

Olga Tribulato

**Ancient Greek Verb-Initial Compounds**



Olga Tribulato

# **Ancient Greek Verb-Initial Compounds**

---

Their Diachronic Development  
Within the Greek Compound System

**DE GRUYTER**

ISBN 978-3-11-041576-6

e-ISBN (PDF) 978-3-11-041582-7

e-ISBN (EPUB) 978-3-11-041586-5

**Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data**

A CIP catalog record for this book has been applied for at the Library of Congress.

**Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek**

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2015 Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin/Boston

Umschlagabbildung: Paul Klee: *Einst dem Grau der Nacht enttaucht ...*, 1918, 17. Aquarell, Feder und Bleistift auf Papier auf Karton. 22,6 x 15,8 cm. Zentrum Paul Klee, Bern.

Typesetting: Dr. Rainer Ostermann, München

Printing: CPI books GmbH, Leck

☺ Printed on acid free paper

Printed in Germany

[www.degruyter.com](http://www.degruyter.com)



This book is for Arturo, who has waited so long.



## Preface and Acknowledgements

I have always been ὀψιανθής, a ‘late-bloomer’, and this book is a testament to it. It began as one of the chapters of my PhD dissertation, submitted to the University of Cambridge in 2005. That thesis addressed topics in dialectal and structural variation in Ancient Greek compounding, with a focus on epigraphic sources: the study of verbal compounds was only a small part of the work. If it has taken me ten years to finally put the word ‘end’ to this research, it is mostly because the topic of structural variation— which my thesis addressed in a very tentative and inexperienced manner—required the kind of attention and in-depth analysis which it was not possible to provide in one chapter or in a series of articles. And yet, for all its length, this book is only a ‘chapter’ itself: it focuses on Greek verb-initial compounds in their interaction with the more pervasive verb-final compounds, but it leaves out other important topics in the structure of compound types and their interaction with one another. My hope is that those who read the book and find it useful may embark on a similar study of other Greek compound categories.

The stimulus to work on the compounds of Ancient Greek came from my Cambridge M.Phil. and Ph.D. supervisor, Torsten Meissner, who taught me Mycenaean Greek and steered my work with matchless patience and good nature: it is a pleasure to record him first in this long list of acknowledgements. That research was generously funded by many institutions: I am grateful to the Faculty of Classics of Cambridge University, the Arts and Humanities Research Board, the Gates Cambridge Trust, and Pembroke College Cambridge for their financial and material support.

The idea that, in order to understand Greek verb-initial compounds, I had to compare them to the morphology of verb-final formations materialized one gloomy afternoon in Cologne, during a stay at the Institut für Linguistik und Historisch-Vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft. I thank Prof. Dr. J. L. García Ramón for the frank talks we had back in 2002. Although he is in no way responsible for what I have written here, I hope that he will appreciate that I stuck to the task that seemed so daunting at the time.

Crucial criticism and eye-opening comments came from my thesis examiners, Jürgen Uhlich and Geoff Horrocks; the latter also provided advice on morphological matters and very kind support at various points in my career, and so did James Clackson with his characteristic generosity and directness. My research on compounding has greatly benefited from talks with Benedicte Nielsen (a fellow ‘compound-addict’), Ollie Simkin (the most knowledgeable and patient person on earth), Io Manolessou, and Antonietta Bisetto, all of whom have kindly put their expertise at my disposal.

This would have been a very different book had several people and institutions not given me the invaluable opportunity to broaden my understanding of many fields of Classical studies and Linguistics in the years that followed my doctorate. In 2005 St John's College Oxford elected me to the Woodhouse Junior Research Fellowship, which gave me time and refreshing freedom to explore other fields of research, including bilingualism, ancient Sicily, comparative religion and (albeit very briefly!) Lithuanian morphology. In this book I have made use of some of my published articles which were written during my JRF at St John's (Tribulato 2006, 2007 and 2010).

By appointing me to a temporary lectureship in Philology and Linguistics in 2007 the Faculty of Classics of the University of Cambridge and Pembroke College Cambridge gave me my first insight into the difficult job of teaching and putting across my thoughts clearly. My dear friend Laura Rossi enabled me to work as an editor for a while—an experience which has taught me about writing and research as well; I am grateful to her for always being on my side throughout the years. Most recently, Italy's Ministero dell'Università, dell'Istruzione e della Ricerca, which elected me to a Rita Levi Montalcini research fellowship in 2010, has enabled me to learn lots about Greek lexicography, philology and literary dialects whilst enjoying the privilege of living in Venice. Here I have been very lucky in having the support and affection of Willy Cingano and Caterina Carpinato, who have helped me find my way in a new place. The Dipartimento di Studi Umanistici at Ca' Foscari University has enabled me to test my ideas on language and literature on their students, who are an integral part of my learning path.

The preparation of the final manuscript of this book benefited from the insightful comments of two referees, the revisions of Michael Carroll and Rachel Barritt Costa, and the careful checks of my heroic assistant, Elisa Criveller; in a period of great stress, she was a veritable haven of serenity and deserves my most heart-felt thanks. Serena Pirrotta, Senior Editor at De Gruyter, also made a huge difference for the final delivery of this project, which she supported from day one with enthusiasm, competence and patience: working with her and her staff at De Gruyter has proven a most rewarding experience.

I have incurred more than one professional and personal debt with Andreas Willi, who has helped me in several ways throughout the years, and always with the intellectual generosity and great humanity which are unique to him. Albio Cesare Cassio has had a huge impact on my development as a scholar and teacher: his example is a constant source of inspiration.

In Cambridge and elsewhere Max and Claudia Sternberg, Vito Tagarielli, Jo Willmott and Marta Zlatić made sure that I had warm food, good friends and a home no matter where I actually lived. Lucia Prauscello has showered me with all her kindness, acumen and inexhaustible energy throughout. Without her, I



would have stopped writing this book at several stages: I am profoundly grateful for her friendship. In the final stages of the book, Marta Cardin, Valentina Copat, Silvia Ferrara, Stefania De Vido and Luca Mondin provided daily cheer and encouragement. I owe all of them more than I can express in a short sentence—they know how important they have been in these last months.

However, I would have never been able to work the way I did without the unfailing and loving support of my extended family and of Sergio in particular, who has showed me the way in the refined art of συνοίκησις among many other things. Above all, I wish to thank two great women, Rosalba and Stefania: without their practical and moral backing, this book would have never happened. I thank them from the bottom of my heart.



# Contents

## List of tables — XVIII

## Abbreviations — XIX

General abbreviations — XIX

Signs and symbols — XX

Bibliographical abbreviations — XX

Ancient authors and works — XXIII

## Introduction — 1

1 Overview — 1

2 Studying AG V1 compounds: scope and aims — 1

3 Methodology: V1 compounds in the context of the AG compound system — 3

4 The Corpus — 4

5 Structure (i): Defining compounding and compound categories — 5

6 Structure (ii): The historical perspective — 6

7 Structure (iii): The use of V1 compounds in context — 9

## Chapter One

### Compounding and the Classification of Compounds — 13

1 Introduction — 13

2 Compounds and compounding — 14

3 The definition of compounds — 14

3.1 Defining criteria: spelling, stress, inflectional markers — 16

4 Ancient Greek compounding as stem compounding — 18

4.1 A typical morphophonological feature: the linking vowel — 20

4.2 Vocalic encounters: hiatus, elision, contraction and lengthening — 24

4.3 Phonological features: accent — 26

4.4 Writing of Greek compounds — 28

5 Semantic approaches to compounding — 30

5.1 Lexicalization and idiomaticity — 31

5.2 Lexicalization and idiomaticity in Ancient Greek — 32

6 Syntactic approaches to compounding — 33

6.1 Synthetic compounds — 34

6.2 Romance compounds — 36

6.3 Recursiveness in compounding — 38

- 6.4 Syntactic approaches to Ancient Greek compounding: inflected FCs and univerbations — 39
- 6.5 Summary — 42
- 7 Towards the classification of compounds: basic criteria — 43
  - 7.1 Heads, headedness and related issues — 43
  - 7.2 Endocentric and exocentric compounds — 44
  - 7.3 Right-headed and left-headed compounds — 45
  - 7.4 Summary — 46
  - 7.5 Syntax and semantics as classificatory criteria — 47
- 8 A model of classification — 49
  - 8.1 Subordinated and coordinated as the two fundamental categories — 50
- 9 The classification of Ancient Greek compounds: introductory issues — 53
  - 9.1 Classic approaches: from Sanskrit to Greek — 53
  - 9.2 *Rektion*, government, verbal nexus — 55
  - 9.3 Endocentric and exocentric in the Greek compound system — 58
  - 9.4 Right-oriented and left-oriented compounds — 60
- 10 Conclusion — 61

## Chapter Two

### The Compound Categories of Ancient Greek — 63

- 1 Introduction — 63
- 2 Coordinated compounds — 63
  - 2.1 Classification issues: endocentric and exocentric coordinated compounds — 64
  - 2.2 Coordinated compounds in Greek — 65
- 3 Iterative compounds — 67
  - 3.1 Iterative compounds in Greek — 68
- 4 Subordinated compounds — 69
  - 4.1 Right-oriented endocentric determinative compounds in Greek — 69
  - 4.2  $[N N]_N$  endocentric determinative compounds — 70
  - 4.3  $[A N]_N$  endocentric determinative compounds — 71
  - 4.4  $[P N]_N$  endocentric determinative compounds — 71
  - 4.5  $[\text{Num } N]_N$  endocentric determinative compounds — 72
  - 4.6  $[P A]_A$ ,  $[A A]_A$  and  $[N A]_A$  endocentric determinative compounds — 73
  - 4.7 Overview of the development of right-oriented endocentric determinative compounds in Greek — 75

- 5 Right-oriented exocentric determinative compounds (bahuvrihis) — 77
- 5.1 Structure, suffixes and accent — 78
  - 5.2 The relationship between bahuvrihis and determinative compounds — 80
  - 5.3 Types and productivity of bahuvrihis — 81
  - 5.4 Metaphorical function of the FC — 83
- 6 V2 compounds — 85
- 6.1 Bound SCs: root compounds — 86
  - 6.2 Bound SCs: compounds in -ής — 88
  - 6.3 Unbound SCs: agentive adjectives and nouns in -ος — 89
    - 6.3.1 Hypotheses on the IE origin of -ος compounds — 89
    - 6.3.2 Compounds in -ος and their *simplicia*: towards a [N N] structure? — 91
    - 6.3.3 On ablaut in the SC — 92
  - 6.4 Unbound SC: agentive compounds in -της (and those in -τηρ and -τωρ) — 93
    - 6.4.1 The rise of -της forms — 94
    - 6.4.2 Morphology and structure of -της compounds — 96
  - 6.5 Summary: agentive compounds in Ancient Greek — 98
  - 6.6 Unbound SCs: compounded participles — 99
  - 6.7 Unbound SCs: verb-second adjectives in -τος — 100
  - 6.8 Unbound second constituents: residual classes — 101
  - 6.9 Greek right-oriented V2 compounds: summary — 102
- 7 Left-oriented subordinated compounds — 103
- 7.1 Prepositional compounds — 104
  - 7.2 Left-oriented determinative compounds — 106
    - 7.2.1 The question of ‘reversed bahuvrihis’ — 106
    - 7.2.2 The *Armstrong* sub-type — 107
    - 7.2.3 [N N]<sub>A</sub> reversed bahuvrihis? — 108
  - 7.3 Left-oriented endocentric determinative compounds with a substantival head — 110
  - 7.4 Determinative compounds with a governing adjectival head — 112
  - 7.5 Left-oriented verb-first compounds and the question of their interpretation — 114
    - 7.5.1 The FC of V1 compounds: descriptive overview — 116
    - 7.5.2 Productivity of Ancient Greek V1 compounds — 116
    - 7.5.3 Exocentricity of V1 compounds — 117
    - 7.5.4 Left orientation and word order patterns — 118
- 8 Onomastics and compounds — 122
- 8.1 Onomastics and V1 compounds — 125

- 9 Compound verbs — 126
- 10 The use of compounds in Ancient Greek — 128
- 11 Conclusion — 130

### Chapter Three

#### The Study of Ancient Greek and Indo-European V1 Compounds in the Last Two Centuries — 133

- 1 Introduction — 133
- 2 The investigation of Greek V1 compounds in the last two centuries: preliminary considerations — 133
- 3 Early nineteenth-century work — 134
- 4 Wilhelm Clemm and the stem hypothesis — 136
- 5 Jacobi, Delbrück and Brugmann: from stems to imperatives — 138
- 6 Beyond the imperatival hypothesis: other approaches to *τερψίμβροτος* compounds — 142
- 7 The syntactic hypothesis and other work on V1 compounds and IE word order — 144
  - 7.1 Further syntactic approaches — 148
- 8 The stem hypothesis reconsidered: recent approaches — 148
- 9 Two twentieth-century works on Greek V1 compounds — 150
  - 9.1 Theodor Knecht's *Geschichte der griechischen Komposita vom Typ τερψίμβροτος* — 150
  - 9.2 Frei-Lüthy (1978) and the influence of onomastics — 153
  - 9.3 On the onomastic origin of V1 compounds: a critique — 155
- 10 Conclusion — 156

### Chapter Four

#### The Historical Perspective: PIE Background and Development of V1 Compounds in Early Greek — 159

- 1 Introduction — 159
- 2 V1 compounds in Indo-European — 160
  - 2.1 The PIE background of V1 compounds — 163
  - 2.2 Summary and working hypothesis: a late PIE bipartite system — 165
- 3 *φερέοικος* type: structure, stems and linking elements — 166
  - 3.1 FCs in -ο- — 168
  - 3.2 FCs in -ι- — 169
- 4 *τερψίμβροτος* type: structure, stems and linking elements — 169
  - 4.1 FCs: -εσι-, -σε- and -σο- — 170
  - 4.2 The synchronic role of action nouns — 172

- 4.3 FCs in -τι- — 173
  - 4.3.1 Do Greek FCs in *-ti-* and *-si-* go back to old action or agent nouns? — 174
  - 4.3.2 The action nouns hypothesis: excursus on the Vedic evidence — 177
- 5 *-ti-* and *-si-* forms: the Mycenaean evidence — 179
  - 5.1 Are *-ti-* forms the ancestors of *-si-* forms? — 183
- 6 V1 compounds in the context of the PIE verbal system — 186
  - 6.1 The derivation of compounds FCs from verbal roots or stems — 188
- 7 Mycenaean compounds as an intermediary stage — 190
  - 7.1 V1 compounds from *\*h<sub>2</sub>er-* — 191
  - 7.2 V1 compounds from *\*h<sub>3</sub>er-* — 192
  - 7.3 V1 compounds from *\*steh<sub>2</sub>-* (or *\*teh<sub>2</sub>-*) — 194
  - 7.4 V1 compounds from *\*k<sub>ens</sub>-* — 195
  - 7.5 V1 compounds from *\*k<sub>end</sub>-* — 196
  - 7.6 V1 compounds from *\*mēd-* — 197
  - 7.7 V1 compounds from *\*nes-* — 197
  - 7.8 V1 compounds from *\*sweh<sub>2</sub>d-* — 199
  - 7.9 The system of V1 compounds in Mycenaean — 199
  - 7.10 Summary — 202
- 8 Compounds in *-ti-* in early alphabetic Greek — 203
  - 8.1 Ὀρίλοχος — 204
  - 8.2 Δωτώ — 204
  - 8.3 βητάρμων — 205
  - 8.4 βωτιάνειρα — 205
  - 8.5 Καστιάνειρα — 206
  - 8.6 ἀρτιεπής — 207
  - 8.7 Summary — 207
- 9 Conclusion — 208

## Chapter Five

### The Analysis Of V1 Compounds Within the Greek Compound System

#### Part I: V1 Compounds Without V2 Counterparts — 211

- 1 Introduction — 211
- 2 Setting up the V1–V2 comparison: corpus and methodology — 212
- 3 V1 compounds without a V2 counterpart: introduction — 213
- 4 Class I: V1 compounds derived from verbs which give rise neither to a V2 compound nor to an agent noun — 214
  - 4.1 Poetic verbs and rare V1 compounds — 218
  - 4.2 Onomastic compound families — 221

- 4.3 Common verbs, rare V1 families (less than four items) — 222
- 4.4 Productive compound families of Class I (four items or more) — 225
- 4.5 Class I: summary — 229
- 5 Class II: V1 compounds without a V2 counterpart deriving from verbs which give rise to agent nouns — 230
  - 5.1 Agent nouns from the verbs in Class II — 232
    - 5.1.1 -της agent nouns — 233
    - 5.1.2 -τηρ and -τωρ agent nouns — 235
    - 5.1.3 Verbs producing agent nouns in -ος — 237
    - 5.1.4 Verbs giving rise to more than one type of agent noun — 238
  - 5.2 Analysis of Class II — 242
  - 5.3 The V1 compounds in Class II — 243
    - 5.3.1 Productive V1 compound families (four items or more) — 244
      - 5.3.1.1 Summary of characteristics — 249
    - 5.3.2 Less productive V1 compound families — 250
      - 5.3.2.1 Summary of characteristics — 254
- 6 Class III: V1 compounds with an intransitive or passive V2 counterpart — 255
- 7 Conclusion — 256

## Chapter Six

### The Analysis of V1 Compounds Within the Greek Compound System

#### Part II: V1 Compounds With a V2 Counterpart — 257

- 1 Introduction — 257
- 2 Class IV: the base verbs, their agent nouns and verbal compounds — 258
  - 2.1 Verbs in Class IV and their agent nouns — 260
    - 2.1.1 Agent nouns and active V2 compounds of the CoC-os type — 262
    - 2.1.2 Agent nouns and active -ος V2 compounds in short vowel — 263
    - 2.1.3 Agent nouns in -τηρ and -τωρ — 264
    - 2.1.4 Agent nouns and V2 compounds in -της — 266
    - 2.1.5 Other types of verbal nouns and compounds with agentive semantics — 268
  - 2.2 Relevance of morphological analysis to the investigation of V1/V2 pairs — 269
  - 2.3 Verbs with only active V2 compounds in -ής — 270



- 3 Competing pairs of V1 and V2 compounds: a contrastive analysis — 271
  - 3.1 Productive compound families — 272
    - 3.1.1 Summary of characteristics — 288
  - 3.2 Less productive compound families — 289
    - 3.2.1 Summary of characteristics — 313
- 4 V1 compounds and deverbative compounds in -ής — 314
  - 4.1 Verbal -ής compounds: a brief history — 315
  - 4.2 -ής formations as the main source of active V2 compounds — 318
    - 4.2.1 Summary of characteristics — 326
  - 4.3 Active -ής compounds complementing other V2 types — 327
- 5 Fulfilling the need of V2 compounds: other right-oriented formations — 332
  - 5.1 Summary of characteristics — 335
- 6 The stylistics of V1 compounds: a few final remarks — 335
  - 6.1 V1 compounds and Greek comic language — 336
  - 6.2 V1 compounds, technical language and scientific discourse — 338
  - 6.3 V1 compounds, phraseology and Greek *Dichtersprache* — 340
    - 6.3.1 Epithets and PNs — 342
    - 6.3.2 Epithets and names in -ιππος — 343
    - 6.3.3 Other compounds and their corresponding phrases — 344
- 7 Conclusion — 344

## Conclusion

**V1 Formations and the system of verbal compounds in Ancient Greek — 347**

## Appendix

**Corpus of V1 Compounds, Their Base Verbs, First Constituents, Corresponding Agent Nouns and V2 Compounds — 359**

Criteria of organization — 359

- 1 Entries — 359
- 2 Classification of verbs and their compounds — 359
- 3 Meanings — 360
- 4 Inscriptions and personal names — 360
- 5 Mycenaean forms — 360
- 6 Dialectal forms — 361
- 7 Dates — 361

Corpus — 361

**Bibliography — 425**

**Index — 442**

# List of Tables

## Chapter 1

- 1.1 Classification of compound categories — 52
- 1.2 Overview of Greek subordinated and coordinated types — 61

## Chapter 4

- 4.1 Transparent V1 compounds with a FC ending in *-ti-* — 175
- 4.2 Mycenaean compounds of the *φερέοικος* type — 180
- 4.3 Mycenaean compounds of the *τερψίμβροτος* and *βωτιάνειρα* types — 181
- 4.4 Parallel *-ti-* and *-s(s)i-* compounds in Mycenaean — 200

## Chapter 6

- 6.1 V1 compounds in scientific authors — 339

# Abbreviations

## General abbreviations

A	adjective
AG	Ancient Greek
acc.	accusative
Adv.	adverb
arch.	archaic
ATAP	attributive-appositive (compounds)
Av.	Avestan
b.	before
C	consonant
c.	century
ca.	circa
dat.	dative
ep.	epigraphic attestation (in the Corpus)
FC	first constituent
fem.	feminine
Fr.	French
gen.	genitive
IE	Indo-European
imp.	imperial (in the Corpus)
It.	Italian
lit.	literally
liter.	literary attestation (in the Corpus)
loc.	locative
masc.	masculine
m.	middle (in the Corpus)
MG	Modern Greek
MS/MSS	manuscript/manuscripts
Myc.	Mycenaean
N	noun
neut.	neuter
nom.	nominative
Num	numeral
OE	Old English
P	preposition
PIE	Proto-Indo-European
pl.	plural
PN	personal name
Port.	Portuguese
ps.	person
Rom.	Romanian
SC	second constituent
sg.	singular

Skt.	Sanskrit
Sp.	Spanish
V	verb
ĩ	short vowel
V1	verb-initial (compound)
V2	verb-final (compound)
Ved.	Vedic
v.l.	<i>varia lectio</i>
VStem	verbal stem

## Signs and symbols

>	'becomes, yields' (in historical changes)
<	'derives from' (in historical changes)
*	reconstructed
**	unattested or ungrammatical
=	'is identical to'
~	'varies with'
//	enclose phonemic transcription
[]	enclose phonetic transcription; enclose compound constituents
<>	enclose graphemes
	line division in poetic texts
√	root

## Bibliographical abbreviations

Abbreviated titles of Classics journals and works quoted in the Bibliography and not included in this list follow those of the *Année Philologique*. Modern linguistics journal titles are not abbreviated.

<i>AP</i>	C. F. W. Jacobs (ed.), <i>Anthologia graeca ad fidem codicis olim Palatini nunc Parisini</i> , revised edn. 3 vols. Leipzig, 1813–1817.
<i>Athen. Mitt.</i>	<i>Mitteilungen des deutschen archäologischen Instituts, Athenische Abteilung</i> . Berlin, 1876–.
Bekker	I. Bekker (ed.), <i>Apollonii sophistae lexicon homericum</i> . Berlin, 1833.
<i>BGU</i>	<i>Berliner griechische Urkunden (Ägyptische Urkunden aus den Königlichen Museen zu Berlin)</i> . Berlin, 1895–.
<i>BKT</i>	<i>Berliner Klassikertexte</i> . Vol. V.1: <i>Griechische Dichterfragmente: Epische und elegische Fragmente</i> . Ed. by W. Schubart and U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf. Berlin, 1907.
<i>BMus. Inscr.</i>	<i>Ancient Greek Inscriptions in the British Museum</i> . Oxford, 1874–1916.
Buck-Petersen	Buck, C. D. and Petersen, W. <i>A Reverse Index of Greek Nouns and Adjectives</i> . Chicago, 1945.
<i>Coll. Alex.</i>	J. U. Powell (ed.), <i>Collectanea Alexandrina</i> . Oxford, 1925.

- Curtius Studien* *Studien zur griechischen und lateinischen Grammatik*. Ed. by G. Curtius (and K. Brugmann vols. 9–10). Leipzig, 1868–1877.
- DGE* P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: Histoire des mots*. Paris, 1968 (New revised edn. Paris, 2009).
- DMic* F. Aura Jorro, *Diccionario micénico*. 2 vols. Madrid, 1985–1993.
- DNP* H. Cancik and H. Schneider (eds.), *Der Neue Pauly: Enzyklopädie der Antike*. 19 vols. Stuttgart and Weimar, 1996–2000.
- EDG* R. Beekes, *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*. With the assistance of Lucien van Beek. 2 vols. Leiden, 2010.
- EM* T. Gaisford (ed.), *Etymologicum Magnum*. Oxford, 1848 (Repr. Amsterdam, 1967).
- Ep. Gr.* G. Kaibel, *Epigrammata graeca ex lapidibus conlecta*. Berlin, 1878.
- GDI* H. Collitz et al. (eds.), *Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften*. 4 vols. Göttingen, 1884–1915.
- GEW* H. Frisk, *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. 3 vols. Heidelberg, 1960–1973.
- GHÅ* *Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift*. Göteborg, 1895–1954.
- Gloss.* G. Loewe, G. Goetz and F. Schoell (eds.), *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum*. Leipzig, 1888–1924.
- Heitsch* E. Heitsch (ed.), *Die griechischen Dichterfragmente der römischen Kaiserzeit*, 2nd edn. Vol. II. Göttingen, 1963.
- IC* M. Guarducci (ed.), *Inscriptiones creticae opera et consilio Friderici Halbherr collectae*. 4 vols. Rome, 1935–1950.
- ICS<sup>2</sup>* O. Masson (ed.), *Les inscriptions chypriotes syllabiques: Recueil critique et commenté*, 2nd edn. Paris, 1983.
- IEL* W. J. Frawley (ed.), *International Encyclopedia of Linguistics*. Oxford, 2003.
- IG* *Inscriptiones Graecae*. Berlin, 1873–.
- I.Ilion* P. Frisch (ed.), *Die Inschriften von Ilion*. Bonn, 1975.
- Inscr. Magn.* O. Kern (ed.), *Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Maeander*. Berlin, 1900.
- K-A* R. Kassel and C. Austin (eds.), *Poetae comici graeci*. Berlin and New York, 1983–.
- KZ* *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung*. Göttingen, 1852–1987 (thereafter = *HSF*).
- LBG* E. Trapp et al. (eds.), *Lexikon zur byzantinischen Gräzität besonders des 9.–12. Jahrhunderts*. Vienna, 1994–.
- Lentz* A. Lentz (ed.), *Grammatici graeci*. Vols. III.1–III.2: *Herodiani technici reliquiae*. Leipzig, 1867 (Reprinted Hildesheim, 1965).
- LGPN* *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*. Oxford, 1987–.
- Vol. I: *The Aegean Islands, Cyprus, Cyrenaica*. Ed. by P. M. Fraser and E. Matthews. Oxford, 1987.
- Vol. II: *Attica*. Ed. by M. J. Osborne and S. G. Byrne. Oxford, 1994.
- Vol. IIIA: *The Peloponnese, Western Greece, Sicily and Magna Graecia*. Ed. by P. M. Fraser and E. Matthews. Oxford, 1997.
- Vol. IIIB: *Central Greece: From the Megarid to Thessaly*. Ed. by P. M. Fraser and E. Matthews. Oxford, 2000.

- Vol. IV: *Macedonia, Thrace, Northern Regions of the Black Sea*. Ed. by P. M. Fraser and E. Matthews, with the assistance of R. W. V. Catling. Oxford, 2005.
- LIV H. Rix et al. (eds.), *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*. 2nd edn. Wiesbaden, 2001.
- LSJ H. G. Liddell, R. Scott and H. Stuart Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon with a Revised Supplement*, 9th edn. Oxford, 1996.
- Maehler H. Maehler (ed.), *Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis*. Vol. II: *Fragmenta Indices*. Leipzig, 1989.
- Monier-Williams M. Monier-Williams, *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*. Oxford, 1899.
- OGI W. Dittenberger (ed.), *Orientalis graeci inscriptiones selectae*. 2 vols. Leipzig, 1903–1905.
- Orbis *Orbis: Bulletin international de linguistique générale et de documentation linguistique*. Louvain, 1952–.
- PBaden F. Bilabel (ed.), *Veröffentlichungen aus den badischen Papyrus-Sammlungen. Griechische Papyri*. 2 vols. Heidelberg, 1923–1924.
- PBerol. = *Berlin Papyri*, cited by inventory no.
- PCairZen. C. C. Edgar (ed.), *Zenon Papyri: Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire*. 4 vols. Cairo, 1925–1931.
- PFlor. *Papiri greco-egizii: Papiri Fiorentini*. Vol. I: *Documenti pubblici e privati dell'età romana e bizantina*. Ed. by G. Vitelli. Milan, 1906.
- PGM K. Preisendanz (ed.), *Papyri graecae magicae: Die griechischen Zauberpapyri*. 2 vols. Stuttgart, 1973–1974.
- P. Lond. *Greek Papyri in the British Museum: Catalogue, with Texts*. London, 1893–Vol. V: Nos. 1647–1911. Ed. by H. I. Bell. London, 1917.
- PMG D. Page (ed.), *Poetae melici graeci*. Oxford, 1962.
- PMGF M. Davies (ed.), *Poetarum melicorum graecorum fragmenta*. Oxford, 1991.
- PMich.Zen. C. C. Edgar (ed.), *Zenon papyri in the University of Michigan Collection*. Ann Arbor, 1931.
- POxy *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri: Published by the Egypt Exploration Society in Graeco-Roman Memoirs*. London, 1898–.
- PPetr. *The Flinders Petrie Papyri: With Transcriptions, Commentaries and Index*. Pt. 2. Ed. J. P. Mahaffy. Dublin, 1893.  
Pt. 3. Eds. J. P. Mahaffy and J. G. Smyly. Dublin, 1905.
- PSI *Papiri greci e latini (Pubblicazioni della Società italiana per la ricerca dei papiri greci e latini in Egitto)*. Florence, 1912–.
- Radt S. Radt (ed.), *Tragicorum graecorum fragmenta*. Vol. III: *Aeschylus*. Göttingen, 1985.
- RV T. Aufrecht (ed.), *Die Hymnen des Rigveda*, 3rd edn. Wiesbaden.
- Σ I. C. Cunningham (ed.), *Synagoge. ΣΥΝΑΓΩΓΗ ΑΕΞΕΣΤΗΝ ΧΡΗΣΙΜΩΝ: Texts of the Original Version and of MS. B*. Berlin and New York, 2003.
- Sammelb. *Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Ägypten*. Vol. I. Ed. by F. Preisigke. Strassburg and Berlin, 1913–1915.
- SIG W. Dittenberger (ed.), *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*, 3rd edn. 3 vols. Leipzig, 1915–1924.
- Stud.Pal. C. Wessely, *Studien zur Paläographie und Papyruskunde*. Leipzig, 1901–.

<i>Tab. Heracl.</i>	<i>Tabulae heracleenses (IG 14.645).</i>
<i>TAM</i>	E. Kalinka (ed.), <i>Tituli Asiae minoris</i> . Vol. II. Vienna, 1920–1930.
<i>TLG</i>	<i>Thesaurus linguae graecae</i> . Online version: <a href="http://www.tlg.uci.edu/">http://www.tlg.uci.edu/</a>
Voigt	E.-M. Voigt (ed.), <i>Sappho et Alcaeus: Fragmenta</i> . Amsterdam, 1971.
Wilson	N. G. Wilson (ed.), <i>Aristophanis Fabulae</i> . 2 vols. Oxford, 2007.

## Ancient authors and works

The abbreviations for the names of Classical and Byzantine authors follow those in *LSJ* and Sophocles (1914). The following less extreme abbreviations have been retained:

Aesch.	Aeschylus
Aristoph.	Aristophanes
Aristot.	Aristotle
Athen.	Athenaeus
Bacch.	Bacchylides
Dem.	Demosthenes
Eur.	Euripides
Hippocr.	Hippocrates
Jos.	Josephus
Lycophr.	Lycophron
Meleag.	Meleager
<i>NT</i>	<i>New Testament</i>
Phil. Epigr.	Philippus Epigrammaticus
Soph.	Sophocles
Theocr.	Theocritus
Thuc.	Thucydides
Xen.	Xenophon





# Introduction

Eine erschöpfende Darstellung der gr. Komposition nach heutigen modernen Gesichtspunkten fehlt.  
Meier-Brügger (1992a: 34).

## 1 Overview

This book provides a study of the diachronic development of compounds with a verbal first constituent (V1 compounds) in Ancient Greek (AG), with a special focus on issues of compound orientation. V1 compounds are just one category—and not even the most prominent one—within the very productive AG compound system. Compounding is a means of word formation which Greek inherited from its parent language, Proto-Indo-European (PIE). But while many features of the Greek compound system are shared with other languages of the IE branch (most notably Sanskrit), AG introduced significant innovations, reshaping inherited categories, developing new ones and dooming others to extinction. For these reasons, AG presents the student of word formation (in Greek, as well as in other languages) with many challenging and fascinating questions, some of which have been only sketchily investigated from a modern perspective, if at all.

The analysis provided in the present book aims to offer a contribution in this direction. Although the study is chiefly addressed to scholars interested in Greek language and literature, it also has the ambition of reaching a wider readership of linguists and of drawing their attention to the many fundamental morphological questions posed by compounding in AG: a language whose far-reaching impact on the development of modern European culture is known to all, but which is becoming increasingly marginalized in modern morphological theory and in typological language models—as though the antiquity of its attestation made it merely the relic of an old-fashioned and outdated linguistic past, which we should now strive to leave behind.<sup>1</sup>

## 2 Studying AG V1 compounds: scope and aims

Within the rich AG compound system, the place occupied by V1 compounds is far from negligible. These formations compound a verbal lexeme (a root or a stem)

---

<sup>1</sup> A relatively recent exception is Lühr (2004), which focuses on some theoretical issues using the evidence provided by Greek and Sanskrit.

and a nominal one, and are mostly used to indicate agents or instruments. For instance, the root φερ- of the verb φέρω ‘to carry’ may be compounded with the stem of the noun οἶκος ‘house’ to form φερέοικος [carry house] ‘one who carries (his) house (with himself)’, an adjectival agentive compound used in Greek to refer to the snail (Hesiod), as well as to nomadic peoples (Herodotus). In another example, κλεψύδρα, the verbal stem κλεψ- ‘steal’ is compounded with the stem ὕδρ- of the word ὕδωρ ‘water’ to create the instrument noun for the water-clock (literally, something which ‘steals water’).

V1 compounds pose specific challenges to morphologists, particularly as concerns the interface between morphology and syntax, and the impact of syntactic structures (including word order) on the patterns of word formation which become productive in a given language. The interest aroused by V1 compounds is visible in most of the many studies on word formation which have appeared over the last decade: from the *Oxford Handbook of Compounding* edited by Lieber and Štekauer (2009a) to the many publications connected to the work of the Bologna-based Morbo-Comp project or arising from the *International Morphology Meetings* and the *Mediterranean Morphology Meetings*. A new study of AG V1 compounds has many insights to offer linguists debating the properties of the V1 category cross-linguistically. Moreover, the most recent monographic studies of AG V1 compounds were published way back in 1946 (Th. Knecht’s *Geschichte der griechischen Komposita vom Typ τερψίμβροτος*) and 1978 (Ch. Frei-Lüthy’s *Der Einfluß der griechischen Personennamen auf die Wortbildung*). Both these works are based on methodological premises which have been largely superseded nowadays, among them a tendency to bypass systematic data-collecting and statistics in favour of analyses closely focusing on literature (Knecht) or early linguistic stages (Frei-Lüthy, who does not go beyond Mycenaean and Homeric Greek: for both, see Chapter 3, section 9).

Since the question of the origin of the V1 type in PIE is central to its understanding in AG, most of the nineteenth- and twentieth-century contributions addressing V1 compounds also have tended to privilege historical reconstruction over the systematic study of the V1 category in its diachronic development within AG (a desideratum which the present monograph aims to fulfil) and of the morphological and semantic phenomena characterizing AG V1 compounds as a whole. Combining the methodology of classic philological studies of AG V1 compounds with that adopted in typological studies of compounding, the investigation of AG V1 compounds provided in this book aspires to offer a multi-faceted approach addressing the diachronic dimension (i.e. how V1 compounds developed from the late PIE phase to Mycenaean, Homeric and Classical and post-Classical Greek) as well as the synchronic dimension (i.e. which verbs produce V1 compounds and how these are used in specific contexts).

### 3 Methodology: V1 compounds in the context of the AG compound system

The methodological premise underpinning this study as a whole is that V1 compounds should not be examined in isolation, but in the wider context of the AG compound system. In Greek, the very existence of the V1 type is surprising, since its left-oriented structure goes against the right-headed orientation of the compound system. More importantly, V1 compounds have a powerful competitor: the large class of verb-final (V2) compounds, many of which express the same agentive semantics by combining a nominal first constituent (FC) with a verbal second constituent (SC). Compounds of this kind are sometimes the exact counterpart of V1 ones: the adjective *οικοφόρος* ‘carrying the house’, for example, combines the same lexemes and has the same meaning as *φερέοικος*, the V1 compound quoted above.

The fact that in AG both patterns survive and are productive raises several questions. Are V1 compounds formed through different processes compared to V2 compounds? Do V1 compounds express different semantic nuances compared to their V2 counterparts? Is the productivity of V1 compounds tied to specific linguistic registers or chronological periods? In other words: are V1 compounds marked formations that stand in contrast to V2 ones, to be interpreted as the standard, unmarked ones? Some of these questions have received more attention than others in past investigations of the AG V1 type. In particular, there has been a noticeable fascination with issues of style and register, which has produced works aiming to prove that V1 compounds fulfil different semantics and functions than V2 ones (e.g. Benveniste 1967). Contributions focusing on the comparative perspective have also attempted to explain the ‘markedness’ of V1 compounds by arguing that they reflect the marked word order of the parent language and, consequently, that they arose to fulfil specific semantic functions, such as the expression of wishes or orders.<sup>2</sup>

My methodological perspective is profoundly different. I do not hold the investigation of syntactic structures, both in AG and at an earlier stage, to be unfruitful, but I maintain that this is not the central issue to be investigated by anyone wishing to understand the *productivity* of V1 compounds in AG. In order to explain why these V1 ‘exceptions’ exist and are relatively numerous in a right-headed language such as Greek, we need to investigate them from the point of view of their structural and semantic relation to the V2 type. The analysis of each of the one hundred and fifty-eight V1 compound families collected in the present

---

<sup>2</sup> E.g. Bergaigne (1875–1878: 30–34), Jacobi (1897: 73–74), Brugmann (1905–1906), Brugmann (1906: 63–64), Lehmann (1969: 2), R. Schulze (1979), Tischler (1979), Dunkel (1992: 200).

study shows that many V1 types were produced as a means to overcome the morphological or structural constraints of the V2 type. Moreover, any understanding of the morphological factors affecting the development and use of a V1 form alongside or in opposition to a V2 compound must necessarily be based on an understanding of the morphological behaviour of the base Greek verbs and their PIE roots, as well as on a deep knowledge of the agentive verbal formations produced by these verbs, i.e. agent nouns and V2 compounds in -ος (e.g. οἰκοφόρος ‘carrying the house’), -της (e.g. κυνηγέτης ‘dogleader, hunter’) and -ης (e.g. θυμοδακίς ‘soul-biting’). These methodological premises inform the synchronic analysis contained in the central section of the present study, Chapters 5 and 6. These two chapters investigate the formation processes and productivity of V1 compound families, comparing them with the V2 compounds and/or simple agent nouns produced by the same base verbs. The parallel existence of other left-oriented compound categories in Greek (on which see Chapter 2, section 7) suggests that V1 compounds were preserved and further developed in Greek precisely to fill the morphological and semantic gaps left by the pervasive right-oriented type. The detailed comparison of V1 and V2 compounds provided in Chapter 6 will show how the low or late productivity of many V2 compound families goes hand in hand with the relatively high productivity of V1 compounds.

## 4 The Corpus

As mentioned above, none of the previous investigations of AG V1 compounds attempt to build a full corpus of forms, since these studies either focus on a limited timespan (often coinciding with the language of a specific author, usually from the Archaic or Classical period), or select examples from different centuries, without an overarching treatment of the development of the V1 type over time.<sup>3</sup>

The Corpus provided in the Appendix is the fullest collection of V1 compounds attempted so far. It is based on existing corpora (such as *LSJ*, Buck-Petersen, Schwyzer (1939), Tserepis (1902), Waanders (2008) and the *LGPN*), but reorganizes their data according to chronological and morphological criteria. For each verb producing V1 compounds the entry in the Corpus also lists the type(s) of FC, the appellative compounds (‘appellative’ is a term which simply identifies

---

<sup>3</sup> The following studies deal with specific authors or literary genres. Homer: Stolz (1874), Magnien (1927), van Strien-Gerritsen (1973), Risch (1974); Hesiod: Stolz (1874), Troxler (1964); Pindar: Tessing (1884), Glaser (1898); Herodotus: Karassek (1880); Thucydides: Holmes (1893). Tragedy: Schultz (1882), Richards (1918), Williger (1928); Aristophanes: Bielecki (1899), da Costa Ramalho (1952). Other works addressing individual compound categories are quoted in Chapter 2.

non-onomastic formations) and the onomastic compounds with their meanings, as well as any simple agent nouns or V2 formations derived from the same verbs. All these data have been coordinated by making extensive use of the online *TLG*, which enables lemma and substring searches: through these, it has been possible to search for all derivations from a given root/stem, thus obtaining a comprehensive picture of the interaction between V1 compounds, V2 compounds, agent nouns and other verbal formations from the same roots. Although the present investigation focuses on AG, which extends between 1400 BC (Mycenaean) and the end of the sixth century AD, data from Byzantine Greek have also been included in the Corpus, especially when they provide important insights into the development of certain compound categories or agent nouns.

## 5 Structure (i): Defining compounding and compound categories

Along with the need to study V1 compounds in relation to V2 ones, a more general assumption underpins the present study: that the comparison between V1 and V2 compounds must take into consideration the prevailing tendencies in the AG compound system (above all, orientation), as well as the development of certain other compound categories. For this reason, the study of V1 compounds is preceded by two more general chapters devoted to compounding as a linguistic phenomenon.

**Chapter 1** addresses the theoretical premises that shape compounding as a universal phenomenon. The need to provide a general chapter of this kind before embarking on a very technical study of a specific class of AG compounds springs from the observation that the state of research on compounding in AG is still very much biased towards the traditional approaches of comparative philology, which grew out of German nineteenth-century linguistics and are much influenced by Sanskrit studies. Although numerous contributions tackle individual AG compound categories and their morphological properties from a modern linguistic perspective, Classical (and more generally comparative) linguists are well aware that a comprehensive study of compounding in AG and a study of IE compounding from a modern perspective are both yet to be produced.<sup>4</sup> This book, which focuses on one class of compounds in relation to others, is obviously unable to fill this gap. However, Chapter 1 aims to make a contribution to the way we may think about AG compounds from a modern perspective, focusing on areas which are central to the current debate on compounding (headedness, exocentricity, incor-

---

<sup>4</sup> The much-awaited volume on compounding of the *Indogermanische Grammatik* is still under way: see Lindner (2011), (2012), (2013).

poration in verbal compounds) and, at the same time, valuable for the study of V1 compounds (see in particular the debate concerning the thorny classification of the so-called synthetic compounds—or compounds with a verbal SC).

While this viewpoint is geared towards students of Greek linguistics, the chapter also pursues the broader aim of making the AG material more accessible to students of general linguistics. For this reason, the AG forms quoted in this book are all translated, and basic information that may be redundant for Classical linguists is included. In particular, Chapter 1 dwells on the peculiarities of AG compounding (stem compounding, linking elements). These properties are often overlooked in typological models of compounding, which are overwhelmingly slanted towards non-inflectional languages (English) or on lexeme-based systems (as Romance is, to some extent).

**Chapter 2** provides a comprehensive overview of all AG compound categories. This sets the ground for the morphological investigation offered in the book, while also serving a different purpose: to provide an accessible and at the same time exhaustive introduction to Greek compound categories for non-Classicists. The very decision to investigate V1 compounds from a perspective which is first and foremost morphological and structural, and only secondarily stylistic or literary, has been made in the hope of providing a useful point of reference for linguists working on V1 compounds in other languages. Those characteristics which separate V1 compounds from other types, including their contiguity with syntactic structures, are amply discussed in the relevant sections of chapters 1 and 2; the latter pays special attention to the left-oriented compound categories and their morpho-syntactic properties.

Chapters 5 and 6, which exclusively focus on AG, offer other useful insights into linguistic issues such as the thematic roles fulfilled by AG V1 compounds and the factors determining their productivity (for instance the need for morphological transparency), as well as their interaction with other compound categories (chiefly synthetic compounds). In this regard, we shall often pay attention to the great productivity of AG V1 compounds in the onomastic lexicon, a feature which is well known to those who study V1 compounds in English and Germanic, since in these languages V1 compounds, an otherwise marginal category, are mostly of an onomastic nature.

## 6 Structure (II): The historical perspective

Aside from the issue of the interaction between V1 and V2 formations in a compound system which is particularly rich in verbal compounds, AG V1 compounds present historical linguists with the more pressing question of their origin. As

already mentioned, V1 compounds exist in other IE languages of ancient attestation, ranging from the Indo-Iranian branch (where this type is more productive) to isolated examples of more difficult interpretation in Latin, Germanic and Celtic (instances of V1 compounds in Romance and Slavic are briefly discussed in Chapter 4). This suggests that the V1 type did not arise independently in Greek and Indo-Iranian but was a feature shared by both, and most probably inherited from PIE. Indeed, the PIE origin of V1 compounds has been a dominant assumption in studies of IE compounding since the birth of comparative philology. The comparison between the Greek and Indo-Iranian examples, however, brings out a number of controversial issues centring around two key questions: first, whether the Greek V1 type characterized by *-si-* and synchronically linked to the *s*-aorist has its roots in a linguistic stage which precedes Greek itself; and secondly—and more importantly—whether V1 compounds in PIE were created according to the principle of stem compounding (the most prevalent form of compounding in AG) or whether they are early examples of inflectional compounding, arising from syntactic phrases. This issue, which is related to the debate on the rules of PIE word formation, also has a huge impact on the way scholars describe the diachronic development of V1 compounds in the early phases of Greek (i.e. Mycenaean and Homeric Greek) and consequently the mechanisms governing V1 compounds at a synchronic level.

Since the diachronic perspective is so central to the study of AG V1 compounds, the synchronic analysis provided in Chapters 5 and 6 is preceded by two chapters which address the historical issues in detail. **Chapter 3** looks at the ways in which AG and ancient IE compounds have been studied over the past two centuries, and functions as a hinge between the theoretical and structural issues studied in Chapters 1 and 2 and the analysis of Greek compounds provided in Chapters 5 and 6 (and to some extent Chapter 4). Far from providing unnecessary padding, Chapter 3 examines the roots of certain ways of thinking about V1 compounds which have deeply influenced the subsequent linguistic debate. The controversies over whether the FC of V1 compounds was originally a noun, an inflected verbal form or a verbal stem—a small chapter in the history of the early development of comparative philology—have shaped contemporary interpretations of Greek V1 compounds. The present investigation does not refrain from identifying areas of semantic or structural overlap between syntactic phrases and V1 compounds, an approach which has its roots in the works of scholars from Jacobi (1897) and Brugmann (1905–1906) down to Benveniste (1967) (all of whom variously favour the hypothesis of a syntactic origin of the V1 type in PIE) and which has more recently informed interesting studies on IE phraseology (briefly sketched in Chapter 6, section 6.3). At the same time, however, the morphological analysis provided in this book takes a step towards the identification of the FC as

a verbal root or stem, thus contributing to parallel debates in the field of Romance linguistics. Different FCs are distinguished by different markers: *-e-* for stems connected to the thematic present, *-si-* for stems connected to the s-aorist, *-o-* for a variety of thematic stems (some of them going back to nouns). In the long history of Greek some of these markers clearly evolved into mere linking devices, semantically empty elements which have the function of bridging the transition from the FC to the SC (*Kompositionsfuge*) and of ensuring the morphological transparency of the stem.

This idea is fully developed in **Chapter 4**, which provides an investigation of the prehistory of AG V1 compounds. In order to understand the morphology of the FC and of its final elements it is necessary to start by studying the early attestations of the V1 type ending in *-ti-* in Mycenaean Greek. The uniquely onomastic nature of the Mycenaean V1 compounds and the difficulties inherent in Linear B spelling conventions require considerable caution as concerns the identification of linguistic forms and their meaning. The part of Chapter 4 focusing on Mycenaean and Homeric Greek V1 compounds in *-ti-* is mostly concerned with highlighting the factors which contributed to preserving this inherited type against its transformation into the *-si-* type. The proposition of Chapter 4 is that FCs in *-ti-* were prototypically based on bare roots which found their appointed verbal formation in the root aorist, as opposed to those based on present stems (marked by *-e-*). This hypothesis is presented within a brief overview of the PIE verbal system which, according to the most authoritative reconstruction, seems to have been based on a formal, semantic and aspectual opposition between the present and the aorist.

The connection of at least one AG V1 category with the aorist is clear: as already noted, compounds characterized by *-si-* are synchronically derived from the stem of the s-aorist and this view is not disputed. The origin of the *-si-* element however continues to be debated. An influential explanation maintains that *-si-* arises from *-ti-* through the sound change of assibilation: the corollary of this is that *-si-* forms are a uniquely Greek innovation. Scholars who adopt this view also tend to posit the origin of *-ti-* compounds in PIE nouns (specifically, action nouns in *-tis*) rather than verbs. The question is not easily settled, but Chapter 4 contributes two insights which count against this view: firstly, the fact that—as just mentioned—many Mycenaean compounds in *-ti-* may be interpreted as being connected to simple roots rather than action nouns; and, secondly, the fact that the proposed structure, with action nouns in the FC, goes against the structural tendencies of the IE compound system.

In order to critically assess the traditional ‘action noun hypothesis’, it is important to pay due attention to the handful of V1 compounds in *-ti-* attested in Vedic. The present study is only tangentially interested in the Sanskrit com-



pound system, and the overview of Sanskrit V1 compounds provided in Chapter 4 is necessarily sketchy and dependent on the work carried out by other scholars. However, in section 4.3.2 I consider the view that Vedic *-ti-* compounds are affected by specific Vedic-internal and mostly poetic factors (such as rhyming phenomena and an artificial inversion of the constituent order), which raise the question of whether Vedic faithfully reflects the PIE situation.

The picture of AG V1 compounds which emerges from Chapter 4 is that of a system in swift evolution at the turn of the second millennium BC. Greek inherits V1 compounds characterized by *-e-* and *-ti-* from PIE and perhaps (though this proposition must necessarily remain speculative) also the category of V1 compounds linked to the *s*-aorist. While this tripartite system seems to endure in Mycenaean, the transition to the next linguistic stage, testified by Homeric Greek, leads to the loss of the *-ti-* type and to the widespread development of compounds with FCs in *-si-*. Compounds in *-e-* with their subtypes in *-o-* and *-i-* (sections 3.1–3.2) are used throughout AG, but the type in *-si-* achieves a high level of productivity, becoming part of a derivational cycle which also includes the *s*-aorist, the future, and action nouns in *-sis* (which appear to have greatly increased from the fifth century onwards, partly as a consequence of the tendency towards nominalization 4.2).

The historical investigation is particularly useful to correct views about the productivity and specialization of V1 compounds in Greek and my analysis will particularly concentrate on individual families which have remained productive throughout the history of the language. Although I make only sporadic forays into MG and its compounds, the evolution of the V1 type from Ancient to Medieval Greek and finally Modern Greek deserves a study in its own right. Works in this direction (e.g. Andriotis (1938)) have shown that V1 compounds, together with other left-oriented types of AG, survive throughout Medieval and early Modern Greek: the perception of them as learned or marginal formations must therefore be revised in the light of this linguistic continuity.

## 7 Structure (III): The use of V1 compounds in context

The synchronic analysis provided in **Chapters 5 and 6** also aims to offer a systematic investigation of the contexts in which individual V1 compounds occur. Part of this investigation obviously concerns literary texts, particularly those of a poetic nature. The study of the incidence of compounds in relation to literary style lies at the core of the pioneering monograph by G. Meyer (1923), according to which the higher or lower frequency of compounds in a given text is connected to the level of ‘pathos’ of its style. This kind of approach, which investigates the

use of compounds vis-à-vis stylistics and pragmatics (and not merely because they are found in a given author or literary genre), has generally not been followed by other scholars, with the notable exception of Williger (1928) and da Costa Ramalho (1952)—the latter having focused on compounds in Aristophanes' comic style.

In the analysis of individual V1 compounds, attention will be paid to phenomena of register variation, allusion, and structural artificiality. Previous studies of Greek V1 compounds have often highlighted these characteristics of the category, but this approach has also led to the frequent generalization that V1 compounds are specific to poetry, or indeed almost exclusive to it. It is not surprising that compounds, including V1 ones, are frequently used in poetic language, given its predilection for condensed and allusive modes of expression. While paying due attention to phenomena which are clearly of a more 'poetic' or 'artificial' nature, the analysis of Chapters 5 and 6 will also consider the use of V1 compounds in technical prose and in what may justifiably be perceived as 'standard language'. Greek literary language also employs compounds which do not have an especially poetic flavour, which are simultaneously attested in inscriptions and which, therefore, were probably common in the spoken language too. Obviously, our reconstruction of a 'common' or 'popular' language is bound to rely on written documents, almost all of which are standardized: but the fact that V1 compounds are also attested in non-literary documents is evidence in favour of their use in 'standard' or at any rate less literary language.

A similar perspective informs the analysis of the role played by V1 compounds in Greek onomastics. It is undeniable that V1 names are an important part of the Greek onomastic stock. In a way, this is self-evident: since V1 compounds represent condensed verbal expressions, it is hardly surprising that they prove popular in the prototypical description of individuals, identified either through the actions/qualities which their parents wish to associate them with, or those they habitually perform (the latter being a function specifically tied to nicknaming). Indeed, even in languages in which V1 compounds are not a productive type, their use as onomastic expressions is high. Yet we should be wary of inferring information about the remote origin of the V1 type in a given language or even in the parent language from this state of affairs. The notion that V1 compounds were prototypically created as onomastic expressions—and thus that they were endowed with a particular meaning and function (a notion which also affects the interpretation of their FCs as imperatival or desiderative forms)—is pervasive in the literature on V1 compounds in PIE and in Greek. The monograph by Freilüthy (1978) spells this out in its very title: *Der Einfluß der griechischen Personennamen auf die Wortbildung*. However, it is only necessary to go through the collections of Greek PNs in Bechtel (1917) or in the *LGPN* to see that V2 compounds are

equally present in the onomastic stock, but this has not led anyone to claim that the origin of individual categories of V2 compounds in PIE is onomastic.

The sensible way to look at the interaction between V1 compounds and onomastics is to analyse the mechanisms ruling individual compound families in order to gain insights into the behaviour of onomastic patterns more generally. Most V1 names are part of larger groups of formations from the same verbs and their structure and productivity are almost never independent from those of the base verb and its other formations. Rather than thinking in terms of an influence of onomastics on Greek word formation patterns, it may be more fruitful to pay attention to the considerable impact of 'general' (i.e. appellative) word formation patterns on Greek onomastics. Drawing these threads together, the analysis of Chapters 5 and 6 aims to contribute towards a better understanding of the use and semantic specificities of the V1 type in AG.



# Chapter One

## Compounding and the Classification of Compounds

### 1 Introduction

This chapter provides an overview of the main issues concerning compounding from a typological point of view and has two aims. The first is to introduce Classicists to concepts which are useful for the analysis of Greek compound categories and to the topics which are most vigorously debated in current morphological research. This is a particularly urgent requirement in Classical studies, since available accounts of Greek compounding usually adopt a traditional framework, which largely disregards the methodologies developed by modern linguists. In particular, this chapter clears the ground regarding the definition of compoundhood, the spelling of compounds, the analysis of accentual patterns, the study of headedness and the distinction between exocentricity and endocentricity, thereby setting the stage for the classification of AG compound categories provided in Chapter 2.

Since a study of AG compounding within a modern framework remains a desideratum, the second aim of this chapter is to make the defining characteristics of AG compounding better known to linguists who work on modern languages.<sup>1</sup> It may come as a surprise that in the recent *Oxford Handbook of Compounding* edited by Lieber and Štekauer (2009a) there are no chapters focusing on individual ancient IE languages and even the diachronic overview by Kastovsky (2009) has some notable omissions.<sup>2</sup> With this in view, the present chapter dwells on those elements which characterize compounding in Greek vs. compounding in English (the use of stems, the presence of a linking vowel at the end of the FC), as well as on general areas of interest (writing and accentuation patterns, the orientation of compounds).

---

1 Lühr (2004) is a step in this direction, but does not cover all areas of interest.

2 In considering the early syntactic approaches to IE compounding—with a strong bias towards Jacobi (1897)—Kastovsky (2009) does not address compound orientation. Also omitted is a discussion of accentual patterns, except for the difference between prefixed verbs and their derivations. An overview of the diachronic development of certain compound categories (e.g. [N N] compounds) would also have been welcome, particularly since some of these categories have become very productive in later chronological stages of IE.

## 2 Compounds and compounding

By its most basic definition, a compound is a word formed by two or more lexemes (e.g. *girlfriend*) or lexical stems (e.g. *Francophile*). The morphological process through which a compound is created is called compounding ('nominal composition', *nominale Komposition* or, simply, *Komposition* are more common terms in Classical linguistics).<sup>3</sup> The kind of compounding studied in this book and introduced in this chapter does not involve forms combining a prefix and a verbal basis (English type *overlook*, AG *ἐπιγράφω* 'write over, incise'), nominals derived from them (e.g. *overlooking*, AG *ἐπιγραφή* 'inscription') or the combination of two verbs (English type *sleep-walk*, MG type *τρωγοπίνω* [eat drink] 'eat and drink'), which is unattested in AG.<sup>4</sup>

Compounding is a widely exploited type of word formation cross-linguistically, which has been studied from a wide range of methodological perspectives. In recent decades the study of compounds and their classification has seen the English language attain a particular prominence. This is the consequence of two facts: the high productivity of compounds in English, which has prompted in-depth studies of their characteristics; and the development of new linguistic approaches in English-speaking countries. As a result, the bulk of bibliography on compounding has, as a *sine qua non*, always engaged with English and its compound categories. Although this has favoured the use of a largely shared terminology on the part of linguists belonging to different schools, it has also caused some disadvantages. This chapter focuses on some elements of tension between current approaches to compounding and the approaches and traditional terminology used in the study of ancient IE languages, and AG in particular.

## 3 The definition of compounds

The previous section began with a basic definition of what a compound is, which non-experts may consider satisfactory. Yet we need only browse a number of introductions to compounding to realize that the status of compound ('compoundhood' in linguistic jargon) is a hotly debated topic, perhaps the very heart of the disputes between linguists of different credos.

Let us start from a simple definition:

A compound is a word which consists of two or more words.  
Fabb (1998: 66).

<sup>3</sup> On terminology in IE linguistics, see too Lindner (2011: 4–6).

<sup>4</sup> See Chapter 2, section 9.

This description of compounds, which is provided in a general introduction to compounding in a general handbook of morphology, echoes the following classic definition of English compounding:

When two or more words are combined into a morphological unit, we speak of a compound.  
Marchand (1969: 11).

Both definitions can be criticized from two angles. First, they assume that the concept of ‘word’ does not require any further definition. Secondly, they ignore the problem that a large number of compounds result from the joining of elements which do not occur as independent *words* in the lexicon of a given language. Although this is a problem of minor importance in English (the language to which these definitions apply), we can appreciate its relevance by considering an English word such as *Gallophile*: neither member of this compound is an independent *word* in English.

An alternative definition may thus prove to be more accurate and unambiguous:

Compounding is the process through which a compound lexeme is derived from two or more simpler lexemes.  
Matthews (1991: 83).

In this case, the problematic term *word* is replaced by the technical term *lexeme*. This substitution brings some advantages.<sup>5</sup> For instance, it allows for the presence of constituents which are not entire *words*, but simple or complex stems, i.e. ‘uninflected parts of independent words that do not themselves constitute independent words’.<sup>6</sup> A large number of languages use stems in compounding: Greek, both Ancient and Modern, is prominent among them. In our example, *Gallophile* ‘lover of French culture’, both constituents can be analysed as Neoclassical simple stems. In its derivation *Gallophilia* ‘love of French culture’, the lexeme *-philia* is a complex stem: it is formed by the simple stem *phil-* ‘love’, followed by the morphological suffix *-ia*, which is specialized for the derivation of feminine nouns.

Not all linguists will agree with this view. Radical morphologists may contest that, from the point of view of English, *Gallo-* is a prefix and *-phile* is a suffix: *Gallophile* therefore is not a compound, but a derivation. Such analyses look at the status of constituents from a synchronic point of view, aside from their histor-

---

<sup>5</sup> See also Kastovsky (2009: 324) and Lindner (2011: 4–13), specifically on IE compounding, the latter with a bibliographical excursus.

<sup>6</sup> Lieber and Štekauer (2009b: 5).

ical origin. Yet it has equally been noted that the exclusion of Neoclassical forms such as *Gallophile* from compounding is unsatisfactory precisely on synchronic grounds, since these forms share many characteristics with native compound patterns and are usually granted compound-status by native speakers.<sup>7</sup> Consider for instance the now pervasive term *gastropub*, a form which combines a Neoclassical stem (*gastro-*) with a common English word (*pub*) to identify a pub serving restaurant-like food. Again, grammars treat *gastro-* as a prefix, but most speakers who know the Neoclassical word *gastronomy* would conclude that *gastropub* is nothing else than a compound.

These examples show not only that theoretical definitions of compounds can differ considerably, but also that the interpretation of individual forms is a matter of debate. As a consequence, much work has been devoted to the study of other interpretative approaches, with the aim of reaching a more problem-free definition.

### 3.1 Defining criteria: spelling, accent, inflectional markers

In order to circumvent some of the problems inherent in classifications of compounds which are based solely on the morphological description of the constituents, other approaches focus on criteria as diverse as spelling, phonetics (particularly accent), semantics, internal syntax and lexicalization. Some of these criteria are easily criticized, especially if they aspire to be universal. For instance, spelling (i.e. the writing of compounds as one graphic unit, with or without internal hyphens) is not a sound criterion for English, where the orthography of compounds is notoriously variable and where even the same form may be spelled differently. A case in point is the spelling of one of the terms with which this book is concerned: both *word formation* and *word-formation* are used in the literature, and both forms are considered compounds. Other provisos may apply to languages whose orthography and writing traditions differ from those of modern-day Europe, and we will return to this point apropos of AG in section 4.4.

Similarly, the so-called ‘stress test’, widely applied for the identification of compoundhood in English, is not uncontroversial. In its basic formulation, the stress test assumes that the accentual pattern of compounds is different from

---

<sup>7</sup> Bauer (2003: 46), Kastovsky (2009: 326). The issue of the classification of Neoclassical compounds is much debated, as is the question of the classification of its constituent elements. For in-depth discussion, see Marchand (1969: 132, 218) Bauer (1998), Petropoulou and ten Hacken (2002), Lieber (2009b: 364). Scalise and Bisetto (2009: 47), in my opinion rightly, conclude that Neoclassical compounds ‘are generally encompassed in the subordinated class [...] The use of the neoclassical label therefore is only a means for describing the kind of constituent that is used’.



that of phrases and predicts that proper compounds will bear only one accent, usually on the left-hand element. The classic examples adduced in this case are *blackbird* ([ˈblækbɜ:(r)d]), a compound which indicates a specific bird, belonging to the *Turdus* genus, vs. *black bird* ([ˈblæk ˈbɜ:(r)d]), a phrase indicating any type of black bird.<sup>8</sup> However, mono-accentuation alone cannot be considered an infallible criterion for compoundhood either, since both constituents may preserve their original accentuation (*word-formation* [ˈwɜ:(r)d fɜ:(r)meɪf(ə)n]) or one of them may acquire a secondary stress for emphasis (as in *man-made* [ˈmæn ˈmeɪd]).<sup>9</sup> When we turn to AG, any consideration concerning accent must take into account writing practices and the transmission of texts, as we will see shortly in section 4.3.

Another criterion, again developed for English, looks at the way inflectional markers are placed within compounds. It predicts that these markers will only be placed in the head of compounds, which for the time being we may define as its leading constituent: this is the so-called ‘isolation rule’ (or ‘inseparability’ / ‘lack of modification’ of the FC). If a given form receives inflectional markers in its non-head, it is probably not a compound. *Black cat* may be changed into *blacker cat*, but the compound *blackbird* has no form such as *\*\*blackerbird*, because the isolation rule predicts that comparative suffixation, as is the case here, can only occur in the head (which is *bird*).<sup>10</sup> Consider a further example, the sequence *student book*. If it is a compound, this sequence will receive the plural ending on its head, giving us *student books*. If, on the other hand, the sequence takes inflectional markers in its non-head, as in the form *students’ books*, it is not a compound, but a phrase referring to the books owned by individual students.

It is useful to note that tests such as the ‘isolation rule’ have their source in the fact that, typically, English compounding involves a large number of what morphologists call ‘syntactic compounds’ and which the uninitiated may simply describe in terms of being ‘more than one word’: *word formation* and *student book* are two examples of syntactic compounds. The isolation rule and the stress test are applied precisely to distinguish English syntactic compounds from mere noun phrases. The isolation rule too falls short as a criterion, however, since the results which it produces are frequently doubtful. Consider for instance the sequence *women’s literature*. The presence of number marking and inflectional ending in its non-head *women’s* goes against the isolation rule; moreover, the sequence has two stresses. Yet semantics and lexicalization encourage us to treat this phrase as

<sup>8</sup> Matthews (1991: 97).

<sup>9</sup> See Sears (1972: 41) and Matthews (1991: 98). A review of the matter is provided by Lieber and Štekauer (2009b: 8–11), with up-to-date bibliography.

<sup>10</sup> Sears (1972: 42).

a syntactic *compound*, contradicting the results of the previous two tests. As concerns AG, section 6.4 will consider the case of forms displaying an inflected FC: under discussion will be the question whether and to what extent it may be useful to speak of *univerbations* in these cases, and we will also take the opportunity to note that, crucially, in AG some linking elements look like inflectional endings, a phenomenon which does not occur in English.

#### 4 Ancient Greek compounding as stem compounding

Unlike the Sanskrit grammarians (see section 9.1), ancient Greek scholars did not devote a lot of attention to the definition of compounds. They contented themselves with distinguishing compounding proper (σύνθεσις, with its derivation σύνθετον ‘compound’) from the process of juxtaposition (παράθεσις: essentially forms with an inflected FC, παράθετα), and the extant sources do not offer any form of theorization.<sup>11</sup> The first characteristic that distinguishes Greek compounds from those of many other languages, particularly English, is that the usual basic definition ‘a compound is the joining of two or more words’ does not apply.<sup>12</sup> Greek compounds typically involve a FC that does not correspond to a full ‘word’ but to a stem, and a SC which may consist of either a stem or an independently attested word, but which usually displays special derivational suffixes when used in compounding.

While the English compound *classroom* can be described as being composed of two words, it is more problematic to say the same of the Greek compound κουροτρόφος lit. ‘young men-nurturer’, i.e. ‘nurturer of young men’, and even more so of the form βουπλήξ ‘ox-goad’. In κουροτρόφος the FC κουρο- corresponds to a stem, not to a full ‘word’, which in its nominative singular is κοῦρος ‘boy’ (κόρος in the Attic dialect); the SC, -τρόφος, corresponds to the autonomous word τροφός ‘nurse’, but we should note, in the first place, that the compound does not retain the accent of the *simplex*. In βουπλήξ the FC βου- is a stem, corresponding to no autonomous form of the word βούς ‘ox’; the SC consists of the verbal root πλῆγ- (the same on which the derived present πλήσσω ‘strike’ is based), which in the nominative singular is followed by the inflectional suffix -ς

<sup>11</sup> Debrunner (1917: 17), Lindner (2011: 6). This may be due to the loss of pre-Imperial Greek grammar, but even later grammarians show little interest in definition: Herodian for instance discusses several examples of compounds (e.g. 3.2.35.11–14, 3.2.47.20–21 Lentz), but always in connection with individual literary passages or accentuation rules. For the definition in Dionysius Thrax’ *Grammar*, see Lindner (2011: 29).

<sup>12</sup> On stem compounding in Greek and Sanskrit, see Lühr (2004: 109–110).

(yielding -πληξ). The literature classifies βουπλήξ as a ‘verbal root compound’ on account of the fact that the stem or noun contained in the SC lacks an overt derivational morpheme (Chapter 2, section 6.1). The general principle that can be derived from these examples is that, on the whole, Greek compounding is stem compounding. In its basic definition, a stem is

a word-class-specific lexeme representation stripped of any inflectional endings, which has to combine with additional derivational and/or inflectional morphemes in order to function as a word.

Kastovsky (2009: 324).

According to Ralli (2009: 457), the use of stems rather than words is connected to the fact that certain languages, including Greek, have stem-based inflectional morphology: the exclusion of inflectional or derivational markers from the FC would appear to be *the* defining characteristic of compounding in these languages. Far from forming systematic categories, Greek compounds with inflected FCs are exceptional cases, and their syntactic origin (however remote) is easy to prove. The question also has important consequences for the analysis of Greek V1 compounds. In Chapter 2, section 7.5.4, and Chapter 4, the idea that the FCs of such compounds represent old inflected forms is criticized: going in the same direction as current analyses of [V N] compounds in Romance and other languages, I maintain that the FCs of Greek V1 compounds contain roots or stems, to which compound markers may be attached. The morphological criteria behind V1 compounds therefore follow the general properties of Greek compounding.

With regard to the nature of the SCs, as already noted, it is possible to distinguish between compounds in which the SC corresponds to an autonomous word (the case of κουροτρόφος vs. τροφός) and compounds in which the SC is a bound form (the case of βουπλήξ).<sup>13</sup> However, our capacity to draw such a distinction attenuates considerably when our focus is on a language which is no longer spoken. Any conclusion drawn from AG depends on the state of the documentation and may be overturned by the discovery of new texts or by a fresh analysis of familiar ones. Some AG autonomous words are attested suspiciously late in comparison to their compound forms, and historical linguists are often led to conclude that some *simplicia* are back-formations from compounds. For instance, simple s-stem adjectives in -ής such as ψευδής ‘false’ derive from the very common class of s-stem compounded adjectives in -ής (Chapter 2, section 6.2);

---

<sup>13</sup> Describing MG compounds, which continue Classical types albeit with a high degree of simplification, Ralli (2009: 456) similarly concludes that ‘[Stem Stem] and [Stem Word] are the two possible structures of most Greek compounds’.

while agent nouns in *-της* (Chapter 2, section 6.4) are thought to arise from their compounded counterparts. Depending on how the relation between compounds and *simplicia* is judged, the interpretation of these two compound classes changes considerably, with consequences for our understanding of AG compounding as whole.<sup>14</sup>

Another category that linguists often debate is the productive type of verbal compounds ending in *-ος*, of which *κουροτρόφος* is representative. This category displays both SCs that correspond to autonomous words (as *κουροτρόφος*) and SCs which do not, among which two common subgroups are those in *-ποιός* ‘maker’ and *-ουπυός* ‘worker’. There is, therefore, no consensus as to the original status of this category: are they prototypically compounds, from which later *simplicia* derive as back-formations? Or are they the compound forms of autonomous words? The fact that the accent of the compounds is usually different from that of the *simplicia* is often used as proof that these formations ought not to be treated as [N N] compounds. We will return to this issue in section 9.2 and Chapter 2, section 6.3.2.

#### 4.1 A typical morphophonological feature: the linking vowel

The FC of Greek compounds can be an adverb (e.g. *εὖ-* ‘well’), a preposition (e.g. *ἐν-* ‘in’), a nominal stem (e.g. *κουρο-* ‘young man’) or a verbal stem (e.g. *φερε-* ‘bring’): on the interpretation of such stems, see Chapter 4, sections 3 and 6.1). An ambiguous case is represented by the so-called particles (e.g. *ἀ(v)-* ‘without’, *δυσ-* ‘badly’). Classic accounts of AG compounding rank them among compound constituents, but since these particles do not occur as autonomous words in the language, it remains an open question whether, from the point of view of morphological theory, formations like *ἄμορφος* ‘without form’ and *δύσμορος* ‘ill-fated’ should not be considered derivations rather than compounds.

When adverbs and prepositions feature in compounds their formal appearance is the same as when they are used as autonomous words, but nominal and verbal FCs are usually represented as bare stems. The most common stems end in *-ο-* or *-ᾱ-/η-*, *-ι-* and *-υ-*: these stems derive from either a root provided with a derivational suffix (the most common of which are *-ο-* and *-ᾱ-/η-*), or from vocalic stems, as in examples (1a–d) below:

<sup>14</sup> Grandi and Pompei (2010: 210–211).

(1)

- a. Noun: ἵππος ‘horse’  
 Stem: ἵππ- (root) + -ο- (suffix)  
 FC: ἵππο-  
 Compound: ἵππόδαμος ‘horse-tamer’
- b. Noun: βουλή ‘counsel’  
 Stem: βουλ- (root) + -η- (suffix)<sup>15</sup>  
 FC: βουλη-  
 Compound: βουληφόρος ‘counsel-bringing’
- c. Noun: πόλις ‘city’  
 Stem: πολι-  
 FC: πολι-  
 Compound: πολίαρχος ‘city-ruler’
- d. Noun: ἄστυ ‘town’  
 Stem: ἄστυ-  
 FC: ἄστυ-  
 Compound: ἄστυάναξ ‘city-lord’.

Some consonantal stems of the third declension may create compound FCs which show the bare stem:

(2)

- a. Noun: πῦρ ‘fire’  
 Stem: πυρ-  
 FC: πυρ-  
 Compound: πυρκαϊά lit. [fire-burning] > ‘funeral pyre’
- b. Noun: ἔπος ‘word’  
 Stem: ἐπ- (root) + οσ-/-εσ- (suffix)<sup>16</sup>  
 FC: ἐπεσ-  
 Compound: ἐπεσβόλος lit. ‘word-throwing’ > ‘speaking hastily’.

**15** The Greek first declension is characterized by two types of suffixes: -ᾱ (ᾱ), which in the Attic-Ionic dialect (and later in Koine Greek) yields -ῆ (ῆ); and -ᾶ (ᾶ) < \*-jǎ.

**16** Third-declension s-stem neuter nouns (type ἔπος, γένος) are formed with the ablauting suffix -es-/-os-, whose modifications are linked to the inflectional paradigm of s-stems nouns in PIE: in Greek, -os- characterizes the direct cases of the singular, while -εσ- (usually not kept in this form through loss of intervocalic [s], resulting in hiatus and contraction) characterizes all other cases.

In practice, though, this distribution is perturbed in Greek by the intervention of analogy, often responding to needs of morphological transparency or phonological convenience. The most common phenomenon is the spread of -o- from FCs of the second declension to other stems, as in (3a) and (3b):<sup>17</sup>

(3)

- a. Noun: πῦρ ‘fire’  
 Stem: πυρ-  
 FC: πυρ-**ο**-  
 Compound: πυροβόλος ‘fire-darting’
- b. Noun: ὕλη ‘wood cut down’  
 Stem: ὕλ- (root) + -η- (suffix)  
 FC: ὕλ-**ο**-  
 Compound: ὕλοτόμος ‘woodcutter’.

Synchronically, πυροβόλος and other third-declension consonantal FCs look as if they have derived from the genitive singular (-ος) and this formal similarity may perhaps be behind the spread of -o- to these stems:

(4)

- a. Noun: ἀσπίς ‘shield’  
 Stem: ἀσπιδ-  
 FC: ἀσπιδ-**ο**- (cf. the gen. sg. ἀσπίδος)  
 Compound: ἀσπιδοφόρος ‘shield-bearing’.
- b. Noun: κύων ‘dog’  
 Stem: κυν-  
 FC: κυνο- (cf. the gen. sg. κυνός)  
 Compound: κυνοκλόπος ‘dog-stealer’.

In (4a–b), -o- is a semantically empty element, whose morpho-phonological function is limited to providing a bridge between the constituents: it does not signify gender, number or case. With the passing of time, -o- became the only linking vowel in Greek, an element which according to Ralli (2009: 455) signifies compoundhood itself in MG: ‘items such as this -o- constitute markers, the primary function of which is to indicate the process of compound formation’. Ralli further

<sup>17</sup> See Lindner (2011: 45). In diachronic terms, the use of -o- in first-declension nouns may be interpreted as a relic from the stage when the ancestors of feminine nouns belonged to the thematic declension, being a type of thematic collective. However, in Greek the spread of -o- to individual first-declension forms seems to be ruled by analogy.

argues that the obligatory presence of such marking is to be explained by the inflectional richness of Greek and the fact that its compounds are stem-based: in languages with no inflection, or where compounding is mostly based on lexemes which occur independently, this marking is not needed.<sup>18</sup>

In AG, compound markers of this kind were originally much more numerous than the -o- which has survived into MG. Just as in the case of -o-, vocalic elements originally belonging to stems were detached from them and used as linking vowels.<sup>19</sup> For instance, -ι- is originally at home in three types of FCs: those from i-stem nouns, as in (2a); those from s-stem nouns belonging to the ‘Caland system’, such as καλλι- from κάλλος ‘beauty’;<sup>20</sup> and those in which -ι- is the relic of an old dative (e.g. δουρικλυτός ‘spear-famous’, probably deriving from the phrase δουρὶ κλυτός ‘famous for the spear’). From these prototypical categories, -ι- spread to other FCs, where its function was restricted to that of a mere linking element. We can see this clearly in the development of compounds with the FC πυρι- as opposed to πυρ-, as in (1a), or πυρο-, as in (3a), and, more importantly, in V1 compounds of the types τερψίμβροτος ‘delighting men’ and βωτιάειρα ‘feeding men’, where -ι- is not part of a stem or root and is devoid of any meaning: it may have been imported into this category by analogy with other classes.<sup>21</sup>

Even -η- was extended from Attic-Ionic first-declension constituents, such as those in (1b), to other types of stems: see for instance ἐλαφρηβόλος ‘deer-shooting’ vs. ἔλαφος ‘deer’ and θαλαμηπόλος ‘bedchamber maid’ vs. θάλαμος ‘bedchamber’. These early examples feature in the language of the Homeric poems and are most probably influenced by the metre, since the expected ἐλαφοβόλος and θαλαμοπόλος, with their sequences of more than two light internal syllables, would not fit the hexameter. The FC may therefore employ a linking vowel according to the morpho-phonological features of the compound and to the needs of the texts in which it is used. Vocalic stems in -υ- and -αυ- are much rarer than those in -ο-, -ᾱ-/-ῆ- and -ι-.

**18** Ralli (2008b), Ralli (2009: 455).

**19** Other accounts speak of ‘compound markers’ or ‘interfixes’. For such interfixes in early IE, see Lindner (2011: 52).

**20** The so-called ‘Caland system’ concerns, among other elements, FCs deriving from adjectives in -ρός or those s-stem neuters in -ος which correspond to comparatives in -ιων and superlatives in -ιστος (e.g. κάλλος with καλλίων, κάλλιστος). In these FCs, the suffixes -ρός and -οσ-/-εσ- are replaced by -ι-: in all appearances, this vowel is a linking element. For a basic introduction to this aspect of the Caland system, see Risch (1974: 218–219), Meissner (2006: 14–16), Rau (2009: 67–77), Lindner (2011: 62–70).

**21** For a full analysis of this series of developments, see Chapter 4, sections 3.2, 4 and 6.1. See also Lindner (2011: 69–70), particularly for the hypothesis that some of these FCs may derive from old verbal nouns.

Many compounds whose FC is a verbal stem feature  $-\epsilon-$  at the end of the FC: this most probably derives from the thematic vowel, which may be attached to roots (e.g.  $\varphi\epsilon\rho-$ ) to form the stem of the thematic present ( $\varphi\epsilon\rho-\epsilon/\omicron-$ ). It is more problematic to infer from this that the FC of  $\varphi\epsilon\rho\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\upsilon\kappa\omicron\varsigma$  compounds was an inflected verbal form—for instance the present imperative  $\varphi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon$  ‘carry!’—from which the compounds would have derived by way of univerbation.<sup>22</sup> There are many problems with this hypothesis. Most accounts do not clarify whether or not in the individual Greek *specimina* this  $-\epsilon-$  is still endowed with syntactic and semantic functions (most notably the expression of time and verbal number). Also, the Greek forms are clearly not univerbations any longer: for the sake of the argument, even if the remote source of  $\varphi\epsilon\rho\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\upsilon\kappa\omicron\varsigma$  were the phrase  $\varphi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon$   $\acute{\omicron}\iota\kappa\omicron\nu$  ‘carry the house!’, the fact remains that the resulting compound contains the adjectival suffix  $-\omicron\varsigma$  and has therefore undergone a process of derivation (on the role of these suffixes, especially in exocentric compounds, see Chapter 2, section 5.1). It may be safer to assume that  $\varphi\epsilon\rho\epsilon-$  and comparable FCs are composed present stems in which  $-\epsilon-$  derives from the thematic vowel but does not have a semantic function (Chapter 4, sections 3 and 6.1). The verbal semantics of the FC is expressed by the verbal stem as a whole.

#### 4.2 Vocalic encounters: hiatus, elision, contraction and lengthening

Because of the spread of linking elements, the majority of AG FCs end in a vowel, even when the stem from which they derive is consonantal. This poses special problems when the SC itself begins with a vowel, as AG tends to not tolerate vocalic hiatus.<sup>23</sup> There are four possibilities in this case:

(1) The hiatus is preserved: examples include compounds in  $-\omicron\epsilon\rho\gamma\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ , in which  $-\omicron-$  is the linking element and  $-\epsilon\rho\gamma\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$  is the SC meaning ‘worker’; or  $\acute{\alpha}\omega\rho\omicron\varsigma$  ‘untimely’, in which the negative prefix  $\acute{\alpha}-$  encounters the SC derived from  $\acute{\omega}\rho\alpha$  ‘time’. Hiatuses of this kind often conceal older stages in which the SC began with phonemes later lost in Classical Greek: [w], as in  $\varphi\epsilon\rho\gamma-$  ‘work’ yielding  $-\epsilon\rho\gamma\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ , and [h] (< \*s- or \*j-), as in  $\acute{\omega}\rho\alpha$  ‘time’ (< \*j-). In some varieties of Classical Greek (includ-

<sup>22</sup> See e.g. Debrunner (1917: 37) and still, recently, Lühr (2004: 29), Grandi and Pompei (2010: 212). See also Chapter 3, sections 3 and 7.

<sup>23</sup> This section purposely simplifies the topic of Greek *Kompositionsfuge* in order to make it accessible to those who are not Indo-Europeanists. For a basic modern introduction to *Kompositionsfuge* in Greek, see Meier-Brügger (1992a: 38–39); for a full appraisal in a comparative perspective, see Lindner (2011: 44–70).



ing Attic) the initial aspiration of the SC -ωρος may also have been pronounced word-internally (the phenomenon known as ‘interaspiration’), but in most other varieties it was probably lost at an early stage (and even in Attic internal [h] is likely to have been articulated very feebly).

(2) The linking vowel is elided: see e.g. φιλά<sup>ν</sup>θρωπος ‘loving mankind’ < \*φιλο-ανθρωπος vs. φιλό-σοφος ‘loving wisdom’.

(3) The two vowels are contracted: this solution is taken in many compounds in -ο-οργός, whose contracted version is -ο<sup>υ</sup>ργός. Similarly, compounds in -ο<sup>υ</sup>χος ‘having’ derive from -ο-οχος, in which -ο- is the linking element, while -οχος derives from ἔχω ‘to have’. These contractions usually replace the hiatuses created by the conditions described under (1).

(4) There is no linking element and the initial vowel of the SC is lengthened rather than elided or regularly contracted. Examples include:

- στρατᾶγός ‘army leader’ vs. ἄγω (expected situations \*\*στρατᾶγός or \*\*στρατωγός).
- ἰππῆλατος ‘driven by horses’ vs. ἐλάω ‘drive’ (expected situations \*\*ἰππ-έλατος or \*\*ἰππούλατος);
- ὁμώνυμος ‘having the same name’ vs. ὄνομα ‘name’ (expected situations \*\*ὀμόνυμος or \*\*ὀμόνυμος).

The phenomenon described in (4) is known among Indo-Europeanists as ‘Wackernagel’s lengthening’, since it was first explained by J. Wackernagel.<sup>24</sup> The lengthened vowels in question have been traditionally viewed as the result of special ancient ‘contractions’: they cannot be regular contractions as the resulting long vowel is always wrong.<sup>25</sup> The phenomenon is now viewed as a kind of compensatory lengthening triggered by the loss of the IE laryngeals in Greek, which colour and lengthen the preceding vowel.<sup>26</sup> Thus, -ᾶγός shows reflexes of the initial \*h<sub>2</sub> of ἄγω, -ηλατος of the initial \*h<sub>1</sub> of ἐλάω and -ώνυμος of the initial \*h<sub>3</sub> of ὄνομα.<sup>27</sup> Classical Greek extended or ignored this type of lengthening largely according

<sup>24</sup> Wackernagel (1889).

<sup>25</sup> See e.g. Debrunner (1917: 59).

<sup>26</sup> Beekes (1971), Meier-Brügger (1992a: 38). The classic account of the development of the IE laryngeals in Greek is Beekes (1969). For a short overview, see Rix (1992: 36–39). For laryngeals in IE *Kompositionsfuge*, see Lindner (2011: 52–61).

<sup>27</sup> -ᾶγός is always quoted as the classic example of the reflexes of \*h<sub>2</sub> in *Kompositionsfuge*, but the [a:] is probably the result of analogy, since the sequence \*-o-h<sub>2</sub>- is expected to yield [ɔ:] (ω) in Greek: see Lindner (2011: 54 n. 28) for a discussion.

to analogy, and often out of rhythmical concerns, such as the need to avoid a sequence of too many light syllables.

### 4.3 Phonological features: accent

In the Greek texts printed in modern editions, all the forms identifiable as compounds show only one accent which, in keeping with the rules of Greek accentuation, falls on one of the last three syllables: this corresponds to the situation in MG.<sup>28</sup> In principle, however, there is no certainty that these texts faithfully represent the situation in spoken Greek, an issue that is also relevant to the spelling of compounds. First, the diacritics for marking accent are a Hellenistic invention, but most manuscripts omit to use them regularly until the seventh century AD. More importantly for our purposes, AG also applies monoaccentuation to sequences of two or three ‘words’ which form a unit in accentual terms. In this case, Greek grammars distinguish between the ‘enclitic accent’, when a word loses its accent and is joined to the preceding one from the point of view of accentuation (e.g. *καί μιν* ‘and him’) and ‘proclitic’ accent, when a word loses its accent and is joined to the following one from the point of view of accentuation (e.g. *ἐκ κεφαλῆς* ‘from the head’). Moreover, in some archaic texts word division is represented in a different way from later texts and the guiding principle is clearly accent: punctuation, when used, tends to mark off accentual units rather than ‘words’.<sup>29</sup> These examples show that inferring the status not only of the notion of ‘compound’ but also of that of ‘word’ from accent is highly problematic in AG and caution should be exercised when accent is used as a test to determine compoundhood.<sup>30</sup>

Modern texts are often edited in view of the practical rules described by the AG grammarians, chiefly Aristophanes of Byzantium, Aristarchus and Herodian.<sup>31</sup> Even these instructions betray a high degree of variation, however, and this prompted Vendryès (1945: 188) to conclude that incoherence is more frequent than regularity. Keeping this in mind, we may note that the following phenomena are typical of those lexical units identifiable as compounds:

**28** Ralli (2013: 79–84).

**29** See e.g. the Linear B example *e-ke-de-mi*, corresponding to *ἔχει δέ μιν* ‘and he has him/it’. Archaic inscriptions sporadically confirm that enclitics and proclitics were not marked as independent units: see for instance *ἠοπαῖς : καλός : ναί* (Attic vase): ‘The boy : (is) fine : yes’, where the article *ὁ* is considered part of the following word. Further examples are discussed by Morpurgo Davies (1987).

**30** For a practical application of this issue, see Hoenigswald (2004: 179).

**31** On the Greek grammatical tradition, see Probert (2006: 21–45).

(1) When the SC corresponds to an autonomous word, the accent of the compound will often be different from that of the autonomous word: the compound, that is, behaves as a new lexical unit, to which the general Greek accentuation rules apply.<sup>32</sup> Thus, although ἀκρόπολις ‘high city’ is arguably a type of πόλις ‘city’, its accent nevertheless moves to the antepenultimate syllable (this is possible because the last syllable is light).

(2) In some well-defined categories of compounds, the accent can go against the general rules of Greek. For instance, while passive V2 compounds of the type ὄρεσίτροφος ‘reared on mountains’ (Chapter 2, section 6.3) follow the trisyllabic rule (acute accent may go on the penultimate or antepenultimate syllable if the last one is light), their active counterparts, formed with the same type of SC, tend to keep the accent on the penultimate syllable: thus κουροτρόφος against \*\*κουρότροφος, which would be equally possible.<sup>33</sup> This accentual opposition is fundamental to the distinction between the passive and the active understanding of the SC (-τροφος) and is generally consistent (see too Chapter 2, section 6.3.1).

(3) In s-stem compound adjectives in -ης, the accent falls mostly on the last syllable, where it tends to be acute if the antepenultimate is light (εὐγενής ‘well-born’), but may also be circumflex, usually if the SC contains an old contraction (thus Περικλῆς < Περικλέφης). If the antepenultimate syllable is heavy, however, the accent tends to be paroxytone (e.g. θρασυμήδης ‘bold of plan’).<sup>34</sup> As Περικλέφης shows, this retraction of the accent also affects compounds with light antepenultimate syllable when they are used as PNs: compare the name Διογένης vs. the adjective διογενής ‘born of Zeus’.

Other rules, concerning specific sub-classes, are listed in Debrunner (1917: 77–79) and Vendryès (1945: 189–199); we will return to some of them in the context of the classification of AG compounds in Chapter 2.

<sup>32</sup> This still holds in MG: see Ralli (2009: 456–457).

<sup>33</sup> As a matter of fact, the original position of the accents in these compounds seems to have been on the last syllable, as for instance in σφορβός, as is suggested by the parallels in Sanskrit (e.g. *go-ghan-á-* ‘oxen-killing’). By the so-called Wheeler’s Law, in oxytone dactylic words the accent moves from the last to the penultimate syllable: thus \*\*βουληφόρος (compare φορός ‘bringing, productive’) becomes βουληφόρος ‘counsel-bringing’. This shift is also extended to compounds that do not have a dactylic rhythm, so that we have κουροτρόφος instead of \*\*κουροτροφός. A number of exceptions apply: in particular, the accentuation of active V2 compounds such as ἵππόδαμος ‘horse-taming’, which Vendryès (1945: 193) defines ‘inexpliquée’, may derive from bahuvrihi: see further Chapter 2, section 6.3.1.

<sup>34</sup> For the accentuation of compounds in -μηδης, see Pontani (2008).

#### 4.4 Writing of Greek compounds

In section 3.1 we saw that the way in which compounds are written is not a helpful criterion for distinguishing English proper compounds from syntactic phrases on account of the lack of a fixed orthographic rule. In AG and other languages of ancient attestation we face two additional practical issues: the orthographic rules in use at the time when a given compound entered the text, and the transmission of the text itself. As noted above, in addition to being written mostly in capitals and without diacritical marks for a large part of its history, AG was also usually written in *scriptio continua*, i.e. without word separators. The epigraphic texts which do use word separators are rare enough to constitute a self-contained group, which means that scholars are unable to derive detailed rules about the perception of compounding vs. syntactic phrases. A notable exception are the second-millennium Mycenaean Linear B tablets, which make systematic use of word separators, but even in this case issues of detail remain unclear: see for instance the discussion of the apparently two-word compound *ke-re-si-jo we-ke* ‘Cretan-made’ (in which the word separator is usually taken to be a mistake) in Chapter 6, section 4.1.

Rather than external appearance, the real differentiating criterion for compoundhood in AG is to be found in the fact that the inflectional nature of the language allows for an automatic distinction of syntactic phrases from compounds. In phrases, the relation between the constituents is made clear by inflectional markers, as in *κούρου τροφός* ‘nurturer of the child’. In compounds, by contrast, the inflectional elements with the responsibility of indicating the relation between the constituents are lost, as in *κουροτρόφος* ‘rearing children’. The difference between the two forms is therefore morphological, not graphic. To take another compound class, the difference between a prepositional phrase and a prepositional compound is usually evident from the fact that in the phrase the noun governed by the preposition is inflected in the case-form required by the preposition (e.g. *ἐν κεφαλῇ* ‘inside the head’), whereas the compound is marked by the derivational suffix *-ος* (sometimes also *-ιος*) in place of the governed case: *ἐγκέφαλος* ‘within the head’ > ‘brain’.<sup>35</sup>

AG still contains a number of ambiguous cases, however. Consider the Homeric adjective *κορυθαίολος* ‘with glancing helmet’ (discussed in Chapter 2, section 7.2.2). Its SC corresponds to an adjective autonomously attested in Greek: *αἰόλος* ‘quick-moving’. This fact is important for the interpretation of

---

<sup>35</sup> The use of suffixes is particularly required in exocentric categories, such as prepositional compounds: see further Chapter 2, section 7.1. In *ἐγκέφαλος* γ represents [η], arising from assimilation of *ἐν* to the initial [k] of *κέφαλ*.

κορυθαίολος, because there are no morphological markers (such as the suffixes mentioned above) that distinguish the SC of the compound from the simple adjective. Accentuation too is an unhelpful criterion for compoundhood in this case. κορυθαίολος is variously accented in modern texts: the most common accentuation is regressive (κορυθαίολος) but the grammarian Herodian (3.1.228.12–13 Lentz) advised that the compound was to be accented like the *simplex* and this is why the accentuation in *LSJ* is κορυθαίολος.<sup>36</sup> More importantly, there are no morpho-phonological features such the presence of a linking vowel or the lengthening of the initial vowel of the SC that signal *Kompositionsfuge*. In principle, we may even doubt that κορυθαίολος is a compound at all. The sequence <KOPYΘAI-OΛOΣ>, written in continuous writing, can be rendered as both κορυθαίολος and κόρυθ' αίολος: the latter is a two-word phrase in which κόρυθ(α) is an accusative of respect restricting the meaning of the adjective ('swift/glittering as concerns the helmet': essentially the same meaning as the compound). Thus there is no formal criterion which guarantees the classification of the Homeric adjective as a compound, and if we tend to do so it is because in our texts the form is written (and hence interpreted) as one word rather than as a phrase.

This leads us to the second practical problem, the mode of transmission of AG texts. The Homeric poems are a good example. It is assumed that these texts were written down after a relatively long oral phase sometime around or after the eighth century BC. The graphic conventions in use at the time involved *scriptio continua*, the use of capitals, the absence of diacritics and (in most local varieties of the alphabet) the absence of graphemes for /e:/ and /o:/ sounds. At some point, this old text was transliterated into a more modern script (the phenomenon known as *metagrammatismós*), a transformation which requires interpretative choices in the realms of phonology (particularly as concerns the quality of /e:/ and /o:/ sounds and initial aspiration) and word-division. In the particular case of κορυθαίολος we are lucky to have Herodian's testimony, which shows that the interpretation as one word has ancient authority. In most other cases, however, linguists depend entirely on the choices made by ancient and modern editors, a fact which underlines the differing nature of the challenges facing ancient and modern linguists.

---

**36** Herodian based this accentuation on the fact that, in his opinion, the SC derived from the verb αιώλλω 'to shift rapidly' rather than from the adjective. The image conveyed by the compound probably refers to the shining of the helmet rather than to physical movement: the meaning is analysed in Chapter 2, section 7.2.2, following the interpretation of Méndez Dosuna (2011) and Méndez Dosuna (2012).

## 5 Semantic approaches to compounding

The previous sections briefly brought semantics into the picture through a consideration of its role in the definition of compoundhood. Before reviewing some of the proposed approaches, we must pay attention to the term ‘semantics’ itself. Although the term evokes the idea of ‘meaning’, investigating the semantics of compounds involves much more than an elucidation of what a compound *means*, and it has become part of complex conceptual models, such as the Parallel Architecture theorized by Jackendoff (1990) or the Lexical Semantics posited in Lieber (2004).

Lieber (2006), Lieber (2009a), Jackendoff (2009), and Jackendoff (2010) all propose models to investigate the semantics of complex words (and thus also of compounds), and these models focus on the semantic functions of minimal units such as affixes and simple lexemes. These minimal units are classified within a model of representation which, in turn, allows the semantic classification of more complex units, on the assumption that ‘the meaning of a compound is a function of the meanings of its constituents’.<sup>37</sup> Lieber identifies basic semantic functions (which she calls the ‘semantic skeleton’): one example is ‘material’, which defines substances and essences and corresponds to the syntactic function of ‘noun’. To these quite abstract functions Lieber adds more concrete ones, which she calls the ‘semantic body’: these are functions influenced by culture and personal perception, for instance the notion of ‘animate’ as an embodiment of the semantic function of ‘material’.<sup>38</sup>

Recent contributions have applied these theoretical frameworks to the definition of compounds, which in turn is intimately bound up with the classification of individual compound categories.<sup>39</sup> Although in principle these are two separate questions, they share many assumptions: to classify compounds according to different criteria (semantic, morphological, syntactic...) means first to have a notion of which criteria rule the joining of individual lexemes into compounds. By applying conceptual semantics to their classification of compounds (to which we will return later) Bisetto and Scalise (2005), followed by Scalise and Bisetto (2009), for instance implicitly recognize its differentiating role in telling compounds apart from non-compounds.

Another recent semantic approach to compounds is Onomasiology, which has flourished in Central Europe and posits that meaning drives patterns of word formation. Onomasiology privileges the cognitive analysis of word formation over

---

<sup>37</sup> Jackendoff (2009: 115).

<sup>38</sup> See the examples in Lieber (2009a: 82–87).

<sup>39</sup> Lieber (2009a), Jackendoff (2009) and, to an extent, Scalise and Bisetto (2009: 48–49).

its formal analysis, focusing on the roles of the speaker and the hearer, and on their perception of language. Conceptual structures are expressed by means of general categories (e.g. ‘substance’) which are then further classified according to their properties (e.g. ‘quality’, ‘action’, ‘agent’, though the details are very different in each model) and these in turn are used to describe compounds and other patterns of word formation. As pointed out by Grzega (2009: 218), onomasiological accounts of word formation do not usually distinguish compounding from other morphological processes, since all are analysed according to the same onomasiological categories. Grzega’s model is the only one which distinguishes the ‘junction of morphemes’ (and thus not only lexemes) from other types of ‘name-giving processes’ (e.g. loanwords) by the use of the term ‘composite’.

Apart from the odd theoretical foray into the definition of compounds vis-à-vis other types of word formation, Onomasiology—like Lexical Semantics—is mostly tailored towards the classification of individual compound types, providing an alternative model for thinking about the relation between compound constituents. It is interesting, for instance, that the different onomasiological models agree on separating forms such as *strawberry*, *gooseberry* and *raspberry*—which in traditional accounts belong to the same compound category, [N N] subordinated compounds—into different classes.<sup>40</sup>

### 5.1 Lexicalization and idiomatcity

When a word is adopted into the lexicon of a language and becomes a readily available means of denoting a required concept, we speak of the lexicalization of that word. In compounds, lexicalization entails that two or more lexemes have become indissolubly linked from a semantic point of view, so that the determiner cannot be substituted without a complete change in meaning (for a definition of ‘determiner’, see next section).<sup>41</sup> For instance, while in the phrases *red clothes* and *black clothes* the difference in meaning caused by the change of determiner is limited (both indicate something which remains the same regardless of its colour), the compound *blackbird* (indicating a specific species of bird and not just a black bird) cannot be changed into *\*\*brownbird* without the semantics of the whole word being considerably altered.

A consequence of lexicalization is idiomatcity.<sup>42</sup> Spencer (1991: 312) draws attention to the fact that ‘compounds are often subject to a semantic drift of a

<sup>40</sup> Grzega (2009: 231-232).

<sup>41</sup> Faiss (1981: 141).

<sup>42</sup> For an account of idiomatcity as applied to compounding, see Kavka (2009).

kind associated with stored words, which means that their meaning becomes non-compositional or even totally idiosyncratic'. He exemplifies this with the Turkish compound *şıp sevdi*, lit. [plop! + he-has-fallen-in-love] > 'impressionable'. Idiomaticity stems from the combined effect of three phenomena: the specialization of certain lexemes as compound constituents, resulting in their subsequent grammaticalization; their parallel disappearance from common language as independent words; and phonetic and morphological changes. It is this phenomenon which has turned Old English compounds into Modern English 'words', and OE words into Modern English suffixes: see for instance *lord*, deriving from the OE compound *hlafweard* 'master of the loaves' > 'master of the house' (from *hlaf* 'loaf' and *weard* 'keeper'), and *childhood*, deriving from the OE compound *childhad*, where *had* is the word identifying state or condition.

## 5.2 Lexicalization and idiomaticity in Ancient Greek

Lexicalization and idiomaticity are also frequent in AG. The former is a very common feature of compounds, but not all lexicalized compounds have constituents which are semantically and morphologically obscure: the V1 compound κλεψύδρα lit. 'steal-water' does not immediately evoke the idea of a water-clock, but its meaning is nevertheless explicable from the semantics of the individual constituents. Idiomaticity on the other hand is typical of forms whose meaning has no immediate connection with the original semantics of the constituents. An account of idiomaticity in Greek compounding is beyond the scope of this chapter and indeed of the whole volume, but the fact that the V1 compounds collected in our Corpus remain quite transparent makes such an account a pressing desideratum.

A special case of idiomaticity concerns forms whose morphological make-up has been obscured by changes in phonology, morphology and the lexicon, with the result that the individual components were probably difficult to analyse for speakers. For instance, in δάπεδον 'floor' the SC is the semantically transparent πέδον 'ground', but only comparative linguistics clarifies that the FC is the zero grade \**d̥m-* of the root \**dem-* 'to build', which is also behind the word δόμος 'house'. δάπεδον meant therefore literally 'the floor of a house', but the structure of the compound was obscured in AG. In the word for 'stool', δίφρος, the FC can still be linked to the adverb δίς 'twice', but the SC is a bound form which speakers are unlikely to have linked to the verb φέρω 'to carry': again, the original meaning of the compound was literal (a stool is something that can be 'carried at both sides'), but the morphology of the form was unclear in Classical Greek.



A similarly obscured SC is contained in ἄριστον ‘breakfast’, which features the adverb ἄρι ‘early’ and the zero grade of the root *\*h<sub>1</sub>ed-* ‘to eat’.<sup>43</sup>

## 6 Syntactic approaches to compounding

In section 5 *strawberry*, *gooseberry* and *raspberry* were defined as ‘[N N] subordinated compounds’, and this classification is based on a syntactic criterion. Syntactic analyses play a significant role in studies of compounding. They inform the approach that scholars take to issues which go beyond the definition of compoundhood and affect the structure of compounds, for instance headedness (section 7.1). Our starting point is again Marchand’s definition, in which compounding is described in the following terms:

The coining of new words proceeds by way of combining linguistic elements on the basis of a determinant / determinatum relationship called syntagma. When two or more words are combined into a morphological unit on the basis just stated, we speak of a compound. Marchand (1969: 11).

Marchand begins by emphasizing the relationship between the compound constituents, a relationship which can only be clarified by transposing the constituents into a syntactic phrase (‘syntagma’). Let us first consider two simple cases. *Blackbird* is a bird (determinatum) which is black (determinant), *girlfriend* is a friend (determinatum) who is a girl (determinant). In both cases, the determinatum occurs on the right, while the determinant, either an adjective or a noun, occurs on the left; more recent accounts would term the determinatum ‘head’ and the determinant ‘non-head’ (or ‘determiner’, or ‘modifier’).<sup>44</sup>

Syntactic transposition is particularly useful for the analysis of [N N] compounds whose structure, and consequently meaning, are less straightforward: only through a syntactic conversion can we clarify that a *steamboat* is not a boat which is a steam (as in the examples *blackbird* and *girlfriend* above), but a boat (determinatum) powered by steam (determinant). The structure of the compounds is superficially identical, but their underlying syntactic structure is different, since in *steamboat* *steam* is not a predicate substantive (> ‘the boat is a steam’, as in *blackbird* > ‘the bird is black’ and *girlfriend* > ‘the friend is a girl’) but a complement of means.

<sup>43</sup> For other examples of obscured compounds, see Brugmann (1904–1905), Debrunner (1917: 21–22) and Hirt (1928: 21–25).

<sup>44</sup> This terminology is misleading: not all *determinata* are heads. See section 9.3.

## 6.1 Synthetic compounds

A very high number of compounds resist being subsumed under Marchand's definition and some of the points of contention will be discussed in the sections at the end of the chapter dealing with the classification of compounds. A brief consideration of some of these problematic issues, however, is useful for an overview of syntactic approaches to compounding. Our starting point is the issue of compounds with a verbal constituent, e.g. *taxi-driver*.

This is a very common type of compound in English, and in Germanic languages generally. Because the non-verbal FC mostly functions as the internal argument (in this case the direct object) of the verbal idea expressed by the second element, these compounds are usually called 'synthetic compounds' (another common term is 'verbal compounds'). The term 'synthetic' draws attention to the fact that these compounds represent the synthesis of a structure involving a Noun and a Verb in which the Noun fulfils the function of the argument of the Verb (*he drives a taxi*). In generative terms, the difference between these verbal/synthetic compounds and other types of compounds is that 'in verbal derivations we often have more than one argument available for co-indexing'.<sup>45</sup> Put more simply, this means that synthetic compounds project more than one argument into the syntax, making their lexical interpretation more complex than that of other compound types. Although non-linguists may think of *taxi-driver* as simply another  $[N N]_N$  compound, linguists tend to hold that, by and large, these forms arise from phrases containing a verb. Many accounts thus explain the structure and meaning of these verbal synthetic compounds by focusing on the underlying syntactic structures from which, according to some (but by no means all) linguists, synthetic compounds derive by way of transformation.<sup>46</sup>

Synthetic compounds are analysed according to two basic structures:  $[[N VStem]_{er}]_N$  (i.e. a structure which is formed with a noun and a verbal stem, to which the derivational suffix *-er* is added to turn this structure into a noun) or  $[N N]_N$  (i.e. a structure in which a verbal noun is compounded with another noun). The first model, which has mainly been developed by Lieber (1983), does not work perfectly in that, as shown by Booij (1988),  $[N V]$  compounded verbs such as *\*\*taxi-drive* are seldom attested in English.<sup>47</sup> Drawing on the second model, therefore, Booij (1988) suggests a somewhat different derivational path.

<sup>45</sup> Lieber (2004: 54).

<sup>46</sup> This approach was first theorized and fully developed in Roeper and Siegel (1978): for a critique, see Selkirk (1982: 43–47), who in turn initiated the lexicalist approach continued in the later works of Lieber (1983), Di Sciullo and Williams (1987) and Booij (1988).

<sup>47</sup> See too the resumé in Booij (2009a: 213) and Lieber (2004: 47–48), who accepts the criticism.

He assumes that synthetic compounds are [N N] formations in which the head is a verbal noun, a structure which can be represented as [N [N<sub>er</sub>]]<sub>N</sub>. Structurally, synthetic compounds do not derive from compounded [N V] verbs, but semantically they display a special feature, termed ‘inheritance of argument structure’, in virtue of which ‘the verbal noun inherits the Patient argument of the verb, and the left constituent receives this Patient role’.<sup>48</sup>

This leads us to a second problem, the interpretation of the relationship between the verbal SC and the nominal FC. Although theoretical discussions of synthetic compounds usually focus on compounds in which the FC functions as the direct object of the verbal SC, across languages (and AG is no exception), the nominal FC often conveys other functions, for instance location (e.g. *Skywalker*, *moonwalker*), time (e.g. *day-dreamer*) or adverbial modification (e.g. *big spender*).<sup>49</sup> Stricter accounts limit the category of synthetic compounds to those forms in which the FC is an argument of the second, satisfying one of the thematic roles (simply put, these are the arguments that each verb syntactically *requires*). All the others, in which the FC adds a ‘locative, manner, or temporal specification to the head, but would not be said to bear a thematic relation, or satisfy the argument structure of the head’, are excluded.<sup>50</sup>

These two issues connected with the interpretation and definition of a compound category which is prevalent in many languages give us a fair picture of how syntactic analyses, sometimes of great complexity, can affect both how we describe the processes at work in the formation of individual types of compounds and how we distinguish between compounds and other linguistic structures. Synthetic compounds are also much-discussed as concerns the morphological interpretation of their verbal constituent, which in many languages tend to be stems: this phenomenon is well-known to Sanskrit and Greek scholars, but also applies to some English compounds.<sup>51</sup> We will return to this problem in two different places: in section 9.2, which discusses the notion of government, and in Chapter 2, section 6, which is specifically concerned with Greek compounds possessing a verbal SC.

The syntactic approach is also frequently applied to V1 compounds, which are studied in relation to parallel phrases in order to gain insights into their origin, orientation and morphological make-up. As we shall see in Chapter 2, section 7.5.4, the syntactic approach has prompted a few scholars to interpret V1 compounds as

**48** Booij (2009a: 213).

**49** Bloomfield (1933: 231-232) and Marchand (1969: 15-19) both tend to match synthetic compounds with the object-verb relationship.

**50** Selkirk (1982: 24). See the overview in Bauer (2009: 353-354).

**51** For MG, see e.g. Ralli (1992) and Ralli (2009).

a ‘more syntactic’ category than others that still preserves an inflected verb in the FC (this is usually interpreted as an imperative or third person singular present). According to these interpretations, syntax overrides morphology, but it is open to debate whether this is the correct way to view the origin of individual V1 compounds cross-linguistically: as concerns AG, our analysis will show that the productive formation patterns of V1 compounds are morphological, not syntactic.

## 6.2 Romance compounds

The syntactic approach is also fundamental to the investigation of compounding as a result of the lexicalization of phrases, and to the differentiation of compounds from syntactic phrases. As mentioned above, it is typical of English to have forms such as *word formation* which are not unverbated but whose morphological and phonological properties, on the whole, allow for their classification as compounds. Romance, by contrast, has a limited number of straightforward compounds (most commonly of the [N N] and [V N] types) but a large number of phrases whose status is hotly debated. In this case, our analysis of the properties displayed by these forms will determine whether we define them as compounds.

Romance phrases that are open to being interpreted as compounds include the following types:

- Forms in which the constituents are linked by a preposition (also termed ‘binomial compounds’): Fr. *piéd à terre* [foot on ground] > ‘small living unit’, *pomme de terre* [apple of earth] > ‘potato’; Sp. *estrella de mar* [star of sea] > ‘starfish’, It. *casa di cura* [house of treatment] > ‘nursing home’; Port. *boca de incêndio* [mouth of fire] > ‘fire hydrant’; Rom. *lapte-de-pasăre* [milk of bird], a kind of dessert.

According to many accounts, all such forms ought to be considered lexicalized phrases (also termed ‘syntactic compounds’ or ‘improper compounds’) rather than proper compounds because they lack the morpho-phonological variation typical of compounding.<sup>52</sup> However, other scholars maintain that many of these forms should be classified as true compounds, since they represent conceptual

---

**52** The literature on the topic is vast. The following are recent works which discuss the issue in various Romance languages and provide state-of-the-art references: French: Corbin (1992: 48–49), Villoing (2003), Fradin (2009: 417–420) and Villoing (2012: 35–36); Spanish: Fabb (1998: 76) and Kornfeld (2009: 437, 442–443) on Spanish [N de N] compounds, drawing from Rainer and Varela (1992) and Val Alvaro (1999); Italian: Masini (2009), Masini and Scalise (2012: 71–75); Portuguese: Rio-Torto and Ribeiro (2012: 126–127); Romanian: Grossmann (2012: 153–154).

units and score positively in the isolation test. This means that it is impossible to separate their constituents with determiners or quantifiers, as in e.g. *pomme de terre* \*\*fertile lit. ‘apple of fertile soil’, *estrella de(\*\*l) mar*, or *casa di cura* \*\*intensiva ‘house of intensive treatment’.

- Forms in which the FC is a preposition: Fr. *sans papier* [without paper] > ‘clandestine’, Sp. *sin vergüenza* / *sinvergüenza* [without shame] > ‘scoundrel’, It. *contro luce* [against light] > ‘backlight’, Port. *după-amiază* [after-noon]. These forms can be used as adjectives or nouns.<sup>53</sup>

Again, a heated debate surrounds the analysis of these prepositional forms. They may be classified as proper compounds on account of their lexicalized status (some are even univertated),<sup>54</sup> but they may also be considered prepositional phrases.

- Forms in which a noun is modified by an adjective to its right (Fr. *guerre froide* [war cold] > ‘Cold War’, It. *carta telefonica* [card of-the-phone] > ‘phone-card’, Sp. *fiebre amarilla* [fever yellow] > ‘yellow fever’) or to its left (Fr. *premier ministre* ‘prime minister’, Sp. *media luna* ‘half moon’).

These forms display a high degree of lexicalization and idiomaticity, both of which semantic properties are typical of compounds: the adjectival constituents cannot be replaced by a synonym (e.g. *guerre glaciale* [war icy] > ‘icy war’) or by another adjective of the same class (e.g. *fiebre roja* [fever red] > ‘red fever’) without the expression losing its characteristic meaning. At the same time, these forms lack some of the elements which characterize compoundhood in the individual Romance languages, with the result that some accounts class them among improper compounds. For instance, Spanish [N A] compounds usually display special morpho-phonological markers: in *pelirrojo* ‘red-haired’ we find the linking vowel *-i-* and the first sound of the SC *-rojo* doubled, whereas the corresponding phrase *pelo rojo* does not display the same markers.<sup>55</sup> The Italian [A N] form *terzo mondo* and [N A] form *carta telefonica* show internal agreement, a property which distinguishes them from proper compounds.<sup>56</sup> Forms such as *premier ministre* also follow the general syntactic formation rules of French.<sup>57</sup>

<sup>53</sup> See Bok-Bennema and Kampers-Manhe (2006: 19–20) for an overview of the type in Romance and the references given in the previous note for accounts in individual languages.

<sup>54</sup> See Kornfeld (2009: 439) for Spanish.

<sup>55</sup> Kornfeld (2009: 443).

<sup>56</sup> Masini and Scalise (2012: 73). For all these criteria, see too Booij (2009b: 221).

<sup>57</sup> Van Goethem (2009: 246).

- Left-headed forms in which a noun is modified by another noun: Fr. *cigarette filtre* [cigarette filter] > ‘filter cigarette’; Sp. *perro policía* [dog police] > ‘police dog’; It. *effetto serra* [effect greenhouse] > ‘greenhouse effect’.<sup>58</sup>

These are usually considered to be proper rather than improper compounds, though it is recognized that they share many properties with phrases and appositions (both syntactic categories).<sup>59</sup>

This brief overview of Romance types shows how the same category of forms can elicit very different responses from scholars depending on their theoretical framework. In all cases, however, the role of syntax is of primary importance. According to the classic study of Di Sciullo and Williams (1987), Romance compounds are produced by syntax before being subjected to a morphological reanalysis: they are not, therefore, ‘true’ compounds (ruled by morphology) but ‘syntactic words’. In her overview of Spanish compounding, Kornfeld (2009: 444) claims that ‘the constituents of compounds can always be explained by syntactic properties of Spanish’. On the other hand, Bisetto (2004) applies a semantic criterion for differentiating compounds from phrasal terms, claiming that compounds tend to be hyponyms of their heads, while phrasal terms are mostly not. The analysis of morpho-phonological elements is perhaps most useful in the case of AG, where compounds (but not phrasal terms or ‘improper compounds’) typically entail the deletion of case and agreement markers in the FC, which becomes a simple stem followed by a compositional vowel (section 4.1).

### 6.3 Recursiveness in compounding

A typical property of English compounds is recursiveness, i.e. the capacity of determiners to accumulate to the left or to the right of the head. Spencer (1991: 48) puts forward the example of *student film society committee scandal enquiry*, in which the primary element *enquiry* is modified by various additions to its left. The textbook example for German is *Donaudampfschiffahrtsgesellschaftskapitänsmütze* ‘cap of the captain of the Danube steam ship company’, but recursive structures are frequent in all Germanic languages, as well as in e.g. Japanese and Turkish.<sup>60</sup>

<sup>58</sup> Rainer and Varela (1992: 125–126).

<sup>59</sup> See Di Sciullo and Williams (1987: 81–82), Booij (2009b: 223).

<sup>60</sup> These and other examples are discussed at length by Bisetto (2010), who is particularly concerned with phenomena of recursiveness in Italian compounding. On recursiveness in coordinated compounds, see too Mukai (2013).

The issue of recursiveness has not yet been addressed from a typological point of view. In a recent attempt to reach a unified analysis, Bisetto (2010) shows that some structures conventionally used as examples of recursiveness are in fact better explained as iterations, with modifying elements to the non-head side. This interpretative problem is central to the understanding of recursiveness in coordinated compounds (compounds whose constituents can be connected with the conjunction ‘and’: see section 8.1 and Chapter 2, section 2), the analysis of which is often controversial. For instance, the classification of the Italian form *poeta pittore regista* ‘poet-painter-director’ as a coordinated compound requires us to interpret its elements as head additions, the distinguishing feature of recursiveness.<sup>61</sup> The other option is to take *regista* as the sole head and *poeta pittore* as non-head additions (i.e. modifying elements of a subordinated compound), in which case the compound would display iteration, not recursiveness.

#### 6.4 Syntactic approaches to Ancient Greek compounding: inflected FCs and univerbations

Following the laconic differentiation between σύνθεσις and παράθεσις made by the ancient Greek grammarians (see section 4), classic studies of AG compounding sometimes refer to ‘improper compounds’ or ‘univerbations’ when analyzing forms in which the FC is an inflected word representing an adjunct of the SC.<sup>62</sup> An example is the toponym Ἡλιούπολις, literally ‘of-the-Sun-city’, in which the FC Ἡλιου- is the genitive singular of ἥλιος ‘sun’. Another example is πυρικόςστος ‘burnt in/by fire’, in which the FC may be interpreted as the dative of πῦρ, expressing the location or the means of the verbal action conveyed by the SC. These forms defy the isolation rule and also go against the Greek tendency to use stems in compounding. Because of this, it is usually assumed that these compounds derive from the univerbation of two originally independent words. In itself, this is a plausible supposition, but it also makes the classification of these forms problematic: to what extent are forms such as Ἡλιούπολις and πυρικόςστος to be considered ‘improper’ compounds, as many scholars have claimed?<sup>63</sup>

<sup>61</sup> Scalise and Bisetto (2009: 46).

<sup>62</sup> See e.g. Richter (1898: 1, 247), Debrunner (1917: 16–20), Salus (1965b: 41), Lindner (2011: 11–12, 15–18, 40).

<sup>63</sup> This tendency is evident in accounts as diverse as Kühner and Blass (1892: 318–319), Meillet and Vendryès (1960: 422), Buck (1933: 35), Meier-Brügger (1992a: 33), and Hoenigswald (2004: 180).

In principle, one might even deny that Ἡλιοῦπολις and πυρῖκαυστος are one word at all: as in the case of κορυθαίολος discussed in section 4.4, the sequences <ΗΛΙΟΥΠΟΛΙΣ> and <ΠΥΡΙΚΑΥΣΤΟΣ> could be rendered as Ἡλιοῦ πόλις and πυρῖ καυστός, which are perfectly meaningful phrases in Greek. For Ἡλιοῦπολις the matter is complicated by two facts: its evident lexicalization, since it was used to refer to one place in particular, and its Latin rendition with one word, *Helio-polis*, rather than two. Both facts testify to the *perception* of this form as a compound. A similar case is the toponym Νεάπολις, which clearly derives from the phrase νέα πόλις ‘new city’ (attested in Herodotus), but was imported into Latin as one word, *Neapolis*. The case of πυρῖκαυστος is more ambiguous, particularly because passive adjectives in -τός, like καυστός ‘burnt’, are rarely compounded with nouns.

Caught between textual practice (which has handed down these and other forms as single words) and theoretical issues, we may wonder whether placing forms with an inflected FC in a separate category is really helpful for our classification of compounds. These forms, although not numerous, exerted a clear influence on other compounds, so that some of the inflected FCs spread to compounds where they were not syntactically justified. In section 4.1 we considered the case where πυρῖ- replaces the stem-forms πυρ- and πυρο-: here the use of -ῖ- as a linking element devoid of any morpho-syntactic role is likely to have been modelled on forms such as πυρῖκαυστος, where -ῖ- is syntactically justified. A different kind of example is θεόδοτος ‘given by god’ (Hes.): θεοσ- is not the stem of θεός (which is θεο-), but something which looks like (but is not) a third-declension genitive in -ος. The FC θεοσ- therefore was probably modelled on διοσ-, which features in the synonym δίοσδοτος ‘given of Zeus’: διοσ- itself is not a stem, but the genitive singular of Ζεύς, which often features as compound FC.<sup>64</sup>

Unfortunately the ancient grammarians do not come to our rescue. Ancient discussion of ambiguous forms mostly appears in connection with Homeric exegesis and is concerned, on a practical level, with the question of whether certain Homeric forms should be written as one word or two (e.g. in the case of κάρη κομόωντες ‘with flowing hair’ in the *Iliad*). Discussing the matter, Debrunner (1917: 17) usefully observes that the distinction between univerbations and ‘proper’ compounds is not one of principle but of chronology: each individual univerbation can, at a later stage of the language, become a ‘proper’ compound and each ‘proper’ compound may, at some remote chronological point, have been a univerbation. The suggestion is apparently that compounding implies a previous syntactic stage where words are joined in a fixed phrase: ‘proper’ compounds

<sup>64</sup> Debrunner (1917: 22–23), Lindner (2011: 46).



(i.e. those using stems rather than inflected FCs) represent the highest level of abstraction from this primitive stage.

Debrunner's short comment is by no means a banal one. Indo-Europeanists of the late nineteenth century thought that the oldest stage of PIE was free of inflections: as a consequence, 'proper' compounds could not contain inflected elements, which would characterize only later and secondary formations.<sup>65</sup> Debrunner, however, seems to point towards a different way of looking at the matter, which takes relative chronology into account and, through the implication that compounding derives from syntax, anticipates some of the conclusions reached by transformational grammar decades later.

Recent research has paid more attention to the question of relative chronology in the make-up of compounds, with the assumption being that univerbations may have been more widespread than previously thought. Dunkel puts the question in clear terms:

Both types of combination are generally reconstructed for the *Ursprache*, but it is often taken for granted that stem compounds are older than univerbations. The only justification for this is that many attested univerbations, such as Πελοπόν-νησος and *magnopere*, are clearly of recent origin. But this does not change the fact that other univerbations, such as \**déms-poti-*, are very old indeed, as underlined by the extremely archaic morphology of the latter's first element.

Dunkel (1999: 47).

Dunkel goes on to argue that univerbations 'make up both the very oldest and the very youngest strata of morphological noun combination', whereas stem compounding, the supposedly primitive type of word formation, is 'a historically intermediate stage'.<sup>66</sup> From a Greek perspective, it is of little relevance that δεσπότης 'master' goes back to the inflected juxtaposition \**déms-poti-* 'lord of the house', because the form has been completely lexicalized.<sup>67</sup> Other formations arose within Greek itself, but possess inflectional endings that are no longer attested in the language. In ὁδοιπόρος 'wayfarer' the FC displays a form which is not attested in the Classical declension of ὁδός 'road' and which is difficult to explain as a mere linking vowel. Comparative analysis, however, helps us to reconstruct ὁδοι- as the old locative case of the thematic declension, surviving in some fixed expressions such as οἴκοι 'at home'. Although we are able to recognize the inflected nature of the FC, from the point of view of the linguistic stage rep-

<sup>65</sup> See also Lindner (2011: 11, 38–41), Lindner (2012: 88–121), the latter with an excursus on the history of the debate in IE studies.

<sup>66</sup> Dunkel (1999: 67).

<sup>67</sup> On this form, see the bibliographical overview in Lindner (2011: 39 n. 19, 40–41).

resented by Greek it is pointless to place *ὄδοιπόρος* in a different category from other compounds.

In conclusion, the term ‘juxtaposition’ is useful only when there are other phenomena, outside the inflected nature of the FC, which betray the syntactic nature status of a sequence of two words. Since AG is a corpus language, however, we are usually unable to run additional tests. For instance, Ralli (2013: 246–248) identifies the following criteria as typical of compounds as opposed to syntactic phrases:

1. A high degree of semantic opacity. Most Greek forms with an inflected FC score negatively in this test, since *ὄδοιπόρος*, *Νεάπολις*, *Διόσκουροι* are highly transparent forms.
2. The possibility of derivational suffixation. This gives better results, with forms such *Νεαπολί-της* ‘habitant of Neapolis’, *ὄδοιπορ-ία* ‘walking’, etc.
3. The constituents have no syntactic freedom: it is impossible to reverse their order (this applies to all quoted forms); the non-head cannot be replaced by another item without a considerable change of meaning (*Ἡλιούπολις* is a different entity from *Νεάπολις*); no other item can be inserted between the constituents.<sup>68</sup>

In conclusion, the definition of ‘improper’ compounds requires not only an understanding of the nature of the inflected FC, but also an assessment of the global morpho-phonological and semantic properties of these forms.<sup>69</sup> The impact of forms with an inflected FC is marginal in Greek, however, where compounding remains by and large stem compounding.

## 6.5 Summary

Synthetic compounds, Romance ambiguous categories, V1 compounds and recursive structures are some prominent examples of the impact that syntax has on compounding, and hence of the importance of syntactic analysis. This section has briefly addressed topics which go beyond the definition of compounds and touch upon the interpretation of compound categories. In the next chapter, syntactic approaches will be used to discuss the structure of AG compounds, and the

<sup>68</sup> Similar and other criteria are also indicated by Lindner (2011: 11).

<sup>69</sup> Ralli (2013: 248–249) suggests differentiating forms which have properties in common with both compounds and nominal phrases with the term ‘loose multiword compounds’ or ‘phrasal terms’. The application of this terminology to AG is beyond our scope, but could be a promising research topic.

issue of their orientation in particular will be explored in view of Greek, and more generally IE, word-order patterns. As concerns the relationship of V1 and V2 compounds, in the course of this volume we will see that these types are generated through a morphological process rather than by syntax, but we will also see that syntactic phrases may influence the creation of individual compounds.

## 7 Towards the classification of compounds: basic criteria

So far this chapter has reviewed some areas which are important for a formal description of Greek compounds: the use of stems, the form and role of the linking vowel, accentuation, the spelling of compounds and the analysis of forms with an inflected FC. Before turning to the classification of the Greek compound types (a classification based on the relationship between the constituents), we need to consider two further criteria which play a central part in current classifications of compounds cross-linguistically: the notion of ‘head’ (and its position within the compound) and the related issues of ‘endocentricity’ and ‘exocentricity’.

### 7.1 Heads, headedness and related issues

The identification of the ‘head’ of a compound is fundamental to the structural issues concerning the syntax and semantics of compounds, and hence to their classification. The property of containing a head is termed ‘headedness’ in current morphological theory. Since headedness is a vast and complex topic, here we will consider it simply with the aim of understanding how headedness applies to compounding.

Let us start with two definitions:

The head of a word or phrase is that part which defines its category [...]. In derivational morphology the category of a simple word is often determined by its outermost suffix. Thus English *-ness* marks a word as a noun.

*IEL s.v. ‘head’.*

The identifying feature of heads in both syntax and morphology is that the properties of the head are those of the whole.

Di Sciullo and Williams (1987: 25).

These are both *morphological definitions* of ‘head’. As such, they concern all words: in *teacher*, for instance, the suffix *-er* is the head, since it determines

gender, case, number and the morpho-syntactic category of the word.<sup>70</sup> In the compound *school teacher*, however, the whole word *teacher* is the head, since it determines the category to which the compound belongs (i.e. a school teacher is a type of teacher). There is an important difference between these two examples. The suffix *-er* is the head of the word *teacher* on morphological grounds, whereas the identification of the word *teacher* as the head of the compound *school teacher* takes place on the level of semantics.<sup>71</sup> Without knowing the meaning of *school teacher*, it would be impossible to decide that it represents a type of teacher (and hence that *teacher* is its head) and to distinguish the category of compound under which it falls from others, e.g. that of *cutpurse* ‘thief’ (which is not a type of purse: hence, we can predict that *purse* is not its head). Further analysis shows that the FC of *cutpurse* is not the head either, since *cutpurse* does not identify a subtype of the action of cutting, but ‘someone who steals by cutting purses suspended on a waistband’. It follows that *cutpurse* does not have a head: it is headless. This has an important impact on the classification of *cutpurse* and similar compounds.

## 7.2 Endocentric and exocentric compounds

In many accounts, compounds with a head are termed ‘endocentric’. This adjective may be literally translated as ‘having a semantic focus (‘-centric’) which lies within (‘endo-’) itself’: *school teacher* refers semantically to a type of teacher, an idea already contained within the compound itself; the FC *school* merely modifies it (and hence, as already mentioned, is termed the ‘determinant’ or ‘modifying element’ or ‘non-head’). *Cutpurse*, on the other hand, is classified by most accounts as an ‘exocentric’ compound. This adjective may be literally translated as ‘having a semantic focus which lies outside (‘exo-’) itself’: *cutpurse* refers to a type of thief, an idea which is semantically contained neither in the compound as a whole nor in one of its constituents. Nevertheless, the relation between the two constituents has a hierarchical nature not dissimilar to that found in *school teacher*: in *cutpurse*, *purse* functions as a sort of specification of the action of cutting, distinguishing it from other types of cutting (e.g. the cutting of throats, to which the similarly exocentric *cutthroat* ‘murderer’ alludes). As a result, the constituents *purse* and *throat* function as modifying elements, and hence as ‘non-heads’. The complication, however, is that, unlike the case of *school teacher*,

<sup>70</sup> Di Sciullo and Williams (1987: 24).

<sup>71</sup> On semantic vs. morphological headedness, see too Lindner (2011: 24 n. 13a).

the FC *cut* also is a ‘non-head’, and this despite the fact that, just like *teacher* in *school teacher*, it functions as the determinatum.<sup>72</sup>

Another class of compounds which are typically exocentric (and hence lack a head) are the so-called ‘bahuvrihis’ or possessive compounds (see Chapter 2, section 5). These compounds indicate a quality or thing possessed by a person: e.g. *long-nose*, which is not a type of nose, but a person characterized by a type of nose. In both *long-nose* (in the sense ‘person with a long nose’) and *school teacher*, *nose* and *teacher* are affected by the same kind of modification through *long* and *school* respectively, the difference being that *school teacher* does not manifest the same shift of semantic focus as *long-nose*: *school teacher* has a head, while *long-nose* does not. The exocentric status acquired by *long-nose* is neither intrinsic to the word *nose*, nor to the formal make-up of the compound itself: it emerges once *long-nose* is used to describe an entity that lies outside the word category indicated by either of its constituents. In Chapter 2, section 5.2, we will return to this issue when considering the relationship between bahuvrihis and determinative compounds in AG.

### 7.3 Right-headed and left-headed compounds

In most languages, the head tends to occur towards the right of the compound: English (and, in general, all Germanic languages) provides the typical example of a right-headed compound system. There are also compound systems, however, in which the head is frequently, or even standardly, located on the left: common examples come from Romance (e.g. *pause café* [break coffee] ‘coffee break’, *vin-aigre* [wine sour] ‘vinegar’ and *main-forte* [hand strong] ‘support’ in French; *pausa pranzo* [stop lunch] ‘lunch break’ and *capostazione* [head station] ‘station-master’ in Italian), but typological studies of compounding also list instances from Samoan (e.g. *potumoe* [room bed] ‘bedroom’), Vietnamese (e.g. *nhà thương* [establishment be wounded] ‘hospital’) and Chinese (though only in the [VN]<sub>v</sub> type, e.g. *jìndú* [prohibit poison] ‘to prohibit the selling and consuming of drugs’).<sup>73</sup> In

<sup>72</sup> The current terminology goes back to Aleksandrow (1888) and was divulged by Brugmann in his contributions on compounding, particularly Brugmann (1905–1906). Bloomfield (1933) adopted the same terminology to describe syntactic structures, with slightly different theoretical implications: cf. the definitions of ‘endocentric’ and ‘exocentric’ in Bussmann (1996: 363; 394) and Barri (1975). For the history of the term ‘exocentric’, see Noordegraaf (1989). For an up-to-date overview of these issues in IE linguistics, see Lindner (2011: 24–28).

<sup>73</sup> Ceccagno and Basciano (2009: 485).

the right-headed English system many left-headed compounds are modelled on Romance types: e.g. Engl. *attorney general* or *knight errant* < *chevalier errant*.

Linguists often suppose that left-headedness derives from the imitation of the standard word order in a given language: left-headed compounds, therefore, would originally represent the lexicalization of syntactic structures rather than being the result of a morphological process.<sup>74</sup> There is, indeed, a certain degree of overlap between left-headedness and the tendency to develop syntactic compounds: this is clearly the case in Romance, where, as noted above, many categories can be interpreted as syntactic structures. In another language, Chinese, the common left-headed [V N]<sub>V</sub> structures are often interpreted to be syntactic phrases, not compounds.<sup>75</sup>

AG may be of some use in the context of this debate. Greek has a right-headed compound system which, however, tolerates a number of left-headed types (see Chapter 2, section 7, for a full analysis). Let us take the example of ἵπποπόταμος ‘hippopotamus’ (lit. [horse river]). The head ἵππο- ‘horse’ is not the individual word ἵππος, but its bare stem: this suggests that a fully morphological process was involved in the formation of ἵπποπόταμος rather than the univertation of a syntactic phrase. Moreover, the equivalent of the phrase ‘horse of the river’ would be either ἵππος ποτάμιος (with the second word being an adjective ending with the suffix -ιος and meaning ‘of the river’) or ἵππος ποταμοῦ (with the second word being the genitive singular of ‘river’). In either case, the corresponding compound constituent -πόταμος has undergone a process of morphological derivation, having lost the morpho-syntactic markers of its antecedent (be it ποτάμιος or ποταμοῦ) and having acquired a new suffix, -ος. It is probable that the left-headedness in this case is influenced by syntactic patterns, but the make-up and productivity of the individual left-headed types is to be accounted for in morphological terms (see Chapter 2, section 7.3 specifically on this class).<sup>76</sup>

## 7.4 Summary

After this brief overview of headedness and the position of heads in compounds it is worth summarizing the following points:

<sup>74</sup> On this view, see e.g. Spencer (1991: 321) and the claim by Di Sciullo and Williams (1987) that all true endocentric compounds are right-headed.

<sup>75</sup> But see Ceccagno and Basciano (2009: 489), who disagree with this interpretation.

<sup>76</sup> Tribulato (2006), Tribulato (2007).

1. 'endocentric' and 'exocentric' (i.e. the presence or absence of head) are universal properties of compounds, although there is a tendency for endocentric categories to be more widespread (see section 7.3).
2. 'Endocentric' is not equivalent to 'right-headed' (as sometimes claimed on the basis of the English compound system): AG in particular shows that there can also be endocentric left-headed compounds in languages whose compound system is mostly right-headed (Chapter 2, sections 7.3–7.4).
3. Exocentric compounds are headless; nevertheless, the relation linking the compound constituents can be identical to that characterizing endocentric compounds, e.g. when the compound is of the modifier-determinatum type (see below).
4. Syntax may influence the creation of left-headed types in largely right-headed systems, but the example of Greek shows that not all such cases are to be analysed as syntactic phrases (i.e. 'improper' compounds').

### 7.5 Syntax and semantics as classificatory criteria

The previous sections have discussed headedness by applying a semantic analysis to compounds: through an examination both of the logical relationship holding between the constituents and of the meaning of the resulting compound, it is possible to tell whether the compound has a head or not. Such a logical relationship is best described by means of syntactic models:

The elements of a compound may have relations to each other which resemble the relations holding between the constituents of a sentence [...]: head – modifier, predicate – argument, and apposition'.  
Spencer (1991: 310).

As discussed in section 6.1, one dimension of the syntactic study of compounding has been a focus on the possibility of transforming compounds into their corresponding phrases, and this proves to be particularly useful when it comes to assigning a given compound to a specific category. A case in point is the identification of the meaning of *cry-baby* as 'person easily reduced to tears'. On the basis of the structure of other compounds with verbal FCs (e.g. *cutpurse*), one might be tempted to take *cry* as the governing element of *baby*. This would result in the phrase *making a baby cry*, which is ill-suited to the contexts in which *cry-baby* is likely to be found. It is only when we transform *cry-baby* into the correct phrase *a baby that cries* that both the meaning and the structure of the compound can be clarified ('a person who complains with little cause'). Part of the ambiguity of this

and similar forms lies in the fact that English words such as *cry* can be interpreted as both verbs and nouns.

The transformational approach, however, is not completely unproblematic, since a number of compounds resist a transparent syntactic and semantic explanation, and it has been criticized by those scholars who prefer to view compounding as an essentially morphological and lexical process. An example often quoted to show the shortcomings of the syntactic approach is *striptease*, the meaning of which can be guessed neither on the basis of the meaning of the individual constituents nor by applying a common syntactic pattern (for instance the verb-predicate pattern).<sup>77</sup> In such extreme cases, the syntactic analysis *follows* the disclosing of the correct meaning on the part of someone who knows it. Since *striptease* is a kind of erotic entertainment (*tease*) in which a person gradually undresses (*strip*), it is possible to conclude that the constituent elements lie on the same syntactic level, being coordinated actions (*strip* and *tease* at the same time). According to this analysis, *striptease* is classed among coordinated compounds (see section 8.1), but the meaning given above could also be seen to express a syntactic structure in which *tease* is the head and *strip* a modifier with an instrumental function (*tease* the viewer by *stripping* clothes): in this second case, *striptease* would be classified among subordinated compounds (see section 8.1). Similarly, the constituents of the American English noun and verb *high-five* ('a celebratory gesture in which two people slap their hands together high over their heads') are clear, yet it would be impossible for someone unfamiliar with basketball or American slang to predict the meaning of this compound by applying a straightforward syntactic analysis, since *five* does not actually denote a number, but is a metaphor for 'open hand'.

In most cases syntactic transformation serves as a useful means of clarifying the meaning and structure of compounds, since a merely formal description is not sufficient to detect any semantic difference between similar-looking structures, e.g. *cry-baby* and *cutpurse*, *car-driving* and *sky-diving*. However, there are also cases in which more than one syntactic interpretation applies: is *house cleaning* a 'cleaning of the house' or a 'cleaning in the house'? As mentioned in section 6.1, these difficulties are particularly salient for compounds containing a verbal noun, since the relationship between the constituents can be seen either in terms of determination or in terms of government (see too section 9.2).

---

<sup>77</sup> Matthews (1991: 87).



## 8. A model of classification

Morphologists busy themselves not only with providing definitions of compounding, but also with offering formal descriptions and classifications of compound types, and identifying the best criteria on which to base those classifications. The topic has received a huge amount of attention in the specialist literature on compounding and I shall refrain from providing a potted history of the field's development. This section, and the theoretical classification which follows, are based on the recent proposal for a new typological classification of compounding made by Sergio Scalise and Antonietta Bisetto, whose contributions to the topic also provide a basic introduction to past classifications.<sup>78</sup>

The main problems facing students of compounding when they address the issue of the definition of compounds are the variety of criteria adopted for the purpose of classification and, consequently, the inconsistent terminology used to describe compound types. It frequently happens that language-specific terms are used to describe universal categories: a good example is the category of 'synthetic compounds', which is central in English but by no means universal (for instance, it is generally absent in Romance). Moreover, confusion may arise from the improper use of certain terms, as is the case with the Sanskrit terms 'bahuvrihi' and 'dvandva' (see section 9.1).<sup>79</sup>

As noted above, the classification of compounds rests on morphological, semantic and syntactic analyses or, more frequently, on a combination of the three criteria, which are able to complement one another in the case of controversy. However, the application of these criteria is often inconsistent across the various classificatory models, and sometimes even within the same model. Scalise and Bisetto (2009) place particular emphasis on the fact that most classifications are based on the criterion of presence/absence of a head (a criterion which, as noted in section 7.1, is driven by semantic analysis), and hence on the categories of endocentricity and exocentricity. However, endocentricity and exocentricity are not overarching principles, each subsuming a number of compound types: rather, they are transversal properties, which cut across each compound category. Before headedness, therefore, classifications must attempt to identify compound types on the basis of other criteria.

---

<sup>78</sup> Bisetto and Scalise (2005), Scalise and Bisetto (2009).

<sup>79</sup> On terminology, see Scalise and Bisetto (2009: 35–37).

### 8.1 Subordinated and coordinated as the two fundamental categories

Following Scalise and Bisetto (2009), I propose a classification of AG compounds based, in the first instance, on syntactic and semantic criteria, which identify the nature of the relationship between the compound constituents and hence the structure of the compound. At a second stage level of classification, morphological analysis (i.e. the study of the formal make-up of the compound) may sometimes be adopted as a further criterion to highlight differences within the same compound macro-category (for instance by distinguishing nominal from verbal endocentric compounds). The third and final level of classification concerns the presence or absence of a head, and this criterion subdivides the same macro-category (e.g. subordinated compounds) into endocentric and exocentric subtypes.

The primary syntactic-semantic criterion is subordination, identifying compound types in which one of the constituents is subordinated to the other, in that it provides a complementation, argumentation or modification of the other.<sup>80</sup> Consider the following examples of subordination:

1. In the  $[N N]_N$  compound *school teacher* the FC *school* modifies the notion expressed by the SC *teacher*: in syntactic terms, it expresses location ('teacher who works in a school') or possession ('teacher who belongs to a school').
2. In the  $[N N]_N$  compound *silk-tail* (the name of a type of bird), the FC *silk* modifies the SC *tail*: it expresses a quality of the SC and is semantically equivalent to an adjective.
3. In the  $[V N]_N$  compound *cutpurse* the SC *-purse* is the argument of the verbal action conveyed by the FC *cut-* and is thus subordinated to it.
4. In the  $[N N]_N$  compound *taxi-driver*, the FC expresses the argument of the verbal action conveyed by the SC *driver* (a noun derived from a verb) and is thus subordinated to it.
5. In the  $[P N]_A$  compound *upstream*, the SC *stream* provides a complement to of the preposition contained in the FC and is thus subordinated to it.

The types of subordination represented in these examples are not of the same kind. For the time being, however, we will focus on the property of headedness, and we will consider the orientation of constituents and, in particular, the location of the slot occupied by the subordinated element. The compounds in (1) and (2) have an identical structure and their morphological category (Noun) is identical, but they diverge in terms of headedness: *school-teacher* is endocentric, while

---

<sup>80</sup> In some accounts, the verb-argument relation is not subsumed under subordination: see Scalise and Bisetto (2009: 44).

*silk-tail* is exocentric (it does not define a type of tail). Similarly, both the syntactic structure and the resultant morphological category (Noun) of the examples in (3) and (4) are identical, but again the compounds diverge in terms of headedness: *cutpurse* is exocentric (it refers to a type of thief, not a type of cutting), while *taxi-driver* is endocentric (it represents a subset or specialization of the notion of ‘driver’). Moreover, within the same syntactic structure (Verb-Argument) we find two opposing orientations: *cutpurse* is left-oriented and the constituent expressing the argument occurs on the right; while *taxi-driver* is right-oriented and the constituent expressing the argument occurs on the left. Different again is the case of (5), in which the SC is strictly speaking properly governed by the first. *Upstream* belongs to the typologically left-oriented category of prepositional compounds, which are always exocentric: *upstream* does not express a subset of either *up* or *stream*, but identifies an external entity which goes ‘against the current’.

Subordination contrasts with another syntactic-semantic criterion: coordination. This can be defined, in negative terms, as the ‘absence of subordination’: namely, no compound constituent is subordinated and all are placed on the same syntactic level. Consider *Austro-Hungary*: it neither identifies a subtype of Hungary (e.g. ‘Austrian Hungary’) nor a subtype of Austria (e.g. ‘Hungarian Austria’), but a geo-political entity made up of both. Coordinated compounds are less numerous and less structurally nuanced than subordinated compounds but they too pose numerous problems at the level of semantic interpretation. In particular, the identification of endocentric and exocentric items is often not straightforward and requires an investigation of the use of individual compounds in context. Consider the following typical examples:

6. *Woman doctor*: this may be interpreted to identify a doctor who is also a woman, or a woman who is also a doctor. It consequently has two heads, both placed on the same level, and this makes it an endocentric coordinated compound.
7. *Mother-child*: the two constituents make up a compound which is used as an adjective and describes the relationship between a mother and her child. The compound refers to an entity which lies outside the compound itself: it is therefore exocentric and has no heads.

Following the analysis proposed for (7), the compound *Austro-Hungary* should also be interpreted as an exocentric compound, since it identifies something other than Austria or Hungary alone. Yet even these textbook examples often receive contrasting interpretations. Granted that *woman doctor* is endocentric, it may be argued that the main idea is expressed by *doctor* alone and only modified by *woman*: hence, the compound is subordinated, not coordinated. The question is not easily settled and depends largely on pragmatics and semantic nuances:

only the context will clarify whether the emphasis is placed on both constituents ('woman *and* doctor') or only on one of them. These issues are central to the interpretation of coordinated compounds in AG as well (Chapter 2, section 2).

In summary, the model adopted here identifies two main categories, subordinated and coordinated compounds, based on the syntactic-semantic relationship between the constituents. Each of these two categories is further divided into endocentric and exocentric types. Table 1.1 shows all the primary combinations with different lexical classes.

**Table 1.1:** Classification of compound categories

Subordinated	Coordinated
Endocentric	
<i>school-teacher</i> ([N N] <sub>N</sub> )	<i>actor author</i> ([N N] <sub>N</sub> )
<i>highway</i> ([A N] <sub>N</sub> )	<i>bitter-sweet</i> ([A A] <sub>A</sub> )
<i>stage-manager</i> ([N N] <sub>N</sub> )	
<i>stage-manage</i> ([N V] <sub>N</sub> )	
Exocentric	
<i>silk-tail</i> ([N N] <sub>N</sub> )	<i>mother-child</i> ([N N] <sub>A</sub> )
<i>long-nose</i> ([A N] <sub>A</sub> )	
<i>cutpurse</i> ([V N] <sub>N</sub> )	
<i>upstream</i> ([P N] <sub>A</sub> )	

This model represents a simplified version of the model developed by Scalise and Bisetto (2009). They also include a third category, termed 'Attributive-Appositive (ATAP)' compounds and characterized by the fact that the non-head modifies the head in the function of an attribute (as in *swordfish*) or an apposition (as in *ape man*). However, ATAP compounds are not immediately distinguishable from subordinated compounds: they are still characterized by modification and described in terms of head and non-head (in *swordfish* the head is *fish*). Scalise and Bisetto's main reason for separating ATAP compounds from subordinated compounds is the fact that the non-head in the former often introduces a kind of metaphorical modification. For instance, in *swordfish* the FC (the non-head) does not express the notion that the fish is a sword, but rather that its bill *looks like* one.<sup>81</sup>

The recognition that some compound constituents act as metaphorical modifiers is a valuable analytical tool, and one which proves particularly useful for interpreting the AG material, since the metaphorical property of the FC is a frequent characteristic of exocentric [N N]<sub>A</sub> compounds (e.g. *ρόδοδάκτυλος* 'having

**81** See in particular Scalise and Bisetto (2009: 52), who discuss the example of *mushroom cloud*.

rosy fingers') and may well reflect an older IE tendency; this issue is discussed in Chapter 2, section 5.4.<sup>82</sup> However, for the purposes of classification the recognition that modifiers may have a metaphorical function adds little to our understanding of the syntactic and morphological patterns of Greek compounds, e.g. by predicting which stems will be used and where the constituents will be placed within the compound, and in the case of other languages too it appears of limited use. Attributive and appositive compounds can therefore be conveniently subsumed under the macro-category of subordinated compounds.<sup>83</sup>

## 9 The classification of AG compounds: introductory issues

We are now equipped with the tools necessary to tackle the classification of the compound types attested in AG in light of current treatments of compounding and its properties. The next sections look at some of the issues involved in the classification of Greek compounds, with a particular focus on how they have been tackled in classic accounts of AG and IE compounding. Especially in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, these accounts have often drawn from Classical Sanskrit grammar for their description of compounding. We will consider the advantages and drawbacks of these Sanskrit-inspired classifications and highlight those issues which are also at the core of more recent debates on compounding.

### 9.1 Classic approaches: from Sanskrit to Greek

As noted in section 4, the ancient Greek grammarians do not provide us with their own classification of compounds, with the result that modern accounts of Greek compounding, following the practice of nineteenth-century comparative philologists, have often relied on the terminology used in Classical Sanskrit grammar, particularly under the influence of the great grammarian Pāṇini (fifth-fourth century BC). In his grammatical masterpiece, the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, Pāṇini adopted a semantic approach for the classification of compounds. He distinguished between compounds in which the meaning is carried by both members (a category identified with the compound *dvandva* 'two-two'), those in which it is carried by the SC (a category identified with the compound *tatpuruṣa*: 'his servant'), and those in which the meaning refers to an external entity (a category

<sup>82</sup> See also Tribulato (2013: 38–42).

<sup>83</sup> See also Grandi and Pompei (2010: 222).

identified with the compound *bahuvrīhi* ‘having much rice’).<sup>84</sup> The category of *tatpuruṣas* corresponds to the category of subordinate compounds which we have considered above. Sanskrit grammars further subdivide the *tatpuruṣas* into three subtypes: *karmadhāraya* compounds, in which the FC functions as a description of the second (essentially [A N]<sub>N</sub> endocentric compounds); *tatpuruṣas* proper, in which the FC functions as an oblique case, or attribute of the second (essentially [N N]<sub>N</sub> and [N A]<sub>A</sub> endocentric compounds); and *dvigu* compounds, in which the FC is a numeral (*dvigu* means ‘two cows’).<sup>85</sup> In addition to these types, the Sanskrit grammarians isolated compounds characterized by the repetition of the same form and conveying an idea of iteration (*āmreḍita* ‘repetition’). In summary, Sanskrit was described as having six different compositional categories.<sup>86</sup>

The classical Sanskrit classification does not identify a separate category of verbal compounds, even though compounds displaying a verbal constituent are extremely prominent in this language. The reason is precisely the semantic approach adopted by the grammarians in their classification. Compounds with a verbal constituent can be subsumed under the macro-category of subordinated compounds, and this is what happens in the Sanskrit classification as well, particularly as concerns the extremely common types with a SC of verbal origin: they are grouped together with the *tatpuruṣas*. The much less widespread Sanskrit type with a verbal FC is addressed in Chapter 4, section 4.3.2, since its interpretation is debated (compounds of this type were sometimes classified with *bahuvrīhis* by the grammarians).

The principles of Sanskrit classification informed the early modern approaches to IE and Greek compounds.<sup>87</sup> At the beginning of the twentieth century, however, new criteria began to be adopted, eventually leading to the abandonment of the Sanskrit terminology (only *dvandva* and *bahuvrīhi* remain common terms) and to the elaboration of a more formal approach, particularly with regard to the category of *tatpuruṣas*.<sup>88</sup> In volume 2.1 of the fundamental *Altindische Grammatik* Wackernagel adopted the label *Determinativkomposita* for the *tatpuruṣas* and described these determinative compounds starting from

**84** Wackernagel (1905: 140). In the following discussion of Greek compounds I omit the macron in the first *i* of *bahuvrīhi* when I use the word as a technical term, as is the practice among morphologists (for the same reason, the word is mostly not italicized). The *Aṣṭādhyāyī* is edited and commented by Renou (1966), Joshi and Roodbergen (1991–).

**85** *Dvigu* must in fact be interpreted as a sub-class of *bahuvrīhis*: see Wackernagel (1905: 140, 305).

**86** Thus Salus (1965b: 40). On the origin of the Sanskrit terminology, see Sadovski (2002).

**87** See e.g. the one in Bopp (1861).

**88** On the interplay between semantic and formal approaches to classification, see also Lindner (2011: 31).

the formal analysis of the SC: verbal nouns, adjectives, and nouns of non-verbal origin.<sup>89</sup> Moreover, in the last sections of the volume Wackernagel discussed a class which does not find a separate treatment in classical Sanskrit grammar: compounds with a governing FC (which he termed *Rektionskomposita* ‘governing compounds’). These were sub-divided into compounds with an adverbial/prepositional FC and compounds with a verbal FC.<sup>90</sup>

In the same years, Karl Brugmann published a profoundly revised version of vol. 2.1 of the *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen* (1906), in which he introduced a modern terminology similar to Wackernagel’s. IE compounds were now distinguished into iterative, copulative, verbal governing (*verbale Rektionskomposita*), prepositional governing (*präpositionale Rektionskomposita*), determinative and bahuvrihis. The last two categories were identified on the basis of their endocentric and exocentric character respectively.<sup>91</sup>

There is an important difference between Brugmann’s and Wackernagel’s treatments. In the *Altindische Grammatik*, the *verbale Rektionskomposita* comprise solely those compounds with a verbal FC, while those with a verbal SC remain part of the *Determinativkomposita* (the Sanskrit *tatpuruṣas*). In Brugmann’s *Grundriss*, on the other hand, the *verbale Rektionskomposita* comprise both compounds with a verbal FC and compounds with a verbal SC.<sup>92</sup> Brugmann’s approach to the *verbale Rektionskomposita* is also followed in Ernst Risch’s *Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache* (1937; 1974<sup>2</sup>), which contains one of the clearest accounts of Greek compounding up to the present. On the other hand, Albert Debrunner’s *Griechische Wortbildungslehre* (1917) and Eduard Schwyzer’s *Griechische Grammatik* (1939), which continue Brugmann’s approach, only include V1 compounds among the *verbale Rektionskomposita*, while compounds with a verbal SC are treated together with determinative compounds.

## 9.2 *Rektion, government, verbal nexus*

The different terminologies and categorizations adopted in these classic studies highlight the interpretative difficulties associated with the two major categories of subordinated compounds, those with a verbal constituent and those with a

<sup>89</sup> Wackernagel (1905: 174–232).

<sup>90</sup> Wackernagel (1905: 308–321).

<sup>91</sup> The introduction of new terms, in German, into the second edition of the *Grundriss*, may perhaps be seen as another contribution of the *Junggrammatiker* Brugmann to the debate on IE word-formation, on which see Chapter 3, section 5.

<sup>92</sup> Cf. Lindner (2011: 21).

nominal head (determinative compounds). The term *verbale Rektionskomposita*—just like its twin *präpositionale Rektionskomposita*—describes a situation in which one of the compound constituents governs the other, as in the corresponding syntactic phrases.<sup>93</sup> While such a characterization applies unproblematically to prepositional compounds, it is far from uncontroversial in the case of verbal compounds: as noted by other scholars, on the whole compounds with a verbal SC do not express a structure which is substantially different from the one expressed by subordinated compounds in general.<sup>94</sup> Of course, in syntax proper there is a difference between government—which identifies ‘a kind of syntactic linkage whereby one word (or word class) requires a specific morphological form of another word (or class)’<sup>95</sup>—and subordination—which identifies a syntactic structure in which a clause depends on another. In compounding this difference is irrelevant, however, because the case-form which government selects in syntax is deleted in the compounds. Consider the following examples from Greek, where the case endings required by certain verbs or prepositions are replaced by suffixes or compositional vowels in the corresponding compounds:

- a. θεῶ̄ εἶκελος ‘similar to a god’ ~ θεοεἶκελος: the dative case marker -ῶ̄ is deleted (θεο- is the bare stem).
- b. φέρειν οἶκον ‘to carry a house’ ~ φερέοικος: the accusative case marker -ον is replaced by the adjectival suffix -ος.

In basic terms, these two examples are formed according to a determiner-determinatum relationship and it is therefore correct to classify them as subordinated compounds (of the determinative kind). The case for distinguishing between ‘verbal governing’ compounds from ‘determinative’ compounds mostly rests on the assumption that the verbal constituent in compounds such as φερέοικος or κουροτρόφος is a verb, not a noun. This theoretical question is very similar to that currently being discussed among morphologists apropos of synthetic compounds.<sup>96</sup> Section 6.1 discussed two possible interpretations of the structure of synthetic compounds, which can equally be applied to a Greek V2 compound such as κουροτρόφος:

- a. A verbal *stem* is selected and compounded with a lexeme: [[κουρο]<sub>N</sub> [τροφ]<sub>STEM</sub>]. The resulting form is provided with a derivational suffix which

<sup>93</sup> See Brugmann (1906: 61) on *verbale Rektionskomposita*: ‘ein Nomen ist “regiert” von einem Verbum oder einer Satzaussage oder von einem verbalen Nomen’. Cf. Lindner (2011: 21).

<sup>94</sup> See e.g. Uhlich (2002), Lindner (2011: 21).

<sup>95</sup> Crystal (1997) s.v. ‘government’.

<sup>96</sup> See Grandi and Pompei (2010: 211–221) for a typological perspective on the issue in Greek.



- makes it a noun or an adjective:  $[[\text{κουρο}]_N[\text{τροφο}]_{\text{STEM}}]_{\text{OC}}]_N$ . In section 6.1, the parallel structure for synthetic compounds was described as  $[[N \text{VStem}]_{\text{er}}]_N$ .
- b. The compound is formed by joining two lexemes:  $[[\text{κουρο}]_N[\text{τροφός}]_N]_N$ . Concerning English synthetic compounds, this structure was described as  $[N [N_{\text{er}}]]_N$ . This second interpretation, which in section 6.1 was favoured for English synthetic compounds, makes the differentiation of a separate category of verbal governing compounds even more redundant.

The problem in the interpretation of *κουροτρόφος* and similar forms lies in the nature of the SC itself, as discussed by Grandi and Pompei (2010: 212). While *κουροτρόφος* corresponds to a *simplex* (*τροφός* ‘nurse’), many other compounds of this kind seem to be formed with bound forms (i.e. there is no *simplex* attested in the whole history of Greek): an example is the numerous group of compounds in *-ποιός* ‘maker’ from *ποιέω* ‘make’, since *ποιός* does not occur as a separate word in Greek. There is no easy way of resolving this question. In a corpus language such as AG, there can be no certainty that the perceived lack of *simplicia* such as *\*\*ποιός* corresponds to reality. Moreover, the formation process of the *simplicia* themselves is debated: some scholars claim that they are back-formations from the compounds (Chapter 2, section 6.3.1). Even if we chose the label ‘verbal governing’ on account of the bound nature of many SCs such as *-ποιός*, we would still have to reckon with the many compound types which look and behave like specializations of the *simplicia* (e.g. *στράταρχος* ‘army-leader’ vs. *ἀρχός* ‘leader’).

The question is different in the case of compounds such as *φερέοικος*, because here the verbal element cannot be taken to be a noun, at least not from a synchronic point of view: this is arguable only for those of the *τερψίμβροτος* type, which some scholars link to action nouns in *-σις*, e.g. *τέρψις* ‘delight’. However, the nominal interpretation of the FC *τερψι-* and comparable forms (a fairly mainstream view) poses several problems in terms of structure: *τερψίμβροτος* and the likes would be left-oriented *bahuvrihis*, an otherwise very rare type in Greek (see Chapters 3 and 4 on this question). As regards the *φερέοικος* type, regardless of whether FCs such as *φερε-* are to be interpreted as stems or inflected verbal forms, it would be hard to class these compounds as determinative. Still, they can be subsumed under subordinated compounds, as in the classification of Scalise and Bisetto (2009: 50), where the ‘verbal nexus’ category belongs to subordinated compounds, or that of Grandi and Pompei (2010: 206).

On account of the difficulties which have just been highlighted, I adopt a classification in which Greek compounds with a verbal constituent are set apart from determinative compounds: this is a purely formal distinction and does not bear on the syntactic interpretation of the type, which I consider to be of the sub-

ordinated kind. For this reason, I have refrained from using the terms ‘governing’ and ‘verbal nexus’ whenever possible.

### 9.3 Endocentric and exocentric in the Greek compound system

Like many other languages, Greek has both endocentric and exocentric compounds. This section looks at a number of examples which may serve to introduce the overview of compound types presented in Chapter 2. The Greek compound system contains two immediately straightforward endocentric types:  $[N N]_N$  determinative compounds such as οἰνόπεδον ‘vineyard’ and  $[A N]_N$  determinative compounds such as ἀκρόπολις ‘high city’, which express subsets of the notions of ‘ground’ (-πεδον) and ‘city’ (-πολις) respectively. Other compound types may be considered to be ambiguous as concerns their endocentric character, and this is because of their primary or possible use as adjectives. Consider the following types:

- a. κουροτρόφος ‘nurturer of boys’. In spite of the existence of the noun τροφός ‘nurse’ mentioned above, the compound is primarily used as an attribution or apposition, for instance of γυνή ‘woman’ or Ἑλλάς ‘Greece’. All V2 compounds of this kind, i.e. those characterized by the masculine/neuter suffix -ος/-ον, are liable to be used as adjectives.
- b. Adjectival determinative compounds such as παμποίκιλος ‘all-variegated’, in which the SC corresponds to the *simplex* ποικίλος ‘variegated’.

Compounds such as the example in (a) display a modification in the morphological class of their head element (-τροφος) when they are used as adjectives: this is particularly evident when they are used in the neuter gender, in which the SC assumes the form -τροφον. When compounds such as κουροτρόφος are used as nouns, it is possible to run a semantic test to verify that they contain a head: to ‘is κουροτρόφος a type of τροφός’ (or: is ‘nurse of children’ a type of ‘nurse?’) the answer is ‘yes’, i.e. the compound is headed and endocentric. However, when κουροτρόφος is used as an adjective, its focus lies outside it: the compound no longer refers to a type of τροφός, but to something else, e.g. a land or city.

If we run another semantic test (is παμποίκιλος a type of ποικίλος? Or: is ‘all-variegated’ a type of ‘variegated’), we see that compounds such as the example in (b) remain in the same morphological class as their head element: παμποίκιλος is an adjective, just like its head ποικίλος.<sup>97</sup> Regardless of the fact that adjectives,

<sup>97</sup> On the usefulness of the semantic test, especially in the determination of headedness in compounding, see Scalise (1992a: 183–184). Without such a semantic understanding of head, the results can be confusing: see e.g. Barri (1975) for the idea that bahuvrihis are endocentric.

by nature status, refer to an external entity, παμποίκιλος is a subset of the idea of ποικίλος.

As already noted, endocentricity and exocentricity are not inherent properties of individual categories or forms, but arise from their use in context. Consider for instance καλλίπαις [beautiful child] which Aeschylus and other poets used with the possessive meaning ‘having beautiful children’ (exocentric determinative, bahuvrihi), but which Euripides used with the meaning ‘beautiful child’ (endocentric determinative: -παις is the head). The issue is also relevant to the debate on the origin of determinative compounds and bahuvrihis in PIE (Chapter 2, sections 4.7 and 5.2). Bahuvrihis such as ῥοδοδάκτυλος ‘with rosy fingers’ (ῥόδον ‘rose’ + δάκτυλος ‘finger’) are formed exactly like other determinative compounds, except that they undergo a mutation of linguistic function, becoming exocentric.<sup>98</sup>

Prepositional compounds such as ἔφαλος ‘by the sea’ (ἐπί ‘on’ + ἄλς ‘sea’) are always exocentric, since they are always used as adjectives and represent neither a subset of the preposition (ἐπί) nor of the governed noun (ἄλς). Another common exocentric category is the V1 type. As discussed in section 7.2 regarding *cutpurse*, the semantic test shows that φερέοικος ‘carry-house, one who carries the house’ is neither a type of φέρειν ‘carry’ nor a type of οἶκος ‘house’. Moreover, the whole compound expresses a morphological class which is different from that of its left-hand element φερε- (whatever its origin) and further confirms that φερε- is not the head of the compound, which is consequently not endocentric.<sup>99</sup>

Some accounts of AG and early IE compounding tend to regard the creation of endocentric compounds as a recent development in IE, part of what Hoenigswald (1977) described as a more general ‘trend towards endocentricity’. Accordingly, exocentric determinative compounds are considered to have arisen earlier than endocentric determinative compounds.<sup>100</sup> Two sets of proofs are adduced in favour of this view. First, some exocentric determinatives are re-used as endocentric ones: for instance καλλίπαις discussed above or ἄφιλος ‘without friends’, later used in the endocentric meaning ‘unfriendly’, i.e. ‘one who is not a φίλος’ (cf. the classic Vedic example *rājā-putra-* ‘having kings as sons’ vs. the endocentric determinative *rāja-pútra-* ‘king’s son’: the difference is marked by the accent). Second, there is the fact that endocentric determinatives seem to be rarer in early Greek.<sup>101</sup>

<sup>98</sup> Lindner (2011: 25).

<sup>99</sup> I adopt an interpretation which is different from that proposed in Tribulato (2006). The headedness of V1 compounds is a controversial issue: it is tackled in more detail in Chapter 2, section 7.5.3.

<sup>100</sup> Wackernagel (1905: 288)

<sup>101</sup> Risch (1944: 5–7).

I will take up this issue again in Chapter 2, sections 4.7 and 5.2, where the view that endocentric determinatives are rare in early Greek will be challenged.

#### 9.4 Right-oriented and left-oriented compounds

The final criterion which is useful for a better understanding of Greek compound types is the orientation of constituents. As noted, the Greek compound system is predominantly right-oriented. In subordinated compounds, therefore, the determinatum mostly occurs on the right, while the modifier mostly occurs on the left (κουροτρόφος, ροδοδάκτυλος, etc.). In endocentric subordinated compounds the determinatum also coincides with the head (ἀκρόπολις, etc.).

There are two kinds of exceptions to the prevailing right-oriented orientation:

1. V1 compounds and prepositional compounds have the determinatum on the left. In φερέοικος ‘house-carrying’, φερέζυγος ‘yoke-bearing’, φερέκαρπος ‘fruit-yielding’ the FC remains the same, but its meaning is specified by the various SCs (compositional forms of οἶκος ‘house’, ζυγόν ‘yoke’ and καρπός ‘fruit’). Similarly, in ἔφαλος ‘on the sea’ and ἐπίγαιος ‘upon the earth’ the FC remains the preposition ἐπί and its meaning is specified by -αλος and -γαιος (compositional forms of ἄλς ‘sea’ and γαῖα ‘earth’).
2. Some endocentric and exocentric determinative compounds have or are interpreted to have the determinatum on the left (this coincides with the head in the endocentric types). In section 7.3 we considered the example of the [N N]<sub>N</sub> endocentric determinative compound ἵπποπόταμος, which is left-headed. Similarly, in the [A N]<sub>A</sub> determinative compound ἀξιόλογος ‘worthy of mention’ the FC is the stem of the adjective ἄξιος ‘worthy’ and its meaning is completed by the SC -λόγος ‘word, mention’: the compound is left-headed and endocentric. For the ambiguous status of other potentially left-oriented compounds (particularly left-oriented bahuvrihis), see Chapter 2, section 7.2.

The left-oriented types exemplified in (1) and (2) do not have the same weight in the Greek compound system. Those under (1) are common and productive types, which remain so at all stages of the language. Those under (2), on the other hand, are self-contained sub-groups at best: this is the case with compounds in ἀξιο-, and others with a limited number of adjectival heads, as well as some animal and plant names with a substantival head (e.g. ἵπποπόταμος). Table 1.2 summarizes all the compound types represented in the Greek compound system.<sup>102</sup>

**102** On these categories and their place in IE linguistics, see too Lindner (2011: 32–36).

**Table 1.2:** Overview of Greek subordinated and coordinated types

	<b>Subordinated</b>		<b>Coordinated</b>
Endocentric	Right-oriented	Left-oriented	
	<b>Determinative</b>	<b>Determinative</b>	$[N N]_N$
	$[N N]_N$ οινόπεδον ‘vineyard’	$[N N]_N$ σύαγρος ‘wild pig’	ιατρόμαντις ‘doctor-diviner’
	$[A N]_N$ ἀκρόπολις ‘high city’ $[A A]_A$ παμποίκιλος ‘all-variegated’	$[A N]_A$ ἀξιόλογος ‘worthy of mention’	
	<b>Verbal</b>		
	$[N V]_{N/A}$ κουροτρόφος ‘nurturer of boys’		
Exocentric	<b>Determinative</b>	<b>Verbal</b>	$[Num Num]_{NUM}$
	$[N N]_A$ ῥοδοδάκτυλος ‘with rosy fingers’	$[V N]_A$ φερέοικος ‘carry-house’	δωδεκά ‘twelve’
	$[A N]_A$ λευκώλενος ‘with white arms’	<b>Prepositional</b>	
		$[P N]_A$ ἔφαλος ‘by the sea’	

## 10 Conclusion

The survey contained in this chapter has shown that compounding is far from being a settled topic, defined by shared and immutable parameters. One advantage of the on-going theoretical interest in the definition and analysis of compounds cross-linguistically is that it prompts us to view some of the specific characteristics of AG compounds in new perspectives and to update some of the classic discussions of Greek compounding in the light of current research. In particular, the classification proposed in this chapter has paid attention to the issues of headedness and orientation in compounding, which are of direct relevance to the category of V1 compounds. In the next chapter, the description of the individual compound categories will be arranged according to the macro-categories of coordinated and subordinated compounds, and hence of endocentric and exocentric types. This full analysis will set the stage for the study of the most prominent left-oriented category of AG: V1 compounds.



# Chapter Two

## The Compound Categories of Ancient Greek

### 1 Introduction

Chapter 1 dealt with those features which characterize compounding from a theoretical point of view and considered how the methodologies developed for modern languages contribute to identifying the key issue of AG compounding as well. Taking those theoretical premises as its starting point, this chapter provides a full classification of AG compound types in the light of those topics which are at the centre of current morphological debates, including headedness, the nature of exocentricity, and compound orientation. The compound system which emerges from this overview is a markedly right-oriented one which admits a limited number of well-defined left-oriented categories. Sections 7.1–7.5 focus on these left-oriented types in preparation for the analysis of the most common variety, V1 compounds, an analysis to which the remainder of this study will then be devoted.

### 2 Coordinated compounds

Coordinated compounds are forms in which all the constituents lie on the same syntactic level and whose structure, therefore, is in direct contrast to that of subordinated compounds. Most of the classic accounts of Greek compounding either treat the question of whether Greek possesses coordinated compounds in a cursory fashion,<sup>1</sup> or omit it altogether.<sup>2</sup> These accounts also tend to map Greek coordinated compounds to the productive Sanskrit category from which the technical term *dvandva* ('pair') derives.

According to the Classical Sanskrit classification, *dvandvas* are forms in which all constituents have the same syntactic function and which are perceived as a conceptual unity.<sup>3</sup> The type developed in Sanskrit through a number of stages. At first, only forms used in the dual were compounded, but they retained their individual accents: the classic example is *mitrá-váruṇā* 'Mitra and Varuna' (both constituents with dual ending). At a second stage, the FC began to appear in a different form from the SC (often in the nominative or accusative) but both

---

1 Debrunner (1917), Schwyzer (1939).

2 Risch (1974).

3 G. Meyer (1874: 2), Richter (1898: 23–47), Wackernagel (1905: 149–173).

constituents still retained their accent, e.g. *mitrā-vāruṇayoḥ* ‘of Mitra and Varuna’ (where the SC has the genitive ending, but the FC is still in the dual). Finally, the compound acquired a single accent (e.g. *indrā-pūṣṇóḥ* ‘of Indra and Pūṣan’) and the FC began to appear in the simple stem (e.g. *indra-vāyú*, where the FC is in the simple stem: compare the form *indrā-* in the previous example).<sup>4</sup> Side by side with this original *dvandva* type, Vedic began to develop another type of coordinated compounds which denoted groups and collective entities: in these newer forms, which are more numerous in Classical Sanskrit, the FC always employs the bare stem, while the SC takes plural endings, as in *ajā-vāyas* [goat sheeps] ‘goats and sheep’ (the [a:] in *ajā-* results from *Kompositionsfuge* of *ajā-* ‘goat’ and *vái-* ‘sheep’).

## 2.1 Classification issues: endocentric and exocentric coordinated compounds

Modern accounts of coordinated compounds criticize the application of the Sanskrit term *dvandva* to forms attested in a variety of modern languages. Typological studies reveal that compounds which can be transformed into a coordinated phrase do not all have the same semantic properties.<sup>5</sup> The basic definition of coordinated compounds as compounds in which ‘all constituents lie on the same syntactic level or have identical status’ is admittedly very broad and, as a consequence, insufficiently precise.<sup>6</sup> This is reflected in the variety of different coordinated structures described in the literature.<sup>7</sup> We begin by listing those which also find parallels in MG; the fact that coordinated compounds are well-represented in that language suggests that their ancestry may extend back to AG.

1. Collective or hyperonymic coordinated compounds (also termed co-compounds). These refer to an entity/notion which is superordinate to the compound constituents: e.g. MG *μαχαροπήρουνα* [knives forks] ‘cutlery’ (a comparable form is the Mandarin compound *dāo-qiāng* [sword spear] ‘weapons’).<sup>8</sup> This is the type which is closest to the Classical Sanskrit class of *dvandvas*.

<sup>4</sup> Wackernagel (1905: 149), Macdonell (1916: 269).

<sup>5</sup> On the issue of terminology, see Arcodia, Grandi and Wälchli (2010: 178–184), Ralli (2013: 157), with references.

<sup>6</sup> Arcodia, Grandi and Wälchli (2010: 177–178) discuss the ambiguities surrounding the concept of ‘coordination’.

<sup>7</sup> This overview is based on the theoretical frameworks developed by ten Hacken (2000), Olsen (2001), Wälchli (2005), Bauer (2008), Scalise and Bisetto (2009).

<sup>8</sup> Arcodia, Grandi and Wälchli (2010: 178), Manolissou and Tsolakidis (2009: 32), both following the framework of Wälchli (2005).



2. Coordinating or hyponymic compounds. These refer to an entity/notion which is subordinated to one of the compound constituents, i.e. they represent a subtype of one of the constituents: e.g. αρχιτέκτονας-αρχαιολόγος [architect archaeologist] ‘an archaeologist who is also an architect’. This type is common to many languages, e.g. *woman doctor*, Sp. *lanza-espada* [spear sword] ‘a spear with a blade’, etc.<sup>9</sup>

The guiding principle in the classification of these two types is semantic, since there are no special features which set the first type apart from the second. However, the examples under (1) are exocentric, while those under (2) are endocentric. According to the typological model proposed in Arcodia, Grandi and Wälchli (2010), compounds of type (1) are the basic type of coordinated compounds, while hyponymic endocentric coordinating compounds of type (2) are a developed type only in the languages of Western and Central Europe.

From a theoretical point of view, the question is whether the endocentric compounds under (2) should be considered to have two heads—i.e. whether in *woman doctor* both constituents add to the meaning of the entity designated by the compound as a whole—or whether only one of them is a head. The question does not receive a single answer in the literature, and individual examples too receive contrasting interpretations.<sup>10</sup> On account of these ambiguities, Olsen (2001: 284–286) chooses to define instances like *woman doctor* as ‘pseudo-dvandvas’.

## 2.2 Coordinated compounds in Greek

The long history of the Greek language makes it a valuable source of insights in respect of this general issue. Greek seems to have moved from a situation in which type (1) was rare and (2) comparatively common to a situation (MG) in which (2) has limited attestation and (1) has become hugely productive. In AG, the collective coordinated compounds of type (1) are used only as numeral forms, e.g. δωδέκα [two ten] ‘twelve’, which semantically expresses a superordinate notion (twelve *contains* two and ten); or as adjectives such as γλυκύπικρος ‘bitter-sweet’ (this taste *contains* elements of bitter and sweet, but is something different from both). It should be noted, however, that γλυκύπικρος might also be interpreted as expressing a nuance of ‘bitter’, according to which the bitterness is accompanied

<sup>9</sup> Arcodia, Grandi and Wälchli (2010: 178), Manolesou and Tsolakidis (2009: 25).

<sup>10</sup> See Scalise and Bisetto (2009: 46) and, *contra*, Arcodia, Grandi and Wälchli (2010: 193); cf. Chapter 1, section 8.

by hints of sweetness: as such, the compound would have an endocentric character and fall within our type (2).

Compounds belonging to (2) are more common in AG, e.g. *ιατρόμαντις* [doctor diviner], *κλαυσίγελως* [tear laughter] ‘laughter mingled with tears’, *μηλοπέπων* [apple melon] ‘type of sweet melon (*Cucumis melo*)’ and *ἵππαλεκτρῶν* [horse cock] ‘gryphon’.<sup>11</sup> However, in many of these cases, an analyst may choose either to focus on the coordinated unit expressed by the compound, in which both constituents have head status and which functions as an apposition of something else, or to decide that there is only one semantic head (usually the SC) and that these are endocentric determinative compounds.<sup>12</sup>

Some AG coordinated compounds have become famous for their recursive character, i.e. the accumulation of constituents (usually to the left). Such forms seem to have been typical of comic style and often occur in contexts where a list is being recited (usually of foods): a well-known example is the spellbinding *λοπ αδο-τεμαχο-σελαχο-γαλεο-κρανιο-λειψανο-δριμι-υποτριμ-ματο-σιλφιο-παραλο-με λιτο-κατακεχυμενο-κιχλ-επικοσσυφο-φαττο-περιστερ-αλεκτρουν-οπτο-πιφαλλιδ ο-κιγκλο-πελειο-λαγωο-σιραιο-βαφη-τραγανο-πτερυγών* in *Ar. Eccl.* 1169–1174, where, together, the many stems identify a dainty dish containing all kinds of fish, meat, fowl and sauces (giving us an exocentric coordinated compound). Comic language also favours a special variety of determinative compound in which the FC is itself a compound, and specifically a compound of the coordinated type: see for instance *σπερμ-αγοραιο-λεκιθο-λαχανό-πωλις* [seed of common sort pulse vegetable-seller]: ‘seller of seeds, cheap pulse and vegetables’ (*Ar. Lys.* 457), in which the head is *-πωλις* ‘female seller’ and its modifier is the recursive coordinated form *σπερμ-αγοραιο-λεκιθο-λαχανό-*. These long determinative compounds continue to be found in popular strata of Medieval and Modern Greek.<sup>13</sup> It was probably this type that prompted Meyer’s statement that Greek ‘*dvandvas*’ belonged to ‘dem Munde des Volkes oder dem Geiste des Kunstdichters’, and were not an inherited feature.<sup>14</sup>

AG also has PNs of the coordinated type (2), such as *Ἄρκολέων* [bear lion], *Ἄρκόλυκος* [bear wolf] and *Λυκολέων* [wolf lion].<sup>15</sup> The semantic interpretation of these names is open to debate: should *Ἄρκολέων* be understood as ‘he who IS a lion and a bear at the same time’ (hence as an endocentric compound), or ‘he who HAS a lion and a bear in himself’ (hence as an exocentric compound)? On a more

<sup>11</sup> Debrunner (1917: 40–1), Manolessou and Tsolakidis (2009: 28).

<sup>12</sup> Uhlich (1993: 91).

<sup>13</sup> Manolessou and Tsolakidis (2009: 36).

<sup>14</sup> G. Meyer (1874: 29).

<sup>15</sup> See Masson (1988).

speculative level, the interpretation ‘he who IS a lion similar to a bear’ (giving us a kind of endocentric determinative) is also defensible, though the resulting meaning is less intuitively plausible.<sup>16</sup>

As already noted, this coordinating hyponymic type (2) became increasingly inconspicuous in the language: MG complies with the typological model theorized by Arcodia, Grandi and Wälchli (2010), according to which type (1) is the more common. The few examples of (2) in MG often have a special morphological status, since they have a [word word] structure which goes against the principle of stem compounding and also have two accents. Manolessou and Tsolakidis (2009: 24–25) therefore maintain that loose multi-word forms like αρχιτέκτονας-αρχαιολόγος ‘architect-archaeologist’ or παιδί-θαύμα ‘child-prodigy’ are modelled on French compounds and do not represent the continuation of the old coordinating type.

Examples of (1) such as γυναικόπαιδα ‘women and children’ (plural) seem to have been introduced from Medieval Greek and are more common in modern dialectal varieties than in standard MG.<sup>17</sup> Type (1) also subsumes a typical feature of standard MG, [V V] coordinated compounds such as κλοτσώ-πατώ [kick step in] ‘kick and step in’.<sup>18</sup>

### 3 Iterative compounds

Sanskrit grammars include among coordinated compounds a subclass in which an inflected word is repeated twice to convey the idea of iteration, e.g. Vedic *dāme-dame-* ‘in every house’ (where *-e* is the locative ending) as opposed to *dāme* ‘in the house’. The technical name given to these forms is *āmreḍita* (lit. ‘repetition’), but it should be noted that the word *dvandva* ‘pair’ is itself an iterative compound. Iterative compounds with inflected constituents are also found in Avestan and Armenian; outside the IE family, they have parallels in Malay.<sup>19</sup> Cross-linguistically, however, iteratives with simple stems rather inflected constituents are the most common variety.<sup>20</sup>

<sup>16</sup> Risch (1944: 56–61) for instance calls these forms ‘Mischungskomposita’ and treats them among determinative compounds.

<sup>17</sup> Manolessou and Tsolakidis (2009: 27–29).

<sup>18</sup> See Manolessou and Tsolakidis (2009: 31) and Ralli (2013: 158–175), though with different terminology.

<sup>19</sup> Salus (1965a).

<sup>20</sup> The prevalent MG forms typified by λίγο-λίγο [little little] > ‘slowly’ and the Italian forms *fuggi-fuggi* [run run] > ‘stampede’ and *piano-piano* [slow slow] > ‘very slow’ should not be considered authentic iteratives like *dāme-dame-*, since they express intensification rather than repe-

### 3.1 Iterative compounds in Greek

AG does not have an unequivocal category of iterative compounds and the interpretation of individual forms is a matter of debate. Rare forms such as *πάμπαν* [all all] ‘wholly’ may be interpreted as reiterations of full words (the adverbial neuter *πᾶν* ‘wholly’) rather than stems.<sup>21</sup> The picture becomes more interesting once we probe the Mycenaean evidence. The Linear B tablets contain the compounds *we-te-i-we-te-i* [year year] ‘every year’, in which both constituents clearly display the locative ending, and *a-mo-ra-ma* [day day] ‘every day’, in which the constituents are likely to be inflected in the accusative.<sup>22</sup> *a-mo-ra-ma* finds a parallel in the adverb *a-ma-ti-a-ma-ti* [day day] ‘every day’, attested in the Cypriot inscription *ICS*<sup>2</sup> 318: this form displays the dative singular of *ἄμαρ*, *ἄμαρτος* ‘day’ (Attic-Ionic *ἡμαρ*) in both constituents.<sup>23</sup>

These three forms, which have clear parallels in Sanskrit, Avestan and Armenian, suggest that iterative compounds may have been inherited from PIE but lost in most varieties of Greek. Since *a-ma-ti-a-ma-ti* is the only example of an iterative compound dating from first-millennium Greek, one might speculate that it represents an ‘Achaean’ relic.<sup>24</sup> It is perhaps just a coincidence, but the Cypriot and the Mycenaean examples are both found in the context of accountancy documents. *a-ma-ti-a-ma-ti* appears twice on side B of a sixth-century BC ostrakon (*ICS*<sup>2</sup> 318), containing a list of offerings consisting in jars of wine.<sup>25</sup> The Mycenaean tablet PY Es 644, containing *we-te-i-we-te-i*, deals with tributes of wheat, while tablet KN Am 660, containing *a-mo-ra-ma*, deals with a list of personnel. It may be speculated that such crystallized expressions survived as part of the lexicon typical of accountancy texts.

---

tition or distribution. Moreover, in the MG type *λίγο-λίγο* both constituents are accented, so that it is unclear whether these forms ought to be considered true compounds in the first place. See Ralli (2013: 39–42), who suggests that this type of doubling in Greek was the result of contact with Turkish. Cf. also Manolessou and Tsolakidis (2009: 24).

**21** For examples of iteration outside compounding, see Debrunner (1950: 700).

**22** The form may derive from *\*ām̥-ām̥*, yielding two different outcomes of *\*r̥* according to its position within the word: for this and other interpretations, see Meissner and Tribulato (2002: 316–317).

**23** See Egetmeyer (2010: 306) and Egetmeyer (1992) s.v. for further references on this form.

**24** ‘Achaean’ is a conventional term to refer to the 2nd-millennium common ancestor of a number of Greek dialects.

**25** Masson (1966), Egetmeyer (2010: 791).

## 4 Subordinated compounds

In subordinated compounds, the constituents do not lie on the same syntactic level, insofar as one of them specifies, restricts or modifies the idea conveyed by the other. When the determinatum represents a hyperonym of the meaning expressed by the whole compound, it also constitutes the head of the compound, which is therefore endocentric. This typology applies to determinative compounds proper and to most verbal compounds. When no constituent fulfils this function, the compound is headless, or exocentric. This typology applies to possessive compounds (*bahuvrihis*), V1 compounds and prepositional compounds. Both typologies include right-oriented and left-oriented groups. Right-oriented compounds are more numerous in AG and will be tackled first.

### 4.1 Right-oriented endocentric determinative compounds in Greek

Endocentric determinative compounds include the majority of compounds attested in modern European languages. According to the most common configuration, the determiner occurs on the left and the head, specified by the determiner, on the right (type *school teacher*), whereas left-headed languages display the opposite structure (e.g. It. *capostazione* ‘stationmaster’, in which *capo* is the head). As noted in Chapter 1, section 9.1, traditional accounts of IE compounding treat determinative compounds according to the Sanskrit subdivision into *tatpuruṣas*, in which the modifier has the function of a case (e.g. the locative or the genitive, as in AG οἰνόπεδον ‘vineyard’, literally meaning ‘ground of wine’), and *karmadhārayas*, in which the modifier describes the SC in an attributive relationship (e.g. ἀκρόπολις ‘high city’). Such a syntactic-semantic subdivision of the notion of determination is now generally abandoned in favour of a formal description of the constituents, which splits determinative compounds into those with a substantival head and those with an adjectival head.<sup>26</sup>

Determinative compounds with a substantival head are by far the most common in Greek and can be further subdivided according to the type of modifier: noun (as in οἰνόπεδον: determiner from οἶνος ‘wine’), adjective (as in ἀκρόπολις: determiner from ἄκρος ‘high’), preposition (as in πρόσοδος ‘entrance’: the determiner is the preposition πρὸς ‘towards’), or prefixoid (as in δυσμήτηρ ‘bad mother’).<sup>27</sup> Determinative compounds as a whole are the least common category in the

<sup>26</sup> Lindner (2011: 31).

<sup>27</sup> See Risch (1944) and Risch (1949), summarized in Risch (1974: 21–23). The attitude of classic accounts of Greek compounding contrasts with current morphological theory, according to

Linear B tablets and their development in early Greek is debated.<sup>28</sup> We will return to this issue after our overview of the various subtypes.

#### 4.2 [N N]<sub>N</sub> endocentric determinative compounds

According to Risch (1944), determinative compounds with a substantival FC are not fully developed in Homeric Greek, representing either relics from older linguistic stages (the case of δεσπότης = Myc. *do-po-ta* ‘lord of the house’, whose FC is a fossilized genitive no longer attested in Greek) or kinship terms (μητροπάτωρ ‘mother’s father, maternal grandfather’, πατροκασίγνητος ‘father’s brother, paternal uncle’, etc.). In Mycenaean, definite examples of this type are very rare and include the much-discussed theophoric epithets *si-to-po-ti-ni-ja* ‘Lady of grain’ (cf. Σιτώ in Sicily) and *a-ne-mo-i-je-re-ja* ‘Lady of the wind’.<sup>29</sup> Homeric Greek also contains other isolated forms, including δημογέρων ‘elder of the people’, ψευδάγγελος ‘false messenger’ (lit. ‘messenger of lies’), etc. The oldest layers of Vedic match Risch’s description of Homeric Greek.<sup>30</sup>

In later archaic texts [N N]<sub>N</sub> endocentric determinative compounds are attested in greater numbers. Forms such as μελίλωτος ‘melilot’ (a fruit), used by Sappho, or κοκκύμηλον ‘plum’ (lit. ‘plum-apple’, ‘fruit of the plum’), used by Hipponax, indicate that the type was more developed in common language, a trend which again corresponds to what we find in the more recent layers of the Vedic poems.<sup>31</sup> Epigraphic sources of the Archaic and Classical periods confirm that [N N]<sub>N</sub> determinative compounds soon became both more widespread and more numerous than those with an adjectival FC.<sup>32</sup>

In this context, special attention should be paid to a subclass which will be useful for the investigation of AG verbal compounds, that of the type Ἐλλησποντοφύλαξ lit. ‘guardian of the Hellespont’ (Athenian customs official who controlled trade in the Hellespont) and ψευδάγγελος ‘false messenger’. The SCs -φύλαξ ‘guardian’ and -άγγελος are nouns which create popular denominative verbs, φυλάσσω ‘to guard’ and ἀγγέλλω ‘to announce’. Similar forms are κήρυξ ‘herald’ > κηρύσσω ‘to be a herald, to proclaim’, μάντις ‘prophet’ > μαντεύομαι

---

which forms in δυο- and negative ἀ- (which are *prefixes*) are not compounds, but derivations. The issue and its implications in the linguistic debate are discussed by Amado Rodríguez (1998: 97–98), Grandi and Pompei (2010: 216).

**28** Meissner and Tribulato (2002: 313–315).

**29** Meissner and Tribulato (2002: 314).

**30** Frisk (1934: 288).

**31** Frisk (1934: 289).

**32** For the latter, see the survey in Tribulato (2005: 116–117).

‘to divine’, ποιμήν ‘herdsman’ > ποιμαίνω ‘to herd’. The compounds containing these nouns in their SC are therefore nominal rather than verbal, but the semantic overlap with V2 compounds is high, and the structure of both categories is identical; as we will see in Chapter 6, section 5, this fact may have some relevance for the formal definition of a part of V2 compounds in Greek.

### 4.3 [A N]<sub>N</sub> endocentric determinative compounds

The picture we gain of determinative compounds with an adjectival modifier in early Greek is a confusing one. According to Risch (1944), adjectival modifiers were more common than substantival ones in early poetic Greek: he draws attention to those in κακο-, e.g. Κακοίλιος ‘unhappy Ilios’ (which finds a semantic parallel in prefixed forms with δυσ- such as δυσμήτηρ ‘bad mother’ and Δύσπαρις ‘unhappy Paris’) and to ethnonyms such as Πανέλληνες ‘all the Hellenes’. Forms of πᾶς, particularly in the adverbial form παν-, are common in determinative compounds of the Archaic period: see for instance παμβασιλεύς ‘absolute monarch’, used by Alcaeus.

From among the categories which developed in the Classical and Hellenistic periods, Risch (1949) singles out compounds in -πολις which (perhaps based on the model of ἀκρόπολις) are typically compounded with adjectival FCs: e.g. νεόπολις ‘new city’, μεγαλόπολις ‘great city’, Καλλίπολις ‘beautiful city’, etc. In general, however, most of the new determinatives are of the [N N]<sub>N</sub> type: this tendency is also confirmed by the epigraphic evidence, where adjectival FCs are not numerous.<sup>33</sup> The development of this type of determinatives has not been studied in earnest: such a study is a *desideratum* in the field of AG compounding.

### 4.4 [P N]<sub>N</sub> endocentric determinative compounds

An often neglected type of determinative compound is that in which the head is modified by a preposition/adverb, e.g. ὑφηνίοχος ‘(subordinated) chariot-eer’ (Hom.), i.e. an ἡνίοχος who is ὑπό ‘below’ someone else. The literary and epigraphic evidence reveals that this type was well-developed in Classical Attic, where we find forms such as ξυνγραμματεύς ‘joint-secretary’ (i.e. a γραμματεύς who is ξύν ‘together with’ someone else), συμπρύτανις ‘joint-prytanis’ (i.e. a πρύτανις who is σύν ‘together with’ another), πρόσοδος ‘approach, entrance’ (i.e.

<sup>33</sup> Tribulato (2005: 119).

an ὁδός which leads πρὸς ‘towards’), etc.<sup>34</sup> The type of determinative compound with a prepositional or adverbial modifier continues into MG, with examples such as πανο-τόκι ‘top interest’ and ἐξό-πορτα ‘outer door’.

These early endocentric examples show that AG was quick to employ a vast range of lexical categories for the formation of determinative compounds, something which appears to support the hypothesis that Greek developed a ‘trend towards endocentricity’ (see section 4.6). In particular, post-Classical Greek was marked by a proliferation of the [P N]<sub>N</sub> type indicating individuals and professions, probably because of the need for more, and more accurate, terms to describe the officers involved in the administration of the vast Hellenistic and Roman Greek world, and perhaps also in connection with the expansion of scientific language, which required transparent terminology. This expansion of [P N]<sub>N</sub> forms was only part of a huge increase in the number of terms for professions and official titles, among which we may mention those with the verbal FC ἀρχι- (which has acquired the function of a prefix meaning ‘chief’; see Chapter 6, section 3.1), e.g. ἀρχιερεύς ‘chief-priest’; those with the adjectival FCs πρωτο-, e.g. πρωταγωνιστής ‘first actor’, and ἀριστο-, such as the honorary title ἀριστοπολιτευτής ‘best citizen’; and various translations of Latin terms, such as δυάνδρες = *duumviri* and ἀντιπαμίας = *proquaestor*.<sup>35</sup>

#### 4.5 [Num N]<sub>N</sub> endocentric determinative compounds

This is a self-contained but relatively productive type. Some compounds in ἡμι-, probably influenced by the bahuvrihi type (see section 5.3), are determinative: see e.g. ἡμίονος ‘half-mule’ (already Myc.). In Classical Greek, compounds with τρι- ‘thrice’ have their own line of development, because they represent emphatic subtypes of their heads: see for instance τρίδουλος ‘thrice a slave’ (Soph.), τριγέρων

<sup>34</sup> The status of Mycenaean forms such as *pe-ra-a<sub>3</sub>-ko-ra-i-ja* ‘Further Province’ and *de-we-ro-a<sub>3</sub>-ko-ra-i-ja* ‘Hither Province’ is ambiguous. The FCs are the locative adverbs πέρας and δεῦρο, which may have a role comparable to the one of prepositions, but the compoundhood of the forms is disputed: see Meissner and Tribulato (2002: 313). According to De Angelis and Gasbarra (2010: 162) early determinative compounds with a prepositional FC were ‘creazioni espressive, probabilmente poetiche, la cui natura di composti sembrerebbe piuttosto secondaria’. In these compounds, the preposition—originally an apposition—would have progressively lost its autonomous status, so that the compounds would have been reanalysed as prepositional rather than determinative. The authors however are mistaken in thinking that this type of determinative compounds is rare and residual: on the contrary, as noted, it shares in the same expansion of usage which affects determinative compounds in post-Classical Greek more generally.

<sup>35</sup> Risch (1949: 247–270).



‘triple old, very old’ (Aesch.).<sup>36</sup> The same structure is probably displayed by the Mycenaean title *ti-ri-se-ro-e* /tris-hērōei/ (dat.) ‘thrice hero’. Adjectives derived from numerals are found in τριτοπάτωρ ‘great-grandfather’, πρώτομηνία ‘new moon’ (Doric), τριτημόριον ‘third part’, etc.

#### 4.6 [P A]<sub>A</sub>, [A A]<sub>A</sub> and [N A]<sub>A</sub> endocentric determinative compounds

As noted, the head of Greek determinative compounds may also be an adjective. In this case the whole compound represents a nuance of the main idea expressed by the adjective, which can be modified by a preposition, a prefix or, more rarely, a noun. Prepositional FCs are the most common: they express a degree of the adjectival idea, as in ὑπέρυθρος ‘reddish’ vs. ἐρυθρός ‘red’, or a locative specification of the head, as in ἀμφιδέξιος ‘ambidextrous’ (literally ‘dexterous at both sides’) vs. δεξιός ‘dexterous’. The type is already attested in the Mycenaean adjective *ku-su-pa* = σύμπας ‘all together’. Adjectival FCs fulfil a similar adverbial function, as in παγχρύσεος ‘wholly golden’, and are already found in the Mycenaean PNs *pa-na-re-jo* = Παν-άρειος ‘all martial, all devoted to Ares’ and *pa-di-jo* = Πάνδιος ‘all divine, all devoted to Zeus’.

Adjectival determinatives too have not been fully investigated from a diachronic perspective, and we still rely on the cursory treatment of Risch (1944: 30–34) and Risch (1974: 213–214). Risch observes that in Homeric Greek only six adjectival determinative compounds are of the [N A]<sub>A</sub> type. These are ἐγχεσίμωρος ‘mad for/with the spear’ (an adjective describing warriors who ‘rage with the spear’), ὑλακόμωρος ‘mad for barking, always barking’, πόδαργος ‘swift at the feet’, ἀρηϊφίλος ‘dear to Ares, martial’, κορυθαίολος ‘swift/glittering as concerns the helmet’ (another adjective describing warriors) and θεοείκελος ‘god-like’. From a semantic point of view, these FCs further define the area of application of the adjectival heads. The presence of what looks like a dative plural in the FC of ἐγχεσίμωρος is consistent with the supposition that the compound derives from a syntactic phrase, from which it inherits the case governed by the adjective μωρός ‘fool’.<sup>37</sup>

A similar syntactic interpretation is likely to apply to all the other examples in which the FC can be seen to carry out the function of dative of limitation or accusative of respect in the underlying syntactic phrases. ἀρηϊφίλος, κορυθαίολος and θεοείκελος all manifest a degree of interference from syntactic phrases, be it the presence of an inflected FC (ἀρηϊφίλος), the odd semantics (κορυθαίολος works

<sup>36</sup> Risch (1949: 275).

<sup>37</sup> Risch (1944: 30).

better if we understand it to mean ‘glittering/colourful at the helmet’, with the FC carrying out the function of an old accusative of respect, rather than ‘moving the helmet quickly’, as in *LSJ*;<sup>38</sup> or the presence of similar syntagms in the Homeric poems (θεοείκελος, which in two cases refers to Achilles, has a parallel in the frequent line-end vocative θεοῖς ἐπιείκελ’ Ἀχιλλεῦ ‘ο Achilles, similar to the gods’). As for πόδαργος, which is often discussed as the typical ‘reversed bahuvrihi’ (i.e., a left-oriented bahuvrihi), it may well derive from the phrase πόδ’ ἀργός, in which the adjective is restricted by the accusative of respect πόδα (see the fuller discussion in section 4.6.1 concerning the development of adjectival determinative compounds in Greek).

Other types of evidence can serve to support the hypothesis that the compounding of adjectives with substantival modifiers was not a fully developed linguistic process in early Greek, a hypothesis which is consistent with the fact that the Homeric nucleus of this compound type seems to have a pronounced syntactic origin.<sup>39</sup> The first piece of evidence is the continuing lack of substantival modifiers in the compounded adjectives attested in later Greek: the modifiers of compounded adjectives continue to be prepositions or other adjectives used adverbially (the [P A]<sub>A</sub> and [A A]<sub>A</sub> types described above). Among these adjectival modifiers, some of the most common are παν-, ὀλιγο-, μεγαλο-, μικρο- and ἄκρο-, i.e. spatial modifications which express degrees along the scale of the meaning conveyed by the adjective. Modifiers which specify the adjectival head more accurately, for instance by expressing the area to which it is limited (as in the English examples *skin-tight*, *garden-fresh* and *care-free*), are still the exception in Classical and post-Classical Greek. When they do occur, they all tend to modify adjectives which express abstract qualities, such as friendship and love (e.g. παιδόφιλος ‘loving children’), folly (e.g. γαστρίμαργος ‘mad for the stomach, gluttonous’ in Pindar and δορίμαργος ‘mad for/with the spear’ in Aeschylus) and value (e.g. δουλοπόνηρος ‘bad like a slave’s’, qualifying a fig of low quality in Teleclides).

There may be a degree of convergence here with the typological model developed by Dixon (1982), which divides adjectives into the universal semantic categories of Dimension, Physical Property, Colour, Human Propensity (e.g. *happy*), Age, Value (e.g. *good*) and Speed.<sup>40</sup> In English, no members of the classes Dimension,

**38** Following Herodian’s interpretation (3.1.228.12–13 Lentz: see Chapter 1, section 4.4), the meaning of the compound is connected by *LSJ* and most of the literature to the idea of ‘moving fast’ (αἰόλλω), but αἰόλος may be better understood as conveying an idea of ‘diversity in colour’: see Méndez Dosuna (2011: 93–95), Méndez Dosuna (2012: 14–16). See also section 7.2.2.

**39** Frisk (1941: 14–20), Risch (1974: 212–213), Stefanelli (1997: 244–248).

**40** Dixon (1982: 16).

Colour, Age and Speed seem to take the prefix *un-* (that is, they cannot be negated by means of a compound form).<sup>41</sup> These categories typically express semantic opposition through antonymic pairs: the opposite of *large* is not *\*\*unlarge* but another word, e.g. *small*. By contrast, Value and Human Propensity allow a great number of *un-* constructions. This can be attributed to the fact that these adjectival categories have less clear-cut semantics, so that the opposite of a word is not always appropriately expressed by another. Antonymic pairs are found for some basic meanings (e.g. *good* and *bad*, as opposed to *\*\*ungood*), but *polite* is negated by both *rude* and *impolite*, demonstrating that *polite* and *rude* are not perceived to be the exact opposite of each other, as *bad* and *good* are.

Dixon is not concerned with compounded adjectives in particular, but it is interesting to note that in English it seems to be possible for all his categories to be compounded with another noun: see *mile-long* (Dimension), *skin-tight* and *garden-fresh* (Physical Property), *red-brown* (Colour), *care-free* (Human Propensity), *weeks-old* (Age), *snail-slow* (Speed).<sup>42</sup> However, adjectives conveying fundamental attributes, particularly in the Value class (*good*, *bad*, *proper*), are usually not compounded, and many which indicate abstract qualities (Human Propensity) are likewise rarely compounded with modifying nouns (see e.g. *jealous*, *kind*, *clever*, *generous*, *happy*, *cruel*).

The Greek restriction on the development of a productive class of endocentric [N A]<sub>A</sub> compounds most likely constitutes proof that the trend towards endocentricity was not fully developed in Greek. The fact that the few compounded adjectives of this type belong to the class identifying abstract qualities may indicate that the restriction was breached in the case of adjectives indicating non-physical qualities, perhaps because of their potential semantic blurriness. This is not the place to test this hypothesis thoroughly, but it may be worthwhile to undertake a comprehensive analysis of Greek compounded adjectives from the point of view of their semantic typology.

#### 4.7 Overview of the development of right-oriented endocentric determinative compounds in Greek

The preceding outline of the categories of determinative compounds lays the ground for a number of concluding comments which need to be made before we can proceed to the analysis of other compound classes. On the whole, determinative compounds comprised the least common compound category in Mycenaean

<sup>41</sup> Dixon (1982: 20).

<sup>42</sup> A corpus of English compounded adjectives is collected in Meys (1975).

and Archaic Greek, but over the history of the language their number increased considerably.<sup>43</sup> The paucity of determinatives in early Greek is seen as an inherited feature, and part of the late development of endocentricity in the IE family.<sup>44</sup>

However, it is important to remember that the documentation for early Greek is biased towards literary evidence. There is a greater tendency for the elevated language of poetry in particular to feature epithets, and these are by definition adjectives and usually exocentric compounds. In his investigation of the connection between compounding and literary style, G. Meyer (1923: 35) noted that determinative compounds were distinctive of the ‘descriptive’ style, typical of prose and less heightened parts of poetry. An investigation of determinative compounds occurring in Archaic and Classical inscriptions shows that this type becomes increasingly common over the first centuries of the history of Greek, acquiring a role that cannot be appreciated solely from the study of Archaic poetic language.<sup>45</sup> The development of determinative compounds observed in post-Classical Greek therefore has its roots in earlier stages of the language and should not be seen as a sudden blooming.

Moreover, if the notion of endocentricity is extended to a large portion of V2 compounds, then it emerges that the oldest stages of Greek already possessed a large number of endocentric types: V2 agent nouns are particularly common in Mycenaean Greek (see sections 6.3.2 and 6.4.1). The Classical Greek compound system is therefore endocentric to a far greater extent than usually acknowledged in classic accounts of AG compounding. The only endocentric category which remains limited is that comprised of  $[N A]_A$  determinative compounds, and this is the result of what seems to have been a restriction on substantival modifiers of adjectives, a characteristic which contrasts with freer situations such as that represented by Modern English. The Greek evidence, paired with the data from other ancient IE languages, may well prove that the compounding of adjectives was a later addition in IE as a whole, but this obviously needs further investigation.<sup>46</sup>

The factors influencing the increase of determinative compounds in AG have not been investigated in a systematic fashion. However, certain suggestions raised in the works of scholars who have tackled various classes of endocentric compounds in IE offer a promising starting point for further analysis. Frisk, discussing  $[A N]_N$  determinative compounds (ἀκρόπολις, γλυκύμαλον), compares them to the common Sanskrit type in which an adjectival modifier is compounded with a verbal SC, e.g. *pūrva-gátvan-* ‘going to meet’ (in which the FC *pūrva-* is an adjec-

<sup>43</sup> Risch (1944: 5).

<sup>44</sup> Risch (1944: 5), Benveniste (1967: 18–21), Hoenigswald (1977), Meier-Brügger (2003: 293).

<sup>45</sup> Tribulato (2005: 115–122).

<sup>46</sup> Hoenigswald (1977: 10).

tive meaning ‘previous’).<sup>47</sup> Frisk does not take this point further, but the implication may be that V2 compounds exerted an influence on the formation of determinative compounds, which were rare in Vedic.

This intuition is more explicitly developed by Risch, who notes that some AG adjectival determinatives have the meaning of a participle and may have been influenced by V2 compounds.<sup>48</sup> Similarly, Risch ascribes the rise of determinative compounds in ἤμι- (e.g. ἤμιονος ‘mule’) to the influence, at the PIE stage, of compounded participles, a type later represented by e.g. Skt. *sāmī-cita-* ‘half-piled’. According to this model, therefore, FCs compounded with verbal SCs were extended to nominal SCs: a case in point is the spread of the negative prefix ἄ- from V2 compounds such as ἄελπτος ‘unexpected’ or ἄζυξ ‘unyoked’ to adjectival determinatives such as ἀμείλιχος ‘implacable’ vs. μέλιχος ‘kind’. Note that ἀμείλιχος is the nominal variant of the verbal passive adjective ἀμείλικτος ‘unsoftened’ (from μελίσσω ‘to soften’). Determinative compounds drew extensively on other compound categories as well. As Risch (1944: 37–38) notes, the spread of the negative prefix ἄ- to substantival determinatives resulted from the semantic reanalysis of some bahuvrihis, leading to the reinterpretation of ἄξενος ‘having no guests’ (Hes. *Op.* 715) and ἄφιλος ‘having no friends’ (Soph. *Phil.* 1018) as endocentric formations meaning ‘inhospitable’ (Eur.) and ‘unfriendly’ (Aesch.) respectively. The combined influence of V2 and possessive compounds therefore gave rise to a whole range of non-verbal negative adjectives in Classical and post-Classical Greek.<sup>49</sup> In general, many substantival and adjectival determinatives have FCs which were earlier used in other categories of compounds, and many subtypes develop out of the reanalysis of older classes: as we have seen, the V1 compound ἀρχιερεύς changes its meaning from ‘person who commands the priests’ to ‘chief-priest’ (determinative structure), while the prepositional determinative ὑφηγίος ‘(sous-) charioteer’ may originally have had a prepositional exocentric structure, indicating ‘someone who is under the charioteer’.

## 5 Right-oriented exocentric determinative compounds (bahuvrihis)

Bahuvrihis are determinative compounds in which a noun, an adjective, a preposition, or a prefix (ἄ-, δυν-) modifies a substantival SC; they always refer to an external entity, and their function is to indicate the characteristics possessed by

<sup>47</sup> Frisk (1934: 285).

<sup>48</sup> Risch (1944: 30).

<sup>49</sup> See the interesting examples in Frisk (1941: 15–20), Risch (1949: 273–275).

that entity. The term ‘bahuvrihi’ derives from the Sanskrit grammatical tradition: since it identifies someone or something which ‘has much rice’, it has become a common label for possessive compounds. ‘Bahuvrihi’ should therefore always be used to mean ‘possessive’ rather than—as is not infrequently the case in modern accounts of compounding—‘exocentric’ in general.<sup>50</sup> It should also not be used to refer to V1 or prepositional compounds, both of which are exocentric categories but do not express a possessive notion.

Greek and Sanskrit make extensive use of this inherited pattern, which seems to have become marginalized in modern IE languages: while the rarity of bahuvrihis in Romance perhaps conforms to the overall restriction on compounding in this branch, the small numbers in English, German and Irish are more striking.<sup>51</sup> In general, in all these languages bahuvrihis mostly survive as denominations (PNs, surnames, nicknames, toponyms), a tendency manifested also by MG (see section 5.3).<sup>52</sup>

## 5.1 Structure, suffixes and accent

The classic handbook example of a Greek bahuvrihi is the Homeric epithet of Dawn ῥοδοδάκτυλος ‘having rosy fingers’: the FC derives from ῥόδον ‘rose’ and modifies the SC δάκτυλος ‘finger’ by indicating its physical characteristics (arguably a rosy colour and softness). The compound is determinative, but it does not indicate a type of finger: its reference point (in this case Dawn) lies outside the constituents. ῥοδοδάκτυλος is therefore an exocentric compound whose adjectival function is conveyed by the suffix -ος (masc./fem.), -ον (neut.). The adjectival status of ῥοδοδάκτυλος is ambiguous in that the adjective ῥοδοδάκτυλος is identical to the simple noun δάκτυλος, so that the adjectival function is not immediately identifiable on formal grounds. The adjectival nature of ῥοδοδάκτυλος emerges, however, once we consider that the masculine form is also used to modify nouns of feminine gender, as in the Homeric formula ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἡώς ‘rosy-fingered Dawn’, where Ἡώς is a feminine noun. In other bahuvrihis the adjectival suffix

**50** Scalise and Bisetto (2009: 36), Bauer (2009: 351).

**51** For Romance possessive compounds, see the overviews in Scalise (1992a), Rainer and Varela (1992), Villalva (1992). For Germanic languages, see Carr (1939), Marchand (1969: 13–14, 386–389), Becker (1992). Old Irish bahuvrihis are discussed by Uhlich (1993: 115–117). Note that this category does not subsume exocentric compounds as a whole, which according to some accounts are a typologically common category: see Scalise, Fábregas and Sforza (2009: 50, 81–82), Lieber (2009a). There are divergent views, however: Dressler (2006) for instance considers exocentric compounds less common, while Bauer (2010: 174) draws attention to their ‘remnant-like status’.

**52** Ralli (2013: 111–113), with examples from the MG dialects.

attached to the SC is more transparent. Consider for instance *πολύανδρος* ‘of many men, full of men’ and *ἀγριόφωνος* ‘with rough voice’: the SCs *-ανδρος* and *-φωνος* derive from the stems *άνδρ-* of *άνήρ* ‘man’ and *φων-* of *φωνή* ‘voice’ respectively, to both of which the adjectival suffix *-ος* is attached.

The modification of the substantival SC through an adjectival suffix is therefore the first marker of Greek bahuvrihis.<sup>53</sup> From a morphological point of view, the suffix signals that the SC has changed morphological class.<sup>54</sup> *-ος* is the most common suffix in SCs derived from first- and second-declension stems, but it is also found with a variety of consonantal third-declension stems (as e.g. in *μελάνυδρος* ‘having black water’ vs. *ὔδωρ* ‘water’ or *ἄπυρος* ‘without fire’ vs. *πῦρ* ‘fire’). Another common suffix is *-εσ-* (*-ης* in the nom. sg. masc./fem.), which serves to derive adjectives from s-stem nouns, as in *πολυανθής* ‘with many flowers’.<sup>55</sup> Other third-declension stems may be left unaltered, e.g. *λεύκασπις* ‘with a white shield’ (< *ἀσπίς* ‘shield’) and *χαλκεοθώραξ* ‘with brazen corslet’ (< *θώραξ* ‘corslet’).

The second marker of Greek bahuvrihis is their tendency to bear the accent on the FC.<sup>56</sup> Among the examples just quoted, *πολύανδρος*, *ἀγριόφωνος*, *μελάνυδρος*, *ἄπυρος* and *λεύκασπις* comply with this rule, but *πολυανθής*, *χαλκεοθώραξ* and the paradigm itself *ρόδοδάκτυλος* do not. In the case of *χαλκεοθώραξ* and *ρόδοδάκτυλος*, this is because of the Greek ‘three-syllable rule’: the accent cannot go beyond the antepenultimate syllable and so *ρόδοδάκτυλος* cannot be accented **\*\*ρόδοδάκτυλος**. The antepenult may be accented if the last syllable is short (as in *ρόδοδάκτυλος*), but the accent must fall on the penultimate if the last syllable is long: this is the case for *χαλκεοθώραξ*, which could not be accented **\*\*χαλκεόθωρηξ**. In *πολυανθής*, on the other hand, the typical bahuvrihi accentuation is overridden by the rule governing so-called ‘Caland compounds’, which seem to have been prototypically accented on the SC.<sup>57</sup>

**53** See Hirt (1928: 40) and, for Sanskrit, Wackernagel (1905: 101–102).

**54** For this reason, some older accounts also call bahuvrihis ‘*mutata*’: among them, see Brugmann (1906: 75).

**55** This suffix is part of the ‘Caland system’, on which see Risch (1974: 218–219), Meissner (2006: 161–165) and Chapter 1, section 4.1.

**56** Cf. Brugmann (1906: 115). Exceptions to this rule in Vedic and Greek are discussed by Melazzo and Melazzo (2010).

**57** In *-ης* compounds the most frequent oxytone accentuation (as in *πολυανθής*) is probably more recent than the residual paroxytone accentuation (e.g. *θρασυμήδης* ‘having bold plans’): see Meissner (2006: 200–201).

## 5.2 The relationship between bahuvrihis and determinative compounds

The recognition that accentuation of the FC is typical of bahuvrihis has led scholars to assign other compound categories which display this feature to the bahuvrihi class. For instance, passive V2 compounds with an o-grade stem in the SC (ὄρεσίτροφος ‘reared on mountains’, see section 6.3.1) are commonly interpreted as deriving from reanalysed bahuvrihis. This development would involve a first stage in which a possessive compound is formed with a *nomen rei actae* (in this case, τροφή ‘nourishment > ὄρεσίτροφος ‘having his nourishment on mountains’) followed by a second stage in which the formal identity between the mutated SC -τροφος and the SC of agentive verbal compounds (κουροτρόφος ‘rearing children’) causes the compound to be semantically reinterpreted as ‘reared on mountains’. The accent on the FC, which is the marker of these passive compounds and sets them apart from the active variety, would thus be inherited from the old bahuvrihi pattern.

Similarly, V2 compounds such as πολέμαρχος ‘war-lord’ have been interpreted as former bahuvrihis containing a verbal noun (in this case, ἀρχή ‘power’), later reanalysed as a *nomen agentis*.<sup>58</sup> Certainly, the group of compounds with an agentive SC is too vast to justify the conclusion that they all arose from possessive structures, but a bahuvrihi origin would help to explain a number of problematic issues concerning the Greek agent nouns and their compounds (see section 6.3.1). J. Schindler proposed a similar explanation to account for the structure of the Greek V1 compounds such as τερψίμβροτος; they derive, in his view, from possessive compounds containing *nomina actionis* in -σις (τέρψις ‘delight’) in the FC (on this hypothesis, which the present study rejects, see Chapter 4 section 4.3.1).

The relationship between bahuvrihis and endocentric determinative compounds too has long been debated by scholars. Some accounts take bahuvrihis to be typical of the oldest stages of PIE, in which inflections had not yet been developed.<sup>59</sup> More recently, the supposed antiquity of bahuvrihis has been adduced in support of the theory that endocentricity was a later development in PIE and the

<sup>58</sup> Brugmann (1906: 116).

<sup>59</sup> See e.g. Hirt (1928: 40): ‘Die Bahuvrihi stammen, wie wir wohl heute mit Sicherheit sagen dürfen, aus der flexionslosen Epoche des Idg.’ and Jacobi (1897: 87–94). This interpretation of bahuvrihis follows the view of the development of PIE from a primordial isolating stage to its final inflectional nature, which was and still is maintained by many scholars, among them Jacobi himself (1897: 111). The issue is tied to the syntactic analysis of other compound types, for instance V1 compounds, which, accordingly, would have at a more recent stage of PIE: see Andriotis (1938: 92–93), Lehmann (1969: 1–4), Kastovski (2009: 329). On the implications of the wider linguistic debate for the interpretation of compounding, see Amado Rodríguez (1988: 94–95), Lindner (2012) and Lindner (2013) *passim*.



IE languages.<sup>60</sup> The high proportion of bahuvrihis in the oldest linguistic layers of Greek and Vedic may be considered evidence in favour of this view. However, the caveat expressed above apropos of the paucity of determinative compounds in early Greek is also relevant to this question, since most of the early documentation is heavily biased towards highly formulaic poetic language abounding in epithets. Even the bureaucratic language of the Linear B tablets is not particularly useful for assessing the antiquity of bahuvrihis, because most of the compounds in question are names, a category in which bahuvrihis are highly prevalent: out of ca. 150 bahuvrihis included in Waanders (2008: 49–63), at least 112 are onomastic.<sup>61</sup> If we had extensive prose passages, our perception of the preponderance of bahuvrihis might well change, but in the present state we should be careful not to draw firm conclusions from the ancient evidence in its present state.

Among those scholars who refuse to analyse the relationship between bahuvrihis and determinative compounds in chronological terms, K. Brugmann holds a position of authority. In a 1906 article Brugmann devoted a few influential pages to the issue of exocentricity, and the view he expounded was that bahuvrihis are, quite simply, substantives transformed into adjectives: in other terms, they are determinative compounds used in an exocentric manner.<sup>62</sup> At the same time, Brugmann was careful not to infer from this that determinative compounds as a group *preceded* bahuvrihis: in the second edition of the *Grundriss* he stated that bahuvrihis and determinative compounds simply went back to the same stage of PIE.<sup>63</sup> This is certainly the most sensible way of looking at the matter. Bahuvrihis and determinatives need not have arisen at different chronological stages: they have the same basic structure, but opposing reference points and functions. The fact that bahuvrihis are numerically more frequent in the oldest written stages of IE can mostly be ascribed to the nature of the documentation in our possession.

### 5.3 Types and productivity of bahuvrihis

The bahuvrihi type remains a familiar pattern throughout the history of AG. Each of its subtypes can be illustrated with examples drawn from Mycenaean and Homeric Greek:

---

<sup>60</sup> Hoenigswald (1977: 9).

<sup>61</sup> See too Meissner and Tribulato (2002: 302).

<sup>62</sup> Brugmann (1905–1906: 59). See also Chapter 1, section 9.3.

<sup>63</sup> Brugmann (1906: 75).

**[N N]<sub>A</sub> type**

*ke-ro-ke-re-we-o*, possibly the genitive singular of the PN /k<sup>h</sup>ēro-klewēs/ ‘whose fame is in the hands, famous for his hands’ is a perfect parallel of historical names such as Πατροκλής ‘having fame from the father’. In both Mycenaean and Homeric Greek, however, bahuvrihis with clearly substantival FCs are rare (but see the caveats in section 5.4).

**[A N]<sub>A</sub> type**

The PN *o-ku-na-wo* /ōku-nāwos/ ‘having fast ships’ displays the same FC as the Homeric epithet ὠκύπτερος ‘having fast wings’. As noted, adjectival FCs are more common than substantival ones.

**[P N]<sub>A</sub> type**

*a-pi-do-ra* /Amp<sup>hi</sup>-dōrā/ ‘who has gifts all around her’ is one of the clearest bahuvrihi PNs of Mycenaean. This prepositional type is well-attested in Homer, with forms such as ὑπό-ρρηνος ‘with a lamb under it’. There is frequently an overlap with other classes of compounds which have prepositional FCs, and this involves a shift in meaning (and thus in compound category). For instance, the morphology of the SC suggests that περικαλλής was originally a bahuvrihi of κάλλος ‘beauty’ meaning ‘having beauty all around’, but it soon came to be understood as a prefixed adjective meaning ‘very beautiful’. Similarly, ἀμφίαλος started off as a bahuvrihi (‘having the sea all around it’) but could be reinterpreted as a prepositional compound, ‘which is by the sea’, with ἀμφί- governing the SC.<sup>64</sup>

**[Prefix N]<sub>A</sub> type**

Some of the most productive types of bahuvrihi contain the prefixes ἀ- and δυσ-. The first is already commonly found in Mycenaean, with forms such as *a-ko-to-no* /a-ktoinos/ ‘without land’ and *a-ka-ra-no* /a-krānos/ ‘without head’. The prefix δυσ- does not seem to be attested in the extant Linear B tablets, but the Homeric poems contain up to ten different bahuvrihis with this FC, among

<sup>64</sup> Risch (1974: 187).

them *δυσκέλαδος* ‘having a bad noise, ill-sounding’ and *δυσκλεής* ‘having a bad reputation, inglorious’.

### [Num N]<sub>A</sub> type

In the Sanskrit tradition, bahuvrihis with a numerical FC receive the name *dvigu*. The type is already well-attested in Mycenaean, with *to-pe-za* = *τράπεζα* [four foot] ‘table’, *ti-ri-po-de* (dat.) = *τρίπους* ‘tripod’, *qe-to-ro-we* /k<sup>w</sup>etr-ōwes/ (neut. sg.) ‘with four handles’ (qualifying a vase). In alphabetic Greek, compounds with a numerical FC often indicate weights and measures: *διώβολον* ‘coin of two obols’ (< ‘containing two obols’), *δίδραχμον* ‘coin of two drachms’, *ἐκατόμπεδος* ‘a hundred feet long’. Among such cases, forms with the bound FC *ἡμι-* (which derives from the root of the numeral *\*sem-* ‘one’) are numerous: e.g. *ἡμίδραχμον* ‘half-drachma’, *ἡμιούγκιον* ‘half ounce’, etc. Semantically, these forms often overlap with determinative compounds (section 4.5).

Although there exist several studies of the language of individual authors, we lack at present an overview of the development of the bahuvrihi class in Greek and, in particular, of its productivity at later stages of the language.<sup>65</sup> The number of bahuvrihis in MG seems to have decreased: apart from those surviving or resurrected from AG, some have their origin in dialectal varieties, most notably Cypriot, Cretan and other southern dialects. The examples from these varieties quoted by Ralli (2013: 112–113) tend to be expressions denoting individuals by way of their physical properties, and may demonstrate that MG, like other modern European languages, mostly exploits the bahuvrihi type for onomastic purposes (see 5.4 below). A full diachronic study of bahuvrihis throughout the history of the language remains a desideratum.

### 5.4 Metaphorical function of the FC

In Greek, primary adjectives like *ώκός* or *λευκός* ‘white’ are less numerous than secondary adjectives, which are derived from nominal stems: for instance, *Αἰγύπτ-ιος* ‘Egyptian’ (< *Αἴγυπτος* ‘Egypt’), *κροκό-εις* ‘saffron-coloured’ (< *κρόκος* ‘saffron’), *χρῦσ-εος* ‘golden’ (< *χρυσός* ‘gold’). Since Greek tends to avoid suffixed forms as compound constituents, it is usually impossible to distinguish between an adjective and the noun from which it derives when these are used

<sup>65</sup> Forster (1950) focuses only on bahuvrihis with a prepositional FC.

in compounding: in Αἴγυπτο-γενής ‘of Egyptian race’, κροκό-πεπλος ‘with saffron-coloured robe’ and χρυσό-πτερος ‘with golden wings’ the FCs always contains a bare stem.<sup>66</sup> Because of this formal ambiguity, the structural classification and semantics of these compounds is often a matter of interpretation: we may understand κροκόπεπλος to mean ‘with a robe coloured with saffron’ (thus taking the FC to be a noun in instrumental function) or ‘with a saffron-coloured robe’ (thus taking the FC to be the adjective κροκόεις). The impossibility of drawing a formal distinction between FCs from nouns and those from secondary adjectives therefore provide grounds for caution in drawing statistical conclusions concerning bahuvrihis with substantival FCs.

In semantic terms, bahuvrihis display an overwhelming tendency to employ secondary adjectives (or the nouns from which they derive) in a metaphorical fashion.<sup>67</sup> ῥοδοδάκτυλος literally means ‘with fingers of roses’: its FC does not *materially* indicate that Eos’ fingers are roses, but metaphorically conveys the idea that they have the same quality (colour, softness, freshness...) as roses. Following Schindler (1986), we may say that ῥοδοδάκτυλος compounds express the notion ‘X (Eos) has B (fingers) like the quality of A (roses)’. Other bahuvrihis, such as κυνώπης ‘having the eyes of a dog’, fulfil a different function, namely ‘X has B (eyes) like that of A (dog)’.<sup>68</sup> In both cases, the FCs convey an idea that works as an apposition of the SC by operating on a metaphorical level.

The Homeric compounds collected in Risch (1974: 183–184) suggest that bahuvrihis with a clearly attributive relationship between the constituents (e.g. χρυσόορος ‘with a golden sword’) were more common. Metaphorical FCs, by contrast, seem to have been more limited in the first samples of recorded Greek record and to have been confined to epithets and PNs. Of the very few Mycenaean compounds with a substantival FC, none has a metaphorical function: we may surmise that the type was either not yet developed or was associated with a kind of language which the administrative character of the Linear B tablets does not represent well.

Adjectival FCs comprise the majority of bahuvrihis attested in the West European languages, while the number of substantival FCs is far more limited. Judging from the material collected in Last (1925), almost all of these rare substantival FCs

<sup>66</sup> This is part of the Greek tendency to avoid suffixed forms as compound members: the bibliography is collected and commented on in Lindner (2012: 74–84); Schindler (1986) and Stefanelli (1997: 262–263) discuss this phenomenon in relation to bahuvrihis. See also Tribulato (2013: 35–37).

<sup>67</sup> The issue is tackled in Tribulato (2013).

<sup>68</sup> Schindler (1986: 393–394). The metaphorical understanding of the FC had already been recognized by Fabian (1931: 37, 57).

have a metaphorical function and indicate physical qualities similar to those of a material (e.g. the bird-names *silk-tail* and *Seidenschwanz*), a concrete object (e.g. *pot-belly*) or animal (e.g. *Swineshead*). All these forms are onomastic, being used as animal names, surnames, nicknames or toponyms: a clear specialization of such exocentric compounds is therefore in evidence, a fact that ties in well with their low productivity in modern Germanic languages.<sup>69</sup> The onomastic specialization of metaphorical bahuvrihis is also observable in a few Old Irish PNs, although the type as a whole is rare: examples include *coinchenn* [dog head], *milbél* [honey mouth], *mordraige* (genitive of a name meaning [blood mind] > ‘stupid’), *órainech* [gold face], *tarbainech* [bull face].<sup>70</sup> As concerns Romance, bahuvrihis with a substantival FC are rare and often represent crystallized expressions used in onomastics.<sup>71</sup> The evidence from these European languages ties in well with the fact that in Homeric Greek metaphorical bahuvrihis are usually epithets, i.e. forms which are by nature very close to onomastics. What emerges, then, is a picture of bahuvrihis as part of that interchange between the poetic lexicon and onomastics which is also observable in relation to other AG compound categories, such as V1 compounds (see section 8).

## 6 V2 compounds

Compounds containing a SC derived from a verbal root, a verbal stem, a verbal noun or a participle are the most common class in Greek compounding. The means of creating such V2 compounds is an inherited feature of the language, but the development of this class in Greek reaches a level of sophistication which can only be compared to that of Sanskrit. In this respect, Greek is both similar to and different from English. Like English, Greek develops right-oriented V2 compounds extensively, but while in English the V2 class is morphologically limited to the common types of synthetics in *-er* and *-ing* (which encompass several semantic classes), in Greek the number of individual subtypes—each attaining a substantial level of productivity—is much higher and involves all kinds of verbal nouns and adjectives, as well as participles.<sup>72</sup>

<sup>69</sup> See further Carr (1939: 167–168), Marchand (1969: 387).

<sup>70</sup> Uhlich (1993: 115). The type with an adjectival FC, on the other hand, is frequent: see Uhlich (1993: 116–117). It has a rival in the *Armstrong* type, on which see section 7.2.2.

<sup>71</sup> See the Italian surnames *Bellarbarba* ‘(Mr) nice beard’ and *Capogrosso* ‘(Mr) big head’.

<sup>72</sup> The status of English forms compounded with gerunds, participles and other verbal nominalizations is disputed and involves the debate over synthetic compounds (see Chapter 1, section 6.1): for an overview, with references, see Spencer (1991: 324).

The next sections provide an introductory and necessarily cursory description of the subtypes of V2 compounds, and from this we will be able to move on to a consideration of several questions concerning their structure and productivity. This background knowledge will be useful for the study of the other type of verbal compounds developed by AG, those with a verbal FC. For the sake of convenience, the right-oriented subtypes are grouped according to whether their verbal constituent *tends* to be a bound form or not. This subdivision is to some extent a simplistic one, in that there exist individual compounds of the first group (with bound SCs) which have attested *simplicia*, while in the second group there are well-known exceptions such as the large classes of compounds in *-ουργός* and *-ποιός*, which do not correspond to *simplicia*. However, the subdivision is a useful means of highlighting the fact that in Greek the overwhelming tendency is to develop and increase types which correspond to verbal *simplicia*. Greek thus moves away from the kind of stem compounding which is reconstructed for PIE and develops a large class of endocentric compounds in which the head corresponds to a nominal or verbal *simplex*, while at the same time marginalizing the inherited bound types.

### 6.1 Bound SCs: root compounds

Bound forms are linguistic elements which only occur as part of other words. In compounding, this is often the case with verbal stems which, modified by suffixes or linking elements, appear as compound constituents (both in second and first position) but which are not attested in the language as independent words. In right-oriented root compounds, the SC is a verbal noun formed without overt suffixes. The typical example of this type is the noun *βουπλήξ* [ox strike] ‘ox-goad’: its SC *-πλήξ* (< *πλήγ-*: *-ς* marks the nom. sg.) contains the root which in Greek creates the present *πλήσσω* ‘to hit’. As with the majority of such verbal root nouns, *-πλήξ* is never attested as a *simplex*. The lack of a derivational suffix marks the antiquity of this compound type, which survives in the IE languages of ancient attestation (among them Sanskrit and Latin, with forms such as *havr-ád-* ‘eating offerings’ and *prin-cēps* lit. ‘taking the first place’) but overall tends to be lost or refashioned into more productive types; an exception is Sanskrit, where the type is extremely productive.<sup>73</sup>

The rarity of root compounds in Greek must be due to the fact that they have three disadvantages. The first is that their SC is almost never attested as an independent noun: half of the existing *simplicia* are found in ancient grammatical

<sup>73</sup> See the monograph by Scarlata (1999).

works only and seem to represent learned back-formations that probably never existed in the spoken language.<sup>74</sup> The second disadvantage is their inflection. The verbal roots employed in these compounds end in a variety of consonants and vowels and the compounds follow the third declension: the lack of a single suffix possessed by all of them makes root compounds difficult to pigeonhole as a well-defined inflectional type. On a semantic level, the lack of a suffix endowed with a clear-cut function constitutes another disadvantage: root compounds do not have fixed semantics, but range from an active-transitive meaning (βουπλήξ) to active-intransitive and even passive semantics (παραβλώψ ‘looking askance’, δίζυξ ‘double-yoked’), a flexibility which can be manifested even by one and the same word (e.g. ἀγνός meaning both ‘not knowing’ and ‘not known’). In terms of grammatical category too these compounds are ambiguous, insofar as they are often used as adjectives, but again the difference between an adjectival or substantival usage is not marked by any suffix: for example, the adjective κορυθαίξ ‘shaking the helmet’ in *Il.* 22.132 (κορυθαίξι πολεμιστή ‘warrior shaking the helmet’) is not characterized by an adjectival suffix.

These difficulties may account for the fact that already in Archaic Greek a low number of root compounds are attested: Risch (1974: 196) counts thirty-one different compounds in the Homeric poems, which, in proportional terms, amount to a far smaller number than the nine hundred individual forms counted by Scarlata (1999) for Vedic. These Homeric compounds, moreover, derive from a limited number of roots which does not increase over time: for the most part, they are relics, sometimes fossilized as instrument nouns (e.g. χέρνυψ, which has a precedent in Mycenaean *ke-ni-qa* ‘hand-washer’), sometimes confined to poetic language.<sup>75</sup>

This lack of a suffix does not apply to roots ending in a vowel. Here, probably to aid the transition from the vocalic root to the third-declension endings, the affix *-t-* is added after the final vowel of the root, e.g. ἀβλήξ, *-τος* ‘not thrown’ from the stem βλη- of βάλλω, or ἀγνός, *-τος* from the stem γνω- of γινώσκω. This *-t-* affix, which must reach as far back as PIE since it is also attested in Sanskrit, Avestan and Latin (*sacer-dōs* < \**sacer-dō-t-s*), does not convey any morpho-semantic function. Such *-t-*enlarged root compounds were probably the starting point for one of the most important innovations in Greek word formation, the development of the category of agentive compounds and nouns in *-tās* (section 6.4.1). Apart from compounds in *-βλήξ*, which exhibit some productivity, these

<sup>74</sup> For the residual nature of many Greek root nouns, see Chantraine (1933: 1–5).

<sup>75</sup> The ending *-a* in *ke-ni-qa* may be interpreted as an accusative singular of the third declension, but also as the nominative plural of the neuter /k<sup>h</sup>ernig<sup>w</sup>on/, which would imply an early thematization of the root compound: see Panagl (1977).

*-t*-enlarged root compounds are residual in Classical Greek and are refashioned, where possible, into new compounds in *-tās* or replaced with other agentive types, all of which have the advantage of a more transparent [N N] structure. As for the hypothesis that *-t*-enlarged root compounds are also behind the FCs of V1 compounds, see Chapter 3, section 6, and Chapter 4, section 4.3.1.

## 6.2 Bound SCs: compounds in *-ής*

Another type of bound compound deriving directly from verbal roots is that of V2 adjectives in *-ής* such as γυναιμανής ‘mad for women’, which shares the *ē*-suffix with the stative (later passive) aorist ἐμάνην ‘to be mad’.<sup>76</sup> The origin of these verbal compounds is not transparent, but a plausible hypothesis is that two originally distinct types merged together to create a highly productive class of V2 compounds. The first of these original types was based on *-η-* aorists; the second came about when ‘Caland’ bahuvrihis derived from *s*-stem nouns (e.g. διογενής ‘having his origin in Zeus’ < γένος ‘kin’) were reinterpreted as V2 compounds (‘born from Zeus’).<sup>77</sup> Such a reinterpretation made it possible to derive compounds from virtually any verbal stem, regardless of the existence of an *-η-* aorist.

V2 compounds in *-ής* have SCs which are almost always bound forms: the few *simplicia* in *-ής* are clearly back-formations.<sup>78</sup> These compounds cover a well-defined semantic spectrum, which ranges from the expression of intransitivity and passivity to the less common expression of transitivity: one possibility is that they were initially created to provide Greek with a class characterized by clear intransitive semantics, but which could also express the range of nuances encompassing passive and intransitive, thus differing both from adjectives in *-τος* (which are mostly passive) and from other types of V2 compounds (which are mostly active-transitive).<sup>79</sup> Since, however, a few V2 compounds in *-ής* are also used with active semantics and might therefore seem to be in competition with other agentive types (most notably V1 compounds), a detailed study of their productivity vis-à-vis other verbal classes is provided in Chapter 6, section 4.

<sup>76</sup> The type is already found in Mycenaean: see *po-ro-e-ke* (probably with the SC *-εχής*), *ke-re-si-jo we-ke* (probably an analytical spelling for the compound Κρησιοεργής ‘of Cretan craftsmanship’).

<sup>77</sup> For the interplay between these two types, see Meissner (2006: 187–188, 196–197).

<sup>78</sup> Meissner (2006: 206–210).

<sup>79</sup> Paliuri (2014: 186–187).



### 6.3 Unbound SCs: agentive adjectives and nouns in -ος

These are compounds with an active or passive meaning whose SC derives from a verbal root and displays the suffix -ος; the paradigmatic examples for the active type are κουροτρόφος ‘children-rearing’ (an adjective used as an epithet of lands and cities) and στρατάρχος ‘army-leader’ (a noun), whereas the passive type is exemplified by ὄρεσίτροφος ‘reared on mountains’, already mentioned in section 5.2. An investigation of the huge productivity of -ος compounds, a type which is still active in MG, and of the evolving semantics of many individual forms, is well beyond the scope of the present volume and indeed would require a monograph of its own. The next sections focus instead on some areas which are relevant for the investigation of the development of V1 compounds within the Greek compound system: the origin of -ος compounds (section 6.3.1); their development into an endocentric [N N] structure and interaction with agentive compounds in -της (section 6.3.2); and their morphological characteristics, particularly as concerns the shape of the verbal roots from which they derive (section 6.3.3). Our investigation of these issues will provide the necessary background for the full investigation of Greek V1 compounds undertaken in this book, since -ος compounds are the most significant rival to V1 compounds, in terms both of semantics (both classes are agentive) and of usage (both classes create compounds which can be used as adjectives).

#### 6.3.1 Hypotheses on the PIE origin of -ος compounds

Nouns in -ος are very common in Greek. Simple and compounded agent nouns make up a very large proportion of them, and can be subdivided into two classes:

1. Nouns in the o-grade from ablauting verbal roots, e.g. τροφός ‘nurturer, nurse’ < τρέφω ‘to nourish’.<sup>80</sup>
2. Nouns from verbal roots which display no ablaut in Greek, e.g. ἀρχός ‘commander’ < ἄρχω ‘command’.<sup>81</sup>

In parallel to these agent nouns in -ός, the same verbal roots often produce simple and compounded *nomina actionis* (expressing a verbal action) or *nomina rei actae* (expressing the result of a verbal action) in -ος such as φόνος ‘murder’. In AG, these are distinguished from the corresponding agentive nouns by the position of the accent, as can be seen in the opposition between the agent noun φονός ‘murderer’ and the *nomen actionis* φόνος ‘murder’. Another kind of formal differenti-

<sup>80</sup> Chantraine (1933: 8).

<sup>81</sup> Chantraine (1933: 12), Risch (1974: 10, 198).

ation between agent and action nouns is achieved through the feminine suffix *-ā* (> Attic-Ionic *-η*), as in the opposition between the agent noun ᾠοιδός ‘singer’ and the *nomen rei actae* ᾠοιδή ‘song’, or between the agent noun ἀρχός and the *nomen actionis* ἀρχή ‘power, ruling’.<sup>82</sup>

This system is sufficiently clear for descriptive purposes, although the relationship between agent and action nouns is often confused, and the same applies to the relationship between *simplicia* and compounds.<sup>83</sup> The SC of *-ος* compounds is often attested independently as a *simplex*, but this is by no means always the case.

When we move to the diachronic level, a number of additional problems arise. The existence of agentive *simplicia* in *-os* cannot be proven beyond doubt, even though a tripartite system based on the opposition between agent nouns, action nouns and *nomina rei actae* can be reconstructed for many IE languages.<sup>84</sup> *Simplicia* agent nouns in *-os* in particular appear most frequently in Greek, Sanskrit, Baltic and Slavic, but are rare in West IE.<sup>85</sup>

A second problem concerns the relation between agentive *simplicia* in *-os* and their compounded forms in the languages of most ancient attestation. In both Greek and Sanskrit, compound forms of this type are extremely numerous. However, in both languages the compound does not always correspond to a *simplex*, and this is particularly noticeable in Sanskrit. Both languages contain a substantial number of compounds that simply correspond to an action noun or a *nomen rei actae* (e.g. Skt. *ap-savā-* ‘giving water’ vs. *savā-* ‘libation’ or *τειχοδόμος* ‘building walls’ vs. *δόμος* ‘house’).<sup>86</sup> Discussions of these problems commonly assume that the original situation involved a system in which nouns accented on the root (Greek type *φόνος*) existed as *simplicia*, whereas the agent nouns accented on the last syllable (Greek type *φονός*) were originally used only in compounding.<sup>87</sup> Agentive *simplicia* were therefore derived from the compounds as back-formations.<sup>88</sup>

Accordingly, as already noted in section 5.1 a common theory for the origin of the AG agentive compounds in *-ος* sees them as deriving from old bahuvrihi

**82** For the feminine action nouns, see Chantraine (1933: 18–26), Gagnepain (1959: 13–16).

**83** Chantraine (1933: 7).

**84** Debrunner (1954: 102).

**85** For their productivity in East IE, see Euler (1979: 60): ‘Mit großer Wahrscheinlichkeit müssen in der östlichen Indogermania diese Nomina Agentis, größtenteils Hinterglieder in Determinativkomposita, schon voreinzelsprachlich produktiv geworden sein’.

**86** See Wackernagel (1905: 185) and particularly Debrunner (1954: 96).

**87** Chantraine (1933: 8–10), Debrunner (1954: 94), Risch (1974: 10).

**88** Risch (1974: 10).

containing action nouns in the SC, later re-analysed as agentive compounds.<sup>89</sup> For example, the bahuvrihi ἄγαρρος ‘having a strong stream’, whose SC derives from the *nomen rei actae* ῥοή ‘stream’, could be interpreted as having the verbal meaning ‘strong-flowing’: as a consequence, the SC -(ρ)πος would be classed as an agent noun (‘someone/something that flows’).<sup>90</sup> Similarly, as noted in section 5.1, the passive subtype exemplified by ὄρεσίτροφος may be interpreted as deriving from possessive compounds with an action noun (τροφή ‘nourishment’), both on semantic grounds (‘having his nourishment on mountains’) and on the basis of the accentuation. According to this scenario, the original bahuvrihi accentuation, which seems to survive in a few active forms including στράταρχος itself, was later lost in favour of a new pattern which placed the accent on the SC. Further proof for the bahuvrihi origin of -ος compounds may be the fact that they are often adjectives with two endings, a pattern which is typical of bahuvrihis.

The next step in this series of analogical developments would have been the creation of agentive *simplicia* from the compounds. The newly created agent nouns in -ός were distinguished by the appearance of the accent on the last syllable, and this may have had the purpose of separating them from the barytone action nouns. In turn, the accent of the *simplicia* would have influenced that of the compounds. In Sanskrit these compounds are usually accented on the last syllable, but in Greek this accentual pattern is perturbed by the intervention of ‘Wheeler’s Law’, according to which in oxytone dactylic words (e.g. \*\*βουληφόρος, cf. φορός ‘bearing’) the accent moves from the last to the penultimate syllable (hence the accentuation βουληφόρος).<sup>91</sup> On the basis of analogy, this shift would also have extended to compounds that do not have a dactylic structure and whose accent might even go back as far as the antepenultimate syllable, such as κουροτρόφος, though—as noted—compounds with accented FC are also attested. It is fair to remark, however, that this reconstructed scenario is highly hypothetical. The fact that agentive *simplicia* were created independently in various IE languages might be cited as evidence for the hypothesis that these were a very old type of *nomina agentis* and not back-formations from the compounds.

### 6.3.2 Compounds in -ος and their *simplicia*: towards a [N N] structure?

The stage of development evidenced by AG seems to have moved a considerable distance from the reconstructed original stage. Now many agentive compounds in -ος correspond to *simplicia* and this, crucially, allows them to be interpreted

<sup>89</sup> Thus explicitly Meier-Brügger (1992a: 33).

<sup>90</sup> Euler (1979: 43).

<sup>91</sup> Wheeler (1885: 89). See also Chapter 1, section 4.3.

as [N N] compounds rather than  $[[N [VStem]_{os}]_N]$  compounds.<sup>92</sup> The fact that these compounds can be used as adjectives is only an apparent complication, and it is sufficient to note both that verbal -ος compounds are especially productive for the creation of titles referring to individuals, so that their interpretation as nouns is beyond doubt, and that their adjectival use arises in specific contexts: poetic language in particular favours the use of epithets and appositions. In Mycenaean, agentive compounds in -ος are usually substantives, and this is probably attributable to the fact that they are used to name individuals or professions (e.g. *to-ko-so-wo-ko* /*tokso-worgos*/ ‘bow-maker’).

Most types have both adjectival and substantival usages, and these often alternate for the same form. Overall, the choice does not seem to be influenced by the presence or absence of a *simplex*: for instance, compounds in -ποιός and -ουργός, for which a *simplex* is not attested, are mostly substantival. It is possible that the evolution of verbal -ος compounds towards a transparent [N N] structure was enhanced by their semantic similarities to agentive compounds in -της; these, unlike -ος compounds, are exclusively substantives and their [N N] structure is more self-evident.

The type of agent compounds in -ος persists in standard MG, and in fact many of the SCs already attested in AG are preserved. Far from being learned resuscitations of AG words, these compounds are created and used productively, although it is also true that their productivity is lower than in AG.<sup>93</sup> From a synchronic point of view, many of these MG compounds appear to contain bound SCs, since they are not attested as independent words, and considerable attention has been devoted to identifying the nature of these SCs.<sup>94</sup> Defining them as stems, Ralli (2013) classes the compounds as full members of the [N N] category.<sup>95</sup> Her conclusion, like mine, is that -ος compounds are right-headed endocentric formations.<sup>96</sup>

### 6.3.3 On ablaut in the SC

The bulk of -ος compounds and *simplicia* derives from ablauting CeC/CoC radical presents (τρέφω : κουροτρόφος). Some of these verbs may have been refashioned along different patterns in Greek: see for instance κλέπτω ‘to steal’ < \**klep-je/o-*, which replaces an old radical present (cf. Lat. *clepō*) but preserves the original ablaut distribution in the perfect κέκλοφα, in the agent noun κλοπός and in the

<sup>92</sup> See Uhlich (2002: 406).

<sup>93</sup> Ralli (2013: 200, 205).

<sup>94</sup> Ralli (2008a) and Ralli (2013: 203–204), with discussion of relevant literature.

<sup>95</sup> Ralli (2013: 207–209).

<sup>96</sup> Ralli (2013: 213).

passive aorist ἐκλάπην. The second substantial, though less numerous, group of -ος formations derives from Greek (C)ŷC presents which keep this short vowel in the agent nouns: e.g. ἄρχω : ἀρχός : στρατάρχος. This same type of agent noun also derives from roots which in Greek build zero-grade presents formed with infixes or suffixes: consider δάμνημι (< \**demh<sub>2</sub>*-), the zero-grade of which is continued in the agent compounds of the ἵππόδαμος type. In cases such as ἵππόδαμος, therefore, the short vowel of the agent nouns arises through synchronic morphological patterns, which tend to replicate the vocalism of the present in deverbal formations. This tendency may also produce the opposite situation, namely agent nouns characterized by a long vowel. A case in point is the group of V2 compounds in -πηγός/-πᾶγός ‘fixing, putting together’, whose long vowel derives directly from the present πήγνυμι ‘to fix’, a -νυ-infix formation in the e-grade (< \**peh<sub>2</sub>g-*).

With the help of these patterns Greek is able to forge an extremely flexible class of verbal nouns and compounds which can be used to express the full semantic range of the verbs, as can be observed in those derived from τρέφω ‘to nurture’. κουροτρόφος ‘rearing children’ expresses active-transitive semantics, πρωτότροφος ‘first reared’ has a passive meaning, whereas a large number of other compounds—in which the FC is either prepositional or does not clearly express the agent of the passive action—oscillate between passive and active-intransitive semantics: ὄρεσίτροφος may mean ‘reared on mountains’ or ‘who dwells on mountains’, while σύντροφος may mean ‘reared with’ but also ‘living with’. In the course of this volume, we will particularly focus on active -ος compounds, since they represent the main rival to V1 compounds (which invariably express active semantics). For the semantic roles expressed by -ος compounds, see section 6.9.

#### 6.4 Unbound SCs: agentive compounds in -της (and those in -τηρ and -τωρ)

The other common class of agentive compounds displays SCs characterized by the suffix -της in the Attic-Ionic variety and -τᾶς in all the other dialects: an example is κυνηγέτης ‘huntsman’ (lit. ‘dog-leader’). Many of these compounds correspond to *simplicia*, for instance ἡγέτης ‘leader’. Both *simplicia* and compounds are a Greek innovation of vast proportions whose origin is still disputed. The addition of this category enables Greek to create agentive compounds and nouns out of virtually any root, with the end result being an extremely flexible compound system.

Simple agent nouns in -της exist alongside those in -τηρ and -τωρ, which are an inherited category and are usually restricted to *simplicia*: their extension to compounds (e.g. πανδαμάτωρ ‘all-taming’ < δάμνημι ‘to tame’ and μηλοβοτήρ ‘shepherd’ < βόσκω ‘to tend’) was probably triggered by analogy with compounds

in *-της*.<sup>97</sup> The next sections focus on two issues: the hypotheses put forward for the origin of *-της* compounds (6.4.1), and the development of these forms within the Greek compound system in relation to the type of verbs from which they derive (6.4.2).

#### 6.4.1 The rise of *-της* forms

We owe to Ernst Fraenkel the first systematic attempt at an explanation of the rise of the *-της* suffix.<sup>98</sup> In his opinion, *-tās* is the result of a conflation of the *-t-* element, employed in the Sanskrit and Greek root compounds described in section 6.1, and the *-ā* vowel, characteristic of root compounds ending in *-stā-* (< \**steh<sub>2</sub>-* ‘stay’).<sup>99</sup> According to this explanation, *-tās* was generalized to avoid confusion in the declension of a large number of root compounds. On the basis of root compounds which displayed the *-t-* suffix and were provided with the enlargement *-ā-*, the sequence *-t-ā-* was perceived as a suffix and was exported to other compounds of verbal origin, thus creating a new category.<sup>100</sup>

Fraenkel also argued that in response to the same need for clarity, *-tās* soon spread from compounds to *simplicia*.<sup>101</sup> The creation of *simplicia* was also possible because of the existence of nominal *simplicia* in *-tās* like *πολίτης*. These could often be interpreted as deriving from both a verb and a noun (e.g. *θωρηκτής* ‘one armed with a corslet’ vs. *θώρηξ* ‘corslet’ or *θωρήσσω* ‘to arm with a corslet’), so that the suffix also became productive in verbal *simplicia* for which no compound existed. This account of the events that led to the constitution of a coherent system of forms in *-tās* is generally accepted.<sup>102</sup>

The main challenge to Fraenkel’s theory has come from Leukart (1994). On the basis of the Mycenaean evidence (which was not available to Fraenkel), Leukart rejects the idea that *-tās* is the result of a conflation between root compounds

**97** Risch (1974: 29–38). According to Debrunner (1954: 679), the few Sanskrit compounds of this type belong to ‘laxe Sprache’. Lazzeroni (2010: 258) maintains that *-τήρ* and *-τωρ* nouns do not allow compounding because, in the noun-verb *continuum*, they are closer to verbs than to nouns. For the original ablaut distribution of *-τήρ* with zero-grade roots and *-τωρ* with full-grade ones, see Risch (1974: 29–30), Leukart (1994: 47 n. 3); for their original semantic differentiation, see Benveniste (1948: 45–56) and the caveats in Lazzeroni (1992), with further bibliography. In Greek, the borders between formations in *-τήρ*, *-τωρ* and *-της* are often confused: for the use of *-τηρ* and *-τωρ* as a means of lending poetry an archaic feel, see Williger (1928: 49).

**98** Older theories are summarized in Leukart (1994: 132–133).

**99** Fraenkel (1912: 157).

**100** See Risch (1974: 32), who summarizes Fraenkel (1912: 157–160).

**101** Fraenkel (1910: 5).

**102** See, for instance, Risch (1974: 31–35).

in *-t-* and those in *-ā-*. Leukart's principal criticism is that verbal nouns in *-tās* display semantic and structural characteristics that are very different from those typical of root compounds: while root compounds are mostly adjectives that can refer to any person or thing and can acquire either an active or a passive meaning, nouns in *-tās* are masculine (active) agent nouns.<sup>103</sup> In his search for a more plausible model, Leukart identifies *simplicia* in *-ās* of the type /Krētā-s/ 'the one from Crete' (< Κρήτᾱς, Myc. PN *ke-re-ta-o*, gen.) and /Oreh-ās/ 'the one from the mountains' (Myc. PN *o-re-a<sub>2</sub>*) as the starting point for *-tās* nouns.<sup>104</sup> Originally, these *simplicia* in *-ās* were 'social nouns' (*Sozialbezeichnungen*) identifying masculine individuals from the point of view of their geographic or social provenance. The bestowal of this 'individualizing' function on the element *-ās* was, according to Leukart, one of the reasons for the success of the *-tās* suffix and its specialization for the indication of male individuals.

As for the origin of *-tās* itself, Leukart revamps Fraenkel's hypothesis of the influence of *-stā-* compounds and identifies a single Mycenaean root compound as the source: the PN /Ores-stās/ 'one who stands on mountains' (< \**steh<sub>2</sub>*-). According to Leukart, the name was re-segmented as /Ores-tās/ and *-tās* was perceived as a suffix.<sup>105</sup> Through the influence of the above-mentioned 'social nouns' ending in *-ās*, /Ores-tās/ came to be interpreted as 'the one who has something to do with the mountains' and *-tās* as a suffix indicating pertinence. From there, according to Leukart, *-tās* spread to denominative *simplicia* such as ἀγρό-της 'countryman' and then to deverbative nouns such as ἐρέτης 'rower', replacing the old suffix -τήρ. Finally, through the deverbative *simplicia*, *-tās* was extended to compounds and replaced the old root type.<sup>106</sup> The replacement also had a semantic significance: while root compounds are mostly adjectival and express a neutral verbal idea, compounds in *-tās* are substantival, refer to specific individuals, and express active semantics.<sup>107</sup>

Leukart's hypothesis may be too bold in positing that a large innovation of this kind had its starting point in a single word, the PN /Orestās/. Leaving this aside, its most momentous consequence is the postulation of a system in which *simplicia* in *-tās* exist alongside the compounds and do not derive from them as back-formations. Compounds in *-tās* would therefore from the very beginning constitute [N N] formations. The data from the eight-second centuries BC show that compounds and *simplicia* in *-της* represent a highly regular system based on the correspond-

**103** Leukart (1994: 275–276).

**104** Leukart (1994: 149–154).

**105** Leukart (1994: 157–160). See also García Ramón (1996–1997: 426).

**106** See the resumé of the development in the earlier Leukart (1975: 188–189).

**107** Leukart (1994: 279).

ence of the *simplex* to the compound (as in English *driver* vs. *taxi-driver*).<sup>108</sup> In a number of cases the *-της* compound replaces other types of agentive compounds: examples are *κυνηέτης* ‘hunter’ for *\*\*κυνηγός* or *νεφεληγερέτης* ‘cloud-gatherer’ (also attested in the poetic nom. sg. *νεφεληγερέτα*) for *\*\*νεφεληγορός*.<sup>109</sup> Among the *simplicia*, too, numerous new forms are created beside those in *-τήρ* and *-τωρ* and the three types coexist for many verbs throughout Classical Greek: specific examples will be discussed apropos of those verbs which also give rise to V1 compounds (Chapter 5, section 5.1, and Chapter 6, section 2.1).

#### 6.4.2 Morphology and structure of *-της* compounds

In formal terms, *-της* is a very convenient suffix: its initial [t] makes it phonologically stable and compoundable with both vocalic and consonantal stems, while its *ā*-declension guarantees flexional regularity. This flexibility does not seem to be entirely reflected in the distribution of *-της* in early Greek *simplicia*, since *-της* tends to mark agent nouns from secondary verbs while the old *-τήρ* and *-τωρ* agentive suffixes have a wider range of applications and are characteristic of primary verbs.<sup>110</sup> In the compounds, ablauting verbs may form agent nouns on both the full and the zero grade, and it is not uncommon to find both for the same verb: e.g. from *βαίνω* *-βήτης* and *-βάτης* (the latter becoming more common in later Greek), from *δίδωμι* *-δωτης* and *-δοτης*, from *βόσκω* *-βωτης* and *-βοτης* (the latter is more common in later Greek).<sup>111</sup>

A number of compounds and *simplicia* display an enlarged version of the suffix, *-ετης*.<sup>112</sup> The starting point for such forms seems to be compounds from roots in *\*-h<sub>1</sub>* (where *-ε-* is therefore etymological) which were erroneously seg-

**108** The data are analysed in Tribulato (2005: 200–205). They suggest that, overall, Greek sought to complete pairs of compound and agent noun in *-της* by providing the existing form (compound or simplex) with its counterpart. This seems to have happened more frequently with compounds lacking a *simplex* and may reveal a tendency to interpret compounds in *-της* as containing an independent noun in the SC.

**109** *-ος* compounds from *ἀγείρω* are attested in Mycenaean, with the form *ri-na-ko-ro* ‘linen-gatherer’; in later Greek they might have been replaced by forms in *-ηγερέτης* to avoid confusion with the homophonous compounds in *-ηγορός* from *ἀγορεύω*: see Chapter 6, section 3.2.

**110** Fraenkel (1910: 18–19).

**111** The few forms with *o*-grade (*-φόντης*, *-ποίητης*), mostly attested in PNs, seem to import the vocalic grade of the *nomina actionis* (*φόνος*, *ποινή*), probably to ensure semantic transparency, given that the phonological changes concerning the outcome of labiovelars in first-millennium Greek have obscured the connection with the verbs *θείνω* and *τίνω* respectively. Further on the shape of roots, see Leukart (1994: 283–287). For the agent nouns of *βόσκω*, see comments in Chapter 4, section 8.4, and Chapter 6, section 3.2.

**112** This is already Mycenaean: see Leukart (1994: 169, 262–268).



mented: thus, e.g. γενέ-της > γεν-έτης. The analogical -ετης is usually attached to consonantal stems, probably to preserve morpho-phonological transparency by avoiding assimilation. A good example is the SC -εργέτης, in which -ετης has the function of preserving the stem ἐργ- and the connection between these compounds and ἔργον, blocking the assimilation to ἐρκ- which would ensue if the suffix were simply -της. The need for transparency may have been felt more strongly in this case since the connection between the present ἔρδω ‘do’ and ἐργ- was no longer formally clear. Analogous forms include -βρεμέτης (< βρέμω ‘clash’), -ηγερέτης (< ἀγειρώ ‘collect’), -ναιέτης (< ναίω ‘dwell’).<sup>113</sup>

-της compounds are as a rule accented on the penultimate syllable. In a few *simplicia*, this customary accentuation may be replaced by an oxytone accentuation (e.g. δικαστής ‘judge’). The accent of agent nouns in -τήρ probably triggered this alternative accentuation, particularly since forms in -της often replace those in -τήρ (compare δικαστήρ and δικαστής).

In the spectrum of active meanings, -της compounds—just like other deverbative compounds—tend to match the semantic range of their base verb. Those from ἴστημι, for instance, reflect the active-causative usage of the verb (e.g. ὀβολοστάτης ‘weigher of obols’) besides the more common active-intransitive meaning (e.g. ὀρθοστάτης ‘upright pillar’, lit. ‘standing upright’).<sup>114</sup> There also are compounds from intransitive verbs such as γίγνομαι ‘to be born’, e.g. αἰθρηγενέτης ‘originating in pure air’.<sup>115</sup>

-της remains a productive suffix throughout the history of Greek. In standard MG, the derivational pattern is similar to that observed in AG: side by side with agentive compounds corresponding to *simplicia* such as θερμιδομετρητής ‘calorie-counter’ (< θερμίδα ‘calorie’ + μετρώ ‘count’) vs. μετρητής ‘counter’, there are compounds such as αφισοκολλητής ‘person who sticks up posters’ (< αφίσα ‘poster’ + κολλώ ‘stick’) for which there is no *simplex* (e.g. \*\*κολλητής ‘person who sticks’). The colloquial nature of some of these neologisms, such as μαχαιροβγάλτης ‘who takes the knife out, criminal armed with a knife’, μυγοχάφτης ‘fly-swallower, lazy person’, αγιογύτης ‘shameless thief, one who strips (even) saints’, confirms that compounds in -της are not mere resurrections of AG types, but a productive means of word formation.<sup>116</sup>

**113** Examples from Fraenkel (1910: 51–62). See further Leukart (1994: 290–292).

**114** Fraenkel (1910: 48–51).

**115** Fraenkel (1910: 47) gives a passive interpretation to this compound (‘born in pure air’) in order to support his claim that -της compounds derive from root compounds, and inherit from them their neutrality of voice. Of course, the passive understanding of -γενέτης is a matter of translation, not of Greek semantics.

**116** I am grateful to Io Manolesou for discussing the issue with me.

### 6.5 Summary: agentive compounds in Ancient Greek

Through the combination of the types in -ος and -της Greek acquires extremely flexible and productive ways of expressing the full semantic range of a verbal base when it is compounded with nouns, adjectives and prepositions. The two types display some important differences which are fundamental to how they are used in context. -της compounds are specialized for the expression of masculine agents and are almost always substantival.<sup>117</sup> As argued by Leukart, their function is to indicate well-defined individuals, often by denoting their social class, provenance or profession.<sup>118</sup> Such semantic specialization partly restricts the otherwise completely free derivation of -της *simplicia* and compounds from any verbal root.

By contrast, -ος compounds are linked to specific types of verbal stems (o-grade stems from ablauting roots; zero-grade stems from radical or suffixal presents in short vowel), but can be used as adjectives. This considerably broadens their range of application, since they can modify masculine, feminine and neuter nouns: for this reason, they are commonly used as epithets and feature prominently in poetic or elevated language. This function brings -ος compounds closer to V1 compounds, which are prototypically adjectival. Moreover, because of their adjectival nature, -ος compounds may also express passive semantics, thus competing with the semantic domains of -ής and -τός V2 compounds: -ος compounds with this function are not in direct competition with the domain of V1 formations, since they predominantly express active semantics.

The substantival use of -ος compounds is not marginal, however: already in Mycenaean Greek, -ος formations are employed for the denomination of individuals performing actions and fulfil some of the functions associated with -της nouns (see the common types in -wo-ko / -ουργός ‘worker’ and -do-mo / -δόμος ‘builder’). Although the adjectival function of -ος compounds never recedes in Greek, the existence of many -ος *simplicia* side by side with the compounds seems to have encouraged their use as nouns and the interpretation of the whole class as a [N N] type. The fact that the SC of some -ος compounds is never attested as a *simplex* does not invalidate this analysis: a German speaker knows that there is no *simplex* \*\**Haber* corresponding to *Liebhaber* (which should be analysed as [[*Lieb-hab*]er]), but he or she would nevertheless be able to associate the SC of the compound with a particular class of nouns, following the structure of pairs such as *Zuckerbäcker* ‘confectioner’ ([*Zucker*[*Bäcker*]) vs. *Bäcker* ‘baker’. In Greek,

<sup>117</sup> The few feminine forms are mostly *simplicia* formed with the suffixes -τρῖς, -τρία and -τεῖρα, originally ‘*Motionsfeminina*’ of -τήρ nouns: see Chantraine (1933: 340–341), Lejeune (1950), Risch (1974: 135, 142).

<sup>118</sup> Leukart (1994: 156–157, 166, 173, 200 n. 178).

existing pairs such as *κουροτρόφος* vs. *τροφός* might have provided a model for the interpretation of *ἀγαλατοποιός* as containing *\*\*ποιός*. What matters here is the possibility of linking the SC of such V2 compounds to a class of nouns.<sup>119</sup> This ties in well with other phenomena observed in the AG compound system, such as the elimination of root compounds, the creation of *-της* compounds and the increase of determinative compounds, all of which suggest an increasing preference for [N N] endocentric structures.

## 6.6 Unbound SCs: compounded participles

Greek is also capable of expressing active or passive verbal semantics by means of compounded participles such as *πασμέλουσα* ‘of interest to all’ (< *μέλω* ‘be an object of care’) and *ἐυκτίμενος* ‘well-built’ (an old root aorist participle, connected to the more recent verb *κτίζω* ‘build’). This type is extremely limited, however. An ample range of substantival FCs is only found in PNs such as *Λαομέδων* and *Ἴπποδάμας*, which usually have transparent semantics (‘who protects/rules over the people’ and ‘who tames horses’ respectively); the type is already attested in Mycenaean. Outside onomastics, the few substantival FCs often betray the syntactic origin of the compound through the use of case endings: this is the case with *πασμέλουσα* (which in *Od.* 12.70 may well cover for the phrase *πάσι μέλουσα*) and for other early participles, such as *δαϊκτάμενος* ‘slain in battle’ (< *δαί κτάμενος*). Similarly, *ἐυκτίμενος* may derive from the univerbation of *εὖ κτίμενος*.

According to Risch (1974: 211), the original core of compounded participles comprises forms negated through the prefix *ἀ-* (e.g. *ἀκάμας* ‘untiring’). The few new forms produced in Classical Greek are usually epithets and often betray an onomastic origin: an example is *ποντομέδων* ‘lord of the sea’ (epithet of Poseidon), which finds parallels in the PNs *Λαομέδων* and *Εὐρυμέδων*. Given these structural restrictions, it is not surprising that Greek resorts to other formations to express active and passive verbal semantics.<sup>120</sup>

<sup>119</sup> Uhlich (2002: 406–407), Kastovsky (2009: 326–327).

<sup>120</sup> According to Lazzeroni (2010: 263), the reason for the low compoundability of participles may be that they are ‘more verbal’ than adjectives in *-τος* and agent nouns in *-της*. Cf. his similar conclusions on the exclusion of *-τήρ* and *-τωρ* agent nouns from compounding in note 97 above.

### 6.7 Unbound SCs: V2 adjectives in -τος

In AG, the most common way of using a nominal to express a passive verbal action is to form a passive adjective in -τος such as φιλητός ‘loved, worthy of love’.<sup>121</sup> The suffix *-tos* originally formed resultative verbal adjectives, which were neutral as concerns voice but were later acquired by some languages to fulfil the function of passive participles (the case of Latin *amātus* ‘loved’) and were kept by others as verbal adjectives.<sup>122</sup>

In Greek, -τος adjectives compete with passive participles and replace them in compounding.<sup>123</sup> The FC of the compounds can be prefixes, adverbs and prepositions (e.g. ἀφιλητος ‘unloved’) or nouns which mostly perform the role of the agent or cause (e.g. θεοφιλητος ‘loved by the gods’). This type of compound is found in other IE languages, for instance in Latin (*mani-festus* ‘clear’, lit. ‘struck with the hand’) and Sanskrit (*a-jāta-* ‘unborn’). However, it is commonly assumed that in the parent language FCs were limited to the negative prefix and a few adverbs.<sup>124</sup>

Substantival FCs, although seemingly less frequent, appear in these compounds as early as Mycenaean (e.g. *ka-ko-de-ta* /k<sup>h</sup>alkodeta/, neut. pl., ‘fastened with bronze’), continue in Homeric Greek, and are also found in Classical inscriptions: examples of the latter include, e.g. δημιόπρωτα ‘sold by public authority’, μολυβδόδετος ‘fastened with lead’.<sup>125</sup> The compounds are to be considered endocentric, insofar as they represent a subset of the idea expressed by their SC. However, the most common types of compounded -τος adjectives remain those with a prefix or an adverb in the FC.

As concerns productivity, *simplicia* and compounds in -τος began to decline in Hellenistic Greek, losing ground to the passive perfect participle, particularly in the lower Koine (though new -τος compounds are found in literary Byzantine Greek). This development led to the MG replacement of -τος formations with adjectives in -μένος, which on a formal level are a continuation of the perfect participle.<sup>126</sup> The functions of these passive compounds were also transferred to compounds of the ὀρεσίτροφος type and to V2 adjectives in -ής, which continued to be productive down to Byzantine Greek.

<sup>121</sup> For the origin of the suffix, see Chantraine (1933: 299–300).

<sup>122</sup> Napoli (2010: 321).

<sup>123</sup> Chantraine (1933: 303).

<sup>124</sup> Frisk (1941: 4), with further references.

<sup>125</sup> Homeric examples are discussed in Risch (1974: 210–211).

<sup>126</sup> Chantraine (1933: 307).

## 6.8 Unbound SCs: residual classes

Greek V2 compounds also include a few more limited types which will here be summarily described in the light of their possible interaction with V1 compounds.

1. Nouns and adjectives in *-ās* (> *-ης* in Attic-Ionic) identifying agents and agentive actions, such as *ὕψαγόρης* ‘braggart’ and *χαμαιεύνης* ‘sleeping on the ground’. The type seems to have its origin in *bahuvrihis* with feminine nouns in the SC (< *ἀγορά* ‘public speaking’, *εὐνή* ‘bed’), but since many of these nouns derive from verbs or create *-έω* denominatives, *-ης* is later reinterpreted as a deverbative suffix *tout court*.<sup>127</sup> This type of compound is well-attested in Classical Greek, sometimes providing alternatives to agent nouns in *-ος* and *-της*, and thus also to V1 compounds: see for instance compounds in *-φίλας/-φίλης* such as *γυναικοφίλας* ‘lover of women’, which compete with those in *φιλο-*. As we will see in Chapter 6, however, the competition between V1 compounds and these forms in *-ās/-ης* is limited.
2. Isolated compounds in which the SC is a verbal noun expressing agentive semantics. Risch (1974: 212) conveniently lists Homeric compounds derived from verbs through suffixes different from those typically used with an agentive function. These forms include adjectives such as *πολυτλήμων* ‘much-enduring’, based on the stem *τλη-* ‘to endure’ and whose suffix *-μων* is used to derive animate nouns, often from verbal roots.<sup>128</sup> Though productive, these animate nouns in *-μων* are not very common in compounding and do not represent a genuine rival to other agentive formations, including V1 compounds.
3. Compounded action nouns. Apart from the previously mentioned *o*-grade action nouns in *-ος* (*φόνος*), Greek also preserves the old PIE type of primary action noun in *-tis*, mostly remade into *-σις* through assibilation (e.g. *δόσις* ‘giving’), and creates secondary *nomina actionis* or *nomina rei actae* in *-ία* (*ἀμαρτία* ‘failure’ < *ἀμαρτάνω* ‘to fail’), *-ιον* (*σφάγιον* ‘sacrifice’ < *σφάζω* ‘to sacrifice’), and *-σία* (*θυσία* ‘sacrifice’ < ‘sacrifice’). These suffixes are highly productive, particularly the last three, which allow the derivation of action nouns from other types of nouns. All these action nouns are also found in compounds, e.g. *ἐτνήρυσις* ‘soup-ladle’, *εὐαγγέλιον* ‘good news’, *βοηλασία* ‘cattle-lifting’, *ἀλωδία* ‘song to the flute’. Since all these nouns identify actions, not agents, their semantic and structural interaction with V1 compounds is non-existent.

<sup>127</sup> Rüedi (1969) studies the development of the verbal meaning of these compounds. For the hypothesis that they might be connected with the Latin *agricola* type, see Fraenkel (1912: 169–174) and Rüedi (1969: 27).

<sup>128</sup> Chantraine (1933: 170–174). See also Chapter 6, section 2.

### 6.9 Greek right-oriented V2 compounds: summary

The main distinction within the vast class of AG right-oriented V2 compounds is between compounds with a bound SC and compounds in which the SC corresponds to a *simplex*, or to a productive class of nominals. This latter type is much more common, proving—if anything—that AG has moved a considerable distance from the original stage of PIE compounding, which is supposed to have privileged stem compounding. Both bound and unbound formations have adjectival and substantival types, but bound compounds tend to be mostly adjectival. The creation of *-της* compounds and the huge increase in *-ος* compounds is clear proof that Greek gradually evolved into an endocentric compound system, in which the determined compound element (usually the SC) represents a hyperonym of that which is denoted by the whole compound.

For this reason, it is better to avoid the term ‘synthetic’ in connection with Greek V2 compounds. This term is sometimes used in the classification of IE V2 compounds, probably based on Wackernagel’s authoritative model.<sup>129</sup> However, while in Sanskrit the number of V2 compounds in which the SC is not attested as a *simplex* is very high, we saw above that this is not the case in Greek: on the contrary, Greek tends to forsake bound types (an exception are V2 adjectives in *-ής*) or to develop correspondences between compounds and *simplicia*. Another reason that the term ‘synthetic’ is best avoided, moreover, is the controversy surrounding the interpretation of the morphological and syntactic properties of synthetic compounds in (mostly) English. Not all scholars agree that a V2 compound in which the non-head does not satisfy the argument function is a synthetic compound (see Chapter 1, section 6.1).<sup>130</sup> Instead, some approaches hold that compounds such as *party drinker* ‘a person who drinks at parties’ are not synthetics, since the non-head expresses determination.<sup>131</sup> The same terminological problem would arise in connection with the many Greek V2 compounds whose non-head does not function as the argument of the verbal head, e.g. *ναύμαχος* ‘fighter on ships’, *ὀλιγαρχία* ‘power of a minority’, etc. Because of these ambiguities, and since the present study is not concerned with the theoretical issue of incorporation, the term ‘synthetic’ has been avoided.

Following on from this, the last issue worth considering concerns the variety of syntactic functions displayed by the FCs of Greek V2 compounds. The funda-

<sup>129</sup> Wackernagel (1905: 174).

<sup>130</sup> See Selkirk (1982: 24), Scalise and Bisetto (2009: 37), Bauer (2009: 353–354). An overview of the various positions on this point is provided by Spencer (1991: 324–343) and Gaeta (2010).

<sup>131</sup> Selkirk (1982: 24). See too Uhlich (2002: 407) on the difficulty of distinguishing ‘verbal government’ and ‘determinative’ compounds in presence of productive verbal *simplicia*.

mental division is between cases where the non-head is an adjective, preposition or adverb and those where it is a noun. In the first type of case, the non-head functions as a modifier: consider the root compounds δίζυξ ‘double-yoked’ and ἄγνος ‘not knowing’, as well as the agentive compounds ἀκροβάτης ‘who climbs aloft, acrobat’ and εὐεργέτης ‘who does well, benefactor’. When the non-head is a noun, however, its function is not pre-determinable and depends on the context, as well as on the semantic properties of the base verb. We have just seen that in compounds such as ὀλιγαρχία ‘power of a minority’ the non-head expresses a modification of the verbal SC -αρχία. In many other cases, the non-head fulfils a role which is not restricted to the object of the verbal base (as e.g. in κουροτρόφος ‘rearing children’), but may correspond to a range of roles: locative in ναύμαχος ‘fighter on ships’, instrument in χαλκίρης ‘fitted with bronze’, agent in θεομισής ‘heated by the gods’ and δίοσδοτος ‘given by Zeus’, etc. A similarly wide range of roles are also fulfilled by V1 compounds, and such flexibility emerges as another defining characteristic of Greek compounding.<sup>132</sup>

## 7 Left-oriented subordinated compounds

Greek left-oriented categories are of two types: productive categories, which are cross-linguistically left-oriented; and more limited categories, which often represent counterparts of common right-oriented categories and whose productivity may be limited to a few well-defined subtypes. The theoretical question underlying the analysis of these categories and their relation to right-oriented ones is whether syntax, and particularly word order, plays a role in their orientation. In the literature, the issue has been discussed particularly in relation to V1 compounds and the so-called ‘reversed bahuvrihis’ (section 7.2.1), and it is at the core of the controversy concerning the nature of compounding itself, namely whether compounding is influenced by syntax, representing the quintessential interface between morphology and syntax, or whether its morphological processes are independent of syntactic structures.

---

**132** Ralli (2013: 189), building on previous work, speculatively argues that ‘languages with strong morphology (i.e. with overt realization of inflectional features), such as Greek, allow a variety of theta-roles to be saturated inside compounds, whereas languages with weak morphology (i.e. with no overt realization of inflectional features), such as English, allow for a more limited set of theta-roles to be saturated’. I have refrained from entering the theoretical debate concerning thematic roles and theta-roles in compounding, which is not relevant to the present analysis of AG: for an overview, see Lühr (2004).

The following sections provide a descriptive morphological introduction to the categories of prepositional compounds, left-oriented exocentric and endocentric determinative compounds, and V1 compounds. This is followed by a typological overview of word order issues and an introduction to Greek word order, with the aim of highlighting the syntactic nature of a number of Greek left-oriented categories. The orientation of Greek V1 compounds cannot be simply understood on the basis of synchronic word order and probably results from the combination of an inherited syntactic pattern with inner-Greek morphological needs, as Chapters 4–6 of this volume argue in detail.

## 7.1 Prepositional compounds

The FC of these compounds is a preposition which governs a SC derived from a noun, as in ἐπιδήμιος ‘among the people’. In the corresponding syntactic phrase the preposition selects a specific case of the word contained in the SC (here: ἐπὶ δήμου ‘among the people’): for this reason, the relationship between the compound constituents is truly one of government and indeed is the only relationship unequivocally of this type in Greek compounding. This governing relationship between FC and SC marks the difference between authentic prepositional compounds and other types of compounds in which the prepositional FC *does not* govern the SC, but rather specifies it. ἐπιδήμιος and *upstream* are different from ἐπιμάρτυρος ‘(additional) witness’ and *uptight*, since in these compounds the prepositions ἐπὶ and *up* do not govern the SC, but rather modify the noun μάρτυρος and the adjective *tight*. ἐπιμάρτυρος and *uptight* are therefore endocentric determinative compounds while, crucially, ἐπιδήμιος and *upstream* are exocentric, since they refer to something which lies outside the compound constituents. In Greek, derivation from prepositional phrases (‘hypostasis’) and exocentricity are usually marked by adjectival suffixes, identical to those found in bahuvrihis: -ος/-ον (e.g. in ἔφραλος ‘on the sea’, where the SC is from ἄλς) and -ιος/-ιον (as in ἐπιδήμιος).<sup>133</sup>

Prepositional compounds of this kind are attested in various other IE languages, including Latin (*egregius* ‘outstanding’ < *ē grege* ‘(standing) out of the flock’), Sanskrit (*ādhi-gartya* ‘on the driver’s seat’), Armenian (*aračawk* ‘ghost’ < ‘in front of the eyes’), Germanic (*ør-viti* ‘out of (one’s) senses’, still used in Faroese).<sup>134</sup> Modern English possesses a productive type of formation in which the FC is a Classical preposition (*transatlantic*, *anti-British*, *pro-feminist*), but *trans-*,

<sup>133</sup> For the origin of the technical expression ‘hypostasis’, see Mikkola (1962: 61–63).

<sup>134</sup> Examples taken from Pollak (1912), Mikkola (1962), Salus (1965b).



*anti-* and *pro-* are not productive as prepositions in English, being rather prefixes: for this reason, formations of this kind pertain more to derivation than to compounding.<sup>135</sup> The high number of prepositional compounds developed in AG seems to be unmatched by other languages and remains a largely unexplored topic in the field of Greek compounding.<sup>136</sup>

The Linear B tablets already contain some uncontroversial prepositional compounds, such as *e-pi-ki-to-ni-ja* /epi-k<sup>h</sup>itōnia/, a neuter plural indicating objects fastened ‘on the tunic’, and *e-po-mi-jo* /ep-ōmiō/, the dual of a compound indicating shoulder pieces (things which stay ‘on the shoulder’), alongside other forms of controversial interpretation.<sup>137</sup> In Mycenaean, as in later Greek, the structural and semantic overlap with *bahuvrihis* of the type ὑπόξυλος ‘having wood underneath’ and with determinatives such as ἐπιμάρτυρος is high.<sup>138</sup> The erosion of the semantic domain of prepositions in post-Classical Greek and their gradual disappearance from late-antique Greek onwards meant that the prepositional type became increasingly marginalized, and in MG it is mostly of a learned nature: this is also a consequence of the fact that many of the ancient prepositions are no longer available as such, having instead acquired the status of prefixes.<sup>139</sup> Moreover, it is difficult in objective terms to tell new learned creations apart from learned survivals: phonology sometimes comes to the rescue, as in the case of ἀντηλιακό ‘sunscreen’, which does not take into account the initial aspiration of the AG form ἥλιος ‘sun’ (in AG the FC would have been ἄνθ-) and is therefore a modern formation.<sup>140</sup>

In the IE family, prepositional compounds are the prototypical class of left-oriented compounds. It is commonly assumed that in PIE the adverbs which later gave rise to prepositions could either precede or follow a case form, although it is also thought that the postposition of such adverbs was more common, in compliance with the basic SOV order postulated for PIE.<sup>141</sup> Thus, preposition-initial compounds might either reflect the marked position of adverbs (as opposed to the unmarked SOV word order), or they might reflect the word order that became

**135** Kastovsky (2009: 338), however, seems to treat *transatlantic* and similar forms as productive compound types which continue an inherited pattern.

**136** Mikkola (1962) and Mikkola (1965) do not address the productivity of the type in a diachronic perspective. Mikkola (1962: 114) provides a statistical comparison between Greek and Latin, which confirms the greater productivity of the type in Greek.

**137** Waanders (2008: 21–28).

**138** For prepositional *bahuvrihis*, see the monograph by Forster (1950); the overlap with determinative compounds is addressed in Clemm (1875: 85), Risch (1944: 45), Mikkola (1962: 109–112).

**139** Ralli (2013: 37).

**140** I am grateful to Io Manolessou for this reference.

**141** Debrunner (1950: 426).

standard after PIE had shifted from a SOV to a SVO structure and adverbs came to be placed before nouns.<sup>142</sup>

Another question is whether this orientation is perhaps less language-specific and in fact reflects a universal tendency to place governing elements such as prepositions before their governed noun. Judging from the available evidence, left-oriented prepositional types are the majority, but right-oriented *specimina* are registered in Germanic (e.g. *zweifelsohne* ‘doubtless’ in German) and in Slave—a language in the Athapaskan family of indigenous North American languages, spoken in Northwest Canada—which has [N Postposition]<sub>N</sub> compounds such as *lu k’ é* ‘spring’ (< *lu* ‘ice’ + *k’é* ‘after’ ‘after-ice’).<sup>143</sup>

## 7.2 Left-oriented determinative compounds

The case of prepositional compounds is very different from that of the few endocentric and exocentric determinative compounds displaying left-orientation. While, as noted, prepositional compounds follow a common typological pattern and have a high productivity in AG, left-oriented determinative compounds are limited, and mostly represent reversed counterparts of more established right-oriented types. An important exception within the determinative macro-category is represented by adjective-initial determinative compounds (e.g. ἀξιόλογος ‘worthy of mention’) which, as is argued in section 7.4, may owe their left-orientation to specific morpho-syntactic constraints associated with their heads. Another well-defined group, which may have originated from left-headed syntagms, contains animal and plant names (e.g. σύαγρος [pig wild] ‘wild pig’, καρποβάλαμον [fruit balsam] ‘fruit of the balsam tree’), and these are mostly used in technical prose or lower-level Greek.

### 7.2.1 The question of ‘reversed bahuvrihis’

Standard treatments of Greek compounding often reserve a few words for forms such as θυμολέων [heart lion] > ‘lion-heart’, ποδήνεμος [foot wind] > ‘having swift feet’, ὀνομάκλυτος [name famed] ‘having a famous name’, πόδαργος [foot swift] ‘having swift feet’, which, because of their apparently peculiar orientation, are either dismissed as oddities or explained as a reversed (and usually late) version

<sup>142</sup> Lehmann (1974: 212).

<sup>143</sup> For these Slave compounds, see Rice (2009: 549). However, Slave also has postposition-initial compounds, discussed in Rice (2009: 550).

of established bahuvrihis.<sup>144</sup> In an analysis of ‘reversed bahuvrihis’ in Welsh and Germanic, however, Zimmer (1992) goes so far as to claim that this category goes back to a ‘zumindest gemeinindogermanisches Alter’.<sup>145</sup> It is not possible to consider the whole of Zimmer’s argument here, which focuses on evidence from languages as diverse as Old Irish, Sanskrit, and Germanic. As far as Greek is concerned, however, his conclusion should certainly be moderated. The Greek candidates for ‘reversed bahuvrihi’ status are not all of the same kind and an in-depth examination, combining morphological, syntactical and literary analysis, shows that many of them can instead be explained in accordance with right-oriented patterns.<sup>146</sup>

### 7.2.2 The *Armstrong* subtype

Let us begin by tackling the [N A]<sub>A</sub> reversed subtype, which is exemplified by ὀνομάκλυτος and πόδαργος. Evidence from languages in which the type is more common suggests that the starting point for these formations in Greek is not an authentic inversion of the more established right-oriented [A N]<sub>A</sub> type, but rather a process of derivation from phrases containing an accusative of respect and an adjective: ὄνομα κλυτός ‘famous a concerns the name’, πόδα ἀργός ‘swift as concerns the foot’.<sup>147</sup> A comparable type are the Celtic *Armstrong* compounds, the old core of which may be identified with adjectival determinative compounds with a noun as their modifier: ‘strong with respect to the arms’.<sup>148</sup> The adjectival SC has an ambiguous reference: *strong* may refer to the external entity, but it may also qualify the FC *arm*. Because of this ambiguity, the type could be semantically re-interpreted as having a possessive sense: ‘with strong arms’.

The paucity of the Greek formations vis-à-vis the productivity of the *Armstrong* type in Celtic and Germanic ties in well with the hypothesis that the compounding of adjectives with substantival modifiers was not a fully developed linguistic process in late PIE and early Greek (section 4.6). ὀνομάκλυτος, πόδαργος, κορυθαιόλος ‘colourful at the helmet’, στόμαργος ‘swift/white at the mouth’ and similar formations thus are not affected by this constraint because they arise from a process of derivation from syntactic structures rather than from compounding

**144** E.g. G. Meyer (1872: 13), Debrunner (1917: 41), Williger (1928: 6 n. 1), Dubois (2000: 49).

**145** Zimmer (1992: 421).

**146** The following section is based on the fuller study of Tribulato (2006).

**147** For a different analysis, see Stefanelli (1997: 249–252, 258–260), with bibliography.

**148** Uhlich (1997: 27), Tribulato (2006: 164–165).

proper.<sup>149</sup> The specific phrases underlying ὄνομακλυτος etc. explain why they, and not others, are the compounds which were created in early Greek. In all these phrases, the first word, in the accusative singular, ends in a short vowel (ὄνομα, πόδα, κόρυθα, στόμα); in three out of four, the adjective begins with the same sound (ἀργός, αἰόλος). It is likely that these phrases were pronounced with elision/coalescing of the two vowels: e.g. [ˈpod<sup>a</sup> arˈgos], naturally evolving into [ˈpodargos]. The univerbation of ὄνομα κλυτός could also occur without any formal (and metrical) changes, since FCs in -ǎ are common in Greek (e.g. ἀνδρᾶ-, μεγᾶ, etc.). A similarly syntactic origin may explain the productivity of other determinative compounds with adjectival heads (section 7.4).

As noted in Chapter 1, section 4.4, it is not possible to be sure about the authentic spelling and pronunciation of these forms, but two comments are necessary. As concerns the univerbation of πόδαργος, this must predate Homeric Greek and (possibly) also Mycenaean, since in both linguistic layers this form is used as a PN.<sup>150</sup> As concerns accentuation in the compounded forms, there are two options: either the accent remained on the SC even after the univerbation had taken place, or it moved backwards on analogy with bahuvrihis; our texts and dictionaries treat these forms in an oscillating manner.<sup>151</sup>

Once univerbations of this kind were semantically re-interpreted as possessive compounds, the unrestricted creation of left-oriented bahuvrihis became feasible. Indeed, this is what happened in Old Irish, where individual [A N]<sub>A</sub> compounds are sometimes transparent inversions of more established right-oriented bahuvrihis (in Greek, see e.g. Κλεοπάτρη vs. Πάτροκλος).<sup>152</sup> However, Greek does not seem to have taken full advantage of the type, probably because of the pressure from right-oriented bahuvrihis and the whole right-oriented compound system.

### 7.2.3 [N N]<sub>A</sub> reversed bahuvrihis?

Having ruled out the hypothesis that some Greek [N A]<sub>A</sub> compounds are reversed bahuvrihis, we can now consider [N N]<sub>A</sub> candidates for this status. Unlike its right-oriented counterpart, this subtype is relatively rare in Greek and limited almost exclusively to onomastics or epithets: this analysis will therefore focus on those Homeric epithets such as θυμολέων ‘lion-heart’, ποδήνεμος ‘having

<sup>149</sup> For the meaning of ἀργός in these compounds, see Tribulato (2006: 165 n. 5), Méndez Dosuna (2012).

<sup>150</sup> Tribulato (2006: 166–167).

<sup>151</sup> The accentuation of these forms may have posed problems to the ancients as well, judging from the comments in Hdn. 3.1.228 Lentz apropos of κορυθαἰόλος.

<sup>152</sup> Uhlich (1997: 35).

wind in the feet, very fast' and Εἰδοθέη 'having the appearance of a goddess, very beautiful' which are typically included in discussions of Greek reversed bahuvrihis.<sup>153</sup> Those who have tackled these compounds have tended to remark on their reversed status and to link their origin to the existence of synonymic forms, such as ἀελλόπος 'with feet like storm, very fast' for ποδῆνεμος and θεοειδής 'god-like' for Εἰδοθέη.<sup>154</sup> If interpreted as bahuvrihis, all these compounds would follow the semantic patterns identified by Schindler (1986): θυμολέων and Εἰδοθέη would mean 'having A (heart, aspect) like that of B (lion, goddess)', while ποδῆνεμος would mean 'having A (feet) like B (wind)'.

The inversion of an existing compound is of course a likely possibility in the poetic language of epic. However, all these early instances of 'reversed bahuvrihis' are also explicable with reference to regular patterns: they could either be right-oriented bahuvrihis in which the FC functions as a metaphorical locative ('having a lion in his heart', 'having a god in her appearance, 'having wind in his feet');<sup>155</sup> or, more plausibly, compounds deriving from predicative phrases, in which the FCs corresponds to an accusative of respect ('(like) a lion with reference to his heart', '(like) a goddess with reference to her aspect', '(like) wind with respect to his feet'. This pattern is attested, for instance, in the Pindaric phrase τόλμα γὰρ εἰκώς | θυμὸν ἐριβρεμετᾶν θηρῶν λεόντων | ἐν πόνῳ, μῆτιν δ' ἄλῳπηξ 'for he resembles the boldness of loudly roaring wild lions in his heart during the struggle, but in skill he is a fox...' (Pi. I. 3/4.45–47, trsl. W. H. Race). Phrases in which the accusatives θυμὸν, πόδα/πόδας and εἶδος limit a noun or an adjective are common in Homer; in the Homeric poems, moreover, these nouns are also found in *similes* containing the words λέων, θεός and ἄνεμος.<sup>156</sup>

θυμολέων, Εἰδοθέη and ποδῆνεμος would then display a similar structure to that of *Armstrong* compounds, with the difference being that their SC is a noun and not an adjective. In the same way that ὀνομάκλυτος and πόδαργος are endocentric, because they represent subtypes of κλυτός and ἀργός, θυμολέων could be interpreted as an endocentric determinative used as an apposition. This pattern might have originated in onomastics, where determinative compounds are used: just as Θεόδωρος is 'god's gift', θυμολέων is 'lion at heart'.<sup>157</sup> In conclusion, as in the case of [A N]<sub>A</sub> compounds, it is advisable to abandon the idea that Greek exploited a 'reversed bahuvrihi' pattern, even though there exist instances, especially among PNs, for which such an interpretation would be the most straightforward one.

<sup>153</sup> Risch (1949: 285).

<sup>154</sup> Risch (1949: 286), Risch (1974: 213), Schmitt (1972: 348), Stefaneli (1997).

<sup>155</sup> This pattern would be exceptional in Homer, however: Tribulato (2006: 169).

<sup>156</sup> Tribulato (2006: 173–175).

<sup>157</sup> Tribulato (2006: 171–173).

### 7.3 Left-oriented endocentric determinative compounds with a substantival head

Left-oriented  $[N N]_N$  or  $[N A]_N$  endocentric determinative compounds are not numerous in Greek and can usually be explained as the reversed counterpart of right-oriented types, which are typical of poetic language or technical registers. In some cases, the interference from syntactic structures is at the origin of these types and we will briefly examine some of these issues.

Various forms are quoted in the literature as possible cases of poetic left-oriented endocentric determinative compounds, but in many of these cases an alternative right-oriented explanation is preferable. For instance, the epithet *πλουτόχθων* ‘rich in treasures of the earth’ (*LSJ*), which is applied to γόνος ‘offspring’ in a choral ode of Aeschylus’ *Eumenides* (947) can be interpreted as a right-oriented bahuvrihi meaning ‘having a land of riches’ rather than as a left-oriented substantival apposition meaning ‘richness of the land’.<sup>158</sup>

An interesting left-oriented compound, again found in Aeschylus, is Dionysus’ epithet *θείοις* ‘god of wine’ (fr. 382 Radt, later re-used by Lyc. *Al.* 1247). The epithet seems to have been known outside poetry, since it gave its name to an Attic feast in honour of the god.<sup>159</sup> The compound may therefore have been a common word of the popular Attic lexicon, perhaps result of a univerbation. In this respect, the epithet would be similar to other god-names, such as *Δημήτηρ* and *Ποσειδῶν*, which derive from the univerbation of phrases (meaning ‘Mother Earth’ and ‘Spouse of the Earth’ respectively). *θείοις* perhaps derives from invocations of the god in which the vocative (*θεός*) was followed by the determining genitive *οἴνου*: this would involve haplology of the final syllable of *θεός*.

Another set of left-oriented determinative involves names of animals and plants; the latter mostly occur in scientific prose.<sup>160</sup> Among animal names, a coherent group is represented by *-αγρος* compounds, all indicating a type of wild beast. The first attested of these compounds is *σύαγρος* ‘wild pig, boar’ (Dion. Trag. and Antiphanes Com.), followed by the much later *ὄναγρος* ‘wild ass’ (LXX), *αἴγαγρος* ‘wild goat’ (Gal.), *βόαγρος* ‘wild bull’ (Philostr.) and *ἵππαγρος* ‘wild horse’ (Opp.). All of these compounds correspond to attested phrases of the type *αἴγες* [...] *ἄγρια* (Hom. *Od.* 9.118–119), *βόες ἄγριοι* (Hdt. 7.126.2), *ὄνοι ἄγριοι*

<sup>158</sup> In *πλουτόχθων*, an epithet referring to the silver mines of Laurion, the use of the nominal *FC πλουτο-* in place of the derived adjective *πλούσιος* is likely to have been inspired by the wish to allude to Pluto (*Πλούτων*), the god who presides over mines.

<sup>159</sup> See Harpocr., Hsch. s.v. *Θεοίνια*, and the *varia lectio* in Ps. Dem. *In Naeream* 78.9. On the connection between this festival and the Dionysia, see Göber (1934).

<sup>160</sup> Tribulato (2005: 293–302).

(Hdt. 7.86.2) and ἵπποι ἄγριοι (Hdt. 4.52.1). The deletion of the adjectival marker in ἄγριος > -αγρος is necessary for the compound to be considered a noun and not an adjective. The shape of the SC may also be influenced by some compounds in which -αγρος derives from ἀγρεύω ‘to hunt’, although there is no reason to suppose that ἀγρεύω provided all the SCs of these compounds, as claimed by Wackernagel.<sup>161</sup> The early appearance of the corresponding phrases just quoted provides strong evidence that the expressions were widespread and the creation of compounds out of these expressions must have happened already in early Classical Greek. The fact that ὄναγρος features in one of the *Psalms* only confirms that these compounds belonged to everyday Greek and not, as Wackernagel assumed, to fashionable language.<sup>162</sup>

That -αγρος compounds derive from phrases containing ἄγριος is also suggested by the structure of another left-oriented animal name, ἵπποπόταμος. This compound, which first appears in the first/second century AD, has a clear antecedent in the phrase ἵππος ποτάμιος (Hdt., Thphr.). The transformation of this phrase into a compound with the SC ποτάμιος may be formally influenced by bahuvrihis ending in -πόταμος, such as διπόταμος ‘having two rivers’ (Eur.).

Various plant names, occurring in scientific prose, may similarly have been influenced by the occurrence of phrases in which a noun is specified by an adjective or genitive. A number of these plant names feature the FC ὄπο- from ὄπος ‘plant juice’. The first of these forms, ὄποβάλαμον ‘juice of the balsam tree’, is attested in Theophrastus.<sup>163</sup> Later forms include ὄποπάναξ ‘juice of Hercules’ woundwort’ and ὄποκάλασον ‘juice of flax’ (a kind of myrrh), both used by Galen. All these forms meet with huge success in late-antique and Medieval Greek, where they become the standard way to refer to these particular plants or extracts. In earlier Greek, phrases containing ὄπος followed by the genitive of a plant name can occur side by side with the corresponding compound, some-

<sup>161</sup> Wackernagel (1895: 47) interprets βοάγριον ‘shield’ as ‘shield made from the leather of a hunted bull’, the name of the Locrian river βοάγριος as ‘river where the hunted bulls seek shelter’ and the name Σύαγρος as ‘boar-hunter’. He suggests that the connection between the SCs and ἄγριος did not exist before the fourth century, when Antiphanes and Dionysius I used σύαγρος with the meaning of ‘wild pig’ for the first time. Risch (1949: 286) agrees with this interpretation. An early derivation from ἄγριος however is equally possible and Σύαγρος may well be understood as one of those Greek names which compare their bearer to the qualities of the named beast: the aristocratic associations of οὔς are well-known.

<sup>162</sup> σύαγρος is the topic of a learned conversation in Ath. 9.64, in which the meaning ‘pig-hunter’ attributed to the PN is contrasted with the meaning ‘wild boar’ which is given as the current one in Athenaeus’ time and which Democritus (one of the banqueters) backs up with a quotation from the Attic playwright Antiphanes, who puts it in the mouth of a boaster.

<sup>163</sup> Thphr. *HP* 4.4.14.19. In the same line ὄποκιννάμων ‘juice of the κιννάμων’ is attested by one of the manuscripts, but editors of the text do not accept the reading: see Amigues (1989: 76).

times even in the same passage, as in Gal. *Comp. med. per gen.* 13. 628.18–19: τοῦ πάνακος (*scilicet* ὀπός) ὁμοίως, ὃν ἐν συνθέτῳ προσηγορία καλοῦσιν ὀποπάνακα ‘the juice of the πάναξ, which is designated by the compound ὀποπάναξ’. In a similar manner, we find καρποβάλαμον ‘the fruit of the balsam’ (Gal.) alternating with καρπὸς βαλσάμου (Gal. *De antidotis libri ii* 14.41.3–4). The use of καρπο- in the FC might have been encouraged by its occurrence in verbal compounds such as καρποφόρος ‘fruit-bearer’, but the creation of the compound in the first place reflects the frequency of the phrase in the technical register of botany and medicine.

These plant names represent a coherent group displaying identical characteristics and sharing a similar derivational process. It seems that they mark the final stage of a process which first led pairs of words such as καρπὸς βαλσάμου or ὄνος ἄγριος to become fixed expressions for the denomination of a certain plant, plant derivative or animal, and then consolidated them as lexical units, i.e. as a type of phrasal term.<sup>164</sup> As argued by Langslow (2000: 206) in connection with medical Latin, this is a frequent phenomenon in the creation of technical languages. The next step was the transformation of these phrasal terms into proper compounds: again, this ties in with the well-known tendency of technical languages to coin a synthetic and transparent terminology.<sup>165</sup> Writers of scientific treatises are in a position to choose between the phrase and the compound on the basis of considerations of style and register. It may be that these plant and animal names which begin to be used in post-Classical Greek represent the relics of a broader trend towards endowing Greek with a scientific language, according to which nominalization supersedes syntax.<sup>166</sup> Some of the FCs might therefore function as convenient ‘tags’, iconic markers of a certain class of elements in the scientific taxonomy. In this respect, Greek technical language seems to privilege morphological patterns which are different from those used in other linguistic registers.

#### 7.4 Determinative compounds with a governing adjectival head

Another class which is commonly mentioned in descriptions of Greek left-oriented compounds comprises forms in which the head is an adjective used as the FC: ἰσόθεος ‘similar to a god’, ἀξιόλογος ‘worthy of mention’, ἀπειρομάχᾳς ‘unused to war’, ἀίδροδικῆς ‘ignorant of law’, κέανδρος ‘empty of men’, ἐρημόπολις ‘bereft

<sup>164</sup> Tribulato (2010: 493).

<sup>165</sup> Langslow (2000: 8–13).

<sup>166</sup> Bussmann (1996: 327), Willi (2003: 57–65, 120–122).



of a city', ὁμοίκριθος 'similar to barley' and ἐμπειροπόλεμος 'expert of war'. This type is different from the preceding types, in that the forms in question cannot be considered to be the 'odd' counterparts of established right-oriented ones, and this is because right-oriented determinative compounds with an adjectival head and a nominal modifier are marginal in Greek (sections 4.6–4.7).

Some previous accounts connect these compounds to syntactic phrases of the type ἴσος θεοῖσι 'similar to the gods', ἄξιος λόγου 'worthy of mention', without much consideration of the mechanisms by which compounds might come to be derived from these phrases.<sup>167</sup> While the derivation of the compound from a phrase is demonstrable in the case of some of these forms (e.g. ἰσόθεος), for most for most of them no corresponding phrase is attested.<sup>168</sup> Moreover, the syntactic order of the attested phrases is by no means always of the adjective + noun kind.

The left-oriented structure of these compounds is ruled by a combination of morpho-syntactic criteria rather than by the mechanistic imitation of particular phrases. The placement of the adjectival head on the left is due to the fact that ἴσος, ἄξιος, ἄπειρος, ἔρημος, αἰδρις, etc. are directors, i.e. governing words which require obligatory complements in order to be semantically complete: this is the syntactic criterion behind their left-orientation. In this respect, these adjectives behave in a similar way to prepositions and the resulting compounds exhibit properties analogous to those of prepositional compounds, including the fact that the SC may be modified by an adjectival suffix (ἄξιότης-ος 'worthy of honour' < ἄξιος + τιμή).<sup>169</sup>

A subclass of this type converges still more closely with prepositions. These are compounds in which the spatial adjectives μέσος 'middle' and ἄκρος 'high' behave as governing FCs with the meaning 'in the middle of' and 'on top of', as in μεσόμφαλος 'in mid-navel, central' and in the noun ἄκρωμία 'withers of a horse' (< 'on top of shoulders').<sup>170</sup>

While the properties displayed by all these adjectival FCs are influenced by syntax, the resulting compounds are not simply condensed syntactic phrases: the placement of the director in the FC ultimately follows the general morphological rules of compound formation, since—as we have previously discussed—in Greek

<sup>167</sup> See e.g. Buck (1933: 355).

<sup>168</sup> Tribulato (2007: 532–540), from which the present section is derived.

<sup>169</sup> Tribulato (2007: 543–544). With the exception of G. Meyer (1872: 14), most of the previous discussions of these compounds fail to identify the governing nature of their FCs: see e.g. Debrunner (1917: 43), Risch (1949: 106).

<sup>170</sup> Risch (1945) mentions some of these compounds in his study of the process leading to the derivation of those *Zugehörigkeitsadjektiva* (adjectives of pertinence) from phrases which are marked by the suffixes -ιος or -ος, e.g. μέσαι νύκτες 'midnight' > μεσονύκτιος 'at midnight'. However, he does not address the governing nature of their FCs.

there is a clear restriction on right-oriented compounded adjectives, the bulk of which derive from phrases containing an accusative of respect.

### 7.5 Left-oriented V1 compounds and the question of their interpretation

The preceding overview shows that there are two very different types of left-oriented compounds. On the one hand, some types represent the sporadic inversion of established right-oriented types and are usually connected to specific registers, such as poetic style in the case of the forms discussed in 7.2.1 and 7.2.2, and scientific language in the case of the left-oriented animal and plant names discussed in section 7.3. On the other hand, adjective-first compounds do not really compete with any particular right-oriented type: they have their origin in morphological constraints, and are also influenced by syntax, since their heads are directors.

A similar combination of word order patterns and morphological constraints characterizes the formation and productivity of V1 compounds in Greek. These compounds are marked by a FC deriving from a verb and a nominal SC functioning as the verb's argument. The most common semantic role acquired by the SC is that of direct object, with the FC expressing transitive or transitive-causative semantics, and this can be observed in the two classic examples which will be used throughout this book: *φερέουκος* 'carry-house' (an epithet used to describe the snail in Hes. and nomadic peoples in Hdt.) and *τερψίμβροτος* 'delighting men' (Hom.). However, V1 compounds may reflect the whole range of semantic roles associated with the Greek verb, mirroring the semantics of the verbal base from which they derive.<sup>171</sup> The SC may therefore correspond to the indirect case governed by the verb, as in *πεισιχάλινος* 'obeying the rein' (Pi.), which mirrors the use of *πέιθομαι* with the dative; or in *ἀψίκορος* 'quickly-satiated' (lit. 'touching satiety', Pl.), which corresponds to the construction of *ἄπτομαι* 'touch, reach' with the genitive. In a few isolated cases, the FC may acquire passive semantics: the SC may then assume the semantic role of agent, as in *ἀκουσίθεος* 'heard by God' (Antip. Thess.), or it may express a concomitant condition such as cause, as in *ἐρασιπλόκαμος* 'loved for the hair' (Ibyc.). In a few more artificial compounds, the verbal FC may express passive semantics but the SC, rather than functioning as the agent, would seem to be *characterized* by the FC: see for instance *στρεψίμαλλος* 'with tangled fleece' (*not* 'tangling the fleece' or 'twisted by the fleece') and *στρεψίκερως* '(antelope) with twisted horns' (*not* 'twisting the horns' or 'twisted by the horns'): on both forms, cf. Chapter 6, section 3.1.

<sup>171</sup> See also Williger (1928: 6 n. 2).

In Greek, the productivity of the V1 type is surprising, since its left-oriented structure goes against the right-headed orientation of the language, and the fact that the same combination of a verbal element and its argument is also expressed by the standard right-oriented V2 type (e.g. οικόφωρος) may make the V1 type appear redundant. Such productivity, which is without parallel, as far as we can tell, among other ancient IE languages, calls for three approaches. The focus of the first is on the origin of V1 compounds and the question of whether they are an inherited type or should be analysed solely as a development peculiar to Greek. The second approach is concerned with the morphological analysis of the FCs and is intimately tied up with the question of the origin of the V1 type. The FCs of the examples φερέοικος and τερψίμβροτος are structurally different, in that the first can be described as containing the root of φέρω followed by -ε-, i.e. the present stem, while the latter can be described as containing the stem of the s-aorist of τέρω ‘delight’ (ἔ-τερψ-α) followed by -ι-; or, alternatively, the stem of the action noun τέρψις ‘enjoyment’. The morphological make-up of V1 compounds in Greek has elicited a variety of interpretations. Some of them privilege a syntactic analysis, according to which the FCs are analysed as the relics of inflected verbal forms (Chapter 3, section 5), while others take the FCs to derive from verbal stems (Chapter 3, sections 6 and 8). As a consequence of these differing approaches, the literature on the topic contains widely varying interpretations of the PIE origin and development of the V1 type(s), as well as their interaction with word order and other compound types.

The third approach focuses on the development of V1 compounds within Greek in the light of its right-oriented compound system, and addresses a number of key questions. Why do V1 compounds co-exist side by side with the more widespread V2 type? Do they express different semantics from V2 compounds? Did they arise to overcome morphological or structural constraints associated with the V2 type?<sup>172</sup> The methodological assumption adopted in this book is that, in order to explain why these V1 ‘exceptions’ exist and are relatively productive in a right-headed language such as Greek, they need to be investigated from the point of view of their structural and semantic relation to the V2 type (an approach with we have similarly applied to the description of the other left-oriented categories described above), as well as from the point of view of their use in context.

---

**172** Namer and Villoing (2007) explore similar questions in their comparison of the morphological processes behind French V1 and V2 compounds. However, their use and understanding of the AG data, is seriously mistaken: for instance, they believe that [N V] compounds may have been lacking in AG!

### 7.5.1 The FC of V1 compounds: descriptive overview

φερέοικος V1 compounds are characterized by a verbal FC ending in *-ε-* or, much more rarely, in *-ο-* (e.g. λιπότεκνος ‘lacking children, childless’, Pi.), *-α-* (e.g. ταλαπενθής ‘bearing grief’, Hom.), *-υ-* (e.g. Ἐρύλαος ‘defending his people’, Hom.), *-η-* (e.g. Τληπόλεμος ‘enduring war’, Hom.) and *-ι-* (e.g. ἀρχιτέκτων ‘chief-builder’, Hdt.).<sup>173</sup> In practical terms, this category tends to be defined in opposition to the second category of Greek V1 compounds, namely those whose FC is characterized by *-σ-*.

τερψίμβροτος compounds are identified by the *-σι-* element and its combinations with velars and labials (*-ξι-*, *-ψι-*); and, more sporadically, by *-σε-* (περσέπολις ‘conquering cities’ < πέρθω ‘to conquer’), *-σο-* (Ἀμεισόπολις ‘conquering cities’ < ἀμύσασθαι ‘to conquer’), *-εσι-* (ἐλκεσίπεπλος ‘trailing the robe’ < ἔλκω ‘to trail’) or *-ησι-* (εὐρησιεπής ‘finding words, inventive of words’ < εὐρίσκω ‘to find’). Chapter 4, section 4.1, investigates the analogical nature of these constituents in *-εσι-*, *-ησι-*, *-σε-* and *-σο-*. A much thornier problem is represented by the few FCs ending in *-τι-* (βωτιάνειρα ‘feeding men’ < βόσκω ‘to feed’), which are mostly attested in Mycenaean or in Homeric Greek. Indeed, our interpretation of the *τερψίμβροτος* type turns out to depend on how we understand this kind of FC, which finds parallels in Vedic forms such as *dāti-vara-* ‘giving riches’ (Chapter 4, section 4.3.2).

As Chapter 3 shows in detail, hypotheses on the origin of the V1 type pivot on the analysis of the FCs, and in particular on their final vocalic element. There are two basic trends: the first interprets these vocalic elements as inflectional relics, originally belonging to inflected verbal forms or (in the case of *τερψίμβροτος* compounds only) as parts of nominal suffixes; the second trend considers these vowels as linking elements, which have the function of making *Kompositionsfuge* easier and are devoid of any special semantic function. We will return to these issues in the next two chapters.

### 7.5.2 Productivity of Ancient Greek V1 compounds

This question of the origin of the type is irrelevant to the diachronic development of V1 compounds in Greek. Speakers developed an internal derivational process according to which *τερψίμβροτος* compounds were mostly based on sigmatic tenses (principally the aorist), while *φερέοικος* compounds were mostly based on thematic presents or aorists. Although this derivational chain includes many

<sup>173</sup> *-ι-* is based on the analogy of *τερψίμβροτος* compounds, as argued in Chapter 4, section 3.2. One also finds *-αι-* in compounds from τλήναι, where ταλαι- provides a metrical alternative to ταλα-.

exceptions, it is fundamentally stable: therefore, in order to understand the creation of certain V1 compounds or the popularity of others, and particularly the way in these interact with existing or non-existing V2 compounds, it is necessary to study the relationship between the compounds and their verbal bases.

On the whole, V1 compounds are used in all linguistic registers. However, they are particularly common in onomastics and poetry (where they are mostly used as epithets), and also occur in the technical register of medical and astronomical texts. When used as PNs or epithets, V1 compounds describe an individual by reference to through his/her characterizing action. It has been claimed that this sort of onomastic formations reflect wishes and this may well be true, although it would not be advisable to infer from this basic observation (which also applies to names expressing qualities such as ‘good’ or ‘beautiful’, or comparing humans to animals) that the FCs of V1 compounds go back to old imperatives or desideratives (Chapter 3, sections 5 and 6). Similarly, the high frequency of V1 compounds in onomastics should not be used to infer that the type must have originated within onomastics and was later transferred to the non-onomastic lexicon: the interaction between onomastics and other spheres of a language is never unidirectional (see section 8 below). More probably, the onomastic use is a specialization of a type which arose for the adjectival description of individuals performing actions, as opposed to types which named those individuals by means of substantival compound types.

### 7.5.3 Exocentricity of V1 compounds

The preceding paragraph leads us on to another identifying characteristic of V1 compounds cross-linguistically which we ought to address briefly: their exocentric character. AG V1 compounds are mostly used as adjectives and this is usually marked by the suffix *-ος/-ον*, as in *ἐχέκολλος* ‘sticky’ (lit. ‘containing glue’, Hippocr.) < *κόλλα* ‘glue’; V1 compounds with a neuter sigmatic stem in the SC regularly take the suffix *-ής*, e.g. *Ἐχεμένης* ‘having strength’ < *μένος* ‘strength’. Depending on the shape of the SC, the adjectival status of the compound may also be signalled through other devices: consider *ἐχέφρων* ‘prudent’ (lit. ‘having mind’) vs. *φρήν* ‘mind’ (where derivation is signalled by the choice of a different vocalic grade); or *ἐχενής* ‘ship-holding’ vs. *ναῦς* (where derivation is signalled by the feminine suffix *-ίς*). Substantival V1 compounds do exist, but they are always derived nouns (e.g. *ἐχεμυθία* ‘silence’ < *ἐχέμυθος* ‘someone who holds back words’).

V1 compounds ought therefore to be regarded as headless. Semantically, the governing FCs are the fixed element of the compound, which the SCs in some way ‘modify’ by providing different arguments: as such—it may be argued—the FC is

a sort of determinatum and thus a sort of *semantic head*. Because clear terminology for defining these properties of the FC of V1 compounds is lacking, the term ‘head’ is sometimes used in reference to the verbal FC of V1 compounds. However, this usage is highly controversial, since some linguists would argue that the FC does not display the typical properties of heads, such as the determination of the grammatical category of the compound itself. This is a particularly cogent objection in connection with the *φερέοικος* type, as its FC cannot be interpreted as deriving from a noun at all (we have already mentioned that the morphological analysis of the FC of *τερψίμβροτος* compounds is controversial): since it is a stem, and not a noun, its identification with the head is problematic.<sup>174</sup>

#### 7.5.4 Left-orientation and word order patterns

As in the case of the other left-oriented compound categories of Greek, the main question concerning the structure of V1 compounds is why they have been created as such. As already mentioned, this question is particularly pressing in connection with a language such as Greek, in which not only is compounding overwhelmingly right-headed, but there also exists a very large and productive category of right-oriented V2 compounds. The question can in fact be subdivided into two further questions. The first concerns the morphological (and perhaps also syntactic) mechanisms which determined the survival and popularity of left-oriented V1 compounds in the Greek right-oriented compound system. This synchronic question has never been addressed in earnest, requiring as it does a comprehensive analysis of V1 compound families in their relationship with V2 types, and such an analysis is the goal of the present volume. The second question concerns the morphological and syntactic mechanisms which influenced the birth of the left-oriented V1 type in the proto-language: this historical question is usually addressed from a comparative and typological point view, in the light of PIE word order and its diachronic development.

---

<sup>174</sup> The issue has been debated regarding modern V1 compounds: for a general appraisal, see Scalise and Fábregas (2010: 113–114). Endocentric analysis of V1 compounds, particularly in Romance languages, is discussed in several contributions, including Di Sciullo and Williams (1987), Lieber (1992: 66–67), Bisetto (1994), Scalise, Bisetto and Guevara (2005: 140–141), Schroten (2010: 91). It should be noted, however, that in the frameworks adopted in some of these contributions, the verbal FC is considered to be a noun (derived from a verb through zero-morpheme suffixation), not a verb or a verbal stem, and this poses problems for Greek in that there is a good chance that the FC of Greek V1 compounds is, quite simply, a stem or a root. I used the term ‘head’ for the description of Greek V1 compounds in Tribulato (2006) and Tribulato (2007); this term is here avoided on account of the difficulties discussed above.

In most IE languages, with the exception of the Romance branch, right-oriented compounds are the majority.<sup>175</sup> Indo-Europeanists have tended to explain this state of affairs by reference to the fact that the basic (unmarked) word order in PIE seems to have been of the SOV type, i.e. with modifying items preceding the modified element(s).<sup>176</sup> Accordingly, the hypothesis is that left-oriented compounds reflect marked word order (VOS), and this theory has been used to account for V1 compounds in particular.<sup>177</sup> In some studies, the interaction between these two inherited types is also seen in chronological terms: V2 compounds reflect a pre-inflectional stage of PIE, in which determination was signalled simply by word order, whereas V1 compounds reflect a later stage, in which determination and other syntactic functions were expressed through endings.<sup>178</sup>

In this connection, a popular view since the nineteenth century has been that V1 compounds arose from PIE imperatival phrases, in which the verb took the first position: accordingly, the FC of V1 compounds has been identified with an inflected imperative, a hypothesis which has won support from the likes of Jacobi, Delbrück, Brugmann and Wackernagel and which is discussed in Chapter 3, section 5.<sup>179</sup> Studies of V1 compounds in the ancient IE languages now generally prefer to interpret the FCs of V1 compounds as stems or (in the case of *τερψιμβροτος* compounds) as verbal nouns, but the imperatival hypothesis continues to hold ground in analyses of modern V1 compounds, particularly in relation to Romance.<sup>180</sup> These studies have contributed useful insights regarding the reconstruction of PIE syntax and its connection with the structure of V1 compounds at that linguistic stage, but they fail to explain the factors at play in the Greek compound system, in which both the V1 and the V2 types are productive.

When transferred to Greek, the debate on the impact of word order patterns on compounding takes on a different significance. Classical Greek word order is notoriously very free, and this freedom, which earlier research mostly linked to stylistics, is now also analysed in pragmatic terms.<sup>181</sup> The view that SOV may still be the basic word order in AG, as opposed to the more pronounced shift to SVO in

**175** Pollack (1912: 62–64), followed by Tischler (1979: 857).

**176** This was recognized as early as Delbrück (1878: 76–78). The application of this theory to the analysis of IE compounding is discussed in Lehmann (1969: 10–11) and Tischler (1979: 858, 865).

**177** Jacobi (1897: 55), Lehmann (1969: 13), Tischler (1979: 865).

**178** E.g. Andriotis (1938: 92–93).

**179** Jacobi (1897: 46–82, especially 73–74), Delbrück (1900: 174), Brugmann (1905–1906: 60–71), Brugmann (1906: 63–64), Wackernagel (1905: 315–320).

**180** Exceptions to this trend, which focus in particular on the imperatival interpretation of *φερπέοικος* compounds, are Frei-Lüthy (1978), Dunkel (1992) and Lühr (2004); others are discussed in Chapter 3, section 6.

**181** Dik (1995) and Dik (2007), applying the methodologies of Functional Grammar to Greek.

MG, is considered controversial by some scholars on the basis of the very different approaches adopted in assessing the data.<sup>182</sup> The evidence provided by compounds *may* speak in favour of the hypothesis that SOV continued to be the basic order in AG, since in compounds the determiner overwhelmingly occurs at the left of the head, but this argument runs a serious risk of being circular.<sup>183</sup>

Accordingly, the presence of V1 compounds in Greek can be viewed in two different ways. The first view adopts a diachronic perspective, according to which Greek V1 compounds reflect a particular PIE word order (whatever its real motivations) that places the verb before its object. The markedness of this pattern would thus be carried over in Greek compounding: in other words, left-orientation would be a relic, preserved in particular areas of the lexicon.<sup>184</sup> The fact that V1 compounds are very common in Greek onomastics is used by some scholars to support the thesis that the pattern originally expressed a marked word order, in which an imperative, used to express a wish for the new-born, was placed first in the phrase.<sup>185</sup> In the remaining areas of the lexicon, this original function would have been lost and V1 compounds would simply represent reversed, and to an extent 'odd', counterparts of the V2 type.

Concerning the connection between syntactic word order and compound orientation, we should pay attention to the pioneering ideas expressed by Andriotis (1938) in the only diachronic study of Greek 'reversed' compounds to extend as far forward as MG. Andriotis was persuaded that V1 compounds were inherited, but he also criticized both the idea that in Greek they were specialized as an onomastic pattern, kept alive by the onomastic tendency to create reversed names, and the idea that in the appellative lexicon V1 compounds were tied to a different stylistic level than V2 compounds.<sup>186</sup> In particular, he paid due attention to the fact that the V1 type (together with other types of left-oriented compounds) remained productive throughout the Byzantine period and down to the modern language, a fact which he interpreted to mean—in my view correctly—that the V1 type was not

---

**182** For the idea that SOV remains more basic in AG, see Dover (1960: 2–3); for the idea that the basic word order is SVO already in AG, see Delbrück (1900: 80–83). The range of differing positions on the topic is summarized in the bibliographical overview in Debrunner (1950: 695). For the standard view that the MG order is basically of the SVO type, see Thumb (1910: 191–192). However, there has recently been considerable debate concerning the phenomena triggering the SVO order in MG and even on whether this order should be considered 'canonical' at all. Studies in this direction have been conducted by Philippaki-Warbuton (1985) and Horrocks (1994).

**183** Andriotis (1938: 92–93) states this overtly.

**184** This is more or less the view expressed by Andriotis (1938: 93–95).

**185** For this onomastic specialization of V1 compounds, see Knecht (1946) and Frei-Lüthy (1978), whose ideas are discussed in Chapter 3, sections 9.1 and 9.2

**186** Andriotis (1938: 95–103).



a mere stylistic device, but a linguistic tool authentically employed in common language as well.<sup>187</sup>

Andriotis' account is a good representative of the second way of viewing to V1 compounds in Greek, which seeks to find internal mechanisms to explain the presence and popularity of this left-oriented type in the language. Efforts have been focused on identifying the specific semantic or functional properties which V1 compounds express *within Greek*, as opposed to those expressed by V2 compounds. Andriotis himself was actually sceptical about the possibility of identifying a semantic and functional differentiation between the two types which, in his view, were simply distinguished by a contrasting structure. Others have put forward more ambitious theories which, it should be noted, have not been tested on a comprehensive corpus of verbal compounds. The most influential of these theories was advanced by Benveniste (1967). In his view, V1 and V2 compounds are not free variations of one another: V1 compounds express 'la réalité du procès' and signify the verbal action 'comme activité constatée', thus corresponding to a *description*;<sup>188</sup> whereas V2 compounds simply correspond to an atemporal *definition* of a given action and express a 'qualité permanente'.<sup>189</sup> It is important to take note of the famous assumption which Benveniste's analysis takes as its starting point, namely that compounding is a 'micro-syntax': accordingly, Greek compounds and their structure are seen as the transformation of free syntactic utterances, and not as crystallized morphological patterns which predate Greek itself.<sup>190</sup> Although Benveniste does not address the issue of orientation, his hypothesis can be further interpreted as suggesting that V1 compounds are opposed—as a 'marked' pattern provided with 'marked' semantics—to V2 compounds, which simply state a fact.

Benveniste's hypothesis has often been cited and made use of in accounts of Greek compounding, but the truth remains that neither his short article nor subsequent studies have been able to prove the semantic and functional repartition which he hypothesizes: on the contrary, the cursory examinations to which individual compound pairs have been subjected tend to disprove Benveniste's claim.<sup>191</sup> In Chapter 3 we will return to this syntactic approach and to Benveniste's conclusion that compounds have the function of transferring the predica-

---

**187** Andriotis (1938: 103).

**188** Benveniste (1967: 23).

**189** Benveniste (1967: 22–24). The same distinction is seen to operate in the Greek agent nouns: Benveniste (1948: 45–56), criticized in Lazzeroni (1992).

**190** For the opposition morphology/syntax, see Benveniste (1967: 15).

**191** Szemerényi (1977: 26), R. Schulze (1979).

tion enunciated by syntactic propositions to a ‘virtual level’.<sup>192</sup> As concerns V1 compounds, Benveniste is right to criticize the view that V1 and V2 compounds are free variants of one another (which was more or less Andriotis’ conclusion). The analysis of the other left-oriented types advanced in this chapter corroborates Benveniste’s criticism, since all productive left-oriented types are not mere inversions of right-oriented types, but are justified by morpho-syntactic factors. Like Andriotis, Benveniste also finds fault with another prevalent view which sees V1 compounds as mere stylistic variants of V2 compounds. As Chapters 5–6 show, a degree of stylistic variation is suggested by the interaction of many individual compound pairs, particularly when the V2 specimen has acquired a semantic specialization which links it to technical or low-level registers. However, it would be wrong to conclude that V1 compounds are always poetic or elevated and that V2 compounds are tied to everyday language: the stylistic repartition must be judged separately for each individual compound family, and in fact often on a pair-by-pair basis.

As we have seen, Benveniste’s response to older hypotheses is to find a semantic solution, according to which V1 compounds correspond to syntactic enunciates containing presents expressing a description, while V2 compounds correspond to phrases containing presents which express a definition. In the analysis proposed in this volume, by contrast, the interaction between V1 and V2 compounds is explained through a combination of factors, ranging from morphology to semantics and syntax. These factors are: the shape of the verbal root lying behind the compounds and the morphological constraints associated with it (particularly in the creation of V2 compounds), i.e. morphology; the specific meaning(s) of the base verbs and how this or these may be expressed through the interaction between different compound types, i.e. semantics; and the relation to attested Greek phrases, the connections which they create between concepts and between the words which express them, and the syntactic order in which these words are placed.

## 8 Onomastics and compounds

The previous section referred to theories which connect the origin of V1 compounds to onomastics. It is now time to say a few general words about the mechanisms ruling AG onomastics as a useful preliminary to the in-depth assessment of the theories which are discussed in Chapter 3, as well as to the study of individual V1 types. The Greek naming system was one of the most creative areas of the

---

<sup>192</sup> Benveniste (1967: 30).

Greek language, and there were very few rules restricting the kind of word or stem that could be used to form a PN.<sup>193</sup> From a structural point of view, three different types of names can be distinguished: compounded PNs (also called ‘dithematic names’, e.g. Πατροκλέης and Σωσίπολις), abbreviated names derived from them (the so-called *Kurznamen* or hypocoristics, e.g. Πάτροκλος and Σωσίας), and monothematic names which do not derive from dithematic forms (the so-called *sobriquets*, e.g. Ἀγάθων ‘the good one’).<sup>194</sup>

The traditional stance on Greek onomastics, represented for instance by Bechtel and Fick (1894), is that all Greek names were originally dithematic (i.e. compounded) and that monothematic names arose only as a result of their shortening. Recent work inclines towards a more moderate view, allowing that Greek possessed originally dithematic names, as well as originally monothematic ones, and that only a portion of monothematic names were created by shortening of dithematic forms.<sup>195</sup> It has been suggested (most notably by Pulgram (1947)) that the structure of Greek PNs reflects social divisions, whereby members of the aristocracy possessed compounded names while monothematic names were used by the lower classes, but this assumption is unwarranted.<sup>196</sup>

Before assessing the possible role of onomastics in the origin and/or development of V1 compounds in Greek, we need to consider some more general problems. One of them is whether or not PNs represent a linguistic realm that obeys completely different rules from those governing other lexemes (appellatives): much of the work that can be done on the morphology of names depends on how this question is answered. It is frequently remarked that PNs tend to be more conservative than other lexical items. This statement is in part correct, and it is supported by the cross-linguistic wealth of PNs whose shape and phonology have resisted the changes undergone by lexical words. At the same time, however, certain PNs can evolve in ways that are out of keeping with the rest of the language, and display original forms of morphological innovation.<sup>197</sup> Examples of both phenomena are provided by Morpurgo Davies (2000: 16–17). The English names Ethel, Audrey, and Etheldreda are all developments of the same original form *Æðelþryd*: this shows that PNs, like other words, may change their phonological shape, but, unlike other words, they do not have to reach a standardized form. PNs may also defy the normal rules of word formation, as is shown by the

**193** See García Ramón (2000c), García Ramón (2011: 220–228).

**194** See further von Kamptz (1982: 6–23) on the semantic and formal criteria on which to base the distinction between *Kurzformen* and *Kurznamen*.

**195** See Hartmann (2002: 61, 73–74).

**196** Hartmann (2002: 75).

**197** Uhlich (1993: 13–20).

Greek creation of the feminine Διοδότη out of a morphological class (verbal adjectives) which in the appellative lexicon does not have a separate feminine form.<sup>198</sup>

Trends towards innovation or conservatism within onomastics also vary according to period and geographical area.<sup>199</sup> A given form may be more conservative in a given region because of specific historical and socio-linguistic conditions, such as the perpetuation of the local god's or king's name, or the wish to preserve communal identity through PNs.<sup>200</sup> On the other hand, the desire to expunge the memory of a given person may lead a community to suddenly drop the use of a name,<sup>201</sup> while other regions may be more prone to accept new names because of their proximity to foreign lands, or because of the multilingual nature of their community.<sup>202</sup> The widespread notion that V1 compounds are used in onomastics because they are linguistic relics, appropriate to an intrinsically conservative area of language, must therefore be reviewed in light of the fact that naming practices are also characterized by innovative trends.

As concerns the mutual influence of the onomastic and appellative lexicons, here too a number of distinctions must be made. From the point of view of morphology, both linguistic realms exploit compounding as a means of word formation; in onomastics, however, we have seen that special short forms can be derived from compound names by taking part of the compound and adding a special suffix to it, e.g. Σώσιλος from Σωσίλαος. Although most of these suffixes in themselves are not confined to onomastics (e.g. -ος, -ιος, -ας, -ίας, -ᾶς, -(ι)ων, -εύς, -έας, -ις, -μος, and -ώ, -ιδ- for women), their use as a means of deriving hypocoristics is exclusive to onomastics: we are here faced with an area of the language partly governed by specific morphological mechanisms. As concerns semantics, we must reflect on the fact that onomastics experiences very few constraints as to what is compoundable, and the result is the mass of seemingly meaningless compounded names that we come across in Greek. This freedom is a consequence of the fact that names, unlike appellatives, do not necessarily need to obey semantic structures in order to 'speak' to us: thus a name formed by elements of both the father's and mother's side may have no structural 'meaning' and yet be transparent in what it represents or evokes. These examples help to bring out the fact that although onomastics may be characterized by linguistic mechanisms which are specific to it, it is not possible to identify a single factor which would support

**198** See also Morpurgo Davies (1999: 391).

**199** For instance, given onomastic suffixes seem to be distributed differently in Arcadia and in Attica: see Morpurgo Davies (1999: 393–396).

**200** See the case of the Arcadian names discussed by Morpurgo Davies (2000: 25–30).

**201** Examples would be the names Adolf and Benito in post-war Germany and Italy.

**202** See the situation on Cyprus as described by Morpurgo Davies (2000: 30–34).

the claim that a given compound type must have originated as onomastic and only later been extended to the appellative lexicon. There is certainly a good deal of exchange between onomastics and common language. Scholars often assume that the exchange is monodirectional, with onomastic patterns permeating the appellative lexicon as suggested for instance by Frei-Lüthy (1978), but the wealth of Greek names derived from common language, such as Λύκος ‘Wolf’, Ἀγάθων ‘The good one’, etc. (arguably nicknames in origin), shows that the opposite phenomenon was much more frequent.

### 8.1 Onomastics and V1 compounds

The focus of the present book is solely on compounded PNs of the V1 type, and on their shortened forms. Examples of both are already found in Mycenaean (see Chapter 4, sections 5 and 7), and the numerous attestations of this type across Greece show that the V1 type remained productive for the whole of AG linguistic history. Many of these names reflect two-member phrases attested in the language, often in the context of poetic phraseology. The investigation of these parallels is useful in order to clarify the authentic meaning of a given name and has often been carried out by scholars, although no comprehensive study of the impact of Greek phraseology on compounded PNs has ever been undertaken: good examples of the results which can be achieved with this methodology come from the many contributions by J. L. García Ramón on Greek (particularly Mycenaean) onomastics, which will often be drawn upon for our analysis of V1 PNs.<sup>203</sup>

At the same time, we should not neglect hypocoristics. These are especially important in the case of verbs which do not have a rich V1 compound family, since they prove the existence of FCs which are never found in fully compounded forms. Identifying those which may go back to a name of the *τερψίμβροτος* type is easier thanks to the *s*-marker attached to these compounds: hypocoristics in *-σευς*, *-σων*, *-σιων*, *-σιας* (and their combinations with occlusives) may have originated as FCs of V1 compounds. Examples from the Corpus include for instance Ἄμειψίας, Βλεψίας, and Βρύσων, all probably going back to compounded names of the *τερψίμβροτος* type derived from ἀμείβω, βλέπτω and βρύω.<sup>204</sup> Recognizing

**203** On phraseology in particular, see Chapter 3, section 7; Chapter 6, section 6.3.

**204** Other examples are discussed for instance by Morpurgo Davies (2000: 36–38) and García Ramón (1992). Matters are particularly difficult with Mycenaean hypocoristics given the ambiguous Mycenaean spelling: individual Mycenaean forms identified as hypocoristics of V1 compounds are discussed by Heubeck (1957a) and Heubeck (1957b), Perpillou (1973: 222–223), Morpurgo Davies (1999: 399).

hypocoristics derived from φερέοικος compounds is harder, as virtually any monothematic name displaying a verbal stem may be interpreted as the hypocoristic of a V1 compound.<sup>205</sup> The Corpus, which represents the first collection of V1 compounds down to the sixth century AD (with forays into Byzantine Greek), systematically collects instances of V1 PNs attested in Greek inscriptions. However, the Corpus only includes the first chronological attestation of the combination of a verb (e.g. ἄρχω) and a given noun (e.g. δίκη, λαός) and does not aim to provide a comprehensive collection of their formal variations (e.g. FCs ending in -ι and -ο), dialectal forms (e.g. with the SCs -δικᾶ or -λεως), hypocoristics or derivations (e.g. feminine forms in -εια). In each case, the form entered in the Corpus (regardless of whether it is a compound, hypocoristic or derivation, and whatever its dialectal colouring) is the most ancient one: for example, in the onomastic forms from ἄρχω the feminine name Ἀρχεδίκᾶ (Thessaly, 7th c.) is preferred to its Attic-Ionic counterpart Ἀρχεδίκη and to the masculine form Ἀρχέδικος because it is attested earlier. The collection is therefore intended to provide the fullest possible range of individual types of PNs, with the aim of studying the productivity of the various compound families: the formal variations of each PN should be investigated separately in the *LGPN* or other onomastic corpora.

## 9 Compound verbs

The preceding analysis of compound types does not include compound verbs such as ἐπιγράφω ‘to inscribe’, which originate from the joining of a preposition/adverb (ἐπί ‘on’) to a verb (γράφω ‘to write’). In that respect, this overview is in line with the tradition of studies of Greek compounding, which tends to exclude such forms from compounding since their historical origin can be traced back to a situation where adverb and verb were independent (the phenomenon known as ‘tmesis’ which is still prominently attested in Homeric Greek).<sup>206</sup> How this type of form is assessed may differ depending on the approach adopted, since these verbs often represent borderline cases between compounding and prefixation: the issue is debated with particular vigour concerning English compounds such as *overcome* and *take off*.<sup>207</sup> Like all other Greek verbs, these preverbed forms are at the root of a large number of verbal nouns in both Ancient and Modern Greek,

**205** For the suffixes used in the derivation of short names, see those discussed in the wider investigation of von Kamptz (1982: 108–175).

**206** Schwyzer (1939: 644), Risch (1974: 181).

**207** E.g. Marchand (1969: 100), Lieber (2009b: 365–366). In her recent study of MG compounding, Ralli (2013: 37) does not include verbs such as ἐπιγράφω among compounds either.

e.g. ἐπιγραφή ‘inscription’, ἐπιγραφεὺς ‘inscriber’, ἐπίγραμμα ‘inscription’: these too are excluded from accounts of compounding proper, since they are formed through derivation from a base form, rather than through compounding. In our investigation of verbal compounds, individual examples of prefixed derivations will be brought into the picture when they provide information on the derivational mechanisms of certain verbs: we will particularly pay attention to prefixed agent nouns such as ἐξεγέρτης ‘one who arouses’ and ἐπιλοιπός ‘remaining’ in Chapter 5, which deals with various classes of V1 compounds for which no corresponding V2 compounds are attested.

MG also has a common type of coordinative [V V]<sub>v</sub> compound (of controversial headedness) exemplified by τρωγοπίνω [eat drink] or ανοιγοκλίνω [open close], a type which is entirely absent in AG and seem to have arisen in the language only around the fourteenth century (see section 2.2).<sup>208</sup> According to Ralli (2013: 172), ‘the emergence of this type of compounds, which makes Greek unique among the Indo-European languages, is an instantiation of a grammatical need to respond to the rise of productivity of compounding in general and coordinative compounding more particularly; it filled an empty slot in the coordinative patterns of the language, that is, the slot based on the category of verbs’. Ralli further argues that [V V]<sub>v</sub> compounds may also be linked to the growth of paratactic structures in the language.

It is left for us to assess another type of structure represented by denominative verbs of the type ἀδικέω ‘I act unjustly’ which are not compound forms of the verbal base (there is no \*\*δικέω ‘to be just’ in AG), but derive, through conversion, from compounded nouns and adjectives such as ἄδικος ‘unjust’.<sup>209</sup> This original developmental chain, which at the first stage requires the existence of the bahuvrihi ἄδικος, is also responsible for the creation of secondary compound verbs from nominal verbal compounds, e.g. εὐεργέτης (compound of εὖ ‘well’ and the verbal stem ἐργ- ‘to work’) > εὐεργετέω ‘to be a benefactor’. A similar development is also assumed for English [N V]<sub>v</sub> structures such as *baby-sit* and *stage-manage*, which are back-formations of the synthetic compounds *baby-sitter* and *stage-manager*.<sup>210</sup>

The morphological issues at stake in the interpretation of this category of verbs are many and they have been recently studied by Grandi and Pompei (2012), who draw particular attention to the fact that ‘the formation of complex verbs ending in -έω is a process at the centre of an intricate net of interactions between various

**208** Ralli (2013: 157–175).

**209** Grandi and Pompei (2012: 404–406).

**210** Mithun (1984: 847), Baker (1988: 78–80).

derivational and compounding processes'.<sup>211</sup> This derivational net apparently enabled the formation of -έω verbs even in the absence of a preceding compound, to the point that the [N V]<sub>v</sub> type has become a productive class of compounds in MG.<sup>212</sup> In this volume, [N V]<sub>v</sub> complex verbs will be brought into the picture when they derive from V1 compounds: for instance, the adjective μνησικάκος is the basis for the technical verb of interstate treaties, (μῆ) μνησικακέω 'to pass an act of amnesty'. However, the Corpus does not systematically include derivations (either verbal or nominal) of V1 compounds, since the focus of this volume is not on the derivational process instantiated by the V1 type in AG.

## 10 The use of compounds in Ancient Greek

The variety and vitality of the compound types discussed in this chapter ought to have already made it clear that compounds are a fundamental part of the lexicon at every stage of the Greek language. As concerns AG, an obvious problem is the faulty nature of our documentation, which in particular does not allow us to form a good idea of the oral component of the language. Both in terms of the number of texts and the amount of research devoted to them, the analysis of AG compounding is usually biased towards literary language, particularly poetry. In turn, this may lead to conclusions on the use of compounds which need to be carefully assessed. Consider for instance the following statement:

La langue populaire n'emploie guère la composition. Les textes littéraires présentent en général d'autant plus de composés qu'ils s'éloignent davantage de l'usage courant. Le composé a le plus souvent quelque chose d'artificiel; il convient aux langues spéciales et techniques de la philosophie, de la science [...] auxquelles il confère à la fois précision et gravité. C'est surtout la langue poétique qui en fait usage. Les poètes qui se piquent d'un langage noble et veulent atteindre un ton élevé, obtiennent l'effet cherché en employant des composés.

Meillet and Vendryès (1960: 421).

This short paragraph by two eminent Classical linguists contains some obvious truths, but also a few generalizations.<sup>213</sup> That compounds are numerous in poetry is hardly surprising, given its preference for economy of style and incisive, con-

<sup>211</sup> Grandi and Pompei (2012: 408).

<sup>212</sup> Ralli (2013: 174).

<sup>213</sup> By contrast, Kühner and Blass (1892: 312) saw that 'in der griechischen Kompositionen hingegen thut sich durchweg eine natürliche, lebenskräftige Entwicklung', which would give Greek compounds their 'schönste Masshaltung, die grösste Leichtigkeit, Gewandtheit, Durchsichtigkeit und Klarheit'.



densed modes of expression: for a study in this direction, see the monograph by Meyer (1923). We have seen above (section 7.3) that the same reasons lead to the use of compounds and to the development of specific compound types in scientific language. On the other hand, it is difficult to imagine on what grounds Meillet and Vendryès can have reached the bold conclusion with which they begin their paragraph, namely that ‘popular language scarcely employs compounding’. Greek literary texts also employ compounds which do not have an especially poetic flavour, and which are simultaneously attested on inscriptions: it is a reasonable supposition that they were common in spoken language too.<sup>214</sup> Given the lack of any oral source, to speak of a Greek ‘langue populaire’ and ‘usage courant’ in such uncritical terms is a paradox which requires many provisos, such as the recognition that our reconstruction of a ‘popular’ or ‘spoken’ language necessarily relies mostly on literary texts (particularly comedy, iambic poetry and oratory) and more rarely on documentary papyri (unavailable for Archaic and Classical Greek) and a few epigraphic genres (ostraka, *defixiones*...). An investigation of these texts, and of inscriptions in particular, shows that compounds are indeed found in non-literary documents such as laws, dedications, and private letters, and that apart from a very few exceptions (which require more careful consideration) all compound categories are attested in both literary and non-literary documents.<sup>215</sup>

We must also take into account the fact that compounding remains a very productive means of word formation in MG and that many ancient types are maintained in the modern language, facts which cannot be attributed only to the influence of high-level literary language. In particular, the evidence from MG has been used to prove that many left-oriented types, including V1 compounds, were not learned marginal types in the ancient language, but must have had a life in lower linguistic levels as well.<sup>216</sup> In light of this diachronic perspective, the investigation of V1 compounds undertaken in this book will at times bring out the patterns through which certain compound families have developed in AG, remaining productive types throughout the history of the language.

---

**214** See Amado Rodríguez (1988: 116–117).

**215** An investigation of compounds attested on Greek archaic and classical inscriptions (eighth-fifth centuries BC) is provided in Tribulato (2005: 72–142).

**216** Andriotis (1938).

## 11 Conclusion

The examination of Greek compound categories provided in this chapter had two aims. The first was to provide a set of references against which both the peculiarities of the AG compound system and its similarities with those of other languages can be investigated. The second was to describe, in the most comprehensive manner possible, the characteristics of the system in which the compound type investigated in this book, that of V1 compounds, finds its place. The overview of compound categories has illustrated that Greek has a right-oriented compound system in which a number of left-oriented formations, including V1 compounds, are admitted. The investigation of endocentric determinative and verbal compounds has allowed us to conclude that Greek seems to have developed towards a more markedly endocentric system than previously thought. Four events contributed to this evolution:

- The gradual abandonment of root verbal compounds, which are ambiguous from the point of view of headedness and semantics (sections 6.1 and 6.9).
- The parallel development of the class of V2 compounds in -ος (section 6.3).
- The creation of a new class of agentive compound nouns in -της (section 6.4).
- The development of endocentric determinative compounds, with the exception of those with an adjectival SC, which remain rarer in Greek (sections 4.7 and 4.9).

Neither the issue of the headedness of AG compounds, nor the structural characteristics of the left-oriented categories, have previously been examined in sufficient detail. As this chapter argues, only some of the left-oriented forms can be regarded as singularities, while others are tied to specific morpho-syntactic constraints. As concerns the orientation of Greek V1 compounds, we have briefly addressed the theories put forward to explain its oddity. In general, most of these theories tend to link the existence of this left-oriented type to the fact that it is a relic from an older linguistic stage and/or to the supposition that V1 compounds were originally confined to the onomastic lexicon. However, the strong productivity of various subtypes of V1 compounds outside onomastics, together with the fact that they survive into MG, encourages the adoption of a different approach to analysing their presence in AG.

The example of other left-oriented categories suggests that V1 compounds, whatever their origin, exist and continue to be productive throughout the history of AG precisely to fill the morphological and semantic gaps left by the pervasive right-oriented type. Chapters 4–6 of this volume are devoted to the identification of the factors which brought it about that, rather than being an optional counterpart of V2 compounds, V1 compounds were often the only, or the best, means

of providing the language with an active verbal compound. At the same time, in order to fully grasp the issues at play in the development of the V1 type, it is also necessary to investigate the morphological make-up and function of the earliest attested compounds and attempt to understand them in the light of a possible diachronic evolution which may have had its roots in the parent language. Chapter 4 is devoted to the investigation of this comparative side of the question, in the context of the diachronic development of V1 compounds from Mycenaean to Archaic Greek. The necessary theoretical background to the comparative question is provided by the individual studies devoted to V1 compounds in the last two centuries and by the analyses which have been advanced in the context of larger investigations of Greek and IE morphology, word formation and even syntax: Chapter 3 provides an overview of these antecedents in view of their relevance to the present investigation.



# Chapter Three

## The Study of Ancient Greek and Indo-European V1 Compounds in the Last Two Centuries

### 1 Introduction

The origin, morphology and semantics of the Greek V1 types *φερέουκος* and *τερψίμβροτος* have been much debated in the last two centuries and remain central topics in the investigation of IE compounding. A survey of the previous works that addressed these compound types proves very useful for an understanding of the methodological questions concerning their analysis in Greek, and the trends that have influenced the scholarly debate over the years. Analyses have generally revolved around four areas of interest:

- The morphological and hence semantic interpretation of the FC and of the elements *-ε-*, *-(τ)ι-*, *-(σ)ι-* and *-ο-*;
- The links between the FC and the Greek verbal system;
- The influence of syntax in the make-up of V1 compounds vis-à-vis V2 compounds;
- The use of V1 compounds in the context of Greek literary texts.

The first three topics have led scholars to consider a wider perspective, investigating the parallels for V1 compounds in other IE languages, and hence inquiring whether they might be an inherited category. In the early stages of comparative linguistics these issues were often central to studies of the PIE verb and noun, as well as syntax and onomastics. Although many of the topics discussed in this chapter presuppose fairly detailed knowledge of morphological issues concerning Greek V1 compounds, consideration of previous scholarship on the category is by no means superfluous: on the contrary, it is essential as a means to clear the ground for the fresher analysis of AG V1 compounds provided in Chapters 5 and 6 of this book.

### 2 The investigation of Greek V1 compounds in the last two centuries: preliminary considerations

The modern study of Greek V1 compounds goes back to the late nineteenth century. The first scholar to produce a monograph on Greek verbal compounds was Wilhelm Clemm, with a Giessen *Habilitationsschrift* entitled *De compositis*

*graecis quae a verbis incipiunt* (1867). Since then, all the studies and contributions on the topic have engaged in work on two fronts: description and analysis of V1 compounds within Greek, and explanation of the origin of the V1 type in the parent language. These two fronts are not necessarily separate: rather, the analysis of the Greek material has often been preparatory to the development of evolutionary theories that encompass other IE languages, and the parent language itself. Greek has occupied an important position in the debate over the existence and development of V1 in PIE, as Greek is the ancient IE language in which the V1 type is most attested and most productive. As a consequence, we now possess a number of studies of Greek V1 compounds but, at the same time, the dearth of similarly full descriptions of V1 compounds in other ancient languages makes delineation of the origin and development of the type in earlier linguistic stages an arduous task (see also Chapter 4, section 2).

The approaches chosen for the study of Greek V1 compounds vary greatly. The bone of contention is the question of whether the *φερείκοις* and *τερψίμβροτοις* types, though differing in the shape of their FCs, represent two subtypes of the same compound category, which express identical semantics and derive from similar formation processes, or not. Depending on how this preliminary question is settled, scholars have either sought to trace the origin of FCs back to the same PIE category (imperatives, bare stems, etc.) or have refrained from reaching a unified solution, privileging a synchronic morphological and semantic description. Those aspiring to an explanation in an IE perspective have struggled to fit the ambiguous evidence provided by the various IE languages into a coherent theory (for often only one or the other of the two types is attested).<sup>1</sup> Aside from the overviews that attempt to offer comprehensive analyses of types of V1 compounds in Greek (e.g. Knecht (1946) and Frei-Lüthy (1978), on which see section 9), an abundant harvest of studies focuses on questions concerning the semantics, productivity, literary usage of V1 compounds or of individual sub-types. Many of these studies are now classic and will be reviewed in this chapter according to the kind of approach they use to study V1 compounds.

### 3 Early nineteenth-century work

Before Clemm's (1867) volume on Greek V1 compounds, no other works specifically addressed the question of the origin of V1 compounds in the parent lan-

---

<sup>1</sup> See, e.g., Wackernagel (1905: 315–320) and Renou (1940–1941: 217–220) for Sanskrit, Watkins (1969a: 95) and Duchesne-Guillemin (1936: 198–202) for Iranian, Kammenhuber (1961: 197) for Anatolian languages, where the type seems to have been lost. See further Chapter 4, section 2.

guage, but V1 compounds were discussed in the context of the theories concerning the development of compounding in PIE. These early works include Jacob Grimm's *Deutsche Grammatik*, in the second volume of which Grimm maintained that the elements *-ε-* and *-σι-* featuring at the end of the FCs of Greek compounds reflected present imperatives and old future imperatives respectively.<sup>2</sup> Grimm was one of the first advocates of the view that V1 compounds derived from syntactic phrases containing inflected verbal forms and, consequently, that V1 forms were to be considered 'false' compounds:<sup>3</sup>

ist es also nothwendig uneigentliche Composition, so folgt, daß das erste Wort nicht die bloße Wurzel, sondern eine leibliche Flexion enthalte.  
Grimm (1826: 984).

An equally syntactic principle underlies Bopp's subsequent interpretation of FCs in *-σι-* as third ps. sg. presents, and Weissenborn's view that they derive from second ps. sg. forms.<sup>4</sup> The 1860s also saw the first publication of the second volume of Leo Meyer's *Vergleichende Grammatik der griechischen und lateinischen Sprachen*, dealing with the IE noun. Meyer claimed that in PIE nouns in *-ti-* endowed with agentive semantics and purely adjectival in origin were employed to form both second and first compound constituents; in his view, the Greek type in *-σι-* was a development of these original formations in *-ti-*.<sup>5</sup>

Justi (1861), on the other hand, went in a different direction, assuming that the FC of V1 compounds concealed an old participle: he explained *φερέσιος* as an alteration of *\*φερέτ-βιος*, supposedly showing a participial stem, which he compared to Sanskrit formations like *kṣáyad-vīra-* 'killing men' (see Chapter 4, section 4.3.2).<sup>6</sup> This was consistent with Justi's idea that compounding arose in a phase of PIE which had already developed inflections: as we will see shortly, this view was soon to be swept away by Georg Curtius' influential 'pre-inflectional' thesis, according to which compounding went back to a phase of PIE in which there existed only roots.

<sup>2</sup> Grimm (1826: 976, 984).

<sup>3</sup> On Grimm's positions in the debate over 'true' and 'false' compounds, see Lindner (2011: 15–16).

<sup>4</sup> See Bopp (1861: 348), where *-σι-* is explained as deriving from the athematic conjugation, and Weissenborn (1865: 12), according to whom compounds in *-εσι-* and in *-σι-* contain second ps. endings, while those in *-ε-* go back to imperatives. Bopp (1861: 440) interpreted *φερε-* etc. as nominal stems in which *-ε-* is the 'reduction' (*Schwächung*) of the nominal suffix *-ο-*.

<sup>5</sup> L. Meyer (1865: 328).

<sup>6</sup> Justi (1861: 45–46).

## 4 Wilhelm Clemm and the stem hypothesis

The two contributions on Greek V1 compounds by Wilhelm Clemm (1867; 1875) contain a few elements of discontinuity with these early views. The 1867 *Habilitationschrift* represents an important step forward in that it gathers together most of the Greek V1 compounds available at that time, which are analysed vis-à-vis nominal stems, with the aim of showing that their FCs should not be linked to nouns but to verbs.

In rejecting the nominal interpretation Clemm went against the hypotheses advanced by Bopp (1861: 439–441) and L. Meyer (1865: 328); but he also rejected the position adopted by Justi (1861: 45), namely that V1 compounds derived from old participles.<sup>7</sup> At the same time, Clemm forcefully excluded Grimm's idea that the FCs of V1 compounds could go back to inflected forms:<sup>8</sup> rather, he asserted that the FCs of both Greek V1 types contained simple verbal stems.<sup>9</sup> Clemm was clearly influenced by Georg Curtius, with whom he briefly studied in Leipzig: Curtius was of the opinion that only stems could be used in 'true' compounds and that the FC of V1 compounds featured verbal stems, sometimes enlarged with thematic vowels -ε-, -ι- and -ο-.<sup>10</sup>

Clemm's work paved the road for a number of disputes over the interpretation of V1 compounds, as well as their IE origin. In 1869 Richard Rödiger critically reviewed Clemm's book, calling stems as 'abstractions that only exist in the minds of linguists' and, particularly, attacking the idea favoured by Clemm (and Curtius) that -ε-, -ι-, and -ο- were mere linking vowels attached to verbal stems.<sup>11</sup> After a few years Clemm launched a repartee with his 1875 article in *Curtius Studien*, a review of new works in the realm of Greek compounding. The article frontally addressed the criticism levelled against Clemm by Rödiger as well as by G. Meyer and reiterated that the FC of the φερέοικος type was a present stem which could keep or obliterate the thematic vowel:

Ihre ersten Glieder sind präsentische Verbalstämme mit erhaltenem oder abgeworfenem Themavocal; im Formen wie τλή-θυμος [...] war ein solcher nie, in λαθ-ήβης [...] braucht

<sup>7</sup> Clemm (1867: 48–78 *passim*).

<sup>8</sup> Clemm (1867: 108–112).

<sup>9</sup> Clemm (1867: 80–94, particularly p. 94).

<sup>10</sup> See Curtius (1863: 139, 143) and Curtius (1875: 199) on the use of stems, and the critical overview in Lindner (2012: 93); for compounding as a relic of a pre-inflectional stage and Curtius' interpretation of V1 compounds, see Curtius (1873: 64–71) and Curtius (1875: 201).

<sup>11</sup> Rödiger (1869: 67–68); cf. Clemm (1867: 124–135). Rödiger (1866) had previously written a dissertation on the vocalic element of Greek FCs.



er nicht vorhanden gewesen zu sein, weil sie auch Reste einer themavocallosen Flexion aufweisen können.

Clemm (1875: 38).

Clemm also restated that sigmatic compounds contained the stem of the s-aorist and criticized the view advanced by some of his critics, who claimed that the s-aorist stem ought to have ended in *-σα*. Clemm countered this view by suggesting that compounds in *-σε-* and *-σο-* represented a ‘reduction’ (*Schwächung*) of the original *-σα*.<sup>12</sup> As regards other shapes of FCs, Clemm interpreted those ending in *-α-* (e.g., *ταλα-*) as showing a pure verbal root, relics of a stage in which verbs were not yet characterized by the thematic vowel. More surprisingly, he also assumed that FCs ending in *-αι-* (e.g., *ταλαι-*) reflected (often unattested) present stems in *-αιω*.<sup>13</sup>

The element *-ι-* received a different treatment. Clemm argued that some of the FCs ending in *-ι-* derived from present stems formed with the *-jé/ó-* suffix (e.g. *χαριεργός* < \**χαρ-ιω*), while others reflected a reduction (*Schwächung*) of the thematic vowel *-ε-* (e.g., *λαθικηδής*).<sup>14</sup> In Clemm’s view, however, the larger number of *-σι-* compounds simply reflected the ‘preferential relationship’ (*Wahlverwandtschaft*) between *-σ-* and *-ι-*, which nominal FCs in *-σι-* and abstract nouns in *-σις* encouraged.<sup>15</sup>

Some of Clemm’s statements may appear pleonastic to us (for instance his emphasis on the first element of V1 compounds being a verb), but they must be placed in context. In those years a heated controversy raged over the question of whether early PIE distinguished between verbs and nouns. With the interpretation of V1 compounds as containing verbal stems, Clemm was probably reacting to the view that in the early stages of PIE verbs and nouns had originally been undifferentiated, and to the corollary that the FCs of V1 compounds could not contain a verbal stem.<sup>16</sup> The details of Clemm’s explanations are often out-dated now, but the core of his interpretation—that V1 compounds contain stems, not inflected verbal forms—has stood the test of time and remains a valid and widely endorsed view (cf. section 8). My analysis will also emphasise the interpretation of the FCs as verbal roots or stems which, in some cases, may be followed by linking elements: see Chapter 4, particularly section 6.1.

<sup>12</sup> Clemm (1875: 52, 54, 64).

<sup>13</sup> Clemm (1875: 50).

<sup>14</sup> Clemm (1875: 48, 63–64).

<sup>15</sup> Clemm (1875: 54).

<sup>16</sup> G. Meyer (1872: 108).

## 5 Jacobi, Delbrück and Brugmann: from stems to imperatives

Between the 1850s and the 1880s the analysis of IE and Greek compounding was extensively influenced by the more general debate surrounding IE morphology.<sup>17</sup> Under Curtius' influence, many of the linguists who addressed V1 compounds in those years assumed that the FCs of these compounds contained stems and went back to a pre-inflectional stage of the language.<sup>18</sup> Clemm's works contributed to spreading these views, but Curtius' influence is also visible in the early editions of the most important works of Karl Brugmann, who studied with Curtius at Leipzig. In the first edition of his *Griechische Grammatik* (1885), Brugmann maintained that the Greek compounds derived from verbal stems represented innovations arising from the re-analysis of older nominal types.<sup>19</sup> The same statement is made in the first edition of Brugmann's monumental *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*, where V1 compounds are not included amongst those of 'Urindogermanische Zeit', but are considered a development of individual languages arising from the misinterpretation of nominal stems.<sup>20</sup> In line with Curtius' teachings, therefore, Brugmann believed the FCs of 'real' compounds to be 'stems': applied to V1 compounds, this led him to identify their FCs with old nominal stems re-interpreted as verbal elements and provided with the linking vowel -ε-, or with stems from -σις abstract nouns which were later associated with the s-aorist.<sup>21</sup> Brugmann explained the alternation of various FCs by pointing to analogical processes affecting the V1 subgroups (for instance, -εσι- was interpreted as analogical on FCs from s-stem nouns).

At the same time, however, Brugmann and the linguists of the Neogrammarian circle became increasingly more critical of Curtius' dogmatism. With regard to the interpretation of compounds, the Neogrammarians' attitude may have prompted a less strict approach to the relationship between compounding and inflections and a renewed interest in the influence of syntax on compounding. Thus, while Curtius' early influence is still perceivable in the first edition of the *Grundriss*, it is also clear that Brugmann had already moved away from his teacher in that he believed the FCs of V1 compounds to be (at least originally) nominal, not verbal stems. In making this claim, Brugmann was in accord with the views of

<sup>17</sup> For an overview of the contributions on compounding published in those years, see G. Meyer (1872: 1–6).

<sup>18</sup> For a critique of the assumption that the FCs of true compounds must show no endings, see now Dunkel (1999: 50–52).

<sup>19</sup> Brugmann (1885: 70), who follows Osthoff (1878: 164–169)

<sup>20</sup> Brugmann (1889: 20–21).

<sup>21</sup> Brugmann (1889: 49–51).

Hermann Osthoff, with whom in 1878 he had started editing the journal *Morphologische Untersuchungen*, which acted as the sounding-board of the Neogrammarian approach to linguistics. In this same year, Osthoff published his monograph on verbal compounds programmatically entitled *Das Verbum in der Nominalkomposition im Deutschen, Griechischen, Slavischen und Romanischen*.<sup>22</sup>

The main points of Osthoff's work are that the FCs of Greek V1 compounds cannot be identified with imperatives;<sup>23</sup> that the equation with the Modern German imperativ compounds is wrong;<sup>24</sup> that both Greek V1 types originally contained nominal stems;<sup>25</sup> and that the use of verbal stems in Greek is the outcome of the reanalysis of old nominal stems:

Wenn Homer Ἀγέ-λαος, ἀρχέ-κακος gebrauchte, so ist nicht unmöglich, dass diesen Bildungen in der Tat ehemalige \*Ἀγό-λαος \*ἀρχό-κακος zeitlich voraus lagen; die homer. φυγο-πτόλεμος, ἡλιτό-μηνος, ἄμαρτο-επιής könnten ja eben die überreste diese früheren Schicht sein. In diesen wurden dann die nominalen Anfangsglieder misgedeutet, an die Verba ἄγω, ἄρχω angelehnt.

Osthoff (1878: 164).

Osthoff's words are echoed in the first edition of Brugmann's *Grundriss*:

Bei manchen Comp. veränderte sich, gleichwie im Germanischen und Slavischen, das Sprachgefühl gegenüber dem das erste Glied bildenden Nominalstamme in der Weise, dass er verbal empfunden wurde. Diess veranlasste dann zahlreiche Neubildungen, in denen nun wirkliche verbale Stammformen als 1. Glied eingesetzt wurden.

Brugmann (1889: 49).

In the second edition of the *Grundriss*, however, Brugmann's enthusiasm for this explanation seems to have cooled and his approach is radically different. Here Brugmann clearly identifies the FC of both compound types, as well as of their parallels in other IE languages, with old imperatives:

In α) und β) [Greek types ἔλκεχ(των and δαμασίμβροτος] war das Vorderglied eine Form mit imperativischer Funktion, so dass im Prinzip z.B. ἔλκεχ(των auf ἔλκε (τὸν) χιτῶνα 'schleppe den Peplos' beruhte. Der Typus α) zeigt bei den Verbalstämmen ohne thematischen Vokal noch die Imperativformen ohne die Partikel *-dhi* (τ-θι), nach Art von gr. ἔξ-ει, ἴστη, lat. *ī, cedo*. Der Typus β) zeigt Infinitivformen auf *-ti* mit imperativischer Bedeutung.

Brugmann (1906: 63–64).

<sup>22</sup> On the collaboration between Osthoff and Brugmann in those years, see Jankowsky (1972: 202–204).

<sup>23</sup> Osthoff (1878: 137).

<sup>24</sup> Osthoff (1878: 138).

<sup>25</sup> Osthoff (1878: 141–142, 169).

Brugmann had expressed his new view in another contribution on Greek compounding, the article published in *Indogermanische Forschungen* of the years 1905–1906, in which he clearly identified the FC of ἀρχέκακος with an imperative and that of ἐλκεσίπελος with an infinitive arising from abstract nouns in *-ti-* and having imperatival function.<sup>26</sup> The radical change in Brugmann's analysis is mirrored in Berthold Delbrück's views on the syntax of compounds, which Delbrück put forward in the third volume of his *Vergleichende Syntax*, published in 1900, while Brugmann was working on the second edition of the *Grundriss*.

This attention to the syntactic patterns behind compounding was inaugurated by another influential work of the 1890s, Jacobi's *Compositum und Nebensatz* (1897).<sup>27</sup> Jacobi himself subscribed to Curtius' view that 'true' compounds employed bare stems, but his ground-breaking methodology resided in linking the shape and semantics of V1 compounds to verbal phrases. Even though Jacobi did not directly relate the structure of compounds to word order issues, which later became the main focus of the syntactic approach to compounding (see section 7), he attempted to explain PIE syntactic patterns through the structure of compounds, an approach later developed by Lehmann.<sup>28</sup>

On the question of verbal compounds in particular, Jacobi identified the SC of V2 compounds as 'relative participles', the FCs of the φερέοικος type as verbal stems, and those of the τερψίμβροτος type as a third person singular.<sup>29</sup> At the same time, he assumed that in PIE, as well as in Greek and Sanskrit, some of these compounds came to be associated with imperatival clauses and their FCs with imperatives:

In einem Compositum wie ἀγέ-λαος ist [...] das erste Glied der Stamm des thematischen Präsens bez. Aorists. Da nun dieser Stamm in historischer Zeit als 2. Pers. Sing. Imperativi fungirt, so könnte man dergleichen Composita als imperativische Satznamen deuten [...]. Denn da viele der fraglichen Composita wie einfache beschreibende Adjektive gebraucht werden, so verlangt die natürliche Auflösung das Prädikat in der dritten Person [...]. Wenn aber das Compositum als Epitheton einer Person oder als Eigenname gebraucht wird, wäre eine imperativische Deutung wohl denkbar. [...] Indem sich nun in diesem engeren Kreise die imperativische Deutung befestigte, werden Neubildungen entstanden sein, in denen nicht nur die ursprünglich berechtigten Formen der 2. Sing. Imp., die mit dem Präsens- oder

**26** Brugmann (1905–1906: 60–61, 70–71, 73). The recognition that compound constituents went back to inflected forms rather than stems echoes Brugmann's (1906: 6) forceful statement that 'eine 'Wurzelperiode' hat es im Urindogermanischen nie gegeben. Denn von jeher hat man nur Wörter, Formen gebildet'.

**27** See the acknowledgment of Jacobi's influence in Brugmann (1905–1906: 61).

**28** See Lehmann (1969: 2) and (1974), particularly chapters 3.1 and 3.7 *passim*.

**29** Jacobi (1897: 20, 58, 61–64). On the nature of Jacobi's 'relative participles', see Agud (1984: 8).

Aorist-stamm identisch sind, sondern auch echte Imperativformen, wie die auf *dhi*, als erstes Compositionsglied verwandt worden sind.

Jacobi (1897: 73–74).

The opposition to the belief that verbal stems could not be used in compounding is clear:

Die gemeine Ansicht nun [...] geht dahin, dass ein Nomen nicht mit einem Verbum in der Zusammensetzung verbunden werden könne. Dieser Satz schien aprioristische Geltung zu haben: um seine Richtigkeit zu erhärten, brauchte man nur an ein gesundes Sprachgefühl zu appelliren. [...] Fast in allen indogerm. Sprachen finden sich nämlich Composita mit verbalem Vordergliede. Man schloss also und musste so bei dem unbestrittenen Grundsatz von der Unzusammensetzbarkeit des Verbums mit dem Nomen schliessen, dass jene Composita nicht in der Ordnung wären, oder mit anderen Worten, dass sie nicht ihre ursprüngliche Gestalt bewahrt hätten.

Jacobi (1897: 49).

Jacobi's ideas had an impact on both Delbrück and Brugmann. Although Delbrück did not agree that the verbal constituent of V2 compounds was a participle and maintained that it was a noun, he agreed with Jacobi that V1 compound constituents such as *μενε-* or *φερε-* contained a verb rather than a noun, and that it was most probable that these verbal forms were old imperatives.<sup>30</sup> Delbrück supported this hypothesis by noting that in syntactic phrases the imperative often occupies the first position. Surprising as it might seem, Delbrück preferred not to comment on the origin of the *τερψιμβροτος* type, suspending his judgment.<sup>31</sup>

For his part, towards the end of his career Brugmann (who died in 1919) had fully subscribed to the syntactic interpretation of V1 compounds, which he took to its extreme consequences by seeking a common function for the FCs of both the *τερψιμβροτος* and the *φερέοικος* types, a line that neither Jacobi nor Delbrück had decided to follow in full. Thanks to the influence of Brugmann's great *Grundriss* (still particularly unsurpassed as far as compounding is concerned), the imperatival hypothesis has had a large following. The same views expressed in the second edition of the *Grundriss* recur in the new editions of Brugmann's *Griechische Grammatik*—although in the fourth edition, reworked by Albert Thumb, the imperatival interpretation of the *φερέοικος* type is not presented as the only possible one.<sup>32</sup> In more general terms, Delbrück's and Brugmann's

<sup>30</sup> Delbrück (1900: 174).

<sup>31</sup> Delbrück (1900: 174).

<sup>32</sup> See Brugmann and Thumb (1913: 199), where a participial interpretation is also considered. The imperatival interpretation was eventually tuned down by Schwyzer in his own reworking of the *Grammatik*: see Schwyzer (1939: 445).

enthusiasm for the syntactic hypothesis may be seen as another Neogrammarian rejection of the postulation that PIE did not possess full ‘words’ but only roots.<sup>33</sup>

Another influential subscriber to the imperativial interpretation was Jacob Wackernagel. In volume 2.1 of the *Altindische Grammatik* two of the Sanskrit V1 types (*trasá-dasyu-* ‘making the enemy tremble’ and *dāti-vara-* ‘giving treasures’) are interpreted as going back to imperatives.<sup>34</sup> In more recent times, the imperativial interpretation has been invoked mainly to explain the Greek φερέοικος type only.<sup>35</sup> Dunkel (1992: 216–220) is one of the few scholars who have retained the imperativial interpretation for the τερψίμβροτος type as well, maintaining that their FC goes back to an old *-si* imperative. He also claims that the Vedic type *bharád-vāja-* ‘bringing/obtaining prizes’ and the Greek specimen φερε-πτόλεμος contain old injunctives, a hypothesis which was first advanced (though eventually rejected) by Renou (1940–1941) and which Watkins (1969a: 94–96) considers as well.<sup>36</sup> According to Dunkel (1992: 200), such injunctive compounds were probably used ‘to make an extra-temporal statement of eternally valid fact’. Both the imperativial and the injunctive hypotheses have received criticism: see Schindler (1997: 539) and section 6 below.

## 6 Beyond the imperativial hypothesis: other approaches to τερψίμβροτος compounds

The imperative hypothesis has a clear corollary: the admission that PIE compounding was not exclusively stem compounding. A number of later works paid increasing attention to the impact of verbal morphology and syntax on V1 compounds. The variety of approaches is most visible in the analysis of τερψίμβροτος compounds. A new interpretation put forward at the beginning of the twentieth century was that their FCs went back to old desiderative stems: see particularly Meillet (1919), still hinted at in Meillet and Vendryès (1960: 429).<sup>37</sup> Another—isolated—view is that which sees in the FC of compounds in *-σι-* an original verbal adjective in *\*-to-*, on which see Renel (1896) and Williger (1928: 6 n. 2).

<sup>33</sup> Amsterdamska (1987: 99).

<sup>34</sup> Wackernagel (1905: 317–320). For the analysis of these Sanskrit types, see Chapter 4, section 4.3.2.

<sup>35</sup> See for instance Debrunner (1917: 37), Hirt (1928: 37), Kretschmer (1936: 243), Leumann (1977: 396), Frei-Lüthy (1978), Dunkel (1992: 199), Lühr (2004).

<sup>36</sup> For other interpretations of the FC of this Vedic class, see the survey in Dunkel (1992: 206–207).

<sup>37</sup> Meillet thereby separated the origin of FCs in *-si-* from that of FCs in *-ti-*.

In contrast, the nominal interpretation of the FC has continued to hold ground and is still the most popular view on *τερψίμβροτος* compounds. We have already seen that the similarities between Greek FCs in *-σι-* and action nouns in *-σις*, as well as that between Skt. FCs in *-ti-* and action nouns in *-tis*, did not escape early scholars such as L. Meyer and R. Rödiger. The idea that FCs in *-σι-* went back to action nouns is found in many works, including Christ (1890: 207), Bréal (1895–1896), Debrunner (1917: 39) and Knecht (1946: 24–25), and received further impulse after Jochem Schindler likewise adopted it. Schindler forcefully rejected the idea that finite verbal forms (either imperatives or third person singulars or infinitives) could be used as compound FCs.<sup>38</sup> For Schindler, the origin of the Vedic and Greek types lay in old action nouns in *-tis*, though the assibilation that intervened in Greek led to a re-analysis of the old types as deriving from sigmatic verbal tenses, and eventually to the uniquely Greek invention of a whole class of compounds based on the stem of the *s*-aorist or of the future.<sup>39</sup> In Schindler's view the original compounds had a possessive structure but came to be interpreted as verbal compounds with a factitive meaning.<sup>40</sup> Schindler's hypothesis is further reviewed in Chapter 4, sections 4.3–4.3.1; an endorsement of his approach can be found, for instance, in Janda (1999), Vegas Sansalvador (1999), Lindner (2011: 70).

Another interpretative trend starts from the assumption that the FC of *τερψίμβροτος* compounds contains a *nomen agentis*. This possibility, already discussed by G. Meyer (1872: 110) and Osthoff (1878: 169), was later revived by P. Kretschmer and F. Specht, who therefore saw the *τερψίμβροτος* type as completely independent from *φερείοικος* compounds. Specht (1932) noted that the FCs of *-ti-* compounds could not contain action nouns, since the root grade shown by these FCs is usually full. Instead, he maintained that the FCs of *τερψίμβροτος* compounds originally contained the same root nouns as those found in the root compounds of the type *ἀ-γνωτ-* and *προ-βλήτ-* (Chapter 2, section 6.1), to which the linking vowel *-i-* was added, at the beginning to aid the transition to SCs beginning with a consonant. On this point his interpretation is ambiguous in that he openly speaks of 'roots' employed in the FC which, however, became nouns through the use of the element *-ti-*.<sup>41</sup> Kretschmer (1934) accepted this interpretation, though he noted the intrinsic vagueness of the statement that the FC is a verbal root used

<sup>38</sup> See for instance Schindler (1997: 539).

<sup>39</sup> See Schindler (1988), Schindler (1997).

<sup>40</sup> Schindler (1988).

<sup>41</sup> Specht (1932: 75): '[...] so können die Bildungen mit *ti* im ersten Kompositionsglied nur die reine Wurzel enthalten, die durch Anfügung von *ti* genau so als Nomen charakterisiert wurde, wie am Schluß des Kompositums durch Erweiterung von *t'*'.

as a noun.<sup>42</sup> Kretschmer identified onomastics as the linguistic realm in which roots enlarged with *-t-* + *-i-* began to be employed in the FC of compounds, considering this just another example of the well-known onomastic tendency to create reverse compounds. The existence of compounds of the *φερέοικος* type (which in Kretschmer's opinion are imperatival) further supported the creation of a new type of compounds with a verbal FC.<sup>43</sup>

The Specht-Kretschmer hypothesis is important in that it looks at a core of root compounds in order to explain the *-ti-* element in the FCs of V1 compounds. At the same time, other aspects of the hypothesis are open to criticism. The claims that the V1 type was already on the way to extinction in the fifth century BC (Specht 1932: 32) and that it was used as a mere stylistic device (Specht 1932: 35) are confuted both by the data collected in this book and by the productivity of the V1 type in onomastics. More importantly, the undeniable similarity of FCs in *-ti-* with root compounds leads Specht and Kretschmer to conclude that these FCs contain nouns, an idea which other linguists have developed to the point of speaking overtly of 'agent nouns'.<sup>44</sup> This hypothesis opens a fundamental question as concerns the structure of these V1 compounds, since they would be the only example of reversed agentive compounds in the whole of Indo-European. Linguists who concern themselves with this issue often have to find an *ad hoc* solution by positing that such an inversion originated within onomastics, i.e. in a linguistic domain which is supposed to be freer as far as morphological patterns are concerned. In Chapter 4 we will return to this issue with an eye to the Sanskrit evidence for compounds in *-ti-*.

## 7 The syntactic hypothesis and other work on V1 compounds and IE word order

As mentioned, some early works such as Grimm's *Deutsche Grammatik* interpreted V1 compounds as deriving from syntactic phrases. In the following years several contributions linked V1 compounds to inflected verbal forms: as noted, Weissenborn (1865) championed the present second person singular, whereas

<sup>42</sup> Kretschmer (1934: 250).

<sup>43</sup> Kretschmer (1934: 250), Kretschmer (1936: 244).

<sup>44</sup> Bader's position on *-ti-* has often changed over time. In Bader (1970: 54) she overtly speaks of a *nomen agentis* employed in the FC, while in Bader (1974: 46) she describes these FCs as roots enlarged with the *-ti-* element. Reviewing the whole debate Stefanelli (2008: 22) adopts a purely synchronic perspective and analyses Greek compounds in *-τι-* as an inversion of compounded *nomina agentis* in *-τᾱ-*. This would place the origin of *-τι-* compounds within Greek, inasmuch as agent nouns in *-τᾱ-* are a Greek innovation.



Theodor Bergk claimed that Greek PNs in  $-\sigma\iota-$  originally contained the present third person singular.<sup>45</sup> Outside Germany, early intuitions on the correlation of compound structure and word order feature in Bergaigne (1875–1878), who particularly insisted that compounds should be used to infer information about word order in the parent language.<sup>46</sup>

The trend was taken up and given full theoretical shape by Jacobi. As mentioned, his views that V1 compounds had their origin in syntactic verbal phrases won the favour of Delbrück, Brugmann, and later also Hirt (1928: 34–35), who admitted that V1 compounds might have been formed both with verbal stems and inflected verbal forms. Apart from these early espousals, however, Jacobi's syntactic interpretation met with considerable criticism, still echoed half a century later in Leonard Bloomfield's words:

Bopp took for granted that the formative elements of Indo-European were once independent words; this is a needless and unwarranted assumption. The last descendant of his error is the assumption that IE compound words are historically derived from phrases (Jacobi, *Compositum und Nebensatz* [...]; this even in Brugmann *Grundriss* II<sup>2</sup>, 1, pp. 37, 78). Bloomfield (1926: 153 n. 3).<sup>47</sup>

A whole school of thought has developed from these early intuitions, which has left aside the issue of whether the FCs of V1 compounds are to be identified with infinitives, imperatives or third persons singular, and has focused on syntactic patterns and word order instead (see Chapter 2, section 7.5.4). The question at the core of such syntactic approaches is the same as that underlying the present study: why do Greek and other IE languages have compound types that are the structural mirror image of one another? In the emphasis accorded to morphological investigation by most nineteenth-century comparative linguistics studies, the issue had been largely ignored.

Early work on the investigation of Greek compound orientation was undertaken by Bechtel and Fick (1894) and later by Andriotis (1938). These two contributions, though different in scope, enquire into the mechanisms behind structural alternations in Greek compounds. Bechtel and Fick (1894) deal with the frequent inversion of members in compounded PNs in the context of a vast investigation of Greek onomastics, while the article by Andriotis (1938) is specifically interested in compound structure. Its most interesting claims are discussed in Chapter 2, section 7.5.4, apropos of the orientation of Greek compounds. Compared to Bechtel and Fick, Andriotis adopts a strikingly different approach in that

<sup>45</sup> Bergk (1872: 100–101).

<sup>46</sup> Bergaigne (1875–1878: 5, 30, 34).

<sup>47</sup> See also Bloomfield's earlier criticism in Bloomfield (1914: 73–75).

he rejects the idea that V1 compounds are specialized as an onomastic type and that their structure is dependent on the tendency to freely create reversed PNs. At the same time, however, Andriotis does not identify clear mechanisms ruling the interaction of V1 and V2 compounds; his suggestions thus differ from other syntactic analyses, which bring word order into the picture. Both contributions reach similar conclusions: the alternation has no linguistic motivation, but springs from the creative character of the Greek language and of the Greeks themselves.<sup>48</sup> We will see in Chapters 5 and 6, however, that specific morphological issues may govern the creation of V1 compounds.

The issue was taken up again by Émile Benveniste in an influential 1967 article, programmatically entitled ‘Fondements syntaxiques de la composition nominale’. Its claims have been addressed in Chapter 2, section 7.5.4, but it is worth re-considering this study here as a chapter in the development of syntactic analyses of V1 compounds. In line with early French contributions on this topic,<sup>49</sup> Benveniste’s article considers both the syntactic interface and the semantic nuances of alternating pairs, placing particular emphasis on the V1/V2 alternation. In Benveniste’s interpretation, while the V2 type expresses a generic verbal action, a ‘présent intemporel de définition’, the V1 type indicates a specific verbal action, the ‘réalité du process’: accordingly οἰκοφóρος (an adjective) identifies a ‘porteur par vocation ou nature’, while φερέουκος (the snail) is someone ‘qui porte effectivement’.<sup>50</sup> However, Benveniste does not clarify what the origin of the V1 type would be.<sup>51</sup>

A turning point is represented by W. P. Lehmann’s article ‘Proto-Indo-European Compounds in Relation to Other Proto-Indo-European Syntactic Patterns’ (1969), which was the first work to rethink the issue of compound orientation in an updated IE syntactic perspective. As Lehmann points out, while Indo-Europeanists of the generation before his own devoted little attention to how the PIE sentence was arranged, recent investigation into PIE syntactic patterns has led to recognition that compound structure is not autonomous of word order: the most common types (e.g. V2 compounds) correspond to the type of word order that *independent* research has recognized as being the standard arrangement in PIE.<sup>52</sup>

**48** See Bechtel and Fick (1894: 7) on the inversion of constituents in Greek PNs as ‘ein bewusstes, heiteres Spiel des griechischen Volksgeistes’ (repeated in Bechtel (1917: xiii)); and Andriotis (1938: 97): ‘es ist bekannt, wie frei der sprachschöpferische Geist der Griechen in der Schöpfung von Personennamen geschaltet hat’. See also Stolz (1904: 173).

**49** See for instance Weil (1869) and Bergaigne (1875–1878: 12–15).

**50** Benveniste (1967: 22–23).

**51** See the criticism in this direction in R. Schulze (1979).

**52** Lehmann (1969: 11; 14), with further reference to standard works such as Meillet (1937) and Watkins (1964).

The most important point of Lehmann's article is the hypothesis that V1 compounds are verb-initial not because they contain old imperatives (which do tend to occupy the first position in a sentence) but because they reflect PIE marked word order:

The derivation from imperatives [...] apparently is based on the preference for initial position of the verb in the PIE imperative sentence. But [...] one type of PIE clause, the clause with marked order, is characterized by initial position of the verb. In view of the use of verb-noun synthetic compounds for names and other stylistically marked compounds, it is far more credible to relate these synthetics with the marked sentence order.

Lehmann (1969: 13).

The hypothesis that V1 compounds reflect the PIE marked word order while V2 compounds reflect the unmarked word order is now widely accepted: see, e.g., Tischler (1979: 864–866), Uhlich (1993: 93–95), and Uhlich (1997: 25 n. 13). The syntactic approach has the merit of having provided another point of view on issues of structure and orientation in IE compounding. Its most important legacy is the recognition—already adumbrated in nineteenth-century works, but now given a full theoretical basis—that it is not possible to treat compounds as being wholly independent of syntax and of the word order and sentence patterns available in a language. The adoption of syntactic analysis in an IE perspective is beneficial in that it allows an explanation of seemingly odd compound structures that go against the general trend manifested by a language, as such structures can be considered in the light of an older syntactic pattern. More importantly, the syntactic approach is the only one that has so far proposed a reasonable explanation of why in PIE some compounds were verb-initial even though the verb-final pattern was available and seemingly more productive.

At the same time, however, the shortcomings of many syntactic analyses must not be overlooked.<sup>53</sup> One such shortcoming is the tendency—evident in all standard works of this kind—to consider PIE word order almost as the *sole* reason why V1 compounds in the individual IE languages are verb-initial. Clearly, any syntactic approach must always take into account that an inherited compound structure may be altered within an individual language to accommodate the special morpho-syntactic rules of that language—with the result that the individual IE languages may in fact contain compound types that are not representative

---

**53** The interface between syntax and compounding is a widely debated topic in the literature on compounding, as can be seen in many of the contributions in Lieber and Štekauer (2009a); see in particular Fradin (2009: 422–428) and Kornfeld (2009: 444–452), on syntax and V1 compounds in French and Spanish respectively. For AG, see Bader (2005). See also Chapter 1, section 6.2 and Chapter 2, section 7.5.4.

of PIE syntactic patterns and *vice versa*. Another shortcoming of contributions focusing on the discovery of syntactic patterns is that they often completely avoid addressing the morphological analysis of compounds. Once it is agreed that the V1 structure reflects an inherited marked word order, the question of what the FC originally represented still remains. There is a remarkable tendency to brush off this fundamental question in some of the syntactic work of the last fifty years.<sup>54</sup> In the analysis of V1 compounds provided in the next chapter, we will propose that V1 compounds are based on simple verbal roots or stems and that their orientation is influenced by marked word order: they are not secondary inversions of V2 types.

### 7.1 Further syntactic approaches

In more recent years the investigation of the PIE syntactic patterns underlying compounds has spun a whole series of works dealing with the discovery of phrases which might have provided the basis for the creation of individual compounds. This represents a specialization of more extensive work carried out on the description of IE word order, poetic language, and its formulae and recurring images.<sup>55</sup>

Within the realm of V1 compounds, etymological and syntactic investigations have chiefly focused on the explanation of V1 PNs in the light of IE poetic language and phraseology. Recent contributions in this direction have been offered particularly by García Ramón (2000a; 2000–2001; 2005a; 2005b; 2006a; 2006b; 2008; 2009; 2011) and also by Dubois (2000; 2001; 2006). For an introduction to this approach and some of its results, see Chapter 6, section 6.3, as well as the interpretation of the Mycenaean PNs in Chapter 4, sections 7.1–7.9.

## 8 The stem hypothesis reconsidered: recent approaches

In recent years the hypothesis that V1 compounds contain simple verbal stems or roots has been re-assessed. We have seen that in the nineteenth century the

---

<sup>54</sup> A clear morphological definition of the FC is missing in Benveniste (1967), Lehmann (1969), as well as Uhlich (1993: 96): ‘Verbalwurzel oder Verbalnomen’ (dealing with Old Irish). Schulze (1979: 806) acknowledges that the connection with the imperative is secondary, without offering a full explanation of what the FC of *φερέοικος* is.

<sup>55</sup> See for instance Watkins (1964), Watkins (1995), Schramm (1957), Schmitt (1973), Bader (1989).

frenzy to explain the FCs as inflected verbal forms partly stemmed from the wish to rebel against the dogmatism of the older generation of Indo-Europeanists who taught that real PIE compounds could only contain pure roots. Scholars nowadays do not find the idea that inflected forms could have been used in compounds of authentic IE age outrageous and assume that in the long life of the parent language there might have been different stages which produced different compound patterns.<sup>56</sup> The problem therefore does not concern whether fully inflected verbal forms *could* be used as compound constituents, but the identification of which verbal forms would have originated these constituents. If present imperatives ending in *-e* are a possibility for *φερέοικος* compounds, the interpretation of *τερψίμβροτος* and related forms as continuing an old *-ti* infinitive—or indeed some kind of modified second or third person present singular—has nowadays been forsaken.<sup>57</sup>

As a result, the hypothesis that the FCs of *τερψίμβροτος* compounds go back to old action or agent nouns remains more fashionable, though it brings the disadvantage that the *φερέοικος* and *τερψίμβροτος* types must be dealt with as two originally different structures in PIE (*φερέοικος* with an inflected FC, *τερψίμβροτος* with a nominal FC). In other words, if we are happy to go down this road we end up with a description of PIE compounding as having one fully developed verbal type (with imperatival FCs ending in *-e*) and a nominal type (with FCs representing *-ti-* abstract nouns): the structure of the latter would be strikingly in contrast with the structure and preferred orientation of IE compounding (see also Chapter 4, section 4.3.1).

As a consequence of these shortcomings, many scholars have continued to defend the stem hypothesis for both compound types. Classic works such as Tserepis (1902), Sommer (1937: 187–189), Schwyzer (1939: 441), Meillet and Vendryès (1960: 428), as well as Schulze (1979: 806), have all gone back to Clemm's explanation of FCs as verbal stems, in some cases explaining the imperatival connection as a later semantic development. There are two obvious advantages in the stem hypothesis. The first is that it is the only interpretation which makes it possible to see both FCs characterized by *-e-* and those characterized by *-ti-* and *-si-* as deriving from the same structural pattern. The second advantage is that it is a relatively economical interpretation: we do not need to posit unattested verbal forms or semantic developments to account for it. Moreover, it is a hypothesis that finds independent support in the way V1 compounds attested in modern IE languages are often interpreted.<sup>58</sup>

<sup>56</sup> See Dunkel (1999: 47) and Chapter 1, section 6.4.

<sup>57</sup> On the imperatival hypothesis, see Dunkel (1992: 216–217).

<sup>58</sup> See Bauer (2009: 347), Fradin (2009: 425), Nielsen Whitehead (2012: 245–248).

In consideration of these advantages, and in the light of the morphological analysis of the earliest V1 compounds attested in Greek and Vedic provided in Chapter 4, my own analysis of Greek V1 compounds assumes that the V1 pattern is of PIE age, and that its FCs originally contained simple verbal roots or stems, which may sometimes be followed by linking elements. This is argued in detail in Chapter 4, sections 6–6.1.

## 9 Two twentieth-century works on Greek V1 compounds

To date, the most recent monographs on Greek V1 compounds are Knecht (1946) on *τερψίμβροτος* compounds and Frei-Lüthy (1978), mostly on *φερέοικος* compounds. Both works assemble a considerable portion of the documentation available (PNs included), though they do not go beyond the fifth century BC and refrain from applying an organic methodology to take both categories into account. However, some of the conclusions these works reach are still relevant, in particular the emphasis both scholars accord to onomastics and the role of the latter in the development of the V1 type.

### 9.1 Theodor Knecht's *Geschichte der griechischen Komposita vom Typ τερψίμβροτος*

Theodor Knecht's 1946 *Geschichte der griechischen Komposita vom Typ τερψίμβροτος* programmatically sets out to overcome the shortcomings of earlier works, particularly the theoretical, almost 'mathematical' treatment of the question, which neglected investigation of the productivity, meaning and relation of individual *τερψίμβροτος* compounds with each other. Knecht's aim is to study the Homeric material in relation to more recent compounds in order to determine which compounds go back to a PIE age and which are Greek innovations. For the investigation, he claims to have produced a full corpus of all the *τερψίμβροτος* compounds attested in authors up to Aristotle, together with a selection of later compounds up to Nonnus, and a few onomastic compounds selected from Homer, Hesiod, and inscriptions down to the end of the sixth century BC.<sup>59</sup> Yet, in spite of the book's stated programme and title, the collected corpus is often deficient, and the perspective adopted is rarely chronological, both in the sense that a historical treatment of *τερψίμβροτος* com-

<sup>59</sup> Knecht (1946: 6–7).

pounds is lacking and also because the announced ‘Geschichte’ in fact halts on the threshold of the fifth century BC.

Rather than in the full productivity of the type, Knecht’s main interest lies in explaining the origin of the FC and identifying which Greek compounds are inherited from PIE. The initial part of the book is devoted to a description of the issue: *τερψίμβροτος* compounds can be connected to either the s-aorist or *-tis* abstract nouns, but neither explanation is problem-free.<sup>60</sup> The aoristic interpretation meets with three problems. First, Greek has *-σι-* compounds which do not correspond to a sigmatic aorist (e.g. *ταμεσίχρως* vs. *ταμείν*). Second, it is difficult to explain the linking vowel *-ι-* within the aorist paradigm. Third, in this interpretative framework the forms in *-τι-* would remain obscure.

Although the other hypothesis—that the FC goes back to abstract nouns in *-tis*—is problematic in view of the early compounds in which the FC has a root in the full grade, Knecht eventually accepts it as the most plausible. He overcomes the problem that the root featured in the FC is usually full (whereas zero grade is expected in *-tis* nouns) by noting that in Greek a number of relatively old *-σις* nouns are formed from the full grade and that such full-grade forms at times replace zero-grade forms. He concludes that ‘der Vollständigkeit halber muss auch für den Rest der ältesten T[erpsimbrotos]K[omposita] die Möglichkeit eines ti-Abstractums untersucht sein, soweit ein solches nicht bezeugt ist’.<sup>61</sup> He consequently proposes to reconstruct a number of such unattested abstract nouns.

Knecht therefore submits that the FC of *-τι-* compounds was in origin an action noun which, in PNs, was—according to his version of the developments—re-interpreted in the role of an agent noun (type *μάντις*). Greek, however, did not have a large number of such agent nouns in *-tis* that could support this semantic re-analysis. As a consequence, the type would have died out, if the assibilation of [ti] into [si] in FCs placed before SCs beginning with a vowel had not intervened to alter the situation. This sound change eventually made the FCs of *τερψίμβροτος* compounds resemble aorists and futures; as a result, the derivation of new compounds from aoristic stems became a productive process. A few forms in *-τι-*, however, were preserved either because the phonetic conditions leading to the assibilation did not arise (that is, when *-τι-* is preceded by *-σ-*); or because a secondary connection with a *-σις* nominal was not possible.<sup>62</sup> The oscillation between *-τι-* and *-σι-* forms was typical of a first chronological stage

<sup>60</sup> Knecht (1946: 3).

<sup>61</sup> Knecht (1946: 22).

<sup>62</sup> Knecht (1946: 19).

characterized by a degree of uncertainty. This was overcome by a second stage, in which all original forms in -τι- automatically changed into -σι-.

Knecht's working approach is to start from the compounds he considers the oldest in Homer and the most representative of compounding in the parent language. He identifies these as consisting of a group of forms shared by both the appellative and the onomastic domains, from which newer forms were likely to have been derived largely through analogical processes. For instance, Knecht considers ῥηξήνωρ 'breaking armed ranks' (lit. 'breaking men, destroying enemies') to be an old form: this compound is then argued to have triggered the creation of φθεισίνωρ 'destroying men', employing a different FC. In turn, φθεισίνωρ gave rise to φθεισίμβροτος 'destroying mortals', this to τερψίμβροτος and the latter to φαεσίμβροτος 'bringing light to mortals', which are both epithets classifying the sun and light in general.<sup>63</sup>

While it is true, in general terms, that analogical processes may lead to the creation of new compounds in the poetic language, Knecht's proposed chain of developments appears too mechanical. In particular, the methodological assumption that old forms only reside in those groups which are shared by both the appellative and onomastic lexicons (ῥηξήνωρ scheint alt zu sein, da es als Appellativ wie als PN Verwendung findet) now appears weak: many of Knecht's supposedly 'old' groups, for instance, are never found in Mycenaean.<sup>64</sup> Although the Mycenaean evidence is certainly very special in that it is transmitted uniquely by bureaucratic texts, the fact that certain FCs are not found in the LB tablets must be taken into account when one attempts to create a 'list' of old Greek FCs.

Knecht's tendency to explain appellatives as back-formations based on existing PNs also is problematic. An example is his treatment of πλήξιππος which 'geht unmittelbar auf den PN Λύσιππος zurück'. However, as Knecht himself acknowledges, Λύσιππος is attested much later than πλήξιππος. Two objections are in order. The first is of principle. Although a degree of exchange between PNs and appellatives is to be expected in compounds, the assumption which posits an almost mechanical priority of PNs over appellatives goes against the (rather obvious) discrepant fact that PNs, and particularly those of Greek, often reflect the appellative lexicon (see Chapter 2, section 8). The second objection is that in this way the role of poetic creativity is diminished: poets would not be able to form new compounds according to a general morphological pattern, but would need—as it were—the leading model of the onomastic lexicon. On a more general level, it should be noted that Knecht's assumptions are not founded on any in-depth

<sup>63</sup> Knecht (1946: 7–9).

<sup>64</sup> Compare the list in Knecht (1946: 21) with those in Chapter 4, tables 4.2 and 4.3: only three FCs have parallels in Mycenaean.



discussion of the role of onomastics in the development of the *τερψίμβροτος* type and in Greek compounding in general (compare on the other hand Frei-Lüthy's approach to the issue in the next section).

In spite of its criticisable methodology, however, Knecht's monograph makes some important claims. Knecht is the first scholar to systematically draw attention to the fact that PNs constitute the largest part of *τερψίμβροτος* compounds in Homer and that onomastics must be taken into full account for the investigation of this compound type. More importantly, his observation that already in Homer *τερψίμβροτος* compounds may result from different derivational patterns (from sigmatic aorists, -σις nominals, present stems, thematic aorists, etc.), leads him to criticize his predecessors' almost unchallenged dogma that in Greek the type represents a crystallized relic; he then shows, instead, that *τερψίμβροτος* compounds are a relatively productive class of compounds which expanded according to a criterion of semantic analogy. To some extent, this description of the productivity of *τερψίμβροτος* compounds is correct, although the assumption that the link with the s-aorist is only a secondary development must, in my view, be reviewed (see Chapter 4, section 6).

## 9.2 Frei-Lüthy (1978) and the influence of onomastics

Christine Frei-Lüthy's study of Greek V1 compounds is part of a monograph (originally a *Magisterarbeit* supervised by Ernst Risch) that explores the influence of onomastics on the Greek appellative lexicon and word formation patterns. Frei-Lüthy's field of investigation is restricted to Greek, and as a consequence she does not offer any new insights into understanding the origin of the V1 type in PIE.<sup>65</sup> On the question of *τερψίμβροτος* compounds, Frei-Lüthy's conclusion entirely follows Knecht's in arguing that this type had its origin in onomastics. Her treatment of the category is succinct, but an advancement on Knecht is the recognition that the *τερψίμβροτος* type remained productive not only in poetry, but also in scientific language.<sup>66</sup>

Within the framework of the book the investigation of *φερέοικος* compounds has a more prominent role. Their origin is clearly identified as having arisen from imperatives, on the grounds that the primary function of the category was that of providing names to express a wish for the new-born baby.<sup>67</sup> Further developments presumably triggered the semantic equation of the FC with a *nomen agentis* or a

<sup>65</sup> See Frei-Lüthy (1978: 14).

<sup>66</sup> Frei-Lüthy (1978: 21).

<sup>67</sup> Frei-Lüthy (1978: 23).

participle (an evolution also postulated by Knecht for *τερψίμβροτος* compounds, as we have seen). According to Frei-Lüthy, precisely such a reconfiguration of the FC represents the first step towards the exportation of the *φερέοικος* type into the appellative lexicon.<sup>68</sup> Frei-Lüthy supports this analysis by noting that *φερέοικος* compounds are only attested as PNs in Mycenaean, while Homer already has a whole group of appellatives. This in turn prompts the question of whether the transfer to the appellative lexicon must be supposed to have taken place during the ‘Dark Ages’ or rather within Homeric Greek itself.<sup>69</sup> Frei-Lüthy’s conclusion is that the expansion of the *φερέοικος* type in the appellative lexicon took place within the epic language—as a result of the use of compounded PNs as epithets.<sup>70</sup>

Frei-Lüthy’s ‘onomastic hypothesis’ calls for two observations. The first is that her whole theory is based on an *argumentum e silentio*, namely the fact that there are no appellative V1 compounds attested in Mycenaean. This, however, is a weak argument: the evidence of the tablets is too limited to allow bold conclusions (one might note that while there are no first person plural verbal forms attested in Mycenaean, this does not mean that the Mycenaean did not use verbs in the first person plural).<sup>71</sup> While the high-style flavour of V1 compounds cannot be denied, one cannot be certain that the appellative use post-dates Mycenaean: in all probability, if we had a different type of textual evidence we would find V1 compounds used in poetry and other linguistic registers in Mycenaean as well. The suggested chronological precedence of PNs over appellatives is therefore purely speculative.

The second observation concerns the interaction between onomastics and poetic epithets. Frei-Lüthy’s remark that V1 compounds are particularly specialized as PNs and epithets is correct; but whether this means that the V1 type specifically originated to cover the particular needs of onomastics is open to doubt: the evidence in support of this suggestion is not clear-cut and, moreover, what we know about Greek onomastics makes the opposite phenomenon—the influence of the appellative lexicon on onomastics—much more likely (see Chapter 2, section 8). We will now address some of these issues in greater depth.

---

**68** Frei-Lüthy (1978: 24).

**69** Frei-Lüthy (1978: 25).

**70** Frei-Lüthy (1978: 37, 80).

**71** Although we do not have incontrovertible examples of V1 appellative compounds in Mycenaean, such an interpretation has been suggested for a number of controversial forms: see Chapter 4, section 5.

### 9.3 On the onomastic origin of V1 compounds: a critique

The case for the hypothesis that in PIE the V1 type exclusively developed within onomastics rests on three observations. Firstly, that the oldest Greek forms are all PNs; secondly, that V1 compounds are frequent in Greek onomastics; thirdly, that within the appellative lexicon there is a tendency to use them as epithets (i.e. as quasi-names).

Of these three observations, the first is not useful: as noted above, the Mycenaean LB tablets are heavily biased towards the recording of PNs in any case. The second observation, that V1 compounds are common in Greek onomastics, in itself does not mean that the V1 type must have originated within onomastics. Bahuvrihis are similarly very common among PNs, though this does not induce linguists to search for their origin within PIE onomastics. The productivity of a given compound structure within Greek onomastics provides information on the mechanisms ruling name-giving in Greek, not on the origin and specialization of PIE word formation patterns.

Finally the third observation—that early V1 compounds are often used as epithets—must be viewed in the light of the available evidence. The first Greek literary works consist exclusively of epic poetry and it is not surprising that V1 compounds, like other adjectival compounds, are mostly used to characterize heroes, deities and elements that are at the centre of these narratives. If anything, these attestations prove the high-style flavour of V1 compounds, not their origin in the onomastic lexicon. This can be further supported by two independent types of evidence. The first is the fact that as soon as there are prose texts of sufficient length, V1 compounds begin to appear outside the poetic lexicon, which means either that by the time these prose works were written, the V1 type had ceased to be specialized for PNs and epithets; or (more probably) that it had never fulfilled that function. The second piece of evidence is provided by a random test: the distribution of another category of adjectival compounds, bahuvrihis, vis-à-vis the distribution of V1 compounds in *Il.* 1–500. In these five-hundred lines there are thirty-eight bahuvrihis and four V1s. Of the bahuvrihis, twenty-eight are used as epithets of heroes, gods, and objects, leaving only ten to be used as common adjectives. Obviously, though, this distribution neither leads us to suppose that the primary function of bahuvrihis was only that of providing epithets, nor that bahuvrihis originated as PNs (as already noted).

These considerations call into question the view, defended by both Knecht (1946) and Frei-Lüthy (1978), that the V1 type specifically developed in the context of IE name-giving. The interpretation of the verbal FC as having an imperatival or augural meaning certainly contributed to the popularity of this compound type

within onomastics, but we simply do not know enough about the parent language to conclude that the type originated for the specific purpose of forming PNs.

## 10 Conclusion

The investigation of the AG evidence has played a central role in the development of theories concerning IE compounding and the origin of V1 compounds in PIE. Early works focused on the interpretation of the FC as an inflected verbal form and often proposed that V1 compounds derived from phrases (Grimm, Bopp: this was the germ of the later syntactic approach), but a view of this kind was usually stigmatized in the nineteenth century, when the prevailing tendency was to interpret the FC of V1 compounds (particularly those in *-ti-*) as nominal or verbal stems. This emphasis on the morphological analysis of the FC is tuned down in later, mostly twentieth-century approaches: scholars such as Bechtel, Andriotis, Benveniste, Lehmann, Dunkel and García Ramón have made substantial contributions towards an understanding of the relationship between word order and compounding, but have usually refrained from explaining what V1 compounds exactly are (an exception being the contributions by Dunkel and García Ramón).

The initial criticism levelled against W. Clemm's stem hypothesis —namely that bare stems 'only exist in the mind of linguists' (R. Rödiger)—has continued to be directed against the advocates of the stem theory to this very day, particularly because in Romance the FCs of V1 compounds are synchronically interpretable as imperative or indicative forms: thus, the idea that they go back to univerbations of inflected forms rather than displaying bare stems remains very popular, particularly for the interpretation of *φερρέουκος* compounds.<sup>72</sup>

However, as noted in section 10, the stem hypothesis is now widely accepted even for the interpretation of V1 compounds in modern IE languages. As far as AG is concerned, it brings the advantage that all V1 types can be interpreted as subclasses of the same macro-category, which are therefore characterized by the same structure: the FC is a verbal stem or a root which may be enlarged by linking

---

<sup>72</sup> For these syntactic analyses in French, see Darmesteter (1875: 146–205); for Ibero-Romance, see Rainer and Varela (1992), Villalva (1992: 212) and Penny (2002: 300); for Italian, see Zauner (1905: 81–82). The theories of these scholars are reviewed by Nielsen Whitehead (2012: 165–192), who subscribes to the interpretation of the FC of Romance V1 compounds as stems, at least prototypically. The role of Classical and Late Latin on these Romance compounds is briefly reviewed in the next chapter. The imperatival hypothesis is also adopted for Slavic compounds by Progovac (2010) and Progovac (2012).

elements (-*t*-) or linking vowels (-*i*-), and the SC is a noun functioning as its argument. In the next chapter this explanation of V1 compounds will be reviewed from a novel point of view, starting from a thorough analysis of early Greek V1 compounds and their comparative background. In particular, we will investigate how Greek V1 compounds could represent the relics of an older system in which the different types of FCs reflect the original opposition between present and aoristic formations that was typical of the PIE verbal system.



# Chapter Four

## The Historical Perspective: PIE Background and Development of V1 Compounds in Early Greek

### 1 Introduction

This chapter addresses some of the questions which have been central in the studies of V1 compounds discussed in Chapter 3 and offers a fresh analysis of the PIE origin of this compound type and of its development in early Greek. The preliminary question from which the chapter starts concerns whether or not the V1 type can be reconstructed for the parent language as a whole. Evidence from the individual ancient IE languages is uneven: the V1 type is fully productive only in Greek, thus opening the question of whether the few V1 forms attested in other ancient languages are relics of a lost type, or innovations which arose independently. Section 2 introduces the issues concerning the comparison of the Greek and Indo-Iranian material, which is the necessary premise for the reconstruction of the V1 class as a formation of PIE age. Sections 3 and 4 look at the morphological properties of V1 compounds in Greek, with close focus on their FCs and the correlation of these with verbal roots and stems.

This analysis in turns leads to the pivotal question of whether the two Greek types of *τερψίμβροτος* and *φερπέοικος* compounds represent subsets of the same compound category or whether they are to be distinguished from one another and accounted for in different terms. The *τερψίμβροτος* type (section 4) is central to this question, since it is disputed whether its FC is a verbal stem or an action noun (the hypothesis that it is an inflected verbal form is now regarded to be less likely). For an appraisal of this issue, section 4.3.2 analyses the Vedic compounds in *-ti-*, which have often been used in support of the action noun hypothesis. On the basis of work carried out by other scholars, this section argues that the available Vedic compounds in *-ti-*, though probably continuing an inherited pattern, have merged with the class of *bahuvrihis*.

Section 5 then turns to the Mycenaean evidence in order to test the action noun hypothesis against the available material. Section 5.1 highlights how the Mycenaean FCs in *-ti-* mostly contain bare full-grade roots, whose primary formation was the root aorist: this section advances the hypothesis that *-ti-* is neither a nominal suffix nor the remains of a verbal ending, but a mere linking element which was developed to 'block' the bare root of these FCs and was later identified as a marker of these formations. In order to better assess the morphological mechanisms at play in the derivation of FCs from bare verbal roots or stems (from

the present or the aorist), section 6 briefly looks at the broader picture, presenting a short introduction to the most widespread theories on the development of the present and aorist formations in the PIE verbal system. This information is also useful to assess the role of compounds based on the s-aorist since in the PIE verbal system the s-aorist arose as an innovation endowed with definite grammatical functions.

Section 7 re-analyzes the Mycenaean compounds with FCs in *-ti-* starting from this premise. This section suggests that Mycenaean represents a ‘transitional stage’ in which the inherited *-ti-* type begins to be superseded and replaced by the new *-si-* type. Sections 7.1–7.8 deal with each of the Mycenaean V1 compounds in *-ti-*, with the aim of detecting the morphological or phonological factors which may have prevented their transformation into *-si-* compounds. The extent to which the hypothesis that *-ti-* compounds merely contain bare verbal roots affects our understanding of early Greek V1 compounds is discussed in section 7.9.

Section 8 then looks at how the V1 categories evolved in early alphabetic Greek. Now largely obscured and superseded by the new derivational pattern in which the s-aorist attained a primary role, the old compounds in *-ti-* were mostly replaced by forms in *-si-*; their partial preservation is due to specific reasons, ranging from conservatism to semantic opacity (sections 8.1–8.6). In alphabetic Greek, V1 compounds thus ended up forming a two-fold system founded on the opposition of types containing or lacking the  $-\sigma\iota-$  marker. The concurrence of various analogical processes (in which  $-\sigma\iota\varsigma$  nominals played an important role) decreed the steady success of the  $\tau\epsilon\rho\psi\iota\mu\beta\rho\tau\omicron\varsigma$  type over  $\varphi\epsilon\rho\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\varsigma$  compounds.

## 2 V1 compounds in Indo-European

Before considering the question of the origin of V1 compounds in PIE, it is necessary to recall a few facts concerning their existence and productivity in the IE family. Compounds showing a left-oriented [V N] structure are common in a large number of languages of the world.<sup>1</sup> Not all of these compounds however are exocentric like those found in Greek. In Mandarin Chinese, for instance, [V N]<sub>v</sub> structures such as *tóuzī* [put money] ‘invest’ are endocentric and the verbal FC is the head.<sup>2</sup> In modern IE languages, exocentric V1 compounds are common in Romance, where they are productive for the derivation of animate agent nouns

<sup>1</sup> Right-oriented [V N] compounds are much more widespread: in these, the SC is the head (e.g. Germ. *Schlafsack* [sleep sack] ‘sleeping bag’, *bakeshop*).

<sup>2</sup> See Ceccagno and Basciano (2009: 480), and Kageyama (2009: 514) for Chinese borrowings into Japanese. A comparable type is attested in Mapudungun: Baker and Fasola (2009: 595).



(e.g. Fr. *porteparole* [carry word] ‘spokesperson’) or instrument nouns (e.g. Sp. *abre-latas* [open cans] ‘can-opener’), and are also common in surnames and nick-names (e.g. It. *Tagliaferro* [cut iron]). All these types are semantic specializations of the agent noun function, which has also produced several plant names in early Romance.<sup>3</sup>

The high number of such V1 forms in Romance has duly been noted by scholars. Studies have mostly revolved around two areas, which are very similar to those debated in Greek linguistics: the morphological analysis of the FC (and hence the processes at the origin of these V1 compounds) and the relation of the Romance formations to those attested in other IE languages, particularly as concerns their historical development.<sup>4</sup> This is not the place to dwell on a full account of the trends in the interpretation of Romance V1 compounds, but it may be useful to note that the debate over whether the FC is a stem or an inflected imperative is central in these studies.<sup>5</sup>

In order to evaluate the peculiarities of Romance V1 compounds, it is useful to take a quick look at the V1 compounds attested in other IE languages. As far as Celtic is concerned, there are no V1 forms among the compounded PNs studied by Uhlich (1993), while the V1 compounds attested in Breton seem to have been borrowed from French (Pilch 1996). In German, English, Baltic and Slavic V1 compounds are restricted and betray an onomastic origin: consider Germ. *Bacbrot* [bake bread] ‘baker’ (a surname), Engl. *pick-pocket* (arguably deriving from a nick-name), Lithuanian *Vytautas* [drive people] ‘leader of the people’ (a name), Old Church Slavonic *Vladislav* [rule Slavs] ‘ruler of the Slavs’ (a name), Serbian *cepi-dlaka* [split hair] ‘hair-splitter’ (an insult).<sup>6</sup> In Germanic, the most probable explanation of this distribution is that these forms were developed through contact with Romance, which led to the adoption of the V1 type in some varieties.<sup>7</sup> If any earlier influence has to be posited, it must be attributed to Late Antiquity and hence to Late Latin influence: Nielsen Whitehead overtly argues

---

**3** See the classification of French V1 compounds in Fradin (2009: 426), who also isolates forms identifying events (*baize-main* [kiss hand] ‘hand-kissing’), places (*coupe-gorge* [cut throat] ‘dangerous back alley’) and causative actions (*pisse-chien* [piss dog], name of a plant which makes dogs urinate).

**4** The analysis of Romance V1 types and their historical development is carried out by Bork (1990), Gather (2001), and Nielsen Whitehead (2012).

**5** Interpretations range from the idea that the FC is a third ps. sg. form (e.g. Schapira (1985)) or an imperative (e.g. Darmesteter (1875: 146–205), Progovac (2012), to the view that it is a stem (e.g. Benveniste (1966)). See also Chapter 3, section 8.

**6** Progovac and Locke (2009), from where the Serbian example is quoted, deal particularly with V1 compounds conveying insults.

**7** *Contra*, cf. Kastovsky (2009: 337).

that the V1 pattern originated in late-antique onomastic practices which spread from Rome to the West Germanic and Slavic areas.<sup>8</sup> The interpretation of the Slavic evidence is not unanimous. Research carried out on South Slavic (Serbian) by Progovac (2010) and Old Church Slavonic by Pohl (1973) tends to suggest that the V1 pattern may have been productive in some Slavic varieties independently of the phenomena of linguistic contact which characterize V1 compounds in East and West Slavic.

Latin obviously has a central role in our understanding of how the V1 compounds spread in the languages of modern Europe. However, V1 compounds are not only extremely rare in Classical Latin, but also of controversial interpretation.<sup>9</sup> The classic handbook examples *versipellis* ‘that changes its skin’ (Plautus) and *flexanimus* ‘that bends, affects the heart’ (Pacuvius) have been variously analysed. Speculatively, it may be argued that they continue an old pattern, employing old s-aorists (which provided the stem of some Latin perfects) in the FC: however, this type of word formation is assumed to have been very restricted.<sup>10</sup> On account of the literary use of these compounds, other scholars have claimed that they are learned calques from the popular Greek type in -σι-.<sup>11</sup>

An alternative analysis, adopted by Bork (1990), is to interpret these Latin compounds as bahuvrihis containing past participles in the FCs: ‘having a changed (*versus*) skin’, ‘having a bent (*flexus*), affected heart’. The latter meaning is again attested in Pacuvius. Consistently with this interpretation, Bork (1990: 241–242) isolates only sixteen forms in which the FC can be interpreted as a simple verbal stem and which are, in his opinion, real V1 compounds. His interpretation is endorsed by Nielsen Whitehead (2012: 114–129) who, after discarding a few further examples, proposes a model of the evolution of V1 compounds in Latin. She submits that the few Latin forms which can be interpreted as real V1 compounds were not inherited from PIE, but arose in Late or sub-standard Latin and were influenced by the syntactic constituent order which characterized the language at this stage.<sup>12</sup> Sentence-names of the type *Vincemalus* ‘he who defeats

**8** Nielsen Whitehead (2012: 251–252).

**9** Gather (2001: 204).

**10** This interpretation of a few Latin compounds is chosen by Nielsen Whitehead (2012: 114–129). Consistently with his idea that compounds in *-si-* go back to old imperatives, Dunkel (1992: 222–223) wonders whether *versipellis*, *flexanimus* and the likes might not belong to this ancient pattern as well.

**11** Bader (1962: 397–398), Bork (1990: 55). *Contra*, Oniga (1988: 157–158) and Nielsen Whitehead (2012: 102–104, 148–150), who also discusses earlier bibliography.

**12** Nielsen Whitehead (2012: 150–151, 207, 210–211). On the connection between Latin V1 compounds and popular language, see also Kastovsky (2009: 336), who follows Jacobi (1897: 73).

evil' also emerged at a late linguistic stage, and particularly in Christian Latin as a result of Semitic influence.<sup>13</sup>

In summary, in modern IE languages the V1 type is mostly productive in Romance, possibly continuing a Late Latin pattern. The Classical roots of this pattern are very hard to trace: the question of whether PIE had a class of V1 compounds must therefore be assessed without using the Latin data.

## 2.1 The PIE background of V1 compounds

Evidence from the other ancient IE languages is uneven, in terms of both chronology and quantity. V1 compounds are attested in Greek, Sanskrit (starting with Vedic) and Iranian (starting with Old Persian); no original V1 compound has been identified in Hittite and Luwian.<sup>14</sup> The Greek *τερψίμβροτος* type, which synchronically derives from the s-aorist, is an isolated formation: as noted in Chapter 3, it is often interpreted as having an ancestor in the Vedic (and early Greek) type in *-ti-*, but the state of the Vedic evidence is ambiguous, as we will see shortly. Similarly, Indo-Iranian shows a common type represented by forms such as Vedic *bharád-vāja-* 'bringing trophy' and Avestan *dārayat-raθa-* 'maintaining the chariot' which finds no parallel in Greek and which is unlikely to continue a PIE pattern.<sup>15</sup> This type shows FCs which can be synchronically connected to participles: it could have arisen from the re-analysis and extension of other inherited V1 categories.<sup>16</sup>

This leaves us with the Greek *φερέοικος* and *βωτιάνειρα* types. For the former, good parallels can be found in Indo-Iranian, while the latter is only comparable to Vedic forms. *φερέοικος* compounds have a counterpart in the Vedic type *trasá-dasyu-* [shiver enemy] 'making enemies shiver' (< *trásati* 'he trembles') and in the Avestan type *niδā-snaiθiš-* 'laying down weapons' (< *niδā-* 'to put down').<sup>17</sup> In both *φερέοικος* and *trasá-dasyu-* the FC ends in a vowel which may derive from the thematic vowel (\**e* regularly yields *a* in Sanskrit): these FCs would therefore contain thematic present stems. In Vedic, this *-a* may sometimes undergo rhythmical lengthening, as in *radā-vasu-* 'dispensing wealth' (< *rādati*). On the other hand, Av. *niδā-snaiθiš-* is likely to be built on the bare root, which ends in a

<sup>13</sup> Nielsen Whitehead (2012: 109–113).

<sup>14</sup> Kammenhuber (1961: 197).

<sup>15</sup> Wackernagel (1905: 318–320).

<sup>16</sup> Nielsen Whitehead (2012: 55, 58).

<sup>17</sup> Wackernagel (1905: 319), Duchesne-Guillemin (1936: 198–202), Renou (1940–1941: 217), Dunkel (1992: 208).

long vowel (*niḍā-* ‘put down’ is a compound of *ni* ‘in’ and *dā-* ‘put’ < \**d<sup>h</sup>eh<sub>1</sub>-*): this type would therefore be similar to the few Greek compounds such as Τλήπολεμος which are based on the simple root. Compounds based on simple long-vowel roots are also attested in Vedic: e.g. *sthā-raśman-* ‘making reins firm, having firm reins’, from \**steh<sub>2</sub>-*.<sup>18</sup> The great majority of these not very common Indo-Iranian compounds with FCs based on stems ending in *-a-* or on bare long-vowel roots, have semantics which make them similar to bahuvrihis: for this reason, Nielsen Whitehead (2012: 40–43) concludes that in this branch inherited V1 compounds merged with bahuvrihis already at an early stage.

A similar development seems to have affected Vedic compounds characterized by FCs ending in *-ti-*, which are also attested in Greek.<sup>19</sup> In Vedic, these compounds have meanings which allow their classification as bahuvrihis: this will be argued in detail in section 4.3.2, which draws on work carried out by Nielsen Whitehead (2012). As in the case of compounds with FCs ending in *-a-* or based on bare roots, it is possible that Vedic re-analysed an inherited category which had become obscure. In Greek FCs in *-ti-* are also residual: there are only six alphabetic forms (Ὀρτίλοχος, Δωτώ, βητάρμων, βωτιάνειρα, Καστιάνειρα and ἄρτιεπής: see section 8), and up to eleven compounded PNs as well as a few *Kurznamen* of this type can be identified in Mycenaean (sections 5 and 7). The common denominator of the alphabetic Greek forms is the fact that the *-ti-* element is preceded by a root ending in a long vowel (Δωτώ, βητάρμων, βωτιάνειρα), in [r] (Ὀρτίλοχος, ἄρτιεπής) or in [d] (Καστιάνειρα < \**kad-ti-*, cf. κέκασμαι: see section 8.5). These associations are also shown by the Mycenaean forms. Outside these categories (which are, therefore, quite clearly defined on the basis of shared properties of their verbal roots), the FCs in *-ti-* were replaced by those in *-si-*, which are the only productive types in Greek. Whether compounds with FCs ending in *-si-* formally continue those with FCs ending in *-ti-* or whether they represent a different type is the bone of contention among linguists.

Views on the origin of Greek compounds in *-si-* vary, as we saw in Chapter 3, sections 5 and 6. There is general consensus on the idea that the association with the s-aorist is a Greek development, arising in the context of a derivational system which productively created V1 compounds from a variety of sigmatic forms (including the future and action nouns: see section 4). However, scholars also tend to think that the *-si-* element derives from the *-ti-* element and hence that it is a PIE relic, later re-analysed in Greek. As discussed in Chapter 3, section 6, these scholars often link the origin of the *-ti-* element to verbal nouns rather

<sup>18</sup> For all these forms, see Wackernagel (1905: 316–317).

<sup>19</sup> Duchesne-Guillemin (1936: 198) assumes that since Sanskrit preserves the type in *-ti-*, Iranian must have inherited and later lost it.

than verbs, thus taking *-ti-* to continue a suffix contained in these nouns.<sup>20</sup> As stated in Chapter 3, the consequence of this theory would be that while *-e-* compounds were based on verbs, *-ti-* compounds would be nominal in origin.

A way to overcome this unfortunate separation of two compound types which share many semantic and structural properties is to go back to the stem hypothesis (Chapter 3, section 8) and to assume that the three types of FCs, characterized by *-e-*, *-ti-* and *-si-*, contain stems or bare roots, sometimes followed by linking elements. The study of the early development of Greek V1 compounds provided in this chapter has its premise in the hypothesis that PIE possessed—at least in its later phases—a V1 category which was split into two subtypes: the ancestor of the Greek and Indo-Iranian type in *-e/a-*, and the ancestor of the Greek and Vedic type in *-ti-*. The PIE origin of *-si-* compounds is more difficult to prove and must therefore remain very tentative: section 6.1 discusses whether the hypothesis of a late PIE origin of *-si-* compounds can bring any advantage to the interpretation of Greek V1 compounds. A useful observation to bear in mind is that in all these ancient languages some of the inherited compound categories were re-interpreted (compounds in *-a-* in Indo-Iranian, compounds in *-ti-* in Vedic) or gradually lost (compounds in *-ti-* in Greek and Iranian). It may therefore be speculated that Indo-Iranian lost the *-si-* type, if this goes back to a late PIE age.

## 2.2 Summary and working hypothesis: a late PIE bipartite system

The hypothesis that the early Greek and Vedic V1 compounds are the relics of a late PIE bipartite system of V1 compounds (with FCs in *-e-* or in *-ti-*) is assessed in the remainder of this chapter, and particularly in sections 5.1–8.7. Analysis of the data starts from the assumption that the Greek *φερῆοικος* and *τερψίμβροτος* types, formal details aside, represent two faces of the same macro-category, which is structurally and semantically coherent: their FCs are pure verbal roots or stems, which may be further enlarged with the use of linking elements (*-ti-*, *-i-* and sometimes *-e-* itself, when it is not part of the present stem but functions as a linking vowel). Section 4.3.1 posits an original compound system in which FCs in *-ti-* were not redundant or exceptional, but were on a par with those in *-e-*, from which they formally differed because they were composed of bare roots followed by the element *-ti-* rather than being based on the present stem. Section 4.3.2 applies this hypothesis to the Vedic material.

---

<sup>20</sup> See the theories of Specht (agent nouns) and Schindler (action nouns) discussed in Chapter 3, section 6.

This hypothesis takes Greek as its indispensable starting point, because of the wealth and antiquity of its V1 stock. In order to proceed to a historical study of V1 compounds, it is useful to add further details to the analysis of φερέοικος and τερψίμβροτος compounds provided in Chapter 2, section 7.5, focusing in particular on the morphological make-up of their FCs. While the description of the φερέοικος type is relatively straightforward from a synchronic point of view, that of τερψίμβροτος compounds—as we saw in the survey of previous work in Chapter 3—is more complex. This is because the origin of their FC can, in principle, be posited in the noun as well as in the verb. For this reason, we first need to have a good understanding of the stems employed in τερψίμβροτος compounds and of the relation between certain stems and certain linking elements, since the various FCs (in -τι-, -σι-, -εσι-, -ησι-, -σε- and -σο-) have different origins and developments: while the origin of -τι- and -σι- forms is clearly rooted in an early linguistic phase, the development of compounds ending in -εσι-, -ησι-, -σε- and -σο- follows inner-Greek compound patterns, largely influenced by analogical processes.

### 3 φερέοικος type: structure, stems and linking elements

Chapter 2, section 7.5.1 described the basic types of FCs represented in the φερέοικος type. The guiding principle (which is admittedly quite broad) for a compound to be subsumed under this type is its lack of the element -σι-. However, there is a great variety in the type of stems or, more frequently, roots selected for these FCs. The majority of FCs employ the stem of thematic radical presents, such as φερε-: the element -ε- therefore derives from the thematic vowel, which characterizes this type of presents.<sup>21</sup> Such derivation from radical presents is predominant in the synchronic development of φερέοικος compounds: see FCs such as ἀγε-, ἄρχε-, βλέπε-, δερκε-, ἔλκε-, ἔχε-, μελε-, μενε- and πειθε-, all corresponding to Greek thematic radical presents.

A much more limited number of FCs is built on thematic suffixed presents of which they retain the characterizing suffix or infix: for instance ἄπτε- from ἄπτω (while the simple root is ἄπ- in Greek), κερπε- from κείρω (simple root κερ-), δαμν(ε)- from δάμνημι (where -ν- is the infix characterizing the present).

<sup>21</sup> As we saw in Chapter 3, there has been a long debate over the nature of the vocalic elements at the end of the FCs and over whether these vowels provide information on the origin of the V1 type. The formal identity of the FC φερε- with the second person imperative φέρε 'carry!' has led to the interpretation of this V1 category as a type of imperative compounds (Chapter 3, sections 3 and 5).

However, the facts that the number of such FCs is limited, that the attestations of the individual compounds employing them are few, and that the compounds are usually associated with poetic language contribute to identifying this sub-type as an oddity arising from the analogical extension of the original type of φερέοικος compounds, those based on radical presents. Contextually, it is worth noting that the verbs whose present is built with suffixes preferentially select the aorist stem for their V1 compounds: see for instance δάκνω, FC δακε- (from ἔδακον) and not \*\*δακνε-; λαγχάνω, FC λαχε- (from ἔλαχον), not \*\*λαγχανε-; βλάπτω, FC βλαψι- (from ἔβλαψα), not \*\*βλαπτε-. The derivation from the thematic aorist stem is an important phenomenon in φερέοικος compounds: we will return to it in the context of its association with the linking element -o-.

A few other FCs of compounds that are subsumed, for the sake of convenience, under the φερέοικος type end in vowels characteristic of roots which in Greek build athematic presents, for instance ἔρυν- (Ἐρύλαος ‘one who keeps off the enemy’) from ἔρυναι ‘keep off’ (later remade into the thematic present ἐρύομαι): here, the present stem coincides with the root.<sup>22</sup> Another different case is that of the FC Τλη- (Τληπόλεμος ‘one who endures war’), which derives from the root employed in the aorist infinitive τληῖναι ‘endure’. As we will see, this type of roots ending in a long vowel preferentially builds FCs in -ti-: the lack of this linking element in Τληπόλεμος may identify it as an old creation, which did not need being remade into a -ti- compound. A small number of FCs also end in -i-, a frequent linking vowel in ‘Caland’ compounds (Chapter 1, section 4.1) and in τερψίμβροτος compounds: see those in ἀρχι- from ἄρχω or τερπι- from τέρπω.

Finally, a defined group of FCs end in -o- (λιπότεκνος ‘abandoning children’). Some of these FCs employ zero-grade roots which are found in the thematic aorist of ablauting verbs: e.g. ἔλιπον from λείπω. It may therefore be formally correct to describe FCs such as λιπο- as *thematic aorist stems*, since -o- can be identified with the thematic vowel. However, it is unlikely that this formation process goes back to an early (pre-Greek) stage. The behaviour of -o-, as well as that of -ε- in V1 compounds suggests that, at a synchronic stage at least, these vowels often functioned as linking elements. In this function, they could be exported to other compound categories. This is further confirmed by the way -o- and -i- are selected and extended to certain compound sub-types.

<sup>22</sup> See also Risch (1974: 190–191) for the inclusion of these types of compounds in the φερέοικος type.

### 3.1 FCs in -o-

-o- does not uniquely characterize compounds from zero-grade roots which could therefore be analysed as employing the stem of the thematic aorist: it is also found in a number of FCs which are not connected to any thematic aorist, such as ἐθέλω ‘want’ > ἐθέλο- (aorist ἠθέλησα) or βούλομαι ‘will’ > βουλο- (aorist ἐβουλήθην). In these FCs, -o- may have been selected in the function of a mere linking element. This seems to have happened through two different derivational processes. The first has its starting point in nominal FCs which were re-interpreted as deriving from verbs. The model is the FC φιλο-, which characterized bahuvrihis such as φιλόξενος (‘having guests dear’) and was later re-interpreted as deriving from φιλέω (‘loving guests’).<sup>23</sup> Risch (1974: 193) situates the analogical process leading to the spread of -o- within the Homeric epics, arguing that φιλοπτόλεμος ‘loving war’ influenced the shape of its antonym φυγοπτόλεμος ‘escaping war’, which has identical SC and prosody.<sup>24</sup> φυγοπτόλεμος could then have triggered the association of -o- with zero-grade roots, employed in thematic aorist formations.

In other cases, as we have seen for φιλο-, -o- seems to be influenced by the existence of a noun or adjective in -ος (e.g. μῖσος ‘hatred’ > μισο-), though this criterion, which could also apply to dozens of other FCs (e.g. ἀρχε- vs. ἀρχός ‘captain’), remains restricted. For an understanding of why -o- was selected for FCs from certain verbs but not for others, it is useful to consider the role of semantic analogy in the spread of this second derivational process. A number of FCs ending in -o- express positive feelings or intentions: e.g. φιλο- ‘love’, βουλο- ‘will’, ἐθέλο- ‘want’ and μελλο- ‘be about to’. Others indicate negative feelings or intentions: e.g. μισο- ‘hate’, λιπο- ‘abandon / lack’ and φυγο- ‘avoid’. If Risch (1974: 193) is correct in assuming that φιλοπτόλεμος triggered φυγοπτόλεμος after φιλο- was re-analysed as a verbal stem, then it is possible to assume that other FCs showing similar meanings to these two (‘love’ / want’, ‘avoid / hate’, etc.) received the linking element -o- by analogy with these archetypes. Obviously this explanation should be regarded as a guiding principle rather than as a rule. Overall, many of the productive FCs in -o- seem to share a tendency to develop special semantics or to become grammaticalised, as we will see in the analysis of individual verbs in Chapters 5 and 6, and this provides early evidence for the spread of -o- as a *passepartout* linking element in Greek.

<sup>23</sup> See e.g. Brugmann (1905–1906: 66) and Chapter 6, section 5.

<sup>24</sup> This might represent a development from φυγε- which may be attested in the Mycenaean personal name *pu<sub>2</sub>-ke-qi-ri* (see section 5).



### 3.2 FCs in -ι-

As noted, a more restricted number of compound families of the *φερέοικος* type show the linking element -ι-. Among these, those from *ἄρχω* have developed a highly productive FC *ἀρχι-* which emerged alongside with the ‘regular’ *ἀρχε-*, though in appellative compounds at least there is a clear semantic and functional differentiation in that *ἀρχι-* is generally used as a prefix meaning ‘chief’ (see analysis in Chapter 6, section 3.1). According to Risch, this -ι- derives from the wrong segmentation of the compound *ἀρχι-ιερέυς* ‘chief-priest’ (Hdt.)—one of the first compounds from *ἄρχω* in which the FC acquires the meaning of ‘chief’—into *ἀρχι-ιερέυς*. He argues that this first example could have influenced another form, *ἀρχιτέκτων* ‘master-builder’ (Hdt.), and that the FC *ἀρχι-* was eventually selected as a determiner restricted to the specialist terminology of private and public professions, enjoying a high degree of productivity in Hellenistic and Roman times.<sup>25</sup>

Risch’s idea, however, is rather implausible in that it makes a single form responsible for a huge phenomenon of analogical extension. It is much more likely that -ι- is analogical on *τερψίμβροτος* compounds.<sup>26</sup> At least two FCs of *φερέοικος* compounds might be understood to be of the *τερψίμβροτος* type because their roots end in [s]: *ἀλεξι-* and *ἀεξι-*. Moreover, there is a manifest degree of artificial overlap between the FCs of the *φερέοικος* type and those of the *τερψίμβροτος* type: a few *τερψίμβροτος* compounds have the FC ending in -ε- or -ο- (e.g. *ἀκερσε-* and *στρεψο-*, see below) and a whole sub-group of forms in -εσι (e.g. *ἐλκ-ε-σι-*) may result from the conflation of both types.

## 4 *τερψίμβροτος* type: structure, stems and linking elements

The overview of the *τερψίμβροτος* type in Chapter 2 section 7.5.1 has shown that in this category too the FCs take different shapes because of the use of different linking elements. However, FCs in -τι- (*βωτιάνειρα*), -σε- (*περσέπτολις*) and -σο- (*Ἀμεισόπολις*) are much more restricted than the pervasive -σι-. The general rule holds that this marker is associated with verbs which produce a sigmatic aorist or future so that in the great majority of cases it is correct to say that -σι- is part of the selected verbal stem and only -ι- is an authentic linking element. This derivational rule is absolutely regular and the exceptions involve only the

<sup>25</sup> Risch (1949: 282–283).

<sup>26</sup> See Schwyzler (1939: 444). On early morphological interpretations of -ι-, which are now linguistically untenable, see the overview in Clemm (1867: 45–103).

FCs ἀγερσι- and ἐγερσι- from verbs ἀγείρω and ἐγείρω, which do not have tenses characterized by -σι-.

In the formation of sigmatic tenses, consonantal roots add -σ- directly to the root and the resulting FCs employ this sigmatic stem: examples are διώκω > aorist ἐδίωξα > FC διωξι-; ἀρπάζω > aorist ἤρπαξα > FC ἀρπαξι-; and ἐρείπω > aorist ἤρειψα > FC ἐρειψι-. Vocalic roots too add -σ- to their root in the full grade: for instance, δίδωμι > future δώσω > FC δωσι- or ἀκούω > aorist ἤκουσα > FC ἀκουσι-. FCs from *verba vocalia* in -έω and -άω usually show FCs in -ησι- and -ᾱσι- (which becomes -ησι- in Attic-Ionic), since the stem of their sigmatic tenses regularly lengthens the vowel: examples are αἰρέω > future αἰρήσω > FC αἰρησι- and νικάω > future νικήσω, aorist ἐνίκησα > FC νικησι-.

However, -έω verbs which have their original sigmatic tenses in -εσ-, i.e. without lengthening the vowel, accordingly tend to have FCs characterized by -εσι-: an example is καλέω > aorist ἐκάλεσα > FC καλεσι-. Since many of these -έω verbs are characterized by analogical phenomena, which lead to the creation of secondary sigmatic tenses in -ησ-, FCs in -ησι- may come to coexist with those in -εσι-. An example is αἰνέω: it produces two aorists, ἤνησα and ἤνεσα, which provide the stem for the FCs αἰνεσι- and αἰνησι-. This situation is the result of the complex history of -έω verbs which—as demonstrated by Tucker (1990)—result from the conflation of different verbal classes and may thus have different paradigms. FCs in -ησι- also regularly feature in compounds from verbs which have futures in -ησ- (but aorists of another type): for instance, εὐρίσκω > future εὐρήσω > FC εὐρησι- (vs. aorist εὔρον); ἀνδάνω > future ἀδήσω > FC ἀδησι- (vs. aorist ἔαδον); κιχάνω > future κιχήσομαι > FC κιχησι- (vs. aorist ἔκιχον).

Leaving aside the issue of the origin of *τερψίμβροτος* compounds and the specific analogical mechanisms behind the less common FCs, which will be tackled in the next sections, it is clear that from a synchronic point of view *τερψίμβροτος* compounds were a popular category in Greek because speakers connected them to sigmatic tenses (the aorist and the future): if this identification was possible, *τερψίμβροτος* compounds could in principle be created from any of these verbal forms.

#### 4.1 FCs in -εσι-, -σε- and -σο-

The popularity of compounds ‘characterized by -σι-’ also led to the exportation of -σι-, as well as -εσι-, to FCs from verbs which did not have sigmatic tenses. This confirms that, derivational rules aside, -σι- was perceived as a marker of this class of compounds as a whole. We considered above the FCs ἀγερσι- and ἐγερσι- in which -σι- does not derive from a sigmatic tense: it is interesting to note that

these FCs are rare and characterize compounds with a clear literary pedigree (see Chapter 6, section 3.2, and Chapter 5, section 5.1.1).

There are also several examples of the marker *-εσι-* being exported to compounds from verbs which do not have tenses in *-εσ-*. Most instances of analogical extension of *-εσι-* are found in FCs from verbs which lack sigmatic tenses: consider ἄγω > ἄγεσι-, ἀλφάνω > ἀλφεσι-, ἐγείρω > ἐγρεσι-, μένω > μενεσι-, τέμνω > ταμεσι-, and φέρω > φερεσι(i)-. Many of these analogical compounds correspond to an established *φερέοικος* type (e.g. ἄγεσι-, ἐγρεσι-, μενεσι- and φερεσι- vs. the more common ἄγε-, ἐγρε-, μενε- and φερε- types), of which they may represent the ‘longer’ (and thus metrically useful) variant.<sup>27</sup>

The artificiality of forms in *-εσι-* is also shown by the fact that many of these FCs are isolated: for instance, ἀλφεσι-, occurring only once in the Homeric epithet ἀλφεσίβοιος ‘bringing in oxen’, may well have been formed in this way to fit a hexametric line; *καμπεσι-* only occurs in two very late compounds; ἐλκεσι-, only found in the Homeric compound ἐλκεσίπεπλος ‘trailing the robe’, was probably created to avoid the cretic in the regular \*\*ἐλκέπεπλος; Helen’s epithet λιπεσάνωρ ‘abandoning her husband’ (Stes.) was a poetic alternative to popular compounds in λιπ(ο)-. Similarly artificial is the FC πειθεσι-, attested only once in the PN Πειθεσίλεως (fourth c. BC), perhaps a fancy substitute of the more common names in πεισι- and πειθε-.

FCs ending in *-σε-* and *-σο-* likewise derive largely from analogy with *φερέοικος* compounds. In Archaic Greek there are only two FCs ending in *-σε-*: ἀκερσε- and περσε-. In both cases *-ε-* is a mere linking element imported from *φερέοικος* compounds and does not have any special function, *pace* Chantraine and Bader, according to whom *-σε-* represents an old desiderative stem.<sup>28</sup> This hypothesis, impossible to prove on semantic and morphological grounds, does not explain why such ‘desideratives’ are not found in the FCs of other compounds. In particular, there is another reason to consider ἀκερσεκόμης ‘who does not shear his hair’ a peculiar formation. Its FC is negated by ἄ-, something which is exceptional in V1 compounds (it only occurs in ἀστεργής ‘not loving’). In some sense, the structure of this compound resembles that of negated *bahuvrihi*s, although the FC does not match any known adjective.<sup>29</sup> All these features concur in identifying ἀκερσεκόμης as a poetic formation with a high degree of artificial-

<sup>27</sup> See also Specht (1932: 69).

<sup>28</sup> See *DEG* s.v. ἀκερσεκόμης and Bader (1974: 3), according to whom forms in *-σε-* ‘sont tous bâtis sur des formes de présents thématiques dérivés (comme Χαυρε- en regard de χαίρω), qui sont des présents en \*-s<sup>e</sup>/<sub>o</sub>’.

<sup>29</sup> The negative prefix also precedes the FC in the Sophoclean ἀκερσεκόμης (identical meaning), which is clearly based on the Homeric compound.

ity. It must also be noted that in Homer the only sigmatic finite form of κείρω is the aorist third ps. sg. κέρσε / ἔκερσεν: the original FC \*\*κερσι- might have been altered into κερσε- through the influence of this verbal form.

As for περσέπτολις, the formula πόλιν πέρσε / πέρσειν occurs at least six times in the poems, thus representing a strong model for the compound (see in particular πέρσεν δὲ πόλιν in *Il.* 19.296).<sup>30</sup> -ε- also occurs in two PNs from ὄρνυμι, Ὀρσεδίκη and Ὀρσέλαος, in which -σε- is again preceded by -ρ-. In all likelihood, the -ε- deriving from φερέοικος compounds spread to the τερψίμβροτος type following formal analogy.

The linking element -ο- is found in a few PNs (Ἄμεινσόπολις, Ὀρσοάλιος, Ὀρσόβαρις) and in a handful of appellatives mostly of very late age. In all cases we face late developments of much more common types: thus Claudius Aelianus' λειψόθριξ 'having lost their hair' and λειψοσέληνον 'the moon's first or last quarter', found in the third-century anonymous treatise *De viribus herbarum*, are by-products of the type in λιπο-. Two compounds in στρεψο-, στρεψοδικέω 'twist the law' and the derivation στρεψοδικοπανουργία 'cunning in the perversion of justice', are found in Aristophanes, himself the source of the only other τερψίμβροτος compound derived from στρέφω 'twist' (στρεψίμαλλος 'with tangled fleece').

An interesting case of a τερψίμβροτος class in -ο- is the one from μείγνυμι, in which the FC μιξο- functions as a sort of prefix meaning 'mixed' or 'half' (e.g. μιξόμβροτος 'half-human': see analysis in Chapter 5, section 4.4). As in the case of ἀρχι- discussed above, this understanding represents a development of the original verbal meaning of the compounds, identifying someone 'who mixes with' (e.g. Μειξίδημος 'he who mingles with the people', μιξοβάββαρος 'mingling with barbarians').<sup>31</sup> Starting from these early forms, the FC in -ο- came to identify a new class of compounds, whose semantics is more of the determinative kind. As noted in section 3.1, -ο- tends to associate itself with verbal FCs which are liable to develop substantival or adjectival semantics.

#### 4.2 The synchronic role of action nouns

In their diachronic development from Classical Greek onwards, τερψίμβροτος compounds are also supported by the similarity with action nouns in -σις, which contribute to the creation of a regular derivational system based on different

<sup>30</sup> For the name of Persephone, which is not etymologically related to πέρθω though it might have been linked to it by folk-etymology, see the analysis in Chapter 6, section 3.2.

<sup>31</sup> Risch (1944: 49).

formations characterized by the *-s-* marker. This system, which decrees that the *τερψίμβροτος* type is more common than the *φερέουκος* type, developed particularly in the late Classical period, when action nouns seem to have greatly increased.<sup>32</sup> From the structural point of view, action nouns simply provide the formal pattern on which certain FCs are based: the compounds, however, are fully V1 compounds and not left-oriented [N N] formations.

The dynamics at play in the influence of action nouns on *τερψίμβροτος* compounds can be better understood by looking at the development that this inherited class of nominals underwent in Greek. In early Greek, action nouns were originally derived from the zero grade of roots,<sup>33</sup> but in Classical Greek they started to be created from verbal roots showing no ablaut, thus acquiring a full grade instead of the expected zero grade.<sup>34</sup> The influence of these later formations on *τερψίμβροτος* compounds is clear: see e.g. *ἔγερσις* ‘awaking’ (Hippocr.) > FC *ἐγερσι-*, *φεῦξις* ‘flight, escape’ (Soph.) > FC *φευξι-*, *ἄγερσις* ‘gathering’ (Hdt.) > FC *ἀγερσι-*. In this way action nouns came to be part of a system of forms sharing the presence of *-σ-*, to the extent that the compositional *-σι-* was perceived as an exportable suffix.<sup>35</sup> This is the reason behind the spread of *-σι-* to the *φερέουκος* type, as argued above. This *passerpartout* nature of the *-σι-* element in Classical Greek may also have been encouraged by the fact that *-σι-* also featured outside V1 compounds, since there were compounds whose FCs derived from dative plurals, such as *ναυσίκλυτος* or *ἐγγεσίμωρος*.

### 4.3 FCs in *-τι-*

Mycenaean and Homeric language also attest to the existence of a residual compound type characterized by a FC ending in *-τι-*. Most of these compounds are opaque as concerns the morphology of their FCs, which cannot be connected to any existing verbal tense or verbal noun characterized by *-t-* except for agent nouns. As we have seen in Chapter 3 (sections 4.4 and 5.1), many scholars have claimed, with various arguments, that compounds in *-τι-* were the oldest type of *τερψίμβροτος* compounds and this is the reason why they are treated here. It is also widely accepted that at a later stage these original *-τι-* forms underwent

<sup>32</sup> On the increase of action nouns from fifth-century Greek onwards, see e.g. Schwyzler (1939: 536), Holt (1941: 158–165), Browning (1958), Willi (2003: 134–136).

<sup>33</sup> It is disputed to what extent this state of affairs represents the original situation in PIE: see section 4.3.1 below.

<sup>34</sup> See Vine (2004: 358).

<sup>35</sup> Horrocks and Stavrou (2001: 26).

assibilation to *-si-*, triggering the formation of a new and independent class of compounds characterized by *-si-* and synchronically linked to sigmatic tenses (τερψίμβροτος). The theories put forward by these scholars—different in the details as they may be—have a common basis: that the FC of τερψίμβροτος compounds originally was not a verb but a noun (either an action noun or an agent noun), and that its association with the s-aorist was a later development. One of the most recent of revivals of this hypothesis is the argument that was voiced by Jochem Schindler, who claimed that the ancestors of τερψίμβροτος compounds were bahuvrihis with an action noun in the FC:

Der ursprüngliche Stammausgang *-τι-* des in der Wurzel hochstufigen Kompositionsanfangsglieds wurde durch die Assibilation zu *-σι-*. Danach entsprach das Wortstück vor dem *ι* (τερψ-) dem Stamm der sigmatischen Tempora Aorist und Futurum. In der Folge hängt die Bildmöglichkeit von TK [τερψίμβροτος-Komposita] von der Existenz eines (synchron) sigmatischen Tempusstammes ab, ohne daß jedoch die Funktion dieser Stämme vom Komp. übernommen wird; δηζίθυμος unterscheidet sich semantisch nicht von δακέθυμος. Schindler (1997: 539).

The second part of Schindler's statement may well serve as a rule of thumb for the synchronic analysis of τερψίμβροτος compounds and their productivity which, as we have seen, depends on the possibility of linking the FC to an existing sigmatic tense. However, we must carefully evaluate the two related sides of the diachronic dimension of his theory. First, the question of whether it can be posited that the FC of these compounds derives from old action nouns, which raises the problem of the unusual structure and orientation of the compounds; secondly, whether the idea that FCs in *-ti-* are the unassibilated ancestors of FCs in *-si-* is tenable. We will tackle the morphological and structural issues first, focusing on the controversial Vedic evidence as well.

#### 4.3.1 Do Greek FCs in *-ti-* and *-si-* go back to old action or agent nouns?

The assumption that forms in *-ti-* and *-si-* originally contained action or agent nouns rather than verbal stems needs revising, for three different reasons. As far as the action noun hypothesis is concerned, this is in no way supported by the Greek evidence, as already noted by Knecht (1946)—who, however, still accepted it. As the data in Table 4.1 show, the root grade of most Greek *-σις* nouns is different from the root grade of the FCs in *-τι-*, so that a derivation of these early V1 compounds from the corresponding action nouns is difficult.

The discrepancy with the vocalic grade of the corresponding action nouns also concerns many of the fifty-one *-si-* compounds attested between the second millennium and the seventh c. BC, which represent the oldest layer of τερψίμβροτος

**Table 4.1:** Transparent V1 compounds with a FC ending in -ti.<sup>36</sup>

Compound	Present	Common aorist	Action noun	Agent noun
βητάρμων	βαίνω	ἔβην	βάσις	-βήτης -βάτης
βωτιάνειρα	βόσκω	ἐβόσκησα	βόσις	βοτήρ, -βότηρ βώτωρ βώτης
Δωτώ < Δωτι-	δίδωμι	ἔδωκα	δόσις	δοτήρ δότης, -δότης
Καστιάνειρα	καίνυμαι			Κάστωρ
<i>ne-ti-ja-no /Nestiānōr/</i>	νέομαι			<i>pi-ro-ne-ta</i> <i>/Philonestās/</i> Νέστωρ
<i>o-ti-na-wo /Ortināwos/</i> Ὀρτίλοχος	ὄρνυμι	ῶρσα		-ορτᾶς

compounds. To begin with, there are sixteen verbs for which an action noun is never attested in Greek: αἰρώ (ἀεροίπους), ἀλφάνω (ἀλφεσίβιος), ἀνάσσω (Ἄναξιμανδρος), δαίδω (Δειοσίνωρ), ἔλκω (ἐλκεσίπεπλος), ἔρω (Ἐρπετίδαμος), ἔρυμαι (ἐρυσίπτολις; ἔρυσις ‘drawing’ is from ἐρύω ‘to draw’), ἴημι (Ἡσίοδος), κείρω (ἀκερσεκόμης), κλέπτω (κλεψίφρων), μμνήσκω (*ma-na-si-we-ko*), ὄλλυμι (ὄλεσίνωρ), πίμπλημι (πλησίσιος), σπένδω (Σπενσίθεος), τέμνω (ταμεσίχρος), φάω (φραεσίμβροτος).

Another thirteen verbs produce an action noun, but this is attested much later than the compounds: ἀάω > ἀεσίφρων (ἄεσις, Hsch.), ἄγαμαι > Ἀγασίλεως (ἄγασις, *EM*), ἀλέξω > *a-re-ka-sa-da-ra* (ἄλεξις, Aristid.), αἰνέω > Αἰνησιμβρότᾶ (αἰνεσις, LXX), δαμάζω > δαμασίμβροτος (δάμασις, Sch. Soph.), ἔραμαι > Ἐρασιμένης (ἔρασις, *EM*), ἡγέομαι > Ἀγησιχόρα (ἡγησις, LXX), πείθω > Πείσανδρος (πεῖσις, Plot.), πέρθω > περσέπτολις (πέρσις, Aristot.), πήγνυμι > πηγεσίμαλλος (πῆξις, Pl.), πλήσσω > πλήξιππος (πλήξις, Ti. Locr.), ράπτω > ράψωδός (ράψις, Eust.), τιμάω > Τιμησικλῆς (τίμησις, Pl.).

The most cogent point is that the FC of many of the oldest -si- compounds shows the full grade of the verbal stem, whereas the attested action nouns are all in the zero grade: see βαίνω > Ἀναβησίλεως (βάσις), ἴστημι > Στησίχορος (στάσις),

<sup>36</sup> The interpretation of most Mycenaean *specimina* is tentative: for this reason, they are not included here (see sections 7.1–7.9 for a full discussion). I have not included in this list the PN Τριπτόλεμος which Janda (2000: 24–35) considers to be an obscured V1 compound derived from τριβω ‘to crush’ and ἔλυμος ‘millet’ (for the initial vowel he compares the *EM* gloss ὄλεμεύς ‘gatherer’), yielding the meaning ‘he who crushes millet’. I consider this interpretation dubious.

λύω > λῦσις (λύσις, with ὕ), φθίνω > φθεισίνωρ (φθίσις), φύω > φύσις (φύσις, with ὕ).

Out of fifty-one compounds only seven among those attested before the fourth century BC have corresponding action nouns: ἄρκέω > Ἄρκεσίλαος (ἄρκεσις, Soph.), *e-ne-si-da-o-ne* (ἔνοσις, Hes.), ζεύγνυμι > Ζευξίδαμος (Ζεῦξις, Hdt.), κταόμαι > Κτήσιππος (κτῆσις, Thuc.), ῥήγνυμι > ῥήξήνωρ (ῥήξις, Hippocr.), τανύω > τανυσίπτερος (τάνυσις, Hippocr.), τέρω > τερψίμβροτος (τέρψις, Hes.). These data support Dunkel's claim that 'the -σι-forms are as closely related to the *s*-aorist as they are distant from nouns in *\*-ti-*'.<sup>37</sup>

Since the formation rules of action nouns in PIE are debated, it may still be possible to assume that the Greek situation is the result of analogical levelling, by which the compound FCs generalized the full grade of PIE action nouns, while the *simplicia* generalized the zero grade.<sup>38</sup> However, the problem that this left-oriented structure is extraordinary in the IE languages, as argued below, would still remain.

We have seen that, according to Schindler, originally τερψίμβροτος compounds were bahuvrihis with action nouns in the FC and another noun in the SC: i.e., if we use τερψίμβροτος as an example, 'having delight (τέρψις) of men'. According to Schindler, these bahuvrihis conveyed a special factitive meaning ('making men happy, delighting men'), which later triggered their association with verbs. But, if this reconstruction is correct, we would be positing that PIE had a large class of left-oriented [N N] bahuvrihis, with the *determinatum* occurring on the left. This issue is completely overlooked in current discussions of the V1 type, but needs careful consideration since the evidence from all the ancient IE languages, and from most of the modern languages as well, shows that such 'reversed bahuvrihis' are exceptional, and often arise within the individual languages for specific morphological or semantic reasons (see Chapter 2, section 7.2): arguing for the existence of a whole class of this type for PIE has important consequences for the way we think about the PIE compound system. It is telling that the theories which implicitly posit the existence of such a reversed structure in PIE

<sup>37</sup> Dunkel (1992: 214).

<sup>38</sup> The views of Indo-Europeanists on the formation of action nouns diverge. According to some, for instance Rix (1979: 736), the original pattern was proterodynamic: strong forms had the full grade of the root and zero grade of the suffix, while weak forms had zero grade in the root and full grade in the suffix. The zero grade shown by many historical action nouns has been considered to arise from an early PIE analogical levelling, which wiped out the full grade from the productive formation of action nouns: see for instance Rix (1992: 358). On the other hand, other scholars—for instance Vine (2004)—maintain that this analogical levelling happened only quite late and that action nouns continuing the full-grade forms are still attested in some of the individual languages. Vine's chronology is heavily dependent on his interpretation of the FCs of τερψίμβροτος and *dāti-vāra-* compounds as old action nouns, based on the full grade of the root.



also end up positing that it conveys special semantics, a feature which is evident in Schindler's class of 'factive bahuvrihis'.

Admittedly, the Vedic evidence is often used as crucial support in favour of the existence of compounds characterized by action nouns in *-ti-* in PIE. But the second reason why the action noun hypothesis seems untenable concerns precisely these Vedic examples. In a nutshell (the evidence is analysed in full in section 4.3.2), in Vedic the *-ti-* type is not common at all and half of the attested forms seem to be mutually influenced: *púṣṭi-gu-* 'making cows prosper' and *śrúṣṭi-gu-* 'making cows obedient' (?) occur in the same line, have the same SC and their FCs rhyme with each other, while *vīti-rādhas-* 'enjoying the gift' and *vīti-hotra-* 'enjoying the offering' have the same FC (more on these compounds in the next section). The Vedic compounds in *-ti-*, as argued below, are certainly liable to be interpreted as 'reversed bahuvrihis', but their very rarity and highly poetic pedigree is a confirmation of their exceptional status, which we should be cautious in attributing to the parent language without further thought.

The same structural problems affect the other theory on the origin of FCs in *-ti-*, the one which—starting from the fact that the root employed in some agentive nouns and compounds characterized by *-t-* is identical to that employed in the FCs of V1 compounds in *-ti-*—suggests that these compounds originally contained agent nouns (Chapter 3, section 6).<sup>39</sup> As sections 5.1 and 6 argue, the idea that *-t-* and *-i-* represent compositional devices specifically used to make it possible to derive compound constituents from certain kinds of roots is a useful one. However, the corollary that these FCs represent real agent nouns must be discarded because, again, we would be facing a left-oriented compound category of the head-determiner kind which is unusual in Greek and unlikely to have existed in PIE. The issue of the structure displayed by these compounds is overlooked by the scholars who subscribe to this hypothesis. Moreover, since V1 compounds are invariably adjectives, it would remain to be explained how these compounds employing agent nouns (which are substantives) in the FC could become adjectives: what is not clear is whether a transition is envisaged from an endocentric character of these compounds in an earlier phase to their exocentric character in Greek.

### 4.3.2 The action nouns hypothesis: excursus on the Vedic evidence

As noted, the starting point of the theory which interprets the original FC of *τερψίμβροτος* compounds as an action noun is necessarily the Vedic layer of Sanskrit, where there are no compounds in *-si-* and there are ten compounds in

<sup>39</sup> Bechtel (1914: 65), Specht (1932: 72), Bader (1968: xix) and Bader (1974: 46). See also Tronci (2000: 304), Stefanelli (2008: 21–22), Nielsen Whitehead (2012: 79).

-*ti*-. Wackernagel (1905: 320) lists only six compounds: *dā́ti-vara-* (RV 1.167.8), *púṣṭi-gu-* (RV 8.3.1b), *vī́ti-rā́dhas* (RV 9.62.29c), *rī́ty-ā́p-* (RV 5.68.5a; 9.106.9c), *vī́ti-hotra-* (RV 1.84.18.d, etc.) and *vṛṣṭi-dyāv-* (RV 5.68.5a). To these, Nielsen Whitehead (2012: 44–46) adds *abhiṣṭi-dyumna-* ‘whose glory is a help/protection’ (RV 4.51.7b), *abhiṣṭi-śavas-* ‘rendering powerful assistance’ (RV 3.59.8b) *āsamāty-ojas-* (RV 6.29.6c) ‘of unequalled strength’ and *śrúṣṭi-gu-* (RV 8.51.1d). She argues that in all these Vedic compounds, except *dā́ti-vara-*, the FC could be an action noun and that they could be reversed bahuvrihis.<sup>40</sup>

*púṣṭi-gu-*, a personal name, is glossed by Wackernagel as ‘making cows prosper’, an interpretation implying that the FC is a verbal form from *puṣ-* ‘to prosper, to make prosper’.<sup>41</sup> The interpretation as a bahuvrihi, suggested by Nielsen Whitehead, is equally possible if one takes the FC to correspond to the action noun *púṣṭi* (or, with alternative accentuation, *puṣṭi*) ‘growth, increase, prosperity’. *púṣṭi-gu-* would thus mean ‘having prosperity of cows’ (left-oriented structure) or ‘having cows of prosperity’ (right-oriented structure). As Nielsen Whitehead (2012: 46) points out, in the same Rig-Vedic line *púṣṭi-gu-* is followed by *śrúṣṭi-gu-* which may contain the action noun *śrúṣṭi-* ‘obedience’ (i.e. ‘having obedient cows’): the two compounds are clearly connected by rhyming principles.

Three of the remaining compounds listed by Wackernagel (1905: 320) correspond to Vedic action nouns. *Rī́ty-ā́p-* ‘moving water’ or ‘having a course of water’ corresponds to *rī́ti-* ‘motion, course’.<sup>42</sup> *Vī́ti-rā́dhas-* ‘enjoying the gift’ and *vī́ti-hotra-* ‘enjoying the offering’ correspond to *vī́ti-* ‘enjoyment, feast’ and could be understood as ‘having enjoyment of gifts’ and ‘having enjoyment of offerings’ respectively.<sup>43</sup> Finally, the FC of *vṛṣṭi-dyāv-* ‘having a rainy sky’ is connected to *varṣ-* ‘to rain’. Wackernagel (1905: 320) interprets this compound as a factitive V1 compound meaning ‘making the sky rain’, but Nielsen Whitehead (2012: 48) notes the formal similarity of its FC with the adjective *vṛṣṭimánt-* ‘rainy’. In Vedic, like in other ancient IE languages, denominal adjectives are not admitted as compound constituents: the FC *vṛṣṭi-* could therefore cover for the adjective *vṛṣṭimánt-*. The other compounds added by Nielsen Whitehead are all compatible with Vedic action nouns as well.<sup>44</sup>

**40** According to Nielsen Whitehead (2012: 40), this explains why the Sanskrit grammarians did not discuss these compounds at all. The V1 interpretation however remains the most popular among scholars: see recently Remmer (2007: 121).

**41** This agrees with Wackernagel’s idea that the FC of these compounds derived from infinitives in -*ti*-.

**42** Nielsen Whitehead (2012: 46).

**43** Nielsen Whitehead (2012: 46–47).

**44** See the analysis in Nielsen Whitehead (2012: 48).

*Dāti-vara-* ‘giving gifts’ is more obscure. While the FC *dāti-* in theory points to an action noun from *dā-* ‘give’ (< \**deh*<sub>3</sub>-), such a simplex is not attested. Moreover, the meaning of this hypothetical bahuvrihi, ‘whose treasures are gifts’, would not be straightforward.<sup>45</sup> Therefore, the question remains open as to whether *dāti-vara-* may be the only relic of a truly V1 type which Vedic has otherwise lost.

As noted in the previous section, the use of action nouns as compound FCs in left-oriented compounds goes both against the structural tendencies that can be reconstructed for the PIE compound system and the practice of Greek, where no such bahuvrihis exist (τερψιμβροτος compounds being construed as V1 compounds based on s-stem tenses by speakers). A few words on this topic are now necessary, since Nielsen Whitehead (2012) does not address the issue of compound orientation. The ‘odd’ Vedic bahuvrihis with action nouns in the FC can be better understood if one considers that in this language right-oriented compounds with an action noun in the SC are extremely common.<sup>46</sup> The development of a full class of compounded action nouns parallels the high number of *simplicia*, which are derived both from roots in the zero grade and from roots in the full grade, and in Classical Sanskrit generally from every kind of verb.<sup>47</sup>

Synchronically speaking, Vedic compounds such as *pūṣṭi-gu-* may then represent the left-oriented counterpart of the more widespread types employing action nouns in the SC. In view of the fact that Sanskrit, just like Greek, shows an overwhelming tendency towards right-oriented compounds (the right-headed determinative type being the most common), the likely conclusion is that the very rare Vedic compounds in *-ti-* containing action nouns in the FC arose in poetic language out of the reanalysis of other types. It is likely that if PIE ever had V1 compositional type with FCs ending in *-ti-* this did not survive in Sanskrit as such. A similar conclusion was reached by Specht, who explained the Sanskrit type with action nouns in the FC as a Sanskrit development, arising from the reinterpretation of an old PIE class which had become obscure in this language.<sup>48</sup>

## 5 -ti- and -si- forms in Greek: the Mycenaean evidence

If we discard the idea that the FC of forms in *-ti-* contained nominal stems, we are left with the hypothesis that they contain verbal stems or roots. As already noted, the nature of the *-ti-* element itself is obscure: in order to assess how it could

<sup>45</sup> Nielsen Whitehead (2012: 48).

<sup>46</sup> See Wackernagel (1905: 190–191).

<sup>47</sup> Debrunner (1954: 622, 629–631).

<sup>48</sup> Specht (1932: 79).

relate to verbal stems, we must consider its relation with *-si-*, both in Greek and in a prospective reconstructed phase. Insofar as concerns the beginnings of the V1 type in Greek, the fundamental question is whether we should posit that FCs in *-si-* uniquely derive from the assibilation of those in *-ti-* (which must therefore be considered as the only authentic type at a PIE stage) or whether it may be possible to assume that a *-si-* type had already developed before assibilation took place, i.e. prior to Mycenaean. In this latter scenario, we would have to assume that *-ti-* and *-si-* characterized two parallel but separate compound types, both possibly of late PIE age.<sup>49</sup>

In order to answer these questions, a careful examination of the Mycenaean evidence is mandatory, since in second-millennium Greek compounds in *-ti-* are still as numerous as those in *-si-*. In Mycenaean, V1 compounds are only attested as PNs. Including many uncertain forms, the total number reaches thirty-nine forms (twenty *φερέοικος* compounds and nineteen *τερψίμβροτος* compounds), though the syllabic script and the inherent difficulty in the analysis of PNs determines that the interpretation of many of these forms is speculative.<sup>50</sup>

**Table 4.2:** Mycenaean compounds of the *φερέοικος* type

Compound	Transcription	Verb/ root
1. <i>a-ke-ra-wo</i>	/Ark <sup>h</sup> elāwos/ /Agelāwos/	ἄρχω ἄγω
2. <i>a-ke-wa-ta</i>	/Ark <sup>h</sup> ewastās/	ἄρχω
3. <i>a-ke-wa-to</i>	/Ark <sup>h</sup> ewastos/	ἄρχω
4. <i>a-ko-so-ta</i>	/Alksoitās/	ἀλέξω
5. <i>a-re-ka-sa-da-ra</i>	/Aleksandrā/	ἀλέξω
6. <i>e-ke-da-mo</i>	/Hek <sup>h</sup> edāmos/	ἔχω
7. <i>e-ke-me-de</i>	/Hek <sup>h</sup> emēdēs/	ἔχω
8. <i>e-ke-ḡu-wo</i>	/Hek <sup>h</sup> e-?/	ἔχω
9. ]e-qe-ra-wo	/Hek <sup>h</sup> elāwos/	ἔπομαι

<sup>49</sup> Not many scholars have posited a separate origin for *-ti-* and *-si-*: among these, see Bader (1970), Dunkel (1992), Stefanelli (2008: 21–22).

<sup>50</sup> For a fuller list, see Waanders (2008: 15–19). Four other forms (the titles *ke-u-po-da* and *da-i-ja-ke-re-u* and the adjectives *we-a-re-pe* and *we-je-ke-a<sub>2</sub>*) have been at times analysed as V1 compounds, but the proposed interpretations are unconvincing. The analysis of *ke-u-po-da* as /k<sup>h</sup>eu-spondās/ ‘libation-pourer’ and *da-i-ja-ke-re-u* as /dahi-agrēus/ ‘land-divider’ defy all formation rules of the V1 type: in the first compound we would expect the FC to be /k<sup>h</sup>ewe-/, while the FC /dahi/, if it derives from /dasi/ < \*das- ‘divide’, would show lenition of intervocalic [s], a phenomenon not attested by other Mycenaean V1 compounds. As for *we-a-re-pe* and *we-je-ke-a<sub>2</sub>*, qualifying oil and wheels respectively, the supposed verbal FC *we-* does not allow a clear interpretation. See Waanders (2008: 16–19), and also *DMic s.vv.*

Compound	Transcription	Verb/ root
10. <i>e-wa-ko-ro</i>	?/Hewak <sup>h</sup> ōros/?	έάω
11. <i>ka-da-no</i>	/Kādānōr/?	κήδομαι
12. <i>ne-e-ra-wo</i> , dat.	/Nehelāwōi/, dat.	νέομαι
13. <i>o-pe-ra-no</i>	/Op <sup>h</sup> elānōr/	οφέλλω
14. <i>pe-ra-ko</i>	/P <sup>h</sup> erakos/	φέρω
15. <i>pi-ro-wo-na</i>	/P <sup>h</sup> ilowoinā/	φιλέω
16. <i>pi-ro-pa-ta-ra</i>	/P <sup>h</sup> ilopatrā/	φιλέω
17. <i>pu<sub>2</sub>-ke-qi-ri</i>	/P <sup>h</sup> ugeg <sup>w</sup> wrīns/	ξφυγον
18. <i>qi-ri-ta-ko</i>	/G <sup>w</sup> rīt <sup>h</sup> ark <sup>h</sup> os/	βρίθω
19. <i>we-wa-do-ro</i>	/Werwandros/	έρύομαι
20. <i>Jke-se-ra-wo</i>	?/Aukselāwos/?	αΰξω

**Table 4.3:** Mycenaean compounds of the *τερψίμβροτος* and *βωτιάνειρα* types

Compound	Transcription	Verb / root
1. <i>a-ti-pa-mo?</i>	/Artiphāmos/	ἀραρίσκω?
2. <i>e-ne-si-da-o-ne</i> , dat.	/Enesidāhōnei/	?
3. <i>e-ti-me-de-i</i> , dat.	/Ertimēdehi/, dat.	ὄρνυμι
4. <i>e-ti-ra-wo</i>	/Ertilāwos/	ὄρνυμι
5. <i>ka-sa-no</i>	/Kassānōr/	* <i>k<sub>h</sub>gd-</i> , κέκασμαι
6. <i>ka-ta-no</i>	/Kastānōr/	* <i>k<sub>h</sub>gd-</i> , κέκασμαι
7. <i>?Jke-ti-ra-wo</i>	?/Kestilāwos/	* <i>kens</i> <sup>51</sup>
8. <i>ke-sa-da-ra</i>	/Kessandrā/	* <i>kens-</i>
9. <i>ke-sa-do-ro</i>	/Kessandros/	* <i>kens-</i>
10. <i>ma-na-si-we-ko</i>	/Mnāsiwergos/	μυνήσκω
11. <i>me-ti-ja-no</i>	/Mēstiānōr/	μήδομαι
12. <i>ne-ti-ja-no</i>	/Nestiānōr/	νέομαι
13. <i>o-ti-na-wo</i>	/Ortināwos/	ὄρνυμι
14. <i>qa-sa-ko</i>	/K <sup>w</sup> āsark <sup>h</sup> os/	πάομαι <sup>52</sup>
15. <i>qi-si-ja-ko</i>	/K <sup>w</sup> īsiark <sup>h</sup> os/	τίνω
16. <i>ta-si-ko-no</i>	?/Stāsigonos/?	ἴστημι?
17. <i>ta-ta-ke-u</i>	/Stātark <sup>h</sup> ēus/	ἴστημι
18. <i>ta-ti-qo-we-u</i>	/Stātīg <sup>w</sup> ōwēus/ or /Tāti g <sup>w</sup> ōwēus]	ἴστημι or *(s)teh <sub>2</sub> - (τητάομαι)
19. <i>wa-ti-ko-ro</i>	/Wāstik <sup>h</sup> oros/	ἦδομαι

<sup>51</sup> ‘Speak authoritatively’: see García Ramón (1992: 245–247).

<sup>52</sup> García Ramón (2000b). The root behind πάομαι, πέπαμαι does not have parallels outside Greek: see EDG s.v. πέπαμαι. The s-aorist ἐπάσαμην is not attested before the fifth century BC (e.g. Gortyn Law Code, 6.5). See also Chapter 5, section 5.

In the *φερέοικος* type (table 4.2) all FCs end in *-e-* or are elided: as far as we can tell, there are no FCs ending in *-i-* and *-o-* (with the exception of those in *φιλο-* which, however, have a special status, see section 3.1). In the *τερψίμβροτος* type (table 4.3), on the other hand, both FCs in *-s(i)-* and in *-t(i)-* are attested.

Although not all the PNs in tables 4.2 and 4.3 have met with unanimous interpretation, a number of them are widely agreed upon: for instance *a-ke-wa-ta*, *e-ke-da-mo*, *a-re-ka-sa-da-ra*, *e-ke-me-de*, *ma-na-si-we-ko*, *ne-ti-ja-no*, *o-ti-na-wo*, and *ke-sa-da-ra*.<sup>53</sup> Once the superficial obscurity of the syllabic script is resolved, it appears that most first and second constituents of V1 Mycenaean compounds may be antecedents of those featuring in widely attested first-millennium names. The Mycenaean V1 compounds that have identical alphabetic parallels are *a-ke-ra-wo* (Ἀγέλαος or Ἀρχέλαος), *pi-ro-pa-ta-ra* (~ Φιλοπάτωρ), *a-re-ka-sa-da-ra* (Ἀλεξάνδρα), *e-ti-ra-wo* (~ Ὀρσίλαος), *ka-sa-no* (~ Κάσσανδρος), *ke-sa-da-ra* and *ke-sa-do-ro* (Κεσάνδρα, a variant attested on Corinthian vases), *ma-na-si-we-ko* (Μνησιεργός), *ne-ti-ja-no* (~ Νέσσανδρος), *qa-sa-ko* (Πάσσαρχος), *ta-si-ko-no* (~ Στᾶσιγόνη), *ta-ta-ke-u* (~ Στήσαρχος).<sup>54</sup>

Other names do not have an identical parallel in alphabetic Greek, but may be continued by forms with the opposite orientation, for instance *pi-ro-wo-na* (~ Ὀινόφιλος) or *me-ti-ja-no* (~ Ἄνδρομήδης). A remarkable element of continuity between the two stages of the Greek language is the preservation of cultic epithets in *ἐνοσί-* (*e-ne-si-da-o-ne*, ἐννοσίδαις, ἐνοσίχθων, εἰνοσίφυλλος, ἐννοσίγαιος: although the differences in the shape of the FCs are problematic), which held ground in spite of the lack of a Greek verb from this verbal root.<sup>55</sup> These correspondences show that archaic Greek onomastics continues a compound type which was already fully developed in Mycenaean.

In other names the constituents do not match attested alphabetic Greek forms, but their structure and semantics are expressed by synonyms, or ‘substitutive elements’ (*Ersatzkontinuante*).<sup>56</sup> These forms include names from \**kens-* ‘speak authoritatively’ (continued by αἰνέω ‘speak well, praise’, e.g. Αἰνησιμβρότᾱ); \**seǵh-* ‘hold’ (*e-ke-me-de*), but also originally ‘overcome’ (*e-ka-no*) and as such semantically continued by names in Νικο- (Νικάνωρ, Νικομήδης), *ne-e-ra-wo* ‘he who brings his people back, he who saves his people’, and as such continued

**53** The question of whether Ἀλέξανδρος (and thus Ἀλεξάνδρα) originally was an Anatolian name is irrelevant: even if it was, in Greek the name was reanalysed according to the V1 pattern and this may well have happened already in the second millennium BC. See also García Ramón (2011: 218).

**54** On all these forms see García Ramón (2009), with further discussion and bibliography.

**55** See Plath (1999), García Ramón (2009), García Ramón (2011: 235).

**56** This concept is often used in J. L. García Ramón’s works on Greek onomastics: see e.g. García Ramón (2000–2001), (2002), (2005a), (2009) among others.

by compounds in  $\Sigma\omega\sigma\iota$ -, and *ta-ti-qo-we-u*, both if the FC is from  $*steh_2$ -, yielding the meaning ‘he who stands by the cows’ or ‘he makes cows stand’ (cf.  $\beta\omicron\upsilon\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\iota\acute{\alpha}$  ‘ox-stall’,  $\Sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\sigma\iota\pi\omicron\varsigma$  ‘he who makes horses stand’) and, conversely, if it is derived from  $\tau\eta\tau\acute{\alpha}\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$  (cf.  $\beta\omicron\acute{\omicron}\kappa\lambda\epsilon\psi$  ‘stealing oxen’). To this group we can also add *pu<sub>2</sub>-ke-qi-ri*, which García Ramón (2009) interprets as following the semantic pattern ‘escaping (a heavy) evil’ (thus corresponding to alphabetic forms such as  $\Phi\upsilon\gamma\acute{\omicron}\lambda\iota\mu\omicron\varsigma$  ‘escaping hunger’).

### 5.1 Are -ti- forms the ancestors of -si- forms?

If forms in -ti- are the ancestors of those in -si-, we must conclude that Mycenaean represents a stage in which the replacement of -ti- with -si- had not been completed yet. The evaluation of the factors impeding the replacement of -ti- forms with -si- forms must start from consideration of the dynamics of assibilation, the phonological innovation yielding the change of [ti] into [si], which many Greek varieties, and among them Mycenaean, underwent. Assibilation concerns the voiceless dentals [t] and [tʰ] followed by [i] and [e], which become sibilants after an intermediate stage as affricates ([ts]).<sup>57</sup> The Linear B tablets, however, also contain a good number of forms in which the sound change has not taken place: e.g. the place-name *do-ti-ja* /Dōtiā/ or the adjective *me-ri-ti-jo* /melitios/ ‘honeyed’.<sup>58</sup>

Among these unassibilated forms there are V1 PNs with the FC ending in -ti-. There are two possible interpretations for the lack of assibilation in these FCs. First, it may be assumed that assibilation had run to completion in Mycenaean, but that -ti- survived in many compound FCs owing to the conservative nature of onomastics. A similar explanation has been offered for the coexistence of  $\text{Ὀ}\rho\tau\acute{\iota}\lambda\omicron\chi\omicron\varsigma$  and  $\text{Ὀ}\rho\sigma\acute{\iota}\lambda\omicron\chi\omicron\varsigma$  in Homeric Greek: the former could be regarded as a more conservative form (see section 8.1). The second possibility is that in these V1 PNs assibilation of [ti] into [si] was blocked in certain environments, failing to run to completion. Work on failed assibilation in Mycenaean has been carried out by Thompson (2008), who mentions analogy and lexical diffusion as two phenomena likely to have interfered with assibilation.

If we follow this second path, it is necessary to find specific factors of a morphological, phonological or analogical nature which could have intervened to block assibilation in V1 FCs in -ti-. In this respect, it is fundamental to realize that the Mycenaean compounds preserving -ti- are of two different types. In the first

<sup>57</sup> Bartoněk (2003: 144).

<sup>58</sup> Forms are collected in Thompson (2008: 754–755).

type, *-ti-* is preceded by [s], be it original (as in compounds in /nesti/ from \*nes-) or secondary (as in compounds in /mēsti/ from \*mēd- or in /kasti/ from \*k̂nd-). In these forms, when the cluster [sti] is followed by a consonant (the initial sound of the SC), [sti] is blocked by the phonetic environment, since the dental is not in intervocalic position.<sup>59</sup> When the SC begins with a vowel some compounds which can be reconstructed as having contained the cluster [sti] appear to have undergone another sound-change, palatalization. Palatalization is a process by which a consonant comes to be pronounced with the tongue against the palate. In Greek, this happens with dentals and velars followed by a closed vowel (e.g. [i]), which occurs before another vowel: [i] becomes a glide, [j]. At a first stage the articulation of the consonant preceding the glide is moved back towards the palate. In Greek, this change also produces a current of air between consonant and vowel, which is similar to that produced by sibilants: as a result, [tj] becomes [tsi] or [ssi] (note that the geminate is represented by simple *s* in the Linear B spelling conventions).<sup>60</sup>

An example of a PN which has been affected by palatalization is *ke-sa-do-ro* /Kessandros/ from /Kesti-andros/ through the intermediary stage /Kestjandros/. Even within this group there are, however, forms in which palatalization has failed to take place: for instance \**Kasti-ānōr* seems to have yielded both *ka-sa-no* /Kassānōr/ and *ka-ta-no* /Kastānōr/ and in the latter the element *-t-* is preserved, but *-i-* is not employed. The dynamics ruling these oscillations are not entirely clear. In section 7.9 we will consider the solution proposed by García Ramón (1992), who argues that the coexistence of palatalized and non-palatalized forms is ruled by rhythmical factors. In summary, therefore, a special phonetic environment isolates a number of FCs in *-ti-* (those preceded by *-s-*) from others.

For the question of the relation between *-ti-* and *-si-* forms the second group of Mycenaean FCs in *-ti-* is, on the other hand, of fundamental importance. This type is characterized by full-grade roots in which the element *-ti-* is preceded by a vowel or by [r]: examples are *ta-ti-ḡo-we-u* (with a FC /Stāti-/ or /Tāti-/) and *o-ti-na-wo* (with the FC /Orti-/). In these phonetic environments, [ti] is free to assibilate, but in the PNs under consideration here it does not. These compounds are similar to the first-millennium *-τι-* forms studied by Specht, characterized by the full grade and the suffix *-τι-* (βητάρμων, Ὀρτίλοχος etc.). As noted by Specht (1932), the simple and compounded agent nouns of these verbs mostly show the same root grade: see compounds in *-βητης* and *-ορτᾶς*. My conclusion, however, is

<sup>59</sup> According to Méndez Dosuna (1991–1993), this is technically a case of dissimilation: [ti] goes to [tsi] (affrication), but this affricate dissimilates because of the preceding [s]: the result therefore is [sti].

<sup>60</sup> On this explanation of palatalization, see Alonso Déniz (2008: 27–28).



different. While Specht assumes that forms such as βητ- are root nouns employed in the FC, I submit that FCs in -ti- (and later -si-) are fully verbal: no nominal stem is involved in their formation.

There are no evident phonetic reasons that could explain why the Mycenaean FCs in -ti- of the second group are not assibilated. The situation therefore is very different from the one just described for the first group, where -ti- may be blocked by the phonetic environment. In the case of forms belonging to the second group a morphological explanation may provide a better answer.<sup>61</sup> The hypothesis which the next sections test is that in some FCs [ti] was prevented from assibilating because assibilation would result in similarity with an s-aorist which the great majority of the verbs behind these FCs did not possess. Moreover, most of these verbs have the root aorist as their primary formation: the identity between the root aorist singular stem and the bare root on which these FCs are based may have further functioned as a kind of blocking. In other words, the tendency to match compound constituents with live verbal forms may have inhibited assibilation in order to maintain morphological transparency. The analysis provided in section 7 pursues this hypothesis with insights into the structure and possible meaning of these Mycenaean FCs in -ti- and their compounds.

On the question of the Mycenaean PNs with FCs in -si-, they do not necessarily *all* have to be interpreted as examples of ‘successful’ assibilation of -ti- which escaped the above-mentioned blocking: rather, four out of five of these Mycenaean -si- forms can only be understood if they were *directly* formed on the s-aorist (*ma-na-si-we-ko*, *qa-sa-ko*, *qi-si-ja-ko*, *ta-si-ko-no*: see analysis in sections 5.1 and 7.9). Since compounds based on the s-aorist are already attested in Mycenaean, it is likely that derivation from the s-aorist might also be *independent* of assibilation from the start.<sup>62</sup>

<sup>61</sup> Thompson (2008: 758) likewise identifies analogical levelling as the cause behind unassibilated τερψιμβροτος compounds, without however pinpointing the source of this analogy.

<sup>62</sup> See Dunkel (1992: 216) and Stefanelli (2008). Stefanelli’s reconstruction differs from mine in the crucial point of the relationship of the two types with one another. She concludes that only -si- was used to derive V1 compounds from verbal stems (the s-aorist), while -ti- characterized FCs formed with agent nouns. Stefanelli (2008: 20) also mentions the fact that West Greek prefers forms in -si- to those in -ti- in order to prove that forms in -si- may not have arisen in Greek through the assibilation [ti] > [si]. I agree with the second part of this proposition (-si- could be originally independent of assibilation), but I am more sceptical about her use of the West Greek evidence. Stefanelli uses the fact that FCs in -ti- are extremely rare in West Greek (where FCs in -si- are pervasive) to argue that assibilation is not responsible for the rise of -si- compounds. In my opinion, the first-millennium West Greek evidence is too recent to prove anything about the origin of these compounds: by the first millennium, compounds in -ti- had ceased to be a productive pattern, regardless of their origin or geographic distribution.

The suggested explanation of FCs in *-ti-* accords a role to the analogical pressure of the root aorist, a formation which is certainly marginal in Classical Greek and in the extant Linear B tablets, but which may have been more common in Mycenaean Greek or at the linguistic stage immediately preceding it.<sup>63</sup> In the next sections we will consider the PIE background of the Mycenaean situation, and attempt to relate the morphology of V1 compounds to the development of the PIE verbal system. Our focus will concern the morphological or analogical processes which may be at play in the selection of the verbal roots or stems featuring in compound constituents.

## 6 V1 compounds in the context of the PIE verbal system

When linguists propose theoretical models of word formation processes they often speak of ‘roots’ or ‘stems’, which are abstract notions: but the word formation rules understood and applied by speakers reflect their knowledge and understanding of analogy and paradigmatic regularity rather knowledge and understanding of the linguistic concept of ‘stem’.<sup>64</sup> Thus, as we have seen in sections 3 and 4, Greek V1 compounds are mostly formed according to a productive set of derivational rules which enable the creation of verbal compounds from stems which are synchronically used for the formation of given verbal tenses, most notably the present, the aorist and the future. It is conceivable that a similar derivational cycle characterized earlier linguistic stages as well, since the type characterized by *-e-*, which seems inherited, derives directly from thematic radical present stems.

Although Greek shows a large number of roots in FCs ending in *-e-*, what we can abstract from their variety is that roots which selected the present as their primary formation—which is signalled by the fact that the present is radical, i.e. formed without affixes—yield FCs in *-e-*, while roots which selected the aorist as their primary formation (again this means the root aorist) yield FCs formed on the root itself, followed by *-ti-*. This hypothetical reconstruction accords a paradig-

**63** There are only ca. thirty aorist forms in the Linear B tablets, reflecting the verbs which are most likely to be found in accountancy texts (e.g. δίδωμι, ἴστημι). The root aorist of a number of them already shows the *-κ-* suffix, e.g. *do-ke* /dōke/, *te-ke* /tʰēke/: see Bartoněk (2003: 326–327).

**64** Nielsen Whitehead (2012: 89–91), an advocate of the stem interpretation of V1 compounds, counters the idea that stems are only linguistic abstractions, submitting that they are ‘linguistically real’ concepts. She stresses the role of proportional analogy in the speakers’ derivation of uninflected stems from paradigms and derivational patterns of given forms. I agree with this view.

matic role to the root present and the root aorist, taken as the most basic verbal formations.<sup>65</sup>

In a widely accepted reconstruction of the PIE verbal system, the root present and aorist are thought to express a grammatical opposition between the ‘perfective’ and ‘imperfective’ aspect respectively.<sup>66</sup> The choice of which aspect (and hence which formation) a given root would receive was probably driven by the inherent lexical aspect of the root. Roots referring to events which are more naturally envisaged as having an end-point (‘telic’ roots), such as ‘give’ or ‘put’, would preferentially chose the perfective aspect, while those which referred to events envisaged as not having an end-point (‘atelic’ roots), such as ‘speak’ or ‘go’, would select the imperfective aspect.<sup>67</sup> In origin, therefore, the root aorist, which is already a relic in most IE languages of early attestation, must have been a very common class.<sup>68</sup> It may be noted, however, that the theoretical distinction between ‘telic’ and ‘atelic’ roots is not always well-matched by the verbal formations attested in the individual languages.<sup>69</sup>

At a second stage, the original primary root present or aorist would be paired with a secondary formation, created through the use of supplementary formants (e.g. present affixes such as *\*-jé/ó-* or *\*-ské/ó-* or reduplication), which would fill the other slot in this binary system. For instance, the root *\*deh<sub>3</sub>-* ‘give’ would select the root aorist as its primary formation, but a secondary present expressing imperfective aspect later emerged: the fact that the present is a secondary formation is shown by its reduplicated stem (*di-deh<sub>3</sub>-*). The same derivational devices could be used to create different present formations from the same root, which conveyed different functions and nuances (*Aktionsarten*). This polymorphism is still formally represented in many daughter languages (prominently in Indo-Iranian and Greek).<sup>70</sup>

**65** The root present is reconstructed to have originally been an athematic formation, which was later often replaced by thematic root presents: see *LIV* 10, 12. The derivation of compounded FCs in *-e-* therefore presupposes that many athematic presents have already been changed into thematic presents.

**66** Champions of this view are e.g. Hoffmann (1970), Cowgill (1975: 563), Erhart (1975), Hardarson (1993: 21–22), Sihler (1995: 445). For a typological introduction to aspect, see Comrie (1976). Strunk (1994: 424, 428) maintains that the opposition only arose after the creation of the *s*-aorist: see n. 75 below.

**67** An accessible discussion of the issues surrounding aspect in PIE, complete with fundamental bibliography, is Napoli (2006: 45–52).

**68** According to the figures in McCullagh (2003: 30), based on *LIV*, there might have been as many as 409 different root aorists in PIE.

**69** Clackson (2007: 134).

**70** This reconstruction of the PIE verbal system mainly rests on the Greek and Vedic evidence and takes the Hittite verb to represent a simplified stage: see Hoffmann (1970: 25–26), Szemerényi

What concerns us here is not whether the FC of prototypical V1 compounds in PIE also expressed aspectual nuances, which would be impossible to prove or disprove in any case. In principle, it is conceivable that in some cases FCs referring to a continuous action were derived from a present stem, while those representing the verbal action in its punctual aspect were characterized by the aorist stem. However, the evidence from the individual IE languages does not support the view that aspect played a role in the make-up of compounds at a synchronic level, so that the hypothesis that this happened in PIE must remain speculative and ultimately impossible to verify.<sup>71</sup> Our concern therefore is purely with the morphological models which may have influenced the selection of the FCs, not with the individuation of their aspectual nuances, which would be a purely speculative exercise.

### 6.1 The derivation of compound FCs from verbal roots and stems

The derivational system of V1 compounds envisaged here rests on the assumption that V1 compounds were formed with different stems or roots, sometimes with the aid of compound markers, in formal association with existing tenses of their base verbs. Roots which found their appointed formation in the present would be represented through FCs derived from the present stem, which is marked by the thematic vowel (we may additionally note that *-e-* was a very rare linking element in all other compound categories, and thus a very good candidate for compounds which were characterized by a distinctly peculiar structure).

As far as *-ti-* is concerned, the early Greek evidence allows the hypothesis that in origin it was a device which marked derivation from roots whose primary formation was the root aorist. Let us reconsider as an example the root *\*deh<sub>3</sub>-* ‘give’. Its primary verbal formation is the root aorist *\*(e)-deh<sub>3</sub>-*, which employs the simple root, while the reduplicated present *\*di-deh<sub>3</sub>-* is secondary. Forms such as  $\Delta\omega\tau\acute{\omega}$  (< *\*\Delta\omega\tau i-*) and *dāti-vara-* could therefore use the full-grade root *\*deh<sub>3</sub>-* because this characterized the primary formation of the verb ‘to give’. As already claimed by Specht, it is likely that the compound device *-t-* was selected on analogy with other compounds based on full-grade roots, namely V2 compounds in *-t-* (type  $\pi\rho\text{-}\beta\lambda\eta\text{-}\tau$ ). In origin, this *-t-* could have been inserted to aid *Kompositionsfuge* when the SC began with a vowel; to the contrary, with FCs beginning with a consonant the vocalic root was free to remain as it was: an example of this

---

(1996: 231, 337). Other recent approaches have attempted to integrate the Hittite evidence into theoretical models of the IE verb: see Jasanoff (2003).

71 *Contra*, see Andriotis (1938: 96–97).

type would be the Greek compound Τλη-πόλεμος (see section 3) and the Vedic compound *sthá-raśman* ‘making reins firm’ (section 2.1). At some point, *-t-* must have been extended to all FCs, making it necessary to develop another device to aid *Kompositionsfuge* before SCs beginning with a consonant: this device is the element *-i-*, which in turn seems to have been extended to all V1 FCs of this kind, of which it became a characteristic marker. In V1 compounds this vowel, probably imported from the Caland system, does not have any semantic function and is a mere linking element.<sup>72</sup> Through the insertion of the whole *-ti-* marker, compounds based on the bare root came to be marked against those derived from the present stem and characterized by *-e-*.

In Greek this system was enriched by an important innovation: namely, the possibility of deriving V1 compounds from the s-aorist. A great incentive to this derivational process was certainly provided by the independent Greek sound change creating [si] out of [ti]. However, given the prominent role that the s-aorist plays in Greek it is likely that an independent derivation of compound FCs from its stem had started even before assibilation took place. The s-aorist itself is likely to have been a late addition to the PIE verbal system, but a widespread one.<sup>73</sup> Scholars mostly disagree as to whether it developed after Anatolian branched off or whether this new verbal formation was somehow shared by all IE languages, becoming productive in some and remaining isolated in others.<sup>74</sup> In Greek, the s-aorist is often opposed to the root aorist, expressing transitivity and causativity, but other models (among many others) suggest that its function originally was that of expressing the perfective aspect roots which found their appointed formation in the present.<sup>75</sup> However, we are usually unable to observe such a clear-cut distribution in the forms attested in the individual daughter languages.

---

**72** Stefanelli (2008: 26, 29) assigns a deeper value to *-i-*: she argues that in Greek this element signalled allomorphy (as in Caland compounds and in V1 compounds in *-τι-*) as well as predication, marking transitivity (as in V1 compounds in *-σι-*). On this view see also Bader (1974: 48). I do not think that these approaches are useful. No other linking element, as far as I can tell, is endowed with extra functions of this kind: the Greek *-ε-*, *-ο-*, *-η*, *-ᾱ-* mark derivation from specific stems or simply serve to aid *Kompositionsfuge*.

**73** Meillet (1908), Strunk (1994: 429), Szemerényi (1996: 282–284).

**74** See Hardarson (1993: 94, 96), Strunk (1994: 429). Some contributions, adopting Meid’s (1975) ‘Space-Time model’, have attempted to show that the aorist was an areal innovation, which arose in East PIE: see Schmitt-Brandt (1987) and Drinka (1995). This view is now generally discarded.

**75** See Strunk (1994: 429), with partly different terminology: ‘Its [the s-aorist’s] main function presumably consisted in bestowing perfectivity on durative verbs, so that these could be used in the sense of a perfective past (aorist)’. According to Strunk, it was only after the appearance of the s-aorist that ‘a clear-cut aspectual system based on an ubiquitous distinction of present- and aorist-stems was really established’. This is a corollary of his belief that there was no formal opposition between the present and the aorist before the creation of the s-aorist, a hypothesis that

The creation of V1 compounds based on the new s-aorist therefore might have happened at a very recent stage, when the Greco-Aryan branch, which shares important innovations in the verbal system, had already broken off; or, in consideration of the fact that such compounds based on the s-aorist are not attested in Indo-Iranian, it might concern uniquely the early phases of Greek. The above observations are useful to contextualize the hypothesis that compounds based on the s-aorist *could* have existed already before the constitution of Proto-Greek, but they cannot be considered conclusive evidence in that direction.

In Greek, the new compounds based on the s-aorist kept their stem, with the characteristic s-suffix.<sup>76</sup> In this respect, the fate of this -s- is similar to that of other suffixes which are used in compounding in association with certain stems, but are also adopted as linking elements and as such exported to other FCs. A good example is -o-, the suffix which characterizes o-stems but is also extended to first- and third-declension stems where it has the function of a mere linking vowel. In FCs in -ti- and in -si- the -i- element, devoid of any semantic role, is another simple linking element. This is shown by the fact that, as noted in section 4.1, the element -si- can also be attached to stems which do not have a sigmatic aorist, such as φυξί- from φεύγω, or φερε-σι- from φερω-.

## 7 Mycenaean compounds as an intermediary stage

The Mycenaean evidence describes a stage in which -ti- compounds have already started coexisting with, and in some cases being replaced by, -si- compounds. As argued, this replacement was swifter when the assibilated FC could be formally likened to existing s-aorists; conversely, the lack of an s-aorist may have been responsible for the preservation of some FCs in -ti- as such. In the sections below we will see that many of the roots behind FCs in -ti- show evidence of having selected the root aorist as their primary formation, while the present or other aorist formations are often clearly more recent additions: the existence of 'live' root aorists versus the lack of s-aorists could therefore be identified as the analogical conditioning factor behind the lack of assibilation. After this period, alphabetic Greek generalized a two-fold system of V1 compounds based on

---

is not followed here. The debate over the original function (and hence origin) of the s-aorist is vast: see Szemerényi (1996: 281–284), Napoli (2006: 48 n. 23), Dunkel (2010) for references.

**76** The origin of the aorist marker -s- is debated. Watkins (1969b: 97–106) maintained that it derived from a third ps. sg. ending -s and that it originally signalled a 'basically neutral, intransitive value of the sigmatic aorist in its earlier manifestations' (1969b: 103), simply predicating 'the existence of a verbal action' (1969b: 104).

the opposition between the present and the s-aorist stems, the  $\varphi\epsilon\rho\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\upsilon\kappa\omicron\varsigma$  and  $\tau\epsilon\rho\psi\acute{\iota}\mu\beta\rho\omicron\tau\omicron\varsigma$  types, with the later addition of the rare and analogical type based on the thematic aorist (e.g. compounds in  $\lambda\upsilon\tau\omicron-$ ). We will begin the analysis of Mycenaean V1 compounds from those in which  $-ti-$  may be blocked precisely by these conditioning factors, followed by compounds in which  $-ti-$  is preceded by [s] and may have been blocked primarily by phonological factors (the first group described in section 5.1).

### 7.1 V1 compounds from $*h_2er-$

<b>Compound</b>	<b>Likely transcription</b>	<b>FC</b>
<i>a-ti-pa-mo</i>	/Artiphāmos/	<i>ar-ti- &lt; V*<math>h_2er-</math></i>

The PN *a-ti-pa-mo*, which has four secure attestations in the Knossos and Pylos tablets and two more doubtful attestations, is usually interpreted as /Antiphāmos/.<sup>77</sup> However, a derivation from  $*h_2er-$ , the root behind  $\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha\rho\acute{\iota}\sigma\kappa\omega$  ‘fit together’, is equally possible.<sup>78</sup> In Greek, the simple root  $\acute{\alpha}\rho-$  characterizes two verbal formations: the middle participle  $\acute{\alpha}\rho\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$  ‘fit, appropriate’ (Hom.) and a few compounds in  $-\acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\eta\varsigma$ , the oldest of which is  $\pi\upsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\eta\varsigma$  ‘gate-fastener’ (Hom.).  $\acute{\alpha}\rho\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$  is the only relic of the old root aorist: it is based on the zero grade of the root ( $*h_2r-$ ) which in Greek yields the same outcome as the full grade  $*h_2er-$ :  $\acute{\alpha}\rho-$ . This root aorist was the primary formation of the root, while the present  $\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha\rho\acute{\iota}\sigma\kappa\omega$ , showing two derivational markers (reduplication and the  $-\sigma\kappa-$  suffix) is clearly a secondary formation.

The FC based on the root *ar-*, followed by *-ti-*, could therefore be supported by a verbal formation, the root aorist, in which the same root featured without the addition of suffixes. Already in Homeric Greek the root aorist of  $*h_2er-$  coexists with two other formations: the reduplicated thematic aorist  $\acute{\eta}\rho\alpha\rho\omicron\nu$ , probably built on the zero-grade forms of the root aorist;<sup>79</sup> and the s-aorist  $\acute{\eta}\rho\sigma\alpha$ , attested already in Homer.<sup>80</sup> It is conceivable that the root aorist was still in use in Myce-

<sup>77</sup> See *DMic s.v.*

<sup>78</sup> Waanders (2008: 17).

<sup>79</sup> The debate over whether the original ablaut pattern of the PIE root aorist was based on the opposition between the full grade of the singular/dual and the zero grade of the plural has no relevance for the present discussion, since compound FCs would be based on the root grade of the singular anyway. On this issue, see Hardarson (1993: 90–93, 150–152), McCullagh (2002: 60–62) (both for the original ablaut distinction); *contra*, Malzahn (2004), with a review of previous theories that go in this direction.

<sup>80</sup> Hardarson (1993: 199), *LIV* 269–270.

naean, providing a paradigmatic form to which FCs in /arti/ could be linked, resisting assibilation into /arsi/. The latter FC may be attested in later compounds such as Ἀρσίνοος (Hom.), perhaps to be interpreted as ‘he who is steady in his mind’.<sup>81</sup>

The interpretation of *a-ti-pa-mo* as /Artiphāmos/ ‘he who fits together words’ or ‘he who fits together prophetic sayings’ is encouraged by the alphabetic epithet ἀρτιεπής ‘good at talking’ as well. Its FC is usually connected to ἄρτιος ‘quick’, but a derivation from *\*h<sub>2</sub>er-* is not only equally possible, but also preferable on morphological grounds.<sup>82</sup> If the FC ἀρτι- derived from ἄρτιος, the lack of the thematic vowel would be odd: in order to explain it, Knecht (1946: 17) has to suppose that ἀρτι- originally derived from the adverb ἄρτι ‘just’ and that the FC was only secondarily connected to ἀραρίσκω, under the influence of Ὀρτίλοχος. It is more probable that old compounds in ἀρτι- based on the root *\*h<sub>2</sub>er-* were semantically re-interpreted when compounds with FCs in *-ti-* had become extinct. This is particularly probable in the case of ἀραρίσκω, a verb characterized by a very low number of derivations, most of which are likely to have been obscure to speakers (Chapter 6, section 3.2).

## 7.2 V1 compounds from *\*h<sub>3</sub>er-*

Compound	Likely transcription	FC
<i>e-ti-me-de-i</i> (dat.)	/Ertimēdehi/	<i>er-ti-</i> < <i>√*h<sub>3</sub>er-</i>
<i>e-ti-ra-wo</i>	/Ertilāwos/	<i>er-ti-</i> < <i>√*h<sub>3</sub>er-</i>
<i>o-ti-na-wo</i>	/Ortināwos/	<i>or-ti-</i> < <i>√*h<sub>3</sub>er-</i>

These three Mycenaean PNs have been linked to the root *\*h<sub>3</sub>er-*, giving rise to the Greek present ὄρνυμι.<sup>83</sup> The most transparent is *o-ti-na-wo* /Ortināwos/ (PY Cn 285), while the interpretation of *e-ti-me-de-i* and *e-ti-ra-wo* is more dubious. Among the interpretations which have been suggested, the most common view sees their FCs as corresponding to the SC of the PN Λαέρτας: this yields /Ertimēdehi/ and /Ertilāwos/. The existence of various by-forms of ὄρνυμι with initial [e], including the glosses ἔρετο, ἔρσεο and ἔρση in Hesychius, is problematic: the different

<sup>81</sup> According to von Kamptz (1982: 66) this name could alternatively derive from αἰέρω.

<sup>82</sup> On the derivation from ἄρτιος, see von Kamptz (1982: 66).

<sup>83</sup> On the reconstruction of the root I follow LIV 299, Rix (1965) and Rix (1992).



vocalism has been explained either as a form of secondary ablaut or as analogical on the root *\*h<sub>3</sub>er-* (ἔρχομαι), but the question remains open.<sup>84</sup>

According to the derivational model hypothesized here, compounds based on *\*h<sub>3</sub>er-* preferentially selected FCs formed on the bare root followed by *-ti-* rather than those characterized by *-e-*: the latter would yield a form (\*\*ὄρ-ε-) which could not be identified with the present stem (ὄρ-υυ-). Formal similarity of this FC with the root aorist, which survives in Vedic, Avestan, Armenian, Tocharian B and Greek, may have played a role in supporting and eventually blocking these FCs in *-ti-*, particularly since this was the primary formation from this root.<sup>85</sup> In Greek the old root aorist only survives in a few middle forms, conveying intransitive semantics (ῶρτο ‘he sprang’, ὄρμενος ‘rushing’ and ὄρσο ‘arise!’). All these forms are built on the zero grade of the root, *\*h<sub>3</sub>r-*, whose outcome in Greek is identical to that of the full grade *\*h<sub>3</sub>er-*, ὄρ- (for a similar situation, compare the outcomes of *\*h<sub>2</sub>er-* discussed in section 7.1). The new sigmatic aorist ὄρσα, on the other hand, reflects the full grade of the root preceded by the augment.<sup>86</sup>

It is necessary to clarify that I am not positing a direct derivation from the root aorist and its meaning: the FC, here and elsewhere, reflects the inherent semantics of the root. First-millennium compounds such as Λαέρτας and Λαόρτας are likely to have a transitive-causative meaning: ‘he who makes the people/army start’. Similarly, *o-ti-na-wo* could then be ‘he who makes ships start’, *e-ti-ra-wo* could be ‘he makes the army start’ and *e-ti-me-de* could be ‘he who stirs thoughts’.<sup>87</sup> Alternatively, the first two could also express the intransitive semantics of the middle (as attested in the extant root aorist forms): ‘he who rushes onto the ship’ and ‘he who rushes upon the army/enemy’.<sup>88</sup>

**84** The forms showing [e] are discussed by García Ramón (2002: 186), who explains the different reflexes in Greek as ‘Ablautvarianten’, and EDG, which is in favour of Greek analogical interference. See also Hardarson (1993: 200).

**85** LIV 299. All the present formations show signs of being secondary: from reduplication in the Vedic present *íyarti*, to suffixes in the Latin present *orior* (*\*-jé-/ó-*) and in the Greek ὄρνυμι (*\*-néw-*).

**86** LIV 300.

**87** On this interpretation of *o-ti-na-wo*, see Neumann (1994b: 643). On the Mycenaean names in *-me-de* and their early Greek counterparts, see Neumann (1985). As he notes, in many cases the SC -μήδης is preceded by a verbal FC.

**88** García Ramón (2002: 186): ‘Da man im Falle von *\*or-ti* mit intrans. ῶρτο (bzw. ὄρουσε, ὠρμήθη) rechnen darf, wäre für /Ortināwos/ prinzipiell auch eine Deutung als ‘der auf die Schiffe losgeht’ [...] vorstellbar, wobei das Hinterglied /°nāwo-/ etwa ἐπὶ νήεσσι, ἐπὶ νῆας entspräche’.

7.3 V1 compounds from *\*steh<sub>2</sub>-* (or *\*teh<sub>2</sub>-*)

Compound	Likely transcription	FC
<i>ta-ta-ke-u</i>	/Stāark <sup>h</sup> ēus/	<i>stā-t(i)-</i> < <i>√*steh<sub>2</sub>-</i>
<i>ta-ti-ḡo-we-u</i>	/Stātig <sup>w</sup> ōwēus/ or	<i>stā-ti-</i> < <i>√*steh<sub>2</sub>-</i> or
/ <i>Tātig<sup>w</sup>ōwēus/</i>	<i>tā-ti-</i> < <i>√*teh<sub>2</sub>-</i>	

On phonological grounds, these two PNs can be interpreted as containing either the root *\*steh<sub>2</sub>-* ‘stand, make stand’ or the root *\*teh<sub>2</sub>-* ‘steal’.<sup>89</sup> The first interpretation is more likely in that *\*steh<sub>2</sub>-* builds a very common verb in Greek, ἵστημι; the reflexes of *\*teh<sub>2</sub>-* on the other hand are very rare outside Hittite, Vedic and Archaic Latin.<sup>90</sup>

Although the Linear B script does not allow us to securely interpret the length of the first vowel in these two forms, the consensus is to interpret this vowel as [a:], deriving from the full grade of the root. /stā/ would therefore be selected to form the FC of V1 compounds, possibly at a stage in which the root had not yet built an s-aorist and its primary formation was the root aorist (ἔστην). The reduplicated athematic present represented in Greek by ἵστημι is a clearly secondary formation: it covers both the transitive meanings of the root (in the active voice) and the intransitive meanings (in the middle). At a later stage, Greek added the s-aorist ἔστησα, an innovation shared only by Old Avestan and specialized for the expression of transitive-causative semantics (‘make stand, place, set up’). V1 compounds based on the stem of the s-aorist στήσ- are a common enough type in Greek (see the Corpus). This is probably attributable to both morphological and semantic reasons: the s-aorist is a very frequent form of ἵστημι and its transitive-causative semantics makes it particularly appropriate for the basic V1 pattern, with the SC expressing the role of the object. There are no compounds based on the simple root stā-/stē- in first-millennium Greek.

According to this interpretation, both Mycenaean PNs therefore preserved an older compound type, based on the simple root, but already in Mycenaean the new type based on the stem of the s-aorist emerged alongside this old type. The semantics of *ta-ti-ḡo-we-u*, if it is to be interpreted as /Stātig<sup>w</sup>ōwēus/, can be clarified on the basis of the later compound Στήσιππος, identifying a person who restrains horses:<sup>91</sup> *ta-ti-ḡo-we-u* would thus be ‘he who makes cattle stand’. *ta-ta-ke-u* is more obscure, though it has been suggested that the SC derives from

<sup>89</sup> On the image of cattle-stealing, attested in several IE languages and continued in the Greek compound βοόκληψ (Soph.), see García Ramón (2009: 7).

<sup>90</sup> LIV 616.

<sup>91</sup> Dubois (2000: 46).

ἀρχή and that the compound corresponds to the phrase καταστήσας δὲ τὰς ἀρχάς ‘he divided his dominions’ (Hdt. 3.89.1).<sup>92</sup> For the correlation between these compounds in *ta-ti-* and the PN *ta-si-ko-no*, built on the s-aorist, see section 7.10. As noted, a derivation of the FC of these compounds from *\*teh<sub>2</sub>-* is less likely, since this root builds no verb in Greek. The advantage of supposing this derivation is that *ta-ti-ḡo-we-u* (but not *ta-ta-ke-u*) would yield a very good meaning, identifying ‘he who steals cattle’.<sup>93</sup>

#### 7.4 V1 compounds from *\*k̂ens-*

Compound	Likely transcription	FC
?  <i>ke-ti-ra-wo</i>	?/Kestilāwos/	<i>kes-ti-</i> < √* <i>k̂ens-</i>

We now come to the FCs in *-ti-* introduced in section 5.1, in which *-ti-* is preceded by [s] and where therefore the preservation of [ti] is phonologically conditioned. The first of the FCs in question are forms in *ke-ti-* /*Kesti-*/ which are likely to reflect the root *\*k̂ens-* ‘give solemnly a piece of advice’, continued in Vedic *śámsati* and Latin *censēo*, but lost in Greek. The FC *\*k̂ens-ti-*, yielding *\*kes-ti-* in Greek, is likely to be preserved in the form |*ke-ti-ra-wo*, probably to be interpreted as a PN, which occurs only once on tablet KN V 7049.<sup>94</sup> In *DMic* the only hypothetical interpretation of this name is /*Akestilāwos*/, with the FC deriving from ἀκέομαι, yielding the meaning ‘healer of the people’ (cf. ἀκεστήρ ‘healer’). However, this interpretation runs counter to everything we know about the use of the *-ti-* element in Greek, which is never found attached to denominative verbs. The interpretation as /*Kes-ti-lāwos*/ ‘who speaks solemnly to his people/army’, from the root *\*k̂ens-* ‘give solemnly a piece of advice’ is preferable, since it is also supported by the existence of the *Kurzname* *ke-ti-ro* /*Kesti-los*/.

As posited in 5.1, FCs containing the cluster [sti] tend to undergo palatalization before a short vowel: thus, *\*kes-ti-andros* yields *Kessandros* (*ke-sa-do-ro*) and *\*kes-ti-andrā* yields *Kessandrā* (*ke-sa-da-ra*) (‘s/he who speaks authoritatively to men’). In *ke-ti-ro* /*Kestilos*/ and |*ke-ti-ra-wo* /*Kestilāwos*/, on the other hand, [sti] is blocked because it is followed by a consonant. Precisely because there are no

<sup>92</sup> García Ramón (2009: 9). Other scholars, however, interpret the FC as /*strat-*/ ‘army’: see Heubeck (1957b: 270), *DMic*. s.v.

<sup>93</sup> Plath (1999), García Ramón (2009: 10).

<sup>94</sup> The tablet is cut on the right-hand side, just before the first syllabogram of the name. Since it is not possible to decide whether or not another sign preceded it, the name may well be preserved entirely.

verbs continuing the root \**k̂ens-* in Greek, these old V1 compounds were eventually lost (there are no compounds in *Κεστι-* in alphabetic Greek) or re-interpreted, as is the case with *Κε(σ)σάνδρα*, which came to be perceived as a less common variant of *Κασσάνδρα* (see below).<sup>95</sup>

### 7.5 V1 compounds from \**k̂end-*

Compound	Likely transcription	FC
<i>ka-ta-no</i>	<i>/Kastānōr/</i>	<i>kasti- &lt; V*<i>k̂eṅd-</i></i>

The PN *ka-ta-no* (to be kept distinct from the toponym attested on KN X 795) is often interpreted as containing the FC */kast-/ < \*kad-t(i)- < \*k̂eṅd-ti*, which probably also features in the PN *Καστιάνειρα*.<sup>96</sup> The IE root \**k̂end-* ‘stand out’ (perhaps originally ‘be visible’) seems to have built perfect forms as its primary formations: a good parallel of the Greek perfect *κέκασμαι* ‘to excel’ is the Vedic perfect *śāśad-* ‘to distinguish oneself’.<sup>97</sup> The Greek middle perfect continues the zero grade of the root, \**k̂ṅd-*, which is also employed in the FC */kast(i)/* (cf. also *Κάστωρ*), clearly based on the only root grade continued in Greek.<sup>98</sup> Here *-i-* is not employed before the SC beginning with a vowel: as noted, this may be reconstructed as the original situation for V1 FCs based on bare roots, in which only the element *-t-* was used, while *-i-* was introduced only before consonantal SC. We may also wonder whether the third ps. of the perfect, *κέκασται*, exercised some kind of analogical pressure on the FC. On the other hand, palatalization has regularly occurred in *Κασσάνδρα < /Kasti-andrā/* (not to be confused with *Κε(σ)σάνδρα*, see 7.4); the meaning of these Greek names could be ‘he/she who distinguishes himself among men’.

<sup>95</sup> García Ramón (1992: 250).

<sup>96</sup> Ruijgh (1967: 170 n. 361), von Kamptz (1982: 66). *Contra* Knecht (1946: 12), who maintains that the original meaning of *Καστιάνειρα* was ‘adornment of men’ (‘Schmuck, Auszeichnung der Männer’) and was later taken to signify ‘she who adorns men’. This semantic and syntactic analysis leads him to interpret the FC as ‘eigentlich ein Abstractum [...], das im Laufe einer bestimmten Entwicklung auf den Aorist bezogen wurde’. The same root is probably contained in the short name *ka-te-u /Kastēus/* and in *ka-to /Kastōr/*.

<sup>97</sup> On the original meaning of the root, see García Ramón (1992: 242); *contra*, LIV 351 n. 1 which, on semantic grounds, assigns Ved. *śāśad-* to an identical but separate root, \**k̂end-*, ‘Stärke entwickeln’.

<sup>98</sup> LIV 351.

7.6 V1 compounds from *\*mēd-*

<b>Compound</b>	<b>Likely transcription</b>	<b>FC</b>
<i>me-ti-ja-no</i>	/Mēstiānōr/	<i>mēs-ti-</i> < $\sqrt{*mēd-}$

This is another compound in [sti] that does not undergo palatalization before the vocalic SC. Among the reasons for this lack of palatalization there might perhaps be the fact that the resulting FC /Mēss-/ would not correspond to any form of the Greek verbs built by the ablauting root *\*mēd-/\*med-*, which give rise to the thematic presents μήδομαι ‘plan’ and μέδομαι ‘devise’.<sup>99</sup> These are thought to be Greek secondary creations from originally athematic present formations.<sup>100</sup>

The same root gives rise to a sigmatic aorist in Avestan and in Greek (ἐμήσατο), which *LIV* 423 regards as the original aorist formation. However, the gloss μήστο· ἐβουλεύσατο in Hesychius makes the case for the existence of an old root aorist. μήστο is interpreted as an old athematic imperfect by Chantraine in *DELG*, an interpretation which is considered possible in *LIV* 423 (‘viell.[eicht]’), but it is also probable that this is the only relic of the full-grade middle root aorist (so *LSJ*): Hesychius’ *interpretamentum* ἐβουλεύσατο (another aorist) may point in this direction. This middle therefore may have analogically generalized the full grade: this is not a unique case in the Greek paradigm, where the middle μήδομαι also may have been an analogical innovation.<sup>101</sup>

In the creation of compounds from μήδομαι the simple root *\*mēd-* was selected because the thematic radical present is a secondary formation and, therefore, the FC /mēde-/ was perhaps not possible: once the simple root /mēd-/ was selected, it was enlarged with the linking element *-ti-*. The meaning of /Mēstiānōr/ could be ‘he who takes care of men’.<sup>102</sup>

7.7 V1 compounds from *\*nes-*

<b>Compound</b>	<b>Transcription</b>	<b>FC</b>
<i>ne-ti-ja-no</i>	/Nestiānōr/	<i>nes-ti</i> < $\sqrt{*nes-}$

The interpretation of this PN as /Nestiānōr/, from the root *\*nes-* ‘survive, escape danger’ is almost unanimous: it is thought to mean ‘he who leads his men back’,

<sup>99</sup> On the ablaut pattern, see Meier-Brügger (1992b: 242).

<sup>100</sup> See *LIV* 423, Meier-Brügger (1992b) and further, on Greek, Neumann (1985: 165–166).

<sup>101</sup> Meier-Brügger (1992b: 242). Dunkel (2010) suggests that this root grade is analogical on the s-aorist ἐμήσατο.

<sup>102</sup> Meier-Brügger (1992b: 241).

saving them.<sup>103</sup> Again, the cluster [sti] does not palatalize before the vocalic SC, just as in /Mēstiānōr/ above: in both cases, this lack of palatalization may be due to the fact that the *-ti-* syllable is both preceded and followed by heavy syllables (*-nes-/mēs-* and *-ān-*). That palatalization is likely to have happened at a much later stage, in the Theassalian PN Νέσσαυδρος,<sup>104</sup> is not a counterargument: at this later stage, no new V1 compounds with FCs in *-ti-* are created and all forms have been levelled out by assibilation or palatalization to comply with the τερψίμβροτος type.

The root *\*nes-* in Greek yields the thematic radical present νέομαι ‘to go back, to return’. This present is a secondary formation, since the oldest forms of the root point towards a root aorist: see the Vedic first ps. optative (*sām*) *nasimahi* (RV 2.16.8) ‘may we be united’ and the middle participle ἄσμενος ‘escaped’ (e.g. *Il.* 20.350), from the zero grade *\*ḥs-*.<sup>105</sup> As in other cases, the original root aorist was later replaced by an s-aorist, which survives (preceded by ἀπό) in a few relics: the middle (with intransitive meaning) ἀπενάσσατο ‘he had gone back’ (e.g. *Il.* 2.629) and the active subjunctive (with transitive-causative semantics) ἀπονάσσωσιν ‘they may send back’ (*Il.* 16.86). The [a] vowel in the stem of this s-aorist cannot be explained as a regular reflex of the full grade *\*nes-*, and must be interpreted as continuing the vocalic grade of the middle (< *\*ḥs-*), which seems to have been the only productive form in first-millennium Greek.<sup>106</sup> Because of the poor transparency of the s-aorist stem νασσ-, Greek replaces this aorist with the suppletive form ἐνόστησα, from the denominative νοστέω ‘to come home’, a more common verb than the mostly poetic νέομαι.<sup>107</sup>

*\*nes-* is the only root for which Mycenaean provides evidence of the parallel creation of a φερέοικος-type compound, *ne-e-ra-wo* /Nehelāwōi/ (dat.), which points to the fact that the present νέομαι was already in use at this early linguistic stage ([s] goes to [h] in intervocalic position).<sup>108</sup> The semantics of this name

**103** *DMic s.v.*

**104** See García Ramón (2009: 7).

**105** *LIV* 454. The preservation of the cluster [sm] in ἄσμενος is a problem, since this is always lost in intervocalic position. For this reason, Wackernagel argued that the participle derived from an s-aorist (*\*ḥs-s-menos*), but *LIV* 455 n. 3 suggests that in the participle [s] may have been triggered by analogy with the forms of the verb in which [s] preceded other consonants, for instance *\*asto* < *\*ḥs-to*.

**106** The connection of these forms with ναίω ‘to live’, proposed by *LSJ*, is secondary and etymologically difficult: see García Ramón (2004: 34, 36), Kölligan (2007: 373–375).

**107** On this suppletion, see Kölligan (2007: 363).

**108** For other possible forms from *\*nes-* in Mycenaean see Heubeck (1987), who also connected to the o-grade of *\*nes-* many Mycenaean compounds showing the element *-no-* (< *\*nohos*).

is likely to be similar to that of *ne-ti-ja-no*: ‘he who escapes the host’ or ‘he who brings his people back home’.<sup>109</sup>

### 7.8 V1 compounds from *\*sweh<sub>2</sub>d-*

Compound	Likely transcription	FC
<i>wa-ti-ko-ro</i>	/Wāstik <sup>h</sup> oros/	<i>wās-ti- &lt; V*sweh<sub>2</sub>d-</i>

This PN is usually interpreted to be the only Mycenaean form containing the root behind the Greek verb ἡδομαι ‘to take pleasure in’; its meaning is transparent: ‘he who takes pleasure in dance’. The same root may also be attested in the *Kurzname* |*wa-ti-ro*, on which see below.<sup>110</sup> The radical present ἡδομαι is likely to be a secondary formation in Greek, as is the Vedic *-jé/ó-* present *sūdáyati* ‘he makes delicious’ (*RV* 3.4.10, etc.).<sup>111</sup> The primary formation seems to have been the root aorist: this is argued on the basis of the thematic aorist third person indicative forms εὔαδε and ἄδε ‘he took pleasure in’, which are based on the zero-grade forms of the root aorist.<sup>112</sup> The old root aorist corresponding to ἡδομαι was replaced by a new s-aorist, already attested in Homer with the form ἥσατο ‘he enjoyed’. The thematic aorist characterized by [a] in turn provided the basis for a new Greek present, ἀνδάνω (which is post-Homeric).

The FC of /wāsti/ therefore results from the full-grade root *\*sweh<sub>2</sub>d-*, which characterized the old root aorist and the radical present ἡδομαι. [sti] is preserved since it is followed by a consonant. The fact that the FC is not *wa-de* /wāde-/ shows that the compound was built on the simple root, not on the present stem and implicitly confirms the tendency to employ FCs in *-ti-* when the primary formation of a given root is not the present.

### 7.9 The system of V1 compounds in Mycenaean

The above sections have considered the likely interpretation and etymology of the Mycenaean PNs characterized by a FC ending in *-ti*. I have endeavoured to prove that in all these cases the element *-ti-* was blocked by several factors. In the cases

<sup>109</sup> Heubeck (1987: 229), García Ramón (2009: 10).

<sup>110</sup> See García Ramón (1992: 243).

<sup>111</sup> *LIV* 606.

<sup>112</sup> The zero-grade root in [a] shown by these forms is analogical on the full grade, since *\*swh<sub>2</sub>d-* should yield [su:d].

in which [ti] would be free to assibilate (i.e. when it is preceded by a vowel or [r]), its blocking arguably has a morphological reason: namely, the fact that the resulting assibilated FC could not be linked to an s-aorist. [ti] is therefore kept to preserve transparency of the root. In these cases, we have noted a correlation with the fact that both the present and the s-aorist of these roots are secondary formations, while their root aorist (still attested in Greek) is the primary formation. This explanation—which assumes that the root aorist could have exercised an analogical pressure on the shape of certain compound FCs—is not meant to imply that these FCs are actively formed on the root aorist stem, or that they reflect the specific semantics of this tense. Although defining the semantics of onomastic forms, particularly in the case of Mycenaean, is a slippery path, in a number of cases it has been possible to envisage likely meanings, which are compatible with the semantics of the given roots in Greek but not specifically with that of the root aorist.

In a second group of FCs—in which [ti] is preceded by [s]—its ability to palatalize is mostly dependent on the phonetic environment: namely, whether or not it is followed by a vowel. If we look at competing pairs, collected in Table 4.4 (nos. 1–3) below, we see that some oscillations are regularly conditioned by phonology.

**Table 4.4:** Parallel *-ti-* and *-s(s)i-* compounds in Mycenaean<sup>113</sup>

Root	<i>-ti-</i> compounds and short names	<i>-si-</i> compounds and short names	Origin of sibilant(s) in the FC
1 <i>*kēns-</i>	<i>ke-ti-ro</i> /Kestilos/	<i>ke-sa-do-ro</i> /Kessandros/ <i>ke-sa-da-ra</i> /Kessandrā/	[ss] through palatalization before a vowel (phonologically conditioned)
2 <i>*kēnd-</i> , <i>κασ-</i>	<i>ka-ta-no</i> /Kastānōr/ <i>ka-ti-</i> /Kasti-/ <i>ka-te-u</i> /Kastēus/ <i>ka-to</i> /Kastōr/	<i>ka-sa-no</i> /Kassānōr/	[ss] through palatalization before a vowel (phonologically conditioned)
3 <i>*sweh<sub>2</sub>d-</i>	<i>wa-ti-ko-ro</i> /Wāstik <sup>h</sup> oros/ <i>wa-ti-ro</i> /Wāstilos/	<i>wa-si-ro</i> /Wāssilos/	[ss] seemingly through palatalization: analogical?
4 <i>*steh<sub>2</sub>-</i>	<i>ta-ta-ke-u</i> /Stātark <sup>h</sup> ēus/ <i>ta-ti-qo-we-u</i> (if /Stätig <sup>w</sup> ōwēus/)	<i>ta-si-ko-no</i> /Stāsigonos/	<i>-si-</i> form based on the s-aorist

<sup>113</sup> Table partly after García Ramón (1992: 246).



In *ke-ti-ro* /Kestilos/, [sti] does not palatalize because it is not followed by a vowel, while in *ke-sa-do-ro* /Kessandros/ and *ke-sa-da-ra* /Kessandrā/ [sti] palatalizes because it is followed by a vowel. However, the same palatalization does not occur in *me-ti-ja-no* (7.6) and *ne-ti-ja-no* (7.7), although here [sti] is also followed by a vowel. I have suggested that these cases could have been treated differently from those of *ke-sa-do-ro* /Kessandros/ and *ke-sa-da-ra* /Kessandrā/ because in *me-ti-ja-no* and *ne-ti-ja-no* [sti] is followed by a long vowel, while in *\*Kesti-andros/* and */Kesti-andrā/*, yielding */Kessandros/* and */Kessandrā/*, the following vowel is short. However, along the same lines one would expect the [sti] of */Kasti-ānōr/*, which is equally followed by [a:], to be blocked but, instead, in one case it palatalizes, yielding *ka-sa-no* /Kassānōr/.

It is clear therefore that the phonological factors triggering or blocking palatalization are of a more complex nature and may perhaps vary according to the type of root contained in the FC. Regarding the coexistence of *ka-ta-no* /Kastānōr/ (with first-millennium Greek Καστιάνειρα) and *ka-sa-no* /Kassānōr/, García Ramón (1992) argues that the oscillations are due to rhythmical conditioning factors, of a similar nature to those ruling word-external sandhi.<sup>114</sup> The same oscillations appear to concern *wa-ti-ro* /Wāstilos/ and *wa-si-ro* /Wāssilos/ as well: in the latter, palatalization occurs even though the SC of the original compound (arguably, */Wāsti-lāwos/*) begins with a consonant, in opposition to the treatment of *wa-ti-ro*, as well as that of *ke-ti-ro* discussed above.

Table 4.4 shows that there is only one pair in which the coexistence of FCs in *-ti-* and in *-si-* may be ascribed to assibilation (no. 4). However, assuming that both *ta-ti-* and *ta-si-* derive from *\*steh<sub>2</sub>-*, assibilation is not the only possible explanation for the alternation of [ti] and [si] in the FC: *ta-si* could derive directly from the s-aorist stem *σθησ-*, thus representing a parallel type of compound to those derived from the simple root. The other Mycenaean V1 compounds in *-si-* which do not have parallel *-ti-* forms demonstrate that the derivation from the s-aorist was a *fait accompli* in Mycenaean times, since all of them are unequivocally derived from productive Greek s-aorists (refer to Table 4.3). *ma-na-si-we-ko* corresponds to ἐμνησάμην, which is among the oldest formations from the root *\*mneh<sub>2</sub>-*.<sup>115</sup> *qa-sa-ko* /K<sup>w</sup>āsark<sup>h</sup>os/ is likely to contain the s-aorist of πάομαι (a verb which in first-millennium Greek mostly survives in Doric varieties). *qi-si-ja-ko* /K<sup>w</sup>iśiark<sup>h</sup>os/ seems to reflect the s-aorist of τίνω (ἔτιισα, ἔτιισα), which would

<sup>114</sup> García Ramón (1992: 254).

<sup>115</sup> LIV 447 identifies the primary formation of this root with an athematic radical present: in Greek, this was remade into the thematic present μνάομαι. The s-aorist is the only aorist which LIV reconstructs from this root: although secondary, it is the oldest form continued in Greek.

therefore be attested already in Mycenaean.<sup>116</sup> All these forms in *-si-* therefore provide strong evidence in support of the hypothesis that compounds in *-si-* could be derived from the s-aorist independently of, and even prior to, assibilation. In parallel with this, it is precisely the fact that we have only one pair of FCs alternating between [ti] and [si] that shows that the indiscriminate replacement of *-ti-* forms with those in *-si-* was *not* heavily underway in Mycenaean, and that there was *not* widespread confusion and overlap between the two patterns: to the contrary, the derivational mechanisms of FCs in *-ti-* and FCs in *-si-* were kept quite separate.

### 7.10 Summary

The conclusion that can be drawn from these data is straightforward. Mycenaean preserves a stage in which FCs in *-ti-* have not started being replaced indiscriminately by those in *-si-*. The [ti] in these FCs may have been blocked to maintain the root employed in them clear, perhaps under the analogical influence of root aorist formations. On the other hand, transparent FCs in *-si-* are mostly linked to s-aorists and—with the sole exception of compounds in *ta-si-* emerging alongside those in *ta-ti-*—there is no single case of coexistence of FCs in *-ti-* and FCs containing sibilants which can be exclusively explained through assibilation. Rather, the sibilants in these alternating FCs, which are often geminates, are explainable within the specific phonetic environment of the compounds.<sup>117</sup>

Mycenaean may thus point to the co-existence of two originally independent types whose overlap has only started to take place. If the wholesale replacement of *-ti-* forms with *-si-* forms—based on assibilation and morphological association with the s-aorist—had already started in Mycenaean, we would expect a heavier

**116** On the [i:] in the stem of the s-aorist ἔτισα, already attested in Homer, see Cassio (1991–1993: 199–200). Lejeune (1971: 305 n. 55) to the contrary reconstructs the aorist \*ἔτεια from \*tei-, formed in the same way as ἔχευα from \*g<sup>h</sup>eu-. This hypothesis is mentioned, without definitive endorsement, in *DEG* 1121 (τίνω). Such an interpretation finds support in the participle *qe-ja-me-no* /k<sup>w</sup>eiamenos/, usually considered to be an aorist participle from τίνω, which does not show [s]. However, the hypothesis that this form continues an old root aorist, though suggested by influential scholars, for instance Lejeune and Chantraine, is not widely accepted. On this theory, see *LIV* 380 n. 7 and *DMic s.v. qe-ja-me-no*, with references. Conversely, the alternative hypothesis that *qe-ja-me-no* represents /k<sup>w</sup>eihamenos/ after intervocalic [s] has gone to [h] is in contrast with the behaviour of the other forms of the s-aorist in Mycenaean (*e-ra-se* = ἔλασε and *e-re-u-te-ro-se* = ἐλευθήρωσε), which preserve the [s]. On [s] > [h] in Mycenaean, see now Morpurgo Davies (2012: 105–107), with bibliography.

**117** As noted, \*k<sup>h</sup>d- is only continued in the perfect κέκασμαι, while \*k<sup>h</sup>ens- was lost and replaced with ἐπαίνεω: see García Ramón (1992: 249).

interchange between the two categories. There should be more *-si-* forms from the same verbal roots as those in *-ti-* and, moreover, we should expect the extension of *-si-* also to those FCs which cannot be linked to an s-aorist. On the contrary, the coexistence of *ta-si-* and *ta-ti-* provides very good evidence in favour of the fact that the replacement of *-ti-* with *-si-* started in the compounds from verbs in which the coexistence of the old root aorist (ἔστην) and a newer s-aorist (ἔστησα) is likely to have been in place already at the chronological stage of Mycenaean. In the absence of s-aorists, some forms in *-ti-* were precisely preserved because no ‘updating’ to the *-si-* type was possible.

## 8 Compounds in *-ti-* in early alphabetic Greek

Early Greek preserves a surprisingly small number of compounds in *-τι-*: the PNs Ὀρτίλοχος, Καστιάνειρα and Δωτώ (< \*Δωτι-), and the appellatives βητάρμων, βωπιάνειρα, ἀρτιεπής, ἀρτίπους and ἀρτίφρων. This shows that the replacement or ‘updating’ of FCs in *-ti-* to those in *-si-* was already accomplished by the time the Homeric poems received their final form. The traditional explanation of these FCs in *-τι-* is that they are relics, preserved by the literary prestige of the Aeolic non-assibilating varieties.<sup>118</sup> However, the epigraphic evidence does not support this hypothesis at all: there is no special incidence of compounds in *-τι-* from West Greek areas, where *-σι-* forms are as common as in East Greek.<sup>119</sup> This suggests that the preservation of *-τι-* is due to other factors.

As claimed in the previous sections, forms in *-τι-* were mostly preserved when their replacement with forms in *-σι-* was not encouraged by the existence of sigmatic tenses. This was often accompanied by another phenomenon, namely the fact that some of the roots on which these FCs were based had become extinct or rare in Greek. At the same time, conservatism may have decreed the preservation

<sup>118</sup> See, e.g. Schwyzler (1939: 442), Risch (1974: 192), Janko (1992: 17), Waanders (2008: 17 n. 32), but the opinion is widespread.

<sup>119</sup> As a matter of fact, there are no straightforward compounded PNs containing *-τι-* other than Ὀρτίλοχος and (perhaps) the Cretan name Ἐρπετίδαμος; on the latter, see Chapter 5 section 4.2. The evidence from short names is not very helpful, chiefly because forms containing *-τ(i)-* and which can be connected to verbal roots are often liable to be interpreted in various ways: for example, are short names in Ἐρατ- relics of the unassibilated Ἐρατι- (corresponding to V1 compounds in Ἐρασι-) or abbreviations of compounds beginning with Ἐρατο-? Among the most likely candidates for the preservation of *-τι-* in the onomastic lexicon it is worth mentioning Ἐργετίων (Arcadia 425–385 BC) for the fact that it is attested in a dialectal area which underwent the assibilation of [t] into [s]: if this form is authentically Arcadian, it proves that the preservation of *-τι-* has nothing to do with non-assibilation.

of some -τι- forms in face of the existence of new -σι- forms, particularly in the case of PNs: this explanation for instance may well apply to Ὀρτίλοχος vis-à-vis the recent form Ὀρσίλοχος, as argued below.<sup>120</sup>

### 8.1 Ὀρτίλοχος

This name follows the formation pattern of the Mycenaean PNs analysed in section 7.2: its FC contains the bare root behind ὄρνυμι; its meaning is quite transparently ‘he who stirs the ambush’. FCs from this verb prove particularly useful for the study of the evolution from -τι- to -σι- FCs. The only compounds attested in Mycenaean are of the -τι- type and belong to a stage which precedes the formation of the popular group of compounds based on the s-aorist ὤρσα, those in ὄρσι-. The co-existence of ὄρτι- and ὄρσι- in Homeric Greek would thus represent a similar situation to that represented by the coexistence of forms in *ta-ti-* and *ta-si-* in Mycenaean (see sections 7.3 and 7.9): forms in ὄρτι- are relics, while those in ὄρσι- are on the way to becoming the only pattern.

### 8.2 Δωτώ

The *Kurzname* Δωτώ, the name of a Nereid, derives from a V1 compound in \*Δωτι- through the feminine suffix -ώ, frequent in hypocoristics. The FC contains the full-grade root δω- < \*deh<sub>3</sub>-, whose use in the FC of compounds may originally have been supported by the root aorist (e.g. ἔδομεν, δότε), the primary formation from this root. Δωτώ is blocked in that it is a short form, going back to a FC which had not undergone assibilation into δωσι-. It is interesting to note that there are no such FCs from δίδωμι before the fifth century BC and even after this date the type is very limited, in spite of the importance of the verb itself: this can probably be explained by the fact that the productive aorist of δίδωμι is the new kappatic aorist ἔδωκα and there is no sigmatic aorist which could support the extensive use of the FC δωσι- (which therefore probably employs the future stem).

### 8.3 βητάρμων

The Homeric compound βητάρμων, usually glossed as ‘dancer’, probably indicated a special kind of acrobat, who was able to step (βῆναι) onto wheels (cf. Myc.

<sup>120</sup> See e.g. Risch (1974: 191), but the interpretation is widespread.

*a-mo*, yielding the plural ἄρμα ‘chariots’ in alphabetic Greek).<sup>121</sup> This meaning suggests that the connection between the root in the FC and the root aorist ἔβην could have functioned as an obstacle of assibilation: although the causative s-aorist ἔβησα ‘make go’ was available, re-analysis of the FC into βησ- did not take place, perhaps because the semantics of the FC βησ- would be different (moreover, βησι- features in only one V1 compound, the Homeric PN Ἄναβησίλεως).

#### 8.4 βωτιάνειρα

This Homeric form has stirred an endless debate and at times has been used to claim that the FC of -τι- forms hides an old agent noun. The interpretation of the FC as an agent noun was prompted by the fact that βωτι- does not correspond to any form of βόσσω ‘feed’, but rather resembles the agent noun βώτωρ and V2 compounds in -βωτης. We will now consider a different interpretation.

The root behind βόσσω is a matter of debate, but it is probably to be reconstructed as \*g<sup>w</sup>eh<sub>3</sub>-.<sup>122</sup> βόσσω is a \*s<sup>k</sup>é/ó- present showing the expected zero grade of this root: \*g<sup>w</sup>eh- (\*g<sup>w</sup>h<sub>3</sub>- > \*g<sup>w</sup>o-, going to βο- in first-millennium Greek). This present is ancient and has influenced the rest of the paradigm, which extraordinarily preserves the -σκ- suffix in all tenses: the future is βοσκήσω (Hom.), the aorist is ἐβόσκησα (*Geoponica*) and the perfect is βεβόσκηκα (Libanius). The extension of the present suffix to the whole paradigm is a very isolated fact in Greek: it is the result of an analogical levelling that must have started early on, as the Homeric future βοσκήσω testifies. The agent noun βοσκός ‘herdsman’, first attested as a simplex in Aesop,<sup>123</sup> further strengthens the impression that the suffix -σκ- was perceived to be part of the root.

<sup>121</sup> See Risch (1974: 52), though he considers this interpretation with caution, and Stefanelli (2008: 23). Previous analyses have interpreted the FC βητ(i)- to cover for an agent noun or an action noun, but the structure of the compound would be extremely artificial. According to Janda (2000: 28), who subscribes to Schindler’s idea that V1 compounds developed out of bahuvrihis with a factitive understanding of the FC, the FC would contain an old action noun: βητάρμων would mean ‘having a running wheel’ and was later interpreted as ‘he who makes the wheel run’. Janda’s interpretation is followed by Nielsen Whitehead (2012: 74–75), who however does not discard the hypothesis that the compound is an artificial formation.

<sup>122</sup> Lubotsky (1990: 133–134), *EDG* 223; the root is strangely not included in *LIV*, which never quotes βόσσω and its derivations. The idea that the root contained a -w appendix, maintained in *DEG* and *IEW*, derives from the form of the Lithuanian noun *gaujà* ‘herd’. It is possible, however, that the Lithuanian noun got its [w] from contamination with the root for ‘cow’, if this is to be reconstructed as \*g<sup>w</sup>eh<sub>3</sub>-w- (though see *contra* De Decker (2011)).

<sup>123</sup> But see the compounds πορνοβοσκός already in Myrtilus and Demosthenes.

The full root grade βω- must be part of the original paradigm of βόσσω, given that it features in its agent noun βώτωρ and in -βωτης compounds, the long vowel of which would otherwise be difficult to explain. βωτιάνερα, βώτωρ, etc. could therefore continue the full-grade root which is likely to have had its appointed primary formation in a root aorist, later replaced by βόσσω and its paradigm. The hypothesis that there existed in Greek a root aorist in βω- is further strengthened by the fact, worth stressing, that ἐβόσκησα and related forms are not attested before a rather late period.<sup>124</sup> βωτιάνερα, an isolated form, may have been preserved because there was no s-aorist \*\*βωσ- and, therefore, there was no verbal form which could support the change of the FC into βωσι-.<sup>125</sup>

### 8.5 Καστιάνερα

Knecht (1946: 11) considers the PN Καστιάνερα to follow the same pattern as βωτιάνερα. Although never openly stated in his monograph, the resulting belief is that Καστιάνερα is a partly artificial form.<sup>126</sup> The Mycenaean evidence discussed in 7.5 however provides a good structural pattern for Καστιάνερα. The FC shows the zero grade \**k̑nd-* of the root \**k̑end-* ‘to excel, to be visible’, provided with the compositional marker *-ti-*. The different treatment of the *Kompositions-fuge* in Καστιάνερα and Κασσάνδρα (the latter showing regular palatalization) may be due to rhythmical factors, as suggested by García Ramón (1992: 255) but consideration should also be given to the context in which Καστιάνερα occurs. This is a hapax identifying one of Priam’s wives (the mother of Teucros) in *Il.* 8.305: since palatalization is a phonologically secondary stage, ensuing from the original /Kasti-/, this FC may have been blocked in its original shape by the metre.

<sup>124</sup> The information in *LSJ s.v.* βόσσω that the sigmatic aorist is not attested before the tenth-century AD collection of agricultural information that goes under the title of *Geoponica* must be corrected. Forms of the sigmatic aorist occur earlier in καταβόσσω (cf. for instance κατεβοσκήσατο in Long. *Daph. et Chloe* 2.16.1.5).

<sup>125</sup> Nielsen Whitehead (2012: 75–77) on the other hand suggests that βωτι- might have been blocked by the analogy with other Homeric compounds ending in -νερα and whose FCs have a trochaic pattern, such as Καστιάνερα, ἀντιάνερα and κυδιάνερα.

<sup>126</sup> Nielsen Whitehead (2012: 79) similarly explains the FC as being analogical on the agent noun Κάστωρ.

## 8.6 ἀρτιεπής

The last compound which may be interpreted as a V1 form in -ti- is ἀρτιεπής ‘ready of speech’. As remarked in 7.1, the Homeric adjectives in ἀρτι- are usually linked to the adverb ἄρτι ‘exactly’ or to the adjective ἄρτιος ‘ready’.<sup>127</sup> However, it is equally probable that the FC originally contained the root \**h<sub>2</sub>er-*, as we have proposed for the Mycenaean PN *a-ti-pa-mo* /Artiphāmos/: this name and the Homeric epithet ἀρτιεπής would both mean ‘he who fits together words’.

This original meaning of the FC however is no longer reflected in the other two Homeric adjectives in ἀρτι-, ἀρτίπους ‘sound of foot’ and ἀρτίφρων ‘sound of mind’: here, the FC has the function of a determiner and the compounds have possessive semantics. With this sub-type in ἀρτι- we thus witness the morphological re-interpretation and semantic evolution of the old -ti- type at work: while ἀρτιεπής is still explainable as an old V1 compound, based on the bare root, the other two are formed according to new syntactic and semantic patterns, in which ἀρτι- is no longer a governing element but acquires the meaning of the adjective ἄρτιος.

## 8.7 Summary

From the above analyses we can draw the conclusion that the few Homeric forms in -τι- were not preserved because they were associated with non-assibilating dialects. In Homeric Greek, -τι- forms are relics which were blocked either by the impossibility of re-analyzing them into more common patterns (for instance because of the absence of an s-aorist, as argued for βωτιάνειρα and Καστιάνειρα) or by conservatism, as in the case of Ὀρτίλοχος vs. its more recent form Ὀρσίλοχος, and Δωτώ (blocked because it is a short form). βητάρμων might also have been preserved because of a transparent semantic connection with the stem of the root aorist ἔβην, since it could—but does not—change into βησ-. ἀρτιεπής on the other hand shows that morphological reanalysis of the FC could trigger the creation of other compounds in -τι- which were no longer based on verbal stems.

These compounds in -τι- are a very ancient relic already in Homeric Greek, where the productive derivational patterns of V1 compounds are only the φερέοικος type, mostly based on present stems, and the τερψίμβροτος type, mostly based on the s-aorist. The next chapter will explore how this bipartite system of V1 compounds was exploited to meet the needs of the language, achieving a good degree of productivity.

<sup>127</sup> For instance by Knecht (1946: 16), von Kamptz (1982: 66).

## 9 Conclusion

This chapter has dealt with a vast range of issues, which have been discussed adopting a historical approach. On the methodological level, we have seen that the analysis of a linguistic phenomenon which characterizes a language (here, V1 compounds in Greek) can greatly benefit from the adoption of a comparative perspective. Although this chapter has dealt with other ancient and modern IE languages only briefly, this comparative approach has helped us to reach the following conclusions:

- There are two types of V1 compounds which seem have been shared by more than one ancient IE language: compounds in *-e-* (Greek, Sanskrit, Iranian) and compounds in *-ti-* (Vedic, Greek).
- Although the extant Vedic *-ti-* compounds are better analysed as bahuvrihis, it is very likely that these few specimina continue an inherited V1 type, which Vedic lost as such and remade into a bahuvrihi pattern.
- The Greek *-si-* type does not have cognates in other ancient languages: the very few Latin compounds in *-si-* (e.g. *versipellis*) are ambiguous and are better interpreted according to different patterns (e.g. by assuming that the FC is a participle).
- Greek compounds in *-si-* may be seen to have arisen out of those in *-ti-* uniquely as a result of assibilation. However, their early association with the s-aorist encourages—if only on a speculative level—the hypothesis that a direct derivation from the s-aorist may have been operative independently of assibilation and perhaps even at earlier chronological stages than Greek itself. In this hypothetical scenario, the lack of *-si-* forms in Indo-Iranian would not be too surprising, given that in this branch V1 compounds of all types are limited and tend to be re-analysed to fit more popular patterns.
- The *-ti-* element seems to have mostly characterized V1 compounds based on bare, mostly full-grade, roots: the residual and often obscure character of *-ti-* compounds can be better understood starting from the assumption that in Greek they survived mostly when their transformation into *-si-* compounds was not supported by sigmatic tenses. This is often connected to the fact that the root aorist was the primary formation from these roots and in many cases was still attested in early Greek. This type in *-ti-* was prototypically opposed to a type employing present stems and characterized by the element *-e-*. However, the use of different stems or roots should not be taken to imply that the FCs express an aspectual opposition.

The development and productivity of V1 compounds in Greek must be sought beyond the possible origin of their FCs in PIE and depends on the morphological



and analogical mechanisms at play in the language. The next two chapters will focus on the formal and semantic interaction of V1 compounds with agent nouns and V2 compounds: a full understanding of the properties of V1 compounds as a whole cannot be reached without good knowledge of the formal make-up of corresponding verbal derivations, particularly in the case of verbs whose derivational rate is high.



# Chapter Five

## The Analysis of V1 Compounds Within the Greek Compound System

### Part I: V1 Compounds Without V2 Counterparts

#### 1 Introduction

Having investigated the origin of V1 compounds in PIE and their early history in Greek, we now come to the analysis of their diachronic development in the language. As noted in Chapters 2 and 3, V1 compounds are not a marginal type, but a relatively productive compound category which interacts with other categories of verbal compounds. The very few studies which have addressed the coexistence of V1 and V2 compounds have tended to attribute it to the freedom characterizing the onomastic domain (Bechtel and Fick 1894), to the alleged ‘creativity’ of the Greek language (Andriotis 1938), or to a supposed semantic distinction between the two patterns (Benveniste 1967).<sup>1</sup> However, none of these short contributions to the question has attempted a full study of all the categories of V1 compounds in their formal, semantic and stylistic relation to V2 compounds: as a consequence, the explanations proposed for the coexistence of these patterns are usually the result of an impressionistic approach to the topic.

This and the next chapter aim to fill this gap by providing a comprehensive study of the productivity, morphological peculiarities and semantics of Greek V1 compounds, and to do so not by treating them as an isolated category, but by examining their interaction with other verbal categories which express similar semantics: V2 compounds in -ος (Chapter 2, section 6.3), in -της (Chapter 2, section 6.4), in -ής (Chapter 2, section 6.2), and a few less common categories (Chapter 2, sections 6.5 and 6.8). Both chapters begin with a morphological analysis of the base verbs which generate V1 compounds. This is necessary for an understanding of the formal constraints which may have influenced the high or low productivity of a given compound structure. An issue that has been entirely overlooked in the literature concerns the large number of V1 compounds which do not have a V2 counterpart (entries marked as Classes I and II in the Corpus). This was certainly a factor in the development of individual types (‘families’) of V1 compounds, and the productivity and morphological features of these various types are addressed in full in this chapter.

At a further level of analysis, this morphological approach must be complemented by a semantic study of individual V1 and V2 families which takes into

---

<sup>1</sup> See Chapter 2, section 7.5.4, and Chapter 3, section 7.

consideration the type of text in which they are attested. This analysis is of course central to the V1–V2 comparison addressed in Chapter 6, but it is also beneficial for a better understanding of that particular class of verbs which generate agent nouns but not V2 compounds (Class II) and for which, therefore, the V1 pattern is the only productive one. In the case of this group of verbs, morphological analysis alone is not sufficient to explain patterns of development and needs to be complemented by a study of the base verbs, their uncompounded agent nouns, and V1 compounds in context. The reasons for the lack of V2 compounds derived from a given verb may differ, ranging from semantic restrictions (e.g. the base verb is used in a limited range of meanings, or the agent nouns derived from the base verb have become specialized as technical terms) to limitations of register or chronology (e.g. the base verb itself is rare, or associated with specific registers, or ceases to be used early on in the history of the language). These factors must be weighed carefully before turning to the function fulfilled by individual V1 compounds.

The semantic and morphological analysis adopted in this chapter for the study of Class I (V1 compounds without a V2 counterpart: section 4) and Class II (V1 compounds derived from verbs which have simple agent nouns but not V2 compounds: section 5) sets the stage for the study of the interaction between V1 and V2 compounds (Class IV). Chapter 6 goes to the core of the question by investigating why the V1 type, a recessive category in Indo-European, becomes a popular pattern in Greek, a language in which V2 compounds are extremely productive. By applying this morphological and semantic approach, both chapters contribute insights which counter the notion that V1 compounds only survived as stylistic devices of the onomastic and poetic lexicons, arguing instead that they filled semantic and morphological gaps associated with both the base verbs and the agent nouns and V2 compounds to which these verbs give rise.

## 2 Setting up the V1–V2 comparison: corpus and methodology

The V1 compounds collected in the Corpus derive from one hundred and fifty-eight different verbs. Eighty V1 families, almost half of the corpus, have a V2 counterpart (types *φερεικος* / *οικοφορος*, *ελασιππος* / *ιπηλατης*, *μαινανδρος* / *γυναιμανης*, *αναξιαλος* / *αστυναξ*), while seventy-eight have none. This divergence encourages a twofold approach to the study of the relationship between V1 and V2 compounds. On the one hand, the analysis must focus on competing V1–V2 pairs and consider the potential morphological, semantic, and stylistic factors determining the differentiation and coexistence of the two patterns. One question of particular pertinence is why, with a V2 compound derived from the same verb already in existence, V1 compounds were nevertheless created. These and similar

questions will be addressed in Chapter 6. On the other hand, the large number of V1 compounds without a V2 counterpart need to be studied in their own right. The first question is whether there are any morphological factors which impede the creation of V2 compounds and agent nouns from a given verb (Class I): an example of this situation is the verb δειδω ‘fear’, which generates V1 compounds such as Δεισήνωρ ‘fearing men’ and δεισιδαίμων ‘fearing the gods’, but possesses neither agent nouns nor V2 compounds. As we shall see, the forty-two verbs in this class share a number of morphological properties, while the V1 compounds they generate are often one-off *specimina* or rare forms: morphology, combined with semantics and stylistics, brings to light the factors likely to be responsible for the lack of V2 compounds and agent nouns.

Another important question we face when considering V1 compounds without a V2 counterpart is why such a large number of verbs (thirty-three) produce agent nouns and yet fail to make use of them in compounding (Class II). An example is μέλλω ‘hesitate’. In spite of the existence of the agent noun μελλητής ‘hesitating person, one who waits’ already in Thucydides, this verb does not create V2 compounds and the V1 pattern (μελλόγαμος ‘awaiting marriage’, Soph.) is the only option. Even taking into account the fact that AG is a ‘dead’ language, this lack of V2 compounds cannot simply be ascribed to chance: the analysis provided in sections 5.1–5.3.2 focuses on issues surrounding the semantics and productivity of both the base verbs and their agent nouns in order to highlight recurrent patterns that might serve to explain the lack of V2 compounds derived from certain verbs.

A different issue again concerns the in-betweenness of verbs and compounds belonging to Class III. These three verbs (e.g. λείπω ‘leave’) fully exploit the morphological means of creating agent nouns and V2 compounds, but they do not admit compounding with nominals and only allow preverbs (e.g. ἐπιλοιπός ‘remaining’): as a consequence, the status of Class III is ambiguous in that there are no morphological constraints on the creation of V2 compounds, but the special semantic restrictions in force prevent the use of these agentive SCs with nominal FCs. In the study of Classes I, II and III we will often have cause to consider the formal make-up of simple and compounded agent nouns, and it is for this reason that an analysis of agent nouns must form an integral part of the study of V1 compounds in the context of the Greek compound system.

### 3 V1 compounds without a V2 counterpart: introduction

The tendencies manifested by V1 compounds without a V2 counterpart constitute a convenient reference point for the investigation of V1 and V2 competing pairs. In order to understand the relationship between a given base verb and the

compounds and agent nouns it generates (or does not generate), it is vital to take a close look at the morphology of the verbal roots themselves and at the type of verbal paradigm which, *from a synchronic perspective*, a given root produces in Greek. The reason this is such an important issue is that paradigmatic regularity and transparency often guide the choices that speakers make regarding the creation and regular use of deverbative formations. By contrast, irregularity—be it morphological, such as suppletivism, or phonological—obscures the formal and semantic links between forms and may be responsible for the unproductive character of many verbal stems. This might explain, for instance, the low productivity of V1 and V2 compounds derived from ἀραρίσκω (Class IV: Chapter 6, section 3.2; see also Chapter 4, section 7.1).

#### 4 Class I: V1 compounds derived from verbs which give rise neither to a V2 compound nor to an agent noun

The following forty-two verbs all form the basis of V1 compounds, but at the same time create neither active V2 compounds nor, it appears, simple agent nouns:

ἄα ‘hurt’, ἄγαμαι ‘admire’, ἀγαπάω ‘love’, ἀμαρτάνω ‘fail’, ἀμέρδω ‘deprive’, ἀμεύομαι ‘surpass’, ἀνδάνω ‘please’, βούλομαι ‘wish’, βρίθω ‘weigh down’, βρύω ‘swell with’, γάννυμαι ‘brighten up’, δέιδω ‘fear’, δοκέω ‘seem, pretend’, εἶλον ‘take’, εἶλω ‘press’, ἐλελίζω ‘whirl round, cause to vibrate’, ἐρείπω ‘throw down’, ἴσχω ‘hold’, κάπτω ‘gulp down’, κείρω ‘crop’, κέκασμαι ‘surpass’, κιχάνω ‘reach’, κύρω ‘obtain’, λαγχάνω ‘obtain by lot’, λανθάνω ‘escape notice, make one forget’, λήγω ‘stop’, μείγνυμι ‘mix’, μέμφομαι ‘blame’, μίμνω ‘stand’, μίσγω ‘mix’, πίμπλημι ‘fill’, ρίπτω ‘throw’, σπένδω ‘pour’, σπεύδω ‘urge’, στυγέω ‘hate’, σχήσω ‘hold’ (future of ἔχω), τανύω ‘stretch’, τίλλω ‘pluck’, τυγχάνω ‘hit upon, meet’, φθίνω ‘consume’, χρέμπτομαι ‘spit’. The root giving rise to the FC ἐν(ν)οσι- ‘shake’, as yet unidentified, can be added to this group.

On the whole, with a few exceptions analysed below, most of these verbs share a certain characteristic: they are neither based on ablauting CeC-/CoC- roots (τρέφω), which give rise to agent nouns in CoC-os (τροφός), the most popular type of agent nouns used in compounding (κουροτρόφος); nor are they based on Greek presents in short vowel (ἄρχω), which give rise to -ος agent nouns with short vocalic grade (ἀρχός), another popular type in compounding (στράταρχος). Their only means of creating an agent noun is to use the base root and add the suffixes -τηρ, -τωρ or -της: the lack of such forms for these verbs may of course be due merely to chance, but we will see below that other factors are perhaps at play.

The verbs which give rise to the V1 compounds in this group belong to the following categories:

- Full-grade thematic radical presents: ἀμέρδω, ἐρείπω (displaying ablaut in the thematic aorist ἤριπτον), λήγω, σπεύδω. The following verbs derive from ablauting CeC/CoC roots, but ablaut is not part of their paradigm and only features in deverbal nouns: μέμφομαι (μομφή ‘blame’), σπένδω (σπονδή ‘libation’).
- Reduplicated presents: δαίδω, ἐλελίζω, ἴσχω, μίμνω, πίμπλημι.
- Roots which form the present with nasal infixes and suffixes: ἀμαρτάνω, ἀνδάνω, βούλομαι, γάνυμαι, εἴλω/εἰλέω, κιχάνω, λαγχάνω, λανθάνω, μείγνυμι/μίγνυμι, τανύω, τυγχάνω, φθίνω.<sup>2</sup>
- -σκω presents: μίσγω (< \*mik̄/ǵ-ské-).
- -jé/ó- presents from consonantal roots: κάπτω, κείρω, χρέμπτομαι.<sup>3</sup>
- -jé/ó- or -éje/o- presents which yield vocalic verbs in Greek: δοκέω, στυγέω.
- Reduplicated perfects: κέκασμαι.
- Thematic aorists: εἶλον (suppletive aorist of αἰρέω, from the root \*selh<sub>1</sub>-).<sup>4</sup>
- Futures: σχήσω (alternative future of ἔχω ‘have’, from the zero grade \*sǵ<sup>h</sup>- of the root).
- Nine verbs of unclear etymology or formation: ἀάω<sup>5</sup>, ἄγαμαι<sup>6</sup>, ἀγαπάω, ἀμεύομαι<sup>7</sup>, βρήθω<sup>8</sup>, βρύω<sup>9</sup>, κύρω<sup>10</sup>, ῥίπτω,<sup>11</sup> τίλλω. The FC ἐνοσι- too is of obscure origin: it is certainly connected with the -σις noun ἔνοσις, but it is unclear whether it derives from a verbal root.<sup>12</sup>

**2** Some of these verbs are very old in origin, to the point that the original n-infix or suffix is no longer visible, as in βούλομαι (if this reconstruction is correct: see *LIV* 208, *EDG* s.v.: another popular interpretation is that the Greek present was formed with the desiderative suffix -s-), or the verb has been remodelled, as in the case of εἴλω/εἰλέω < \*wel-n. Other verbs were created within Greek by adding the suffix -av-, e.g. ἀμαρτάνω, formed on the basis of the inherited zero-grade aorist ἤμαρτον: *LIV* 281.

**3** χρέμπτομαι is seemingly a \*jé/ó- present formed on the same root from which χρεμετίζω derives, unless -πτ- is based on the analogy of the other verb for ‘spit’ πτύω: see *GEW* ii, 1116.

**4** Hardarson (1993: 156, 166).

**5** The connection with ἄτη is beyond doubt, but the verb cannot be a denominative derivation from it: see *GEW* i, 2, 178; *EDG* 3.

**6** *EDG* 7 derives it from the intensive prefix ἀγα-, a derivation which *GEW* i, 5 considers less likely.

**7** *GEW* i, 92; *EDG* 87 tentatively suggests \*h<sub>2</sub>meu-.

**8** From βρή ‘heavily’ through a θ-enlargement? See *EDG*, s.v. βρή.

**9** *GEW* i, 274–275; *EDG* 246.

**10** *GEW* ii, 46; *EDG* 808–809.

**11** From \*ǵr-i-p-? See *GEW* ii, 659. *EDG* 1288 however deems this etymology ‘highly implausible’, suggesting a proto-Greek origin for the verb.

**12** *GEW* i, 523; *EDG* 430; *DMic* s.v. e-ne-si-da-o-ne.

Here we have a coherent group of verbs whose lack of V2 compounds can be attributed, first and foremost, to the impossibility of deriving an -ος agent noun from them: the verbs which allow this type of formation are only three of those listed in the first typology. In the second place, semantic factors may have intervened to block the creation of agent nouns in -της, -τηρ or -τωρ, since there are no particular phonological constraints on the formation of agent nouns of this kind from the roots in this group of verbs. The lack of agent nouns is therefore likely to depend on the combined constraints of morphology (i.e. the difficulty of creating an easily compoundable and transparent agent noun) and semantics. I provide a few interpretative suggestions below.

Some verbs may have been too rare or elevated in register to build productive agent nouns. An example is the epic verb *ἄω* ‘damage’, seldom used in other poetic genres. Moreover, *ἄω* is semantically restricted: it refers solely to damage done to the mind, whether through infatuation, deception or intoxication. Its agent noun would consequently have the specialized meaning ‘one who damages the mind’ and would not convey the general idea of ‘damaging’: this is further confirmed by the semantic specialization of the deverbal personified form Ἄτη ‘she who blinds one’s mind’. Similarly, *ἐλελίζω* ‘whirl round, cause to vibrate’ is a poetic verb associated with epic, where it is used mostly for actions involving weapons or the shaking of earth and mountains on the part of the gods. Its poetic status is confirmed by the fact that it is glossed in Apollonius Sophista’s Homeric lexicon (66.5 Bekker).

Two other rare verbs are *ἁμείβομαι* ‘surpass’ and the old perfect *κέκασμαι* ‘I am adorned’. *ἁμείβομαι* is a Doric form corresponding to *ἁμείβομαι*. It is mostly confined to Cretan inscriptions and highly poetic language (Pindar, Euphorion). The V1 compounds are similarly poetic (Pindar), while the few onomastic forms are mostly attested in West-Greek regions. *κέκασμαι* and its new present *καίνυμαι* are mostly associated with epic poetry, particularly in their original meaning of ‘surpass’ (in later texts we sometimes find the meaning ‘to adorn’): already in Hellenistic Greek forms of *καίνυμαι* are attested exclusively in poetry or lexicography, and soon the only form of the verb remains the perfect participle *κεκασμένος/κεκαμμένος*. The rarity of this verb is matched by the recessive character of the PNs based on it: in particular, the old-fashioned shape of the FC of *Καστιάνειρα* may have contributed to ousting this name from the onomastic practice of later Greek, while the opacity of its connection with *κέκασμαι*, itself a scarcely productive verb in word formation, may have prevented the creation of new forms.

In other cases, a given agent noun may have been redundant on account of the availability of synonyms. For instance, *ἀγαπάω* ‘love’ and *στέργω* ‘love, be fond of’ may have suffered competition from the common agent nouns derived from the synonymous verbs *φιλέω* and *ἔραμαι*; while *τάνυμαι* and *τανύω* ‘stretch’,



which are mostly poetic (with the exception of astronomical prose, where they are common), encompass the same semantics as the more pervasive *τείνω*, which gives rise to V2 compounds in *-τονος*. As another example, we may consider the case of *κάπτω* ‘gulp down’, which signifies a specific mode of eating associated with animals. The verb was particularly popular in comedy, where it was associated with lower-class people.<sup>13</sup> However, in comic language gluttons are instead designated with the term *κατωφαγᾶς/καταφαγᾶς* ‘eating with the head down’, a derivative of *φαγεῖν*, which conveys a similarly bestial resonance (animals eat with their head down). The popularity of V2 compounds from *φαγεῖν* may therefore have contributed to making agent nouns and compounds derived from *κάπτω* seem superfluous.

Some of the verbs in Class I develop verbal compounds in *-ής*, but these are always passive and usually quite rare: see the entries on *βρίθω*, *εἶλω*, *λανθάνω*, *μείγνυμι*, *μέμφομαι* and *ρίπτω* in the Corpus, and, further, Chapter 6, section 4.3. In the case of these verbs, we must rule out the possibility that morphological constraints played a role in blocking the development of an active compound in *-ής*; rather, this is to be attributed to semantic factors, as well as to the fact that the acquisition of an active meaning is a much more sporadic and patchy phenomenon in the development of verbal compounds in *-ής* (Chapter 6, section 4.1).

Rarity, stylistic specialization and the competition of synonyms are not relevant to the case of all the verbs in Class I, but the adoption of a more nuanced approach, combining morphology, phonology and semantics, may help us to sift through the material and spot trends in this group. The relative rarity of some verbs, which often occur in fixed poetic images to the point of appearing almost semantically specialized, and the fact that others were in competition with more popular verbs are not just possible factors in the lack of agent nouns: they often influenced the make-up, meaning and productivity of the V1 compounds themselves.

If we look at the quantity and chronological distribution of the V1 compounds in Class I, we note that only the seventeen families analysed in section 4.3 below comprise more than four items, while most of the remaining families are not only smaller in number, but are often represented by only a single item (notably those derived from *άάω*, *άγαπάω*, *βρίθω*, *βρύω*, *γάννυμαι*, *έλελίζω*, *κάπτω*, *κέκασμαι*, *κιχάνω*, *κύρω*, *λαγχάνω*, *μέμφομαι*, *σπένδω*, *σχήσω*, *τυγχάνω* and *χρέμπτομαι*: sixteen out of forty-two verbs). Moreover, most of the V1 compounds in Class I are used in poetry and onomastics, and the productivity of individual FCs usually wanes in post-Classical Greek.

<sup>13</sup> See Taillardat (1965: 82).

#### 4.1 Poetic verbs and rare V1 compounds

There is a correlation between poetic verbs (i.e. verbs attested mostly in poetry, which often also have only a few attestations) and the low, if not non-existent productivity of certain compound forms.

##### ἄάω

The compound derived from ἄάω, ἀεσίφρων, and its derivation ἀεσιφροσύνη ‘folly’ are both Homeric creations, corresponding to syntagms joining ‘mind’ and ‘damaging’ (e.g., φρένας ἄασε οἴνω ‘he damaged his heart with wine’, *Od.* 21.297). After Homer and Hesiod, ἀεσίφρων is used only by Quintus Smyrnaeus: its poetic status is confirmed by its appearance as a lemma in the popular Homeric lexicon of Apollonius Sophista. As is the case with other poetic V1 formations, this compound is quite artificial: the FC does not correspond to any stem of ἄάω (the sigmatic tenses have the shape ἄασ-: see, however, the later forms ἀασίφρων, Hsch., and ἀασιφρονία, Phot.). Moreover, the semantics of the whole compound is not agentive: the SC does not fulfil the function of the object (‘damaging the mind’) but rather restricts the meaning of the FC as an adjunct (‘damaged in the mind’).

##### ἀγαπάω

This is a rare verb in early Greek and features in only one compound, ἀγαπήνωρ, used in Homer both as a PN and as an adjective meaning ‘loving manliness’. This meaning depends on a restricted understanding of the SC -ήνωρ as ‘fighting men, warriors’, rather than simply ‘men’ or ‘human kind’. The adjective is not used much after early epic, but is often commented upon in lexica such as those of Apollonius Sophista and Hesychius.

##### ἀμέρδω

This is a poetic verb. The three compounds in ἀμερσι-, based on the stem of the aorist and future, are late (Nonnus, Hesychius) and perhaps parallel the late creation of the action noun ἄμερσις ‘deprivation’, first attested in Eustathius.

##### ἀμεύομαι

This is believed by some to be a Doric form:<sup>14</sup> it is attested in Pindar, where we also find the only two appellative compounds derived from it, ἀμευσιεπής ‘surpassing words’ (reflecting the meaning of the verb ‘surpass’) and ἀμευσίπορος ‘shifting paths’ (reflecting the semantic similarity of the verb to ἀμείβομαι ‘change one with another’). These are based on the only attested tenses of this verb, the

<sup>14</sup> See *LSJ* and *DGE s.vv.*; *EDG* (ἀμεύσασθαι) is more cautious.

sigmatic future and aorist. It would appear that this is a process of word formation internal to Pindar's poetic language: outside Pindar, ἀμευσιεπής is only used once in Hesychius. The meaning 'purchase' for ἀμεύομαι is perhaps attested in Cretan (*GDI* 4964). This would give a more fitting meaning to the PN Ἀμεύσιππος 'one who purchases horses'. It is also possible that here the SC represents the thing or field in which one individual surpasses the rest: thus, the Cretan name Ἀμευσίχαρμος may perhaps be understood as 'surpassing in joy or 'procuring joy'.

### βρίθω

This poetic verb is very common in early epic. It produces only one V1 compound, βρισάρματος 'weighing down chariots', which is created within the later epic corpus (the pseudo-Hesiodic *Shield* and the probably late-antique Homeric *Hymn to Ares*). While this compound employs the stem of sigmatic tenses, the present stem may perhaps have been used in the Mycenaean PN *qi-ri-ta-ko* (see Chapter 4, section 5, with table 4.2).

### εἰλέω

This verb and its by-forms εἴλω, εἴλλω, ἴλλω etc. are common in epic language. Mirroring the specialization of the base verbs, the only V1 compound—the adjective εἰλίπους 'rolling the feet, moving the feet with a rotary movement'—remains a popular epic epithet of oxen down to Late Antiquity, with the variant εἰλιπόδης in Nonnus.

### ἐλελίζω

As noted above, this verb is used mostly in early poetry, particularly with the meaning 'cause to vibrate'. This meaning is also conveyed by the only compound derived from the verb, the Pindaric epithet ἐλελίχθων 'shaking the earth', which after Pindar is used only by Aeschylus.

### ἐρείπω

This typically epic verb is often used in conjunction with cities, their walls and doors. These associations persist in the two V1 compounds, ἐρειψιπύλας 'overthrowing gates' and ἐρειψίτοιχος 'overthrowing walls', which first appear in fifth-century poetry (Bacch., Aesch.) and are not used after that date.

### μίσγω

This is a poetic (mostly epic) cognate of the more common μείγνυμι 'mix, mingle with'. Of the three compounds derived from its present stem, μισγάγκεια 'place where waters meet' is Homeric and confirms the epic flavour of the verb, while

the PN Μισγόλας, attested in an Attic inscription, looks like a non-Attic name (the SC would be -λεως in Attic). In both cases we can reconstruct a V1 structure meaning ‘making the waters meet’, which yields the current meaning ‘place where waters meet’ (for a similar meaning see also μισγοδία ‘place where streets meet’, Hsch.), and ‘he who mingles with the people’, which yields ‘he who comes from a mixed people’. The evolution in the semantics of V1 compounds in μισγο-, which draws closer to that of determinative compounds, mirrors the development of the popular class of compounds in μιξο-, on which see section 4.4.

### στυγέω

This is a less common synonym of ἐχθαίρω ‘hate’ and is mostly a poetic verb. The only two compounds, στυγάνωρ ‘hating the male sex’ (Aesch.) and the almost synonymous στυγόμενος ‘hating marriage’ (Agathias), are both poetic. In the latter, the FC in -ο- may perhaps be influenced by the FC μισο- from the synonymic verb μισέω ‘hate’.

### χρέμπτομαι

Probably an onomatopoeic formation, this verb is attested twice in Attic comedy (Aristoph., Eup.), where we also find the compound χρεμψιθέατρος ‘he who spits in the theatre’, transmitted as an anonymous *adespoton* by Hesychius, the *Suda* and the Λέξεις κωμικαί. The FC is based on the s-aorist, attested in the *Corpus Hippocraticum* for the first time.

In all these eleven examples there seems to be a clear correlation between the rarity and/or poetic status of the base verb and the character of the compounds derived from it: they are always attested in poetry, usually describe unusual actions (e.g. ἀμερσίγαμος ‘robbing of wedlock’, ἐλελίχθων ‘earth-shaking’, ἐρειψιπύλας ‘overthrowing gates’, χρεμψιθέατρος ‘spitting in the theatre’), and are often one-off formations. Lexica and commentaries aside, ἀσειφρων, ἀγαπήνωρ, ἀμευσιεπής, ἀμευσίπορος, βρισάρματος, ἐλελίχθων, ἐρειψιπύλας, ἐρειψίτοιχος, μισγάγκεια, στυγάνωρ, στυγόμενος and χρεμψιθέατρος are not productive after their first attestations in early poetry. On the other hand, ἀμερσίγαμος and ἀμερσίνοος only make their first appearance in Late Antiquity. Of the compounds discussed, the only forms which have a few attestations after the Classical age are ἀγαπήνωρ and εἰλίπους (the latter confined to epic poetry).

Compounds with the FC ἐν(ν)οσί-, which are not linked to an attested verb, only survive either as cultic epithets of Poseidon (all attested for the first time within the fifth century BC) or—in the case of εἰνοσίφυλλος—as an epithet of mountains. The existence of the action noun ἔνοσις ‘shaking’ (Hes.) ensured that

the meaning of the FC was not obscure to speakers, and the popularity of these forms led the learned John of Gaza (sixth c. AD) to coin another ἐνοσί-compound in his *Ecphrasis*, ἐνοσίφρων ‘shaking the mind’. The etymology of the FC of these compounds is unidentified but, given the presence of *e-ne-si-da-o-ne* in Mycenaean and its seemingly different vocalism, it has been suggested that the root behind it was of Minoan origin.<sup>15</sup>

## 4.2 Onomastic compound families

Another large portion of these verbs of low productivity give rise only to onomastic compounds. These include: ἄγαμαι, yielding several names;<sup>16</sup> ἀνδάνω, yielding the *Kurzname* φηαδήσιος as well as, probably, φασάνωρ and other names in φασ-; βρύω (the FC may be attested in the *Kurzname* Βρύσων); γάννυμαι (Γαννυμήδης); κέκασμαι (Καστιάνειρα); κιχάνω (Κιχήσιππος ‘one who overtakes horses?’); λαγχάνω (Λαχέμοιρος ‘one who obtains his portion (of land?)’); κύρω (the FC may persist in the *Kurzname* Κυρσίλος); μίμνω (e.g. Μίμνερος, a less productive family than compounds derived from cognate μένω ‘stand’: see section 6); σπένδω (Σπενσίθεος ‘one who makes libations to the gods?’);<sup>17</sup> σπεύδω (with names probably reflecting the intransitive meaning ‘strive eagerly after something’: e.g. Σπεύσιππος ‘striving after horses’, Σπευσικλῆς ‘one who strives after fame?’); σχήσω (Σχησίπολις ‘one who holds the city’); τυγχάνω (Τυχήσιππος).<sup>18</sup>

With the exception of the names in ἄγασι-, Μιμν(ο)- and Σπευσι-, most of these formations seem to be isolated. Outside Γαννυμήδης, Κιχήσιππος, Λαχέμοιρος, Σπενσίθεος, Σχησίπολις and Τυχήσιππος, the FCs Γαννυ-, Κιχησι-, Λαχε-, Σπενσι-, Σχησι- and Τυχησι- are not used in other compounds; moreover, in three cases the existence of a V1 compound is only reconstructed from a *Kurzname* (Βρύσων, Κυρσίλος).

<sup>15</sup> See Plath (1999), García Ramón (2009).

<sup>16</sup> A few compounds in ΑΓΑΣΙ- from West-Greek areas are of ambiguous derivation and may be thought to have their origin in ἠγεύμαι instead, since after the introduction of the Milesian alphabet <H> was not used to denote initial aspiration. However, the fact that names such as ἄγασιλεως, ἄγασιππος and ἄγασικλῆς are also attested in Attic-Ionic areas (where compounds in ἀγασι- for ἠγησι- are not expected) seems to confirm the existence of PNs from ἄγαμαι. Judging from the database in the *LGPN*, most of these names died out in the Hellenistic age, while the others did not survive beyond the third c. AD.

<sup>17</sup> On the unusual phonology of the FC, see the *Corpus s.v.*

<sup>18</sup> Τυχήσιππος may reflect the meaning ‘obtain something’ of its base verb, but it may also be the case that the FC is influenced by τύχη and that the name is not formed according to the V1 pattern.

### 4.3 Common verbs, rare V1 families (less than four items)

Other compound families derive from common Greek verbs but do not share their popularity. The great majority of these compounds are attested in poetic texts: we will consider their use in the light of the semantics of the base verbs.

#### βούλομαι

Though a pervasive verb in Greek, βούλομαι yields only one clear V1 compound, βουλόμαχος ‘desiring strife’. This seems to have been coined by Aristophanes to mock Lysimachus’ name (in *Pax* 1293 it is also followed by the rhyming κλαυσίμαχος ‘rue-the-fight’: see section 5.3.2), a fact which strengthens the impression that compounds in βουλο- were not productive in Greek. A likely reason is that βούλομαι is typically construed with the infinitive, while constructions with a direct object are rare and often limited to the meaning ‘wanting something for someone, wishing someone something’ (e.g. Τρώεσσιν [...] ἐβούλετο νίκην ‘he wished victory for the Trojans’, *Il.* 7.21). Note that compounds derived from the synonymous ἐθέλω ‘want’ likewise do not express the notion ‘want something’, but are used to identify individuals who do something voluntarily, such as ἐθελοπρόξενος ‘voluntary proxenos’, thereby evolving into a kind of determinative compounds (see section 3.3.1). As in compounds in ἐθελο-, the linking element -o- is probably influenced by the thematic vowel used in the first ps. sg. βούλομαι.

#### δοκέω

This is another extremely popular verb, but the V1 compounds derived from it are almost all associated with comic language. δοκησιδέξιος ‘clever in one’s own conceit’ features in Pherecrates fr. 163 K-A, while Pollux attributes the same compound to Callias (fr. 34 K-A) and quotes it to gloss δοκησίνονος ‘one who believes himself to be clever’, a hapax.<sup>19</sup> A third compound, δοκησίσοφος, appears in Antipho and Aristophanes and is later frequently used by Philo Judaeus. In Aristophanes *Pax* 44, δοκησίσοφος is used to describe ‘some young know-all’ person in the audience who might be frowning in response to the play’s plot. The context in

<sup>19</sup> The entry δοκησίνονος in *LSJ* is misleading. It laconically says ‘foreg., *ibid.*’, referring to the entry δοκησιδέξιος, where Pherecrates and Callias are quoted. From ‘*ibid.*’ one gets the impression that δοκησίνομος is also attested in Callias, but in fact Poll. 4.9, the source of Callias’ fragment, states that only δοκησιδέξιος was used by Callias: καὶ μέντοι καὶ δοκησίνομος, ὃν καὶ δοκησιδέξιον Καλλίας εἴρηκεν ὁ κωμικός (fr. 34 K-A). Olson (1998: 76), commenting on Aristoph. *Pax* 44, perpetuates the mistake, whereas K-A in Callias fr. 34 correctly set δοκησιδέξιον apart in the quotation: this is the only word to be attributed to Callias.

which δοκησιδέξιος is used in fr. 163 K-A from Pherecrates' *Pseuderacles* may well be comparable: the fragment begins with what seems to be the end of a similar statement (εἴποι τις ἄν τῶν πάντων δοκησιδεξίων '[thus] would speak one of those exceedingly clever in their own conceit') and may continue with a metapoetic statement (ἐγὼ δ' ἄν ἀντείποιμι· μὴ πολυπραγμόνει | ἀλλ' εἰ δοκεῖ σοι, πρόσσεχε τὸν νοῦν κάκρω 'but I would answer: if you like, pay attention and listen'). The appearance of two similar-looking compounds opens up the possibility that the two passages were somehow related.<sup>20</sup>

### εἶλον

The stem of this thematic aorist, completing the suppletive paradigm of αἰρέω, is used in three compounds. They all feature in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* (vv. 689–690) within a famous word-play on Helen's name, etymologized as 'the destroyer'. The word-play begins with the allusive ἐλέναυς 'destroying ships', to which Aeschylus adds ἔλανδρος 'destroying men' and ἐλέπτολις 'destroying cities'. While ἐλέναυς and ἔλανδρος remain rare words, ἐλέπτολις is also used by Euripides, and the variant ἐλέπολις is the name of a war-engine and is often found in later sources.

### κάπτω

This seems to have been a fairly common verb, but most of its attestations come from comedy. It should not be surprising, then, that καψιδρώτιον 'the thing which gulps down saliva, napkin' is attributed to an anonymous play of Middle Comedy (*adespoton* 799 K-A) by Poll. 7.69, who glosses it with the Koine terms ἡμιτύβιον and σουδάριον, both meaning 'napkin' (but Hesychius κ 1946 glosses this term with εἶδος χιτωνίσκου 'a kind of short tunic'). The structure suggests that this was not a common name for the napkin, but rather a mockingly recherché term coined as a one-off formation.

### κείρω

This is the verb most frequently used for the action of cropping the hair and it features in ἀκερσεκόμης (Hom.) and ἀκειρεκόμης (Soph.) 'with unshaven hair, not shaving the hair', two rather artificial compounds often used as epithets of Apollo.<sup>21</sup> Their structure reflects the common phrases κόμην κερεῖν (*Il.* 23.146) and κείρασθαι τε κόμην (*Od.* 4.198) and, by negating this action, the compounds evoke youth, beauty and happiness (to cut off one's hair was a sign of mourning), attributes particularly suited to Apollo. ἀκερσεκόμης originates within epic language, since it employs the stem of the typically epic sigmatic aorist ἔκρσα (the

<sup>20</sup> This hypothesis does not seem to have been discussed in the literature on Old Comedy.

<sup>21</sup> On the artificial structure and -ε- element of this compound, see Chapter 4, section 4.1.

usual aorist of the verb is ἔκειρα). In ἀκειρεκόμης, seemingly built on the present stem, this epic flavour is partly relinquished.

### λήγω

This is another common verb in Greek. All compounds in ληξι-, which employ the stem of the sigmatic tenses, are relatively late and typically function as technical terms. In Galen's *De antidotis* 14.136.2 we find the pair ληξιπύρετα and ληξιφάρμακα in a passage attributed to Asclepiades. Of the two forms, the former is a proper V1 with causative meaning 'stopping fever', while the meaning 'drugs (φάρμακα) that have the property of stopping (fever)' (cf. *LSJ s.v.*) identifies the latter as a determinative compound in which the FC ληξι- has the function of a modifier. Both Hippocrates and Galen very frequently describe the abatement of high temperature by using forms of λήγω together with πυρετός or θέρμη 'fever': the compound ληξιπύρετος seems to have been coined to express, in condensed fashion, the property of the remedies which were meant to achieve this goal.<sup>22</sup> The shape of the FC may also be influenced by the action noun λήξις 'cessation', but the existence of the variant ληξοπύρετος in several passages of Galen's works supports the hypothesis that verbal stems are the starting point for the process of derivation of these V1 compounds. Another technical compound is ληξίφωτος 'waning in light', attested in the fourth-century AD astronomer Hephaestion where it is opposed to ἀυξίφωτος 'waxing in light': both probably reflect the popularity of the action noun λήξις as an astronomical term.<sup>23</sup>

### μέμφομαι

This is the standard verb for 'to blame' and remains so down to MG. In comparison with this vitality, the existence of only one V1 compound and the lack of a productive type of V2 compounds are surprising. However, μεμψιμοιρός 'criticizing' and its derivative μεμψιμοιρία 'fault-finding', both first used by Isocrates, are still used in MG.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. ὁ πυρετὸς ἐδόκει λήξει περὶ ἑβδόμῃν (Hippocr. *Epid.* 7.1.12) 'fever seemed to stop on the seventh day'; λήγοντος τοῦ πυρετοῦ (*ibid.* 4.1.25) 'when fever ceased...', while in Galen the most frequent construct is with a form of λήγω followed by the prepositional clause εἰς ἀπυρεξίαν, indicating conditions (often fevers) which finally end with the absence of high temperature.

<sup>23</sup> Note that ληξίφαρχος, the Athenian officer who kept order in the ἐκκλησία, does not belong to the group of V1 in ληξι-: the head is -αρχος, which is modified by λήξις, to be understood as 'allotment, property' (cf. the explanation in Poll. 8.104).



### πίμπλημι

This is a common verb in both Classical and Koine Greek. Compounds in *πλησι-* reflect the two basic meanings of the verb: the transitive meaning in *πλησίσιος* ‘filling the sails’ (Hom.), where the FC functions as the direct object of the verb; and the stative-intransitive meaning ‘to be full’ conveyed by the middle and passive aorist forms of the verb in *πλησιφαής* ‘being full of light, with full light’ (Man.) and in the PN *Πλησικράτης* ‘full of might’.

### τίλλω

This verb is found in both poetry and prose, including the *Septuagint*, the New Testament and some papyri: it seems, therefore, to have been an ordinary verb. The sole V1 compound, *τιλλοπώγων* ‘one who plucks out his beard’, is only attested in a one-word *adespoton* and it is consequently impossible to give greater definition to the context of its usage. However, the compound is likely to reflect the comic use of the verb in relation to effeminate men.<sup>24</sup>

The analysis of this subgroup comprising rare compounds derived from nine common verbs gives us the opportunity to refine our understanding of the V1 compounds that make up Class I as a whole. Until now we have been noting the probable correlation between poetic and/or rare verbs and mostly poetic and rare compound families. The examples which we have just reviewed in this section, however, serve to counter the idea that the productivity of compounds is always a reflection of the productivity of their base verbs, since we here have verbs as common as *τίλλω*, *βούλομαι* and *μέμφομαι* which fail to generate equally common compounds. If one were to judge the productivity and distribution of the V1 category as a whole on the basis of these families, a natural conclusion would be that the compounds are highly literary and unusual. However, the productivity of many other compounds, including those analysed in the next sections, again suggests that a more cautious approach is advisable when it comes to evaluating the V1 type.

#### 4.4 Productive compound families of Class I (four items or more)

Even the verbs which, for statistical purposes, can be included among those whose compounds are productive, do not produce large compound families: the only exceptions are the compounds derived from *μείγνυμι* and *τανύω*. In most cases, we are dealing with small, self-contained groups whose productivity may

<sup>24</sup> See Taillardat (1965: 458).

be connected to a specific linguistic register. Of these compounds, those derived from ἄγαμαι and μίμνω are exclusively onomastic and have already been mentioned; the remaining ones are mostly poetic.

### ἀμαρτάνω

This is a fairly common verb in Homer, where we also find the first appellative compound derived from it, ἀμαρτοεπής ‘erring in words’. The selected stem corresponds to the thematic aorist, followed by -ο- (as is often the case); or, less frequently, by -ι-, which is probably based on the analogy of FCs in -τι-. As in the Hesiodic ἀμαρτίνοος ‘erring in mind’, the SC performs the same syntactic function as the genitive or dative in phrases such as μύθων ἡμάρτανε ‘failed of good speech’ (*Il.* 11.511) or ἐάν τις ῥήματι ἀμάρτη ‘if someone errs in his speech’ (*Pl. Grg.* 489c). ἀμαρτολόγος ‘speaking faultily’, first attested in Athenaeus, is construed in the same way as ἀμαρτοεπής (though the accentuation on the SC is analogical on V2 compounds from λέγω), while Nonnus’ hapax ἀμαρτίγαμος (*D.* 48.94) is semantically ambiguous. The translation of this form in *LSJ* as ‘failing of marriage’ reflects the other meaning of ἀμαρτάνω, ‘be deprived of’: accordingly, with the expression ἀμαρτιγάμων ὑμεναίων Nonnus would be implying that Pallene, subjected to the illicit love of her father, has been deprived of a real marriage. Vian (2003) however interprets the structure of ἀμαρτίγαμος as identical to that of the other compounds deriving from ἀμαρτάνω and translates it as ‘d’une union coupable’ (i.e. ‘erring in marriage’). ἀμαρτοεπής is rarely used after Homer, except by Cyrillus, who is very fond of it; ἀμαρτίνοος, though uncommon, is attested in poetry down to the age of Paulus Silentiarius. This family of compounds is thus mostly linked to elevated registers, and this explains the limited productivity of the individual items.

### δειδω

This is another common verb: the few compounds in δεισι- are relatively productive, both in terms of longevity (δεισιδαίμων ‘fearing gods’ is routinely used from Xenophon down to Late Antiquity and survives into MG) and in terms of creativity (with the new compounds ἀδεισιδαίμων and ἀδεισίθεος appearing as late as Diodorus Siculus and Julian respectively).

### ἴσχω

This reduplicated present, deriving from the same root as ἔχω, is used with a stronger meaning than ἔχω, to express firm possession or even restraint of something. This is particularly clear in the three appellative compounds used as masonry technical terms (ἰσχέγασον, name of a type of wall ‘retaining earth’, ἰσχέπλιθα ‘brick-retaining’, ἰσχέθυρον ‘door-retaining’), all attested in fourth/

third-century inscriptions. It is more difficult to assess whether V1 PNs derived from ἴσχω are semantically differentiated from those in ἔχε-: for instance, Ἰσχεύοος could mean ‘he who restrains his mind’ rather than ‘he who has intelligence/heart’, while the PNs Ἰσχεδάμος and Ἰσχόλαος could mean ‘he who restrains the people’ or ‘he who firmly holds the people’.

### λανθάνω, λήθω

Compounds in λαθι- and λησι-, all attested in poetic sources, derive from the cognate verbs λανθάνω and λήθω: FCs in λαθι- employ the zero-grade root (contained in the thematic aorist ἔλαθον), while those in λησι- are based on the sigmatic stem λησι-; FCs in λαθι-, as in λαθίπυρος ‘forgetful of sorrow’, derive directly from the present λήθω (where [ε:] is the Attic-Ionic result of [a:]) and are therefore West Greek forms. All these compounds indicate, with causative meaning, someone or something which renders forgetful (λαθικηδής ‘banishing care’, qualifying μαζός ‘breast’ in Homer and οἶνος in Alcaeus) or, with transitive meaning, someone who has forgotten something (λαθίπυρος, or λαθίνοστος ‘forgetful of returning home’). The image that λαθικηδής conveys in one word is also expressed, in more extended fashion, by phrases in which the verbs are coupled with synonyms of κῆδος ‘anxiety’: compare *Il.* 15.60 ὄφρα (Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων) [...] λελάθη (Ἔκτορα) [...] ὀδυνάων ‘so that Apollo may *cause* Hector *forget his pains*’. λαθίπυρος finds a synonymous parallel in *Eur. Alc.* 198 ἄλγος, οὐ ποτ’ οὐ λελήσεται ‘*rain*, which (Admetus) will never *forget*’, while λαθίνοστος ‘forgetful of returning home’, attested in Hesychius but perhaps from a lost poetic text, compresses the Homeric phrase νόστου τε λαθέσθαι (*Od.* 9.97). Another compound, λαθάνεμος ‘escaping wind’ reflects another meaning of λανθάνω and λήθω, ‘to escape notice’, and corresponds to the phrase οὐδ’ ἀνέμους ἔλαθεν ‘he did not escape the winds’ (*Pi. Pa.* VI, fr. 52f.110 Maehler). This meaning of the verb also features in λησιμβροτος ‘taking men unawares’ (*H. Hom. Merc.* 339), the only compound in which the FC derives from the sigmatic tenses of the verb.

### μείγνυμι

This common verb provides the stem for the very popular group of V1 compounds in μιξο- and μειξι-, which indicate beings whose nature is mixed. In their diachronic development these compounds transcended the typical V1 structure to become, in practical terms, a type of determinative compound in which the FC acquires the function of an adjective meaning ‘mixed’ and no longer governs the SC (e.g. μιξολύδιος ‘half Lydian’). According to Risch, this meaning developed out of obscured V1 compounds such as μισαγάκεια (section 4.1), which originally

meant ‘making waters meet’, but later evolved into ‘meeting of the waters’.<sup>25</sup> The original verbal meaning of the FC was perhaps also preserved in the PN Μειζίδημος ‘he who mingles with the people’, and in μιξέλληνας, which Risch interprets as having originally signified ‘people who mingle with the Greeks’.<sup>26</sup> The evolution of μιξο- compounds into a kind of determinative compound, which mirrors that of compounds in ἀρχι- (see Chapter 6, section 3.1), determines the huge popularity of this type: the new understanding of the FC is also associated with the use of the linking vowel -ο-, which signals the equation of the FC with a nominal form.

### ρίπτω

This verb expresses the action of throwing something away with a sudden movement. Although it is attested in Classical Greek, it becomes especially common in the Koine. The compounds do not reflect this popularity, being instead tied to specific images: ριψάχηνη ‘tossing the neck’, often used as an epithet of horses but employed for the first time by Pindar as an epithet of κλόνος ‘throng’, reflects the use of ρίπτω and its frequentative form ριπτάζω with bodily parts (see too the later ριψόφθαλμος ‘casting the eyes about’, Ptol.). ρίψοπλος ‘throwing away one’s weapons’ (Aesch.) and ρίψασπις ‘throwing away the shield’ (Aristoph.), on the other hand, mirror the images in which ρίπτω is coupled with weapons: e.g. ἀσπίδα ρίψας (Anacr. fr. 63b *PMG*) or ρίψαντες τὰ ὄπλα (Plb. 4.69.7). The appellative compounds are therefore all poetic in flavour, but it is interesting that the only onomastic compound dates to the Archaic age.

### τανύω

As noted above, τανύω is mostly used in poetry. The FCs of its productive compounds derive from the present stem, which retains the -νυ- infix and does not employ the vowel -ε-; a few are also enlarged in τανυσι-. The relatively high number of V1 compounds from τανύω is perhaps best explained by taking two factors into account. First, the more common synonym of τανύω, τείνω, does not produce V1 compounds: compounds in τανυ- and τανυσι- may therefore fill a semantic gap. Secondly, the group of Homeric compounds (which encompasses the famous τανύπεπλος ‘stretching the robe’) seems to have provided a model imitated by later authors (see particularly the compounds attested in the hexametric poetry of Oppianus, Quintus Smyrnaeus and Nonnus collected in the *Corpus*). As noted in the *Corpus*, the structure of these compounds is seldom governing: the FC seems rather to function as an attribute of the SC (as e.g. in τανυήκης ‘with

<sup>25</sup> Risch (1944: 46).

<sup>26</sup> Risch (1944: 49).

a long point or edge'), so that the whole category may already at an early stage have experienced a shift in structure and semantics. We can speculate whether this semantic shift was encouraged by the fact that the FC ends in a vowel and was thus equated to a nominal form (but there is no adjective **\*\*τανύς**). This is the most productive compound family in Class I as a whole.

### **φθίνω**

This verb creates only three proper V1 compounds, all derived from the s-aorist stem φθεισ-/φθῖσ: the Homeric epithets φθεισῆνωρ and φθισίμβροτος 'destroying men', and the much later φθισίφρων 'destroying the mind' (Opp.). In the other three compounds derived from this verb, all of mostly poetic attestation, the FC derives from the present stem and, exceptionally, retains the -v- infix. The structure of these compounds too is different, in that the FC modifies the SC and the meaning of the compound seems to be either possessive (φθινόκαρπος 'having lost its fruits', φθινόκωλος 'with wasting limbs') or determinative (φθινόπωρον 'autumn' is the waning of ὀπώρα 'summer'). As noted above in relation to compounds in μ(ε)τιξο-, this 'determinative' structure is often associated with the use of the linking vowel -ο-.

## **4.5 Class I: summary**

The analysis of Class I reveals that the creation of V1 compounds derived from verbs which do not produce V2 compounds was a widespread phenomenon in Greek. These V1 forms are attested in both the appellative and onomastic domains, a fact which rules out the hypothesis that mere stylistic requirements govern their creation. There is a good deal of correspondence between literary and onomastic compounds (those derived from ἀγαπάω, ἀμεύομαι, βρίθω, δείδω, ἴσχω, μείγνυμι, μίσγω, ῥίπτω, τανύω), but families represented only by PNs also exist (section 4.2).

I have suggested that the orientation of these compounds owes much to the impossibility of creating a V2 counterpart from the same roots. In this case, then, the V1 pattern is not simply a stylistically marked construction, but a morphological device. This kind of morphological supplementation was established already in the earliest stages of Greek: most of the compounds belonging to this group are Archaic or Classical, and the number of newly emerging compound families in the post-Classical age is limited (see compounds derived from ἀμέρδω, λήγω and σχήσω).

Our in-depth analysis of these families has also highlighted their tendency to be associated with the poetic register and to be of low productivity. The sug-

gestion in sections 4 and 4.1 was that there may be a correlation between the low productivity of the compounds derived from *άάω*, *άγαπάω*, *άμέρδω*, *άμεύομαι*, *βρίθω*, *είλέω*, *έλελίζω*, *έρείπω*, *κέκασμαι*, *μίσγω*, *στυγέω* and *χρέμπτομαι* and the fact that their base verbs are comparatively rare in Greek. On the whole, the base verbs and compounds uniquely attested in onomastics (section 4.2) are also characterized by a low productivity: the exceptions are *άνδάνω*, *λαγγάνω* and *τυγγάνω*, all common Greek verbs.

In section 4.3 we considered some common verbs whose compounds are nevertheless of limited productivity: in this subgroup too we noted that the compounds tend to feature in poetic texts. Out of forty-two compound families in Class I, only eight comprise more than four items, but most of the individual forms are of limited productivity (section 4.4). There is a tendency for some FCs to develop adjectival semantics, and when this is the case the FC forsakes the typical markers *-ε-* and *-σι-* and acquires a different shape (*μ(ε)τιξο-*, *τανυ-*, *φθινο-*). These structural characteristics may explain why these three compound families are the most productive in Class I as a whole: as we shall see apropos of compounds in *έθελο-*, *κρυψι-*, *μελλο-* (section 5.3.1) and of those in *φιλο-* and *άρχι-* (Chapter 6, section 3.1), in other compound families a similar connection is to be found between verbal FCs which behave like adjectives (or, even, quasi-prefixes) and the high productivity of the compounds.

In conclusion, Class I is characterized by the following properties:

- The base verbs do not belong to the types that produce agent nouns in *-ος*,
- The vast majority of the compound families have less than four items each.
- The vast majority of the compounds are used uniquely in poetry.
- Thirteen out of forty-two base verbs produce only onomastic compounds.

## 5 Class II: V1 compounds without a V2 counterpart deriving from verbs which give rise to agent nouns

The group of V1 compounds which do not have a V2 counterpart but derive from verbs which produce agent nouns comprises thirty-three families. The reasons for the lack of a compounded form of the agent noun (a V2 compound) are not always clear: in order to attain a better understanding of the interaction between base verbs, agent nouns and V1 compounds, section 5.1 collects and analyses all agent nouns derived from the verbs in this class. This analysis suggests that the semantic specialization of a number of these agent nouns and the seemingly low productivity of most of them are contributing factors to their exclusion from compounding. Many V1 compounds derived from these verbs may therefore have been created in response to the constraints affecting the agent nouns: section 5.3 tests

this hypothesis by studying the use and productivity of these V1 compounds, paying special attention to what separates the more productive families (those containing four or more individual compounds) from less common ones.

To start off, it is useful to consider what types of verbs and stems feature in Class II. The thirty-three verbs in question are:

αἰνέω ‘praise’, αἰρέω ‘take’, ἀκέομαι ‘heal’, ἀλέξω ‘keep off’, ἀνύω ‘accomplish’, ἄπτω ‘touch’, ἀράομαι ‘pray’, αὔξω ‘increase’, ἐγείρω ‘wake’, ἐθέλω ‘to be willing’, ἐργάζομαι ‘work’, ἔρπω ‘go’, ἐρύκω ‘restrain’, ἔρμαι ‘protect’/ἐρύω ‘drag’, εὐχομαι ‘pray’, ζεύγνυμι ‘yoke’, ἴημι ‘release, hasten’, κελεύω ‘command’, κλαίω ‘weep’, κράζω ‘scream’, κρύπτω ‘hide’, κτάομαι ‘acquire’, μέλλω ‘be about to’, μέλω ‘care’, ὀνίνημι ‘profit’, ὀρμάω ‘set in motion’, παύω ‘stop’, πέπᾶμαι ‘own’, ῥήγνυμι ‘break’, ταράσσω ‘stir’, τίνω ‘avenge’, τρέπω ‘turn, twist’, χαράσσω ‘engrave’.

The morphology of these verbs has an impact on the type of agent nouns which they produce. These verbs belong to the following types:

- Mostly full-grade thematic radical presents: ἀλέξω,<sup>27</sup> αὔξω,<sup>28</sup> ἐθέλω, ἔρπω, ἔρμαι/ἐρύομαι (whose compounds are homonymous with those derived from ἐρύω, a verb of unclear etymology),<sup>29</sup> εὐχομαι, μέλω. τρέπω shows CeC/CoC ablaut within its paradigm.
- Full-grade reduplicated presents: ἴημι.
- Roots which form the present with nasal infixes and suffixes: ἀνύω (in Greek the -νυ- suffix is extended to the whole paradigm), ζεύγνυμι, ὀνίνημι,<sup>30</sup> ῥήγνυμι, τίνω.

**27** The root is ἀλεκ- < \*h<sub>2</sub>lek-: the additional [s] is explained as a desiderative suffix (see *DGE s.v.*, *LIV* 278).

**28** As in the case of ἀλέξω, the Greek present is reconstructed from the root \*h<sub>2</sub>eug- (Lat. *augeo*) enlarged with the suffix -s, expressing either a desiderative (*DGE*) or an inchoative meaning (*LIV* 274–275, 288–289). ἀέξω, which provides the FC to many V1 compounds, is a variant deriving from a different and old e-grade (*EDG s.v.*, *LIV* 289).

**29** According to *DGE*, followed by *EDG*, ἔρμαι ‘rescue’ is an ablauting radical present while ἐρύω does not have a clear etymology; *LIV* 684–685, however, attributes both to the root \*wer-, which would yield these radical presents through an -u- enlargement. On a more recent etymology, see Hackstein (2002: 123–131).

**30** According to *LIV* 302, ὀνίνημι was originally an ablauting n-infix present \*h<sub>3</sub>ŋ-né/n-h<sub>2</sub>- which was remodelled to follow the pattern of reduplicated presents.

- *-jé/ó-* presents from consonantal roots: ἄπτω, ἐγείρω, ἐργάζομαι,<sup>31</sup> κλαίω, κράζω,<sup>32</sup> κρύπτω, μέλλω (the present stem μελλ- is extended to the whole paradigm), τaráσσω, χαράσσω.
- *-jé/ó-* or *-éje/o-* presents which yield vocalic presents in Greek: αἰνέω, αἰρέω,<sup>33</sup> ἀκέομαι, ἀράομαι, κτάομαι,<sup>34</sup> ὀρμάω.
- Various verbs of unclear etymology or formation: ἐρύκω,<sup>35</sup> κελεύω,<sup>36</sup> πέπᾱμαι,<sup>37</sup> παύω.<sup>38</sup>

### 5.1 Agent nouns from the verbs in Class II

These verbs produce various types of agent nouns, sometimes more than one type from the same verb. The most numerous group is that of verbs which only produce agent nouns in *-της* (5.1.1), followed by those in *-τηρ* and *-τωρ* (5.1.2), while only two agent nouns in *-ος* are attested (5.1.3), in keeping with the low number of ablauting roots (see the first entry in the above list). Section 5.1.4 collects verbs which produce more than one type of agent noun. The combined data of these four sections show that agent nouns in *-της* (analysed in 5.1.1 and 5.1.3) are the most common type.

**31** ἐργάζομαι is traditionally explained as a denominative from the agent noun ἐργάτης, itself deriving from the plural ἔργα ‘works’ (EDG, DGE).

**32** The Greek words from this root are of unclear formation. The most likely explanation is that the present κράζω is a secondary *-jé/ó-* formation based on the perfect κέκραγα, and that κραγός is the agent noun derived from the same root.

**33** αἰρέω does not have an agreed etymology (cf. EDG), but it seems to have been assimilated to *-έω* denominatives in the Greek verbal system.

**34** The etymology is controversial. EDG assumes that the root was *\*tkeh<sub>1</sub>-*, persisting in the Greek forms in *-η-* (pf. κέκτημαι, aor. ἐκτεσάμην) and that the present is a later analogical formation. LIV 619 n. 1, on the other hand, posits a root *\*tek-*: its zero grade *\*tk-* would yield the feminine noun *\*tk-eh<sub>2</sub>-*, from which κτάομαι would derive as a denominative.

**35** According to EDG, this verb is formed from the same root yielding ἔρῃμαι with the aid of a κ enlargement.

**36** The formation of κελεύω is not clear: the verb derives from the same root as κέλλω and κέλομαι ‘command’, but the use of the *-εω-* suffix, which normally characterizes denominal formations such as παιδέω and βασιλεύω, is extraordinary: see EDG s.v.

**37** The reduplicated formation may well be the original one, but all derived nominal formations have the radical long syllable πᾱ, which is also used in the FC πασι-.

**38** DGE takes the present as the starting point and tentatively posits a *-jé/ó-* present *\*paw-jé/ó-*; LIV 462, followed by EDG, tentatively reconstructs the root *\*peh<sub>2</sub>μ-*, which gives rise to the s-aorist ἔπαυσα as its primary formation.



### 5.1.1 -της agent nouns

In chronological order of first attestation:

**τίνω** ‘avenge’ > τίτᾱς ‘avenger’ (Aesch.; at Gortyn, a magistrate who inflicted fines). This agent noun is attested only twice.<sup>39</sup>

**μέλλω** ‘to be about to’ > μελλητής ‘one who has a hesitating character’ (Thuc.). μελλητής is first used by Thucydides in a famous passage of book 1.70 in which the Corinthians contrast the Athenians’ virtues (including the ability to make swift decisions) with the Spartans’ conservatism: καὶ μὴν καὶ ἄσκητοι πρὸς ὑμᾶς μελλητάς (‘Moreover, [the Athenians] are prompt [in decision], while you are dilatory’). As in the Thucydides passage, the tendency in other sources too is to use μελλητής either in contrast to adjectives expressing the idea of ‘swift’ or in conjunction with terms derived from ὄκνος ‘hesitation’. In Aristotle’s profile of the great-souled man (ὁ μεγαλόψυχος) at *Nicomachean Ethics* 1124b.17–26, he states that it is characteristic of this man not to occupy places of honour and go where other people take the first place, but to be idle and procrastinate (καὶ ἄργὸν εἶναι καὶ μελλητήν) except when pursuing high honours or achievements. Much later, Philo uses μελλητής as often as six times, three times in conjunction with ὄκνος or ὀκνηρός;<sup>40</sup> the same pair (ὀκνηρός and μελλητής) is used by Dio Cassius (*Ant. rom.* 214.11) in a passage where he translates Fabius Cunctator’s *agnomen* into Greek, and by John Chrysostomus. μελλητής was probably considered to be a good Attic word, acceptable in learned speech: we gain this impression from the fact that it is discussed four times in Pollux’ *Onomasticon*. Its semantics is closer to an adjective than to an agent noun.

**πέπᾱμαι** ‘own’ > πάστᾱς ‘owner’ (Crete, fifth c. BC).

This rare agent noun is only attested in the Gortyn laws.

**ρήγνυμι** ‘break’ > ῥήκτης ‘breaker’ (Aristot.).

Contrary to its meaning, in Aristot. *De mundo* 396a.5 this agent noun is not used to indicate ‘someone who breaks’ but rather a kind of earthquake: οἱ δὲ χάσματα ἀνοίγοντες καὶ τὴν γῆν ἀναρρηγνύοντες ῥήκται καλοῦνται (‘[earthquakes] which open up chasms and break the earth are called *breakers*’). The same meaning is attested in Posidonius, Stobaeus and Lydus in passages dealing with earthquakes. This agent noun was therefore a technical word.

<sup>39</sup> Another form, ἀτίτης ‘unpunished, unhonoured’, is formed like an agent noun, but has the semantics of the verbal adjective ἄτιτος.

<sup>40</sup> Phil. Jud. *De somn.* 1.165, 2.67; *Quis rerum divinarum heres sit* 254.

**αἰνέω** ‘praise, advise’ > αἰνετής ‘one that praises’ (Hdn. *Partitiones* 34.7 Boissonade = Eust. *in Od.* 1.152.46; Greg. Naz. *De vita sua* 814).

A very rare agent noun, which does not seem to have existed in Classical Greek.

**ἐγείρω** ‘rouse, raise’ > ἐγέρτης ‘one who rouses’ (Hdn.).

This agent noun is attested in two very similar passages containing lists of words in Herodian’s *Περὶ καθολικῆς προσφθίας* (3.1.77.25 Lentz) and *Περὶ ὀρθογραφίας* (3.2.423.20 Lentz) which illustrate issues of accentuation and phonology; its meaning is not stated. As is usually the case with Herodian’s work, we cannot be sure that the fragments are all original; be that as it may, it is worth noting that ἐγέρτης is not attested elsewhere, except in its late prefixed form ἐξεγέρτης ‘one who arouses’ (*PGM* 12.225). The only V2 compound formed with this agent noun, νεκρεγέρτης, appears in the late Byzantine age, in line 239 of the *Christus Patiens* (whose attribution to Gregory of Nazianzus is now considered erroneous): whatever its origin, the first attestation of this form is obviously too late for it to constitute a genuine alternative to Classical V1 compounds derived from ἐγείρω.

**εὐχομαι** ‘pray’ > εὐχέτης ‘one who prays’ (Hdn.).

In the *Partitiones* attributed to Herodian (165.17 Boissonade = Eust. *in Od.* 1.83.9) εὐχέτης appears in a list of words ending in -έτης and is not glossed; as with most of Herodian’s work, evidence that might allow a secure dating of the material that has reached us under his name is scarce. This attestation aside, all other instances of εὐχέτης are found in Byzantine texts.

**αἰρέω** ‘take, seize’ > αἰρέτης ‘one who chooses; favourer’ (Vett. Val.); also used in the specialized meaning of ‘searcher of archives’ in *POxy* 1654.7 (second c. AD).

This agent noun is sporadically attested in Greek. In *POxy* 1654, an account of payments to various persons, it is followed by ἡγεμονικῆς βιβλιοθήκης ‘prefect’s library’ and likely indicates the person in charge of producing documents after a search (a function usually expressed by the prefixed form προαἰρέτης). In Vett. Val. 2.1, αἰρέτης is followed by ἀγαθῶν: its meaning in context seems to be ‘procurer of good things’.<sup>41</sup>

**αὐξω** ‘increase’ > αὐξητής ‘increaser’ (*Orph. H.*).

This form features among the titles of Pan in *Orph. H.* 11.11 and of Zeus in *Orph. H.* 15.8.

<sup>41</sup> On both contexts, see Grenfell and Hunt *ad POxy* 1654.

**ἀνύω** ‘accomplish’ > ἀνυτής ‘tax-collector’ (Just.).

This agent noun is attested only in late-antique Greek as a translation of the Latin term *exactor*.

The nouns in this list are ten in total and are attested mostly in post-Classical Greek for the first time. In terms of semantics, πάστᾱς, αἰνετής, ἐγέρτης, εὐχέτης and ἀύξητης convey the general verbal idea expressed by the base verbs, while the remaining ones seem to have acquired a specialized meaning, restricting the semantic sphere of the verb and identifying specific types of individuals or things: μελλητής is not just someone who hesitates to do something, but a hesitating person *tout court*, and ῥήκτης is the name of a type of earthquake. Specialized agent nouns often provide names for professions or officials: this is the case with τίτᾱς (a magistrate at Gortyn), αἰρέτης (searcher of archives) and ἀνυτής (tax-collector).

In sum, it is plausible that five out of ten of these nouns in -της were exclusively specialized for the expression of a restricted meaning, and this surely limited their suitability as ingredients in the creation of V2 agentive compounds. Together with semantic specialization, low productivity may also have played a role in the exclusion of these agent nouns from compounding. As noted in the comments above, the majority both of the agent nouns expressing the general verbal idea and of the specialized agent nouns are rare and/or late: see τίτᾱς, αἰνετής, ῥήκτης, ἐγέρτης, εὐχέτης, αἰρετής, ἀύξητης and ἀνυτής (eight out of ten). Semantic specialization and low productivity may also explain the exclusion from compounding of the agent nouns that feature in the next two groups.

### 5.1.2 -τηρ and -τωρ agent nouns

In chronological order of first attestation:

**ἀλέξω** ‘protect’ > ἀλεξητήρ ‘protector’ (Hom.), ἀλκτήρ ‘one who wards off’ (*ibid.*) ἀλεξήτωρ ‘protector’ (Soph.).

ἀλεξητήρ and its feminine form ἀλεξήτειρα are rare words, which continue to be used down to Byzantine Greek but are also glossed in lexicographical works (Σ, Photius, *EM*) on account of their rarity. ἀλεξήτωρ is only attested in Sophocles, Apoll. Gramm. and the scholia. ἀλκτήρ, which employs the zero-grade root behind the thematic aorist ἀλαλκεῖν, features in various poetic works, but was probably not common, since it is often glossed in lexicographical works.

**ἀράομαι** ‘pray, invoke’ > ἀρητήρ ‘one that prays, priest’ (Hom.).

Most of the post-Homeric attestations of this agent noun feature in discussions of poetic language and echo *Il.* 1.11, where ἀρητήρ is used in apposition to Chryses.

The word had a clear poetic status, reflected in Arist. *Po.* 1457b.33–35: πεποιημένον δ' ἐστὶν ὃ ὅλως μὴ καλούμενον ὑπὸ τινῶν αὐτὸς τίθεται ὁ ποιητής, δοκεῖ γὰρ ἔνια εἶναι τοιαῦτα, οἷον τὰ κέρατα ἔρρυγας καὶ τὸν ἱερέα ἀρηπτήρα ('An invented word is one absolutely not used by any people and coined by the poet. There seem to be such words, e.g. 'sprouters' for horns and 'prayer' for priest'). This agent noun was rare and limited to poetic registers.

**ἄπτω** 'touch' > ἐφάπτωρ 'one who touches or caresses' (Aesch.).

There are no simple agent nouns derived from ἄπτω, but the existence of the compounded form ἐφάπτωρ shows that the word formation pattern was possible. ἐφάπτωρ, however, does not seem to have been a productive word. It is only attested several times in Aeschylus' *Supplices*, where it is one of a number of derivatives of ἐφάπτω playing with the name of Eraphus, the ancestor of the Danaids, whom the maidens portray as having been conceived by the mere touch of Zeus.

**χαράσσω** 'sharpen, scratch, carve' > χαρακτήρ 'engraver' (Eur.) but also 'impressed mark' (Eur.) and from this literal meaning > 'distinctive mark, character of a person'.

χαρακτήρ is frequently used with the meanings 'mark' and 'character', but the simple agentive meaning 'engraver' is rare.

**κτάομαι** 'acquire' > κτήτωρ 'possessor' (D. S.).

The agent noun remains productive until the sixth century AD.

**ἐρύκω** 'keep in, restrain' > ἐρυκτήρ 'class of Spartan freedmen' (Myro Hist.).

Myro's fragment is quoted by Athenaeus (6.102) and there are no other attestations.

**ὀνίνημι** 'profit' > ὀνήτωρ 'bringing benefits' (Gal.).

This agent noun is first securely attested in Galen as the name of a special plaster, but its glossing in Hesychius as ὄνησιν φέρων 'bringing benefit' shows that it could also convey a more general meaning. The two earlier attestations registered in *LSJ* are based on conjectures not unanimously accepted. This agent noun is also used as a PN.

**κλαίω** 'cry, lament' > κλαυστήρ 'weeper' (Manetho).

This agent noun is a hapax.

This group contains six agent nouns in -τηρ (ἀλεξητήρ, ἀλκτήρ, ἀρητήρ, χαρακτήρ, ἐρυκτήρ, κλαυστήρ) and four in -τωρ (ἀλεξήτωρ, ὀνήτωρ, ἐφάπτωρ and κτήτωρ). As in the previous group, some nouns convey a general verbal idea: these are ἀλεξητήρ, ἀλεξήτωρ, ἐφάπτωρ, κτήτωρ, κλαυστήρ and ὀνήτωρ (six out of ten). Of these, only ἀλεξητήρ is securely an archaic form. ἀλεξήτωρ and ἐφάπτωρ are first attested in Classical Greek, but are very rare. κλαυστήρ is a hapax. ἐφάπτωρ is a special case in that its attestations are all closely linked to the web of etymologies spun by Aeschylus in the *Supplices* and one may well wonder how common the form was in Greek. The only productive agent noun appears to have been κτήτωρ ‘possessor’.

Three of the ten forms are semantically specialized. The most ancient, ἀρητήρ, wavers between conveying the general idea of its base verb (‘one who prays’) and indicating a special kind of individual who prays, i.e. the priest. χαρακτήρ, on the other hand, encompasses a large number of meanings, ranging from the general—and much rarer—‘engraver’ to the more specialized ‘mark’ and ‘character’, which also manifest an extraordinary passive meaning (semantically, they are *nomina rei actae*). Such a narrowing down of the sphere to which the agent noun applies is more evident in ἐρυκτήρ, a Spartan technical term.

The agent nouns in this group thus seem to have been less semantically specialized than those in the previous one, but again they are mostly rare forms and are often associated with poetic registers. κτήτωρ aside, none of the forms expressing general verbal meanings appear to have been productive in Greek.

### 5.1.3 Verbs producing agent nouns in -ος

**τρέπω** ‘turn, change’ > τροπός ‘twisted leathern thong’ (Hom.).

This is the paradigm of a formally agentive noun which becomes specialized as an instrument noun: the τροπός (literally ‘turner’) was a strap by means of which the oar was fastened to the thole. The numerous compounds in -τροπος are mostly bahuvrihis indicating a person with a kind of ‘manner’, derived from the *nomen rei actae* τρόπος; e.g. ἑτερότροπος ‘of different sort’ (Aesch.), δύστροπος ‘ill-conditioned’ (Eur.). In the few examples in which -τροπος seems to have an agentive meaning, the compound has a prepositional FC (παλίντροπος ‘turning back’, Soph.). This leaves only the name of the sun-flower, ἡλιότροπος (with its more common diminutive ἡλιοτρόπιον) as a likely, though not perfect, V2 compound roughly meaning ‘turning with the sun’. These data suggest that strong semantic pressure from τρόπος ‘manner’, paired with the specialized meaning of τροπός ‘leathern thong’, inhibited the formation of a productive class of compounds in -τροπος with a clear verbal meaning.

### 5.1.4 Verbs giving rise to more than one type of agent noun

In alphabetical order:

**ἔρϋμαι** ‘heal’ > ἀκέστωρ ‘healer, saviour’ (Eur.), ἀκεστήρ ‘healer’ (Soph.), ἀκεστής ‘mender, healer’ (Xen.).

At Euripides *Andromache* 900 ἀκέστωρ is used as an epithet of Apollo. Subsequently it is mostly attested as a PN, returning at a later date in Gregory of Nazianzus and Paulus Silentarius. ἀκεστήρ is a Sophoclean hapax, while ἀκεστής appears in the *Cyropaedia* with the meaning ‘mender’ and is later used by Lycophron as an epithet of Chalcas. Apparently in light of its use and meaning in Xenophon, ἀκεστής is recommended by Phrynichus *Ecl.* 64 against ἠπητής ‘mender’, which is also a much rarer word.

**ἐθέλω** ‘to be willing’ > ἐθελοντήρ ‘volunteer’ (Hom.), ἐθελοντής ‘volunteer’ (Hdt.), θελητής ‘one who wills’ (LXX).

ἐθελοντήρ and ἐθελοντής are formed from the participle stem ἐθελοντ-, which also features in the adverb ἐθελοντήν ‘voluntarily’. ἐθελοντήρ is very rare (it is basically a Homeric hapax, which is later commented upon three times in lexicographical works), while ἐθελοντής is a common form. θελητής ‘one who wills’ (LXX) is mostly attested in Christian authors and is not very common (it acquires a compounded form in ecclesiastical Byzantine Greek, μωνοθελητής, indicating an adherer to the sect that believed that Christ had two natures but only one will).

**ἐργάζομαι** ‘work’ > ἐργάτης (Archil.), ἐργαστήρ (Xen.), ἐργαστής (A.D.), all ‘workman’.

ἐργάτης (probably deriving from ἔργα: see note 31) is a very common agent noun in Greek; it continues to be used down to Late Antiquity and survives into MG, later providing the SC for a number of V2 compounds which in Byzantine Greek replace those in -ουργός (e.g. ἀμπελουργός ‘vine-dresser’: ἀμπελεργάτης, Manass.). These forms are never attested in AG authors, however.

ἐργαστής, which is morphologically more correct since it preserves the full stem ἐργαδ- > ἐργασ-, is found only in grammatical sources (Apollonius Dyscolus, Herodian, Orion) which address its relationship with ἐργάτης, ἐργαστήρ is even rarer: used once by Xenophon, it is later discussed by Pollux with quotations from Xenophon, and it features also in Claudius Aelianus and Stobaeus.

**ἔρπω** ‘move, go’ > ἔρπησθής ‘a reptile’ (Nic.), ἔρπησθῆρ ‘creeping thing, reptile’ (Opp.).

The agent nouns derived from this verb, which expresses a kind of slow movement associated with certain beasts, are generally used as generic terms for ‘reptile’ or other animals which creep (guinea worms, mice, etc.).

**ἔρμαι/ἔρώ** ‘rescue, draw, drag off’ > ῥυτήρ ‘one who draws, rein; defender’ (both meanings Hom.), ῥύτωρ ‘defender; stretcher’ (both meanings Aesch.), ῥύστης ‘saviour’ (LXX), ἔρυτήρ ‘drawer’ (Nic.). The semantic range of these agent nouns reflects that of the homophonous base verbs.

ῥυτήρ is used until Late Antiquity, while ῥύτωρ dies out in the Hellenistic age, and is later attested mostly in lexicographical works. ῥύστης, on the other hand, makes its first appearance in the *Septuagint* but continues to be used down to the sixth century AD. After Nicander, ἔρυτήρ features only in grammatical and lexicographical sources.

**ζεύγνυμι** ‘yoke’ > ζευκτήρ (Jos.), ζευκτής (Hsch.): both ‘one who yokes’.

Its first attestation in Josephus aside, ζευκτήρ is found only three other times in lexicographical sources. ζευκτής is a hapax.

**ἴημι** ‘release’ > ἀφέτης ‘one who lets off a military engine’ (Plb.), ἀφετήρ ‘starting point’ (Iambl.).

These preverbed formations show that, from a morphological point of view, ἴημι creates agent nouns. However, ἴημι is a full member of Class II in that there are no V2 compounds which derive from the simple verb ἴημι. ἀφέτης itself creates determinative compounds, such as Σαλαμιναφέτης ‘betrayed of Salamis’ (Sol.), γαστραφέτης ‘stomach-bow’ (Hero), καταπαλταφέτης ‘artillery-man’ (Phil. Mech.), ἀνεμαφέτης ‘wind-releaser’ (PGM 14.1363), ἰαφέτης ‘archer’ (AP 9.525.10).

**κελεύω** ‘order’ > κελουστής ‘one who gives the time to rowers’ (Eur.), κελύστωρ ‘one who commands’ (Phryn.).

κελουστής is often found in Classical Greek, though it remains a specialized term. The general verbal idea, however, is conveyed by κελύστωρ, as Phrynichus notes in the *Praeparatio sophistica* 81.1.3 (the only source to attest to the existence of this word): κελύστωρ διαφέρει τοῦ κελουστής. ὁ μὲν γὰρ κελουστής ἐστὶν ὁ ἐν νηϊ κελύων τοῖς ἐρέταις τι, ὁ δὲ κελύστωρ ὁ ἐπικελουόμενος καὶ παρορμῶν ‘κελύστωρ is different from κελουστής. For the κελουστής is the person who gives orders to rowers in a boat, whereas the κελύστωρ is someone who exhorts and incites’.

**κράζω** ‘bawl’ > **κεκράκτης** ‘bawler’ (Hippocr.), **κράκτης** ‘bawler’ (Aristoph.), **κραγός** ‘bawling’ (Aristoph.).

Both **κεκράκτης** and **κράκτης** have a dozen attestations in total. **κραγός** is attested only once in Aristophanes and then mostly in lexicographical works. Quite apart from the low productivity of these agent nouns, the issue of the relationship between V1 and V2 compounds from this verb must be discussed in relation to the context in which most of these forms occur, Aristophanic comedy (see section 5.3.2).

**κρύπτω** ‘hide’ > **κρύπτης** ‘member of the Spartan corps called **κρυπτεία**’ (Eur.?), **κρυπτήρ** ‘convenient for concealing’ (Sch. Opp.).

Both words are hapax legomena. **κρύπτης** is currently edited as Euripides fr. 1126 Nauck, but its attribution to Euripides is even dubious: the scholia to Aristoph. *Thesm.* 600 in codex R, commenting on the verbal adjective **κρυπτός** add, somewhat inconsequentially, that **καλοῦνται μὲν γὰρ καὶ κρύπται παρὰ Πλάτωνι τῷ φιλοσόφῳ καὶ παρ’ Εὐριπίδῃ καὶ ἐν ταῖς Λακεδαιμονίων πολιτείαις** (which roughly translates as ‘**κρύπται** are also mentioned in Plato the philosopher, in Euripides and in the constitutions of the Spartans’), but already Dindorf suspected that the reference to Euripides was out of place and suggested replacing his name with Aristotle’s.<sup>42</sup> The first attestation of **κρύπτης** may therefore be slightly later than assumed.

**μέλω** ‘care’ > **μελέτωρ** ‘one who cares for, avenger’ (Soph.), **μελητής** ‘one who is in charge’ (Eust.).

**μελέτωρ** is a hapax in Sophocles, later glossed in the *Suda*; **μελητής** is a rare word, without attestation before the Byzantine age (it is not present in *LSJ*).

**ὀρμάω** ‘set in motion’ > **ὀρμητής** ‘imperious person’ (Philostr. Jun.) and ‘someone ready to strike’ (Philostr.), **ὀρμάστειρα** ‘one who urges on’ (*Orph. H.*).

**ὀρμητής** appears late in Greek and is rarely attested. The feminine **ὀρμάστειρα** is a hapax, used as an epithet of Athena in *Orph. H.* 32.9 (corrected into **ὀρμήτειρα** by Abel).

**παύω** ‘stop’ > **παυστήρ** (Soph.), **παύστωρ** both ‘one who stops’ (Isyll.).

Both are rare forms: **παυστήρ** is attested twice in Sophocles and once in Alexis (the latter quoted by Athenaeus 10.71), while **παύστωρ** is a hapax.

<sup>42</sup> See Jouan and Van Looy (2003: 122).



**ταράσσω** ‘stir, trouble’ > **ταράκτωρ** (Aesch.) and **ταράκτης** (Lycophr.) both ‘disturber’.

Both these agent nouns are rare and poetic: they have one attestation each in AG, while the others all occur in Byzantine texts (Psellus, Eusthatius, etc.).

This group, comprising sixteen nouns in *-της* (ἀκεστής, ἔθελοντής, θελητής, ἐργάτης, ἐργαστής, ἐρπηστής, ῥύστης, ἀφέτης, ζευκτής, κελουστής, κεκράκτης, κράκτης, κρύπτης, μελητής, ὄρμητής, ταράκτης), ten in *-τηρ* (ἀκεστήρ, ἔθελοντήρ, ἐργαστήρ, ἐρπηστήρ, ῥυτήρ, ἐρυτήρ, ἀφετήρ, ζευκτήρ, ὀρμάστειρα, παυστήρ), six in *-τωρ* (ἀκέστωρ, ῥύτωρ, κελύστωρ, μελέτωρ, παύστωρ, ταράκτωρ) and one in *-ος* (κραγός), is more mixed than the previous three. Not only does the productivity and semantic use of individual agent nouns vary greatly, but the various agent nouns derived from the same verb can also have significantly different meanings. Those agent nouns which express the general verbal action are: all the agent nouns derived from ἀκείομαι, ἐργάζομαι, ἐρύμαι/ἐρύω, ζεύγνυμι and παύω; and θελητής and κελύστωρ.

Outside this majority, we find a number of agent nouns which have become specialized. This is the case with ἐρπηστής and ἐρπηστήρ ‘reptile’, κελουστής ‘one who gives the time to rowers’, κρύπτης ‘member of the κρυπτεία’ and ὄρμητής ‘imperious person’. ἔθελοντήρ and ἔθελοντής also appear to have more restricted semantics than the base verbs and are seemingly close to being adjectives. As already argued in connection with the previous three groups, semantic specialization is likely to have prevented the formation of V2 compounds.

As concerns the other agent nouns, which lack specialized semantics, we may note that thirteen forms are first attested in the post-Classical age: ἀφέτης (Plb.), ἀφετήρ (Iamb1.), ἐργαστής (A.D.), ἐρπηστήρ (Nic.) and ἐρπηστής (Opp.), θελητής (LXX), ῥύστης (LXX), ἐρυτήρ (Nic.), ζευκτήρ (Jos.), ζευκτής (Hsch.), κελύστωρ (Phryn.), κρυπτήρ (Sch. Opp.), μελητής (Eust.), ὄρμητής (Philostr. Jun.), ὀρμάστειρα (*Oroph. H.*), παύστωρ (Isyll.) and ταράκτης (Lycophr.). There is an even larger number of rare forms, adding up to eighteen: ἀκεστήρ (hapax), ἔθελοντήρ, ζευκτήρ, ζευκτής (hapax), θελητής, ῥύτωρ, ἐρυτήρ, κελύστωρ (hapax), κρύπτης and κρυπτήρ (both hapax legomena), μελέτωρ (hapax), ὄρμητής and ὀρμάστειρα (hapax), παυστήρ and παύστωρ (hapax), ταράκτωρ (hapax) and ταράκτης. The lack of V2 compounds may therefore be linked to the very low productivity of these *simplicia*.

## 5.2 Analysis of Class II

The distribution of agent nouns in the four groups above is not surprising. Given the shape of the verbal roots involved, it was expected that the derived agent nouns would be of the -της or -τηρ/-τωρ types, which can be created virtually out of any verbal root, rather than of the -ος type. In general, -τηρ/-τωρ nouns are not compoundable (cf. Chapter 2, section 6.4): in order to create a V2 compound, they would first have to be turned into a -της form. There are no morphological reasons why this should be impossible for the forms collected in section 5.1.2: the fact that such agent nouns were seemingly excluded from compounding suggests that other factors might be at work.

A related question is why verbs which have -της agent nouns (those collected in 5.1.1 and 5.1.4) do not produce V2 compounds: since -της agent nouns can be formed on any verbal root (Chapter 2, 6.4.2), the creation of V2 compounds based on them should always be possible. It follows that the lack of such compounds (or, for that matter, of simple agent nouns) may simply be due to chance and to the state of our documentation. In particular, it is not clear why pairs of verb/agent noun such as αύξω/αύξητής ('increase'/'increaser') or έργάζομαι/εργάτης ('work'/'worker') should not produce V2 compounds in Classical Greek. However, this line of argument, which can never be dismissed when languages no longer spoken are under investigation, does not exempt us from searching for further possible factors in the lack of V2 compounds derived from certain verbal roots.

Another look at the above lists of agent nouns prompts two observations. The first concerns the productivity of the attested forms. As concerns -της agent nouns, we saw that τίτᾱς, πάστᾱς, αἰνετής, ῥήκτης, ἐγέρτης, εὐχέτης, ζευκτής, αἰρέτης, αύξητής, άνυτής (5.1.1) and θελητής, μελητής, ὄρμητής and ταράκτης (5.1.4) are all rare, sometimes only attested once or twice in the whole of Greek. Among the nouns in -τηρ and -τωρ, a category which progressively wanes in post-Classical Greek, rare forms are more common and include ἀλεξητήρ, ἐρυκτήρ, κλαυστήρ, ἀκεστήρ, ἐθελοντήρ, ῥύτωρ, ἐρυτήρ, ζευκτήρ, κελεύστωρ, κρυπτήρ, μελέτωρ, ὀνήτωρ, ὀρμάστειρα, παυστήρ and παύστωρ. These add up to two thirds of the total.

The second, and crucial, observation concerns the semantics of many of these *simplicia*. As noted in the analyses, in a number of cases the agent noun does not convey a general verbal idea, but has a more specialized usage: thus, for instance, αἰρέτης is not simply 'one who takes' but 'one who produces documents at the end of a search', a 'searcher of archives'; άνυτής is the Greek translation of the Latin term *exactor*; μελλητής is not 'someone about to do something' (which would permit the use of a nominal FC), but 'one who has a hesitating character'; the ῥήκτης is a type of earthquake; ἐρυκτήρ designates a 'class of Spartan

freedmen'; χαρακτήρ mostly indicates a mark or character. Such semantic specialization suggests that a compound form of the agent noun would not convey a general verbal idea, but would represent a subtype of the specialized meaning expressed by the agent noun.

Semantic specialization may also account for the lack of compounds derived from the agent nouns listed in 5.1.4, in which nouns in -τηρ/-τωρ alternate with those in -της; the latter are the only ones which, as a rule, can be compounded. If the -της *simplicia* from the same verbs have acquired a specialized meaning, compounds derived from these -τηρ/-τωρ *simplicia* would look like compounded forms of the semantically specialized nouns in -της. This may be the reason why such -της compounds are never attested.

This can be illustrated by considering the pair of agent nouns derived from κρύπτω 'hide'. The generic verbal meaning is conveyed by κρυπτήρ 'convenient for concealing', while the -της agent noun κρύπτης has acquired the very specific sense of 'member of the Spartan κρυπτεία'. Similarly, while κελεύστωρ 'one who commands' expresses a generic verbal idea, κελευστής—the form which could be used in compounding—is specialized as 'one who gives the time to rowers': its compound forms would arguably convey the same semantic notion. As concerns the remaining agent nouns, there are no clear semantic reasons or productivity factors which provide a good explanation for the exclusion from compounding of e.g. θελητής 'one who wills', ἀκεστής 'healer', ἀρπακτής 'robber', etc.

### 5.3 The V1 compounds in Class II

The above analysis has suggested that many of the V1 compounds derived from verbs in this group were created because the semantic restrictions and limited productivity of the agent nouns prevented the creation of transparent or prolific V2 compounds. It is now time to analyse the thirty-three V1 compounds in Class II in order to observe their use and productivity. The material is divided into two subgroups, arranged according to the base verb. The first subgroup contains nineteen productive compound families, i.e. families with four compounds or more, with each of the individual items having a relatively high level of productivity. The second subgroup contains fourteen compound families of low productivity which are often restricted to the onomastic domain. The reader is invited to consult the Corpus for full details on individual families and forms.

### 5.3.1 Productive V1 compound families (four items or more)

#### αἰνέω

This verb only creates onomastic compounds, and these are quite productive and attested from the sixth century BC onwards. In this case the choice of the V1 structure depends on two factors: the onomastic tendency to prefer V1 compounds over V2 compounds in -της, and the fact that the agent noun αἰνετής is a very rare and seemingly late form (see section 5.1.1 above).

#### ἀκέομαι

Both onomastic and appellative compounds are attested from the late fifth century onwards. The meaning of the FCs of these forms is quite patently ‘healer’: see the unambiguous cases of the PNs Ἀκέσανδρος and Ἀκεσίμβροτος (‘one who heals men’), and the epithet ἀκεσσίπυος ‘healing toil’ in Nonnus (according to some editors anticipated by ἀκεσσίνουος ‘healing disease’, conjectured in an epigram by Crinagoras in *AP* 9.516.4). As noted above, the agent noun ἀκεστής appears in its primary meaning of ‘healer’ for the first time in Lycophron and mostly occurs with this meaning in lexicographical sources. Starting with Xenophon (the earliest attestation of the form), ἀκεστής acquired the specialized meaning ‘clothes-mender’, perhaps making prospective V2 compounds with a SC -ακεστής meaning ‘healer’ impossible.

#### ἀλέξω

Compounds derived from this verb may be formed using the stem of the present, but with -ι- as a linking element (by analogy with τερψίμβροτος compounds, see Chapter 4, section 3.2); or the zero-grade root ἀλκ- (employed in the reduplicated thematic aorist ἀλαλκεῖν), followed by the linking elements -ι-, -ε- and -εσι-.<sup>43</sup> Compounds in ἀλεξ(ι)- are a very common type, particularly in onomastics, starting with the Mycenaean form *a-re-ka-sa-da-ra* (Chapter 4, section 5); PNs in ἀλκι- begin in Homer, while those in ἀλκε- and ἀλκεσι- only appear in the Hellenistic age and are much rarer. There are no semantic reasons behind the lack of V2 compound in -αλεξητής, except perhaps that the simplex ἀλεξητήρ ‘protector’ is itself not very productive.

#### ἄπτω

This verb creates both appellative and onomastic compounds based on the stem of the sigmatic tenses. In all of these, the SC corresponds to the argument of the verb, which is usually expressed by a genitive in Classical Greek. The mean-

<sup>43</sup> All these FCs may show interference from ἀλκή ‘strength’.

ings range from the idea of ‘attaining’, conveyed by ἀψίκορος (‘one who attains satiety’), to ‘touch’ proper, either in a physical manner (the PN Ἀψιππος probably describes the task of the person who was able to calm horses down by touching them: cf. Xen. *Eq.* 6.14) or in a metaphorical sense, as in ἀψιμαχία [touch battle] > ‘skirmish’, ἀψικάρδιος ‘heart-touching’ and ἀψίμοθος [touch conflict] > ‘kindling conflict’. As noted, the only agent noun derived from this verb is the preverbed and rare form ἐφάπτωρ.

### αὔξω/ἀέξω

V1 compounds derived from this verb are common, though mostly post-Classical. Almost all forms are attested in poetry, starting with the first example, ἀξίγιος ‘strengthening the limbs’, epithet of ἄεθλα ‘contests’ in Pindar. In post-Classical Greek, they feature particularly in astronomical and Orphic compositions. Similarly, αὐξητής ‘increaser’, a very rare agent noun, is employed as an Orphic epithet.

### ἐγείρω

This productive compound family displays variation in the creation of FCs. Archaic compounds in ἐγρε- contain the stem of the thematic aorist ἔγρεσθαι; this is later replaced by the enlarged form ἐγρεσι- and by ἐγερσι-: the latter employs the full-grade root ἐγερ- followed by the element -σι- and is likely to have been influenced by the action noun ἔγερσις ‘awaking’. This direct derivation from an action noun might explain the exclusively post-Classical attestations of the FC ἐγερσι-. By contrast ἐγείρω has no clear derivations in the onomastic domain: the names Ἐγέρτιος and Ἐγρετίων might be short forms deriving from compounds with unassibilated FCs ending in -τι-, but their interpretation is not straightforward. The productivity of V1 compounds again contrasts with the fact that the agent noun ἐγέρτης is a hapax.

### ἐθέλω

This verb provides the FC to a large number of compounds, which are initially typical of Attic prose (though the first attested compound, ἐθελόπορνος, is found in Anacreon). As is often the case with verbal FCs ending in -ο-, ἐθελο- acquires an adjectival meaning from early on. Ἐθελοπρόξενος may be understood as a proper verbal compound meaning ‘willing to be proxenos’, but also as ‘he who is proxenos willingly’: accordingly, -πρόξενος would be the head and ἐθελο- its adjectival or adverbial modification. While the verbal interpretation of ἐθελο- applies to some of the other compounds (e.g., ἐθελοκίνδυνος ‘courting danger’ lit. ‘wanting danger’, Poll.), most of the compounds in the Corpus are ambiguous: for instance, ἐθελόδουλος ‘serving voluntarily’, may be either ‘one who wants to

be a slave' (V1 structure) or a 'voluntary slave' (determinative structure). Perhaps because of this particular structure, the reverse V2 type, displaying ἔθειλοντής in the SC, may have been felt to yield an inadequate meaning.

### ἔρῡμαι/ἔρῡω

ἔρῡμαι 'protect' and ἔρῡω 'drag' provide homophonous FCs for a number of V1 compounds, and the verb at the root of the FC can only be ascertained on the basis of the compound's meaning. The oldest V1 compounds build the FC from the bare verbal root (Ἐρύλαος, probably finding a parallel in Myc. *we-wa-do-ro* /*Werwandros*/) but already in Homeric Greek the sigmatic tenses provide an alternative stem, and this becomes the more common option, with forms such as ἔρῡσίπτολις (Hom.) and ῥῡσίπολις (Aesch.) and two Hellenistic PNs, Ἐρῡσίλαος and Ἐρῡσιππος. Here the preference for the V1 structure cannot be attributed to morphological or semantic constraints affecting the agent nouns, which are both numerous and productive. It perhaps depends on the specialization of these agent nouns as names or epithets of gods (see the analysis in section 5.1 above).

### εὐχόμεαι

This common verb, used in both poetry and prose and surviving into MG (albeit only with the meaning 'wish, give blessing to'), does not appear to have been productive in word formation. The agent noun εὐχέτης is only attested in grammatical sources; its rarity, and the consequent lack of V2 compounds, does not seem to have been compensated for by the production of many V1 compounds. The only examples are eight PNs, among which the FC εὐξι- is most common.

### ζεύγνυμι

With the sole exception of the epithet ζευξίλεως, this verb creates only onomastic compounds. The relatively low number of these forms, as compared to the frequency of the verb, can be explained by considering the limited amount of images which involve the action of 'yoking' and are suitable for PNs: one might have expected to find 'yoker of oxen' side by side with Ζεύξιππος, but, unlike the latter, this name would not carry an aristocratic or military association. As noted, agent nouns derived from this verb are both late and very rare. The lack of agentive V2 compounds is not offset by the existence of the type in -ζυγής, since it remains passive throughout (the only exception being βιοζυγής 'yoking lives together' in Nonnus).

### κρύπτω

This compound family starts off slowly with the first attestation in Xenophon (κρυψίνους 'hiding one's thoughts'), but then becomes relatively productive in

post-Classical Greek, particularly once the FC κρυψι- becomes a sort of modifying prefix meaning ‘secretly’ (e.g. κρυψίγονος ‘secretly born’, *Orph. H.*), a function which in English the Neoclassical prefix *crypto-* continues to fulfil to some extent. But while the productivity of compounds in κρυψι- was certainly fostered by this particular structure, another incentive must have been the fact that, given the highly specialized meaning of the agent noun κρύπτης in Spartan civic terminology, active V2 compounds derived from this verb were probably not possible: the rare type in -κρυφής remains passive throughout AG.<sup>44</sup>

### κτάομαι

V1 compounds in κτησι- are particularly popular in onomastics and attestations begin in the fifth century BC. The only appellative compound is the adjective κτησίβιος ‘possessing property’ (Aesch.). Given both the general semantics of the agent noun κτήτωρ ‘possessor’ and its productivity in post-Classical Greek, it is not clear why there are no V2 compounds derived from this verb.

### μέλλω

This family exhibits the typical features associated with compounds whose FC ends in -ο-: μελλο- has acquired a quasi-adjectival meaning, or even the role of a prefix meaning ‘almost’, discernible in compounds such as μελλόνυμφος ‘almost wedded’ or μελλογυμνασιάρχος ‘gymnasiarch to be, almost a gymnasiarch’. The productivity of compounds in μελλο- depends partly on these factors, but it is also a reflection of the specialization of the agent noun μελλητής as ‘hesitating’, rather than ‘on the point of doing something’, which is the meaning conveyed by the FCs of the V1 compounds. The V1 type remains productive down to the Roman age.

### μέλω

V1 compounds are mostly onomastic and identify individuals with a particular interest in something, for instance Μελήσιππος ‘one who cares for horses, one whose interest is in horses’, or Μελέαγρος, which was understood as ‘one who cares for hunting’ (ἄγρα) but is likely to have originally contained a word for ‘weapon’, \*φαγρος (cf. Ved. *vájraḥ*, Av. *vazrō* ‘weapon’).<sup>45</sup> The onomastic specialization of V1 compounds and the rarity of agent nouns from μέλω are likely explanations for the productivity of V1 compounds: V2 compounds in -μελής, even

<sup>44</sup> Paliuri (2014: 54).

<sup>45</sup> This etymology was first suggested by Delbrück, as Watkins (1995: 413) discusses in his contribution to the understanding of Meleager’s name within the context of Indo-European poetics.

when they acquire an active meaning, never use nominal FCs and therefore do not constitute alternatives to the V1 type.

### ὀνίνημι

The family of onomastic compounds derived from this verb is large and mirrors the productivity of those derived from κτάομαι. This in fact is hardly surprising, since the acquisition and possession of wealth are something which a great many parents will wish for their child. Appellative forms on the other hand are limited to the old compound ὀνησίπολις ‘profiting the state’ (Simon.), a hapax.

### παύω

This verb constitutes a popular starting point for both onomastic and appellative V1 compounds. The semantic transparency of onomastic forms is higher than usual: see for instance the antonyms Πασίλυπος ‘one who ends toil’ and Πασίχαρις (a sort of ‘Mr. Spoilsport’?) and the pair Πασίμαχος ‘one who ends strife’ and Πασισπόλεμος ‘one who ends war’ (seemingly celebrating the irenic attitudes of some individuals). There are no semantic reasons why these V1 compounds should not have competed with V2 *specimina*, and the lack of any such *specimina* likely depends on the very low productivity of the agent nouns παυστήρ and παύστωρ (see above).

### πέπᾶμαι

This is a rare verb, but the existence of the Cretan term πάστᾱς ‘owner’ lends support to the tentative interpretation of certain PNs beginning with Πασι- (at least those from Doric areas) as V1 compounds derived from this root, which seem to have an ancestor in the Mycenaean PN *qa-sa-ko* (= Πάσαρχος). In this respect, it is telling that many names in Πασι- are exclusively or predominantly attested in *LGPNI*, the volume containing Cretan names (see e.g. the *Kurzname* Πασίας and the compounds Πασίνοος, Πάσιππος and Πασίτιμος, to mention only the most common). Again, many other such names feature in volumes IIIa and IIIb, which cover mostly West-Greek areas. This, coupled with the fact that only a few of these compounded names feature in Attica (and most of them display ‘passepartout’ SCs: e.g. Πασικλῆς, Πασικράτης, Πασιμένης and Πασιτέλης), encourages the interpretation that at least some of these names constitute V1 compounds derived from πέπᾶμαι. However, their productivity certainly also follows from the interference of compounds derived from πᾶς.

### ρήγνυμι

This is a popular verb in Classical Greek, but it is later replaced by ῥήσσω. Neither of these verbs survives into MG. V1 compounds derived from ῥήγνυμι are not



numerous and are seemingly confined to the poetic lexicon: ῥηξήνωρ ‘breaking armed ranks’ remains an epic epithet; ῥηξίχθων ‘breaking the earth, bursting from the earth’ is attested once in Straton and later only in the *Orphic Hymns* and in magical papyri as an epithet of several deities; ῥηξικέλευθος ‘opening a path’ and ῥηξίνοος ‘breaking the wits’ are both very late forms. The PNs are also quite uncommon: Ῥηξίβιος has only two attestations in the *LGPN*, while Ῥηξίμαχος has five. The semantic specialization of ῥήκτης ‘earthquake’ made it impossible to derive V2 compounds from it. On the other hand, the formal association of compounds in -ρραγής with the passive aorist ἐρράγην prevented their transformation into a productive active type: the first active forms are ψυχορραγής ‘letting the soul break loose’ (Eur.) and αἰμορραγής (Soph.), which is also common in medical language, but this active meaning remains marginal.<sup>46</sup>

### τίνω

V1 compounds are exclusively onomastic, but relatively common: the first form is probably the Mycenaean PN *qi-si-a-ko* (= Τείσαρχος; see Chapter 4, sections 5 and 7.9). Many of the names can be interpreted according to meaningful patterns: the semantics of the active τίνω ‘pay a price, acquit oneself of something’ may lurk behind Τεισίτιμος ‘one who pays a fine’? (cf. *Il.* 3.289), Τεισίδικος ‘one who is condemned’? (cf. e.g. Soph. *Aj.* 113) and Τεισίπινος ‘one who repays sorrow’; while the semantics of the middle τίνομαι ‘avenge’ may be recognized in Τεισίφονος ‘one who takes vengeance for a murder’ (cf. τείσασθαι φόνον, *Il.* 15.116), Τεισίβιος ‘one who takes vengeance for an act of violence’ (cf. ὄφρ’ [...] τίσαιτο βίην, *Od.* 23.31) and perhaps in Τείσαρχος and Τεισικράτης, indicating individuals who take vengeance for, or perhaps on, established powers (ἀρχή, κράτος). As noted above, the lack of V2 compounds derived from this verb can be explained first and foremost by reference to the rarity and semantic specialization of the agent noun τίτᾱς, indicating an official at Gortyn, but, as in the case of other compound families, we must also consider the possibility that the established V1 onomastic pattern exercised some analogical pressure on the make-up of these compounds.

#### 5.3.1.1 Summary of characteristics

One fact emerges unmistakably from the above group of nineteen verbs and compounds: more than half of the V1 families in this group correspond to rare agent nouns (those derived from αἰνέω, ἀλέξω, ἄπτω, αὔξω, ἐγείρω, εὐχόμεαι, ζεύγνυμι, μέλω, ὀνίνημι, παύω and τίνω), while four more are linked to specialized agent nouns (those derived from ἀκέομαι, μέλλω, κρύπτω and ῥήγνυμι). In the case

<sup>46</sup> Paliuri (2014: 40–42).

of *πέπᾶμαι*, moreover, we are unable to judge whether its agent noun *πάστᾶς*, attested in Cretan, might have had specialist status. These numbers lend strong support to the hypothesis outlined at the beginning of this section, namely that oscillations in the popularity of the V1 pattern are partly dependent on the nature of the corresponding agent nouns and on the difficulty of creating productive V2 compounds.

In the case of the remaining verbs (*ἐθέλω*, *ἔρυναι/ἐρύω*, *κτάομαι*) there seem to have been no constraints governing the formation of agent nouns. The lack of V2 compounds may thus be accidental. However, it is worth considering other factors that might have contributed to the selection of the V1 over the V2 structure. One such factor is relevant only to compounds derived from *ἐθέλω*, which probably developed from an original V1 type into a subclass of determinative compounds whose FC was characterized by quasi-adjectival semantics. Another factor is the development of specific compound families within the poetic lexicon (see e.g. compounds derived from *αὔξω*, *ἔρυναι/ἐρύω* and *ρήγνυμι*) and/or in onomastics (see those derived from *ζεύγνυμι* and *κτάομαι*). In these cases, analogical pressure from the compound family may have contributed to perpetuating the V1 structure, making it the preferred choice. This conclusion is also supported by the observation that even among those verbs whose agent nouns are rare or specialized (and for which V2 compounds were therefore more difficult to create), uniquely or mostly onomastic families are the majority: see those derived from *αἰνέω*, *ἀκέομαι*, *ἀλέξω*, *ζεύγνυμι*, *κτάομαι*, *μέλω*, *πέπᾶμαι* and *τίνω*, adding up to almost half of the entire group.

### 5.3.2 Less productive V1 compound families

We now come to the analysis of those verbs which produce rare V1 compounds. Most of the V1 families in this group are exclusively onomastic, while the appellatives among the other families are mostly rare forms.

#### **αἰρέω**

In spite of the great frequency of this verb, the compounds derived from the root *αἰρ-* only amount to three: the names *Αἰρήλιππος* (a fifth-century Laconian form for *Αἰρήσιππος*, employing the future stem) and *Αἰρίππη*, both conveying the same image ('one who seizes horses'); and the title of a play by Diphilus, *αἰρησιτείης* 'taker of walls', which is a hapax. As already noted, V2 compounds derived from this verb may not have been possible because of the specialized meaning of the agent noun *αἰρέτης*.

**ἀνύω**

This verb, which is often used in Archaic and Classical Greek, produces very few and late derivations. The two V1 compounds, ἀνυσίεργος ‘finishing work’ (Theocr.) and the PN Ἄνυσικλῆς (fourth/third c. BC), are post-Classical. Its agent noun ἀνυτής is late-antique.

**ἀράομαι**

V1 compounds are limited to two PNs. Ἀρησίμβροτος might have a meaning which is compatible with that of the verb (‘one who invokes mortals’ or perhaps even ‘one who curses mortals’), but Ἀρήσιππος is more obscure. We should not rule out the possibility that these may be erroneous variants of names derived from αἰρέω (especially since both are written in the post-Euclidean alphabet, which does not have a sign for initial aspiration). V2 compounds derived from ἀράομαι might have been blocked by the highly literary status of the agent noun ἀρητήρ (see 5.12). In general, the low productivity of derivations from ἀράομαι seems to be linked to the fact that the verb is mostly poetic.

**ἐργάζομαι**

Derivations from this verb are limited, no doubt because of the competition from those derived from the root ἐργ- giving rise to the present ἔρδω, which forms the basis of a very productive family (the situation is the opposite in MG, where forms in -ουργός have been replaced by the common type in -εργάτης: Chapter 6, section 3.1). The existence of V1 compounds derived from ἐργάζομαι can be reconstructed from *Kurznamen* beginning with Ἔργασι- (e.g. Ἐργασίων and Ἐργάσιλος). The rarity of such short forms, along with the restriction of the original compounds to the onomastic domain, contrasts with the frequency of the simplex agent noun ἐργάτης. Very tentatively, we might suggest that the lack of onomastic V2 compounds derived from ἐργάτης is connected to the semantics of this agent noun, which does not simply indicate ‘someone who works’ but more specifically a workman: could this meaning be felt to be inappropriate for a personal name?

**ἔρπω**

This was the common present formation for ‘go’ in Doric varieties. Its prevalence in V1 compounds, however, is extremely low, perhaps because ‘go’ is an intrinsically intransitive action, whereas V1 compounds tend to have transitive semantics. The only PN whose structure is unambiguous, Ἐρπετίδαμος, is one of the very few examples of compounds in -τι- attested outside Homeric language; its meaning can only be tentatively surmised: ‘one who goes among the people?’. The interpretation of another PN, Ἐρπίνικος (Athens 255/6 AD) is more difficult and it is not to be excluded that this is not a V1 compound from ἔρπω.

### ἐρύκω

As we have seen, the agent noun derived from this verb, ἐρυκτήρ, has the very specialized meaning ‘type of Spartan freedman’. Because of this, the V1 pattern was the only possible one for compounds derived from ἐρύκω. V1 compounds, however, exhibit low productivity both in the number of different forms (only two PNs) and in their individual attestations (Ἐρυξίλαος is attested only once, while Ἐρυξίμαχος is attested five times). ἐρύκω has a poetic character.

### ἦμι

This is another pervasive verb, but it only produces two PNs. The first is Ἡσίοδος, the meaning of which, however, is opaque. Already Götting (1843: xii-xiii) proposed two interpretations, both of which analyse the SC as deriving from ὁδός ‘road’: the first, following EM 438, takes the compound to mean ‘he who hastens on the road, guide’; the second takes the FC to derive from ἦδομαι and the compound to mean ‘he who takes pleasure in (showing) the right road’. This last interpretation is favoured also by Meier-Brügger (1990), who cites Thessalian and Boeotian names in φασ- as likely parallels for the derivation of the FC from ἦδομαι/ἀνδάνω. Another popular etymology derives the SC from αἰοδή ‘song’ and takes the compound to mean ‘he who emits songs’.<sup>47</sup> This etymology of the SC poses problems on a phonological level, however.<sup>48</sup>

The interpretation of Hesiod’s name is likely to remain a topic of controversy. Here we have opted for the derivation of the FC from ἦμι on account of its [ε:]: an authentic Aeolic name derived from ἦδομαι/ἀνδάνω would have [a:] or [a]. In order to bypass this problem Meier-Brügger (1990: 66) assumes that Hesiod, an epic rhapsode, would have taken an Ionicized name in the Panhellenic world. While this cannot be ruled out *a priori*, it also seems unnecessary: we have evidence that the local dialects were mutually intelligible and did not require ‘translation’; moreover, the practice of funerary epigrams, which often forsake the local dialect in favour of a more Panhellenic language, shows that personal names tended to keep their dialectal phonology.

A derivation from ἦμι is also likely for Ἡσίδωρος (Peloponnese?), which could mean ‘he who throws gifts’. However, since this name is dated to the first c. AD, the derivation of the FC from ἦμι is not beyond doubt: it could also derive from ἦδομαι, since by this time dialectal colouring in onomastics is likely to have waned. Ἡσίοχος (Athens) is similarly ambiguous: the FC may derive from ἦμι, but also from ἦδομαι. The only appellative compound, ἠσιεπής ‘throwing words’,

<sup>47</sup> Schulze (1892: 17 n. 3) and most recently Nagy (1999: 296–297). Subscribers to this interpretation are listed in Meier-Brügger (1990: 63–65).

<sup>48</sup> Summary of criticism in Meier-Brügger (1990: 64). See further EDG s.v. αἰοδή.

is solely attested in *EM* 699, where a case is made for its derivation from ἦσω, the future of ἴημι.

### κελεύω

There are no proper V1 compounds derived from this verb, but the existence of a type may be reconstructed from the *Kurzname* Κελεύσος. As noted, it is probable that V2 compounds in -κελευστής were not created because of the semantic specialization of κελευστής ‘one who gives time to rowers’.

### κλαίω

This is another verb of low productivity. The agent noun κλαυστήρ ‘weeper’ is late, while the only V1 compound, κλαυσίμαχος (*Pax* 1293), is a rather artificial Aristophanic formation designed to play with Lysimachus’ name.

### κράζω

This is a special case. Derivations from this verb often display the reduplicated stem κεκραγ-: this is the case with the agent noun κεκράκτης and the V1 compound κεκραξίδαμας [bawling conquering], i.e. ‘conquering all in bawling’ (Aristoph. *V.* 596). The structure of κεκραξίδαμας is doubly artificial in that its SC -δαμας is itself verbal. Aristophanes’ aim probably was to create a high-sounding epithet for Cleon which reminded his audience of the language of eulogic poetry, but whose meaning was disparaging. This aim is likely to have prompted him to choose a V1 structure rather than a V2 compound in -κραγος. The restricted semantics of the verb is no doubt responsible for the lack of other compounds.

### ὀρμάω

There is only one compound derived from this verb, the PN Ὀρμασίλας. Its FC may reflect the meaning of ὀρμάω as ‘rush headlong at someone’ so that the compound perhaps means ‘he who rushes at the enemy’. Alternatively, the FC may correspond to the meaning ‘incite, set in motion’, which is also reflected in the agent noun ὀρμητής ‘imperious person’, perhaps giving us the meaning ‘he who urges on his people’ for the compound as a whole. The impression one gains from an analysis of this V1 compound and the two agent nouns is that ὀρμάω had a low derivational impact, with the result that it is difficult to set clear parameters for the comparison between the V1 compound, the agent nouns and the lack of V2 forms.

### ταράσσω

This verb expresses both physical and mental commotion and creates compounds which closely correspond to attested phrases. ταραξικάρδιος ‘troubling the heart’

mirrors e.g. τὶς σὴν ταρασσει καρδίαν ‘who troubles your heart’ (Eur. *Ba.* 1321); ταραξιππος ‘troubling horses’ corresponds to σὺν ἵππους ἐτάραξε ‘he threw into confusion the horses’ (*Il.* 8.86), while ταραξιππόστρατος ‘troubling the horse-array’ (Ar. *Eq.* 247), where the element ἵππο- plays with the Ἴππεῖς of the title, is a comic extension of the latter. These compounds may also be influenced by the action noun τάραξις ‘commotion’.

### τρέπω

This is a common verb which, however, has a low rate of productivity as concerns verbal compounds. As noted in section 3.2, compounds ending in -τροπος are semantically related to the *nomen rei actae* τρόπος ‘manner’: there are no V2 agentive compounds in -τροπος, probably because the old agent noun τροπός has become a technical term for a kind of strap. For this reason, one would expect V1 compounds to have been productive: instead, there is only one such compound, τρεψίχρωσ ‘changing colour’ (Aristot.), which may have been coined for the purposes of scientific communication.

### χαράσσω

V1 compounds are limited to the poetic hapax χαραξιπποντος ‘carving the sea’, used by Simonides as the epithet of a ship. As noted in section 5.1.2, the creation of V2 forms may have been prevented by the fact that the agent noun χαρακτήρ was provided with specialized meanings (‘mark’, ‘character’, etc.).

#### 5.3.2.1 Summary of characteristics

This group is different from the previous in that it contains fourteen V1 compound families with low or extremely low productivity. This allows little scope for analysing their chronological development, and hence for drawing firm conclusions concerning their existence vis-à-vis the lack of V2 compounds derived from the same verbs. Again, the numbers suggest that there is a strong correlation between a specialized or rare agent noun, the lack of V2 compounds, and the existence of V1 compounds: this applies to forms derived from αἰρέω, ἀνύω, ἐρύκω, εὐχομαι, κελεύω, κλαίω, ταρασσω and χαράσσω, i.e. more than half of the whole group.

When agent nouns are more productive, and V2 compounds therefore a possibility, we find that the V1 compounds are typically rare poetic forms or even one-off formations: see those derived from κλαίω and κράζω, which are Aristophanic inventions of a highly artificial character. As in Class I, uniquely or mostly onomastic compounds are predominant: see the compounds derived from αἰρέω, ἐργάζομαι, ἔρω, ἐρύκω, εὐχομαι and κελεύω.

## 6 Class III: V1 compounds with an intransitive or passive V2 counterpart

Before tackling the vast number of V1 compounds which correspond to a V2 type in the next chapter, it will be useful to conclude the investigation of V1 compounds without a V2 counterpart by briefly focusing on a smaller class of verbs (Class III in the Corpus). These are all CeC/CoC ablauting verbs producing either preverbed -ος formations which are characterized by an intransitive meaning (e.g. παράμονος ‘steadfast’ from παραμένω), or by a passive meaning (e.g. μετήρορος ‘lifted off the ground’, from μεταίρω). Thus, although Greek created -ος formations from these verbal roots, in each case the semantics of the verb seems to have prevented the formation of active V2 compounds.

The ablauting verbs in Class III are αείρω, λείπω and μένω. Their morphology explains the existence of V2 forms even in the absence of agentive *simplicia*, a feature which we will also observe in a number of verbs derived from ablauting roots included in Class IV. Preverbed forms of αείρω produce only one passive V2 compound, τετράρορος ‘four yoked together’, which reflects one of the meanings of the verb: ‘take up and bring (together)’. The same SC is common in the agentive formations derived from the compounded forms of the verb, for instance μετήρορος ‘lifted off the ground’ from μεταίρω ‘lift up’.

μένω ‘stand’ creates a large number of agentive forms in -μονος, all of which, however, are derivations of the preverbed verbs (e.g. παράμονος ‘steadfast’ from παραμένω ‘stand fast’). There are no agent nouns corresponding to the simple verb and no V2 compounds with a non-prepositional FC. A similar situation can be observed in compounds derived from λείπω ‘leave’. In spite of the verb’s active meaning, V2 compounds usually have intransitive or passive meanings and are preverbed forms: see ἐπίλοιπος ‘remaining’, περίλοιπος ‘surviving’, etc. These correspond to the simplex λοιπός ‘remaining’, formally a type of agent noun, which has acquired the semantics of an adjective.

μένω, λείπω and αείρω all have productive V1 compounds. Those in μενε-, μενο-, and μενεσι- are productive both as appellatives and as PNs, with a preference for the latter. Compounds derived from λείπω are overwhelmingly appellative: among the numerous poetic forms, it is worth noting the set of bureaucratic terms λιποστρατίη ‘desertion from the army’ (Hdt.), λιποτελέω ‘to be in arrear with taxes’ (Oeanthea, fifth c. BC), λειπογνώμων ‘lacking interpreters’ (Athens, fourth c. BC), and λιποταξία ‘desertion’ (Dem.). On the other hand, V1 compounds in ἀερσι- appear to have been exclusively poetic: e.g. ἀερσίπους ‘lifting the feet, high-stepping’ (Hom.), ἀερσίνοος (Causabon’s conjecture for the transmitted ἀερσίπνοος in Ion Lyr. *PMG* 744) or ἀερσιπότης ‘lifting the flight, flying high’ (Hes.).

The conclusion we ought to draw here is clear: the high number of V1 compounds derived from these verbs is a result of the deficiency of their V2 counterparts, which have restricted verbal semantics. The V1 type is not in competition with V2 compounds, but emerges to fill the gap left vacant by them.

## 7 Conclusion

This chapter has analysed the behaviour of V1 compounds in relation to other formations from the same verbs, investigating the role fulfilled by these V1 compounds where no V2 formations are attested. We have seen that the explanation for the absence of these formations lies partly in the morphological constraints of the verbs themselves, partly in the rarity of particular base verbs, and—in the case of verbs creating agent nouns but no V2 compounds—in the semantic specialization of the simple agent nouns. In the case of Class III, an additional reason is the fact that simple agent nouns tend to have intransitive semantics and only allow prefixation.

V1 compounds from Classes I and II provide a convenient alternative to the missing V2 type. Not all of the families contain many items: we have attempted to explain this low productivity by examining the semantics and use in context of the base verbs. As concerns the productive families (four items or more), these amount to eight for Class I and nineteen for Class II. Among them, there are a few predominantly onomastic families (those derived from *αἰνέω*, *ἀκέομαι*, *εὐχομαι*, *ζεύγνυμι*, *κτάομαι*, *μέλω*, *ὀνίνημι*, *τίνω* and perhaps *πέπᾱμαι*), but it would be incorrect to claim that the V1 pattern is closely tied to onomastics: for exclusively or mostly appellative families, see those derived from *λανθάνω*, *δεῖδω*, *μείγνυμι*, *τανύω* (Class I) and *αὔξω*, *ἐγείρω*, *ἐθέλω*, *ἔρυμαι/ἐρύω* and *κρύπτω* (Class II).

At the same time, the large number of new literary creations even in post-Classical and late-antique Greek shows that the V1 type enjoyed an enduring popularity throughout the history of the language. As noted elsewhere in the present study, we should therefore correct the current view that V1 compounds are on the whole a scarcely productive relic. The great vitality of individual V1 families, which testifies to the morphological productivity of the pattern, emerges even more clearly from the study of Class IV carried out in the next chapter.



# Chapter Six

## The Analysis of V1 Compounds Within the Greek Compound System

### Part II: V1 Compounds With a V2 Counterpart

#### 1 Introduction

This chapter studies V1 compounds derived from verbs that also give rise to V2 agentive compounds (Class IV), with a particular focus on the interaction between the two patterns. The complexity of this class calls for a variety of investigative approaches. The first part of the chapter analyses the morphology of the verbs from which these V1/V2 pairs derive and brings to light the features which distinguish these verbs from those in Classes I, II and III (Chapter 5). The focus then turns to the agent nouns derived from these verbs, and in particular to the interaction between agent nouns and V2 compounds, with the purpose of investigating how the semantics, formal characteristics and productivity of the former affect the latter.

The second part of the chapter is devoted to a full-scale study of the compound families produced by each of the verbs in Class IV. The chronological development, productivity and morphology of individual V1 compounds is compared to that of their V2 counterparts in order to move closer to answering some of the questions at the core of this book: do V1 and V2 compounds derived from the same verb fulfil partly different functions? Is it true that V1 compounds are mostly poetic, onomastic and recessive? Is the V2 pattern always the preferred one? Is there a correlation between a given type of compound and particular linguistic registers or stylistic contexts? In assessing these questions, we shall have to be on the look out for morphological features and semantic constraints associated with specific base verbs which may have influenced the choice of the V1 pattern.

In order to gain an improved understanding of how V1 compounds interact with right-oriented compounds, the third part of this chapter investigates the relation between V1 compounds and active *-ής* compounds (Class IVa), which arguably took on the role of providing a means of creating a right-oriented type in the absence of other agentive compounds (section 4). Finally, section 5 turns to the small number of V1 compounds in competition with right-oriented types that are structurally denominative rather than verbal, but from a semantic point of view are in fact the equivalent of V2 compounds (Class IVb: type *ἀναξίλαος* : *ἀστυάναξ*). The hope is that the combined study of these subclasses will provide insights into the various kinds of interactions which affected Greek verbal com-

pounds as a whole. Finally, section 6 offers a few insights into the use of V1 compounds in association with certain literary registers and briefly looks at the interaction between poetic language, phraseology and V1 compounds, highlighting the issues which may have contributed to the choice of V1 compounds over other verbal formations.

## 2 Class IV: the base verbs, their agent nouns and verbal compounds

Class IV contains verbs which produce agent nouns and use them to create V2 compounds that coexist with V1 compounds derived from the same verb. A more limited subgroup, comprising verbs which only give rise to V2 compounds in -ής (Class IVa), will be introduced in section 2.3 and analysed in section 4.

The verbs in Class IV are fifty-eight:

ἀγείρω ‘gather’, ἄγω ‘lead’, ἀκούω ‘listen’, ἀμείβω ‘change, exchange’, ἀραρίσκω ‘fit together’, ἀρπάζω ‘snatch away’, ἀρτύω ‘prepare’, ἄρχω ‘begin, lead’, βαίνω ‘step’, βλέπω ‘see’, βόσκω ‘feed’, γιγνώσκω ‘know’, δάκνω ‘bite’, δάμνημι/δαμνάω/δαμάζω ‘tame’, δέχομαι ‘receive’, δίδωμι ‘give’, διώκω ‘chase, drive’, ἐλάω ‘drive, set in motion, strike’, ἔλκω ‘drag’, ἔραμαι ‘love’, ἔρδω ‘do’, εὐρίσκω ‘discover’, ἔχω ‘have, hold’, ἡγέομαι ‘lead’, θέλω ‘charm’, ἵστημι ‘stand’, καλέω ‘call’, κάμπτω ‘bend, turn’, κινέω ‘set in motion’, κλέπτω ‘steal’, κοσμέω ‘arrange, equip’, κρούω ‘strike’, λαμβάνω ‘catch, receive’, λύω ‘release’, μιμνήσκω ‘remind of, remember’, ὄλλυμι ‘destroy’, ὄρνυμι ‘incite, make to arise’, πέρθω ‘destroy’, πήγνυμι ‘fix, make solid’, πλήσσω ‘strike’, πράσσω ‘accomplish, exact payment’, ῥάπτω ‘sew together’, σειώ ‘shake’, στέλλω ‘make ready, fit out, send’, στρέφω ‘turn, twist’, σώζω ‘save’, τελέω ‘fulfil, accomplish, kill’, τέμνω ‘cut’, τιμάω ‘honour’, τλήναι ‘endure’, τρέφω ‘rear’, τρέχω ‘run’, φαγεῖν ‘eat’, φέρω ‘carry, bring’, φεύγω ‘flee, shun’, φθείρω ‘destroy’, φράζω ‘indicate, tell’, φύω ‘produce’.

These verbs belong to the following classes:

- Athematic radical presents: ἔραμαι.
- Full-grade thematic radical presents: θέλω, σειώ<sup>1</sup>. ἄγω, a full-grade present, in Greek behaves like zero-grade radical presents in short vowel and produces simple and compounded agent nouns in -ος.

<sup>1</sup> See *LIV* 654.

- Full-grade thematic radical presents from verbs which preserve the original CeC/CoC ablaut of the root: ἀμείβω, βλέπω,<sup>2</sup> δέχομαι, ἔλκω, ἔρδω (< \**werg-*), ἔχω, πέρθω, στρέφω, τέμνω, τρέφω, τρέχω, φέρω. φεύγω preserves full/zero grade ablaut alternation in its paradigm.
- Zero-grade thematic radical presents: ἄρχω, λύω,<sup>3</sup> φύω.<sup>4</sup> ἄρχω produces simple and compounded agent nouns in -ος.<sup>5</sup>
- Reduplicated athematic presents: δίδωμι, ἴστημι.
- Presents formed with nasal infixes and suffixes: δάκνω, δάμνημι, λαμβάνω, ὄλλυμι, ὄρνημι, πήγνυμι.
- -σκω presents: ἀραρίσκω, βόσκω, γιγνώσκω, εὐρίσκω, μιμνήσκω.<sup>6</sup>
- -*ῆ/ό-* presents derived from consonantal roots: ἀκούω,<sup>7</sup> ἀρπάζω,<sup>8</sup> βαίνω, κάμπτω, κρούω,<sup>9</sup> πλήσσω, πράσσω, ῥάπτω, σώζω,<sup>10</sup> φράζω. Of these, ῥάπτω and σώζω form -ος V2 compounds (-ραφός and -σοός).<sup>11</sup> The following -*ῆ/ό-* presents derive from CeC/CoC roots, and display the ablaut of those roots

**2** The etymology of βλέπω is debated. The existence of root compounds in -βλωψ might imply that it is based on an ablauting root; however, *DEG* acknowledges the possibility that this [o:] may be analogical (perhaps on compounds in -ωψ), while *EDG* considers the possibility that the verb is a ‘pre-Greek’ formation.

**3** The [u:] displayed by the present of λύω in Classical Greek is analogical on the s-aorist: most Homeric forms of λύω have [u] instead. The original root is reconstructed as \**leuH-* by *LIV* 417 (yielding the zero-grade thematic present stem \**luH-é-* in Greek) and as \**teh<sub>1</sub>-u-* by *EDG*.

**4** φύω is a Greek innovation based on an original root aorist. The short vowel displayed by the present is the result of a secondary opposition between [u:] and [u], and not a reflex of the original zero-grade of the root, \**b<sup>h</sup>uH-*, since this yields [u:] in Greek. See *EDG* s.v. φύω and further *LIV* 98–101.

**5** The root of ἄρχω is obscure: perhaps \**h<sub>2</sub>rg<sup>h</sup>-* (*EDG*), pointing to an original zero grade. See further *LIV* 498, which analyses ἄρχω as a \**ské/ό-* zero-grade present from the root \**reg<sup>h</sup>-*.

**6** γιγνώσκω and μιμνήσκω derive from ablauting roots. The present is built on the zero grade, but the laryngeals in the root yield a long vowel in Greek: \**ǵnh<sub>3</sub>-* > γνω-, \**mnh<sub>2</sub>-* > μνᾶ-. These presents also display reduplication, which in -σκω verbs is a Greek innovation. Reduplication in ἀραρίσκω derives from the stem of the thematic aorist ἤραρον, extended to the present: see *LIV* 269–270.

**7** *EDG* posits a Greek form \**akous-jō*, possibly related to a root \**h<sub>2</sub>kous-*. Derivations in ἀκο- such as ἀκοή and compounds in -ηκοος display false ablaut, which is the result of shortening in hiatus: see *EDG* s.v. ἀκούω.

**8** *EDG* supposes that ἀρπάζω is a denominative, formed with the -*ῆ/ό-* suffix from a nominal stem, ἀρπαγ-, and goes so far as to advance the hypothesis that, rather than being linked to an IE root (\**serp-?*), the verb is a Proto-Greek formation. If so, the agent noun ἄρπαγος would represent a form of greater antiquity than the verb instead of a derivation from it. See further section 3.2.

**9** On this interpretation of κρούω, see *LIV* 371.

**10** σώζω (older form σώζω) probably derives from the contracted adjective σώς (< σαός) ‘safe’ through the Greek suffix -ίζω, itself of denominative origin (from stems in -ιδ-): see *DEG* s.v. σώς.

**11** The root behind ῥάπτω is unclear: *LIV* 690 analyses it as a derivation from \**uerp-* ‘turn over and over’, but admits that the semantics is problematic. *LIV* fails to acknowledge, however, that

in their paradigms and derivations: ἀγείρω (\**h<sub>2</sub>ger-*: ἀγορά, compounds in -ηγόρος), κλέπτω (\**klep-*: κλοπός, κέκλοφα), στέλλω (\**stel-*, στολή), φθείρω (\**g<sup>w</sup>ǵ<sup>h</sup>er-*: compounds in -φθόρος).

- -*jé/ó-* or -*éje/o-* presents which yield vocalic verbs in Greek: ἀρτύω,<sup>12</sup> ἐλάω,<sup>13</sup> ἠγέομαι, καλέω, κινέω, κοσμέω, τελέω, τιμάω.
- Athematic radical aorists: τλήναι.
- Zero-grade thematic aorists: φαγεῖν.
- Verbs of unclear etymology or formation: διώκω.<sup>14</sup>

The verbs in Class IV belong to the full range of Greek verbal formations. Among them, those derived from ablauting roots are particularly numerous and distributed across several classes: e-grade thematic presents of the CeC/CoC type (ἀμείβω, δέχομαι, ἔλκω, ἔρδω, ἔχω, πέρθω, στρέφω, τέμνω, τρέφω, τρέχω, φέρω), -*jé/ó-* presents derived from CeC/CoC roots (ἀγείρω, κλέπτω, στέλλω, φθείρω), e-grade presents alternating with zero-grade formations (φεύγω), and athematic reduplicated presents (δίδωμι, ἴστημι), amounting to eighteen verbs overall. Fifteen of the verbs in the first three groups give rise to -ος agent nouns, as do presents with a short vowel (ἄγω, ἄρχω), the nasal presents δάκνω, δάμνημι/δαμάζω and λαμβάνω, the -*jé/ó-* presents ράπτω and σώζω, and the zero-grade aorist φαγεῖν: in summary, twenty-three of the fifty-eight verbs in Class IV produce an -ος agent noun of some kind, a fact which distinguishes this class from Classes I and II.

## 2.1 Verbs in Class IV and their agent nouns

In order to gain a thorough understanding of the make-up of agent nouns derived from the verbs in Class IV, we need first to consider several facts pertaining to the interaction between the original roots and the present formations. Greek reconfigured many old roots into new patterns, often moving away from the original present (or aorist) formation. The original formation can, however, offer a valuable insight into the behaviour of certain Greek verbs with respect to ablaut and derivation, particularly so far as the creation and morphology of agent nouns is concerned.

---

the Mycenaean plural participle *e-ra-pe-me-na* /*errap<sup>h</sup>mena*/ ‘stitched’ shows that the verb had no initial [w] in Greek: see further *EDG* s.v. ράπτω.

<sup>12</sup> According to *EDG*, ἀρτύω is a denominative from ἀρτύς ‘ordering’, a word attested only in Hesychius, which would derive from the root \**h<sub>2</sub>er-*.

<sup>13</sup> Ἐλαύνω seems to be a younger form than ἐλάω, but its origin is not clear: see *GEW*, *EDG* s.v.

<sup>14</sup> See *LIV* 107 n. 1.

It may be beneficial at this point to consider two examples. Given its morphological make-up, we would expect the Greek *-jé/ó-* present κλέπτω to create the agent noun κλεπ-της, just as πράσσω (< πρακ-jé/ó-) creates πρήκτης and πρακτήρ. This expectation would be well founded, since Greek does indeed contain the agent nouns κλέπτης (Hom.) and κλεπτήρ (Man.). At the same time, however, the existence of the rare agent noun κλοπός ‘thief’ and, more importantly, the existence of V2 compounds in -κλοπος such as άνδραποδοκλόπος ‘slave-stealer’ (Soph.) reveal that κλέπτω derives from a CeC/CoC root, whose ablaut surfaces in the perfect κέκλοφα and in the iterative ύποκλοπέομαι ‘lurk in secret places’. κλέπτω has therefore replaced the radical present \*\*κλέπω, which finds a parallel in the Latin *clepō*. This morphological reshaping of the Greek present from the root \**klep-* in turn has an effect on the structure of the agent nouns and compounds derived from it: the old (and morphologically inherited) forms displaying the o-grade κλοπ- are eventually replaced by those in κλεπ-, as if κλέπτω did not derive from an ablauting root (see the analysis in section 3.1). A similar chain of morphological readjustments applies in the case of the new *-jé/ó-* present ράπτω: in late-antique Greek this creates the agent noun ράπτης ‘mender’, but the original agent noun ought to have been \*\*ράφος, as the V2 compounds in -(ρ)ραφος demonstrate.

The second example concerns Greek verbs which have largely forsaken the original ablaut of the IE root and whose derivations mostly reflect the vocalism of the present stem. This phenomenon can be illustrated by means of two verbs, both of which belong to the same category of presents formed with a nasal infix: δάμνημι/δαμνάω and δάκνω (the fact that the former alternates between the athematic δάμνημι and the thematic δαμνάω is of no relevance here). These presents are built on the zero grade of the ablauting roots \**demh<sub>2</sub>-* and \**denk̑-* and, in chronological terms, are secondary formations: in both cases, the primary formation from these roots was the root aorist, which in Greek was then replaced by the sigmatic aorist ἐδάμασσα and the thematic aorist ἔδακον respectively.<sup>15</sup> Although these roots do have an o-grade, reflected in the Latin verb *domō* and in the late Vedic causative present *damśayati* ‘to cause to bite’ (< \**donk̑-*),<sup>16</sup> Greek has extended the zero grade to the whole paradigm. As with other Greek presents characterized by a short vowel, the result is that the V2 compounds derived from δάμνημι and δάκνω display [a]: see the V2 compounds in -δαμος (e.g. ἱππόδαμος ‘taming horses’) and -δάκης (e.g. θυμοδακής ‘biting the heart’). However, both verbs also have agent nouns characterized by a long vowel: in the

<sup>15</sup> See *LIV* 116 and 117.

<sup>16</sup> See *LIV* s.v. \**denk̑-*. [a] is the regular reflex of IE [o] in Sanskrit. *m̐* represents the ‘true Anusvāra’, transcribed with n in Monier-Williams.

case of δάμνημι/δαμνάω, the agent noun δμητήρ ‘tamer’ (Hom.) is the result of the analogical extension of the zero grade *\*dmh<sub>2</sub>-*; in the case of δάκνω, the agent noun δήκτης ‘biter’ (< δᾶκτης) has an analogical [a:], which cannot represent the original development of the e-grade *\*denk-*.

The examples of κλέπτω on the one hand and δάμνημι/δαμνάω and δάκνω on the other bear out the well-known Greek tendency to alter inherited ablaut patterns in the interests of morphological regularity. These examples also serve as a useful means of linking the above list of Greek presents, in which the verbs are classified according to a combination of historical morphology and synchronic description, with the lists of agent nouns laid out below. These lists classify agent nouns solely according to their morphology, i.e. irrespective of the shape of the presents to which they are related: in each list, the verbs precede the agent nouns in order both to facilitate alphabetization and to throw into relief the fact that the same kind of agent noun may be linked to very different present formations.

### 2.1.1 Agent nouns and active V2 compounds of the CoC-os type

- **ἀγείρω** > compounds in -ηγόρος, e.g. *ri-na-ko-ro* ‘linen-gatherer’. In later Greek, V2 compounds in -ηγόρος have come to be associated with ἀγορεύω ‘speak’: the productive V2 compounds derived from ἀγείρω are those in -ηγερέτης (see section 3.2).
- **ἀμείβω** > ἀμοιβός ‘one who exchanges’ and compounds in -αμοιβός (Aesch.).
- **δέχομαι** > compounds in -δόκος and -δόχος (Hom.).<sup>17</sup>
- **ἔλκω** > ὄλκος ‘hauling-engine’ (Hdt.) and V2 compounds in -ουλκός (Aesch.).
- **ἔρδω** > compounds in -ουργός and -εργός (Myc.).
- **ἔχω** > compounds in -οχος (Myc.).
- **κλέπτω** > κλοπός ‘thief’ (Hom.) and compounds in -κλόπος (Soph.).
- **πέρθω** > only the V2 compound πτολιπόρθος ‘destroying cities’ (Hom.).
- **στέλλω** > some V2 compounds in -στολος, e.g. πυγοστόλος ‘decorating her buttocks’ (Hes.).
- **στρέφω** > compounds in -στροφήος (Pi.).
- **τέμνω** > τομός ‘cutting’ (an agent noun which has acquired an adjectival function) and compounds in -τομός (Hom.).
- **τρέφω** > τροφός ‘nurse’ (Hom.) and compounds in -τροφήος (Hom.).
- **τρέχω** > τροχός ‘wheel’ (Hom.) and the V2 compound ἀλίτροχος ‘running through the sea’ (Ibyc.).
- **φέρω** > compounds in -φόρος (Hom.).
- **φθείρω** > compounds in -φθόρος (Thgn.).

<sup>17</sup> For the alternation between κ and χ, see the comments in the Corpus.

The fifteen base verbs in this list tend to create only agent nouns and V2 compounds in -ος: δέχομαι and κλέπτω are the only verbs which produce -της agent nouns side by side with the original CoC-os ones; these -της forms also become more common over time (the need for paradigmatic regularity is behind this in the case of κλέπτω). Another clearly discernible tendency in this group is for V2 compounds to exist even in the absence of simple agent nouns, while this is not the case for the group of compounds in -της analysed in 2.1.3 below. We will see in the analysis of individual compound families that CoC-os forms usually create very productive compound categories (see those derived from δέχομαι, ἔρδω, ἔχω, πέρθω, στρέφω, φέρω, φθείρω). This happens regardless of whether a *simplex* is attested: the V2 compounds derived from ἔρδω and ἔχω, for instance, are among the most common V2 compounds throughout the history of the language, despite the absence of any corresponding *simplicia*.<sup>18</sup>

### 2.1.2 Agent nouns and active -ος V2 compounds in short vowel

- ἄγω > ἄγος ‘leader’ and compounds in -ἄγός/-ηγός (Hom.).
- ἄρχω > ἀρχός ‘leader’ and compounds in -αρχος (Myc.).
- δάμνημι/δαμάζω > compounds in -δαμος (Hom.).
- πήγνυμι > compounds in -πηγός (Hom.).<sup>19</sup>
- ῥάπτω > compounds in -ρράφος (Soph.).
- σῶζω > compounds in -σόος (A.R.).
- φαγεῖν > φάγος ‘glutton’ (NT) and compounds in -φαγος (Hom.).
- φεύγω > only the V2 compound ὀψίφυγος ‘fleeing late’ (Hdn.).

This group is smaller because the verbal roots involved are more restricted in number. The ratio of V2 compounds accompanied by an agent noun to those lacking a corresponding *simplex* is similar to that observed in the previous group: again there is a tendency for compounds to be created even in the absence of a simple agent noun (see those derived from πήγνυμι, ῥάπτω, σῶζω and φεύγω).

So far as -ος forms in short vowel in particular are concerned, however, an interesting phenomenon becomes evident when they are grouped together: the majority of the agent nouns and V2 compounds in our list are accompanied by *simplicia* in -της, -τήρ and -τωρ. In fact this applies to all of the verbs except πήγνυμι, φαγεῖν and φεύγω. In the case of the last two, the extreme popularity of compounds in -φαγος may have rendered the creation of a different type of

<sup>18</sup> Chapter 2, section 6.3.2.

<sup>19</sup> Greek has extended the long vowel of the e-grade to agentive compounds (we would expect -πάγος as in compounds in -πάγης).

agentive V2 compound redundant, while φεύγω is in any case not a particularly productive source of agent nouns and V2 compounds, to the point that verbal compounds derived from φεύγω are of the V1 type.

As for the verbs which do develop alternative forms, ἄγω, ἄρχω, δάμνημι/δαμάζω and σώζω develop *simplicia* (ἄκτωρ, ἀρχέτας, δμητήρ and σωτήρ respectively) which are not accompanied by compounded counterparts in -της: the productive V2 compounds continue to be those in -ηγός, -αρχος, -δαμος (though this type is restricted) and -σόος. The agent noun δαμαστής derived from δαμάζω is a hapax. ῥάπτω is the only verb whose agent noun, ῥάπτης, is also compounded.

Some of these alternating agent nouns survive in MG while others have disappeared. Compounds in -αρχος and -ηγός have continued to be productive, but the primary agent nouns ἀγός and ἀρχός are no longer in use; the secondary nouns ἀρχέτας and ἄκτωρ, both rare forms already in the ancient language, have become extinct. Compounds in -δαμος have died out in MG and been replaced by those in -δαμαστής (from δαμάζω), which correspond to the simple agent noun δαμαστής ‘tamer’. Compounds in -σόος have been replaced by more transparent ones in -σωος, since σώζω is still used in MG; σωτήρ survives as σωτήρας, which produces four compounds (λαοσωτήρας, εθνοσωτήρας, ανθρωποσωτήρας, πισσωτήρας).<sup>20</sup>

### 2.1.3 Agent nouns in -τηρ and -τωρ

- ἄγω > ἄκτωρ ‘leader’ (Aesch.).
- ἄρτύω > ἀρτυτήρ ‘director’ (Thera, third c. BC) and the V2 compound ὄψαρτυτής ‘cook’ (Hyp.).
- βαίνω > βατήρ (Amips.) ‘that on which one treads, threshold’.
- βόσκω > βοτήρ and βώτωρ, both ‘herdsman’ (Hom.), and the V2 compound μηλοβοτήρ ‘herdsman’ (Hom.).
- γινώσκω > γνωστήρ ‘one that knows; surety’ (Xen.).
- δάμνημι/ δαμάζω > δμητήρ ‘tamer’ (Hom.).
- δέχομαι > δεκτήρ ‘receiver’ (title of an official, Mantinea second/first c. BC).
- δίδωμι > δωτήρ, δώτωρ, δοτήρ, all ‘giver’ (Hom.).
- διώκω > διωκτήρ ‘pursuer’ (Babrius).
- ἐλάω > ἐλατήρ ‘driver’ (Hom.).
- ἔρδω > ἔρκτωρ ‘doer’ (Antim.): a hapax transmitted by the *EM* and attributed to Antimachus.
- ἠγέομαι > ἠγήτωρ ‘chief’ (Hom.), ἠγητήρ ‘guide’ (Soph.).

<sup>20</sup> All forms have been collected from the database in Anastasiadi-Simeonidi (2002).



- **θέλω** > θέλωτωρ ‘charmer’ (Aesch.?.; but see the analysis in 3.2), θελωτήρ ‘charmer’ (*H. Hom.* 16.4) and the V2 compound πανθέλωταιρα ‘charming all’ (Simon.).
- **ἴσθημι** > στατήρ ‘a weight or coin’ (Eur.).
- **καλέω** > κλητήρ ‘summoner’ (Thgn.), κλήτωρ ‘summoner’ (Teos fourth c. BC) and compounds in -κλητήρ and -κλητήρ.
- **κάμπτω** > καμπτήρ ‘bend’ (Xen.).
- **κινέω** > κινήτηρ ‘one that sets going’ (*H. Hom.* 22.2).
- **κοσμέω** > κοσμήτωρ ‘commander’ (Hom.), κοσμητήρ ‘title of a magistrate’ (Aeschin.).
- **λύω** > λυτήρ ‘deliverer’ (Eur.).
- **μυμνήσκω** > μνηστήρ ‘suitor’ (Hom.), μνήστωρ ‘mindful of’ (Aesch.) and the V2 compound πολυμνήστωρ ‘much-remembering’ (Aesch.).
- **ὄλλυμι** > ὀλετήρ ‘destroyer’ (Hom.) and compounds in -ολετήρ/-ολέταιρα (Aesch.), -ολέτωρ (Aesch.), and -ολέτης (Phil. Epigr.).
- **πλήσσω** > πληκτήρ ‘striking object or person’ (Hdn.),<sup>21</sup> πλάκτωρ (Doric form, Phaias Epigr.).
- **πράσσω** > πρηκτήρ ‘doer’ (Hom.), πράκτωρ ‘one who does or executes’ (Soph.) and the V2 compound λογοπράκτωρ (dubious sense, *PBaden* 26.40, third c. AD).
- **σώζω** > σωτήρ ‘saviour’ (Hom.).
- **τελέω** > τελέστωρ ‘initiator’ (epithet of Apollo in *AP* 9.525.20).
- **τιμάω** > τιμητήρ ‘assessor of taxable property’ (Cyrene, fourth c. BC).
- **φράζω** > φραστήρ ‘teller’ (Xen.).
- **φύω** > φύτωρ ‘begetter’ (Hsch.) and two compounds in -φύτωρ (Pl.).

Agent nouns in -τήρ and -τωρ are numerous but, overall, recessive. The Greek rule prohibiting the compounding of agent nouns in -τήρ and -τωρ (Chapter 2, section 6.4) is often breached: see μηλοβοτήρ ‘herdsman’ (which, however, is only used by Homer and his late imitators), πανθέλωταιρα, two compounds in -κλητήρ, two compounds in -κλητήρ, πολυμνήστωρ, a few forms in -ολέτωρ/-ολέταιρα, λογοπράκτωρ and two compounds in -φύτωρ. It may be noted that in all these cases, ἀρτύω, βαίνω and βόσκω aside, parallel compounds in -της are either lacking or of limited productivity: compounds in -ολέτης start with θηρολέτης in the epigrammatist Philippus (first c. AD) and eventually come to five forms, while compounds in -πράκτης are limited to the hapax παντοπράκτης ‘ready to do anything’, attested in the second-century AD mathematician Ptolemaeus.

<sup>21</sup> This agent noun features in a list of words in Hdn. 3.2.922.31 Lentz which are not glossed.

The forms in this list confirm that the tendency is for *simplicia* in -τηρ and -τωρ to be progressively replaced by forms in -της: of the twenty-eight verbs in this list, only ἔρδω, καλέω, μιμνήσκω, ὄρνυμι and φύω never give rise to a -της *simplex*. It will not come as a surprise, therefore, that the group of -της agent nouns and V2 compounds corresponding to V1 compounds, collected in 2.1.4, is the most numerous of the four.

#### 2.1.4 Agent nouns and V2 compounds in -της

- **ἀγείρω** > ἀγέρτας ‘collector of dues’ (Tauromenium, Hellenistic age), σιταγέρτης ‘collector of corn’ (Heraclea, fourth c. BC), and compounds in -ηγερέτης (Hom.).
- **ἄγω** (or ἡγέομαι?) > compounds in -ηγέτης (Myc.).
- **ἀκούω** > ἀκουστής ‘hearer’ (Men.) and the V2 compound ὠτακουστής ‘eavesdropper’ (Aristot.).
- **ἀραρίσκω** > only the V2 compound πυλάρτης ‘gate-fastener’ (Hom.).
- **ἄρχω** > ἀρχέτας ‘leader’ (Eur.).
- **βαίνω** > βάτης ‘one that treads’ (Philox.) and compounds in -βάτης (Pi.). The V2 compound ἐμπυριβήτης ‘standing in the fire’ contains a different agent noun, based on the full grade of the root.
- **γιγνώσκω** > γνώστης ‘one that knows’ (NT) and the V2 compound καρδιογνώστης ‘knower of hearts’ (NT).
- **δάκνω** > δήκτης ‘biter’ (Eur.) and λαθροδήκτης ‘biting secretly’ (Phryn.).
- **δέχομαι** > δέκτης ‘receiver, beggar’ (Hom.) and compounds in -δέκτης (H. Hom. Cer.).
- **δαμάζω** > δαμαστής ‘tamer’ (Ps. Epich.? For this hapax, see the analysis of δαμάζω in section 3.1) and two compounds in -δαμαστής (PMich.Zen. 71.4, third c. BC).
- **δίδωμι** > δώτης (Hes.), δότης (LXX) ‘giver’ and compounds in -δώτης (Hes.) and -δότης (Hes.).
- **διώκω** > διώκτης ‘pursuer’ (NT) and compounds in -διώκτης (Theocr.).
- **ἐλάω** > ἐλάτης ‘driver’ (Eur.) and compounds in -ηλάτης and -ελάτης (Hom.).
- **ἔραμαι** > ἐραστής ‘lover’ (Ibyc.) and compounds in -εραστής (Aristoph.).
- **εὐρίσκω** > εὐρετής ‘discoverer’ (Pl.) and the compound πρωθευρετής ‘first discoverer’ (Nicomachus).
- **ἡγέομαι** > ἡγέτης ‘leader’ (Synes.) and compounds in -ηγετης (Myc.).
- **ἴστημι** > compounds in -στάτης (Cratin.).
- **κάμπτω** > compounds in -κάμπτης (Aristoph.).
- **κινέω** > κινήτης (Aristoph.) ‘one that sets going’ and the V2 compound φωτοκινήτης ‘mover of light’ (PGM 4.599).

- **κλέπτω** > κλέπτης ‘thief’ (Hom.) and compounds in -κλέπτης (Aesop.).
- **κοσμέω** > κοσμητής, name of an Athenian magistrate (Pl.), and the two compounds in -κοσμήτης (Vett. Val.).
- **κρούω** > κρούστης ‘butting’ (Dosithe.) and compounds in -κρούστης (Artemid. Onir.).
- **λαμβάνω** > λήπτης ‘catcher’ (Zonar.) and compounds in -λήπτης (Telecl.).
- **λύω** > compounds in -λύτης (Plin.).
- **ἄλλυμι** > V2 compounds in -ολέτης (ὀλέτης, read by Kaibel in *Ep. Gr.* 334.15 and included in *LSJ*, is a mistake for πολειύν, now accepted in *I.Illion* 176. There is therefore no attested *simplex* in -της).
- **ὄρνυμι** > rare compounds in -έρτας and -όρτας (both Hom.).
- **πλήσσω** > πλήκτης ‘striker’ (Aristot.) and the V2 compound ἰσχυροπλήκτης ‘wounding severely’ (Hsch.).
- **πράσσω** > πρήκτης ‘treacherous person’ (Hippocr.: for this form, see section 3.2) and the V2 compound παντοπράκτης ‘ready to do anything’ (Ptol.).
- **ράπτω** > ράπτης ‘clothes-mender’ (Philox.) and two compounds in -ράπτης (Phryn.).
- **σειώ** > σειστής ‘kind of earthquake’ (Johannes Laurentius Lydus, sixth c. AD) and the compound πυργοσειστής ‘tower-shaker’ (Anon. in *Rhetorica anonyma* 3.350 Walz).
- **τελέω** > τελέστης, name of an official at Elea (sixth c. BC), but also ‘initiator’ (Max. Tyr.), and the V2 compound βουτελέστης ‘one who kills oxen (for sacrifice)’ (Hsch.); τελετής ‘priest’ (Euphron.).
- **τιμάω** > τιμητής ‘valuer, assessor of damages’ (Pl.) and the compound στιπποτιμητής ‘tow-valuer’ (*POxy* 103.28, fourth c. AD).
- **φράζω** > φράστης ‘one who speaks well’ (Gloss.) and V2 compound σκινδαλαμοφράστης ‘straw-splitter’ (Agath.).

The majority of verbs in this group have both *simplicia* and V2 compounds in -της. The only verbs which give rise to compounds but lack a *simplex* in -της are ἄγω, ἀραρίσκω, ἴστημι, κάμπτω, λύω, ἄλλυμι and ὄρνυμι: apart from ἀραρίσκω and ὄρνυμι, the other three verbs have alternative agent nouns, as we have already seen in section 2.1.3.

The V2 compounds which have their origin in the Classical and early Hellenistic ages form the majority, while the compounds attested after this period are those derived from δάκνω, εὐρίσκω, κινέω, κρούω, λύω, ἄλλυμι, πλήσσω, ράπτω, τελέω, τιμάω and φράζω. The detailed comparison of V1 and V2 compounds which follows in this chapter will show that the late or low productivity of many of these V2 families is linked to the higher productivity of corresponding V1 compounds (or alternative verbal compounds). This applies, for example,

to V2 compounds derived from δάκνω (which has V1 compounds in δακε- and δηξι- and active V2 compounds in -δακής), κρούω (which has a small handful of V1 compounds in κρουσι-), λύω (whose V1 compounds are extremely common), ὄλλυμι (which has both a small group of V1 compounds and alternative V2 compounds in -ολέτωρ/-ολέτειρα), τελέω, τιμάω and φράζω (all with very common V1 compounds).

### 2.1.5 Other types of verbal nouns and compounds with agentive semantics

- **ἄρπάζω** > of the agent nouns produced by this verb (ἄρπακτήρ, Hom.; ἄρπαξ, Aristoph.; ἄρπακτής, Call., all meaning ‘robber’; and ἄρπαγος ‘hook’, Aesch.), only the root noun ἄρπαξ is used in a V2 compound: δελεάρπαξ ‘snapping at the bait’ (Leon.), a harax.
- **βλέπω** > the root compound κυνοβλώψ (Hsch.), whose SC is already attested in the Homeric παραβλώψ ‘looking askance’; the late compounded participle πολυβλέπων (*P. Lond.* 5.1821.268).
- **βόσκω** > the agent noun βοσκός ‘herdsman’ and the V2 compounds in -βοσκός are secondarily derived from the present following the pattern of agent nouns in -ος (see Chapter 4, section 8.4).
- **δάμνημι/δαμάζω** > compounds in -δάμας ‘taming’.
- **κλέπτω** > the root compound βοόκληψ ‘stealing oxen’ (Soph.) and the root agent noun κλέψ ‘thief’ (Phryn.: a back-formation from βοόκληψ?); the root agent noun κλώψ ‘thief’ (Hdt.).
- **μυμνήσκω** > μνήμων ‘mindful’ (Hom.) and its compound ἀμνήμων ‘unmindful’ (Pi.).
- **τλήναι** > rare compounds in -τλήμων and -τλας ‘bearing’ (Hom.).

All things considered, these are recessive types, although different kinds of phenomena affect each individual form. κλώψ, κλέψ and its compound are soon replaced by κλέπτης and κλοπός with their compounds. κυνοβλώψ is a harax.

βοσκός is a curious innovation, not just because it keeps the -σκ- suffix of the present stem but also because the existence of the agent nouns βοτήρ and βώτωρ, which have productive compounded forms in -βώτης and -βότης, renders it semantically redundant. It could be that this innovation was originally prompted by the desire to separate the idea of ‘feeding, nourishing’ from the notion of ‘herdsman’, which βοτήρ, βώτωρ and their compounds had acquired, in part through their phonological similarity to βοῦς ‘cow’. However, compounds in -βοσκός express the notions both of ‘feeder’ and of ‘herdsman’, just as compounds in -βώτης and -βότης do, with the result that, even if this semantic differentiation was present at an earlier time, it is no longer visible in our sources.

What we are faced with in the other cases are various alternative means of forming nouns or compounds with agentive semantics. The suffixes *-μων* (\*-mōn) and *-ᾶς* (< *-α-ντς*) are linked to verbal stems: the latter contains the participial suffix *-ντ-* and its *-α-* in fact derives from the [a] (usually \*h<sub>2</sub>) of disyllabic roots (as is the case with *δάμνημι* and *τλῆναι* here), but synchronically these forms are not participles. The nouns formed with these two suffixes express active semantics and can also be used with an adjectival function (as is the case with *μνήμων* ‘mindful’). While forms in *-τλας* are limited, and always display an adjectival-adverbial FC, those in *-δαμας* and *-μνήμων* are more productive and can also be compounded with substantival FCs: e.g. *ἄνδροδάμας* ‘man-taming’ and *ἱερομνήμων* ‘mindful of sacred things’. The sole case of a compounded participle, *πολυβλέπων*, is a late form which is not productive elsewhere.

The agent nouns and compounds in this group offer a valuable glimpse of the kinds of phenomena that we will be discussing in relation to the competition between V1/V2 pairs. The language exploits various morphological patterns for the purpose of creating formally convenient and semantically transparent agent nouns, many of which have compounded counterparts. When the morphology of a given verb hinders the application of the more established patterns, Greek resorts to alternative means: we have just examined the case of root nouns and forms in *-μων* and *-ας*, and the creation of a secondary *-ος* noun from the present stem (*βοσκός*). To these strategies, we must add the creation of V1 compounds and the creation of compounds in *-ής*, a phenomenon associated with other compound families analysed in this chapter.

## 2.2 Relevance of morphological analysis to the investigation of V1/V2 pairs

Certain patterns have now begun to come into view in the uncharted and seemingly haphazard expanse of parallel V1/V2 compounds. In the first place, verbs producing agentive formations in *-ος* (collected in sections 2.1.1 and 2.1.2) develop extremely productive compound families. In some cases, these V2 compounds are accompanied by forms in *-της* (see e.g. *ἄγω* or *δέχομαι*), but these newer forms never replace compounds in *-ος*. Given this productiveness, we can predict that in most cases the alternative V1 compounds will not become genuine rivals to these V2 forms. The existence of V1 compounds may therefore be influenced by other factors. We will investigate two potential causes in the following analysis: onomastics and stylistic variation in literary language.

In the case of verbs which give rise to *-τηρ* and *-τωρ* *simplicia* (section 2.1.3), the situation is rather different. These are subject to a morphological rule which, by and large, makes them unsuitable for compounding and prescribes that they

are replaced by compound forms in -της. We can anticipate, therefore, that in such cases the competition between V1 and V2 forms will be stronger because V1 compounds provide an already established model.

The forms collected in 2.1.4 allow us to see at a glance the relation between V1 compounds and those in -της. And what we find is that, while agentive forms in -της are pervasive, in a large number of cases they are first attested in post-Classical Greek (see those derived from ἀγείρω, ἀκούω, γιγνώσκω, δάκνω, δαμάζω, διώκω, εὐρίσκω, κινέω, κοσμέω, κρούω, λαμβάνω, λύω, ὄλλυμι, πλήσσω, πράσσω, ράπτω, σείω, τελέω, τιμάω, φράζω) or, although documented earlier, are infrequently attested (see ἀραρίσκω, ὄρνυμι), leaving only those derived from ἄγω, ἄρχω, δέχομαι, ἐλάω, ἔραμαι, ἠγέομαι, κάμπτω and κλέπτω as seemingly productive types. Given the rarity of the -της compounds derived from many verbs, it is necessary to investigate how the language fulfils the need for an agentive compound derived from these bases, to what extent the V1 pattern is predominant, and whether alternative means of creating V2 compounds are exploited. The analysis of -ής compounds in section 4 reveals that δάκνω, λαμβάνω, ὄλλυμι, πλήσσω, ράπτω, τελέω, τιμάω and φράζω produce alternative right-oriented compounds, but that the other verbs do not: in the conclusion we shall note that a number of the V1 compounds corresponding to less productive -της forms are very common.

### 2.3 Verbs with only active V2 compounds in -ής

A small group of verbs do not produce agent nouns or agentive compounds in -ος/-της, but develop verbal adjectives in -ής endowed with active semantics. This phenomenon must be viewed in light of the long-term evolution of verbal adjectives in -ής, which seem to have originated from intransitive or passive verbs in the first instance: the creation of entire classes of active compounds is in general a limited phenomenon and it is worth considering in which cases it may be linked to the need to create pairs of V1 and V2 compounds.

The verbs involved in this development, which are fully analysed in section 4, are seventeen:

ἀλγέω 'grieve', ἀλφάνω 'bring in', ἀρκέω 'keep off, avail, be sufficient', βλάπτω 'distract, pervert, damage', δέρκομαι 'see', θάλλω/θαλέω 'sprout, blossom', μαίνομαι 'rage, be mad', μισέω 'hate', πείθω 'persuade'/πείθομαι 'obey', στέργω 'love', τέρπω 'delight', τήκω 'consume', φαίνω 'show, make to appear, reveal', φάω 'shine', φείδομαι 'spare', φλέγω 'burn', χαίρω 'rejoice, take pleasure in'.

Besides these more clear-cut families (Class IV), Greek also develops a number of active *-ής* compounds side by side with other V2 compounds. An example is the group of compounds in *-δακής* ‘biting’, a typical case of morphological replacement: while, in general, active *-ής* compounds arise through a semantic reanalysis of passive *-ής* compounds, those in *-δακής* are all active from the start. They seem to have been created to compensate for the unproductive character of the more traditional agentive formations: the agent noun *δήκτης* ‘biter’ and its only compound *λαθροδήκτης* ‘biting secretly’ (section 2.1.4) are rare forms. These alternative *-ής* forms will be included in the analysis of V1 and V2 compounds from Class IV below (sections 3.1 and 3.2), while section 4 will situate their development within the evolution of the whole class of deverbal *-ής* compounds.

### 3 Competing pairs of V1 and V2 compounds: a contrastive analysis

The purpose of this part of the chapter is to compare the use and productivity of V1 and agentive V2 compounds derived from the verbs of Class IV, so as to gain a more comprehensive understanding of their interaction. In Chapter 5 we tested the hypothesis that the existence of a good number of V1 compounds is due to the deficiencies associated with the relevant V2 compounds. A natural consequence of this hypothesis is that V1 compounds should not be attested when V2 compounds derived from the same verb exist, or at least that the V1 pattern should not be productive. A close investigation of all V1/V2 pairs in part confirms that V2 compounds are indeed generally more productive: in these families, V1 compounds tend to be onomastic, or more productive in onomastics than in the appellative domain.

There are also families, however, in which the V1 pattern is favoured or where we find it highly developed also in the appellative lexicon. The reason for this state of affairs varies from verb to verb, but in general terms the make-up, chronology and productivity of the agent nouns and compounds created by each individual verb play no small part in determining the creation and continuing productivity of certain V1 compounds (a hypothesis already anticipated in section 2.2). For instance, we will see that V1 forms derived from *λύω* are very common, and this seems to be connected with the fact that the verb produces only a few late and extremely rare compounds in *-λύτης* and does not develop alternative types of right-oriented compounds.

The verbs of Class IV are divided into two subgroups. The first contains seventeen compound families in which V1 and V2 compounds are both numerous and productive. As we will see in the conclusion to this part of the chapter, many

of these families have V2 compounds in -ος. The second subgroup consists of forty-one compound families in which either one of the two patterns is unproductive or the productivity of both types of compounds is low. V2 compounds in this subgroup are of various kinds, and the reason for the low attestation of a given form may be semantic or morphological in nature, or may indeed be obscure. This second subgroup mostly contains V2 compounds in -της and many of these have low productivity: those in -ος, by contrast, tend to be prolific when attested.

### 3.1 Productive compound families

#### ἄγω

The compound family derived from this verb provides an excellent introduction to the phenomena which persistently characterize the interaction of V1 and V2 compounds. V2 compounds in -ἄγός/-ηγός are by far the more productive, continuing into Byzantine and Modern Greek (for this reason, the cut-off point for the collection of V2 compounds in the Corpus is the end of the fourth century BC). They often provide occupational terms (e.g. στρατηγός ‘army leader’, κυνᾶγός ‘huntsman’, λοχᾶγός ‘leader of an armed band’, χορηγός ‘chorus-leader’, etc.), as well as a number of adjectives (e.g. ἀρχηγός ‘originating’ and χοληγός ‘carrying off bile’). The V2 compounds indicate a more specific entity than their V1 counterparts: for instance, the λοχᾶγός is *the* leader of an armed band and not simply someone who leads or may lead a band.

The distribution of the V1 forms, on the other hand, is a telling one. Appellatives amount to four very old forms, two of which—ἀγήνωρ [lead men] ‘heroic’ and ἀγέστρατος ‘host-leading’—are specialized as epithets.<sup>22</sup> This type is therefore on the wane already within the Archaic age and individual forms survive because of their ornamental character and epic flavour. In onomastics, on the

<sup>22</sup> The third compound, ἀγέχορος, is G. Hermann’s plausible conjecture for the sequence ἄγε χορόν transmitted by cod. R at Aristoph. *Lys.* 1281 Wilson (ἄγετε χορόν *recentiores*), in the context of the so-called ‘Attic song’. Many editors, including Henderson (1987) and Wilson (2007), print the Doric hapax ἀγέχορον from ἠγέομαι, on account of metre (since the line is interpreted as a catalectic trochaic trimeter). This, however, introduces an exceptional Doric feature in a song which is otherwise transmitted as being in Attic-Ionic (see e.g. the relative ἦν of l. 1290). To explain this oddity, Henderson (1987: 217) comments that ‘perhaps the ambassador wants to give the invocation some Doric colouring’: against this reasoning, see Colvin (1999: 262). Parker (1997: 391) also advises against accepting the emendation ‘without reserve’. On balance, the interpretation of the form as the compound ἀγέχορος (from ἄγω), as in Coulon’s edition, is the best one: it eliminates the linguistic problem and at the same time allows for greater stylistic variation than the transmitted ἄγε χορόν, which would be a repetition of the imperatives πρόσσγε and ἔπαγε of the preceding line.



other hand, we find seventeen different compounds in *-αγός/-ηγός*, a fact which suggests that in this case the V1 type mostly survived because it was felt to be suitable for the needs of onomastics. From this perspective, the fact that three out of the four appellative compounds are epithets acquires a new significance: their use as such could be seen to represent a borrowing from the practice of name-giving. Conversely, V2 compounds in *-ηγός* are not often attested in onomastics, and when they are, it is usually the case that the compound is also used in the appellative lexicon to indicate a profession. Thus, the PN *Κυνηγός* should be understood as ‘Mr Hunter’ rather than as ‘one who leads the hounds’; *Στρατηγός* is ‘Mr Colonel’ rather than ‘one who leads an army’, etc. There are only three pairs formed from the same constituents: *Ἀγέλοχος* and *λοχᾶγός*, *Ἀγέαρχος* and *ἀρχηγός*, *Ἀγέσιππος* and *ἱππηγός* (the latter, not included in the Corpus, is attested in Philochorus and qualifies ships equipped for the transportation of horses).

### ἄρχω

This compound family is one of the most productive in Greek and is likely to have been present already in Mycenaean, where PNs such as *a-ke-ra-wo* or *a-ke-wa-ta* can be interpreted as containing the FC *ἀρχε-*, while the appellative *ka-ra-na-ko* may refer to the ‘supervisor of water supply’ (/krānark<sup>h</sup>os/ < κρήνη ‘fountain’). V1 PNs are widespread, but appellative forms are more common still. This is principally due to the fact that the first constituent *ἀρχι-* was soon grammaticalized as a prefix meaning ‘chief’ and was often attached to words indicating jobs or occupations, providing a convenient means for the creation of a sort of professional hierarchy. This process was in origin a semantic one, as already mentioned in Chapter 4, section 3.2. A compound like *ἀρχιδικαστής*, indicating a person who leads or coordinates the judges in a court, basically identifies the chief judge: *ἀρχι-* no longer has a verbal function, becoming instead a form of tag.<sup>23</sup>

This rapid specialization of V1 compounds derived from *ἄρχω* is the likely cause of the disappearance, already by the end of the fifth century BC, of forms in which the FC has a genuine governing function: if we can trust our sources, no new formations are created after this point, a fact that has important consequences for the productivity of V2 *specimina*. Once we recognize that compounds in *ἀρχι-* represent a class apart, it becomes clear that there is little scope for competition between the V1 and V2 patterns. V2 compounds are the productive type, and the partial list provided in the Corpus, which takes the end of the fourth c. BC as its cut off point, affords a glimpse of the pervasiveness of this type in every reg-

<sup>23</sup> For other similar cases of grammaticalization, see Chapter 5, section 4.4 (compounds in *μζο-*, *φθινο-* and *τονυ-*) and section 5.3.1 (compounds in *έθελο-*, *κρυψι-* and *μελλο-*).

ister and through all periods of the Greek language. This is further confirmed by the very low rate of semantic overlap between V1 and V2 compounds derived from this verb. Two (out of three) appellative V1 compounds in the Corpus (i.e. excluding those which have acquired a determinative structure) have V2 counterparts: see ἀρχέπολις ‘ruling a city’ (Pi.) and πολίαρχος ‘ruler of a city (Pi.), ἀρχεσίμολπος ‘beginning the song’ (Stes.) and μολπαρχέω, ‘lead the song and dance’ (IG 12(7).415), which presupposes \*\*μόλπαρχος). On the other hand, V1 PNs evoke images that are not found in connection with the V2 pattern: see for instance Ἀρχίλοχος, Ἀρχαγόρας, Ἀρχανδρος, Ἀρχεαγάθα, Ἀρχεάναξ, Ἀρχέδειπνος and Ἀρχένοος (the list is not exhaustive).

Yet despite the productive and unproblematic nature of compounds in -αρχος, from early on Greek developed an alternative type in -ης (< -ᾶς), to the point that in our extant sources many -άρχης forms appear to be exactly contemporary with those in -αρχος; an example is νομάρχης ‘governor of a region’, attested in Herodotus alongside νόμαρχος. The linguistic process which gives rise to these new formations involves the creation of denominatives from compounds in -αρχος (such as νομαρχέω ‘to hold the office of governor of a region’ from νόμαρχος): such denominatives are extremely common already in Classical Greek. These verbs in turn produce compounds in -άρχης, and this becomes such a common pattern that we find new forms being created even in the absence of a base verb. In the case of ἄρχω, this morphological process is also supported by the existence of the feminine noun ἀρχή, according to the system of triplets involving a noun in [a:] (> Attic-Ionic η), a compound in -ᾶς/-ης, and a denominative verb in -έω or -άω investigated by Rüedi (1969), e.g. νίκη ‘victory’, Ὀλυμπιονίκης ‘winner of an Olympiad’ and νικάω ‘to win’.<sup>24</sup>

There is no obvious reason why both the type in -αρχος and that in -άρχης continued to be preserved, and this gives us a good idea of the great morphological flexibility of the Greek compound system. Eventually, the latter won out as the sole productive type: it is common in Standard Modern Greek, with old words such as πατριάρχης ‘head of the orthodox church’ or γυμνασιάρχης ‘headmaster of high school’ side by side with new forms, ranging from learned terms such as εργοστασιάρχης ‘factory owner’ to recent non-learned examples such as κονεξιάρχης ‘somebody who advances through good connections’ and καναλάρχης ‘TV channel owner’, in both of which the FCs derive from the English words *connection* and *channel* (the former has infiltrated slang with the plural form τα κονέξια ‘connections’, while the latter has further extended the seman-

<sup>24</sup> See too section 5 and Chapter 2, section 6.8.

tics of the Latin loanword κανάλι ‘canal’).<sup>25</sup> The few common MG compounds in -αρχος, on the other hand, all tend to be resurrections from AG.

### δάμνημι/δαμάζω

Compounds derived from these two verbs are relatively productive until the end of the Classical age. New forms are created both as V1 compounds in δαμνα/ε- or δαμασι- and as V2 compounds in -δαμος or -δαμαστής. After the Classical age, new V1 and V2 forms are limited to δάμνιπτος ‘horse-taming’ (Orph. *Argonautica*), θειόδαμος ‘taming the gods’ (Orac. ap. Porph.), άργυροδάμας ‘name of a precious stone’ (meaning ‘subduing silver’?, Plin.) and άστροδάμας ‘subduing the stars’ (*PGM* 4.603). The shape of the FC δάμν-, which preserves the n-infix of the present, testifies to the late and artificial character of δάμνιπτος, a variation on the more common δαμάσιπτος which may have been prompted by the requirements of metre.

The only cases of semantic overlap are the pairs δαμάσιπτος/δάμνιπτος vs. ιππόδαμος (Hom.), Δαμασιᾶς vs. Λᾱοδάμας, and δαμασίμβροτος ‘taming mortals’ (Simon.) vs. άνδροδάμας ‘man-taming’ (Pi.). Overall, one gets the impression that all the forms derived from δάμνημι are associated with highly literary contexts. The V2 type in -δαμος has disappeared in MG, where it is replaced by compounds in -δαμαστής; this evolution is connected with the progressive replacement of δάμνημι by δαμάζω in AG, but the parallel development of compounds in -δαμαστής is not a common phenomenon in AG, where only two forms of this kind are to be found.<sup>26</sup>

### δέχομαι

The V1 type is far more productive in onomastics than in the appellative lexicon. Against more than a hundred different PNs in δεξι- collected in the *LGPN* (the Corpus only includes one form per type and does not list *Kurznamen*) stand only two appellative forms, both of relative antiquity: δεξιστρατος ‘receiving the host’ (Bacch.) and δεξιπυρος ‘receiving fire’ (Eur.). The recessive character of appellatives in δεξι- is further confirmed by the fact that both forms are hapax legomena.

<sup>25</sup> Io Manolessou, p.c.

<sup>26</sup> The sole evidence for the existence of the simplex δαμαστής in AG is a short quotation in the so-called *Fraudes Fulgentianae*, from Fulgentius’ *Mythologia*, which transmits three quotations attributed to Epicharmus and edited among the *Pseudoepicharmeia* in K-A (fr. 298–300). In fr. 299 K-A Fulgentius’ Latin transliteration reads *damastes heros leonte adinami taleros*, rendered by editors of Epicharmus as δαμαστής Ἔρωσ λεοντεῖα δυνάμει θαλερός. It is unclear whether Fulgentius should be identified with the bishop Fulgentius of Ruspe (sixth century AD). There is therefore no evidence on which to base a precise date for the form δαμαστής.

This state of affairs is likely to be a consequence of the extreme popularity of V2 compounds in *-δοκος* and *-δοχος*, both of which are among the most numerous categories of compounds with a SC of the CoC-os type. Compounds in *-δοκος* are the oldest, starting with *ιοδόκος* ‘holding arrows’ in Homer; they are also frequently attested as PNs. The SC *-δοχος* is not attested in appellatives before the fourth c. BC (*ξενηδόχος* ‘one who receives strangers’ in Menander) and its onomastic use is limited to a few forms (see e.g. *Ξενόδοχος*, Thrace, 329 BC; *Πολύδοχος*, Western Locris, second c. BC).<sup>27</sup> As noted in the Corpus, this pervasive V2 type is accompanied by a less productive type in *-δέκτης* which, despite the early attestation of the *simplex* *δέκτης* (Hom.), is mostly post-Classical; it survives in a few MG forms (e.g., *πανδέκτης*, *δωροδέκτης*), but compounds in *-δοχος* remain the most common.

### δίδωμι

This family of compounds may have started with an old V1 in *δωτι-*, whose existence can be reconstructed on the basis of the *Kurzname* *Δωτώ* (Chapter 4, section 8.2). Despite the obvious prominence of the verb ‘to give’, appellative V1 compounds are not only limited but also emerge late: the Classical *δωσίδικος* ‘referring disputes to a court’ (Hdt.) is a unique case among a handful of otherwise very late hapax legomena. Among these, *δωσιάρα* ‘giving evil’ (Hsch., in the dative pl. *δωσιάραϊς*) may perhaps be a poetic epithet. *δωσίπυγος* ‘offering the arse’ is only attested in a lemma in Suid. δ 1482 glossing a line from the epigrammatist Nicarchus which describes the sexually bold woman. Onomastic compounds are equally sparse: although *Δωσίθεος* acquires a high level of productivity, they are not attested before the fourth century BC.

The dominant type is therefore the right-oriented one: the wealth of available agent nouns, the majority attested already in Homer, enabled the formation of compounds in *-δότης*, *-δότης* and occasionally also in *-δῶτωρ* (*βιοδῶτωρ* in the *Εὐχή* of the *Orphic Hymns*), which were convenient for covering different metrical patterns. V2 compounds of these types are extremely common at all levels of the ancient language. The explanation for this distribution of the two patterns is likely to be entirely morphological: V1 compounds in *δωσι-* were neither backed up by an s-aorist nor by the action noun *δόσις*, which has a different vocalic grade. As a result, the FC *δωσι-* could not be associated with one of the productive models for the derivation of *τερψίμβροτος* compounds.

<sup>27</sup> The distribution and productivity of these compounds in the earliest phases of Greek reflect the fact that *δέκομαι* is the original form, while *δέχομαι* is mostly Attic (though it is found in Homer).

**ἐλάω**

Compounds derived from this verb exhibit a clear preference for the V2 pattern, which is attested from Homer onwards (ἵππηλάτης ‘driver of horses’) and remains productive down to the Byzantine period;<sup>28</sup> a few compounds in -ηλάτης are still used in MG. The early productivity of V2 compounds may be connected to the fact that the agent noun ἐλατήρ ‘driver’ (Hom.) is of considerable antiquity, and that a second agent noun ἐλάτης appears in the fifth century BC.

The SC of V2 compounds can take two forms: -ηλάτης, in which -η- results from the contraction of the laryngeal at the beginning of the root *\*h<sub>1</sub>elh<sub>2</sub>-* and the linking vowel of the FC, and -ελάτης. The latter is clearly the more recent, both in terms of linguistic chronology and dates of attestation, starting with αἰγελάτης ‘goatherd’ in Plutarch, and may be analogical on the *simplex* ἐλάτης: this agent noun perhaps represents an ‘updating’ of the old ἐλατήρ. A few of these compounds in -ελάτης replace older *specimina* in -ηλάτης, perhaps not independently of metrical factors (cf. ἵππελάτης in Orpian); in the case of those which are attested in prose texts (the majority), where there is no metre to offer any clues, it is impossible to ascertain whether they simply replace older compounds in -ηλάτης. Interestingly, these compounds in -ελάτης have died out in MG, where the only form assumed by the SC is -ηλάτης: this may be connected with the fact that the verb itself has disappeared, surviving only in the interjections ἐλα and ελάτε ‘come on’, which derive from the present imperative of the ancient verb. Most of these MG compounds in -ηλάτης are imported from AG and/or high-level language (e.g. ἰχνηλάτης ‘tracker’ or στρατηλάτης ‘inspired military leader’) and -ηλάτης is not a productive suffix (the common noun ποδηλάτης ‘bicycle rider’ is a secondary formation from ποδήλατο ‘bicycle’).<sup>29</sup>

Given that the V2 pattern is characterized by this degree of productivity in AG, it will not come as a surprise that V1 compounds are limited to three forms: ἐλασιβρόντας ‘hurling thunder’, ἐλασίχθων ‘earth-striking’ and the PN Ἐλάσιππος. Both epithets, first used by Pindar, are associated with the semantic sphere of ‘strike, set in motion’ and they share the fate of reappearing only infrequently in later literature. More surprising is the fact that, in the absence of compounded PNs ending in -ηλάτης or -ελάτης, the V1 pattern is not exploited more in onomastics: Ἐλάσιππος, perhaps connected with the semantic sphere of ‘drive away, carry off’ (for a syntagm with horses, cf. *Il.* 5.236), has a mere three attestations in the corpus provided by the *LGPN*.<sup>30</sup>

<sup>28</sup> See the list in Buck-Petersen 547.

<sup>29</sup> Io Manolessou, p.c.

<sup>30</sup> <http://www.lgpn.ox.ac.uk/database/lgpn.php>, last accessed 01.12.2014.

### ἔλκω

The competing V1 and V2 types in this family exhibit a telling distribution. V1 compounds are less numerous and are all used as epithets, but they are also more ancient. ἔλκεχίτων ‘trailing the tunic’ and ἔλκεσίπελος ‘trailing the robe’ both occur in Homer, while the hapax ἔλκετρίβων ‘cloak-trailer’ in Plato Comicus, a clear instance of wordplay on the epic forms, appears in a fragment in which other novel compounds of a high-sounding but ultimately disparaging nature, including σπαρτιοχαίτης ‘with rosy hair’ and ῥυποκόνδυλος ‘with dirty knuckles’, are used to describe a Laconian character.<sup>31</sup> The epic flavour of ἔλκεχίτων and ἔλκεσίπελος is also confirmed by the fact that they are not used outside early lyric poetry, late-antique epic or scholarly discussions of Homeric passages.

V2 compounds are more numerous but are also younger in origin. They begin with τοξουλκός and ξιφουλκός in Aeschylus, but most of the numerous *specimina* come from a much later period. None of them represents the right-oriented counterpart of a V1 compound: there are no overlaps between the two patterns. ἔλκω survives in MG only as a learned resurrection, and this explains why compounds in -ουλκός are limited and of a similarly learned nature: apart from the Neoclassical compound εμβρουλκός ‘forceps’, used in the technical lexicon of obstetrics, the few standard words such as ρυμουλκός ‘towing’ and its derivation ρυμουλκό ‘tug’ and βαρούλκο ‘winch, crank’ would not be associated with ἔλκω by most speakers, since the ablaut pattern is no longer available in the MG verb ἔλκω.

### ἔρδω

V2 compounds in -ουργός and -εργός are amongst the most productive in the whole of Greek linguistic history, and this despite the fact that speakers could not trace them back to a homophonous verb \*\*ἔργω.<sup>32</sup> From a historical point of view, the two shapes assumed by the SC are the result of two different processes. -ο-οργος (where the first [o] belongs to the FC, but through contraction yields the common SCs -ουργός and -ωργός) originally identified verbal compounds. On the other hand, the SC -ο-εργος originally characterized bahuvrihi compounds derived from ἔργον ‘work’.<sup>33</sup>

<sup>31</sup> On these forms, see Pirrotta (2009: 266–267).

<sup>32</sup> The present ἔρδω, attested in Homer, derives from the e-grade of the root which in Mycenaean produces the zero-grade present \*wǝǝ-jō, attested in the form *wo-ze* (where [o] therefore is the outcome of \*ǝ). In Attic Greek, ἔρδω is replaced by synonyms such as ποιέω, ἐργάζομαι and πράττω, but it survives in other dialects, e.g. Cretan. Another present formation, \*werǝ-jō, survives in ῥέζω, which is more commonly found in Attic authors, though not in prose.

<sup>33</sup> Bader (1965: 89, 91–92).

As Bader (1965) has shown, this repartition was perturbed already in the early stages of Greek. Homeric language features some *agentive* compounds in -ο-εργός, which replace the original and uncontracted agentive compounds in -ο-οργός and soon spread to other dactylic poetry, and later also to prose. Further confusion was created by the fact that both -ο-εργός and -ο-οργός (whatever the structure of the compound) were contracted into -ουργός. This series of developments also triggered the creation of a class of compounds in -ουργής from those in -εργής, which are passive in origin, but later acquired active semantics (though active forms in -ουργής are rare): on these, see section 4.3 below.<sup>34</sup>

Given the considerable popularity of the entire family of V2 compounds derived from ἔρδω, it is not surprising that V1 forms are sparse, limited to the onomastic lexicon and formed on the stem of the s-aorist (Ἐρξικλείδης, Ἐρξανδρος, etc.). V1 compounds derived from ἐργάζομαι are similarly rare: cf. Chapter 5, section 5.3.2. The V2 type in -ουργός has died out in MG, where it has been replaced by forms in -εργάτης, corresponding to the present ἐργάζομαι.

### ἔχω

Both V1 and V2 compounds derived from this verb are extremely productive and both patterns have been used in Greek from Mycenaean until the present. The V1 structure has more individual entries in onomastics, whereas V2 forms are far more frequent in the appellative lexicon. Appellative V1 compounds, however, do not just feature in poetry (starting with ἐχέθυμος ‘under self-control’ and ἐχέφρων ‘prudent’ in Homer, both still used in MG), but also appear in prose: see ἐκεχειρία ‘truce’ (< \* ἐχε-χειρία after dissimilation of the first aspirated stop; Thuc. and inscriptions), ἐχέκολλος ‘sticky’ (Hipp.), ἐχεμυθία ‘silence’ (Plu.), ἐχεδερμία ‘being hide-bound’ (*Hippiatr.*), ἐχέσαρκος ‘clinging close to the body’ (Ath.), and ἐχεπάμων ‘holding property’, attested in inscriptions from Lokroi.

The right-oriented type in -οχος/-ουχος, already used to characterize an individual in Mycenaean (*ko-to-no-o-ko* /ktoino-ok<sup>h</sup>os/, in all likelihood a ‘land holder’), is one of the most popular V2 categories and survives into MG. Substantives are also attested in Homer with forms such as ἡνίοχος ‘one who holds the reins, charioteer’, while an early adjective is σκηπτούχος ‘bearing a sceptre’, an epithet of kings in Homeric epic. Semantic overlap between the two types of compounds is to be found in the following two pairs only: the Myc. PN *e-ke-da-mo* vs. δημοῦχος (the meaning ‘possessor of the land’, attested in Sophocles, may apply in the case of the Myc. form too), and Ἐχέπολις vs. πολιοῦχος ‘protecting a city’ (attested in Homer as πολιήοχος).

<sup>34</sup> Bader (1965: 175–180).

### ἡγέομαι

This is another old and productive compound family. V1 compounds are extremely common in the onomastic lexicon, appearing as early as the seventh century BC. It is less easy to ascertain whether PNs derived from ἡγέομαι existed in Mycenaean, but the two PNs in *a-ke-* are more likely to derive from ἄρχω (see the analysis above). Because of the close similarity of forms derived from ἡγέομαι and from ἄγω outside Attic-Ionic and in contexts where it is not possible to determine the quantity and aspiration of the initial vowel, a number of compounds in ἀγε- attested in prose and in inscriptions may well belong with ἡγέομαι instead. At any rate, both ἡγέομαι and ἄγω are unproductive sources of V1 appellatives (see above), a fact which is only partially explicable with reference to the popularity of the V2 pattern.

V2 compounds derived from ἡγέομαι present interpretative difficulties of a similar kind to the V1 compounds. The SC -ᾠγέτης/-ηγέτης could in principle derive from ἄγω, through Wackernagel's *Dehnungsgesetz* (on which see Chapter 1, section 4.2). Such a view is maintained, for instance, by Ruijgh (1967: 119), followed by *EDG s.v.* ἄγω (though without accepting Ruijgh's hypothesis that the regular reflex of *\*h<sub>2</sub>o-* in Greek was [a]).<sup>35</sup> Chantraine's view, on the other hand, is that compounds in -ᾠγός/-ηγός derive from ἄγω, while those in -ᾠγέτης/-ηγέτης derive from ἡγέομαι.<sup>36</sup> Since the two verbs are very close in meaning, it may well be that speakers did not in fact operate a clear-cut distinction between the two compound types, particularly since the initial aspiration of SCs from ἡγέομαι is likely to have been articulated very feebly already in Classical Greek. What might encourage us to favour Chantraine's idea that compounds in ᾠγέτης/-ηγέτης are linked to ἡγέομαι, if anything, is the fact that this verb would otherwise lack compound derivatives, given that the V1 pattern is almost exclusive to the onomastic lexicon.

### ἵστημι

Compounds derived from ἵστημι exhibit a neat repartition. V1 compounds are exclusively onomastic: the FC Στησι- conveys the transitive-causative semantics of the s-aorist, e.g. in Στησίχορος 'he who sets up a chorus' or Στήσιππος 'he who makes the horse stand'.<sup>37</sup> V2 compounds, on the other hand, tend to express the intransitive meaning of the verb ('stand'). Consider, for instance, the small group of forms identifying chorus members: ἀριστεροστάτης 'standing on

<sup>35</sup> See too Wackernagel (1889: 39), Fraenkel (1910: 59–62).

<sup>36</sup> Chantraine (1956: 91), *DEG s.v.* ἡγέομαι. Chantraine (1956: 90) also criticizes the idea (going back to Meillet) that both -ᾠγέτης/-ηγέτης and -ηγός derive from ἡγέομαι.

<sup>37</sup> See Dubois (2000: 46) and discussion in Chapter 4, section 7.4.



the left', πρωτοστάτης 'one who stands first', τριτοστάτης 'standing third from the corypheus', δεξιοστάτης 'one who stands in the right file of the chorus' and δευτεροστάτης 'one who stands in the rear file of the chorus'. In each case the FC serves as an adjective qualifying the SC and, in syntactic terms, expresses a spatial or temporal modification of the verb. This structure involving an adjectival FC is shared by ὀρθοστάτης 'upright shaft', τριστάτης 'one who stands third (next to the king and queen)' and μεσοστάτης 'inner beam'. Similarly, the FC of πυριστάτης 'standing on the fire' expresses a spatial modification.

A smaller group of V2 compounds express the transitive meaning of ἴστημι and their FCs take on the semantic role of the object: ὀβολοστάτης 'weigher of obols', ζυγοστάτης 'one who sets up the beam of the balance, weigher' and χοροστάτης 'one who sets up the chorus, chorus-leader'. In this compound family, therefore, the V1 orientation tends to be selected to express the verb's transitive and transitive-causative semantics, while the V2 structure is mostly used when the intransitive meaning is required. As with most other pairs in this subgroup, however, the V1 type is limited to onomastics: the relevant semantic distinction does not seem to have been needed in the onomastic lexicon, where the few V2 compounds in -στάτης, too, express the transitive and transitive-causative meaning of the verb.

### κλέπτω

This verb features in a handful of V1 compounds whose FCs convey the idea of 'stealing', though a few later forms in κλεψι- are based on the other meaning of κλέπτω, 'conceal': see e.g. κλεψιχώλος 'disguising lameness' (Luc., a hapax). These V1 compounds are typically epithets and rather recherché in character (e.g. κλεψίνυμφος [steal wife] > 'seeking illicit love' in Lycophron, or κλεψίτοκος 'concealing offspring' in Oppian and attested only another time in Nonnus). Other forms have a reasonably high level of productivity, such as κλεψύδρα, the name of a relatively common object; κλεψιάμβος, indicating a nine-string musical instrument; κλεψίγαμος [steal marriage] > 'seeking illicit love' (Orac. Sib.), which has a second life in Christian authors like Eusebius; and κλεψίνοος 'beguiling the mind', which again is rather popular with Christian authors and particularly favoured by Nonnus.

V2 compounds are more numerous. The old root compounds in -κλεψ and the CoC-os compounds in -κλόπος are recessive types, which from the late Classical age onwards begin to be replaced by compounded forms of the agent noun κλέπτης (Hom.). The root noun κλώψ (Soph.) does not yield compounds. The fact that βοόκλεψ 'stealer of oxen' (and its contracted form βοῦκλεψ) and τυρόκλεψ 'cheese-thief' are mostly attested in grammatical sources confirms their recessive status, since it is for this very reason that the grammarians are prompted to discuss their derivational pattern. Similarly, all compounds in -κλόπος are

restricted to less than ten attestations each: ἀνδραποδοκλόπος ‘slave-stealer’ is basically a hapax, transmitted by Photius with an attribution to Sophocles (hence its entry in *LSJ* as a Sophoclean word); κυνοκλόπος ‘dog-stealer’ seems to be Aristophanes’ creation, later only found in lexicographical texts; φρενοκλόπος ‘stealing the understanding’ is a hapax; πανεπίκλοπος ‘all-treacherous’ is found only in Oppian and the scholia to the *Halieutica*; γαμοκλόπος ‘adulterous’ is a relatively common form in later epic, particularly in Nonnus; βουκλόπος ‘ox-stealing’ too is a late-epic form.

Compounds in -κλέπτης are much more numerous, but the productivity of each individual compound is low and are words whose subsequent attestations after their appearance in a given author are solely of a lexicographical nature: these are Menander’s ἀνδραποδοκλέπτης ‘slave-stealer’, Theocritus’ κηριοκλέπτης ‘stealer of honeycombs’, Lycophron’s λαμπτηροκλέπτης ‘lamp-stealer’ and ζωστηροκλέπτης ‘one who steals belts’, Heroda’s ὄρνιθοκλέπτης ‘bird-stealer’, Athenaeus’ ψηφοκλέπτης [pebble stealer] > ‘one who juggles with pebbles’, Diogenes Laertius’ ἱματιοκλέπτης ‘clothes-stealer’ and πορφυροκλέπτης ‘stealer of purple’, Lucillius’ νυκτικλέπτης ‘thief of the night’, and ἀσημοκλέπτης ‘thief of plate’ in *AP* 11.360.3. ὀφθαλμοκλέπτης ‘stealer of the eye’ in the scholia to Lycophron and παιδοκλέπτης ‘stealer of children’ in the scholia to Callimachus are hapax legomena or words whose subsequent attestations are merely lexicographical. Similarly, ποτηριοκλέπτης ‘cup-stealer’, the title of a play by Euphron of Chalcis, is only attested as such and does not have a life of its own. Although these compounds are found in literature and poetry, in some cases we are dealing with authors whose language is supposed to have been closer to lower registers (e.g. Menander, Herodas). At the same time, their appearance in the scholia can be seen as a sign that compounds in -κλέπτης were associated with more common language (see also μικροκλέπτης ‘petty thief’, which has two attestations in scholiographical sources). This supposition is further supported by the fact that κλέπτης, its standard modern form κλέφτης, and their compounds are preserved and indeed commonly attested in MG (some, like καρδιοκλέφτης ‘stealer of hearts’, may even be demotic). Forms in -κλοπος, on the other hand, are rare, with λογοκλόπος ‘plagiarist’ being the only standard form of this kind.<sup>38</sup> The choice between these agentive SCs was probably prompted not only by fashion (it is true that forms in -κλειψ cease to be productive early on, in contrast to the later productivity of those in -κλέπτης) but also by practical needs: the three SCs are suited to different metrical shapes.

**38** I am grateful to Io Manolessou for correcting my views on forms such as τυποκλοπία ‘piracy’, which though listed in Anastasiadi-Simeonidi is by no means standard.

In comparison to V2 compounds, where we do not find a single item with a high level of productivity, certain V1 compounds seem to have been more popular: this is suggested at least by the higher number of attestations of κλειψύδρα, κλειψιάμβος, κλειψίγαμος and κλειψίνοος. In this case, therefore, the V1 type seems to have enjoyed greater popularity, at least in certain registers.

### λύω

This verb is an extremely popular source of V1 compounds, which are particularly productive in onomastics. Amongst the appellative *specimina*, a few forms such as λυσιτελέω ‘indemnify for expenses incurred’ (preserved in MG), λυσιγυῖα ‘relaxation of the limbs’ and λυσιπόλεμος ‘type of war-engine’ seem to have been created outside poetry. Moreover, most of the appellative V1 compounds enjoy a relatively high level of productivity, and this applies even to those that were created in later Greek. The only exceptions are λυσιγυῖα (a hapax in Hippocrates), λυσίκακος (first attested in Theognis and later used only by Hesychius as an *interpretamentum* of λαθικηδέες) and λυσιπόλεμος (a hapax).

The popularity of the V1 type in both onomastics and the appellative lexicon may be responsible for the unproductive character of the V2 compounds, with the lack of an agentive *simplex* perhaps an additional factor. The semantics of ὠδινολύτης ‘setting free from pain’ (Plin.) and νοουολύτης ‘freeing from illness’ (*Ep. Gr.* 1026) is close to that of the V1 compounds λυσίπονος ‘releasing from pain’ (Pi.) and λυσιμέρμνος ‘driving care away’ (*AP*). However, in contrast to the strong productivity of the V1 compounds, V2 forms derived from λύω are either hapax legomena (ὠδινολύτης, νοουολύτης and κομβολύτης ‘cut-purse’) or attested in very late sources (χρησμολύτης ‘expounder of oracles’ in Gregory of Antiochia and Tzetzes). The type survives in a few MG forms, although these are hardly standard: τουρκοκαταλύτης ‘destroyer of the Turks’ is a poetic word, coined in the nineteenth century. Its SC is the prefixed agent noun καταλύτης, which as a *simplex* is used only in the technical sense of ‘catalyst’ or ‘converter’. The fact that its compounds preserve the AG meaning of ‘destroyer’ reveals their poetic and learned nature: most compounds in -καταλύτης are demotic creations and not to be found in contemporary Standard MG.

### στρέφω

This compound family exhibits a clear preference for the V2 pattern, as is usually the case with ablauting roots preserving a CoC-os agent noun or V2 type. Out of six V1 compounds, two are PNs. Of these, Στρεψιπιπίδης has a transparent meaning, corresponding to e.g. *Il.* 8.168 ἵππους τε στρέψαι ‘to turn horses’: ‘he who makes the horses turn’.

The appellative compounds mostly have an artificial structure. στρεφεδινέω ‘whirl round’ is assumed to derive from the unattested compound \*\*στρεφεδίνης, in much the same way as the participial masculine form δυσμενέων is created from δυσμενής.<sup>39</sup> The semantics of στρεφεδινέω is also artificial in that, rather than assuming the role of the object, the SC derived from δίνη ‘whirlwind, rotation’ seems instead to qualify the verbal action of the FC: ‘whirl in rotation’.<sup>40</sup>

Another artificial compound is στρεψίμαλλος ‘with tangled fleece’ (Aristoph. fr. 682 K-A), whose verbal FC expresses passive semantics. It seems to have been coined following the model of an equally artificial Homeric compound, πηγεσίμαλλος ‘with compressed fleece’ (see the analysis below), and is being used to characterize Euripides’ dramatic art, but the incomplete context of this one-line fragment makes it impossible to judge whether an allusion to Homer was intended by Aristophanes; the meaning of στρεψίμαλλος was probably disparaging.<sup>41</sup> Similarly, the name of the African antelope attested in Pliny, στρεψίκερωσ, implies an adjectival and therefore passive understanding of the FC, ‘having twisted horns’: it describes the Greater Kudu, whose modern scientific name, *Tragelaphus strepsiceros*, retains the old Greek compound.

στρεψοδικοπανουργία ‘cunning in the perversion of justice’, a typically extended comic compound, and στρεψοδικέω ‘pervert justice’ are both Aristophanes’ creations, and were probably coined as neat counterparts to Strepsiadēs’ own name, itself allusive.<sup>42</sup> Another compound, the hapax στρεψαύχην ‘twisting the neck’, features in Theopompus’ fr. 55 K-A, transmitted by Athenaeus in the context of a discussion dealing with drinking-vessels. It qualifies a κώθων, a Laconian vase apparently typical of soldiers (the title of Theopompus’ play is Στρατιώτιδες, ‘Female soldiers’), whose shape was designed to prevent the content from spilling.

It is apparent, then, that V1 compounds derived from στρέφω are of limited productivity and display various artificial features: this group thus neatly brings out the tendency of V1 compounds to surface in poetic, comic or scientific lan-

**39** For a different view on the origin of many of these -εω verbs, which holds that they represent early cases of incorporation, see Grandi and Pompei (2012).

**40** The derivational process is analysed by Tucker (1990: 62–72); on the Homeric form στρεφεδίνηθεν in particular, see Risch (1974: 181), Meissner (2006: 213 n. 122).

**41** See the comment in Eust. in *Od.* 1.354.33–34: στρεψίμαλλους ἐκάλουν οἱ παλαιοὶ τοὺς περιλαοῦντας καὶ κακοσχόλως φράζοντας, λαβόντες τὸ σκῶμμα ἀπὸ ἐρίων συνεστραμμένους μαλλοῦς ἐχόντων καὶ οὕτω δυσλύτων ‘the ancients called στρεψίμαλλοι those who talked a lot and said mischievous things: they derived the pun from the flocks whose wool was entangled and had not been washed’. All passages commenting on this compound confirm that the FC has a passive meaning: see also Hsch. σ 1997, Ph. s.v.

**42** Kanavou (2011: 67–68).

guage (see section 6). The V2 pattern is much the more productive, but as far as we can judge from the compounds attested before the third century BC, it is mostly used in poetic language: οἰακοστρόφος ‘helmsman’ is used only by Pindar, Aeschylus, Euripides and Gregory of Nazianzus; ἄσπιδηστρόφος ‘shield-wielding’, the original MS reading for the current ἄσπιδηφόρος at Aesch. Ag. 825, would be a hapax;<sup>43</sup> ἠνιοστρόφος ‘charioteer’ is a Sophoclean hapax; Aristophanes’ ἱμνιοστρόφος ‘water-drawer’ is later only quoted by lexicographers; and Theocritus’ ἔδρροστρόφος ‘(wrestler) who throws his adversary’ is another hapax. Even accounting for the fact that V2 compounds are more numerous, this compound family as a whole is a highly literary one in character. στρέφω and compounds in -τροφος survive into MG, with standard forms such as the opposites δεξιόστροφος / αριστερόστροφος ‘which turns to the right/left’ and αργόστροφος ‘whose mind turns slowly, stupid’ / εύστροφος ‘whose mind turns quickly, intelligent’, in both of which the FC has an adverbial meaning.

### σώζω

This common compound family displays a clear-cut repartition. With the exception of the epithet σωσίπολις, all the V1 compounds are PNs, adding up to ninety-seven different items in the *LGPN* database.<sup>44</sup> Some of the names have transparent semantics: see for instance the very popular Σωσίβιος ‘one who saves lives’, Σώσιππος ‘one who saves horses’, Σωσιβῶτας ‘one who saves cattle’, Σωσιγένης ‘one who saves his family’, Σωσίδημος and Σωσίλαος both ‘one who saves his people’, Σωσίστρατος ‘one who saves the army’, etc. The appellative form σωσίπολις, which is also used as a PN, is not particularly common: it only features in Aristophanes, Strabo and Hesychius.

All the V2 compounds, on the other hand, are appellative, though they begin to appear only in the Hellenistic age and usually have few attestations. Their formation was probably hindered by the fact that the SC -(σ)σόος is also characteristic of compounds derived from σεύω ‘chase’. If we focus solely on the distribution of the forms attested before the third century BC collected in the Corpus, we note both their low popularity in the Classical age and their increased use in late-antique poets. κουροσόος ‘child-saving’, used by the epigrammatist Perses, is a hapax; μηλοσόος ‘sheep-protecting’ has only two attestations outside lexicographical sources; πολισόος ‘protecting the city’ (*H. Hom. Mart.* 2) and μελισσοσόος ‘preserver of bees’ (Zonas Epigr.) are hapax legomena; οἰκοσόος (Max. Astrol.) has only two attestations; βιοσόος is used only by Nonnus;

<sup>43</sup> The linguistic and philological issues are briefly discussed by Fraenkel (1978: 379), with bibliography.

<sup>44</sup> <http://www.lgpn.ox.ac.uk/database/lgpn.php>, last accessed 08.12.2014.

ξενοσσοός (Nonn.) is another hapax; ψυχοσσοός is found only in Nonnus and in two epigrams of the *Anthologia Palatina*; βροτοσσοός is mostly discussed in grammatical sources dealing with accentuation; δημοσσοός is a hapax in Hesychius, where it is glossed with two opposite meanings: τὸν δῆμον σώζων ‘one who saves the people’ (i.e. as if it were a V2 compound derived from σώζω) and ὁ δημοδίωκτος ‘he who is chased/banished by the people’ (i.e. as if it were a passive V2 compound derived from σέω). Many of these late V2 compounds are mirror images of older V1 PNs: see the pairs Σωσίβιος and βιοσσοός, Σωσίδημος and δημοσσοός Σωσίμβροτος and βροτοσσοός, σωσίπολις and πολισσοός, Σωσίξενος and ξεινοσσοός, Σωσίνεως and νηοσσοός (attested in Apollonius Rhodius but not included in the Corpus). As noted in section 2.1, the agent noun σωτήρ does not give rise to agentive compounds in AG but its modern form, σωτήρας, does.

### φαγεῖν

Compounds in -φαγος, deriving from the PIE root which supplies the aorist stem of the Greek verb ‘to eat’, are amongst the most common in both Ancient and Modern Greek.<sup>45</sup> There is no real V1 counterpart to these: the only attested form is φαγέσωρος ‘glutton’, which has been transmitted to us as an anonymous comic fragment (*adesp.* 786 K-A) by Pollux, together with the feminine form φαγεσωρίτις; its SC derives from σωρός ‘heap, quantity’. There is therefore no competition between the two compound patterns: V2 compounds, as we might expect, are the dominant type, and this continues to be the case in MG.

### φέρω

This compound family exemplifies the trends which characterize the interaction of V1 and V2 competing types more generally. V1 compounds are both appellative and onomastic, but V1 appellatives sometimes contain the artificial FCs φερεσι- and φερεσ-, and these are never attested in PNs. V2 forms are also used as PNs, though the overwhelming majority belongs to the appellative lexicon. Compounds in -φορος remain highly productive in MG, and we even find a few forms in φερε- preserved or newly introduced: see φερέγγυος ‘giving surety’, φέρελις ‘producing hope’, φερέφωνο ‘mouthpiece, spokesman’ (< Fr. *porteparole*). The non-verbal constituents of the two types of compounds frequently overlap, as the number of pairs testifies: an analysis of their history may thus serve as a useful source of insights into the interaction of V1 and V2 patterns.

Let us start with the most famous pair of all, φερέοικος ‘house carrier, snail’ (Hes.) vs. οἰκοφόρος ‘bearing one’s house’ (Ps. Scymn.). φερέοικος is sparingly used, except in Hesiod (epithet of the snail), Herodotus (to describe the living

<sup>45</sup> For MG, see the list in Anastasiadi-Simeonidi (2002: 420–421).

habits of the Scythians) and Plutarch (for a type of wasp). It subsequently features only in grammatical sources, before resurfacing in Nonnus and Gregory of Nazianzus. Although limited, this is in fact a quite high rate of use compared to that of οἰκοφόρος: as far as we can tell, it only features in Ps. Scymn. 854 (= *Peripl. M. Eux.* 49) to describe the habits of nomadic peoples. Even as far as usage in context is concerned, οἰκοφόρος is the exact counterpart of φερέοικος, differentiated solely by the fact of being more recent and much rarer. An investigation of the contexts in which individual forms are attested disproves Benveniste's thesis that forms in -φορος identify a 'porteur par vocation ou nature', i.e. express a definition, while those in φερε- express a description:<sup>46</sup> suffice it to note that both φερέοικος and οἰκοφόρος are used as epithets of nomadic peoples.

Such a distribution, with the V1 compound being older and more frequently used than its V2 counterpart, also characterizes other pairs derived from φέρω. φέρρασις 'shield-bearing' first appears in Aeschylus' *Persae* and *Agamemnon*, and is subsequently only employed in the late Homeric hymn to Ares and by Proclus.<sup>47</sup> However, its counterpart ἄσπιδοφόρος is attested for the first time in the late-antique author Theodoretus of Cyrhha. In the case of other pairs, the V1 compound, although older, has fewer attestations than the V2 one. φερέζυγος 'bearing the yoke' is a very likely emendation in Alc. fr. 249.3 Voigt and is later only used by Ibycus and Proclus, while ζυγοφόρος appears in Eur. *HF* 121 (the manuscript reading is ζυγηφόρος), and later only in Plutarch and Athanasius. φερεστέφανος 'bringing victory' is only attested in Bacchylides, whereas στεφανηφόρος is found in a large number of texts beginning with Herodotus and Euripides.

Finally, there are pairs in which the V2 type is both older and more productive. σακεσφόρος 'shield bearing' has a few attestations in lyric, tragic and comic poets of the fifth century, before becoming a word of interest to lexicographers. φερεσσακής on the other hand is a rare and mostly late form, attested in the Pseudo-Hesiodic *Shield*, in Tryphiodorus and Nonnus, and then in an epic *adespota* of the seventh century AD (Heitsch 40). καρποφόρος 'yielding fruit' has more than a hundred attestations, starting with Pindar, while φερέκαρπος is used only by Plutarch and Nonnus. σταφυλοφόρος, which features in Aristotle's *Historia animalium* as a seemingly technical term to describe the uvula (= σταφυλή), is used again only by Rufus and Pollux, while φερεστάφυλος 'bearing bunches of grapes' is attested in Archestratus Parodius (quoted by Athenaeus) and Oppian. Finally, φερέπτερυξ 'bearing wings' is a hapax in Oppian, as is πτερυγοφόρος in Dioscorides.

<sup>46</sup> Benveniste (1967: 22).

<sup>47</sup> For the attribution of this hymn to Proclus or someone from his circle, see the summary in West (2003: 17) and the more detailed discussion in Càssola (1975: 297–298).

All the forms in the pairs considered above seem to have belonged to a highly literary, and usually poetic, register. The exceptions are *οικοφόρος*, used to characterize nomadic peoples, and the ‘scientific’ term *σαφυλοφόρος*. If this tells us anything about the distribution of the V1 and V2 patterns, it is perhaps that we ought to be more cautious in attributing the former to poetic registers and the latter to more common, ‘everyday’ Greek. While it is true that, throughout the whole linguistic history of Greek, V2 compounds in *-φόρος* are the source of many common terms, it is not the case that they are restricted to less poetic registers than the V1 compounds: the competing pairs display, by and large, a similar distribution across the two types.

Similarly, it would be wrong to attribute chronological precedence to one of the two types. An even distribution is discernible across the different competing pairs, with three cases of a V1 compound being older, two cases of simultaneity, and three cases where it is the V2 compound which is older. It may instead be more fruitful to interpret the evidence as suggesting that the V1 form is, by and large, less frequently used. The exceptions to this trend are *φερρείκος* and *φέρασπις*, which have more attestations than *οικοφόρος* and *ἀσπιδοφόρος* respectively.

### 3.1.1 Summary of characteristics

Most of the productive compound families in this subgroup contain V2 compounds in *-ος* (the *κουροτρόφος/στρατηγός* types). The exceptions are the families derived from *δίδωμι*, *ἐλάω*, *ἠγέομαι*, *ἴστημι* and *λύω*, which have compounds in *-της*, and *κλέπτω*, which has some V2 compounds in *-της* as well as compounds in *-ος* and root formations. In general, all these V2 compounds are extremely numerous and there is a clear correlation between their productivity and the limited number of corresponding V1 compounds: this productivity may have had an impact on the development of parallel V1 compounds, which remain more limited even when they are very old in origin (e.g. those derived from *ἄγω* or *ἔλκω*). There is a clear tendency for the V1 compounds in this class to be extremely productive in onomastics (see those derived from *ἄγω*, *ἄρχω*, *δάμνημι/δαμάζω*, *δέχομαι*, *ἠγέομαι*) or indeed exclusively onomastic (*ἔρδω*).

These families therefore confirm the general Greek trend towards right-oriented compounds: in connection with the extremely productive agentive type in *-ος*, V2 compounds are more numerous, and many serve as names of professions or as adjectives describing objects of common use. V1 compounds are rarer, and often feature exclusively in poetic language or become specialized as PNs. This distribution provides a likely explanation of the fact that in most previous studies V1 compounds have been treated as a predominantly onomastic type. Indeed, many of these seventeen base verbs are among the most productive sources of



verbal compounds: if we were to ground our conception of the entire V1 type on the behaviour of ἄγω, ἄρχω, δέχομαι, ἔχω, ἔρδω or φέρω, it would be natural to conclude that V1 compounds have become specialized as an onomastic type and are perhaps even a relic, no longer productive as a means of word formation. For instance, within the corpus of Mycenaean V1 compounds collected in Tables 4.2 and 4.3, possible names derived from ἄρχω and ἔχω amount to three and four respectively: this means that PN<sub>s</sub> in Ἄρχε- and Ἐχε- may together account for one third of the whole Myc. corpus of φερέοικος compounds. However, this need not mean that in Mycenaean compounds derived from ἄρχω and ἔχω were exclusively onomastic since (as mentioned in Chapter 3, apropos of Frei-Lüthy's hypothesis) the Mycenaean evidence is limited and the supposed specialization of V1 compounds as an onomastic type amounts to an *argumentum e silentio*, namely the fact that in the tablets there are no appellative V1 compounds. If we go beyond the Mycenaean evidence, we see that in later Greek compounds derived from ἄρχω and ἔχω—as well as those derived from the two other common verbs ἄγω and φέρω—may also give rise to appellatives, even though they are predominantly productive in onomastics. In the Homeric poems, the FC ἄρχε- features in two PN<sub>s</sub> (Ἀρχέλοχος and Ἀρχεπτόλεμος) and in the adjective ἀρχέκακος, whereas the FC ἔχε- features in five PN<sub>s</sub> (Ἐχέπωλος, Ἐχέμμων, Ἐχεκλῆς, Ἐχέφρων, Ἐχένηος) and in three appellatives (ἔχεπευκίς, ἐχέφρων, ἐχέθυμος). ἄγω produces both PN<sub>s</sub> and appellatives in Homeric Greek, whereas φέρω seems to have developed later: in Homer there is only a *Kurzname*, Φέρεκλος (*Il.* 5.59), and appellatives appear only in Hesiod and in the Homeric Hymns (φερέοικος 'house carrying, φερέσβιος 'giving life', φερεσανθής 'bringing flowers').

In conclusion, V1 compounds derived from ἄρχω, ἔχω and φέρω are not exclusively onomastic and are useful to contravene the general behavioural patterns associated with the seventeen verbs collected in this section. This is perhaps connected with the semantics of the base verbs, which identify common transitive actions, a feature which may have contributed to the creation of appellative V1 compounds despite the existence of a productive V2 counterpart.

### 3.2 Less productive compound families

As anticipated above, the compound families in this subgroup are characterized by features which allow us to separate them from those of the previous subgroup. The first feature is that one of the two patterns (but often both) is of low productivity: this is usually the case with V1 compounds, but there also are families in which the V1 pattern is more productive than the V2 pattern. The second feature is that the interaction between the two types often betrays a certain artificiality,

with one pattern seemingly influencing the other. The creation and structure of individual V1 compounds in particular may be influenced by metrical requirements or wordplay (the latter is especially common in comic language).

### ἀγείρω

The compound family derived from this verb provides a good example of one of the phenomena which characterize the creation of V1 compounds vis-à-vis V2 compounds: wordplay. As we might expect, V2 compounds are the productive type, though they are mostly limited to the formation of poetic epithets such as νεφεληγερέτα ‘cloud-gatherer’: the old Myc. form *ri-na-ko-ro* /lināgoros/ ‘flax-gatherer’ and the later name of the Heracleian official σιταγέρτης ‘collector of corn’ are the only forms that refer to commonplace activities.

There is only one V1 compound, ἀγεροκύβηλις, and it is an artificial one. This hapax is transmitted by Hesychius, who attributes its use to Cratinus (fr. 66 K-A) in the comedy *Drapetides*:

Hsch. α 461: ἀγεροκύβηλις· Κρατίνοσ ἐν Δραπέτισιν ἐπὶ Λάμπωνοσ, τὸν αὐτὸν ἀγύρτην καὶ κυβηλιστὴν εἶπεν, οἰονεὶ θύτην καὶ μάντιν. Κύβηλιν γὰρ ἔλεγον τὸν πέλεκυν [...] ὄθεν καὶ Λύσιπποσ ἐν Βάκχαισ τὸν αὐτὸν <ὡσ> ἀγύρτην κωμωδεῖ.

‘Cratinus [uses ἀγεροκύβηλις] in the *Drapetides* in reference to Lampon. He calls him ‘begging priest’ and ‘axe-wielder’, which is to say, a priest and a diviner. For the name of the (sacrificial) axe was κύβηλις [...] for which reason the same man is also ridiculed by Lysippus in the *Bacchae* as a begging-priest.

The *interpretamentum* connects the constituents of the compound to two rare words (ἀγύρτης and κυβηλιστής) which are glossed with the common terms θύτης ‘sacrificer, priest’ and μάντις ‘diviner’ respectively. ἀγύρτης indicated a kind of mendicant priest who lived on collected offerings (ἀγείρω): this term was used in particular for the priests of Cybele. The similarity between the goddess’ name and the rare word κύβηλις, indicating the sacrificial axe, seems to have brought about the misconception that the compound is related to Cybele.<sup>48</sup>

The literal translation of ἀγεροκύβηλις as ‘one who collects axes’, retained in the Corpus for the sake of semantic clarity, probably does not get to the essence of this comic compound: rather than being a real verbal compound, ἀγεροκύβηλις is more likely to have been formed by juxtaposing the stem of the action noun ἄγεροις (Hdt.+), conveying the ideas of collecting and begging, with the stem of

<sup>48</sup> In α 146 Photius, who follows Hesychius, also adds the information that others preferred the reading ἔγεροκύβηλις, explaining the compound as ‘he who raises the axe above/against himself (τὸν ἐφ’ ἑαυτὸν ἐγείροντα τὸν πέλεκυν).

the ‘technical’ attribute of sacrificing priests, the κύβηλις. The structure of this compound therefore reveals the impact of -σις nominals on the formation of neologisms (on which see also Chapter 4, section 4.2).

The inclusion of ἀγερσικύβηλις in a corpus of V1 compounds is justified by the fact that, ultimately, V1 compounds provided Cratinus with the structural model on which to base his comic compound. The playwright was probably keen to impart a high-sounding quality to the epithet coined for Lampon. This would be consistent with the style and register of the *Drapetides*, a comedy which Bakola (2010: 141) describes as ‘unparalleled in its use of tragedy’: a long V1 compound, composed of rare words (ἀγερσις is found only three times in AG, κύβηλις is mostly discussed in grammatical and lexicographical sources) fits the bill perfectly.

In conclusion, in the family of compounds derived from ἀγείρω the existence of the odd V1 formation is determined by stylistic factors. ἀγερσικύβηλις is neither in competition with a specific V2 compound nor a redundant formation: on the contrary, its existence is fully justified by the stylistic effect intended by its inventor.

### ἀμείβω

Neither type of compound is numerous. V1 PNs can only be reconstructed on the basis of the *Kurzname* Ἀμειψίας, which corresponds to the FC found in appellative compounds. The extant appellative compounds in ἀμειψι- all seem to have belonged to scientific language. Two, ἀμειψικοσμία ‘change of condition’ and ἀμειψιρρυσμία ‘change of form’, are attributed to Democritus on the testimony of Hesychius and Diogenes Laertius (9.47; see too Hsch. α 3563 ἀμειψιρρυσμεῖν); Hesychius α 3564 is also the source of a third unattributed form, ἀμειψίχρον, probably corresponding to ἀμειψίχρουν, the accusative of the adjective ἀμειψίχρους ‘changing colour’. The *interpretamentum* μεταβάλλοντα is in the accusative as well, to which Latte adds <τὴν χροάν> (‘the skin’). In Phryn. *Ecl.* 408 we find a parallel for the construction of ἀμείβω with χρώς: καὶ τόπον ἀλλάσσειν διὰ τε χροά φανὸν ἀμείβειν (the subject is the things that mortals suppose ‘to change their place and alter their bright appearance’). ἀμειψίχρους may thus be another compound related to science or philosophy. The scientific specialization of compounds in ἀμειψι- is confirmed by the fact that the only form of this type in MG is the botanical technical term ἀμειψισπορά ‘crop rotation’.

The V2 compounds of ἀμείβω, on the other hand, all indicate professions or practical activities. Aeschylus’ χρυσαμοιβός, used as a powerful epithet of Ares, the god of war who gives gold in exchange for dead bodies, is a famous variation on the common ἀργυραμοιβός ‘money-changer’, as recognized by the scholia.<sup>49</sup>

<sup>49</sup> See too Fraenkel (1978: 228).

In more homely register, ἀλφιταμοιβός ‘dealer in barley-groats’ is found only in Aristophanes (three times) and in lexicographical works, where its interpretation is provided: for Pollux the ἀλφιταμοιβοί are οἱ πιπράσκοντες τὰ ἄλφιτα ‘those who sell barley-groats’, while Hesychius offers the synonymic compound, ἀλφιτοπώλης ‘seller of barley-groats’.

All these V2 compounds derived from ἀμείβω are associated with Classical Greek. We see this clearly not only from the fact that almost all of them are not used after the Classical age, but also from the numerous comments they elicit in lexicographical sources. ἀργυραμοιβός in particular is quoted a total of ten times in Atticist lexicography. Phrynichus recommends it as the correct Attic word for ‘money-changer’, against the new word κολλυβιστής, used in less ‘approved’ Attic authors such as Lysias and Menander, and common in the Koine (also see Moe. α 113).<sup>50</sup> This may reflect the fact that ἀμείβω is very much a poetic verb, whose semantic sphere becomes more restricted with the passing of time, leading to the current MG meaning of ‘remunerate’. Of the V2 compounds, ἀργυραμοιβός is the only one to have remained common in the modern language.

### ἀκούω

Considering that the numerous forms in -ήκοος are mostly bahuvrihis derived from ἀκοή ‘hearing’ (a feature preserved in MG), the family of compounds derived from ἀκούω is a limited one. This is shown first of all by the low productivity of V2 formations, the sole representative of which is the word for ‘spy’, ὠτακουστής.<sup>51</sup> V1 compounds are similarly limited, amounting only to the post-Classical ἀκουσίθεος ‘heard by the gods’, whose passive meaning is also unusual for the V1 pattern. The context in which ἀκουσίθεος occurs, an epigram by Antipater of Thessalonica, suggests that it was a *recherché* word. It is used as the epithet of φέγγος, the light of a torch sent by Antipater to his patron Pison and accompanied by the short epigram: its light will show that Pison has appreciated the gift and that Antipater’s prayers will have been ‘heard by the gods’.

### ἀραρίσκω

This is an old and recessive compound family, which mirrors the rarity of the base verb (mostly a poetic word). V1 forms compounded with the root ἀρ- may be as old as Mycenaean: the interpretation of the PN *a-ti-pa-mo* as /Artiphāmos/ is phonolog-

<sup>50</sup> κολλυβιστής and ἀργυραμοιβός in fact form part of the battleground in the war waged by Phrynichus against the ‘unacceptable’ language of Menander: see his scathing remarks at *Ecl.* 408.

<sup>51</sup> A later form is the late Byzantine compound πατρακουστής meaning ‘one who listens to the Father’s word’.

ically possible, although scholars have generally opted for /Antiphāmos/. As discussed in Chapter 4, sections 7.1 and 8.6, a close semantic parallel for /Artiphāmos/ would be the epithet ἀρτιεπής ‘he who fits together words’. The influence of ἄρτι ‘just’ and ἄρτιος ‘ready’ may already have been felt in connection with these old *specimina*, particularly since the element -τι- in the FC was opaque from a morphological point of view. Moreover, morphological obscurity may have been reinforced by the fact that speakers were unlikely to have linked most other derivations of ἀραρίσκω, such as ἄρμα ‘chariot’ or ἄρθμιος ‘allied’, to the verb, with the result that it probably ceased to be productive from a derivational point of view.

In the same way, the V2 πυλάρτης ‘gate-fastener’ must have been morphologically obscure: it remains an isolated formation, which after Homer is taken up again by Moschus and otherwise by lexicographers. The morphological opacity of -άρτης is also discernible in the fact that in later Greek a homophonous SC develops out of ἀείρω/αἴρω ‘lift’, whose regular V2 compounds end in -ορος. In this connection, it is worth considering another form, the hapax λιθάρτης. It features in *IG* 2<sup>2</sup>.1424.col.II.272 as an apposition of καρκίνος, which in the context of the inscription (an inventory of the treasures of Athena) seems to refer to an object (a small crab?) made of stone: another possibility is that καρκίνος has the technical meaning of ‘pair of pincers’ and that λιθάρτης means either ‘assembling stones’ (< ἀραρίσκω) or ‘removing stone’ (< αἴρω), but the preservation of such a technical object in the treasury of Athena would be more difficult to understand.

### ἀρπάζω

This verb creates only two compounds unequivocally of the V1 type, ἀρπάξανδρος ‘snatching away men’ (Aesch.) and ἀρπαξομίλης ‘snatching the pleasures of sexual intercourse’ (fr. *adesp.* 597 K–A). The PN Ἀρπάλυκος (Thessaly 3rd c.) might also be based on this verb: if so, its FC would seem to delete the [g] of the root. There are no cogent semantic or morphological reasons why V2 compounds with ἀρπακτής ‘robber’ in the SC should not have been created: we may recall however that ἀρπακτής, ἀρπακτήρ and ἀρπαστής are all late and rare words (see section 2.1.5). The only V2 compound, the root formation δελέαρπαξ ‘snapping at the bait’ (Leon.), is a hapax.

### ἀρτύω

This verb mostly creates onomastic compounds which reflect the general meaning ‘prepare’: see particularly Ἀρτύλοχος ‘one who prepares an ambush’, corresponding to the phrase λόχον ἀρτύναντες (Hom. *Od.* 14.469, featuring the epic by-form ἀρτύνω). The only V2 compound, ὄψαρτυτής ‘cook’ (Hyp.), on the other hand, reflects the specialized meaning ‘prepare a meal’. The simple agent noun ἀρτυτήρ ‘director’ (*IG* 12(3).330.144–145, Thera, third c. BC) is a hapax.

### βαίνω

The productive compounds derived from βαίνω are those in -βάτης. These, like the *simplex* βάτης which is only attested in Hesychius, are based on the present and are thus likely to represent a more recent development than the forms based on the root βη-, which is the basis of the original verbal formation, the root aorist.<sup>52</sup> However, Homeric Greek already contains some compounds in -βάτης, and this shows that the new Greek agent nouns in -της could be formed on any vocalic grade.<sup>53</sup>

As discussed in Chapter 4, section 8.3, βητάρμων has usually been explained as an analogical formation on ἐμπυριβήτης, from which it would import not only the vocalic grade, but also the [t] in the FC. A different explanation has been suggested here: βητάρμων is not an artificial form, but an old compound based on the bare root and backed-up by the root aorist, the original verbal formation. The residual nature of compounds in -τι-, together with the Greek creation of the secondary present formation βαίνω, contributed to the ousting not only of βητάρμων (whose archaic character can also be defended on the basis of its SC, as discussed in Chapter 4, section 8.3), but also of compounds in -βήτης, of which ἐμπυριβήτης is the only example.

The popularity of the new V2 compounds in -βάτης might have made the creation of other V1 compounds unnecessary, particularly since both the stem βα-, featuring in the present, and the stem βη-, featuring in the aorist, end in a vowel, a fact which makes them less suitable as compound FCs. In the absence of sigmatic tenses which could provide a FC of the τερψίμβροτος type, the only way to create a phonologically suitable FC would be to use the whole present stem βαιν-: however, with the exception of two compounds in φαιν- (see section 4.2), this type of present stem is not found in V1 compounds, whose FCs also tend to exclude other suffixed present stems (exceptions are φθινο-, τανυ- and δακν-). The shape of the root is therefore the very likely cause of the lack of V1 compounds derived from βαίνω and of the success of V2 forms in -βάτης (which have been preserved into MG).

### βλέπω

All forms are rare. βλεπεδαίμων has been preserved for us by Poll. 1.21, with the comment that it is a comic formation, in the context of a discussion of terms pertaining to the sacred sphere:

ὁ δὲ ὑπερτιμῶν δεισιδαίμων καὶ δεισίθεος· κωμικὸν (fr. *adesp.* 749 K-A) γὰρ ὁ βλεπεδαίμων.

He who greatly honours the gods [is called] δεισιδαίμων and δεισίθεος [‘fearing the gods’]; a comic word is βλεπεδαίμων.

<sup>52</sup> LIV 205. See also Chapter 4, section 8.3.

<sup>53</sup> Risch (1974: 32).

It is not entirely clear from the context whether we are supposed to understand βλεπεδαίμων as an afterthought, not directly linked to the topic of the sentence (terms for the person who honours the gods). In Hsch. β 699 the compound is glossed with ‘a person who is consumed by illness and whose complexion is made to look bad by the gods’ (ὁ ὑπὸ νόσου κατεσκληκῶς καὶ κακόχρους ὑπὸ δαιμόνων). In Eust. *in Il.* 1.314.31 (with parallels in the *Suda* and Photius) βλεπεδαίμων is glossed as ‘a blind person who looks like he has been hit by a god’ (ὁ διεστραμμένος τὰς ὄψεις καὶ οἶον ὑπὸ δαίμονος πεπληγῶς). On the basis of these two passages, and of Eustathius’ information that according to the Atticist Pausanias βλεπεδαίμων was used to mock the Socratics, the compound has been loosely interpreted as referring to someone who ‘looks like a ghost’, understanding δαίμων with its later meaning of ‘ghost’. Although βλεπεδαίμων is a one-off creation, it does in fact reflect usages of βλέπω followed by a nominative or accusative with the meaning ‘to look like X’, e.g. φόβον βλέπων ‘looking terrible’ (Aesch. *Th.* 498), ἔβλεψε νᾶπτu ‘looking mustard’, i.e. ‘giving dark looks’ (Aristoph. *Eq.* 631).

What all this reveals is the artificial (and probably comic) character of βλεπεδαίμων. As noted in section 2.1, the status of the rare V2 compounds κυνοβλόψ and πολυβλέπων is no more prominent. This is somewhat surprising, given that βλέπω was a common verb in Greek, still preserved in MG.

### βόσκω

In the case of this compound family we cannot really speak of competition between V1 and V2 compounds. V2 compounds are common, and this is connected to the fact that, as noted in section 2.1.3, βόσκω has a large number of simple and compounded agentive forms which cover two semantic domains, namely the idea of ‘nourishing’ and the idea of ‘being a herdsman’.

The only V1 compound is the Homeric epithet βωτιάνειρα (Chapter 4, section 8.4). Although semantically transparent, βωτιάνειρα must have been felt to be typical of high poetic language because of the ‘old-fashioned’ shape of the FC as well of its Homeric associations. It is never found again after Homer and Hesiod except in grammatical or lexicographical sources. We should also note that there is no V2 compound conveying the same meaning. As we have seen with βητάρμων, the rarity of βωτιάνειρα is certainly linked to the shape of the FC, which could not be replaced by a sigmatic form since there is no s-aorist \*\*ἔβωσα. The morphological constraints of the root explain both the lack of V1 compounds and the productivity of V2 compounds.

**γιγνώσκω**

Despite the very pervasive use of this verb, verbal compounds are limited and enjoy a certain level of productivity only in onomastics, with the V1 type in Γνωσι-. In the case of these compounds, it is possible that the popularity of the FC was enhanced by the existence of the noun γνώσις ‘knowledge’: see for instance the example of Γνωσιφίλᾱ, which may be interpreted as ‘one who knows her friends’ but yields a better meaning when construed as ‘one who loves knowledge’. The influence of γνώσις is also evident in other non-V1 forms, such as γνωσιμαχέω ‘fight having knowledge of one’s power’ (Hdt.).

The restriction of V1 compounds to onomastics is not compensated for by the development of the V2 pattern. As noted in section 2.1, the only V2 compound is καρδιογνώστης ‘knower of hearts’, attested—just like the agent noun γνώστης—in the *New Testament*. It is also used in the *Septuagint* with the more restricted meaning of ‘diviner’. It is unclear why verbal compounds derived from γιγνώσκω are so rare in AG: the type in -γνώστης is more common in MG.<sup>54</sup>

**δάκνω**

This is an interesting case of a family of compounds whose character is unmistakably literary and artificial and in which the V1 and V2 patterns influence one another. The starting point is θυμοδακής ‘biting the heart’, used in Homer as an epithet of μῦθος. For an analysis of this early active form in -ής see section 4.3.1 below. The existence of ὤμοδακής ‘fiercely gnawing’ in Aeschylus (an attribute of ἕμπος ‘desire’) confirms that the Homeric form is not an oddity.

If we are to trust the extant sources, θυμοδακής served as the model for the coinage of the V1 compound δακέθυμος ‘biting the heart’. This is used by Simonides (fr. 74.5 PMG) to characterize the sweat (ιδρώς) of the man who has reached the peak of manliness and is thus able to see virtue (ἀρετή). In turn, δακέθυμος provides the model for Aeschylus’ δηξίθυμος, based on the s-aorist stem: in Ag. 743 it characterizes a pleasurable sensation, metaphorically described as the ‘flower of desire’ (ἔρωτος ἄνθος), brought to Troy by Helen. The same epithet is found in a rather different context in a fragment describing a fine meal from Sopater’s *Physiologos* (fr. 20 K-A), where it is paired with ὀξάλμη, a sauce made with vinegar and brine.

The only V2 compound with a regular formation, λαθροδέκτης, is difficult to assess. The word is attested only once in Phrynichus’ *Praeparatio sophistica* 87.11 and apparently identifies a type of dog that jumps up at people and bites without barking. Phrynichus condemns the word, preferring the expression λαίθαργος κύων (cf. Aristoph. *Eq.* 1068), the starting point for his discussion.

<sup>54</sup> Anastasiadi-Simeonidi (2002) collects thirty-five forms.



On balance, both the active use of compounds in -ής and the appearance of θυμός in three out of the four Classical compounds derived from δάκνω identify this family as a mostly artificial one. The other V2 compound, λαθροδίκητης, is also characteristic in that the FC provides and adverbial modification of the verbal SC, rather than its argument. In MG both δάκνω and its compounds have died out: the verb has been replaced by δαγκώνω and δαγκάνω, which do not yield compounds.

### διώκω

A neat chronological development is discernible in this family. The V1 pattern is older, although not commonly found in appellatives: διώξιππος ‘driving horses’ is a common epithet in epinician poetry, but later dies out, surviving only as a PN; διωξικέλευθος ‘urging on the way’ is almost a hapax, qualifying κέντρα ‘horse-goats’ in an epigram which has been attributed both to Philodemus (first c. BC) and to Argentarius (fourth c. AD). The chronological precedence of the V1 pattern is further confirmed by the onomastic attestations, which are all from the fifth c. BC onwards.

V2 compounds, on the other hand, first appear in Theocritus, and on the whole are infrequently attested. This may be connected to the fact that the agent noun διώκτης is itself not attested before the *New Testament* and that the verb does not possess other morphological means of creating agent nouns. διώκω is preserved in MG in the form καταδιώκω, which does not yield any compounds.

### ἔραμαι

This family of compounds exhibits another unusual distribution. The V1 pattern is both older and overall more productive than the V2 pattern, although it is mostly specialized in onomastics. The two appellative compounds which display an unequivocal verb-argument structure—ἔρασιμολπος ‘loving song’ and ἔρασιχρήματος ‘loving money’—are both attested in the Classical age. This, together with the chronology of the V2 compounds, is a strong indication that the creation of a compound family from ἔραμαι was mostly a Classical accomplishment. V2 compounds start with παιδεραστής ‘lover of boys’, attested in Aristophanes, the source also of the first attestation of the agent noun ἔραστής. Semantic overlap between the two types is limited to the pair Ἐρασίδημος (beginning of the second century BC) and δημοραστής ‘friend of the people’ (Pl.). A few forms in -εραστής are preserved in MG.

### εὐρίσκω

This family of compounds has a low level of productivity. The V1 pattern is attested earlier and tends to display a FC derived from the future stem εὐρησ- (εὐρησιεπής

‘inventive of poetry’, Pi.). In a much later specimen, εὐρεσίκακος ‘inventive of evil’, attested in the scholia to Euripides’ *Medea*, the FC may be influenced by the action noun εὐρεσις ‘discovery’ (Pl.). Both compounds find parallels in syntactic phrases: see Isocr. *In Call.* 53 ἵνα μὴ μεταθείντο τὸ πρᾶγμα μηδ’ ἑτέρους **λόγους ἐξευρίσκουσιν** ‘in order that they might not change their plans and invent another story’ and Eur. *Herc.* 1177 ἄλλ’ ἄλλο πού τι καινὸν **εὐρίσκω κακόν** ‘some new evil I discover here’.

Since the *simplex* εὐρετής is a common form, attested as early as Plato, it is not clear why V2 compounds are limited to πρωθυρετής ‘first discoverer’, found in the second-century author Nicomachus of Gerasa, and clearly derived from the phrase πρῶτος εὐρετής. Perhaps the low productivity of these compounds is influenced by the fact that the agent noun does not seem to be used to refer to someone engaged in a generic act of finding, but rather to a quite specific person, the inventor of something: see for instance the Isocratean λόγων εὐρετής ‘prose-writer’ (*Evag.* 40), Plato’s οὐτε γὰρ εὐρετής οὐτε μαθητής οὐδενός περὶ τῶν τοιούτων γεγρονέναι (‘For [Socrates says] that he has never been either a discoverer or a learner of any of these things’, *La.* 186e), or D.L. 9.25 φησὶ δ’ Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν τῷ σοφιστῇ εὐρετὴν αὐτὸν γενέσθαι διαλεκτικῆς, ὥσπερ Ἐμπεδοκλέα ῥητορικῆς (‘In the *Sophist* Aristotle says that he [Zeno] is the inventor of dialectic, just as Empedocles [is the inventor] of rhetoric’).

If this is the case, we are faced with a situation similar to the one described in Class II: the agent noun has a low rate of compounding because of its semantic specialization. This hypothesis is perhaps strengthened by the observation that πρωθυρετής is not an argument-verb compound, but rather a specification of εὐρετής.

### θέλω

The four V1 compounds in θελι- are all poetic and cover the period between the fifth century BC and the third century AD. Agentive V2 compounds are limited to πανθέλκτειρα ‘all-charmer’ (Simon.). This low productivity may be connected to the fact that the agent noun θελκτήρ has very few and late attestations (one in the late Homeric *Hymn to Asclepius* and two in Nonnus). The only alternative form, θέλκτωρ, is a hapax, conjectured by Musgrave at Aesch. *Suppl.* 1040 for the *vox nihili* θεακτορι transmitted by codex M. The correction is a likely one in the context of *Suppl.* 1040, where θέλκτωρ would be an epithet of Πειθῶ, yielding the meaning ‘Persuasion the charmer’.

This lack of compounded agent nouns was not compensated for by the existence of other compound types: only two active compounds in -ής develop in Late Antiquity (πανθεληγής ‘charming all’, Nonn., and φρενοθεληγής ‘charming the heart’, Procl.). The low level of overall productivity is consistent with the the fact

that θέλω, a common verb in early Greek texts, is not productive in later Greek, where it remains mostly associated with epic poetry.

### καλέω

V1 and V2 forms are both rare. V1 compounds are late and unproductive: καλεσσίχορος ‘calling to the dance’ is a hapax. V2 formations are older and more numerous, but it is important to note that ὁμοκλητήρ ‘shouter’ (Hom.) is in fact the agent noun of the verb ὁμοκλάω (Hom. ὁμοκλέω ‘shout’), while ψευδοκλητήρ ‘one who falsely subscribes his name as witness to a summons’ (Theopomp.) rather belongs to the category of determinative compounds, since the FC does not function as an argument of the verb. This type is not preserved in MG.

### κάμπτω

Both compound patterns are attested first in the fifth century BC. V1 compounds are slightly more numerous, but they all seem to belong to literary language. καμψίπους ‘bending the foot’, the epithet of the Erinys in Aeschylus *Th.* 791, is a hapax of unclear meaning, as shown by the uncertainty of the scholia *ad loc.*: ἡ κάμπτουσα τῶν κολαζομένων τοὺς πόδας καὶ συμποδίζουσα καὶ μὴ ἔωσα φυγεῖν, ἢ ἡ τοὺς ἑαυτῆς πόδας ἐπικλίνουσα καὶ πρὸς πάντα ἐπερχομένη (‘bending the feet of those who are chased [by her], entangling the feet, not letting [them] run away; or bending her own feet and attacking all’).

This epithet finds a parallel in another hapax, attested in Hesychius in connection with an Erinys: καμπεσίγονος ‘bending the knees’, which may perhaps represent a variant of the Aeschylean form. Another hapax, καμπεσίγιος ‘bending the limbs’ qualifies παίγνια (to be understood as ‘games’, but the context is not clear) in a fragment attributed to Orpheus by Clement of Alexandria and Eusebius. The only non-poetic compound in this group may well be καμψίουρος ‘bending the tail’, which according to Hesychius is an alternative name for the σκίουρος ‘squirrel’ (perhaps a scientific name?).

A number of the V2 compounds too have an artificial character and reflect the association of κάμπτω with musical contexts, in which connection the compounds introduce a negative connotation.<sup>55</sup> The hapax ἄσματοκάμπτης ‘twister of song’ is used by Aristophanes (*Nu.* 333) together with various other compounds to identify the categories of intellectuals ‘fed’ by the Clouds. Similarly, Τιμοθέου Ἴωνοκάμπτης ‘one who sings with soft Ionic modulations’ disparagingly qualifies one of the poet’s rivals. In both Aristoph. *Nu.* 969–971 (εἰ δέ τις αὐτῶν βωμολοχεύσαιτ’ ἢ κάμψειέν τινα καμπήν, οἷας οἱ νῦν, τὰς κατὰ Φρῦνιν ταύτας τὰς δυσκολοκάμπτους ‘but if any of them were to play the buffoon, or to turn any

<sup>55</sup> Taillardat (1965: 457).

quavers, like these difficult turns the present artists make after the manner of Phrynios...’, trsl. W. J. Hickie) and Pherecr. fr. 155.15 K-A κάμπτων με καὶ στρέφων (‘twisting and turning me [Music]’), κάμπτω and its derivations are associated with the citharode Phrynios.<sup>56</sup> A third compound, πιτυοκάμπτης ‘pinebender’, is used in various sources (starting with Strabo) as an epithet of Sinis, who killed travellers by tying them to pinetrees. κάμπτω survives in MG, but yields no compounds.

### κινέω

The only V1 compound derived from this verb is the epithet κινήσιος, which Heyschius uses to gloss the much more common epithet έννοσίγαιος ‘shaking the earth’. The choice of this FC may have been prompted by the frequent use of agent nouns derived from κινέω in reference to Poseidon and it is worth considering the use of these agent nouns in context to corroborate this interpretation. κινήτηρ is attested only three times in Greek, and always as an epithet of the god. κινήτης is equally rare, and is used for the first time by Aristophanes in *Nu.* 1397 in reference to Pheidippides, who is about to state his case:

σὸν ἔργον, ὦ καινῶν ἐπῶν κινήτᾳ καὶ μοχλευτά,  
πειθῶ τινα ζητεῖν, ὅπως δόξεις λέγειν δίκαια  
Your business, mover and upheaver of new words,  
Is to seek some means of persuasion, so that you shall seem to speak justly.

In his commentary on the *Clouds*, Dover (1968: 257–258) notes that μοχλευτής—the other epithet referring to Pheidippides in these lines—occurs earlier in the play as an epithet of Poseidon, who is imagined to cause earthquakes with a lever: in the same way, κινήτης here may allude to Poseidon’s traditional epithet. The allusion perhaps draws attention to the fact that, just as Poseidon moves the earth by invisible means, the techniques which Pheidippides will employ to move words are obscure and impenetrable to the chorus. Given this background, we can speculate that Hesychius’ gloss κινήσιος has its source in hymnic poetry concerned with Poseidon.

There are no attested V1 PNs derived from κινέω, but their existence is guaranteed by the *Kurzname* Κινήσιος, V2 compounds too are limited to one specimen, the late φωτοκινήτης ‘mover of light’, an epithet of the god Helios-Mithras invoked in the magical papyrus containing the so-called ‘Mithras liturgy’ (*PGM* 4.599).<sup>57</sup> This compound is one of a series of forms containing πῦρ or φῶς (see in par-

<sup>56</sup> See Dover (1968: 216).

<sup>57</sup> On this text, see Betz (2003).

ticular φωτός κτίστα ‘light-maker’, πνευματόφως ‘light-breather, φωτοκράτωρ ‘light-master’, αυξησίφως ‘light-increaser’): φωτοκινήτης belonged to an artificial, evocative language, and this explains the form’s rarity. Forms in -κινήτης are attested in MG, but only with preverbs; modern forms in κινήσιο- are not verbal compounds, but compounds of κινήσις, e.g. κινήσιοθεραπεία ‘cinesiotherapy’.

### κοσμέω

This family is unproductive across all its categories. V1 compounds are limited to only two PNs, both post-Classical. Κοσμησίστρατος has transparent semantics (‘one who arranges the army’, see e.g. Hdt. 7.161.3 διακοσμήσαι στρατόν: the use of κοσμέω in a military sense is pervasive) and Κοσμησιάναξ could perhaps mean ‘he who adorns the lord’.

The low productivity of V2 compounds could be linked to the fact that the relevant agent nouns are mostly specialized. The contexts in which κοσμήτωρ ‘commander’ is usually found in Greek literature are restricted to epic poetry and quotations of the common Homeric formula κοσμήτορε λαῶν ‘marshaller of armies’. κοσμητής and κοσμητήρ have been transmitted to us mostly as the names of magistrates at Athens and elsewhere, but in Hesychius κ 3766 κοσμητής· κουρεύς. ένταφιαστής we also find evidence for a meaning connected to the idea of ‘prepare, adorn’ conveyed by the verb in certain contexts: κουρεύς refers to a kind of hairdresser, whereas ένταφιαστής suggests that a κοσμητής could also be in charge of embalming dead bodies in preparation for burial. It is likely that this meaning of κοσμητής arose in Koine Greek, since the two V2 compounds which rely on it—χρυσοκοσμητής ‘decorator with gold’ (Vett. Val.) and τριχοκοσμητής ‘hairdresser’ (Hsch.), both referring to a type of κοσμητής specialized in adorning certain things or using certain adorning techniques—are hapax legomena from a late period. MG has preserved no compounds of this kind.

### κρούω

In spite of the existence of the agent noun κρούστης and of the V2 compound ζυγοκρούστης ‘one who uses a false balance’ (attested only twice), compounds derived from this verb tend to be created according to the V1 pattern. The two existing forms are rare, however. κρουσίλυρης ‘striking the lyre’ is a hapax, one of the many epithets of the Κουρήτες celebrated in the 38th *Orphic hymn*. κρουσίθυρος, the name of a type of flute-song, is recorded in grammatical sources (the attribution to Trypho comes from Athenaeus).

Two other compounds in κρουσι-, κρουσιδημέω ‘cheat the people’ (Aristoph.) and κρουσιμετρέω ‘cheat in measuring’ (Hsch.), retain the semantics of the action noun κρούσις in its meaning ‘attempt to deceive’, attested in Aristoph. *Nu.* 318. A

similar meaning is to be understood in the case the V2 compound ζυγοκρούστης, identifying one who cheats with his balance.

The low productivity of V2 forms may be connected to the fact that the simple agent noun κρούστης seems to have been very rare. It is attested only once, in the fourth-century AD grammarian Dositheus, where it is glossed with *petulcus*, a relatively rare Latin adjective mostly used to describe animals with a tendency to butt.<sup>58</sup> Semantic specialization is perhaps a further reason why the V1 pattern was privileged in this case.

### λαμβάνω

Surprisingly, considering the frequency of λαμβάνω in Greek, there are very few compounds derived from this verb. The lack of V1 forms, with the PN Λαβίππᾶ the sole representative, is all the more striking given that V2 compounds are quite limited as well. Forms in -λήπτης are already attested in Classical Greek (ἐργολήπτης ‘contractor’ in Teleclides, preserved in MG) but are unproductive: the other two forms are δωρολήπτης ‘greedy of gain’ (LXX), which is quite common in Christian authors, and προσωπολήπτης ‘respector of persons’ (NT). This type survives in MG, with forms such as δανειολήπτης ‘someone who takes a loan’ and αιμολήπτης ‘blood-receiver’. The simple agent noun λήπτης ‘catcher’ is only attested in the late lexicon of Zonaras.

Other types of active V2 compounds are similarly limited. Those in -λάβος amount to three forms (this type persists in some MG words), while those in -λαβής are limited to ὄξυλαβής ‘quick at seizing’ (said of the eagle in Aristot. HA) and εὐλαβής which, in the meaning ‘devout’, continues to be used into MG.<sup>59</sup>

### μυμνήσκω

Compounds derived from this verb display a clear preference for the V1 pattern, which is used both in onomastics and in the appellative lexicon. This type emerges very early in Greek, with the PN *ma-na-si-we-ko*, finding an alphabetic Greek counterpart in Μνησίεργος ‘one who is mindful of work’. Some of the PNs have perfectly clear semantics and it may be no chance that they are among the most common names in Greek: see for instance Μνησίθεος ‘one who is mindful

**58** The discussion in Dositheus. 22.5 Bonnet is concerned with nominals which share characteristics with participles. The Latin forms quoted by Dositheus to explain the Greek ones, however, are all characterized by suffixes like *-bundus* and *-ulcus*, which are typical of verbal adjectives (Bonnet 2005: 135). The discussion therefore seems really to be concerned with Greek verbal derivations which acquire a quasi-adjectival meaning, and this may add further support to the hypothesis that κρούστης had acquired a specialized meaning.

**59** For a full analysis of compounds in -λαβής, see Paliuri (2014: 133–134).

of the gods', Μνησίμαχος 'one who remembers the fight' and Μνησίστρατος 'one who is mindful of the army'.<sup>60</sup>

Appellatives are productive only until the end of the Classical age, after which no new forms are coined. As far as productivity is concerned, the most common compound is μνησικάκος 'one who remembers injuries, revengeful', together with the typical verb of Attic oaths and treaties μνησικακέω (usually preceded by a negation: 'I shall not be revengeful ...'); both μνησιπήμων and μνᾱσιστέρφανος are hapax legomena (μνησιπήμων also receives comment in the scholia to Aeschylus).

As noted in section 2.1.5, V2 compounds are based on the noun μνήμων. With the exception of ἱερομνήμων, a form often found in prose texts, these compounds in -μνήμων are not very common. The impression one gains is that μμνήσκω ceased to be a productive source of compounds already in the Classical age.

### ὄλλυμι

The sum total of both V1 and V2 compounds is relatively small, and is confined (unsurprisingly, given the meaning of the verb) to appellative forms. V1 compounds all derive from the aorist stem, which may be altered into the artificial FCs ὠλεσι- or ὄλεσσι- for metrical purposes. Of these forms, only ὠλεσικάρπος 'losing its fruits' (Hom.) enjoys some popularity in later sources: all the remaining compounds are rare.

Each of the three agent nouns derived from the verb features in V2 compounds. Of these, formations in -τηρ and -τωρ are generally rare: ἀνδρολέτειρα 'murderess' is found in Aeschylus and in a lyric *adespota*, παιδολέτειρα and παιδολέτωρ (both 'child-murdering') are used only by Euripides and later by Nonnus, πατρολέτωρ 'parricide' is a hapax, and Γιγαντολέτωρ 'giant-killer' is mostly quoted in order to be contrasted with the more recent form Γιγαντολέτης. The forms in -της are from later periods and never display high productivity; they are not preserved in MG, where ὄλλυμι has been lost.

### ὄρνυμι

This is a special case in that V1 pattern, which has its first attestations in Mycenaean and Homeric Greek (see Chapter 4, sections 7.2 and 8.1), is the only prolific one. This seems to be due to the fact that there are no simple agent nouns derived from ὄρνυμι. Moreover, the connection with the two V2 compounds etymologically linked to this verb, Λαέρτας and Λυκόρτας, was probably obscure to speakers, because of the different vowel displayed in the SC.<sup>61</sup>

<sup>60</sup> On the semantic transparency of Μνησίθεος, see Pl. *Cra.* 394e.

<sup>61</sup> On this alternation, see Chapter 4, section 7.2.

The appellative V1 compounds seem to have been highly poetic formations. They are all hapax legomena (or poetic forms later quoted only in lexicography), with the exception of the accusative ὀρσιγυναίκα, epithet of Dionysos, which has four attestations because it belongs to a lyric *adespoton* quoted in three different works of Plutarch. Semantic overlap between V2 and V1 forms can be observed only in Ὀρσέλαος vs. Λαέρτας. ὄρνημι does not survive into MG.

### πέρθω

The only two compounds derived from this verb are the mirror image of one another and betray a certain degree of artificiality: περσέπτολις (Hes.) and πτολίπορθος (Hom.). Both mean ‘destroying cities’ and enjoy a similar level of popularity in the poetic register, above all hexametric poetry. The FC in πτολίπορθος always appears in its Homeric shape: the more common πολι- is never attested in this compound. The sparsity of compounds could be linked to the fact that the base verb is a poetic formation and rarely used in prose.

This is a convenient place for a note on the name Περσεφόνηια, which already in antiquity was etymologized as deriving from πέρθω. With very few exceptions, this etymology is now rejected.<sup>62</sup> Both the association of the FC with πέρθω and of the SC with θείνω (> -φονος) yield no meaningful sense, and it is now recognized that the original shape of the SC was -φαττα. Janda (2000: 224–250) provides an excellent overview of the alternative etymologies which have been proposed. His suggestion is that the FC originally derived from \**per-* ‘bring back’ and that the SC is connected to the same root which yields Greek φῶς ‘light’: Persephone would thus be ‘she who brings back light’.<sup>63</sup> On the other hand, Wachter (2006: 139–144) and (2007–2008) proposes etymologizing the name as a compound of \**persó-* ‘leek’ and \**g<sup>wh</sup>en-* ‘hit’. He interprets Persephone as ‘the threshing maiden’, someone who helps to beat the sheaves: an appropriate name for the daughter of the goddess of crops.

### πήγνυμι

The first attested compound derived from this verb is the Homeric epithet πηγεσίμαλλος, whose FC, however, does not have a governing function (‘compressing fleece’) but rather works as an adjective: ‘having thick, compressed fleece’.<sup>64</sup> πηγεσίμαλλος, as suggested by Knecht (1946: 29), probably serves as a substitute for \*πηγόμαλλος (< πηγός ‘solid’), whose cretic shape prevents its

<sup>62</sup> Exceptions include Bader (1974) and Bader (1989: 38).

<sup>63</sup> ‘Die den (immer wieder) Glänzenden [= die Sonne] hinüberbringt’: see in particular Janda (2002: 244–248, 301).

<sup>64</sup> See Clemm (1867: 30 n. 75), Knecht (1946: 29).



inclusion in the hexameter. The only other compound is the apparent epithet *πηξιθάλαττα* ‘she that freezes the sea’, transmitted by the lexicographer Phrynichus and edited as the comic *adespoton* 655 K-A; its FC is formed with the stem of the sigmatic tense of *πήγνυμι*. It is not really possible to speak of ‘competition’ between the V1 and V2 compounds: the only productive pattern of active compounds are those in *-πηγός*, which emerge in Homer and continue in post-Classical Greek. Probably under the influence of these compounds in *-πηγός*, the old passive type in *-παγής* develops a few late active forms: *γυιοπαγής* ‘stiffening the limbs’ (Antip.), *ἰχθυπαγής* ‘piercing fish’ (Theaet.) and *ναυπηγής* ‘ship-building’ (Man.).

### πλήσσω

The compounds derived from this verb amount to a mere four forms. The two older forms are both compounded with words indicating animals: *πλήξιππος* ‘striking horses, inciting horses’ is a common epithet of heroes in poetry and as such is also used as a PN; *βουπλήξ*, one of the few root compounds to hold their ground in Greek, identifies the ox-goad or an axe for felling an ox.

The third item, Hesychius’ *hapax* *ἰσχυροπλήκτης* ‘wounding severely’, corresponds to the agent noun *πλήκτης* ‘striker’: its FC expresses a modification of the head and the structure is very close to that of determinative compounds. *ἰσχυροπλήκτης* is the *interpretamentum* of another form in *-πλήκτης*, *διοπλήκτᾶν* (δ 1897): its [a:] and accusative ending suggest that it was taken from a poetic text in Doric or Aeolic. Its meaning (not glossed in *LSJ*) may be similar to that exemplified in certain passive compounds derived from *πλήσσω* which are attested in late sources and compounded with *θεός*: *θεοπλήξ* (Hsch.) and *θεόπλάκτος*, both meaning ‘stricken by god’: perhaps it meant ‘one who strikes the gods’ (and thus ‘wounding severely’?). Active compounds in *-πληγής* (e.g. *φρενοπληγής* ‘striking the mind’, Aesch.) are sporadic.

While the lack of other active forms in *-πλήξ* is probably due to the fact that root compounds were a moribund type already in Archaic Greek, it is open to speculation why V1 compounds in *πληξι-* did not continue into Classical Greek. Part of the reason is perhaps discernible in the fact that the active voice of *πλήσσω* is very much confined to early Greek. *LSJ* s.v. notes that the present is not used by Attic authors, who prefer the synonyms *παίω* and *τύπτω*; an entry on *πλήσσω* is altogether lacking in Sophocles (1914).

### πράσσω

The group of compounds derived from *πράσσω* belongs among the less productive families on account of two facts: the onomastic specialization of the V1 compounds and the low number of attestations of V2 compounds. Some of the V1 PNs

display meaningful combinations of constituents, for instance Πραξιτέλης ‘one who achieves his goal’ or ‘one who exacts taxes’ and Πραξιδική ‘she who exacts penalties’. However, the popularity of these names was no doubt reinforced by the frequency of the action noun πράξις, which had a wide range of applications and was particularly common in the language of commerce.

The low number of compounded agent nouns (amounting to the hapax legomena παντοπράκτης ‘ready to do anything’ and the dubious λογοπράκτωρ) may be connected to the nature of the relevant agent nouns. πρηκτήρ and πρακτήρ are mostly used by authors who quote Homer’s line μύθων τε ῥητῆρ’ ἔμειναι πρηκτῆρά τε ἔργων ‘to be a speaker of words and a doer of things’ (*Il.* 9.443). Their status as rare words which, it may have been felt, needed to be actively preserved in learned Greek is confirmed by the fact that Pollux twice quotes πρακτήρ in his *Onomasticon* (5.103 and 8.114), at one point while informing his readers that it was used as the name of an official. πράκτωρ, attested down to Late Antiquity, oscillates between the general meaning ‘doer’ (as in its first attestation in *Soph. Tr.* 251), which is more long-lived, and the specialized meaning ‘official who executes a judgment for debt’, attested in Attic orators and inscriptions and recalled by Pollux 114 πράκτης in the general meaning of ‘doer’ is found exclusively in lexicographical sources, but in its Ionic form πρήκτης is perhaps attested in the Hippocratic *Epistulae* with the meaning ‘treacherous person’ (see too Hesychius’ *interpretamentum* of πράκτης as τολμητής ‘bold person’).<sup>65</sup>

The sparsity of the agentive type seems to have encouraged the late development of a small group of active compounds in -πράγης, starting in the second c. AD (δυσπράγης ‘faring ill’, *Vett. Val.*); for their analysis, see section 4. In MG πράσσω has been lost and the only V2 compound is the Neoclassical formation χειροπράκτης ‘chiropractor’.

### ράπτω

This is another case where competition between V1 and V2 forms is lacking. V1 compounds derived from ῥάπτω are all appellative and amount to ῥαψωδός and its derivations: they obviously have many attestations in Greek, but the compound type itself is not productive. The predominance of V2 forms is evident from the fact that there are three separate subgroups: one in -ρραφος, which starts with μηχανορράφος, literally ‘stitching together crafty plans’ (*Soph.*); a less common one in -ρράπτης, which corresponds to the rare agent noun ῥάπττης

<sup>65</sup> The nominative plural πρήκται is read in most of the manuscripts transmitting the shorter version of Hippocrates’ 19th epistle (l. 8), whereas codex D (followed in Littré’s edition) reads πλήκται. πρήκτης is also read twice in the longer version of the epistle (section 43) transmitted by Cod. Urbinas 68: see Diels (1918: 67, 76).

‘clothes-mender’ (Philox.); and a mostly passive one in -ρραφής, which includes two active forms (see section 4.2.2).

ράβω is the standard form of the verb in MG, while ράπτω is a very high-sounding archaic word and the same applies to its compounds ελληνοράφτης ‘tailor who makes traditional Greek clothes’ and φραγκοράφτης ‘tailor who makes Western-style clothes’. Compounds in -ράφτης have therefore ceased to be productive because of pragmatics.<sup>66</sup>

### σειώ

With compounds derived from this verb we witness the opposite state of affairs to that just described in respect of ράπτω: only the V1 type has some level of productivity, whereas V2 compounds would be altogether lacking (thus making σειώ a member of Group II) were it not for the late attestation of πυργοσειστής ‘tower-shaker’, the name of a war engine, found in the anonymous lexicon *Περὶ τῶν τεσσάρων μερῶν τοῦ τελείου λόγου*. Its other occurrences are in the twelfth-century author Constantinus Manasses, a fact which suggests that the compound was probably coined in Medieval Greek. As noted in section 2.1.4, the simple agent noun σειστής is a late-antique form identifying a kind of earthquake.

V1 compounds, although amounting to four forms, are widely distributed. σεισίχθων ‘shaking the earth’ (Pi.) is one of Poseidon’s traditional epithets and enjoys continuous popularity in poetry and beyond. σεισάχθεια, the name of Solon’s measures for the relief of private and public debt, has the status of a technical term and is often quoted in the context of Athenian political discourse. The PNs Σεισίλοχος ‘Shakespeare’ and Σεισίππος ‘one who shakes horses’ may have their origin in a military context, though clear parallels are not attested.

### στέλλω

This is another compound family where only one of the two types is a productive means of word formation, and this time it is the existence of the PN Στελλανδρίδης side by side with V2 compounds which places the family as a whole in Group IV. The meaning of this PN may reflect the phrase attested in *Il.* 4.294 ἐτάρους στέλλοντα καὶ ὀτρύνοντα μάχεσθαι ‘preparing his comrades and urging them to fight’.<sup>67</sup> The common compounds derived from στέλλω are those in -στολος. As noted in the Corpus, many can still be seen to betray their bahuvrihi origin, but some of the later forms have a clearer agentive structure (e.g. νεκροστόλος ‘ferrying the dead’, Antip. Thess.). This agentive type, however, is generally late.

<sup>66</sup> Io Manolessou, p.c.

<sup>67</sup> The gloss Hsch. σ 1725 στελλάνδρα· ἡ κόρη probably represents a relic from a text in which Στελλάνδρα was a girl’s name, so that the *interpretamentum* would simply be referring to this.

### τελέω

Compounds derived from this verb are included among the less common families, despite the popularity of the V1 PNs, due to the lack of V1 appellatives and the fact that there is only one V2 compound, βουτελέστης, glossed with θύτης ‘sacrificer’ in Hesychius. To begin with this last form, we should note that it is not clear whether the SC -τελέστης simply conveys the verbal idea of ‘to finish off, to kill’, so that the compound indicates any person performing a sacrifice; or whether the FC acquires the specialization evidenced by many attestations of the simple agent nouns τελέστης and τελετής ‘priest, initiator’, so that the compound refers to a particular kind of priest connected with the Eleusinian mysteries. As noted in the Corpus, τελέω does not even develop a productive type of active compounds in -τελής: the only form which can be interpreted as such is καρποτελής ‘bringing fruit to perfection’, attested in Aeschylus.

PNs are quite common, as already mentioned, to a large extent because the availability of two different FCs allows the duplication of certain patterns (these have been noted in the Corpus whenever possible). The database in the *LGPN* registers ninety forms beginning with Τελε-: of these, thirty-two have the FC Τελεσι- (in both cases the final number includes various *Kurznamen* and compounds which are not listed in the Corpus).<sup>68</sup> Given the semantic range of τελέω and the lack of appellatives, whose meaning we could expect to be transparent, it is not easy to interpret the semantics of these names. In certain cases the stems Τελε- or Τελεσι- may allude to the Eleusinian mysteries, which gained popularity at the end of the fifth century BC, the precise period in which most of these PNs begin to appear.<sup>69</sup> However, the assortment of SCs displayed by these names is closely similar to what we find in the case of other common V1 families of PNs, so that even if a mystic allusion were contained in some of these forms, it would be confined to the FC only and not concern the meaning of the whole compound.

### τέμνω

In this case it is not possible to speak of genuine ‘competition’, as the V1 type is attested only once in the Homeric adjective ταμείχρως ‘cutting the skin’, whose FC is, from a synchronic point of view, based on the stem of the thematic aorist

<sup>68</sup> <http://www.lgpn.ox.ac.uk/database/lgpn.php>, last accessed 01.12.14.

<sup>69</sup> For terminology connected to the mysteries and τελέω, see the monograph by Riedweg (1987). The semantic sphere of τελέω has evolved with the passing of time: see the comprehensive entry in *DEG s.v. τέλος* and Waanders (1983).

ἔταμον.<sup>70</sup> This compound is found in other, mostly poetic, texts down to Nonnus, who makes great use of it.

V2 compounds in -τομος, on the other hand, constitute one of the most productive categories of V2 compounds in Greek. They go back to Mycenaean, which has two occupational terms ending in *-tomos*, and are used both as adjectives and as nouns. Nouns indicating professions are particularly common and some are still preserved in MG (e.g. υλοτόμος ‘tree-feller’), where τέμνω ‘cut, pass through’ is also used.<sup>71</sup>

### τιμάω

This is a compound family in which only the V1 pattern is productive, though it is attested solely in onomastics. PNs display the FC Τιμησι-, based on the sigmatic tenses; a number of compounds in Τιμο- and Τιμα- may also have a verbal origin and have been included in the Corpus. Among the potentially meaningful PNs, see Τιμησαρέτη ‘one who values virtue’, Τιμησίδικος ‘one who values justice’ and Τιμησίθεος ‘one who honours the gods’.

The fact that V2 compounds amount to a single form can be ascribed to two factors. The first is the specialization of the two nomina agentis τιμητής and τιμητήρ, which both indicate officials who were in charge of assessing properties or taxes. The late compound στιπποτιμητής ‘tow-valuer’ (fourth century BC) retains this meaning and represents a specialization of τιμητής.

The second factor is the existence of compounds in -τιμος which started off as bahuvrihis containing τιμή ‘value’ (e.g. ἄτιμος ‘dishonoured’ or βούτιμος ‘worth an ox’) but soon acquired the semantics of verbal compounds: see e.g. ξενότιμος ‘honouring strangers’ (Aesch.). This type follows the same development as other nominal compounds which acquire the semantics of the associated denominative verb (type ἀνάσσω : ἄναξ); these compounds will be analysed in section 5. However, compounds in -τιμος that have a clear active meaning and cannot be interpreted as bahuvrihis are not common: the type remains marginal.

<sup>70</sup> According to some scholars, ταμ- was the original stem of the present, later replaced in most of Greek by a new e-grade stem based on the old root aorist: for this view, see Wackernagel (1916: 14), Forssman (1966), *DEG s.v.* τέμνω. Beekes (1969 : 222), by contrast, considers τεμ- the regular phonetic outcome of the zero-grade thematic aorist, later replaced by the analogical ἔταμον. *Contra*, see Hardarson (1993: 161), according to whom τάμνω is analogical on ἔταμον; he is now followed by Beekes in *EDG*.

<sup>71</sup> A full list, adding up to forty-one items, is provided by Anastasiadi-Simeonidi (2002: 466).

### τλῆναι

Compounds derived from the root which produces the root aorist τλῆναι and, secondarily, the present τολάω are included in this group because they represent a mostly poetic and not particularly productive category, and this despite the fact that a relatively high number of different formations contribute to their creation. As noted in the Corpus, the abundance of FCs (τλη-, ταλα-, ταλαι-, τλησι-) can be explained with reference to the interference of other morphological patterns, particularly adjectives in the case of ταλα- (τάλας) and ταλαι- (τάλαινα).

In general, the whole compound family seems to have been characterized by a high degree of artificiality: the FC τλησι- is the only one whose shape can be explained according to one of the productive V1 patterns, although there is no sigmatic verbal form to which it can be connected. τλη- does not end with any linking element but employs the bare root and this, as tentatively suggested in Chapter 4, section 3, may even be considered the original state of affairs for compounds based on bare roots.

V2 compounds derived from τλῆναι are not formed with the suffixes -της, -τηρ and -τωρ. Verbal semantics is conveyed by the compounds of τλήμων ‘patient’ (< ‘bearing’) and τάλας ‘wretched’ (< ‘suffering’), as well as by Ἄτλας and πολύτλας. However, the fact that none of these forms is compounded with a substantival FC calls into question their status as verbal compounds: forms in -τλήμων and -τάλας could also be interpreted as adjectival determinative compounds (which tend to display adverbial or adjectival FCs: see Chapter 2, section 4.6), while the two forms in -τλας comply with the formation patterns of compounded participles, which mostly employ prepositional and adverbial FCs (substantival FCs are really limited to PNs: see Chapter 2, section 6.6).<sup>72</sup>

### τρέφω

This is another compound family in which the V2 orientation is ancient and clearly predominant. The earliest form is κουροτρόφος ‘rearing children’, a common epithet of lands and cities, which we have often used for illustrative purposes when discussing the category of active V2 CoC-os compounds. In this case, the existence of the agent noun τροφός ‘nurse’ may have been a factor in making the type productive at all chronological stages. τρέφω, τροφός and compounds in τρόφος survive into MG.

Rather surprisingly, given the semantics of the verb, V1 forms are limited to the PN Τρεφέλεως, the mirror image of λαοτρόφος ‘nourishing the people’ attested in Pindar. Here, then, the popularity of the V2 pattern forestalled the development of the other type.

<sup>72</sup> Risch (1974: 211).

### τρέχω

Because of the intransitive semantics of this verb, it is not common to find compounds of either the V1 or V2 type in which the other compound constituent functions as an argument of the verbal constituent. Only the V1 compound *τρέχδειπνος* ‘running to dinner’ (Posidipp.) has such a structure. This compound, used to describe the attitude of the typical parasite who is ready to accept any invitation to dinner, has a good number of attestations in post-Classical texts.

V2 compounds derived either from *τρέχω* or the suppletive root *δραμ-/δρομ-* in which the FC is a noun are rare. Again, this is probably the result of the intransitive semantics of the verb. Among the forms with a substantival FC collected in the Corpus, *άλίτροχος* ‘running through the sea’, attributed to Ibycus, is in fact only discussed in grammatical sources in connection with its declension pattern; *αίθεροδρόμος* ‘ether-skimming’ is not used in AG after its first attestation in Aristophanes and only resurfaces in late Byzantine authors; only *δολιχοδρόμος* ‘running the *δόλιχος* (long race)’ is a frequent form in Classical Greek. In MG, some forms in *-δρόμος* have active verbal semantics, e.g. *πεζόδρομος* ‘walker’, but in most cases their SC is the noun *δρόμος* ‘route’.

### φεύγω

This compound family is peculiar in many respects. V1 compounds are by far the most common, given that the V2 pattern is limited to the late *ὀψίφυγος* ‘fleeing late’.<sup>73</sup> Apart from two onomastic specimens (*Φυγοστρατίδης* and *Φευγόλιμος*), both semantically transparent, all V1 compounds are appellatives. In most cases the FC is derived from the aorist stem *φυγ-* and followed by the linking vowel *-ο-* rather than by the common *-ε-*.<sup>74</sup> The full-grade root (used to form the thematic radical present) is attested only in the late *φεύγυδρος* ‘shunning water’ (Polybos) and in *Φευγόλιμος* (fourth c. BC). In a few other forms *-σι-* is artificially attached to this aorist stem, e.g. *φυξίμηλον* (Aesch.), *φυξήλιος* (Nic.), and *φυξίπολις* (Opp.). These rarer FCs, which no doubt are also influenced by the action noun *φύξις* ‘flight, refuge’, have disappeared already in Byzantine Greek; the only FC preserved in MG is *φυγο-*.<sup>75</sup>

<sup>73</sup> Technical terms such as the Italian *ignifugo* ‘fire-resistant’ are Neoclassical formations that have no basis in either AG or Classical Latin. In MG, only *κεντρόφυγος* ‘centrifugal’ is attested.

<sup>74</sup> On the hypothesis that this linking vowel is analogical on substantival FCs, see Chapter 4, section 3.1.

<sup>75</sup> See the common *φυγοδικία* ‘default’, *φυγόκεντρος* ‘centrifugal’, *φυγομαχία* ‘avoiding a fight’ *φυγόποινος* ‘fugitive’, *φυγόπονος* ‘lazy’, *φυγοπόλεμος* ‘deserter’, *φυγοστρατός* ‘draft dodger’.

The productivity of the individual forms collected in the Corpus is not high, however. φυγοπτόλεμος ‘escaping war’ remains a Homeric adjective (it is later found in Herodian and Quintus Smyrnaeus); attestations of φυγόμαχος ‘escaping battle’ end with Stobaeus; φυγόξενος ‘shunning strangers’ is a Pindaric hapax (later only found in the scholia); φυξίμηλον ‘avoiding cattle’ is a rare form attributed to Aeschylus and discussed also by Plutarch; φυξανορία ‘aversion to men’, perhaps to be read in Aesch. *Supp.* 8, is a hapax; φυγαίχμης ‘fleeing from the spear’ is a learned term, after Aeschylus used by Callimachus and discussed in lexicographical sources; after appearing in Demosthenes, φυγοδικέω ‘shirk a trial’ is discussed by Pollux and surfaces again only in late-antique authors; φυξήλιος ‘shunning the sun’ is found only in Nicander, Porphyrius and Hesychius. The later Greek forms φυγόπονος ‘shunning work’, φυξίπολις ‘fleeing the city’ and φυγόλεκτρος ‘shunning the marriage-bed’ are all hapax legomena in AG (they may be discussed in the scholia or resurface in later Byzantine authors, but are generally unproductive). The V1 pattern thus emerges as a poetic or learned type in AG: it is only thanks to the preserving influence of linguistic purism that forms such as φυγοδικία or φυγόστρατος survive in MG.

### φθείρω

In this family the V2 orientation is the more common: it emerges in Theognis and remains productive well into Byzantine times, as is testified by forms such as θανατοφθόρος ‘destroying death’, used by the patriarch Germanus I, or φλογοφθόρος ‘extinguishing fire’, attested in the twelfth-century author Nicetas Eugenianus. φθείρω is still used in MG, but its phonology (with the cluster φθ being preserved and not turned into φτ, as is normally the case in standard language) betrays its learned status. Its compounds are not numerous, with ψυχοφθόρος [mind destroy] ‘harrowing, extremely distressing’ the only common form. The only ancient V1 compound, φθερσιγενής ‘destroying the race’, is almost a hapax, only found in the scholia outside its first attestation in Aeschylus. It is not clear why φθείρω creates no onomastic compounds.

### φράζω

In this family V1 compounds are associated with onomastics. PNs in φρασι- emerge at the end of the sixth century BC with Φρασίκλεια; it is hard to attribute precise semantics to most of these onomastic forms (could Φρασίδημος mean ‘one who speaks to/among the people?’). The low productivity of this verb in compounding is also demonstrated by the lack of V2 compounds, which only seem to appear for the first time with Agathias’ learned σκινδαλαμοφράστης, indicating a person who splits hairs over something. φράζω survives into MG, where, however, the only forms in -φραστής are preverbed agent nouns (e.g. μεταφραστής ‘translator’).



## φύω

Overall, φύω is not as common a verb in compounding as its meaning would perhaps lead one to expect. The V1 pattern, although already used in Homeric Greek (φυσίζοος ‘producing life’), is later not exploited at all. V2 compounds are also rare and their lack of productivity is shown by the fact that in πτεροφύτωρ ‘feather-producing’ (Pl.) and ἀμπελοφύτωρ ‘wine-planter’ (Leon.) the SC keeps the -τωρ suffix. The competing -ής type (e.g. πτεροφυής ‘growing feathers or wings’, Pl.) also never becomes a common pattern.

### 3.2.1 Summary of characteristics

The forty-one compound families analysed above have been included in this subgroup either because one of the two patterns is unproductive, or because attestations of both types are low. The first trend that we can observe is that V1 compounds are predominantly onomastic, while V2 forms are predominantly appellative. This trend is so predictable that it might well serve as a rule. The families in which a clear subdivision is particularly evident are those derived from ἀρτύω, διώκω, ἔραμαι, κοσμέω, λαμβάνω, μιμνήσκω, πράσσω, τελέω, τιμάω, τρέφω and φράζω. This distribution agrees with what was observed for some of the seventeen families of the first group (see section 3.1.1).

In general, however, individual types of V2 compounds are not very numerous. The only productive types are those derived from βόσκω, πήγνυμι, ράπτω, στέλλω, τέμνω, τρέφω and φθείρω: note that, βόσκω aside, these are all V2 compounds with SCs ending in -ος. This confirms that the V2 pattern is not the predominant type by default, but tends to be so only in association with a well-defined morphological structure. In contrast to these common V2 forms, the corresponding V1 compounds show a clear tendency to be rare, highly poetic or artificial (see βωτιάνειρα, πηγεσίμαλλος, ταμεισίχρω, φθερσιγενής), limited to one item (ῥαψωδός), or specialized as PNs (see στέλλω, τρέφω).

The remaining V2 types prove to be mostly rare forms. Some are associated with markedly poetic language: see those derived from ἀγείρω, κάμπτω, μιμνήσκω, ὄλλυμι, πέρθω, πλήσσω, τλήναι, τρέχω and φύω. Of these, only V2 compounds derived from πέρθω and τρέχω are compounds of the CoC-os type. Others have late first attestations and tend to remain isolated: see the compounds derived from γιγνώσκω, δάκνω, εὐρίσκω, κινέω, κοσμέω, κρούω, λαμβάνω, πράσσω, σείω, τελέω, τιμάω, φεύγω and φράζω. These are all forms in -της, except for those derived from φεύγω. V2 compounds derived from ἀραρίσκω are unproductive because of their morphological opacity, while those derived from ἀκούω and καλέω are semantic specializations of the *simplicia* (thus, a kind of determinative compound) and remain rare. This perhaps adds further support to

what we observed in section 2.2, namely that V1 compounds may provide stronger competition to V2 compounds in *-της*, since these tend to develop later and more slowly than V2 compounds in *-ος*. Another factor which probably comes into play is the fact that *-της* compounds are exclusively nouns, while V1 compounds are prototypically adjectives and hence afford a higher grammatical flexibility.

If we now focus on the V1 compounds corresponding to the rare V2 compounds we have just reviewed, it emerges that the forms which, to an extent, fill in for unproductive V2 compounds are those derived from *εύρίσκω*, *θέλω*, *μυμήσκω*, *σείω* and *φεύγω*. In all other cases, we are faced with isolated V1 formations corresponding to isolated V2 formations. These include compounds derived from *ἀραρίσκω*, *καλέω*, *κινέω*, *κρούω*, *πέρθω*, *πήγνυμι*, *τλήναι*, *τρέχω* and *φύω*. There also is a high number of typically poetic forms (see the V1 compounds derived from *δάκνω*, *κάμπτω*, *ἄλλυμι*, *ὄρνυμι* and *τελέω*), while others are clearly artificial (see under *ἀγείρω*, *ἀκούω* and *πήγνυμι*).

Let us now summarize these results. The low productivity of the compounds in these families was of course to be expected, since that was the criterion on the basis of which they were assigned to this subgroup. It is rather more surprising to discover that in parallel with rare V1 compounds we generally also find rare V2 compounds. This means that productivity cannot be assessed solely on the basis of theoretical models (such as one which predicts that Greek will always prefer the V2 orientation), but must be tested against a comprehensive study of all attestations. When this is carried out in earnest, it becomes evident that the behaviour of compounds is very often related to the productivity of the relevant verb, its use in a certain type of text (e.g. *κάμπτω* in musical terminology) or chronological period (e.g. compounds in *-κοσμητής*), and semantic restrictions (as noted e.g. for *καλέω* and *τρέχω*, or for the agent nouns derived from *πράσσω*). What the analysis in this section has contributed, therefore, is a new method of approach that can help to correct the simplistic view of V1 compounds as an exclusively marginal type in contrast to the invariably productive V2 type.

#### 4 V1 compounds and deverbative compounds in *-ής*

So far we have mostly focused on the interaction of V1 compounds with V2 compounds in *-ος*, *-της*, *-τηρ* and *-τωρ*: these are the most productive categories of active verbal compounds and often represent exact counterparts of V1 forms. In passing, we have also noted the development of a few active compounds in *-ής* (see *δάκνω*, *ράπτω*, *λαμβάνω*). In all these cases, the active compounds do not provide productive counterparts to V1 compounds or other types of V2 formations, but mostly add a later and usually uncommon alternative (also see section 4.2.2).

There exists, however, a group of seventeen verbs for which active -ής compounds are the only productive V2 pattern, and the creation of these compounds must be investigated, first, in view of the general development of verbal -ής compounds in Greek and, secondly, by taking into consideration the behaviour of the base verbs with respect to the creation of agent nouns and V1 compounds. Since deverbative compounds in -ής seem originally to have been limited to the expression of passive or stative-intransitive semantics, we will first review the initial development of this type in order to see how the earlier passive examples opened the way for the later growth of active formations. This background knowledge will prove useful when it comes to assessing the role of the new -ής active compounds within the system of verbal compounds, and particularly their interaction with V1 compounds.

#### 4.1 Verbal -ής compounds: a brief history

The early development of verbal -ής compounds in Greek has recently been studied by Meissner (2006) from a comparative point of view. While non-verbal compounds in -ής originate as adjectives derived from neuter stems in \*-es/-os (e.g. *δυσμενής* 'evil-minded' from *μένος* 'mind') and have parallels in other IE languages, those derived from verbal stems are an exclusively Greek innovation (see too Chapter 2, section 6.2).<sup>76</sup> The hypothesis that these verbal compounds too derive from neuter nouns is an inconvenient one, since, as more than one scholar has pointed out, it forces linguists to reconstruct a large number of unattested nouns.<sup>77</sup>

While in the past these verbal compounds were considered to be exceptions to the so-called 'Caland system', scholars are now more open to the idea that they may have originated within that system, despite later developing independently. Risch (1974: 81) suggested that the trigger was the semantic reanalysis of a few 'Caland' bahuvrihis into verbal compounds (e.g. *διογενής* 'having divine origin' > *ἐκ Διὸς γενέσθαι* > 'born from Zeus'), which eventually led to new forms being created in the absence of an already existing bahuvrihi.

However, this semantic factor, while certainly at play, was probably not enough to initiate a linguistic phenomenon of such large proportions. Other factors, of a morpho-phonological kind, must also have played a role. A large number of early forms correspond to passive aorists in -η- (e.g. *ἀγής* 'unbroken': *ἔαγην* 'I am broken'), and at times also to sigmatic aorists in -ησ- (which in

<sup>76</sup> Meissner (2006: 161–166).

<sup>77</sup> Meissner (2006: 163, 186–187), with earlier bibliography.

Greek often take the place of old statives in  $*\bar{e}- < *eh_1-$ ),<sup>78</sup> as well as a few perfect stems containing  $-\eta-$ .<sup>79</sup> Attempts have been made to connect this stative suffix to the Caland system:<sup>80</sup> this would have the consequence of situating the origin of deverbal  $-\eta\varsigma$  compounds in an earlier period than previously thought.

In early Greek there is a clear morphological and semantic correlation between  $-\eta\varsigma$  compounds and passive or intransitive aorists in  $-\eta-$ , which may well have constituted the original core of the category. However, in Mycenaean and Homeric Greek some  $-\eta\varsigma$  compounds are derived from other verbal formations as well, a fact which shows that the derivational process must have been perturbed already at an early stage. The Mycenaean two-word sequence *ke-re-si-jo we-ke* is likely to represent the compound /krēsio-wergēs/ ‘Cretan-made’: this would therefore derive from the e-grade of the root  $*werg-$ , a root which otherwise creates passive and active compounds derived from the o-grade (see the analysis in section 3.1 above).

A similar case is represented by verbal compounds derived from  $\tau\rho\acute{\epsilon}\phi\omega$ : side by side with the numerous active and passive compounds in CoC-ος (κουροτρόφος and ὄρεσίτροφος) and the passive compounds in  $-\tau\rho\alpha\phi\acute{\eta}\varsigma$ , an alternative passive type in  $-\tau\rho\epsilon\phi\acute{\eta}\varsigma$  is found already in Homeric Greek (Διοτρεφής ‘fostered by Zeus’). This is later followed by a handful of *active* compounds (e.g.  $\mu\epsilon\lambda\omicron\tau\rho\epsilon\phi\acute{\eta}\varsigma$  ‘breeding marrow’, Timoth.). In this case, the compounds are neither based on the passive aorist (ἐτράφην) nor on an aorist in  $-\eta\sigma-$ : they simply develop on the basis of analogy. Since these active compounds are already attested in Homer, where there are other passive compounds in  $-\tau\rho\epsilon\phi\acute{\eta}\varsigma$ , the influence of the analogy must have come into effect early on.<sup>81</sup>

Another derivational path links  $-\acute{\epsilon}\omega$  verbs to compounds in  $-\eta\varsigma$ .  $\phi\iota\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omega$  is a good example: there is no neuter noun in  $-\omicron\sigma-/-\epsilon\sigma-$ , but s-stem compounds in  $-\phi\iota\lambda\acute{\eta}\varsigma$  are nevertheless attested, and this shows that they must derive directly from the denominative. These compounds are mostly passive (e.g.  $\delta\upsilon\sigma\phi\iota\lambda\acute{\eta}\varsigma$  ‘hard to love’ and  $\acute{\epsilon}\upsilon\phi\iota\lambda\acute{\eta}\varsigma$  ‘well-loved’, both Aesch.), but active forms are also attested: see  $\gamma\upsilon\nu\alpha\iota\kappa\omicron\phi\iota\lambda\acute{\eta}\varsigma$  ‘woman-loving’ in Polyzelus and  $\mu\omicron\upsilon\sigma\omicron\phi\iota\lambda\acute{\eta}\varsigma$  ‘lover of the Muses’ in Philodemus.

Early forms in  $-\eta\varsigma$  are therefore mostly passive, but in the course of its chronological development the category assumes a variety of functions, and in the large semantic spectrum which it covers the categories of passivity and, more

<sup>78</sup> Meissner (2006: 191) calls these verbs ‘Tucker statives’, drawing on the study of  $-\acute{\epsilon}\omega$  verbs by Tucker (1990).

<sup>79</sup> Meissner (2006: 188–191, 196).

<sup>80</sup> Jasanoff (2002–2003: 143–165).

<sup>81</sup> Meissner (2006: 92), Paliuri (2014: 62–65).

importantly, intransitivity play a fundamental role.<sup>82</sup> This semantic specialization explains why the type in -ής quickly gained immense productivity, as it conveniently filled several gaps in the system of Greek verbal compounds. Greek had inherited only one type of passive verbal compound from PIE, that of compounded verbal adjectives in \*-tos. As we have seen (Chapter 2, section 6.7), this type was already quite productive in Mycenaean and early Greek, but, crucially, it seems to have predominantly selected particles or prepositions as its FCs (e.g. ἄελπτος ‘unhoped for’, κασίγνητος ‘brother’ lit. ‘born together’), with the use of nominal FCs gaining ground only in the Classical period. Passive adjectives in -ής afforded a higher flexibility, as there was no restriction on their being compounded with nominal FCs.

Moreover, forms in -ής were more versatile than passive compounds of the ὀρεσίτροφος type, another Greek innovation which probably arose through the semantic reanalysis of bahuvrihis (Chapter 2, section 5.2). In spite of their productivity, ὀρεσίτροφος compounds introduced another kind of inconvenience, namely the fact they could only be formed from ablauting verbal roots. In the light of these difficulties associated with the derivation of passive compounds, the quick spread of -ής formations becomes more understandable.<sup>83</sup> At the same time, because of their connection with the ‘stative’ -η- aorist, -ής compounds filled a gap left open by prior categories of active compounds by introducing a type mostly associated with intransitivity.

The next stage in the development of -ής deverbative adjectives is their acquisition of active semantics, a process which seems to involve stages of increasing transitivity. However, while there exist exclusively passive or intransitive families, no exclusively transitive one is to be found: this shows that the development of a transitive meaning is a secondary stage in the evolution of the category, a fact consistent with the hypothesis that -ής compounds originated and evolved to provide a morphologically flexible passive and intransitive type.<sup>84</sup>

Our first examples of active compounds in Homeric Greek have, overwhelmingly, intransitive or stative semantics (e.g. εὐρρεής ‘well-flowing’, ἐριθηλής ‘very-flourishing’), while θυμοδακίς ‘soul-biting’ is the only transitive compound proper to be found.<sup>85</sup> The development seems to have been prompted by seman-

<sup>82</sup> See Paliuri (2014: 183–190), who refines the conclusions reached by Meissner (2006) on the basis of the early evidence only.

<sup>83</sup> See Meissner (2006: 194), who also points out that passive -ος compounds with a FC functioning as the agent of the passive action are unattested in Homer. This might have further reinforced the need for a more versatile type of passive formation.

<sup>84</sup> See Paliuri (2014: 184–185), who situates the active-transitive compounds at the periphery of the category.

<sup>85</sup> Meissner (2006: 193–194).

tic reanalysis of bahuvrihis in -ής, since there is a clear correspondence between the early examples with an active meaning and the existence of neuter nouns in -οσ-/εσ-, while, according to Meissner (2006: 194), transitive forms are ‘largely restricted to verbs whose root vowel could not ablaut’. It is only in the Hellenistic period that deverbative -ής compounds are used indiscriminately for both the active and the passive meaning, by which point they have also come to be derived from a large variety of verbal stems. We will study this development in relation to those verbs which also produce V1 compounds.

As we have seen, the extension of the -ής type to a large number of verbs is very likely connected to the need to develop a well-defined and morphologically free category specialized for the expression of semantic areas which are not unequivocally covered by other V2 compounds. The productivity of individual subtypes should therefore be analysed in view of the structure and productivity of other verbal compounds derived from the same root. In the next section, our sole focus will be on active compounds in -ής, since they provide a semantic alternative to the V1 compounds collected in the Corpus. We will first tackle those verbs for which the -ής type is the main source of active V2 compounds (Class IVa). Section 4.2.2 will briefly review the case of those active -ής compounds, mentioned in sections 3.1 and 3.2 above, which are created alongside other more established V2 types.

## 4.2 -ής formations as the main source of active V2 compounds

The seventeen verbs which produce exclusively active -ής compounds (see section 2.3) represent only one tenth of the whole Corpus, but they manifest certain interesting phenomena in respect of their chronological development and interaction with other simple and compounded verbal derivations. Of these verbs, only ἀλφάνω and πείθομαι produce agent nouns: ἀλφρηστής ‘enterprising man’ (Hom.) is a common form, while πειστήρ ‘one who obeys’ (Suid.) is a late hapax. In both cases, there are no attested compounds of these agent nouns. There is thus a clear correlation between the lack of agent nouns and the development of active -ής compounds. Our analysis of the families which pair V1 compounds with V2 compounds in -ής will be ordered chronologically, so that it starts with those families in which the the V2 forms are already attested in the Archaic age.

### ἄρκέω

This verb produces V1 PNs and only one appellative V1 compound. The compounds seem mostly to retain the meaning ‘ward off’, as in the transparent PN Ἄρκεσίλαδος ‘one who wards off the enemy’; or ‘avail’, as in the appellative

ἀρκεσίβουλος ‘availing in council’ and probably also in the PNs Ἄρκεσίδημος, Ἄρκεδήμος and Ἄρκεφίλος (‘one who helps the people/his friends’).

In the absence of agent nouns, ἀρκέω was to remain without V2 compounds. However, bahuvrihis compounded with the neuter noun ἄρκος ‘defence’ (Alc.) seem to have assumed a verbal meaning from early on. Achilles’ famous epithet ποδαρκής is already an ambiguous form. Although from a structural point of view it seems to be compounded with ἄρκος, the possessive meaning ‘whose defence/means of defence is in the feet’ is not particularly satisfactory. It is possible, then, that ποδαρκής was already formed as a verbal compound, meaning ‘succouring with the feet’ (thus *LS*).<sup>86</sup>

At any rate, direct derivation from the verb is undeniable for those fifth-century forms in which the SC exhibits the secondary meaning of ἀρκέω ‘to be strong enough, to be sufficient’: see αὐτάρκης ‘sufficient in oneself’ (Aesch.), πανταρκής ‘all-powerful’, down to ὀλιγαρκής ‘contented with little’ (Luc.). Most of these compounds occur in prose texts, so that the category is not distinguished by being particularly poetic. Meissner includes compounds in -αρκής among the earliest examples of transitive -ής compounds, in which the FC functions as the object of the verb. However, ἀρκέω is mostly intransitive, with its complements usually being declined in the dative case, and its semantics range from the expression of state (‘be sufficient’) to that of action (‘bring help, avail’).<sup>87</sup> Compounds in -αρκής therefore represent a typical example of the active-intransitive specialization of the type in -ής and it is particularly plausible in this case that they were created to complement an unproductive V1 type.

### μαίνομαι

This is a family of compounds in which the V1 type is limited to μαίανδρος ‘mad after men’, attested in the late collection of *Epimerismi* attributed to Herodian. The numerous V2 compounds in -μανής, on the other hand, appear as early as Homer, with γυναιμανής ‘mad for women’. The starting point for this category is the stative aorist ἐμάνην ‘I am furious, mad’. Forms in -μανής mostly correspond to this stative-intransitive meaning of the base verb, which the FC completes mostly as a complement of place (e.g. φρενομανής ‘mad in the mind’, Aesch.), as a complement of manner (e.g. δοριμανής ‘raging with the spear’, Eur.), or as a spatial limitation (e.g. ἀκρομανής ‘on the verge of madness’, Hdt.; ἥμιμανής ‘half-mad’, Aeschin.).

The class is semantically diverse, however, and also comprises compounds whose SC conveys a metaphorical idea of abundance: e.g. ἵππομανής ‘abound-

<sup>86</sup> Meissner (2006: 183–184).

<sup>87</sup> Paliuri (2014: 103).

ing in horses’ (Soph., qualifying λειμών ‘meadow’).<sup>88</sup> In θηλυμανής ‘maddening women’ (Antim.) the SC acquires a transitive-causative meaning, which with the passing of time seems to have become the default interpretation of many of these compounds in -μανής: see e.g. Hesychius’ glossing of γυναιμανής as ἐπί γυναιξὶ μεμηνώς, ἢ τὰς γυναῖκας ἐκμαίνων ‘being mad after women or making women mad’ (Hsch. γ 1010).<sup>89</sup> A handful of compounds also have a passive meaning, with the FC indicating the agent: e.g. θεομανής ‘maddened by the gods’ (Aesch.), οἰστρομανής ‘mad from the gadfly’s sting’ (Tim.). Most of the compounds also develop derivations in -ία and denominative verbs in -έω, a sign of the great productivity of this type.

Both because of the semantic range associated with the verbal SC and the variety of the FCs with which it compounds, the category of compounds in -μανής emerges as a unique type, especially since in early Greek compounds in -ής are generally of the passive type. This flexibility reflects the productivity and range of the base verb, but must also represent a response to the lack of other formations (particularly adjectives) from μαίνομαι.

### ἀλγέω

Compounds in -αλγής must have started off as bahuvrihis of ἄλγος ‘pain’ but—as is the case with other -ής compounds corresponding to denominatives in -έω—some forms may also have been derived directly from the verb. However, they never achieve productivity as agentive compounds proper: θυμολγής ‘heart-grieving’ (Hom.) remains the only clear example of an object-verb relationship. V1 compounds are even more restricted: ἀλγεσίθυμος ‘grieving the heart’ (*Orph. H.*) is clearly a late reversed form of θυμαλγής.

### φαίνω

V1 compounds derived from φαίνω are limited to a few PNs, beginning with Φαινεκλῆς (sixth c. BC), and one epithet, φαινομηρίς ‘showing the tight’ (Ibyc.): in both cases, the FC extraordinarily retains the stem of the present φαιν- against the simple root φαν-. It is the V2 type, represented by compounds in -φανής, which proves to be the dominant one. These compounds are based on the intransitive aorist ἐφάνην ‘appear, appear to be’ and become an extremely common type in Greek, with over a hundred forms listed in Buck-Petersen. The meaning ‘appearing, being visible’ is more common in early forms, such as τηλεφανής ‘appearing from afar’, but post-Classical Greek develops a large number of forms in which the SC -φανής means ‘seeming, having the appearance of’, e.g. γεωφανής

<sup>88</sup> The full range of these functions is analysed by Paliuri (2014: 80–81).

<sup>89</sup> Meissner (2006: 195), Paliuri (2014: 80).



‘seeming like earth’ (Theophr.) or ταυροφανής ‘bull-like’ (Dion. Per.). The evolution of these forms mirrors that of compounds in -ειδής ‘having the appearance of’: in both cases, the SC was progressively grammaticalized, almost acquiring the function of a suffix meaning ‘like’.<sup>90</sup> The development of this function may have been connected to the needs of creating a transparent language for scientific taxonomy.<sup>91</sup>

It is apparent, then, that V1 and V2 compounds derived from φαίνω exhibit a clear-cut distribution. V1 compounds reflect the transitive meaning of the active voice φαίνω, whereas those in -φανής correspond to the meanings of the ‘passive’ aorist ἐφάνην and of the middle φαίνομαι. The great productivity of compounds in -φανής is also due to their specialization in technical registers.

### δέρκομαι

This verb does not seem to have been productive in the formation of V1 compounds: the only possibility is to see one behind the *Kurzname* Δέρκας (fourth c. BC). V2 compounds in -δερκής, on the other hand, comprise one of the most developed families of compounds in -ής and compensate for the lack of agentive compounds and V1 formations. They appear early—an example is to be found already in Hesiod’s *Theogony* (πολυδερκής ‘much-seeing’)—thus constituting an early exception to Meissner’s claim that in Archaic Greek the active type developed out of the reanalysis of bahuvrihis or from intransitive aorists in -η-: δέρκομαι derives from an ablauting root and has a passive aorist in δρακ-, but the active compounds all derive from the stem of present, δερκ-.

The existence of three more forms in fifth-century Greek (ξανθοδερκής ‘with fiery eyes’, lit. ‘looking yellow’, όβρμοδερκής ‘with a mighty glance’ in Bacchylides and όξυδερκής ‘quick-sighted’ in Herodotus) shows that this was not an exceptional type, but a relatively well-established pattern. The semantics of these forms is mostly intransitive and involves the qualification of the glance in question: the FCs therefore tend to be adjectives used adverbially. The only substantival FC too qualifies a type of glance: λιθοδερκής ‘whose glance is like stone, who petrifies with a glance’ (Antiphil.).

### θάλλω/θαλέω

V1 compounds derived from this root amount to only two PNs (Θαλησικλής, perhaps ‘one who makes fame bloom’, Eretria third c., and Θαλησιγένης, perhaps ‘one who makes his race bloom’, Athens 146/5 BC). Their FC θαλησι- may derive loosely from the stem of the sigmatic future θάλλισομαι, but it is more likely that

<sup>90</sup> Paliuri (2014: 82–87).

<sup>91</sup> Tribulato (2010: 488–490).

these forms are influenced by compounds in -θαλής. The vowel quantity of this SC varies: forms in -θηλής (< -θαλής), attested already in Homer (e.g. νεοθηλής ‘fresh-budding’), seem to be connected to the perfect τέθηλα ‘to be in bloom’, originally a stative formation.<sup>92</sup> These are accompanied by forms in -θαλ(λ)ής, which may either reflect the stem of the present θάλλω/θαλέω or derive from the noun θαλλός ‘flower’ (also attested in the form θάλος with the specialized metaphorical meaning of ‘child’). The border between possessive compounds and verbal ones therefore is not always clear-cut in this family, but the existence of forms in -θηλής suggests that the verbal stem was functioning as a source of derivations already in the Archaic age. Some of the forms in -θαλής, moreover, are not easily interpretable as bahuvrihis from a semantic point of view: see for instance ὄρειθαλής ‘blooming on the hills’ (Lycophr.).

In this family, therefore, we witness the early development of an active -ής type, a development which reflects the very low productivity of the V1 pattern. The shape of the FC θαλησι- in the V1 pattern, moreover, points to the influence of V2 compounds in -ής, a phenomenon which is observable also in other pairs of this kind (see e.g. δάκνω).

### τέρπω

V1 compounds derived from τέρπω begin with τερψίμβροτος and τερπικέρανος ‘delighting in thunder’, both in Homer, and continue as an exclusively poetic type, with new forms coined in Late Antiquity. PNs are a common type and are based on both the s-aorist stem τερψ- and the present stem τερπ-. Compounds in -ής compensate for the lack of agentive V2 formations. It is likely that they are derived directly from the root rather than from the neuter noun τέρπος ‘delight’, which is attested much later than the first compounds (SEG 3.774.8, first century BC–first century AD) and looks like a back-formation from compounds in -τερπής.<sup>93</sup> The first forms, starting with Homer’s ἀτερπής ‘unpleasing’, are not compounded with a substantival FC, but in later Greek the type in -τερπής fully replaces the V1 pattern, which in the appellative domain is not particularly productive after Bacchylides: see e.g. θεοτερπής ‘pleasing the gods’ (Philoxy.) and ὄχλοτερπής ‘delighting the mob’ (Poll.).

### φείδομαι

This is a common verb, which survives into MG. Its V1 compounds are all onomastic, with the exception of the denominative φειδαλιπέω ‘to be sparing of barley’ (cf. Phryn. *P.S. epitome* 121.9). Another fragment of Phrynichus’ *Praeparata*

<sup>92</sup> Meissner (2006: 190).

<sup>93</sup> For this derivational cycle, see Meissner (2006: 86–93).

*tio sophistica* (fr. 365), echoed by Suid. φ 243, also attests to the existence of the adverb φειδαλφίτως ‘thriftily’. PNs derived from φείδομαι are all compounded with common SCs, and some of these names appear to be meaningful: see the Homeric Φείδιππος ‘one who uses horses sparingly’ i.e. ‘one takes care of horses’ (cf. *Il.* 5.202), later recast in the *Clouds* as the comic name Φειδιππίδης, which denotes both the thriftiness of its bearer’s father and the obsession with aristocracy of his mother;<sup>94</sup> Φειδόμβροτος ‘one who spares men’ (cf. *Il.* 24.158), a meaning probably conveyed also by Φειδεσίλεως and comparable forms; and perhaps Φειδοτίμος ‘one who has consideration for one’s reputation’. The relative productivity of the V1 type is also shown by the existence of three different types of FC: φειδε-, φειδι-, φειδεσι-.

φείδομαι gives rise to a sort of agent noun characterized by the suffix -ων: this is used as a PN, Φείδων, which is also employed in comedy for the comic type of the thrifty person (as in Antiphanes fr. 189.22 K-A); it returns as an apposition in the epigrammatist Nicarchus (*AP* 11.179). Pollux 10.169 moreover informs us that φείδων was also the name of a type of oilcan that let only a little run out.

V2 compounds in -ής are more restricted: they begin with the Homeric PN Πολυφείδης and continue with the adjective ἀφειδής ‘not-sparing’, whose FC too has an adverbial meaning. The only form in which the FC represents the direct object of the verbal action is the much later βιοφειδής ‘sparing on sustenance, penurious’ (Phil. Epigr.). In this case, compounds in -ής do not seem to have developed in compensation for the low productivity of V1 compounds, and the development of active -ής compounds from other verbs may in fact have been the model for their creation.

### φλέγω

This is a very common verb in both Classical and post-Classical Greek, where it mostly appears in the preverbed form καταφλέγω ‘burn up’. The popularity of the latter is shown by the fact that the only compound—καταφλεξίπολις ‘inflamer of cities’, used by an anonymous poet of the *Anthologia Palatina* to describe a courtesan—keeps the prefix κατα-. The same phenomenon is on view in the action noun κατάφλεξις ‘burning’ (Luc.), which replaces φλέξις, attested only as a gloss.

V2 compounds in -φλεγής, which feature already in Homer, predate the creation of V1 compounds. However, they are never compounded with a noun representing the object of the verbal action, so that the category does not appear to have been exploited for the formation of [N V] compounds.

<sup>94</sup> On this name, see Panagl (1983) and section 6.1 below.

### φάω

V1 compounds are limited to the old Homeric epithet φαεσίμβροτος, usually glossed as ‘bringing light to mortals’. However, Hesychius’ gloss φαέσασθαι ἰδεῖν (φ 28) suggests that the verb could also mean ‘to see’: if φαεσίμβροτος reflected this sense, it would mean ‘seeing mortals’, which is particularly appropriate for an epithet of Helios and Eos.<sup>95</sup> Perhaps because of the limited use of the V1 pattern, forms in -φαής became a convenient means of deriving verbal compounds from this root. Compounds in -φαής clearly starts off as bahuvrihis of φάος ‘light’ (see e.g. χρυσοφαής ‘having the shine of gold’, Sapph.), but the creation of verbal forms is already a Classical phenomenon (e.g. νυκτιφαής ‘shining by night’, Parm.) and may be ascribed to the interference of compounds in -φανής. Forms in -φαής and -φανής meaning ‘shining’ or ‘appearing’ are often compounded with the same FCs or attested as *variae lectiones* in the same text, so that it is not possible to make clear-cut distinctions between the two classes.

### ἀλφάνω

This verb is rare and poetic, which may explain why there is only one V1 compound, ἀλφρεσίβοιος ‘bringing in oxen’, used twice in the *Iliad* as an epithet of παρθένοι, and later by Aeschylus and Theocritus as an epithet of ὕδωρ. Ἀλφρεσίβοια was also the name of a nymph. There is no morphological reason why V2 compounds could not be created using the agent noun ἀλφρηστής: we may note, however, that given its meaning (‘earner, trader’), potential V2 compounds would have identified a kind of trader in something, a very different meaning from that of the V1 type. The only form in -ής is τιμαλφής ‘fetching a prize’ (Aesch.), connected to the verb τιμαλφῶ ‘do honour’ (Pi.).

### βλάπτω

This is a common verb in Greek, but there are only two compounds in βλαψι-, both poetic in character. After its first attestation in Aeschylus, βλαψίφων ‘damaging the mind’ is used only by Euphorion, Tryphiodorus and Eusebius, while the hapax βλαψίταφος ‘violating the grave’ is attested in a fourth-century AD funerary epigram. This low productivity could be due to the fact that compounds in -βλαβής, either bahuvrihis from βλάβος ‘damage’ or verbal formations connected to ἐβλάβην, are common. Forms with active semantics develop in the fifth century, possibly starting with the shift in the meaning of ἀβλαβής from ‘without harm’ (Sapph.) to ‘not harming’ (Aesch.). Especially in the Imperial age, active compounds in -βλαβής with a substantival FC become a common pattern in

<sup>95</sup> Knecht (1946: 9).

poetry, forming a group of synonyms whose FCs usually refer to bodily parts (see Corpus).

### πείθω/ πείθομαι

πείθω ‘persuade’ and its middle πείθομαι ‘obey’ are among the most common Greek verbs. They create various FCs (πεισι-, πειθε-, πειθο-, πειθεισι-, the latter only in PNs), which mostly seem to retain the meaning of the middle ‘obey’. The compounds, frequent in both the appellative and the onomastic domains, are productive down to the late Hellenistic age: the only later compound is πειθοδικαίουσυνος ‘obedient to justice’ (PGM 5.403).

The fact that compounds derived from πείθω are exclusively of the V1 type can safely be linked to the lack of an agent noun, since the only time we find one attested, πειστήρ ‘one who obeys’, it is in the *Suda*. Some V2 compounds acquire an active meaning, partly in compensation for the lack of other agentive forms. The early forms have adverbial FCs (e.g. ἀπειθής ‘disobedient’, Soph., εὐπειθής ‘ready to obey’, Pl.), followed by new forms such as ἔτοιμοπειθής ‘ready to obey’ (Hdn.). The only compound which specifies the person whom one obeys is θεοπειθής ‘obedient to God’ (Hierocles).

### μισέω

V1 compounds derived from μισέω are quite productive. The meaning of the FC μισο- is fully consonant with that of the base verb, while the various SCs specify the object of hatred: e.g. μισόθεος ‘hating the gods’ (Aesch.) and μισοτύραννος ‘tyrant-hater’ (Hdt.). This type emerges in the fifth century BC and remains productive throughout the history of Greek, being preserved in the modern language. The productivity of these compounds is probably connected to the popularity of their antonyms, compounds in φιλο-, from which it is likely that they import the linking element -ο- (see Corpus and Chapter 4, section 3.1).

The V2 type is limited to a few forms in -μισής, beginning in the fifth century BC. In principle, these may have originated as bahuvrihis derived from μῖσος ‘hatred’, but a direct derivation from the verb is also possible. Their low number can be understood in light of the huge popularity of compounds in μισο-.

### στέργω

Though a fairly common verb down to Koine and Christian Greek, στέργω seems to suffer from competition with φιλέω in the creation of compounds: its V1 compounds come to two in total and are highly artificial. ἀστεργάνωρ ‘not loving men’ (Aesch.) is, together with ἀκερσεκόμης and ἀκειρεκόμης discussed in Chapter 5, section 4.3, one of the very few negated V1 compounds: it may be analogical on the negative adjective ἀστεργής ‘not loving’ (Soph.). στεργοζύνεunos ‘loving one’s

consort' displays the typical artificiality of Lycophron's compounds and is a hapax (later only commented in the scholia to Lycophron). Apart from ἀστεργής, the other active V2 compounds are formed on the o-grade and are late: τεκνοστοργής 'full of filial affection' and ὁμόστοργος 'feeling the same affection' (Nonn.).

### τήκω

Compounds derived from τήκω are limited and all poetic. The only V1 compound is the post-Classical form τηξιμελής 'consuming the limbs', used by the epigrammatist Philip. The same idea is conveyed by two later V2 compounds in -τακής, γυιστακής 'melting the limbs' (Antip. Thess.) and σαρκοτακής 'wasting the flesh' (Procl.). Their starting point is the intransitive aorist ἐτάκην 'melt away, waste away' (attested from the fifth c. BC), but the compounds express a transitive-causative notion which is not associated with the -η- aorist and is typical, rather, of the s-aorist. The first specimen is the late Classical form κατακυμοτακής 'melting the waves' (Tim.), whose structure, with the preposition κατα- preceding the object of the verb, κυμο-, is extraordinary and might perhaps be reminiscent of the frequent Homeric phrase κατὰ κύμα. Both the late development of the compounds and their semantic and structural peculiarities identify this family as a markedly artificial one.

### χαίρω

V1 compounds appear from the sixth century BC onwards but, with the exception of χαρεκακία 'taking pleasure in one's neighbour's misfortune' (Aristot.), they are all onomastic. The FC is mostly built on the present stem χαυρ-, followed by -ε, -ο, -ι, -εσι and even -ησι. V2 compounds in -χαρής, on the other hand, are an extremely productive type, no doubt because of their formal association with the aorist ἐχάρην. In most cases, these compounds reflect the intransitive semantics of the -η- aorist: many FCs are adverbial and those which are substantival mostly identify the thing in which one delights (e.g. μουσοχαρής 'delighting in the Muses', Maecius, ἐπιδεσμοχαρής 'bandage-loving', Luc.). Only a few forms in -χαρής express an active-transitive meaning: ὄγλοχαρής 'courting the mob' (M. Ant.) and δημοχαρής 'pleasing the people' (Paul. Alex.; cf. the PNs Χαϊρέδημος and Χαρησίδαμος).

#### 4.2.1 Summary of characteristics

If we consider the interaction between these early compounds in -ής and the corresponding V1 compounds, we see that, on the whole, the -ής type seems to have been developed to complement the V1 type, which is either predominantly onomastic (see ἀρκέω, θάλλω, τέρπω, χαίρω), not attested at the time when the

first -ής forms appear (see *μαίνομαι*, *φαίνω*, *δέρκομαι*, *φείδομαι*, *φλέγω*, *βλάπτω*, *τήκω*), or very limited (see *φάω*). Only the compounds in -μισής are less numerous than their V1 counterparts, but, as noted, this may reflect the fact that compounds in *μισο-* became a popular pattern in parallel with the very common antonymic type in *φιλο-*.

The earlier compounds in -ής are phonologically and semantically tied to stative aorists in -η- and have, therefore, mostly intransitive semantics: see those derived from *μαίνομαι*, *φαίνω*, *βλάπτω* and the later families derived from *τήκω* and *χαίρω*. With the exception of compounds in -τακής, which are rare and late, the V2 compounds derived from the stem of aorists in -η- are very popular types. Those in -χαρής and -φανής develop into common patterns, and this is a possible factor in the confinement of V1 compounds derived from those verbs to the onomastic lexicon. At the same time, early bahuvrihi categories develop into verbal types: we noted this for compounds derived from *ἀρκέω*, *θάλλω*, *φάω* and *μισέω*.

Once the -ής pattern had become an established means of deriving verbal compounds, including those of the active type, new categories were created independently from an -η- aorist in order to complement unproductive V1 types: this is particularly clear in the case of V2 compounds derived from *δέρκομαι*, *φλέγω* and *τέρπω* (whose V1 compounds are mostly archaic), all of which employ the full-grade root. Compounds derived from *δέρκομαι*, in particular, constitute a clear case of the early development of a new word formation pattern whose function was to compensate for the unproductive character of V1 formations derived from the verb. V2 -ής compounds derived from presents may also be unproductive: this always corresponds to the low productivity of both the base verb and the V1 type (see the families derived from *φείδομαι*, *ἀλφάνω* and *στέργω*).

The compounds analysed in this section confirm that -ής forms probably developed to provide an easily formable type of compound endowed with verbal semantics. This is consistent with the Greek trend towards right-oriented structures: when possible, the language resorts to V2 types which correspond to V1 compounds of low productivity. The only exception to this general trend are compounds in *μισο-*, which remain much more productive than those in -μισής, and the family derived from *πείθω*, where, as noted, the survival of both types is linked to a distribution in which the V1 pattern corresponds to the transitive and the V2 pattern to the intransitive meaning of the verb.

### 4.3 Active -ής compounds complementing other V2 types

The type in -ής also interacts with other agentive V2 types, and eventually replaces a number of them. This development must be placed in the context of the great

expansion of the -ής type in post-Classical Greek, when the derivation from the present had become a normal morphological process. The factors affecting the make-up and productivity of particular types within individual families vary, but we may note two general trends. On the one hand, these -ής compounds tend to replace earlier unproductive V2 compounds; on the other hand, in the presence of productive types, active -ής compounds remain one-off *specimina*, exceptional instances of the mostly passive -ής type. We will review these phenomena by first focusing on some individual verbal families.

### δάκνω

As noted in section 3.2, the type in -δήκτης is late and very rare: the original way of creating V2 compounds from δάκνω was to resort to the -ής type. The early existence of active compounds in -δακής can be explained on the assumption that they are bahuvrihis, but the neuter noun δάκος is only attested in the specialized meaning of ‘obnoxious (biting) beast’ (Aesch.). There is thus a possibility that already in Homer compounds in -δακής were derived directly from the verb.

Θυμοδακής derives from the zero-grade root employed in the present, given that its regular passive aorist is ἐδήχθη (Soph.): ἐδάκην is only attested once in Aretaeus, a second-century AD author. The shape of the SC -δακής may have been influenced by the other Homeric compounds ending in -αής which were tied to a stem in -η- (-αής < ἄημι, -δαής < ἐδάην). Later compounds in -δακής mostly follow the structure of the Homeric model: their FCs are nouns functioning as the direct object of the verb (λαιμοδακής ‘throat-biting’, Phil. Epigr., σαρκοδακής ‘biting flesh’, Orph. Fr.). A different structure is found in σηψιδακής ‘causing mortification by its bite’ (Aristot.) in which the FC represents the result of the verbal action, and ὤμοδακής ‘fiercely gnawing’ (Aesch.), in which the FC expresses an adverbial modification.

V2 compounds in -δακής are an exceptional case in that the -ής category is attested before the V1 pattern. They are the productive, albeit still limited, pattern for creating agentive compounds from δάκνω, while those in -δήκτης and V1 compounds remain very rare.

### φύω

V2 compounds in -φύτωρ are increasingly replaced by compounds in -φυής, which seemingly start off as irregular bahuvrihis of φυή (see e.g. ἀφυής ‘without natural talent’, Democr.) and later, under the formal influence of the intransitive aorist ἐφύην ‘grow’, assume a verbal meaning, according to which the SC governs the FC (e.g. πετροφυής ‘growing feathers or wings’, Pl.). Forms in -φυής are particularly common in scientific terminology and represent the productive type, compensating for the rarity of the V1 type and of forms in -φύτωρ.



### φράζω

As noted in section 3.2, while V1 compounds are specialized as PNs, there is only one V2 compound formed with the agent noun -φράστης: σκινδαλαμοφράστης (Agath.). Some of the many compounds in -φραδής, on the other hand, have an active meaning, starting with κακοφραδής ‘who thinks foolishly’ (Hom.): in this case, too, the active -ής type develops early to compensate for the lack of other agentive compounds.

### πλήσσω

The very low productivity of V1 forms and V2 compounds in -πλήκτης, with ισχυροπλήκτης ‘wounding severely’ in Hesychius the sole representative, is partly compensated for by the fact that some compounds in -πληγής, deriving from the full-grade root, have active semantics: φρενοπληγής ‘striking the mind’ (Aesch.) and καρτεροπληγής ‘striking fiercely’ (D. S.). On the other hand, the type in -πλαγής, deriving from the zero-grade stem of the passive aorist, is exclusively passive.

Relatively productive active compounds in -ής which do not replace other common V2 compounds are those derived from ἔρδω, τρέφω and ἔχω, verbs which all have agentive compounds in -ος. Active forms in -εργής, -τρεφής and -εχής are mostly late and represent the newest additions to fully developed compound families in which the active semantics is already conveyed by V2 compounds in -ος and -της and by V1 compounds, while compounds in -ής are mostly assigned the function of expressing the passive voice. The following verbs from Class IV, too, have a few (often late) active compounds in -ής among what is usually a larger number of passive forms:

- ὄλλυμι > a few compounds in -ωλης (which are usually passive) also take on an active meaning, starting with πανώλης ‘all-destructive’ (Soph.); V1 and other V2 compounds derived from this verb are common.
- φεύγω > the low productivity of V2 compounds derived from this verb is not compensated for by the creation of -ής forms, the only instance of which is ἀφυγής ‘not fleeing’ (Timoth.).
- δέχομαι > there is only one -ής compound, πανδεχής ‘all-receiving’ (Pl.), since the V2 types in -δοκος and -δέκτης are very common.
- λαμβάνω > only ὄξυλβής ‘quick at seizing’ (Aristot.): though not very productive, V2 compounds in -λήπτης and -λάβος are more common.
- τρέχω > only εὐθυτρεχής ‘running in a straight line’ (IG 2<sup>2</sup>.463.73, 307/6 BC); active V2 compounds are those in -δρομος.
- ἔλκω > there are three active compounds in -ελκής, starting with κεραελκής ‘drawing by the horns’ (Call.), but the productive types are V1 compounds in ἔλκε- and V2 compounds in -ουλκός.

- ἄπτω > the few compounds in -αφής are passive, with the exception of εὐαφής ‘touching gently’ (Arat.); though not very common, the only productive type are V1 compounds in ἄψι-.
- πράσσω > there are only five late compounds in -πραγής, of which δυσπραγής ‘faring ill’ (Vett. Val.) is the oldest. All are compounded with adverbial FCs (εὐ-, κακο-, ἀδικο-, δικαιο-), so that their structure is not exactly comparable to that of other compounds derived from this verb. Each of these compounds in -πραγής is also accompanied by an -έω verb of older date.<sup>96</sup> Compounds in -πραγής are more numerous than compounds in -πράκτης.
- ῥάπτω > compounds in -ρραφής are usually passive, but there are two active forms in Nonnus: λινορραφής ‘making nests’ (previously ‘sewn of flax’, Soph.) and δολορραφής ‘weaving treacherously’ (previously ‘woven treacherously’, Opp). Compounds in -ρράφος are the productive type.
- θέλω > φρενοθελητής ‘charming the heart’ (Procl.), πανθελητής ‘charming all’ (Nonn.). Other V2 compounds are equally rare; the productive type are V1 compounds in θελξι-.

Many of the other families of -ής compounds derived from verbs of Class IV are exclusively passive. Consider the following verbs, which are mostly ablauting verbs with productive active compounds in -ος:

- φέρω > compounds in -φερής are attested from Homer onwards, but they are clearly selected for the expression of passive semantics: e.g. προφερής ‘carried before’ (Hom.).
- φθείρω > there are only two passive compounds, starting with πολυφθερής ‘subject to many forms of destruction’ (Emp.).
- λείπω > compounds in -λ(ε)ιπής, beginning in the fifth c. BC, are all passive.
- ῥήγνυμι: compounds in -ρραγής are passive except for ψυχορραγής ‘letting the soul break loose’ (Eur.).
- στέλλω > all compounds in -σταλής, starting with εὐσταλής ‘well-equipped’ (Aesch.), are passive.
- ῥίπτω > compounds in -ρριφής, attested from the fifth c. BC onwards (δημορριφής ‘hurled by the people, Aesch.), are all passive.
- κάμπτω > δυσκαμπής ‘hard to bend’ (Plu.) and other passive compounds.
- πήγνυμι > ξυλοπαγής ‘built on piles’ (Str.) and other passive compounds.
- στρέφω ‘twist’: all compounds in -στραφής and -στρεφής are passive.

<sup>96</sup> Paliuri (2014: 43) considers the possibility that these are examples of -ής compounds derived directly from the -έω verbs.

To these forms we can add examples of passive compounds in -ής derived from the verbs in Classes I and II which were analysed in Chapter 5 (verbs with no active V2 compounds):

- βρίθω > compounds in -βριθής (e.g. σιδηροβριθής ‘iron-loaded’, Eur.);
- ζεύγνυμι > compounds in -ζυγής (e.g. νεοζυγής ‘newly yoked’, Aesch.);
- μείγνυμι > compounds in -μιγής (e.g. παμμιγής ‘all-blended’, Aesch.);
- στυγέω > bahuvrihis based on στύγος ‘hatred’ develop into a class of passive compounds, e.g. βροτοστυγής ‘hated by men’ (Aesch.).

Within this category of mostly passive compounds derived from verbs in Classes I and II, there are some sporadic and usually late cases of isolated active compounds. On balance, the appearance of these late or extraordinary formations does not alter the impression that their base verbs were not involved in the development of a productive category of agentive V2 compounds. Consider for instance the following verbs, presented in chronological order:

- κράζω (Class II): ἀκραγής ‘not barking’ (Aesch.) is a hapax.
- ἔρπω (Class II): there is only χαμερπής ‘crawling on the ground’ (Olymp. Alch., fourth c. AD).
- ἐθέλω (Class II): there is only κακοθελής ‘malevolent’ (Adamantius Physiognomicus, fourth c. AD).
- αὔξω (Class II): μυελαυξής ‘increasing the marrow’ (Hsch.) is a hapax.
- κρύπτω (Class II): there are only three compounds in -κρυφής, which appear from the fourth c. AD onwards; one of them develops active semantics in Byzantine Greek: θεοκρυφής ‘hiding God’ (George of Pisidia).

From this overview we gain the impression that the -ής type, while attested for a number of the verbal roots under consideration here, did not acquire the role of rival to (or replacement for) active-transitive V2 compounds at any stage of Greek. Neither does it provide a productive means of word formation for the verbs which do not have other types of V2 compounds (Classes I and II). The small portion of data collected here in connection with verbs which give rise to V1 compounds serves as a useful means of refining our perception of the role of -ής compounds in Greek, confirming that the priority in the development of verbal -ής compounds was to provide Greek with a flexible method of forming passive verbal adjectives rather than another type of active verbal compound. -ής compounds developed as competition for passive adjectives in -τός and -ος (ὄρεσίτροφος type) because in the case of the first type the use of nominal constituents was restricted, whereas the latter was morphologically confined to certain types of roots.

At the same time, the morphological contiguity with the -η- aorist triggered the early development of active-intransitive semantics, which was to become the

other identifying feature of -ής compounds throughout the history of Greek. Transitive semantics is tied to specific verbs, and these may produce an entire family of transitive -ής compounds (e.g. ἀρκέω or δάκνω) or simply endow individual forms with active meaning (e.g. ὄλλυμι, ῥάπτω, θέλω). This might be due to the productivity and diversification of the other active V2 categories, but the data in this chapter have also shown that -ής transitive compounds tend to be sporadic in the case of verbal roots which give rise to a productive V1 type covering active and transitive semantics. It is perhaps worth stressing that the vast majority of the transitive V2 compounds in -ής analysed in this section do not have FCs in the function of direct object: the full verb-object relation is conveyed by V1 compounds and by V2 compounds in -ος and -της. In the general conclusion we will discuss the relevance of this evidence for the description of the Greek system of verbal compounds as a whole.

## 5 Fulfilling the need of V2 compounds: other right-oriented formations

We lastly come to a small subclass (IVb) that deserves separate treatment in view of the exceptional phenomena by which it is affected. This class contains five verbs (ἀνάσσω, κρατέω, νικάω, φιλέω, φοβέω), not all characterized by high productivity, which give rise to V1 compounds and to right-oriented forms that, though formally compounded with nouns rather than verbal stems, in semantic terms constitute V2 counterparts to the V1 compounds.

In order to illustrate the characteristics of this group, let us start with ἀνάσσω ‘rule’. This is a denominative verb from the noun ἄναξ ‘lord’, which gives rise to V1 compounds in ἀναξι-.<sup>97</sup> In morphological terms, compounds ending in -αναξ are compounds of the *simplex* and hence determinative compounds, expressing a special type of ἄναξ: for instance, ἀστυάναξ is the lord of a city. However, because of the close relation between noun and denominative verb, in semantic terms it is impossible to separate ἀστυάναξ and a V2 compound such as στρατάρχος ‘leader of the army’. As discussed in Chapter 2 section 4.2, morphologists would class the two forms differently (determinative vs. verbal compound), but in semantic terms they are identical. What is more important, for the purposes of our investigation, is that compounds in -αναξ constitute semantic counterparts to V1 formations and must thus be included in our analysis if we hope to attain a more complete understanding of the productivity of the latter.

<sup>97</sup> For the formation of this denominative, see Ruijgh (1999: 530).

### ἀνάσσω

V1 compounds in ἀναξι- function both as appellatives and as PNs. The poetic epithets are all attested in Bacchylides and Pindar for the first time, a fact which Trümper (1986) speculatively and controversially connected with the hypothesis that the language of choral lyric would have preserved a core of very old forms deriving directly from Mycenaean, in which ἄναξ is indeed an important term. Of the forms attested in choral poetry, Bacchylides' ἀναξίαλος 'ruling the sea', ἀναξιβρέντας 'ruling the thunder' and ἀναξίμολπος 'queen of song' are hapax legomena, while ἀναξιφόρμιγξ in Pindar is later reused by Menander. The numerous PNs in ἀναξι- are attested from the Archaic age onwards and remain popular in post-Classical onomastics.

Forms in -αναξ are compounded with FCs which do not find a parallel in the V1 type. Apart from ἀστυάναξ, which is often attested in Greek sources because of its use as the name of Hector's son, the other compounds are rare forms: εὐρυνάναξ 'wide-ruling' is another Bacchylidean creation, later only used by Gemistus as an epithet of Poseidon (Bacchylides uses it as an epithet of Zeus); ἰπιάναξ 'king of horsemen' (Aesch.) and εὐδιάναξ 'ruler of the calm' (Luc.) are hapax legomena. Overall the impression we gain is that the V1 type was very much the more productive.

### κρατέω

This family of compounds neatly exemplifies the phenomena which characterize Class IVb as a whole. In all likelihood, κρατέω is a denominative verb deriving from the neuter noun κράτος 'power'. This noun creates a class of bahuvrihis in -κρατής ('having power, force', e.g. ἰσοκρατής 'possessing equal rights') which, as is often the case with bahuvrihis in -ής corresponding to denominatives in -έω, end up acquiring verbal semantics: see for instance the early ναυκρατής 'master of the sea' (Hdt.) and αὐτοκρατής 'ruling by oneself' (Anax.). However, compounds with clear verbal semantics are limited and generally post-Classical.

Although later Greek possesses the agent nouns κρατήτωρ, which has the specialized meaning 'ruling star' (Ptol.), and κρατητής 'possessor' (Procl.), there are no regular agentive compounds derived from κρατέω. The V2 pattern is covered by the very common type in -κράτωρ, starting with αὐτοκράτωρ 'sole ruler' (Thuc.). The origin of these compounds is debated, as summarized in *DEG* s.v. αὐτοκράτωρ. Benveniste (1973: 123), following an idea of Ernst Fraenkel, maintained that -κράτωρ was an ancient neuter in -ωρ: this would have the consequence that compounds in -κράτωρ were originally compounds of the simple neuter noun (and thus determinative compounds). More plausibly, however, as suggested by Schwyzler (1939: 531 n. 11), compounds in -κράτωρ developed out of

those in -κρατής, which had begun to manifest purely verbal semantics: through the use of the ending -ωρ these forms became agent nouns.

This last hypothesis is also supported by considering the broader context of the compound family of κρατέω as a whole. It makes sense that the language should develop a convenient means of creating compounds with transparent verbal semantics, and those in -κρατής are not very much exploited for this purpose, perhaps because they were *not* verbal compounds in the first place and the connection with κράτος was still transparent. By creating a new type in -κράτωρ the language enables a verb without authentic agent nouns (or at least without ancient ones) to make use of the V2 structure. From the fifth century onwards, therefore, Greek acquires a class of compounds expressing the idea of ‘sovereign ruler’, which are of particular importance in political discourse: see the above-mentioned αὐτοκράτωρ, to which we can add θαλασσοκράτωρ ‘master of the sea’, featuring in Herodotus, Thucydides and Xenophon, and ναυκράτωρ ‘master of the sea’, used by Herodotus and Thucydides for the first time.

### νικάω

V1 PNs in Νικο- and Νικησι- are extremely common in Greek, a fact which is at odds with the complete lack of V1 appellatives. The verb produces three, apparently post-Classical, agent nouns (νικᾶτήρ, νικήτωρ ‘victorious’ and νικητής ‘winner in games’) but none of them is used in compounding. Semantically, the agentive function is covered by compounds in -νικος and -νίκης, meaning ‘winner’. The first of these types seemingly developed from bahuvrihis with νίκη ‘victory’, as is suggested by the retention of the accent on the FC. This structure is still clear in the oldest *specimina*, e.g. καλλίνικος ‘of beautiful victory’ (Archil.). The transformation into a fully verbal type is evident already in the language of the late sixth c. BC, where we find forms such as Ἰππόνικος ‘winning with horses’ (PN, Simon.), οὐρανόνικος ‘conquering heaven’ (Aesch.) and the derivation ἀθλονικία ‘victory in the games’, which presupposes \*\*ἀθλόνικος ‘winner of games’.

Compounds in -νίκης, on the other hand, developed directly from the verb through interference from νίκη, according to the process studied by Rüedi (1969) (see Chapter 2, section 6.8). A good number of forms are to be found already in fifth-century Greek and they probably played a part in the verbal reinterpretation of those in -νικος as well. V1 compounds therefore remained specialized as PNs, while V2 compounds in -νίκης enjoyed great popularity in the appellative lexicon.

### φιλέω

The compound family associated with φίλος and φιλέω is extremely productive. Compounds in φιλο- are typically cited as the chief example of the development of V1 FCs ending in -ο- from nominal forms, in this case the adjective φίλος (Chapter 4,

section 3.1). It is possible that, in origin, compounds in φιλο- were bahuvrihis in which the adjectival FC qualified a substantive: e.g. φιλόξενος ‘having guests dear’, whose meaning subsequently developed into ‘loving guests’, with the consequent creation of a genuine family of V1 compounds. These are productive at all stages of the Greek language, in both onomastics and appellatives.

In semantic terms, these V1 compounds compete with the very common determinative compounds in -φιλος. As in the case of νικάω, a proper V2 category ending in -φιλας/-φιλης (later accompanied by a sigmatic and rare active type in -φιλής) is derived directly from φιλέω, but these forms are not as prevalent as those in -φιλος. V1 compounds in φιλο- are the most popular category from this verb.

### φοβέω

V1 compounds derived from this verb are not productive: φοβέστρατος ‘scaring hosts’, an epithet of Athena (Hes.) and its elongated variant φοβεισστράτη (Aristoph.) are the only forms. These compounds follow the semantics of the active φοβέω ‘to scare someone’, whereas the bahuvrihis compounded with φόβος ‘fear’ which develop verbal semantics follow the meaning of the middle φοβέομαι ‘to fear something’: ἄφοβος ‘without fear’ > ‘who does not fear’, ὕδροφόβος ‘having terror of water’ > ‘fearing water’. Compounds with a substantival FC are rare, however, and mostly post-Classical.

## 5.1 Summary of characteristics

Most of the right-oriented compounds in this subclass seem to have been created to fulfil the need for V2 forms, particularly when that need is exacerbated by the specialization of V1 compounds as PNs and their generally low productivity as appellatives. We have observed this situation in the case of compounds derived from νικάω: compounds in -νικος are an extremely popular pattern. In two cases we have also witnessed the creation of V2 forms side by side with a V1 type which remains more popular: this applies to ἀνάσσω and especially to φιλέω. Finally, the balance between V1 and V2 forms is even in the case of both κρατέω and φοβέω, although the former creates a much more numerous compound family than the latter, a rare verb in compounding. Overall, the phenomena observed in Class IVb confirm that Greek tended to develop right-oriented forms, but also kept and sometimes multiplied V1 compounds connected with specific compound families or derivational patterns (this particularly applies to compounds in φιλο-, which share the popularity of other compounds characterized by the linking vowel -o-).

## 6 The stylistics of V1 compounds: a few final remarks

The above investigation has contributed new insights to the understanding of V1 compounds by providing a model of morphological analysis which, rather than studying V1 compounds in isolation, seeks to investigate them in the context of the larger system of agentive formations. Our analysis has, however, only cursorily addressed the relation between V1 compounds, phraseology and stylistics. The study of the bigger literary picture is beyond the scope of this book and remains a largely unexplored field from a systematic point of view. The aim of the next three sections is merely to consider samples of the kinds of questions which arise from these areas of discussion with a view to highlighting issues deserving of fuller examination.

### 6.1 V1 compounds and Greek comic language

Greek comic language has a predilection for compounds.<sup>98</sup> This is partly due to the fact that compounds afford a more condensed mode of expression, one of the requirements of a successful pun, since they allow the author to place possibly unrelated concepts side by side. Hypertrophic formations such as those mentioned in Chapter 2, section 2.2 are well-known examples of the degree of sophistication achieved by compounding in comedy. On the other hand, compounds are also numerous in comedy because of their perceived association with high-style poetry, a frequent target of comic parody. In the latter category, we may mention some V1 compounds seemingly coined to play with serious poetry. The neologism βροντησικέραυτος ‘thundering and lightning’ in *Nub.* 265, where Socrates summons the Clouds with solemn language, is evocative of poetic and religious language.<sup>99</sup> The adjective is a clear allusion to the Homeric epithet of Zeus *τερπικέραυτος*, but it is also employed to describe what is happening on stage, with the chorus of clouds entering amidst special effects created with the ‘thunder-engine’ (βροντεῖον).<sup>100</sup> On the surface, Aristophanes’ purpose is to give a ceremonious feel to Socrates’ invocation through the use of a grand-sounding epithet, but the audience may also have detected the tongue-in-cheek reference behind its structure. As noted in section 3.2 above, word-play is also behind Cratinus’ ἀγεροσικύβηλις, a *recherché* neologism in a comedy abounding with

<sup>98</sup> See the monograph by da Costa Ramalho (1952).

<sup>99</sup> For the compound, see Williger (1928: 36 n. 2). Socrates’ language in these lines is inspired by traditional prayers: see Willi (2003: 18–23).

<sup>100</sup> Guidorizzi (1996: 227).



tragic parody; similarly, Plato Comicus introduces the Homeric-sounding epithet ἔλκετριβῶν ‘cloak-trailer’ (section 3.1) to disparage a Laconian character.

Tragic parody and allusion to poetic and religious registers are not always easy to detect, but there is a chance that the use of some ‘serious’ V1 compounds too is allusive or parodic. For instance, Aristophanes uses the adjective ἀλεξίκακος, usually said of Heracles or heroes, in reference to Hermes in *Pax* 422 and to himself in *V.* 1043. In both cases the use of the epithet may be serving to reinforce a heightening in the register of the comedy: in *Pax* 422 ἀλεξίκακος comes at the end of the chorus’ and Trygaeus’ attempt to win Hermes over to the human side, followed by the donation of the cup and the propitiatory libation (l. 423–425), while in *V.* 1043 it is used to compare Aristophanes, whose art has purified Athens from all her monstrous enemies, to Heracles. As in the *Peace*, this passage ends with a libation and a solemn oath (1046–1047), both requiring a heightened register.

At the same time, it is common to find compounds which, while belonging to an established type, create novel connections between the verbal idea expressed by the FC and the SC: μελλοδειπνικός ‘(song sung) waiting for dinner’, μελλονικιάω ‘delay victory’ (both Aristoph.: the latter is a word-play on Nicias’ name), μίξοφρυς ‘having eye-brows that meet’ (Cratin.), ἐθελόσυχνος ‘fond of repetitions’, and λιποπωγωνία ‘want of a beard’ (both Crates Com.) are all drawn from the common classes of compounds in μελλο-, μίξο-, ἔθελο- and λιπο- but are at the same time comic inventions which appear in no other types of texts except for lexicographical sources. Another common type, compounds in μισο-, is exploited to create μισολάκων ‘hating Laconians’ and μισοπόρπαξ ‘hating the shield-handle’ (both Aristoph.); neologisms beginning with φιλο- are also particularly numerous (see Corpus under φιλέω). The FC παυσι- features in the ingenious name of a collar worn by slaves while grinding corn to prevent them from consuming the produce, the παυσικάπη ‘ending the gulping-down’.<sup>101</sup>

The V1 pattern is also exploited to create PNs that make a comic point about the characters’ attitudes and activities, or to sketch their personality: in Aristophanes, the FC of Strepsiades’ name ‘is a comment on his constant legal ‘twisting’ as well as his restlessness in bed’;<sup>102</sup> Philocleon is an enthusiastic supporter of the

**101** Cf. the explanation of the compound given by Aristophanes himself in fr. 314 K-A παύσειν ἔοιχ’ ἢ παυσικάπη κάπτοντά σε ‘the collar seems to be stopping you from gulping down’.

**102** Olson (1992: 307). This interpretation, based on the ancient scholia, had already been suggested by Marzullo (1953: 115–119), who pointed out that Στρεψιάδης must in origin have been an equestrian name: ‘il povero Strepsiade, nemico giurato dell’ippica sua rovina, porta inconsapevolmente un nome equestre’ (: Στρεψιπτιδης).

Athenian statesman Cleon and of his law-court frenzy, etc.<sup>103</sup> Compound names need not be absurd in order to make the audience smile: most of those found in Aristophanes are historical names which, introduced at the right moment in the plot, become speaking names highly relevant to the comedy's themes.<sup>104</sup> In this way the historical name Pheidippides could be re-used for the horse-mad son of a thrifty conservative and his aristocratic wife, and acquire the humorous meaning 'son of the Spare-and-Horses' *vel sim.*<sup>105</sup> A few appellative compounds, in turn, play with the names of historical or fictional characters to achieve a comic effect: this is the case, for instance, with κλαυσίμαχος 'rue-the-fight' and βουλόμαχος 'strife-desiring' in *Pax* 1293, both alluding to Lamachus.<sup>106</sup>

An amount of artificiality is of course to be expected in connection with comic compounds. A few forms with the V1 structure do not have the expected verb-object relationship, for instance χρεμψιθέατρος 'spitting in the theatre' (fr. *adesp.* 1100 K-A), στρεψοδικοπανουργίαν 'cunning in the perversion of justice' and κεκραξίδαμας 'who conquers all in bawling' (both Aristoph.): the last two are formed with two verbal stems. Structural analysis shows that in a number of forms the FC does not derive from a verb but from an action noun, of which it often preserves the semantics. An example is κρουσιδημέω 'cheat the people', in which the FC acquires one of the meanings conveyed by the nomen actionis κρούσις 'attempt to deceive' rather than reflecting the semantics of the verb κρούω 'strike'. The reasons behind the creation of so many V1 compounds in comic authors are certainly stylistic and peculiar to the comic genre, but the frequency of τερψίμβροτος-type compounds is perhaps also attributable to the fondness of the comic style for -σις nominals.<sup>107</sup>

**103** For such 'speaking names' in Aristophanes, see Kanavou (2011).

**104** Bonanno (1987), Kanavou (2011: 11). Olson (1992: 306–307) notes that most Aristophanic characters are identified by their name well into the play's plot. Such delayed naming 'allows Aristophanes to establish a character or situation and then bestow a name as a final climatic joke'.

**105** For the 'hybrid' status of this name in the *Clouds*, which is also allusive of Alcibiades, see Kanavou (2011: 71–72). The name itself is historical and based on Φειδίππος. According to Panagl (1983), the original meaning of Φειδίππος was 'one who releases horses', following the meaning of the IE root *\*b<sup>h</sup>eid-* 'split, divide'. Later, since the Greek verb φείδομαι means 'to spare', Φειδίππος was interpreted as 'spare horses': Panagl (1983: 303) points out that this paraetymological interpretation is already Homeric.

**106** Olson (1998: 309).

**107** This is often linked to parodic intentions: see Handley (1953: 141–142), Willi (2003: 134–136).

## 6.2 V1 compounds, technical language and scientific discourse

Another type of text in which V1 compounds may have followed a peculiar line of development is scientific literature. The identification of technical language in AG is a complex task: there are no clear structural properties that separate technical from standard terms; the distinction between ordinary and specialized language is not reflected in a dichotomy between Greek words and those imported from another language; the only texts we have at our disposal are literary in character; and it is often impossible to draw the line between science, philosophy and even poetry'.<sup>108</sup> The argument of Chapter 2, section 7.3, however, was that there may indeed be categories of compounds that, though not *exclusive* to a particular genre or register, are especially exploited by certain authors to create a scientific terminology. Here we will consider how new V1 compounds were created to meet the needs of technical language. Only those forms which unequivocally refer to phenomena, objects and ideas that are 'technical' are included in Table 6.1 below: epithets or words which do not pertain exclusively or especially to scientific discourse are omitted.

**Table 6.1:** V1 compounds in scientific authors

Compound	Meaning and first attestation
ἀμειψικοσμή	'change of condition' (Democr.)
ἀμειψιρρυσμία	'change of form' (Democr.)
ἀμειψιρρυσμέω	'change form' (Hippocr.)
αύξιφως	'increase of light' (Hephaest. and other astronomers)
αύξιφωτέω	'increase in light, wax' (Hephaest. and other astronomers)
ἐχέκολλος	'sticky' (Hippocr. and other medical authors)
ἐχεδερμία	'being hide-bound' ( <i>Hippiatr.</i> )
ληξιπύρετος	'allaying fever' (Gal. and other medical authors)
λιπόδερμος	'without skin' (Diosc., Ps. Gal.)
λιποθυμέω	'faint' (Hippocr., Gal.)
λιποθυμία	'fainting' (Hippocr., Gal.)
λιποψυχέω	'swoon' (Hdt., Xenarch., Gal.)
λιποψυχία	'swooning' (D. S., Plut., Gal.)
λυσιγυΐα	'relaxation of the limbs' (Hippocr.)

**108** The question of whether we can hope to arrive at an objective identification of expert groups of scientists in Antiquity, who shared the same language, is open to debate: see Dover (1997: 116), Langslow (2000: 26–27). There are a few linguistic features that may point to the existence of a coherent form of scientific discourse, which in turn may reveal the existence of specialist groups; but we must never forget that these intellectuals are likely to have been active in a variety of very different fields. See also Tribulato (2010) for a preliminary discussion of 'scientific' morphology.

Compound	Meaning and first attestation
λυσιπόνιον	'loose-pain', name of a medicinal unguent (Gal. and other medical authors)
μιξαίθρια	'alternation of fair and foul weather' (Hippocr.)
μνησίτοκος	'philoprogenitive' (lit. 'mindful of offspring'; Hippocr.)
τρεψίχρως	'changing colour' (Aristot.)

These V1 compounds appear in works from different epochs, whose authors were engaged in different kinds of 'science', from atomistic philosophy to medicine and astronomy, but they do not seem to have constituted a popular pattern which scientists would exploit to create families of scientific compounds.<sup>109</sup> Rather, the impression one gains from Table 6.1 is that the creation of new V1 compounds was sporadic, perhaps prompted by necessity rather than the convenience of the V1 structure. The relative rarity of V1 compounds in these scientific texts may thus reflect aversion to this compound type. This obviously cannot be taken to imply that the V1 type was perceived as too artificial, since scientific language itself often manifests a high level of terminological sophistication and remoteness from common language. Rather, it is possible that the V1 category was felt to be markedly poetic.

A closer inspection of the types of V1 compounds found in scientific language provides evidence in this direction. With the exceptions of compounds derived from ἀμείβω and ἔχω, all V1 forms in Table 6.1 belong to verbs which do not give rise to V2 compounds (αὔξω, λείπω) or whose V2 pattern is not productive (κλέπτω, λύω, μείγνυμι, μιμνήσκω, τρέπω). It is likely, therefore, that these V1 forms were created according to the disfavoured V1 pattern because no other structure was available. This explanation is consistent with the general conclusions reached by the present study concerning the factors behind the productivity of many V1 families.

### 6.3 V1 compounds, phraseology and Greek *Dichtersprache*

Since V1 compounds function as condensed verbal phrases, they often correspond to attested Greek expressions. Insights into the relationship between compounding and IE or Greek phraseology can be found in a variety of contributions dealing with individual compounds (particularly PNs),<sup>110</sup> and especially in a

<sup>109</sup> See, by contrast, my analysis of 'families' of scientific compounds in Theophrastus' botanical writings in Tribulato (2010: 491–493).

<sup>110</sup> E.g. Marzullo (1953); Dubois (2000).

number of articles by J. L. García Ramón.<sup>111</sup> However, we still stand in need of a more systematic investigation into the interface between phraseology, poetic language, and compounds. Rüdiger Schmitt's 1973 *Indogermanische Dichtersprache und Namengebung* only offers a brief sketch of the issue, while Schramm's 1957 *Namenschatz und Dichtersprache* is confined to Germanic.

Research into Greek and IE phraseology is especially enlightening for our understanding of PNs, the meaning of which we are often unable to grasp solely on the basis of the semantics of their two constituents. We have seen in Chapter 2, section 8, that 'meaningless' or 'irrational' PNs are not an infrequent phenomenon in Greek. We cannot always be sure of the process that led to their formation, but it appears that a number of meaningless names result from the juxtaposition of two constituents which originally belonged to 'meaningful' names. An example is provided by compounds with the FC δαμασι- from δάμνημι 'to tame'. The names Δαμασικλῆς and Δαμασικράτης, both attested from the middle of the fourth century onwards, ultimately make little sense: judging by their constituents, they might mean 'taming fame' and 'taming power' respectively, but these meanings are less than satisfactory. Such forms become more understandable once we consider that the FC δαμασι- first occurs in the names Δαμασίστρατος 'one who tames the (enemy) army', Δαμασάνωρ 'one who tames men', and Δαμάσιππος 'one who tames horses', which have perfectly clear meanings and evoke imagery associated with war and horsemanship. The FCs -κλῆς and -κράτης are common in bahuvrihis such as Πατροκλῆς and Πασικράτης: Δαμασικλῆς and Δαμασικράτης thus result from the conflation of these two types.

We might call both Δαμάσιππος and Πατροκλῆς 'primary' compound names, and Δαμασικλῆς a 'secondary' compound name.<sup>112</sup> The fact that a PN looks 'meaningless' should not prevent one from searching for possible phrases from which it might have derived, and thus finding a means of accounting for its structure.<sup>113</sup> It is at this point that phraseology and research into attested phrases containing a verb and its argument (in either order) come into the picture, as they may reveal that there is a rational pattern behind a seemingly meaningless V1 PN.

We must also reflect on the fact that such an analysis may yield different results depending on whether it is limited to Greek or takes other IE languages and the historical perspective into consideration. Accordingly, a methodological issue arises: can we call 'irrational compounds' those forms which make little sense from the point of view of Classical Greek semantics, but which, if traced back to an earlier period, might well be perfectly explainable? To return to the name of

<sup>111</sup> García Ramón (2000b), (2000–2001), (2005), (2006), (2008).

<sup>112</sup> Schmitt (1973: 7).

<sup>113</sup> García Ramón (2008: 323–324).

Strepsiadēs' son in the *Clouds*, Pheidippides (see above), this suddenly becomes more transparent if we suppose that it was formed at a time when \**b<sup>h</sup>eid-* still had the meaning 'split, separate', and then reflect on the fact that the releasing of horses was a common enough action in societies in which the horseman held a position of great prominence.<sup>114</sup>

Leaving the comparative perspective aside, since it would certainly require a study in its own right, we shall now focus on a selection of compound families in order to give a sense of what the analysis of phraseology can achieve. These families have been taken from our Corpus of V1 compounds, with the exception of (1) families represented by *Kurznamen* or forms of difficult etymology; (2) compounds derived from ἄρχω, since their FCs often have no governing function at all.

### 6.3.1 Epithets and PNs

Epithets can sometimes evoke rather unusual ideas, but in most cases they qualify a person by referring to his or her most characteristic qualities or actions. In this respect, V1 compounds often exhibit combinations of elements which are attested in parallel phrases. Divine epithets for instance often refer to the gods' ability to strike the earth and make it shake; among these, ἐλασίχθων 'earth-striking' (Pi.) refers to an action described in *Hom. H. Ap.* 333 ἔλασε χθόνα '[she] struck the earth', while ἐλελίχθων 'earth-shaking' (Pi.) finds a parallel in the image ἐλέλιξε δὲ μακρὸν Ὀλυμπον '[Hera] made the mighty Olympus shake' (*Il.* 8.199). βλαψίφρων 'perverting the mind', first attested in Aeschylus, is a short way of expressing the effect of the gods' maddening power, for which cf. *Il.* 15.724 ἀλλ' εἰ δὴ ῥα τότε βλάπτε φρένας εὐρύσοπα Ζεὺς 'but if far-seeing Zeus did indeed warp my mind then ...'.

Among the many Homeric epithets which are supported by Homeric phrases, compare ἀγαπήνωρ 'loving men' (Hom.) with *Il.* 24.464 ἀθάνατον θεὸν ὧδε βροτοὺς ἀγαπαζέμεν ἄντην '[for it would be a shameful thing] that an immortal god should **love mortal men** thus openly' and βωτιάνειρα with *Od.* 11.365 **βόσκει** γαῖα μέλαινα πολυσπερέας **ἀνθρώπους** 'the dark earth breeds men scattered far and wide'. Other epithets or names may of course have parallels in phrases attested in other authors. Continuing with forms drawn from the vast cohort of compounds derived from ἔχω, we may mention ἐχνηίς 'ship-holding' (Aesch.) and *Od.* 10.91 ἔνθ' οἱ γ' εἴσω πάντες **ἔχον νέας** ἀμφιελίσσας 'then all **held** their curved ships in', ἐχεμυθία 'silence' and *Od.* 19.502 ἀλλ' **ἔχε** σιγῆ **μῦθον** 'hold the matter in silence'.

<sup>114</sup> Panagl (1983).

For a selection of actions frequently celebrated in onomastics, we may quote the following verbs and their productive V1 compounds:

### **ἀρτύω** (section 3.2)

Ἄρτύλοχος is the warrior who ‘prepares an ambush’ (= *Od.* 14.469 ὡς ὄθ’ ὑπὸ Τροίην **λόχον** ἤγομεν **ἀρτύναντες** ‘as when we made ready our ambush and led it beneath Troy’), Ἄρτύμαχος is probably the person who gets the army ready for battle (cf. *Il.* 11.216 ἀρτύνθη δὲ μάχη ‘and the battle was set in array’), while Ἄρτυσίλεως and Ἄρτύλαος can be understood as ‘putting the army in order, preparing the army’ in the light of *Il.* 12.43 πυργηδὸν **σφέας αὐτοὺς ἀρτύναντες** ‘putting themselves in order, dressing their ranks like a tower’.

### **δαμάζω** (section 3.1)

Δαμασίστρατος ‘taming the enemy army’ and Ζευξίδᾶμος ‘subjugator of the people’ find a parallel in Aesch. *Pers.* 278–279 πᾶς δ’ ἀπώλλυτο στρατὸς δαμασθεῖς ‘the whole army perished, overwhelmed’ and Ctes. *Fr.* 3c.688.F.13.120 ζευγνὺς τὴν Ἄβυδον ‘having subjugated Abydos’ respectively (in this last case the phrase does not refer to the subjugation of people, but to that of the city of Abydos).

### **ἐρύκω** (Chapter 5, section 5.3.2)

Ἐρυξίλαος refers to the action of restraining the enemy, for which cf. *Il.* 24.658 λαὸν ἐρύκω ‘I keep back the host’.

### **εὐχομαι** (Chapter 5, section 5.3.1)

The origin of the PN Ἐυξίθεος ‘one who prays to the gods’ can be traced back to phrases such as *Il.* 3.296 εὐχοντο θεοῖς ‘they prayed the gods’

## **6.3.2 Epithets and names in -ιππος**

Even in the small corpus under consideration, compounds in -ιππος play an important role and can be explained in the light of attested phrases. ἐλάσιππος ‘driving horses’ describes a common action, cf. *Il.* 23.357 Τυδείδης ὄχ’ ἄριστος ἐὼν λάχ’ ἐλανόμεν ἵππους ‘the son of Tydeus, though far the best, drew a lot to drive his horses’. The PN Ἀγάσιππος refers to a person who appreciates horses and is able to select them: cf. Xen. *Eq.* 4.1 Ὅταν γε μὴν ἀγασθεῖς ἵππον πρίηταί τις... ‘When a man, having found a horse which he likes, buys it...’. Similarly, the Laconian name Αἰρήηιππος describes someone who is good at capturing horses, while Ἄψιππος refers to another action performed by horsemen, the striking of the horse to quieten it, cf. Xen. *Eq.* 6.14.3 (which explains that, if the horse is shy

of anything, the owner should touch the horse and gently lead it to whatever is causing the fear).<sup>115</sup>

### 6.3.3 Other compounds and their corresponding phrases

Among the other V1 compounds for which it is possible to identify parallel phrases, we may mention the following ones derived from verbs in Classes I and II:

#### **αἰρέω** (Chapter 5, section 5.3.2)

αἰρησιτείχης ‘taker of walls’, the title of a play by Diphilus, is the compound form of a common set of expressions, e.g. Isoc. *Ep.* 2.21 κάλλιον ἔστιν τὰς εὐνοίας τὰς τῶν πόλεων αἰρεῖν ἢ τὰ τεῖχη ‘it is so much more beautiful to conquer the favour of cities rather than their walls’ and Xen. *Hell.* 4.5.5 τὸ ἐντετειχισμένον τεῖχος αἰρεῖ ‘[the regiment] captures the fortified stronghold [of Oenoe]’.

#### **ἀκέομαι** (Chapter 5, section 5.3.1)

Names such as Ἀκέσανδρος and Ἀκεσίμβροτος, and appellatives such as ἀκεσίπνονος ‘healing toil’ (Nonn.) find parallels in several phrases: see for instance Democr. fr. 31.2 σώματος νόσουσ ἀκέεται ‘[it] heals the diseases of the body’.

#### **ἀνύω** (Chapter 5, section 5.3.2)

ἀνυσίεργος ‘finishing work’ (Theocr.) corresponds to phrases such as *Od.* 16.373 ἀνύσσεσθαι τάδε ἔργα ‘[since I do not believe that, as long as he lives,] this work will be accomplished’.

#### **ἄπτω** (Chapter 5, section 5.3.1)

The word for ‘skirmish’, ἀψιμαχία (Plu.) and the PN Ἀψιμάχης (Macedonia 3rd c. AD), have parallels in Hdt. 6.108.5 συνάπτειν μάχην ‘join battle’ and Megasth. *Fragm.* 38a.38 οὐκ αὐτίκα μάχης ἄπτονται ‘they do not start fighting immediately’; ἀψικάρδιος ‘heart-touching’ (M. Ant.) has a parallel in Eur. *Hel.* 960 καρδίας ἀνθάψεται ‘[that which] shall touch (your) heart’.

#### **βούλομαι** (Chapter 5, section 4.3)

Aristophanes calls Lamachus βουλόμαχος ‘a man who desires strife’, which is far from unheard of in contemporary literature, cf. e.g. Thuc. 4.91 βουλόμενος τῆν μάχην ποιῆσαι ‘wanting to make battle’.

<sup>115</sup> For these and other compounds in -ιπτος, including the frequent δάμνιπτος, see Dubois (2000) and García Ramón (2005b).



## 7 Conclusion

The compounds analysed in this chapter in part confirm the traditional view of Greek V1 compounds: namely that they are less productive than V2 compounds and are generally used in onomastics and poetry. The in-depth analysis of the interaction of V1 and V2 compounds within individual families, however, has also shown that this traditional view must be refined in a number of crucial respects. The starting point of our approach has been to organize the verbs which produce both V1 and V2 compounds into four different subgroups, based on whichever type the V2 compounds fall under. Within the large Class IV, which contains V2 compounds of the *-ος* and *-της* types, the important distinction is between productive and unproductive families. Productive families tend to exhibit a neat distribution, whereby V1 compounds are mostly productive as PNs, while V2 compounds are mostly productive as appellatives (see summary in section 3.1.1). This is consistent with our hypothesis that Greek tended to increase its right-oriented types: in these cases, V1 compounds were preserved primarily for onomastic purposes. Families in which this distribution is especially apparent are those derived from *ἄγω*, *δέχομαι*, *ἔρδω*, *ἠγέομαι*, *ἵστημι* and *σώζω*. However, the crucial point to bear in mind is that these onomastic V1 compounds represent a functioning means of word formation rather than a dying relic: the analysis of the V1 compounds in this group has consistently confirmed the high productivity of this type.

Less productive families, on the other hand, exhibit a less predictable distribution of forms, and one which is greatly affected by the productivity and semantic restrictions of their base verbs. Unsurprisingly, the number of V1 compounds decreases in the presence of productive V2 compounds, and the type is often tied to a particular linguistic domain: onomastics (e.g. compounds derived from *ἔραμαι*, *πράσσω* or *τιμάω*) or poetic language (e.g. compounds derived from *βόσκω*, *ράπτω*, *φθείρω*). On the other hand, rare V2 compounds are not necessarily compensated for by an increased number of V1 forms, a phenomenon which can only be accounted for in the light of the behaviour of their base verbs. On the whole, however, even in the case of these less productive families we are not given the impression that V1 compounds were a limited category in Greek: the success or unsuccess of individual families is largely determined by the peculiarities of their base verbs, and not by the V1 pattern itself.

The analysis of V2 compounds in *-ής* conducted in section 4 has been a useful means of confirming the Greek trend towards right-oriented structures. As noted, this verbal type was specialized for the expression of passive and stative semantics, but was occasionally also exploited for the expression of active (though mostly intransitive) semantics. In the case of the seventeen verbs of Class IVa,

which lack V2 compounds in -ος and -της, these forms in -ής, albeit with differences across the individual families, clearly constituted the productive type of compound: their V1 parallels are mostly rare or at any rate less numerous than those in -ής (an exception are compounds in μισο-).

The few verbs in Class IVb analysed in section 5 display some peculiar behaviours, and this must be connected with the fact that neither their V1 nor their V2 compounds are verbal in origin. Thus, the immense popularity of compounds in φιλο- seems to be due (at least in part) to the fact that its FC derives from an adjective (although it was connected to the verb φιλέω). The left-oriented compounds of this class are generally quite common (an exception is φοβέω, whose V2 compounds, however, are also rare) but again they are mostly productive in onomastics.

Within a compound system which privileges right-oriented V2 formations, V1 compounds often provide useful alternatives for the expression of special meanings and a structure which continues to be favoured in the onomastic and poetic domains. With the help of the survey provided in this chapter we have also been able to show that factors other than those of a morphological nature are at play in determining the creation and development of individual V1 families. In many of the individual analyses of verbs producing V1 compounds there was scope for issues of style and literary language to come to the fore, and the brief overview in section 6 also tackled the influence of phraseology and register variation in particular literary genres (comedy and scientific texts) as well as in onomastics. No attempt has been made to investigate systematically the role and structural characteristics of V1 compounds in the AG literary genres, but the short survey provided here shows that such a topic certainly deserves a study in its own right.

## Conclusion

# V1 Formations and the system of verbal compounds in Ancient Greek

This book has provided an investigation of the diachronic development of AG V1 compounds, from the reconstructed phase of late PIE to the linguistic stage represented by late-antique texts. The analysis has adopted historical linguistics as its main methodological framework, but it has also taken account of theories developed by morphologists for the study of compounding cross-linguistically. **Chapter 1** addressed compounding from a typological point of view, while at the same time providing a general introduction to the peculiarities of AG compounding. Its defining characteristic is the use of stems, which in some FCs are followed by linking elements (e.g.  $\pi\upsilon\rho\text{-}\sigma\text{-}$  from  $\pi\upsilon\rho$  ‘fire’). In comparison to the later stage of development represented by MG, stems and linking elements both present a high degree of variation in AG (section 4.2). V1 compounds, too, are synchronically formed from a variety of stems/root grades (Chapter 4, sections 3–4), and formal analysis of their FCs has been central to the formulation of theories concerning the origin of this category in PIE.

The methodological assumption underlying the investigation pursued in this book is that V1 compounds should be analysed in the context of the Greek compound system, whose main categories were described in **Chapter 2**. Among the various areas of interest addressed in this chapter, the following have proven especially relevant to the analysis of V1 compounds:

(1) The development of AG V2 compounds into endocentric [N N] structures. This tendency is initiated by the creation in Greek of an exclusively substantival type of agentive compound formed with the suffix  $-\tau\eta\varsigma$ . Such compounds are mostly reserved for expressing well-defined masculine agents and diverge in that respect from those in  $-\sigma\varsigma$ , which—being nouns or adjectives—are less semantically restricted and have a larger range of applications, since they can qualify masculine, feminine and neuter nouns and acquire either an active or passive voice. It was noted in section 6.9 that these properties make agentive compounds in  $-\sigma\varsigma$  quite similar to V1 compounds. This observation receives further support from the analysis, provided in Chapter 6, of competing V1/V2 pairs: when the individual types of V2 compounds in these pairs are compared, it emerges that those in  $-\sigma\varsigma$  have higher productivity than those in  $-\tau\eta\varsigma$ . The situation in MG represents the outcome of the trend which took shape in Classical Greek: while agentive compounds in  $-\sigma\varsigma$  are still a productive type (whereas V1 compounds are not,

except in some dialects),<sup>1</sup> they have become manifestly substantival in nature, losing those adjectival functions they previously fulfilled.<sup>2</sup> Chapter 2 argued that this process of conversion of V2 -ος compounds into an exclusively substantival category has its roots in Classical Greek, where the presence of -ος agentive *simplicia* may have encouraged the use of the corresponding compounds as nouns, with the result that the class as a whole was interpreted as an [N N] type. Crucially, this situation no longer applies in MG, where the verbal SC of these forms is most often a bound stem inherited from AG.<sup>3</sup> The understanding of MG verbal compounds in -ος could therefore benefit from a study which takes into consideration the evolution of agentive compounds in AG.

(2) The development of determinative compounds over time, which can be viewed in the context of the more general Greek trend towards endocentricity (section 4.7). A degree of overlap with determinative compounds has been noted in connection with some of the V1 types analysed in Chapters 5 and 6, particularly those in ἀρχι-, μιξο-, and ἔθελο-. These may represent examples of incipient grammaticalization, in which the FC has lost its governing function and has become or is close to becoming a prefix modifying the SC.

(3) The transition of verbal compounds in -ής from their original stative/passive function to the expression of the active voice is also an integral part of the peculiar development of the AG compound system. These compounds are mainly intransitive but a few also have the same active semantics as V1 compounds, to which they provide an alternative (albeit a limited one: see Chapter 6, section 4).

(4) Apart from the cross-linguistically common forms with a verbal or prepositional FC, AG also developed a number of left-oriented categories which have never been comprehensively studied. As noted in sections 7.2–7.4, a high degree of interference from syntactic structures is apparent in the make-up of these compounds: in those with an adjectival FC (analysed in section 7.4), the left-orientation is clearly due to the governing nature of the FC, while others are seemingly influenced by frequent noun + genitive phrases, which may have attained the status of ‘phrasal terms’ in specific registers (section 7.3). Analysis of these forms enabled us to see that V1 compounds are not an isolated type: their orientation and close relationship with phraseology find parallels in other left-oriented formations. Many of the Greek left-oriented categories are therefore not rare exceptions, but relatively prolific types whose structure is determined by the nature of their FC, and by the morphological and syntactic properties which this displays.

<sup>1</sup> Ralli (2013: 83).

<sup>2</sup> Ralli (2013: 201–219).

<sup>3</sup> Ralli (2013: 203–209).

It is precisely the interplay of morphology and syntax in the formation process of V1 compounds which is the focus of many analyses of this category in Greek. These were reviewed in **Chapter 3**, which paid special attention to theories that identify the FC of V1 compounds with verbal stems (sections 4 and 8) and to early studies of the impact of syntax and word order on the structure of V1 compounds (sections 5, 7 and 8). Following both older and more recent approaches to V1 compounds in ancient and modern languages, which identify their FCs with stems, **Chapter 4** advanced the view that the elements contained in the FCs of the Greek *φερέοικος*, *τερψίμβροτος* and *βωτιάνειρα* types are verbal roots or stems and rejected the hypothesis that some of these FCs might originally have contained nouns. The chapter proposed a model for the historical evolution of V1 compounds in the IE languages. It submitted that PIE possessed two types of V1 compounds (those in *-e-* and those in *-ti-*), which were later lost or re-interpreted in Indo-Iranian and West IE, and were preserved and further developed in AG (section 2). The presence of rare V1 compounds in the onomastic stock of Germanic languages can be explained with reference to the influence of Late Latin and early Romance, where the V1 type is productive. In Late Latin, V1 compounds arose independently from the old PIE type (which Classical Latin appears to have lost), probably as a result of shifts in the word order patterns of the language. The evaluation of the Slavic evidence as a whole is more problematic: although the few East Slavic V1 compounds have been explained as borrowings, the more extensive evidence of such formations in South Slavic and the presence of a few V1 compounds in Old Church Slavonic may point to the continuation of the inherited type.

As far as AG is concerned, the high productivity of two separate types of V1 compounds (*φερέοικος* and *τερψίμβροτος*) as well as the preservation of isolated forms of the *βωτιάνειρα* type raises two questions: firstly, whether all three types were inherited from an older linguistic stage; secondly, what factors determined the survival of a left-oriented verbal category in the AG right-oriented compound system. In dealing with the first question, the analysis provided in this book differed from previous investigations of the dynamics behind the genesis of the V1 type in PIE. Although we subscribed to the view that syntactic structures can influence patterns of word formation, our analysis did not concern itself with the possible impact of PIE syntax and constituent order on the structure of compounds. The idea that V1 compounds might reflect a marked word order and/or imperatival phrases is not to be discarded, but it is largely unverifiable, and not particularly useful for understanding the meaning and development of V1 compounds in the individual IE languages. By contrast, the investigation of PIE verbal morphology vis-à-vis types of verbal compounds is a more rewarding enterprise, since it can provide hints as to the way in which compound constituents might have been selected.

Accordingly, Chapter 4 focused on the formal make-up of the FCs of V1 compounds rather than on the impact of word order, and advanced the hypothesis that at an early linguistic stage V1 compounds were formed using simple roots, in parallel with the behaviour of these roots in the PIE verbal system. V1 compounds based on roots whose primary formation was the root present selected the thematic radical present stem (characterized by *-e-*). The Greek φερέουκος type extends this latter formation process to a large number of verbs whose present formation is not of the root type (e.g. λανθάνω): the FCs derived from them are usually formed on the simple root followed by *-ε-*. In the case of secondary presents such as λανθάνω, this often corresponds to the thematic aorist stem (λαθ-ε-), a fact which brings out the extent to which AG innovated on the original derivational system posited here. On the other hand, the Sanskrit type of compounds in *-a-* (< *-e-*) has only been cursorily examined in this book: a thorough morphological investigation of the types of stems behind the FC of such Vedic compounds in *-a-* vis-à-vis the Greek ones is a *desideratum*.

V1 compounds derived from roots whose primary formation was the root aorist were marked by presence of the element *-ti-*, in which *-t-* appears to have been imported from V2 root compounds, while *-i-* is merely a linking vowel. This element might have come into existence after an initial stage in which FCs could have contained the mere root, as in Greek form Τληπόλεμος and in the Vedic *sthā-raśman* ‘making reins firm’ (Chapter 4, section 2.1). In Vedic and Greek—the only two languages where these *-ti-* compounds are attested—this category is clearly a rarity. Following work carried out by Nielsen Whitehead (2012), our conclusion was that the Vedic *-ti-* compounds constitute a rather artificial type of ‘reversed bahuvrihis’, probably the result of reanalysis of the inherited type (section 4.3.2). In Homeric Greek, by contrast, *-τι-* compounds have a clear V1 structure (no re-analysis has taken place), but they are confined to PNs and rare epithets. The evaluation of the Mycenaean evidence for V1 compounds in *-ti-* provided in Chapter 4 proved to be essential for understanding the factors at play in the preservation or loss of individual *-ti-* compounds. The hypothesis that *-ti-* marked compounds derived from roots whose primary formation was the root aorist was tested on a number of such Mycenaean FCs (e.g. those derived from ἀραρίσκω or ὄρνυμι). These preserved the [ti] cluster against Mycenaean assibilation to ensure morphological transparency, particularly in those cases where the prospective assibilated FCs in *-si-* would not be supported by an existing s-aorist (e.g. those derived from ἀραρίσκω, analysed in 7.1; the same applies to the Homeric form βητάρμων, analysed in 8.3). In other FCs, on the other hand, [ti] was prevented from assibilating or palatalizing because of the phonetic environment in which it found itself: this applies to those FCs in which [ti] is preceded by [s] (e.g. those derived from κέκασμαι, 7.5, including Καστιάνειρα, 8.5).

Both the make-up of Mycenaean compounds in *-ti-* and the related question of the dynamics of assibilation in Mycenaean benefit from the hypothesis, advanced in section 5, that *-ti-* compounds and *-si-* compounds are independent of one another, with the latter attested only in AG (starting with Mycenaean: see *ta-si-ko-no* in section 7.9). We submitted that from the start these FCs in *-si-* were formed by employing the stem of the sigmatic aorist: the origin of this type of FC, therefore, is not to be sought in the assibilation of FCs in *-ti-*. Aside from the lack of evidence for comparable compounds in *-si-* from the other IE languages of early attestation, there are no particularly strong arguments against the hypothesis that V1 compounds derived from the s-aorist in a chronologically late phase of IE (section 6.1). In AG, this derivational process was further encouraged by the independent phenomenon of assibilation, which arguably transformed many old *-ti-* compounds into *-si-* compounds in the linguistic stage immediately following Mycenaean Greek. The characteristic *-si-* element—in which *-s-* marks derivation from the s-aorist (as well as the future) and *-i-* is merely a linking vowel—attained huge popularity in the Greek compound system, since it encouraged the inclusion of V1 compounds in a derivational cycle which also contained the future and action nouns in *-σις*. This is the factor behind the much higher productivity of *τερψίμβροτος* compounds over the *φερρέουκος* type (section 4.2).<sup>4</sup> In positing a system in which compound FCs were derived from verbal roots and stems, often in association with specific verbal formations, Chapter 4 rejected the hypothesis that these FCs also expressed aspect: such a hypothesis is unverifiable as far as the parent language is concerned and AG does not provide any evidence for the existence of aspectual nuances in V1 compounds.

After assuming this historical perspective, the book has focused on the synchronic study of AG V1 compounds, developing a methodological approach based on comparing them with V2 compounds. Unlike previous attempts of this kind, the analysis provided is based on a full database of V1 compounds which also provides information on competing V2 structures. The guiding principle behind the contrastive analysis of V1 and V2 compounds has not been the desire to understand the semantic and stylistic dynamics governing the choice of one pattern over the other: indeed, the identification of these factors has been the primary concern of all previous contributions which have dealt with the relationship between these forms, from Andriotis (1938) to Benveniste (1967). By contrast, the approach adopted in this book envisages morphology and its rules as the dominant factor behind the choice of V1 and V2 patterns. Our contention has been that, in order to understand these morphological rules and the constraints which follow from them, we must first understand the history of the verbs which

---

<sup>4</sup> For MG, see Ralli (2013: 182–183).

produce these compounds, and secondly the mechanisms that determine the derivation of verbal *simplicia* and compounds from them.

Our investigation has therefore endeavoured to develop a model of morphological analysis in which the study of V1 compounds is not separated from the study of agent nouns in -ος, -τηρ, -τωρ and -της, which form the basis of the majority of V2 compounds. Besides the mainstream types of agentive V2 compounds in -ος and -της, this book has also addressed the behaviour of other types of V2 compounds which are capable at times of fulfilling the same function as V1 formations: from the rare class of root compounds (Chapter 2, section 6.1) to the more common verbal adjectives in -ής, which acquired an active meaning over the course of the Classical age.

The synchronic survey provided in the last two chapters of this book, however, also took account of the stylistic factors which influenced the success of many compound families, as well as the semantic re-interpretations that they were sometimes subjected to. It is precisely the study of V1 compounds in context which often provides evidence for the hypothesis that the creation of a large number of V1 compounds came about independently of stylistic concerns and was instead influenced by various well-defined morphological factors and constraints. An example of a tendency ruled by morphology is the fact that V1 compounds derived from verbs producing V2 compounds in -ος are less productive than V1 compounds derived from verbs which do not produce V2 compounds in -ος. A large number of verbs which do not produce -ος agentive forms are also lacking in other agent nouns: in this case, the creation of V1 compounds (ruled by morphology) is responsible for the preservation of the V1 type in Greek and its usage in a large number of contexts.

Almost half of AG V1 compounds exist in isolation from V2 formations, and the productivity, contextual use and semantics of these verbs is closely bound up with those of the simple agent nouns derived from the same verbs. **Chapter 5** addressed the question of whether there are any morphological factors which impede the creation of V2 compounds and agent nouns from a given verb. The verbs in Class I share a number of morphological properties, the most conspicuous of which is that they are neither based on CeC/CoC ablauting roots nor do they belong to the category of ‘Greek presents in short vowel’: the lack of V2 compounds derived from them can therefore be attributed, first and foremost, to their inability to create -ος agent nouns. The V1 compounds produced by these verbs also tend to be isolated forms and an investigation of the base verbs and their compounds has made it possible to link this low productivity to semantic and stylistic factors, which certainly also contributed to the lack of agent nouns and compounds. Among these factors, special attention has been paid to the poetic specialization of some base verbs (e.g. ἀμέρδω, ἀμείουμαι, εἰλέω) and the



competition which others faced from more popular synonyms (e.g. ἀγαπάω and στυγέω).

Even in Class II the majority of verbs are not based on CeC/CoC roots and the presents in short vowel are similarly very few. However, the verbs in this class as a whole produce a substantial number of agent nouns in -της, which in principle are free to compound. The fact that these thirty-three verbs do not seem to have produced V2 compounds cannot be ascribed only to the vagaries of our sources: the analysis of agent nouns carried out in sections 5.1–5.1.4 suggested that the low productivity and late attestation of many of these *simplicia*, combined with the clear semantic specialization of others, is responsible for the lack of V2 formations. The high number of V1 compounds derived from the three verbs in Class III too is assuredly connected to the semantic limitations of their V2 counterparts (which are all intransitive or passive). In Classes I–III, therefore, recourse is made to the V1 type whenever the V2 pattern cannot be formed or is unavailable. The productivity of these V1 compounds is reasonably high in both the appellative and the onomastic domains, a fact which confirms that the function which they fulfilled was—on some level at least—a central one.

In **Chapter 6** the focus shifted to competing pairs of V1/V2 compounds, and the individual morphological factors at play in the success of either pattern came under scrutiny. As just noted, V1 compounds corresponding to V2 compounds in -ος tend to be more marginal, and are sometimes limited to onomastics. Conversely, V2 compounds in -της are not always very productive and in a number of specific cases the deficiencies of the V2 structure are compensated for by a productive V1 type. In section 3.2.1 we also noted that V1 compounds may be a stronger competitor for V2 compounds in -της because the semantic sphere of V1 forms is ampler, in that they can be used as adjectives (whereas -της forms cannot). At the same time, the language may seek to develop alternative types of right-oriented compounds: section 4.2.1 concluded that most of the seventeen families of active compounds in -ής were probably developed to complement V1 types of a mostly onomastic nature. What we appear to have in this case, therefore, is a neat distribution of structures, as well as an exceptional acquisition of active semantics on the part of -ής compounds in order to make up for the deficiencies of the V1 structure. As noted in section 4.3, however, these active -ής compounds never become wholesale substitutes for other V2 types and they do not intervene to provide the V1 compounds of Classes I–III with a productive V2 counterpart. This confirms that the primary function of active compounds in -ής was a different one, namely the expression of intransitivity (section 4.3). The impact of determinative compounds of the ἀστυάναξ type (section 5) is similarly very restricted, but their analysis is useful for refining our understanding of the Greek trend towards right-oriented endocentric formations.

Especially in the comparison of V1 compounds with common V2 compounds, discussion of style and literary contexts complemented the morphological analysis. It is often the case that the V2 compounds derived from a given verb are attested in all linguistic registers and therefore also in ‘common’ Greek: an example is *ἐλάω*, discussed in Chapter 6. In these cases, V1 compounds tend to be marked as being either more high-level (e.g. those derived from *ἐλάω* itself, *κλέπτω* and *στρέφω*) or even poetic (see particularly *βόσκω* with *βωπιάνειρα*), or limited to onomastics (e.g. *ἡγέομαι*, *ἴστημι*). We must be attentive to such register variations in the use of compound patterns, but we must also be wary of attributing the specific characteristics and tendencies of individual types/families to the whole V1 category as if they represented general rules of behaviour. V2 compounds are by no means uniquely ‘low level’, being in fact represented across all literary and epigraphic genres. It was noted in Chapter 6, for instance, that the very prevalent type of V2 compounds derived from *φέρω* is far from being confined to more ‘standard’ linguistic levels compared to the corresponding V1 type: both structures have a similar distribution.

What tends to be more predictable, however, is the onomastic specialization of V1 forms that are in competition with common V2 compounds. Such onomastic specialization also applies to a number of the V1 families discussed in Chapter 5, in which case the lack of V2 counterparts of course means that the presence of the V1 orientation cannot be ascribed to such competition. This certainly shows that V1 compounds were one of the types most frequently selected for PNs. At the same time, the exclusive onomastic specialization of certain families may have more to do with the meanings of the base verbs and their popularity in onomastics than with the V1 pattern as a whole. When we combine our the data for exclusively onomastic V1 compounds (from all four classes) with our data for V1 families confined to literary language, however, it becomes clear that V1 compounds are a widely exploited compound type rather than a scarcely productive relic.

Of course, both the Corpus and any conclusions derived from it are inevitably going to have a degree of uncertainty associated with them: we know AG mostly from literary or highly standardized epigraphic texts, and this has certainly meant the obliteration of a large number of forms that would have belonged to the oral language. Particularly in connection with the conclusions reached in Chapter 5, since V1 compounds without V2 counterparts were under discussion there, we should bear in mind that the lack of a given form could very easily be due to poor documentation or to the fact that a particular form was not appropriate to the specific socio-linguistic variety represented by the texts we have. That said, many of our results concerning the lack of V2 forms and/or agent nouns derived from a given verb have turned out to be supported by the general behavior of the

relevant base verbs, which often seem to be rare or an unproductive source of derivatives (for examples of this, see Chapter 5, section 4.1).

Comprehensive data collecting and in-depth analysis of individual compound families and their base verbs, combined with the study of the contexts and registers in which V1 compounds are used, have offered new insights into the structure of V1 compounds and improved our understanding of their development within the AG compound system. The productivity of V1 compounds:


1. is very often connected to that of the base verb (Chapter 5, for instance, examined the low productivity of many V1 families derived from exclusively poetic archaic verbs);
2. is explainable on the basis of the base verb's behaviour in certain registers/types of texts (e.g. in Chapter 6 this was noted apropos of the specialization of κάμπτω in musical terminology);
3. is influenced by the chronological distribution of the corresponding agent nouns and V2 forms (in Chapter 6 we noted, for instance, the late rise and semantic specialization of V2 compounds in -κοσμητής, a fact which may explain the early productivity of the V1 type in κοσμησι-);
4. may be due to special semantic restrictions associated with the base verbs (as noted in relation to καλέω, τρέχω, and the agent nouns from πράσσω in Chapter 6).

Through the close study of V1 compounds, this book has also contributed to clarifying the role of verbal compounds in the Greek compound system. Though not without contradictions and 'uneconomic' phenomena, this is a very flexible system as regards both the exploitation of those patterns allowed by the morphology of each verbal root and their semantic specialization. Verbal roots of the ablauting type tend, if possible, to give rise to V2 structures, both active (κουροτρόφος type) and passive (ὀρεσίτροφος type). Some of these verbal roots also create productive V1 compounds. Roots which give rise to Greek verbs in short vowel (e.g. ἄρχω) too tend to give rise to active V2 compounds in -ος. Other verbal roots can form active V2 compounds by using compound agent nouns in -της. Alongside these, and especially when -της compounds do not exist for a given verb, the V1 pattern can prove another viable option.


These active and largely agentive verbal compounds are accompanied by passive verbal adjectives. In addition to those in -τος (on their morphological constraints see Chapter 2, section 6.7), Greek developed a new passive type in -ής. Change of voice is common within some families of -ής compounds, and active or even active-transitive compounds in -ής can be created out of previously passive ones or immediately as such. However, this is also a limited phenomenon overall:

active compounds in *-ής* never become a systematically productive type which replaces other types of agentive compounds.

The interaction between all the above-mentioned verbal compounds is far from haphazard, since these formations are neatly distributed along a scale combining transitivity and voice. Passive compounds in *-τος*—the prototypical passive type, which Greek inherited from PIE—stand at one end of the spectrum, while V1 compounds (whose SCs mostly fulfil the direct object function and are therefore highly transitive) are at the other end.

V2 -τος	ἄφερτος ‘intolerable’	Passive	<b>Passive</b>  <b>Active</b>
V1	φερέοικος ‘carrying the house’	Transitive	

The other verbal formations discussed in this book are distributed between these two extremes. Next to compounds in *-τος*, *-ής* compounds express passive semantics (e.g. ἀνωφερής ‘borne upwards’), but also add the expression of active-intransitive semantics (e.g. οἰνοφερής ‘inclined to wine’), with transitivity being a limited development in some defined families. They are followed by *-ος* compounds, which include a passive type (ἀνώφορος ‘borne upwards’) and a very productive active one, which can be either transitive (οἰκοφόρος ‘carrying the house’) or intransitive (λαυπηροδρόμος ‘swift-running’). *-της* compounds, on the other hand, are not passive (the odd passive semantics of certain compounds is

V2 -τος	ἄφερτος ‘intolerable’	Passive	<b>Passive</b>  <b>Active</b>
V2 -ής	ἀνωφερής ‘borne upwards’	Passive	
V2 -ος	ἀνώφορος ‘borne upwards’	Passive	
V2 -ής	οἰνοφερής ‘inclined to wine’	Intransitive	
V2 -ος	λαυπηροδρόμος ‘swift-running’	Intransitive	
V2 -ος	οἰκοφόρος ‘carrying the house’	Transitive	
V2 -της	κυνηγέτης ‘dog-leader, hunter’	Transitive	
V1	φερέοικος ‘carrying the house’	Transitive	

an exceptional phenomenon) and are devoted to the full expression of the verbal agent, thus having a high degree of transitivity: these can accordingly be placed closest to V1 compounds at the other end of the spectrum. Through the combina-

tion of these formations, Greek achieves a degree of semantic flexibility for the expression of voice and thematic roles in compounding which is one of the most striking characteristics of its sophisticated compound system.

This system of verbal compounds requires a more detailed study, which could delve into the impact of voice on the formal make-up of verbal compounds and pay careful attention to the diachronic development of all verbal compound categories and to their relation to one another. An investigation of AG verbal compounds vis-à-vis phrases with finite verbs or participles would also be worthwhile, as would—on a much larger scale—a study of the factors determining the use of a compound instead of a corresponding syntactic phrase. Some work in this direction was described in Chapter 2, section 7.4 apropos of structures with governing adjectives and their complement, or nouns and their specifying genitive (section 7.3). All of these topics would naturally benefit from a diachronic approach, tracing patterns of development all the way from Ancient Greek to the medieval and modern varieties of the language: an investigation which I hope others will embark upon.



# Appendix

## Corpus of V1 Compounds, Their Base Verbs, First Constituents, Corresponding Agent Nouns and V2 Compounds

### Criteria of organization

#### 1 Entries

The purpose of this collection is to provide a comprehensive corpus of V1 compounds down to the 6th c. AD, with forays into the Byzantine period, and a systematic picture of their formal variations. Entries are organized according to the verb from which the V1 compounds derive: these are mostly presents, but a few thematic aorists have also been included. Each entry provides information on the FC(s) of the V1 compounds, their first attestation, and a full list of appellative and onomastic compounds. In some more numerous families, compounds may be divided between literary and epigraphic attestations. This information is followed by a list of the agent nouns produced by the same verb (if there are any) and by a full list of active V2 compounds which are semantically comparable to V1 ones: chiefly those in -ος, -της, -τηρ/τωρ, as well as active V2 compounds in -ής.

#### 2 Classification of verbs and their compounds

The following Roman numbers are used to refer to the classes of verbs and their compounds studied in Chapters 5 and 6; these numbers follow the verb in each entry:

**I:** V1 compounds from verbs which do not create agent nouns or V2 forms (analyzed in Chapter 5): forty-two verbs;

**II:** V1 compounds from verbs which create agent nouns but no V2 forms (analyzed in Chapter 5): thirty-three verbs;

**III:** V1 compounds with a V2 counterpart from verbs which do not give rise to an agent noun: three verbs;

**IV:** V1 compounds with V2 counterparts of the agentive type (in -ος or -της), analyzed in Chapter 6: fifty-eight verbs;

**IVa:** V1 compounds with only V2 counterparts in -ής (analyzed in Chapter 6): seventeen verbs;

**IVb:** V1 compounds with no V2 counterpart, but corresponding to nominal compounds which cover for verbal semantics (e.g. -φιλος), analyzed in Chapter 6: five verbs.

### 3 Meanings

Meanings are provided to orient the reader in the interpretation of compounds, but should not be considered exhaustive: they usually follow *LSJ* or the first meaning provided there, although for some forms a more literal rendering has been preferred. Readers however should check the semantic range of each form in the dictionary.

### 4 Inscriptions and personal names

Epigraphic compounds have been included, with dates, whenever possible. This corpus is mostly based on available lexica and should not therefore be considered exhaustive. PNs are collected from the *LGPN*, unless otherwise indicated. Forms whose belonging to a certain compound pattern is uncertain are followed by '?'. Abbreviations used in epigraphic attestations follow those in the *LGPN*: note in particular the use of '?' preceding dates for dubious dating and following place-names for dubious provenance. The list of PNs is meant to give an idea of the use of a given FC in onomastics, rather than to provide a complete corpus of forms: for this reason, formal and dialectal variants of individual names are omitted (see Chapter 2, section 8.1). Names attested in inscriptions are arranged in alphabetical order, while those attested in literary texts keep the chronological order adopted for appellatives as well. In larger compound families, literary and epigraphic compounds are listed in separate entries.

The collection of PNs was completed before the publication of *LGPN VA* (Costal Asia Minor: Pontos to Ionia, 2010) and *VB* (Costal Asia Minor: Caria to Cilicia, 2014): consequently, names included in these volumes are not listed in this Corpus.

### 5 Mycenaean forms

Mycenaean V1 and V2 compounds are included, with a transliteration, whenever they provide information for the dating of phenomena and the productivity of a given compound type in Greek. However, not all the Mycenaean V1 PNs have been included, particularly in the case of those which are lost or re-analysed in alpha-



betic Greek. These also include some forms analysed in Chapter 4 (*me-ti-ja-no*, names from \**ĥens-*).

## 6 Dialectal forms

[a:] (ā) is always marked in forms which are not in Attic-Ionic, in accordance with *LSJ* practice.

## 7 Dates

All dates are BC unless otherwise stated (BC is retained in years to avoid ambiguity). The dating of forms mostly follows *LSJ* and the *LGPN*, unless when corrections have been introduced. Appellative compounds are given in a roughly chronological order, although the dating of certain literary authors is uncertain and many Hellenistic inscriptions are notoriously difficult to date: ‘span-dates’ (e.g. 1st–2nd c.) and ‘period-dates’ (e.g. ‘hell.’ for ‘hellenistic’) used in the *LGPN* have been retained. As noted, uncertain dates are preceded (without space) by ‘?’; reference to an uncertain period (e.g. ‘hell.’) are followed by ‘?’, as in the *LGPN*.

In the Corpus, compounds from the Orphic *Hymns* are listed among the words from the period between the 2nd and 3rd c. AD, since the exact dating of these poetic texts is uncertain.<sup>1</sup>

## Corpus

### ἄάω ‘hurt, damage’ (I)

FC: ἄεσι-, ἄασι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: ἀσίφρων ‘damaged in mind’ (Hom., ἀσίφρων Hsch.; cf. also the derivations ἀσιφροσύνη ‘folly’, *ibid.*, and ἀσιφρονία, Phot.). In spite of the shape of the FC, the meaning of this compound points to a *bahuvrihi* structure.

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: None.

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: None.

AGENT NOUNS: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: None.

<sup>1</sup> For this dating, see Ricciardelli (2000: xxxi).

**ἄγαμαι** ‘wonder, admire’ (I)

FC: ἀγασι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: Ἀγασίλεως (Euboea 7th c.).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Ἀγάσανδρος (Delphi? ca. 300 BC), Ἀγάσαρχος (Sicily 6th–5th c.), Ἀγασιγράτις (Argolis 3rd c.), Ἀγασιδάμος (Thebes 5th–4th c.), Ἀγασικλῆς (Thera 7th–6th c.), Ἀγασικράτης (Athens ca. 510 BC), Ἀγασιμένης (Sicyon ca. 405 BC), Ἀγάσιππος (Athens 4th c.), Ἀγασισθένης (Sparta 149 BC), Ἀγασίστρατος (Athens 220/19). In Boeotia some of these names show [ss] in the FC: e.g. Ἀγασσιγίων (Boeotia ca. 230–210). In West Greek areas there is a chance that some of these names overlap with those from ἡγέομαι: see Chapter 5, section 4.2.

AGENT NOUNS: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: None.

**ἀγαπάω** ‘love’ (I)

FC: ἀγαπ-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: ἀγαπήνωρ ‘loving manliness’ (Hom.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: None.

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Only Ἀγαπήνωρ (Hom.) and its dialectal variants.

AGENT NOUNS: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: None.

**ἀγείρω** ‘gather, collect’ (IV)

FC: ἀγερσι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: ἀγερσικύβηλις ‘collecting axes’ (said of a mendicant priest; Cratin.). For the meaning, see Chapter 6, section 3.2.

AGENT NOUNS: ἀγέρτᾱς ‘collector of dues’ (IG 14.423, Tauromenium, hell.).

V2 COMPOUNDS: Myc. *ri-na-ko-ro* ‘linen-gatherer’. Other compounds in -ηγόρος/ -ᾱγόρος are semantically linked to ἀγορεύω ‘speak’, e.g. κακᾱγόρος ‘evil-speaking’ (Pi.), νεφεληγερέτα (epic for νεφεληγερέτης) ‘cloud-gatherer’ (Hom.), στεροπηγερέτης ‘lightning-gatherer’ (Hom.), κεφαληγερέτης ‘head-collector’ (Cratin.), ἄστεροπηγερέτης (Cerc.). The compounded form of the agent noun ἀγέρτᾱς occurs in σιταγέρτης ‘collector of corn’ (Tab. Heracl.).

**ἄγω** ‘lead’ (IV)

FC: ἀγε-, ἀγεσι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUNDS: Ἀγέλαος ‘leading men’, ἀγελεΐη ‘driver of spoil’, ἀγήνωρ ‘heroic’, all in Hom.

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: ἀγέστρατος ‘host-leading’ (Hes.), ἀγέχορος ‘leading the chorus’ (Aristoph.): for this form, see Chapter 6, section 3.1.

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Ἀγεάναξ (Rhodes ca. 68 BC; also in Theocr.), Ἀγέαρχος (Thessaly 2nd c. AD), Ἀγέδαμος (Phokis 3rd–2nd c.), Ἀγεκράτης (Rhodes 2nd–1st c.), Ἀγεκύδης (Nisyros hell.), Ἀγελάδα (Argolis 6th–5th c.), Ἀγέλαρχος (Boeotia ?2nd–1st c.), Ἀγέλοχος (Sparta 5th c.), Ἀγέμαχος (Rhodes 405/4 BC), Ἀγέμορτος (Mytilene 4th–3rd c.), Ἀγένομος (Crete 223/2 BC), Ἀγέπολις (Rhodes 375–350), Ἀγεσίλας (Dalmatia 3rd c.), Ἀγέσιππος (Crete imp.), Ἀγεσίμᾶ? (Kasos 4th–3rd c.), Ἀγέστρατος (Sicily 6th c.), Ἀγέτιμος (Crete 223/2), Ἀγέφαντος (Rhodes 3rd c.).

AGENT NOUNS: ἀγός ‘leader’ (Hom.), ἄκτωρ ‘leader’ (Aesch.).

V2 COMPOUNDS: ὄχετηγός ‘conducting water by a ditch’ (Hom.). Compounds in -ᾱγός/-ηγός are numerous: a full list is provided by Buck-Petersen 626. The following are the forms which appear before the 3rd c.: στρατηγός ‘army leader’ (Archil.), φορτηγός ‘one who carries cargoes’ (Thgn.), κυνᾱγός ‘hound-leader, huntsman’ (Aesch.), ἀρχηγός ‘originating’ (lit. ‘bringing the beginning’, Soph.), λοχᾱγός ‘leader of an armed band’ (Soph.), ποδηγός ‘guiding the foot’ (ibid.), χορηγός ‘chorus-leader’ (Hdt.), χοληγός ‘carrying off bile’ (Hippocr.), ξενᾱγός ‘commander of mercenary troops’ (Thuc.), οὐραγός ‘leader of the retroguard’ (Xen.), ἱματηγός ‘loaded with apparel’ (Thphr.), σιτηγός ‘conveying corn’ (Dem.), ὕδατηγός ‘drawing water’ (Call.), ταριχηγός ‘salt-fish hawker’ (Alex.).

Compounds in -ᾱγέτης/-ηγέτης are listed under ἡγεομαι.

### ἀείρω ‘lift, increase’ (III)

FC: ἀ(ε)ρσι-, ἄρσι- (see below).

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: ἀερσίπους ‘lifting the feet, high-stepping’ (said of horses; Hom.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: ἀερσιπότης ‘lifting the flight, flying high’ (Hes.),<sup>2</sup> ἀερσίμαχος ‘rousing the fight’ (Bacch.), ἀερσίνοος (Ion Lyr.), ἀερσίλοφος ‘lifting the crest, high-crested’ (A.R.), ἀερσίφρων ‘lifting the heart’ (IG 2<sup>2</sup>.12664, Athens, ca. 150 AD).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Ἀρσίνοος ‘lifting the soul’? (Hom.), with variants; Ἀρσίλοχος (Boeotia 480 BC), Ἀρσιφρώνδα (Boeotia 245–240). These names may also derive from ἀραρίσκω: for the FC, see Chapter 4, section 7.1.

AGENT NOUNS: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: The only compounds from this root are preverbed -ος compounds, e.g. μετήροσ ‘raised from off the ground’.

### αἰνέω ‘praise, advise’ (II)

FC: αἰνεσι-/αἰνησι-

<sup>2</sup> The SC of this compound is ποτή ‘flight’ and does not directly derive from ποτέομαι, as implied in LSJ.

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: Αἰνησιμβρότᾱ ‘praising men’ (Alcm.).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Αἰνέλαος ‘one who praises his men’ (Aetolia 163 BC), Αἰνεσίβουλος (Thessaly 2nd c.), Αἰνεσίλας ‘advising his people’ (Thera 5th c.), Αἰνεσίπολις (Thessaly 3rd c.), Αἰνεσίππος (Thessaly 2nd c.), Αἰνέστρατος (Argolis 1st c.), Αἰνησαγόρας (Rhodes 3rd–2nd c.), Αἰνήσανδρος (Arcadia 3rd c.), Αἰνησίβιος (Epidaurus ca. 370–365), Αἰνησίδᾶμος (Phintias-Gela 6th c.), Αἰνησικλῆς (Amorgos 3rd c.), Αἰνησικράτης (Amorgos 3rd c.), Αἰνήσιππος (Nisyros 3rd c.), Αἰνησίτιμος (Rhodes ca. 211 BC), Αἰνησιφίλη (Amorgos 3rd–2nd c.), Αἰνίπᾱ? (Corinth ca. 570–550).

AGENT NOUNS: αἰνετής ‘one that praises’ (Hdn. = Eust.).

V2 COMPOUNDS: None.

### αἰρέω ‘take, seize’ (II)

FC: αἰρ(ε)-, αἰρησι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: Αἰρήηπιπος ‘taking horses’ (Laconia ca. 431–403).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: αἰρησιτεῖχης ‘taker of walls’ (title of a play by Diphilus).<sup>3</sup>

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Αἰρίππη (Euboea 3rd c.).

AGENT NOUNS: αἰρέτης ‘one who chooses’ (Vett. Val.; used also in the specialized meaning of ‘searcher of archives’ in *POxy.* 1654.7, 2nd c. AD). An earlier form is attested in the noun καθαιρέτης ‘overthrower’ derived from the compound verb καθαιρέω ‘put down, destroy’.

V2 COMPOUNDS: None.

### ἄκεομαι ‘heal’ (II)

FC: ἄκε(σ)σι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: Ἀκέσανδρος ‘healing men’ (Cyprus 5th–4th c.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: ἄκεσίπνονος ‘healing toil’ (Nonn.).<sup>4</sup>

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Ἀκεσιγένης (Rhodes 70 BC), Ἀκεσίμβροτος (Rhodes 3rd c.), Ἀκεσιπίδης (Amorgos 4th–3rd c.), Ἀκεσίστρατος (Kalymnos ca. 200 BC).

AGENT NOUNS: ἄκεστήρ (Soph.), ἄκέστωρ (Eur.), ἄκεστής (Xen.): all ‘healer’.

V2 COMPOUNDS: None.

<sup>3</sup> Another form, αἰρεσιάρχης (S.E.), is not a V1 compound. The FC derives from αἴρεσις in its meaning ‘system of philosophical principles, sect’ and the compound means ‘leader of a philosophical school’.

<sup>4</sup> ἄκεσίνουος ‘healing disease’ has been conjectured in *AP* 9.516.4 (Crinagoras) and is included in *LSJ*.

**ἀκούω** ‘listen’ (IV)

FC: ἀκουσι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: Ἀκουσίλαος (Argos 5th c.). Cf. Ἀκούσιλος (Boeotia 6th–5th c.)

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: ἀκουσίθεος ‘heard by God’ (Antip. Thess.).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Ἀκουσαγόρας (Melos 4th c.), Ἀκουσίθεος (Locris ca. 315–280 BC).

AGENT NOUNS: ἀκουστής ‘hearer’ (Men.).

V2 COMPOUNDS: ὠτακουστής ‘eavesdropper’ (of a person employed as a spy; Aristot.). The numerous compounds in -ήκοος are bahuvrihis, as shown by the position of the accent and by the fact that the FC of these and similar compounds always functions as a determination of the SC, never as its object.

**ἀλγέω** ‘grieve’ (IVa)

FC: ἀλγεσι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: ἀλγεσίθυμος ‘grieving the heart’ (*Orph. H.*).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: None.

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: None (Ἄγαλσος, Illyria 168 BC, is unclear).

AGENT NOUNS: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: None. Some compounds in -αλγής, e.g. θυμαλγής ‘heart-grieving’ (Hom.), may derive directly from the verb rather than from ἄλγος. Of these, only θυμαλγής has the SC in the function of the direct object; the few other active compounds have adverbial FCs, e.g. βαρυαλγής ‘grievously suffering’ (*Orph. H.*).**ἀλέξω** ‘keep off, ward off, protect’ (II)

FC: ἀλεξι-, ἀλκε-, ἀλκι-, ἀλκεσι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: *a-re-ka-sa-do-ro* /Aleksandros/.<sup>5</sup>APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: (**LITER.**) ἀλεξίκακος ‘keeping off ill’ (Hom.), ἀλεξάνεμος ‘averting wind’ (ibid.), ἀλεξιάρη ‘she that guards off from ruin’ (Hes.), ἀλεξιμβροτος ‘protecting men’ (Pi.), ἀλεξιάθριος ‘screening from chill air’ (Soph.), ἀλεξίμορος ‘warding off death’ (ibid.), ἀλεξίπνοος ‘warding off pain’ (ibid.), ἀλεξιφάρμακος ‘acting as antidote’ (Sophr.), ἀλεξήνωρ ‘aiding man’ (Paus.), ἀλεξίγαμος ‘shunning marriage’ (Nonn.), ἀλεξιβέλεμος ‘keeping off darts’ (Paul. Sil.), ἀλεξίκηπος ‘protecting the garden’ (Geop.; title of a work on gardening by Nestor).(EP.) ἀλεξίχορος ‘helping or favouring the chorus’ (*IG* 2<sup>2</sup>.4533.35, Attica 3rd c. AD).

<sup>5</sup> This interpretation consciously leaves aside the question of whether Ἀλέξανδρος may have had a non-Greek origin. Even if the foreign etymology were to be proven correct, it is likely that the name was transformed into a meaningful Greek form and connected with the verb ἀλέξω.

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: (**LITER.**) Ἀλκίνοος (Hom.), Ἄλκανδρος ‘keeping off the enemy’ (ibid.), Ἀλκιβίη (Archil.). (**EP.**) Ἀλεξήνωρ (Athens 5th–4th c.), Ἀλέξαρθος (Cimmerian Bosphoros 307 AD), Ἀλέξαρχος (Thasos 5th c.), Ἀλεξιάδης (Athens ca. 350 BC), Ἀλεξιβιά (Corinth a. 480 BC), Ἀλεξιδήϊος? (Chios 6th c.), Ἀλεξίδικος (Keos 5th c.), Ἀλεξίκακος (Athens 187/8 AD), Ἀλεξικλῆς (Athens 5th c.), Ἀλεξικράτης (Rhodes ca. 325 BC), Ἀλεξίλας (Acarnania 3rd c.), Ἀλεξίλοχος (Rhodes ca. 258 BC), Ἀλεξίμαχος (Corinth ca. 570–550), Ἀλεξίμβροτος (Rhodes 1st c.), Ἀλεξιμένης (Athens ca. 350 BC), Ἀλεξιμήδης (Boeotia 5th c.), Ἀλεξίναος (Megaris ?221 BC), Ἀλεξίνικος (Rhodes ca. 325–308 BC), Ἀλεξίνους (Melos ?1st c. BC–1st c. AD), Ἀλεξίπολις (Melos 4th c.), Ἀλεξίππᾶ (Sparta ?8th–7th c.), Ἀλεξίστρατος (Rhodes 3rd c.), Ἀλεξιτέλης (Keos 4th–3rd c.), Ἀλεξίτιμος (Amorgos 4th–3rd c.), Ἀλεξιφάης (Thessaly ca. 168 BC), Ἀλεξιφάνεια (Siphnos hell.?), Ἀλεξόμμᾶς? (Illyria 3rd–2nd c.), Ἀλκέμαχος (Epiros ?198 BC), Ἀλκεσίδαμος (Rhodes 3rd–2nd c.), Ἀλκείσπιπος (Aetolia ca. 200–182), Ἀλκιβιάδης (Athens 6th–5th c.), Ἀλκιδάμος (Kalymnos 7th c.), Ἀλκίθεμις (Crete 3rd c.), Ἀλκίθεος (Amorgos 6th c.), Ἀλκικράτης (Rhodes 2nd c.), Ἀλκίμαχος (Euboea 6th c.), Ἀλκιμέδων (Aegina 460 BC), Ἀλκινόφᾶ (Corinth ca. 615–600), Ἄλκιππος (Thasos 5th–4th c.), Ἀλκισθένης (Athens 500–480 BC), Ἄλκίστρατος (Acarnania 3rd–2nd c.), Ἀλκίφρων (Sicily 6th c.).

AGENT NOUNS: ἀλεξητήρ ‘protector’ (Hom.), ἀλκτῆρ ‘one who wards off’ (ibid.), ἀλεξήτωρ ‘protector’ (Soph.).

V2 COMPOUNDS: None.

### ἀλφάνω ‘bring in’ (IVa)

FC: ἀλφει-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: ἀλφειβόιος ‘bringing in oxen’ (Hom.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: None.

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: None.

AGENT NOUNS: ἀλφηστής ‘earner, enterprising man’ (Hom.).

V2 COMPOUNDS: Only the active τιμαλφής ‘fetching a prize’ (Aesch.), producing the denominative verb τιμαλφῶ ‘do honour’ (Pi.).

### ἀμαρτάνω ‘fail; be deprived of’ (I)

FC: ἀμαρτο-, ἀμαρτι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: ἀμαρτοεπής ‘erring in words’ (Hom.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: ἀμαρτίνοος ‘erring in mind’ (Hes.), ἀμαρτολόγος ‘speaking faultily’ (Athen.), ἀμαρτίγαμος ‘failing of marriage’ (Nonn.).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: None.

AGENT NOUNS: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: None.

**ἀμείβω** ‘change, exchange’ (IV)

FC: ἀμειψι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUNDS: ἀμειψικοσμία ‘change of condition’ (Democr. = Hsch.), ἀμειψιρρυσμία ‘change of form’ (ibid. = D.L.), ἀμείψιχρους ‘changing colour’ (Democr.? = Hsch.); see Chapter 6, section 3.2.

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: None.

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: The existence of these PNs is confirmed by the *Kurzname* Ἄμειψίας (Athens 5th c.).

AGENT NOUN: ἀμοιβός ‘one who exchanges’ (Hom.).

V2 COMPOUNDS: χρυσαμοιβός ‘one who exchanges something into gold’ (Aesch.), ἀλφιταμοιβός ‘dealer in barley-groats’ (Aristoph.), ἀργυραμοιβός ‘money-changer’ (Pl.), ἱεραμοιβός ‘interpreter of the gods’ (Hsch.).

**ἀμέρδω** ‘deprive’ (I)

FC: ἀμερσι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUNDS: ἀμερσίγαμος ‘depriving of wedlock’ (Nonn.), ἀμερσίνοος ‘depriving of mind’ (ibid.), ἀμερσίφρων ‘depriving of mind’ (Hsch.)

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: None.

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: None apart those above.

AGENT NOUNS: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: None.

**ἀμεύομαι** ‘surpass, pass over’ (I)

FC: ἀμευσι-, ἀμευσο-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: ἀμευσιεπής ‘surpassing words’ (Pi.), ἀμευσίπορος ‘shifting the path’ (ibid.)

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Ἄμεύιππος (Laconia ca. 500 BC), Ἄμευσίχαρμος (Crete 3rd–2nd c.), Ἄμευσόπολις (Thessaly 4th c.).

AGENT NOUNS: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: None.

**ἀνάσσω** ‘to be lord, rule’ (IVb)

FC: ἀναξι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: Ἄναξιμανδρος (Ionia 7th c.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: ἀναξίαλος ‘ruling the sea’ (Bacch.), ἀναξιβρέντας ‘ruling the thunder’ (ibid.), ἀναξιμολπος ‘queen of song’ (ibid.), ἀναξιφόρμιγξ ‘ruling the lyre’ (Pi.), ἀναξιδώρα ‘queen of gifts’ (Soph., explained as ἡ ἀνάγουσα δώρα by the scholia).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Ἄναξαγόρας (Aegina 6th–5th c.), Ἄνάξανδρος (Sparta 7th c.), Ἄναξαρέτη (Delos 3rd c.), Ἄναξαρχος (Thrace ca. 380–320), Ἄνάξερμος

(Lesbos 3rd c.), Ἀναξιβία (Thera 6th c.), Ἀναξιβουλος (Thasos ?a. 250 BC), Ἀναξιδᾶμος (Sparta 7th c.), Ἀναξιδικός (Thrace ca. 500–475), Ἀναξίδωρος (Athens 459 BC), Ἀναξίθεμις (Delos 304 BC), Ἀναξίθεος (Tenos 3rd c.), Ἀναξίθυμος (Rhodes 1st c.) Ἀναξικλῆς (Athens 4th c.), Ἀναξικράτης (Thera ?6th c.), Ἀναξιλᾶς (Rhegion 6th–5th c.), Ἀναξιμβροτος (Rhodes ca. 325 BC), Ἀναξιμένης (Camarina 5th c.), Ἀναξινόη (Tenos 3rd c.), Ἀναξίπολις (Thasos 5th c.), Ἀνάξιππος (Cyrene 5th c.), Ἀναξίστρατος (Cimmerian Bosphoros 4th c.), Ἀναξίτιμος (Telos 5th–4th c.), Ἀναξίφιλος (Euboea 3rd c.).

AGENT NOUNS: ἀνάκτωρ ‘lord, ruler’ (Aesch.). ἄναξ ‘has the same semantics.

V2 COMPOUNDS: None, but compounds in -αναξ express verbal semantics: ἀστυάναξ ‘lord of the city’ (PN in Hom. and appellative in Aesch.), ἵππιάναξ ‘king of horsemen’ (Aesch.), χειρῶναξ ‘master of his hands, handicraftsman’ (Hdt.), εὐρυάναξ ‘wide-ruling’ (Bacch.), εὐδιάναξ ‘ruler of the calm’ (Luc.).

### ἀνδάνω ‘please, delight’ (I)

FC: ἀδησι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: *wa-ti-ko-ro* /Wāstik<sup>h</sup>oros/. In alphabetic Greek, the following short forms may be derived from the stem of the future ἀδήσω: φηαδήσιος (Corinth 6th c.). A sigmatic stem (see the later aorist ἦσα in Plot.) may also be behind the following names: φᾶσάνδρειος (Pherai 4th c.), φᾶσάνωρ (Thessaly, 6th–5th c.), φᾶσιδᾶμος (Thessaly 6th–5th c.), φᾶσικράτεις (Thessaly 4th c.). Some of the Attic-Ionic names in Ἦσ- may also belong here: see Meier-Brügger (1990), the analysis of Ἦσίοδος below and Chapter 5, section 5.3.2.

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: None.

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: None.

AGENT NOUNS: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: None.

### ἀνύω ‘accomplish’ (II)

FC: ἀνυσι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: ἀνυσίεργος ‘finishing work’ (Theocr.).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Ἀνυσικλῆς (Rhodes 4th–3rd c.).

AGENT NOUNS: ἀνυτής ‘tax-collector’ (Just.).

V2 COMPOUNDS: None.

### ἄπτω ‘touch’ (II)

FC: ἄψι-, ἄπτ(ε)-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: ἀψίκορος ‘quickly sated’ (lit. ‘reaching satiety’, Pl.).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Ἀψιμάχης (Macedonia 3rd c. AD), Ἄψιππος (Arcadia 2nd c.).



APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: ἀψιμαχία ‘skirmish’ (i.e. ‘just engaging in battle’, Plu.; cf. also ἀψιμαχος Alex. Aphr.), ἀψικάρδιος ‘heart-touching’ (M. Ant.), ἀψίμοθος ‘kindling conflict’ (Nonn.).

AGENT NOUNS: ἐφάπτωρ ‘one who touches or caresses’ (Aesch.).

V2 COMPOUNDS: None.

### ἀράομαι ‘pray, invoke’ (II)

FC: ἀρησι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: Ἀρησίμβροτος ‘invoking mortals’ (Delos 359/8).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Ἀρήσιππος (Messenia 2nd c.): for this name, see Chapter 5 section 5.3.2.

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: None.

AGENT NOUNS: ἀρητήρ ‘prayer, priest’ (Hom.).

V2 COMPOUNDS: None.

### ἀραρίσκω ‘fit together’ (IV)

FC: ἀρτι-, ἄρσι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: *a-ti-pa-mo* /Artiphāmos/.

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: PNs in Ἄρσι- could be connected to this verb: see those under ἀείρω.

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: ἀρτιεπής ‘he who fits together words; good at talking’ (Hom). These compounds from ἀραρίσκω were soon assimilated to the adjective ἄρτιος, with the result that new formations were created in which the FC had the semantics of the adjective: e.g. ἀρτίδακρυς ‘ready to weep’ (Eur.). This semantic shift may have started already in Homeric Greek, where ἀρτίφρων ‘ready of mind’ may have been formed as a V1 compound (‘he who puts together his mind’) but its meaning was assimilated to that of ἄρτιος. See discussion in Chapter 4, sections 7.1 and 8.6, and Chapter 6, section 3.2.

AGENT NOUNS: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: πυλάρτης ‘gate-fastener’ (Hom.), λιθάρτης ‘assembling stones?’ (IG 2<sup>2</sup>.1454a.col.II.272, Athens 371/0: see Chapter 6, section 3.2). A few and later other compounds in -αρτης seem to derive from αἴρω ‘lift’, e.g. νεκροάρτης ‘remover of corpses’ (AJP 34.448, Egypt ca. 2nd c. AD).

### ἀρκέω ‘assist; suffice’ (IVa)

FC: ἀρκεσι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: Ἀρκεσίλαος ‘warding off the enemy’ (Hom.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: ἀρκεσίβουλος ‘availing in council’ (Cerc.).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Ἀρκέδημος (?Athens 323/1), Ἀρκεσίδαμος (Kalymnos 3rd–2nd c.), Ἀρκεφίλος (Athens 331/0), Ἀρκέφρων (Euboea 4th–3rd c.).

AGENT NOUNS: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: Only forms in -ής with active meaning, which may start off as bahuvrihis (ποδαρκής ‘providing defence with his feet’?, Hom.) but soon acquire a fully verbal meaning (see analysis in Chapter 6, section 4.2). Ancient Greek has the following forms: (**LITER.**) γυιαρκής ‘strengthening the limbs’ (Pi.), ξεναρκής ‘aiding strangers’ (ibid.), αὐτάρκης ‘sufficient in oneself’ (Aesch.), πανταρκής ‘all-powerful’ (or ‘defending all?’ ibid.), πολυαρκής ‘much-helpful’ (Hdt.), βιαρκής ‘supplying the necessaries of life’ (Archias Epigr.), ὀλιγαρκής ‘contented with little’ (Luc.). (**EP.**) ζωαρκής ‘life supporting’ (Miletus 4th c. AD).

### ἄρπάζω ‘snatch away’ (IV)

FC: ἄρπαξι-, ἄρπα-?

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: ἄρπάξανδρος ‘snatching away men’ (Aesch.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: ἄρπαξίβιος ‘living by rapine’ (Archestr.), ἄρπαξομίλης ‘snatching the pleasures of sexual intercourse’ (Phryn. = fr. *adesp.* 597 K.-A.).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Ἀρπάλυκος (Thessaly 3rd c.).

AGENT NOUNS: ἄρπακτήρ (Hom.), ἄρπακτής (Call.): both ‘robber’; ἄρπαστής ‘ravish’ (Tat.).

V2 COMPOUNDS: δελέαρπαξ ‘snapping at the bait’ (Leon.).

### ἄρτύω ‘prepare, make ready’ (IV)

FC: ἄρτυ-, ἄρτυσι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: Ἄρτυσίλειος ‘one who prepares the army (for battle)’ (Thasos 6th c.). Ἄρτυσίλαος is also the name of a public servant at Delos (Athen.).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Ἄρτυκλῆς (Epidaurus ca. 370–365), Ἄρτύλαος (Boeotia b. 338 BC), Ἄρτύλοχος (Euboea 4th–3rd. c.), Ἄρτύμαχος (Tenos 3rd c.), Ἄρτυμήδα (Thera ?4th–3rd c.), Ἄρτυσίλειος (Thasos 6th–5th c.), Ἄρτυσίτραγος? (Delos hell.?).

AGENT NOUNS: ἄρτυτήρ ‘director’ (IG 12(3).330.144–145, Thera, 3rd c.).

V2 COMPOUNDS: ὄψαρτυτής ‘cook’ (Hyp.).

### ἄρχω ‘begin, lead’ (IV)

FC: ἀρχε-, ἀρχι-, ἀρχεσι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: *a-ke-wa-ta* /Ark<sup>h</sup>ewastās/, *a-ke-wa-to* /Ark<sup>h</sup>ewastos/, *a-ke-ra-wo* /Ark<sup>h</sup>elāwos/.

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: ἀρχέκακος ‘beginning mischief’ (Hom.), ἀρχεσίμολπος ‘beginning the song’ (Stes.), ἀρχέπολις ‘ruling a city’ (Pi.; elsewhere as PN), ἀρχέχορος ‘leading the chorus’ (Eur.). These are the forms which preserve a clear governing structure; I have excluded compounds in which the FC ἀρχι- or ἀρχε- functions has a prefix meaning ‘chief’ as they have acquired determinative struc-

ture and are not in competition with V2 compounds: see Chapter 2, section 4.4; Chapter 4, section 3.2 and Chapter 6, section 3.1.

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Ἀρχάγαθος (Athens ca. 440–420), Ἀρχαγόρας (Argos 401 BC), Ἀρχάγορος (Thessaly 457 BC), Ἀρχανδρίδης (Euboea 4th c.), Ἀρχαρέτη (Euboea ?3rd c.), Ἀρχεάνασσα (Lesbos 7th–6th c.), Ἀρχεάναξ (Rhodes ca. 450–411), Ἀρχέβιος (Athens 5th c.), Ἀρχέβουλος (Thrace 5th–4th c.), Ἀρχέδειπνος (Athens 324/3), Ἀρχέδημος (Athens ca. 450 BC), Ἀρχεδίκᾱ (Thessaly 7th c.), Ἀρχεθάλης (Camarina 5th c.), Ἀρχεκράτης (Argos ?ca. 460–450), Ἀρχέκωμος (Athens 4th c.), Ἀρχελάος (Sparta 8th c.), Ἀρχέμαχος (Euboea 5th c.), Ἀρχέμβροτος (Sparta 7th c.), Ἀρχέμηλος (Delphi ?320 BC), Ἀρχέμορος (Euboea 3rd c.), Ἀρχεναύτης (Athens ca. 440 BC), Ἀρχένεως (Athens ca. 550 BC), Ἀρχένικος (Athens 4th c.), Ἀρχένοθος (Euboea 4th–3rd c.), Ἀρχένομος (Athens 405 BC), Ἀρχένοος (Sicyon 6th–5th c.), Ἀρχέπολις (Thasos 6th–5th c.), Ἀρχεπτόλεμος (Athens 5th c.), Ἀρχεσίλας (Argos ?ca. 575–550), Ἀρχεστρατίδης (Athens 577/6), Ἀρχέτιμος (Athens 5th c.), Ἀρχέφιλος (Paros hell.), Ἀρχέφρων (Euboea 4th c.), Ἀρχιλέων (Argolis 3rd c.), Ἀρχίλοχος (Paros 7th c.), Ἀρχίμυθος (Taras ca. 315–280 c.), Ἀρχίξενος (Doris 2nd c.), Ἀρχιππος (Samos ?6th–5th c.), Ἀρχιτέκτων (Athens 4th c.), Ἀρχιτέλης (Chios? 6th c.).

AGENT NOUNS: ἀρχός ‘leader’ (Hom.), ἀρχέτας ‘leader’ (Eur.).

V2 COMPOUNDS: Μyc. *ka-ra-na-ko* may indicate the ‘supervisor of water supply’ (/krānark<sup>h</sup>os/). AG compounds in -αρχος are among the most productive V2 types. The following forms are attested before the 3rd c.: μούναρχος ‘sole ruler’ (Thgn.), ἀρίσταρχος ‘best-ruling’ (Simon.), ἵππαρχος ‘ruling the horse’ (Pi.; later ‘commander of cavalry’, Hdt.), πολίαρχος ‘ruler of a city’ (ibid.), στράταρχος ‘general of an army’ (ibid.), πλεισταρχος ‘holding widest sway’ (Bacch.), πολέμαρχος ‘war-lord’ (ibid.), βούλαρχος ‘adviser of a plan’ (Aesch.), ναύαρχος ‘commander of a fleet’ (ibid.), στασιάρχος ‘chief of a band’ (ibid.), τόξαρχος ‘lord of the bow’ (ibid.), χιλίαρχος ‘captain over a thousand’ (ibid.), νόμαρχος ‘governor of a region’ (Hdt.), στέγαρχος ‘master of the house’ (ibid.), ταξίαρχος ‘commander of a corps’ (ibid.), τριήραρχος ‘captain of a trireme’ (ibid.), φύλαρχος ‘chief officer of a φυλή’ (ibid.), πάναρχος ‘ruling all’ (Soph.), τεκτόναρχος ‘chief of the builders’ (ibid.), ὀρνίθαρχος ‘king of birds’ (Aristoph.), περιπόλαρχος ‘commander of a patrol’ (Thuc.), Βοιωτάρχος ‘chief magistrate of the Boeotian league’ (Xen.), δεκάδαρχος ‘commander of ten men’ (ibid.), δωδεκάδαρχος ‘leader of twelve’ (ibid.), ἑκατόνταρχος ‘commander of a hundred’ (ibid.), μυρίαρχος ‘commander of 10,000 men’ (ibid.), πέζαρχος ‘leader of infantry’ (ibid.), πεμπάδαρχος ‘commander of five’ (ibid.), πεντηκόνταρχος ‘commander of fifty men’ (ibid.), συμποσίαρχος ‘president of a drinking-party’ (ibid.), φρούραρχος ‘commander of a watch’ (ibid.), φρατρίαρχος ‘president of a φρατρία’ (Dem.), γυμνασίαρχος

‘superintendent of athletic training’ (And.), εὐαρχος ‘governing well’ (Lycophr.), λήταρχος ‘public priest’ (ibid.).

Most of these forms are duplicated by forms in -άρχης, which are collected in Buck-Petersen 10–11. On these, see the commentary in Chapter 6, section 3.1.

### **αὐξω/ἀέξω** ‘increase’ (II)

FC: αὐξι-, ἀεξι-, αὐξο-, αὐξησι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: ἀεξίγυιος ‘strengthening the limbs’ (Pi.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: (**LITER.**) ἀεξίφυλλος ‘nourishing leaves’ (Aesch.), ἀεξίφυτος ‘nourishing plants’ (Mel.), ἀεξίτροφος ‘promoting growth’ (*Orph. H.*), αὐξίφαις ‘increasing light’ (Man.), ἀεξίνους ‘strengthening the mind’ (Procl.), ἀεξίτοκος ‘nourishing the fruits of the womb’ (ibid.), αὐξίδημος ‘increasing the people’ (Hsch.), αὐξίφωτία ‘increase of light’ (Lyd.), αὐξοσέληνον ‘waxing of the moon’ (Maced.). (**EP.**) ἀεξίκερωσ ‘growing horns’ (*IG* 14.1301, Rome; Kaibel: ‘*ex recentissimis*’),

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Αὐξίβιος (Delos 218 BC). There are no names with a FC ἀεξι-. The FC αὐξησι- only appears in Αὐξησιλευέ (Scythia Minor 4th c.). See also Ἀυξιάς (Euboea 3rd c.) and the name of the goddess of growth Ἀυξώ in Paus. 9.35.2.

AGENT NOUNS: αὐξητής ‘increaser’ (*Orph. H.*).

V2 COMPOUNDS: None. μυελαυξής ‘increasing the marrow’ (Hsch.) is a late hapax.

### **βαίνω** ‘step’ (IV)

FC: βητι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: βητάρμων ‘dancer’ (originally ‘someone who steps on wheels’; Hom.), creating the derivative βηταρμός ‘dance’ (A.R.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: None.

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: None. The FC Βητι- may be attested in the *Kurzname* Βητίδας (Orchomenos ca. 215 BC).

AGENT NOUNS: βάτης ‘one that treads or covers’ (Philox. Gramm.), βατήρ (Amips.) has the semantics of a *nomen rei actae*: ‘that on which one treads, threshold’.

V2 COMPOUNDS: ἐμπυριβήτης ‘standing on the fire’ (Hom.). The most common type however ends in -βάτης, which is attested already in Homer with the PN Εὐρυβάτης. The full list is provided by Buck-Petersen 546. The following fully nominal compounds are attested before the 3rd c.: αἰγιβάτης ‘goat-mounting’ (Pi.), ἀβροβάτης ‘one who steps delicately’ (Bacch.), Ἄιδοβάτης ‘one who has gone to the nether world’ (Aesch., probable), αὐριβάτης ‘swift-striding’ (Aesch.), ἐλειοβάτης ‘walking the marsh’ (ibid.), ἵπποβάτης ‘horseman’ (ibid.), ναυβάτης ‘seaman’ (ibid.), τεθριπποβάτης ‘driver of a four-horse chariot’ (Hdt.), ὄρειβάτης ‘mountain-ranging’ (Soph.), πτερονοβάτης ‘one who walks on his heels’ (Hippocr.),

κιγκλοβάτης ‘moving like the a dabchick’ (Aristoph.), στυλοβάτης ‘base of a column’ (Plato Com.), ἠλιβάτας ‘haunting the heights’ (Antiph.).

### **βλάπτω** ‘damage’ (IVa)

FC: βλαψι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: βλαψίφων ‘damaging the mind, maddening’ (Aesch.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: βλαψίταφος ‘violating the grave’ (IG 14.943 Latium, 4th c. AD).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: None.

AGENT NOUNS: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: None. Bahuvrihis from βλάβος ‘damage’ develop into a verbal type: cf. φρενοβλαβής ‘damaging the mind’ (Hdt.), μεγαλοβλαβής ‘greatly injuring’ (Apollon. Soph.), σθενοβλαβής ‘hurting the strength’ (Opp.), etc.

### **βλέπω** ‘see, look’ (IV)

FC: βλεπε-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: βλεπεδαίμων ‘looking like a ghost’ (fr. *adesp.* 749 K-A).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: None.

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Βλε(πέ)πυρος? (Eretria 4th c.). The FC Βλεψι- may appear in *Kurznamen* such as Βλεψίας (Delos 250 BC).

AGENT NOUNS: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: κυνοβλώψ ‘with a dog’s look’ (Hsch.), πολυβλέπων ‘much-seeing’ (*PLond.* 5.1821.268, 6th c. AD).

### **βόσκω** ‘feed’ (IV)

FC: βωτι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: βωτιάνειρα ‘feeding men’ (Hom.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: None.

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: There are no compounds from βόσκω. The FC βωτι- may be behind the *Kurzname* Βώτος (Camarina 6th c.).

AGENT NOUNS: βοτήρ ‘herdsman’ (Hom.), βώτωρ ‘herdsman’ (ibid.), βοσκός (Aesop.).

V2 COMPOUNDS: *su- $qo$ - $ta$*  = συμβώτης ‘swineherd’ (Hom.), *qo-u- $qo$ - $ta$*  = βουβότης ‘cowherd’, μηλοβοτήρ ‘herdsman’ (ibid.), μηλοβότης ‘shepherd’ (Pi.), βουβότης ‘someone who feeds cattle’ (ibid.), ούρεσιβώτης ‘feeding on the mountains’ (Soph.), οιοβώτας ‘feeding alone’, άγροβότης ‘feeding in the fields’ (ibid.), ιπποβότης ‘feeder of horses’ (Hdt.), συμβότης ‘swineherd’ (Aristot.), ύοβότης ‘swineherd’ (Hsch.), όρφοβότης ‘someone who brings up orphans’ (ibid.).

Other compounds are created from the secondary agent noun βοσκός: αἰγοβοσκός ‘goatherd’ (Aesop.), πολύβοσκος ‘much-nourishing’ (Pi.), χηνοβοσκός ‘gooseherd’ (Cratin.), πορνοβοσκός ‘brothel-keeper’ (Myrtil.), ἀνθοβοσκός ‘nourishing flowers’ (Soph.), γηροβοσκός ‘nourishing those in old age’ (ibid.), μηλοβοσκός ‘sheep-feeding’ (Eur.), κραιπαλόβοσκος ‘which feeds on drunkenness’ (said of thirst; Sopat.), αἰλουροβοσκός ‘keeper of sacred cats’ (PSI 4.440.2, 3rd c.), ἰβιοβοσκός ‘keeper of the sacred ibis’ (PCairZen. 270.7, 3rd c.), ἱερακοβοσκός ‘hawk-feeder’ (PPetr. 3p.239, 3rd c.), καμηλοβοσκός ‘camel-herd’ (Str.), κυνοβοσκός ‘feeder of sacred jackals’ (Sammelb. 5796, 1st c.), ἀρηνοβοσκός ‘shepherd’ (Paus.), παιδοβοσκός ‘keeping boys’ (Luc.), χειροβοσκός ‘supporting oneself by manual work’ (Poll.), ἵπποβοσκός ‘feeding horses’ (Ael.), κροκοδιλοβοσκός ‘feeder of sacred crocodiles’ (BGU 734.2.7, 3rd c. AD), προβατοβοσκός ‘shepherd’ (Hsch.), βοοβοσκός ‘herdsman’ (Suid.), χοιροβοσκός ‘swineherd’ (schol. D II.).

There is a certain amount of semantic exchange between forms in -βότης and forms in -βοτος: the former acquire passive semantics in αἰγιβότης ‘browsed by goats’ (Leon.), while the latter acquires active meaning in e.g. αἰγιβότος ‘feeding goats’ (Nonn.). Compounds in -βοσκος also show the odd passive meaning: see e.g. χιονόβοσκος ‘nourished by snow’ (Aesch.).

### **βούλωμαι** ‘wish, will’ (I)

FC: βουλο-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: βουλόμαχος ‘desiring strife’ (Aristoph.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: None.

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: There are numerous PNs with a FC Βουλ-, which often represents the noun βουλή. For a possible V1 interpretation, cf. Βουλαγάθᾶ ‘she who desires/wishes well?’ (Nisyros 2nd c.).

AGENT NOUNS: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: None.

### **βρίθω** ‘weigh down, press with’ (I)

FC: βρισ-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: *qi-ri-ta-ko* /G<sup>w</sup>riṯ<sup>h</sup>ark<sup>h</sup>os/?

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: βρισάρματος ‘chariot-pressing’ (Hes.)

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: V1 PNs from the s-aorist seem to be represented by the *Kurzname* Βρισηῖς, in which the FC probably means ‘full of’ (beauty, wealth, etc.).

AGENT NOUNS: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: None. The limited class of compounds in -βριθής (e.g. ἀβριθής ‘without weight’, Eur.) are mostly bahuvrihis formed with βριθος ‘weight’; their meaning is passive.

**βρύω** ‘swell with’ (I)

FC: βρυσ(ι)-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: None, but the existence of compounds in βρυσ(ι)- may be testified by the *Kurzname* Βρύσων (Acarnania ca. 425–400).

OTHER COMPOUNDS: None.

AGENT NOUNS: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: None.

**γάνυμαι** ‘brighten up’ (I)

FC: γανυ-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: Γανυμήδης (Hom.).

OTHER COMPOUNDS: None.

AGENT NOUNS: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: None.

**γιγνώσκω** ‘know’ (IV)

FC: γνωσι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: Γνωσίδημος (Euboea 4th c.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: None. The four compounds in γνωσι- show the action noun γνῶσις ‘knowledge’ in the FC: e.g. γνωσιμαχέω ‘fight having knowledge of one’s power’ (Hdt.).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Γνωσάνωρ (Lesbos hell.), Γνωσίδικος (Delos 314–250 BC), Γνωσίλαος (Delphi 166 BC), Γνώσιππος (Sparta 3rd c.), Γνωσιφίλα (Thessaly 186 BC).

AGENT NOUNS: γνωστήρ ‘one that knows: surety’ (Xen.), γνώστης ‘one that knows’ (NT).

V2 COMPOUNDS: καρδιογνώστης ‘knower of hearts’ (NT).

**δάκνω** ‘bite’ (IV)

FC: δακε-, δηξι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: δακέθυμος ‘biting the heart, heart-vexing’ (Simon.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: δηξιθυμος ‘biting the heart’ (Aesch.).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: None.

AGENT NOUNS: δήκτης ‘biter’ (Eur.).

V2 COMPOUNDS: λαθροδήκτης ‘biting secretly’ (Phryn.). The most common agentive V2 compounds are those in -δακής: θυμοδακής ‘biting the heart’ (Hom.), ὤμοδακής ‘fiercely gnawing’ (Aesch.), λαμοδακής ‘throat-biting’ (Phil. Epigr.), σαρκοδακής ‘eating flesh’ (Orph. Fr.).

**δάμνημι/δαμάζω** ‘tame’ (IV)

FC: δαμασι-, δαμν(α-)

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: δαμασίμβροτος ‘taming mortals’ (Simon.).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: The *Kurzname* Δάμασος (Hom.) is the first attestation of a personal name with a FC δαμασι-.

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: δαμασίφρων ‘taming the heart’ (Pi.), δαμασίθων ‘earth-subduer’ (Bacch.), δαμάσιππος ‘horse-taming’ (Lamprocles, perhaps to be attributed to Stesichorus?), δαμασικόνδυλος ‘conquering with the knuckles’ (Eur.), δάμνιππος ‘horse-taming’ (Orph. A.).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Δαμασαγόρας (Tenedos 4th c.), Δαμασάνωρ (Cyrene 5th c.), Δαμασικλής (Athens 4th c.), Δαμασικράτης (Rhodes? ca. 250–175), Δαμασίλας (Rhodes ca. 261 BC), Δαμασίπολις (Thessaly ?3rd–2nd c.), Δαμάσιππος (Thrace 5th c.), Δαμασίστρατος (Athens ca. 530–520), Δαμναγόρας (Thrace 4th c.), Δαμνασυλλίς (Syracuse 5th c.), Δάμνιππος (Athens? 404 BC), Δαμνοδίκᾱ (Lesbos imp.).

AGENT NOUNS: δμητήρ ‘tamer’ (Hom.), δαμαστής ‘tamer’ (Ps. Epich.? See Chapter 6, section 3.1).

V2 COMPOUNDS: ἵπποδάμος ‘tamer of horses’ (Hom.), γυιόδαμος ‘taming limbs’ (Pi.), θειόδαμος ‘taming the gods’ (Orac. ap. Porph.). Agentive semantics is also expressed by compounds in -δάμας: (**LITER.**) λαοδάμας ‘subduer of peoples’ (Hom.; later also as an appellative), ἀνδροδάμας ‘man-taming’ (Pi.), λεοντοδάμας ‘lion-taming’ (ibid.), χαλκοδάμας ‘subduing bronze’ (ibid.), τοξοδάμας ‘subduing with the bow’ (Aesch.), κεκραξιδάμας ‘conquering all in bawling’ (Aristoph.; but see also under κράζω), ἀστροδάμας ‘subduing the stars’ (PGM 4.603, 3rd c. AD). (**EP.**) ἄστυδάμας (Athens ca. 560 BC), Δᾶμοδάμας (Delphi 321 BC), Χαλκοδάμανς (Argos? ca. 625–600). Compounds in -δαμαστής are only two: πωλοδαμαστής ‘tamer of foals’ (PMich.Zen. 71.4, 3rd c.) and ἵπποδαμαστής ‘tamer of horses’ (Poll.).**δείδω** ‘fear’ (I)

FC: δεισι-, δειδι-?

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: Δεισήνωρ (Hom.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: ἀδεισιβόας ‘not fearing the battle cry’ (Bacch.), ἀδεισιδαμονία ‘freedom from superstition’ (Hippocr.), δεισιδαίμων ‘fearing the gods’ (Xen.), ἀδεισιδαίμων ‘without superstition’ (D.S.), ἀδεισίθεος ‘not fearing the gods’ (Jul.).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Δεισίθεμις (Rhodes 2nd c.), Δεισίθεος (Athens ca. 480 BC), Δείσιππος (Thessaly ca. 190–180). The present stem may appear in Δειδίκυρος (Macedonia 2nd c. AD).

AGENT NOUNS: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: None.



**δέρκομαι** ‘see’ (IVa)

FC: δερκε-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: None, but the stem of the verb seems to be contained in the *Kurzname* Δέρκας (Troezen 4th c.).

OTHER COMPOUNDS: None.

AGENT NOUNS: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: Compounds in -δερκής cover for the lack of agentive compounds. The following forms have active semantics: πολυδερκής ‘much-seeing’ (Hes.), ξανθοδερκής ‘with fiery eyes’ (lit. ‘looking with red [eyes]’, Bacch.), όβριμοδερκής ‘with a mighty glance’ (ibid.), όξυδερκής ‘quick-sighted’ (Hdt.), λιθοδερκής ‘petrifying with a glance’ (Antiphil.), πανδερκής ‘all-seeing’ (Q.S.), μεσοδερκής ‘looking towards the middle’ (Man.), γλυκυδερκής ‘with a sweet glance’ (Hsch.), κακοδερκής ‘with a bad glance?’ (ibid.).

**δέχομαι** ‘receive’ (IV)

FC: δεξι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: Δέξανδρος (Corinth 8th c.), δεξίστρατος ‘receiving the host’ (Bacch.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: δεξίπυρος ‘receiving fire’ (Eur.)

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Compound PNs, as well as *Kurznamen*, are frequent: Δεξαγόρας (Rhodes 3rd–2nd c.), Δεξαρέτᾱ (Boeotia 5th c.), Δέξαρχος (Cyrene 3rd c.), Δεξενικά (Phokis 3rd c.), Δεξίβιος (Amorgos 4th c.), Δεξίβουλος (Rhodes ca. 180–170), Δεξιγίτων (Boeotia ?3rd–2nd c.), Δεξίδημος (Euboea 4th c.), Δεξίθεος (Sicyon 6th–5th c.), Δεξικλῆς (Rhodes ca. 400 BC), Δεξικράτης (Samos 6th c.), Δεξίκριτος (Boeotia 3rd–2nd c.), Δεξίλαφος (Sybaris 6th c.), Δεξίλοχος (Arcadia 4th–3rd c.), Δεξίμαχος (Athens? ca. 440–430), Δεξίμβροτος (Rhodes ca. 325 BC), Δεξιμένης (Athens 4th c.), Δεξιναύτᾱς (Rhodes 1st c. BC–1st c. AD), Δεξίνικος (Athens 4th–3rd c.), Δεξίνομος (Athens 5th c.), Δεξίξενος (Athens 335/4), Δεξίοχος (Athens 138/7), Δεξίπολις (Delos 298 BC), Δέξιππος (Sparta 6th c.), Δεξισθένης (Boeotia ?202 BC), Δεξίστρατος (Argos ca. 400 BC), Δεξιτέλης (Amorgos 4th–3rd c.), Δεξιφάνης (Arcadia 4th–3rd c.), Δεξίφιλος (Athens 450–430), Δεξίχαρις (Rhodes ca. 180–140 BC).

AGENT NOUNS: δέκτης ‘receiver, beggar’ (Hom.), δεκτήρ ‘receiver’ (title of an official, Mantinea 2nd–1st c.).

V2 COMPOUNDS: πολυδέγμων and πολυδέκτης ‘the All-receiver, Hades’ (*H. Hom. Cer.*), δωροδέκτης ‘one that takes bribes’ (LXX), πανδέκτης ‘all-receiver’ (name of universal dictionaries, Clem. Al.), σιταποδέκτης ‘corn-collector’ (*PFlor.* 43.9, 4th c. AD), χρυσυποδέκτης ‘receiver of taxes in gold’ (*Stud. Pal.* 8.1111.5, 6th c. AD). The most common types however are those in -δοκος (first form ιοδόκος ‘holding arrows’, Hom.), -δοχος (first form ξενηδόχος ‘one who receives strangers’, Men.)

which together add up to more than a hundred forms in Buck-Petersen. They may have started off in Mycenaean, with the PN *ra-wo-do-ko* /Lāwodokos/. Most specimens however are attested in Late Greek.

### δίδωμι (IV)

FC: \*\*δωτι- (cf. Δωτώ), δωσι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: The first trace of a V1 compound from δίδωμι is the *Kurzname* Δωτώ (Hom.); see too Δῶτος (Archil.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: δωσίδικος ‘referring disputes to a court’ (Hdt.), δωσίβιος ‘life-giving’ (*Mus. Belg.* 16.70, Attica 2nd c. AD), δωσιάρα ‘giving evil’ (Hsch.), δωσίπυγος ‘offering the arse, sodomite’ (Suid.).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Δωσιάναξ (Rhodes ca. 285 BC), Δωσίθεος (Rhodes 4th–3rd c.), Δωσισθένης (Thera 2nd c.).

AGENT NOUNS: δωτήρ (Hom.), δῶτωρ (ibid.), δοτήρ (ibid.), δώτης (Hes.), δότης (LXX): all ‘giver’.

V2 COMPOUNDS: ἀδότης ‘non-giver’ (coined as the antithesis of δώτης, Hes.), χαριδότης ‘joy-giver’ (*H. Hom. Merc.*), ἠπιოდότης ‘giver of gifts’ (*Orph. H., Εὐχή*), ὀλβιοδότης ‘bestower of bliss’ (*Orph. H.*), ἐλπιδοδότης ‘giver of hope’ (*AP* 9.525.6, *adesp.*), μεθιδότης ‘giver of wine’ (*AP* 9.524, *adesp.*), ὠρεσιδότης ‘one who brings out the seasons’ (*AP* 9.525.25, *adesp.*), πνευματοδότης ‘giver of spirit’ (*PGM* 4.1371, 4th c. AD).

Compounds in -δότης are even more common. A full list is provided by Buck-Petersen 561. The following are the earliest forms: πλουτοδότης ‘giver of riches’ (Hes.), ὑπνοδότης ‘giver of sleep’ (Aesch.), οἰνοδότης ‘giver of wine’ (Eur.), ὀλβοδότης ‘giver of bliss’ (ibid.), μισθοδότης ‘paymaster’ (Pl.), βιοδότης ‘giver of livelihood’ (ibid.).

### διώκω ‘pursue, chase, drive’ (IV)

FC: διωξι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: διώξιππος ‘driving horses’ (Pi.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: διωξικέλευθος ‘urging on the way’ (*AP*: perhaps Philodemus of Gadara, 1st c.).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Διώξανδρος (Athens 326/5), Διωξίμαχος (Athens ca. 450 BC), Διώξιππος (Athens ca. 550 BC).

AGENT NOUNS: διώκτης ‘pursuer’ (*NT*), διωκτήρ ‘pursuer’ (Babr.).

V2 COMPOUNDS: ἵπποδιώκτης ‘driver of steeds’ (Theocr.), Περσοδιώκτης ‘chaser of the Persians’ (Theaet.), ἐργοδιώκτης ‘taskmaster’ (*PPetr.* 2p.6, 3rd c.), κνισοδιώκτης ‘Fat-hunter’ (name of a mouse in the *Batrachomimachia*), ληστοδιώκτης ‘one who chases robbers’ (name of a board game; *Gloss.*), ὄφιοδιώκτης ‘snake-chaser’ (ibid.), κολλοποδιώκτης ‘one who chases effeminate men’ (*schol.* Aristoph.).

**δοκέω** ‘seem, pretend’ (I)

FC: δοκησι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: δοκησιδέξιος ‘clever in one’s own conceit’ (Pherecr.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: δοκησίσοφος ‘wise in one’s own conceit’ (Aristoph.), δοκησίνους ‘one who believes to be clever’ (Poll.), δοκησισοφία ‘conceit of wisdom’ (ibid.).

AGENT NOUNS: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: None in Ancient Greek.

**ἐγείρω** ‘rouse, raise’ (II)

FC: ἐγρε- (from the aorist ἔγρετο), ἐγερσι-, ἐγρεσι-, ἐγερτι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: ἐγρεμάχη ‘rousing the fight’ (*H. Hom. Cer.*).APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: ἐγρεκύδομος ‘strife-stirring’ (Hes.), ἐγερσιμάχᾱς ‘rousing the fight’ (Antip. Sid.), ἐγερσιφαής ‘light-stirring’ (Phil. Epigr.), ἐγερσιβόης ‘raising the cry’ (*IG 2<sup>2</sup>.3118*, Attica 2nd c. AD), ἐγερσίχορος ‘leading the dance’ (Opp.), ἐγερσίνοος ‘soul-stirring’ (Nonn.), ἐγρεσίκωμος ‘stirring up to revelry’ (ibid.), ἐγερσίγελως ‘rousing laughter’ (Paul. Sil.).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Ἐγέρτιος (Athens 360–350), Ἐγρετίων (Arcadia ca. 425–385).

AGENT NOUNS: ἐγέρτης (Hdn.), ἐξεγέρτης ‘one who arouses’ (*PGM 12.225*, 3rd c. AD).V2 COMPOUNDS: None in Antiquity proper; νεκρεγέρτης ‘rousing the dead’ is found in the *Christus Patiens* (11th–12th c. AD).**ἐθέλω** ‘to be willing’ (II)

FC: ἐθελο-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: ἐθελόπορνος ‘voluntary catamite’ (Anacr.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: ἐθέλεχθρος ‘bearing one a grudge’ (Cratin.; cf. also the denominative in -έω), ἐθελοσύχνος ‘fond of repetitions’ (ibid.), ἐθελοκακέω ‘play the coward deliberately’ (Hdt., from the compound ἐθελόκακος, attested in D.H.; there are also other derivatives), ἐθελοπρόξενος ‘one who voluntarily charges himself with the office of πρόξενος’ (Thuc.), ἐθελόπονος ‘willing to work’ (Xen.), ἐθελουργός ‘willing to work’ (ibid., with denominative ἐθελουργέω), ἐθελόδουλος ‘serving voluntarily’ (Pl.; cf. also the derived forms ἐθελοδουλεία and ἐθελοδουλέω), ἐθελόκαλος ‘showing goodwill’ (Phld.), ἐθελοκωφέω ‘affect deafness’, (S.E.), ἐθελοκίνδυνος ‘courting danger’ (Poll.). ἐθελοθηρησκεία ‘will-worship’ (*NT: Ep. Col.*; glossed with ἐθελοσέβεια in Hsch.), ἐθελορήτωρ ‘would-be orator’ (*Antiatticista*), ἐθελάστιος ‘wanting to be refined’ (Hld.), ἐθελακριβής ‘making pretence of accuracy’ (*schol. Luc.*), ἐθελοφιλόσοφος ‘would-be philoso-

pher' (*EM*). Some of the later forms are more probably determinative compounds in which the FC functions as a modifier.

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Ἐθελοκράτης (Athens 4th c.). Other compounds (e.g. Ἐθέλανδρος) are most probably determinative compounds.

AGENT NOUNS: ἔθελοντήρ 'volunteer' (Hom.), ἔθελοντής 'volunteer' (Hdt.), θελητής 'one who wills' (LXX).

V2 COMPOUNDS: None. An active type in -θελής develops in Late Antiquity.

### εἶλον 'take, seize' (I)

FC: ἔλε-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: ἔλανδρος 'man-destroying' (Aesch.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: ἐλέπτολις 'city-destroying', ἐλέναυς 'destroying ships' (both Aesch.). These three compounds constitute a set in which Aeschylus plays with the name of Helen in the *Agamemnon*.

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: None.

AGENT NOUN: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: None.

### εἶλω 'press, roll up' (I)

FC: εἶλι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: εἶλίπους 'rolling the feet' (Hom.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: εἶλιπόδης 'rolling the feet' (Nonn.).

AGENT NOUNS: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: None. For ἀολλής < \*ἀ-φολνής 'all pressed together' (Hom.), see *EDG* s.v.

### ἐλάω 'drive, set in motion, strike' (IV)

FC: ἐλασι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: ἐλάσιππος 'driving horses' (Pi.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: ἐλασιβρόντας 'hurling thunder' (Pi.), ἐλασίχθων 'earth-striking' (ibid.).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Ἐλάσιππος (Aegina? 5th c.).

AGENT NOUNS: ἐλατήρ 'driver' (Hom.), ἐλάτης 'driver' (Eur.).

V2 COMPOUNDS: Compounds in -ελάτης and -ηλάτης are very common, particularly in later Greek, and remain so down to the Byzantine age. A full list is available in Buck-Petersen 547. Only the forms which appear before the 3rd c. are listed here. ἰππηλάτης 'driver of horses' (Hom.), ἄρματηλάτης 'charioteer' (Pi.), βοηλάτης 'one that drives away oxen' (Aesch.), διφρηλάτης 'charioteer' (ibid.), ζευγηλάτης 'driver of a yoke of oxen' (Soph.), τροχηλάτης 'charioteer'

(*ibid.*). Compounds in -ελάτης are first attested in Plutarchus, with αἰγελάτης ‘goatherd’.

**ἐλελίζω** ‘cause to vibrate’ (I)

FC: ἐλελι-. Note that it uses the bare stem; -ι- is not a linking vowel.

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: ἐλελίχθων ‘earth-shaking’ (Pi.).

OTHER COMPOUNDS: None.

AGENT NOUNS: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: None.

**ἔλκω** ‘drag’ (IV)

FC: ἔλκε-, ἔλκεσι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUNDS: ἐλκεχίτων ‘trailing the tunic’ (Hom.), ἐλκεσίπελος ‘trailing the robe’ (*ibid.*).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: ἐλκετριβών ‘cloak-trailer’ (nickname of a Laconian in Pl. Com.).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Ἐλκεβίᾱ (Thessaly hell.).

AGENT NOUNS: ὀλκός ‘hauling-engine’ (Hdt.).<sup>6</sup>

V2 COMPOUNDS: ξιφουλκός ‘drawing a sword’ (Aesch.). The full list of compounds in -ουλκός and -ολκός, which are a very frequent type in Greek, is provided by Buck-Petersen 672. The following compounds are attested before the 3rd c.: τοξουλκός ‘drawing the bow’ (Aesch.), κερουλκός ‘drawing a bow made of horn’ (Soph.), νεωλκός ‘one who hauls up a ship into dock’ (Aristot.), κηρουλκός ‘bringing destruction’ (Lycophr.).

**Root unknown (I)**

FC: ἐνοσι-, εἰνοσι-, ἔνοσι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: *e-ne-si-da-o-ne* /En(n)esidāhōnei/ (dat.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: ἐνοσίχθων ‘shaking the earth’ (Hom.), εἰνοσίφυλλος ‘shaking the leaves’ (*ibid.*), ἔνοσιγαιος ‘shaking the earth’ (*ibid.*), ἔνοσιδᾶς ‘shaking the earth’ (Pi.), ἐνοσίφρων ‘shaking the mind’ (Jo. Gaz.).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: None.

AGENT NOUNS: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: None.

<sup>6</sup> DEG interprets ὀλκός as a *nomen actionis*, which would be justified by the secondary meaning ‘trace’. But the accent, the specialized meaning ‘hauling-engine’ and the use of the word as an adjective also suggest an origin as a *nomen agentis*.

**ἔραμαι ‘love’ (IV)**

FC: ἔρασι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: Ἐράσιππος (Lokroi Epizephyrioi ?8th–7th c.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: ἐρασίμολπος ‘loving song’ (Pi.), ἐρασιχρήματος ‘loving money’ (Xen.). In two other compounds, ἐρασιπλόκαμος ‘with lovely hair’ (Ibyc.) and ἐρασίπτερος ‘with amorous wing’ (Nonn.) the FC ἔρασι- does not have a governing function.

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Ἐρασίδημος (Siphnos ca. 200–175), Ἐρασικλῆς (Thera ?7th c.), Ἐρασίλειος (Thasos 300–270), Ἐρασίμβροτος (Rhodes ca. 68 BC), Ἐρασίνικος (Keos 4th–3rd c.), Ἐρασιπτόλεμος (Crete 2nd c.), Ἐρασισθένης (Syros 2nd–1st c.), Ἐρασίστρατος (Athens 5th c.), Ἐρασίτιμος (Thessaly 3rd–2nd c.), Ἐρασίφων (Paros 3rd c.).

AGENT NOUNS: ἐραστής (Ibyc. *PMGF* 181).

V2 COMPOUNDS: παιδερραστής ‘lover of boys’ (Aristoph.), δημεραστής ‘friend of the people’ (Pl.), γυναικεραστής ‘lover of women’ (Poll.), ἵππεραστής ‘lover of horses’ (Ael.), οἴνεραστής ‘lover of wine’ (ibid.).

**ἐργάζομαι ‘work’ (II)**

FC: ἐργασι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: None.

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: None.

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: No compounds are attested, but the FC is probably to be read in the *Kurzname* Ἐργασίων (Athens? 5th c.), Ἐργάσιλος (Athens 45/6 AD), Ἐργάσιμος (Apulia imp.).

AGENT NOUNS: ἐργάτης (Archil.), ἐργαστήρ (Xen.), ἐραστής (A.D.), all ‘workman’.

V2 COMPOUNDS: None in Antiquity proper, but in the Byzantine age compounds in -εργάτης become very common, replacing those in -ουργός.

**ἔρδω ‘do’ (IV)**

FC: ἔρξι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: Ἐρξανδρος (Lesbos 6th–5th c.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: None.

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Ἐρξιγέννης (Athens ca. 320 BC), Ἐρξίδικος (Athens 335/4), Ἐρξικλείδης (Athens 548/7), Ἐρξιλᾶς (Cyrene 5th c.), Ἐρξιμένης (Athens 459 BC).

AGENT NOUN: ἔρκτωρ ‘doer’ (Antim.).

V2 COMPOUNDS: *a-pu-ko-wo-ko* /ampukoworgoi/ ‘headband-makers’, *i-je-ro-wo-ko* /hieroworgos/ perhaps ‘sacrificing priest’, *ko-wi-ro-wo-ko*, interpretation uncertain, *ku-ru-so-wo-ko-i* /k<sup>h</sup>ürsoworgoi/ ‘goldsmiths’, *ku-wa-no-wo-ko-i* (dat. pl.) /kuanoworgohi/ ‘enamel-workers’, *no-ri-wo-ko* (uncertain interpretation), *to-ko-so-wo-ko* /toksoworgos/ ‘bow-maker’. Compounds in -οργός, -ουργός and -εργός

are among the most productive V2 compounds in Greek. The full list is provided by Buck-Petersen 629–631: because of the high number of forms attested already in Classical Greek, this Corpus does not contain a list of items. For an analysis of the structure of these compounds, see Chapter 6, section 3.1. A handful of compounds in -εργής has active semantics: see Chapter 6, section 3.1.

### **ἐρείπω** ‘throw down’ (I)

FC: ἐρειψι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: ἐρειψιπύλας ‘overthrowing gates’ (Bacch.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: ἐρειψίτοιχος ‘overthrowing walls’ (Aesch.).

OTHER COMPOUNDS: None.

AGENT NOUNS: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: None.

### **ἔρπω** ‘go, come’ (II)

FC: ἐρπετι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: Ἐρπετίδαμος (Crete 8th–7th c.).

OTHER COMPOUNDS: Ἐρπίνικος? (Athens 255/6 AD).

AGENT NOUNS: ἐρπηστής ‘a reptile’ (Nic.), ἐρπηστήρ ‘creeping thing, reptile’ (Opp.).

V2 COMPOUNDS: None.

### **ἐρύκω** ‘keep in, restrain’ (II)

FC: ἐρυξι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: Ἐρυξίμαχος ‘one who keeps away the fight’ (Athens 5th c.), Ἐρυξίλαος ‘one who keeps away the enemy’ (Thebes 5th c.).

OTHER COMPOUNDS: None.

AGENT NOUNS: ἐρυκτήρ ‘class of Spartan freedmen’ (Myro).

V2 COMPOUNDS: None.

### **ἔρμαι/ἔρύομαι** ‘protect’ / **ἔρύω** ‘drag’ (II)

FC: ἐρυ-, ἐρυσι-, ῥυσι-: there is no formal difference between the compounds from the two verbs, which can be differentiated only on the basis of their meaning.<sup>7</sup>

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUNDS: *we-wa-do-ro* /*Werwandros*/, Ἐρύλαος (Hom.), ἐρυσίπολις ‘protecting the city’ (ibid.), ἐρυσάρματος ‘chariot-drawing’ (ibid.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: ῥυσίδιφρος ‘preserving the chariot’ (Pi.), ῥυσίβωμος ‘defending altars’ (Aesch.), ῥυσίπολις ‘saving the city’ (ibid.), ἐρυσίχθων ‘tearing

<sup>7</sup> For the etymology of the two verbs, which do not seem to be cognates, see *DEG* s. *vv.* and Chapter 5, section 5.

up the earth' (Strato Com.), ἐρυσίθριξ 'curry-comb' (AP, possibly Philodemus), ἐρυσινηίς 'preserving ships' (Phil. Epigr.), ῥυσίπονος 'saving from toil' (AP 9.525.18, *adesp.*).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Ἐρύσιππος (Cyrene 3rd c.).

AGENT NOUNS: from both verbs ῥυτήρ 'guardian' / 'drawer' (e.g. of the bow; later also as 'strap') and ῥυτωρ 'saviour' / 'one who draws (the bow)' (hapax); from ἔρυσμαι only: ῥύστης 'saviour' (LXX); from ἐρύω only: ἐρυτήρ 'that which draws up' (said of an emetic; Nic.), ῥυστήρ 'rein' (Phot.; also used with the meaning 'deliverer' in Tryphiodorus).

V2 COMPOUNDS: None.

### εὐρίσκω 'find, discover' (IV)

FC: εὐρησι-, εὐρεσι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: εὐρησιεπής 'inventive of poetry' (Pi.), εὐρησιλογέω 'invent ingenious arguments' (Plb.; εὐρησίλογος is attested in D.L.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: εὐρεσικάκος 'inventive of evil' (*schol.* Eur.).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Εὐρησίβιος (Eretria 4th–3rd c.), Εὐρησίδημος (Euboea 4th–3rd c.), Εὐρήσιππος (Thrace ca. 336–311).

AGENT NOUNS: εὐρετής 'discoverer' (Pl.).

V2 COMPOUNDS: πρωθυερετής 'first discoverer' (Nicomachus, 2nd c. AD).

### εὐχομαι 'pray' (II)

FC: εὐχ(ε)-, εὐξι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: Εὐχῆνωρ 'one who prays men' (Hom.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: None.

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Εὐξιδᾶμος (Argolis ?2nd–1st c.), Εὐξίθεμις (Thrace ca. 365–336), Εὐξίθεος 'one who prays the gods' (Athens 520–510), Εὐξίμβροτος (Cos ca. 200 BC), Εὐξίππᾶ (Boeotia 5th–4th c.), Εὐξιτέλης (Locris 2nd c.), Εὐξίφαντος (Boeotia ca. 230–200), Εὐχέλᾶς (Melos 5th c.).

AGENT NOUN: εὐχέτης 'one who prays' (Hdn. = Eust.).

V2 COMPOUNDS: None.

### ἔχω 'have, hold' (IV)

FC: ἔχε-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUNDS: *e-ke-da-mo* /Hek<sup>h</sup>edāmos/, *e-ke-me-de* /Hek<sup>h</sup>emēdēs/, ἐχέθυμος 'under self-control' (Hom.), Ἐχέπωλος 'having horses' (both Hom.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: ἐχεπευκής 'sharp' (Hom.), ἐχέφρων 'prudent' (*ibid.*), ἐχενηίς 'ship-holding' (Aesch.), ἐχεπάμων 'holding property' (Locris 5th c.), ἐχέγγυος 'trustworthy' (Soph.), ἐκεχειρία 'truce' (Thuc.), ἐχέκολλος 'sticky' (Hippocr.), ἐχεμυθία 'silence' (Plu.; from the compound ἐχέμυθος attested in



Suida), ἔχεδερμία ‘being hide-bound’ (*Hippiatr.*), ἐχεγλωττία ‘tongue-truce’ (Luc.), ἐχέσαρκος ‘clinging close to the body’ (Ath.), ἐχεκτέανος ‘with great possessions’ (Rhian.), ἐχεκήλης ‘ruptured’ (Hsch.).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Ἐχέβιος (Sikinos imp.), Ἐχέβωλος (Thera 5th c.), Ἐχεδαμίδα (Argolis ?ca. 575–550), Ἐχέδικος (Nesos 3rd c.), Ἐχέδωρος (Rhodes ca. 170–160), Ἐχεκλής (Athens 6th–5th c.), Ἐχεκράτης (Thasos 6th–5th c.), Ἐχεκύδης (Thasos 5th c.), Ἐχέλεως (Scythia Minor 6th c.), Ἐχέμαντις (Delos 274–250), Ἐχέμαχος (Phokis 2nd c.), Ἐχέμβροτος (Boeotia 7th c.), Ἐχεμενεΐδα (Boeotia 5th c.), Ἐχεμήδης (Laconia 3rd c.), Ἐχέμηλος (Phokis 169 BC), Ἐχέμυθος (Athens ca. 330 BC), Ἐχεναΐς (Thessaly ca. 480–450), Ἐχένικος (Samos 321–306), Ἐχεπάμων (Rhodes 3rd c.), Ἐχέπολις (Thrace 5th c.), Ἐχεσσοθένης (Boeotia ?424 BC), Ἐχέστροτος (Boeotia ca. 550–525), Ἐχέταρμος (Aetolia ?228–215), Ἐχετέλης (Sparta 362–360), Ἐχετέρμων (Acarmania 2nd c.), Ἐχέτιμος (Cyprus 6th c.), Ἐχέφρων (Athens? 3rd c.), Ἐχέφυλος (Zakynthos 4th c.), Ἐχιππος (Rhegion 6th c.).

AGENT NOUNS: The adjective ὄχος ‘solid’ (hapax in Ph. Byz.) might represent the continuation of an old agent noun meaning ‘holding together’. The same semantics is shown by ὄχος ‘anything that holds’ (hapax in Hom.), whose accent however is typical of action nouns. The PN Ἐκτωρ may represent an old agent noun.

V2 COMPOUNDS: *a-ni-o-ko* = ἡνίοχος ‘rein-holder, charioteer’, *ko-to-no-o-ko* /*ktoino-okhos*/ ‘land holder’, *wa-tu-o-ko* /*Wastuok<sup>h</sup>os*/ ‘citadel-holder’ (PN). Compounds in -ουχος are among the most common V2 compounds in Greek: for this reason, they have not been included in this Corpus. A full list is provided by Buck-Petersen 684–685 and 688.

## ζεύγνυμι ‘yoke’ (II)

FC: ζευξι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: Ζευξιδάμος ‘subjugator the people’ (Sparta 7th c.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: ζευξίλεως ‘subjugator of men’ (Soph.).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Ζευξαγόρα (Argolis ?2nd–1st c.), Ζεύξαιλος (Epidauros ca. 335–325 c.), Ζευξίδωρος (Megara 242–238), Ζευξιθέα (Rhodes 1st c. BC–1st c. AD), Ζευξίμαχος (Cyrene 4th–3rd c., Epidauros ca. 365–335), Ζεύξιππος (Pind. fr. 51c Maehler).

AGENT NOUNS: ζευκτήρ (Jos.), ζευκτήης (Hsch.): both ‘one who yokes’.

V2 COMPOUNDS: None: with the exception of the late βιοζυγής ‘yoking lives together’ (Nonn.), all compounds in -ζυγής are passive.

**ἡγέομαι** ‘lead, command’ (IV)

FC: ἡγε-, ἡγησι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: Ἀγησιχόρα ‘she who leads the chorus’ (Alcm.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: ἀγησίλαος ‘leading the people’ (Aesch.), ἡγησίπολις ‘leader of the state’ (D.L.), ἡγέμαχος ‘chieftain’ (Hsch.).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Ἠγεάνασσα (Thrace 4th c.), Ἠγεκράτης (Thrace 6th–5th c.), Ἠγεκρέων (Samos 4th–3rd c.), Ἠγέλεως (Keos 5th–4th c.), Ἠγέλοχος (Athens 5th c.), Ἠγέμαχος (Athens 5th c.), Ἠγέπολις (Chios 5th c.), Ἠγέστρατος (Athens 7th c.), Ἠγησαγόρης (Samos 5th c.), Ἠγήσανδρος (Athens ca. 510–500), Ἠγησάρετος (Thessaly 3rd–2nd c.), Ἠγήσαρχος (Thasos ca. 520–490), Ἠγησιάναξ (Thasos b. 510 BC), Ἠγησίβουλος (Thasos ca. 550–520), Ἠγησίδημος (Thrace 5th–4th c.), Ἠγησίδικος (Macedonia 4th c.), Ἠγησίθεμις (Chios 5th–4th c.), Ἠγησικλῆς (Samos ?ca. 542–520), Ἠγησικράτης (Athens? 4th c.), Ἠγησίλεως (Paros, arch.), Ἠγησίλοχος (Thera 5th c.), Ἠγησίμαχος (Thasos 5th/4th c.), Ἠγησίμβροτος (Macedonia 2nd–3rd c. AD), Ἠγησίνικος (Euboea hell.), Ἠγησίπολις (Thrace 6th c.), Ἠγήσιππος (Thasos 5th c.), Ἠγησιπύλη (Thrace 6th/5th c.), Ἠγησισθένης (Athens 95/4 BC), Ἠγησίστρατος (Athens? 6th c.), Ἠγησιτέλης (Thasos 5th c.), Ἠγησιφάνης (Athens 369/8 BC).

AGENT NOUNS: ἡγήτωρ ‘chief’ (Hom.), ἡγητήρ ‘guide’ (Soph.), ἡγέτης ‘leader’ (*Ep. Gr.* 1035, 2nd c. AD).V2 COMPOUNDS: *ku-na-ke-ta* (= κυνηγέτης) ‘hunter’, *ra-wa-ke-ta* /*lāwāgetās*/ ‘chief’. Μουσαῖγέτας ‘leader of the Muses’ (Pi.), ξενᾶγέτας ‘one who takes charge of guests’ (ibid.), ἔβδομαγέτης ‘epithet of Apollo’ (to whom the Spartans offered sacrifices on the 7th of every month; Aesch.), ἀρχηγέτης ‘first leader’ (ibid.), λοχᾶγέτας ‘leader of an armed band’ (ibid.), νυμφηγέτης ‘leader of the nymphs’, (*IG* 1<sup>2</sup>.8.358, Thasos 5th c.), εἰππηγέτης ‘driver of horses’ (Lycophr.), ναυηγέτης ‘commander of a fleet’ (ibid.), ποδηγέτης ‘guide’ (ibid.), Ληνᾶγέτας ‘leader of Bacchanals’ (*BMus. Inscr.* 902, Halicarnassus 3rd c.), κωμηγέτης ‘leader of a κῶμος’ (*OGI* 97.10, Egypt 2nd c.), στρατηγέτης ‘army-leader’ (*SIG* 588.60, Miletus 2nd c.), μοιραῖγέτης ‘guide of fate’ (Paus.), χοραῖγέτας ‘leader of the chorus’ (*IG* 42(1).133. col.II.1.7, Epidaurus 3rd c.). On the scholarly debate surrounding compounds in ᾶγέτης/-ηγέτης, see Chapter 6, section 3.1.**θάλλω/θαλέω** ‘sprout, blossom’ (IVa)

FC: θαλησι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: Θαλησικλής perhaps ‘one who makes fame bloom’ (Eretria 3rd c.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: None.

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Θαλησιγέννης (Athens 146/5 BC).

AGENT NOUNS: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: Compounds in -θηλής (< -θαλής) and many of those in -θαλ(λ)ής are likely to derive from the verb: ἐριθηλής ‘very flourishing’ (Hom.), νεοθηλής ‘fresh-budding’ (ibid.), πανθηλής ‘all-blossoming’ (Bacch.), δυσθαλής ‘hardly growing’ (Cratin.), ιοθαλής ‘blooming with violets’ (Philox.), ὄρειθαλής ‘blooming on the hills’ (Lycophr.), ἀειθαλής ‘evergreen’ (Mel.), χοροθαλής ‘flourishing in the dance’ (Antip.), ἱεροθαλής ‘blooming holily’ (*Orph. H.*), κυμοθαλής ‘abounding with waves’ (*Orph. H.*).

### θέλω ‘enchant, charm’ (IV)

FC: θελί-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: θελίμβροτος ‘charming men’ (Bacch.), θελίεπις ‘charming with his words’ (ibid.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: θελίνοος ‘charming the heart’ (Antiph. Epigr.), θελίμελής ‘charming with music’ (*IG 2<sup>2</sup>.5200*, Attica ca. 250 AD).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: None.

AGENT NOUNS: θέλκτωρ ‘charmer’ (Aesch., see Chapter 6, section 3.2), θελκτήρ ‘charmer’ (*H. Hom.* 16).

V2 COMPOUNDS: πανθέλκτειρα (Simon.). Two active compounds in -ής develop in Late Antiquity: φρενοθελής ‘charming the heart’ (Procl.), πανθελής ‘charming all’ (Nonn.).

### ἵμι ‘release, hasten’ (II)

FC: ἴσι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: Ἡσίοδος (8th c.). For the analysis of this name, see Chapter 5, section 5.3.2.

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: ἴσιεπής ‘uttering words’ (*EM*).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Ἡσίοχος (Athens ca. 411 BC), Ἡσίδωρος (Peloponnese? 11 AD).

AGENT NOUNS: There are no *simplicia*. The verb could clearly create agent nouns, as we can see from the preverbed forms ἀφέτης ‘one who lets off a military engine’ (Plb.; also attested with other meanings) and ἀφετήρ ‘starting point’ (Iamb.). These are compounded into determinative formations: see e.g. Σαλαμιναφέτης ‘betrayed of Salamis’ (Sol.).

V2 COMPOUNDS: None from ἵμι, only from ἀφίμι.

### ἵστημι ‘stand; set up’ (IV)

FC: στήσι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: *ta-ta-ke-u* /Stātark<sup>h</sup>ēus/?, *ta-ti-ḡo-we-u* /Stätig<sup>w</sup>-ōwēus/?

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Στησαγόρας (Athens 7th–6th c.), Στάσανδρος (Cyprus 5th–4th c.), Στᾶσιάνναξ (Cyprus 6th c.), Στᾶσιγένης (Cyprus 5th c.), Στᾶσιδάμος (Cyprus ?5th–4th c.), Στᾶσικλῆς (Argolis 4th c.), Στᾶσικρέτης (Cyprus ?5th c.), Στᾶσίκυπρος (Cyprus 478–470), Στᾶσιμένης (Epidaurus ca. 335–325), Στᾶσιόικος (Cyprus 5th c.), Στᾶσιππος (Arcadia ca. 370 BC), Στᾶσιτιμᾶ (Cyprus 6th c.), Στᾶσίφυλος (Cyprus 6th c.), Στᾶσίφυλος (Cyprus 5th c.), Στᾶσίχαρις (Cyprus 5th c.), Στήσαρχος (Athens 333/2), Στησικράτης (Cyprus 4th–3rd c.), Στησίλειος (Athens ca. 520–510), Στησίμαχος (Amorgos 6th c.), Στησίμβροτος (Thasos 5th c.), Στησίτιμος (Ios 290–280), Στησίχορος (Himera 7th–6th c.).

AGENT NOUNS: στατήρ ‘a weight or coin’ (Eur.; also ‘debtor’ in Epich.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: None. The plant name στησίφυλλον ‘leaf that sticks to the skin’ (Hsch.) does not seem to have a governing structure, but rather seems to specify a type of φύλλον ‘leaf’.

V2 COMPOUNDS: ἀριστεροστάτης ‘standing on the left’ (Cratin.), ὀρθοστάτης ‘upright shaft’ (Eur.), πρωτοστάτης ‘one who stands first’ (Thuc.), ὀβολοστάτης ‘weigher of obols’ (Aristoph.), τριτοστάτης ‘standing third from the corypheus’ (Aristot.), χοροστάτης ‘leader of a chorus’ (IG 12(2).645.36, Nesus, 4th c.), ζυγοστάτης ‘weigher’ (Cerc.), ἱεροστάτης ‘governor of the temple’ (LXX), τριστάτης ‘one who stands next to the king and queen’ (ibid.), μεσοστάτης ‘inner beam’ (Philo Mech.), δεξιοστάτης ‘one who stands in the right file of the Chorus’ (Poll.), δευτεροστάτης ‘one who stands in the rear file of the Chorus’ (Them.), πυριστάτης ‘standing on the fire’ (a kind of tripod; *schol.* Aristoph.).

### ἴσχω ‘hold, restrain’ (I)

FC: ἰσχε-, ἰσχο-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: Ἰσχένοος (Hdt.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: ἰσχέγαον ‘earth-retaining’ (name of a type of retaining wall, Delphi 4th c.), ἰσχέπλινθα ‘brick-retaining’ (perhaps a type of door-jamb or a socket to secure lintel and sill, Delphi 4th c.), ἰσθέθυρον ‘door-retaining’ (a type of window-frame, Delos 3rd c.).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Ἰσχέδαμος (Delphi 325 BC), Ἰσχόλαος (Sparta 5th–4th c.), Ἰσχόμαχος (Kroton 508–504), Ἰσχόπολις (Acarmania 4th–3rd c.).

AGENT NOUNS: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: None.

### καλέω ‘call’ (IV)

FC: καλε(σ)σι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: καλεσσίχορος ‘calling to the dance’ (Orph. *L.*).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: καλεσάνδρᾶ ‘summoner of men’ (PGM 7.696, 3rd c. AD).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: The *Kurzname* Καλεσίας (Athens 4th c.) attests to the existence of PNs in καλεσι-.

AGENT NOUNS: κλητήρ ‘summoner’ (Thgn.), κλήτωρ ‘summoner’ (SIG 344.43, Teos 4th c.).

V2 COMPOUNDS: ὁμοκλητήρ ‘shouter’ (Hom.) derives directly from ὁμοκλέω ‘shout’; ψευδοκλητήρ ‘one who falsely subscribes his name as witness to a summons’ (Theopomp.), δειπνοκλήτωρ ‘one who invites to dinner’ (v.l. in *Ev. Matt.*), ὀνομακλήτωρ ‘one who announces guests by name’ (Luc.).

### **κάμπτω** ‘bend, turn, guide round’ (IV)

FC: καμψι-, καμπεσι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: καμψίπους ‘bending the foot’ (Aesch.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: καμπεσίγιος ‘bending the limbs’ (Orph. *Fr.*), καμψίουρος ‘bending the tail’ (Hsch.), καμπεσίγονος ‘bending the knees’ (ibid.).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: the FC καμψι- may be contained in the *Kurzname* Καμφίας.

AGENT NOUNS: καμπτήρ ‘bend’ (Xen.).

V2 COMPOUNDS: ἄσματοκάμπτης ‘twister of song’ (Aristoph.), Ἴωνοκάμπτης ‘one who sings with soft Ionic modulations’ (Timoth.), πιτυοκάμπτης ‘pinebender’ (Str.). Compounds in -καμπής are passive.<sup>8</sup>

### **κάπτω** ‘gulp down’ (I)

FC: καψι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: καψιδρώτιον ‘napkin’ (i.e. ‘absorbing saliva’, Poll. and fr. *adesp.* 799 K.-A.).

OTHER COMPOUNDS: None.

AGENT NOUNS: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: None.

### **κείρω** ‘cut short, crop’ (I)

FC: κειρε-, κερσε-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: ἀκερσεκόμης ‘not cropping the hair’ (Hom.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: ἀκειρεκόμης (Soph.).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: None.

AGENT NOUNS: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: None.

<sup>8</sup> Paliuri (2014: 130).

**κέκασμαι** ‘surpass’ (I)

FC: καστι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: *ka-ta-no* /Kastānōr/ ‘he who distinguishes himself among men’ (see discussion in Chapter 4, section 7.6).OTHER COMPOUNDS: *ka-sa-no* /Kassānōr/, Καστιάνειρα (Hom.).

AGENT NOUNS: None. From a morphological point of view Κάστωρ is an agent noun from this verb, but its exclusive use as a PN does not encourage its classification as a productive agent noun in Greek.

V2 COMPOUNDS: None.

**κελεύω** ‘order’ (II)

FC: κελουσι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: There are no compounds attested from this verb, but a FC κελουσι- might be hidden behind the *Kurzname* Κελεύσος (Athens 459 BC).

AGENT NOUNS: κελουστής ‘one who gives the time to rowers’ (Eur.), κελεύστωρ ‘one who commands’ (Phryn.).

V2 COMPOUNDS: None.

**κινέω** ‘set in motion, move’ (IV)

FC: κινησι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: κινησίγαιος ‘shaking the earth’ (Hsch.; gloss on έννοσίγαιος).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: The FC κινησι- may be behind the *Kurzname* Κινησίας (Athens 6th c.).AGENT NOUNS: κινητήρ (*H. Hom.* 22), κινητής (Aristoph.) both ‘one that sets going’.V2 COMPOUNDS: only φωτοκινήτης ‘mover of light’ (*PGM* 4.599, 4th c. AD).**κιχάνω** ‘reach, overtake’ (I)

FC: κιχησι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: Κιχήσιππος (Athens 440/39).

OTHER COMPOUNDS: None.

AGENT NOUNS: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: None.

**κλαίω** ‘cry, lament’ (II)

FC: κλαυσι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: κλαυσίμαχος ‘rue-the-fight’ (parody on the name of Lamachus in Aristoph.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: None (κλαυσιγέλως ‘tears mingled with smiles’, Demetr., seems to be a coordinated compound showing κλαῦσις ‘weeping’ in the FC).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: None.

AGENT NOUNS: κλαυστήρ ‘weeper’ (Man.).

V2 COMPOUNDS: None.

### κλέπτω ‘steal’ (IV)

FC: κλεψι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: κλεψίφρων ‘thievish, having the mind of a thief’ (*H. Hom. Merc.*: it is a bahuvrihi though).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: κλεψύδρα ‘a small vessel for transferring liquids’ (lit. ‘steal-water’, Emp.), κλεψίνυμφος ‘seeking illicit love’ (lit. ‘stealing wives’, Lycophr.), κλεψιάμβος ‘a kind of musical instrument’ (Athen.), κλεψίγαμος ‘seeking illicit love’ (Hdn.), κλεψιχώλος ‘disguising lameness’ (Ps. Luc.), κλεψίτοκος ‘concealing offspring’ (Opp.), κλεψίνοος ‘beguiling the mind’ (Ignatius).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: The FC may appear in the *Kurzname* Κλεψίας (Chios? 6th c.).

AGENT NOUNS: κλέπτης (Hom.), κλοπός ‘thief’ (*H. Hom. Merc.*), κλώψ (Hdt.), κλέψ (Phryn.): all ‘thief’.

V2 COMPOUNDS: Root compounds: βοόκλεψ ‘stealer of oxen’ (Soph.), τυρόκλεψ ‘cheese-thief’ (Hdn.).

Compounds in -κλόπος: άνδραποδοκλόπος ‘slave-stealer’ (Soph.), κυνοκλόπος ‘dog-stealer’ (Aristoph.), φρενοκλόπος ‘stealing the understanding’ (Maecius Eprigr.), πανεπίκλοπος ‘all-treacherous’ (Opp.), γαμοκλόπος ‘adulterous’ (Philemon), βουκλόπος ‘ox-stealing’ (Porph.).

Compounds in -κλέπτης: μωροκλέπτης ‘stupid thief’ (Aesop.), άνδραποδοκλέπτης ‘slave-stealer’ (Men.), κηριοκλέπτης ‘stealer of honeycombs’ (Theocr.), λαμπτηροκλέπτης ‘lamp-stealer’ (Lycophr.), ζωστηροκλέπτης ‘one who steals belts’ (ibid.), όρνιθοκλέπτης ‘bird-stealer’ (Herod.), ποτηριοκλέπτης ‘cup-stealer’ (Euphron), βαλαντιοκλέπτης ‘cutpurse’ (Phryn.), ψηφοκλέπτης ‘one who juggles with pebbles’ (Athen.), ίματιοκλέπτης ‘clothes-stealer’ (D.L.), πορφυροκλέπτης ‘stealer of purple’ (ibid.), νυκτικλέπτης ‘thief of the night’ (Lucill.), άσημοκλέπτης ‘thief of plate’ (*AP* 11.360.3, *adespoton*), μικροκλέπτης ‘petty thief’ (*schol.* Aristoph.), όφθαλμοκλέπτης ‘stealer of the eye’ (*schol.* Lycophr.), παιδοκλέπτης ‘stealer of children’ (*schol.* Call.).

### κοσμέω ‘arrange, equip, adorn’ (IV)

FC: κοσμησι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: Κοσμησίστρατος (Oliaros ?2nd–1st c.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: None.

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Κοσμησιάναξ (Rhodes 1st c.–1st c. AD).

AGENT NOUNS: κοσμήτωρ ‘commander’ (Hom.), κοσμητής ‘name of an Athenian magistrate’ (Pl.), κοσμητήρ ‘title of a magistrate’ (Aeschin.).

V2 COMPOUNDS: χρυσοκοσμητής ‘decorator with gold’ (Vett. Val.), τριχοκοσμητής ‘hairdresser’ (Hsch.).

### **κράζω** ‘scream, bawl’ (II)

FC: κεκραξι- (cf. the reduplicated future κεκράξομαι in Aristoph.).

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: κεκραξίδαμας ‘who conquers all in bawling’ (Aristoph.; this is in fact a comic formation in which both members have a verbal value).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: None.

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: The same verbal stem may appear in the *Kurzname* Κράξιος (Boeotia 3rd–2nd c.).

AGENT NOUNS: κεκράκτης ‘bawler’ (Hippocr.), κράκτης ‘bawler’ (Aristoph.), κραγός ‘bawling’ (ibid.).

V2 COMPOUNDS: None. ἀκραγής ‘not barking’ (Aesch.) is a hapax.

### **κρατέω** ‘conquer, prevail’ (IVb)

FC: κρατησι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: Κρατησίκλεια (Sparta 6th c.)

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: κρατησίμαχος ‘conquering in the fight’ (Pi.), κρατήσιππος ‘victorious in the race’ (ibid.), κρατησίπους ‘victorious in the foot-race’ (ibid.).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Κρατεισαγόρᾱ (Thessaly 4th–3rd c.), Κρατησιβούλη (Euboea 3rd c.), Κρατησίλας (Keos 4th–3rd c.), Κρατησίλοχος (Thera 3rd c.), Κρατησιμάχᾱ (Thessaly 4th–3rd c.), Κρατησίνικος (Laconia 2nd c.), Κρατησίπολις (Macedonia? 315–307), Κρατήσιππος (Rhegion ca. 420–410).

AGENT NOUNS: κρατήτωρ ‘ruling star’ (Ptol.), κρατητής ‘possessor’ (Procl.).

V2 COMPOUNDS: None. Many of the very common bahuvrihis in -κρατής (< κράτος ‘power’) may have acquired verbal semantics. Similarly, the type αὐτοκράτωρ ‘sole ruler’, which becomes a very popular pattern, conveys a verbal meaning: see the analysis in Chapter 6, section 5.

### **κρούω** ‘strike, knock’ (IV)

FC: κρουσι-



FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: κρουσίθυρος ‘knocking at the door’ (type of flute-song mentioned by Trypho).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: κρουσιλύρης ‘striking the lyre’ (*Orph. H.*). For κρουσιδημέω ‘cheat the people’ (Aristoph.) and κρουσιμετρέω ‘cheat in measuring’ (Hsch.) see the analysis in Chapter 6, section 3.2.

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: None.

AGENT NOUNS: κρούστης ‘butting’ (Dosith.).

V2 COMPOUNDS: ζυγοκρούστης ‘one who uses a false balance’ (Artem.), κεφαλοκρούστης ‘striking the head’ (*schol. Nic.*, type of poisonous spider), κυμβαλοκρούστης ‘one who strikes cymbals, player upon cymbals’ (*Gloss.*).

## κρύπτω ‘hide’ (II)

FC: κρυψι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: κρυψίνοος ‘hiding one’s thoughts’ (Xen.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: κρυψιμέτωπος ‘hiding the forehead’ (Luc.), κρυψίποθος ‘hiding one’s longing’ (*EM*), κρυψίφρων ‘hiding one’s thoughts’ (Eust.), κρυψίχολος ‘hiding one’s anger’ (*ibid.*). In other compounds the FC κρυψι- does not have a governing meaning: e.g. in κρυψίγονος ‘secretly born’ (*Orph. H.*), κρυψίδομος ‘dwelling in secret’ (conjectured in place of the transmitted κρυψίδρομος, *Orph. H.*) and κρυψόρχης ‘with undescended testicles’ (Sor.).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: None.

AGENT NOUNS: κρύπτης ‘member of the Spartan κρυπτεία’ (Eur.? see Chapter 5, section 5.1.4 for this dubious attestation), κρυπτήρ ‘convenient for concealing’ (*schol. Opp.*).

V2 COMPOUNDS: None. The few ancient forms in -κρυφής are passive: εύκρυφής ‘easy to hide’ (Aristot.), νυκτικρυφής ‘hidden by night’ (*ibid.*). The first active compound dates to the 7th c. AD: θεοκρυφής ‘hiding God’ (Georg. Pisid.).

## κταόμαι ‘get, acquire’ (II)

FC: κτησι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: Κτήσιππος (Hom.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: κτησίβιος ‘possessing property’ (Aesch.).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Κτήσανδρος (Thasos 4th–3rd c.), Κτησαρέτη (Euboea 3rd c.), Κτησίαρχος (Athens 5th–4th c.), Κτησίβιος (Athens 5th–4th c.), Κτησίβουλος (Athens ca. 360–350), Κτησιγένης (Euboea 4th–3rd c.), Κτησίδημος (Mykonos ?4th/3rd c.), Κτησιέπης (Paros ?1st c.), Κτησικλής (Athens ca. 450 BC), Κτησικράτης (Euboea 4th c.), Κτησίκριτος (Keos 4th–3rd c.), Κτησίλεως (Keos 4th–3rd c.), Κτησιμένης (Imbros? 4th–3rd c.), Κτησίνικος (Keos 4th–3rd c.), Κτησίπολις (Chios ?ca. 200 BC), Κτήσιππος (Athens 5th c.), Κτησισθένης (Delos 246–208), Κτησίφιλος (Euboea 5th c.), Κτησιχάρης (Athens 4th c.).

AGENT NOUNS: κτήτωρ ‘possessor’ (D.S.).

V2 COMPOUNDS: None except for the PN Φιλοκτίτης.

### κύρω ‘obtain’ (I)

FC: κυρσι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: No compounds from this verb are attested, but the existence of the FC κυρσι- is proven by the *Kurzname* Κυρσίλος (Athens 480 BC).

OTHER COMPOUNDS: None.

AGENT NOUNS: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: None.

### λαγχάνω ‘obtain by lot’ (I)

FC: λαχε- (from the aorist λαχεῖν).

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: Λαχέμοιρος (Athens 5th–4th c.).

OTHER COMPOUNDS: None.

AGENT NOUNS: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: None.

### λαμβάνω ‘catch, receive’ (IV)

FC: λαβε- (from the aorist λαβεῖν)

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: Λαβίπᾶ ‘one who catches/receives horses’ (Laconia ?2nd–1st c.).

OTHER COMPOUNDS: None.

AGENT NOUNS: λήπτης ‘catcher’ (Zonar.).

V2 COMPOUNDS: ἐργολήπτης ‘contractor’ (Telecl.), δωρολήπτης ‘greedy of gain’ (LXX), προσωπολήπτης ‘respector of persons’ (NT). There are only a few active V2 compounds in -λάβος: ἐργολάβος ‘contractor’ (Pl.), ἀστρολάβος ‘armillary sphere’ (Ptol.) and δεξιολάβος ‘spearman’ (Act. Ap.). There are two active -ής compounds: εὐλαβής ‘undertaking prudently’ (Democr.), itself producing various derivations, and ὄξυλαβής ‘quick at seizing’ (Aristot.).

### λανθάνω / λήθω ‘forget, make one forget’ (I)

FC: λᾶθι- (from the aorist λαθεῖν), λᾶθι- (from λήθω), λησι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: λαθικηδής ‘banishing care’ (Hom.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: λαθίφθογος ‘banishing voice’ (epithet of death in Hes.), λησίμβροτος ‘taking men unawares’ (H. Hom. Merc.), λᾶθάνεμος ‘escaping wind’ (Simon.), λᾶθίπονος ‘forgetful of sorrow’ (Soph.), λαθίνοστος ‘forgetful of returning home’ (Hsch.: βραδύνων ἐπανελθεῖν), λαθίπαινος ‘forgetful of vengeance’ (ibid.).

Other compounds in λαθι- have a different structure, compare λαθιφροσύνη ‘forgetfulness’ (A.R.) or λαθιτορφυρίς ‘which feeds in the dark’ (Ibyc.). Two compounds in λαθι- have a long root vowel and derive from λήθω (see below).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: None.

AGENT NOUNS: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: None. ἀληθής ‘true’ is formally a passive verbal compound meaning ‘not hidden’.

### λείπω ‘leave, loose, to be wanting’ (III)

FC: λιπεσ-, λιπο-, λειπο-<sup>9</sup>

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: λιπεσάνωρ ‘abandoning her husband’ (Stes.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: λιπότεκνος ‘childless’ (Pi.), λιπόξυλος ‘lacking wood’ (Emp.), λιπόνανος ‘deserting the fleet’ (Aesch.), λιποτελέω ‘to be in arrear with taxes’ (IG 9(1).334.14 Oeanthea 5th c.), λιποπωγωνία ‘want of a beard’ (Cratin.), λιποστρατίη ‘desertion from the army’ (Hdt.; from the unattested \*λιπόστρατος), λιποψυχέω ‘swoon’ (ibid.), λιπόγαμος ‘deserting her marriage’ (Eur.), λιποταξία ‘desertion’ (Dem.), λιποθυμέω ‘faint’ (Hippocr.), λειπογνώμων ‘lacking interpreters’ (IG 2<sup>2</sup>.1357.9–10 Athens 4th c.), λιπάδελφος ‘brotherless’ (Ep. Gr. 241, 1st c.), λιπόκεντρος ‘leaving a sting’ (Coll. Alex. adesp. 1), λιπομήτωρ ‘leaving one’s mother’ (Phil. Epigr.), λιπόπνοος ‘breathless’ (Mel.), λιπανδρία ‘want of men’ (Str.), λιπαυγής ‘sunless’ (IG 12(5).891, Macedonia, imp.), λιπόγυιος ‘wanting a limb’ (Pl. Jun.), λιπόδερμος ‘without a skin’ (Diosc.), λιπόπαις ‘childless’ (Man.), λιπόγληνος ‘sightless’ (Nonn.), λιπόγλωσσος ‘tongueless’ (ibid.), λιπόθριξ ‘hairless’ (ibid.), λιπόθορος ‘wanting voice’ (ibid.), λιπόπατρις ‘leaving one’s country’ (ibid.), λιποπτόλεμος ‘leaving the war’ (ibid.), λιπόπτολις ‘leaving the city’ (ibid.), λιποσθενής ‘powerless’ (ibid.), λιπόσκιος ‘without shadow, casting no shadow’ (ibid.), λιπόβιοι ‘dead ones’ (Hsch.).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Λιπόδωρος (Cyprus? hell.?).

AGENT NOUNS: None. λοιπός is specialized as an adjective, meaning ‘remaining’.

V2 COMPOUNDS: all forms in -λοιπος (beginning with the prefixed forms ο-πι-γο-ρο = ἐπίλοιπος and πρ-ρι-γο-ρο = περίλοιπος, both ‘left’) have passive semantics (‘left, remaining’).

### λήγω ‘stop’ (I)

FC: ληξι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUNDS: ληξιπύρετος ‘allaying fever’ (Gal.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: ληξιφωτος ‘waning’ (Heph. Astr.).

OTHER COMPOUNDS: None.

<sup>9</sup> On the alternation in Medieval manuscripts of λιπο- and λειπο-, see LSJ s.v. λείπω.

AGENT NOUNS: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: None.

### λύω ‘release, redeem’ (IV)

FC: λυσι-, λυε-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUNDS: Λύσανδρος (Hom.), λυσιμελής ‘releasing the limbs’ (ibid.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: λυσικάκος ‘ending evil’ (Thgn.), λυσιμβροτος ‘relaxing men’ (Pi.), λυσιπόνος ‘realising from pain’ (ibid.), λυσιμάχη ‘ending strife’ (Aristoph.), λυσιτελέω ‘indemnify for expenses incurred’ (ibid.), λυσιγυῖα ‘relaxation of the limbs’ (Hippocr.), λυσιζωνος ‘loosing the lower girdle’ (epithet of Eileilythia, Theocr.), λυσιπόλεμος ‘type of war-engine’ (*P.Berol.* 13044, *BKT* 5.1 p. 7–12 no. I.2, ca. 1st c. BC), λυσίοκος ‘letting the hair loose’ (Philostr.), λυσιπήμων ‘ending sorrow’ (*Orph. H.*), λυσιμέριμος ‘driving care away’ (*adesp.* in *AP*), λυσίγαμος ‘dissolving marriage’ (Greg. Naz.).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Λύανδρος (Athens 5th c.), Λυσαγόρᾱς (Paros 6th c.), Λυσαιθιδᾶς (Messenia 2nd c.), Λυσαινέτη (Athens? 5th–4th c.), Λύσαιχος (Athens 4th c.), Λυσανδρίδᾶς (Corinth ca. 610–590), Λυσανίας (Athens 466/5), Λυσαρέτη (Athens 5th c.), Λυσαρίστη (Athens? 4th c.), Λύσαρχος (Euboea 5th c.), Λυσέρως (Calabria imp.), Λυσιάναξ (Elis 4th c.), Λυσιβίος (Euboea 5th c.), Λυσιδάμος (Sikyon 6th–5th c.), Λυσιδικᾶ (Epidaurus 7th–6th c.), Λυσιθεος (Athens ca. 475–450), Λυσικλῆς (Athens 6th–5th c.), Λυσικράτης (Euboea 6th–5th c.), Λυσίκριτος (Athens ca. 360 BC), Λυσικύδης (Argolis 4th c.), Λυσίλεως (Thasos b. 510 BC), Λυσίλοχος (Argos ?320 BC), Λυσίμαχος (Euboea 6th c. BC), Λυσιμβρότη (Nisyros 2nd–1st c.), Λυσιμέδων (Athens 128/7 BC), Λυσιμένης (Athens 4th c.), Λυσιμήδης (Athens? ?2nd c.), Λυσιμνάστᾱ (Boeotia hell.), Λυσίνικος (Arcadia 4th c.), Λυσιξένη (Athens? 5th–4th c.), Λυσίπατρος (Thessaly 27 BC–14 AD), Λυσίπολις (Athens 459/8), Λυσίπονος (Boeotia 3rd c.), Λύσιππος (Corinth ?ca. 550 BC), Λυσιπτόλεμος (Euboea ?6th c.), Λυσίστρατος (Argos 8th c.), Λυσιτάφᾶς (Crete 2nd c.), Λυσιτέλης (Pholegandros 2nd–1st c.), Λυσίτιμος (Athens 4th c.), Λυσιφάνης (Athens ca. 411 BC), Λυσίφημος (Athens 409 BC), Λυσίφιλος (Athens ca. 500–480), Λυσιχάρης (Athens ca. 330–320).

AGENT NOUNS: λυτήρ ‘deliverer’ (Eur.).

V2 COMPOUNDS: ὠδινολύτης ‘setting free from pain’ (name of a kind of shell-fish, Plin.), νουσολύτης ‘freeing from illness’ (*Ep. Gr.* 1026), κομβολύτης ‘cut-purse’ (Hsch.), χρησμολύτης ‘expounder of oracles’ (Tz. in *schol.* Lycophr.). Compounds in -λύτης become more common in Byzantine Greek: see list in Buck-Petersen 571.

### μáινομαι ‘rage, be mad’ (IVa)

FC: μαιν-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: *μαίνανδρος* ‘mad after men’ (Hdn.).

OTHER COMPOUNDS: None.

AGENT NOUNS: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: None with agentive suffixes, but the verb develops a very common type in *-μανής* starting with *γυναίμανής* ‘mad for women’ (Hom.). A full list is provided in Buck-Petersen 721–722. The following forms are attested before the 3rd c.: *φρενομανής* ‘mad in the mind’ (Aesch.), *ἀκρομανής* ‘on the verge of madness’ (Hdt.), *ἵππομανής* ‘abounding in horses’ (Soph.), *καρπομανής* ‘running to fruit’ (ibid.), *δοριμανής* ‘raging with the spear’ (Eur.), *θυρσομανής* ‘he who raves with the thyrsus’ (ibid.), *χορομανής* ‘mad after dancing’ (Aristoph.), *ἡμιμανής* ‘half-mad’ (Aeschin.), *θηλυμανής* ‘maddening women’ (Antim.).

### **μείγνυμι** ‘mix’ (I)

FC: *μιξο-*, *μειξι-*

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: *μιξέλληνες* ‘half-Greeks’ (Hellanic.) Here the FC follows the meaning of the passive *μείζομαι* ‘to be mixed up with’. Compounds in *μιξο-* are a very frequent category; only Archaic and Classical examples are listed below.

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: *μιξολύδιος* ‘half Lydian’ (name of a musical tone; Bacch.), *μιξονόμος* ‘feeding promiscuously’ (Simon.), *μιξοβόας* ‘mingled with shouts’ (Aesch.), *μιξόθορος* ‘with mingled cries’ (ibid.), *μιξόμβροτος* ‘half-human’ (ibid.), *μίξοφρυς* ‘having eye-brows that meet’ (Cratin.), *μιξοπάρθενος* ‘half-maiden’ (Hdt.), *μιξοθήρ* ‘half-beast’ (ibid.), *μιξοβάρβαρος* ‘half-barbarian’ (Eur.), *μειξαιθρία* ‘alternation of fair and foul weather’ (Hippocr.).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: *Μειξαρέτη* (Euboea 3rd c.), *Μειξιγένης* (Athens 4th c.), *Μειξίδημος* (Athens 5th–4th c.), *Μειξίθεος* (Euboea 4th–3rd c.), *Μειξικλής* (Athens 376/5), *Μειξικράτης* (Athens ca. 367–360), *Μειξίλαος* (Boeotia ca. 76 BC), *Μειξίππος* (Athens 4th c.), *Μειξίφρων* (Euboea 4th–3rd c.), *Μειξωνίδης* (Athens 4th c.).

AGENT NOUNS: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: None of the active type in AG. Compounds in *-μιγής* are all passive.<sup>10</sup> Byzantine Greek has the form *δουλομίκτης* ‘one who consorts with slaves’ (Tz.). See too *ἀρρενομίκτης* ‘one who consorts with men’ (Man.).

### **μέλλω** ‘to be about to’ (II)

FC: *μελλο-*

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: *μελλόγαμος* ‘awaiting marriage, betrothed’ (Soph.).

<sup>10</sup> Paliuri (2014: 45–46).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: μελλοδειπνικός ‘(song sung while) waiting for dinner’ (Aristoph.), μελλονικιάω ‘delay victory’ (ibid.), μελλέπταρμος ‘just going to sneeze’ (ibid.), μελλοθάνατος ‘at the point of death’ (*schol.* Aristoph.). As in other compound families, the FC often acquires the function of a modifying prefix, meaning ‘almost’: in the compounds μελλόνυμφος ‘about to be wedded’ (Soph.) and μελλογυμνασίαρχος ‘about to be gymnasiarchos’ (*P. Lond.* 2.1166.3, 1st c. AD) the FC seems to modify the SC, thus constituting a determinative structure.

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: None.

AGENT NOUNS: μελλητής ‘one who has a hesitating character’ (Thuc.).

V2 COMPOUNDS: None.

### μέλω ‘care, to be an object of care’ (II)

FC: μελε-, μελησι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: Μελέαγρος (Hom.): see Chapter 5, section 5.3.1.

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: μελησίμβροτος ‘an object of care to men’ (Aesch.).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Μελέϊππος (Thera 3rd–2nd c.), Μελήσιππος (Sparta 5th c.), Μελέδᾶμος (Lesbos 3rd c.), Μελησαγόρης (Chios ?4th–3rd c.), Μελήσανδρος (Thasos b. 510 BC), Μελήσαρχος (Euboea 4th–3rd c.), Μελησίδημος (Thasos 5th–4th c.), Μελεσικράτης (Thrace ca. 265–260), Μελήσιππος (Athens 5th–4th c.).

AGENT NOUNS: μελέτωρ ‘one who cares for, avenger’ (Soph.), μελητής ‘one who is in charge’ (Eust.).

V2 COMPOUNDS: Forms in -μελής are rare and mostly passive. None of them is compounded with a noun.

### μέμφομαι ‘blame’ (I)

FC: μεμψι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: μεμφίμοιρος ‘criticizing’ (lit. ‘blaming the fate’; Isoc.).

OTHER COMPOUNDS: None. The late verb μεμψιβολέω ‘cast reproaches’ (Phot.) derives from a V2 compound with μέμψις ‘blame’ in the FC.

AGENT NOUNS: None. The adjective μεμπτός has the active meaning ‘throwing blame upon’ in Soph. *Tr.* 446).

V2 COMPOUNDS: None. Bahuvrihis in -μεμφής which could be treated as active verbal compounds are absent: the only exception could be the late πολυμεμφής ‘much-blaming’ (Nonn.), which however could still be interpreted as a bahuvrihi.

### μένω ‘stand, abide, await’ (III)

FC: μενε-, μενο-, μενεσι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: Μενέλᾶος (Hom.), μενεδήιος ‘abiding battle, steadfast in battle’ (Hom.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: μενεπτόλεμος ‘abiding war’ (Hom.), μενεχάρμης (ibid.) and μενέκτυπος (Bacch.) both ‘staunch in battle’, μένανδρος ‘awaiting a husband’ (Dion. Trag.) and μενέμαχος (App.) ‘staunch in battle’, μενέδουπος ‘steadfast in the battle-din’ (Orph. A.).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Μέναιχμος (Locris 5th c.), Μενάλκης (Locris 468 BC), Μένανδρος (Thessaly 524 BC), Μενάρχᾶ (Boeotia 5th c.), Μενέβουλος (Thessaly 2nd c.), Μενεγείτων (Boeotia ?ca. 200–170), Μενεγένης (Cyrene 4th–3rd c.), Μενεδάϊος (Sparta 426 BC), Μενέδᾶμος (Boeotia, Archaic period), Μενέδωρος (Cimmerian Bosphoros 2nd–1st c.), Μενεθάλης (Delos 229 BC), Μενεθάρης (Crete 2nd c.), Μενέθιοις ‘one who awaits the feast?’ (Boeotia 5th c.), Μενεκάρτης (Crete 3rd c.), Μενεκλής (Athens 5th c.), Μενέκορρος (Thessaly 3rd c.), Μενεκράτης (Corcyra 625–600), Μενέκριτος (Boeotia 5th c.), Μενεκύδης (Athens ca. 350–320), Μενέκωλος (Syracuse ca. 600 BC), Μενέλοχος (Athens 326/5), Μενέμαχος (Athens? 4th–3rd c.), Μενεϊκᾶ (Crete 223/2), Μενέξενος (Athens 5th c.), Μενέπολις (Acarnania 3rd c.), Μενεπτόλεμος (Selinous 7th–6th c.), Μενέσαιχμος ‘one who stands by his spear’ (Athens ca. 500 BC), Μενεσθένης (Athens 4th c.), Μενέστρατος (Athens 5th c.), Μενέστρωτος (Boeotia 3rd–2nd c.), Μενετέλης (Athens 412/11), Μενέτιμος (Sikyon 6th–5th c.), Μενέφιλος (Eretria 4th c.), Μενέφρων (Eretria ?500–480), Μενέφυλος (Boeotia 5th c.), Μενεχαρίδης (Sparta ca. 400–375), Μενέχαρμος (Scythia Minor 4th c.), Μενέχωρος (Eretria 2nd c.), Μενέψοφος (Athens 464 BC), Μένιππος (Athens 5th c.). A number of PNs in Μενε- have variants in Μενεσι-: e.g. Μενεσικράτης (Athens? 4th c.), Μενεσίστρατος (Rhodes 2nd c.), Μενέσιππος (Amorgos ?2nd–1st c.) or in Μενο- e.g. Μενοπτόλεμος (Tenos hell.?).

AGENT NOUNS: Only forms deriving from compound verbs, like παράμονος ‘constant’.

V2 COMPOUNDS: None. The only form conveying verbal active semantics is αείμονος ‘everlasting’, attested in Byzantine Greek (LBG).

### μμνήσκω ‘remind of’/ μμνήσκομαι ‘remember’ (IV)

FC: μνησι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: *ma-na-si-we-ko* (= Μνησίεργος).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: μνάσιστεφανος ‘remindful of crowns’ (LSJ: ‘wooling crowns’; Pi.), μνησιπήμων ‘reminding of misery’ (Aesch.), μνησικάκος ‘vengeful’ (Aristot.; the denominative μνησικακέω ‘remember past injuries’ occurs in Hdt. and in contemporary Attic inscriptions), μνησίθεος ‘name of a plant’ (Ps. Diosc.).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Μνάσάλκης (Boeotia ?ca. 550–525), Μνάσανδρίδης (Selinous 5th c.), Μνάσιγείτων (Athens 4th–3rd c.), Μνάσιγένης (Boeotia 6th–5th c.),

Μνᾱσιδικᾶ (Sapph.), Μνᾱσίδωρος (Rhodes 4th–3th c.), Μνᾱσιθάλης (Gela 6th–5th c.), Μνᾱσίθεος (Aegina 6th–5th c.), Μνᾱσικάρτης (Crete 3rd c.), Μνᾱσικύδης (Delos 2nd c.), Μνᾱσίμαχος (S. Italy? 6th–5th c.), Μνᾱσίμορτος (Crete? 75th c.), Μνᾱσίξενος (Phokis 5th c.), Μνᾱσίοργος (Boeotia 3rd c.), Μνᾱσίοχος (Megaris 3rd c.), Μνᾱσίπονος (Thera ?6th c.), Μνᾱσιρῶ (Boeotia ?3rd–2nd c.), Μνᾱσισθένης (Messene ca. 208 BC), Μνᾱσίτιμος (Rhodes 374/3), Μνησαγόρας (Athens 423 BC), Μνησαρέτη (Athens ca. 450–425), Μνήσαρχος (Samos 6th c.), Μνησιάναξ (Cos 3rd c.), Μνησίβιος (Athens ca. 411 BC), Μνησίβουλος (Athens 4th c.), Μνησίδημος (Athens 4th c.), Μνησιέπης (Paros ?2nd–1st c.), Μνησίεργος (Athens 398/7), Μνησικαρίας? (Euboea 5th c.), Μνησικήδης (Athens 464 BC), Μνησικλής (Chios? 6th c.), Μνησικράτης (Athens ca. 411 BC), Μνησικρίτη (Athens? 4th c.), Μνησίλεως (Paros ?5th), Μνησίλοχος (Athens 5th c.), Μνησίμβροτος (Samos 3rd c.), Μνησιμήδη (Athens? 4th c.), Μνησίπολις (Dalmatia 4th–3rd c.), Μνήσιππος (Athens 5th c.), Μνησιπτολέμᾱ (Athens 5th c.), Μνησιστράτη (Athens? 5th c.), Μνησιτέλης (Athens 405 BC), Μνησιφάνης (Athens 4th c.), Μνησίφιλος (Athens 5th c.), Μνησιχάρης (Athens 4th c.).

AGENT NOUNS: μνηστήρ ‘suitor’ (Hom.), μνήστωρ ‘mindful of’ (Aesch.). The old formation μνήμων ‘mindful’ (Hom.) also has the function of an agent noun.

V2 COMPOUNDS: πολυμνήστωρ ‘much-remembering’ (Aesch.), ἀμνήμων ‘unmindful’ (Pi.), ἱερομνήμων ‘mindful of sacred things’ (usually indicating the representative of the Delphic council, Dem.), εὐμνήμων ‘easy to remember’ (Xen.), πολυμνήμων ‘remembering many things’ (Plu.).

### **μίμνω** ‘stay, stand’ (I)

FC: μμν(o)-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: Μίμνερμος (7th c.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: None.

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Μιμναγόρης (Thasos 5th–4th c.), Μιμνοκλῆς (Athens 104/3), Μιμνοκράτης (Athens 4th c.), Μιμνόμαχος (Thasos ca. 385 BC), Μιμνόπολις (Crete 228/7).

AGENT NOUNS: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: None.

### **μίσγω** ‘mix’ (I)

FC: μισγ(o)-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: μισγάγκεια ‘meeting of the waters’ (Hom.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: μισγοδία ‘place where streets meet’ (Hsch., synonym of μιξοδία).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Μισγολᾶς (Athens 5th c.).

AGENT NOUNS: None.



V2 COMPOUNDS: None of the active type. Compounds in -μῆγής are always passive: see μείγνυμι, and Chapter 6, section 4.3.

### μισέω ‘hate’ (IVa)

FC: μισο-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: μισόθεος ‘hating the gods’ (Aesch.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: μισοτύραννος ‘tyrant-hater’ (Hdt.), μισοδήμος ‘hating democracy’ (Aristoph.), μισολάκων ‘hating Laconians’ (ibid.), μισοπόρπαξ ‘hating the shield-handle (hating war)’ (ibid.), μισοβάρβαρος ‘hating foreigners’ (Pl.), μισόσοφος ‘hating wisdom’ (ibid.), μισοπόνηρος ‘hating knaves’ (Dem.), μισότεκνος ‘hating children’ (Aeschin.), μισοφιλιππος ‘hating Philip’ (ibid.), μισόφιλος ‘hating friends’ (Aristot.), μισόθηρος ‘hating the chase’ (Xen.), μισοπέρης ‘hater of the Persians’ (ibid.). For other post-Classical compounds, see *LSJ*.

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: None.

AGENT NOUNS: μισητής ‘hater’ (Athanasius).

V2 COMPOUNDS: There are no compounds in -μισητής. The following compounds in -μισής have verbal active semantics: θεομισής ‘hating the gods’ (Aristoph.); the passive meaning ‘heated by the gods’ is attested in Plato, φανερομισής ‘hating openly’ (Aristot.), πολυμισής ‘much-hating’ (Luc.).

### νικάω ‘win’ (IVb)

FC: νικησι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: Νικᾶσίβιος (Corcyra 5th c.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: None.

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: The FC is either νικο- or νικησι- (νικᾶσι-). SCs freely occur with both FCs. The following list includes only names which have a probable V1 structure (doublets are not repeated): Νικαγόρης (Thasos b. 510 BC), Νίκαθλος (Cyrenaica 68 or 4 BC), Νικᾶναξ (Telos 3rd c.), Νικάνδρη (Naxos ca. 650 BC), Νικάνθης (Cyprus 5th–4th c.), Νικάνωρ (Paros 5th c.), Νικαρέτη (Athens ca. 480–470), Νίκαρχος (Athens ca. 510 BC), Νικᾶσίβιος (Corcyra ca. 500 BC), Νικᾶσιβούλα (Messenia 4th c.), Νικᾶσίδᾶμος (Locris 336–332), Νικᾶσίδικος (Tenedos 4th–3rd c.), Νικᾶσίθεος (Rhodes 146 BC), Νικᾶσικλῆς (Rhodes ca. 370 BC), Νικᾶσικράτης (Rhodes 4th–3rd c.), Νικᾶσίλας (Thera ?6th c.), Νικᾶσίμαχος (Thessaly ca. 230–200), Νικᾶσίπολις (Thessaly 4th–3rd c.), Νικᾶσιχάρης (Boeotia ?277–274), Νικᾶσίχορος (Locris ca. 230 BC), Νικησίδικος (Athens 377/6), Νικήσιππος (Athens ca. 520 BC), Νικόβουλος (Athens 424 BC), Νικογένης (Athens 4th c.), Νικόδημος (Athens ca. 485–480), Νικόδικος (Macedonia 5th c.) Νικόδρομος (Aegina 6th–5th c.), Νικόδωρος (Arcadia b. 425 BC), Νικοθέα (Athens? ?3rd c.), Νικόθεμις (Amorgos ca. 200 BC), Νικοκλῆς (Aegina 6th–5th c.), Νικοκράτης (Athens 4th c.), Νικοκρέων

(Cyprus 4th c.), Νικόκριτος (Kalymnos ca. 200 BC), Νικόλαος (Corinth 7th–6th c.), Νικολέων (Aetolia 2nd c.), Νικόλοχος (Laconia 5th c.), Νικόμαχος (Metapontum ?ca. 525–500), Νικομένης (Athens 459/8), Νικομήδης (Messenia 8th–7th c.), Νικονίκη (Athens? 4th c.), Νικονόα (Macedonia 7th–6th c.), Νικόνομος (Athens 109–96), Νικόξενος (Athens ca. 500 BC), Νικοπάτρᾶ (Athens 4th c.), Νικόπολις (Athens? 440–430), Νικοσθένης (Chios? 6th c.), Νικόστρατος (Athens ca. 520 BC), Νικοτέλεια (Messenia 8th–7th c.), Νικότιμος (Rhodes ca. 242 BC), Νικοτύχη (Crete 182 AD), Νικόφᾶμος (Rhodes ca. 335 BC), Νικοφάνης (Sicyon 6th–5th c.), Νικοφρέων (Athens 226/5), Νικοχάρης (Athens 5th–4th c.).

AGENT NOUNS: νικᾶτήρ ‘winner’ (Crete 3rd c.–2nd c. BC), νικήτωρ ‘victorious’ (Greek translation of *Victrix* in *Legio Victrix*, Dio Cassius), νικητής ‘winner in games’ (CIG 5035, Nubia 240 AD; also used as ‘conqueror’).

V2 COMPOUNDS: There are no compound forms of the agent nouns. Active verbal semantics is conveyed by some of the compounds in -νίκης and -νικος. The following forms are the most ancient: οὐρανόνικος ‘conquering heaven’ (Aesch.), Ὀλυμπιονίκος ‘victorious in the Olympic games’ (Pi.), Πυθόνικος ‘winner at the Pythian games’ (ibid.), Ἴσθμιόνικος ‘winner in the Isthmian games’ (Bacch.), πάννικος ‘all-victorious’ (ibid.); Ὀλυμπιονικᾶς ‘conqueror in the Olympic games’ (Pi.), Πυθιονικᾶς ‘winner in the Pythian games’ (ibid.), Ἴσθμιονικᾶς ‘winner in the Isthmian games’ (Bacch.).

### ὄλλυμι ‘destroy’ (IV)

FC: ὄλεσι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: ὠλεσίκαρπος ‘destroying fruits’ (Hom.; the long vowel is explained by *DEG* as a metrical variant).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: ὄλεσῆνωρ ‘destroying men’ (Thgn.), ὄλεσίθηρ ‘destroying wild beasts’ (Eur.), ὄλεσίπολις ‘destroying cities’ (Tryph.), ὄλεσιτύραννος ‘destroying tyrants’ (Cometas), ὄλεσίμβροτος ‘destroying men’ (Procl.).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: None.

AGENT NOUNS: ὄλετήρ ‘destroyer’ (Hom.). ὀλέτης ‘destroyer’ (*LSJ*) is a *vox nihili*: see Chapter 6, section 2.13.

V2 COMPOUNDS: ἀνδρολέτειρα ‘murderess’ (Aesch.), παιδολέτωρ ‘child-murdering’ (ibid.), παιδολέτειρα ‘murderess of her children’ (Eur.), πατρολέτωρ ‘parricide’ (Antiph. Epigr.), θηρολέτης ‘slayer of beasts’ (Phil. Epigr.), Γιγαντολέτωρ ‘giant-killer’ (Luc.), ψυχολέτης ‘soul-destroyer’ (Hdn.), αἰνολέτης ‘dire destroyer’ (Orph. A.), Γιγαντολέτης ‘giant-killer’ (AP 9.524, *adesp.*), δρακοντολέτης ‘serpent-slayer’ (AP 9.525.5, *adesp.*). A few active compounds in -ωλής are attested from the 5th c. onwards.

**ὀνίνημι** ‘profit’ (II)

FC: ὀνησι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: ὀνησίπολις ‘profiting the state’ (Simon.)

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: None.

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Ὀνάσαγόρας (Cyprus 7th–6th c.), Ὀνασίαναξ (Cyprus 4th c.), Ὀνασιγένης (Kalymnos 3rd c.), Ὀνασιδάμος (Cyprus ?5th c.), Ὀνασιθάλης (Cyprus 4th c.), Ὀνασίθεμις (Cyprus 6th c.), Ὀνασίθεος (Delos ca. 100 BC), Ὀνασικρέτης (Cyprus 6th–4th c.), Ὀνασίκυπρος (Cyprus 6th–4th c.), Ὀνασίλας (Cyprus 6th c.), Ὀνασίμαχος (Kalymnos ca. 200 BC), Ὀνασίμβροτος (Thessaly ca. 160 BC), Ὀνασιμένης (Cyprus 4th c.), Ὀνασίδικος (Cyprus 5th–4th c.), Ὀνασίδικος (Cyprus 4th c.), Ὀνασίδορος (Cyprus ?5th–4th c.), Ὀνασίπολις (Laconia 3rd c.), Ὀνασίστρατος (Rhodes 2nd c.), Ὀνασιτέλης (Rhodes 2nd c.), Ὀνασίτιμος (Cyprus 6th–4th c.), Ὀνασιφάνεια (Rhodes 2nd c.), Ὀνασίφαντος (Cyprus 4th c.), Ὀνασίφιλος (Boeotia ca. 220–200), Ὀνασίχαρις (Paros 6th c.), Ὀνασίχαρμος (Crete hell.), Ὀνήσανδρος (Athens 5th c.), Ὀνησαρέτη (Amorgos 4th–3rd c.), Ὀνήσαρχος (Euboea 4th–3rd c.), Ὀνησίβιος (Athens ca. 550 BC), Ὀνησίβουλος (Eretria 4th–3rd c.), Ὀνησικλῆς (Amorgos 4th c.), Ὀνησίκριτος (Athens 4th c.), Ὀνησιμανή (Cyprus 3rd c. AD), Ὀνησίπιπτος (Athens ca. 400 BC), Ὀνησιφόρος (Cimmerian Bosphoros 3rd c.).

AGENT NOUNS: ὀνήτωρ ‘bringing benefits’ (Gal.: technical name of a kind of plaster).

V2 COMPOUNDS: None.

**ὀρμάω** ‘set in motion’ (II)

FC: ὀρμησι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: Ὀρμασίλας (Argos 4th c.).

OTHER COMPOUNDS: None.

AGENT NOUNS: ὀρμητής ‘someone ready to strike’ (Philostr.) and ‘imperious person’ (Philostr. Jun.), ὀρμάστειρα ‘one who urges on’ (*Orph. H.*).

V2 COMPOUNDS: None.

**ὄρнуμι** ‘incite, making to arise, start up’ (IV)

FC: ὄρπι-, ὄρσι-, ὄρσο-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUNDS: *e-ti-me-de-i* /Ertimēdehi/ (dat.), *e-ti-ra-wo* /Ertilāwos/ (for both, see the interpretation in Chapter 4, section 7.2), *o-ti-na-wo* /Ortināwos/.

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: ὄρσινεφής ‘raising the clouds’ (Pi.), ὄρσίκτυπος ‘stirring noise’ (ibid.), ὄρσοτρίαίνα ‘wielder of the trident’ (ibid.), ὄρσίαλος ‘stirring the sea’ (Bacch.), ὄρσίβακχᾶς ‘inciting Bacchantes’ (ibid.), ὄρσίπους ‘raising the foot’ (Simm.), ὄρσιγυνάικα ‘exciting women’ (*PMG adesp.* 1003, acc. sg.), ὄρσόθριξ ‘raising the hair’ (Theognost.).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: (**LITER.**) Ὀρσίλοχος (Hom.), Ὀρτίλοχος (ibid.), Ὀρσέ-  
 λᾶος (Pi.). (**EP.**) Ὀρσικῖνος (Syracuse 3rd–5th c. AD), Ὀρσικλῆς (Crete 2nd c.),  
 Ὀρσικράτης (Acarnania 3rd c.), Ὀρσίμαχος (Boeotia 3rd c.), Ὀρσιμένης (Athens ca.  
 505 BC), Ὀρσιππος (Athens 6th c.), Ὀρσίφαντος (Sparta 6th–5th c.), Ὀρσοάλτιος  
 (Thrace 3rd c.).

AGENT NOUNS: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: Λαέρτᾱς (Hom.), Λυκόρτᾱς (ibid.).

### παύω ‘stop’ (II)

FC: παυσι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: παυσάνεμος ‘stopping the winds’ (Aesch.), παύσυβρις  
 ‘checking insolence’ (ibid.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: παυσανίας ‘allaying the sorrows’ (Soph.), παυσίλυπος  
 ‘ending pain’ (ibid.), παυσίνοσος ‘ending illness’ (ibid.), παυσίπνονος ‘ending toil’  
 (Eur.), παυσινύσταλος ‘ending drowsiness’ (Ael. Dion.), παυσώδυνος ‘stopping  
 pain’ (*schol.* Soph.).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Παύσανδρος (Cyprus ?6th c.), Παυσικᾶς (Cyprus 5th  
 c.), Παυσικλῆς (Melos 5th–4th c.), Παυσικράτης (Eretria 4th–3rd c.), Παυσίλοχος  
 (Rhodes 188–167), Παυσίλυπος (Athens ca. 148–117), Παυσίμαχος (Samos ?b. 500  
 BC), Παυσιπόλεμος (Rhodes ca. 325 BC), Παύσιππος (Sparta 330 BC), Παυσίστρατος  
 (Athens 405 BC), Παυσίτιμος (Cyprus 5th c.), Παυσίχαρις (Cyprus 5th c.).

AGENT NOUNS: παυστήρ ‘one who stops’ (Soph.), παύστωρ ‘one who stops’ (Isyll.).

V2 COMPOUNDS: None.

### πείθω/πειθομαι ‘persuade, obey’ (IVa)

FC: πεισι-, πειθε-, πειθο-, πειθεσι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: Πείσανδρος (Hom.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: πεισιχάλινος ‘obeying the rein’ (Pi.), πεισίμβροτος  
 ‘obeying mortals’ (Bacch.), πεισίβροτος ‘id.’ (Aesch.), πείθαρχος ‘obeying author-  
 ity’ (ibid.), πειθαρχέω ‘obey one in authority’ (Eur.), πεισιθάνατος ‘persuading to  
 die’ (D.L.), πειθοδικαίσιμος ‘obedient to justice’ (PGM 5.403, 4th c. AD).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Πειθαγόρας (Cyprus 6th c.), Πείθανδρος (Euboea 5th  
 c.), Πείθαρχος (Eretria 4th–3rd c.), Πειθέλᾱος (Thessaly ca. 191 BC), Πειθένους  
 (Athens ca. 330–320), Πειθέρως (Calabria 1st c. AD), Πειθεσίλειος (Thrace ca.  
 360–350), Πειθιδᾶμος (Laconia 5th c.), Πειθικλῆς (Athens ca. 259–256), Πειθιμένης  
 (Keos 4th–3rd c.), Πειθιππος (Thessaly 4th–3rd c.), Πειθόδημος (Athens 39/8),  
 Πειθοκράτης (Rhodes 3rd–2nd c.), Πειθόλᾱος (Thessaly 4th c.), Πειθομένης (Thes-  
 saly ?160 BC), Πειθόξενος (Athens 189/90 AD), Πειθόστρατος (Rhodes 3rd–2nd  
 c.), Πεισαγόρας (Thera ?7th–6th c.), Πείσανδρος (Rhodes 7th–6th c.), Πεισαρέτᾱ  
 (Rhodes imp.), Πείσαρχος (Syracuse 317 BC), Πεισιάνᾱξ (Athens ca. 530–520),

Πεισίβουλος (Paros 279 BC), Πεισιδάμας (Athens 330/29), Πεισιδάμος (Kalymnos 3rd c.), Πεισιδίκη (Athens ca. 400 BC), Πεισιδότᾱ (Rhodes ca. 115 BC), Πεισίθεος (Athens 371/0), Πεισικλῆς (Athens ca. 338–326), Πεισικράτης (Taras 6th c.), Πεισίλεως (Athens 405 BC), Πεισίλοχος (Rhodes ca. 325 BC), Πεισιμαχίς (Cos ca. 200 BC), Πεισίμβροτος (Rhodes 3rd c.), Πεισίνικος (Keos 4th–3rd c.), Πεισίνους (Rhodes ?6th c.), Πεισίπολις (Rhodes 3rd c.), Πεισίπορος (Thera ?6th c.), Πείσιππος (Athens ca. 450–430), Πεισίστρατος (Athens ?7th c.), Πεισίρροδος (Taras 6th c.), Πεισιτέλης (Tenos 4th BC), Πεισόδωρος (Thessaly 27 BC–14 AD).

AGENT NOUNS: *πειστήρ* ‘one who obeys’ (Suid.).

V2 COMPOUNDS: *έτοιμοπειθής* ‘ready to obey’ (Hdn.), *θεοπειθής* ‘obedient to God’ (Hierocl.).

### πέπᾱμαι ‘own’ (II)

FC: *πασι-*

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: *qa-sa-ko* /K<sup>w</sup>āsark<sup>h</sup>os/? (= Πάσαρχος, Corinth ?274 BC).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: None.

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: *Πασίβοιος* (Boeotia 3rd c.), *Πάσιππος* (Cyrene 4th c.) and *Πασικράτης* (Rhodes ca. 350–325) yield meanings which can be connected to *πέπᾱμαι*. Many other names in *Πασι-* may derive from this root, but the homonymy of compounds of *πᾱς* makes it difficult to separate the two groups. See analysis in Chapter 5, section 5.3.1.

AGENT NOUNS: *πάστᾱς* ‘owner’ (IC 4.72.col.II.1.43, Crete 5th c.)

V2 COMPOUNDS: None.

### πέρθω ‘destroy’ (IV)

FC: *περσι-*

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: *περσέπτολις* ‘destroying cities’ (Hes.). For *Περσεφόνεια*, which is not to be connected to *πέρθω*, see the discussion in Chapter 6, section 3.2.

OTHER COMPOUNDS: None.

AGENT NOUNS: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: Only *πτολιπόρθος* ‘destroying cities’ (Hom.).

### πήγνυμι ‘fix, make solid’ (IV)

FC: *πηγεσι-*, *πηξι-*

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: *πηγεσίμαλλος* ‘thick-fleeced’ (Hom.). The FC does not have a governing function and characterizes a ‘compressed’ fleece: for the structure of this compound, see Chapter 6, section 3.2.

OTHER COMPOUNDS: *πηξιθάλαττα* ‘she that freezes the sea’ (fr. *adesp.* 655 K-A).

AGENT NOUNS: None from the simple verb, but see ἐμπήκτης ‘one who sticks up judicial notes’ (Aristot.).

V2 COMPOUNDS: ἄμαρτοπηγός ‘building chariots’ (Hom.), ναυπηγός ‘ship-builder’ (Thuc.), σοροπηγός ‘coffin-maker’, (Aristoph.), ἄλοπηγός ‘one who prepares salt’ (Nic.), ἄμαξοπηγός ‘cartwright’ (Plu.), ἀσπιδοπηγός ‘shield-maker’ (Poll.; already present in the comic compound *τορνευτολυρασπιδοπηγός* ‘lyre-turner and shield-maker’, Aristoph.), κλινοπηγός ‘maker of beds’ (Theognost.), ἀγριοπηγός ‘someone who works raw wood’ (*schol.* Aristoph.). The following three forms in *-παγής* have active meaning: γυιοπαγής ‘stiffening the limbs’ (Antip.), ἰχθυοπαγής ‘piercing fish’ (Theaet.) and ναυπηγής ‘ship-building’ (Man.).

### πίμπλημι ‘fill’ (I)

FC: πλησι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: πλησίστιος ‘filling the sails’ (Hom.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: πλησιφαής ‘with full light’ (Man.).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Πλησικράτης (Thasos 4th–3rd c.).

AGENT NOUNS: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: None.

### πλήσσω ‘strike’ (IV)

FC: πληξι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: πλήξιππος ‘striking horses’ (Hom.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: None.

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Πλήξιππος (Athens ca. 510 BC).

AGENT NOUNS: πλήκτης ‘striker’ (Aristot.), πληκτήρ ‘striking object or person’ (Hdn.), πλάκτωρ ‘striker’ (Doric form, Phan.).

V2 COMPOUNDS: διοπλήκτᾶν (acc. sg.) ‘stricken by god?’ (Hsch.), ἰσχυροπλήκτης ‘wounding severely’ (*ibid.*). See also the earlier φρενοπληγής ‘striking the mind’ (Aesch.), καρτεροπληγής ‘striking fiercely’ (D.S.).

### πράσσω ‘accomplish, achieve, exact payment’ (IV)

FC: πραξι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: Πραξιτέλης (Athens ca. 490 BC).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: None.

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Πραξαγόρᾱς (Aegina 5th c.), Πράξανδρος (Cyprus 6th c.), Πραξιάναξ (Cos ca. 366–350), Πραξιβίος (Laconia 5th c.), Πραξιβουλος (Athens 421/0), Πραξιδάμος (Arcadia 4th c.), Πραξιδικᾶ (Thessaly 6th c.), Πραξιέπης (Myconos 297 BC), Πραξιεργος (Athens 471/0), Πραξιθέᾶ (Cos 5th c.), Πραξικλῆς (Melos 5th c.), Πραξικράτης (Megara 3rd c.), Πραξικρέων (Myconos 297 BC),

Πραξικύδης (Melos 5th c.), Πραξίλας (Keos 4th–3rd c.), Πραξιμένης (Locris ?ca. 625–600), Πραξιμήστωρ (Kalymnos ca. 200 BC), Πραξίνικος (Athens ca. 450 BC), Πραξίνοος (Arcadia ca. 425–385), Πραξίοδος (Rhodes 6th c.), Πραξισιώ (Pholegandros ?1st c. AD), Πραξιόχος (Crete 223/2), Πραξιπολις (Kalymnos ca. 200 BC), Πράξιππος (Cyprus 4th c.), Πραξίστρατος (Thera imp.), Πραξιτέλης (Troizen ?ca. 500 BC), Πραξιτιμᾶ (Argolis 4th c.), Πραξιφάνης (Lesbos 3rd c.), Πραξιφαντος (Kalymnos ca. 200 BC), Πραξιχαρις (Rhodes 3rd–2nd c.).

AGENT NOUNS: πρηκτῆρ ‘doer’ (Hom.), πράκτωρ ‘one who does or executes’ (Soph.), πρήκτης ‘treacherous person’ (Hippocr.): for this form, see Chapter 6, section 3.2.

V2 COMPOUNDS: παντοπράκτης ‘ready to do anything’ (Ptol.), λογοπράκτωρ, of dubious sense (*PBaden* 26.40, 3rd c. AD). Active compounds in -ής: δυσπράγης ‘faring ill’ (Vett. Val.), εὐπράγης ‘doing well’ (adverb in John Chrys.), ἀδικοπράγης ‘acting wrongly’ (Stob.), κακοπράγης ‘evil-doing’ (Hsch.), δικαιοπράγης ‘acting justly’ (*PSI* 1.76.5, 6th c. AD).

### ῥάπτω ‘sew together’ (IV)

FC: ῥαψ(i)-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: ῥαψωδός ‘one who sews together poems, reciter of epic poems’ (Hes.), with its derivations ῥαψωδία and ῥαψωδέω.

OTHER COMPOUNDS: None.

AGENT NOUN: ῥάπτης ‘clothes-mender’ (Philox. Gramm.).

V2 COMPOUNDS: δικορράπτης ‘pettifogger’ (Phryn.), σαγματοράπτης ‘saddler’ (*POxy.* 1883.3, 6th c. AD): both have older parallels ending in -ρράφος, which is the older and more productive type of SC from this root, though most forms belong to post-Classical Greek. A full list is provided in Buck-Petersen 401. The following forms are attested before the 3rd c.: μηχανορράφος ‘forming crafty plans’ (Soph.), ιστορράφος ‘sail-patcher’ (Poll.: used in the sense of ‘tricky fellow’ in Aristoph.), νευρορράφος ‘one who stitches with sinews, mender of shoes’ (Aristoph.). Active -ής compounds: λινορραφής ‘making nests’ (Nonn.; previously ‘sewn of flax’) and δολορραφής ‘weaving treacherously’ (Nonn.; previously ‘woven treacherously’).

### ῥήγνυμι ‘break’ (II)

FC: ῥηξι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: ῥηξήνωρ ‘breaking armed ranks’ (lit. ‘breaking men’; Hom.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: ῥηξίχθων ‘bursting forth from the earth’ (lit. ‘breaking the earth apart’; Strato Com.), ῥηξικέλευθος ‘opening a path’ (*AP* 9.525.18, *adesp.*), ῥηξίνοος ‘breaking the wits’ (*AP* 9.524, *adesp.*).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Ῥηξίβιος (Locris 536 BC), Ῥηξίμαχος (Euboea 4th–3rd c.).

AGENT NOUNS: ῥήκτης ‘breaker’ (Aristot.).

V2 COMPOUNDS: None of the agentive type. There are two 5th-century compounds in -πραγής with active meaning, αἰμορραγής ‘bleeding’ (Soph.) and ψυχορραγής ‘letting the soul break loose’ (Eur.), but the type remains overwhelmingly passive throughout.

### **ῥίπτω** ‘throw, hurl’ (I)

FC: ῥίψι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: ῥιψαύχην ‘tossing the neck’ (Pi.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: ῥίψοπλος ‘throwing away one’s weapons’ (said of a panic flight; Aesch.), ῥίψασπις ‘throwing away the shield’ (Aristoph.), ῥιψόφθαλμος ‘casting the eyes about’ (Ptol.).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Ῥιψόλαος (Sparta 624 BC).

AGENT NOUNS: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: None of the active type. Compounds in -ρριφής, attested from the 5th c., are all passive.<sup>11</sup>

### **σειώ** ‘shake’ (IV)

FC: σεισι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: σεισίχθων ‘shaking the earth’ (Pi.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: σεισάχθεια ‘shaking off of burdens’ (Aristot.).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Σεισίλοχος (Athens 5th c.), Σείσιππος (Aeolic Cyme 350–250).

AGENT NOUN: σειστής ‘kind of earthquake’ (Lyd.).

V2 COMPOUNDS: πυργοσειστής ‘tower-shaker’ (an engine of war; Anon. in *Rhetorica anonyma* 3.350 Walz).

### **σπένδω** ‘pour, make a drink offering’ (I)

FC: σπενσι-, σπενδε-?

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: Σπενσίθεος ‘one who makes offerings to the gods’ (Crete ca. 500 BC). If the etymology is correct, the FC would seem to be formed on the original stem of the s-aorist σπεν-σ-, with a phonological treatment only reserved to secondary [ns] sequences in Cretan.

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: the FC σπενδε- may lie behind the *Kurzname* Σπένδων (Thebes ca. 316–250), which however is interpretable also as a participle.

AGENT NOUNS: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: None. Compounds in -σπονδος are bahuvrihis containing σπονδή: e.g. τρίσπονδος ‘consisting of three pourings’ (Soph.), οινόσπονδος ‘with

<sup>11</sup> Paliuri (2014: 55).



offerings of wine' (Poll.), or, more rarely, prepositional governing compounds like *ὑπόσπονδος* 'under a treaty' (Hdt.) and *παράσπονδος* 'contrary to a treaty' (Thuc.).

**σπεύδω** 'urge, strive after' (I)

FC: σπευσι-, σπευδε-?

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: *Σπεύσιππος* (Athens 415 BC).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: *Σπευσανδρίδης* (Athens? 5th–4th c.), *Σπευσικλῆς* (Athens 4th c.), *Σπευσικράτης* (Athens ?343–2 BC). The FC *σπευδε-* may lie behind the *Kurzname* *Σπεύδων* (Pharsalos ca. 230–200 BC).

AGENT NOUNS: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: None.

**στέλλω** 'make ready, fit out, send' (IV)

FC: στελλε-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: *Στελλανδρίδης* (Thasos 5th–4th c.).

AGENT NOUNS: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: Although most of the frequent compounds in *-στολος* are bahuvrihis from *στόλος* 'equipment' or *στολή* 'expedition', the following forms have a probably V2 agentive structure: *πυγοστόλος*, literally 'fitting out, decorating her buttocks' (Hes.), and by *γαμοστόλος* 'preparing a wedding' (attributed to Pisander by *schol. Eur.*), *πομποστόλέω* 'conduct a procession' (*IG 2.1325*, Athens, 174–173), *νεκροστόλος* 'ferrying the dead' (Antip. Thess.), *νυμφοστόλος* 'escorting the bride' (Jos.), *νεκροστόλος* 'layer-out of corpses' (Artem.), *φορτοστόλος* 'sending off a freight' (Man.), *ψυχοστόλος* 'escorting souls' (Tryph.).

**στέργω** 'love' (IVa)

FC: στεργ-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: *ἀστεργάνωρ* 'not loving men' (i.e. 'not having loved men', said of Io who was loved by Zeus, Aesch.) is a poetic formation likely to be based on the unattested **\*\*στεργάνωρ**.

OTHER COMPOUNDS: *στεργοξύνευνος* 'loving one's consort' (Lycophr.).

AGENT NOUNS: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: One of the few compounds in *-στεργής*, *ἀστεργής* 'not loving', has an active meaning in *Soph. Aj. 776*, while it is passive in *Soph. OT 229*. Two other late compounds have active meaning: *τεκνοστοργής* 'full of filial affection' (*Sidyra, TAM 2.235*) and *ὁμόστοργος* 'feeling the same affection' (Nonn.).

**στρέφω** 'turn, twist' (IV)

FC: στρεφε-, στρεψι-, στρεψο-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: στρεφεδινέω ‘whirl round the stream’ (Hom.), seemingly from the unattested \*\*στρεφεδινής.

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: στρεψίμαλλος ‘with tangled fleece’ (Aristoph.); for the analysis of this artificial compound, see Chapter 6, section 3.1), στρεψοδικέω ‘twist the right’ (ibid.), στρεψοδικοπανουργία ‘cunning in the perversion of justice’ (ibid.), στρεψάυχην ‘twisting the neck’ (Theopomp. Com.), στρεψίκερος ‘African antelope’ (Plin.).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Στρεφένεως ‘turning the ship’ (Athens 3rd c.), Στρεψιπιδᾶς (Boeotia ca. 237–230).

AGENT NOUNS: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: οἰακοστρόφος ‘helmsman’ (Pi.). Compounds in -στροφος are very numerous: Buck-Petersen 405–406 provides a list, which also includes bahuvrihis compounded with στροφή ‘turning’ (the majority). The following V2 compounds are attested before the 3rd c.: ἀσπιδηστρόφος ‘shield-wielding’ (Aesch., *v.l.*), ἥνιοστρόφος ‘charioteer’ (Soph.), ἰμονιοστρόφος ‘water-drawer’ (Aristoph.), ἔδροστρόφος ‘wrestler who throws his adversary’ (Theocr.).

### **στυγέω** ‘hate’ (I)

FC: στυγ-, στυγο-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: στυγάνωρ ‘hating the male sex’ (Aesch.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: στυγόδεμος ‘hating marriage’ (Agath.).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: None.

AGENT NOUNS: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: None. The rare bahuvrihis in -στυγής convey passive semantics.

### **σχήσω** ‘hold’ (suppletive future of ἔχω) (I)

FC: Σχησι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: Σχησίπολις ‘one who will hold the city’ (Thasos 360–330).

OTHER COMPOUNDS: None.

### **σώζω** ‘save’ (IV)

FC: σωσι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: σωσίπολις ‘saving the city’ (Aristoph.).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Σωσαγόρας (Thrace 2nd c.), Σωσανδρίδης (Boeotia 6th c.), Σωσαρέτᾶ (Argolis 2nd–1st c.), Σώσαρχος (Crete 223/2), Σωσιάναξ (Cyrene 3rd c.), Σωσίβιος (Skythia 5th–4th c.), Σωσίβουλος (Boeotia 3rd c.), Σωσιβώτᾶς (Boeotia ?424 BC), Σωσιγένης (Athens ca. 400 BC.), Σωσιγίτων (Boeotia ca. 210 BC), Σωσίδημος (Athens 4th c.), Σωσίδικος (Telos ca 275 BC), Σωσίθεος (Athens

4th c.), Σωσικλῆς (Melos 5th c.), Σωσικρατίδᾶς (Sikinos 5th c.), Σωσίλαφος (Arcadia 6th c.), Σωσίλοχος (Illyria 250–50), Σωσίμαχος (Delos ca. 360–330), Σωσίμβροτος (Boeotia 5th c.), Σωσιμένης (Tenos 6th–5th c.), Σωσιμήδης (Tenos 2nd c.), Σωσίνεως (Athens 575–550), Σωσίνικος (Cyprus? 4th–3rd c.), Σωσίνομος (Athens 402/1), Σωσίνους (Crete ca. 400 BC), Σωσίξενος (Delphi ?161 BC), Σωσιπάτρᾳ (Athens 350–340), Σωσίπολις (Athens 5th c.), Σώσιππος (Cyrene 5th c.), Σωσισθένης (Delos 309–302 BC), Σωσίστρατος (Athens 5th c.), Σωσιτέλης (Eretria 4th–3rd c.), Σωσίτιμος (Rhodes ca. 275–237), Σωσιφάνης (Syracuse 4th c.), Σωσίφιλος (Telos ca. 275 BC), Σωσιχάρης (Lokroi Epizephyrioi 4th–3rd c.).

AGENT NOUN: σωτήρ ‘saviour’ (Hom.).

V2 COMPOUNDS: πολισσός ‘protecting the city’ (*H. Hom. Mart.*), κουροσός ‘child-saving’ (Perses Epigr.), μελισσοσός ‘preserver of bees’ (Zonas Epigr.), οἰκοσός ‘maintaining the house’ (Max. Astrol.), μηλοσός ‘sheep-protecting’ (Leon.), βροτοσός ‘man-saving’ (Orph. *L.*), βιοσός ‘life-preserving’ (Nonn.), ξενοσός ‘saving strangers’ (ibid.), ψυχοσός ‘saving the soul’ (ibid.), δημοσός ‘saving the people’ (Hsch.).

### τανύω ‘stretch’ (I)

FC: τανυ-, τανυσι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUNDS: τανύπελος ‘stretching the robe, with flowing robe’ (Hom.), τανύγλωσσος ‘long-tongued’ (ibid.), τανυγλῶχis ‘with a long point’ (ibid.), τανυήκης ‘with a long point or edge’ (ibid.), τανυσίπτερος ‘with extended wings’ (ibid.), τανύφυλλος ‘with long-stretched bark’ (ibid.), τανύφυλλος ‘with long-pointed leaves’ (ibid.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: τανύπτερος ‘with long wings’ (*H. Hom. Cer.*), τανύσφυρος ‘with long taper ankles’ (ibid.), τανύθριξ ‘long-haired’ (Hes.), τανύρριζος ‘with stretching roots’ (ibid.), τανυέθειρα ‘with long hair’ (Pi.), τανυχηής ‘far-sounding’ (ibid.), τανύδρομος ‘running at full stretch’ (Aesch.), τανύπους ‘stretching the foot’ (Soph.), τανυμήκης ‘long-stretched’ (Thyillus), τανυσιπτέρυγος (Man.), τανυήλιξ ‘of advanced age’ (Leon.), τανύπρωρος ‘with a long prow’ (Q.S.), τανύφθογγος ‘far-sounding’ (ibid.), τανύκραιρος ‘long-horned’ (Opp.), τανύπλεκτος ‘in long plaits’ (ibid.), τανύρροιζος ‘with long whizzing’ (ibid.), τανύσκιος ‘with a long-stretching shadow’ (ibid.), τανύγληνος ‘large-eyed’ (Nonn.), τανυκνήμις ‘long-legged’ (ibid.), τανυκρήπις ‘with long foundation’ (ibid.), τανυπλόκαμος ‘with long hair’ (ibid.), τανύπρεμος ‘with long stem’ (ibid.), τανυσίσκοπος ‘far-seeing’ (Jul.), τανύπλευρος ‘long-sided’ (Jul. Aegypt.).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Τανύβοτος? (Scythia Minor 2nd c.).

AGENT NOUNS: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: None.

**ταράσσω** ‘stir, trouble’ (II)

FC: παραξι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUNDS: παραξικάρδιος ‘troubling the heart’ (Aristoph.), παραξιπλόστρατος ‘troubling the horse-array’ (ibid.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: ταραξίππος ‘troubling horses’ (D.Chr.).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: None.

AGENT NOUNS: ταρακτωρ (Aesch.) and ταρακτής (Lycophr.) both ‘disturber’.

V2 COMPOUNDS: None.

**τελέω** ‘fulfil, accomplish; kill’ (IV)

FC: τελε-, τελεσι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: Τελένικος ‘accomplishing victory’? (Athens 6th–5th c.).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Τελέβουλος (Thasos 5th–4th c.), Τελέδᾶμος (Rhodes ca. 265 BC), Τελέδικος (Boeotia 3rd c.), Τελέμαντις (Eretria 4th–3rd c.), Τελεσαγόρης (Thasos 390–360), Τελέσανδρος (Samos 6th c.), Τελέσαρχος (Samos 6th c.), Τελεσιάναξ (Rhodes 1st c.), Τελεσιβόλᾱ (Lucania 5th c.), Τελεσιγένης (Anaphe hell.?), Τελεσιγέρων (Rhodes 6th c.), Τελεσίδημος (Athens 170–150), Τελεσιδίκα (Thera 2nd c.), Τελέδωρος (Delphi 337 BC), Τελεσικλής (Paros 7th c.), Τελεσικράτης (Naxos 361/0), Τελεσίλας (Thera ?6th c.), Τελέμβροτος (Rhodes ca. 265 BC) : Τελεσίμβροτος (Rhodes ca. 325 BC), Τελένικος (Athens 6th–5th c.), Τελέσιππος (Athens 5th c.), Τελέστρατος (Keos 4th c.), Τελεσίφρων (Athens 4th c.), Τελέστροφος (Corinth 7th c.).

AGENT NOUNS: τελέστης, name of an official at Elea (6th c.), but also ‘initiator’ (Max. Tyr.); τελετής ‘priest’ (Euphron.), τελέστωρ ‘initiator’ (epithet of Apollo in *AP* 9.525.20, *adesp.*). In most of their usages these nouns reflect mysteric vocabulary: τελετής in particular derives from τελετή ‘initiation’.

V2 COMPOUNDS: βουτελέστης ‘one who kills oxen (for sacrifice)’, glossed with θύτης in Hesychius. Out of bahuvrihis in -τελής a verbal type has developed, but it is not frequent and the semantics is mostly passive. An early active form is καρποτελής ‘bringing fruit to perfection’ (Aesch.), but it could still be understood as a bahuvrihi: ‘having completion of the fruit’.

**τέμνω** ‘cut’ (IV)

FC: ταμεσι- (employing the stem of the aorist ἔταμον: see Chapter 6, section 3.2).

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: ταμεσίχρως ‘cutting the skin’ (Hom.).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: None.

AGENT NOUN: the adjective τομός ‘cutting’ retains the accent and meaning of an old agent noun.

V2 COMPOUNDS: compounds with a SC -τομος are very numerous, although many have a passive meaning. A full list is provided in Buck-Petersen 198–199. The following forms are attested before the 3rd c.: *du-ru-to-mo* = δρυτόμος ‘wood-cutter’ (Hom.), *i-za-a-to-mo-i*, interpretation uncertain, ὕλοτόμος ‘cutting wood’ (Hom.), ὄμφαλητόμος ‘someone who cuts the navel-string, midwife’ (Hippon.), γᾶτόμος ‘cleaving the ground’ (Aesch.), λαίμοστόμος ‘throat-cutting’ (Eur.), βαλλαντιοτόμος ‘cut-purse’ (Aeschin.), καινοτόμος ‘cutting new, novel’ (Aristot.), λατόμος ‘stone-cutter’ (IG 4.823.50, Troezen 4th c.), ῥιζοτόμος ‘cutter of roots’ (Nic.), λιθοτόμος ‘mason’ (IG 1<sup>2</sup>.347.36, Athens 5th c.).

### τέρπω ‘delight’ (IVa)

FC: τερπι-, τερπε-, τερψι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUNDS: τερπικέραυνος ‘delighting in thunder’ (Hom.), τερψίμβροτος ‘delighting mortals’ (Hom.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: τερψιεπής ‘delighting with words’ (Bacch.), τερψίφρων ‘delighting the mind’ (Nonn.), τερψίχορος ‘enjoying the dance’ (AP 9.525.20, *adesp.*).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Τέρπανδρος (Lesbos 7th c.), Τέρπαυλος (Athens? 510–500), Τερπέλαος (Thera imp.), Τερπέφιλος (Selinous 6th–5th c.), Τερψικλής (Epiros 5th c.), Τερψίλαος (Athens 169–182 AD), Τερψιχόρη (Hes.).

AGENT NOUNS: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: None. Active semantics is covered by compounds in -τερπής, which are likely to derive directly from the verbal stem (see analysis in Chapter 6, section 4.2): ἀτερπής ‘unpleasing’ (Hom.), μελιτερπής ‘pleasing like honey’ (Simon.), εὐτερπής ‘delightful’ (Pi.), παντερπής ‘all-delighting’, δυστερπής ‘ill-pleasing’ (Aesch.), θεοτερπής ‘pleasing the gods’ (Philox.), ποικιλοτερπής ‘delighting by variety’ (Antip. Thess.), ὄχλοτερπής ‘delighting the mob’ (Poll.), παντερπής ‘all-delighting’ (PMG *adesp.* 942; also Opp.), εἰαροτερπής ‘joying in spring’ (Orph. H.), τυμπανοτερπής ‘delighting in drums’ (ibid.), φρενοτερπής ‘heart-delighting’ (Nonn.), χοροτερπής ‘delighting in the dance’ (ibid.).

### τήκω ‘consume’ (IVa)

FC: τηξι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: τηξιμελής ‘consuming the limbs’ (Phil. Epigr.).

OTHER COMPOUNDS: None.

AGENT NOUNS: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: κατακυμοτακής ‘melting the waves’ (Timoth.), σαρκοτακής ‘wasting the flesh’ (Procl.), γυιοτακής ‘melting or wasting the limbs’ (Maced.).

**τίλλω** ‘pluck’ (I)

FC: τιλλο-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: τιλλοπύγων ‘one who plucks out his beard’ (Phryn. = fr. *adesp.* 671 K-A).

OTHER COMPOUNDS: None.

AGENT NOUNS: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: None.

**τιμάω** ‘honour’ (IV)

FC: τιμησι-, τιμο-, τιμᾶ-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: Τιμησικλῆς (Athens 7th–6th c.).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Τιμᾶβούλᾶ (Rhodes ?6th–5th c.), Τιμᾶγαθος (Argolis ca. 290–270), Τιμᾶγγελος (Argolis ca. 365–335), Τιμᾶγένης (Laconia ca. 525–500) : Τιμογένης (Eretria 4th–3rd c.), Τιμᾶγόρας (Thera ?m. 7th c.) : Τιμησαγόρας (Amorgos 4th c.), Τιμάνδρη (Hes.), Τιμᾶκράτης (Rhodes 384/3) : Τιμησικράτης (Thasos 5th c.) : Τιμοκράτης (Akragas 6th c.), Τιμᾶναξ (Rhodes ca. 325 BC) : Τιμησιάνναξ (Athens 5th–4th c.) : Τιμοάναξ (Cyprus 6th–4th c.), Τιμάνθης (Argolis 456 BC), Τιμᾶπολις (Rhodes 3rd–2nd c.) : Τιμησιπόλη (Amorgos 4th c.): Τιμόπολις (Boeotia ?5th–4th c.), Τιμᾶρέτᾶ (Aegina 6th–5th c.) : Τιμησαρέτη (Delos 4th c.), Τιμαρίστᾶ (Corinth ?6th c.) : Τιμησαρίστη (Paros ?2nd–1st c.), Τίμαρχος (Rhodes 5th c.) : Τιμᾶσαρχος (Rhodes 4th c.), Τιμᾶσίθεος (Boeotia 6th–5th c.) : Τιμόθεος (Metarontum 6th–5th c.), Τιμᾶσικρέων (Lesbos hell.) : Τιμοκρέων (Rhodes 5th c.), Τιμᾶσιμβρότᾶ (Sparta 7th c.), Τιμᾶσίξενος (Rhodes 98 BC) : Τιμόξενος (Macedonia 480 BC), Τιμᾶσίστρατος (Rhodes 220–214) : Τιμοστράτη (Cyrene 4th c.), Τιμᾶσίφιλος (Boeotia 6th c.), Τιμησίδημος (Delos ca. 300 BC) : Τιμόδᾶμος (Sicyon 6th–5th c.), Τιμησίδικος (Thasos ca. 520–490) : Τιμοδίκη (Athens ?ca. 560 BC), Τιμησίεργος (Delos 301 BC), Τιμησικλῆς (Athens 7th–6th c.) : Τιμοκλείδης (Athens ca. 540 BC), Τιμησίλεως (Thasos 5th c.) : Τιμόλεως (Samos 6th c.), Τιμόβιος (Athens 223/2), Τιμόγαμος (Cyprus ?5th c.), Τιμογεῖτων (Athens 5th c.), Τιμόδωρος (Cyprus 5th–4th c.), Τιμοθάλης (Delos 297–279), Τιμόθεμις (Cyprus 5th–4th c.), Τιμόκριτος (Cyprus 5th c.), Τιμόκυπρος (Cyprus 6th c.), Τιμολέων (Eretria 4th–3rd c.), Τιμόλοχος (Aetolia 3rd c.), Τιμόλυκος (Cos 3rd c.), Τιμόμαχος (Athens? ca. 510–500), Τιμόνικος (Cyprus 5th c.), Τιμόνοθος (Athens ?447 BC), Τιμόνους (Keos 4th–3rd c.), Τιμοσθένης (Aegina 5th c.), Τιμοτέλης (Athens ?422 BC), Τιμόφιλος (Rhodes 4th–3rd c.), Τιμόχαρις (Cyprus ?5th c.).

AGENT NOUNS: τιμητής ‘valuer, assessor of damages’ (Pl.), τιμητήρ ‘assessor of taxable property’ (*SEG* 9.1.8-9 Cyrene 4th c.).V2 COMPOUNDS: στιπποτιμητής ‘tow-valuer’ (*POxy.* 103.28, 4th c. AD). Only two of the attested bahuvrihis in -τιμος seem to cover for active verbal semantics:

νυμφότιμος ‘honouring the bride’ (Aesch.) and ξενότιμος ‘honouring strangers’ (ibid.). See too Δαμότιμος (Troezen 550–525).

### **τίνω** ‘pay a price; avenge’ (II)

FC: τισι-, τεισι-, τεισα-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: *qi-si-a-ko* /K<sup>w</sup>isiark<sup>h</sup>os/ (= Τείσαρχος).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Τεισαγένης (Rhodes? 2nd–1st c.), Τεισαγόρας (Rhodes 306 or 300 BC), Τείσανδρος ‘one who avenges men’ (Athens 7th–6th c.), Τείσαρχος (Euboea 5th c.), Τεισίβιος (Delphi 326 BC), Τεισιδάμος (Illyria hell.), Τεισίδικος (Delos b. 313–308), Τεισικλής (Athens ca. 510–500), Τεισικράτης (Kroton 496–492), Τεισίλαος (Cyrene 4th c.), Τεισίλοχος (Thessaly 3rd c.), Τεισίμαχος (Thasos b. 510 BC), Τεισίπολις (Rhodes 3rd c.), Τεισίπυλος (Thera 2nd c.), Τεισίππη (Athens 5th–4th c.), Τεισιστράτη (Athens? 4th c.), Τεισίτιμος (Athens 6th c.), Τεισίφονος (Thessaly 359–352).

AGENT NOUNS: τίτας ‘avenger’ (Aesch.).

V2 COMPOUNDS: None.

### **τλήναι** ‘endure’ (IV)

FC: τλη-, ταλα-, ταλαι-, τλησι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: Τληπόλεμος ‘enduring war’ (Hom.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: ταλαεργός ‘enduring work’ (Hom.), ταλαπείριος ‘enduring (many) trials’ (ibid.), ταλαπενθής ‘bearing grief’ (ibid.), ταλαύρινος ‘bearing a shield of a bull’s hide’ (ibid.), ταλαίπυρος ‘miserable’ (lit. ‘bearing stones’). Other forms do not have a governing meaning. For instance, ταλάφρων, ταλακάριος, τλήθυμος and τλησικάριος (Aesch.) all mean ‘patient of mind’: the FC conveys a kind of adjectival idea and is probably influenced by the adjective τάλας.

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Τλήθυμος (Athens 367/6), Τλησίβιος (Euboea 5th c.), Τλησίμαχος (Boeotia 431–404), Τλησιμένης (Athens 464 BC).

AGENT NOUNS: There are no agent nouns, but the transitive semantics of the verb is expressed by τλήμων ‘patient’.

V2 COMPOUNDS: The compounded forms of τλήμων all show quasi-adverbial FCs e.g. πολυτλήμων ‘much-enduring’ (Hom.), δυστλήμων ‘suffering hard things’ (*H. Hom. Ap.*), εὐτλήμων ‘much-enduring’ (Aesch.). A similar restriction concerns compounds in -τάλας and -τάλας e.g. πολύτάλας ‘much-enduring’ (Hom.), Ἄτλας ‘bearing all’ (ibid.), παντάλας ‘all-wretched’ (Eur.).

### **τρέπω** ‘turn, change’ (II)

FC: τρεψι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: τρεψίχρως ‘changing colour’ (Aristot.).

OTHER COMPOUNDS: None.

AGENT NOUNS: Formally, τροπός ‘strap, twisted leathern thong’, is the agent noun from this verb, specialized as an instrument noun.

V2 COMPOUNDS: None (see Chapter 5, section 5.3.2).

### τρέφω ‘rear’ (IV)

FC: τρεφε-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: Τρεφέλεως ‘one who rears, nurtures the people’ (Paros 4th c.).

OTHER COMPOUNDS: None.

AGENT NOUNS: τροφός (Hom.) ‘nurse’, with variant τροφεύς (Aesch.).

V2 COMPOUNDS: Compounds in -τροφος are very numerous, and many have a passive meaning. The full list is provided by Buck-Petersen 404–405. The following active forms are attested before the 3rd c.: κουροτρόφος ‘nurturing children’ (Hom.), πορτιτρόφος ‘nourishing calves’ (*H. Hom. Ap.*), ιπποτρόφος ‘horse-feeding’ (Hes.), μηλοτρόφος ‘sheep-feeding’ (Archil.), μεθυτρόφος ‘producing wine’ (Simon.), παιδοτρόφος ‘nourishing young life’ (ibid.), λαοτρόφος ‘nourishing the people’ (Pi.), ἀμπελοτρόφος ‘nurturing vines’ (Bacch.), νηριτοτρόφος ‘breeding sea-snails’ (Aesch.), παντοτρόφος ‘all-nurturing’ (ibid.), τεθριπποτρόφος ‘keeping a team of four horses’ (Hdt.), γηροτρόφος ‘nourishing people in old age’ (Eur.), Διοτρόφος ‘nurse of Zeus’ (epithet of Creta in Eur.), θηροτρόφος ‘feeding wild beasts’ (ibid.), καρποτρόφος ‘nurturing fruits’ (ibid.), λωτοτρόφος ‘producing lotus’ (ibid.), μελισσοτρόφος ‘feeding bees’ (ibid.), χιονοτρόφος ‘fostering snow’ (ibid.), χλοεροτρόφος ‘producing green grass’ (ibid.), κυνοτρόφος ‘keeping dogs’ (Ctes.), ιδιοτρόφος ‘feeding individuals’ (Pl.), ὀρτυγοτρόφος ‘keeper of quails’ (ibid.), ἀλεκτρυονοτρόφος ‘cock-feeder’ (Aeschin.), ἔγγελυοτρόφος ‘keeping eels’ (Aristot.), ὀλιγοτρόφος ‘taking little nourishment’ (ibid.). Only a few forms in -τρεφής have active meaning: μυελοτρεφής ‘breeding-marrow’ (Timoth.), θεοτρεφής ‘nourishing the gods’ (Nonn.), βρεφοτρεφής ‘rearing infants’ and τεκνοτρεφής ‘rearing children’ (both Theod. St.).

### τρέχω ‘run’ (IV)

FC: τρεχε-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: τρεχέδειπνος ‘running to dinner’ (Posidipp.).

OTHER COMPOUNDS: None.

AGENT NOUNS: τροχός ‘wheel’ (Hom.); also ‘running’ (Pi.).

V2 COMPOUNDS: All the compounds in -τροχος are either passive or compounded with τροχός ‘wheel’; the only agentive compound seems to be ἀλίτροχος ‘running through the sea’ (Ibyc.). The meaning ‘run’ is covered by the suppletive root yielding V2 compounds in -δρομος. These are often compound forms of δρόμος



‘race’ or display passive semantics. Active forms tend to have adjectival or adverbial FCs, undoubtedly because of the intransitive semantics of the verb. Among the Classical forms, see ἀνυόδρομος ‘swiftly-running’ (Sapph.), αἰθεροδρόμος ‘ether-skimming’ (Cinesias, quoted by Aristophanes), βοηδρόμος ‘running to give help’ (Eur.), λαυσηροδρόμος ‘swift-running’ (ibid.), βραχυδρόμος ‘running a short way’ (Xen.), δολιχοδρόμος ‘running the δόλιχος’ (Pl.). An isolated form is εὐθυτρεχῆς ‘running in a straight line’ (IG 2<sup>2</sup>.463.73, Attica 307–306).

### τυγχάνω ‘hit upon, meet’ (I)

FC: τυχησι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: Τυχήσιππος (Athens 5th–4th c.).

OTHER COMPOUNDS: None, although it is possible that a few PNs with a FC τυχ- (e.g. Τύχανδρος Athens 500–480) may be V1 compounds.

AGENT NOUNS: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: None.

### φαγεῖν ‘eat’ (IV)

FC: φαγε-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: φαγέσωρος ‘eating a great quantity, glutton’ (Poll. = fr. *adesp.* 781 K-A).

OTHER COMPOUNDS: None. φαγέδαινα ‘cancerous sore’ (Aesch.) and its derivatives seemingly are not compounds: see *DEG s.v.* φαγεῖν (the feminine of an old noun \*\*φαγεδών?).

AGENT NOUNS: φάγος ‘glutton’ (NT).

V2 COMPOUNDS: Compounds in -φάγος are amongs the most numerous V2 compounds in Greek. A full list is available in Buck-Petersen 624–625. The following forms are attested before the 3rd c.:<sup>12</sup> ἀνδροφάγος ‘eating men’ (Hom.), λωτοφάγοι ‘lotus-eaters’ (ibid.), σιτοφάγος ‘eating corn’ (ibid.), ὠμοφάγος ‘eating raw flesh’ (ibid.), δωροφάγος ‘devouring gifts’ (Hes.), ὕλοφάγος ‘feeding in the woods’ (ibid.), παμφάγος ‘all-devouring’ (Alcm.), βαλανηφάγος ‘acorn-eating’ (Alc.), βουφάγος ‘ox-eating’ (Simon.), ἄρτοφάγος ‘bread-eater’ (Hecat.), πασπαληφάγος ‘feeding on nice meals’ (Hippon.), παιδοφάγος ‘child-devouring’ (Pi.), θηηφάγος ‘devouring offerings’ (Aesch.), σκατοφάγος ‘eating dung’ (Epich.), ἰχθυοφάγος ‘eating fish’ (Hdt.), κρεοφάγος ‘eating flesh’ (ibid.), ἄλλοτριοφάγος ‘eating another’s bread’ (Soph.), ταυροφάγος ‘bull-eating’ (ibid.), θυμβροφάγος ‘eating savory’ (Aristoph.), κολλικοφάγος ‘roll-eating’ (ibid.), κομαροφάγος ‘eating the fruit of the arbutus’ (ibid.), μονοφάγος ‘eating alone’ (superlative form in Aris-

<sup>12</sup> Given the large number of forms, this list does not take into account whether a derived noun in -φαγία or a denominative in -φαγέω is attested before the quoted compound.

toph.), ὄψοφάγος ‘eating delicacies’ (ibid.), μαζοφάγος ‘eating barley-bread’ (Hippocr.), οἰσοφάγος ‘gullet’ (ibid.), ὀλιγοφάγος ‘eating little’ (ibid.), ποηφάγος ‘eating grass’ (ibid.), πολυφάγος ‘eating too much’ (ibid.), χλωροφάγος ‘eating green food’ (ibid.), ἰαμβειοφάγος ‘glutton at iambs’ (Dem.), Μελινοφάγοι ‘Millet-eaters’ (a Thracian tribe, Xen.), ἀνθρωποφάγος ‘man-eating’ (Antiph.), ἀγκιστροφάγος ‘biting the hook’ (Aristot.), ἀκανθοφάγος ‘feeding on thistles’ (ibid.), ἀλληλοφάγοι ‘eating each other’ (ibid.), ζωοφάγος ‘carnivorous’ (ibid.), θριποφάγος ‘eating wood-worms’ (ibid.), καρποφάγος ‘living on fruit’ (ibid.), ὀρνιθοφάγος ‘eating birds’ (ibid.), ῥιζοφάγος ‘eating roots’ (ibid.), σαρκοφάγος ‘eating flesh’ (ibid.), σκνιποφάγος ‘eating σκνῖτες (small creatures which infest fig trees)’ (ibid.), σκωληκοφάγος ‘eating worms’ (ibid.), φυκιοφάγος ‘eating seaweed’ (ibid.).

### φαίνω ‘show, make to appear, reveal’ (IVa)

FC: φαينو-, φαινε-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: φαينوμηρίς ‘showing the thigh’ (Ibyc.).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Φαιναγόρας (Argolis ?2nd–1st c.), Φαίανδρος (Argolis 1st c.), Φαιναρέτᾱ (Epiros 4th–3rd c.), Φαινόθεος (Athens? imp.), Φαινεκλῆς (Paros? 6th c.), Φαινόκριτος (Rhodes ?3rd–2nd c.), Φαινόμαχος (Thessaly ?3rd c.), Φαινέλαος (Phocis 3rd c.).

OTHER COMPOUNDS: None.

AGENT NOUNS: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: Active semantics is conveyed by some of the compounds in -φανής, a numerous class (see Buck-Petersen 722–723). Excluding forms with an adverbial FC (e.g. ἀειφανής ‘ever-shining’ or δεξιοφανής ‘not reflecting a reversed image’ (of a mirror); lit. ‘appearing right’), active compounds amount to the following items: πασιφανής ‘shining on all’ (Bacch.), ἡμεροφανής ‘shining by day’ (Pl.), ὀφθαλμοφανής ‘apparent to the eye’ (Aristot.), ξυλοφανής ‘showing wood’ (D.S.), κρυσταλλοφανής ‘looking like crystal’ (Str.), δημοφανής ‘public’ (Philo), σολοικοφανής ‘like a solecism’ (D.H.), ψιμυθοφανής ‘looking like white lead’ (Diosc.), χαλκοφανής ‘having the appearance of copper’ (ibid.), χρυσοφανής ‘shining like gold’ (ibid.), θηλυφανής ‘like a woman’ (Plu.), δουλοφανής ‘slave-like’ (Jos.), γεωφανής ‘looking like earth’ (Archig.), ναρθηκοφανής ‘looking like fennel’ (ibid.), σαρκοφανής ‘looking fleshy, with a fleshy outside’ (S.E.), πτωχοφανής ‘like a beggar’ (Thd.), ταυροφανής ‘bull-like’ (Dion. Per.), ἔλαιοφανής ‘resembling oil in appearance’ (Gal.), ἄμμοφανής ‘sandy’ (*Ep. Gr.* 430.3, 3rd–4th c. AD), ὑπνοφανής ‘appearing in sleep’ (Man.), νυκτιφανής ‘shining by night’ (Stob.), μεσοφανής ‘appearing in the middle’ (Nonn.), νεβροφανής ‘fawn-like’ (ibid.), πυριφανής ‘appearing in fire’ (*PGM* 4.3023).

**φάω** ‘shine’ (IVa)

FC: φαεσι-, Φαε-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: φαεσίμβροτος ‘bringing light to mortals’ (Hom.).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Φαενίκης (Argolis ?2nd–1st c.).

AGENT NOUNS: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: Bahuvrihis in -φαής from φάος ‘light’ soon take on the meaning of ‘shining’. Their development and semantics are similar to those of compounds in -φανής (see above), but their productivity is more limited. Early examples with a substantival FC are: νυκτιφαής ‘shining by night’ (Parm.), ἤλεκτροφαής ‘gleaming like amber’ (Eur.), κεραυνοφαής ‘flashing like lightning’ (ibid.).

**φείδομαι** ‘spare’ (IVa)

FC: φειδε-, φειδι-, φειδεσι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: Φείδιππος ‘he who uses horses sparingly’ (Hom.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: φειδαλιφίτω ‘to be sparing of barley’ (Phryn., edited as fr. *adesp.* 684 K-A), φειδαλιφίτως (Phryn., Suid.).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Φειδαγόρας (Rhodes 1st c.–1st c. AD), Φειδέκριτος (Amorgos 2nd–1st c.), Φειδέστρατος (Athens 5th c.), Φειδιάνναξ (Delos 296 BC), Φειδοκλής (Epidaurus ca. 370–365), Φειδοκράτης (Boeotia? ca. 382 BC), Φειδόλας (Corinth 512 BC), Φειδόμβροτος (Cos 2nd–1st c.), Φειδόμηλος (Boeotia 2nd–1st c.), Φειδότιμος (Boeotia ?1st c.–1st c. AD).

AGENT NOUNS: None with the traditional suffixes, but see φείδων ‘type of oil-can (that lets only a little run out)’ (Poll.), also attested as a PN (Antiph.).

V2 COMPOUNDS: Πολυφείδης (‘much-sparing’, PN in the *Odyssey*), ἀφειδής ‘not-sparing’ (Aesch.), βιοφειδής ‘sparing on sustenance, penurious’ (Phil. Epigr.).

**φέρω** ‘carry’, bring’ (IV)

FC: φερε-, φερεισ(i)-, φερεισ-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: *pe-ra-ko* /P<sup>h</sup>erakos/. See too the Homeric *Kurzname* Φέρεκλος, which probably goes back to \*\*Φερέκλεφης ‘bringing fame’.

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: φερέσβιος ‘giving life’ (*H. Hom. Ap.*), φερεισανθής ‘bringing flowers’ (*H. Hom.* 30), φερέουκος ‘house carrier, snail’ (Hes.), φερεισακής ‘shield bearing’ (ibid.), φερέζυγος ‘bearing the yoke’ (Alc.), φερειμελής ‘spear bearing’ (Mimn.), φερέμηλος ‘bearing much cattle’ (Pi.), φερέπολις ‘upholding the city’ (ibid.), φερέπονος ‘bearing toil’ (ibid.), φερεικυδής ‘bearing glory, renown’ (Bacch.), φερειστέφανος ‘bringing victory’ (ibid.), φεράσπις ‘shield-bearing’ (Aesch.), φερέγγυος ‘giving security’ (ibid.), φερειστάφυλος ‘bearing bunches of grapes’ (Archestr.), φερειανθής ‘bringing flowers’ (Mel.), φερέκαρπος ‘yielding fruit’ (Plu.), φερέκακος ‘shield bearing’ (ibid.), φερέπτερυξ ‘bearing wings’ (Opp.),

φέροπλος ‘bearing arms’ (*IG* 9(12).2.312a, Acharmania 2nd c.), φερεγλαγής ‘bringing milk’ (*Orph. L.*), φερέβοτρυς ‘bearing bunches of grapes’ (Nonn.), φερέζωος ‘bringing life’ (*ibid.*), φερέσταχυς ‘bearing ears of corn’ (*ibid.*), φερεαυγής ‘bringing light’ (Damoch.).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Φερεβώλᾶ (Thera ?1st c.), Φερέγγυος (Cyrene 4th–3rd c.), Φερέδᾶμος (Thessaly ca. 175–150), Φερέδωρος (Euboea 5th c.), Φερεκλῆς (Athens 423 BC), Φερεκράτης (Macedonia 6th–5th c.), Φερέκριτος (Athens? 2nd–1st c.), Φερεκύδης (Boeotia 6th c.), Φερέλᾶος (Acarmania ca. 250–167 BC), Φερέμβροτος (Achaia ?3rd–2nd c.), Φερένικος (Athens ?ca. 500–480), Φερέπονος (Karpathos 2nd c.), Φερετίμᾶ (Cyrene 6th c.).

AGENT NOUNS: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: *di-pte-ra-po-ro* /dip<sup>h</sup>t<sup>h</sup>erāp<sup>h</sup>oros/ ‘bearer of leather’, *ka-ra-wi-po-ro* /klāwip<sup>h</sup>oros/ ‘key-bearer’, *te-o-po-ri-ja* /t<sup>h</sup>eoph<sup>h</sup>oriā/ ‘sacred ceremony’, βουληφόρος ‘bringing advice’ (Hom.). Compounds in -φορος are the most numerous V2 compounds in Greek. A full list is available in Buck-Petersen 332–336. Because of the great number of forms, this list—differently from all others—contains only forms found in Homer: ἰσοφόρος ‘bearing equal weights’, λαοφόρος ‘bearing people’, τοξοφόρος ‘bow-bearing’, πυρροφόρος ‘wheat-bearing’, τελεσφόρος ‘bringing fulfilment’. There also are a few compounds in -φερής which, however, are mostly compounded with prepositions; see παμφερής ‘all-bearing’ (Gal.).

### φεύγω ‘flee, avoid’ (IV)

FC: φυγο, φυγε-, φυγο-, φυξι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUNDS: *pu<sub>2</sub>-ke-qi-ri* /Phugeg<sup>w</sup>wīns/?, φυγοπτόλεμος ‘escaping war, coward’ (Hom.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: φυγόμαχος ‘shunning battle’ (Simon.), φυγόξενος ‘shunning strangers, inhospitable’ (Pi.), φυξιμηλον ‘avoiding cattle’ (Aesch.; said of trees which have grown too high to be grazed by sheep), φυξανορία ‘aversion to men’ (probable in Aesch. *Supp.* 8), φυγαίχμης ‘fleeing from the spear’ (Aesch.), φυγοδικέω ‘shirk a trial’ (Dem.; the compound φυγόδικος is attested much later), φυξήλιος ‘shunning the sun’ (Nic.), φυγόπονος ‘shunning work’ (Plb.), φυξίπολις ‘fleeing the city’ (Opp.), φυγόλεκτρος ‘shunning the marriage-bed’ (*Orph. H.*), φυγόπατρις ‘fleeing one’s country’ (*Cat. Cod. Astr.*), φεύγυδρος ‘shunning water’ (Polybos).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Φυγοστρατίδης ‘one who flees the army’? (Eretria 4th–3rd c.), Φευγόλμος (Eretria 4th–3rd c.).

AGENT NOUNS: None with the traditional agentive suffixes, but the semantics of the agent noun is conveyed by φυγᾶς ‘one who flees’ which however is specialised to indicate a fugitive fleeing one’s country.

V2 COMPOUNDS: only ὀψίφυγος ‘fleeing late’ (Hdn.).

**φθείρω** ‘destroy’ (IV)

FC: φθερσι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: φθερσιγενής ‘destroying the race’ (Aesch.).

OTHER COMPOUNDS: None.

AGENT NOUN: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: compounds in -φθόρος are fairly common. A full list is provided by Buck-Petersen 330. The following forms are attested before the 3rd c.: λαοφθόρος ‘ruining the people’ (Thgn.), ἀνδροφθόρος ‘man-destroying’ (Pi.), πολυφθόρος ‘destroying many’ (ibid.), βροτοφθόρος ‘man-destroying’ (Aesch.), πολεμοφθόρος ‘wasting by war’ (ibid.), ὕστεροφθόρος ‘late destroying’ (Soph.), οἰκοφθόρος ‘one who ruins a house’ (Eur.), κυματοφθόρος ‘plundering by sea’ (ibid.), πολιτοφθόρος ‘hurtful to the citizens’ (Pl.), ξυλοφθόρον ‘an insect that destroys wood’ (Aristot.), νασιφθόρος ‘ship-destroying’ (Timoth.), ἀλιφθόρος ‘destroying on sea; pirate’ (Leon.), λαρνακοφθόρος ‘killing in a box’ (Lycophr.), ναυτιλοφθόρος ‘bane of sailors’ (ibid.), πενθεροφθόρος ‘slaying one’s father-in-law’ (ibid.).

**φθίνω** ‘consume, cause to decay’ (I)

FC: φθεισι-, φθισι-, φθινο-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: φθεισίγηρ ‘consuming men’ (Hom.), φθισίμβροτος ‘destroying men’ (ibid.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: φθινόκαρπος ‘having lost its fruits’ (Pi.), φθινόπωρον ‘the waning of ὄπώρα (‘summer’), autumn’ (Hdt.), with derived adjectives φθινοπωρινός and φθινοπωρικός ‘autumnal’, φθινόκωλος ‘with wasting limbs’ (Man.), φθισίφρων ‘destroying the mind’ (Opp.).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: None.

AGENT NOUN: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: None.

**φιλέω** ‘love’ (IVb)

FC: φιλο-, φιλησι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: *pi-ro-wo-na* /P<sup>h</sup>ilowoinā/ (= Φίλοινος ‘one who loves wine’), *pi-ro-pa-ta-ra* (= Φιλοπάτρα ‘she who loves her father’).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: There are no PNs in φιλησι-, but the online *LGPN* lists 262 individual forms in Φιλο-, which are not repeated here for space constraints. Among the most common of the transparent forms, see Φιλοδέσποτος ‘he who loves his master’ (Herculaneum 1st c. BC–1st c. AD, a slave’s name), Φιλόδημος ‘he who loves his people’ (Athens ca. 530–520), Φιλόθεος ‘he who loves the gods’ (Athens ca. 450 BC), Φιλόθηρος ‘he who loves hunting’ (Athens 4th c.), Φιλοκλής ‘he who loves glory’ (Chios 5th c.), Φιλοκράτης ‘he who loves power’ (Athens

485/4 BC), Φιλοκτήμων ‘he who loves riches’ (Athens 5th c.), Φιλοκύδης ‘he who loves glory’ (Athens 5th c.), Φιλόκωμος ‘he who loves merry-making’ (Athens? ca. 520–510), Φιλόλαος ‘he who loves his people’ (Corinth 8th c.), Φιλόλογος ‘he who loves talking’ (Delos ?ca. 100 BC), Φιλόμβροτος ‘he who loves mankind’ (Sparta ?676–668), Φιλόμηλος ‘he who loves/cares about his herd’ (Athens 6th c.), Φιλόμουσος ‘he who loves the Muses’ (Thrace 2nd c.), Φιλόνικος ‘he who loves winning’ (Athens? 5th–4th c.), Φιλόξενος ‘he who is friendly to his guests’ (Chios? 6th c.), Φιλόστρατος ‘he who likes the army’ (Athens? 5th–4th c.).<sup>13</sup>

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: φιλησίμολπος ‘loving song’ (Pi.). Appellative compounds in φιλο-, which start off in Homer (φιλοπτόλεμος ‘loving war’), are extremely productive at every stage of the Greek language. A full list of such forms can be found in *LSJ*. On their role in the creation of other V1 compounds, see Chapter 4, section 3.1. For their analysis within the V1/V2 competition, see Chapter 6, section 3.1.

AGENT NOUNS: The proper morphological agent noun is φιλητής ‘lover’, attested late in Macedonius of Thessalonica.

V2 COMPOUNDS: None in -φιλητής. The competing right-oriented compounds are those in -φιλος, -φίλης and -φιλής. Forms showing active semantics of the SC are: παιδόφιλος ‘lover of children, loving children’ (Sapph.), γυναικοφίλας ‘lover of women’ (Polyz.), λογοφίλης ‘fond of words’ (Philo) and λογόφιλος ‘fond of argument’ (Zeno Stoic.), πορνοφίλης ‘fond of prostitutes’ (Nicarchus?), έρημοφίλης ‘loving solitude’ (Paul. Sil.), γραόφιλος ‘lover of old women’ (*schol.* Aristoph.).

### φλέγω ‘burn’ (IVa)

FC: φλεξι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: καταφλεξίπολις ‘inflaming cities’ (AP 5.1).<sup>14</sup>

OTHER COMPOUNDS: None.

AGENT NOUNS: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: Among the few compounds in -φλεγής there are some active-intransitive ones: ζαφλεγής ‘full of fire’ (Hom.), όμοφλεγής ‘burning together’ (Nonn.), αείφλεγής ‘always burning’ (Greg. Naz.). From the structural point of view these are not real counterparts of V1 compounds in that their FC is never a noun. Compounds in -φλογος are always either bahuvrihis (e.g. άφλογος ‘without flame in it’).

### φοβέω ‘terrify, put to flight’ (IVb)

FC: φοβε-, φοβεσι-

<sup>13</sup> Data from <http://www.lgpn.ox.ac.uk/database/lgpn.php>, last accessed 05.07.2014.

<sup>14</sup> Most probably a very late epigram: see Waltz (1960: 20).

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: φοβέστρατος ‘scaring hosts’ (Hes.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: φοβεσιστράτη ‘she who scares the host’ (Aristoph.).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: None.

AGENT NOUNS: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: None. Compounds in -φοβος are structurally bahuvrihis. However, they often have meanings which can be assimilated to the semantics of verbal compounds e.g. αίμοφόβος ‘fearing blood’ (Gal.), ύδροφόβος ‘having a horror of water’ (Arr.), θεόφοβος ‘fearing God’ (Porph.).

### **φράζω** ‘indicate, tell’ (IV)

FC: φρασι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: Φρασίκλεια (Athens ca. 540 BC).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Φρασίδημος (Athens ca. 407 BC), Φρασικάρτης (Crete 2nd c.), Φρασικύδης (Keos 4th–3rd), Φρασίλᾶς (Rhodes ca. 310–240), Φρασιμήδᾶ (Thessaly ca. 440–430), Φρασίνικος (Crete 2nd c.), Φρασίνους (Thessaly ?1–10 AD), Φρασισθένης (Athens 4th c.), Φρασιτελίδης (Athens 410/9), Φρασιφάνης (Thera hell.).

AGENT NOUNS: φραστήρ ‘teller’ (Xen.), φράστης ‘one who speaks well’ (Gloss.).

V2 COMPOUNDS: only σκινδαλαμοφράστης ‘straw-splitter’ (lit. ‘one who talks about splinters, quibbles’, Agath.) and a few active compounds in -φραδής.

### **φύω** ‘produce’ (IV)

FC: φυσι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: φυσίζοος ‘producing life’ (Hom.).

OTHER COMPOUNDS: None.

AGENT NOUNS: φύτωρ ‘begetter’ (Hsch.).

V2 COMPOUNDS: πτεροφύτωρ ‘feather-producing’ (Pl.), ἀμπελοφύτωρ ‘wine-planter’ (Leon.). However, the most common type of compounds are those in -φυής, which start off as bahuvrihis of φυή (see e.g. ἀφυής ‘without natural talent’, Democr., or τριφυής ‘with three stems’, Thphr.) but later also take on a verbal meaning: see the full list in Buck-Petersen 731–732. The following Classical forms show active semantics: πτεροφυής ‘growing feathers or wings’ (Pl.), ρίζοφυής ‘growing out roots’ (Thphr.).

### **χαίρω** ‘rejoice, take pleasure in’ (IVa)

FC: χαρε-, χαρεσι-, χαρησι-, χαρο-, χαρι-

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: Χαίριππος ‘delighting in horses’ (Athens 6th c.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: χαρεκακία ‘taking pleasure in one’s neighbour’s misfortune’ (Aristot.).

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: Χαϊρέβιος (Euboea 4th–3rd c.), Χαϊρέβοτος (Athens 2nd–1st c.), Χαϊρεβούλη (Athens 4th c.), Χαϊρέδαμος (Sikyon 7th–6th c.), Χαϊρεκράτης (Athens 5th–4th c.), Χαϊρέλεως (Athens 6th–5th c.), Χαϊρέμαχος (Argolis 3rd c.), Χαϊρένεως (Athens ca. 378/7), Χαϊρέπολις (Thera 2nd c.), Χαϊρέστρατος (Athens ca. 500–490), Χαϊρετύχη (Thera imp.), Χαϊρεφάνης (Athens 452/1), Χαϊρέφιλος (Athens 375/4), Χαϊρησίλεως (Gela 6th–5th c.).

AGENT NOUN: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: Only those in *-χαρής*, listed in Buck-Petersen 727. Of these, the following have active meaning: *μικροχαρής* ‘easily pleased’ (Antip. Stoic.), *δακρυχαρής* ‘delighting in tears’ (Mel.), *εἰδωλοχαρής* ‘delighting in images’ (Nic. Dam.), *εἶροχαρής* ‘delighting in wool’ (Archias), *μουσοχαρής* ‘delighting in the Muses or in poetry’ (Maecius Epigr.), *ἐπιδεσμοχαρής* ‘bandage-loving’ (Luc.), *κλινοχαρής* ‘fond of bed’ (ibid.), *ὄχλοχαρής* ‘courting the mob’ (M. Ant.), *ἀντροχαρής* ‘enjoying caves’ (*Orph. H.*), *κισσοχαρής* ‘delighting in ivy’ (ibid.), *λεκτροχαρής* ‘enjoying the marriage-bed’ (ibid.), *ὄπλοχαρής* ‘delighting in arms’ (ibid.), *δημοχαρής* ‘pleasing the people’ (Paul. Al.), *κεδροχαρής* ‘rejoicing in cedar’ (Man.), *γεωχαρής* ‘fond of the earth’ (Jul.), *παγχαρής* ‘gladdening all’ (Hermario ap. Amm. Marc.), *πυριχαρής* ‘rejoicing in fire’ (*PGM* 4.593), *νυκτιχαρής* ‘rejoicing in the night’ (*PGM* 4.1795), *βελεσσιχαρής* ‘joying in darts’ (*AP* 9.525.3, *adesp.*), *νευροχαρής* ‘delighting in bow-string’ (ibid.), *ξυνοχαρής* ‘rejoicing with all alike’ (ibid.), *ψαλμοχαρής* ‘delighting in harp-playing’ (ibid.), *αἵμοχαρής* ‘delighting in blood’ (Orac. Syb.), *θυρσοχαρής* ‘delighting in the thyrsus’ (*Inscr. Magn.* 215a.23).

### **χαράσσω** ‘sharpen, scratch, carve’ (II)

FC: *χαραξι-*

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: *χαραξίπιντος* ‘carving the sea’ (Simon.).

APPELLATIVE COMPOUNDS: None.

ONOMASTIC COMPOUNDS: None, but the FC *χαραξι-* may be behind the *Kurzname* *Χάραξος*.

AGENT NOUNS: *χαρακτήρ* ‘engraver’ (Eur.), but also ‘impressed mark’ (ibid.) and from this literal meaning ‘distinctive mark, character of a person’.

V2 COMPOUNDS: None.

### **χρέμπτομαι** ‘clear one’s throat’ (I)

FC: *χρεμψι-*

FIRST ATTESTED COMPOUND: *χρεμψιθέατρος* ‘spitting in the theatre’ (fr. *adesp.* 1100 K-A).

OTHER COMPOUNDS: None.

AGENT NOUN: None.

V2 COMPOUNDS: None.



# Bibliography

- Agud, A. (1984) 'El primer elemento en los compuestos indoeuropeos: su interpretación como residuo de una fase preflexional', in Oroz Arizcuren (1984), 8–14.
- Aleksandrow, A. (1888) *Litauische Studien*. Vol. I: *Nominalzusammensetzungen*. Dorpat.
- Alonso Déniz, A. (2008) *Estudios sobre la aspiración de /s/ en los dialectos griegos del I milenio*. PhD thesis Madrid.
- Amado Rodríguez (1998) 'Panorama general de la composición nominal en griego antiguo', *Verba* 25: 93–125.
- Amigues, S. (ed.) (1989) *Théopraste: Recherches sur les plantes*. Vol. II: *Livres III–IV*. Paris.
- Amiot, D. (ed.) (2008) *La composition dans une perspective typologique*. Artois.
- Amsterdamska, O. (1987) *Schools of Thought: The Development of Linguistics from Bopp to Saussure*. Dordrecht.
- Anastasiadi-Simeonidi, A. (2002) *Αντίστροφο Λεξικό της Νέας Ελληνικής*. Thessaloniki. [http://www.greeklanguage.gr/greekLang/modern\\_greek/tools/lexica/reverse/index.html](http://www.greeklanguage.gr/greekLang/modern_greek/tools/lexica/reverse/index.html)
- Andriotis, N. P. (1938) 'Die wechselnde Stellung von Kompositionsgliedern im Spät-, Mittel- und Neugriechischen', *Glotta* 27: 92–134.
- Arcodia, G. F., Grandi, N. and Wälchli, B. (2010) 'Coordination in compounding', in Scalise and Vogel (2010), 177–198.
- Bader, F. (1962) *La formation des composés nominaux du latin*. Paris.
- (1965) *Les composés grecs du type de demiourgos*. Paris.
- (1968) 'Ortiloque et Orsiloque', *REG* 81: XVII–XIX.
- (1970) 'De mycénien *matoropuro*, *arepozoo* à grec ματρόπολις, ἀλειφόβιος: le traitement des sonantes-voyelles au premier millénaire', *Minos* 10: 1–53.
- (1974) 'Persée, πέρθω et l'expression archaïque du temps en indo-européen', *BSL* 69: 1–53.
- (1989) *La langue des Dieux ou l'hermétisme des poètes indo-européens*. Pisa.
- (2005) 'Fondements syntaxiques de la composition nominale', in Moussy (2005), 11–28.
- Baker, M. C. (1988) *Incorporation: A Theory of Grammatical Function Changing*. Chicago.
- and Fasola, C. A. (2009) 'Araucanian: Mapudungun', in Lieber and Štekauer (2009a), 594–608.
- Bakola, E. (2010) *Cratinus and the Art of Comedy*. Oxford.
- Banfi, E. (ed.) (1997) *Atti del secondo incontro internazionale di linguistica greca*. Trento.
- Barri, N. (1975) 'Note terminologique: endocentrique–exocentrique', *Linguistics* 163: 5–18.
- Bartoněk, A. (2003) *Handbuch des mykenischen Griechisch*. Heidelberg.
- Bauer, L. (1998) 'Is there a class of neoclassical compounds in English and is it productive?', *Linguistics* 36: 403–422.
- (2003) *Introducing Linguistic Morphology*, 2nd edn. Edinburgh.
- (2008) 'Dvandva', *Word structure* 1: 1–20.
- (2009) 'Typology of compounds', in Lieber and Štekauer (2009a), 343–356.
- (2010) 'The typology of exocentric compounding', in Scalise and Vogel (2010), 167–175.
- Bechtel, F. (1914) *Lexilogus zu Homer: Etymologie und Stammbildung homerischer Wörter*. Halle.
- (1917) *Die historische Personennamen des Griechischen bis zur Kaiserzeit*. Halle.
- Bechtel, F. and Fick, A. (1894) *Die griechischen Personennamen nach ihrer Bildung erklärt und systematisch geordnet*, 2nd edn. Göttingen.
- Becker, T. (1992) 'Compounding in German', in Scalise (1992b), 5–36.

- Beekes, R. S. P. (1969) *The Development of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Greek*. The Hague.
- (1971) 'μῶνυχες ἵπποι', *Orbis* 20: 138–142.
- , Lubotsky, A. and Weitenberg, J. (eds.) (1992) *Rekonstruktion und relative Chronologie: Akten der VIII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft. Leiden, 31. August–4. September 1987*. Innsbruck.
- Benveniste, É. (1948) *Noms d'agent et noms d'action en indo-européen*. Paris.
- (1966) 'Convergences typologiques', *L'Homme* 6 (2): 5–12, reprinted in Benveniste (1974), 103–112.
- (1967) 'Fondements syntaxiques de la composition nominale', *BSL* 62: 15–31, reprinted in Benveniste (1974), 145–162.
- (1973) *Origines de la formation des noms en indo-européen*, 4th edn. Paris.
- (1974) *Problèmes de linguistique générale*. Vol. II. Paris.
- Bergaigne, A. (1875–1878) 'Essai sur la construction grammaticale considérée dans son développement historique, en sanskrit, en grec, en latin, dans les langues romanes et dans les langues germaniques', *Mémoires de la Société de linguistique de Paris* 3: 1–54.
- Bergk, T. (1872) *Griechische Literaturgeschichte*. Vol. I. Berlin.
- Betz, H. D. (ed.) (2003) *The Mithras Liturgy: Text, Translation, and Commentary*. Tübingen.
- Bielecki, F.-J. (1899) *Les mots composés dans Eschyle et dans Aristophanes: Étude littéraire et grammaticale*. Luxembourg.
- Bisetto, A. (1994) 'Italian compounds of the *accendigas* type: A case of endocentric formation?', *University of Venice Working Papers in Linguistics* 4 (2): 1–10.
- (2004) 'Composizione con elementi italiani', in Grossman and Rainer (2004), 33–51.
- (2010) 'Recursiveness and Italian compounds', *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics* 7: 14–35.
- and Scalise, S. (2005) 'The classification of compounds', *Lingue e linguaggio* 4 (2), 319–332.
- Bloomfield, L. (1914) 'Sentence and word', *TAPhA* 45: 65–75.
- (1926) 'A set of postulates for the science of language', *Language* 2 (3): 153–164.
- (1933) *Language*. New York.
- Bok-Bennema, R. and Kampers-Manhe, B. (2006), 'Taking a closer look at Romance VN compounds', in Nishida and Montreuil (2006), 13–26.
- Boldrini, S. et al. (eds.) (1987) *Filologia e forme letterarie: Studi offerti a Francesco Della Corte*. Vol. I. Urbino.
- Bonanno, M. G. (1987) 'Metafore redive e nomi parlanti. (Sui modi del *Witz* in Aristofane)', in Boldrini et al. (1987), 213–228.
- Bonnet, G. (ed.) (2005) *Dosithée: Grammaire latine*. Paris.
- Booij, G. (1988) 'The relation between inheritance and argument linking: Deverbal nouns in Dutch', in Everaert, Evers, Huybregts and Trommelen (1988), 57–74.
- (2009a) 'Compounding and construction morphology', in Lieber and Štekauer (2009a), 201–216.
- (2009b) 'Phrasal names: A constructionist analysis', in Schlücker and Hüning (2009), 219–240.
- and van Marle, J. (eds.) (2001) *Yearbook of Morphology 2000*. Dordrecht.
- et al. (eds.) (2007) *Proceedings of the Fifth Mediterranean Morphology Meeting (MMM5). Fréjus, 15–18 September 2005*. Bologna. [http://www3.lingue.unibo.it/mmm2/wp-content/uploads/2012/09/MMM5-Proceedings\\_full.pdf](http://www3.lingue.unibo.it/mmm2/wp-content/uploads/2012/09/MMM5-Proceedings_full.pdf)

- Bopp, F. (1861) *Vergleichende Grammatik des Sanskrit, Sınd, Armenischen, Griechischen, Lateinischen, Litauischen, Altslavischen, Gothischen und Deutschen*. Vol. III, 2nd edn. Berlin.
- Bork, H. D. (1990) *Die lateinisch–romanischen Zusammensetzungen Nomen + Verb und der Ursprung der romanischen Verb–Ergänzungs–Komposita*. Bonn.
- Bosque, I. and Demonte, V. (eds.) (1999) *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*. 3 vols. Madrid.
- Braasch, A., and Povlsen, C. (eds.) (2002) *Proceedings of the Tenth EURALEX International Congress, EURALEX 2002, Copenhagen, Denmark, August 13–17 2002*. Copenhagen.
- Bréal, M. (1895–1896) 'Étymologies: versicolor, flexipedus', *BSL* 9: 32–33.
- Broganyi, B. (ed.) (1979) *Studies in Diachronic, Synchronic, and Typological Linguistics: Festschrift for Oswald Szemerényi on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*. Vol. II. Amsterdam.
- Browning, R. (1958) 'Greek abstract nouns in -sis, -tis', *Philologus* 102: 60–73.
- Brugmann, K. (1885) *Griechische Grammatik*, 1st edn. Nördlingen.
- (1889) *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Vol. II.1: *Wortbildungslehre (Stammbildungs- und Flexionslehre): 1. Hälfte*, 1st edn. Strasbourg.
- (1904–1905) 'Verdunkelte Nominalkomposita des Griechischen und des Lateinischen', *IF* 17: 351–373.
- (1905–1906) 'Zur Wortzusammensetzung in den idg. Sprachen', *IF* 18: 59–76.
- (1906) *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Vol. II.1: *Allgemeines, Zusammensetzung (Komposita), Nominalstämme*, 2nd edn. Strasbourg.
- and Thumb, A. (1913) *Griechische Grammatik*. 4th expanded edn. edited by A. Thumb. Munich.
- Buck, C. D. (1933) *Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*. Chicago.
- Bussmann, H. (ed.) (1996) *Routledge Dictionary of Language and Linguistics*. London.
- Cardona, G. and Zide, N. H. (eds.) (1987) *Festschrift for Henry Hoeningwald on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*. Tübingen.
- Carr, C. T. (1939) *Nominal Compounds in Germanic*. Oxford.
- Cassio, A. C. (1991–1993) 'La più antica iscrizione di Cuma e τῖν(ν)υμῶν in Omero', *Sprache* 35: 187–207.
- Càssola, F. (ed.) (1975) *Inni omerici*. Milan.
- Ceccagno, A. and Basciano, B. (2009) 'Sino-Tibetan: Mandarin Chinese', in Lieber and Štekauer (2009a), 478–490.
- Chantraine, P. (1933) *La formation des noms en grec ancien*. Paris.
- (1956) *Études sur le vocabulaire grec*. Paris.
- Christ, W. (1890) 'Die verbalen Abhängigkeitskomposita des Griechischen', *Sitzungsberichte der königl. bayer. Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil. Klasse* 1890 (1): 143–246.
- Clackson, J. (2007) *Indo-European Linguistics: An Introduction*. Cambridge.
- and Olsen, B. A. (eds.) (2004) *Indo-European Word Formation: Proceedings of the Conference Held at the University of Copenhagen (October 20th–22nd 2000)*. Copenhagen.
- Clemm, W. (1867) *De compositis graecis quae a verbis incipiunt*. Giessen.
- (1875) 'Die neuesten Forschungen auf dem Gebiet der griechischen Composita', *Curtius Studien* 7: 1–99.
- Colvin, S. (1999) *Dialect in Aristophanes: The Politics of Language in Ancient Greek Literature*. Oxford.
- Comrie, B. (1976) *Aspect: An Introduction to the Study of Verbal Aspect and Related Problems*. Cambridge.

- Corbin, D. (1992) 'Hypothèses sur les frontières de la composition nominale', *Cahiers de grammaire* 17: 25–55.
- Costa Ramalho, A. da (1952) *DIPLA ONOMATA no estilo de Aristofanes*. Coimbra.
- Cowgill, W. (1975) 'More evidence for Indo-Hittite: The tense–aspect systems', in Heilmann (1975), 557–570.
- Crespo, E. and García Ramón, J. L. (eds.) (1997) *Berthold Delbrück y la sintaxis indoeuropea hoy: Actas del Coloquio de la Indogermanische Gesellschaft, Madrid, 21–24 de septiembre de 1994*. Madrid and Wiesbaden.
- Crystal, D. (1997) *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*, 4th edn. London and Oxford.
- Curtius, G. (1863) *Erläuterungen zu meiner griechischen Schulgrammatik*, 1st edn. Prague.
- (1873) *Zur Chronologie der indogermanischen Sprachforschung*, 2nd edn. Leipzig.
- (1875) *Griechische Schulgrammatik*, 11th edn. Prague.
- Darmesteter, A. (1875) *Traité de la formation des mots composés dans la langue française comparée aux autres langues romanes et au latin*, 1st edn. Paris.
- De Angelis, A. and Gasbarra, V. (2010) 'Tra morfologia e sintassi: mic. *e-pi-ko-wo / o-pi-ko-wo* e le forme omeriche del tipo ἐπήρετμος', in Putzu, Paulis, Nieddu and Cuzzolin (2010), 150–167.
- Debrunner, A. (1917) *Griechische Wortbildungslehre*. Heidelberg.
- (1950) *Griechische Grammatik*. Vol. II: *Syntax und syntaktische Stilistik*. Munich.
- (1954) *Altindische Grammatik*. Vol. II.2: *Die Nominalsuffixe*. Göttingen.
- De Decker, F. (2011) 'Stang's law and the Indo-European word for "cow"', *IF* 116: 42–59.
- Deger-Jalkotzy, S., Hiller, S. and Panagl, O. (eds.) (1999) *Florent Studia Mycenaea: Akten des X. internationalen Mykenologischen Colloquiums in Salzburg vom 1.–5. Mai 1995*. 2 vols. Vienna.
- Delbrück, B. (1878) *Syntaktische Forschungen*. Vol. III: *Die altindische Wortfolge aus dem Çatapathabrâhmana*. Halle.
- (1900) *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Vol. III. Strasbourg.
- Diels, H. (1918) 'Hippokratische Forschungen V', *Hermes* 53: 57–87.
- Dik, H. (1995) *Word Order in Ancient Greek: A Pragmatic Account of Word Order Variation in Herodotus*. Amsterdam.
- (2007) *Word Order in Tragic Dialogue*. Oxford.
- Di Sciullo, A. M. and Williams, E. (1987) *On the Definition of Word*. Cambridge, MA.
- Dixon, R. M. W. (1982) *Where Have All the Adjectives Gone? And Other Essays in Semantics and Syntax*. Berlin.
- Dover, K. J. (1960) *Greek Word Order*. London.
- (1968) *Aristophanes: Clouds*. Edited with Introduction and Commentary. Oxford.
- (1997) *The Evolution of Greek Prose Style*. Oxford.
- Dressler, W. U. (2006) 'Compound types', in Libben and Jarema (2006), 23–44.
- Kastovsky, D., Pfeiffer, O. E., and Rainer, F. (eds.) (2005) *Morphology and its Demarcations*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia.
- Drinka, B. (1995) *The Sigmatic Aorist in Indo-European: Evidence for the Space–Time Hypothesis*. Washington.
- Dubois, L. (2000) 'Hippolytos and Lysippos: Remarks on some compounds in ἵππο-, -ἵππος', in Hornblower and Matthews (2000), 41–52.
- (2001) Handout of the paper delivered at the conference *Die altgriechischen Dialekte: Wesen und Werden* (Freie Universität Berlin 19.–22. September 2001).
- (2006) 'Le nom de Pythagore', in Pinault and Petit (2006), 55–62.

- and E. Masson (eds.) (2000) *Philokypros: Mélanges de philologie et d'antiquités grecques et proche-orientales dédiés à la mémoire d'Olivier Masson*. Salamanca.
- Duchesne-Guillemin, J. (1936) *Études de morphologie iranienne 1: Les composés de L'Avesta*. Paris.
- Duhoux, Y. and Morpurgo Davies, A. (eds.) (2011) *A Companion to Linear B: Mycenaean Greek Texts and Their World*. Vol. II. Louvain-la-Neuve and Walpole, MA.
- Dunkel, G. E. (1992) 'Two old problems in Greek: πτόλεμος and τερψίμβροτος', *Glotta* 70: 197–225.
- (1999) 'On the origins of nominal composition in Indo-European', in Eichner, Luschützky and Sadovski (1999), 47–68.
- (2010) 'The IE s-aorist as an athematic denominative', in Kim, Oettinger, Rieken and Weiss (2010), 19–26.
- Egetmeyer, M. (1992) *Wörterbuch zu den Inschriften im kyprischen Syllabar*. Berlin and New York.
- (2010) *Le dialecte ancien grec de Chypre*. 2 vols. Berlin and New York.
- Eichner, H., Luschützky, H. C. and Sadovski, V. (1999) *Compositiones indogermanicae: In memoriam Jochem Schindler*. Prague.
- Erhart, A. (1975) 'Das Verbalsystem im Indoeuropäischen und im Baltischen', *Baltistica* 11: 21–30.
- Etter, A. (ed.) (1986) *O-o-pe-ro-si: Festschrift für Ernst Risch zum 75. Geburtstag*. Berlin and New York.
- Euler, W. (1979) *Indoiranisch-griechische Gemeinsamkeiten der Nominalbildung und deren indogermanische Grundlagen*. Innsbruck.
- Everaert, M., Evers, A., Huybregts, R. and Trommelen, M. (eds.) (1988) *Morphology and Modularity: In Honour of Henk Schultink*. Dordrecht.
- Fabb, N. (1998) 'Compounding', in Spencer and Zwicky (1998), 66–83.
- Fabian, E. (1931) *Das exozentrische Kompositum im Deutschen*. Leipzig.
- Faiss, K. (1981) 'Compound, pseudo-compound and syntactic group especially in English', in Kunsmann and Kuhn (1981), 132–150.
- Forssman, B. (1966) 'τέμνω und τάμνω', *Glotta* 44: 5–14.
- Forster, H. (1950) *Zur Geschichte der griechischen Komposita vom Typus ἐπίχρυσος*. Zurich.
- Fradin, B. (2009) 'IE, Romance: French', in Lieber and Štekauer (2009a), 417–435.
- Fraenkel, Eduard (1978) *Aeschylus: Agamemnon*. Edited with a commentary. Reprinted with corrections. Vol. II. Oxford.
- Fraenkel, Ernst (1910) *Geschichte der griechischen Nomina agentis auf -τήρ, -τωρ, της (-τ-)*. Vol. I: *Entwicklung und Verbreitung der Nomina im Epos, in der Elegie und in den außerionisch-attischen Dialekten*. Strasbourg.
- (1912) *Geschichte der Nomina agentis auf -τήρ, -τωρ, της (-τ-)*. Vol. II: *Entwicklung und Verbreitung der Nomina im Attischen, Entstehung und Accentuation der Nomina auf -της*. Strasbourg.
- Frei-Lüthy, C. (1978) *Der Einfluß der griechischen Personennamen auf die Wortbildung*. Heidelberg.
- Frisk, H. (1934) 'Zum Typus ἀκρόπολις in den idg. Sprachen', *IF* 52: 282–295, reprinted in Frisk (1966), 124–138.
- (1941) 'Über den Gebrauch des Privativpräfixes im indogermanischen Adjektiv', *GHÄ* 47: 1–47, reprinted in Frisk (1966), 183–229.

- (1966) *Kleine Schriften zur Indogermanistik und zur griechischen Wortkunde*. Stockholm, Göteborg and Uppsala.
- Fritz, M. and Zeilfelder, S. (eds.) (2002) *Novalis Indogermanica: Festschrift für Günter Neumann zum 80. Geburtstag*. Graz.
- Gaeta, L. (2010) 'Synthetic compounds: With special reference to German', in Scalise and Vogel (2010), 219–236.
- Gagnepain, J. (1959) *Les noms grecs en -ος et en -ᾶ: Contribution à l'étude du genre en indo-européen*. Paris.
- García Ramón, J. L. (1992) 'Mycénien *ke-sa-do-ro* /Kessandros/, *ke-ti-ro* /Kestilos/, *ke-to* /Kestōr/: grec alphabétique Αἰνησιμβρότα, Αἰνησίλαος, Αἰνήτωρ et le nom de Cassandra', in Olivier (1992), 239–255.
- (1996–1997) 'Eine wichtige Studie über die Nomina auf -tās und -ās im Frühgriechischen' (Review of Leukart 1994), *Minos* 31–32: 423–432.
- (2000a) 'Anthroponymica Mycenaea: 3. Mykenisch *to-wa-no* /T<sup>h</sup>owānōr/, homerisch Πρόθοος und Προθοήνωρ', *ŽAnt* 50: 205–212.
- (2000b) 'Mycénien *qa-sa-ko* /K<sup>w</sup>ās-ark<sup>h</sup>os/, grec alphabétique Πάσαρχος, Κτήσαρχος et le dossier de \*k<sup>w</sup>ā(s)- dans la langue des tablettes', in Dubois and Masson (2000), 153–176.
- (2000c) 'Personennamen', *DNP* vol. 9: 622–626.
- (2000–2001) 'Anthroponymica Mycenaea: 1. Mykenisch *o-ki-ro*, alph.-gr. ὄρχιλος; 2. Mykenisch *da-te-wa* /Daitewās/ und *e-u-da-i-ta*, alph. gr. Δαίτας, Πανδαίτης', *Minos* 35–36: 431–442.
- (2002) 'Mykenisch *o-ti-na-wo* /Ortināwos/ und vedisch *īyarti nāvam*, homerisch Ὀρτίλοχος / Ὀρσίλοχος, \*ῶρσε λόχον, und λόχον εἶσε', in Fritz and Zeilfelder (2002), 183–193.
- (2004) 'Zum Paradigma von idg. \*nes-: homerisch ἀπενάσσατο, kausat. ἀπονάσσωσιν als Aoriste von (°)νέομαι und die Entstehung des Präs. νάω', in Krisch, Linder and Müller (2004), 33–47.
- (2005a) 'Anthroponymica Mycenaea: 4. Micénico *pe-ra-ko*, gr. alf. Φέρακος y el topos ἄκος φέρειν, ἀκέσφορος', in Polí and Vottéro (2005), 101–110.
- (2005b) 'Av. *Yuxtāspa* und av. ap. *Vīštāspa*, griech. Ζεύσιππος und Ἰππόλυτος (bzw. Λύσιππος)', in Kazansky (2005), 322–331.
- (2005c) 'Indogermanische Dichtersprache, Phraseologie und griechische Onomastik', in Meiser and Hackstein (2005), 117–138.
- (2006a) 'Anthroponymica Mycenaea: 5. *a-wi-do-to* /Awisto-dotos/ und die unsichtbaren Götter im Alph.-Griechischen. 6. *we-re-na-ko* /Wrēn-āgos/ oder /Wrēn-ākos/ und Myk. /wrēn-/\*: alph.-gr. ῥρην-, ἄρην 'Lamm', *ŽAnt* 55: 85–97.
- (2006b) 'Homme comme force, force d'homme: un motif onomastique et l'étymologie du vieil irlandais *gus*', in Pinault and Petit (2006), 79–93.
- (2008) 'Mykenische Personennamen und griechische Dichtung und Phraseologie: *i-su-ku-wo-do-to* und *a-re-me-ne*, *a-re-i-me-ne*', in Sacconi, Del Freato, Godart and Negri (2008), 323–335.
- (2009) 'Mycenaean onomastics, poetic phraseology, and Indo-European comparison: The man's name *pu<sub>2</sub>-ke-qi-ri*', in Yoshida and Vine (2009), 1–26.
- (2011) 'Mycenaean onomastics', in Duhoux and Morpurgo Davies (2011), 213–251.
- Gather, A. (2001) *Romanische Verb-Nomen-Komposita: Wortbildung zwischen Lexikon, Morphologie und Syntax*. Tübingen.
- George, C., McCullagh, M., Nielsen, B., Ruppel, A. and Tribulato, O. (eds.) (2007) *Greek and Latin from an Indo-European Perspective*. Cambridge.

- Glaser, M. (1898) *Die zusammengesetzten Nomina bei Pindar*. Amberg.
- Göber, W. (1934) 'Theoinia', *RE* 5 A.2: 1994–1996.
- Göttling, K. W. (ed.) (1843) *Hesiodi Carmina*, 2nd edn. Gotha.
- Grandi, N. and Pompei, A. (2010) 'Per una tipologia dei composti del greco', in Putzu, Paulis, Nieddu and Cuzzolin (2010), 204–225.
- (2012) 'Complex -*éō* verbs in Ancient Greek: A case study at the interface between derivation and compounding', *Morphology* 22: 399–416.
- Grimm, J. (1826) *Deutsche Grammatik*. Vol. II, 1st edn. Göttingen.
- Grossmann, M. (2012) 'Romanian compounds', in Scalise and Masini (2012), 147–173.
- Grzegza, J. (2009) 'Compounding from an onomasiological perspective', in Lieber and Štekauer (2009a), 217–232.
- Guidorizzi, G. (ed.) (1996) *Aristofane: Le Nuvole*. Milan.
- Hackstein, O. (2002) *Die Sprachform der homerischen Epen*. Wiesbaden.
- Händel, P. and Meid, W. (eds.) (1983) *Festschrift für Robert Muth zum 65. Geburtstag am 1. Januar 1981 dargebracht von Freunden und Kollegen*. Innsbruck.
- Handley, E. W. (1953) '-σις nouns in Aristophanes', *Eranos* 51: 129–142.
- Hänssel, B. and Zimmer, S. (eds.) (1994) *Die Indogermanen und das Pferd: Akten des Internationalen interdisziplinären Kolloquiums Freie Universität Berlin, 1.–3. Juli 1992. Bernfried Schlerath zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet*. Budapest.
- Hardarson, J. A. (1993) *Studien zum urindogermanischen Wurzelaorist und dessen Vertretung im Indoiranischen und Griechischen*. Innsbruck.
- Hartmann, I. J. (2002) "'What name? What parentage?'" The classification of Greek names and the Elean corpus', *Oxford University Working Papers in Linguistics, Philology & Phonetics* 7: 55–81.
- Heilmann, L. (ed.) (1975) *Proceedings of the 11th International Congress of Linguists, Bologna–Florence, Aug. 2–Sept. 2, 1972*. Vol. II. Bologna.
- Henderson, J. J. (1987) *Aristophanes: Lysistrata*. Translated with Introduction and Notes. Oxford.
- Hettrich, H. (ed.) (2002) *Indogermanische Syntax: Fragen und Perspektiven*. Wiesbaden.
- Heubeck, A. (1957a) 'Bemerkungen zu den griechischen Personennamen auf den Linear B-Tafeln', *BN* 8: 28–35, reprinted in Heubeck (1984), 473–480.
- (1957b) 'Weitere Bemerkungen zu den griechischen Personennamen auf den Linear B-Tafeln'. *BN* 8: 268–278, reprinted in Heubeck (1984), 481–491.
- (1984) *Kleine Schriften zur griechischen Sprache und Literatur*. Hrsg. von B. Forssman, S. Koster, E. Pöhlmann. Erlangen.
- (1987) 'Zu den griech. Verbalwurzeln \*nes- und \*neq-', *Minos* 20–22: 227–238.
- Hirt, H. A. (1928) *Indogermanische Grammatik*. Vol. IV: *Doppelung, Zusammensetzung, Verbum*. Heidelberg.
- Hoenigswald, H. M. (1977) 'Diminutives and tatpuruṣas: The Indo-European trend toward endocentricity', *JIES* 5: 9–13.
- (2004) 'Ἐλλήσποντος', in Penney (2004), 179–181.
- Hoffmann, K. (1970) 'Das Kategoriensystem des indogermanischen Verbums', *MSS* 28: 19–41.
- Holmes, D. H. (1893) *The Limitations of the Composition of Verbs with Prepositions in Thucydides*. Phil. Diss. Baltimore.
- Holt, J. (1941) *Les noms d'action en -σις (-τις): Études de linguistique grecque*. Aarhus and Copenhagen.
- Hornblower, S. and Matthews, E. (eds.) (2000) *Greek Personal Names: Their Value as Evidence*. Oxford.

- Horrocks, G. (1994) 'Subjects and configurationality: Modern Greek clause structure', *Journal of Linguistics* 30: 81–109.
- and Stavrou, M. (2001) 'Lexeme-based separationist morphology: Evidence from the history of Greek verbal abstracts', in Booij and van Marle (2001), 19–42.
- Jackendoff, R. S. (1990) *Semantic Structures*. Cambridge, MA.
- (2009) 'Compounding in the parallel architecture and conceptual semantics', in Lieber and Štekauer (2009a), 105–128.
- (2010) *Meaning and the Lexicon: The Parallel Architecture 1975–2010*. Oxford.
- Jacobi, H. G. (1897) *Compositum und Nebensatz: Studien über die indogermanische Sprachentwicklung*. Bonn.
- Janda, M. (1999) Ενοσίχθων "Erderschütterer", in Eichner, Luschützsky and Sadovski (1999), 183–203.
- (2000) *Eleusis: Das indogermanische Erbe der Mysterien*, Innsbruck.
- Janko, R. (1992) 'The origins and evolution of the epic diction', in G. S. Kirk (ed.), *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Vol. IV (ed. by R. Janko). Cambridge, 8–19.
- Jankowsky, K. R. (1972) *The Neogrammarians: A Re-evaluation of Their Place in the Development of Linguistic Science*. The Hague and Paris.
- Jasanoff, J. (2002–2003) 'Stative \*-ē- revisited', *Sprache* 43: 127–170.
- (2003). *Hittite and the Indo-European Verb*. Oxford and New York.
- Joshi, S. D. and Roodbergen, J. A. F. (1991–) *The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini*. With Translation and Explanatory Notes. 14– vols. New Delhi.
- Jouan, F. and Van Looy, H. (2003) *Euripide: Tragédies*. Vol. VIII.2: *Fragments: De Bellérophon à Protésilas*. Paris.
- Justi, F. (1861) *Über die Zusammensetzung der Nomina in den indogermanischen Sprachen*. Göttingen.
- Kageyama, T. (2009) 'Isolate: Japanese', in Lieber and Štekauer (2009a), 512–526.
- Kammenhuber, A. (1961) 'Nominalkomposition in den altanatolischen Sprachen des 2. Jahrtausends', *KZ* 77: 161–218.
- Kamptz, H. von (1982) *Homerische Personennamen: Sprachwissenschaftliche und historische Klassifikation*. Göttingen.
- Kanavou, N. (2011) *Aristophanes' Comedy of Names: A Study of Speaking Names in Aristophanes*. Berlin and New York.
- Karasek, J. (1880) *Über die zusammengesetzten Nomina bei Herodot*. Saaz.
- Karlík, P. (ed.) (2010) *Development of Language through the Lens of Formal Linguistics*. Munich.
- Kastovsky, D. (2009) 'Diachronic perspectives', in Lieber and Štekauer (2009a), 323–340.
- Kavka, S. (2009) 'Compounding and idiomatology', in Lieber and Štekauer (2009a), 19–33.
- Kazansky, N. N. (ed.) (2005) *Ḥrdā Mānasā: Studies Presented to Professor Leonard G. Herzenberg on the Occasion of his 70-Birthday*. St. Petersburg.
- Kim, R., Oettinger, N., Rieken, E. and Weiss, M. (eds.) (2010) *Ex Anatolia Lux: Anatolian and Indo-European Studies in Honor of H. C. Melchert on the Occasion of his Sixty-fifth Birthday*. Ann Arbor and New York.
- Knecht, T. (1946) *Geschichte der griechischen Komposita vom Typ τερψίμβροτος*. Zurich.
- Kölligan, D. (2007) *Suppletion und Defektivität im griechischen Verbum*. Bremen.
- Kornfeld, L. M. (2009) 'IE, Romance: Spanish', in Lieber and Štekauer (2009a), 436–452.
- Kretschmer, P. (1934) Review of Specht (1932), *Glotta* 22: 249–251.
- (1936) 'Nochmals die Hypachäer und Alaksandus', *Glotta* 24: 203–251.



- Krisch, T., Lindner, T. and Müller, U. (eds.) (2004) *Analecta homini universali dicata: Arbeiten zur Indogermanistik, Linguistik, Philologie, Politik, Musik und Dichtung. Festschrift für Oswald Panagl zum 65. Geburtstag*. Vol. I. Stuttgart.
- Kühner, R. and Blass, F. (1892) *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*. Vol. I.2: *Elementar- und Formenlehre*, 3rd edn. Hannover and Leipzig.
- Kunsmann, P. and Kuhn, O. (eds.) (1981) *Weltsprache Englisch in Forschung und Lehre: Festschrift für Kurt Wächtler*. Berlin.
- Kuryłowicz, J. (1964) *The Inflectional Categories of Indo-European*. Heidelberg.
- Langslow, D. R. (2000) *Medical Latin in the Roman Empire*. Oxford.
- Last, W. (1925) *Das Bahuvrihi-Compositum im Altenglischen, Mittelenglischen und Neuenglischen*. Greifswald.
- Lazzeroni, R. (1992) 'L'espressione dell'agente come categoria linguistica: I nomi indoeuropei in *-tér/-tor*', *SSL* 32: 233–245.
- (2010) 'Nomi d'agente e composizione in greco antico: una scala di nominalità', in Putzu, Paulis, Nieddu and Cuzzolin (2010), 256–265.
- Lehmann, W. P. (1969) 'Proto-Indo-European compounds in relation to other Proto-Indo-European syntactic patterns', *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 12: 1–20.
- (1974) *Proto-Indo-European Syntax*. Austin.
- Lejeune, M. (1950) 'Les noms d'agent féminins en grec', *RPh* 24: 9–28.
- (1971) *Mémoires de philologie mycénienne*. Vol. 2: *Deuxième série (1958–1963)*. Paris.
- Leukart, A. (1975) 'Zur Herkunft der griechischen Nomina vom Typus ἀρότης, οἰκέτης und περι-κίτης, κυν-ηγέτης', in Rix (1975), 175–191.
- (1994) *Die frühgriechischen Nomina auf -tās und -ās*. Vienna.
- Leumann, M. (1977) *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft vol. II.2.1)*. Munich.
- Libben, G. and Jarema, G. (eds.) (2006) *The Representation and Processing of Compound Words*. Oxford.
- Lieber, R. (1983) 'Argument linking and compounds in English', *Linguistic Inquiry* 14: 251–285.
- (1992) *Deconstructing Morphology: Word Formation in Syntactic Theory*. Chicago and London.
- (2004) *Morphology and Lexical Semantics*. Cambridge.
- (2006) 'The category of roots and the roots of categories: What we learn from selection in derivation', *Morphology* 16: 247–272.
- (2009a) 'A lexical semantic approach to compounding', in Lieber and Štekauer (2009a), 78–104.
- (2009b) 'IE, Germanic: English', in Lieber and Štekauer (2009a), 357–369.
- and Štekauer, P. (eds.) (2009a) *Oxford Handbook of Compounding*. Oxford.
- (2009b) 'Introduction: Status and definition of compounding', in Lieber and Štekauer (2009a), 4–18.
- Lindner, T. (2011) *Komposition*, in *Indogermanische Grammatik*, vol. IV.1. Hrsg. von T. Lindner, Lieferung 1. Heidelberg.
- (2012) *Komposition*, in *Indogermanische Grammatik*, vol. IV.1. Hrsg. von T. Lindner, Lieferung 2. Heidelberg.
- (2013) *Komposition*, in *Indogermanische Grammatik*, vol. IV.1. Hrsg. von T. Lindner, Lieferung 3. Heidelberg.
- Lubotsky, A. (1990) 'La loi de Brugmann et \*H<sub>3</sub>e', in Kellens (1990), 129–136.

- Lühr, R. (2004) 'Nominalkomposition im Altindischen und Altgriechischen', in Nowak (2004), 107–214.
- Luján, E. R. and García Alonso, J. L. (eds.) (2011) *A Greek Man in the Iberian Street: Papers in Linguistics and Epigraphy in Honour of Javier de Hoz*. Innsbruck.
- Lunt, H. G. (ed.) (1964) *Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Linguists, Cambridge, Mass., August 27–31, 1962*. The Hague.
- Macdonell, A. A. (1916) *A Vedic Grammar for Students*. Oxford.
- Magnien, V. (1927) 'Les composés dans la langue et la poésie homérique', in *Raccolta di scritti in onore di Felice Ramorino*. Milan, 27–48.
- Malzahn, M. (2004) '3 : 3, 5 : 1, or 4 : 2? On the ablaut of the root aorist in Greek and Indo-European', *HSF* 117: 50–75.
- Manolessou, I. and Tsolakidis, S. (2009) 'Greek coordinated compounds: Synchrony and diachrony', *Patras Working Papers in Linguistics* 1: 23–39.
- Marchand, H. (1969) *The Categories and Types of Present-day English Word-Formation: A Synchronic–Diachronic Approach*, 2nd edn. Munich.
- Marzullo, B. (1953) 'Strepsiade', *Maia* 6: 99–124.
- Masini, F. (2009) 'Phrasal lexemes, compounds and phrases: A constructionist perspective', in Schlückter and Hüning (2009), 254–271.
- and Scalise, S. (2012) 'Italian compounds', in Scalise and Masini (2012), 61–91.
- Masson, O. (1966) 'À propos de deux formules redoublées au locatif'. *Žant* 15: 257–266.
- (1988) 'Noms grecs du type Ἄρκολέων "Ours-lion"', in ἩΔΙΣΤΟΝ ΛΟΓΟΔΕΙΠΝΟΝ: *Logopedies. Mélanges de philologie et de linguistique grecques offerts à Jean Taillardat*. Paris, 171–177, reprinted in Masson (1990), 617–623.
- (1990) *Onomastica graeca selecta*. Vols. I–II. Paris.
- Matthews, P. H. (1991) *Morphology*, 2nd edn. Cambridge.
- McCullagh, M. (2002) 'Greek ἔβλην and the development of the root aorist in Greek', *HSF* 115: 59–78.
- (2003) *Middle and Passive Aorists in Early Greek*. PhD thesis Cambridge.
- Meid, W. (1975) 'Probleme der räumlichen und zeitlichen Gliederung des Indogermanischen', in Rix (1975), 204–219.
- Meier-Brügger, M. (1990) 'Zu Hesiods Namen', *Glotta* 68: 62–67.
- (1992a) *Griechische Sprachwissenschaft*. Vol. I: *Bibliographie, Einleitung, Syntax*. Berlin and New York.
- (1992b) 'Rund um griechisch μεστός', *HSF* 105: 240–242.
- (2003) *Indo-European Linguistics: With contributions by Matthias Fritz and Manfred Mayrhofer*. Translation by C. Gertmenian of *Griechische Sprachwissenschaft* (8th edn., Berlin 2002). Berlin.
- Meillet, A. (1908) 'Sur l'aoriste sigmatique', in *Mélanges de linguistique offerts à M. Ferdinand de Saussure*. Paris, 81–106.
- (1919) 'Le nom de Calypso et la formation désidérative', *REG* 32: 384–387.
- (1937) *Introduction à l'étude comparative des langues indo-européennes*, 8th edn. Paris.
- and Vendryès, J. (1960) *Traité de grammaire comparée des langues classiques*, 3rd edn. Paris.
- Meiser, G. and Hackstein, O. (eds.) (2005) *Sprachkontakt und Sprachwandel: Akten der XI. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, 17.–23. September 2000, Halle an der Saale*. Wiesbaden.

- Meissner, T. (2006) *S-stem Nouns and Adjectives in Greek and Proto-Indo-European: A Diachronic Study in Word Formation*. Oxford.
- and Tribulato, O. (2002) 'Nominal composition in Mycenaean Greek', *TPhS* 100: 289–330.
- Melazzo, L. and Melazzo, R. (2010) 'A proposito della collocazione dell'accento su certi composti del tipo *bahuvrīhi* in vedico e in greco antico', in Putzu, Paulis, Nieddu and Cuzzolin (2010), 286–298.
- Méndez Dosuna, J. (1991–1993) 'A note on Myc. *a-ze-ti-ri-ja*, Att. *σβέννυμι* and palatalization', *Sprache* 35: 208–220.
- (2011) 'Deceptive echoes: The tarnished shine of Ajax's sword (S. *Aj.* 1025)', in Luján and García Alonso (2011), 93–100.
- (2012) 'La polisemia del gr. ἀργός ('blanco', 'veloz')', *Nova Tellus* 30 (2): 11–37.
- Meyer, G. (1872) 'Beiträge zur Stammbildungslehre des Griechischen und Lateinischen', *Curtius Studien* 5: 1–116.
- (1874) 'Die dvandva-zusammensetzung im griechischen und lateinischen', *KZ* 22: 1–31.
- (1923) *Die stilistische Verwendung der Nominalkomposition im Griechischen: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der ΔΙΠΛΑ ΟΝΟΜΑΤΑ*. Leipzig.
- Meyer, L. (1865) *Vergleichende Grammatik der griechischen und lateinischen Sprachen*. Vol. II. Berlin.
- Meys, W. J. (1975) *Compound Adjectives in English and the Ideal Speaker-Listener: A Study of Compounding in a Transformational-Generative Framework*. Amsterdam.
- Mikkola, E. (1962) 'Die präpositionale Hypostase, Apostase und Metabase im Lateinischen, Griechischen und Altindischen: Einige Wirkungsformen der gestaltenden Kraft der Sprache', *Arctos* 3: 55–118.
- (1965) *Die präpositionale Hypostase, Apostase und Metabase im Lateinischen, Griechischen und Altindischen: Einige Wirkungsformen der gestaltenden Kraft der Sprache II*. Helsinki and Leiden.
- Mithun, M. (1984) 'The evolution of noun incorporation', *Language* 60: 847–894.
- Morpurgo Davies, A. (1987) 'Folk-linguistics and the Greek word', in Cardona and Zide (1987), 263–280.
- (1999) 'The morphology of personal names in Mycenaean and Greek: Some observations', in Deger-Jalkotzy, Hiller and Panagl (1999), 389–405.
- (2000) 'Personal names and linguistic continuity', in Hornblower and Matthews (2000), 15–39.
- (2012) 'Phonetic laws, relative and absolute chronology, language diffusion and the drift: The loss of sibilants in the Greek dialects of the first millennium BC', in Probert and Willi (2012), 102–121.
- Moussy, C. (ed.) (2005) *La composition et la préverbation en latin*. Paris.
- Mukai, M. (2013) 'Recursive compounds and linking morpheme', *International Journal of English Linguistics* 3: 36–49.
- Nagy, G. (1999) *The Best of the Achaeans*, 2nd edn. Baltimore and London.
- Namer, F. and Villoing, F. (2007) 'Have cutthroats anything to do with tracheotomes? Distinctive properties of VN vs. NV compounds in French', in Booij et al. (2007), 105–124.
- Napoli, M. (2006) *Aspect and Actionality in Homeric Greek: A Contrastive Analysis*. Milan.
- (2010) 'Il morfo \*-mo-: uno studio diacronico e qualche nota tipologica', in Putzu, Paulis, Nieddu and Cuzzolin (2010), 314–335.
- Neumann, G. (1985) '*i-pi-me-de-ja*, eine mykenische Göttin', *MSS* 46: 165–171, reprinted in Neumann (1994a), 595–601.

- (1994a) *Ausgewählte Kleine Schriften*. Hrsg. von E. Badali, H. Nowicki und S. Zeifelder. Innsbruck.
- (1994b) 'Schiffahrt und Seehandel im Spiegel altgriechischer Personennamen', in Neumann (1994a), 641–649.
- Nielsen Whitehead, B. (2012) *Pickpocket Compounds from Latin to Romance*. PhD thesis Leiden.
- Nishida, C. and Montreuil, J.-P. Y. (eds.) (2006) *New Perspectives on Romance Linguistics*. Vol. I: *Morphology, Syntax, Semantics, and Pragmatics*. Amsterdam.
- Noordegraaf, J. (1989) 'From the history of the term "exocentric"', *Historiographia Linguistica* 16: 211–215.
- Nowak, E. (ed.) (2004) *Komplexe Wortstrukturen: Komposition, Inkorporation, Polysynthese*. Berlin.
- Olivier, J.-P. (ed.) (1992) *Mykenaïka: Actes du IX<sup>e</sup> Colloque international sur les textes mycéniens et égéens organisé par le Centre de l'Antiquité Grecque et Romaine de la Fondation Hellénique des Recherches Scientifiques et l'École française d'Athènes (Athènes, 2–6 octobre 1990)*. Athens, 239–255.
- Olsen, S. (2001) 'Copulative compounds: A closer look at the interface between syntax and morphology', in Booij and van Marle (2001), 279–320.
- Olson, S. D. (1992) 'Names and naming in Aristophanic comedy', *CQ* 42: 304–319.
- (1998) *Aristophanes: Peace*. Edited with Introduction and Commentary. Oxford.
- Oniga, R. (1988) *I composti nominali latini: Una morfologia generativa*. Bologna.
- Oroz Arizcuren, F. J. (ed.) (1984) *Navicula tubingensis: Studia in honorem Antonii Tovar*. Tübingen.
- Osthoff, H. (1878) *Das Verbum in der Nominalkomposition im Deutschen, Griechischen, Slavischen und Romanischen*. Jena.
- Paliuri, I. (2014) *Gli aggettivi deverbali in -ής: Uno studio diacronico*. M.A. thesis, Venice.
- Panagl, O. (1977) 'Hom. χέρνιψ, χέρνιβον, χερνίψαντο—myk. ke-ni-qa, ke-ni-qa-te-we', *Sprache* 23: 49–52.
- (1983) 'Pheidippides: Etymologische Überlegungen zu einem aristophanischen Personennamen', in Händel and Meid (1983), 297–306.
- Parker, L. P. E. (1997) *The Songs of Aristophanes*. Oxford.
- Penney, J. H. W. (ed.) (2004) *Indo-European Perspectives: Studies in Honour of Anna Morpurgo Davies*. Oxford.
- Penny, R. (2002) *A History of the Spanish Language*, 2nd edn. Cambridge.
- Perpillou, J. L. (1973) *Les substantifs grecs en -εύς*. Paris.
- Petropoulou, E. and ten Hacken, P. (2002) 'Neo-Classical word formation in WM electronic dictionaries', in Braasch and Povlsen (2002), 169–174.
- Philippaki-Warbuton, I. (1985) 'Word order in Modern Greek', *TPhS* 83: 113–143.
- Pilch, H. (1996) 'Word formation in Welsh and Breton: A comparative study', *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 48: 34–88.
- Pinault, G.-J. and Petit, D. (2006) *La langue poétique indo-européenne: Actes du Colloque de travail de la Société des Études Indo-Européennes (Indogermanische Gesellschaft / Society for Indo-European Studies)*. Paris, 22–24 octobre 2003. Paris.
- Pirrotta, S. (2009) *Plato comicus: Die fragmentarischen Komödien. Ein Kommentar*. Berlin.
- Plath, R. (1999) 'Bekannte mykenische Wörter—neu gedeutet', in Deger-Jalkotzy, Hiller and Panagl (1999), 503–520.
- Pohl, H. D. (1973) 'Verbale Rektionskomposita mit regierendem Vorderglied im Slavischen und in anderen indogermanischen Sprachen', *Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch* 18: 190–202.

- Poli, F. and Vottéro, G. (eds.) (2005) *De Cyrène à Catherine: Trois mille ans de Libyennes. Études grecques et latines offertes à Catherine Dobias-Lalou*. Nancy.
- Pollak, H. W. (1912) 'Zur Einteilung der Komposita', *IF* 30: 58–64.
- Pontani, F. (2008) 'Zur Akzentuierung der griechischen Komposita auf -μηδης', *Glotta* 84: 114–125.
- Probert, Ph. (2006) *Ancient Greek Accentuation: Synchronic Patterns, Frequency Effects, and History*. Oxford.
- and Willi, A. (eds.) (2012) *Laws and Rules in Indo-European*. Oxford.
- Progovac, L. (2010) 'Imperative in compounds: Implications for historical and evolutionary studies', in Karlík (2010), 137–145.
- (2012) 'Compounds and commands in the evolution of human language', *Theoria et historia scientiarum* 9, 49–70.
- and Locke, J. L. (2009) 'The urge to merge: Ritual insult and the evolution of syntax', *Biolinguistics* 3: 337–354.
- Putzu, I., Paulis, G., Nieddu, G. and Cuzzolin, P. (eds.) (2010) *La morfologia del greco tra tipologia e diacronia*. Milan.
- Rainer, F. and Varela, S. (1992) 'Compounding in Spanish', in Scalise (1992b), 117–142.
- Ralli, A. (1992) 'Compounding in Modern Greek', in Scalise (1992b), 143–174.
- (2008a) 'Composés déverbaux grecs à "radicaux liés"', in Amiot (2008), 189–210.
- (2008b) 'Compound markers and parametric variation', *Language Typology and Universals* 61: 19–38.
- (2009) 'IE, Hellenic: Modern Greek', in Lieber and Štekauer (2009a), 453–463.
- (2013) *Compounding in Modern Greek*. Dordrecht.
- Rau, J. (2009). *Indo-European Nominal Morphology: The Decads and the Caland System*. Innsbruck.
- Remmer, U. (2007) 'Gamonyms, internal derivation and the Greek suffix -ώ', in George, McCullagh, Nielsen, Ruppel and Tribulato (2007), 121–130.
- Renel, C. (1896) *Compositorum graecorum quorum in XI prior pars exit de origine et usu*. Lyon.
- Renou, L. (1940–1941) 'Notes de grammaire védique', *BSL* 41: 208–220.
- (1966) *La Grammaire de Pāṇini*. 2 vols. Paris.
- Ricciardelli, G. (ed.) (2000) *Inni orfici*. Milan.
- Rice, K. (2009) 'Athapaskan: Slave', in Lieber and Štekauer (2009a), 542–563.
- Richards G. C. (1918) 'Greek compound-adjectives with a verbal element in tragedy', *CQ* 12: 15–21.
- Richter, O. (1898) 'Die unechten Nominalkomposita des Altindischen und Altiranischen', *IF* 9: 1–62, 183–252.
- Riedweg, C. (1987) *Mysterienterminologie bei Platon, Philon und Klemens von Alexandrien*. Berlin and New York.
- Rio-Torto, G. and Ribeiro, S. (2012) 'Portuguese compounds', in Scalise and Masini (2012), 119–145.
- Risch, E. (1944) 'Griechische Determinativkomposita', *IF* 59 (1): 1–61, reprinted in Risch (1981), 1–61.
- (1945) 'Griechische Komposita vom Typus μεσο-νύκτιος und ὄμο-γάστριος', *MH* 2: 15–27, reprinted in Risch (1981), 112–124.
- (1949) 'Griechische Determinativkomposita', *IF* 59 (3): 245–294, reprinted in Risch (1981), 62–111.
- (1974) *Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache*, 2nd edn. Berlin and New York.

- (1981) *Kleine Schriften zum siebzigsten Geburtstag*. Hrsg. von A. Etter und M. Looser. Berlin and New York.
- Rix, H. (1965) 'Hom. ὀρώρεται und die Verben ὄρνυμι und ὀρίνω', *IF* 70: 25–49.
- (ed.) (1975) *Flexion und Wortbildung. Akten der V. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Regensburg, 9.–14. September 1973*. Wiesbaden.
- (1979) 'Abstrakte Komplemente im Urindogermanischen', in Brogyanyi (1979), 725–747.
- (1992) *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen: Laut- und Formenlehre*, 2nd edn. Darmstadt.
- Rödiger, R. (1866) *De priorum membrorum in nominibus graecis compositis conformatione finali commentatio*. Leipzig.
- (1869) Review of Clemm (1867), *KZ* 18: 66–73.
- Roeper, T. and Siegel, M. E. A. (1978) 'A lexical transformation for verbal compounds', *Linguistic Inquiry* 9 (2): 199–260.
- Rüedi, E. H. (1969) *Vom Ἐλλανοδικας zum ἀλλαντοπώλης: Eine Studie zu den verbalen Rektionskomposita auf -ας/-ης*. Diss. Zurich.
- Ruijgh, C. J. (1967) *Études sur la grammaire et le vocabulaire du grec mycénien*. Amsterdam.
- (1999) 'Ἰάναξ et ses dérivés dans les textes mycéniens', in Deger-Jalkotzy, Hiller and Panagl (1999), 521–535.
- Sacconi, A., Del Freo, M., Godart, L. and Negri, M. (eds.) (2008) *Colloquium Romanum: Atti del XII colloquio internazionale di micenologia (Roma, 20–25 febbraio 2006)*. 2 vols. Pisa and Rome.
- Sadovski, V. (2002) 'Dvandva, tatpuruṣa and bahuvrīhi: On the Vedic sources for the names of the compound types in Pāṇini's grammar', *TPhS* 100: 351–402.
- Salus, P. H. (1965a) 'The types of Āmreḍīta', *Orbis* 14: 37.
- (1965b) 'The types of nominal compounds of Indo-European', *Orbis* 14: 38–62.
- Scalise, S. (1992a) 'Compounding in Italian', in Scalise (1992b), 175–199.
- (ed.) (1992b) *The Morphology of Compounding*, in *Rivista di Linguistica* 4 (1). Pisa.
- and Bisetto, A. (2009) 'The classification of compounds', in Lieber and Štekauer (2009a), 34–53.
- Bisetto, A. and Guevara, E. (2005) 'Selection in compounding and derivation', in Dressler, Kastovsky, Pfeiffer and Rainer (2005), 133–150.
- and Fábregas, A. (2010) 'The head in compounding', in Scalise and Vogel (2010), 109–126.
- , Fábregas, A. and Sforza, F. (2009) 'Exocentricity in compounding', *Gengo Kenkyu* 135: 49–84.
- and Masini, F. (eds.) (2012) *Special Issue on Romance Compounds*, in *Probus* 24 (1). Berlin and Boston.
- and Vogel, I. (eds.) (2010) *Cross-Disciplinary Issues in Compounding*. Amsterdam.
- Scarlata, S. (1999) *Die Wurzelkomposita im Ṛg-Veda*. Wiesbaden.
- Schapira, C. (1985) 'Les composés roumains à thème verbal, et leur place dans l'ensemble des langues romanes', *Revue de linguistique romane* 49: 15–26.
- Schindler, J. (1986) 'Zur den homerischen ῥοδοδάκτυλος-Komposita', in Etter (1986), 393–401.
- (1988) 'Zur Theorie der Doppelpossessiva'. Handout of an unpublished paper given in Basel on 13th October 1988.
- (1997) 'Zur internen Syntax der indogermanischen Nominalkomposita', in Crespo and García-Ramón (1997), 537–540.
- Schlücker, B. and Hüning, M. (eds.) (2009) *Words and Phrases: Nominal Expressions of Naming and Description*, in *Word Structure* 2 (2). Edinburgh.

- Schmitt, R. (1972) 'Florilegium onomasticum 4. Ein Name aus Eretria: Κύναρρος', *BN* 7: 347–348.
- (1973) *Indogermanische Dichtersprache und Namengebung*. Innsbruck.
- Schmitt-Brandt, R. (1987) 'Aspektkategorien im PIE?', *JIES* 15: 81–92.
- Schramm, G. (1957) *Namenschatz und Dichtersprache: Studien zu den zweigliedrigen Personennamen der Germanen*. Göttingen.
- Schroten, J. D. W. (2010) 'The head of Verb+Noun compounds in the Romance languages', *IBERIA: An International Journal of Theoretical Linguistics* 2 (2): 85–98.
- Schultz, H. (1882) *Quae nova Sophocles protulerit nomina composita*. Diss. Königsberg.
- Schulze, R. (1979) 'φερέ-οικος—οικο-φόρος und die wechselnde Stellung des Verbalbestandteiles bei einigen griechischen Komposita', in Brogyanyi (1979), 801–808.
- Schulze, W. (1892) *Quaestiones epicae*. Gütersloh.
- Schwyzer, E. (1939) *Griechische Grammatik*. Vol. I: *Allgemeiner Teil, Lautlehre, Wortbildung, Flexion*. Munich.
- Sihler, A. L. (1995) *New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*. New York and Oxford.
- Sears, D. A. (1972) 'The system of compounding in Modern English', *Linguistics* 91: 31–88.
- Selkirk, E. O. (1982) *The Syntax of Words*. Cambridge, MA.
- Sommer, F. (1937) 'Ἀἰῆσις und kein Ende?', *IF* 55: 169–297.
- Sophocles, E. A. (1914) *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods: From B.C. 146 to A.D. 1100*, 2nd edn. Cambridge, MA, and Leipzig.
- Specht, F. (1932) 'Beiträge zur griechischen Grammatik I: Zu den Komposita mit verbalem Vorderglied', *KZ* 59: 31–83.
- Spencer, A. (1991) *Morphological Theory: An Introduction to Word Structure in Generative Grammar*. Oxford.
- Spencer, A. and Zwicky, A. M. (eds.) (1998) *The Handbook of Morphology*. Oxford.
- Stefanelli, R. (1997) 'Origine e status dei composti 'inversi' in greco antico: il tipo ποδώκης, πόδαργος', in Banfi (1997), 243–269.
- (2008) 'È un composto nominale: analizzare con cautela', *AGI* 93: 3–45.
- Stolz, F. (1874) *Die zusammengesetzten Nomina in den Homerischen und Hesiodischen Gedichten*. Klagenfurt.
- (1904) 'Weitere Beiträge zur griechischen Wortzusammensetzung und Wortbildung', *WS* 26: 169–184.
- Strien-Gerritsen, M. van (1973) *De Homerische Composita*. Assen.
- Strunk, K. (1994) 'Relative chronology and Indo-European verb-system: The case of present- and aorist-stems', *JIES* 22: 417–434.
- Szemerényi, O. J. L. (1977) *Studies in the Kinship Terminology of the Indo-European Languages, with Special Reference to Indian, Iranian, Greek, and Latin*. Leiden.
- (1996). *Introduction to Indo-European Linguistics*. Engl. transl. of the 4th German edn. Oxford and New York.
- Taillardat, J. (1965) *Les images d'Aristophane: Études de langue et de style*, 2nd edn. Paris.
- ten Hacken, P. (2000) 'Derivation and compounding', in G. Booij (ed.), *Morphologie*. Berlin, 349–360.
- Tessing, S. (1884) *De compositis nominibus Aeschyleis et Pindaricis*. Lund.
- Thompson, R. J. E. (2008) 'Mycenaean non-assibilation and its significance for the prehistory of the Greek dialects', in Sacconi, Del Freo, Godart and Negri (2008), 753–765.
- Thumb, A. (1910) *Handbuch der neugriechischen Volkssprache*, 2nd edn. Strasbourg.

- Tischler, J. (1979) 'Zu den syntaktischen Grundlagen der Nominalkomposition: Die Reihenfolge der Teilglieder', in Brogyanyi (1979), 853–869.
- Tribulato, O. (2005) *Studies in Greek Nominal Composition: Headedness, Centricity and Socio-linguistic Variation as Evidenced in Epigraphic and Literary Sources*. PhD thesis Cambridge.
- (2006) 'Homeric θυμολέων and the question of Greek "reversed bahuvrihi"', *Oxford University Working Papers in Linguistics, Philology & Phonetics* 11: 162–178.
- (2007) 'Greek compounds of the type ἰσόθεος 'equal to a god', ἀξιόλογος 'worthy of mention', ἀπειρομάχος 'ignorant of war', etc.', *Mnemosyne* 60: 527–549.
- (2010) 'Per una "tipologia" delle lingue scientifiche antiche: Lessico e morfologia nei trattati di botanica di Teofrasto', in Putzu, Paulis, Nieddu and Cuzzolin (2010), 479–494.
- (2013) 'Exocentric ATAP compounds: The view from early Ancient Greek', *Lingue e linguaggio* 12 (1): 31–45.
- Tronci, L. (2000) 'Eredità indoeuropea e innovazione nel greco omerico: L'elemento -i° come «marca» caratterizzante di primi elementi di composto', *SSL* 38: 275–311.
- Troxler, H. (1964) *Sprache und Wortschatz Hesiods*. Zurich.
- Trümper, C. (1986) *Vergleich des Mykenischen mit der Sprache der Chorlyrik: Bewahrt die Chorlyrik eine von Homer unabhängige alte Sprachtradition?* Bern, Frankfurt am Main and New York.
- Tserepis, G. N. (1902) *Τα σύνθετα της ελληνικής γλώσσης*, 2nd edn. Athens.
- Tucker, E. Fawcett (1990) *The Creation of Morphological Regularity: Early Greek Verbs in -έω, -ᾶω, -όω, -ῦω and -ῖω*. Göttingen.
- Uhlich, J. (1993) *Die Morphologie der komponierten Personennamen des Altirischen*. Witterschlick and Bonn.
- (1997) 'Der Kompositionstyp 'Armstrong' in den indogermanischen Sprachen', *HSF* 110 (1): 21–46.
- (2002) 'Verbal governing compounds (synthetics) in early Irish and other Celtic languages', *TPhS* 100: 403–433.
- Val Alvaro, J. F. (1999) 'La composición', in Bosque and Demonte (1999), 4757–4841.
- Van Goethem, K. (2009) 'Choosing between A+N compounds and lexicalized A+N phrases: Evidence from word-formation with French *entre-* and Dutch *-tussen*', in Schlücker and Hüning (2009), 241–253.
- Vegas Sansalvador, A. (1999) 'En torno al antropónimo micénico *qi-si-ja-ko*', in Eichner, Luschützky and Sadovski (1999), 545–553.
- Vendryès, J. (1945) *Traité d'accentuation grecque*. Paris.
- Vian, F. (2003) *Nonnos de Panopolis: Les Dionysiaques*. Vol. XVIII: *Chant XLVIII*. Paris.
- Villalva, A. (1992) 'Compounding in Portuguese', in Scalise (1992b), 201–219.
- Villoing, F. (2003) 'Les mots composés VN du français: Arguments en faveur d'une construction morphologique', *Cahiers de Grammaire* 28: 183–196.
- (2012) 'French compounds', in Scalise and Masini (2012), 29–60.
- Vine, B. (2004) 'On PIE full grades in some zero-grade contexts: \*-tī-, \*-tō-', in Clackson and Olsen (2004), 357–379.
- Waanders, F. M. J. (1983) *The History of ΤΕΛΟΣ and ΤΕΛΕΩ in Ancient Greek*. Amsterdam.
- (2008) *An Analytic Study of Mycenaean Compounds: Structure, Types*. Pisa and Rome.
- Wachter, R. (2006) 'Review of *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*, fasc. 19 and 20', *Kratylos* 51: 136–144.
- (2007–2008) 'Persephone, the threshing maiden', *Sprache* 47: 163–181.



- Wackernagel, J. (1889) 'Das Dehnungsgesetz der griechischen Composita', *Programm zur Rektoratsfeier der Universität Basel 1889*: 1–65, reprinted in Wackernagel (1969–1979), 897–961.
- (1895) 'Miszellen zur griechischen Grammatik', *KZ* 33: 1–62.
- (1905) *Altindische Grammatik*. Vol. II.1: *Einleitung zur Wortlehre: Nominalkomposition*. Göttingen.
- (1916) *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer*. Göttingen.
- (1969–1979) *Kleine Schriften*. 3 vols. Göttingen.
- Wälchli, B. (2005) *Co-Compounds and Natural Coordination*. Oxford.
- Waltz, P. (1960) *Anthologie grecque. Première partie: Anthologie Palatine*. Vol. II: *Livre V*, 2nd edn. Paris.
- Watkins, C. (1964) 'Preliminaries to the reconstruction of Indo-European sentence structure', in Lunt (1964), 1035–1042.
- (1969a) *Geschichte der indogermanischen Verbalflexion*, in *Indogermanische Grammatik*, vol. III.1. Hrsg. von J. Kuryłowicz. Heidelberg.
- (1969b) *Indo-European Origins of the Celtic Verb*. Vol. I: *The Sigmatic Aorist*. Dublin.
- (1995) *How to Kill a Dragon: Aspects of Indo-European Poetics*. New York.
- Weil, H. (1869) *De l'ordre des mots dans les langues anciennes comparées aux langues modernes*, 2nd edn. Paris.
- Weissenborn, E. (1865) *De adiectivis compositis homericis*. Halle.
- West, M. L. (2003) *Homeric Hymns. Homeric Apocrypha. Lives of Homer*. Edited and translated. Cambridge, MA, and London.
- Wheeler, B. I. (1885) *Der griechische Nominalaccent*. Strasbourg.
- Willi, A. (2003) *The Languages of Aristophanes: Aspects of Linguistic Variation in Classical Attic Greek*. Oxford.
- Williger, E. (1928) *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu den Komposita der griechischen Dichter des 5. Jahrhunderts*. Göttingen.
- Wilson, N. G. (ed.) (2007) *Aristophanis fabulae*. 2 vols. Oxford.
- Yoshida, K. and Vine, B. (eds.) (2009) *East and West: Papers in Indo-European Studies*. Bremen.
- Zimmer, S. (1992) 'Die umgekehrten Bahuvrihi-Komposita im Kymrischen und Indogermanischen', in Beekes, Lubotsky and Weitenberg (1992), 421–435.

# Index

## Index of passages quoted

This list is selective and privileges passages which are discussed in the text.

### Ancient authors and works

<i>Adespota comica</i>			
fr. 799 K-A	223	<i>Lys.</i>	
		457	66
		1281	272 n. 22
Aeschylus		<i>Nu.</i>	
<i>Ag.</i>		265	336
689–690	223	333	299
743	296	969–971	299
825	285	1397–1398	300
<i>Pers.</i>		<i>Pax</i>	
278–279	343	44	222–223
<i>Suppl.</i>		422–425	337
1040	298	1293	222, 253, 338
<i>Th.</i>		<i>V.</i>	
498	295	596	253
791	299	1043–1047	337
fr. 382 Radt	110	fr. 314 K-A	337 n. 101
		fr. 682 K-A	284
Alcaeus		Aristotle	
fr. 249 Voigt	287	<i>Po.</i>	
		1457b.35	236
Anacreon		<i>De mundo</i>	
fr. 63b PMG	228	396a.5	233
<i>Anthologia Palatina</i>		<i>EN</i>	
9.516 (Crinagoras)	244	1124b.17–26	233
9.525 ( <i>adespoton</i> )	239, 265		
11.360 ( <i>adespoton</i> )	282	Athenaeus	
		9.64	111 n. 162
Antiphanes		Callias	
fr. 189 K-A	323	fr. 34 K-A	222
Aristophanes		Cratinus	
<i>Eccl.</i>		fr. 66 K-A	290
1169–1174	66	Dio Cassius	
<i>Eq.</i>		<i>Ant. Rom.</i>	
247	254	214.11	233
631	295		
1068	296		

Diogenes Laertius		Hesychius	
9.25	298	α 3563	291
Euripides		α 3564	291
<i>Alc.</i>		α 461	290
198	227	β 699	295
<i>Andr.</i>		δ 1897	305
900	238	γ 1010	320
<i>Ba.</i>		κ 1946	223
1321	254	κ 3766	301
<i>Hel.</i>		σ 1725	307 n. 67
960	344	Hippocrates	
<i>Herc.</i>		<i>Epidem.</i>	
1177	298	4.1.25	224 n. 22
fr. 1126 Nauck	240	7.1.12	224 n. 22
Eustathius		<i>Ep.</i>	
<i>in Il.</i>		19.8	306 n. 65
1.314.31	295	Homer	
<i>in Od.</i>		<i>Iliad</i>	
1.152.46	234	1.11	235
1.354.33–34	284 n. 41	3.296	343
Galen		4.294	307
<i>Comp. med. per gen.</i>		7.21	222
13.628.18–19	112	8.86	254
<i>De antidotis libri ii</i>		8.168	283
14.41.3–4	112	8.199	342
14.136.2	224	8.305	206
Herodian		9.443	306
<i>De prosodia catholica</i>		11.216	343
3.1.77.25 Lentz	234	11.511	226
Περὶ ὀρθογραφίας		12.43	343
3.2.423.20 Lentz	234	15.60	227
<i>Partitiones</i>		15.116	249
34.7 Boissonade	234	15.724	342
165.17 Boissonade	234	16.86	198
Herodotus		19.296	172
3.89.1	195	22.132	87
4.52.111	111	23.146	223
6.108.23	344	23.357	343
7.86.2	110	24.464	342
7.126.5	110	24.658	343
7.161.3	301	<i>Odyssey</i>	
		4.198	223
		9.97	227
		9.118–119	110
		10.91	342

11.365	342	Pindar	
12.70	99	<i>I.</i>	
14.469	293	3/4.45–47	109
16.373	344	fr. 52f.110	227
19.502	342	Plato	
21.297	218	<i>Cra.</i>	
23.31	249	394e	303 n. 60
<i>Homeric Hymns</i>		<i>Grg.</i>	
<i>To Apollo</i>		489c	226
333	342	<i>La.</i>	
Ion Lyr.		186e.2	298
fr. 744 <i>PMG</i>	255	Pollux	
Isocrates		1.21	294
<i>Ep.</i>		4.9	222 n. 19
2.21	344	7.69	223
<i>Evag.</i>		8.104	224 n. 23
40	298	Polybius	
<i>In Call.</i>		4.69.7	228
53	298	sch. Aristoph.	
Nonnus		<i>Thesm.</i> 600	240
<i>Dionysiaca</i>		Simonides	
48.94	226	fr. 74.5 <i>PMG</i>	296
<i>Orphic Hymns</i>		Sophocles	
32.9	240	<i>Tr.</i>	
Pherecrates		251	306
fr. 155.15 K-A	300	Theopompus com.	
fr. 163 K-A	222	fr. 55 K-A	284
Photius		Thucydides	
α 146	290 n. 48	1.70	233
Phrynichus Atticista		4.91	344
<i>Ecl.</i>		Xenophon	
64	238	<i>Eq.</i>	
408	291	4.1	343
<i>PS</i>		6.14	343
fr. 365	323	<i>Hell.</i>	
<i>epitome</i>		4.5.5	344
81.1–3	239		
87.11	296		

**Greek inscriptions**

<i>Ep. gr.</i>		<i>IG</i>	
334.15	267	2 <sup>2</sup> .1424.col.II.272	293
		12(3).330.144–145	293
<i>ICS<sup>2</sup></i>			
318	68		

**Mycenaean texts**

KN An 660	68	KN V 7049	195
-----------	----	-----------	-----

**Papyri**

<i>POxy</i>	
1654.7	234

**General index**

- accent (in Greek compounds) 26–27, 79  
action nouns 8, 9, 101, 143, 151, 172–173, 174–177, 179  
agent nouns (and derivations) 89–99, 143–144, 151, 177, 214, 216, 232–241, 260–270, 347–348, 352, 355  
āmreḍita 54, 67  
aorist stem 8, 116–117, 167, 186, 188  
appellative compound, definition 4  
‘Armstrong’ compounds 107–108  
assibilation 183–184, 185  
attributive-appositive (compounds) 52
- bahuvrihi(s) 49, 54, 77–85, 91, 106–109, 174, 176, 179  
Benveniste, Émile 121  
Bisetto, Antonietta 49  
Brugmann, Karl 55, 81, 138–141
- Caland system 23, 315–316  
Clemm, Wilhelm 133, 136–138  
comic language 336–338
- compounded adjectives 73–75  
compounded verbs 14, 34, 126–128  
compounding 14, 18  
contraction (in compounds) 25  
coordinated compounds 50, 51, 63–67  
Curtius, Georg 135, 136, 138
- Delbrück, Berthold 141  
determinative compounds 54, 55, 69–103, 348  
determiner (and modifier) 33, 56, 69  
*dvanda* 49, 53, 54, 63–65, 67  
*dvigu* 54, 83
- endocentric (and endocentricity) 44, 49, 58–61, 72, 75–77, 80–81, 86, 99, 102, 130, 347–348  
exocentric (and exocentricity) 44–45, 47, 49, 51, 58–61, 81, 104, 117–118
- Fraenkel, Ernst 94  
Frei-Lüthy, Christine 2, 10, 153–156

- García Ramón, José Luis 125, 341  
 Grimm, Jacob 135  
 governing compounds (and government) 55–58, 102 n. 131, 104, 106, 112–113
- head (and headedness) 17, 33, 43–47, 49, 50–52, 58, 59, 65–66, 118  
 hiatus (in compounds) 24–25
- imperative 119–120, 139–141  
 isolation rule 17, 39  
 iterative compounds 67–68
- Jacobi, Hermann 140–141, 145  
 Justi, Ferdinand 135
- karmadhāraya* 54, 69  
 Knecht, Theodor 2, 150–153  
*Kompositionsfuge* 8, 24–26, 116, 188–189, 206
- left-oriented compounds 60–61, 103–122, 348  
 lexicalization 31–33  
 linking vowels (and compound markers) 8, 18, 20–25, 40, 116, 136–137, 138, 143, 150, 159, 165–169, 171, 172, 188–189, 190  
 literary style 9, 76, 122, 128–129, 336–345, 354
- mutation (and *mutata*) 59, 79 n. 54  
 Mycenaean (compounds) 8, 81–84, 88 n. 76, 92, 94–96, 98, 100, 105, 108, 116, 152, 154, 159, 160, 164, 173, 175, 179–186, 190–203, 204, 206, 207, 316, 350–351
- Neoclassical compounds 15–16, 105 n. 135
- Onomasiology 30–31  
 onomastics 6, 10–11, 117, 122–126, 153–156, 337–338, 341–342, 354  
 Osthoff, Hermann 139
- palatalization 184  
 Pāṇini 54
- particles (and prefixes, prefixoids) 14, 20, 24, 69, 77, 82, 100, 105, 126–127  
 phraseology 125, 148, 340–344  
 prepositional compounds 55, 56, 104–105  
 present stem 8, 116–117, 166, 186, 188
- right-oriented compounds 60–61, 119, 160, 349  
 Risch, Ernst 55  
 recursiveness 38–39  
 Rödiger, Richard 136  
 Romance compounds 36–38, 160–161
- Scalise, Sergio 49  
 Schindler, Jochem 80, 174  
 scientific language 112, 339–340  
 semantics (of compounds) 30–33  
 sigmatic aorist 189–190  
 spelling (writing of compounds) 16, 26, 28  
 stem (and stem compounding) 15, 18, 20–24, 136–138, 149–150, 165, 349  
 stress test 16–17  
 subordinated compounds 50–51, 69  
 syntactic compounds 17, 19, 36–38  
 synthetic compounds 34–36, 48, 49, 56–57, 102
- tatpuruṣa* 53–54, 69
- univerbations (and juxtapositions) 18, 39–42, 108
- V1 compounds (general issues) 1–3, 6–7, 10, 19, 114–122, 125–126, 160–165, 351–354, 355  
 V2 compounds 3, 85–103, 212, 242–243, 352–353
- Wackernagel, Jacob 54, 142  
 ‘Wackernagel’s lengthening’ 25  
 Wheeler’s Law 27, 91  
 word order 105–106, 118–122, 144–148

## Avestan index

*dārayat-raθa-* 163

*niḏā-snaiθiš-* 163

## Greek index

Owing to the large number of Greek forms analysed in this volume, verbal compounds and derivations are listed under their base verb; page numbers in bold refer to the sections devoted to the compound family deriving from each verb.

- ἀάω (and derivations) 175, 214, 215, 216, **218**, 230, 361
- ἄγαμαι (and derivations) 175, 214, 215, **221**, 343, 362
- ἀγαπάω (and derivations) 214, 215, 216, **218**, 229, 230, 342, 362
- ἀγάρροος 91
- ἀγείρω (and derivations) 96, 258, 260, 262, 266, **290**, 313, 362
- ἀγερσικύβηλις 290, 336
- νεφεληγερέτης 96
- ἄγω (and derivations) 166, 171, 258, 263, 264, 266, **272**, 288, 289, 362
- κυνηγέτης 93, 96
- ἀδικέω 127
- ἀείρω (and derivations) 175, **255**, 363
- ἀελλόπος 109
- ἀέξω (and derivations) 169, **245**, 372
- αἴγαγρος 110–111
- αἰθροδικής 112–113
- αἰνέω (and derivations) 170, 175, 231, 232, 233, **244**, 249, 363
- αἰρέω (and derivations) 170, 231, 232, 233, **250**, 254, 343, 344, 364
- ἀκέομαι (and derivations) 231, 232, 238, **244**, 249, 364
- ἀκούω (and derivations) 170, 258, 259, 266, **292**, 365
- ἀκουσίθεος 114
- ἀκρόπολις 27, 58, 69
- ἀκρωμία 113
- ἀλγέω (and derivations) 270, **320**, 365
- ἀλέξω (and derivations) 169, 175, 231, 235, **244**, 249, 365
- ἀλεξίκακος 337
- ἀλφάνω (and derivations) 171, 175, 270, **324**, 366
- ἀμαρτάνω (and derivations) 214, 215, **225**, 366
- ἀμείβω (and derivations) 258, 259, 262, **291**, 339–340, 367
- ἀμείλιχος 77
- ἀμέρδω (and derivations) 214, 215, **218**, 229, 230, 367
- ἀμεύομαι 214, 215, 216, **218**, 229, 230, 367
- ἀμφιδέξιος 73
- ἀνάσσω (and derivations) 175, 332, **333**, 367
- ἀνδάνω (and derivations) 170, 199, 214, 215, **221**, 230, 368
- ἀντιταμίας 72
- ἀνώω (and derivations) 231, 234, **250**, 254, 344, 368
- ἄξενος 77
- ἄξιόλογος 60, 112–113
- ἀπειρομάχῃς 112–113
- ἄπτω (and derivations) 166, 231, 232, 236, **244**, 249, 330, 343, 344, 368
- ἀψίκορος 114
- ἀράομαι (and derivations) 231, 232, 235, **250**, 369
- ἀραρίσκω (and derivations) 191–192, 258, 259, 266, **292**, 369
- ἀρτιεπής 192, 206
- ἀρηϊφίλος 73
- ἄριστον 33
- ἀριστοπολιτευτής 72
- ἀρκέω (and derivations) 176, 270, **318**, 369
- Ἄρκολέων 67
- Ἄρκολυκος 67
- ἀρπάζω (and derivations) 170, 258, 259, 268, **293**, 370

- ἀρτύω (and derivations) 258, 260, 264, **293**, 313, 343, 370
- ἄρχω (and derivations) 72, 166, 167, 169, 258, 259, 263, 266, **273**, 288, 289, 370
- πολέμαρχος 80
- στρατάρχος
- – (type of compound) 89, 214
- – (individual compound) 56, 91
- ἀρχιερεύς 77, 169
- αὔξω 231, 233, **245**, 249, 331, 339–340, 372
- ἄφιλος 59, 77
- βαίνω (and derivations) 96, 175, 258, 259, 264, 266, **294**, 372
- βητάρμων 204–205
- βλάπτω (and derivations) 167, 270, **324**, 342, 373
- βλέπω (and derivations) 166, 258, 259, 268, **294**, 373
- βόαγρος 110–111
- βόσκω (and derivations) 258, 259, 264, 267, **295**, 313, 342, 373
- βωτιάνειρα
- – (individual compound) 205–206
- – (compound type) 23, 116, 164–165, 350
- βούλομαι (and derivations) 168, 214, 215, **222**, 344, 374
- βουλόμαχος 222, 338
- βρίθω (and derivations) 214, 215, 217, **219**, 229, 230, 331, 374
- βροντησικέραυτος 336
- βρύω (and derivations) 214, 215, 221, 375
- γάνυμαι (and derivations) 214, 215, 221, 375
- γαστρίμαργος 74
- γίγνομαι (and derivations) 97
- Αἴγυπτογενής 84
- διογενής 27, 88, 315
- γιγνώσκω (and derivations) 258, 259, 264, 266, **296**, 313, 375
- ἄγνωσ 87
- γλυκύπικρος 65
- δαϊκτάμενος 99
- δάκνω (and derivations) 167, 258, 259, 266, 271, **296**, 313, **328**, 375
- δαμάζω (and derivations) 175, 258, 263, 264, 266, 268, **275**, 343, 376
- δάμνημι (and derivations) 93, 166, 258, 259, 263, 264, 268, **275**, 288, 341, 376
- δάπεδον 32
- δείδω (and derivations) 175, 213, 214, 215, **226**, 229, 376
- δέρκομαι (and derivations) 166, 270, **321**, 377
- δεσπότης 41, 70
- δέχομαι (and derivations) 258, 259, 262, 264, 266, **275**, 288, 329, 377
- δημογέρον 70
- δίδραχμον 83
- δίδωμι (and derivations) 96, 170, 258, 259, 266, **276**, 288, 378
- διόσδοτος 40
- Δωτώ 204
- θεόσδοτος 40
- δίφρος 32
- διώβολον 83
- διώκω (and derivations) 170, 258, 260, 264, 266, **297**, 313, 378
- δοκέω (and derivations) 214, 215, **222**, 379
- δουλοπόνηρος 74
- δουάνδρες 72
- δυσμήτηρ 70
- ἐγείρω (and derivations) 171, 231, 232, 233, **245**, 249, 379
- ἐγκέφαλος 28
- ἐγχεσίμωρος 73–74
- ἐθέλω (and derivations) 168, 222, 231, 238, **245**, 250, 331, 337, 379
- Εἰδοθέη 109
- εἶλον (and derivations) 214, 215, **223**, 380
- εἶλω/εἶλέω (and derivations) 214, 215, 217, **219**, 230, 380
- ἐκατόμπεδος 83
- ἐλαφηβόλος 23
- ἐλάω (and derivations) 258, 260, 264, 266, **277**, 288, 342, 343, 380
- ἐλελίζω (and derivations) 214, 215, 216, **219**, 230, 342, 381
- ἔλκω (and derivations) 166, 169, 175, 258, 259, 262, **278**, 329, 381
- ἔλκετριβων 278, 337



- Ἐλλησποντοφύλαξ 70  
 ἐν(ν)οσι- compounds 214, 215, **220–221**, 381  
 ἐπιδήμιος 104  
 ἐπιμάρτυρος 104  
 ἔραμαι (and derivations) 175, 258, 266, **297**,  
 313, 382  
 – ἐρασιπλόκαμος 114  
 ἐργάζομαι 231, 232, 238, **250**, 254, 382  
 ἔρδω (and derivations) 92, 97, 258, 259, 262,  
 264, **278**, 288, 382  
 ἐρείπω (and derivations) 170, 214, 215, **219**,  
 230, 383  
 ἐρημόπολις 112–113  
 ἔρω (and derivations) 175, 231, 239, **250**,  
 254, 331, 383  
 ἐρύμαι/ἐρύω (and derivations) 167, 175, 231,  
 239, **246**, 250, 383  
 εὐκτίμενος 99  
 εὐρίσκω (and derivations) 170, 258, 259, 266,  
**297**, 313, 384  
 εὐχόμεαι (and derivations) 231, 233, **246**, 249,  
 254, 343, 384  
 ἔφαλος 59, 60  
 ἔχω (and derivations) 166, 258, 259, 262,  
**279**, 289, 339–340, 342, 384  
 – ἐχέκολλος 116, 339  
 – ἐχεμυθία 116  
 – ἐχενήϊς 116  
 – ἐχέφρων 116
- ζεύγνυμι (and derivations) 176, 231, 239,  
**246**, 249, 331, 385  
 – δίζυξ 87
- ἠγέομαι 175, 258, 260, 264, 266, **280**, 288,  
 386  
 ἠλιοῦπολις 39, 40, 42  
 ἠμίδραχμον 83  
 ἠμίονος 72
- θαλαμηπόλος 23  
 θάλλω/θαλέω (and derivations) 270, **321**, 386  
 θείνω (and derivations) 96 n. 111  
 θέλω (and derivations) 258, 265, **298**, 330,  
 386
- θεοειδής 109  
 θεοεἰκελος 73–74  
 θέοινος 110  
 θυμολέων 108–109
- ιατρόμαντις 66  
 ἴημι (and derivations) 175, 231, 239, **252**, 386  
 ἵππαγρος 110–111  
 ἵππαλεκτρῶν 66  
 ἵπποπόταμος 45, 60, 111  
 ἰσόθεος 112–113  
 ἴστημι (and derivations) 97, 175, 194–195,  
 201, 258, 259, 265, 266, **280**, 288, 386  
 ἴσχω (and derivations) 214, 215, **226**, 229, 388
- καίνυμαι/κέκασμαι (and derivations) 214,  
 215, 216, **221**, 230, 390  
 – Κασσάνδρα 196, 206  
 – Καστιάνειρα 196, 206  
 Κακοίλιος 70  
 καλέω (and derivations) 170, 258, 260, 265,  
**299**, 388  
 καλλίπαις 59  
 κάμπτω (and derivations) 258, 259, 265, 266,  
**299**, 313, 330, 389  
 κάπτω (and derivations) 214, 215, 216, **223**, 389  
 κείρω (and derivations) 166, 169, 175, 214,  
 215, **223**, 389  
 – ἀκερσεκόμης 171–172  
 κελεύω (and derivations) 231, 232, 239, **250**,  
 254, 390  
 κινέω (and derivations) 258, 260, 265, 266,  
**300**, 313, 390  
 κιχάνω (and derivations) 170, 214, 215, **221**,  
 390  
 κλαίω (and derivations) 231, 232, 236, **253**,  
 254, 390  
 – κλαυσίγελως 66  
 – κλαυσίμαχος 253, 338  
 κλέπτω (and derivations) 92, 175, 258, 260,  
 262, 267, 268, **281**, 288, 391  
 – κλεψύδρα 2, 32  
 κοκκύμηλον 70  
 κορυθαίολος 28–29, 73–74, 107–108  
 κορυθαίξ 87  
 κοσμέω (and derivations) 258, 260, 265, 267,  
**301**, 313, 391

- κράζω 231, 232, 240, **253**, 254, 331, 392  
κρατέω **333**, 392  
κροκόπεπλος 84  
κρούω (and derivations) 258, 259, 267, **301**,  
313, 338, 392  
κρύπτω (and derivations) 231, 232, 240, 243,  
**246**, 249, 331, 393  
κτάομαι (and derivations) 176, 231, 232, 236,  
**247**, 250, 393  
κυνώπης 84  
κύρω (and derivations) 214, 215, **221**, 394
- λαγχάνω (and derivations) 167, 214, 215, **221**,  
230, 394  
λαμβάνω (and derivations) 258, 259, 267,  
**302**, 313, 329, 394  
λανθάνω/λήθω (and derivations) 214, 215,  
217, **227**, 394  
λείπω (and derivations) 167, 171, 172, 213,  
**255**, 330, 337, 339–340, 395  
λήγω 214, 215, **224**, 229, 339–340, 395  
Λυκολέων 66  
λύω (and derivations) 176, 258, 259, 265, 267,  
**283**, 288, 339–340, 396  
– Λύσιπος 152
- μαίνομαι (and derivations) 270, **319**, 396  
– γυναιμανής 88  
μείγνυμι (and derivations) 172, 214, 215, 217,  
**227**, 229, 256, 331, 337, 340, 397  
μελίλωτος 70  
μέλλω (and derivations) 168, 213, 231, 232,  
233, **247**, 249, 337, 397  
μέλω (and derivations) 231, 240, **247**, 249,  
398  
– πασιμέλουσα 99  
μέμφομαι (and derivations) 214, 215, 217,  
**224**, 398  
μένω (and derivations) 166, 171, **255**, 398  
μεσόμφαλος 113  
μηλοβοτήρ 93  
μηλοπέπων 66  
μιμνήσκω (and derivations) 175, 258, 259,  
265, 268, **302**, 313, 340, 399  
μίννω (and derivations) 214, 215, **221**, 400  
μίσγω (and derivations) 214, 215, **219**, 229,  
230, 400
- μισέω (and derivations) 270, **325**, 337, 401  
μολυβδόδετος 100
- Νεάπολις 40, 42  
νεόμαι (and derivations) 197–199  
νικάω (and derivations) 170, **334**, 401  
ξυγγραμματεύς 71
- ὄδοιπόρος 41  
οινόπεδον 58, 69  
ὄλλυμι (and derivations) 175, 258, 259, 265,  
267, **303**, 313, 329, 402  
ὄναγρος 110–111  
ὄνιμη (and derivations) 231, 236, **248**, 249,  
403  
ὄνομάκλυτος 107–108  
ὀποβάλασμον 111  
ὀποκάλασσον 111  
ὀποπάναξ 111  
ὀρμάω (and derivations) 231, 232, 240, **253**,  
403  
ὄρνυμι (and derivations) 172, 192–193, 258,  
259, 267, **303**, 403  
– Ὀρτίλοχος/Ὀρσιλοχος 183, 204
- παγχρύσεος 73  
παμβασιλεύς 70  
παμποίκιλος 58  
πανδαμάτωρ 93  
Πανέλληνες 70  
παραβλώψ 87  
παράθεσις (and παράθετα) 18, 39  
πατροκασίγνητος 70  
παύω (and derivations) 231, 232, 240, **248**,  
249, 337, 404  
πειθω (and derivations) 166, 175, 270, **325**,  
404  
– πεισιγάλιος 114  
πέπαμι (and derivations) 231, 232, 233, **248**,  
250, 405  
πέρθω (and derivations) 171, 175, 258, 259,  
262, **304**, 313, 405  
– περσέπολις 172  
πήγνυμι (and derivations) 93, 175, 258, 259,  
263, **304**, 313, 330, 405  
πίμπλημι (and derivations) 175, 214, 215, **225**,  
406

- πλήσσω (and derivations) 175, 258, 259, 265, 267, **305**, 313, **329**, 406  
 – βουπλήξ 18–19, 86, 87  
 – πλήξιππος 152  
 πλουτόχθων 110  
 πόδαργος 73–74, 107–108  
 ποδήνεμος 108–109  
 ποιέω (and derivations) 92, 99  
 πολυτλήμων 101  
 ποντομέδων 99  
 πράσσω 258, 259, 265, 267, **305**, 313, 330, 406  
 πρωταγωνιστής 72  
 πυρίκαυστος 39, 40
- ράπτω (and derivations) 175, 258, 259, 263, 267, **306**, 313, 330, 407  
 ρήγγυμι (and derivations) 176, 231, 233, **248**, 249, 330, 407  
 – ρηξήνωρ 152  
 ρίπτω (and derivations) 214, 215, 217, **228**, 229, 330, 408  
 ροδοδάκτυλος 52, 59, 78
- σειώ (and derivations) 258, 267, **307**, 313, 408  
 σπένδω (and derivations) 175, 214, 215, **221**, 408  
 σπεύδω (and derivations) 214, 215, **221**, 409  
 στέλλω (and derivations) 258, 260, 262, **307**, 313, 330, 409  
 στέργω (and derivations) 270, **325**, 409  
 στόμαργος 107–108  
 στρέφω (and derivations) 172, 258, 259, 262, **283**, 330, 338, 409  
 – στρεψίκερως 114  
 – στρεψίμαλλος 114  
 συγέω (and derivations) 214, 215, **220**, 230, 331, 410  
 σύαργος 110–111  
 σύνθεσις 18, 39  
 σχήσω (and derivations) 214, 215, **221**, 229, 410  
 σώζω (and derivations) 258, 259, 263, 265, **284**, 410
- τανύω (and derivations) 176, 214, 215, 216, 229, **288**, 411
- ταράσσω (and derivations) 231, 232, 241, **253**, 254, 412  
 τελέω (and derivations) 258, 260, 265, 267, **308**, 313, 412  
 τέμνω (and derivations) 171, 175, 258, 259, 262, **308**, 313, 412  
 τέρπω (and derivations) 167, 176, 270, **322**, 413  
 – τερπικέραunos 336  
 – τερψίμβροτος  
 – – (individual compound) 114, 152, 176  
 – – (compound type) 23, 57, 115, 116, 142–144, 149, 150–153, 169–177, 181, 350  
 τήκω (and derivations) 270, **326**, 413  
 τίλλω (and derivations) 214, 215, **225**, 414  
 τιμάω (and derivations) 175, 258, 260, 265, 267, **309**, 313, 414  
 τίνω (and derivations) 96 n. 2, 231, 233, **249**, 249, 415  
 τλῆναι (and derivations) 258, 260, 268, **310**, 313, 415  
 – Τλήπολεμος 164, 167, 189, 350  
 τρέπω (and derivations) 231, 237, **254**, 340, 415  
 τρέφω (and derivations) 93, 258, 259, 262, **310**, 313, 316, 416  
 – κουροτρόφος  
 – – (individual compound) 18, 27, 28, 57, 58  
 – – (compound type) 20, 89, 214  
 – ὀρεσίτροφος  
 – – (individual compound) 27, 93  
 – – (compound type) 80, 89, 91, 317  
 – τροφός 18  
 τρέχω (and derivations) 258, 259, 262, **311**, 313, 329, 416  
 τριγέρων 72  
 τρίδουλος 72  
 τριτοπάτωρ 73  
 τυγχάνω (and derivations) 214, 215, **221**, 230, 417
- ύλακόμωρος 73  
 ύπερυθρος 73  
 ύφηνίοχος 71, 77
- φαγεῖν (and derivations) 258, 260, 263, **286**, 417  
 – καταφαγαῖς/καταφαγαῖς 217

φαίνω (and derivations) 270, **320**, 418  
 φάω (and derivations) 175, 270, **324**, 419  
 – φαεσίμβροτος 152  
 φείδομαι (and derivations) 270, **322**, 338, 419  
 φέρω (and derivations) 171, 258, 259, 262, **286**, 289, 330, 419  
 – οίκοφόρος 3, 146, 286–287  
 – φερέοικος  
 – – (individual compound) 2, 114, 146, 286  
 – – (compound type) 24, 57, 59, 60, 115, 116, 149, 153–154, 163, 166–169, 180, 182, 350  
 – φερεπτόλεμος 142  
 – φερέσβιος 135  
 φεύγω (and derivations) 168, 258, 259, 263, **311**, 313, 329, 420  
 φθείρω (and derivations) 258, 260, 262, **312**, 313, 330, 421  
 φθίνω (and derivations) 176, 214, 215, **229**, 421

## English index

*Austro-Hungary* 51  
*baby-sit* 127  
*blackbird* 17, 31, 33  
*childhood* 32  
*cry-baby* 47  
*cutpurse* 44, 50, 51  
*Gallophile* 15-16  
*Gallophilia* 15  
*gastropub* 16  
*girlfriend* 33  
*high-five* 48  
*long-nose* 45  
*lord* 32  
*mother-child* 51  
*party drinker* 102

## Latin index

*flexanimus* 162  
*egregius* 104  
*sacerdōs* 87

– φθεισῆνῶρ 152  
 – φθεισίμβροτος 152  
 φιλέω (and derivations) 101, 168, 316, **334**, 421  
 – παιδόφιλος 74  
 φλέγω (and derivations) 270, **323**, 422  
 φοβέω (and derivations) **335**, 422  
 φράζω (and derivations) 258, 259, 265, 267, **312**, 313, **328**, 423  
 φύω (and derivations) 176, 258, 259, 265, **313**, **328**, 423  
  
 χαίρω (and derivations) 270, **326**, 423  
 χαράσσω (and derivations) 231, 232, 236, **254**, 424  
 χρέμπομαι (and derivations) 214, 215, **220**, 230, 338, 424  
 χρυσόπτερος 84  
 ψευδάγγελος 70

*pick-pocket* 161  
*pot-belly* 85  
*school teacher* 44, 45, 50  
*silk-tail* 50, 85  
*steamboat* 33  
*striptease* 48  
*student book* 17  
*Swineshead* 85  
*sword-fish* 52  
*taxi-driver* 34, 50, 51  
*upstream* 50, 51, 104  
*uptight* 104  
*woman doctor* 51, 65  
*word formation* 17

*versipellis* 162  
*Vincemalus* 162

## Mycenaean index

*a-ka-ra-no* 82  
*a-ke-ra-wo* 182  
*a-ko-to-no* 82  
*a-mo-ra-ma* 67  
*a-ne-mo-i-je-re-ja* 70  
*a-pi-do-ra* 82  
*a-re-ka-sa-da-ra* 175, 182  
*a-ti-pa-mo* 191–192  
*de-we-ro-a<sub>3</sub>-ko-ra-i-ja* 72 n. 34  
*e-ke-de-mi* 26, n. 29  
*e-ne-si-da-o-ne* 176, 182  
*e-pi-ki-to-ni-ja* 105  
*e-po-mi-jo* 105  
*e-ti-me-de-i* 192–193  
*e-ti-ra-wo* 182, 192–193  
*ka-ko-de-ta* 100  
*ka-sa-no* 182, 184, 201  
*ka-ta-no* 184, 195  
*ke-ni-qa* 87  
*ke-re-si-jo we-ke* 128, 316  
*ke-re-ta-o* 95  
*ke-ro-ke-re-we-o* 82  
*ke-sa-da-ra* 182, 195, 201  
*ke-sa-do-ro* 182, 184, 195, 201  
 ?]ke-ti-ra-wo 195  
*ke-ti-ro* 195, 201  
*ku-su-pa* 73  
*ma-na-si-we-ko* 182, 185, 201

*me-ti-ja-no* 182, 197, 201  
*ne-e-ra-wo* 182, 198  
*ne-ti-ja-no* 182, 197–199, 201  
*o-ku-na-wo* 82  
*o-re-a<sub>2</sub>* 95  
*o-ti-na-wo* 184, 192–193  
*pa-na-re-jo* 72 n. 34  
*pi-ro-pa-ta-ra* 182  
*pi-ro-wo-na* 182  
*pu<sub>2</sub>-ke-qi-ri* 183  
*qa-sa-ko* 182, 185, 201  
*qe-ja-me-no* 202 n. 116  
*qe-to-ro-we* 83  
*qi-si-ja-ko* 185, 201  
*ri-na-ko-ro* 96 n. 109, 290  
*si-to-po-ti-ni-ja* 70  
*ta-si-ko-no* 182, 185  
*ta-ta-ke-u* 182, 194–195  
*ta-ti-qa-we-u* 183, 184, 194–195  
*ti-ri-po-de* 83  
*ti-ri-se-ro-e* 73  
*to-ko-so-wo-ko* 92  
*to-pe-za* 83  
*wa-si-ro* 201  
*wa-ti-ko-ro* 199  
*wa-ti-ro* 201  
*we-te-i-we-te-i* 68

## Modern Greek index

ανοιγοκλίνω 127  
 αντηλιακό 105  
 αρχιτέκτονας-αρχαιολόγος 65, 67  
 αφισκοκλητής 97  
 γυναικόπαιδα 67  
 εξό-πορτα 71  
 θερμιδομετρητής 97  
 κλοτσώ-πατώ 67

λίγο-λίγο 67 n. 20  
 μαχαιροβγάλτης 97  
 μαχαιροπήρουνα 64  
 μυγοχάφτης 97  
 παιδί-θαύμα 67  
 πανο-τόκι 71  
 τρωγοπίνω 127

## Sanskrit index

*ásamāty-ojas-* 178  
*abhiṣṭi-dyumna-* 178  
*abhiṣṭi-śavas-* 178  
*ádhi-gartya* 104  
*ajā-vāyas* 64  
*ap-savā-* 99  
*bharād-vāja-* 142  
*dāti-vara-* 142, 178, 179  
*indrā-pūṣṇóḥ* 64  
*havir-ád-* 86  
*indra-vāyú* 64  
*mitrā-váruṇā-* 63

*pūrva-gátvan-* 76  
*pūṣṭi-gu-* 177, 178  
*radā-vasu-* 163  
*rīty-āp-* 178  
*sāmí-cita-* 77  
*śrúṣṭi-gu-* 177, 178  
*sthā-raśman-* 164, 189, 350  
*trasā-dasyu-* 142, 163  
*vítí-hotra-* 177, 178  
*vítí-rādhas-* 177, 178  
*vṛṣṭi-dyāv-* 178