

Wojciech Sowa 
Jagiellonian University, Kraków

Two Epigraphical Notes from Lesbos¹

ABSTRACT: The article addresses the issue of a dialectal lexicon, using the example of two forms, *αθιτελεας* and *ανερ[ι]θευτως* (‘on the spot in an uncorrupted way’), found in a document from Asiatic Kyme (KYM 01, 4). The adjective *αθιτελεας* (‘on the spot’) is a *hapax legomenon*, which can be considered a regular and expected outcome of the accusative plural in Lesbian: /^oteles+as/ → /^oteleas/. However, the forms in -εα should rather be interpreted as borrowings from Epic language with secondary adaptation to Aeolic. Thus, *αθιτελεας* could be explained as an element of the high register of the dialect, modelled after a literary pattern.

The form *ανερ[ι]θευτως* (‘uncorrupted’) appears in other regions and does not seem to be bound to a specific dialect. It is an adverb derived from the privative verbal adjective *ανεπιθευτος*, from *ἐπιθεύω* (‘to work for a daily salary’). The etymology of the verb has been discussed, and the semantic development has been demonstrated. Thus, the form *ανερ[ι]θευτως* has been interpreted as part of the conventional official language of Hellenistic inscriptions. *αθιτελεας*, however, may be specific to

¹ I use the term ‘Lesbian’ to refer to the so-called ‘Asiatic Aeolic’ or ‘East Aeolic’ dialect in general – that is, the vernacular dialect used on the islands of the northeastern Aegean (Lesbos, Tenedos) and in the adjacent parts of Asia Minor (Aigai, Kyme, Assos), as well as the literary variant of the lyric poetry of Sappho and Alkaios; cf. Hodot 2006:178, n. 65 for the problems of definition. The Lesbian inscriptions are quoted after Hodot 1990: 272–317, with the find/found? spot of the Lesbian inscriptions specified as: MYT Mytilene, MAT Methymna, ERE Eressos, LES Lesbos without the determination of a city and NAS the island of Nessos.

the Lesbian dialect, but its distinct origin suggests that it may have originated from a literary variety.

KEYWORDS: Ancient Greek dialects, Lesbian, etymology, word-formation, dialectal lexicon

In the course of research on the various dialects of Ancient Greek, the lexicon (apart from the etymologies of individual words) has not been examined in the same way as it has been done with phonology and morphology. The same seems to be true of syntax.² This situation is not especially surprising, as the majority of dialect forms attested both in inscriptions and other sources can be interpreted as ‘normal’ Greek words, which may differ in their phonetic shape or (less frequently) their morphological features.³

The interpretation of dialectal material is a complex endeavour since the observed forms can occur in different constellations, as different forms can be attested with more or less identical semantics. However, one may also find forms which are formally identical, but express quite different meanings (cf. e.g. *παῖς* Lesbian inscriptions used both

² Partial studies of the lexicon of Arcadian, Cretan, East Ionian, Thessalian, Lesbian and Cyrenaean have been undertaken, but there is still no systematic, monographic description of the vocabulary of each of the Greek dialects. A dialectal dictionary containing synonyms from various dialects is still a desideratum, and the material of dialectal glosses has never been critically edited and compared with the epigraphic data of individual dialects.

³ One can expect different distributions of the forms, e.g. a) the form is attested in the same meaning in other dialects and in Attic and Koine – in such cases one could assume Common Greek provenance; b) the form can belong to the Koine stock, but it reveals some dialectal colouring – for instance orthography, phonetics or morphology typical of one dialect/dialectal group; c) the form may be attested in various dialects, but neither in Attic nor in Koine; d) the form occurs in one particular dialect, but neither in Attic nor in Koine; e) the form is attested in one dialect of a particular region, without any equivalents in other dialects; f) the form is specific to a particular region/dialect and is opposed to forms in other dialects (García Ramón 1997: 522–524).

for ‘son’ υἱός and ‘daughter’ θυγάτηρ; especially in dialectal inscriptions from the Roman period).⁴

Of course, one can also expect that these forms will be attested in different word-formation variants. Due to the nature of surviving sources, a large portion of the dialectal lexicon consists of special terms relating to social institutions. Such *termini technici*, frequently including *hapax legomena*, require special analysis, as well as frequently occurring hypercorrect or hyperdialectal forms, which should be interpreted in accordance with the character of the inscription. Especially in this case, the specific sociolinguistic contexts of the period should be taken into consideration, e.g. the stylistic tendencies occurring in Lesbian epigraphical documents during the Imperial Roman period.⁵

Among the ancient Greek dialects, Lesbian offers a very rich field for exploration of the lexicon. On the one hand, it is attested in a large number of epigraphic monuments; on the other, it also occurs as a literary variety in the original literature of Sappho and Alkaios. This poetry, written to a certain extent in the vernacular dialect, exerted great

⁴ Cf. Hodot 1990: 229–231. This does not necessarily have to be the Lesbian peculiarity, LSJ ‘cf. Il.1.20.443, 3.175; παῖδες ἄρρενες και θήλειαι Pl. Lg.788a; ...in relation to an Age, child, boy or girl, νέος π. Od.4.665; παῖδες νεαροί Il.2.289; σμίκρα π. Sapph.34: with another Subst., π. συφορβός boy-swineherd, Il.21.282; παῖδα κόρην γαμεῖν Ar.Lys.595; slave, servant, man or maid (of all ages)’.

⁵ The period from the 2nd century BC is a complicated and difficult time in the history of the Greek language on Lesbos. The competition between the dialect and Koine, which may be observed in epigraphical documents from the 3rd century, ends with the domination of Hellenistic Greek. Hodot admits a phase of diglossia, in which the users of a dialect could adopt new phonetic habits. The use of dialect itself, however, disappears from the documents by the time of Roman domination c. 100 BC (Hodot 1990: 22). Paradoxically, during the period of Roman occupation, which lasted for more than 400 years, the Lesbian dialect reappeared in inscriptions. Of course, they may not be considered as testimonies of a spoken language, but more as a result of general archaising tendencies at the time of the Roman Empire. The documents are written in a mixture of Koine, native Lesbian, and vulgar elements under strong influence of Lesbian literary tradition (Thumb, Scherer 1959: 86; Hodot 1990: 22–23). The use of hyperaolisms and artificial forms, stylised onto a dialect, which often occur in documents from that period, should be considered a proof of such tendencies (cf. the situation in the decree for L.V. Labeo from Kyme, dated 2 BC–14 AD [IK V, 19], where forms such as προαγγρημμενω 1.6, ισοθεοισι 1.15 (cf. however Sapp. fr. 31, 1 V ἴσος θέοισιν) or ευεργετησαντεσσι in 1.9 are attested – this can also be interpreted as a kind of fashion of that time.

influence on later poetic works, especially on Archaic poetry, then in the Hellenistic period (cf. the three idylls by Theocritus written in literary Lesbian), and finally, on Roman lyric poets, who took over Aeolic metre and many poetic motifs. The epigrams of Balbilla, written in the Lesbian dialect, testify that it was still popular in the 2nd century AD. This constant interaction between epigraphic and literary traditions is also reflected in the lexicon.⁶ The sources for Lesbian include around 500 dialect inscriptions which are attested over a millennium, from the 7th century BC to the 3rd century AD. They come from the areas of Lesbos (Mytilene, Methymna, Eressos, Antissa), Nesos, Tenedos and the Aeolian region of Asia Minor, e.g. from Assos, Kyme or Myrina. Archaic inscriptions are extremely rare and contribute little to our knowledge of dialectal vocabulary.⁷ The majority of documents date from the period between the 3rd and 2nd centuries BC and from the Roman period (464 documents out of a total number of 524).⁸ Therefore, the possibility of influence from the Hellenistic Koine should always be considered, just as later documents from the Imperial period offer forms that can be regarded as the result of archaic tendencies in Hadrian's time. Such dialectal forms seem to be rather examples of a stylisation after the literary Lesbian dialect and should not be automatically regarded as testimonies of the *lingua uernacula* of that time.⁹

In a document from the Asiatic Kyme (KYM 01, 4, dated before 306 BC), two interesting forms may be found. The inscription is an honorary decree issued by the Kymeaeen polis in honour of the judges from Magnesia. In the specific juridical context in line 4, one reads the following: *ἐπι ταῖς δικαῖς ταῖς ἰδίαις ἐγδεδίκακε παῖσαις αὐθιτελεᾶς*

⁶ Cf. Hodot 1990: 66–69.

⁷ As e.g. fragmentary evidence from the ceramics found in Naucratis, a colony in the delta of the Nile.

⁸ Cf. Hodot 1990: 18.

⁹ Cf. Hodot 1990: 19. Lexical material attested in glosses does not fit, in many cases, the epigraphical evidence, as it is often quoted from literary works, making impossible the use of the same method as in the case of inscriptions. For a proposed methodological approach to the glosses and dialectal vocabulary see García Ramón 1997: 521–552 and above all García Ramón 2004: 235–264; for Lesbian glosses and problems of Lesbian dialectal vocabulary in general see Sowa 2006: 233–258 and Sowa 2011: 159–183 for the dialectal glosses.

ανερ[ι]θρευτως [και δικαι]ως..., which means: ‘in all private cases (they) judged on the spot in an (uncorrupted) independent and [right] way’. Both formations, αυθιτελεας and ανερ[ι]θρευτως, pose certain nontrivial problems and raise the question whether they belong to a specific stock of Lesbian dialectal vocabulary.

1. αυθιτελεας (*αυθιτελής)

The hapax legomenon αυθιτελεας (related apparently to the adj. αυθιτελής) is attested in the Kyme inscription as an adjective in the accusative plural.¹⁰ The form is built in a similar way as e.g. adj. αυθιγενής ‘born in this place’,¹¹ with first element consisting of the adverb αυθι ‘here, immediately, straightaway’¹². Such compounds are attested in Greek from the period of Archaic Lyric, the first example apparently being αυθιγενής (Μουσα), occurring in Bacch. 2, 11.¹³ In the Lesbian poetry αυθι is attested, cf. Sappho Fr. 83, 2: [λ]’ αυθι με[¹⁴]; the second ingredient of the compound °τέλης (‘finished, paid’) is well attested in the Lesbian inscriptions as well, e.g. gen. sg. εντελεος MYT 402 and 403 (3rd cent. BC); nom. pl. ατελεες AIG 01, 16.18 (beginning of the 3rd cent. BC), ατελειαις KYM 09, 6, etc.¹⁵ It should be noted, however,

¹⁰ Interestingly, the stone here reads <αυιοελεασ>; the conjectured reading <αυθι> seems however to have been generally accepted (cf. IK V, 2As already suggested by Bechtel 1921: 117).

¹¹ Cf. e.g. Hsch. A 8265–8267: *αυθιγενής· αυτόχθων γνήσιος ιθαγενής; αυθιγενές· ἐγγενές, ἐπίγονον.

¹² Attested since Homer, cf. e.g. A 492: αυθι μένων, ποθέεσκε δ’ αυτήν τε πτόλεμόν τε; cf. also Hsch. A 8264 with reference to Homeric epic: *αυθι· ἐπι τόπου, αυτόθι (A 492) and αυθι μένων· ἐπι τόπω μένων (A 492). The adverb αυθι ‘right here, there, immediately’ being originally a hapology of αυτόθι, a form of a locative in *-d^hi next to *-d^he ‘where?’, the form has been considered as having undergone a later contamination with αυθις ‘again’ (Schwyzer 1939: 629; Frisk GEW 185; Beekes 2010: 169).

¹³ The form also occurs in Ionic prose, cf. e.g. Hdt. 4, 180: τῆ αυθιγενεί θεῶ λέγουσαι τὰ πάτρια ἀποτελέειν, and in Attic drama, cf. e.g. Eur. *Rhes.* 895: ιαλέμω αυθιγενεῖ, τέκνον...; the other examples come from a later period (4th cent. BC onward).

¹⁴ Cf. Hamm 1957: 114.

¹⁵ Hodot 1990: 120.

that forms such as the abovementioned ἀθιγενής cannot be found in Lesbian dialectal sources, either literary or epigraphic.

In general, Ancient Greek attests a large number of *s*-adjectives of the type δυσμενής ‘ill-minded’, some of which can be considered to continue a type inherited from Proto-Indo-European. However, since the *s*-stem adjectives are amongst the most productive word formation categories within Greek, most of them should be regarded as inner-Greek innovations. They are distinctly more productive than comparable formations in Indo-Iranian or any other Indo-European branch.¹⁶ This formation comprises mostly compound active and passive adjectives derived from verbs, the majority being exocentric compounds of the *bahuvrīhi* type (e.g. δολιχεγγής ‘with tall spears’, cf. Hom. Φ, 155), but also governing compounds or *Rektionskomposita* (e.g. ἀμφοτεγγής ‘encompassing the walls’, A. Th. 291) which, however, seem to be first attested in the post-Homeric period.¹⁷ From a diachronic perspective, one assumes hysterokinetic adjectives to exocentric compounds containing *s*-stems in the second ingredient as the derivational basis. Such formations were then later reinterpreted as verbal governing compounds since they were related to the verbal stems.¹⁸ As the first ingredient one finds substantives, numerals and adverbs, sometimes also preverbs.¹⁹ Meissner points out that the original basis for these adjectives includes neuter nouns in **-es-/*-os*, which form the nucleus of such formations. From a very early period, however, Greek adjectives in *-ης* were no longer dependent on the existence of such nouns. Rather, they developed partly into a deverbative category, which may explain

¹⁶ Aside from the type of Gr. δυσμενής ~ Skt. *durmanās*, OAv. *dušmanah-*, YAv. *dušmanah-* ‘having an evil mind’, cf. Hitt. *antuahḫaš*, oblique stem *antuḫša-* ‘man’, which – according to Eichner – should be understood as a compound of the so-called ἔνθεος type from **dʷéh₂ōs*, *duh₂és* ‘breath’, therefore ‘having a breath inside’ (Eichner 1979: 77).

¹⁷ Meissner 2006: 167.

¹⁸ This assumption has been challenged by Meissner 2006: 161–165. In any case, the claim that the parent language possessed the adjectival suffix **-es-*, which served to create compound adjectives from neuter *s*-stem nouns, seems to have been generally accepted (Schindler 1975: 260).

¹⁹ Lühr, Balles 2008: 264–265.

the almost unlimited productivity of the *s*-stem adjectives in the later language.²⁰

As it is commonly observed, the further development of this formation within Greek is associated with a tendency to connect the original *s*-stems with first declension forms. This is especially true of Attic, Ionic (and later Koine) due to the merger of *-ης* < **-ās* and *-ης* < **-ēs* in the nominative singular, but such remodelling is also attested in other dialects. In Aeolic inscriptions, the evidence (mostly onomastic) exhibits a similar tendency: the original accusative has been replaced with that of first-declension nouns and always ends in *-ην*. Dative forms in *-ηι* and genitive forms in *-η* occur, but they are considerably rarer than the expected *s*-stem forms in *-ει*, *-εος*. In appellative vocabulary, a good number of acc. sg. forms in *-ην*, such as Sapph. Fr. 120 ἀβάκην, are attested,²¹ but the historically ‘correct’ forms in *-εα* remain in use. It appears, however, that the inscriptional evidence can be arranged according to geographical principles: Mainland Aeolic (Thessalian) has *-εα* until the Roman period, while Lesbian shows the innovative form in *-ην*. It is thus interesting that the literary dialect yields both endings.²² It seems, however, that the acc. in *-εα* is restricted to lexemes occurring in Homer’s works and may thus be simply an epic borrowing with superficial phonological Aeolicisation.²³

The chronological distribution of variants is linked to their geographical distribution, with the *-ην* forms of the islands contrasting with the *-εα* forms of the Mainland. Thus *ατελεα*, attested in Kyme at the

²⁰ Meissner 2006: 160.

²¹ Cf. ἀλλά τις οὐκ ἔμμι παλιγκότων || ὄργαν, ἀλλ’ ἀβάκην τὰν φρέν’ ἔχω.

²² Cf. Hamm 1957: 88ff.

²³ For the description of formations such as εὐάνθεα, μελιάδεα in Lesbian lyric, see Hamm 1957: 86–89. Cf. also the distribution in *-ην* and *-εα* in Hodot 1990: 120: singular nom.-acc. neut. επιμελε[ς] MYT 03, 12 (end of 4th cent. BC) and four examples from the beginning of the 2nd century; επανανκες MYT 035, 8 (end of 2nd cent.); gen. εντελεος MYT 402 and 403 (3rd cent. BC); ευγενεος and συγγενεος ERE 121, 13–14 and 15 (3rd cent.); dat. διηνεκει KYM 016, 6 (under Augustus); for the plural, nom. animate ατελεες AIG 01, 16.18 (early 3rd cent. BC); συγγενεες 3x (beginning of 2nd cent. BC), but compare also attested συγγενεις MYT °021, 16 (id.); acc. αυθιτελεας KYM 01, 4 (end of 4th cent. BC) and four other examples from the end of the 3rd century to the time of Augustus. Neuter ατελεα AIG 01, 19; gen. νεοσταθεων MYT 026.21, 2 (1st cent.); dat. επιφανεεσι KYM 014, 29 (end of 2nd cent. BC).

end of the 3rd cent. BC, is the regularly expected acc. sg. of a paradigm based on the stem /ateles-, but sporadically occurring -εα in the reign of Augustus is confined to literary examples. In contrast, fragments of the Lyrics already contain examples of innovative -ην next to accusatives in -εα.²⁴ This innovation, as observed already by Bechtel, probably originated in compound personal names in -ης, but geographic factors played a role here as well: in Aeolis such forms kept the old inflection of *s*-stems, as did adjectives, whereas in Lesbos and Troas they were remodeled well before the 6th cent. BC to the pattern of masculine names in -ας, -α,²⁵ and ultimately resulted in stems in /-e-:/, which were also partially extended to adjectives (stems in /-e-:/ to direct cases of the animate singular, stems in /-es-/ for the rest of the inflection).²⁶

In view of these facts, the form αθιτελεας attested in Kyme inscription KYM 01 is noteworthy. On one hand, it could be considered a regular and expected outcome of the animate acc. pl. in Lesbian: /^oteles+as/ → /^oteleas/; cf. also συγγενεας in MAT 010/ERE 010 (official decree, before 167 BC). The preserved part of the inscription does not yield any form which could be interpreted as showing epic or Homeric influence, and the style of the document is official with true dialectal forms, such as the acc. pl. ταις δικαις, ταις ιδιαις, παισαις. On the other hand, however, it must be recalled that the attested form is a hapax legomenon, which resembles the type of αἰθιγενής as known from Bacchylides. As has already been stated, such compounds are not attested in Lesbian. Even if the ingredients of the compound do occur separately in both poetic and epigraphic attestations, and the acc. pl. forms in -εας should be interpreted as archaic borrowings from the epic language with a secondary adaptation to the Lesbian dialect, then the formation αθιτελεας, occurring in the honorary document, should be explained as an element of the high register of the dialect, modelled after a literary pattern known from Ancient Lyric. The first element of the compound seems to be connected with literary use of Lesbian, cf. the

²⁴ Bechtel 1921: 69–70; Hamm 1957: 156–157; Hodot 1990: 120.

²⁵ Bechtel 1921: 69–70.

²⁶ Hodot 1990: 123. An alternative solution, according to Hodot, could include some influence from personal names of the type in -ις, -ιος, especially in the spoken language. This, however, would have to be considered a much more recent phenomenon (Hodot 1990: 208–209).

already mentioned attestation in Sappho Fr. 83, 2: [λ' αῦθι με]. This example lacks context, but the form seems to resemble the Homeric use of αῦθι. As for compounds in °τελης (attested only twice in Homer), gen. sg. εντελεος MYT 402 and 403 (3rd cent. BC) and nom. pl. ατελεες AIG 01, 16.18 (beginning of the 3rd cent. BC), ατελειας do occur in the epigraphic dialect of the inscriptions.²⁷

The form αυθιτελεας should therefore be interpreted as another example of a word which ultimately can be traced back to the period of penetration of Homeric vocabulary into the literary register of the dialect with assumed secondary adaptation to the dialectal system and thus to a specific *color epicus* of Aeolic poetry, which should be understood as the presence of the motifs, themes and elements of Homeric diction in the poetry of Sappho and Alcaeus.²⁸ One could also inquire as to the impact of this literary dialect upon the epigraphically attested idiom; thus, one could assume that there was the increased presence of exclusively literary forms in official, honorary documents such as KYM 01. However, a precise answer to this question does not seem possible in light of the material currently at our disposal.

2. ανεριθευτως (*ἀνεριθεύτως ‘uncorrupted’)

The second interesting form occurring in the same sentence of inscription KYM 01 is the adverb ανεριθευτως, which may be translated as ‘in an uncorrupted, independent, impartial manner’: cf. the already mentioned context επι ταις δικαις ταις ιδιαις εγδεδικακε παισαις ανερ[ι]θευτως [και δικαι]ως ‘in all private cases judged in an (uncorrupted) independent and right manner’.

Differently to the case of αυθιτελεας, similar forms to the adv. ανεριθευτως do recur in other regions and do not appear to be bound to a specific dialect; cf. the frequent attestations in epigraphical material from Calymna, Mylasa, Crete, Chios and Teos, e.g. Mylasa IK 34, 101, 45 (Hellenistic; honorary decree): των δε τας δια[ι]τας [και τ]ας [κ]ρισεις απο παντος του βελτιστου ποιει τε[λ]εως]

²⁷ Hodot 1990: 120.

²⁸ On this problem see Kazik-Zawadzka 1958.

ανεριθευτον και αδωροκητον εαυτον παρεχομενος εμ πα[σ]ιν; Mylasa IK 34, 105, 5: και φιλοστοργως και εμπασιν αμεμπτος και ανεριθευτος και αδω[ροκητος γεν]ομενος; Mylasa IK 34, 110, 7: προ[τερον μεν στρα]τηγος γενομενος ηρξεν την αρχην καλως και αξιως ου μονον της [φυλης αλλα και] του συμπαντος δημου ανεριθευτος και αδωροκητος γενομενος; Mylasa IK 34, 127, 11: [ποιει τελεως ανερ]ιθε[υτ]ον [και] α[δωροκητον εαυτον παρεχομενος εμ πασιν]; Creta IC III, 4, 8, 26 Itanos: ξενικαν των πολιταν [ουδε]νι εριθεοταν (2nd cent. BC); Calymna (TitCal 19, XVI, B 46): εκριναν δια γαφου κατα τε το διαγραμ[μα του] βασιλεως και τους νομους, οντες ανεριθευτοι; Teos 59, 46 (ca. 303 BC): α[ποδειξει δε εκατερους] νομογραφους τρεις μη νεωτερους ετων τεσσερακοντα [οντας ανεριθευτ]ους; Chios (SGDI 5653, b.25–26): καγδικασαντων τριηκοσιων μηλασσοντες ανεριθευτοι εοντες.

The form attested in KYM 01 is an adverb based on the privative verbal adjective ανεριθευτος ‘uncorrupted’, from the verb εριθεύω ‘work for one’s daily salary’, clearly a denominative of εριθος ‘day-salary worker’. The noun is attested in Homer, cf. e.g. Σ 550–551: ‘Εν δ’ ἐτίθει τέμενος βασιλήϊον· ἔνθα δ’ ἔριθοι || ἧμων ὄξεϊας δρεπάνας ἐν χερσὶν ἔχοντες.²⁹ The verb apparently occurs quite late in Greek (first attestations in Aristoteles, Polybius, etc.);³⁰ on the other hand, the com-

²⁹ Cf. also Hsch. E 5709: εριθος· ἐρεθιστής, παροξυντικός r and E 5840: *εριθοι· οί γεωργοί. This is derived from τὴν ἔραν ἐργάζεσθαι, which refers to land (vgn.). It is used in a derogatory sense to refer to ἐριουργοί (Σ 550) or labourers in a negative context (Σ 560). The form has long been considered a word without a clear etymology, as noted by Frisk GEW I 558, a view also supported by Beekes in his dictionary (Beekes 2010: 458). Beekes suggests that it may be an element of pre-Greek lexical stock. However, it appears that the ultimate origin of the form might be found in the Greek word ἔρις, which is attested in various contexts such as ‘dispute, conflict, confrontation, fight, duel, argument, contest’ (cf. LfrgE). According to Janda 2014, ἔρις (gen. ἔριδος, but still acc. ἔριν 4x in the *Odyssey*) should be reconstructed to the PIE zero grade *h₁ri-, which is also found in the Vedic compounds *sūri-* and *kavāri-* (*suH-Hri-, *kava-Hri-), meaning ‘someone who has a good reward’ and ‘someone who diminishes reward’, respectively, with the basic meaning of ‘prize, reward’. An alternative view expressed by Weiss 1998: 35–47 and Watkins 2011: 24 suggests deriving it from the PIE root *h₁erh₂-, meaning ‘to separate, adjoin, divide, or divide for oneself’.

³⁰ Cf. Arist. *Pol.* 1303a 16: μεταβάλλουσι δὲ αἱ πολιτεῖαι καὶ ἄνευ στάσεως διὰ τε τὰς ἐριθείας, ὥσπερ ἐν Ἡραΐᾳ (ἐξ αἰρετῶν γὰρ διὰ τοῦτο ἐποίησαν κληρωτάς, ὅτι ἡροῦντο τοὺς ἐριθευομένους); also *Pol. Fr.* 173, 1–2: [Κατεριθευομένου] τὸ δ’ ἐναντίον κατεριθευομένου τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ τῆς χώρας ἀπεχομένου.

pound ανερίθευτος is attested only twice outside epigraphic contexts, both examples from Philo: Philo Alex. *In Flaccum* 145, 4: ὁ δὲ Φλάκκος οὐδὲν ἐπ’ αὐτῷ περιειργάζετο, νομίσας ἐκποδῶν ἐκουσίῳ γνώμῃ γεγονότος ἀστασίαστα καὶ ἀνερίθευτα τὰ κατὰ τὴν πόλιν ἔσσεσθαι; Philo Alex. *Legatio ad Gaium* 68, 8: τί δὲ ἄμεινον εἰρήνης; εἰρήνη δὲ ἐξ ἡγεμονίας ὀρθῆς φύεται· ἡγεμονία δὲ ἀφιλόνευκος καὶ ἀνερίθευτος ὀρθὴ μόνη, δι’ ἧς καὶ τᾶλλα πάντα κατορθοῦται.

In order to explain the attested sense of ανερίθευτος ‘uncorruptly’, one has to operate with a derivational development from ἐριθος ‘day-worker’ to the denominative verb ἐριθεύω ‘to be a day-worker’, with the verbal adjective ἐριθευτός. The semantic shift should also be assumed: /be a day-worker/ → /act [be paid] (sc. as a day worker)/ → /be paid [corrupted] as indicated by the Suda Δ 173, 5–174, 2: ὅμοιον καὶ τὸ ἐριθεύεσθαι τῷ δεκάζεσθαι ἐστίν. καὶ γὰρ ἡ ἐριθεῖα εἴρηται ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ μισθοῦ δόσεως. Δεκάζεσθαι: δωροδοκεῖσθαι. καὶ Δεκάζειν, διαφθεῖρειν χρήμασιν, ἢ δώροις. In fact, the form ἐριθεοταν (acc. sg.) attested in Crete clearly means ‘corrupted’.³¹

The context of the Kymeian inscription enables two interpretations, which are actually very close to each other: either ‘uncorruptly’ (‘in an uncorrupted manner’) or ‘in an independent manner’. The inscription concerns honour to be bestowed on foreign judges (coming from Magnesia) after they decided in some private cases in Kyme (IK V, 1–2). One should also note the similarity to other examples of the use of ανερίθευτος, which always occurs in a juridical and political context. It may be observed that in Mylasa the synonymous form ἀδωροκητος is used; in all cases the forms apply to the judges.

The form ανερίθευτος occurs in the Lesbian inscriptions only once, although such documents honouring foreign judges are well attested for the Lesbian cities (the custom of ‘importing’ judges from outside the city was common in the Hellenistic period not only in Aiolis but also in Thessaly and other regions).³² Those judges are usually described

³¹ Bile 1988: 112156; Genevrois 2017: 142–143. Cf. e.g. IC III iv 8 Itanos

[παξε]ω ξενικων των πολιταν
[ουδε]νι **εριθεοταν** παρεορεσι ου-
[δεμι]αι. ουδε βουλευσεω περι τα-

³² For a historical context, see Labarre 1996: 73–74, 79, 175.

with other epithets, cf. the expression *ανδρας καλοις και αγαθοις* in e.g. MAT 010, 31: *ανδρας καλοις και αγαθοις*, MAT 01, 7: *οτι απεσειλεν επι τη[ι] εγδικασιαι των δικων ανδρας καλους και αγαθους*; or Eressos IG XII.2. 530, 6: *δικαστας ως επιεικεστατ[ους]*, etc.³³ Furthermore, one may observe that the adverb *ανεριθεντως* applies to the way the decision was made by judges. It occurs in a text together with the second adverb *δικαιως*, and as such it stands in place of the conventionally used *ορθως/καλωσ/ισως* in the commonly attested expression *ορθως/καλωσ/ισως και δικαιως*; cf. MAT 010, 33: *ταις τε δικαις εδικασσαν ορθως και δικαιως* (cf. also *καθ'ογ καιρον εδικαζον* in line 34); MAT 01, 10: *καλωσ και δικαιως vac. δικασαντας*; LES 01, 12: *και διελυε ισως κ[αι δικαι]ως και κατα τοις νομοις*; LES 01, 25: *ορθως και δικαιως*; ERE 03, 29: *οτι εδικ[α]σαν Παριανοισι ταις δικαις καλωσ και δικαιω[ς] κ[αι] συμφεροντως*; etc.³⁴

³³ Cf. also other inscriptions: IG VII, 21.6 (Megara): *[δ]ιατηρειν ταν δια προγονων υπαρχουσαν φιλιαν ταις πολεσ[ιν] [πο]τ' αλλαλας; εδωκαν δικαστας και υπογραμματεα ανδρας καλους και αγαθους*; Delphi BCH 1991, 174, 7: *τας δε λοιπας δικαιωι ε[δ]ικ[α]σαν κατα τους νομους*; Thessaly SEG 26, 677, 39 (in the context of foreign judges): *τιμων δε τους κα[λους] καγαθους ανδρας ταις αξια[ι]ς τιμαις*; Thessaly BCH 59, 64, 3 A 17 (cf. also lines 23.34): *δικαστας ανδρας καλους και αγαθο[υ]ς και αξιου[ς] του ημετερου δημου*; Miletos 25 B 1 1 33: *απεσελλαν ανδρας καλοις και αγαθοις... οι και παραγενομενοι ταις τε δικαις εδικασσαν ορθως και δικαιως*.

³⁴ The expression is widely attested in similar inscriptions from other regions of Greece, cf. e.g. Delphi BCH 1991, 174, 7: *τας δε λοιπας δικαιως ε[δ]ικ[α]σαν κατα τους νομους*; Thessaly BCH 59, 64, 3 A 39–40: *και επι τωι τας κρισεις ισως] και δικαιως διεχρηναι*; Scythia Minor (Istros) Inscr. Scyth. Min. II, 30, 2: *καλωσ κ[αι] δικαιω[ς] εδικασεν κατα τους νομους*; Sporades Dor. IG XII, 3 Suppl. 172, 12: *ας μεν εδ[ικα]σ[αν] δ[ικας] ορθω[ς] κ[αι] δικαι[ω]ς και κατα τους νομους*; Cyclades IG XII, 5 722, 29: *κ[αι] εδικα]σε[ν] τας ενεσθχεισας δικας ισως και δικ[αι]ω[ς]*; 870, 9 ους *[δ]ε μη ηδυνθη[σ]αν διακουσαντες εδικασαν ισ[ω]ς και δικ[αι]ω[ς]*; IG XII, 9 4,5 (Euboea): *δικασται δεδικακασι παρ' ημειν [κ]αλωσ και ακ<ο>λουθω[ς] τοις νομο[ι]ς*; Knidos (Asia Minor) IK Knidos 1 218 A 19: *τας τε δικας εδικασαν ορθως και δικαι[ω]ς*; Mysia and Troas (Adramytenos Kolpos) 715 II 7: *και [δι]ε[δικασ]ε[ν] τ[ας] εισασθεισας δικας ισως και δικ[αι]ω[ς] τηρων τους τ[ε] νομ[ο]υ[ς] κ[α]ι*; Ionia Chios 12 A 1 1 10: *επαινεσαι δε και τους δικαστας, οτι [κ]αλωσ και δικαιως εδικαζον τας [δικας]*; Ionia Erythrai 9, 12: *εδικασε ταις δικαις παντεσσι ισως [και δικαι]ω[ς]*; Ionia Klazomenai 15, 3: *[– τας μεν ε]δικασα[ν] [των εισαθχεισων εις αυτοθς δικων ορθ]ω[ς] και δικ[αι]ω[ς] κατα τους νομους*; Miletos 26, 71: *οι και παραγενομενοι εις Μεσσον ταις μεν εδ[ι]κασσαν ταν δικαν ορθως και δικαιως*; Caria Kaunos 3, 8: *τ[ας] [μ]εν διεδικασαν των δικων καλωσ*

It may therefore be assumed that ἀνερίθευτος, even if attested in the Lesbian epigraphical dossier as a *hapax*, was a part of the conventional official language of the Hellenistic inscriptions (Koine). Its semantic nuances may be observed as well: when a context applies to politics, it may be translated as ‘independent, impartial’ (*qui neutrius partis est*), and when a subject applies to the juridical sphere of life the meaning is ‘unblemished’. The semantic evolution from the base form ἐρίθος ‘day-salary worker’ should then be considered a relatively late development.

The sentence KYM 01, 4: ἐπι ταῖς δίκαις ταῖς ἰδίας ἐγδεδίκακε παῖσαις ἀσθητελεᾶς ἀνερ[ι]θευτος [καὶ δίκαι]ως thus contains a mixture of pure dialectal forms, such as ταῖς δίκαις ταῖς ἰδίας or παῖσαις, with elements of the official register of that period, namely ἀνερίθευτος, and a high stylistic element rooted probably in the *color epicus* of Lesbian poetry, cf. ἀσθητελεᾶς. If one wishes to apply strict criteria proposed by García Ramón to determine whether the two words in question may or may not belong to a “specific dialectal” stratum of the Lesbian epigraphic vocabulary³⁵ one should state then that the form ἀνερίθευτος belongs to group 1 of possible cases, consisting of terms which are not specifically dialectal but simply Greek – in other words they are attested in the same meaning in other dialects and in Attic or Koine as an element of the common Greek stock.³⁶ The form ἀσθητελεᾶς raises more problems, as it is a *hapax legomenon*, therefore it could satisfy

καὶ δίκαιως; Caria Magnesia 33, 19: τὰς τε δίκας ἐδίκασαν ὀρθ[ῶς] καὶ δι[καιο]ς; Mylasa 18, 29: ἐδίκασεν [καὶ] διεκριν[εν] ἴσως καὶ δίκαιως.

³⁵ García Ramón 1997: 522–524; slightly modified in García Ramón 2018: 58–60.

³⁶ One could probably ascribe the form ἀνερίθευτος to the official political register of Hellenistic Greek, which could be supported by the late attestation of the term and its specialised semantics, allowing its use in honorary contexts next to forms which also belong to the Koine stock but reveal some dialectal colouring, in this case phonetics typical of the Aeolic dialectal group (e.g. παῖσαις). For problems concerning the application of the terms *register*, *genre* and *style* to various Greek texts, see Willi 2010 who would see the register as the form (or *signifiant*) plane of an utterance or text, which corresponds to the genre as the content (or *signifié*) plane: genres are “text categorisations made on the basis of external criteria relating to author/speaker purpose” or “text categories readily distinguished by mature speakers of a language” (Biber 1988: 68; Biber 1995: 9), whereas registers are constituted by linguistic features identifying these text categories (Willi 2010: 298).

basic criteria to consider the form ‘properly dialectal’, i.e. attested neither in any other dialect nor in Attic (or Koine), or attested in other dialects and/or in Koine, but with a different meaning.³⁷ In the case of the adj. *αυθιτελεας* one could probably consider the form *αὐτίκα* as its semantic counterpart,³⁸ even if this element is not observed as part of the compound. It seems more justified to claim that the entire sentence: *επι ταις δικαις ταις ιδιαις εγδεδικακε παισαις αυθιτελεας ανερ[ι]θευτωσ [και δικαι]ωσ* should be taken as corresponding to phrases such as *τασ τε δικασ εδικασαν ορθ[ωσ] και δι[καιωσ* (Caria, Magnesia 33, 19), which would rather indicate that there is no precise semantic counterpart to be found elsewhere. But even if one considers the form specific to the Lesbian dialect, one cannot deny its special provenance, which would point to a literary variety as the original source.

There is no doubt that the Ancient Greek dialectal texts yield heterogeneous variants of epichoric idioms: pure dialectal forms often mix with literary (poetic) ones, especially in the funerary context of metrical inscriptions; obsolete forms are replaced by recently adopted or more frequent forms, or forms belonging to a dialect with more prestige at a given chronological stage (e.g. Attic or Koine). Similarly, one may assume that the Greek dialects possessed social varieties connected with various social groups as in the case of any other language, which could leave traces in written documentation. It would be a mistake, however, to believe that the epigraphic material will always allow us to uncover these variants. Even if the practice of treating the Ancient Greek dialects in a manner similar to the sociolinguistic interpretations of data from modern languages/dialects may be a justified desideratum, one must raise serious reservations: ‘Methods applied in the context of modern languages may prove inadequate for the overwhelming majority of the Greek dialects due to the very simple reason that the epigraphic evidence does not allow us any proper confirmation, even in the most remote sense’.³⁹ Nevertheless, our knowledge of the Ancient

³⁷ García Ramón 2018: 59.

³⁸ It seems however that in Greek inscriptions *αὐτίκα* is attested in the majority of examples (c. 150x) with *μάλα* as ‘presently, now’ without any reference to ‘the way of taking decisions or doing things’, and no special register can be detected here.

³⁹ García Ramón 2018: 64.

Greek dialects can come only from written evidence. Here one may observe that aside from situations where the written message appears to reflect linguistic reality, the written language often has only the most tenuous relationship to the spoken vernacular, or it can even represent the artificial revival – for symbolic reasons – of a dead language or dialect.⁴⁰ The use of a script (written discourse) presupposes some contact, however slight, with formal schooling, and generally evolves more slowly than the code of spoken discourse. Therefore, as writing is a normalised activity, the use of a script allows the reintroducing of forms which already disappeared from speech, so that one would expect a constant interplay between the written ‘norm’ and the spoken language. The forms *αθητελεας* and *ανερ[ι]θεντως*, occurring beside ‘ordinary’ Lesbian forms, could be then interpreted in such a manner as coming from other registers and dialects of different prestige, i.e. the literary dialect or official Koine, which at this time already functioned as the “high” variety beside the traditional dialects, appropriate for the elevated register of an honorary decree.

References

Ancient authors

The ancient authors have been quoted according to the electronic editions in the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae project prepared for the Packard Humanities Institute CD. The abbreviations follow the model as in *LSJ*. The Lesbian poets, however, have been quoted according to the edition of E. Lobel, D.L. Page, 1955, *Poetarum Lesbiorum fragmenta*, Oxford; the fragments according to D.L. Page, 1974, *Supplementum lyricis Graecis*, Oxford.

Collections of Inscriptions and Papyri

The non-Aeolic Inscriptions and Papyri have been quoted after the electronic edition in PHI CD 6/7 (prepared for the Packard Humanities Institute by the Greek Epigraphy Project at Cornell University). The abbreviations follow the standard model.

⁴⁰ Brixhe 2007: 489.

- Frisk, GEW = Frisk H., 1960, *Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg.
- IG XII, 2 = *Inscriptiones Graecae*, vol. 12, fasc. 2: *Inscriptiones Lesbi, Nesi, Tenedi. Consilio et auctoritate Academiae Litterarum regiae Borussicae*, W. Paton (ed.), Berolini 1899.
- IK 4 = *Inschriften griechische Städte aus Kleinasien*, vol. 4: *Die Inschriften von Assos*, R. Merkelbach (ed.), Bonn 1976.
- IK 5 = *Inschriften griechische Städte aus Kleinasien*, vol. 5: *Die Inschriften von Kyme*, H. Engelmann (ed.), Bonn 1976.
- LfrgE = Snell B., 1955–2010, *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*, B. Snell (ed.), Göttingen.
- LIV2 = *Lexikon der Indogermanischen Verben. Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstammbildungen. Unter der Leitung von Helmut Rix und der Mitarbeit vieler anderer bearbeitet von M. Kümmel, T. Zehnder, R. Lipp, B. Schirmer*, Auflage 2, M. Kümmel, H. Rix (eds), Wiesbaden 2001.
- LSJ = *Greek-English Lexicon: With a Revised Supplement*, 9th edition, H.G. Liddel, R. Scott (eds), Oxford 1996.
- Supplement = *Inscriptiones Graecae*, vol. 12: *Supplementum. Consilio et auctoritate Academiae Litterarum regiae Borussicae*, F. de Gaertinger (ed.), Berolini 1939.
- Bechtel F., 1921, *Die griechischen Dialekte*, vol. 1: *Der lesbische, thessalische, böotische, arkadische und kyprische Dialekt*, Berlin.
- Beekes R.S.P., 2010, *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*, Leiden–Boston.
- Biber D., 1988, *Variation across Speech and Writing*, Cambridge, <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511621024>.
- Biber D., 1995, *Dimensions of Register Variation: A Cross-Linguistic Comparison*, Cambridge, <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511519871>.
- Bile M., 1988, *Le dialecte crétois ancien*, Paris.
- Brixhe C., 2007, ‘A Modern Approach to the Ancient Greek Dialects’, [in:] *A History of Ancient Greek: From the Beginnings to Late Antiquity*, A.-F. Christidis (ed.), Cambridge, pp. 486–499.
- Eichner H., 1979, ‘Rezension zu J. Friedrich – A. Kammenhuber, Hethitisches Wörterbuch 2’, *Die Sprache* 25, pp. 77–78.
- García Ramón J.L., 1997, ‘Cuestiones de léxico y onomástica tesalios’, [in:] *Katà diálekton. Atti del III Colloquio Internazionale di Dialettologia Greca. Napoli – Fiaiano d’Ischia, 25–28 settembre 1996*, A.C. Cassio (ed.), Napoli, pp. 521–552.
- García Ramón J.L., 2004, ‘Del trabajo en una gramática del tesalio. Para una valoración lingüística de las glosas’, [in:] *Dialetti, dialettismi, generi letterari e funzioni sociali. Atti del V Colloquio Internazionale di Linguisti-*

- ca Greca (Milano, 12–13 settembre 2002)*, G. Rocca (ed.), Alessandria, pp. 235–264.
- García Ramón J.L., 2018, ‘Ancient Greek Dialectology: Old and New Questions, Recent Developments’, [in:] *Studies in Ancient Greek Dialects: From Central Greece to the Black Sea*, G.K. Giannakis, E. Crespo, P. Filos (eds), Berlin, pp. 29–106, <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110532135-006>.
- Genevrois G., 2017, *Le vocabulaire institutionnel crétois d’après les inscriptions (VII^e–I^e s. av. J.-C.): étude philologique et dialectologique*, Genève.
- Hamm E.-M., 1957, *Grammatik zu Sappho und Alkaios*, Berlin, <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783112644904>.
- Hodot R., 1990, *Le dialecte éolien d’Asie: la langue des inscriptions VII^e s. a.C.–IV^e s. p.C.*, Paris.
- Hodot R., 2006, ‘Un point de vue sur le lesbien’, [in:] *Peuplements et genèses dialectales dans la Grèce antique*, C. Brixhe, G. Vottéro (eds), Nancy–Paris, pp. 55–179.
- Hoffmann O., 1893, *Die Griechischen Dialekte in ihrem historischen Zusammenhange mit den wichtigsten ihrer Quellen*, vol. 2: *Der nord-achäische Dialekt*, Göttingen.
- Janda M., 2014, *Purpurnes Meer. Sprache und Kultur der homerischen Welt*, Innsbruck.
- Kazik-Zawadzka I., 1958, *De Sapphicae Alcaicaeque elocutionis colore epico*, Wrocław.
- Labarre G., 1996, *Les cités de Lesbos aux époques hellénistique et impériale*, Lyon–Paris.
- Lühr R., Balles I., 2008, *Nominale Wortbildung des Indogermanischen in Grundzügen. Die Wortbildungsmuster ausgewählter indogermanischer Einzelsprachen*, vol. 1: *Latein. Altgriechisch*, R. Lühr, I. Balles (eds), Hamburg.
- Meissner T., 2006, *S-Stem Nouns and Adjectives in Greek and Proto-Indo-European: A Diachronic Study in Word Formation*, Oxford, <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199280087.001.0001>.
- Page D., 1955, *Sappho and Alcaeus: An Introduction to the Study of Ancient Lesbian Poetry*, Oxford.
- Risch E., 1974, *Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache*, Berlin–New York.
- Schindler J., 1975, ‘Zum Ablaut der neutralen s-Stämme des Indogermanischen’, [in:] *Flexion und Wortbildung. Akten der V. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft*, H. Rix (ed.), Wiesbaden, pp. 259–267.
- Schwyzler E., 1939, *Griechische Grammatik*, vol. 1: *Allgemeiner Teil, Lautlehre, Wortbildung, Flexion*, München.

- Sowa W., 2006, 'Bemerkungen zum Lesbischen dialektalen Wortschatz', *Emerita. Revista de Lingüística y Filología Clásica* 74/2, pp. 233–258, <https://doi.org/10.3989/emerita.2006.v74.i2.17>.
- Sowa W., 2011, 'Griechische Dialekte, dialektale Glossen und die antike lexikographische Tradition', *Glotta* 87/1–4, pp. 159–183, <https://doi.org/10.13109/glot.2011.87.14.159>
- Sowa W., 2020, 'Thracian', *Palaeohispanica. Revista Sobre Lenguas Y Culturas De La Hispania Antigua* 20, pp. 787–817, <https://doi.org/10.36707/palaeohispanica.v0i20.377>.
- Thumb A., Scherer A., 1959, *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte*, vol. 2, Heidelberg.
- Watkins C., 2011, *The American Heritage Dictionary of Indo-European Roots*, Boston–New York.
- Weiss M., 1998, 'Erotica: On the Prehistory of Greek Desire', *Harvard Studies on Classical Philology* 98, pp. 31–61.
- Willi A., 2010, 'Register Variation', [in:] *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*, E.J. Bakker (ed.), Oxford, pp. 297–310, <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444317398.ch20>.