

Hypotheses of interference between Greek and the languages of Ancient Anatolia: the case of patronymics

Following an overview of how the different languages attested in Anatolia during the Iron Age express patronymics, this paper explores the alleged interferences among the strategies found in these languages. Particular focus is placed on the possible interactions between Greek and the Anatolian languages in the use of genitive patronymics with or without a noun for ‘son’ or ‘daughter’ (following prior studies by Merlin and Pisaniello 2019 and Rutherford 2002) and on the claim of a Lydian origin for Greek patronymics in *-ιδας/-ιδης* (Dardano 2011), for which an internal Greek development is accepted after the inclusion of relevant data from Phrygian. All in all, very few local interactions are sustained as being valid.

Keywords: patronymics; Anatolian languages; Phrygian language; Greek language; language contact.

Introduction

A patronymic is a complement to the personal name based on the given name of father’s name. They were used to identify a person in many ancient cultures before surnames replaced them, although many modern surnames are fossilized patronymics, for example, Scottish Gaelic *MacNéill* ‘the son of Niall’, English *Peterson* ‘the son of Peter’, Spanish *Martínez* ‘the son of Martín’ and Portuguese *Henriques* ‘the son of Henrique’. Ancient traditions are still in use in places like Iceland, where there are no surnames. For instance, the name of the current Icelandic president is *Guðni Thorlacius Jóhannesson*: *Guðni Thorlacius* is his first name and *Jóhannesson* derives from his father’s name, *Jóhannes Sæmundsson*, through the addition of the suffix *-son* ‘son’ (as in many current Germanic surnames). Because of their social relevance and their relationship with personal identity and ethnicity, patronymics can be used as a source of cultural information on a given community and can provide details about linguistic contact.

Earlier scholars have suggested some cases of contact between Anatolian languages and Greek on the basis of shared features with regard to the formation of patronymics. However, few of the proposals in the literature are based on updated knowledge of the Anatolian material and most avoid providing an overview of the subject. Moreover, in the last decades, the ancient languages of Anatolia (crucially for this paper, those of the Anatolian branch of the Indo-European family and Phrygian) have been subject to more systematic scientific study and the data, when available, are now more abundant and more reliable. Therefore, we have a good opportunity to provide an updated overview of patronymics in the languages attested during the Iron Age (§ 1)¹ and to review prior proposals of contacts in the light of our current knowledge (§ 2, 3 and 4). The Greek patronymic suffix *-ιδας/-ιδης* is one of the most important points here, since it has been identified as a possible borrowing from Lydian (Dardano

¹ There are no claims of contact between Greek and Anatolian languages based on patronymics during the Bronze Age. Therefore, I leave aside the intricate question of the contact between Greek (attested only in the Mycenaean dialect) and Hittite and Luwian.

2011). Finally, an account of Phrygian variation is given (§ 5), since this language has been largely overlooked in the linguistic map of Anatolia, despite the central position it occupies.

1. Overview of patronymics attested in Anatolia during the Iron Age

There were different ways of expressing the patronymics in Anatolia during the Iron Age, and in some cases several of these are attested in a single language. As we will see, Hieroglyphic Luwian, Lycian, Phrygian and Greek use different strategies to form patronymics, while Carian, Lydian, Sidetic, Phoenician, Aramaic and Urartian have only one patronymic form.²

The most widespread patronymic form in Anatolia is the creation of a “possessive” or “genitival” adjective, which derives from the father’s names through a suffix. There are two variants in the different languages: those which place the adjective in agreement with the nouns for ‘son’ and ‘daughter’ and those in which the adjective stands alone. In the first group of languages, which use the noun, we find Hieroglyphic Luwian, which uses adjectives derived through the suffix *-assali-* (1), and Lycian, which uses genitival-adjectives derived through *-h-* (when governed by nominative) / *-he* (by locative) / *-hñ* (accusative).³

1. Hieroglyphic Luwian: Bohça § 1

[! ?]ku+ra/i-ti-i-sá !á-<sa-hwali-si>-sa₄ !HEROS-li-i-sa ! (“INFANS”)ni-mu-wali-za-sa
Kurtis-n.sg.C Ashwis-adj.n.sg.C. of the hero-n.sg.C. son-n.sg.C.
‘Kurtis, the hero Ashwis’ son’

2. Lycian: TL 36, 2 (Xanthos)

ahqqadi: pizibideh: tideimi
Ahqqadi-nom.sg.C. Pizibide-adj.nom.sg.C. son-nom.sg.C.
‘Ahqqadi, son of Pizibide’

3. Lycian: TL 25a, 5–6 (Tlos)

tikeukēpre ... urtaquijahñ kbatru
Tikeukēpre-acc.sg.C. Urtaqija-adj.acc.sg.C. daughter-acc.sg.C.
‘Tikeukēpre, daughter of Urtaqija’

In the second group, those languages in which the adjective stands alone can be classed as Lydian, which builds an adjective through the suffix *-li-* (4), Lycian (5), Phrygian through *-evais-* (6) and, perhaps, *-(e)yo-* (7), Aeolic Greek through *-yo-* (8) and Urartian through *-hə* (9).⁴

4. Lydian: LW 001, 4 (Sardes)

manelid kumlilid šilukalid
Manes-adj.nom-acc.sg.N. Kumli(i)-adj.nom-acc.sg.N. Seleukia-adj.nom-acc.sg.N.
‘(belongs) to Manes (the son) of Kumli- (the grandson of) Seleukia’

² It may be significant that of the languages in this group, it is the Anatolian ones that remain more cryptic (Lydian and Carian) or present an extremely fragmentary corpus (Sidetic). Note that Carian has personal names that can be considered to have a patronymic meaning, if *mno-* is accepted as meaning ‘son’ (see fn. 9): cf. Ἐκατόμνωσ, Carian *ktmno-*, *ktmño-* (Adiego 2007: 375, 378), as adduced by Yakubovich in his discussion about the origin of Μεγ-μν-ᾶδ-εσ (2017: 289).

³ I follow here the analysis by Adiego 2010. This work is not considered in Merlin and Pisaniello 2019, who assumed a derivation through the Lycian suffix *-ahi-/ehi-*. This last suffix commonly creates adjectives, but never patronymics. For an overview of the possessive adjective in the Luwic languages in place of the genitive case, see Melchert 2012.

⁴ Carian could be added to this list, if forms in *-ś* are not considered as genitives (see fn. 10).

5. Lycian: TL 105, 2 (Limyra)
esete muleseh
 Esete-n.sg.C Mulese-adj.nom.sg.C
 ‘Esete (son) of Mulese’
6. Phrygian: M-01a (Yazılıkaya)
ates arkievais akenanogavos
 Ates-n.sg.M. Archias-adj.n.sg.M. akenanogavos-n.sg.M.
 ‘Ates (son) of Archias the *holder* of the *akenan*’
7. Phrygian: G-183 (Gordion)
tiveia imeneia
 Tiveia-n.sg.F. Iman-adj.n.sg.F. ?
 ‘Tiveia (the daughter of) Iman’ ?
8. Greek: Buck 24 (Kebrene)
 ἄπι Σθενεΐαι [...] τῷ Νικιαίοι
 prep Stheneias-dat.sg.M. Nikias-adj.dat.sg.M.
 ‘upon Stheneias (the son) of Nikias’
9. Urartian: CTU 1 A 08-01, 2-3 (Van)
mar-gi-iš-ti-š[e] mmi-nu-ú-a-ḫi-ni-še
 Argišti-erg.sg. Minua-adj.erg.sg.
 ‘Argišti (the son) of Minua’

It is worth recalling here that Greek has different patronymic adjectives but only the Aeolic patronymic in *-ιος*⁵ is found in Anatolia instead of the widespread genitive. Other Greek types are reported by the *Tékhnē Grammatiké* (GG I, 1: 25–26):

Πατρωνυμικὸν μὲν οὖν ἔστι τὸ κυρίως ἀπὸ πατρὸς ἐσχηματισμένον, καταχρηστικῶς δὲ καὶ τὸ ἀπὸ προγόνων, οἷον Πηλεΐδης, Αἰακίδης ὁ Ἀχιλλεύς. Τύποι δὲ τῶν πατρωνυμικῶν ἀρσενικῶν μὲν τρεῖς, ὁ εἰς δης, ὁ εἰς ων, ὁ εἰς αδιος, οἷον Ἀτρεΐδης, Ἀτρεΐων, τρεῖς, ὁ εἰς δης, ὁ εἰς ων, ὁ εἰς αδιος, οἷον Ἀτρεΐδης, Ἀτρεΐων, καὶ ὁ τῶν Αἰολέων ἴδιος τύπος Ὑρράδιος. Ὑρρα γὰρ παῖς ὁ Πιττακός. Θηλυκῶν δὲ οἱ ἴσοι τρεῖς, ὁ εἰς ις, οἷον Πριαμῖς, καὶ ὁ εἰς ας, οἷον Πελιάς, καὶ ὁ εἰς νη, οἷον Ἀδρηστίνη. Ἀπὸ δὲ μητέρων οὐ σχηματίζει πατρωνυμικὸν εἶδος ὁ Ὅμηρος, ἀλλ’ οἱ νεώτεροι.⁶

‘The patronymic is, properly, a form derived from [the name of] the father and by extension from [that of] the ancestors, such as *Pēlidēs* or *Aiacidēs* said of Achilles. There are three types of masculine patronymics: the type ending in *-δης*, that in *-ων*, and the type proper to the Aeolians, in *-αδιος*, as respectively *Atreidēs*, *Atreion*, and *Hyrradios*. Pittacus was, in fact, the son of Hyrra. Similarly, there are three types of feminine forms: the type in *-ις*, that in *-ας*, and that in *-νη*, as *Priamis*, *Pelias*, and *Adrestine*. Homer does not derive the patronymic from [the name of] the mother, but the new poets do’.⁷

The famous patronymics ending in *-ίδας/-ίδης* are restricted to literary sources (mainly after the influence of Homer), with the sole exception of some cases found in syllabic inscriptions from Cyprus (see below). It is true that the suffix *-ίδας/-ίδης* is found in some personal names from Anatolia but it is never used as a proper patronymic. No examples of patronymics ending in *-ίων* and *-αδιος* (both secondarily derived) are found in epigraphic sources, including, of course, the inscriptions from Anatolia.

⁵ There is also a variant in *-ειος* as seen in [Aql]στούξενος Βάκχαιος ‘Aristoxenos (the son) of Bakkhos’ (Nécropole de Myrina 116, 20).

⁶ It is a fact that in Homer there are no examples of patronymics derived from any mother’s name. However, this strategy is not unknown in archaic poetry. See, Περσεύς Δαναΐδης ‘Perseus the son of Danae’ in *Aspis* 229.

⁷ Translation by S. Merlin, who generously shared it with me.

A second way of expressing patronymics in the languages attested in Anatolia is the use of the genitive case. Again, the languages have two variants: the genitive can occur followed by the noun for ‘son’ or ‘daughter’ or it can stand alone. Languages that use the first variant include Hieroglyphic Luwian (10) and Greek (11). Carian may also be added to this list, if the identification of *mno-* as the word for ‘son’ is accepted (12).⁸ One could also include Lycian in this list (13), if the debated “adesinential genitives” reflect the inherited genitive ending *-s > -ø (Adiego 2010: 5).⁹

10. Hieroglyphic Luwian: HAMA 4 Hama A1 § 1
u+rali-hi-li-na PRAE-*tá-sa* †INFANS.NI-*wali-za-sa*
 Urhilina-n.sg.C Paritta-gn.sg.C son-n.sg.C
 ‘Urhilina the son of Paritta’
11. Greek: TAM I 117 (with Lycian TL 117, Limyra)
 Σιδάριος Παρμένοντος υἱός
 Sidarios-n.sg.M Parmenon-gn.sg.M son-n.sg.M
 ‘Sidarios the son of Parmenon’
12. Carian: C.Ka 1 (Kaunos)
psuśólś *malś:* *mnoś*
 Psuśól-gn.sg.C Mal-gn.sg.C son-gn.sg.C
 ‘of Psuśól, son of Mal’ (Adiego 2010, 170, with caveats)
13. Lycian: TL 61 (Phellos)
sbikezijēi: *mrexisa:* *tideimi*
 Sbikezijēi-n.sg.C. Mrexisa-gen.sg.C son-nom.sg.C.
 ‘Sbikezijēi son of Mrexisa’

The second group of languages with this structure uses a sole genitive to express the patronymic, without using the noun for ‘son’ or ‘daughter’. Here we include Carian (14, with caution),¹⁰ Sidetic (15), Phrygian (16)¹¹ and Greek (17).¹² Again, Lycian could be added to this list (18), if the “adesinential genitive” is accepted. Note, however, that the only Lycian inscription containing this kind of filiation formula is TL 145, and unfortunately it shows some gaps. As can be seen, Carian, Greek and, perhaps, Lydian provide examples of both variants (with and without the noun for ‘son’ or ‘daughter’).

14. Carian: C.Hy 1, 4 (Hyllarima)
mane : *uśólś*
 Manes-n.sg.C Uśól-gn.sg.C or
 ‘Manes (the son) of Uśól’

⁸ I follow here the identification by Adiego (defended, e.g., in 2010b: 167–170). However, an alternative interpretation was given by Schürr (2013: 28–29) and Simon (2019: 299–302).

⁹ There are few examples of such an alleged category (TL 5 4, 61 1, 77 2, 117 3, 127 1, N 315 2, with \diamond in TL 69 2). Cf the critical remarks in Schürr 2010: 120–121.

¹⁰ Carian forms in -ś could be also interpreted as adjectives, since it is difficult to differentiate them from a possible genitive (Adiego, personal communication).

¹¹ The Phrygian patronymic or papponymic *manitos* in *manes iyungidas manitos* (B-07) can be added to this list, although the form *iyungidas* remains unclear (see below). It should be noted that, in a recent lecture, Rostislav Oreshko defended the identification of *masa urgitos* as the Luwian name *Masaurahisas* (cf.]*ma-sa*-MAGNUS+*rali-hi-sà-sá* in Porsuk 1 § 4).

¹² In addition, despite being attested only in Imperial Roman times, Pisidian exhibits the same feature: e.g. 5 Μουσητα Τας ‘Museta (the son) of Ta’ (a man is depicted on the stele where the inscription occurs).

15. Sidetic: S1, 1 (Side)
artmon *θanpijs*
 Artemon-n.sg.C Athenobios-gn.sg.C
 ‘Artemon (the son) of Athenobios’
16. Phrygian: K-01 (Kerkenes Dağ)
masa *urgitos*
 Masa-n.sg.M Urgi(s)-gn.sg.M
 ‘Masa (the son) of *Urgi(s)’
17. Greek: TAM II 232, 1–2 (Sidyma)
 Χρύσιππος Ζωσίμου
 Chrysippos-n.sg.M Zosimos-gn.sg.M
 ‘Chrysippos (the son) of Zosimos’
18. Lycian: TL 145, 1 (Limyra)
hla *ñterubila*
 Hla-n.sg.C Ñterubila-gen.sg.C
 ‘Hla (the son) of Ñterubila’

Finally, the two Semitic languages attested in Anatolia, Phoenician and Aramaic, use their particular, inherited system: construct from of the word for ‘son’ followed by the father’s name (19 and 20).

19. Phoenician: KAI 24 (Samʿal)
klmw *br* *hyʿ*
 Kilamuwa son-cons.sg. Haya
 ‘Kilamuwa the son of Haya’
20. Aramaic KAI 318 (Daskyleion)
ʔlnp *br* *ʔšy*
 Elnaf son-cons.sg. Ašay
 ‘Elnaf son of Ašay’

	Genitive alone	Genitive + ‘son/daughter’	Possessive adjective	‘son/daughter’ construct + name
Hieroglyphic Luwian	–	+	+	–
Lycian	±	±	+	–
Carian	±	±	±	–
Lydian	–	–	+	–
Sidetic	+	–	–	–
Phrygian	+	–	+	–
Greek	+	+	+	–
Phoenician	–	–	–	+
Aramaic	–	–	–	+
Urartian	–	–	+	–

2. The Aeolic patronymic adjective as influenced by the Anatolian languages

A well-known feature of Greek as recorded in Aeolis and, mainly, in Lesbos is the use of the adjectival patronymic ending in *-ιος* instead of the widespread genitive. This has sometimes been considered an influence of those Anatolian languages which use a patronymic adjective, such as Lydian or Luwian (Hawkins 2001: 58–59). A problem derives from the fact that the Aeolic forms can be considered an archaism because the suffix **-iyo-* forms possessive adjectives in a variety of Indo-European languages (Yakubovich 2010: 148–149).

The question is difficult to evaluate, since we do not have a morpheme borrowing in Greek (see below) and the patronymic use of **-iyo-* > *-ιος* is not so far removed from other occurrences in Greek: it forms an adjective to express belonging or relation (*ἀγρός* ‘field, country’ >> *ἄγριος* ‘living in the fields; wild’). Therefore, there are three possible scenarios: an archaism in Aeolic, an internal development, or a development triggered by the contact with the Anatolian language. Although far from certain, it is possible that a feature – the possibility of creating an adjective from a personal name – was promoted following the strategies of other neighboring languages, as a kind of influence.

However, Mycenaean shows the very same patronymic adjective for a Greek dialect during the Bronze Age. For example, in *a-re-ku-tu-ru-wo e-te-wo-ke-re-we-i-jo* *Alektruōn Etewoklewehiyos* ‘Alectryon (the son) of Eteocles’ (PY An 654.8–9), the suffix *-i-jo* /*ijos*/ (< **-iyo-*) is used to build a patronymic after the personal name found in alphabetic Greek as *Ἐτεροκλήρης* (classical *Ἐτεοκλήης*).¹³ Of course, it is feasible that both Mycenaean and Aeolic developed this strategy of building the patronymic adjective from an inherited adjective independently. But the simplest scenario is to assume that Mycenaean and Aeolic patronymics in **-iyo-* are a common, inherited feature. It is possible that, unlike the other Greek alphabetic dialects, Aeolic preserved this kind of patronymic because of its similarity to the analogous feature in neighboring languages, but this is difficult to prove; as an archaism, however, it does not need more substantiation than already provided by the current data. Note also that this feature could be treated as a typical archaism of a peripheral area. The same conclusion is reached by Hajnal (2018: 2046–2047), who adduced three points: 1. “*io*-adjectives that denominate belonging or possession of objects are not attested in Lesbian”. 2. In the Luwic languages, **-/io-/* was affected by the *i*-mutation, which does not occur in Greek *io*-patronymics. 3. As in Mycenaean, Lesbian shows that the possessive adjectives in */-io-/* interfered on “material adjectives” in */-e(i)o-/*.

It is possible that Phrygian, the closest language to Greek in genetic terms, also has the suffix **-eyo-*, used to form patronymics, if *tiveia imeneia* ‘Tiveya (the daughter) of Iman’ (G-183b) is, in fact, a feminine personal name followed by a possessive adjective derived from *iman* (Obrador-Cursach 2020: 254) and not a “material adjective”: ‘those things belonging to Ti(v)es Iman’ (*vel. sim.*). Leaving aside this example, Phrygian *-eyo-* expresses ethnics (*τεμρογεις* 1.1 = 48, derived from the name of the river Thymbris), *matar kubeleya* (B-01) ~ *kubileya* (W-04) ‘Cybele’ (literally, ‘the mother from Kybelon’) and seems to derive adjectives from nouns like *mireyun* (B-05) from *meros* (B-07)/*μῆρος* (MPhr-01) ‘?’. In any case, it seems that, contrary to Aeolic Greek, in Phrygian the suffix *-eyo-* influenced the possessive adjectives in **-eyo-*.

¹³ One can add that these patronymics also occur in some names with the ending *-i-jo* in agreement with the nouns *ko-wo* /*korwos*/ ‘boy’ and *u-jo*, *i-**65 and *i-jo* ‘son’, so they could be very productive in Mycenaean. Nevertheless, these endings can be also interpreted as a variant of the thematic genitive in *-i-jo-jo* (cf. Duhoux 2008: 357–359).

3. Greco-Anatolian influences in the use of ‘son/daughter’ after genitive for the patronymic formula?

In a recent paper, Merlin and Pisaniello (2019: 97–98) raised the question of whether the Greek pattern genitive + υἰός ‘son’ is triggered by Lycian genitive + *tideimi* ‘id.’ in the bilingual inscriptions from Lycia. Note that they operate with the traditional assumption that Lycian patronymics in *-h* are mere genitive forms (as in eDiAna, but against Adiego 2010). Rutherford (2002: 210–212) stated earlier that the occurrence of υἰός ‘son’ following the genitive of the father’s name in the Greek part of the bilingual inscriptions is a calque of the Lycian formula father’s alleged genitive + *tideimi*. After consulting the bilinguals and the uses in the monolingual Greek inscriptions from Lycia, Merlin and Pisaniello observed that in the eight useful bilinguals, three texts show the Greek formula genitive + υἰός for the patronymic where the Lycian part has genitive + *tideimi* (TL 72,¹⁴ TL 117, N 320 [2x]), three other texts lack the word for ‘son’ in both versions (TL 6 [2x], TL 45 A, N 312), and in only two instances (TL 25a, TL 56) divergences occur (in the Lycian text *tideimi* is used after the genitive while the Greek counterpart lacks the word υἰός).¹⁵ They also observed that the “the occurrence of υἰός with the father’s name is quite sporadic” in the monolingual inscriptions from Lycia and, in fact, the only occurrence is found in “an inscription from Limyra (H ii 34, iv/iii c. BC), whose structure fully reproduces that of the Lycian sepulchral inscriptions, with a topicalized object, followed by the verb, the subject and the filiation formula with the father’s name in genitive case + the noun ‘son’ (both personal names are Anatolian), and the indirect object (the builder himself, his wife, and their sons)” (Merlin and Pisaniello 2019: 98).¹⁶ All in all, one can easily conclude that the use of υἰός in the Greek inscriptions from Lycia (almost all confined to the bilingual documents) can be attributed to the influence of the Lycian formula. However, Merlin and Pisaniello (2019: 98) acknowledge that the possible interference “does not operate against the Greek rules or create something new; it rather expands an uncommon epigraphic use already existing in the Greek”. Note also that a similar process occurred in Roman times with the Latin influence of the formula genitive + *filius* (usually abbreviated as F.) on Greek (Adams 2003: 670–677). See, for example, the inscription Klazomenai 11, l. 3–4 (Ionia, 41/54 AD): Τι(βέριος) Κλαύδιος Μενάνδρου υἰός ‘Tiberius Claudius the son of Menandros’.

A second point studied by the same authors (Merlin and Pisaniello 2019: 98–99) addresses the reverse scenario: the lack of *tideimi* in the Lycian inscriptions as a calque of the Greek formula, as suggested by Rutherford (2002: 212). They quote the interesting bilingual inscription N 312 (Xanthos),¹⁷ where the Greek text precedes the Lycian and seems to be primary because of the layout and the content, as a Lycian text lacking *tideimi* likely influenced by the Greek formula. Three more cases of the twenty examples available are found in bilingual inscriptions, where the feature can be considered a Greek influence. However, this is difficult to state

¹⁴ On this text, see the new edition and commentaries by Christiansen (2019: 83–84).

¹⁵ Note that Lycian also has a patronymic with a zero ending (Melchert 2012: 275). In most examples, the genitive depends on the word *tideime/i-* ‘son’ (TL 5 4, TL 61 1, TL 77 2, TL 117 3, TL 127 1 and N 315 2) or *kbatra-* (TL 87 5), although there is an example without these words (*Hla: Ñterubila* ‘Hlas (the son) of Ñterubila-’ TL 145 1).

¹⁶ The inscription reads as follows: τοῦτο τὸ μνημεῖον κατεσκευάσατο Κενδας Ασσᾶ υἱ[ὸς] ἑαυτῶ <τ>ε καὶ τῆν γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῖ[ς] τέκνοις. ‘This monument, Kendas son of Assas built (it) for himself, his wife, and (their) children’.

¹⁷ The patronymic sequences read in the bilingual inscriptions are Greek Δεμοκλ[εῖ]δης Θε[ρ]βησιος Λιμυρεὺς ‘Demoklides (the son) of Therbesis, from Limyra’ (l. 1–2) and Lycian *ñtemuxlida krbbe[s]eh zemuris* ‘Ñtemuxlida (the son) of Krbbase, from Limyra’ (l. 4–5).

with any certainty because of the small number of instances with explicit Greek data and the same use in other surrounding Anatolian languages.

A similar situation with regard to possible interference with Greek can be found in other Anatolian languages, although these other languages are more fragmentary than Lycian and data are scarce or, in the worst cases, not consistently interpreted. One such case is Carian. According to Adiego (e.g. 2007: 291, 383), the word *mno-* means ‘son’ and occurs 11 times¹⁸ in contexts similar to the abovementioned C.Ka 1: *sñis : sdisas : psuśólś malś: mnoś* (C.Ka 1) ‘this (is) the tomb of Psuśól, son of Mal’. Note, however, that this point has been analysed in other terms by Schrürr and Simon (see fn. 9). In any case, “the most typical Carian onomastic formula” consists of individual name + father’s name with the genitive ending *ś*, sometimes followed by a postclitic *ki* (Adiego 2007: 265–266).

As far as we know from the few identified inscriptions, the Sidetic formula is always two-fold: name followed by the father’s name in genitive without any word for ‘son’ or ‘daughter’: *artmon θanpijś* ‘Artemon (the son) of Athenobios’ S1, 1 (Side). The case of Phrygian is also interesting: it has some suffixes to create patronymic adjectives but also the genitive without any noun for ‘son’ or ‘daughter’: *masa urgitos* ‘Masa (the son) of Urgis’ (K-01, Kerkenes Dağ). Therefore, western Anatolia provides examples of languages using the genitive without any noun to express patronymics. It is true that Caria was one of the earliest Hellenized territories in Anatolia, leaving apart the Greek colonies proper. Likewise, Sidetic was surrounded by Pamphylian Greek, and Phrygian is so close to Greek that this feature could be inherited. It is likely, then, that the lack of the noun for ‘son’ or ‘daughter’ after the patronymic genitive was triggered by Greek and/or Phrygian in the Anatolian languages. An areal feature could be a more feasible explanation. As in the case of Lycian, however, a simple elision of the noun as an independent innovation (as occurred in Greek and Phrygian) is very likely, and such an influence cannot be considered a fact.

4. Greek *-ιδᾶς/-ίδης* and variants and the alleged Lydian borrowing

As noted by Masson (1965: 222–227, also in Dardano 2011: 42), Greek alphabetic inscriptions lack any Greek patronymic in *-ιδᾶς/-ίδης*. Only syllabic Cypriot inscriptions attest four instances of this kind of patronymic: *o-na-sa-to a-ra-wa-ti-ta-u* Ὀνάσα(ν)το(ς) Ἀρφατίδαι ‘of Onasas, son of Arwatos’, *e-ke-ti-mo te-o-to-ki-ta-u* Ἐχετίμω Θεοδοκίδαι ‘of Echetimos, son of Theodokos’, *sa-ta-si-wo-se to-pa-po-pa-si-le-wo-se sa-ta-si-pi-li-ta-u* Στάσιφος τῷ Πάφῳ βασιλῆφος Στασιφιλίδαι ‘of Stasis, king of Paphos, son of Stasiphilos’ and *o-na-si-ti-mo-se ti-wi-so-ni-ta-se* Ὀνασίτιμος Διφισωνίδας ‘Onasitimos, son of Diwison’ (see Keurentjes 1997: 385–386). In fact, the suffix *-ιδᾶς* is found for the first time in some personal names read in the Mycenaean tablets. However, they are used as plain personal names, not as patronymics: see the suitable example of *ko-ni-da-jo* /konnidajos/ (KN AS 1516.7, quoted by Dardano 2011: 42). The Mycenaean patronymic suffix is *-ijos* <(i)-jo> (Bartoněk 2003: 422), the relational suffix, also found forming the patronymic as *-ιος* in the Aeolic dialect and in some Homeric instances (e.g. Νηληϊῶ υἱ Ἴλ. 2.20). From this last suffix, the variant *-ίων* derives through the agglutination of the individualizing suffix *-ων*. The patronymic use of *-ιδᾶς/-ίδης* seems to be an innovation of the literary tradition applied to significant characters which spread with Homer’s influence. As Dardano summarizes (2011: 43, improving on prior statements by Keurentjes 1997), the function of the suffix was not to form patronymics in the strict sense; rather, it denotes a vague relation with

¹⁸ C.Eu 1, C.Ka 5, C.Ka 1, C.Kr 1. E.Me 10, E.Me 12, E.Me 16, E.Me 27, E.Me 39, E.Me 43b, and E.Me 47.

an ancestor, as seems to be apparent through its use in the names of the demi (Αἰθαλίαδαι, Ἰωνίδαί, etc.), the names of the Attic φυλάι (cf. Αἰαντίδης), the names of relevant families (e.g., Βαγχιάδαι, Κυψελίδαί, Πεισιστρατίδαι, even Ἀχαιμενίδαί for the same dynasty found in Old Persian as *Haxāmanišiya-* ‘Achaemenid’). It may also denote a relation with a place, for example in Εὐριπίδης (derived from Εὐριπος) and Βρασίδης (from *Βράσιος). In the light of these different functions, Dardano (2011: 43) concludes: “le forme in esame non sono patronimici, sono piuttosto aggettivi relazionali derivati da un antropónimo o da un toponimo”.

A problem arises from the origin of *-ídās*. After considering the difficulties to substantiate prior explanations for the etymology of this suffix, Dardano (2011: 48–58) suggests that Lydian *-da-* < **-ida-* < **-iyo-* (Gérard 2005: 89, with a common syncope) is the origin for Greek *-ídās*. In fact, this suffix is used to create the ethnics in the light of *sfar-* ‘Sardis’ >> **sfar-ida-* > *sfarda-* ‘Sardian’ (in LW 22 alternatively *sfardēti-* ‘Sardian’) and, if accepted, **luda-* ‘Lydian’ (Greek Λυδός) < *luwīya-* ‘Luwian’ (see Yakubovich 2017: 287–288, with references).¹⁹ However, the hypothesis cannot be upheld for several reasons.

First, the existence of Mycenaean personal names in /-ídās/ invalidates the theory of a Lydian borrowing because they predate the Lydian documentation by several centuries. It is true that at least *mo-ri-wo-do-* /*moliwdo-*/ ‘lead’ (DMic. I 457–458, alphabetic Greek μόλυβδος, ου, ό, ή) is suggested to be a borrowing from Lydian in the light of the theonym *mariwda-* (LW 004a).²⁰ In fact, Myc. /*moliwdo-*/ shows Lydian consonant treatments, if we assume the likely etymology **mork^w-iyo-*, a derivative from PIE**merk^w-* ‘dark’. But the possibility exists that it is simply a cultural loanword, which does not imply the close contact required to support the theory of suffix borrowing.²¹ This is also the case of Greek κύανος ‘enamel, lapis lazuli, blue copper carbonate’, found in Mycenaean as *ku-wa-no-* ‘smalt’ (DMic. I 415–416), and somehow related to Hittite *ku(wa)nna(n)-* ‘copper, ornamental stone’ (Simon 2018: 396 § 85). The same can be said of κύμινον ‘cumin’, Myc. *ku-mi-no* /*kuminon*/ (DMic. I 401), very likely a borrowing from a Semitic language (Rosół 2013: 55–56). It is, however, to be noted that, leaving aside the possibility of the patronymic suffix *-ídās*, there are no other traces of Anatolian structural influences on Greek (see a summary in Simon 2018: 277–378).

Second, Bronze-Age Greek speakers would need a large number of borrowed forms in *-(i)da-* to be able to recognize and use this suffix in a productive way in their own language (borrowing indirectly through complex loanwords containing this suffix)²² but we lack any evidence for this (the documentation does not provide any more alleged Lydian words). Direct borrowing of the suffix is a possibility, but it implies a direct knowledge of the donor language, in this case Lydian. Such knowledge is not confirmed in the use of the suffix: Lydian *-(i)das* is used to form at least one ethnic (if not two, as said above) but never occurs in patronymics, which are built through the suffix *-li-* (as seen in example 4).

¹⁹ Dardano (2011: 55) alleged other formations that now are considered to contain a clitic = *dav*: the alleged *taac-* ‘votive offering’ >> *taacda-* ‘relative to the votive offering’ became *taac=dav* ‘the podium’ + ‘from’; *sfēn(i)-* ‘relative?’ (*sfēn(i)-* for her, I use the current transliteration) >> *sfēnda-* ‘?’ became *sfēn=dav*. The same clitic is also found in *amu=dav* ‘T’ (LW 023 and 024, see Yakubovich 2017: 278), *cidaλm=dav* ‘?’ (LW 022) and *τελm=dav* ‘?’. Only, **mλwen-* ‘of grave’ (in **mλwēnš(i)-*) >> *mλwēndav* ‘(burial) installation?’ remains as so.

²⁰ First suggested by Melchert 2008 and followed by Simon 2018: 400 § 107 and Bianconi 2020: 139 fn. 5.

²¹ Note, however, that we do not know if any other language of the area was affected by the same shifts. It also remains unclear where Proto-Lydian was spoken during the Bronze Age.

²² In fact, neither of the other two criteria established by Seifart (2015: 513) can be applied here: Greek does not have “a set of pairs of loanwords, one with and one without the affix” (e.g., profit–profitable) and, consequently, one cannot observe if “[w]ithin pairs of complex loanwords and corresponding simple loanwords, complex loanwords have a lower token frequency than the corresponding simple loanwords”.

Moreover, it remains unclear why Mycenaean adopted the Lydian suffix *-ida-* as *-do-* in *mo-ri-wo-do-* /moliwdo-/ but as *-idā-* in personal names such as *ko-ki-da* (MY Au 102.8). Finally, onomastics represents a special sphere of the language and the introduction of a suffix that is only operative in onomastic formulae would only be plausible in a context of strong contact and even with a linguistic subordination of Mycenaean to Lydian.

As discussed so far, it seems unlikely that Proto-Lydian exerted such an influence that Mycenaean could have borrowed any suffix. Therefore, it is time to move to another scenario. All the given approaches to Greek *-ιδᾶς* ignore the recent Phrygian evidence, yet this evidence is relevant given the genetic relationship of the two languages. In fact, Phrygian is the closest language to Greek (Obrador-Cursach 2019) and the languages share very specific exclusive features such as the suffix **-eu-/*-ēu-* (Greek *-εύς, -έως, Epic -ῆος*, Phrygian *-avos* thematized) and a dental enlargement of the masculine *i*-stems in cases other than nominative and accusative. This last Phrygian feature was identified by Brixhe (2006: 40; see also Obrador-Cursach 2019: 236) through genitives: *artimitos* (B-05, the Greek goddess Ἀρτεμις, genitive Ἀρτέμιδος, but Mycenaean *a-te-mi-to*, Ἀρτέμιτος Alc.54, Ἀρτάμιτος CID 1.10.8, 12), *manitos* (B-07, genitive of *manes*) and, perhaps, *urgitos* (K-01). Importantly, *manitos* and *urgitos* are genitives used as patronymics: *manes iyungidas manitos* (if *iyungida-* is a patronymic, *manitos* is a papponymic) and *masa urgitos*.²³

After considering the existence of a shared dental enlargement, one might ask if the Phrygian feature can be used in discussing the origin of Greek patronymics in *-ιδᾶς*. In fact, the Phrygian enlargement *-it-* may go back to a proto-form **-it-* or **-id-* (through the Phrygian devoicing of the stops identified by Lubotsky 2004). Therefore, the presence of this feature in both close languages confirms the plausibility of an inherited treatment from a proto-Greco-Phrygian suffix nom. **-is*, gen. *-idos*. This point is the key to ruling out a borrowing from Lydian: the older the form, the more unlikely the Lydian borrowing. Of course, this approach implies that Greek *-ιδᾶς* is to be analysed as *-ιδ-ᾶς*, where the second element is the individualizing suffix which goes back to **-eh₂+s*, as found in some nouns such as *νεανίας* ‘young man’ or in Greek and Latin verbal governing compounds of the type *βαθυδίνης* ‘deep-eddying’ and *agricola* ‘farmer’, respectively (Fellner and Gretenberger 2016). This analysis for Greek *-ιδ-ᾶς* is not new and has been considered by prior scholars (Chantraine 1933: 339, 362; Schwyzler 1953: 510). What we can rule out definitively is that *-ιδ-ᾶς* is the mere masculinization of feminine words in *-ιδ-*, since **-eh₂- > -ᾶ+ς* only individualizes the form, which is a suitable explanation for the creation of mere personal names, as seen in the Mycenaean stage. Secondly, when used to qualify masculine personal names, it receives the analogical *-s* form nominatives of other stems, as is also the case of *νεανία-ς*.

Despite this segmentation, the origin of **-id-* remains unexplained and has no parallels outside the Greco-Phrygian branch.²⁴ As such, a form inherited from Proto-Indo-European and only attested in these two languages is highly unlikely. As stated above, a borrowing from Lydian is difficult to substantiate because of the Lydian chronology and use. Therefore, only an internal innovation seems plausible. At this point it can be proposed that the Greek derivatives in *-ις, -ιδος* are in fact etymological derivatives in **-i-* (see an earlier proposal in Chantraine 1933: 339, 362). If this is correct, it would explain the relatively limited presence of this suffix in Greek and the abundance of **-ιδ-*.

²³ Note, however, that I suggested a possible continuity from Hurrian *Urḫi-*, as in *Urḫi-Tešub*, heteronym of Muršili III (Obrador-Cursach 2020: 142), see fn. 9.

²⁴ I leave aside the problem of the origin of some dental suffixes found in Luwian such as CLuwian *-aḫit-/āḫid/ < -eh₂+id-* (according to Hajnal 1994: 137 fn. 4) or *-it-/id-* (Starke 1990: 151–224), which goes beyond the scope of my knowledge.

Proto-Indo-European *i*-stems are used to form nouns and adjective of all genders, as one can infer from some ancient Indo-European languages: see, e.g., Hittite *palh-i-* ‘broad’, Vedic *śúc-i-* ‘bright’, Greek τροφ-ι-ς ‘stout, large’, Latin *turpis* ‘ugly’ (< **mor-i-*), Old Irish *maith* ‘good’. However, details on this possible category in PIE remain cryptic if not controversial, since exact formations in different branches are not found (see Balles 2009; Rau 2009: 72, 132; Grestenberger 2014: 94–95). Leaving aside the exact origin of *i*-stem adjectives in Indo-European languages, we can assume that those found in the prehistory of Greek are relational adjectives in **-i-* ‘belonging, related to’, with no gender distinction (as assumed for PIE and as still seen in Latin and in some Greek words),²⁵ secondly individualized (**-eh₂-*) and masculinized (through an analogical **-s* in the nominative) ‘he who is related to’, as seen in the diversity of types of words that *-ιδας* derives: they can be derived from a personal name, such as the gentilics derived from a mythical ancestor (Αἰθαλίδαι, Ἰωνίδαι, Σκαμβωνίδαι) and the names of families (Βαγχιάδαι, Κυψελίδαι, Πεισιστρατίδαι, etc.), from a place name (Εὐριπίδης, Βρασιδάς) or even from nouns (like εὐπατριδής or κοιρανιδής). In fact, the history of the patronymic in *-ίων* is very similar, where after an adjective in **-yo-* a patronymic was built by the addition of the individualizing *-ων*. At some point in Greek pre-history after the creation of personal names in *-ιδας*, the suffix *-ιδ-* was identified as a feminine formation, since many words derived through **-i-* (but not all) are found as feminine in historical times. Consequently, *-ιδας* was not the masculine of *-ιδ-*, as previously suggested.

The suffix *-ιδ-* may have arisen as an analogical inflection after the Greco-Phrygian shift **-VT-s#* > *-Vs#*. In the case of Greek, this shift can be seen in Attic νεότης ‘youth’ (Doric, Aeolic νεότης, Latin *nouitās* ‘newness, novelty’) < PIE **néuo-teh₂t-s* (Rix 1992: 143, §157), χάρις, χάριτος ‘beauty, elegance; gratitude’ < PIE **ǵʰr̥-i-t-* and Doric πῶς, ποδός ‘foot’ < PIE **póds* (Attic πούς is problematic). For Phrygian, the shift occurs in Old Phrygian *nevos* ‘male descendant’ < **nepot-s* (acc. sg. *nevotan*, identified by Hämmig 2013) and the theonym Βας < **bʰóh₂-t-* / **bʰéh₂-t-* (acc. sg. *batan*, Βαταν see Obrador-Cursach 2017). Importantly, there are problems and divergences in the inflection of *i*-stems in Greek (Chantraine 1933: 114; Beekes 1973: 241–245). Alongside the words which retained the inherited inflection (ὄις, οἴος ὄ and ἦ ‘sheep, ram’) and variants (π(τ)όλις, πόλιος or -ηρος/-εως ‘city’), there are words that follow two inflections, with and without the dental enlargement: μῆνις ‘wrath’ gen. μῆνιος or μῆνιδος, μῆτις, ἦ ‘wisdom, skill, craft’ gen. μῆτιος and μῆτιδος, εὖνις, ὄ, ἦ ‘reft of, bereaved of’ gen. εὖνιδος and εὖνιος and nom.pl. εὖνιδες and εὖνιες, πτερίς, ἴδος has the variant πτέρις, εως ἦ ‘male fern, Aspidium Filix-mas’, etc. There are also words with an accusative singular which shows an earlier stage: for instance, ἔρις, ἴδος ‘strife, quarrel, contention’ (an original *-i* stem, EDG 459) has ἔριν together with ἔριδα. As far as we know, Phrygian *i*-stems only retain the original ending in the accusative: the personal name *manes* has a genitive *manitos* but an accusative *manin*.²⁶ Therefore, it can be inferred that the inflection of some *i*-stem words merged the dental stems (which have a *-Vs* nominative), resulting in the creation of a new derivative suffix not found outside Greco-Phrygian or an analogy of the genitive from dental stems (*-VTos*) that prompted a reanalysis of such stems. The advantage of this hypothesis is that it would explain the presence of the dental in unexpected environments such as παῖς, παιδός, ὄ, ἦ ‘child; daughter or son’ < **péh₂u-i-s* << **péh₂u-* ‘few, little’ (seen in Attic παῦς, cf. EDG 1142–1143) and even why this word can be used as both masculine and feminine. Just like *-is*, *-is* in the third Latin declension, in the early stages of Greek pre-history, the suffix **-is* could have been indifferent

²⁵ The same claim was made by Leukart 1994: 255–256, who stated “Das Suffix /-id-/ war ursprünglich genus-indifferent, vgl. παῖιδ-”. Note that παῖς (Epic πάϊς), παιδός ‘child’ (masculine and feminine) goes back to **peh₂u-*.

²⁶ We can infer from **dh₃-ti-m* > *totin* ‘gift, offering’ (Ligorio 2016) that the same accusative is preserved in the derivatives in *-ti-*, as in Greek (cf. the acc. δόσιν of δόσις, εως or ιος).

to the masculine and feminine gender. Consequently, the formation $-\dot{\iota}\delta\text{-}\bar{\alpha}\varsigma$ can be considered the “Maskulinisierung des genusindifferenten Suffixes $-\dot{\iota}\delta\text{-}$ ” (Meier 1975, § 66), during the specialization process of the suffix $*-id\text{-}$ as forming feminine and diminutive words. A similar process can be found in Luwian. In this language the i -stems of foreign origin were adapted as neuter id -stems (Starke 1990: 210–226). This is, for example, the case of Hurrian loanwords: e.g., Hurrian *abi*- ‘sacrificial pit’ is adapted in Luwian as *abid*- and *erippi*-, *irimpi*- ‘cedar’ as *irimpid*-, *irippid*-.²⁷

If the above scenario is accepted for Greek, it is likely that $*-id\text{-}$ can in fact be analysed as $*^{\circ}i\text{-}d\text{-}$, since in many instances it is an innovation of inherited i -stems (e.g. $*\mu\acute{e}lp\text{-}$ ‘expect’ > $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\pi\text{-}\acute{\iota}\varsigma$, $\acute{\iota}\delta\text{o}\varsigma$ ‘hope, expectation’, EDG 415). This new suffix $-d\text{-}$ was also analogically added to other stems such as derivatives in $*-iH\text{-}$ > $*-i\text{-}$ ($\kappa\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\iota\varsigma$, $\kappa\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\iota\delta\acute{o}\varsigma$ ‘bar, bolt’ < $*\kappa\lambda\acute{e}h_{2u}\text{-}iH\text{-}$, EDG 711) and some non-inherited u -stems: $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$, $-\acute{\upsilon}\delta\text{o}\varsigma$, $\acute{\eta}$ ‘fresh-water tortoise, esp. *Emys lutaria*’ (also $\acute{\alpha}\mu\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$, $-\acute{\upsilon}\delta\text{o}\varsigma$, $\acute{\eta}$), $\pi\eta\lambda\alpha\mu\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$, $\acute{\upsilon}\delta\text{o}\varsigma$, $\acute{\eta}$ ‘young tunny’, $\chi\lambda\alpha\mu\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$ ‘short mantle, cloak’. One can add to this list $\pi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\mu\upsilon\varsigma$, $\upsilon\delta\text{o}\varsigma$ ‘king’, a clear borrowing from Lydian *qaλmu*- ‘king’. The same process occurs in the inflection of foreign personal names, such as the eight Lydian names in genitive used as patronymic which were adapted in Greek as dental stems²⁸ in the inscriptions of Ephesos *IEphesos* I.2 (= *Ephesos* 572):

Αταδος (l. 24, 26, 54, 55), genitive of Ατας (LGPN V5a-45664–5, KPN § 119–2), Lydian *ata-* (LW 030, Sardis).

Ατιδος (l. 23, 43, 47, 56), genitive of Ατις (LGPN V5a-45671–6, KPN § 119–4).

Βαβαδος (l. 50), genitive of Βαβας (LGPN V5a-45956 and 45962, KPN § 133–1).

Ιβιδος (l. 55), genitive of Ιβις (not included in KPN nor in LGPN, only in literary sources).

Καδωδος (l. 37, 50), genitive of Καδως (LGPN V5a-49067–8, KPN § 500–10), Lydian *katowa-* (LW 010, Sardis).

Καρουδος (l. 16, 17, 18, 33, 45, 46, 48, 49, 54), genitive of Καρους (LGPN V3b-28762–72, KPN § 542–2), Lydian *karo-* (e.g. LW 010, Sardis).

Κονδαδος (l. 33), genitive of Κονδας (LGPN V5a 49365, not included in KPN).

Ποταδος (l. 57), genitive of Ποτας (LGPN V5a 52275–6, not included in KPN).

This short list shows how three different patterns were adapted²⁹ in a similar way: we have names with a nominative in $-\text{o}\upsilon\varsigma$ (Καρους), in $-\text{i}\varsigma$ (Ατις and Ιβις) and in $-\text{a}\varsigma$ (Ατας, Βαβας, Κονδας and Ποτας). Καδως, Καδωδος is a special case, since it shows the evolution of a name in $-\text{a}\varsigma$ with the vowel contraction occurring after the loss of $/w/$: Lydian *katowa-* > Καδοας (KPN § 500–7) > Καδως. The dental adaptation for names in $-\text{i}\varsigma$ is not surprising in light of observations made above. The adaptation of Καρους can be explained by the inflection of $\pi\acute{o}\upsilon\varsigma$, $\pi\acute{o}\delta\acute{o}\varsigma$. The names in $-\text{a}\varsigma$ follow the inflection of some Greek nouns in $-\bar{\alpha}\varsigma$ $-\bar{\alpha}\delta\text{o}\varsigma$ (e.g. $\phi\epsilon\upsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$, $\phi\epsilon\upsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\delta\text{o}\varsigma$ ‘exile’), which remain problematic. It is common to read that the suffixes $-\dot{\iota}\delta\text{-}$, $-\upsilon\delta\text{-}$ and $-\alpha\delta\text{-}$ are variants of a Pre-Greek suffix (see Keurentjes 1997: 397). However, no traces of Pre-Greek have been identified in Phrygian, the language which shares at least the dental ex-

²⁷ I provide these examples according to Yakubovich 2015. For a possible instance of a similar development in an inherited Luwian lexeme, cf. Yakubovich 2016: 481. In fact, it seems that at some stage of this language almost all the neuter i -stems were eliminated, some by way of transfer to the id -class through a proportional analogy of a similar kind (Yakubovich in p.c.).

²⁸ See Kearns 1994, who defended the presence of the dental adaptation as a “transformation of the Lydian possessive adjectives in $-\text{i}\varsigma$ ”. This statement is unnecessary, since they are names in genitive, not adjectives. The inscription contains a death sentence passed against Sardian men for sacrilege against Artemis Ephesos.

²⁹ Note that the adaptations of these names do not always follow the same pattern. In Pisidia we find the dative Ατα (MAMA 4.245) of Ατας without any trace of a dental inflection. The same is seen with Βαβα, the genitive of Βαβας found in Bithynia and Phrygia.

tension for the *i*-stems. If we add to this the possible internal development of the suffix as argued here, an alternative origin for *-αδ-* must be found.

To develop the hypothesis of analogy suggested for *-ιδ-*, it would be necessary to find a kind of nominative which could be the source of such a stem. Here, one could suggest some *as*-stem neuters. In fact, they have multiple origins: they can be “primary *s*-stems derived from a root in final **-h₂*” like γῆρας ‘old age’ or γέρας ‘prize of honor’ < **gh₂-s-*, from “secondary *s*-stem derivatives from **h₂-stems*” (Nikolaev 2010a: 191) like δέμας ‘bodily frame’ (see Nikolaev 2010b) and from a heteroclitic **r/n*-stem. The latter is the case of only two Greek words, “τέρας ‘marvel’ and πείρας/πέρας ‘limit’, which may continue **k^wer-γ* and **per-υγ*” (Nikolaev 2010a: 190). Note that the first has two inflections, Epic τέρας, τέραος vs. the dental extension in the most common τέρας, τέρατος, and the second also has variants, Epic and Lyric πείραο and πείρας, but it is commonly inflected as a *t*-stem: πέρας, πέρατος. However, a complex process of stem reconversion and a gender shift is unlikely as an explanation for the origin of the words containing the suffix *-αδ-* because it requires the assumption of two processes that cannot be proved.

The process can be explained in other terms, including a prior neuter stage. In fact, the words with *-αδ-* may derive from ancient collective neuters in **-h₂* with the ending for animate nouns in **-s*, a kind of “singulative” found, e.g., in δρῦς, δρῦός ‘tree, oak’ (feminine) < **druh₂-s* ‘a single tree’ << **dru-h₂* ‘wood’ << **doleru* ‘tree’ (Janda 1997: 141–145). A similar process has been considered for the masculine Greek noun λᾶας, λᾶος by Nikolaev (2010a: 192–193): **leh₂-e/os-* ‘stone’ >> **leh₂-es-h₂* ‘mass of stones’ >> Proto-Greek *lāha-s* ‘stone’. Thus, we can hypothesize that a singulative like νιφάς ἄδος, ἡ ‘snowflake; snowstorm’ has the following prehistory: PIE **sneǵ^{wh}-* ‘to snow’ >> **niǵ^{wh}-h₂* ‘the snow’ >> **niǵ^{wh}-h₂-s* ‘snowflake’. The same applies to φυγάς, ἄδος, ὁ, ἡ ‘one who flees, fugitive, exile’: PIE **b^hueǵ-* ‘to flee’ >> **b^hug-h₂* ‘exile’ >> **b^hug-h₂-s* ‘a single exile’. The parallel process can be hypothesized for λιθάς, ἄδος, ἡ ‘stone’, λαμπάς, ἄδος, ἡ ‘torch’ and words with the same suffix. After the creation of **s*-stem non-neuter nouns and the shift **-VT-s#* > *-Vs#* with the rise of the new suffix *-δ-*, the nominative resulting from **-h₂-s*, with a strange short-vowel nominative and **s*-stem inflection was re-analysed as **-a-d-s* > **-α-ς* and a new stem **-a-d-* considered to be a suffix. Following this process, the new suffix *-α-δ-* was also used as an allomorph of *-ιδ-* after *-ι-*, as in Ἰλιον/Ἰλιος >> Ἰλιάς, ἄδος, ἡ ‘the Troad; a Trojan woman; The Iliad (the poem)’. It also occurs in the patronymics built after this suffix such as Δέξιος >> Δεξιάδης (*Il.* 7.15).

To sum up, the main idea is that the nominatives of some ancient stems (mainly the relational adjective **-is* and the singulative of an ancient collective **-h₂-s* > *-as*) were re-analysed after the shift **-VT-s#* > *-Vs#* and, as a result, a new suffix **-V(δ)-* was created in Greek (and Phrygian). On the basis of the resulting suffix **-id-*, singulatives in **-id-eh₂-s* were created and became used as patronymics in Homer (and in Cyprus, according to the syllabic inscriptions).

5. Variation in Phrygian patronymics

Similarly to Lycian and Greek, Old Phrygian shows different ways of expressing patronymics. To the best of our knowledge, Phrygian has patronymics built with a plain genitive without any noun for ‘son’ or ‘daughter’. There are two different structures of this formula. The first is the personal name followed by the father’s name in genitive:³⁰

³⁰ The identification of *-oy*, written both <oi> and <oy>, as the thematic genitive is a recent proposal by Oreshko (fthc.), who also adds the Middle Phrygian inscription W-11 νικοστρατος κλευμαχοι ‘Nikostratos (the

W-08: *ates agomoi* ‘Ates (the son) of Agomos’ (according to Oreshko fthc.).

B-05: *atriyas davoı* ‘Atriya (the son) of Davos’ (according to Oreshko fthc.).

K-01: *ḡasa urgıtos* ‘Masa (the son) of Urgis’

HP-102: *midas aiasay* ‘Midas (the son) of Aiasa’ ?

Conversely, there are several examples of a possible genitive preceding the name, which is usually the case of normal genitives in Indo-European languages but does not occur with patronymics:

M-06: *davoı iman* ‘Iman (the son) of Davos’ (according to Oreshko fthc.).

G-136: *tadoy : iman* ‘Iman (the son) of Tados’ ?? dative?

G-144: *estatoi avun* ‘Avun (the son) of Estados’ ???

Dd-101: *pser²keyoy atas* ‘Atas (the son) of Pser/ukeyoıs’ ?

Dd-102: *surgastoy inas* ‘Inas (the son) of Surgastos’ ?

Alternatively, Phrygian has “possessive” or “genitival” adjectives used as patronymics.

The clearest are those with the suffix *-(e)vais*, *-(e)vanos* < **-wnt-s*,

T-02b: *[-?]-ḡumıda : memeuıs* ‘[-?]-ḡumıda (the son) of Meme(s)’³¹

P-02: *bugnos vasos kanutii²evanoıs* ‘Bugnos (the son) of Vasos (the son) of Kanuḡı’

P-03: *vasous iman mekas ḡanutieivaiıs* ‘Vasos Iman the great (the son) of Kanuḡı’

M-01a: *ates : arkiavais* ‘Attes (the son) of Archias’

M-01b: *baba : memevais* ‘Baba (the son) of Meme(s)’

M-02: *bba : memevais* ‘Baba (the son) of Meme(s)’

Other kinds of patronymic adjective are more problematic. As stated above, there is one possible example of a patronymic in *-eyo-*: G-183 *tiveia imeneia* ‘Tiveia (the daughter) of Iman’. Also problematic is the alleged example of a Phrygian patronymic in *-idas*: B-07 *manes iyungıdas manıtos*.³² Is Manes the son of a man called *ıyungı-* and grandson of a man called Manes? In fact, *ıyungıdas* is a hapax and even its spelling is strange in Phrygian (there are no other attested examples of <ıy> at the beginning of a word). We do not know the origin of this form, although theoretically it could be an ethnic in **-eh₂-s* like *tias* (G-249, said of a *sekel* ‘weight’), New Phrygian Πουντας (said of the god *Bas* in 1.1 = 48), which can be equated to Greek Ποντανηνός (KON 504 § 1085), and, before being a personal name, **Gordiyas* > Γορδίας, equated to Greek Γορδιανός (literally ‘the one from Gordion’).³³ The most striking feature, however, is that *-idas* is incompatible with the homophonic Greek patronymic suffix if both are inherited. If *ıyungıdas* is a patronymic in *-idas*, it must be a feature borrowed from Greek. But can we be sure that it is not another kind of formation? We cannot, and unfortunately it is a hapax.

When considering the Phrygian variant of patronymic expression, one wonders if this – or indeed any of the attested variants – can be considered a contact-induced feature. In fact, the formulas attested in Phrygian have parallels in other languages from Anatolia, with the sole exclusion of the possible sequence father’s name in genitive + personal name. As explained above (§2), however, the use of *-(e)yo-* (Obrador-Cursach 2020: 84–85) seems to be an inherited feature shared with Mycenaean Greek and Aeolic. The suffix *-(e)van-* is also inherited and used to create some patronymics (Obrador-Cursach 2020: 84–85). So, Phrygian, like Greek, shows no suffix transference in its patronymic formations. It is also plausible that the genitive use of

son) of Kleumakhos’. According to him, the suffix *oi*, *-oy/-oi* goes back to **-osyo* as Mycenaean Greek *-o-jo* /*-oyo/*, Epic *-oio* and Thessalian *-oi* (after apocope). One can wonder whether it is a case of syncretism rather than apocope. Before his proposal, these forms were considered dative singular.

³¹ The form *memeuıs* instead of *memevais* (M-01b) is explained as influenced by the Anatolian shift *wa* > *u*. Note that the inscription was found in *Tuvana* (Greek Τύανα), a relevant Luwian capital.

³² This is a proposal by Brixhe (2004: 77–78), followed by Avram 2019: 312.

³³ On Phrygian ethnics in **-eh₂-s* > *-as*, see Obrador-Cursach 2019b.

the patronymic could be an influence of the Anatolian languages with this strategy and/or Greek on Phrygian. At least the genitive followed by the personal name has no parallels in Anatolian, so an influence is not expected. A Greek influence can also be ruled out: early contacts are only detected in the case of Aeolic, a dialect whose patronymics are built with a derivative in **-iyo-* (as seen above). Therefore, one must conclude that the genitive patronymics in Phrygian are an internal innovation, although an Anatolian influence (Luwian would be the most likely candidate) cannot be ruled out or traced back.

Conclusions

Having compared the available data with the suggested proposals, it seems prudent to assume that patronymics do not provide evidence of a strong influence between Greek and the languages spoken in Anatolia. Suffix transference, as suggested for *-ιδᾶς/-ίδης* and for Aeolic *-ιος*, are accounted for as purely Greek features. Only local calques can be accepted at most, as in the case of ‘son’ or ‘daughter’ used after the father’s name in Greek-Lycian bilingual inscriptions. More controversial is the case of the father’s name in genitive alone: this Greek feature is also found in Phrygian, Lycian, Carian and Sidetic, while Luwian always shows the presence of the noun for ‘son’. Coastal areas are known to have been quickly Hellenized, so it is possible that Greek exerted an influence on these languages, if it is not an areal feature (despite the absence of Lydian from this list). However, the elision of the noun ‘son’ in genealogies is so general that an internal feature cannot be ruled out.

Acknowledgements

This paper was produced in the framework of the project PALaC, which has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (Grant Agreement n° 757299). An earlier version was presented at the workshop “Contacts in Pre-Hellenistic Anatolia and Ancient Near East: From Languages to Texts” (Verona, 25–27 February 2021), organized by PALaC and the project Luwili.

References

- Adams, James Noel. 2003. *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Adiego, Ignacio Javier. 2007. *The Carian Language*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Adiego, Ignacio Javier. 2010a. On Lycian Genitives in *-h*, *-he*. In: R. Kim, N. Oettinger, E. Rieken, M. Weiss (eds.). *Ex Anatolia Lux: Anatolian and Indo-European studies in honor of H. Craig Melchert on the occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday*: 1–8. Ann Arbor, New York: Beech Stave Press.
- Adiego, Ignacio Javier. 2010b. Recent developments in the decipherment of Carian. In: R. van Bremen and J.-M. Carbon (eds.). *Hellenistic Karia. Proceedings of the First International Conference on Hellenistic Karia – Oxford, 29 June – 2 July 2006*: 147–576. Bordeaux: Ausonius Éditions.
- Avram, Alexandru. 2019. Phrygian personal names in Phrygian inscriptions. In: G. R. Tsitskhladze (ed.). *Phrygia in Antiquity: from the Bronze Age to the Byzantine Period. Proceedings of an International Conference ‘The Phrygian Lands over Time: From Prehistory to the Middle of the 1st Millennium AD’, held at Anadolu University, Eskişehir, Turkey, 2nd–8th November, 2015*: 305–349. Leuven/Paris/Bristol: Peeters.
- Balles, Irene. 2009. Zu den *i*-stämmigen Adjektiven des Lateinischen. In: R. Lühr and S. Ziegler (eds.). *Protolanguage and Prehistory. Akten der XII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 11. bis 15. Oktober 2004 in Krakau*: 1–26. Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag.

- Bartoněk, Antonín. 2003. *Handbuch des mykenischen Griechisch*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Beekes, Robert S. P. 1973. The Greek *i-* and *u-*Stems and *πόλις, -ης*. *Glotta* 51(3–4): 228–245.
- Bianconi, Michele. 2020. The linguistic relationships between Greek and the Anatolian languages. (Dissertation Summary). *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 20: 133–145.
- Brixhe, Claude. 2006. Préhistoire et début de l'histoire des dialectes grecs. *Incontri Linguistici* 29: 39–59.
- Chantraine, Pierre. 1933. *La formation des noms en grec ancien*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Christiansen, Birgit. 2019. Editions of Lycian Inscriptions not Included in Melchert's Corpus from 2001. In: I.-X. Adiego, J.V. García Trabazo, M. Vernet, B. Obrador-Cursach, E. Martínez Rodríguez (eds.). *Luwic dialects and Anatolian. Inheritance and diffusion*: 65–134. Barcelona: Publicacions Universitat de Barcelona.
- Dardano, Paola. 2011. I patronimici in *-iḏāç* del greco antico tra conservazione e innovazione. *Res Antiquae* 8: 41–62.
- Duhoux, Yves. 2008. "Mycenaean anthology". In: Y. Duhoux, A. Morpurgo Davies (eds.). *A Companion to Linear B. Mycenaean Greek Texts and their World*. Volumen I: 243–394. Louvain-La-Neuve/Dudley: Peeters.
- EDG = Beekes, Robert S.P. 2010. *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Fellner, Hannes A., Laura Gretzenberger. 2016. Greek and Latin verbal governing compounds in **-ā* and their pre-history. In: B. S. S. Hansen, B. N. Whitehead, Th. Olander, B. A. Olsen (eds.). *Etymology and the European Lexicon. Proceedings of the 14th Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, 17–22 September 2012, Copenhagen*: 135–149. Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag.
- Gérard, Raphaël. 2005. *Phonétique et morphologie de la langue lydienne*. Louvain-la-neuve: Peeters.
- Gretzenberger, Laura. 2014. Zur Funktion des Nominalsuffixes **-i-* im Vedischen und Urindogermanischen. In: N. Oettinger, Th. Steer (eds.). *Das Nomen im Indogermanischen. Morphologie, Substantiv versus Adjektiv, Kollektivum. Akten der Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 14. bis 16. September 2011 in Erlangen*: 88–102. Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag.
- Hajnal, Ivo. 1994. Die lykischen *a*-Stämme: Zum Werdegang einer Nominalklasse. In: J. E. Rasmussen, B. Nielsen (eds.). *In honorem Holger Pedersen, Kolloquium der Indogermanische Gesellschaft vom 25. bis 28. März 1993 in Kopenhagen*: 135–171. Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag.
- Hajnal, Ivo. 2018. Greco-Anatolian contacts in the Mycenaean Period. In: Jared Klein, Brian Joseph, Matthias Fritz (eds.). *Handbook of Comparative and Historical Indo-European Linguistics. Volume 3*: 2037–2055. Berlin: DeGruyter.
- Hämmig, Anna Elisabeth. 2013. *Nevotan niptiyan*. Die Fluchformel der Stele von Vezirhan. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 118: 134–38.
- Hawkins, Calvert. 2001. An Indo-European Linguistic Area and its Characteristics: Ancient Anatolia. Areal Diffusion as a challenge to the Comparative Method?. In: A. Y. Aikhenvald, R. M. W. Dixon (eds.). *Areal Diffusion and Genetic Inheritance*: 44–63. Oxford University Press.
- Kearns, John M. 1994. A Greek Genitive from Lydia. *Glotta* 72(1): 5–14.
- Keurentjes, M. B. G. 1997. The Greek patronymics in *-(i)ḏαç / -(i)ḏηç*. *Mnemosyne* 50(4): 385–400.
- LGPN = Fraser, Peter M., Elaine Matthews (eds.). 1987–. *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Ligorio, Orsat. 2016. Old Phrygian *totin*. *Lucida intervalla* 45: 33–39.
- Lubotsky, Alexander. 2004. The Phrygian Zeus and the Problem of the 'Lautverschiebung'. *Historische Sprachforschung* 117(2): 229–37.
- Masson, Olivier. 1965. Trois questions de dialectologie grecque. *Glotta* 43: 217–234.
- Meier, Michael. 1975. *-iḏ-*. *Zur Geschichte eines vorgriechischen Nominalsuffixes*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Melchert, H. C. 2008. Greek *mólybdos* as a Loanword from Lydian. In: B. J. Collins, M. R. Bachvarova, I. C. Rutherford (eds.). *Anatolian Interfaces: Hittites, Greeks and their Neighbours. Proceedings of an International Conference on Cross-Cultural Interaction, September 17–19, 2004, Emory University, Atlanta*: 153–157. Oxford University Press.
- Melchert, H. Craig. 2012. Genitive case and possessive adjective in Anatolian. In: Vincenzo Orioles (ed.). *Per Roberto Gusmani. Linguistica storica e teorica: Studi in ricordo. 2nd edition. Vol. 1*: 273–286. Udine: Forum.
- Merlin, Stella, Valerio Pisaniello. 2019. Linguistic strategies in filiation formulas: data from Lycian-Greek bilingual texts. *Incontri linguistici* 42: 89–108.
- Nikolaev, Alexander. 2010a. Time to Gather Stones Together: Greek and Its Indo-European Background. In: S. W. Jamison, H. C. Melchert, B. Vine (eds.). *Proceedings of the 21st Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference*: 189–206. Bremen: Hempen.
- Nikolaev, Alexander. 2010b. Indo-European **dem(h₂-)* 'to build' and its derivatives. *Historische Sprachforschung* 123: 56–96.
- Obrador-Cursach, Bartomeu. 2017. The Phrygian god Bas. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 76(2): 307–317.

- Obrador-Cursach, Bartomeu. 2019a. On the place of Phrygian among the Indo-European languages. *Journal of Language Relationship* 17(3): 233–245.
- Obrador-Cursach, Bartomeu. 2019b. Γορδίας and Γόρδιον: a remark on Phrygian onomastics and ethnics. *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 47(3–4): 545–552.
- Obrador-Cursach, Bartomeu. 2020. *The Phrygian language*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Oreshko, Rostislav. Forthc. *Phrygian and the Early History of Greek Dialects*.
- Rau, Jeremy. 2009. *Indo-European Nominal Morphology. The Decads and the Caland System*. Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft.
- Rix, Helmut. 1992. *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen. Laut- und Formenlehre*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Rosół, Rafał. 2013. *Frühe semitische Lehnwörter im Griechischen*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Rutherford, Ian. 2002. Interference or Translationese? Some Patterns in Lycian-Greek Bilingualism. In: J. N. Adams, M. Janse, S. Swain (eds.). *Bilingualism in Ancient Society: 197–219*. Oxford University Press.
- Schürr, Diether. 2010. Lykische Genitive. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 115: 118–126.
- Schürr, Diether. 2013. Kaunisch-Karisches in Krya: Revision der Grabinschrift und Vergleiche. In: O. Henry (ed.). *4th Century Karia. Defining a Karian Identity under the Hekatomnids: 21–31*. Istanbul/Paris: Institut Français d'Études Anatoliennes.
- Schwyzler, Eduard. 1953. *Griechische Grammatik. Erster Band: Allgemeiner Teil. Lautlehre. Wortbildung. Flexion*. München: Verlag C. H. Beck.
- Seifart, Frank. 2015. Direct and indirect affix borrowing. *Language* 91(3): 511–532.
- Simon, Zsolt. 2018. Anatolian Influences on Greek. In: Ł. Niesiołowski-Spanò, M. Węcowski (eds.). *Change, Continuity, and Connectivity. North-eastern Mediterranean at the turn of the Bronze Age and in the early Iron Age: 376–418*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Simon, Zsolt. 2019. Zu den karisch-griechischen Lehnbeziehungen. *Glotta* 95: 295–308.
- Starke, Frank. 1990. *Untersuchung zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Nomens*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Yakubovich, Ilya. 2010. *Sociolinguistics of the Luwian Language*. Leiden: Brill.
- Yakubovich, Ilya. 2015. *The Luwian Language*. Oxford Handbooks Online. doi: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199935345.013.18.
- Yakubovich, Ilya. 2016. A Luwian Welcome. In: Šárka Velhartická (ed.). *Audias fabulas veteres: Anatolian Studies in Honor of Jana Součková-Siegelová: 463–484*. Leiden: Brill.
- Yakubovich, Ilya. 2017. An agreement between the Sardians and the Mermnads in the Lydian language? *Indogermanische Forschungen* 122: 265–294.

БартOMEУ ОбРАДОР-КУРСАК. Патронимы и проблема интерференции между древнегреческим языком и древними языками Малой Азии

В статье описываются стратегии выражения патронимов (отчеств) в различных языках, засвидетельствованных в Малой Азии железного века (I тыс. до н. э.), а также обсуждается возможность обоснования языковых контактов на данном материале. Особое внимание уделяется вопросу о возможной интерференции генитивных патронимов в сочетании со словом «сын/дочь» или без такового, обсуждавшемся ранее в работах Merlin, Pisaniello 2019 и Rutherford 2002, а также гипотезе о лидийском влиянии на греческие патронимы и родовые имена с формантом *-ídaς/-íδης* (Dardano 2011). В последнем случае, сравнение с фригийским материалом говорит в пользу унаследованного характера данной модели в древнегреческом языке. В целом лишь в очень немногих случаях удастся проследить ареальное происхождение патронимов и сходных образований.

Ключевые слова: патронимы; анатолийские языки; фригийский язык; древнегреческий язык; языковые контакты.