

On Some Adverbs with Variable Endings in Ancient Greek

By CATALIN ANGHELINA, Columbus (OH)

Greek possesses a series of adverbs, which end in *-t(e)i* or, more generally, in *-(e)i*. They are quite numerous and their formation seems to be old. The Doric form ἄβοᾷτί (“without cry”, cf. βοή = “cry”) suggests that the *-t(e)i* adverbs may be of Common Greek date.

The majority of these adverbs are composed with the privative prefix ἀ-: ἀτριβί, ἀβλαβί, ἀμογητί, ἀμαχητί, ἀνουτητί, ἀνιδρωτί, ἀναίμωτί, ἀνωιστί, ἀβοατί, etc.¹

There are two main striking facts about these adverbs:

- 1) the accent is oxytonic
- 2) the endings of these adverbs display a variation between *-ī*, *-ī̄*, *-ei*, which is not only the result of scribal errors in the manuscripts

Most of these adverbs have a corresponding adjective, which can be either thematic or in *-es*; the majority of the latter are either derived from *s*-stem neuters or *deverbativa*.²

- a) thematic adjectives either in *-tos* or in *-os*

- ἀνιδρωτί - ἀνιδρωτος = “without having sweated” (O 228)
- ἀμογητί - ἀμόγητος = “unwearied” (Λ 637)
- ἀσπονδί - ἄσπονδος = “to whom no drink-offering is poured” (SIG 168.9; SIG 110 – from 5th century B.C.)
- ἀμαχητί - ἀμάχητος = “without fight” (Φ 437)
- ἄωρί - ἄωρος = “untimely” (Theoc.11.40)
- ἄθει - ἄθεος = “without god” (σ 353)
- ἀνουτητί - ἀνούτητος = “unwounded” (X 371)

¹ A list of them can be found as early as Kissling, KZ 17 (1868) 213. A more complete list is found in F. Bader, “Neutres grecs en *-ti*: absolutifs et privatifs verbaux”, BSL 65 (Paris 1970) 85-136; cf. E. Schwyzler, *Griechische Grammatik I* (München 1939) 622sqq.

² I will use, for the sake of convenience, only the ending *-i*.

- πανδημί - πάνδημος = “belonging to all people”, (A. *Th.* 296), etc.

b) adjectives ending in *-es*:

- παμμελεί - παμμελής = “with all kinds of melodies” (Porph.*Chr.* 94)
- παμπλεθεί - παμπλεθής = “with the whole multitude” (Ev.*Luc.* 23.18)
- αὐτοθελεί - αὐτοθελής = “voluntarily” (AP7.740)
- αὐτοτετεί - αὐτοτετής = “within the same year” (Theoc.28.13)
- ἀτριβεί - ἀτριβής (“not worn”), ἀτρεμεί - ἀτρεμής (“unmoved”) (Hdn.*Epim.* 255, see below), etc.³

Other adverbs of this type are derived from verbs in *-ζω*:

- ὀνομαστί = “by name” (Call. *Aet. Oxy.* 2080.81), from ὀνομάζω
- ἀνδριστί = “like a man” (Ar.*Ec.* 149; Theocr.18.23)
- ἀνθρωπιστί = “in the language of men” (Soph. *Fr.* 827)
- Δωριστί = “in Doric language” (Call. *Iamb.* 1.354)
- Ἰαστί = “in Ionic” (Pl.*Rep.* 398e)
- Ἑλληνιστί = “in Greek” (Pl.*Ti.* 21e)
- μελειστί = “by members” (Ω 409, ι 291, σ 339)

The adverb ἐγρηγορτί = “awake” is a class of its own. The ending *-ti* was attached to the perfect stem of the verb ἐγείρω.

The most important fact regarding these adverbs is that they show variable endings in both manuscripts and inscriptions. The quantity of the last syllable is also variable. The main question then concerns the original morphological form of these adverbs. We will present here only the most relevant examples for our argument.

In Homer the privative type of these adverbs show the final syllable as metrically long:⁴

³ Other adverbs can be used in parallel: e.g., ἀβλαβῶς, ἀτριβῶς, etc; Homer has αὐτοτετές = “within the year” (γ 322), which is a former accusative of the same stem.

⁴ At the end of the hexameter one cannot tell the quantity: e.g., ἀμαχητί (Φ 437).

- ἀνωιστί = “unlooked for” (from οἶμαι, δ 92)
- ἀνουτητί “without wound” (from οὐτάω, X 371)
- ἀνιδρωτί = “without sweat” (from ἰδρώω, O 228)
- ἀναιμωτί⁵ = “without blood” (P 363)

In fact, a form like ἀνιδρωτί (~ - - -) could not even fit the meter if the final *i* had been short. One could deduce from here that the long final syllable is the original one. But Homer uses also μελειστί (Ω 409, ι 291, σ 339), where the final syllable is metrically short. An obvious and easy answer to this would be that this is only a metrical shortening. The data we have, however, show that the issue is more general than the examples in Homer let us see. In post-Homeric times, these adverbs show the same variability of their endings in both manuscripts and inscriptions. The problem is further complicated by the fact that many of these occurrences show an ending *-ei*, which can be metrically associated with *ī*, but not, of course, with *ī̄*. The latest edition of the *Iliad*, for example, reads all the endings of these adverbs in Homer as *-ei*.⁶ Inscriptions show this variation as early as the 5th century BC.⁷

The short *-ī*, on the other hand, is also often metrically attested:

- ἐγκονητί = “being active” (Pind. *N*.3.36)
- ἄβοατί = “without cry” (Pind. *N*.8.9)
- ἄμογητί = “without work” (Call. *H. Art.* 25)
- ἄστενακτί = “without sighing” (Eur. *Fr.* 307), etc.

An important fact comes up in Sophocles. The word ἄστακτί = “not in drops” is used in the same play both with *ī̄* or *-ei* (OC 1646) and *ī̄* (OC 1251).

⁵ It is unclear where the ω comes from. Homer uses the adjective ἀναιμῶν = “bloodless” (E 342). Bader (n.1) 93 saw it as built after ἀνιδρωτί; cf. E. Risch, οὐκ ἄθεεῖ, *MH* 29 (1972) 66-7.

⁶ M.L. West, *Homeri Ilias* (Stuttgart-Leipzig-München 1998-2000); μελειστί keeps the *ī̄*, of course.

⁷ ακονιται (SIG 36B, Olympia) vs. ακονιτι (SIG 36A, Delphi), αδαιτη (Del. 179 a 13, Crete) with -ηι standing for *-ei*, ονομασται (SIG 355.13, 4-3rd century BC) vs. ονομαστι (IG I² 57.44, 5th century BC), etc.

These facts show also that the variability of these adverbial endings is not a matter of dialectal variation. What we find beginning with Homer is that these endings were completely mixed up by speakers. This conclusion is supported by the ancient grammarian Herodianus (2nd century AD).⁸ In trying to explain how to use orthographically *-ei* or *-i* in these adverbs, he comes to the conclusion that the endings depend on the precedent consonant: e.g., after *b* one should use *-i* (ἀτρίβι, ὀβλαβί, etc.), whereas after *l*, *m* and *n*⁹ one should use *-ei* (ἀμελεί, ἀτρεμεί, ὀφανεί, etc.).¹⁰ It is clear that there is no way we can explain the rationale behind Herodianus' argument. In his time, the orthographical use of the endings was unpredictable. The metrical examples, the inscriptional data and the manuscript tradition show also that in historical times the situation on the ground was the same.

Different explanations have been given for the origin and variation of these adverbial endings. The short *-i* has been thought to originate either in the locative of the consonantal stems or in the nominative-accusative forms of the neuter adjectives in *-i*.¹¹ The *-ei* ending was seen as a former locative of the thematic stems.¹²

⁸ *Epim.* 254sqq.

⁹ He sees the use of *-ei* after *n* to be rather an exception in the case of ὀφανεί; the rule would be that even after *n* one should use *-i*: νηποινί, ὀθηρνί: cf. Herodianus (n.8).

¹⁰ Herodianus (n.8) is not interested in the length of the final *i*. This is not surprising since in his time the length distinction was not relevant anymore: cf. A. Meillet, *Aperçu d'une histoire de la langue grecque* (Paris 1965) 284.

¹¹ Locative: G. H. Mahlow, *Die langen Vokale A, E, O in den europäischen Sprachen* (Berlin 1879) 120sqq; neuter adjectives: W. Schulze, *Berl. Phil. Wochenschrift* (1896), 1330-7 = *Kleine Schriften* (Göttingen 1966) 656-7; K. Brugmann, *IF* 27 (1910) 233sqq; J. Wackernagel, *Vorlesungen über Syntax II* (Basel 1957) 289-90.

¹² Kissling, *KZ* 17 (1868) 213sqq; E. Fraenkel, *M.S.L.* 19 (1916) "Notes Baltiques et Slaves" 36; Wackernagel (n.11); Mahlow (n.11) saw them as locatives of the adjectival themes in *-i*.

H. Jacobsohn, on the other hand, rejected the argument that -τί might represent a locative of a *t*-stem.¹³ According to him, the *t*-stems in Greek function as *nomina agentis* in compounds: ὀδμής, ἐπιβλής, etc., and, consequently, words like ἀμαχητί, ἄμογητί, ἀνιδρωτί would not belong in this category. He also rejected the opinion that these adverbs could be frozen accusative neuters in -τι. This is because the Homeric nouns in -τις, σις are derived from primary verbs, which is not the case with the adverbs mentioned above.¹⁴ To these arguments we can add the fact that in PIE the *t*-stems were scarcely represented, so that it seems hard to conceive the -τι ending originating in few words.

Another problem which cannot find a satisfactory explanation is the oxytonic accent. The general assumption is that these adverbs reflect the locative of the hysterodynamic declension, where the accent shifts on the endings during the inflection.¹⁵ Nevertheless, the -ει locative ending is unusual for the *o*-stems, where one would expect -οι, not -ει.¹⁶ Beekes thinks that this ending was imported from the pronominal stems, which are still visible in Greek in some adverbs: ἐκεῖ, πεῖ (Doric for “where”), τουτεῖ (Doric for “here”), διπλεῖ (Doric for “twice”).

Although not impossible, the above scenario seems unlikely. The adverbs here in question are oxytonic, whereas the accent on the pronominal stems is perispomene. On the other hand, the accent on Greek privative thematic adjectives is recessive, which makes the whole assumption of a thematic oxytonic locative doubtful.¹⁷

¹³ *Glotta* 16 (1928) 54; this opinion is found in Schulze (n. 11), Kretschmer, *KZ* 30 (1913) 586, E. Fraenkel, *Geschichte der griechischen nomina agentis*... (Strassburg 1910-12) 11; A. Debrunner, *Griechische Wortbildungslehre* (Heidelberg 1917) §352.

¹⁴ Ἀνιδρωτί, however, is derived from the verb, otherwise it would have shown the old stem in *s* from ἰδρώς. Jacobsohn sees it as “Denominativum”.

¹⁵ R.S.P. Beekes, *The Origins of the Indo-European Nominal Inflection* (Innsbruck 1985) 1sq and 126sq.

¹⁶ Cf. the locative Ἰσθμοῖ or οἶκοι.

¹⁷ An adjective αὐτόχειρ is found in Soph. *Ant.* 172, πλῆγεντες αὐτόχειρ σὺν μιάσματι, in the dative and with proparoxytonic accent, which suggests that the correspondent adverb has a different origin.

The most comprehensive study of these adverbs is given by Bader, who thinks that all three variants, *-tei*, *-tī* and *-tī̃*, are the result of former case endings.¹⁸ In her view, the *-tī̃* ending is a former accusative neuter, which may reflect a stage in PIE when the language was ergative, and this ending was that of an absolutive.¹⁹ An example of an absolutive would be found in Pindar (*N.8.9*), where ἄβοατί and ἔκοντες seem to be coordinated:

ἄβοατί γὰρ ἡρώων ἄωτοι περυναιεταόντων
ἤθελον κείνου γε πείθεσθ' ἀναξίαις ἔκοντες
“Since the best of the surrounding heroes wanted to listen to his
behest willingly.”

This idea had already been suggested by Wackernagel, who had confined himself to say that “Diese *-ti* Bildungen funktionieren nach Art des einst allgemein indogermanischen Absolutiv”.²⁰

It may be that in the example from Pindar ἄβοατί could be regarded as functioning similarly to an absolutive. The problem is, however, whether what we find in Pindar can be attributed to a PIE or pre-PIE stage. On the other hand, Bader seems to omit the fact that ἔκοντες is in the plural, whereas ἄβοατί would represent the singular if indeed her assumption about the *-ti* accusatives were correct. Consequently, I believe we would go too far in interpreting ἄβοατί here as a former absolutive. A similar interpretation is given to words like Ἑλληνιστί, ὀνομαστί, etc., where both the long and short final syllables are attested. Bader thinks these words are also former accusative neuters. Nevertheless, her example shows exactly the contrary: the passage presented Ἑλληνιστί ξυνιέναι, is incomplete; its

¹⁸ Bader (n.1); she also believes that there are actually two series of adverbs, one in *-ī, -ei* (type ἄωρί, ἄθει), and the other in *-tī, -tī̃*.

¹⁹ In ergative languages, the ergative is the case of the subject of a transitive verb; the absolutive is the case which characterizes the subject of an intransitive verb and the object of a transitive verb.

²⁰ Wackernagel (n.11) 288.

complete form runs τὰ πάντα Ἑλληνιστὶ ξυνιέναι,²¹ “to understand everything *in* Greek”, which sheds a completely different light on the whole syntactic construction. The word in question is an adverb of manner and not an absolutive.

As for the *-tī* adverbs, Bader thinks they are former instrumentals from the stems in *-ti*. Similarly, in Sanskrit, the ending *ī* reflects the instrumental of nouns whose theme ends in *i*: *cittī*, *ūṭī*, etc.²² Her rationale is based on the syntactic function of the privative adverbs, which is indeed instrumental. In her view, the PIE instrumental ending **-/iH#*/²³ would have given in Greek the long vowel present in our adverbs. Nevertheless, in Greek, the result of **-/iH#* is not *ī*, but *-ia* or *-ie*, which is shown, for example, by cases like PIE **/triH₂/* “three” > τρία, (Ved. *trī*) or the dual for “eyes” **/H₃ekʷiH₁/* > Hom. ὄσσε (Ved. *akṣī*).²⁴

Another attempt to solve the problem was made by Risch, for whom *-ei* reflects a locative ending.²⁵ What is interesting is that the *-tei* ending is not, in his view, old. Thus, this ending would have its origin either in verbal adjectives like ἀμάχητος or in forms like ἀδαιτεῖ, where the *t* belongs etymologically to the theme of the noun. Words like ἀμαχητί (*-εῖ*) would be a blend between ἄμαχος / ἀμαχεί, which is older, and ἀμάχητος.²⁶ He gives several examples of parallel words like ἄμαχος - ἀμάχητος: ἄμετρος - ἀμέτρητος, ἄτιμος - ἀτίμητος, ἄπυρος - ἀπύρωτος. On the other hand, the Greek adverbs ending in *-ei* would be, in his view, parallel to Sanskrit adverbs like *askambhané* (RV 10.149.1 = “without support”/ *skhambhaná-* = “support”), *anudré* (RV 10.115.6 = “without water”), *avamśé* (RV 2.15.2 = “without

²¹ Xen. *An.* 7.6.8.

²² See Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik* III (Göttingen 1930) 145sqq; T. Burrow, *The Sanskrit Language* (Delhi 2001) 232.

²³ H is a laryngeal.

²⁴ See A. Sihler, *New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin* (Oxford 1995) 47; I. Hajnal, *Sprachschichten des Mykenischen Griechisch* (Salamanca 1987) 84, n. 141.

²⁵ Risch (n.5) 70-2; his opinion is shared by Beekes (n.15) 127.

²⁶ “Vom Homerischen Material aus sieht es so aus, als ob ἀμαχητί eine (künstliche?) Kreuzung aus ἀμαχεί (seit Thuc. und Xen) und ἀμάχητος (bzw. οὐδὲ μαχητός) ist”; cf. Risch (n.5) 72.

a bamboo-stick”), etc. The Avestan *anareθe* (Y.65.9) would also belong to this category. These examples, however, raise some doubts. In privative compounds of this sort, the accent is not recessive in Indo-Iranian as is in Greek. In all the examples presented by Risch, the accent is originally oxytonic on the second member of these compounds: *skhambaná-*, *udrá-*, etc.²⁷ In addition to this, it seems that in *bahuvrīhi* compounds of this sort in Sanskrit the accent shifts on the last syllable of the word: *aphalá-* (“without offspring”) from *phála-*, *subandhú-* (“closely related”) from *bándhu-*, which might be due to the change of the linguistic category.²⁸ Therefore, the accent in the words mentioned by Risch might be due not to the PIE locative, but to other reasons, which are specific to Sanskrit.

As for the adverbs written *-ī* or *-ī̄*, Risch argues for a possible origin in either the accusative neuter in *-i* or the instrumental in *-ī*.²⁹ A further proof of this would be the existence in Sanskrit and of adverbs like *prá-yukti* (RV 10.30.1 = “by being attached forward”, “auf Antrieb”), *nī-tikti* (RV 6.4.5 = “curious”), or the Young Avestan *apaitibusti* (<*a+poti+budh- = “to recognize, to be aware of”), which were explained as being neuter accusatives or shortened instrumentals in *-ī*.³⁰

I have already addressed the assumption whether *ī* might come from an instrumental. This is not possible in Greek for phonological reasons. On the other hand, the existence of *-ti* neuters was already questioned by Jacobsohn. It seems then that we should look elsewhere for the origins of these adverbial endings.

I suggest here another solution to the problem, which tries to account, within Greek rather than in PIE, for both the oxytonic

²⁷ Even for the word *avīré*, one can see from Risch’s examples (ŚB 11.5.1) that the nominative form is *avīrám*, oxytonic: cf. Risch (n.5) 70; otherwise, the Vedic forms are paroxytonic, e.g. RV 10.95.3 (*avīre*).

²⁸ L. Renou, *Grammaire de la langue védique* (Paris 1952) 140, calls this process “oxytonèse”; cf. A.A. Macdonell, *A Vedic Grammar for Students* (Delhi 1975) 455; Wackernagel (n.22) II/1, 295.

²⁹ Risch (n.5) 72; H. Humbach, *Corolla linguistica, Festschr. F. Sommer* (Wiesbaden 1955) 92-96.

³⁰ Wackernagel (n.22) 146sq; Schwyzler (n.1) 623.

accent and the original form of the endings. Among the adverbs we analyze here, there are many which have a corresponding adjective in *-es*: e.g., ἀτριβής, ἀβλαβής, ἀμελής, ἀφανής, παγγενής, etc. The inflection of these adjectives follows the paradigm of the type ἀληθής, which had the locative ἀληθεῖ.³¹ This locative might be at the origin of our adverbs. However, the locative accent was perispomene, not oxytonic, a problem for which there has been no satisfactory explanation so far. Nevertheless, Brugmann noticed that there was a similarity between the accent of these adverbs and that of others, which are also compounds: for example, the use of ἀτριβεῖ instead of ἀτριβεῖ is similar to the adverbial use of ἐκποδῶν instead of the original ἐκ ποδῶν; the same applies to οὐδ-εῖς, in which the second part of the compound was εῖς, with perispomene. This suggests that in some compounds of this sort, where there is a change in morphological categories, the accent changes from perispomene to oxytonic.³²

The word αἰεῖ < */aiwesi/ may provide a further proof of this observation. This word, which is believed to be a former locative, is used in Homer with *-ei* as a diphthong.³³ The original word underwent the same changes the adjectives in *-es* did: namely the loss of *s* resulted in the sequence *-ei*, which would have given a perispomene by Greek rules. The fact, then, that this simple adverb has an oxytonic accent shows that the reason for change from perispomene to oxytonic needs to be explained not necessarily through compounding, but through the morphological change from nouns to adverbs.

³¹ Ἀληθεῖ < *ἀληθέσι. The perispomene accent is the result of a sequence / \. If the accent had been on the last syllable, then we would have had oxytonic accent directly.

³² *Kurze vergleichende Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen* (Berlin 1970) 453.

³³ See Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque* (Paris 1968-80): */aiwési/ would be the locative of a noun αἰές < PIE */ay-w-es/, which can still be seen in the adverb αἰές; cf. M. Mayrhofer, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen I* (Heidelberg 1986-) 171sq.; *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos I* (Göttingen 1955-).

Nevertheless, the problem is more complicated than it seems. This is because it is not clear either where the accent stood on */aiwesi/ or what the origin of the word is. Klingenschmitt saw /aiei/ as representing a former dative in /-ei/, corresponding to the Avestan /yavaē/ ‘always’, which, in turn, is a dative of an Indo-Iranian /āyu-/ ‘age’.³⁴ However, this solution is problematic: the Greek form (* /h₂eyw-/) has a different ablaut grade from the Avestan one (* /h₂yew-/, which can be clearly seen in the Avestan genitive /yaoš/.³⁵ Therefore, the Avestan and the Greek forms may not represent the same PIE form.

Another view is that */aiwesi/ is the result of the inflection (in locative as well) of a collective feminine noun */aiwōs/, which would still be visible in the Greek αἰῶ < */aiwōsa/.³⁶ Αἰεῖ then would be from */aiwesi/, which, in turn, would be an ablaut form (in the locative) from */aiwōs/.³⁷ However, it is likely that this type of nouns behaved like the *r*-stems, where the locative accent was paroxytonic: cf. Skt. Loc. *pitāri* (*pitā* = “father”).³⁸ On the other hand, this type of *s*-stems shows that in Greek the paradigm was leveled before the *s* dropped; other frozen locatives are of no great use when it comes to the position of the PIE hysterodynamic nominal accent in the locative.³⁹ It is thus likely that the accent resulted from the contraction was perispomene. Αἰεῖ then shows that the change in the

³⁴ G. Klingenschmitt, *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 33 (1975) 67sq., Anm.7.

³⁵ H. M. Hoenigswald, *Studies in Memory of Warren Cowgill* (Berlin 1987) 51-3, calls this solution “a mirage”.

³⁶ J. Schmidt, *KZ* 38 (1905) 48; *Die Pluralbildungen der indogermanischen Neutra* (Weimar 1889, NY 1980) 142sq.

³⁷ Nom. *aiwōs, gen. ayus-ós; Sanskrit has *āyus*, *āyusās*, which is the result of leveling; *ā* reflects “Brugmann’s law” (*o>ā/ RV in */H₂oywes-/).

³⁸ R. Beekes, *Comparative Indo-European Linguistics* (Philadelphia 1995) 177; A.M. Lubotsky, *The System of Nominal Accentuation in Sanskrit and Proto-Indo-European* (Leiden 1988) esp. 168-74; Sihler (n.24) 308-11 and 278-81.

³⁹ Αἰδώς has the dative αἰδοῖ < */aidósi/: the perispomene shows that the accent was previously paroxytonic. The position of the accent in the former locative οἴκοι shows no traces of a hysterodynamic accent; ἱσθμοῖ also shows that its locative accent was paroxytonic: */isthmói/ (N. ἱσθμός).

morphological category (noun > adverb) led to the change of the nature of the accent.⁴⁰

The above considerations lead to the conclusion that the ending *-ei* of the adverbs here in question may have its origin in the locative of the adjectival stems in *-es*. From here *-ei* could spread to other adverbs as a marker of the privative instrumental type. Ἀτριβής - ἀτριβεῖ became the basis for ἀνιδρωτός - ἀνιδρωτεῖ; subsequently, by resegmentation, *-tei* could spread to form adverbs like ἐγρηγοτεῖ.

I would like to add a final argument. Risch and Beekes thought that the origin of these adverbs was in the locative of a thematic form, e.g., /atheeí/ would be a locative form from /átheos/.⁴¹ This would mean that from here the ending spread to the /-es/ stems by analogy. However, the themes in /-es/ themselves had their locative form. Why would we look for an uncertain PIE form when we already have at hand the needed form in Greek itself? On the other hand, thematic adjectives such as /átheos/ are *bahuvrīhi* compounds, and, in Greek, the accent on them is recessive. This represents an additional problem when we consider their locative form. Is it the case that the accent was recessive in the nominative, but not in the locative? It seems to me that one cannot easily answer to this question.

Therefore, instead of supposing that the locative spread from the thematic forms to the themes in /-es/, we can choose a simpler, in my view, solution which sees the analogy as having taken place in the other direction.

The only thing then, which remains to be clarified, is the origin of *ĩ*.⁴² Since we have dismissed the interpretation that this ending might be a frozen accusative neuter, there are not too many possible solutions left. One of them was already given by Schulze, who saw it as the locative ending of the consonantal

⁴⁰ In fact, adjectives like ἀβλαβής, ἀτριβής, etc. still have perispomene on the dative ending.

⁴¹ Cf. n.25 above.

⁴² The long *ĩ* can be explained as an orthographical error of the scribes in post-Classical times, after the diphthong *-ei* was monophthongized.

stems.⁴³ The way, however, this ending got mixed with the *-ei* ending does not seem clear to me. The instrumental use of the new datives in *ĩ*, e.g., *χειρί*, *ποδι* etc., might have played a role in this. The fact that the second member in some of these compounds was a consonantal stem with oxytonic accent on the dative ending, e.g., *αὐτοχειρί*, *αὐτομηνί*, *παμπαιδί*, *αὐτοποδι*, etc., could also contribute to the confusion. It may be also that the variation seen in these adverbs reflects the general confusion caused by the fusion between the locative and dative, between the *-ei* dative ending and the *-ĩ* locative ending. This confusion can still be seen in Mycenaean, where the writing with *e* for the dative suggests the older form of the dative *-ei*.⁴⁴ Thus, the loss of the locative and its merger with the dative, on one hand, and the ending of the consonantal stems, on the other, could create the premises for the variation between *ĩ* and *-ei* in these adverbial endings.

⁴³ Schulze (n.12); nevertheless, he considers the adverbs in *-ti* as the result of *t*-stems locatives. This runs again against the argument that, as far as we know, the *t*-stems were very rare in PIE.

⁴⁴ See C.J. Ruijgh, *Études du grec mycénien* (Amsterdam 1967) 85; cf. I. Hajnal (n.24) 85sq. E. Risch, *Kleine Schriften* (Berlin, NY, W. de Gruyter 1981) 382 gives the example of an Arcadian *Ἰέτι* instead of *Ἰέτει*, which would be a hyperurbanism and a reflection of a time when the variation of the type *ποιμένει-ποιμένι* still existed.