

Robert S.P. Beekes

Homeric ἐμεῖο, Myc. *toe* and the PIE nominal and pronominal genitive singular

1. The Homeric form of the genitive of the personal pronoun ἐμεῖο (σεῖο, εἶο) has been explained in, mainly, three ways: 1. from **eme-sio* (Brugmann, *KZ* 27, 1885, 397 ff.); 2. *-io* (and *-o*) “d’après l’analogie de la flexion thématique,” Chantraine, *Gr. Hom.* 1.263 ff.; 3. as metrical lengthening from ἐμέο, Schwyzler, *Gr. Gr.* 605, Rix, *Hist. Gr.* 177.¹ The first explanation is sometimes used as an argument for the pronominal origin of the ending *-sio*. I think that there is reason to reconsider the problem. Two points must be considered: first the forms actually occurring, and second the general background.

2. The relevant forms are found *only* in Homer. The forms found for the genitive are (leaving aside those in *-θεν*):

stressed	ἐμεῖο	51	ἐμέο	1	μεῦ	27	tot. 79
unstr.	*μεῖο	0	*μεο	0	μευ	65	65
stressed	σεῖο	28	σέο	22	σεῦ	21	71
unstr.	*σειο	0	σεο	1	σευ	13	14 ²
stressed	εἶο	2	ἔο	12	εῦ	2	16
unstr.	*εῖο	0	έο	1	εῦ	5	6

As the reflexive pronoun is rather rare and learns us nothing new, I shall disregard it further. The absence of *μεο and the near absence of σεο will be apparent only: in many cases μευ and σευ will have replaced *μεο, *με’ etc.; Chantraine, *Gr. Hom.* 58 f. (In fact σευ counts nine times as single

¹ E. Hermann (*Silbenbildung* 32 f.) started from εἰοῖ beside οἷ and ἐέ beside ἔ and assumed that beside ἔο a form *ἔέο existed, which became εἶο; ἐμεῖο, σεῖο would be analogical. I think that it is very improbable that these rare forms were the basis of the first and second person forms. Also the proposed contraction is impossible as *-εο* < **-eso* contracted earlier than *ἐε-* < **sewe-*.

² It is remarkable that the enclitic 2nd person is much less frequent than that of the 1st person. I wonder whether this is the normal situation: one refers in an emphatic way as often to the person addressed as to oneself, but unemphatically more often to oneself than to the other.

short, twice occupies a longum in the thesis, and only twice in the arsis, both in the *Odyssey*).

However, the total absence of unstressed *μειο (*σειο) etc. should be accounted for.³ If one assumes *(e)mesio, I can only imagine that *μειο was avoided as an enclitic because of the 'weight' of the form (i.e. its long vowel). This explanation seems rather weak to me. If, however, we assume that ἐμεῖο is a metrically lengthened form of ἐμέο, the explanation follows immediately: the enclitic form of ἐμέο was *μεο, and this form needed no (metrical) lengthening. Parallel forms were then created beside σέο and ἔο, again only for the stressed forms.

It has been objected that in a form of three short vowels by metrical lengthening the first vowel was lengthened, not the second one; cf. Chantraine, *Gr. Hom.* 100 (beside οὔνομα we now know that εἵνεκα has metrical lengthening). The argument is not strong enough to reject the interpretation of ἐμεῖο. There is no inherent reason why the first vowel should always be lengthened. In the next section we shall find another case where the second vowel was lengthened.

3. Homer presents a form ἐῆος, at the end of the verse (except ο 450) after υἱος, παῖδος, ἀνδρός and φωτός. It was taken as the genitive of ἐύς, i.e. *ἔέος with metrical lengthening, both by ancient and modern scholars. Schwyzler (*Sitzber. preuss. Akad. Berlin* 1938, 81–92) presented a quite different interpretation. He took it to represent *ἔέο, again with metrical lengthening, the genitive of ἑέ 'himself', parallel to ἔο from ἔ, with later addition of -s after the preceding genitives. There are four reasons for this interpretation: 1. the meaning 'good' (in valour, i.e. 'brave', or in social status, i.e. 'noble'), which is required in the *Odyssey* (ξ 505, ο 450), does not fit very well in the other instances, and is impossible in A 393; 2. the form has often aspiration; 3. a frequent variant is ἐοῖο; 4. another variant is ἐηο, without -s. I must say that on reconsidering the problem I found Schwyzler's argumentation quite convincing. But after all I think it must be abandoned.

I make the following remarks. Ad 1. Though 'of yourself, your own' fits excellently in A 393, we cannot say that it is impossible that it belongs to ἐύς. To deny that is to misunderstand the Homeric epithet. As we have ἐὺς παῖς in B 819, M 98, P 391 and υἱὸν ἐὺν in Θ 303, the formula παῖδος/υἱὸς ἐῆος could be simply an inflected form of this syntagm. Also, ἐύς seems to me a quite appropriate qualification of a son, and it should be noted that

³ Hermann (see n. 1) thought he could explain it. He observed that the 'long' forms, ἑέ etc., are always stressed, whereas the short forms occur both stressed and unstressed. This would explain why the forms in -εῖο are stressed only. But his explanation cannot stand (see n. 1).

ἐύς was an archaic word that may have had a strong emotional effect. (Cf. also ἀγαθὸς πάις θ 130, 143.)

Ad 2. The asper could be the result of the interpretation 'own.' (Schwyzer argues that it must be older.)

Ad 3. Again this could be an ancient conjecture. Schwyzer stresses that the ancient critics did not make such guesses without a solid basis. He suggests that EO was written for EEO, and that this was interpreted as EOO = ἐοῖο.

Ad 4. This fact is an argument for Schwyzer. It is hard to see why the -s was removed. Schwyzer rejects contamination with ἐοῖο. It is remarkable that neither Chantraine, *Gr. Hom.* 254, 274, nor Hoffmann (see n. 5) nor Ruijgh (see below) mention this fact.

But there are other objections. One is that the poet of the Odyssey interpreted the form as the genitive of 'good', which means that he must have known the form with the ending -s. This is more important than the manuscript reading without it.

Another point is that it is hard to understand that, given εῖο, i.e. ἔο, the ancient scholars did not understand ἐηο as ἔεο and write it *ἔεῖο.

A last point is that Homer does not have the contracted form of *ἔέο, i.e. *ἔεῦ. A form ἐοῦ, too, is very rare in Greek; see Kühner-Blass 1, 580 ff.

Taking all this together it is best to accept that it is what it seems to be: the genitive of ἐύς, i.e. *ἔέος with metrical lengthening.⁴ This is also the view of Hoffmann, *Aufsätze* 602.⁵

⁴ ἦύς etc. must have metrical lengthening. (I withdraw *Development* 287 ff.) In **h₁esu-* a lengthened grade is impossible, as long vowels in Proto-Indo-European arose only in monosyllables and when a vowel in final syllable stood before resonant (except *m*); thus Wackernagel, *AiGr.* 1. 66 ff.; cf. Kortlandt, *Slavic Accent.* 85; Beekes, *Origins* 152 ff. I think that this explanation is one of the major insights into the structure and history of Indo-European. Together with the explanation of the *e/o*-ablaut (*Origins* 156 ff.) the whole of the IE ablaut has now been explained in principle. Neuters with long root vowel (therefore) did not exist (cf. *Origins* 3), except when root nouns (like **kērd*). – Ruijgh, *Minos* § 22, assumes a neuter root noun **h₁ēs*, which would have given its long vowel to **h₁esu-*. The latter is rather improbable, the first mere speculation. – One could start from **h₁eh₁su-/h₁h₁su-* (thus F. Sommer, *Gr. Lautstud.* 1905, 7), which would give ἦύς/ἐύς, but, first, such ablaut forms are rarely preserved in Greek, and secondly, if traces of such ablaut are preserved, it is not within one paradigm, let alone in such a way that a given form can have two ablaut grades, like ἐύς/ἦύς. Therefore it must have metrical lengthening. It is hard to say, and not very important, whether this originated in the compounds (e.g. ἦύχομος, where a metrical lengthening was necessary) or in a formula like ἐύς τε μέγας τε. This formula would otherwise violate Hermann's bridge. I suggest that the formula, with ἐύς, dates from a time when the bridge was not yet observed.

⁵ K. Hoffman, *Aufsätze* 602, suggests that ἐηος comes from **h₁uesu-os*. But this would give *ἔεῖος, with -ει- that is 'sprachwirklich', and it is hard to see how this would have

What is important is that the word has the second of three short vowels lengthened. Thus Ruijgh (*Mnem.* 24, 1971, 407): "il est probable que les aèdes des générations antérieurs à Homère se sont permis l'allongement métrique d'une brève au temps fort du 6^e pied, tandis que les aèdes postérieurs ont tendu à écarter cette licence."⁶

4. We must now consider the origin of these genitive forms in Greek. It is often stated that there were several formations. Thus Schwyzler, *Gr. Gr.* 604: "... wurden in verschiedener Weise ... erweitert" (Schwyzler starts from *genitives* *(ἐ)με, *(τ(ε)φε, which cannot be maintained); Rix, *Hist. Gr.* 177: "Die griech. Formen sind Neubildungen vom Akk. aus, an dessen Formen ... Gen.-Endungen traten, und zwar teils -so ..., teils -os ..., teils -t^{hen}." I think that this is not what happened.

The Doric forms that have -os can be easily explained as containing the form in -o to which secondarily an -s was added; e.g. Chantraine, *Morph. hist.* 133. This explanation, I think, becomes imperative when we realize that Doric also has forms in -o without -s (Schwyzler 604 f.; Kühner-Blass 1, 580 ff.). The Aeolic forms with -θεν can easily have been formed later, beside the old forms which they eventually replaced in one or two dialects. A form ἐμέ-θεν is very easily coined, and it is easy to understand that this expressive form ousted the older one. Originally these forms will have had a different meaning; thus P. Wathelet, *Les traits éoliens*, 288: "pour marquer l'origine et distinct du génitif proprement dit." This explanation becomes the more probable as forms in -θεν are also found in Epidauros and in Syracuse. It cannot be demonstrated that Aeolic had forms in -o. Boeotian had forms in -ους which may be of Doric origin, but they might have only the -s from Doric. (Note that according to Blümel, *Die aiol. Dial.* 267 no inscriptional evidence is known at all for these forms.) However, if Doric as well as Ionic-Attic had this form in -o, we can be sure that Aeolic had it as well.

become -η- (after βασιληος according to Hoffmann). Also, it would have to be separated from ἐύς. Therefore Hoffmann suggests that ἐύς is a Rückbildung from the adverb ἐύ. This is a priori improbable and I see no reason to suppose that. In any case ἡέα· ἀγαθά Hes. proves that other forms (than the nom. and acc.) were made from the adjective.

⁶ In *Minos* n. 215 Ruijgh calls ἐηος "un doublet de *ἐε(φ)ος, (cf. ἡύς, doublet de ἐύς); on pourrait même penser à l'influence de *ἡφος < *εσφος (vocalisme achéen), gén. du nom neutre *εσν (cf. *δοϕ-ός gén. de δόϕν)." But if the vocalism of ἡύς goes back to a root noun (as Ruijgh supposes, see n. 4 above), it cannot explain the long vowel of the *suffix* in ἐηος. The further suggestion is quite improbable: a genitive (*ἐέος) influenced by another type of genitive which is not attested. It is much simpler and quite satisfactory to stick to Ruijgh's earlier interpretation.

Thus it is most probable that the genitive in *-o* < *-so* was a common Greek innovation.⁷ In some Dorian dialects this form was enlarged with an *-s*. Forms in *-θεν* were (later) created in some dialects, at first with a special meaning (indicating the origin), which ousted the other form in one or two dialects.

If one assumes **eme-sio*, this form must come from a dialect which changed **eme-so*. As the form must be of pre-Homeric date, **emeso* probably still was **emeho*. It is quite improbable, given the fact that all dialects from which we have data have **emeso*, that one dialect only did not partake in this common innovation but created **emesio*. Nor is it probable that one dialect (only) replaced **emeso* > **emeho* by **emesio* > **emeiio*. I see neither a motivation (**eme(h)o* was quite clear) nor a model for it, for there is no evidence for any other form in *-esio* in Greek; the thematic inflection of course had only **-osio*.

Thus a form **emesio* > **emeiio* cannot be accommodated in the history of these Greek forms.

A priori, of course, it is very probable that a deviating form which is found only in Homer, and which would otherwise fit only with difficulty in the hexameter, contains a metrical licence.

5. The Indo-European background has changed, too. When Brugmann (*KZ* 29, 1885, 397) posited **emesio*, it was taken for granted that *-osio* was a pronominal ending (on the authority of Sanskrit). We now know that *-so* was certainly a pronominal ending, and that this cannot be said of *-sio*. I have argued that, to all probability, *-sio* was not a pronominal ending. One point is that there is no certain evidence for *-esio*, whereas *-osio* is well established (see my *Origins* 185). This makes a Greek innovation **eme-sio* rather improbable.

Then there are reasons why *-so* was the only pronominal ending: the *-s-* of the gen. pl. (*-som*) and the *-s-* in the feminine of the Germanic forms can only be explained by a (general) gen. *-so* (see my article in the *FS Polomé*). On the other hand we know that the original ending of the *o*-stems was *-os*; it was evidently this ending which was lengthened with *-io*.

⁷ This is apparently also the view of G. Schmitt, *Stammbildung u. Flexion der idg. Personalpron.* 139, but he gives not much argumentation. His view that the starting point was the gen. **teue*, not the accusative forms, cannot be discussed here. – Improbable is the suggestion by Rix, *Hist. Gr.* 177, that ἐμείτο could also continue “*e-mei-so* vom ererbten Gen. aus.” That is (as appears from the context), from the enclitic gen. **mei*. Of this form there is no (other) trace in Greek, and it would be hard to explain why there is only ἐμείτο and no ***μειο*, as **mei* was exactly the enclitic form. Further it is improbable that one dialect (only) did not participate in the clearly Common Greek innovation (as is set out below) but had a different creation.

This means that *-(o)sio* was a nominal ending, *-so* the pronominal one (*Origins* 185 f.). Greek now confirms that the pronominal ending was *-so* because, when a (new) genitive was made for the personal pronouns, *-so* was used: this was apparently *the* pronominal ending.

6. Summary. The preceding can be summarized as follows:

1. PIE had no form in **-esio*.
2. The PIE pronominal genitive ending was (only) *-so*; *-osio* was the ending of the *o*-stem nouns.
3. Proto-Greek made a new genitive **(e)me-so* etc. This confirms that the PIE pronominal ending was *-so*.
4. There is neither motivation nor model for a change to **emesio* > **emeiio* (in one dialect).
5. A deviant shape of a form which would otherwise fit difficultly in the hexameter, which is found only in Homer, is probably a metrical licence.
6. ἐμῆο /eméo/ is a metrical lengthening of ἐμέο.
7. This explains why there is no **μειο* etc.
8. ἐνος probably is the genitive of ἐός, i.e. **έός* with metrical lengthening. It confirms that the second of three consecutive short vowels could be lengthened for the sake of the metre.

7. In his article in *Minos* (§ 9 ff.) Ruijgh discusses the Mycenaean forms *tome* (Ep 613,8) and *toe* (Eb 842), which are probably datives of *to-*, /tō-*m^hei/* and /to*hei/*. The first continues PIE **tosmei*. The other form he explains from **tosei*, which was created analogically. Ruijgh thinks that this form was made after gen. **tosyo*. I think, however, that a system **tosyo* – **tosmei* would have given ***tosyei*. Ruijgh objected (by letter) that this is impossible because there was no genitive ending *-o*. This does not seem a valid objection to me, and the same kind of objection can be made to Ruijgh's own explanation: there is no genitive ending in *-yo*, so an analysis **tos-yo* was impossible. (The genitive ending, of course, was *-syo* here.) So his explanation does not imply a morphological analysis: "Noter que *τοσ- est l'élément commun à gén. *τοσσο et à dat. *τοσμει, ..." What happened, to my mind, is that the consonant clusters between the vowel of the stem and the vowel of the ending were made identical, irrespective of a morphemic analysis. (The problem with **tosmei* was exactly that it was hard to analyze.) For Ruijgh's explanation, however, I don't see how it could have worked. Thus I think that the creation of **tosei* requires the existence of a gen. **toso*. That is, **toso* – **tosmei* was reshaped into **toso* – **tosei* (whereas **tosyo* – **tosmei* would have given **tosyo* – ***tosyei*).

If this is correct, it would prove that the *o*-stem demonstrative had the genitive singular *-so*, not *-sio*. The latter ending can easily be explained as taken over (at a later date) from the nominal inflection.

8. Thus ἐμεῖο does not provide evidence for a pronominal ending *-sio* (only for *-so*). Myc. *toe* could indirectly point to **toso*, i.e. the ending *-so* in the pronominal *o*-stems. This confirms my reconstruction of the PIE endings, which is extremely simple: the genitive ending of the noun was *-os* (with *-os-io* in the *o*-stems because there the nominative had *-os*), that of the pronoun was *-so*.

Bibliography

- Beekes, R. S. P. The Origin of the IE Pronominal Inflection. To appear in the FS Polomé.
 Ruijgh, C. J. Problèmes de philologie mycénienne. To appear in *Minos*.
 Schwyzler, E. Ein altes Problem der homerischen Sprache. Sitzungsber. preuss. Akad. Berlin 1938, 81–92.