



On the historical development of the preposition  $\mu \epsilon \xi / \mu \epsilon \varsigma$  (mex/mes) ‘until’ in the Thessalian dialect of Ancient Greek

Minamimoto, Toru

---

(Citation)

国際文化学研究 : 神戸大学大学院国際文化学研究科紀要, 64:157-174

(Issue Date)

2025-09

(Resource Type)

departmental bulletin paper

(Version)

Version of Record

(JaLCOI)

<https://doi.org/10.24546/0100497894>

(URL)

<https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14094/0100497894>



# On the historical development of the preposition $\mu\epsilon\xi/\mu\epsilon\varsigma$ (*mex/mes*) ‘until’ in the Thessalian dialect of Ancient Greek

Toru MINAMIMOTO

## 1. Introduction

The preposition  $\mu\epsilon\xi$  (*mex*) ‘as far as, until’ is a *hapax legomenon* — a word attested only once — in the Thessalian dialect of Ancient Greek. Unlike its related form  $\mu\epsilon\varsigma$  (*mes*), which has long been known and studied, the historical origin of  $\mu\epsilon\xi$  (*mex*) has not been extensively discussed; therefore I attempt to fill the gap in the present work. I will argue that  $\mu\epsilon\xi$  (*mex*) was created in Thessalian based on the model of another preposition,  $\epsilon\acute{\xi}/\epsilon\varsigma$  (*ex/es*) ‘out of’. In this scenario, several factors that were present in Thessalian and not in other dialects led to the creation of the form  $\mu\epsilon\xi$  (*mex*). This analysis has some advantages over the previous assumption which associated  $\mu\epsilon\xi$  (*mex*) with  $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\chi\rho\iota$  (*mekhri*) ‘until’.

This article is organized as follows: Section 2 describes the background of the Thessalian forms  $\mu\epsilon\xi/\mu\epsilon\varsigma$  (*mex/mes*) and reviews previous studies on them, with focus on the etymology of  $\mu\epsilon\varsigma$  (*mes*) and related forms in other dialects of Greek. Section 3 gives my own analysis on the historical development of  $\mu\epsilon\xi/\mu\epsilon\varsigma$  (*mex/mes*) in Thessalian, where a particular attention will be given to the creation of the form  $\mu\epsilon\xi$  (*mex*). Concluding remarks will be given in Section 4.

Throughout this article, inscriptions are identified by a system of abbreviation:

LAR 1 = IG 9,2 517 (Pelagiotis – Larisa, 214)

- LAR 2 = *SEG* 31:577 (Pelasgiotis – Larisa, ca. 136/135)  
 LAR 3 = Béquignon 1935, 55, no. 2 (Pelasgiotis – Larisa, 2<sup>nd</sup> c.)  
 = Helly 2006  
 LAR 4 = Helly 1970 (Pelasgiotis – Larisa, late 3<sup>rd</sup> c.)  
 LAR 5 = Helly 2008, a highly improved reading of *IG* 9,2 506  
 (Pelasgiotis – Larisa, after 197)  
 SCOT = Missailidou-Despotidou 1993 = *SEG* 43:311 (Pelasgiotis  
 – Scotussa, ca. 197–185)

Translations of Greek texts into English are mine unless otherwise specified.

As a final note before the main body of the article, I admit that I occasionally make references to “changes” as if dialectal forms are historically derived from the forms in the standard language, Attic or Attic-based Koiné. This is of course erroneous, or misleading at the very least, since the standard and the dialects are in sibling relation as descendants of the reconstructed proto-language. In the present work, however, I will sometimes pursue convenience when rigorous reconstruction of the Proto-Greek forms is not deemed necessary. I will also be lenient about the distinction between Attic as the local dialect of Athens and Koiné as a standard language derived thereof.

## 2. Background and previous studies

### 2.1. Attestations of $\mu\epsilon\xi$ / $\mu\epsilon\varsigma$ (*mex/mes*) ‘as far as, until’ in Thessaly

The only known occurrence of the form  $\mu\epsilon\xi$  (*mex*) is in an inscription dated to early 2<sup>nd</sup> century from the city of Scotussa (SCOT), which describes the use of land in and around the city. The following passages are of importance here (as to the translations into English and the interpretations of difficult passages, I follow the editor of the inscription):

## (1) SCOT, Face A, L. 70 f.:

ατ τοι οντ[ο]ι [ c. 9 **μ**]εξ ποτ τα[ν κα]μπαν / τοι μεσαπυργοι το[ι] κατ το Κερ[δ]  
οιον

(at toi ont[o]i [ c. 9 **m**]es pot ta[n ka]mpan / toi mesapurgoi to[i] kat to  
Ker[d]oion)

“from the upper (?)<sup>1</sup> … **as far as** the bend of the curtain near the  
Kerdoion<sup>2</sup>”

## (2) SCOT, Face A, L. 74 ff.:

ατ τοι πυργοι // τοι ετ του γουνιαιου τοι εκκατου τοι Κερδοιοι **μ**εξ εμ ποταμον  
δαμος/σαν εμμεν **μ**εξ ποτ τον Βυσταν

(at toi purgoi // toi et tou gouniaiou toi ekkatou toi Kerdoioi **m**ex em  
potamon damos/san emmen **mes** pot ton Bustan)

“from the tower near the corner one<sup>3</sup> below the Kerdoion **as far as**  
the river to<sup>4</sup> be public area **as far as** towards Bystas”

## (3) SCOT, Face B, L. 56 ff.:

τα εντος τας πολιος ατ τουν Αντιλαιιουν **μ**εξ ποτ τον πυργον τας / πυλας  
Αυροσχαδοφοροι εκρινναμεν ατ τοι τειχεος απεχεμεν / ποδας δεκαδουος

(ta entos tas polios at toun Antilaeioun **mes** pot ton purgon tas / pulas  
Auros khadophoroi ekrinnamen at toi teikheos apekhemen / podas  
dekaduos)

“As for properties inside the city, we decided that from the Antilaeia  
**as far as** to the tower of the Auros chadophoros gate they should be  
kept from the wall 12 feet”

## (4) SCOT, Face B, L. 58 f.:

ατ τοι πυργοι τοι υστεροι τας Αυροσχαδοφοροι **μ**εξ / ποτ ταν πυλαν ταν επ  
Εννεαπελεθρον

(at toi purgoi toi usteroi tas Auroskhadophoroi **mes** / pot tan pulan tan ep Enneapelethron)

“from the second tower of the Auroschadophoros gate **as far as** to the gate leading to Enneapelethron”

(5) SCOT, Face B, L. 60 f.:

ατ τας πυλας τας επ Εννεαπελεθρον / ατ τοι τειχεος κυκλου **μεξ** ποτ τον Μιρουνδαν  
(at tas pulas tas ep Enneapelethron / at toi teikheos kuklou **mes** pot ton Miroundan)

“from the gate leading to Enneapelethron, from the city wall all around **as far as** to Miroundas”

The variant *μεξ* (*mex*) appears only once, whereas the other variant, *μεξ* (*mes*), is used five times in the same inscription (including the partially restored passage).

The form *μεξ* (*mes*) is furthermore attested in two other inscriptions from a different city (LAR 2 and LAR 3), both in the dating formula, where certain public offices are mentioned in order to specify the year when the inscribed decree was voted on:

(6) LAR 2, L. 6 ff.:

γυμνασιαρχεντων / **μεξ** μεν τας πετραδος τοι Ομολουιοι μειννος Νικασιππο[ι]  
/ Νικοστρατειοι και Σουστρατοι Σουστρατειοι, ατ τας μα πεμ/πτας Επικρατιδα  
Επικρατιδαιοι και Κορουνοι Δαμοκρατε[ι]/οι,

(gumnasiarkhentoun / **mes** men tas petrados toi Omolouioi meinnos Nikasippo[i]  
/ Nikostrateioi kai Soustratoi Soustrateioi, at tas ma pemptas Epikratida Epikratidaioi kai Korounoi Damokrate[i]/oi)

“when the office of gymnasiarchs was held by Nikasippos son of Kikostratos and Soustratos son of Soustratos **until** the 4<sup>th</sup> of the month

Homolouios, but from the 5<sup>th</sup> by Epikratidas son of Epikratidas and Korounos son of Damokrates”

(7) LAR 3, L. 6 ff.:

γυμνασιαρχεντων / **μεξ** τας πετ[ραδος τ]οι Ομολουιοι Πλειστια Ασκα/λαπιαδαιοι  
και Δουριμαχαιοι Λαμειοι, *vac.* ατ τα[ς] / μα πεμπτας Ιπποδρομ[ιοι] Αισχιναιοι και  
Φερεκρ[α]/τεος Μενεκρατει[οι]

(gumnasiarkhentoun / **mes** tas pet[rados t]oi Omolouioi Pleistia Aska/  
lapiadaioi kai Dourmimakhaioi Lameioi, *vac.* at ta[s] / ma pemptas  
Ippodrom[ioi] Aiskhinaioi kai Pherekr[a]/teos Menekratei[oi])

“when the office of gymnasiarchs was held by Pleistias son of Askalapiadas and Dourmimakhaiois son of Lamos **until** the 4<sup>th</sup> of the month Homolouios, but from the 5<sup>th</sup> by Hippodromos son of Aiskhinas and Pherekrates son of Menekrates”

A doubtful attestation may, then, be mentioned here:

(8) LAR 4, L. 41 f.:

—**μεξ** τα ταγεντα [τα] / εδοξε του κοινου των Πετθαλων

(—)**mes** ta tagenta [ta] / edoxe tou koinou toun Petthaloun)

“**with**(?) the orders decided by the commonwealth of the Thessalians”

Here, the editor of the inscription does not identify this sequence **μεξ** (*mes*) with the preposition in question, on the ground that the following noun is in the accusative case rather than the genitive case, which would be expected for a noun governed by the preposition **μεξ** (*mes*). He then conjectures that this **μεξ** (*mes*) is possibly a Thessalian version of **μετά** (*meta*) ‘with’, in the sense of ‘in conformity with’ in this context (Helly 2008: 73). In any case, this instance will not be included in the considerations that follow.

Finally, the preposition in question is also attested in a grammaticalized form as a subordinate conjunction:

(9) LAR 1, L. 13 f.:

**μεσποδι** κε ουν και ετερος επινοεισουμεν αξιος τοι παρ αμμε / πολιτευματος ...

(**mespodī** ke oun kai eteros epinoeisoumen aksios toi par amme politeumatōs ...)

“therefore, **until** we might think of other men who would be worthy of citizenship among us ...”

The etymology of *-ποδι* (*-podī*) is not relevant here (I find the analysis given by García Ramón 1993, who identifies *-podī-* with the word for ‘foot’, to be more convincing than the major competing theory that sees in *-podī-* the relative pronoun *\*k<sup>w</sup>od*, advanced by *DELG*, entry μέσφα); the relevant morpheme *μεσ-* (*mes-*) is clearly the same form meaning ‘until’.

No one so far appears to have made an explicit mention that, even though the form *μεξ* (*mex*) is attested only once, there is little reason to doubt that it is synchronically a pre-vocalic variant of the other, more frequently attested variant *μεσ* (*mes*), whose occurrences are limited to pre-consonantal environments. This observation will be crucial in the following discussion on the historical development of this preposition in Thessalian.

## 2.2. Etymology of the forms related to Proto-Greek *\*me(s)* ‘as far as, until’

These Thessalian forms are considered to share their origin with forms of similar form and function in other Greek dialects (see, for example, *DELG* and *GEW* entries μέσφα and μέχρι): It is a standard view (which I accept) that *μέχρι* (*mekhri*) ‘as far as, until’ goes back to *\*me-ǵ<sup>h</sup>sr-i*, literally ‘until the hand (of ...)', which is also preserved in Armenian as *merj* ‘near’.

The preposition *\*me* ‘until’ is therefore securely reconstructed in a stage predating Proto-Greek. Furthermore, the existence of various forms within Greek with similar meaning, μέσφα (*mespha*), μέσφι (*mesphi*), μέστα (*mesta*), etc., suggests an extended form *\*mes* in Proto-Greek, if not earlier (*LIPP* entry *\*me* gives *\*me-s* as a potentially PIE form, although evidence is restricted to Greek).

Regarding the Thessalian forms μεξ (*mex*) and μες (*mes*), Lillo (2007: 261) argues that this usage, where μεξ/μες (*mex/mes*) is immediately followed by another preposition, ποτ (*pot*) ‘to’ or εμ (*em*) ‘in’, results from the crossing (“Kreuzung”) of the native Thessalian preposition μες (*mes*) with the Koiné usage of μέχρι (*mekhri*). He appears to assume that the Thessalian form μεξ (*mex*) is a product of apocope that deleted the second syllable of μέχρι. Although he does not provide an exact formulation of this deletion process, his treatment implies that the velar segment /k/ in μεξ (*mex*) etymologically corresponds to the velar consonant /kh/ in μέχρι (*mekhri*).

Lillo (2007: 262) is slightly more explicit about the development of the other variant, μες (*mes*), citing two competing analyses, although he does not state which one he believes to be more convincing. One theory holds that μες (*mes*) is derived from μέχρι (*mekhri*) by apocope (a view which Lillo ascribes to Missailidou-Despotidou [1993], but for the details of this scenario, see further below), while Béquignon (1935) thinks that haplology shortened μέσφα (*mespha*) ‘until’.

The present work will leave open the question of the etymology of μες (*mes*). An old view, which I believe is still a strong possibility, claims that a longer form, perhaps μέστα (*mesta*), went through haplology (i.e. *\*mesta tās* → *mes tās*) in the specific context of μες τας πεμπτας (*mes tas pemptas*) “until the fifth (day)” (*DELG*, entry μέσφα), or *\*mespha podi* → *mes podi* in μεσποδι κε … (*mespodī ke* …) ‘until …’ (Bechtel 1963: 196). Despite the skepticism against the haplology theory expressed by *LIPP* entry *\*mé* (especially note 5)

— see further below — I hold that a haplogized form may very well have established itself in the dialect beyond the context where it originally arose.

Another possibility is that this Thessalian preposition is a direct continuation of the Proto-Greek preposition \**mes*. This seems to be the position taken by *LIPP*, who is reluctant to accept the haplology theory because, unlike when the haplology theory was first proposed, we now have multiple occurrences of μες (*mes*) in Thessalian inscriptions. The direct continuation theory is attractive in that it involves no complicated changes. Its weakness, on the other hand, is that the attestation of the exact form μες (*mes*) as a preposition, rather than a base for a longer form, is limited to Thessalian, other dialects using forms such as μέστα (*mesta*) or μέσφα (*mespha*). The reconstruction of the Proto-Greek preposition \**mes* based on the sole evidence from Thessalian, therefore, verges on being ad hoc.

A third possibility is pointed out by, apparently independent of each other, Schmidt (1889: 245) and García Ramón (1993: 141 n. 63). In this scenario, the origin of μες (*mes*) can be traced back to a longer form like μέστα (*mesta*) or μέσφα (*mespha*), and the shortening process in Thessalian could have been something other than haplology — in fact, a very well-known diachronic change in Thessalian, namely the word-final vowel deletion. Just as κατά (*kata*) ‘down’ became κατ/καπ (*kat/kap*) and ἐπι (*epi*) ‘on’ became επ/ετ (*ep/et*), an older μέστα (*mesta*) or μέσφα (*mespha*) could have lost its final vowel, and the now-word-final consonant cluster *-st/-sph* would have naturally been reduced to a single *-s* if the following word began with a consonant. Schmidt’s century-old consideration, cited also by Schwyzer (1953: 630 n. 1), was mentioned by Bechtel, however, with reference to haplology as the driving mechanism (explicitly in Bechtel 1963: 196 “die durch Haplologie verkürzte Präposition μέσφα”, and less explicitly, 1963: 105 “thess. μεσόδι aus μέσφα πόδι”). Only the haplology theory, and not the original word-final vowel deletion theory by Schmidt, nor its revitalization

by García Ramón, was mentioned by Lillo (2007: 262).

Any of the three accounts given so far could explain the form  $\mu\epsilon\varsigma$  (*mes*) in Thessalian, and I make no attempt to select one over the others. On the creation of the variant  $\mu\epsilon\xi$  (*mex*), however, I will challenge what appears to be silently assumed in previous studies: instead of a derivation from  $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\chi\rho\iota$  (*mekhri*), I will propose an alternative analysis of the history of  $\mu\epsilon\xi/\mu\epsilon\varsigma$  (*mex/mes*) in Thessalian.

### 3. Proposal of an alternative analysis

In my alternative analysis,  $\mu\epsilon\xi$  (*mex*) is an analogical creation within Thessalian. Just like other Greek dialects, Thessalian has two allomorphs for the preposition ‘out of’, and it is well known that Thessalian and some other dialects alternate between  $\epsilon\xi$  (*ex*) before a vowel and  $\epsilon\varsigma$  (*es*) before a consonant, in contrast to the group containing Attic/Koiné, which has  $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa$  (*ek*) before a consonant. Now, in my proposed analysis, since  $\mu\epsilon\varsigma$  (*mes*) rhymes with  $\epsilon\varsigma$  (*es*), based on the model of  $\epsilon\xi$  (*ex*), a new form  $\mu\epsilon\xi$  (*mex*) was created as an alternant before a vowel.

Lillo (2007: 262) indeed mentions  $\epsilon\xi/\epsilon\varsigma$  (*ex/es*) in relation with  $\mu\epsilon\xi/\mu\epsilon\varsigma$  (*mex/mes*), but his focus is not on the origin of the form  $\mu\epsilon\xi$  (*mex*), but rather on how the group of dialects including Thessalian used  $\mu\epsilon\varsigma$  (*mes*) to replace  $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\epsilon$  (*este*), a subordinate conjunction meaning ‘until’. His conclusion is that, in those dialects that have the preconsonantal variant  $\epsilon\varsigma$  (*es*) ‘out of’, rather than  $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa$  (*ek*), the form  $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\epsilon$  (*este*) was not able to survive with the meaning ‘until’, which contradicts the meaning of the (etymologically unrelated but synchronically associable) preposition  $\epsilon\varsigma$  (*es*) ‘out of’. I agree with this conclusion, but I move further to claim that the pairwise contrast between  $\mu\epsilon\varsigma$  (*mes*) ‘until’ and  $\epsilon\xi/\epsilon\varsigma$  (*ex/es*) ‘out of’ was crucial in the very creation of the form  $\mu\epsilon\xi$  (*mex*).

### 3.1. Problems with the previous theory

One serious problem with the assumption that  $\mu\epsilon\xi$  (*mex*) is a product of sound-deletion from Proto-Greek *\*me-k<sup>h</sup>sr-i* is that the sound change that supposedly took place is not well-supported. Lillo (2007) himself does not clearly state what he considers the exact change was, so a speculation about what he had in mind needs to be made here, but it is difficult to accept a sound change responsible for producing  $\mu\epsilon\xi$  (*mex*) out of *\*me-k<sup>h</sup>sr-i* as supported beyond being ad hoc.

One possibility is that the sequence *-ri-* was deleted. The deletion of the sequence *-ri-* is indeed quite well documented in the Thessalian dialect, so Lillo may have assumed that the same deletion process was responsible for the creation of the form  $\mu\epsilon\xi$  (*mex*). However, detailed analysis of the relevant data makes this approach less attractive. The most prominent cases of the loss of *-ri-* are found in proper names such as  $\Lambda\sigma\alpha\iota\omicron\iota$  (*Lasaioi*) ‘Lariseans’, cf. Attic/Koiné  $\Lambda\rho\iota\sigma\alpha\iota\omicron\iota$  (*Larisaioi*), and man’s names in  $\Lambda\sigma\tau\omicron-$  (*Asto-*) ‘best’, corresponding to Attic/Koiné  $\Lambda\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron$  (*Aristo-*) (Buck 1955: 75). However, those cases involve the sequence *-ri-* preceded by a vowel, and the behavior of the Thessalian dialect regarding the sequence *-ri-* preceded by a consonant — as was the case for *\*me-k<sup>h</sup>sr-i* — was quite different.

When a consonant precedes the sequence *-ri-* and a vowel follows it, Thessalian often deletes the *-i-*, resulting in forms like  $\text{Αφροί}$  (*Aphroi*) ‘of the month Aphrios’ corresponding to Attic/Koiné  $\text{Αφρίων}$  (*Aphriou*) (Helly 2006: 176), where the number of syllables is reduced by one because of the loss of *-i-* but the consonant *-r-* is retained. I have not encountered any case of the deletion of *r* preceded by a consonant, which makes the change from *\*me-k<sup>h</sup>sr-i* to  $\mu\epsilon\xi$  (*mex*) or  $\mu\epsilon\varsigma$  (*mes*) an isolated case. The fact that other prepositions with word-final sequence containing an *-r-*, such as  $\text{περι}$  (*peri*) ‘around’ and  $\text{παρα}$  (*para*) ‘beside’ lose their final vowel but maintain the *-r-*, resulting in  $\text{περ}$  (*per*) and  $\text{παρ}$  (*par*) in Thessalian (Buck 1955: 81) —

although they are not strict parallels to *\*me-kʰsri* because of the vowel, not a consonant, that precedes *-r-* — also disfavors the etymological connection between *\*me-kʰsri* and μεξ/μεξ (*mex/mes*).

### 3.2. Supporting arguments for the proposed analysis

There are a number of reasons to accept the alternative analysis proposed here as worthy of consideration. The first to discuss is the pairwise opposition between ‘until, up to’ and ‘out of’. The two notions represent the beginning and the end of a movement, making them a semantic pair. It is well known that paired notions can induce analogical change, with the oft-quoted example in English: the modern English form *female* has been influenced by its opposite, *male*, cf. older *femelle* (Campbell 2013: 98). It has to be admitted that, in the inscription SCOT, LAR 2 and LAR 3, the preposition μεξ/μεξ (*mex/mes*) ‘until’ is paired with ατ (*at*) ‘from’ (see Examples 1–7 above), so pairwise connection between these prepositions was probably felt more strongly. But this does not invalidate the semantic opposition between μεξ (*mes*) ‘until’ and εξ/εξ (*ex/es*) ‘out of’. As a well-known case in which εξ (*ex*) is used in the temporal sense ‘since, after, from the time’, I quote the very beginning of Homer’s *Iliad*:

(10)Homer, *Iliad* L. 1 ff.:

μη̄νιν ἄειδε θεὰ Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος / οὐλομένην, ἣ μυρί’ Ἀχαιοῖς ἄλγε’ ἔθηκε,  
/ πολλὰς δ’ ἰφθίμους ψυχὰς Ἄϊδι προΐαψεν / ἠρώων, αὐτοὺς δὲ ἐλώρια τεῦχε  
κύνεσσιν / οἰωνοῖσί τε πᾶσι, Διὸς δ’ ἐτελείετο βουλή, / ἐξ οὗ δὴ τὰ πρῶτα  
διαστήτην ἐρίσαντε / Ἀτρεΐδης τε ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν καὶ δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς.

(mēnin aeide thea Pēlēiadeō Akhilēos / oulomenēn, hē myri’ Akhaiois  
alge’ ethēke, / pollas d’ iphthimous psykhas Aīdi proīapsen / hērōōn,  
autous de helōria teukhe kynessin / oiōnoisi te pāsī, Dios d’ eteleueto  
boulēm / **ex hou** dē ta prōta diastētēn erisante / Atrēidēs te anax

andrōn kai dīos Akhilleus.)

“Sing the anger, goddess, of Achilles son of Peleus, the destructive anger that placed countless pains on the Achaeans, sent many strong souls of heroes to underworld, made their bodies spoils for dogs and all birds, and the plan of Zeus was coming to its goal, (sing that anger) **from the time when**, in the first place, the Atreid king of men and the godly Achilles stood in opposition.”

The fact that the Thessalian dialect belonged to the group which had the allomorphy εξ/ες (*ex/es*) rather than the Attic/Koiné type ἐξ/ἐκ (*ex/ek*) would have made it even easier to analogically extend the pattern to μες (*mes*), resulting in the creation of μεξ (*mex*).

It should also be noted that the Thessalian dialect, after the extensive loss of word-final vowels, is a language particularly rich in consonantal allomorphy in prepositions (see, for example, Buck 1955: 81: “[...] Thessalian, which in general has more extensive apocope than any other dialect”). Positive evidence is available for the alternation *καπ/κατ* (*kap/kat*) from *κατα* (*kata*) ‘down, according to’ and *επ/ετ* (*ep/et*) from *επι* (*epi*) ‘on’:

(11) LAR 1, L. 20:

το μα ψαφισμα τονε κυρρον εμμεν **καπ** παντος χρονου

(to ma psaphisma tone kurrōn emmen **kap** pantos khronoi)

“this decree shall be in power at all times”

(12) LAR 1, L. 17 f.:

**κατ** τα ο βα/συλευς εγραψε

(**kat** ta o ba/sileus egrapse)

“in accordance with what the king wrote”

(13) LAR 4, L. 36:

επβασκει ετ το ψιλον Φιλισκος

(epbaskei et to psilon Philiskos)

“Philiskos comes to the open (land)”

Thus Thessalian could be described as a dialect where it was not exceptional for prepositions to have consonantal variants depending on the following sound. This contrasted with other dialects, especially Attic/Koiné, where consonantal allomorphy in prepositions was indeed exceptional, limited to ἐξ/ἐκ (*ex/ek*) ‘out of’ alone (thus requiring a special mention near the beginning of a reference grammar, such as van Emde Boas *et al.* 2019: 15). Furthermore, Attic/Koiné has a history of diachronic elimination of consonantal allomorphy: πρὸς (*pros*) ‘near, against’ used to be a prevocalic variant of προτί (*protí*), i.e. \**proty* (*DELG* entry πρὸς), but Attic/Koiné generalized the form πρὸς to preconsonantal environments at the cost of the alternant προτί (*protí*), reducing consonantal variation in the preposition.

The contrast between Thessalian, with extensive prepositional allomorphy, and Attic/Koiné may have even been consciously reinforced. Evidence has been found to show that some words and phrases in Thessalian inscriptions are indeed ‘Thessalianized’ version of the Attic-based Koiné elements rather than ‘pure’ Thessalian. Examples (García Ramón, p.c., in an unpublished sketch of the Thessalian dialect) include οναλουμα (*onalouma*) ‘expense’, a Thessalianization for the Attic/Koiné αναλωμα (*analōma*), whose ‘pure’ Thessalian equivalent is known to be οναλα (*onala*), and σταλλα (*stalla*) ‘stale’, Thessalianized from Attic/Koiné στήλη (*stēlē*), whose meaning was conveyed in traditional Thessalian by a distinct word, κιον (*kioun*) ‘stone’. This indicates that the Thessalian people made active (perhaps conscious) conversion from Attic/Koiné into Thessalian in writing their drafts to be inscribed, sometimes leaving traditional Thessalian

forms into oblivion. This situation could have put pressure on prepositions to create new allomorphy, which I argue happened on  $\mu\epsilon\zeta$  (*mes*) ‘until’.

With only one attested case, the diachrony of  $\mu\epsilon\xi$  (*mex*) is difficult to clarify, since we lack any information about its historical behavior (increase or decrease in attestations over time, for example). Such a situation poses great difficulty in determining the historical origin of  $\mu\epsilon\xi$  (*mex*), but it is at least possible to hypothesize that its creation was modeled on the allomorphy of the preposition  $\epsilon\xi/\epsilon\zeta$  (*ex/es*) ‘out of’, which stood in a semantic opposition with  $\mu\epsilon\zeta$  (*mes*) ‘until’. The combination of two factors, the existence of the particular allomorphy  $\epsilon\xi/\epsilon\zeta$  (*ex/es*) and the rich allomorphy in other prepositions due to the extensive word-final vowel deletion, would have encouraged the analogical creation of  $\mu\epsilon\xi$  (*mex*) in this dialect. This alternative proposal is free from the phonological problem faced by its competing analysis that connects  $\mu\epsilon\xi$  (*mex*) with  $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\chi\rho\iota$  (*mekhrī*).

#### 4. Conclusion

In this article I proposed that, while the Thessalian  $\mu\epsilon\zeta$  (*mes*) ‘as far as, until’ may come from any of the three possible sources, the historical origin of its prevocalic variant  $\mu\epsilon\xi$  (*mex*) may be found in its formal resemblance and semantic opposition with  $\epsilon\xi/\epsilon\zeta$  (*ex/es*) ‘out of’. The analogical creation of  $\mu\epsilon\xi$  (*mex*) may have furthermore been assisted by the general tendency of Thessalian to have consonantal allomorphy in prepositions. Even though this is not intended to be conclusive, this hypothesis has advantage over the existing interpretation that associates  $\mu\epsilon\xi$  (*mex*) with  $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\chi\rho\iota$  (*mekhrī*), and is therefore worthy of consideration.

#### Notes

I According to the editor of the inscription,  $\omicron\nu\tau[\omicron]$  is “not immediately recognizable”, and “may be related to  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\alpha}$  [...] in which case it might mean ‘upper’, which seems

appropriate in [the context]” (Missailidou-Despotidou 1993: 193).

2 The Kerdoion is a sanctuary of Apollo (Missailidou-Despotidou 1993: 194).

3 “One” = “tower”: “The tower at the corner below the Kerdoion” is mentioned in the immediately preceding sentence, and this passages uses another tower “near that one” as the reference point.

4 The infinitival phrase “to be public area” depends on an understood “we decided”.

## Bibliography

### *Abbreviated references*

*DEG* = Pierre Chantraine. 1999. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: Histoire des mots* (avec un Supplément). Paris: Klincksieck.

*GEW* = Hjalmar Frisk. 1973. *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (3 vols). Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

*IG* 9,2 = Otto Kern (ed.). 1908. *Inscriptiones graecae*. Volumen IX: *Inscriptiones Graeciae septentrionalis voluminibus VII et VIII non comprehensae*. Pars secunda: *Inscriptiones Thessaliae*. Berlin: Reimer.

*LIPP* = George E. Dunkel. 2014. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Partikeln und Pronominalstämme* (2 vols.). Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.

*SEG* = *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*

### *Other references*

Bechtel, F. 1963. *Die griechischen Dialekte*, I. *Der lesbische, thessalische, böotische, arkadische und kyprische Dialekt* (2<sup>nd</sup> edn.). Berlin: Weidmann.

Béquignon, Yves. 1935. Études thessaliennes VII: Inscriptions de Thessalie (2). *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* 59: 36–77.

Buck, Carl Darling. 1955. *The Greek dialects*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Campbell, Lyle. 2013. *Historical linguistics: An introduction* (3<sup>rd</sup> edn.). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

- van Emde Boas, Evert, Albert Rijksbaron, Luuk Huitink & Mathieu de Bakker. 2019. *Cambridge grammar of Classical Greek*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- García Ramón, José Luis. 1993. Dos problemas de lingüística tesalia: I. 3.Pl. Med. <-vθειν> e Inf. Aor. <-σειν>, Inf. Med.-Pas. <-σθειν>. II. Tesalio μεσποδι κε «ἕως ἄν» (\*mes-podi 'hasta [el pie del]') y ποκκι «ὄτι» (\*ποτ[ι]-κι = πρὸς ὄτι): dialecto y koiné en las inscripciones tesalias. In Emilio Crespo, José Luis García Ramón & Araceli Striano (eds.), *Dialectología graeca: Actas del II Coloquio Internacional de Dialectología Griega (Miraflores de la Sierra [Madrid], 19-21 de junio de 1991)*, 125–146. Madrid: Ediciones de la Universidad Autónoma de Madrid.
- Helly, Bruno. 2006. Décret de Larisa pour Bombos, fils d'Alkaios, et pour Leukios, fils de Nikasias, citoyens d'Alexandrie de Troade (ca. 150 av. J.-C.). *Chiron* 36, 171–203.
- Helly, Bruno. 2008. Encore le blé thessalien: Trois décrets de Larisa (IG IX 2, 506) accordant aux Athéniens licence d'exportation et réduction des droits de douane sur leurs achats de blé. *Studi Ellenistici* 20, 25–108.
- Lillo, Antonio. 2007. Zu den Temporalonstruktionen in den griechischen Dialekten: ἐς ὃ, ἔσται und μέσται. In Ivo Hajnal (ed.), *Die altgriechischen Dialekte: Wesen und Werden. Akten des Kolloquiums Freie Universität Berlin 19. – 22. September 2001*, 223–263. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck.
- Missailidou-Despotidou, V. 1993. A Hellenistic inscription from Skotoussa (Thessaly) and the fortifications of the city. *The Annual of the British School at Athens* 88: 187–217.
- Schmidt, Johannes. 1889. *Die Pluralbildungen der indogermanischen Neutra*. Weimar: H. Böhlau.
- Schwyzler, Eduard. 1953. *Griechische Grammatik, I: Allgemeiner Teil, Lautlehre, Wortbildung, Flexion*. Munich: C. H. Beck.

## **Acknowledgement**

This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 24K16055.

古代ギリシア語テッサリア方言における前置詞  $\mu\epsilon\zeta/\mu\epsilon\varsigma$  (*mex/mes*) ‘until’ の  
歴史的発展について

南本 徹

古代ギリシア語テッサリア方言の前置詞  $\mu\epsilon\zeta$  (*mex*) ‘as far as, until’ は、 $\mu\epsilon\varsigma$  (*mes*) の異形態として一例のみ存在が確認される。この語形について、本論文は  $\epsilon\zeta/\epsilon\varsigma$  (*ex/es*) ‘out of’ からの類推によって生じたものと論じる。 $\mu\epsilon\zeta$  (*mex*) が  $\mu\epsilon\chi\rho\iota$  (*mekhri*) から生じたとする従来の説は音変化の面で受け入れ難い。テッサリア方言は、語末母音消去の結果として異形態を持つ前置詞が多かったため前置詞に新たに異形態交替を受け入れる素地があり、またアッティカ・イオニア方言の  $\epsilon\zeta/\epsilon\kappa$  (*ex/ek*) とは異なる  $\epsilon\zeta/\epsilon\varsigma$  (*ex/es*) という異形態交替を持っていたので、新たに  $\mu\epsilon\zeta$  (*mex*) という形式を作ることができたと考えられる。

**Keywords** : Ancient Greek, Thessalian dialect, historical linguistics, analogy, preposition  
キーワード : 古代ギリシア語、テッサリア方言、歴史言語学、類推、前置詞