

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Artificial word formation in the epic tradition: *θοῦρος* ('fierce') and the formula *θοῦριδος ἀλκῆς*

Lucien van Beek

Leiden University

E-mail: L.van.Beek@hum.leidenuniv.nl

Abstract

The Homeric adjectives *θοῦρος* and *θοῦρις* (gen. -ιδος) are normally glossed as 'rushing, impetuous, furious'. While *θοῦρις* exclusively qualifies feminine nouns, no feminine form of *θοῦρος* is attested. What was the exact relationship between *θοῦρος* and *θοῦρις*? In this paper it is argued that *θοῦρις* is not the paradigmatic feminine of *θοῦρος*, but an artificial formation of epic Greek. It arose in the formula *θοῦριδος ἀλκῆς* due to the metrical constraints of epic hexameter, and subsequently ousted the original feminine of *θοῦρος*. In elaborating this scenario, I show that the basic meaning of *θοῦρος* and *θοῦρις* is 'fierce'. Other instances of artificial change of inflection in the Homeric *Kunstsprache* are discussed, and it is argued that the mechanism underlying their creation is linguistic contamination.

Keywords: Homeric lexicography; morphology; formulaic language; *Kunstsprache*

I. Introduction

The adjective *θοῦρις* is attested exclusively as an epithet of feminine nouns, and only occurs in hexameter verse and a few elegiac couplets.¹ On the other hand, a feminine form of *θοῦρος* (whether in the shape *θοῦρα*/*θοῦρη* or *θοῦρος*) never occurs in Greek. In a way, then, *θοῦρις* functions as the feminine of *θοῦρος*. Why do we find only this abnormal feminine form? And how exactly do both stem forms relate to each other: could *θοῦρις* be an older paradigmatic feminine of *θοῦρος*, or is it a separate lexical item derived from *θοῦρος*?

When investigating these questions, it is imperative to first deal with the attestations and semantics of both forms, considering their contexts, the remarks of ancient scholia and lexicographers, as well as etymology (section II). Next, the Homeric evidence will be considered in more detail. I argue that *θοῦρις* spread from the formula *θοῦριδος ἀλκῆς* to its other occurrences, taking the place of the expected feminine, *θοῦρη* or *θοῦρος* (section III). Since verse-final **θοῦρης ἀλκῆς* (or **θοῦρου ἀλκῆς*) was unmetrical due to the metrical law called Meister's Bridge, and since *θοῦρις* cannot be explained as an old paradigmatic feminine of *θοῦρος* (section IV), the question arises whether *θοῦριδος ἀλκῆς* could be an artificial creation. In section V, it is argued that *θοῦρις* is a metrically induced contamination between *θοῦρος* and its antonym *ἄνακτις*, and Homeric parallels for an artificial change of inflection are discussed. Finally, the view that *θοῦρις* is an artificial form presupposes that it cannot be explained as a 'conventional' morphological derivation. This claim is bolstered in section VI with an analysis of the functions of the suffixes -ι- and -ιδ- and their Indo-European precursors.

¹ The only occurrence in a pentameter is *θοῦριν Ἀθηναίης ἄσπιδα μελμαμέναν* (Corinna fr. 14, *Anthologia Graeca* 9.26.6).

II. Attestations and lexical meanings of *θοῦρος* and *θοῦρις*

Already in the Greek lexicographical tradition, it was recognized that *θοῦρις* and *θοῦρος* belong together.² Modern lexicographical works, in part following the ancient sources, generally consider *θοῦρις* and *θοῦρος* to be synonyms meaning ‘rushing, impetuous, furious’.³ These translations are imprecise for several reasons. First, since epithets generally denote extra-temporal qualities of their referents rather than an ongoing action, a translation like ‘rushing’ does not make much sense. Moreover, renderings like ‘impetuous, i.e. that rushes/leaps with violent impetus at enemy’⁴ are not based on how *θοῦρος* is used, but inspired by the supposed etymological connection with *θορεῖν* (‘to leap’) or by glosses given in the scholia. Finally, while the rendering ‘impetuous, furious’ is perhaps not impossible for *θοῦρος*, it is clearly inadequate for *θοῦρις*.

Let us consider the attestations of both forms in more detail. In Homer, *θοῦρος* is an exclusive epithet of the war god Ares (*θοῦρον Ἄρηα* 9x, verse final or before the trochaic caesura, and *θοῦρος Ἄρης* 2x). After Homer the adjective continues to be applied mainly to Ares (Tyrtaeus, Simonides, Euripides and also in an Attic epigram);⁵ more exceptionally, it qualifies other warlike persons or beings, but only in the tragedians.⁶ Instructive is the phrase *καὶ θοῦρός περ ὄν* (Aesch. fr. 199.2 Radt, Prometheus speaking to Heracles). It is reminiscent of the Homeric (*καὶ*) *κρατερός περ ἑών* (‘however fierce you are’) and shows that the meaning of *θοῦρος* was similar to that of *κρατερός* (‘fierce, warlike’).⁷ Finally, *θοῦρος* does not qualify a person, but a weapon in *θοῦρον ... δόρυ* (Eur. *Rhes.* 492, cf. also *δόρυ θοῦρον* in Ap. Rhod.).

The second form *θοῦρις* (gen. -ιδος) exclusively occurs in dactylic poetry and only modifies feminine nouns. It has an acc. sg. *θοῦριν* and is especially frequent in the verse-final phrase *θοῦριδος ἀλκῆς* (‘fierce fighting spirit’, 22x in Homer), which is preceded by various verb forms beginning at one of the third foot caesurae: *μνήσασθε δὲ θοῦριδος ἀλκῆς* (Il. 16.270, etc.), *ἔπαυσε δὲ θοῦριδος ἀλκῆς* (Il. 17.81) and several others. A number of these phrases also occur with *χάρμης* replacing *θοῦριδος ἀλκῆς*, for example, *μνήσαντο δὲ χάρμης* (Il. 4.222, etc.), *παῦσε δὲ χάρμης* (Il. 12.389). This gave epic poets the option of shortening (or extending) the phrase by one dactyl; to use the term coined by Egbert Bakker, *χάρμης* and *θοῦριδος ἀλκῆς* are ‘functional synonyms’ in such pairs of phrases.⁸ This point illustrates that *χάρμη* and *ἀλκή* are near synonyms themselves: both express the concept of fighting spirit or martial courage.⁹ In a second and more marginal

² *Etym. Magn.* 475 *Kallierges τὸ θοῦρις ἀπὸ τοῦ θοῦρος γίνεται*, ‘*θοῦρις* comes from *θοῦρος*’.

³ LSJ s.v. *θοῦρος*. Cf. Cunliffe (1924) s.v. *θοῦρος*: ‘rushing, impetuous, eager for the fray’.

⁴ O’Sullivan (1991) s.v. *θοῦρος*.

⁵ *στεθι : καὶ οἰκτιρον : Κροισο // παρα σεμα θανοντος : /hov // ποτ ενι προμαχοις : ολεσε // θορος : Αρες* (IG 1³ 1240, 540–530 BC). This epigram proves that <ου> in epic *θοῦρος* is a spurious diphthong.

⁶ It qualifies a Persian warrior in *τὸν αἰχμηθέντα θοῦρον εὐνατήρ’ ἀποπεμψαμένα* (‘having sent on his way her valiant and fierce bedfellow’, Aesch. *Pers.* 136–37); cf. *Τυφῶνα θοῦρον* (‘fierce Typhon’, Aesch. *PV* 354).

⁷ Cf. verse-initial *Ἄρηϊ κρατερῷ* (‘fierce Ares’, Il. 2.515). Both *κρατερός* and the formulaic phrase *θοῦρον Ἄρηα* appear in connection with the verb *μαίνομαι*, denoting a battle rage: cf. Il. 5.830–31, 6.97–101, 15.127–29. Interestingly, *θοῦρον Ἄρηα* refers exclusively to the personified deity, whereas *ὄξυν Ἄρηα* usually means ‘severe battle’.

⁸ Cf. Bakker (2005) 22–37 on the use of different formulas containing the dative of ‘spear’.

⁹ There is a debate, stemming from antiquity, about whether *χάρμη* means ‘battle’ or ‘battle lust, fighting spirit’; see, for example, Latacz (1966). That the original meaning was ‘battle rage’ not only becomes clear from the Homeric contexts, but now also receives support from the side of etymology: Janda (2014) has attractively proposed to connect *χάρμη* with the root of English *grim* and German *Grimm*, which derive from an inherited Indo-European root **ǵʰrem-* denoting battle rage or fury. This renders obsolete the etymological connection with the root of *χάιρω*, Proto-Indo-European **ǵʰer-* (‘desire, want’), still defended by Latacz (1966). As for *ἀλκή*, its basic meaning is ‘fighting spirit’, but since *ἀλκή* is often at stake when someone is under attack, it also developed the lexical meaning ‘resistance’ (i.e. a display of fighting spirit). Cf. *οὐδέ τις ἀλκή | γίγνεθ’* (Il. 21.528–29), said of the Trojans fleeing *en masse* at the sight of Achilles.

use, *θοῦρις* in Homer qualifies the aegis and a shield, bringing to mind the post-Homeric phrase *θοῦρον δόρυ* just mentioned.¹⁰ The derivative *θοῦριος*, which occurs mainly in the tragedians, likewise qualifies warlike fighters as well as their weapons; it is rightly considered to be a synonym of *θοῦρος* by the dictionaries.¹¹

Now, an important question is: how could an epithet meaning something like ‘impetuous, furious’ be applied to a shield, an inanimate defensive weapon? The dictionaries and commentaries come up with various emergency solutions.¹² Cunliffe remarks that there has been a ‘transference of epithet from the bearer to the shield’, but it is not immediately obvious what exactly is meant by this, other than that *θοῦρος* primarily qualified persons.¹³ How could this transfer take place? It seems to me that sturdy weapons are called *θοῦρος* or *θοῦρις* because they are tough-looking: as such they confer *ἀλκή* on their bearer (who gains confidence by carrying them) and diminish that of an adversary (who will be intimidated by their aspect).¹⁴ In this way we may also understand the use of *ἄλκιμος* (‘valiant, brave’) as a qualification of spears (*ἄλκιμον ἔγχος, ἄλκιμα δοῦρε*) in Homer.

In order to illustrate this, let us briefly review the three instances where the Homeric feminine acc. sg. *θοῦριν* qualifies a weapon. The first is *ἄσπιδα* *θοῦριν* (*Il.* 11.32), about Agamemnon picking up his shield in an arming scene, the place *par excellence* to describe weapons and their special properties. As becomes clear from its description, Agamemnon’s shield is intended to terrorize: ‘it was crowned with a wild-faced Gorgon, which gazed terribly and was flanked by Fear and Rout’ (*Il.* 11.36–37).

The phrase *ἄσπιδα* *θοῦριν* also occurs in a three-line description of Aeneas (*Il.* 20.161–63) trying to intimidate his opponent Achilles by showing his military prowess:

Αἰνεΐας δὲ πρῶτος ἀπειλήσας ἐβεβήκει
νευστάζων κόρυθι βριαρῆ· ἀτὰρ ἄσπιδα θοῦριν
πρόσθεν ἔχε στέρνοιο, τίνασσε δὲ χάλκεον ἔγχος.

Aeneas had stepped out first, uttering threats, nodding with his heavy helmet; his fierce shield he held before his breast, and he brandished his bronze spear.

Finally, *θοῦρις* qualifies the *aegis* at *Il.* 15.308 (verse end *αἰγίδα* *θοῦριν*), an attribute of which the exact referent was probably no longer understood, but which is described in this passage as being carried *ἐς φόβον ἀνδρῶν* (‘for the routing of men’).¹⁵

¹⁰ Cf. also the vocative *θοῦρι κράνεια* (*Anth. Pal.* 6.122.1), where the word for cornel cherry metonymically denotes the product made from it, a spear.

¹¹ The phrase *θοῦρια φάλαγγες* in Euripides brings to mind the Homeric *καρτεραὶ φάλαγγες*, again suggesting a connection with the unwavering fighting spirit (*ἀλκή*) of the phalanx.

¹² For instance, LSJ suggests that *θοῦριν* denoted the shield with which one rushes to the fight, taking up the translation ‘rushing’ (probably based on a wrong interpretation of ancient glosses: see n.18 below). The *T*-scholia ad *Il.* 14.12, commenting on the phrase *ἄλκιμον ἔγχος*, say that *ἄλκιμος* is applied to a weapon with reference to the carrier: *ἄλκιμον· εἰρηται κατὰ τὴν πρὸς τὸν φοροῦντα ἦτοι κομίζοντα ἀναφορὰν* (Erbse (1969–1988) ad loc. with app. crit.).

¹³ Cunliffe (1924) s.v. *θοῦρος*. O’Sullivan (1991) s.v. *θοῦρος* also uses the phrase ‘transference from onrushing warrior to his shield’.

¹⁴ This comes close to an interpretation found in the ancient tradition, Eust. *Il.* 3.144: *ὡσπερ ἀλλαχοῦ* *θοῦρις ἀλκή ἢ* *θοῦρόν τινα ποιοῦσα, ὃ ἐστὶν ὀρηγίαν, οὕτω καὶ ἄσπις* *θοῦρις* (‘as elsewhere *θοῦρις ἀλκή* is that which makes someone *θοῦρον*, that is impetuous; likewise also *ἄσπις* *θοῦρις*). While commenting on the metaphor of putting on clothes in phrases like *θοῦριν ἐπιείμενοι ἀλκίην* (‘clothed in fierce fighting spirit’, said of the Aiantes), Cairns (2016) 37 makes the following remark: ‘In these locutions, there is a link (but also a disjunction) between the physical armour that one needs to put on in order to enter battle and the right emotional attitude that is the more important form of armour’.

¹⁵ On the aegis, cf. Kirk (1985) on *Il.* 2.446–51 and Janko (1993) on *Il.* 15.308–10. The idea that it referred to a goatskin of sorts is confirmed by depictions from the Classical period. In Homer it had tassels (cf. the epithets *ἀμφιδάσεια* and *θυοσσανόεσσα*). Watkins (2000) has argued that it originally referred to a goatskin bag containing

Thus, in all three passages *θοῦριον* qualifies a weapon or attribute that is explicitly described as having an intimidating effect. As a qualification of *ἀλκή*, *θοῦρις* may also have referred to the intimidating aspect of a warrior displaying his martial prowess. On the other hand, *θοῦρος* as an epithet of Ares signified not ‘furious’ (describing a state that applies within a specific time frame) but rather ‘fierce, warlike’ (a generic, timeless characteristic). I suspect that this is the older meaning and that the phrase *θοῦριδος ἀλκῆς* was interpreted by Homeric singers as describing the intimidating effect a fierce fighting spirit may have on opponents. In this sense, the epithet could then be applied to the shields of Agamemnon and Aeneas.¹⁶

This is in part also what ancient commentators and lexicographers suggested. On the one hand, the scholia present us with clear folk etymologies, for instance when they gloss *θοῦρον* with *θεῖως ὀρούων* or *θοῶς ὀρούων* (‘who rushes like a god/quickly’) (for example, sch. vet. *ad Il.* 5.35, Erbse). This is a clear example of the strategy, known from Plato’s *Cratylus*, of etymologizing a word by providing it with a gloss that contains a permutation of all its constituent letters/sounds. On the other hand, we also find glosses that are concerned more with the sense, and they confirm what has just been said. The *D*-scholia *ad Il.* 5.30 render *θοῦρον* with *ἐνθουσιαστικόν* (‘raging, furious’) as well as *εὐκίνητον ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ* (‘agile in battle’). Various other sources gloss forms of *θοῦρος* or *θοῦρις* with *πολεμικός* (‘warlike’) and/or *ὀρητικός*,¹⁷ which in this context is best interpreted as ‘warlike’, too.¹⁸

Etymology, finally, is of little help in determining the lexical meaning of *θοῦρος*. A derivation from the root of *θρόσκω* (aor. *ἔθορον*) (‘to jump, leap’) seems to be generally accepted.¹⁹ This connection was already made by ancient lexicographers, commentators and in the scholia: for example, *θοῦριδος ἀλκῆς· τῆς πολεμικῆς· ἀπὸ τοῦ θορεῖν, ὃ ἐστι πηδησαι, ἀφ’ οὗ καὶ θοῦρος Ἄρης* (Hsch.). However, as we have seen, the translations ‘rushing’ or ‘jumping’ do not match the actual use of *θοῦρος*. In fact, the etymological relationship with *θρόσκω* is by no means certain, as a viable alternative exists: *θοῦρος* could reflect an agentive nominal **d^hors-ó-* (‘who ventures/attacks’), from the root of *θρασύς* (‘bold, dauntless’; from Proto-Indo-European (PIE)) **d^hers-*, with loss of **-s-* and compensatory lengthening. The formation would be of the same type as, for example, *τομός* (‘cutting, sharp’), *φονός* (‘who slays’). This etymology would account in a straightforward

the attributes of prosperity and power, and that as such it is a cultural borrowing from Anatolia, where descriptions and depictions of such an item are found. However, the idea that it must mean ‘goatskin’ is based on the presumed etymological derivation from *αἴξ*, which remains uncertain (see Watkins (2000) 4 n.6). Janko thinks it originally denoted the thunderbolt, which would explain its use as an offensive weapon and the fact that the smith Hephaestus was involved in its fabrication. That it referred to a shield is less obvious; this view mainly rests on its description as containing ‘*Ἐρις*, *Ἀλκή*, *Ἴοκὴ* and a Gorgon’s head (*Il.* 5.740–41), which brings to mind other descriptions of shields.

¹⁶ Again, we may note a similarity with *κρατερός*, which occurs as a qualification of *ἄσπις* in Homer in the phrase *ἀνεγνάμφοι δέ οἱ αἰχμῆ | ἄσπιδ’ ἐνὶ κρατερῇ* (*Il.* 3.348–49 and 17.44–45). It is possible that *κρατερός* here refers to the toughness of the material of which the shield is made, but it might also refer to its fierce or intimidating aspect: in both passages, the reference is to the shield of Menelaus.

¹⁷ For example: *θοῦρον· ὀρητικὸν ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ* (sch. vet. *D ad Il.* 5.454); *θοῦριον· πολεμικὴν* (sch. vet. *D ad Il.* 20.162); *θοῦριον· Ἦτοι, πολεμικὴν ἢ, εὐκίνητον καὶ κούφην τῷ φοροῦντι* (‘either warlike, or easy to wield and light for the person who carries it’) (sch. vet. *D ad Il.* 11.32). See also *θοῦρος· ὁ ὀρητικός, ὁ πολεμιστής* (*Etym. Magn.* 453 Kallierges s.v. *θοῦρος*); *θοῦριδος ἀλκῆς· τῆς πολεμικῆς* (Hsch. *Θ* 665 Latte); *θοῦρος ὁ ὀρητικός* (Eust. *Il.* 2.153).

¹⁸ Both *ὀρητικός* and *εὐκίνητος* might be the source of the translation ‘rushing’ found in modern lexica: note that *ὀρμάω* can be intransitive, meaning ‘to rush’.

¹⁹ The form is reconstructed as **t^horwó- < *d^hor(h₃)-wó-*, with the third compensatory lengthening. See García Ramón (2000), Chantraine (1968–1980) s.v. *θρόσκω* (‘repose certainement sur **θορ-Φος*’) and also Beekes (2010) and Frisk (1960–1972), both s.v. *θοῦρος*. This accounts for the root vowel <ou> which, as we have seen, is a spurious diphthong.

way for the lexical meaning of *θοῦρος*; it would presuppose that the accent of **d^horsó-* was secondarily retracted.²⁰

To conclude this lexicographical discussion, *θοῦρος* ('fierce, warlike') is mostly said of warriors, while *θοῦρις* means 'fierce' in the sense of 'sturdy, tough-looking, intimidating', qualifying weapons and fighting spirit. If there is a lexical difference between the two forms, it is slight: note that *θοῦρος* occurs as an epithet of *δῶρυ* after Homer. Thus, lexical semantics gives us no compelling reason to expect a difference in stem formation.

III. The spread of *θοῦρις* in Homer

As a feminine form of *θοῦρος*, one expects either a form in *-ā* (as normally in thematic adjectives) or in *-ος* (as usually in compounds, but also in some uncompounded thematic adjectives).²¹ In reality, no feminine form of *θοῦρος* is attested in our extant evidence: it is *θοῦρις* which exclusively qualifies feminine nouns. Does it follow that *θοῦρις* is the paradigmatic feminine of *θοῦρος*? Not necessarily: *θοῦρος* is an uncommon poetic relic, and it typically qualifies referents of masculine gender. This means that the absence of a feminine form in, for example, Attic drama might in principle be ascribed to chance.²² Moreover, occurrences of *θοῦρις* are limited to hexameter verse and elegiac couplets. Therefore, our question can be made more precise: why is the morphologically expected feminine form of *θοῦρος* (whether this was *θοῦρη* or *θοῦρος*) never attested in the epic tradition?

The key to the answer lies in the formulaic phrase *θοῦριδος ἀλκῆς*, which accounts for 22 of the 28 occurrences of *θοῦρις* in Homer. In verse-final position, **θούρης ἀλκῆς* or **θούρου ἀλκῆς* would not be well-formed because it violates Meister's Bridge, which states that word end was avoided after a spondaic fifth foot. Of all the metrical laws concerning hexameter verse, Meister's Bridge is observed best by far in Homer (better than Wernicke's Law and Hermann's Bridge). The exceptions, only a handful, are listed and discussed by Meister.²³ A number of them are resolvable by the fact that contraction took place relatively late, notably in the formulaic phrase *ἦῶ δῖαν* for earlier **ἦῶα δῖαν*.²⁴ Only three Homeric verse ends are irreducible counterexamples to Meister's Bridge: *κνῆ τυρόν* (*Il.* 11.639), *κρῖ λευκόν* (*Od.* 4.604) and *λις πέτρῃ* (*Od.* 12.64).²⁵ This means that the rule was very strict in earlier stages of the tradition.

²⁰ Note that the accepted reconstruction **d^hor(h₃)-wó-* also operates with an accent retraction. I intend to publish the details of the proposed reconstruction **d^horsó-* in the near future.

²¹ If *θοῦρος* is to be analysed as an action noun of the type *τομός* ('cutting'), the second option is more plausible because most such adjectives appear to have no separate feminine form.

²² A TLG search shows that the synonymous adjective *θοῦριος* does occur twice in its expected feminine form: *ναοῖσι θουριάς* (*Eur.* *IA* 238) and *φάλαγγα θουριάν* (*Lycoph.* 931).

²³ Meister (1921) 7–8.

²⁴ As Meister (1921) 9 remarks, in practice this means that most spondaic verse ends contain a word boundary after the fifth arsis (for example, *μερόπων ἀνθρώπων*) or at the bucolic dieresis (for example, *αὐδήσσσα*). Word end after the sixth arsis is quite rare in spondaic verse ends (for example, *εὐρεῖα χθόν*), but it was not as strongly avoided as word end at the fifth dieresis.

²⁵ As for *κρῖ λευκόν*, however, Meister (1921) 7–8 with n.3 rightly remarked that this word group may even have been realized as a compound, with one main lexical accent. The resolvable forms are *δήμου φῆμις* (*Od.* 14.239, possibly for **δήμοο φῆμις*, cf. Hackstein (2010) 406 for the genitive ending **-οο*), *ιδρῶ πολλόν* (*Il.* 10.574, for **ιδρόα πολλόν*), *ἦν ἄλσος* (*Od.* 17.208, for **ἔεν ἄλσος*) and *Πατρόκλεις ἱππεῦ* (*Il.* 16.20 and *passim*, the form rightly printed by West (2000), instead of *Πατρόκλεες ἱππεῦ* as printed by Monro and Allen (1920)). In the last phrase, it is unclear whether the contraction had already taken place when the *Iliad* was composed, or whether we are dealing with a post-Homeric form that entered the text later in the (oral or textual) tradition. As West (1998) xxv notes, contracted *-εις* is metrically guaranteed at *Il.* 16.693 and 859, but poets may have had the choice between disyllabic *-εις* and contracted *-εις*. Thus, we do not know whether Homer could still use the disyllabic form. At any rate, it is attractive to assume with Meister that violations of the bridge that carries his name became more

I propose that the form *θοῦρις* first came into being as part of the phrase *θοῦριδος ἀλκίης*, and that the other six Homeric instances, all in the accusative *θοῦριν*, were created as replacements of the older form (whether *θοῦρον* or *θοῦρην*) under the influence of this frequent formula. First, a few remarks on the acc. *θοῦριν*. Three of these six cases are found in the verse end *θοῦριν ἐπιεμμένοι ἀλκίην* ('clad in fierce fighting spirit'), said of the Aiantes. On two of these occasions the Aiantes are mentioned as part of a list of nine Achaean champions who volunteer to fight: *τοῖσι δ' ἐπ' Αἴαντες θοῦριν ἐπιεμμένοι ἀλκίην* (*Il.* 7.164 and 8.262).²⁶ This line may well be a very old one:²⁷ the canon of Achaean champions (*ἀριστῆες*) is probably traditional in some form, and in both passages the well-known line mentioning Meriones, with its irregular scansion of *Ἐνωαλίῳ ἀνδρειφόντη*, follows two lines later.²⁸

The formula *θοῦριν ἐπιεμμένοι ἀλκίην* is remarkable for the *brevis in longo* in the final syllable of *θοῦριν*. This metrical irregularity is unexpected for two reasons. First, **θοῦρην ἐπιεμμένοι ἀλκίην* would be metrically regular and semantically unproblematic. Secondly, an alternative and metrically equivalent way of versifying a similar idea was available, as illustrated by the verse *ἄνδρ' ἐπελεύσεσθαι μεγάλην ἐπιεμμένον ἀλκίην* (*Od.* 9.214, cf. also 514).²⁹ Being metrically regular, this seems a more recent modification of the (traditional) verse mentioning the Aiantes.

It has been claimed that *θοῦριν ἐπιεμμένοι ἀλκίην* is a case of metrical lengthening,³⁰ but this does not take into consideration that this verse end may be a modification of an older, metrically regular prototype.³¹ As is well known, metrical lengthening is virtually restricted to words of specific prosodic shapes, mainly tribrachic (for example, *οὔνομα*) and antispastic words (for example, *Ἀπόλλωνα*), and it could be applied secondarily in cretic sequences, too.³² However, in words with a trochaic shape like *θοῦριν*, there was no motivation for metrical lengthening. One may therefore suspect that the prototype of this formula had the shape **θοῦρην ἐπιεμμένον ἀλκίην*. This may have been changed at some point into *θοῦριν ἐπιεμμένον ἀλκίην*, in spite of the metrical irregularity that was introduced, because *θοῦρις* had come to be viewed as the standard epithet of *ἀλκίη* due to the frequency of the phrase *θοῦριδος ἀλκίης*.

Next, the same substitution could take place also in the verse-final phrases *ἀσπίδα θοῦριν* and *αἰγίδα θοῦριν* (which account for the remaining three occurrences), especially since this had no metrical repercussions. This second substitution was perhaps made easier by the fact that *θοῦρος* was otherwise used exclusively as an epithet of Ares with

acceptable once verse ends with contracted forms like *ἦῶ δῖαν* had gained currency in epic performances. The verse end *νηλιτεῖς εἰσὶ* (*Od.* 16.317, 19.498, 22.418, repeated verse), also cited by Meister, is the reading of most older manuscripts, but it cannot be the original form in view of the irregular length of the *iota* (the root of *ἄλιπαιῖον*, *ἦλιπτον* has a short *iota*). Other attested readings are *νηλιτίδες* and *νηλητεῖς*. West (2017) prints *νηλειτίες εἰσιν* in all three places, but linguistic analysis rather suggests that the older form was **νηλειτέες* (cf. Beekes (1969) 108–09; Tichy (1977) 174). This, then, is another instance of a resolvable contraction.

²⁶ The third occurrence of the formulaic phrase, *Il.* 18.157, seems derived from the other two. On the clothing metaphor, see Cairns (2016) (cf. n.14 above).

²⁷ Pace the remark of Kirk (1990) on *Il.* 7.161–68.

²⁸ See Singor (1991) 33–61, especially p. 42, on nine as a traditional number for a group of warriors. There is a difference between the catalogues of *ἀριστῆες*: Thoas and Odysseus are present in that of book 7, while Menelaus and Teucer are included in book 8.

²⁹ Another means of solving the metrical problem would have been to use *φρεσίν* as a satellite before the participle, as in the phrase *ἐν δ' Ἀχιλλεύς Τρώεσσι θόρε φρεσίν εἰμμένος ἀλκίην* (*Il.* 20.366). However, being the only occurrence of *φρεσίν εἰμμένος* in Homer, this phrase is probably a one-off creation (note that the double consonant *φρ-* is needed to make position).

³⁰ For instance, by Sommer (1909) 208, but without argumentation.

³¹ For the concept of formulaic prototypes, see Hoekstra (1965).

³² For the secondary nature of metrical lengthening in cretic sequences, see Wyatt (1969) 160–64 on the abstract suffix *-ῆν*, and van Beek (2014) 99–100 on doublets like *πλεῖω ~ πλέω*, *κλείω ~ κλέω*.

the meaning ‘fierce, warlike’, which made it less suited to defensive weapons (cf. section II). Since ἀλκή was conceptually close to a defensive weapon (it is something which protects, and in which one dresses), it was logical to generalize the stem form known from the formulaic phrases θούριδος ἀλκῆς and θοῦριν ἐπιειμένον ἀλκῆν.

In these last paragraphs I have assumed that the original feminine form was θούρη, but as I remarked earlier, it cannot be excluded that θοῦρος once had this function, too. In fact, in that case it would be even easier to explain why, for example, ἀσπίδα θοῦρον was replaced by ἀσπίδα θοῦριν: the latter would have been more clearly marked as a feminine. On the other hand, if θοῦρος was the original feminine form, the metrical irregularity in θοῦριν ἐπιειμένοι ἀλκῆν remains unaccounted for.

Thus, all Homeric occurrences of the accusative θοῦριν can be viewed as secondary replacements of either θούρη or θοῦρον under the influence of the frequent phrase θούριδος ἀλκῆς. We have seen that θούριδος was preferred in that phrase over θούρης or θούρου because these alternatives would have caused a violation of Meister’s Bridge. As I will argue in section V, poets probably also created the form θούριδος for this very reason. However, let us first see whether θοῦρις as a feminine of θοῦρος can be explained by normal morphological processes.

IV. θοῦρις is not a flexional feminine in origin

There are two conventional linguistic means to account for a feminine adjectival form θοῦρις, having approximately the same meaning as θοῦρος. It could be an old paradigmatic feminine of θοῦρος, or originally a separate adjective derived from θοῦρος. Most handbooks remain vague or agnostic about these possibilities.³³ Is one of these scenarios likely?

The first option, an old paradigmatic feminine, was defended by Wackernagel.³⁴ This may seem reasonable in view of the distribution between θοῦρος and θοῦρις, but there is one very serious objection. There are two regular ways in Greek to mark feminine agreement with adjectives (both directly reflecting a procedure inherited from Indo-European):

- with third declension stems: add the suffix **-iā*, **-iā-*, for example, βαρύς, f. βαρεῖα < **-em-iā*; φοῖνιξ, f. φοίνισσα < **-ik-iā*;
- with stems in *-os*: substitute **-ā-* (PIE **-eh₂-*) for the thematic vowel, for example, νέος, f. νεῆα.

By contrast, the suffixes *-i-* and *-id-* are not normally used to mark the feminine of adjectives, but Wackernagel apparently thought that *-id-* had this function in the prehistory of Greek. In support of this claim he cites the following Homeric words in *-is*:

- κορωνός adj. ‘curved’ (Hippoc.); ‘having a curved horn’ (Archil.) → κορωνίς f. (17x dat. pl. κορωνίσιν, formulaic epithet of νηυσί ‘ships’);
- ἥμερος adj. ‘tame, cultivated’ → ἡμερίς f. ‘cultivated vine’;
- νύκτερος adj. ‘of the night, nightly’ (Aesch.+) → νυκτερίς f., properly ‘(animal) of the night’, hence ‘bat’;

³³ In his monographic treatment of the suffix *-id-*, Meier (1975) 47 remarks rather vaguely that θοῦρις ‘ist Feminin zu häufigerem θοῦρος -on’ (however, note that θοῦρις is in fact more frequent than θοῦρος). Likewise, Schwyzler (1939) 464 merely remarks: ‘Vereinzelt sind die Femininbildungen θοῦρις, νεῆνις’. Chantraine (1933) 341 lists θοῦρις together with the compounds in *-ōpis* (γλαυκῶπις, etc.) and the feminines νεῆνις, κραταιάς and παλλακίς (all Homeric), but without clearly noting that θοῦρις and the type γλαυκῶπις are adjectives, while νεῆνις, κραταιάς and παλλακίς are nouns. Chantraine (1958) and Risch (1974) give no further comment on θοῦρις.

³⁴ Wackernagel (1914) 110–11, followed, for example, by Nagy (1999) 349.

- κραταιός adj. ‘strong, powerful’ → κραταιίς f. ‘powerful force’ (Wackernagel speaks of a ‘substantiviertes Femininum’).³⁵

Before continuing, we must briefly address the accentuation and inflection of stems in -ις. If correctly adduced, the above parallels (which have the oxytone suffix -ις, -ίδος irrespective of the accent of the base form) would lead one to expect a form *Θουρίς, but instead we find Θούρις, with barytone accentuation and an accusative Θούριν. Wackernagel accounted for this as a case of ‘Aeolic barytonesis’: traditional epic words with an unexpectedly retracted accent that stem from an Aeolic dialect with recessive accentuation. In this context, he mentioned other forms such as ἵππουρις and ἄκοιτις; he saw the acc. sg. in -ιν of these words as typical for Aeolic.³⁶ However, the evidence for Aeolic barytonesis in Homer is not abundant, and both the barytone accentuation of these compounds and their acc. in -ιν may be seen as archaisms.³⁷ On the other hand, the accentuation of Θούρις may have been influenced by that of Θούρος, and it sometimes happens in Homer that an acc. sg. in -ιν is secondary for -ίδα.³⁸ This means that Θούρις can, but need not, be compared to forms in -ις, -ίδος (that is, the accentuation and inflection of Θούρις do not directly inform us about the type of derivation).

Returning to the above examples: do they justify Wackernagel’s suggestion that -ιδ- could originally mark the feminine of adjectives in -ος? Upon closer consideration, none of the cases is convincing.³⁹ There is no reason to think that the nouns ἡμερίς, νυκτερίς and κραταιίς were once part of the paradigms of the adjectives ἡμερος, νύκτερος and κραταιός. Moreover, κραταιίς has its own feminine, attested in the old formula μύρα κραταιή. If anything, ἡμερίς, νυκτερίς and κραταιίς are substantivizations derived from their respective adjectival base forms.⁴⁰ By comparison, the most promising parallel for Θούρις as a feminine of Θούρος is the epithet κορώνις, but the derivational analysis of this form remains uncertain, as we will see in section VI.

Thus, adjectives in -ος never had a paradigmatic feminine in -ις. An alternative account would be that Θούρις was originally an independent derivative that was secondarily incorporated into the paradigm of Θούρος as its feminine form. As we will see in section VI, such an account cannot be easily applied to the pair of forms Θούρος with Θούρις either. Before going into the technical issues, I will first show how Θούρις may have originated as an artificial substitute for the feminine of Θούρος.

V. Θούριδος ἀλκῆς as a case of artificial contamination

As we have seen, the formula Θούριδος ἀλκῆς stands in for metrically awkward *Θούρης ἀλκῆς or *Θούρου ἀλκῆς. I submit that the ending -ίδος in this formula arose under the influence of ἀναλκις -ίδος ‘cowardly; coward’ (20x Hom.), an antonym of Θούρος. Later on,

³⁵ Wackernagel (1914) 111.

³⁶ Wackernagel’s point is that an original oxytone accentuation of Θούρις is not ruled out by its acc. in -ιν.

³⁷ Simple *i*-stems inherited from PIE often changed their inflection into an *ιδ*-stem (cf. Meier (1975) 12–14). This is the origin of alternating accusative forms in -ιν and -ίδα in poetry. In some cases the inflection without -δ- was preserved longer (for example, nom. pl. ἴδριες beside later ἴδριδες), but in other cases Homer has already generalized -ιδ- (apart from Θούρις and ἀναλκις, cf. ὄπις, acc. ὄπιν and ὄπιδα).

³⁸ For instance, the acc. ἔριν (ἔρις, ‘strife’) might be secondary to ἔριδα, given the likely etymological analysis of this word as a root noun to ἐρείδω (‘to lean against’); cf. Meier (1975) 15 with references.

³⁹ Wackernagel also mentions a few late examples, such as the glosses ἡμορίς κενή, ἐστερημένη (‘bereft’) versus ἡμορος ἄμορος (‘without a share’), both in Hesychius. These are subject to the same problem: it cannot be proven that the form in -ις is the flexional feminine of a masculine in -ος, rather than a derived lexical entry.

⁴⁰ The same may hold for the peculiar adjectival use of ἀπλοῖς (‘single-layered cloak’) in Homer (not mentioned by Wackernagel; only in the phrase ἀπλοῖδας χλαίνας, ‘single-layered cloaks’) beside the adj. ἀπλόος (‘simple’). Further evidence for the antiquity of substantivizations in *-i- will be discussed in section VI.

the new feminine *θοῦρις*, *-ιδος* completely ousted the original form according to the scenario proposed in section III.

Before discussing how *ἀναλκίς* *-ιδος* influenced the creation of *θοῦριδος ἀλκίς*, let us first consider some well-known Homeric parallels for a change of declension or conjugation type,⁴¹ so as to better understand the nature of artificial word formation in Homer.

Beside the formulaic phrase *τετιηότι θυμῷ* ('with a vexed spirit', instrumental dative), we find another formulaic phrase *τετιημένος ἦτορ* ('vexed at heart', where *ἦτορ* is an internal accusative). The reason for changing the active participle into a middle one is that **τετιηώς ἦτορ* would have violated Meister's Bridge.⁴² Replacement with a middle form was made easier by the significant semantic overlap between both voices in the perfect stem, and also by the fact that verses ending in *-μένος ἦτορ* were more widespread (for example, *βεβλημένος ἦτορ*, *κεχλωμένος ἦτορ*).

The middle voice could be used artificially also in the present or aorist stem in cases where using the active voice would have violated Meister's Bridge or Wernicke's Law. A clear example is furnished by the phrases *καὶ ἐξερεεῖντο μῦθῷ* (*Il.* 10.81) and *ἄφαρ δ' ἐρεεῖντο μῦθῷ* (*Od.* 17.305), both in speech introductions, replacing **ἐρέεινεν μῦθῷ*.⁴³ The sequence *-ετο μύθῳ* occurring in other verse ends may have served as a model: cf. *καὶ ἐπέιθετο μύθῳ* (*Il.* 1.33, 24.571) and especially *καὶ ἀμείβετο μύθῳ* (*Il.* 24.200 and *passim*), again in a speech introduction.

The name *Ἀντιφάτης* occurs five times in Homer, with an accusative *Ἀντιφάτην* (twice) and a verse-final genitive *Ἀντιφάταο* (*Od.* 10.106). The accusative also appears in the form *Ἀντιφατήα* (*Od.* 10.114), belonging to a would-be nominative *Ἀντιφατεύς* but referring to the same *Ἀντιφάτης* as *Ἀντιφάταο* eight lines before. We must assume that the poet used the accusative of a name in *-εύς* for metrical reasons. From a morphological viewpoint this was certainly not trivial, because nouns in *-εύς* are normally not compounds, as noted by Meister.⁴⁴ Similar instances are found in the inflection of compounds in *-ος*. For instance, the genitive of *ἠνίοχος* appears in the form *ἠνίοχοιο*, used five times at verse end. The wish to use other case forms in the same metrical position then led poets to create the artificial forms *ἠνιοχήα* and *ἠνιοχῆες*.⁴⁵

Perhaps the most famous cases of artificial nominal inflection in the fifth foot are the verse-final phrases *εὐρέα πόντων* and *εὐρέα κόλπον*. They are artificial because the only current form of the masculine acc. sg. ending of adjectives in *-ύς* in any form of Greek is *-ύν*, not *-έα*. The motive for avoiding the grammatically regular phrases *εὐρὸν πόντων* and *εὐρὸν κόλπον* is that these would have violated Meister's Bridge.⁴⁶ Witte proposed that *εὐρέα πόντων* (2x *Il.*, 1x *Od.*) arose by inflection of the dative *εὐρέϊ πόντῳ* (7x *Od.*), that is, by analogical levelling of the paradigm, and in this he is all but universally followed.⁴⁷ However, he does not explain how poets were able to create an *ungrammatical* acc. sg. *εὐρέα*. In my view, it is more attractive to suppose that the ending of *εὐρὸν* was artificially changed into that of an adjective in *-ής*, a type which shares many case forms with stems

⁴¹ For these and further examples, see Meister (1921) 10–22; Hackstein (2010) 410–12 with references.

⁴² Hackstein (2010) 411 with literature.

⁴³ Meister (1921) 19, with more examples of middle for active in the fourth foot.

⁴⁴ Meister (1921) 30.

⁴⁵ Again, note the unexpected appearance of *-εύς* in a compound, which makes it unlikely that *ἠνιοχεύς* was created in a form of spoken Greek. See Meister (1921) 173–74.

⁴⁶ Cf. already Witte (1911) 113.

⁴⁷ See, for example, Chantraine (1958) 97; Hoekstra (1965) 112. Another proposal was made by Meister (1921) 18–19, who suggested that poets creating *εὐρέα πόντων* started out from the formula *ἐπ' εὐρέα νῶτα θαλάσσης* ('over the broad back of the sea'). However, reanalysing *εὐρέα* as an accusative singular requires that poets could view *νῶτα* not as a neuter plural to *νῶτος* or *νῶτον*, but as the accusative singular of a third declension noun **νῶς* *ωτός* (*vel sim.*). This is questionable, as *νῶτον* unambiguously follows the second declension in Homer.

in -ύς. This is made likely by the existence of other verse ends in -έα πόντον, notably ἐπ' ἡεροειδέα πόντον.⁴⁸

What actually happened in linguistic terms in these examples is usually left unstated.⁴⁹ In my view, all of the artificial epic forms discussed above are best viewed as *contaminations* or *blends* with other forms and formulas that came to the poets' minds as they composed.⁵⁰ As is stressed by treatments of contamination in handbooks about historical linguistics,⁵¹ contamination usually occurs in words that regularly co-occur, for example, in antonymic pairs (cf. English *male and female* for older *male and femelle*) or in sequences of numerals (for example, in the Greek dialect of Heraclea, where ὀκτώ, ἐννέα become ἠοκτώ, ἡεννέα under the influence of ἕξι, ἑπτά). In epic verse composition, contaminations are likely to have been promoted by the fact that specific words regularly occurred in certain metrical positions. The examples just discussed clearly illustrate this point. Thus, in the case of verse-final ἡνιοχῆα, -ῆες, -ῆας, some poet may have created these forms when he was reminded of the simplex noun ὄχευς (13x Hom.), which occurs in the case forms ὄχηα, ὄχηες, ὄχηας (12x in total), and always in verse-final position. A similar example is πατροφονῆα (3x *Od.*, each time referring to Aegisthus): we may suspect that the poet of the *Odyssey* (or a precursor) coined it by crossing the simplex φονεύς ('slayer', Hom.+, attested at verse end in gen. sg. φονῆος, acc. pl. φονῆας) with the expected but rare compound πατροφόνος ('slaying a father'), or with the more usual πατροκτόνος ('parricide').

In epic Greek, conditions were favourable for a contamination between θούρος and ἄναλκις.⁵² The demands of verse composition provided a clear motivation for reshaping existing word forms. When confronted with the undesirable metrical shape of verse-final *θούρης ἀλκῆς or *θούρου ἀλκῆς, epic poets may have been led to think of phrases containing the antonym ἄναλκις.⁵³ This connection was favoured in particular by the fact that ἄναλκις is linked to ἀλκή etymologically. In addition, Homer uses the phrases ἀνάλκιδα θυμόν ('cowardly spirit', *Il.* 16.355 and 656) and ἀνάλκιδα φύζαν ('weak-spirited panic', *Il.* 15.62), which refer to the opposite of θούριδος ἀλκῆς ('fierce fighting spirit'). These are similar not only in terms of semantics, but also word order and word shape: in all cases the head noun follows the modifier, and it is disyllabic.⁵⁴ Finally, as one

⁴⁸ I elaborated on this scenario for the genesis of εὐρέα πόντον in a paper presented at the conference 'Homer as a Cultural Horizon' (Nice, 21–23 October 2021) and intend to publish the argument separately.

⁴⁹ Hackstein (2002) 89–90 stresses that the creation of artificial forms is not haphazard but subject to rules, and notes that analogical models are normally applied, just as in everyday language. Witte, too, ascribes the rise of artificial forms to analogical influence, for instance in Witte (1909) 135, where he explains στήθεσσι as an artificial plural that arose under the influence of φρεσί. Neither scholar, however, makes explicit what type of analogical influence we are dealing with. Meister (1921) 23 comes fairly close to the views expressed here, for instance when speaking of προσώπατα as a hypostasis of the phrase πρὸς ὅπα 'in Anlehnung an das Bedeutungsgleiche ὄμμασι ὄμματα', but as far as I am aware he does not use the term 'contamination'. Cf. also the remarkable form ἐκ δαιτύος (*Il.* 22.496), which Meister (1921) 19 correctly identified as an 'Umbildung nach ἐδητύος' for expected *ἐκ δαιτύος.

⁵⁰ For a critical discussion of the conditions under which contamination may occur, see Vine (2006).

⁵¹ For example, Hock (1991) 197–99.

⁵² It is unlikely that θούρις arose by contamination in some spoken variety of Greek that contributed to the epic tradition. As a context where contamination of θούρος and ἄναλκις could take place, one could think of a question like θούρος εἶ ἢ ἄναλκις; ('Are you a fighter or a coward?'). It is problematic, however, that adjectives in -ις are rare and unproductive in Greek generally (see section VI.ii below). One would therefore expect a normal contamination of θούρος and ἄναλκις to have yielded *ἄναλκος, all the more since this is the expected form of a privative compound of ἀλκή.

⁵³ That θούρος and ἄναλκις are antonyms is illustrated well by the phrase ἀπτόλεμος καὶ ἄναλκις (*Il.* 2.201), acc. ἀπτόλεμον καὶ ἀνάλκιδα (*Il.* 9.35): one of the glosses structurally applied to θούρος as an epithet of Ares in the Greek lexicographical tradition (cf. section II) is πολεμικός ('warlike'), the opposite of ἀπτόλεμος.

⁵⁴ It could be held against the assumed influence that ἀνάλκιδα θυμόν (φύζαν) could not have easily occurred in the same metrical position (verse final) as θούριδος ἀλκῆς, as this would have caused a violation of Hermann's

reviewer of this paper remarked, the fact that $\theta\omicron\iota\delta\text{-}\acute{\alpha}\lambda\kappa\text{-}$ (in $\theta\omicron\upsilon\tau\iota\delta\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\lambda\kappa\eta\varsigma$) is a phonic permutation of $\text{-}\acute{\alpha}\lambda\kappa\text{-}\iota\delta\text{-}\theta\omicron\iota\delta\text{-}$ (in the phrase $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\kappa\iota\delta\alpha\ \theta\omicron\upsilon\mu\acute{\omicron}\nu$) may have played a role.

The proposed source of the contamination, $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\kappa\iota\varsigma\ \text{-}\iota\delta\omicron\varsigma$, is an adjective in $\text{-}\iota(\delta)\text{-}$ with identical masculine and feminine forms. Such adjectives were on the verge of extinction (cf. section VI.i), and the suffix $\text{-}\iota\delta\text{-}$ in the contaminated phrase $\theta\omicron\upsilon\tau\iota\delta\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\lambda\kappa\eta\varsigma$ could easily be reinterpreted as a feminine marker: nouns with this suffix were feminine almost without exception, and there were a few other adjectives in $\text{-}\omicron\varsigma$ with a derived feminine in $\text{-}\iota\delta\text{-}$ (cf. sections III and VI.i). Consequently, other forms of the original feminine of $\theta\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ could also be replaced by forms of $\theta\omicron\upsilon\tau\iota\varsigma$ along the lines set out in section II.

Two further epic words in $\text{-}\iota\varsigma$ must be discussed as parallels for an artificial contamination: the nouns $\pi\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\kappa\iota\varsigma$ ('concubine') and $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\kappa\alpha\lambda\iota\varsigma$ ('bent arms, embrace'). As noted by Meier,⁵⁵ the use of both forms in Homer must be metrically conditioned: compared to the Classical Ionic-Attic forms $\pi\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\kappa\eta$ and $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\kappa\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta$, they appear to have undergone an artificial change of declension type:⁵⁶

- Since the only practicable case forms in a hexameter were $\pi\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\kappa\eta$, $\pi\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\kappa\eta$ and $\pi\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\kappa\alpha\iota$ (before vowels), whereas $\pi\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\kappa\iota\varsigma$ could be used in all case forms, it is likely that the latter is an artificial substitute for $\pi\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\kappa\eta$.⁵⁷ In my view, it is conceivable that $\pi\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\kappa\eta$ was blended with concubine names in $\text{-}\iota\varsigma$ such as $\chi\upsilon\tau\iota\varsigma$, $\beta\upsilon\tau\iota\varsigma$, perhaps aided by $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\omicron\iota\tau\iota\varsigma$ ('spouse') (though that has a different accentuation).
- In Homer, $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\kappa\alpha\lambda\iota\varsigma$ occurs only in the phrase $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\kappa\alpha\lambda\iota\delta\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$ (*Il.* 18.556, 22.503), which clearly stands in for $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\kappa\acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\varsigma$ (unmetrical in a hexameter, but common in Classical Attic). Outside of hexametrical Greek, $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\kappa\alpha\lambda\iota\varsigma$ does occur, but with a different meaning, 'armful', that is, 'that which is carried in bent arms' (for example, *Ar. fr.* 418). In fact, in *Il.* 18.556 both meanings are conceivable, and this ambiguity may have licensed the use of $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\kappa\alpha\lambda\iota\delta\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$ as a substitute for $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\kappa\acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\varsigma$ ('in the arms') at *Il.* 22.503.

The examples discussed in this section illustrate that the idea of an inflectional contamination of $\theta\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ with $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\kappa\iota\varsigma$ within epic Greek is an attractive option, for which various parallels can be adduced.

VI. Accounting for the pair of forms $\theta\omicron\upsilon\tau\iota\varsigma$ with $\theta\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ by means of derivation

In this final section, I argue that $\theta\omicron\upsilon\tau\iota\varsigma$ cannot have been derived from $\theta\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ in a regular way, neither by derivational mechanisms that were operative within Greek, nor as an archaism inherited from the Indo-European parent language.

Bridge. However, when preceded by $\kappa\alpha\iota$ the form $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\kappa\iota\delta\alpha$ does occur in this position in other phrases (verse-final $\kappa\alpha\kappa\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\kappa\iota\delta\alpha\ \phi\eta\sigma\epsilon\iota$ (*Il.* 8.153), $\kappa\alpha\kappa\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\kappa\iota\delta\alpha\ \phi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ (*Il.* 14.126); see also $\kappa\alpha\kappa\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\kappa\iota\upsilon\ \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ (*Od.* 3.375)), as do other adjectives in $\text{-}\iota\delta\text{-}$ (for example, $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\iota\kappa\acute{\omicron}\pi\iota\delta\alpha\ \kappa\omicron\upsilon\tau\eta\rho\eta\nu$ (*Il.* 1.98), $\epsilon\upsilon\acute{\omicron}\pi\iota\delta\alpha\ \kappa\omicron\upsilon\tau\eta\rho\eta\nu$ (*Od.* 6.113 and 142)). Note that these accusatives in $\text{-}\iota\delta\alpha$ may themselves be artificial reshaping of forms in $\text{-}\iota\upsilon$, again elicited by their occurrence in the fifth foot.

⁵⁵ Meier (1975) 37 and 53.

⁵⁶ The exception is Xenophon, who uses both $\pi\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\kappa\iota\varsigma$ (4x) and $\pi\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\kappa\eta$ (1x), without any apparent semantic distinction.

⁵⁷ The fact that $\pi\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\kappa\iota\varsigma$ occurs in Homer even where $\pi\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\kappa\eta$ could have been used ($\acute{\epsilon}\mu\acute{\epsilon}\ \delta\prime\ \acute{\omicron}\nu\eta\tau\eta\ \tau\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\epsilon\ \mu\eta\tau\eta\rho\ \mid\ \pi\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\kappa\iota\varsigma$, *Od.* 14.202–03) suggests that $\pi\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\kappa\iota\varsigma$ is the traditional epic lexeme. However, since $\pi\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\kappa\iota\varsigma$ occurs only three times in Homer, this conclusion remains tentative.

i. θοῦρις derived from θοῦρος within Greek

Most handbooks assume a derivational relation between θοῦρις and θοῦρος but are vague about the precise details. An exception is the overview of Greek derivational morphology by Balles,⁵⁸ who categorizes θοῦρος → θοῦρις as an adjectival feminine ‘Motionsbildung’ (i.e. θοῦρις would have been introduced to distinguish the natural sex of the referent). This is not plausible, as θοῦρις does not qualify natural female beings.

In order to appreciate the problem more clearly, let us briefly look at the different types of feminine forms with the suffix -ιδ-.⁵⁹ The main issue is that most words in -ιδ- are nouns, whereas θοῦρις is an adjective. There are, however, instances where -ιδ- does make adjectives. Consider the following types of derivation:⁶⁰

1. feminine patronymics: ὁ Ἄτλας → ἡ Ἀτλαντίς (‘daughter of Atlas’);
2. feminines of ethnic names: ὁ Δάρδανος → ἡ Δαρδανίς (‘Dardanian woman’);
3. feminine nouns identifying the referent by a toponym: οἱ Δελφοί → ἡ Δελφίς (‘woman from Delphi, the territory of Delphi, a coin from Delphi’);
4. feminine adjectives denoting appurtenance: ὁ βασιλεύς → f. adj. βασιληίς (‘kingly, royal’) (Hom.+); ὁ στρατιώτης → f. adj. στρατιῶτις (‘of a soldier’) (Classical);⁶¹
5. feminine nouns derived from masculine nouns in -της: ὁ πολίτης → ἡ πολίτις (‘female citizen’);⁶²
6. feminine nouns for objects characterized by the base word: τὸ ἄργυρον → ἡ ἀργυρίς (‘silver cup’);
7. diminutives: ἡ ἄμαξα → ἡ ἀμαξίς (‘little cart’).

It is debatable how all these different derivational types are interrelated. Some of them (types 5 and 7) are clearly secondary. The function of deriving lexicalized nouns for concrete objects (type 6) is well-established, but irrelevant for θοῦρις and perhaps unrelated to types 1 to 4.⁶³

More relevant for present purposes are the adjectives of appurtenance (type 4). It is likely that types 1, 2 and 3 were originally adjectives of appurtenance as well.⁶⁴ An illustrative example is Αἰολίς (‘Aeolian’), which functions as a patronymic denoting a daughter of Aeolus, as a feminine adjective of appurtenance (used of cities, dialect and the musical mode), and as a noun denoting the region Aeolid. It is possible that the feminine of ethnic names (type 2) developed from the patronymic use: Δαρδανίς may have originally referred to a female descendant of the eponymous ancestor Δάρδανος.

It appears, however, that θοῦρις cannot be analysed as an original adjective of appurtenance. First of all, the supposed base form θοῦρος is not a noun (as in all the above cases) but an adjective.⁶⁵ In response to this, one might hypothetically assume that θοῦρις was

⁵⁸ Balles (2008) 234 and 304.

⁵⁹ The suffix arose by a formal merger of at least two different suffixes, -ι- (from Indo-European *-i-) and -ιδ- (of debated origin). On PIE substantivizing -i- and its reflexes in Greek, see section V.

⁶⁰ Cf. Risch (1974) 141–44 for the formations in -ις attested in Homer; for an overview of all early attestations and functions of -ις, see Meier (1975). See also Balles (2008) 334.

⁶¹ Cf. also πατήρις (‘of one’s father’, modifying words for ‘land’), also substantivized ἡ πατήρις (‘fatherland’); ἡρωίς (‘of a hero’), also substantivized ‘heroine’; στρατηγίς (‘of a general’, said of ships, of a tent), also ‘female general’.

⁶² The accented penult of πολίτις is generally thought to have been taken over from the masculine form πολίτης.

⁶³ Other examples are νεβρός (‘fawn’) → νεβρίς (‘fawnskin’); παρειά (‘cheeks’) → παρηίς (‘cheekpiece’).

⁶⁴ Thus Kastner (1967); in contrast, Meier (1975) 67 claims that stems in -ιδ- originated as feminine nouns.

⁶⁵ Most of the adjectival feminines in -ις compared with θοῦρις by Balles (2008) 304 are derived from nouns, and therefore not suitable as parallels.

derived from a now-lost noun, for example, *θουρά or *θούρος ('battle rage'). However, a second problem is that adjectives of appurtenance in -ίς are derived from nouns belonging to specific semantic categories: personal names, place names and words denoting concrete persons or objects.⁶⁶ This also holds for the following two feminine adjectives in -ίς, attested in Classical historiography, which offer a further illustration of the problem:

- συμμαχίς ('allied, ally') (Thuc., Hdt.) beside σύμμαχος -ον ('allied, ally')
- περιουίς ('neighbouring, neighbour') (Thuc., Hdt., Xen.) beside περίουκος ('neighbouring, neighbour')

These cases have in common with the pair of forms θούρις with θούρος that the special feminine form is derived from an adjective in -ος. That is where the similarity ends, however. Deriving the forms συμμαχίς and περιουίς was possible because σύμμαχος and περίουκος usually refer to persons and may be used as substantives. Indeed, συμμαχίς and περιουίς are often used in apposition to nouns with concrete referents (πόλις, ναῦς and πόλις, νῆσος, χώρα, respectively), and this is precisely why ἡ συμμαχίς may occur in substantivized form, denoting an allied military force.⁶⁷ The semantics of θούρις ἀλκή is quite different: it does not have a concrete referent but denotes an abstract entity. Therefore, a hypothetical substantivization ἡ θούρις would hardly be meaningful, as it would not distinguish a concrete individual specimen of fighting spirit.

We may conclude that θούρις cannot be derived from θούρος as a feminine adjective.

ii. The pair of forms θούρις with θούρος as an Indo-European inheritance

Another function of -ίδ- was to transform an adjective in -ος into a feminine noun, as in νύκτερος ('nightly') → νυκτερίς ('bat') (cf. section III). This pattern of derivation differs from that discussed in section VI.i in that it operates on adjectives. In a recent proposal, Nussbaum has argued that θούρος → θούρις is an instance of this substantivizing derivation.⁶⁸

In this function, -ίδ- was probably an extended form of the suffix -i- inherited from Proto-Indo-European. The exact origin and function of these adjectival stems in -i- is a subject of debate,⁶⁹ but a widely followed scenario was formulated by Schindler and further elaborated by Nussbaum. These scholars have argued that the suffix *-i-, when replacing *-o- in adjectives, made adjectival abstracts.⁷⁰ More recently, Nussbaum has argued that

⁶⁶ Cf. Meier (1975) 35–36. Compare also the remarks of Balles (2008) 205 on the overarching function of -ίδ-: 'Als Grundfunktion lässt sich die Bezeichnung von Zugehörigkeit bestimmen, doch ist diese nicht unspezifisch, generisch wie bei den Zugehörigkeitsadjektiven, sondern *substantiviert und individualisiert*, so dass durch das Wortbildungsmuster *immer ein konkreter Gegenstand bezeichnet* wird. Seine Funktion ist die *Aussonderung eines Individuativums* aus der Menge der durch das Grundwort erfassten Dinge' (emphasis added).

⁶⁷ Compare Kastner (1967) 60: 'Bemerkenswert ist, dass in πατρις γαῖα u.ä. das Adjektiv auf -ίδ- das natürliche Geschlecht bezeichnet ... Bei der grossen Zahl von Eigennamen-Ableitungen mit -ίδ- steht gleichfalls das natürliche Femininum im Vordergrund (Frau, Land). Weiter wird das -ίδ- Femininum häufig substantiviert und erscheint somit in der Bedeutungssphäre eng begrenzt'.

⁶⁸ Nussbaum (2014) 305.

⁶⁹ Balles (2009) has pleaded for the existence of primary PIE *i*-stem adjectives, but in Greek the evidence for such a function is negligible (see below). Meier (1975) 12 appears to assume that the adjectival use of accented -ίδ- (on which see section VI.i) is secondary, while adjectives in -i- (as those listed here) were inherited as such from PIE. In my view, the original situation is exactly the reverse: see below.

⁷⁰ See Schindler (1980) 390; Nussbaum (1999) 299; (2014). In support of his idea, Schindler drew attention to feminine abstracts made with the suffix *-i- in Slavic languages, remarking that abstracts may lexicalize as concrete nouns, as in German *Flüssigkeit* ('liquid'), which was originally an abstract meaning 'liquidity'. The

*-i- could also form substantivizations of adjectives in Proto-Indo-European.⁷¹ The evidence includes derivations like the following:

adjective in *-o-	→ substantivization in -i-
Lat. adj. <i>rauus</i> ('hoarse')	→ <i>rauis</i> ('hoarseness, angina')
Gr. adj. ἄκρος ('high, top')	→ ἄκρις ('summit') ⁷²
Vedic Sanskrit adj. <i>jīrá-</i> ('agile, lively')	→ <i>jīri-</i> ('flowing water')
Avestan adj. <i>tiṣra-</i> ('sharp, pointed')	→ <i>tiṣri-</i> ('arrow')

If this scenario is correct, how should we account for the existence of *adjectives* in -i- in Greek and other Indo-European languages, especially in Latin where adjectives in -is are widespread (cf. *fortis, grauis*, etc.)?⁷³ Nussbaum views these adjectives in -i- as 're-adjectivizations' of substantivized nouns.⁷⁴ Applying this scenario to θοῦρις, he analyses this as a substantivized form in origin, meaning '(the) fierce one'. At some point, θοῦρις would have been pushed back into the function of a regular adjective, and then reinterpreted as the feminine of θοῦρος. Nussbaum compares θοῦρις with the Homeric epithet of ships, κορωνίς, and speaks of both forms as 'inconsistent and abortive creations of specifically feminine adjectival forms'.⁷⁵

Does this scenario account for the actual use of these feminines in -ίς? As for κορωνίς, this epithet may mean something like 'curved' or 'having a curved bow',⁷⁶ but its derivation from κορωνός remains uncertain. After Homer the form is used not as an adjective, but as a noun denoting concrete objects that are characterized by a curved shape or curved parts.⁷⁷ We must also take into account that the related noun κορώνη (a substantivization of κορωνός) may denote the curved bow of a ship.⁷⁸ Therefore, it is conceivable that κορωνίς, in the Homeric phrase νηοῖ κορωνίσιν, denotes a *type* of ship characterized by its κορώνη.⁷⁹ If κορωνίς was derived not from κορωνός but from κορώνη, it is similar to other de-substantival ship names in -ίς attested in the Classical period;⁸⁰ and comparable to the Homeric φόρτος ('cargo') → φορτίς ('freighter').

doctrine that *-i- made adjectival abstracts is now widely accepted: cf. Balles (2006) 272–87; Vine (2006); Meusel (2015).

⁷¹ Nussbaum (2014).

⁷² Cf. also ὄκρις ('jagged point'), Old Latin (Festus) *ocris* ('rugged or stony mountain'), Vedic *ásri-* ('corner'), all reflecting PIE **h₂ókr̥i-*.

⁷³ Adjectives in -i- are also relatively common in Hittite and Celtic languages: see, for example, Balles (2009).

⁷⁴ Nussbaum (2014).

⁷⁵ Nussbaum (2014) 305. With the term 'abortive', Nussbaum presumably refers to the fact that some substantivized adjectives were never born as distinct lexemes.

⁷⁶ Cf. Meier (1975) 47: 'κορωνίς "mit gekrümmtem Bug" ... wohl Ableitung zu κορωνός "gekrümmt"'.

⁷⁷ See LSJ s.v. κορωνίς, II: 'as Subst., anything curved or bent', for example, 'wreath, garland' (Stesichorus), and notably 'hook-shaped stroke with the pen' (late authors), which is probably a diminutive of κορώνη. The phrase ἐπι βοσῶι κορωνίστι (Theoc. 25.151) is reminiscent of Homeric ἐπι νηοῖ κορωνίστι and perhaps based on it.

⁷⁸ See LSJ s.v. κορώνη, II: 'door handle' (Od.), 'curved tip of a bow' (Il.+), 'curved stern of a ship' (Aratus, *Phaen.* 345), 'tip of the plough pole (ιστοβοεός), upon which the yoke is hooked or tied' (Ap. Rhod.+), 'coronoid process' (Hippoc.+).

⁷⁹ For this possibility, see also Risch (1974) 144.

⁸⁰ Cf., for example, πορθμίς ('ferry boat'), στρατηγίς ('flagship'), θεωρίς ('mission ship'), φρουρίς ('guardian ship'), etc.

There are also a handful of other Greek adjectives in *-ις* which Nussbaum does not comment on, but which may well be analysed as *i*-stem substantivizations of *o*-stem adjectives.⁸¹ The most important instances attested before the Classical period are:⁸²

1. ἴδρις, usually translated as ‘skilled, skilful, experienced’ (Hom.+). In Homer and Hesiod, the syntactic behaviour of ἴδρις is consistent with that of a noun or substantivized adjective meaning ‘expert, skilled person’.⁸³ In the following lines (*Od.* 6.232–34 = 23.159–61), ἴδρις is used in apposition to ἀνὴρ, as a runover word in enjambment:

ἀνὴρ
ἴδρις, ὃν Ἥφαιστος δέδαεν καὶ Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη
τέχνην παντοίην.

a man, an expert, whom Hephaestus and Pallas Athena have taught a versatile craft.

The only other Homeric occurrence is Φαίηκες ... ἴδριες ... νῆα θοὴν ἐνὶ πόντῳ ἐλαυνόμεν (‘the Phaeacians ... experts in steering a swift ship on sea’, *Od.* 7.108–09). Meusel has already shown that the adjectival use of ἴδρις may be a late development, starting from its use in apposition to ἀνὴρ or γυνή. Moreover, he argues that Pindar may preserve a trace of an older abstract noun ἴδρις (‘expertise’).⁸⁴

2. εὖνις (‘bereft, severed’) (Hom.+). As I argue elsewhere,⁸⁵ εὖνις is originally a substantivization meaning ‘bereft person’, as in both its Homeric attestations it is used predicatively as the object of a so-called light verb meaning ‘to make, render’: ὅς μ’ υἱὼν πολλῶν τε καὶ ἐσθλῶν εὖνιν ἔθηκε (*Il.* 22.44) and ψυχῆς τε καὶ αἰῶνός ... εὖνιν ποιήσας (*Od.* 9.523–24).
3. ψεῦδις (‘lying, deceitful’) (*hapax*, Pind. *Nem.* 7.50). In its sole attestation, ψεῦδις is used predicatively and might in fact be analysed as a noun: οὐ ψεῦδις ὁ μάρτυς ἔργμασιν ἐπιστατεῖ (‘it is no lying witness that presides over achievements of the offspring of you and Zeus, Aegina’, tr. Race (1997)).

⁸¹ Of these words, εὖνις and ἴδρις preserved the inflection with *-ι-* (cf. nom. pl. τρόφιες, ἴδριες); in the case of εὖνις we find *-ιδ-*, though only after Homer.

⁸² Cf. Risch (1974) 166, Balles (2009) 14. In addition to the four words discussed, another comparable instance of *-ις* derived from an adjective is ἡ πηγυλίς (‘icy night’), apparently from a lost *πηγύλος (for adjectival *-ύλος*, cf., for example, καμπύλος and ἀγκύλος (‘bent’)). However, in its only old attestation (*Od.* 14.476) πηγυλίς stands in enjambment with νόξ in the preceding line and could therefore very well be a noun in apposition. The only adjective in *-ις* that is not clearly a substantivization is θέσπις (‘wonderful’) (*vel sim.*): in Homer, it qualifies αἰοιδὴ and αἰοιδός. It is originally a compound of the roots θεσ- and σπ- (either ‘speak’ or ‘wield, ply’), but as its lexical meaning and exact derivation remain uncertain, θέσπις cannot be used as a parallel for θούρις. On ἀνακίς and other compounds in *-ις*, see below.

⁸³ It has been supposed that ἴδρις is a contamination between older *ιδρός (‘knowing’) and the compounds ἄιδρις (‘inexperienced’), πολύιδρις (‘expert’) (both Hom.+): cf. Le Feuvre (2016) 184 n.17, who compares Old Norse *vittr* (‘smart’) reflecting *wid-ró-. However, such a scenario presupposes that *-ις* was at first limited to compounds, which is doubtful (see below). For further reflections on this issue, see Meusel (2015).

⁸⁴ Meusel (2015).

⁸⁵ See van Beek (2019), where the syntax and etymology of εὖνις are discussed. I derive εὖνις from an adjective *jeuno- (‘private’) based on an Indo-European root *jeu- (‘to separate, keep apart’), and argue that such an adjective is also reflected in εὐνή (‘bed, nest’). The substantivized form in *-ι-* has a counterpart in Vedic Sanskrit *yóni-* (‘private place, bed’) < *jeuni-.

4. *τρόφις* ('full-grown') *vel sim.* (*Il.* 11.307; Hdt. 4.9.4), a complicated case.⁸⁶ In its sole Homeric attestation, which is of disputed interpretation, it might perhaps be a neuter noun: *πολλὸν δὲ τρόφι κῦμα κολίνδεται* (*Il.* 11.307).⁸⁷ The predicative use in *ἐπεὶ γένωνται τρόφιες* (Hdt. 4.9.4) is compatible with an old noun meaning something like 'grown-up, adult'.

In cases like *ἴδρις* and *εἶνις* we might indeed speak of the 'abortive creation' (to borrow Nussbaum's term) of an adjective from its substantivized form.⁸⁸ We must now ask whether *θοῦρις* can be analysed in the same way. The answer is negative, for two reasons. First of all, whereas the other four simple adjectives in *-ις* discussed above are used predicatively or in apposition in their oldest attestations, *θοῦρις* is used attributively in *all* its Homeric attestations. Secondly, the other forms in *-ις* have concrete referents (in most cases, persons) of which they describe an acquired and distinctive characteristic, while the epithet *θοῦρις* modifies an abstract noun (*ἀλκή*, 'fighting spirit') of which it describes an inherent, generic aspect. Thus, the assumption that *θοῦρις* is an old substantivization appears to be gratuitous.

Let us finally discuss the origin of *ἄναλκις*. The synchronically expected derivation from *ἀλκή* would be **ἄναλκος*. It is widely assumed that the suffixation of *ἄναλκις* is due to a prehistoric rule stating that **-o-* had to be replaced by **-i-* in possessive compounds. This compound substitution is indeed widespread in Latin (e.g. *arma* → *inermis*, *lingua* → *trilinguis*, etc.) and in certain Celtic languages, but traces of the same rule in Indo-Iranian and Greek are meagre at best.⁸⁹ In fact, *ἄναλκις* is the only Greek example usually mentioned in this connection. Moreover, in Latin, simplex *i*-stem adjectives were also widespread (for example, *fortis*, *gravis*, etc.). In my view, it is more attractive to account for *ἄναλκις* and a few other Greek compounds by the same token as simple adjectives in *-ις*: they are originally substantivizations of adjectives in *-ος*. In other words, *ἄναλκις* was originally a noun meaning 'one without *ἀλκή*, coward'. It would have competed with an adjective **ἄναλκος* 'without fighting spirit' that was used attributively. When the distinction between *-ος* and *-ις* became obsolete, most forms in *-ις* lost currency, but *ἄναλκις* ('coward') was preserved, presumably because it was much more frequent than its attributive counterpart **ἄναλκος*.⁹⁰ Indeed, in Homer *ἄναλκις* is often used predicatively as an invective (*Il.* 9.34–35).⁹¹

⁸⁶ For the derivation and semantics of this word, see Le Feuvre (2016) with ample discussion of earlier proposals. Le Feuvre notes that other *o*-graded stems in *-ις* are nouns (cf. Chantraine (1933) 112) and argues that a noun *ἡ* *τρόφις* meaning 'crystallized matter' is presupposed by other evidence. She therefore assumes that the Homeric *τρόφι* was originally a noun, too, and views the attestation in Herodotus as based on a wrong interpretation of the Homeric passage.

⁸⁷ In my view, the most attractive interpretation of *πολλὸν δὲ τρόφι κῦμα κολίνδεται* is to take *κῦμα* in its collective sense 'the surge/swell', to view the middle voice of *κολίνδεται* as artificial (for this phenomenon before the bucolic dieresis, see Meister (1921) 19–20 on forms like *ἀκούετο*, *διώκετο*, *ἰθύνετο*, *τιτάνετο*) and to translate *πολλὸν ... τρόφι* as 'much foam' (cf. *κύματα ... τροφόνετα*). Thus, the entire phrase would mean: 'and the sea-surface pushes on a lot of foam'.

⁸⁸ According to Nussbaum (2014) and Meusel (2015), *i*-stem adjectives may also have developed from original abstracts. In my view, it is preferable to view *i*-stems as substantivizations, or even as predicative adjectives in origin, but this point cannot be pursued here.

⁸⁹ Cf. the short list of examples given in Wackernagel (1905) 105, for example, Vedic *árdha-* ('side, half') beside *práty-ardhi-* ('person to whom belongs one half').

⁹⁰ Directly comparable in terms of suffixation and meaning is the Homeric *hapa* *φύξηλις* ('coward', *Il.* 17.143), which is used predicatively: *ἦ σ' αὐτως κλέος ἐσθλὸν ἔχει φύξηλιν ἐόντα*. As with *ἄναλκις*, a thematic by-form is not attested.

⁹¹ Besides the case that follows, cf. also *Il.* 2.201, 5.331, 8.153, 9.41, 14.126; *Od.* 3.375, 4.334.

ἀλκὴν μὲν μοι πρῶτον ὀνειδίσας ἐν Δαναοῖσι
φᾶς ἔμεν ἀπτόλεμον καὶ ἀνάλκιδα.

[F]or first of all you have taunted my fighting spirit among the Achaeans, saying that I am unwarlike and a coward.

On the other hand, in three Homeric instances ἄναλκις does function as an attributive adjective meaning ‘cowardly’: ἀνάλκιδα θυμόν (*Il.* 16.355 and 656) and ἀνάλκιδα φύζαν (*Il.* 15.62). Thus, ἄναλκις covers functions that (we may suppose) were once fulfilled by *ἄναλκος.⁹²

Two other old compounds in -ις can be analysed along the same lines. First, ἄκοιτις ‘spouse’ looks like the substantivization of an older adjective *ἄκοιτος < **sm-koito-* (‘who shares the same bed’), derived from κοιτός (‘sleep, bed’) or κοίτη (‘bed’).⁹³ Secondly, Homeric ἵππουρις is normally considered an adjective meaning ‘with a horse-tail crest’ (*cf.* οὐρά, ‘tail’), qualifying words for ‘helmet’. However, in six of its seven Homeric occurrences, ἵππουρις is a runover word starting the line, and clearly placed in apposition. As with κορωνίς, we may suspect that it was not merely an epithet but denoted a *type* of helmet, the ἵππουρις. Thus, ἵππουρις would be the substantivization of an adjective *ἵππουρος (‘having a horse tail’).

In sum, the other adjectival stems in -ις are mostly used predicatively or placed in apposition, and can therefore be analysed as old substantivizations.⁹⁴ The form κορωνίς is used attributively in the phrase νηυσὶ κορωνίσιν, but it modifies a noun with a concrete referent. By contrast, the syntactic use and lexical meaning of θοῦρις are very different: there is no indication that it originated as a predicative or substantival form, and it primarily modifies an abstract noun, ἀλκή. Indeed, the only other adjective in -ις that modifies abstract nouns is ἄναλκις (θυμός, φύζα) – another point in favour of the contamination proposed in section V.

VII. Conclusions

The Homeric adjective θοῦρις -ιδος is best rendered as ‘fierce’ (of fighting spirit) and ‘tough, intimidating’ (of weapons). It functions as the feminine of θοῦρος, which also means ‘fierce’ and is an epithet of Ares. Since -ις was not originally a morphological marker of the feminine of adjectives, the pairing of θοῦρις with θοῦρος must be accounted for.

A derivational suffix -ις does occur in various different functions: a few other Greek adjectives in -ος have a special feminine form in -ίς, and there are parallels from other Indo-European languages for a suffix replacement -ο- → -ι- making substantivized adjectives. However, these cases are all quite different from the case of θοῦρος with θοῦρις. First, other adjectives in -ις are mostly used predicatively or in apposition, while θοῦρις is only used attributively. Secondly, other instances of -ίς beside -ος have concrete referents, whereas θοῦρις qualifies the abstract noun ἀλκή.

I have therefore proposed a scenario in which θοῦρις was created as an artificial form, through contamination of θοῦρος with the antonym ἄναλκις -ιδος (‘cowardly’), whose *i*-stem inflection is an archaism. This contamination first occurred in the traditional verse-final formula θοῦριδος ἀλκῆς, in avoidance of unmetrical *θούρης ἀλκῆς or *θούρου ἀλκῆς (Meister’s Bridge). Subsequently, the accusative θοῦριν supplanted the original form (*θούρην or *θούρον) in other phrases. If the original form was *θούρην,

⁹² Compare the English adjective *cowardly*, which could have derived from the noun *coward* because that form is often used predicatively (for example, ‘he showed himself a coward’).

⁹³ The rare masculine form ἀκοίτης may well be secondary with respect to ἄκοιτις.

⁹⁴ For the exception θέσις, see above.

this may explain the occurrence of *brevis in longo* in the traditional phrase *θοῦριν ἐπιεμένοι ἄλκῆν*.

This study has shown how attention to morphological detail may shed light on issues of lexical semantics, on the syntactic behaviour of adjectives and on the mechanisms governing the creation of formulaic phrases in the epic tradition. It has been argued in passing that many well-known artificial forms in Homer are best analysed as contaminations. If the scenario proposed here for *θοῦριδος ἄλκῆς* is correct, it also offers further support for the antiquity of Meister's Bridge, and for the creation of artificial word forms at the early stage of the epic tradition when the phrases containing *θοῦριδος ἄλκῆς* were coined.

Acknowledgements. With the usual disclaimers, I thank Jesse Lundquist and the two anonymous reviewers of *JHS* for their helpful feedback on an earlier draft. I would also like to thank Douglas Cairns and Lin Foxhall for their help during the editorial process.

Funding statement. The writing of this article was made possible by a VENI grant (NWO, Dutch Organization for Scientific Research) for the project Unraveling Homer's Language.

Bibliography

- Bakker, E. (2005) *Pointing to the Past: From Formula to Performance in Homeric Poetics* (Washington, DC)
- Balles, I. (2006) *Die altindische Cvi-Konstruktion: Form, Funktion, Ursprung* (Bremen)
- (2008) *Nominale Wortbildung des Indogermanischen in Grundzügen: die Wortbildungsmuster ausgewählter indogermanischer Einzelsprachen. Band 1: Latein, Altgriechisch* (Hamburg)
- (2009) 'Zu den i-stämmigen Adjektiven des Lateinischen', in R. Lühr and S. Ziegler (eds), *Protolanguage and Prehistory* (Wiesbaden), 1–26
- Beekes, R.S.P. (1969) *The Development of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Greek* (The Hague)
- (2010) *Etymological Dictionary of Greek* (2 vols) (Leiden)
- Cairns, D. (2016) 'Clothed in shamelessness, shrouded in grief: the role of "garment" metaphors in ancient Greek concepts of emotion', in G. Fanfani, M. Harlow and M.-L. Nosch (eds), *Spinning Fates and the Song of the Loom: The Use of Textiles, Clothing and Cloth Production as Metaphor, Symbol, and Narrative* (Oxford), 25–41
- Chantraine, P. (1933) *La formation des noms en grec ancien* (Paris)
- (1958) *Grammaire homérique. Tome 1: phonétique et morphologie* (2nd edition) (Paris)
- (1968–1980) *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: histoire des mots* (Paris)
- Cunliffe, R.J. (1924) *A Lexicon of the Homeric Dialect* (London)
- Erbse, H. (ed.) (1969–1988) *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem: Scholia vetera* (7 vols) (Berlin)
- Frisk, H. (1960–1972) *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (3 vols) (Heidelberg)
- García Ramón, J.-L. (2000) 'Homerisch οὔρος "Fahrtwind", θοῦρος "ungestüm", οὔλος "verderblich": zur Funktion der o-stufigen *-υό-Bildungen im Griechischen', in A. Hintze and E. Tichy (eds), *Anusantatyai. Festschrift für Johanna Narten zum 70. Geburtstag* (Dettelbach), 63–77
- Hackstein, O. (2002) *Die Sprachform der homerischen Epen* (Wiesbaden)
- (2010) 'The Greek of epic', in E. Bakker (ed.), *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language* (Chichester and Malden MA), 401–23
- Hock, H. (1991) *Principles of Historical Linguistics* (Berlin)
- Hoekstra, A. (1965) *Homeric Modifications of Formulaic Prototypes* (Amsterdam)
- Janda, M. (2014) *Purpurnes Meer* (Innsbruck)
- Janko, R. (1993) *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume IV: Books 13–16* (Cambridge)
- Kastner, W. (1967) *Die griechischen Adjektive zweier Endungen auf -ος* (Heidelberg)
- Kirk, G.S. (1985) *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume I: Books 1–4* (Cambridge)
- (1990) *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume II: Books 5–8* (Cambridge)
- Latacz, J. (1966) *Zum Wortfeld 'Freude' in der Sprache Homers* (Heidelberg)
- Le Feuvre, C. (2016) 'Le type τρόπις, στόφις, τρόφις et le problème de τρόφι κύμα', in A. Blanc and D. Petit (eds), *Nouvelles acquis sur la formation des noms en grec ancien* (Louvain-la-Neuve), 179–202
- Meier, M. (1975) *-ιδ-: zur Geschichte eines griechischen Nominalsuffixes* (Göttingen)
- Meister, K. (1921) *Die homerische Kunstsprache* (Leipzig)
- Meusel, E. (2015) 'Griechisch ἴδρις und das Verständnis von Pind. O. 1, 104 im Lichte von Indogermanistik und klassischer Philologie', *Glotta* 91, 184–207

- Monro, D.B. and Allen, T.W. (1920) *Homeri Opera 2: Iliadis Libros XIII-XXIV Continens* (3rd edition) (Oxford)
- Nagy, G. (1999) *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry* (rev. edition) (Baltimore)
- Nussbaum, A.J. (1999) ‘*Jocidus: an account of the Latin adjectives in -idus’, in H. Eichner and H.-C. Luschützky (eds), *Compositiones indogermanicae in memoriam Jochem Schindler* (Prague), 377–419
- (2014) ‘Feminine, abstract, collective, neuter plural: some remarks on each (expanded handout)’, in S. Neri and R. Schuhmann (eds), *Studies on the Collective and Feminine in Indo-European from a Diachronic and Typological Perspective* (Leiden), 273–306
- Race, W.H. (ed. and tr.) (1997) *Pindar* (2 vols) (Cambridge MA)
- Risch, E. (1974) *Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache* (2nd edition) (Berlin)
- Schindler, J. (1980) ‘Zur Herkunft der altindischen *cvi*-Bildungen’, in M. Mayrhofer, M. Peters and O. Pfeiffer (eds), *Lautgeschichte und Etymologie* (Wiesbaden), 386–93
- Schwyzler, E. (1939) *Griechische Grammatik 1* (Munich)
- Singor, H. (1991) ‘Nine against Troy: on epic *φάλαγγες, πρόμαχοι*, and an old structure in the story of the *Iliad*’, *Mnemosyne* 44, 17–62
- O’Sullivan, J.N. (1991) ‘*Θοῦρος*’, in B. Snell and H.-J. Mette (eds) *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos II* (Göttingen)
- Sommer, F. (1909) ‘Zur griechischen Prosodie’, *Glotta* 1, 145–240
- Tichy, E. (1977) ‘Griech. *ἀλειτηρός, νηλειτής* und die Entwicklung der Wortsippe *ἀλειτής*’, *Glotta* 55, 160–77
- van Beek, L. (2014) ‘Homeric *κρείων* “lord” and the Indo-European word for “head”’, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 119, 99–124
- (2019) ‘A look into the Indo-European bedroom: Vedic *yóni-* and Greek *εὐνή*’, *Historical Linguistics* 132, 4–34
- Vine, B. (2006) ‘An alleged case of “inflectional contamination”: on the *i*-stem inflection of Latin *civis*’, *ILing* 29, 139–58
- Wackernagel, J. (1905) *Altindische Grammatik: Band II, 1: Einleitung zur Wortlehre. Nominalkomposition* (Göttingen)
- (1914) ‘Akzentstudien III: Zum homerischen Akzent’, *Nachrichten der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen: Philologisch-historische Klasse* 1914, 97–130
- Watkins, C. (2000) ‘A distant Anatolian echo in Pindar: the origin of the *aegis* again’, *HSPH* 100, 1–14
- West, M.L. (1998) *Homerus Ilias 1: Rhapsodias I–XII Continens* (Stuttgart and Leipzig)
- (2000) *Homerus Ilias 2: Rhapsodias XIII–XXIV Continens* (Munich and Leipzig)
- (2017) *Homerus Odyssea* (Berlin and Boston)
- Witte, K. (1909) ‘Zur homerischen Sprache’, *Glotta* 1, 132–45
- (1911) ‘Zur homerischen Sprache’, *Glotta* 3, 105–53
- Wyatt, W.J. (1969) *Metrical Lengthening in Homer* (Rome)