

POSTSCRIPT ON DEMETER AND POSEIDON

I

It is convenient here to list certain corrigenda and addenda which it proved impossible to include in the proofs of my article on «The Name of Demeter», *Minos* N.S. 9, 1968, 198 ff.

p. 198, l. 8 of text up: read **daiā-*.

p. 199, l. 5: of text up: insert footnote 7a.

7a I cannot therefore agree with Chantraine *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*, 273: «Les formes dialectales, notamment Δωμᾶτηρ, n'apportent aucun secours, au contraire, pour l'étymologie.»

fn. 4: read 95.

fn. 7, l. 2 up: read γᾶ.

p. 200, l. 15: of text up: insert footnote 10a.

Thessalian dat. Δαμμᾶτερῖ (*IG IX 2, 1235*).

l. 11: of text up: read Doric ᾠμε-.

p. 203, l. 14: read *dās...* Dā.

l. 16: read *αῖ.

l. 20: read *ᾠῖ yields Aeolic ᾠ.

l. 25: for > read <.

p. 204 l. 3: read *Δᾶς.

l. 13: read Dās; l. 14 Dās-mother; l. 15 Dās.

l. 16: insert footnote 23.

23 Chantraine, *DELG* 273, in reviewing older attempts at explanation but without considering the morphological implications which I here find crucial, favors as the first element δᾶ «earth», but recognizes that the existence of δᾶ («d'ailleurs inexplicable») has been contested.

II

Since submitting that article for publication I have seen C. J. Ruijgh's customarily excellent and thorough article «Sur le nom de Poséidon et sur les noms en -ᾱ-φοῦν-, -ī-φοῦν-», in the *Revue des études grecques* 80, 1967, 6-16. Although my article deals only in passing with the name of Poseidon, while Ruijgh's argument goes on to dwell extensively on pertinent but different suffix formations, nothing could be more pleasant and gratifying than to observe the virtually complete convergence of our results and details of argument in respect of Poseidon. Of course the temporal priority belongs to Ruijgh.

I take this opportunity to offer some further comment on the basis of Ruijgh's article; numbers below refer to his paragraphing.

§ 1. Ruijgh is clearly correct in criticizing Heubeck's **potidahas* < **pnti-dnsos*; I agree with Ruijgh's view that Myc. *o* cannot come from **ŋ*. Furthermore, the name would then have to be diffused from a limited dialectal source. But even more telling, I think, is another feature which is not generally appreciated as it should be¹. The fact is that πᾶτος / πόντος cannot be anywhere in Indo-European an *i*-stem. Latin *pons pontis* is of course not diagnostic; Balto-Slavic regularly shows *i*-stems as the normal outcome of old consonant stems; Sanskrit *panthi-* is late and reflects schwa. The original stem was surely **p(o)ntH-* (> ποντ(ο)- / πατ(ο)-).

§ 2. On the interpretation of τ against σ in the variants Ruijgh is certainly right. I also agree with him completely on the evaluation of the vocalisms ο: ε: zero. On this matter see in particular my article, p. 202, footnote 16.

§ 3.1. I also agree completely, it will be seen, on the conclusion to be drawn from the Attic contraction.

§ 3.2. In addition, Ruijgh advances an excellent point on the genitive form in -ων- which escaped me.

¹ I argue this question in full elsewhere.

§ 3.3. We agree that the consonant must be *-h-*. Additionally Ruijgh advances a fine argument on the expected form of derivatives in *-ios*.

§ 4. Here Ruijgh and I accord completely; see my article p. 203 and above corrigenda, especially the crucial misprint on * $\bar{\alpha}\delta$.

§ 5. Again we agree on *-h-*, but Ruijgh clinches the matter with his penetrating point on $a_2 = h\alpha$. This leads nicely to § 6 and § 7, with the splendid elucidation of Ποτειδᾶς as *Ποτειδᾶς alongside Ἑρμᾶς = *e-ma-a₂* = Ἑρμᾶς. A really elegant juxtaposition.

§ 8. Ruijgh is of course right in his proposed interpretation of *-fov-* for the Corinthian form.

§ 10. Though my own topic was not occupied with this matter, let me here record my admiration for the clear distinction that Ruijgh has led us to in disengaging the two separate suffixes, underlying *-i ω n-* and *-i ω v-*, respectively from *-i \bar{f} ov-* (*-i(:) + won-*) and transformed from *-io-*. On the former type we now have in addition Ruijgh's excellent exhaustive study of the suffix *-won-*, *Minos* 9, 1968, 109-55.

ERIC P. HAMP

University of Chicago