

Dialect contact and koineization: the case of the Greek colonies of Aegean Thrace¹

Paloma Guijarro

Universidad Complutense of Madrid

palguija@ucm.es

ABSTRACT

The objective of this paper is the analysis of cross-dialectal interaction among the Greek colonies established in the northern Aegean Sea, alongside the Greek-Thracian border. Aside from the linguistic exchanges between Greek and non-Greek speakers (referred to as ‘Thracians’ by the Greeks), I will focus on contacts between the various epichoric Greek dialects, largely from a diachronic perspective, including the process of koineization attested in this region.

KEY WORDS

Dialect contact, Aegean Thrace, Ionic dialect, Attic-Ionic koine, Atticization.

Dialect contact in the northern coast of the Aegean Sea

During the last decades, we have witnessed a renewed multidisciplinary interest in the northern coast of the Aegean Sea, greatly motivated by the systematic research of the National Hellenic Research Foundation on northern Greece and by new publications². Very importantly, these recent works have also boosted linguistic research. The relatively recent edition of the epigraphic corpus from Aegean Thrace (*I. Thrake Aeg.*) provides us now with the entire body of inscriptions (many of them unpublished) found in this peripheral area until 2005³. New numismatic evidence from Orthagoreia, Abdera and Maroneia came to light thanks to Chryssanthaki-Nagle (2004, 2007) and Psoma *et al.* (2008). Furthermore, in 2015 the whole collection of inscriptions from the sanctuary of

¹ This paper is framed within the research topic of the European HERA project *Uses of the Past: Multilingualism and Minority Languages in Ancient Europe*, funded by the EU (grant agreement no. 649307), and within the Madrid-Research-Unit project (*Dialect contacts and Dialect Levelling in Ancient Northern Greece*), whose focus lies on the analysis of documents produced in the geographical area of modern northern Greece, Bulgaria, Albania and North Macedonia. In this sense, my work covers the northern coast of the Aegean Sea, in other words, the eastern part of this west-east geographical axis.

² A work that also comprises Ancient Macedonia. An account of recent archaeological findings can be found in Fournier, Hammond and Parissaki 2015; on the linguistic interest in the area, see Guijarro Ruano (2019).

³ Loukopoulou, Parisaki, Psoma and Zournatzi 2005. See Thoneman’s review 2006.

Apollo in Zone was finally published in *Αρχαία Ζώνη* I⁴. Elaborating partly on new evidence, onomastic studies have also benefited from this research, due to the publication of the *LGN IV* (2005)⁵, Dana's *Onomasticon Thracicum* (2014)⁶, and Parissaki's (2007) prosopographical analysis.

As far as language is concerned, cross-linguistic interaction between the northern local population(s), designated as *Thracians* by the Greeks,⁷ and Greek settlers must have been a reality alongside the Greek-Thracian strip, located between the rivers Strymon and Nestos and bordered by the Rhodope Mountains in the north. Their traces, however, are difficult to recover. In this work, I will therefore focus on cross-dialectal contacts. The existence of Aeolian and Dorian colonies in the neighbouring areas of the Black Sea and in Potidea⁸ and the intense trade activity alongside the northern Aegean coast, ensured the interaction among local communities and, consequently, dialect contact, despite the meagre material evidence⁹. Two main Ionic varieties emerge in this area: Cycladic Ionic (in Thasian colonies such as Neapolis, Berge, Galepsos, Stryme, etc.) and Asia Minor Ionic (in Abdera, Maroneia and in the Samothracian peraea, as in Zone, Drys, Sale, etc.)¹⁰. Nevertheless, we have to deal with the difficulty of locating many of these settlements (Dikaia, Mesembria, Stryme, etc.), while the identification of others with modern places or cities is either debated or still unconfirmed¹¹. From the period of the Attic control over this northern coast after the Persian wars (475-450 BC) onwards, contact with the Attic dialect must have emerged too (and obviously later during the spreading of the Attic-Ionic koine). Not in vain, neighbouring Imbros and Lemnos were Attic-speaking areas due to the establishments of cleruchies. Furthermore, inland Thasian colonies achieved their independence from Thasos at the same time as Athens benefited from the occasion.

⁴ First notices in Brixhe 2006, 124; 2008, 21; later references in Brixhe 2018, 1852-1853.

⁵ It also comprises Macedonia, Thrace and northern regions of the Black Sea.

⁶ See also the online supplement (*OnomThracSuppl*, version 6, November 2019) available in <http://www.anhima.fr/IMG/pdf/onomthracsuppl.pdf>. See also Dana's 2014 review by Halmagi 2015.

⁷ Up-to-date accounts of the Thracian language in Brixhe 2006, Panayotou 2007, Tzitzilis 2014, Yanakieva 2018, Brixhe 2018 and Sowa 2020. On the new epigraphic and linguistic research into this specific area, see Guijarro Ruano (2019, 69-76).

⁸ A Corinthian colony created ca. 600 BC.

⁹ Aeolian colonies were founded in Ainos (on the mouth of the Nestos river) and in the Propontis. An account of the possible Aeolic origins of the first Greek settlers of Samothracia can be seen in del Barrio 2018a, 491-496, with earlier bibliography.

¹⁰ On Ionic and its varieties, see del Barrio 2014. On Ionic, see also Bechtel 1924, Knitl 1938, Thumb and Scherer 1959, Stüber 1996 and del Barrio 2018a (an updated version of her previous work of 2015). Alonso Déniz' 2018 study on Archilochus and the dialect of Thasos is also revealing.

¹¹ For more extensive references to particular areas, see Loukopoulou 2004a, 2004b and Flensted-Jensen 2004 and the introductory parts devoted to geographical regions in *I.Thrake Aeg.*

Our research is mainly based on the epigraphic corpus of *I.Thrake Aeg.*, which includes 499 inscriptions¹², though only ca. 50 are dated between the 6th and late-5th/early-4th c. BC (only one is a public document). They mainly come from Abdera, the classical site of cape Molyvoti, and Zone. Until the 3rd c. BC, we find around 132 texts, and between the 2nd and the 1st c. BC, when the region came under Roman control (first as a client region and then as a province in 46 AD), we count ca. 80 inscriptions. Most of the epigraphic evidence comes from the 1st c. AD, since Greek remained the primary language of communication over Latin¹³. Updated material from the *SEG*¹⁴, *Αρχαία Ζώνη* and later numismatic publications are also considered, although there are no new documents of significant linguistic interest¹⁵.

Such documents were mostly written in the koine, yet this region, not included in Bubenik's (1989) study on koineization, has not received as much scholarly attention as other neighbouring areas: see Panayotou's (1998) on Macedonia and Tokhasiev (2009), Slavova (2009) and Bechet (2009) on the western coast of the Black Sea. Thanks to del Barrio's study of the extant epigraphic evidence from the northern Aegean (2018a), we now have at our disposal the linguistic description of the use of the Ionic dialect between the rivers Strymon and Hebrus¹⁶. Thus, it seems compelling to explore possible interferences among dialects and the later koineization of Aegean Thrace in comparison with other surrounding areas. To do so, we will examine diachronically the extant evidence, starting from the linguistic representation of Ionic and Attic in the inscriptions. We will then analyse the emergence and development of the Attic-Ionic koine in the whole area.

1. Dialect contact in the prekoine stage

1.1. Ionic dialect

¹² We have excluded Christian texts, for which see *I.Thrace orientale byz.*

¹³ *I.Thrake Aeg.* 149. The reverse situation in Lower Moesia, cf. Dana 2015, 244.

¹⁴ The latest *SEG* volume included in *I.Thrake Aeg.* was n. 50 [2000]. New texts are short and/or fragmentary, and are not linguistically revealing (cf. *SEG* 52, 657bis-1162; 54, 640; 59, 720; 62, 485-488, 495-496; 64, 606); some readings have been corrected (cf. *SEG* 54, 640; 61, 557; 62, 503; 63, 492; etc.). Following del Barrio 2018a, we incorporate Thasian colonies located between the rivers Strymon and Nestos.

¹⁵ From the previously unpublished Greek material in *Αρχαία Ζώνη*, only three texts can be read: IV, ΑΓΚ 640 + 6143, A, (late-5th/early-4th); V, ΑΓΚ 6139a+b (ca. 411-400/375 BC) and VI, ΑΓΚ 6152 (late-5th/early-4th). They have no dialectal relevance. For Thracian documents, see *Αρχαία Ζώνη I*, 209-564. Inscriptions contained in *Αρχαία Ζώνη II*, IIIa and IVa where already published in *I.Thrake Aeg.*

¹⁶ Her work includes *I.Thrake Aeg.* but also adds the region between the rivers Strymon and Nestos to the East.

In the epigraphic corpus of *I.Thrake Aeg.*, safe diagnostic features of Ionic can be traced from the 5th c. BC onwards, as del Barrio (2018a) has revealed¹⁷. Beyond graphic interferences¹⁸, however, the analysis is exclusively confined to the realm of phonetics and morphology, since older documents are quite short and mainly funerary, with simple and repetitive sentence constructions. Syntax and vocabulary remain an unknown field in the archaic and classical periods. Among the salient traits of Ionic prior to ca. 350 BC we can highlight the use of <H> for \bar{a} in all contexts, also after /r/, /e/ and /i/¹⁹. It could also be the case of the foreign ethnics Αιγινήτης (E165, Molyvoti, ca. 450-425 BC, fun., see also Φρασιδήμῳ) and Κυρηναῖος (E60, Abdera, ca. 350 BC, fun.), although they could also be Attic and point to wider (trading?) contacts. We also find unaltered -ηιο-sequences in Ποσιδήϊος²⁰, as well as forms in ἱρο- (cf. Ἱρομνήμων, *LGN IV*, Abdera, ca. 360-350 BC, coin) and in ἰστ- (Ἰστής, E14, Abdera, late 5th BC, dedication).

Normally, hiatuses do not contract. Thus, εο and εω were graphically preserved until the 4th c. BC in common words (cf. [ὕ]πνωδεος, ὠνεομέν[οις] in E3, Abdera, bef. 350 BC, law), in personal names (Ἄρθέων, E222, Maroneia, 4th c. BC, fun.)²¹ and in Θεο^ο and Νεο^ο compounds. The singular genitives of a-stems and s-stems display non-contracted -

¹⁷ Inscriptions from *I.Thrake Aeg.* are quoted E1, E2, etc., as in del Barrio 2018a. When the term Molyvoti is used, it refers to the Molyvoti Peninsula.

¹⁸ *I.Thrake Aeg.* editors date inscriptions in the epichoric alphabet according to Pouilloux' study on the Thasian alphabet (which fell into disuse from ca. 430-420 onwards, cf. Pouilloux 1954, 443), but often no references to the alphabet are expressed, so that we are not certain about the use of local alphabets. The influence of the Parian-Thasian alphabet (use of <Ω> for /o/, /o:/ and <O> for /ɔ:/) is observed in two documents found in Abdera (E30, mid-6th BC, funerary; E13, mid-5th BC, ex-voto), on which editors cast doubt regarding its possible Thasian origin; also possible in another document owing to the rendering of *rho* (E1, ca. 480-470 BC). The Parian-Thasian alphabet spread up to Zone, as Brixhe (2015, 283-284) infers from the lunar *beta* and from the exchange between *omicron* and *omega* as they appear in Ἀπώλ(λ)ο^ο and in Χωιρῖνωσ. It must have been imported by Thasian settlers (or by Parians, cf. Brixhe 2006, 126).

¹⁹ Ἀρτεμισίης (E32, Abdera, ca. 475-450 BC), πρωτέρη, ὑστέρη (*SEG* 51,797, Berge, ca. 470-460 BC), Ἰστής, Πυθείης, E14, Abdera/Thasos, late-5th BC), Ἀθηνάης (08, Molyvoti, late-5th BC), Ἀθηναγόρης, ἡμέρης (*SEG* 52, 711, Pistiros, late-5th BC), Ἥγησαγόρης (May 1996, nn. 228-232, Abdera, c.415-395BC, coin) and Πολυαρήτου (E141, Molyvoti, ca. 375-350 BC, fun.).

²⁰ Ποσιδήϊο (E113, Molyvoti, ca. 450-400 BC, fun.), Ποσιδήϊου ((S)GDI 5685.18, Maroneia, 450-400 BC, coin), but later Ποσιδείου ((S)GDI 5685.19, Maroneia, 400-350 BC).

²¹ Ἄρθέων has been interpreted as an Illyrian name, although a Greek origin seems more probable, cf. Parissaki (2007, 136-137).

εω²² and -εος²³ respectively (mostly from Molyvoti, Zone and Maroneia, but see *infra* Θεογένως and Ἀντιφάνως, as well)²⁴, along with the genitive plural forms of a-stems in εων, mainly in ethnics²⁵. Indeed, alleged contracted forms -εω > -ω are dubious. In E39 (Abdera, ca. 400-350 BC, fun.) we read Μεγαδο[], assumed to be a genitive Μεγάδω by the first editor, and thus rendered in *SEG* 47, 1029²⁶. Μεγάδω implies a nominative Μεγάδης and the contraction -εω > -ω after a consonant (del Barrio 2018a, 501). However, another possibility comes into play: nom. Μεγάς, gen. Μεγάδο[ς], as proposed in *I.Thrake Aeg.*, and suggested by Parissaki (2007, 209). This second hypothesis has the advantage of presenting more parallels of these hypocoristic names (cf. Μεγάτος *P. Petrie* 3.43, Egypt, 240 BC)²⁷, against the unique example of Μεγάδης, which appears in Homer but as a patronymic (Πέριμον Μεγάδην, *Il.* 16.695)²⁸. Besides, it matches with the characteristic Ionic declension -ᾶς, -ᾶδος attested and in the same region (cf. Μολπᾶδος, Abdera, 450-425 BC, coin) and in Zone (cf. Βοστᾶδος E404, mid-5th BC; E411 and E412, ca. 400-350 BC, fun.) in the same period²⁹. Additionally, a contracted Μεγάδω is not represented in Aegean Thrace until the mid-4th century, unless we understand other forms

²² Ἰππέω (E33, Abdera, ca. 475-450 BC), τῷ Μένεω (E163, Molyvoti, mid-5th BC, fun.), Νυμέω (E123, Molyvoti, ca. 425-400 BC, fun.), Θεοξενίδεω, (E222, Maroneia, 4th BC, fun.), Ἐρμαγόρεω (E38, Abdera, early 4th BC), Ἀπελλέω (E136, Molyvoti, ca. 400-375 BC, fun.), Ἀπελλέω, Ἀριστόλεω, Ἥγησαγόρεω, Ἡρακλείδεω, Ἀθήνεω ((S)GDI 5686, Maroneia, 400-350 BC, coins), Ἀθήνεω (Schönert-Geiss, *Maroneia* 152, ca. 432-423, coin). The patronymic of Πατροκλῆς Πανσανία (E138, Molyvoti, ca. 400-375 BC, fun.), devoid of context, can be a foreign (Doric?) form (we cannot dismiss the Spartan influence/presence in this coast before the general participation of these poleis in the Second Athenian League in 378 BC, cf. Brixhe 2015, 275) or a koine genitive. On the rapid spread of the declension -ίας, -ία from the early 4th BC onwards, even in Ionic territory, see Brixhe and Panayotou 1988, 251; Brixhe 1963 and del Barrio 2014, 264.

²³ Ἀριστομένεος (E112, Molyvoti, ca. 450-400 BC, fun.), Διονυσοφάνεος (E137, Molyvoti, ca. 400-375 BC, fun.), Πολυχάρεος (E414, Zone, ca. 400-350 BC, fun.), Πολυκράτεος (E420, Zone, mid-4th BC, fun.), Καλλικράτεος, Μητροφάνεος ((S)GDI 5685, Maroneia, 400-350 BC, coins).

²⁴ An overview of the interferences between a-stem and s-stem genitives in Thasos and Archilochus in Alonso Déniz 2018, 546-550.

²⁵ Ἀβδερτιτέων ((S)GDI 5644, nn. 2, 5, 14, 17, 20, 21, 500-350 BC, coins), Μαρωνειτέων ((S)GDI 5685.15, 400-350 BC, coins), Νεοπολιτέων ((S)GDI 5488, 350-300 BC), Ἀπολλωνιτέων (*SEG* 49, 911, Pistiros, ca. 359-339, regulation), Ὀρθαγορέων (Chryssanthaki-Nagle 2004, 52-53, ca. 350-300 BC), Μαρωνιτέων/Μαρωνειτέων/Μαρωνιτέων (cf. Bechtel 1924, 49) and ἔμποριτέων (*SEG* 49, 911, Pistiros, ca. 359-339).

²⁶ Cf. ΜΕΓΑΔΩ Triantaphyllos *AD* 1992 [1997], 499-500; cf. []πὼ Μεγάδω γυνή in *SEG* 47, 1029, and [A]σπὼ Μεγαδο [] γυνή in *I.Thrake Aeg.* E39.

²⁷ For these genitives, see Dubois 2017, 317-321. ΜΕΓΑ in a coin from Abdera (May 1966, III 100-101) does not represent a telling occurrence.

²⁸ Μεγάδης derives from Μέγας (attested in Mycenaean, cf. Mycenaean gen. *me-ka-o* PY Na 571), cf. Eustatius *ad loc* (I thank the anonymous referee for this reference). See also both accusatives Μέγητα (*Il.* 19.239) and Μέγην (*Il.* 15.302) in Homer. It only exists Μεγγίδιας in Boeotia (IG VII 585, Tanagra, 426 BC). All the *LGN* forms (14 entries) appear under a nominative Μέγας (cf. Bechtel 1917, 299-300), according to Μέγης (around 10 examples among which we find the dental inflection in -ητος, the earliest in IG XII,9 944, Euboea, mid-2nd BC). But gen. -ᾶδος/ᾶτος forms point to Μεγάς.

²⁹ Bechtel 1924, 129; del Barrio 2014, 264; Curbera 2013, 115.

such as Ἀλκεβιάδῶ/Ἀλκιβιάδῶ (E405-407, Sapli Dere, mid-5th BC fun.) in the same way, though these are probably Attic forms (see *infra*)³⁰.

The interpretation of Πρωτόφαος (E130, Molyvoti ca. 400 BC, fun.) is debated. For the *I. Thrake Aeg.* editors it is in the nominative case, while for del Barrio (2018a, 488, 506) it must be a contracted genitive in -φαῶς (=φάους < -φάεος), built upon names in -φάης, documented in Thasos, its peraea and in the neighbouring Aeolis.

With regard to E30 (Abdera < Thasos?, mid-6th BC), written in the Parian-Thasian alphabet, Gauthier and Dubois' (*BE* 118 [2005] 436) read ΠΠΟΤΙΟ as Πρωτίω. However, Del Barrio (2018a, 501) and Alonso Déniz (2018, 549-550, n. 66) point to the possibility of a graphic Parian-Thasian variant of the *omega* with two oblique strokes (ΠΠΟΤΙΩ). While the former interprets Πρωτίῶ as Πρωτίου, an Attic(-koine) genitive of Πρωτίας or Πρώτιος, Alonso Déniz proposes two different readings: a genitive Πρωτίω with vowel loss -εω > -ο,³¹ or Πρωτίῶ, with contraction -εω > -ῶ. Alonso Déniz' hypothesis is based on an analogical phenomenon attested in 4th-century-Thasian anthroponyms, by which -εω genitives replace genitives in -εω in a-stems (cf. in Thasos Λεωνίδεω, *SEG* 31, 782; Σοκράτεω, Pouilloux 1954, 313 n. 108). An analogous case could be found in ΦΡΑΣΙΗΡΙΔΩ (*CEG* 162, Thasos, 500-490 BC), in which the epichoric Parian-Thasian alphabet permits a double reading Φρασηρίδῶ (= Φρασηρίδω < Φρασηρίδεω) or Φρασηρίδο (< Φρασηρίδεο). In Alonso Déniz' opinion, this phenomenon could be related to the replacement of -εω with -ῶ „under the influence of -ίω and -έω (< *έεω) for which vowel dropping or contraction is regular“ in other Ionic dialects³². Be as it may, it would be a localized feature still open to debate.

Other distinctive morphological Ionic features are mainly visible in some anthroponyms, such as i-stem anthroponyms, which exhibit genitives in -ιδος, but also in -ιως³³. Further potential Ionic traits are late enough to attribute them to the koine (see *infra*).

³⁰ εω > ω is mostly documented in s-stems and in gen. pl. of a-stems (also in literary Ionic). Nevertheless, synizesis of /o/ after /e/ is attested in metrical inscriptions from Ionic regions (cf. Méndez Dosuna 1993, 100), such as Naxos, Paros and Thasos (for the latter, see Alonso Déniz 2018, 531 n. 3, 532 n. 4). Concerning literary Ionic, it applies to iambic authors, not to elegiacs (cf. Méndez Dosuna 1993, 99-101 and Kaczko 2016, 292).

³¹ He also raises a similar case of Homeric imperative *ἀποαιρέεω > ἀποαίρεο 'take away'. Aside from the possible metrical use of this form, this poetic example belongs to a different morphological category and contradicts his hypothesis of a substitution of -εω genitives with -εο in some Ionic areas.

³² See for instance Ἀριστίδω, Ποσειδεωνίω or Ξανθίω (IG XII,6 2, 996, Samos, ca. 550 BC); cf. Bechtel 1924, 140.

³³ Πάρμιδος (E43, Abdera, mid-4th BC), Πόσιδος (E224, Nea Maroneia, ca. 325-300 BC, fun.) and Φάσιδος (E212, Maroneia, 2nd-1st BC, cat.), but Νέστιος (E114, Molyvoti, ca. 450-400 BC, fun.), Εὐξιθέμιος,

Concerning the sketching out of local Ionic sub-varieties across this geographical border, very few traces have survived, and salient features occur mostly in anthroponyms. This important caveat makes it difficult to draw conclusive observations. Regarding the Eastern Ionic variety, the aforementioned Ἰρομνήμων (*LGN IV*, ca. 360-350 BC, coin) from Abdera fits in well with ἰρός, but is at variance with the almost sure form ἰ[ερ]ῆς (E3, bef. 350 BC), from the same polis too³⁴. In this Ionic variety ἰερός is also documented in the Dodecapolis, although ἰρός appears in the northernmost cities of Asia Minor too³⁵. However, it is impossible to know whether word-initial aspiration was pronounced in this word.

The so-called 3rd compensatory lengthening is not well represented in our corpus aside from anthroponyms, where we find non-lengthened forms in **ksenu-* (cf. Θεροξενίδεω, E222, Maroneia, 4th BC, fun.; Ξενοφῶντος, E146, Molyvoti, ca. 400-350 BC, fun.; Ξεναῖος, E238, Maroneia, 3rd BC, fun.)³⁶ and contradictory outcomes from **koru-* in two contemporary inscriptions from Molyvoti Διοσκορίδ[ης] (E129, ca. 400 BC, fun.) and Διοσκουρ[ίδου] (E143, ca. 375-350 BC, fun.)³⁷.

The issue of aspiration in the northern Aegean colonies is far from clear. In general lines, East Ionic is psilotic while Central Ionic is not. In fact, only Thasian data permits serious discussion of aspiration: on different grounds, del Barrio (2018a, 479-484) and Alonso Déniz (2018, 538-542) have attempted to prove the existence of psilosis in Thasos, in contrast with what happens with its metropolis Paros. The absence of a written sign for initial /h/ in Thasos and in its colonies indicates that <H> was used for /ε:/, and does not necessarily imply psilosis. This could be the case of ὑστέρη (*SEG* 50, 575; *SEG* 51, 797, Berge ca. 470-460 BC)³⁸. In the Thasian colonies, where the Parian-Thasian alphabet was imported, the data are contradictory: see in Galepsos ἠώρος vs. word-boundary psilosis

Εὐπόλιος, Κλεοπόλιος ((S)GDI 5685, Maroneia, 400-350 BC, coins) and Τείσιος (E51, Abdera, 3rd-2nd BC). Examples of common names are fairly late (cf. τῆς πόλεως, E7, Teos < Abdera, 2nd BC, proxeny decree). Hellenised Thracian names are not consistent with their adaptation to this declension; see, for instance, the rendering in gen. -πορεως ([Ῥασκου]πόρεως, E458, Plotinopolis, 42-31 AD, dedication; Μουπορεως, E273, Maroneia, 2 AD., fun.; Μοκαπορεως E387, Dyme, 1 AD., fun.), completely assimilated to Greek -πολεως (cf. [Ῥασκου]πόλεως, E207, Maroneia, 1st BC/1st AD), but -por in Egypt, or -ποριος, -ποριδος outside Aegean Thrace.

³⁴ Masson 1984, 52; del Barrio (2018a, 500).

³⁵ cf. del Barrio 2014, 263.

³⁶ There are no conclusive forms from Abdera: νόσου (E2, before 350 BC) and προξέ[ν]ων (E7, found in Teos, 2nd BC, proxeny decree).

³⁷ In *I.Thrace Aeg.* no indications concerning the alphabet are provided. For later examples, see μόνου (E205, Maroneia, mid-2nd/early 1st BC), Ξενοκρίτος, Ξενοκρίτου, Ξένωνος, Θεόξενος[ς], Θεοξένου, Φιλόξενος and Φιλοξένου vs. Διοσκουρίδης and Διοσκουρίδου in E212 (Maroneia, 2nd-1st BC, catalogue).

³⁸ del Barrio 2018a, 488-489.

in τὸκατωνπέδω (*SEG* 43, 400, ca. 500 BC, boundary). No occurrences from Molyvoti show attempts to render an initial *h*-³⁹. Traditionally, this place has been identified with Stryme, a Thasian colony, but more recently with the site of pre-Hellenistic Maroneia, originally founded by Chios⁴⁰. If the examples were conclusive, psilosis could be attributed to of any of the two possible metropolises, Thasos or Chios. To this end, we have to either accept that the Thasian dialect was psilototic or support the identification Molyvoti-Maroneia. Even so, however, there is no direct evidence of Maroneian aspirated/psilototic forms in this period. As del Barrio (2018a, 502) states, the absence and lack of dialectal features „provide us with little information on its dialect”.

According to del Barrio (2018a, 500), in the absence of conclusive proofs of psilosis in Abdera, we may hypothesize that it existed, as in Teos. There are, indeed, some forms without *h*- (cf. article ὀ, E15, late 5th BC), but others remain problematic. First, <ΙΣΤΙΗΣ> (E14, late 5th BC), rendered Ἴστ- by the editors but Ἴστ- by del Barrio (*ib.*), appears in an inscription whose left part is broken so that the aspiration could have been marked in the lost part⁴¹. Similarly, Ἴρομνήμων (*LGPN* IV, ca. 360-350 BC, coin) has no indication of *h*- in del Barrio’s analysis in contrast to Masson’s reading Ἴρο- (1984, 52 = *OGS* II, 431). In addition to the explanation of <ΠΠΟΤΙΩ> (see *supra*), <ΗΤΑΙΠΟΙ> (E30, mid-6th BC, fun.) has also been the subject of discussion. For del Barrio (2018a, 502), <H> is as an abbreviated writing of <HE>, likely documented in Paros too. Notwithstanding the use of local stone from Abdera, she solves the problem by attributing <H> to the alleged Parian origin of the deceased, following the editors’ remarks. Contrasting the non-aspirated article ὀ (=ὀ) with the initial /h/ in <ΗΤΑΙΠΟΙ>, Alonso Déniz (*ib.*, 542) sees a starting process of lenition of word-initial aspiration, first rendered in grammatical words.

Other distinctive East Ionic traits are not preserved in our texts, such as the demonstrative pronoun κείνος or the plural datives in -οισι(v)/-η(ι)σι(v), aside from later occurrences in (semi-)metrical texts⁴². The same applies to the outcome εο, εου > ευ and to the

³⁹ Ὀρίῳ (E107, ca. 450-400 BC), Ἡραίννη<ι> (E109, ca. 450 BC), Ἡροβόλῳ (E119, ca. 450-425 BC), Ἡροδῶρῳ (E163, mid-5th), Ἡράϊννα (E127, ca. 400 BC), Ἡρεσσστράτῳ (E130, ca. 400 BC), etc.

⁴⁰ Cf. Loukopoulou and Psoma 2008, 55-86. See the whole report in Arrington *et al.* 2016, 4, who prefer to set this place under Maroneia’s influence, rather than identify it with pre-Hellenistic Maroneia.

⁴¹ The cult of Hestia is first documented in the area (Thasian epigraphic evidence dates from the 4th BC, see *I.Thrake Aeg.* p. 216).

⁴² οἴσι δόμοις (E436, Traianoupolis, late-2nd/early-3rd AD, sundial), ἐν Μαρῶν[ι]ταῖσιν (E217, Maroneia, 2nd-3rd AD, epigram).

interchangeable use of $\alpha\omicron$ and $\epsilon\omicron$ and $\alpha\upsilon$ and $\epsilon\upsilon$ (attested in Thasos and other regions)⁴³. Before ca. 350 BC $\pi\tilde{\omega}\varsigma/\kappa\tilde{\omega}\varsigma$ -type adverbs do not appear, and later only $\pi\tilde{\omega}\varsigma$ occurs⁴⁴.

1.2. Attic dialect

The Athenian presence in Aegean Thrace is known from historical accounts, but also from some of the extant epigraphic material. Furthermore, historical and archaeological sources, which report the incorporation of some colonies into the First Maritime League and their inclusion in the Athenian tribute lists and commercial trade, confirm a two-way relationship between Athens and the colonies of the north-Aegean coast. The inscriptions bear testimony to Athenians buried across this area and trade exchanges⁴⁵ and, conversely, to the passing of Aegean-Thrace people in Athens from the mid-4th c. BC. Owing to the nature of the anthroponyms (cf. $\Theta\rho\tilde{\alpha}\iota\zeta$ and $\Theta\rho\tilde{\alpha}\iota[\tau\tau]\alpha$ and the common Thracian name Κότυος) and patronymics (Γέτου ‘Geta’, Ταλούλου , both „Attic” genitives), these were probably Thracian slaves buried there⁴⁶. Attic evidence from the 5th century on local institutions and cults is also detected in the Molyvoti documents. Here the worship of Athena and Zeus *Horioi*, imported from Athens, is attested for the first time in $\text{Ἀθῆν[ά]ς Δ<\iota>ὸς Ὀρίῳ}$ (E107, ca. 450-400 BC)⁴⁷. Besides, the addition of Athena to the three healing divinities Podaleirius, Machaon and Periesto ($\text{Ποδαλιρῖῳ Μαχάδωνος Περιεστῶς Ἀθηνάης}$) in E108 (Molyvoti, late-5th BC), all of them Asclepius’ children, points to an Attic loan: probably, this Athena has to be related with Athena Ὑγεία, another of Asclepius’ children⁴⁸. Both texts, dated to the 5th century, when Athenian influence in the area was more intense, display Ionic traits though (cf. $\text{Ἀθηνάης} < \text{Ἀθηναίης}$). For this reason, linguistic interferences between Attic and Ionic dialects in our inscriptions can be expected from this time onwards.

Attic features found in our epigraphical corpus in the prekoine stage are mainly limited to the presence of the so-called Attic retroversion, which dates from the mid-4th century

⁴³ del Barrio 2014.

⁴⁴ In official Ionic inscriptions we also find $\pi\tilde{\omega}\varsigma$ -type, cf. Horrocks 2010, 60-61. Similarly, $\epsilon\sigma\theta\lambda\acute{o}\varsigma$ appears late (cf. E88, *Topeiros*, 3rd AD).

⁴⁵ $\text{Θαλίαρχος Ἀθηναῖος ΚΕ[...]ὸς Θαλίηνῳ}$ (E58, *Abdera*, ca. 475-450 BC). On trade, see, for instance, E3 (*Abdera*, before 350 BC).

⁴⁶ $\text{Κότυος [Μαρῶ]νίτης}$ (IG II² 9289, post ca. 350 BC), $\text{Θρῆιζ Γέτου Μαρωνίτης}$ (IG II² 9287, III BC), $\text{Γλακίας Ταλούλου Μαρωνίτης}$ (IG II² 9286, Roman period) and $\text{Θρῆι[ττ]α Ἀνδράβυδος Μ<\alpha>ρωνίτης}$ (IG II² 9288, undated).

⁴⁷ See the editors’ references in *I.Thrake Aeg.* to other testimonies to this cult in Athens, *Abdera* (E14) and *Propontis Thrace*.

⁴⁸ See Masson (*BÉ* 104 [1991], 210) pace *I.Thrake Aeg.* 288, 290 (also concerning the assimilation Περιεστῶ - Ἴασις). On the cult in Attica of Ἀθηνᾶ Ὑγεία as Asclepius’ daughter, see Paus.1.23.4.

(cf. Ἀνταγόρας, E149, Molyvoti, mid-4th BC, fun.). A troublesome feature is the -ō rendering of thematic genitives instead of the Ionic -εω in the mid-5th century, documented in Samothracian colonies, in Ἀλκεβιάδῳ/Ἀλκιβιάδῳ (E405-407, Zone, fun.) and Ἀνταγόρῳ (E109, Molyvoti, fun., epigram). Around 350 BC we already encounter in the area of Molyvoti Ἡγησιππίδου (E151, fun.), Δάδου (E153, fun.)⁴⁹ and Ἀντιπατρίδου (E161, fun.). Supposedly, these could be Attic forms in -ου or, in the light of the oldest examples, contracted Ionic genitives in (-εω >) -ω. However, given the absence of later genitives in -ω, together with the rendering of /ɔ:/ with <Ω> in other mid-5th examples (cf. Πυθόδωρος, E409, Zone, ca. 450-400 BC, fun.; Ἀπολλωνίδου, E152, Molyvoti, mid-4th BC, fun.; see *infra*), del Barrio (2018a, 498-499) claims that „they belong to Attic-Ionic koine”. After all, -ου genitives finally predominate, even in Hellenised Thracian names⁵⁰. Indeed, Parissaki (2007, 126) attempts to link individuals from Zone named Ἀλκιβιάδης with Athens, bearing in mind the influence of Athens in this place and, particularly, the regional distribution of these anthroponyms, since the majority of them come from Attica⁵¹. To this end, we must compare the whole Ἡγησίλαος Ἀλκιβιάδῳ (E407), and its final -λαος, with the proper Ionic Ἡγησίλεως (cf. Schönert-Geiss, *Maroneia* 162, ca. 400-378 BC, coin). Tellingly, these forms start to appear in a period in which the so-called Great Attic emerges, which develops in the 5th c. BC and is especially prominent during ca 425-336 BC⁵². It coincides with the inclusion of most of north-Aegean cities in the Athenian tribute lists and among the members of the Delian League⁵³.

In connection to this, we are confronted with two analogous interpretations when analysing the contracted s-stem genitives Θεογένῳς (E409, Sapli Dere, ca. 450-400 BC, fun.)⁵⁴, and Ἀντιφάνῳς (E126, Molyvoti, ca. 400 BC, fun.). These could be Attic or early contracted Ionic forms (del Barrio 2018a, 498)⁵⁵, but there is no reason to deny an Attic

⁴⁹ A Thracian name in Dana 2014 s.v. Dada, Δαδας; see also Parissaki 2007, 155 with earlier bibliography.

⁵⁰ Despite the issue of establishing their declension and their graphic variants, cf. Ρομητάλκου, Καπρουβήβου (E387, Dyme, 1st AD, fun.), Δωλέου (E249 Maroneia, 2nd AD, fun.), Τήρου (E384, Agiasma, 3rd AD, dedication), Δολεοῦ, Βίζου (E386, Asomatoi, 3rd AD?, fun.), some of them seem to have been clearly reinterpreted as a-stem masculine names (cf. Τηρης, Τηρου; -αλκης, -άλκου). On the Hellenization of Thracian names, see Dana 2017.

⁵¹ Parissaki brings forth E401 (ca. 425-400 BC) and E403 (ca. 425-400 BC); on the strong Athenian influence in classical Maroneia, see Psoma 2008, lii-liiii too.

⁵² Horrocks 2010, 73-78; Teodorsson 2014.

⁵³ In the case of Zone, see the assessment decree of 422/1 (IG I³ 77.5.27-28).

⁵⁴ Θεο^ο remains unaltered, without contraction nor diphthongization (see §1.1).

⁵⁵ Both inscriptions are very short and without further linguistic clues to clarify the dialect used. See note 89 for later outcomes in -ους.

influence, given other non-contracted occurrences from Sapli Dere until the mid-4th (Πολυχάρεος, E414, ca. 400-350 BC, fun.; Πολυκράτεος, E420, mid-4th BC, fun.) and the historical Athenian influence over the region. Indeed, both forms are accompanied by Πυθόδωρος (E409) and Ἀπο[λ]λόδωρος (E126), where a graphic distinction between original /ɔ:/ <Ω> and /o/ <O> is made. Thus, in E126 /o/ and /ɔ:/ are graphically differentiated from secondary [o:], rendered by ὀ < /eo/ (Ἀπο[λ]λόδωρος vs. Ἀντιφάνῳ)⁵⁶. Indeed, a little later we find Ἀπολλωνίδου (E152, Molyvoti, mid-4th BC, fun.). The analysis of the genitive forms in -κλεος attested in the region (cf. Θεοκλέος, E121, Molyvoti, ca. 425-400 BC, fun.; Προκλέος, E135, Molyvoti, ca. 400-375 BC, fun.; Σωκλέος, E418, Zone, mid-4th BC, fun.; Πατροκλέος, Schönert-Geiss *Maroneia*, 492-493, 365-336 BC, coin; [Π]αντακλέος, E223, mid-4th BC, fun.) represents a similar difficulty. They can render the expected Ionic genitive (-κλέ(ε)ος >) -κλέος⁵⁷ or early cases of Attic contraction -κλέῶς (-κλέουσ). In *I.Thrake Aeg.* no clear indication to their alphabets is made, but <H> and <Ω> are used in the same inscriptions (cf. Σωκλέος in E418, Διονυσοφάνης in E121, Ἀθηναῖς in E135 or Ἡραῖς in E223). Unfortunately, there are no parallels of secondary /o:/ until the 3rd c. BC, when we do come across Ἀθηνοκλέους (E234, Maroneia, fun.) and Χαρικλέους (E235, Maroneia, fun.), Πατροκλέους (E254, Maroneia, Hellenistic period, fun.). This means that the abovementioned -κλεος genitives might well be interpreted as Ionic *-klēōs*, but they could also be contracted -κλέῶς forms not yet rendered -κλέουσ due to the lack of other dialectal features and to the early Attic influence over the region⁵⁸.

2. A turning point, the 4th c. BC

Because of the continuous contact between Ionic and Attic speakers and the gradual growth of a supradialectal variety in the Greek world, the 4th c. BC is the most suitable period to detect the influence of the koine and phenomena of dialect levelling in our corpus⁵⁹. However, few inscriptions seem to point to dialect contact thus far.

In some regions such as Zone, the earliest documents only exhibit Attic(-koine) features. As we can see in *Αρχαία Ζώνη I*, ΑΓΚ 640 + 6143 (late-5th/early-4th, decree?), a clear

⁵⁶ del Barrio 2018a does not report examples of <Ω> for original /ɔ:/ nor <O> for secondary /o:/.

⁵⁷ Bechtel 1924, 66

⁵⁸ If some extra documentary evidence proved the kinship of the Διονυσοφάνης Θεοκλέος of E121 with the one in Πατροκλής Διονυσοφάνεος (E137, Molyvoti, ca. 400-375 BC), as proposed in *I.Thrake Aeg.*, 304, we could have further arguments to claim the Ionic origin of these individuals.

⁵⁹ A similar approach in Brixhe and Panayotou 1988 (see also Brixhe 2010), Crespo 2009, 2010.

Attic [ἄ]σουλίαν stands out with other forms like ἐκγόνοις, [πο]λέμωι, [εἰρήν]ηι, which can also be Ionic⁶⁰. Nonetheless, in E3, a decree from Abdera dated before 350 BC, specific Ionic features such as /ε:/ (ἰ[ε]ρ]ῆς, δυσεντερῆς and [πο]δαλγῆς), non-contracted ὠνεομεν[and [ὕ]πνωδεος and the numeral τέσσαρας coexist with Attic/Attic-Ionic koine forms in grammatical words, such as the dative τοῖς or ἐάν (vs. the expected τοῖσι and ἐήν in Abdera)⁶¹. The reconstructed forms [ἄγορ]ᾶς and -more securely- [ἦμ]έρας point to the same direction⁶². Additionally, the genitive Διονυσᾶδος (E2, Abdera, ca. 350-300 BC) and probably the ethnic Κυρηναῖος (E60, Abdera, ca. 350 BC, fun.) also exhibit an Ionic layer⁶³ that contrasts with later Σωτάδας (E263, Maroneia, 3rd BC, fun.) and [Π]τολέμα[ς] (E264, Maroneia, 3rd BC, fun.) who come from Crete (Κρής) and Philippoi (Φιλιππεύς) respectively⁶⁴.

Another interesting case is the famous Pistiros inscription, found in Vetren (Bulgaria) and first published in *IGBulg V 5557(3)*, which is dated after 359 BC⁶⁵. Here salient Ionic traits are retained: /ε:/ in πρήσσειν, φρουρήμ, Μαρωνείης, Πιστιρηνώμ and Ἀπολλωνητέων; /εο:/ in the genitives ἐμποριτέωμ and Ἀπολλωνητέων, along with ἀποκτενέω (/ea/ is also uncontracted in τέλεα) and ταῶτα and αὐτόμ instead of ταῦτα and αὐτόν, which could reflect East Ionic or Thasian influence (but αὐτός, αὐτούς, as well). Furthermore, the ethnic suffix -ηνός (cf. Πιστιρηνώμ) is also common in Propontis and Asia Minor⁶⁶. On the other hand, μηδεμίαν, along with the datives τοῖς ἐμπορίταις and aspiration in word-boundary (ἀφαιρεῖ[σθ]αι, ἀφαιρήσομαι), could also be attributed to the Attic(-koine)⁶⁷. When it comes to analysing these forms, we are faced with the much-debated identification between the *Pistiros* (Πίστιρος) mentioned in the inscription, a trading centre in modern Bulgaria, and a Thasian colony called *Pistyros* (Πίστυρος), located by Herodotus (7.109.2) in the northern coastline of the Aegean⁶⁸. The widespread

⁶⁰ The inscription is labelled as *bilingual*, but it does not seem a bi-version text (in Greek and Thracian), but two different texts (cf. *Αρχαία Ζώνη I*, 257-269, 358-372).

⁶¹ Plural dative in -οις/-ηις is documented in East Ionic from the 4th c. BC (cf. del Barrio 2014, 264); in Thasos it spread out even in lexical forms (cf. Alonso Déniz 2018, 533).

⁶² Del Barrio 2018a, 499-500. For γῖνος 'small mule', cf. Hesychius s.v. γίννος (Latte-Cunningham 567).

⁶³ Κῖκος *vacat* Φρασιδήμῳ Αἰγινήτης *vacat*. According to Threatte 1980, 52, 539, foreign toponyms and ethnonyms used to appear adapted to Attic in Attic inscriptions, although from the 5th BC foreign forms prevail even in the tribute lists.

⁶⁴ According to *LGPN IV*, there is one more example in Macedonia (*ILeukopetra* 17, 1, Beroia, 184 AD).

⁶⁵ We follow Chankowski and Domaradzka's final edition 1999 (= *SEG* 49, 911) with later corrections of *SEG* 63, 492.

⁶⁶ del Barrio 2018a, 491.

⁶⁷ In Thasos dat. -οις/-ηις is expected, cf. Alonso Déniz 2018, 533 n. 9.

⁶⁸ Herodotus describes Pistyros as παραθαλασσία and Ἑλληνίς. Other occurrences of Pistiros, in combination with our epigraphic testimony, appear in Stephanus of Byzantium 524.11 (Πίστιρος, ἐμπόριον

assertion that the Aegean Pistyros is a Thasian colony is based on its identification with modern Pontolivado, where some Thasian material evidence has been found. In light of the resemblance between both toponyms, some authors have identified the two settlements as the same, while the majority favour the idea that the *emporion* of Pistiros was founded by citizens from the Aegean Pistyros⁶⁹. Be as it may, the text shows the interaction with the Ionic dialect of its metropolis, already displayed in earlier graffiti⁷⁰, mixed with Attic(-koine) forms. In conclusion, the statement that this text is in Ionic dialect is reasonable in linguistic terms but its connection with a particular region is a matter of dispute.

After ca. 350 BC, we deal with the ever-growing difficulty of differentiating Attic (or Great Attic) from Attic integrated within the Attic-Ionic koine⁷¹. This is mainly the case with the rendering of a-stem masculine genitives in -ου and of the using of $\bar{\alpha}$ instead of η after palatal vowels and /r/. The first testimonies to $\bar{\alpha}$ date from the second half of the 4th century (cf. Ἀγταγόρας, E149, Molyvoti and Μαιανδρία, E422, Zone). Similarly, in E400 (late-4th/early-3rd BC), a decree-copy found in Molyvoti issued by Drys, we find non-Ionic /a:/ in Πολυάρατος and other lexical words (προξενίαν, εὐεργασίαν, πολιτείαν). The local Ionic origin of Πολυάρατος is confirmed by his patronym Ἰστιαῖος, common in Ionic-speaking regions⁷², and by other occurrences of Πολυαρητ^ο- in Molyvoti (E141, ca. 375-350 BC, fun.), in some coins from Maroneia (Schönert-Geiss, *Maroneia* 494-8, ca. 365-336 BC) and in a contemporary inscription from Thasos (IG XII, 8 267, early-3rd BC). The latter (Πολυάρητος ὁ Ἰστιαίου), probably the same person as in our inscription, received the Thasian citizenship⁷³. The form Πολυάρατος in E400 is due to the strong influence of the koine in this official text (as opposed to the Thasian inscription, in which local features -mainly in anthroponyms- coexist with koine features in common words). Along with participle ὄν or the datives ἐκγόνοις and Δρυίταις, the document also exhibits

Θράκης), distinguished as *emporion* from *ib.* 171.6 (Βίστιρος, πόλις Θράκης ὡς Πίστιρος τὸ ἐμπόριον). On the whole, see Loukopoulou 2004a, 866. Due to the mention of Maronites in the inscription, del Barrio (2018, 490) does not rule out the possible influence of their dialect in the text (or, failing this, the dialect of its metropolis, Chios).

⁶⁹ Velkov and Domaradzka 1999, 7, Loukopoulou (2004a, 867) and Hatzopoulos 2013, 15-16.

⁷⁰ Αθηναγόρης, ἡμέρης (*SEG* 52, 711, late-5th), Δημέα (*SEG* 64, 606, 5th-3rd BC).

⁷¹ See the seminal works of Bubenik 1989, 1993; López Eire 1993, 1996; Brixhe and Hodot 2001.

⁷² Parissaki 2007, 193, 232 n. 597. That Πολυάρητος is the Ionic form is assured by other occurrences in Samos, Paros and Erythrae, as well.

⁷³ Parissaki 2007, 231-232; *I. Thrake Aeg.* 504.

other koine-forms, such as an analogical aorist εἶπαν (for εἶπον)⁷⁴ and the standardized formula καὶ εἴσπλουν καὶ ἔκπλουν καὶ ἐμ πολέμοι καὶ ἐν εἰρήνῃ.

Other standard koine forms such as πραγμ⁰⁷⁵ or νᾶός⁷⁶ start to appear from the 2nd c. BC onwards, whereas the mixing of η and ᾱ arises at a later period (cf. τῆ ἱερίῃ but μνείας, Λολλία in E93, Abdera, imp. Rom.) and in two late epigrams from Maroneia⁷⁷. Among non-Greek anthroponyms, there is no fixed tendency in the rendering of some concrete names, as for instance, those Hellenised with the ending -αλκας/αλκης, such as Ῥομητάλκας (E84, Topeiros, 46-54 AD [x2]) or Σιτάλκας (E212, Maroneia, 2nd/1st BC), or Σεύθης/ας (cf. Σεύθης, E255, Maroneia, 1st BC, fun.)⁷⁸.

3. Koineization

From the 2nd c. BC, we detect other conventional phonetic features of the koine. Among these are the use of <EI> for <I> (/i:/), which is overall attested in Maroneia from the late-3rd BC⁷⁹ (and from the 1st c. BC in other regions)⁸⁰. Later, more changes associated with vowel quantity and the reduction of diphthongs emerge. This is the case of <H> instead of <EI> before a vowel from the 1st c. AD⁸¹, or <I> instead of <EI>⁸², and <E> for <AI>⁸³, both dated to the 3rd c. AD (and even later <Y> for <OI>)⁸⁴. Among other vocalic

⁷⁴ These analogical aorists are also attested in Ionic prose, cf. Vessella 2016, 356.

⁷⁵ Πράγμασιν (E6.16, Teos < Abdera, 166-160 BC, decree), πράγματα (E5.17, Teos < Abdera, 166-160 BC, decree; and E5.180, B13, Samothracia < Maroneia, 41/42 or 46 AD, decree).

⁷⁶ τοὺς ναοὺς but γαίης (E6, Teos < Abdera, 166-160 BC, decree), ναυσίν (E168, Maroneia, 167 BC, treaty, [x2]).

⁷⁷ Cf. γαίης and μοίρης vs. φο[β]ερᾶς, ἱερᾶς, ἡλικίαν (E221, Nea Maroneia, 3rd-4th AD) and Εὐδικίης in the metrical part vs. εὐνοίας in prose (E217, 2nd-3rd AD).

⁷⁸ More forms in n. 50. The geographical distribution of Ῥομητάλκας/ης does not display significant differences (the previous, attested in other parts of Thrace, Attica, Scythia Minor, Chios, Mysia and Egypt, while the latter also occurs in Thrace, Moesia Superior, Chios and Mysia, cf. Dana 2014, s.vv). Interestingly, there are no cases of Ῥοματαλκ^ο. Frequently, the choice of η/ᾱ is arbitrary (and there is no certainty about the long quantity of the vowel), as in Βεισούλας (E64, Abdera, 1st BC/1st AD).

⁷⁹ Common words: πολειτῶν (E180, found in Samothrace, 41/42 or 46 AD, decree), σφραγεῖδι (E180, fr. A, found in Samothrace, 41/42 or 46 AD, decree, but σφραγι<σ>άμενοι), ἡμεῖν (E180, found in Samothrace, 41/42 or 46 AD, decree), τιμῆς (E181, 1st/2nd AD, honorific decree). In Greek onomastics: Ἀφροδεισία (E240, Nea Maroneia, 3rd/2nd BC, fun.), Εἴσιδι (E199, 2nd/1st BC?), Εἴσιδος, Δειφίλου, Νεικία<ς>, ἱερωνει[κης] (E212, 2nd/1st BC, cat.), [N]εικονέμεισιν (E204, 1st BC, dedication), Βερωνείκη (E303, Nea Maroneia, 1st BC/1st AD, fun.), and in Latin names: Πρεῖσκα (E276, Nea Maroneia, 2nd AD, fun.), Πρεῖσκο[υ] (E196, Nea Maroneia, 3rd AD).

⁸⁰ Maroneia: Ποσιδῶνος (E204, 1st BC, dedication); Topeiros: Δῖνις (E85, 46-54 AD), Ἀβδ[ηρ]εῖτης, παροδεῖτα (E103, 2nd AD), χεῖλια, δῶσι (E88, 3rd AD); Abdera: παροδεῖτα (E104, 3rd AD).

⁸¹ Cf. ἀπολήας, πρεσβήα, συνεδρήαν (E180, Samothrace < Maroneia, 41/42 or 46 AD, decree), θῆναι (E312, Maroneia, 3rd AD, fun.).

⁸² [ύ]ποκίμενο[υ] (E100, Topeiros, 3rd AD), οὐδῖς (E466, Plotinopolis, 3rd AD, epigram), κῖτε (E440, Traianoupolis, 3rd/4th AD, fun.) and Σοκλείους (E183, Maroneia, 2nd BC, honorific decree).

⁸³ κέ τεξ γυνεξίν, κέ [x3] (E396, Dione-Kokkinochomata, 235-238 AD, fun.), κέιμε (E466, Plotinopolis, 3rd AD, epigram) κῖτε (E440, Traianoupolis, 3rd/4th AD, fun.).

⁸⁴ κυμητήριον (E96, Topeiros, 5th/6th AD).

changes, contracted forms prevail from the 3rd c. BC⁸⁵, and έαυτός is rendered with άυ- or έα- forms from the 2nd c. BC⁸⁶.

Koine (and Ionic) -σσ- and -ρρ- for Attic -ττ- and -ρσ- start to appear in the 3rd/2nd c. BC, although only -σσ- is attested in later examples⁸⁷. Once more, examples come chiefly from Maroneia, Topeiros and Abdera. Two 2nd-century decrees from Abdera found in Teos document the first examples of μηθείς and ούθείς⁸⁸.

An important grammatical development is the analogical processes of levelling occurring in s-stems. No Ionic genitives in -εος have survived after the mid-4th c. BC. We find, instead, Attic/koine -ους in three inscriptions (previously rendered with -ός, cf. §§1.1, 1.2)⁸⁹. However, most of the s-stems nouns (nom. -φάνης, -γένης, -μενης, -σθένης, -άλκης, -πειθης), dated between the mid-4th century and the Roman Imperial period, present -ου genitives by analogy with masculine a-stems⁹⁰. A third analogical genitive in -κλήους appears from the 2nd c. BC (cf. Άριστοκλήους, E62, Abdera; Μενεκλήους, E269, Maroneia), which contrasts with those in -κλέους (or -κλέος, see *supra*). Finally, we find Άριστήος (E241, Nea Maroneia, 3rd-2nd BC, fun.). According to Bechtel (1923, 486; 1924, 153), -ηος derives from analogical levelling influenced by the nominative case⁹¹, but for Nieto Izquierdo (2009, 123-124) it results from a hesitation between <H> and <E> due to the loss of contrastive distinctions in vowel quantity between /ε:/ and /e/ before a vowel⁹².

⁸⁵ See, for instance, Άβδηριτών (E4, Abdera, mid-3rd BC).

⁸⁶ αυτόν (E451, Traianoupolis-Doriskos, ca. 250-200 BC), καθ' αυτόν (E7, Teos < Abdera, 2nd BC), αυτόν (E176 Maroneia, ca. 150-100 BC, honorary decree), αυτή (E438, Traianoupolis, 2nd AD, fun.), έατῶ (E321, Nea Maroneia, 3rd/4th AD, fun.), αύ[τής] (E 475, Plotinopolis, 501 AD, fun.).

⁸⁷ κρείσσον [x2], διαλλάσσον, ήσσον (E205, Maroneia, mid-2nd/early 1st BC, aretalogy), διαφυλάσ[σιν] (E6, Teos < Abdera, 166-160 BC, decree), και κατά γήν και κατά θάλασσαν, τασσομένους (E168, Maroneia, 167 BC, treaty), φυλάσσηται (E180 B9, Samothrace < Maroneia, 41/42 or 46 AD, decree), τεσσεράκοντα (E88, Topeiros, 3rd AD, fun.), etc. For -ρρ-, cf. θαρρών (E205, Maroneia, mid-2nd/early 1st BC, aretalogy) and NP [..]ρρίας (E236, Maroneia, 3rd BC, fun.).

⁸⁸ ούθέν (E6, 166-160 BC), μηθέν (E5, 166-160 BC).

⁸⁹ Διογένους, Προκλέους (E251, Maroneia, Hellenistic period?, fun.), Πλουτογένους (E290, Nea Maroneia, Rom. Imp. period, fun.), Διογένους (E446, Traianoupolis-Alexandroupolis, 2nd AD, letter).

⁹⁰ Εύπειθου (E41, Abdera, ca. 350-300 BC, fun.), Διογένου (E257, Maroneia, 3rd BC, fun.), Διογένου, [Διογέν]νου (E259, Maroneia, Hellenistic period, fun.), Μητροφάνου (E199, Maroneia, 2nd/1st BC?), Μητροφάνου, Λεωσθένου, Διογένου, Καλλιγένου, Λεοντομένου, Διονυ[σιφ]άνου, Έπάλκου (E212, Maroneia, 2nd/1st BC, cat.), Πλουτογένου (E286, Nea Maroneia, Rom. Imp. period, fun.).

⁹¹ On the influence of the vocative case on the hesitation between s-stems and a-stems, see Schulze 1893, 195-197; 1924.

⁹² Discussed forms in Bechtel 1924, 153, from Pantikapaion (Αότοκλήος, IosPE II 140, 174, 4th BC); Delphi (Διοκλήος, SGDI II 2259, 50/51 BC); Hermion (Λακράτηος, IG IV, 78.6, 3rd BC; Κλεομήδηος, IG IV, 731, 2nd-1st BC?) and Crete (Δαμοκάδηος, IC II iii 6, Aptera, early-2nd BC; Θυραγιένηος, IC II xi 4, Diktynnaion, 1st BC); there are also new examples (cf. Διοκλήος, IK Byzantion 365, undated).

In a similar way, other examples of analogical levelling emerge in the accusative and dative of s-stems: cf. Σωκλήν (E183, Maroneia, 2nd BC, hon. decree), [Πυ]θογένην (E297, Nea Maroneia, 1st BC, fun.) and Ἀρφοκράτη (E199, Maroneia, 2nd-1st BC?)⁹³. An analogous process is observed in the 3rd-plural active and middle imperative verbal forms -τώσαν and -σθώσαν (for -των and -σθων respectively). The earliest occurrence is dated to the mid-3rd c. BC (cf. [ἀπο]λογισάσθωσαν, [ἐπι]μελείσθωσαν, E4, Abdera, honorary decree), and they occur until one century later in official documents, mostly from Abdera⁹⁴.

In a longer perspective, some Ionic features resist during the Hellenistic period and even later in anthroponymy. Despite the unstoppable linguistic colonization of the Attic-Ionic koine, some names still exhibit Ionic genitive forms in -εω, as we see in Maroneia, as late as the 2nd c. BC: cf. Πόρκης Πόρκεω⁹⁵ (E184, Nea Maroneia, decree) and Ἀθήνεω (E168, Maroneia, 167 BC, treaty). However, in the latter example, Ἀθήνεω is combined with other koine forms (cf. Μητροφάνου, φιλία, συμμαχία, ναυσίν, etc.). The problem of distinguishing between koine and Ionic forms emerges concerning genitives like Ξουσα̃ (E482, prov. inc., aet. rom., dedication) or Ἀσκλα̃ (E483, prov. inc. [Komotini Mus.], 2nd/3rd AD., dedication). A similar situation is reflected in the final outcome of γιν- > γιν-, which is attested from the 2nd c. BC⁹⁶. An artificial Ionic veneer is observed in Κλεοπάτρη (E154, Molyvoti, ca. 350 BC, fun.), which contrasts with Κλεοπάτρα (E420, Zone, ca. 350 BC, fun.) and Σωσιπάτρα (E229, Maroneia, early-III BC, fun.)⁹⁷.

Finally, it is possible that some late Thracian names could have maintained Ionicisms in the light of some genitive forms, such as non-contracted genitives in -εος, attested in Αὐλοῦ[ζ]ενεος (E478, Komara, 2nd-3rd AD) or Διασενεος, Αὐλουζενεος (E104, Abdera 3rd

⁹³ In the inscription there is also a koine form Μητροφάνου.

⁹⁴ [ἀν]αγραψάτωσαν, [στησά]τωσαν, ἐ<λ>έσθωσαν, κομισά[σ]θωσαν (E5, Teos < Abdera, decree), ἀναγραψάτωσαν, δότωσαν, ἐλέσθωσαν (E7, Teos < Abdera, proxeny decree), ἀναγραψάτωσαν (E8, Abdera, honorary decree), ἀναθέτωσαν (E9, Abdera, honorary decree), διέτωσαν, χορηγείτωσαν (E168, Maroneia, 167 BC, treaty).

⁹⁵ Πόρκης is considered a Greek name by Parissaki 2007, 233, while Detschew 1976 and Brixhe 2006, 139 suggest a possible Thracian origin; included in Dana 2014, s.v. PORK[.], Πορκης.

⁹⁶ [γ]ινώσκωσιν (E5, Teos < Abdera, 166-160 BC, decree), γινόμενος (E10, Abdera, 2nd BC, honorary decree), γίνεται (E8, Abdera, 2nd BC, honorary decree), γεινόμενον, ἐπιγινώσκωσιν (E183, Maroneia, 2nd BC, honorary decree), γινώσκων (E205, Maroneia, mid-2nd-early 1st BC), [παρα]γινόμενοι, παραγίνεσθαι (E185, Maroneia, 131 AD, edict); but cf. γίνομαι in Thasos (IG XII Suppl. 349, late 5th BC).

⁹⁷ There is no context apart from names. According to del Barrio 2018a, 484, 487, Κλεοπάτρη and nom. πάτρη, acc. πάτρη (in Thasos and Samos) are hyper-Ionicisms since this -a was originally short.

AD)⁹⁸. However, their adaptation to a particular Greek declension is not consistent so that we find alternative renderings of the same names, cf. Διασενεως (E387, Dyme, 1st AD, fun) or Αὐλουξειδος (E212, Nea Maroneia, 2nd-1st BC). Be that as it may, these graphic inconsistencies and variations when writing similar names⁹⁹ and the loss of vowel-quantity distinction should be treated cautiously, since they can lead us to wrong hypotheses. While it is true that factors like chronology or geographical distribution can play an important role in the analysis of these names, the extant evidence from our region is not sufficient enough to draw any definite conclusions¹⁰⁰.

Conclusions

As we have seen, due to the scarcity of the available material, linguistic analysis is mainly limited to anthroponymy in pre-Hellenistic times, and to some concrete phonetic and morphological categories in later periods. Distinctive Ionic features arise from the period spanning the mid-6th c. BC (in inscriptions whose Thasian origin is still questionable) and the 5th and 4th centuries, while during the 4th century they coexist with Attic(-koine) traits. The Ionic dialect residually survives in personal names until the 2nd c. BC (leaving aside possible remnants of Hellenised anthroponyms). Furthermore, isolating intra-dialectal differences in this area remains a challenging task, due to the lack of extensive parallels and to extra-linguistic factors, such as the early influence of Athens and the technical complexity of identifying some colonies. Indeed, Attic influence seem to emerge at an early date, around the mid-5th c. BC, in contracted genitives such as Ἀλκιβιάδῳ (E405-407, Zone, fun.) and Ἀνταγόρῳ (E109, Molyvoti, epigram). These forms, along with the reading of Μεγαδο[] (E39, Abdera, ca. 400-350 BC, fun.) as Μεγάδῳ and <ΠΙΠΟΤΙΩ> as Πρωτίῳ (E30, Abdera < Thasos?, mid-6th BC), could be taken as examples of Ionic contraction -εω > -ω in the genitives of masculine a-stems. However, all these forms admit alternative interpretations (Μεγαδο[ς], Πρωτίου/Πρωτίο), so that they do not constitute definitive arguments in favour of this change.

As things stand and in view of the available evidence, Attic traits in inscriptions before the arrival of the Hellenistic koine can easily be explained by the strong interest and

⁹⁸ In both examples the nominative Αὐλούζεινις also appears in the text. Compare with gen. Αὐλουζενεω (*IGBulg* III,2 1794, Hadrianopolis, 2nd c. AD [date after Dana 2014, 19]). On the variation of this name (nom. -ζηνεις/ζεινις/ζηνης/σανις/ζανος), see Dana 2014, 18-22.

⁹⁹ See Dana 2014, XCIV-XCV.

¹⁰⁰ See Dana's 2014 hypothesis about the existence of four main Thracian onomastic regions, and Guijarro Ruano (forthcoming) for its application into Aegean Thrace.

presence of Athens (and therefore of Great Attic) in the region after the Persian wars: many of these cities were members of the Delian League and were included in the Athenian tribute lists. Ionic-Attic convergence appears hesitantly in E3 (Abdera, bef. 350 BC, law), where the Ionic η or uncontracted forms ($\delta\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\nu\tau\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\eta\varsigma$, $[\acute{\upsilon}]π\acute{\nu}\acute{o}\delta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$) are found side by side with other Attic features visible in grammatical words ($\tau\omicron\iota\zeta$, $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\nu$). An early diffusion of the Attic dialect in the northern Aegean coast matches with previous accounts of its rapid spread in Macedonia, from the early 5th c. BC,¹⁰¹ and with its later expansion toward the western and northern coasts of the Black Sea, where already koine features appear shortly after, from the 4th c. BC onwards¹⁰². Overall, these were neighbouring regions without clear political borders and with blurry geographical limits.

In general lines, we see how the patterns of dialectal convergence and dialect levelling led to the adoption of the *koine* as the sole common linguistic vehicle for communication. These phenomena relate to a process of simplification of the grammar that gradually gave rise, through koineization, to a new variety, the emerging Attic-Ionic koine.

Bibliography

Alonso Déniz, Alcorac (2018), „The Dialect of Thasos and the tTransmission of Archilochus’ Fragments“, in: Georgios K. Giannakis / Emilio Crespo / Panayotis Filos (eds.), *Studies in Ancient Greek dialects. From Central Greece to the Black Sea*, Berlin-Boston, 531-560.

Arrington, Nathan T. / Terzopoulou, Domna / Tasaklaki, Domna / Lawall, Mark L. / Brellas, Demetrios J. / White, Chantel E. (2016), „Molyvoti, Thrace, Archaeological Project: 2013 Preliminary Report“, in: *Hesperia* 85, 1-64.

Αρχαία Ζώνη I = Tsatsopoulou-Kaloudi, Polyxeni / Brixhe, Claude / Pardalidou, Chrysaphenia (2015), *Αρχαία Ζώνη I: Το Ιερό του Απόλλωνα*, Vol. 1, Κομοτηνή.

Bechet, Florian (2009), „Les colonies grecques du Pont gauche: histoire et langue“, in: Guy Vottéro (ed.), *Le grec du monde colonial Antique: Le N. et N.-O. de la Mer Noire*. Actes de la table Ronde de Nancy, 28-29 septembre 2007, Nancy, 81-118.

¹⁰¹ Brixhe and Panayotou 1988; Panayotou 1998.

¹⁰² Slavova 2009, 209; Bechet 2009, 107-111; Tokhasiev 2009.

Bechtel, Friedrich (1917), *Die historischen Personennamen des Griechischen bis zur Kaiserzeit*, Halle (reimp. Hildesheim, George Olms, 1964).

Bechtel, Friedrich (1923), *Die griechischen Dialekte II. Die westgriechischen Dialekte*, Berlin.

Bechtel, Friedrich (1924), *Die griegische Dialekte III. Der ionische Dialekt*, Berlin.

Brixhe, Claude (1963), „Les noms de personnes en -ᾶς/-ᾷ, -ᾶς/-ᾶτος et -ης/-ητος dans le dialecte pamphylien“, in: *RÉG* 76(359), 10-33.

Brixhe, Claude (2006) „Zôné et Samothrace: lueurs sur la langue thrace et nouveau chapitre de la grammaire commparée?“, in: *CRAI* 150, 1, 121-146.

Brixhe, Claude (2008), „Un phénomène aréal: la substitution de< E> à< O> en finale en Thrace, à Thasos et en Thessalie“, in: Μαρία Θεοδωροπούλου (ed.), *ΘΕΡΜΗ ΚΑΙ ΦΩΣ. LICHT UND WÄRME. Αφιερωματικός Τόμος στη μνήμη του Α.-Φ. Χριστίδη*, Thessaloniki, 215-223.

Brixhe, Claude (2010), „Quelle koiné en Macédoine au début de notre ère? Filetest de Leukopétra“, *Dic mihi, Musa, virum. Homenaje al profesor Antonio López Eire*, Salamanca, 61-68.

Brixhe, Claude (2015) = cf. *Αρχαία Ζώνη I*.

Brixhe, Claude (2018), „Thracian“, in: Jared Klein / Brian Joseph / Matthias Fritz (eds.), *HSK* 41.3, Berlin-Boston, 1850-1854.

Brixhe, Claude / Hodot, René (2001), „De l’attique à la koiné“, in: *MSLP nouvelle série* 11, 29-46.

Brixhe, Claude / Panayotou, Anna (1988), „L’atticisation de la Macédoine: l’une des sources de la koiné“, in: *Verbum* 11, 245-260.

Brixhe, Claude / Panayotou, Anna (1997), „Le Thrace“, in: Françoise Bader (ed.), *Langues indo-européennes*, Paris, 179-203.

Bubenik, Vit (1989), *Hellenistic and Roman Greece as a Sociolinguistic Area*, Amsterdam.

Bubenik, Vit (1993), „Dialect contact and Koineization: the Case of Hellenistic Greek“, in: *IJSL* 99, 9-24.

- Chankowski, V. and Domaradzka, L. (1999), „Réédition de l'inscription de Pistiros et problèmes d'interprétation“, in: *BCH* 123(1), 246-258.
- Chryssanthaki-Nagle, K. (2004), „Le monnayage d'Orthagoreia“, in: *Revue numismatique* 160, 49-62.
- Chryssanthaki-Nagle, K. (2007), *L'histoire monétaire d'Abdère en Thrace (VIe s. av. J.-C. – IIe s. ap. J.-C.)*, Athens.
- Crespo, Emilio (2009), „La difusión temprana del dialecto ático en el Peloponeso“, in: Alfonso Martínez Hernández (ed.), *Estudios de epigrafía griega*, La Laguna, 137-144.
- Crespo, Emilio (2010), „El proceso de configuración y fijación de la koiné en el siglo IV“, in: Francisco Cortés Gabaudán *et al.* (eds.), *Dic mihi, mvsa, virvm*, Salamanca, 139-146.
- Curbera, Jaime (2013), „Simple Names in Ionia“, in: Robert Parker (ed.), *Personal Names in Ancient Anatolia*, Oxford, 107-143.
- Dana, Dan (2014), *Onomasticon Thracicum : répertoire des noms indigènes de Thrace, Macédoine Orientale, Mésies, Dacie et Bithynie*, Athens.
- Dana, Dan (2015), „Inscriptions“, in: Juli Valeva / Emil Nankov / Denver Graninger (eds.), *A Companion to Ancient Thrace*, Malden (Massachusetts)-Oxford, 243-264.
- Dana, Dan (2017), „Hellénisation par suffixation: noms non grecs et suffixes grecs“, in: Alcorac Alonso *et al.* (eds.), *La suffixation des anthroponymes grecs antiques (saga)*. Actes du colloque international de Lyon, 17-19 septembre 2015, Université Jean-Moulin-Lyon 3, Genève, 201-223.
- Del Barrio = Del Barrio Vega, M^a Luisa (2014), „Ionic“, in: Georgios K. Giannakis *et al.* (eds), *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek language and Linguistics*, vol. 2, Leiden-Boston, 260-267.
- Del Barrio Vega, M^a Luisa (2015), „Η ιωνική του βόρειου Αιγαίου (από τον Στρυμόνα μέχρι τον Έβρο“, in: Georgios K. Giannakis (ed.), *Ο γλωσσικός χάρτης της κεντρικής και βόρειας Ελλάδας κατά την αρχαιότητα*, Thessaloniki, 153-182.
- Del Barrio Vega, M^a Luisa (2018a), „The Ionic of North Aegean (from the River Strymon to the River Hebrus)“, in: Georgios K. Giannakis / Emilio Crespo / Panayotis Filos (eds.),

Studies in Ancient Greek dialects. From Central Greece to the Black Sea, Berlin-Boston, 473-510.

Del Barrio Vega, M^a Luisa (2018b), „The Greek Language in the Black Sea“, in: Georgios. K. Giannakis / Emilio Crespo / Panayotis Filos (eds.), *Studies in Ancient Greek dialects. From Central Greece to the Black Sea*, Berlin-Boston, 511-530.

Detschew, Dimitar (1976), *Die thrakischen Sprachreste, mit Bibliographie 1955-1974 von Živka Velkova*, Vienne.

Dubois, Laurent (2017), „Des noms en -ᾶς“, in: Alcorac Alonso *et al.* (eds.), *La suffixation des anthroponymes grecs antiques (saga)*. Actes du colloque international de Lyon, 17-19 septembre 2015, Université Jean-Moulin-Lyon 3, Genève, 299-332.

Flensted-Jensen, Pernille (2004), „Thrace from Axios to Strymon to Nestos“, in: Mogens H. Hansen / Thomas H. Nielsen (eds.), *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*, Oxford, 810-853.

Fournier, Julien / Hamon, Patrice / Parissaki, Maria-Gabriella (2015), „Recent Epigraphic Research in Thasos, Aegean Thrace & Samothrace (2005-2015)“, in: *Archaeological Reports* 61, 75-93.

Guijarro Ruano, Paloma (2019), „The Northern Coast of the Aegean Sea: A Linguistic Overview“, in: *Linguarum Varietas* 8, 63-83.

Guijarro Ruano, Paloma (forthcoming), „Onomastics and Linguistic contact in the Greek Colonies of Aegean Thrace“, in: A. Alonso *et al.* (eds.), *Contacts linguistiques en Grèce ancienne : diachronie et synchronie*. Actes du colloque international Coliga (7-9 avril 2021), Lyon.

Hălmagi, Dragoș (2015), „Dan Dana, Onomasticon Thracicum. Répertoire des noms indigènes de Thrace, Macédoine Orientale, Mésies, Dacie et Bithynie“, in: *Studia Antiqua et Archaeologica* 21, 2, 259-271.

Hatzopoulos, M. (2013), „Τὰ τῶν ἐμποριῶν φιλόπρωπα: Observations on the Pistiros Inscription (SEG XLIII 486)“, in: P. Martzavou / N. Papazardakas (eds.), *Epigraphical Approaches to the Postclassical Polis : 4th Century BC to 2nd Century AD*, New York.

Horrocks, Geoffrey (2010)², *Greek: a History of the Language and its Speakers*, Oxford; Malden (Massachusetts).

I.Thrace orientale byz. = Asdracha, Catherine (2003), *Inscriptions protobyzantines et byzantines de la Thrace orientale et de l'île d'Imbros (IIIe-XVe siècles) : présentation et commentaire historique*, Athens.

I.Thrake Aeg. = Loukopoulou, Louiza D. / Parissaki, Maria-Gabriella / Psoma, Selene, Zournatzi, Antigoni (2005), *Ἐπιγραφές τῆς Θράκης τοῦ Αἰγαίου μεταξύ τῶν ποταμῶν Νέστου καὶ Ἑβρου (Νομοὶ Ξάνθης, Ροδόπης καὶ Ἑβρου)*, Athens.

Kaczko, Sara (2016), „Il giambo“, in: Albio C. Cassio (ed.), *Storia delle lingue letterarie*, Milano, 289-304.

Knitl, Elisabeth (1938), *Die Sprache der ionischen Kykladen nach den inschriftlichen Quellen*, München.

LGN IV = Fraser, Peter Marshall / Matthews, Elaine / Catling, Richard W. V. (2005), *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names IV: Macedonia, Thrace, Northern Regions of the Black Sea*, Oxford.

López Eire, Antonio (1993), „De l’attique à la koiné“, in: Claude Brixhe (ed.), *La koinè grecque antique: I. Une langue introuvable?*, Nancy, 41-57.

López Eire, Antonio (1996). „L'influence de l'ionien-attique sur les autres dialectes épigraphiques et l'origine de la koiné“, in: Claude Brixhe (éd.), *La koiné grecque antique. II La concurrence*, Nancy, 7-42.

Loukopoulou, Louisa D. (2004a), „Thrace from Strymon to Nestos“, in: Mogens H. Hansen / Thomas H. Nielsen (eds.), *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*, Oxford, 854-869.

Loukopoulou, Louisa. D. (2004b), „Thrace from Nestos to Hebros“, in: Mogens H. Hansen / Thomas H. Nielsen (eds.), *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*, Oxford, 870-884.

Loukopoulou, Louisa and Psoma, Selene (2008), „Maroneia and Stryme Revisited: Some Problems of Historical Topography,“ in: Louisa Loukopoulou / Selene Psoma (eds.), *Thrakika Zetemata I (Meletemata 58)*, Athens, 55–86.

Masson, Olivier (1984), „Quelques noms de magistrats monétaires grecs“, in: *Revue de Numismatique* 6 (24), 48-60 [= *OGS II*, 427-439].

- May, John Maunsell M. (1966), *The coinage of Abdera (540-345 B.C.)*, London.
- Méndez Dosuna, Julián (1993), „Metátesis de cantidad en jónico-ático y heracleota“, in: *Emerita* 61, 95-134.
- Nieto Izquierdo, Enrique (2009), *Gramática de las inscripciones de la Argólide*, Tesis doctoral inédita, Madrid.
- Panayotou, Anna (1998), „L’Atticisation de la Macédoine: l’une des sources de la koine“, in: *Verbum* 11, 245-260.
- Panayotou, Anna (2007), „Greek and Thracian“, in: Anastasios-Phoibos Christidis (ed.), *A History of Ancient Greek. From the Beginnings to Late Antiquity*, Cambridge, 745-775.
- Parissaki, Maria-Gabriella (2007), *Prosopography and Onomasticon of Aegean Thrace*, Paris.
- Pouilloux, Jean (1954), *Recherches sur l’histoire et les cultes de Thasos. I: de la fondation de la cité à 196 avant J.-C.*, Paris.
- Psoma, Selene / Karadima, Chryssa / Terzopoulou, Domna (2008), *The Coins from Maroneia and the Classical City at Molyvoti: A Contribution to the History of Aegean Thrace*, Athens.
- Schönert-Geiss, Edith (1987), *Griechisches Münzwerk: Die Münzprägung von Maroneia*, 2 vols, Berlin.
- Schulze, Wilhem (1893), „Koseformen im Griechischen“, in: *ZVS* 32, 195-197 (= *Kleine Schriften* 1966, 310-312).
- Schulze, Wilhem (1924), „Zur Bildung des Vokativs im Griechischen und im Lateinischen“, in: *Αντιδόρον. Festschrift J. Wackernagel*, Göttingen, 240-254 (= *Kleine Schriften* 1966, 82-96).
- Slavova, Mirena (2009) „The Greek Language on the Bulgarian Coast of the Black Sea in Antiquity (6th cent. BC -1st cent. BC)“, in: Guy Vottéro (ed.), *Le grec du monde colonial Antique: Le N. et N.-O. de la Mer Noire. Actes de la table Ronde de Nancy, 28-29 septembre 2007*, Nancy, 195-220.
- Sowa, Wojciech (2020) „Thracian“, in: *Palaeohispanica. Revista sobre lenguas y culturas de la Hispania Antigua* 20, 787-817.

- Stüber, Karin (1996), *Zur dialektalen Einheit des Ostionischen*, Innsbruck.
- Teodorsson, Sven-Tage (2014), „Attic“, in: Georgios K. Giannakis *et al.* (eds), *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek language and Linguistics*, vol. 1, Leiden-Boston, 194-195.
- Threatte, Leslie (1980), *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions 1: Phonology*, Berlin.
- Thonemann, Peter J. (2006), „Loukopoulou, L. D., Parissaki, M. G., Psoma, S. & Zournatzi, A. (2005), Ἐπιγραφὲς τῆς Θράκης τοῦ Αἰγαίου μεταξὺ τῶν ποταμῶν Νέστου καὶ Ἐβρου (Νομοὶ Ξάνθης, Ροδόπης καὶ Ἐβρου), Αθήνα“, in: *CIR* 56, 2, 458-459.
- Thumb, Albert / Scherer, Anton (1959), *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte*, vol. 2 (2nd ed. by A. Scherer), Heidelberg.
- Tokhasiev, Serguei R. (2009), „De nouvelles données sur l’histoire des formes les plus anciennes de la koiné dans le nord de la Mer Noire“, in: Guy Vottéro (ed.), *Le grec du monde colonial Antique: Le N. et N.-O. de la Mer Noire*. Actes de la table Ronde de Nancy, 28-29 septembre 2007, Nancy, 33-49.
- Tzitzilis, Christidis (2014), „Greek and Thracian“, in: Georgios K. Giannakis *et al.* (eds), *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek language and Linguistics*, vol. 2, Leiden-Boston, 83-89.
- Velkov, Velizar / Domaradzka, Lidia (1999), „Kotys I (383/382–359 av. J.-C.) et l’emporion Pistiros de Thrace“, in: *BCH* 118, 1–15.
- Vessella, Carlo (2016) „La prosa“, in: Albio C. Cassio (ed.), *Storia delle lingue letterarie*, Milano, 354-384.
- Yanakieva, Svetlana (2018) „The Thracian Language“, in: *ORPHEUS. Journal of Indo-European and Thracian Studies* 25, 26-68.