Classical Quarterly 62.2 441–465 (2012) Printed in Great Britain
doi: 10.1017/S0009838812000055

SIBLING TERMINOLOGY IN HOMER: PROBLEMS WITH *ΚΑΣΙΓΝΗΤΟΣ* AND *ΑΔΕΛΦΕΟΣ**

How often have I said to you that when you have eliminated the impossible, whatever remains, *however improbable*, must be the truth?
(Sherlock Holmes, in *The Sign of the Four*)

Homeric Greek has two sibling terms: (1) κασίγνητος/-η, a general term for any sibling; (2) ἀδελφεός, a male ego's male sibling. The restriction of ἀδελφεός to male ego – that is, the fact that in Homer only males ever have an ἀδελφεός – appears not to have been previously noticed. This overlap requires explanation.

The problem is an anthropological one, to do with kinship categories, but the solution proposed here is primarily linguistic. It is already known that ἀδελφεός was originally adjectival, and represents a trace of the unattested collocation *φράτηρ ἀδελφεός 'uterine brother'.[1] The key to the problem, in a nutshell, is that ἀδελφεός in Homer is an archaism. This is contrary to what one might expect; in later times, κασίγνητος was the term that carried connotations of archaism and elevated language, while ἀδελφ(ε)ός was the term used in everyday language.

There are many competing interpretations to consider that, on the face of it, look more likely than the actual solution. In addition, there is a great deal of data concerning the usage of both terms to consider. The following argument, therefore, relies partly on a process of exclusion, as well as on positive evidence. Supporting evidence will emerge only in the course of reviewing and rejecting other hypotheses.

Part 1 of the paper outlines the central problem: that Homeric terms for siblings overlap in an unusual and uneconomical way. (Here 'uneconomical' has nothing to do with metrical formulae, but refers to the economy of kin categories; see below.) It therefore seems that there ought to be some factor that makes the cost of this system worthwhile. Part 2 shows that all obvious candidates for such a factor – including the possibility of mere coincidence – may be rejected with great confidence. Part 3 reviews linguistic evidence relating to both terms. Finally, Part 4 suggests a solution and outlines some ramifications.

* I am indebted to David Rosenbloom and an anonymous reader for *CQ* for many useful comments and recommendations on an earlier version of this paper; and to Margalit Finkelberg for prompting me to investigate the topic in the first place. All faults are my own.

[1] See especially J.-L. Perpillou, 'Frères de sang ou frères de culte?', *SMEA* 25 (1984), 205–20. Some details of Perpillou's argument are discussed in n. 45, below. Also repeatedly cited below are M. Lejeune, 'Hittite kati-, grec κασι-', *BSL* 55 (1960), 20–6; V. Pisani, 'Hom. κασίγνητος, kypr. κάς und Verwandtes', *ZVS* 77 (1961), 246–51; J. Gonda, 'Gr. ἀδελφός', *Mnemosyne* 15 (1962), 390–2; H.P. Gates, *The Kinship Terminology of Homeric Greek* (Baltimore, 1971); O. Szemerényi, 'Studies in the kinship terminology of the Indo-European languages', *Acta Iranica* 16 = 3e série 7 (1977), 1–240; W. Donlan, 'The social groups of Dark Age Greece', *CPh* 80 (1985), 293–308; P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque* (Paris, 2009[2]).

1. THE PROBLEM

In early Greek hexameter *κασίγνητος*/*-η* may refer to any sibling of anyone; but *ἀδελφεός* only ever refers to a male sibling of a male ego.[2] 'Ego' in this context refers to the person from whose perspective the relationship is expressed: if the *Iliad* refers to Agamemnon as the brother of Menelaus, Menelaus is 'ego'. Henceforth the terms are abbreviated as *κ.* and *ἀ.*, and relationships between specific individuals are expressed as 'ego-sibling', for example 'Menelaus–Agamemnon' means Menelaus = ego, Agamemnon = sibling.

Table 1 shows occurrences of both terms in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. Occurrences of the compound *αὐτοκασίγνητος* 'sibling sharing both parents' are indicated in round parentheses, so for example there are 57 occurrences of *κ.*, plus 7 occurrences of *αὐτοκ.*, for a total of 64. No compounds of *ἀ.* are attested. The distribution for *κ.* is fairly consistent with what we would expect, based on the proportion of male to female characters in Homer: the ratio of brothers to sisters is 4.82:1 for *κ.* (or 6.64:1 for *κ.* and *ἀ.* combined), and the ratio of male ego to female ego is 3.00:1 for *κ.* (4.25:1 for both terms). But *ἀ.*, although it appears 20 times, appears in only one of the four possible combinations.

TABLE 1. OCCURRENCES OF *ΚΑΣΊΓΝΗΤΟΣ* AND *ἈΔΕΛΦΕ͂ΟΣ* IN THE *ILIAD* AND *ODYSSEY*

	Male Sibling *κασίγνητος*	Female Sibling *κασιγνήτη*	Total	Male Sibling *ἀδελφεός*	Female Sibling *ἀδελφεή*	Total
Male ego	37 (3)	7 (1)	44 (4)	20	0	20
Female ego	10 (3)	3 (0)	13 (3)	0	0	0
Total	47 (6)	10 (1)	57 (7)	20	0	20

As Table 1 indicates, in Homeric Greek *κ.* is the more commonly attested sibling term. In Classical Attic, however, *ἀ.* comes to be the sole term for all siblings, varying in grammatical gender as *κ.* does in Homer; by the Classical Period *κ.* appears only in poetic and archaic contexts (see Part 3, below).

Duplication of terms is not in itself unusual in the Homeric kinship system. Homeric Greek has a much greater variety of terms for lineal and co-lineal kin than Classical Attic, as is illustrated by the standard existing survey of Homeric kinship terminology, that of Gates.[3] This is in spite of the fact that Attic kinship terms are much better attested. In Homer, multiple terms for son and daughter also exist: alongside *υἱός* 'son' and *θυγάτηρ* 'daughter' we find *κοῦρος*, *πάϊς*, *τέκος* and *τέκνον*, all 'child'.[4] The most striking cases of duplication are the terms for

[2] A third term, *γνωτός* 'acknowledged', is also used of siblings, but is not in itself a sibling term and is glossed as one by ancient lexicographers incorrectly. See Gates (n. 1), 26–7; cf. *γνήσιος* 'legitimate, lawful', used of sons, and the *-γνητος* element in *κασίγνητος* (see further Part 3, below).

[3] Gates (n. 1). An earlier survey, M. Miller, 'Greek kinship terminology', *JHS* 73 (1953), 46–52, is unsatisfactory in many respects; Gates, 61–3, offers a stern critique.

[4] See Gates (n. 1), 5–10 on parent terms and 11–14 for children. As Gates illustrates, *κοῦρος* and *πάϊς* are used in both kin- and non-kin senses under various circumstances.

'husband' and 'wife'. Where Attic Greek has only one regularly used term for each of these (*ἀνήρ* and *γυνή* respectively), in Homer Gates discusses four terms for 'husband' and six for 'wife':[5] for 'husband' *πόσις* (29×), *ἀνήρ* (17×),[6] *ἀκοίτης* (3×) and *παρακοίτης* (2×); for 'wife' *ἄλοχος* (109×), *γυνή* (58×),[7] *ἄκοιτις* (23×), *παράκοιτις* (17×), *δάμαρ* (5×) and *ὄαρ* (2×). We may also note the regular use of the adjective *κουρίδιος*/*-η* 'wedded, lawfully wedded' (18×), including one use as a substantive (*Od.* 15.22). For the most part, these duplicate terms are not clearly distinguished in meaning. There are exceptions: Gates argues that (*παρ*)*άκοιτης*/*-ις* are not kin terms as such, but refer to the type of relationship that exists between an individual and his/her spouse, namely 'bedmate, lover' rather than 'husband' or 'wife'.

This proliferation of terms is most simply explained by the way in which early Greek epic concatenates traditions from multiple periods and regions. Epic language is traditional, and as a result has absorbed phrases and words from various dialects and poetic traditions. Most of the above terms die out in later Greek except as poetic archaisms. In the case of *κ.* and *ἀ.*, Gates agrees with an ancient scholion that *κ.* is a classificatory term in Ionic ('kinsman') but descriptive in Aeolic and Achaean ('brother').[8] However, this does not clarify the division of labour between the two terms within Homer.

All this is to say: it is not the mere fact of duplication that is the problem with sibling terms. Rather, the problem lies in the nature of the overlap. Gates already noted that while *κ.* is regularly used for any sibling, *ἀ.* is only ever used of male siblings in Homer;[9] but as we have seen, it is even more specific than that: only males ever have an *ἀ.*

The nature of the problem is most precisely explained in anthropological terms. The overlap of *κ.* and *ἀ.* avoids the cost of disjunctivity, but at the price of economy. In virtually all languages, sibling terms are organized conjunctively. A conjunctive system is one where a category of siblings is defined by the presence of one attribute, or joint presence of multiple attributes. A system where a category is defined by the *absence* of attributes is disjunctive: for example, a sibling category defined as *male sibling of a male ego* is conjunctive, but the complementary term for 'all other siblings' – that is, *either a female sibling, or any sibling of a female ego* – would be disjunctive.[10]

Languages typically use three criteria for drawing binary distinctions between siblings: [I] gender of sibling; [II] relative gender (that is, whether the sibling is the same sex as ego or not); and [III] relative age of sibling.[11] In discussing such

[5] See Gates (n. 1), 16–19 on spouse terms.

[6] This represents the number of times that *ἀνήρ* requires the meaning 'husband' rather than 'man'; the count is Gates's (n. 1), 19, based on J. Latacz, *LfgrE* s.v. *ἀνήρ*.

[7] Gates (n. 1), 17: 'Out of 263 occurrences of *gunḗ*, 58 probably call for the meaning "wife".'

[8] Gates (n. 1), 16, referring to *Σ* bT on *Il.* 15.545; cf. Hdt. 1.171.6, 4.104.3. Part 3, below, rejects the thesis that *κ.* was classificatory in Ionic; or more precisely, that *κ.* was ever a kin term in spoken Ionic.

[9] See Gates (n. 1), 14–16 on sibling terms.

[10] S. Nerlove and A.K. Romney, 'Sibling terminology and cross-sex behavior', *American Anthropologist* 69 (1967), 179–87 is a seminal discussion of the importance of conjunctivity, highlighting the fact that conjunctive systems are more cognitively efficient and 'easier'. For more recent linguistic treatment of PIE kinship terminology see Szemerényi (n. 1); for an anthropological treatment see G.V. Dziebel, *The Genius of Kinship* (Youngstown, NY, 2007), 255–85.

[11] 'Relative gender' sounds as if it ought to be interchangeable with 'gender of ego', but it is not. Nerlove and Romney (n. 10) note that, with three distinctions, a sibling typology with up to

systems it is customary to adopt a system of abbreviations to avoid confusion: the abbreviations followed here are B = 'male sibling', Z = 'female sibling', Si = 'sibling of either sex'; mB = 'male ego's brother', foSi = 'female ego's older sibling of either sex', ayZ = 'any ego's younger sister'; and so on.

Some languages make no distinction between siblings at all: that is to say, they have only one sibling term, perhaps varying in grammatical gender. Examples of this are Greek of the Classical Period (*ἀδελφός*/-*ή*) and Spanish (*hermano*/-*a*). Both terms are adjectival in origin. Many European languages employ one distinction, [I] gender of sibling, and so have terms for B and Z (Eng. *brother*, *sister*; Rus. *брат*, *сестра*; Rom. *frate, soră*). Other languages use two distinctions, thereby having four sibling terms. Hungarian distinguishes by [I] gender of sibling and [III] relative age, with terms for oB (*báty*), oZ (*nővér*), yB (*öcs*) and yZ (*hug*); Basque by [I] gender of sibling and [II] relative gender, with terms for mB (*anaia*), mZ (*arreba*), fB (*neba*) and fZ (*ahizpa*). Some languages use two or more of these criteria but do not have a separate term for every possible combination. For example, Turkish distinguishes by [III] age of sibling but, while older siblings are further distinguished by [I] gender of sibling (oB *ağabey*, oZ *abla*), there is only one term for all younger siblings (ySi *kardeş*). In Polynesian languages all three criteria are used, with [II] relative gender as the primary distinction; if the sibling is the same gender as ego, there is a secondary distinction by [III] relative age, but if the sibling is the opposite sex the secondary distinction is [I] gender; thus the terms available are moB/foZ (for example, Māori *tuākana*), myB/fyZ (*tāina*), fB (*tungāne*) and mZ (*tuāhine*).

All of these systems are conjunctive. Furthermore, they are economical: there are few redundancies, so that for any given combination of criteria it is possible to know exactly which sibling term applies.

When redundancy occurs, it is an anomaly that requires explanation. For example, in Māori, in addition to the four terms outlined above, there is also an English loanword *parata* 'brother' (aB). In that case, the explanation is very easy to find: it is the dominance of the English language in New Zealand education and culture. In such cases conjunctivity tends to override economy. Kronenfeld notes another case in Ghana, among the Fanti, who have two overlapping terms: one for mZ, and another for aSi. The explanatory factor is again socio-cultural, in this case an inheritance mechanism from a male ego to his sister's children: the mechanism establishes a special relationship between a male ego and his sister. But as Kronenfeld points out, even that redundancy is not enough to push the Fanti to economize the system by having one term for mZ and another for fZ/mB/fB: the latter term would violate conjunctivity.[12]

The Homeric case is similar to that of the Fanti, being conjunctive at the expense of economy. In a more economical division, where *ἀ.* = mB and *κ.* = fZ/

eight terms is possible; therefore, there is a total of 4140 possible typologies for distinguishing between these terms. They bring this figure down to just twelve, a figure that agrees well with their empirical data, by adopting a set of careful assumptions, among which are (1) the exclusion of disjunctive systems, on the principle that they are cognitively costly and therefore rare; (2) abandoning 'gender of ego' in favour of 'relative gender'. For example, Polynesian sibling terminology (outlined below) would be disjunctive if analysed in terms of 'gender of ego', but in terms of 'relative gender' it is neatly conjunctive.

[12] D.B. Kronenfeld, 'Sibling typology: beyond Nerlove and Romney', *American Ethnologist* 1 (1974), 489–506, at 500–1.

TABLE 2. ATTESTATIONS OF *ΚΑΣΊΓΝΗΤΟΣ* AND *ἈΔΕΛΦΕ͂ΟΣ* IN TEXTS OF THE ARCHAIC PERIOD

	κασίγνητος/-η					*ἀδελφ(ε)ός/-ή*				
	Brother		Sister			Brother		Sister		
	mB	fB	mZ	fZ	Total	mB	fB	mZ	fZ	Total
Homer, *κ.*	37	10	7	3	57					
Homer, *αὐτοκ.*	3	3	1	0	7					
Homer, total	**40**	**13**	**8**	**3**	**64**	**20**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**20**
Other hexameter, *κ.*	11	2	3	0	16					
Other hexameter, *αὐτοκ.*	3	1	1	0	5					
Other hexameter, total	**14**	**3**	**4**	**0**	**21**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Elegy	2	0	0	0	**2**	1	0	0	0	**1**
Lyric/iambic	4(?)	1	1	1(?)	7	0	0	2(?)	2	4
Lyric/iambic, uncertain/other					3					1
Lyric/iambic, total					**10**					**5**

mZ/fB, *κ.* would be disjunctive. Unlike the Māori and Fanti cases, however, the explanatory factor for the redundancy is difficult to find. It is important to realize that this duplication is different *in kind* from the duplication we find in other Homeric kin terms. In a case such as the six terms for 'wife', the duplication is total: each term is entirely interchangeable with the others. If *κ.* and *ἀ.* were used in approximately similar ways in Homer, it would be easy to regard them as just another simple duplication. As it is, we have a problem.

Table 2 presents a fuller account of sibling terminology in early Greek. The table does not list attestations of either term in prose texts. Very little prose from the Archaic period survives except in testimonia and paraphrases, which consistently use Attic/*koinē* and are therefore useless for our purposes. Of prose earlier than 500 that does survive, *κ.* appears only in two or three inscriptions in the Cypriot syllabary; and *ἀ.* in three prose inscriptions dating to the latter half of the sixth century.[13] Table 2 does not include occurrences of the compounds *πατροκασίγνητος* 'father's brother' and *ματροκασίγνητος* 'mother's brother', since these are not sibling terms;[14] and it does not list compounds of *ἀ.*, as none are used in Archaic verse. Attestations of *κ.* in 'other hexameter' refer to attestations in both complete and fragmentary poetic texts, and in two Archaic inscriptions.[15] Attestations of *κ.* and *ἀ.* in 'elegy' refer to hexameter lines (there are no attestations in pentameters);

[13] *κ.*: *ICS* 103, 164 (both sixth century), and possibly 153 (sixth to fourth century). *ἀ.*: *IG* 1³.1210 and 1265 (both Attic, 540–530), and *IGDOlbia* 23 (Ionic, second half of sixth century). All citations of inscriptions may be found in Packard Humanities Institute, 'Greek epigraphy', http://epigraphy.packhum.org (retrieved 17 Mar. 2010).

[14] *πατροκ.* appears in the Archaic period in: *Il.* 21.469; *Od.* 6.330, 13.342; *Theog.* 501; and *h.Cer.* 31. *ματροκ.* appears in *IG* 12 suppl. 180 (Sikinos, sixth century).

[15] Full references are: *h.Ven.* 135; *h.Cer.* 80, 85, 364; *h.Merc.* 539; *h.Bacch.* 31; *h.Hom.* 27.13; Hes. *Theog.* 756; *Op.* 184, 328, 371, 707; [*Sc.*] 17, 50 (= *Cat.* fr. 195.24, 57 M–W); *Cat.* fr. 37.5, fr. 197.5; *Cat.Peir.* fr. 280.15, 18, 21 M–W; *Inscr. Delos* 2 (Delos, mid-seventh century); *IG* 9.1.867.6 (Corcyra, late seventh century).

'lyric/iambic' refers to attestations of the terms in non-hexameter poets.[16] 'Uncertain' attestations represent fragmentary texts where the identities, and therefore genders, of the siblings are unclear.

The distribution of uses of κ. shown in Table 2 is again consistent with what we would expect, based on the proportion of male to female characters in Greek verse. When we look at the figures for ἀ., however, some additional problems emerge. First is the problem with which we began, that in Homer ἀ. is only ever used for mB.

A second problem is this: why does ἀ. scarcely appear at all in the corpus of non-Homeric hexameter? We find one use of ἀ. in elegy, in the 'new Archilochus' fragment published in 2005, which matches Homeric usage and, being Archilochus, is very early; but that is the only non-Homeric use in hexameter. This cannot be explained by small sample size: non-Homeric hexameter is approximately a quarter the size of the Homeric corpus, and we do have 21 occurrences of κ. in the same corpus. The absence of ἀ. is especially counter-intuitive given that it went on to become the standard term for all siblings in later Greek. It shows, at any rate, that we cannot solve our problem by supposing that κ. is the older term and ἀ. the newer one, since we should then expect to find a smaller proportion of ἀ. in Homer, the older corpus.[17] Instead, we have a new problem.

Third: why is the use of ἀ. so clearly circumscribed in Homer (and Archilochus), but not in lyric? In lyric, ἀ. is attested for two of the four possible gender combinations, and presumably could be attested in all four combinations if more lyric verse survived. This Homeric–lyric divide suggests a metrical solution to our first problem, above. The metrical solution will be duly considered – and rejected – below.

The main distinction between the two terms, outside Homer, has always been that κ. belongs to elevated language and epic, while ἀ. belongs to the language of prose. For example, Aristophanes uses κ. once only, and that in a passage parodying high tragedy (*Thesm*. 900); verse inscriptions use a mix of both terms, while prose inscriptions (except for the Cypriot syllabary) invariably use ἀ. This simple distinction neatly explains the second and third problems, why non-Homeric hexameter uses κ. exclusively, and why iambic and lyric poetry use both terms. However, it leaves unanswered the more central questions of why the *Iliad* uses ἀ. as much as it does, and why it is used only for mB. (The solution proposed in Part 4 solves these problems by turning this distinction on its head and concluding that ἀ. is the more archaic term; but, since that is a counter-intuitive hypothesis, I do not wish to draw on it yet, for fear of begging the question.)

[16] Elegy: κ. at Thgn. Eleg. 1.99 = 1.1164c Young; [Simon.] Epigr. 73 Page; ἀ. in the 'new Archilochus', *P Oxy*. 4708^{v}.14. Lyric/iambic: κ. (mB) at Alc. frr. 283.12, 5.1a.11(?) *PMG*/Voigt; Archil. frr. 89.11(?), 89.23(?) West; κ. (fB) Sappho fr. 5.2 *PMG*/Voigt; κ. (mZ) Sappho fr. 5.9; κ. (fZ) Alcm. fr. 5.1a.10(?) *PMG*; κ. (other) Hipponax frr. 48, 103.10, 144 W (all Hipponax attestations refer to inanimate objects, and genders are doubtful in two cases). References for ἀ. in lyric/iambic are given in Table 3, below. I omit *P Oxy*. 670.10 ἀδελ[, which some assign to the major *Hymn to Dionysus*, as there is little likelihood that the papyrus text is pre-Hellenistic; see A. Faulkner, 'The *Homeric Hymn to Dionysus*: P.Oxy. 670', *ZPE* 172 (2010), 1–2.

[17] Although early epics seem to be largely traditional, the study of R. Janko, *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns* (Cambridge, 1982) indicates that there is at least some sense in which the Homeric epics are linguistically earlier than most other hexameter. Linguistic dating does not necessarily have a bearing on the dating of mythical content, but the latter does not directly concern us here.

Table 3 presents fuller details of the attestations of *ἀ.* in Archaic verse. The discussion in Part 2, below, will refer back to Table 3 several times. One point that may be noted straight away is that in the *Odyssey* *ἀδελφεός* appears only in Book 4. A similar table for *κ.* is omitted as it would take too much space (though I have drawn up such a table).

But before the possible solutions are considered in detail, we have one final curiosity – if not an actual problem – to note. Pairs of brothers in Homer tend to be either *ἀδελφεοί* or *κασίγνητοι*, but not generally both, as Table 4 shows. In

TABLE 3. ATTESTATIONS OF *ΑΔΕΛΦΕΌΣ* IN HOMER, ARCHILOCHUS AND ARCHAIC LYRIC

	Ego	*ἀδελφεός*	Context	Full-/Half-brother
Il. 2.409	Agamemnon	Menelaus	*ᾔδεε γὰρ κατὰ θυμὸν ἀδελφεὸν ὡς ἐπονεῖτο.*	full
2.586	Agamemnon	Menelaus	*τῶν οἱ ἀδελφεὸς ἦρχε βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Μενέλαος*	full
5.21	Idaeus	Phegeus	*οὐδ' ἔτλη περιβῆναι ἀδελφειοῦ κταμένοιο·*	unknown
6.61	Agamemnon	Menelaus	*ὣς εἰπὼν ἔτρεψεν ἀδελφειοῦ φρένας ἦρως*	full
6.515	Paris	Hector	*Ἕκτορα δῖον ἔτετμεν ἀδελφεὸν εὖτ' ἄρ' ἔμελλε*	full
7.2	Hector	Paris	*τῷ δ' ἄμ' Ἀλέξανδρος κἹ ἀδελφεός· ἐν δ' ἄρα θυμῷ*	full
7.120	Agamemnon	Menelaus	*ὣς εἰπὼν παρέπεισεν ἀδελφειοῦ φρένας ἦρως*	full
8.318	Hector	Cebriones	*Κεβριόνην δ' ἐκέλευσεν ἀδελφεὸν ἐγγὺς ἐόντα*	agnatic
10.32	Menelaus	Agamemnon	*βῆ δ' ἴμεν ἀνστήσων ὃν ἀδελφεόν, ὃς μέγα πάντων*	full
10.72	Agamemnon	Menelaus	*ὣς εἰπὼν ἀπέπεμπεν ἀδελφεὸν εὖ ἐπιτείλας·*	full
13.695	Ajax O.	Medon	*ἔσκε Μέδων Αἴαντος ἀδελφεός· αὐτὰρ ἔναιεν*	agnatic
13.788	Paris	Hector	*ὣς εἰπὼν παρέπεισεν ἀδελφειοῦ φρένας ἦρως·*	full
15.187	Poseidon, Zeus, Hades		*τρεῖς γάρ τ' ἐκ Κρόνου εἰμὲν ἀδελφεοὶ οὓς τέκετο Ῥέα*	full
15.334	Ajax O.	Medon	*ἔσκε Μέδων Αἴαντος ἀδελφεός· αὐτὰρ ἔναιεν*	agnatic
23.608	Antilochus	Thrasymedes?	*σός τε πατὴρ ἀγαθὸς καὶ ἀδελφεὸς εἵνεκ' ἐμεῖο·*	full
24.736	indefinite	indefinite	*χωόμενος, ᾧ δή που ἀδελφεὸν ἔκτανεν Ἕκτωρ*	indefinite
Od. 4.92	Menelaus	Agamemnon	*ἠλώμην, τεῖός μοι ἀδελφεὸν ἄλλος ἔπεφνε*	full
4.199	Pisistratus	Antilochus	*καὶ γὰρ ἐμὸς τέθνηκεν ἀδελφεός, οὔ τι κάκιστος*	full
4.225	indefinite	indefinite	*οὐδ' εἴ οἱ προπάροιθεν ἀδελφεὸν ἢ φίλον υἱὸν*	indefinite
4.512	Menelaus	Agamemnon	*σὸς δέ που ἔκφυγε κῆρας ἀδελφεὸς ἠδ' ὑπάλυξεν*	full
Archil., *P Oxy.* 4708^{v}.14	gods	mortals	*παῖδές τ' ἀθανάτων κ̣α̣ὶ̣ ἀδελφεο̣ί̣,* [*οὓς Ἀγαμέμνων*	agnatic

Lyric/iambic:

	Ego	*ἀδελφεός*	Context
Sappho fr. 99.i.20 Voigt	Apollo? (m.)	Artemis? (f.)	*κ̣α̣*[...]*ε̣να̣*[.]*φο.*[...]*ν.*<u>*αδελφέαν*</u>
Alcaeus fr. 98.1 Voigt	uncertain	uncertain	[...] | <u>*ἀ*]*δελφέωι*</u>[...
Alcaeus fr. 364.2	Poverty (f.)	Hardship (f.)	*Πενία … ἀ …* *δάμναι λάον Ἀμαχανίαι σὺν* <u>*ἀδελφέαι*</u>
Iamb. adesp. 35.13 W	indefinite (m.)	indefinite (f.)	*ἀλλ' οὐδέ*]*πω τις ἄλλος οὔτε μητέρα*[... *προδοὺς*] *μέγ' εὗρε κέρδος οὐδ'* <u>*ἀδελφ*[*εήν*</u>*.*
Alcman fr. 64.1 *PMG*	Law, Persuasion (f.)	Fortune (f.)	*Εὐνομίας* <*τε*> *καὶ Πειθῶς* <u>*ἀδελφὰ*</u>

TABLE 4. PARTIAL LIST OF *ἈΔΕΛΦΕΟΙ* AND *ΚΑΣΙΓΝΗΤΟΙ* IN HOMER

	ἀδελφεός	*κασίγνητος*
Agamemnon + Menelaus	7×	1×
Hector + Paris	3×	—
Ajax Oileides + Medon	2×	—
Antilochus + Pisistratus	1×	—
Ajax Telamonides + Teucer	—	4×
Hector + Helenus	—	2×
Antilochus + Thrasymedes	(1×? *Il.* 23.608)	1×
Pisistratus + Thrasymedes	—	1×

particular, a single individual may have some brothers who are *ἀδελφεοί* and others who are *κασίγνητοι*: Hector and Paris are *ἀδελφεοί*, but Hector and Helenus are *κασίγνητοι*. Nestor's sons are also striking, though there are fewer attestations: *ἀ.* is used of Pisistratus' brother Antilochus, but *κ.* is used of Thrasymedes; the relationship between Thrasymedes and Antilochus is that of *κ.* at *Iliad* 16.326, but appears to be that of *ἀ.* at *Iliad* 23.608 (though it is not certain that Thrasymedes is the brother meant there).

Agamemnon and Menelaus are the most frequently mentioned *ἀδελφεοί*, but also present the clearest exception to this division at *Iliad* 4.155, where Agamemnon addresses Menelaus as *φίλε κασίγνητε*. This may or may not represent a significant exception: *ἀ.* appears nowhere in the vocative, although it is metrically perfectly possible.[18] Outside Homer we find *κ.* used of Agamemnon-Menelaus again, at *Catalogue* fr. 197.5 M–W, but this is not significant, given that *ἀ.* is not attested in any other non-Homeric hexameter.

2. HYPOTHETICAL SOLUTIONS

When faced with a problem like this a linguist might perhaps think first of etymologies as a place to look for an explanation; an anthropologist might think of social structures; a Homerist, of metrical formulae. These are good models for the kinds of areas we should look in for hypothetical solutions. Various considerations suggest the following as the best candidates:

1. *Coincidence.* The distinction is not statistically significant.
2. *Metrical formulae.* The words are used differently because of formulae characteristic of the Homeric hexameter.
3. *Transitional change in vocabulary.* The appearance of *ἀ.* in Homer represents a transition from a supposedly older term, *κ.*, to a newer term.
4. *Parentage.* One of the two terms has a tendency to refer to half-brothers; alternatively, one of the two terms should be interpreted as a classificatory term, applying to cousins as well as siblings.
5. *Inheritance. ἀ.* indicates a mechanism of inheritance from ego to the children of the *ἀ.*, or alternatively a mechanism of inheritance from the previous generation.

[18] By contrast, *κ.* appears in the vocative 3× *Il.* (all masculine), 1× *Od.* (feminine); also 1× *h.Merc.* (masculine).

Other hypotheses that are based on the idea of one term having a specialized meaning are, in general, very weak ones. Here are a few, *exemplorum gratia*:

6. *Relative age (or status).* One of the two terms refers to an older (or younger) brother, or a brother with greater (or lesser) status.
7. *Closeness or sentiment.* ἀ. refers to brothers who have a particularly close relationship, or at least a particularly close empathy at the moment of utterance.
8. *Upbringing.* ἀ. refers to brothers that have been brought up separately (or together), and stresses that they are none the less related.
9. *Wooing.* One of the two terms refers to a brother who woos a wife on behalf of the other brother.

These, too, are assessed below; but these hypotheses are suggested only by *a priori* considerations, and there is very little evidence to support them.

Of these hypotheses, numbers 4 to 9 explore various ways of explaining the anomaly in terms of a distinction in meaning: they suppose that one term is general, while the other is more specialized. The following discussions, in rejecting these hypotheses, act as a kind of *reductio ad absurdum* argument: they show that the anomaly cannot be explained solely in terms of semantics.

Even if we could successfully demonstrate a hypothesis based on meaning, we would still be faced with the secondary questions of why ἀ. is avoided in other Archaic epic, and why both terms are used seemingly indiscriminately in lyric and iambic. A distinction based on register (κ. is epic, and ἀ. is prose) easily explains these secondary problems; but then that leaves the central question unexplained. It turns out that solving both sets of problems at once is challenging.

1. Coincidence

Pro. This first hypothesis is that there is, in fact, no problem at all. Gates already noticed that ἀ. only ever refers to brothers in Homer, and he was not troubled by the discrepancy; the gender of ego should not trouble us either.

Contra. If our 20 occurrences of ἀ. were a statistically representative sample, we should ideally expect them to include *c*. 13 occurrences of ἀδελφεός with male ego, about three with female ego, about three of ἀδελφε(ι)ή with male ego, and perhaps one occurrence of ἀδελφε(ι)ή with female ego. That one or perhaps even two of these permutations might not be represented could perhaps be explained as coincidence; but three out of four is asking too much. A possible explanation for the absence of two of the four permutations is that ἀδελφεή 'sister' is not easily accommodated in dactylic hexameter. However, three forms of ἀδελφεή could be accommodated by correption, the common metrical phenomenon of shortening a long vowel at word end when followed by a vowel in the next word, as we in fact find with ἀδελφεοί in *Iliad* 15.187 and, presumably, in the new Archilochus.[19] Moreover, any form of ἀδελφεή could be accommodated in

[19] We do not find later literary epics using ἀδελφεή by means of correption, but a few hexameter inscriptions do so: Dütschke, *Ant. Bildw. Oberitalien* 4.168, 399 (Attic; no date, but the presence of ἔ̆λ]ιπεμ φάος and ἐ̆ῶσαι points to the Classical Period), and two Roman-era inscriptions, *IGUR* 3.1226 and 1239.

hexameter by lengthening, viz. ἀδελφειή, as we actually find in the masculine ἀδελφειοῦ (*Il.* 5.21, 7.120, 13.788). There the lengthening of ε is a side effect of the contraction *-όο > -οῦ: the older form *ἀδελφεόο was perfectly metrical, but a rigidly regular hexameter could not tolerate *ἀδελφεοῦ.[20] There is nothing to stop the exact same process happening with ἀδελφεή; indeed we do find late poets using ἀδελφειή by analogy with ἀδελφειοῦ.[21] It would be arbitrary to accept correption of ἀδελφεοί and lengthening in ἀδελφειοῦ while denying these on principle for ἀδελφεή.

2. Metrical formulae

Pro. Parry himself considered that formulaic epithets carry no meaning of their own, but are purely rhythmic devices. The relative frequency of κ. and ἀ., and the near-complete absence of the latter term in non-Homeric hexameter, suggests that κ. is the most usual term, and that ἀ. is more closely connected to metrically specific situations. As Table 3 shows, 19 of the 20 occurrences of ἀ. are in the same metrical position, after a third-foot trochaic caesura. Some lines add an extra hemipes (ἀδελφειοῦ), but this is not significant as it is metrically necessary.

Contra. Words often gravitate to one metrical position in Homer, but that is certainly not the same thing as a metrical formula. In fact all of the occurrences of ἀ. in Homer are independent of one another except for four or perhaps five. Three (or four) are formulaic: *Iliad* 6.61 ≈ 7.120 = 13.788 (≈ 10.72, though this is more dissimilar). The formulaic lines are of the form ὣς εἰπὼν παρέπεισεν (or ἔτρεψεν) ἀδελφειοῦ φρένας ἧρως.[22] Two others are part of a repeated passage referring to the same individuals (*Iliad* 13.695 = 15.334). But even if we exclude repetitions, we are still left with sixteen independent uses of the term.

3. Transitional change in vocabulary

Pro. ἀ. is the standard term for all siblings in Classical Greek. Given the greater frequency of κ. in earlier Greek, it looks as though κ. had been the standard term for all siblings, and that ἀ. is a late arrival. Its appearance in Homer could represent an intermediate stage in a transition from κ. to ἀ.

Contra. ἀδελφειοῦ is extremely early, predating the contraction *-όο > οῦ.[23] Furthermore, on this hypothesis we should expect an increase in the use of ἀ. over time, displacing κ.; instead we find the opposite. The avoidance of ἀ. in later hexameter could be waved away as false archaism, but there is no actual

[20] On this process see Janko (n. 17), 87–8 and 248–9 n. 41; id., *The Iliad: A Commentary. Vol. IV: Books 13–16* (Cambridge, 1992), 15.

[21] ἀδελφειή appears in hexameter from the Roman period onwards (*IG* 2².3998, *IGUR* 3.1304, Doroth. *Fragmenta graeca* 407.13 Pingree, Quintus *Posth*. 1.30).

[22] In fact the full formula extends to the following line: ὣς εἰπὼν παρέπεισεν (ἔτρεψεν) ἀδελφειοῦ φρένας ἧρως | αἴσιμα παρειπών, *Il*. 6.61–2, 7.120–1. On the interpretation of these lines see S. Goldhill, 'Supplication and authorial comment in the *Iliad*: *Iliad* Z 61–2', *Hermes* 118 (1990), 373–6; N. Yamagata, '*Αἴσιμα παρειπών*: a moral judgement by the poet?', *PP* 45 (1990), 420–30. Note also the possible variant at *Il*. 10.72.

[23] See n. 20.

evidence for that. (In fifth-century tragedy we find an increase in the usage of κ. from Aeschylus to Sophocles and Euripides; there it is clearly false archaism. On this see Part 3, below.)

4. Parentage

Pro. The notion that the two terms indicate some distinction between siblings on the basis of which parents they share, or how many parents they share, is the solution that has been suggested most frequently. There are four main alternatives here.

(a) One of the two terms means 'half-brother' (that is, only one shared parent), while the other means 'full brother'.[24] This is the most general form of this hypothesis.

(b) More specifically, ἀ. means 'uterine brother', as suggested by the word's etymology (see Part 3, below); earlier still it would have meant just 'uterine'. By implication, κ. would be more general, which is why the exact relationship is sometimes clarified by an adjective (κ. ὄπατρος 'agnatic brother', κ. ὁμογάστριος 'uterine brother', and other constructions beyond Homer).[25] It is also sometimes clarified by the compound αὐτοκασίγνητος 'full brother'.[26]

(c) κ. means either 'agnatic sibling' or 'uterine sibling'. If the former, the occasions where κ. is qualified with ὄπατρος would be emphatic, while ὁμογάστριος would represent a reversal of the more fundamental meaning; if the latter, then vice versa.[27]

(d) We should interpret κ. as a classificatory term, referring to collateral as well as co-lineal relatives, including cousins as well as siblings.[28] At *Iliad* 15.545 Hector gives commands to his κασίγνητοι, including one Melanippus who is in fact a cousin. One scholion reports that this classificatory usage is Ionian, and a use of κ. in Herodotus 4.104.3 seems to confirm this. Moreover, in Homer κ. is regularly juxtaposed with ἔταιι, a term for collateral kin, and with ἔταρος, perhaps also to be construed as a kin term.[29] The interpretation of κ. as classificatory stems ultimately from Fustel de Coulanges's argument that early Greece had a clan system, and his interpretation of γένος as 'patrilinear clan' to match his analysis of the Roman

[24] This is the presumption of Miller (n. 3), 46–7.

[25] κ. ὄπατρος: *Il*. 11.257 (Coon–Iphidamas), 12.371 (Ajax–Teucer); also *Cat.Peir*. (Hes. fr. 280) 21 (Hades–Demeter). κ. ὁμογάστριος: *Il*. 24.47 (indefinite–indefinite). ὁμογάστριος is also used by itself substantivally, *Il*. 21.95 (Hector–Lycaon). Other constructions: ὁμόσπορος 'from the same seed', *h.Cer*. 85 (Demeter–Hades); ὁμοπάτριος 'agnatic', Hes. fr. 280.18 (Hades–Demeter); οἳ ὁμόθεν γεγάασιν 'who were born from the same place', *h.Ven*. 135 (Anchises–collective).

[26] Lejeune (n. 1), 22 succinctly refutes the notion that κ. is an abbreviated form of αὐτοκασίγνητος.

[27] Lejeune (n. 1), 22 presents these alternatives. κ. appears with ὄπατρος at *Il*. 11.257 and 12.371; with ὁμογάστριος at *Il*. 24.47.

[28] *LfgrE* s.v. κασίγνητος (M. Schmidt, vol. 2.14, 1991) presents a much fuller, though still inconclusive, account of arguments for and against a classificatory meaning. P. Chantraine, 'Note sur l'emploi homérique de κασίγνητος', *BSL* 55 (1960), 27–31, argues that κ. refers to all patrilineal co-lineal and collateral kin ('fraternité patriarcale', 30), i.e. both agnatic and classificatory.

[29] With ἔταιι 4×: *Il*. 6.239 (ego = the Trojan women), 16.456 = 674 (ego = Sarpedon), *Od*. 15.273 (ego = Theoclymenus). With ἔταρος 3×: *Il*. 4.441 (Ares–Eris), 24.793 (Hector–collective), *Od*. 21.216 (Telemachus–Eumaeus and Philoetius). On ἔτης and ἔταρος see further A. Andrewes, 'Phratries in Homer', *Hermes* 89 (1961), 129–40, at 134–7; Gates (n. 1), 28–32, with bibliography; Donlan (n. 1), 300–1; D. Petit *apud* Chantraine (n. 1), 1300, s.v. both words; H. Hagen, 'ἔταρος, ἑτάρη, ἑταίρα, ἑταῖρος bei Homer', *Glotta* 81 (2005), 83–5.

aristocratic *gens*.[30] In support of this hypothesis, the only reflexes of PIE **b^{h}réh$_2$tēr* 'brother' in Greek – *φρήτρη*, *φράτηρ*, and related words – undoubtedly refer to an institution much larger than the nuclear family, though its exact nature remains very uncertain.[31]

Contra. Gates has already assessed these suggestions, and firmly rejected all of them.[32]

(a) Both terms are used indiscriminately for full brothers and half-brothers. Out of 22 occurrences of *κ.* where both parents are certainly known (or where *αὐτοκ.* is used, which implies that both parents are shared), eight refer to half-brothers;[33] and as Table 3 shows, out of 19 occurrences of *ἀ.* where both parents are known, four refer to half-brothers. This does not indicate any preference one way or the other. In particular, note the cases of Hector, Paris and Helenus: all three are full brothers, but Paris is an *ἀ.* to Hector, while Helenus is a *κ.* (*Iliad* 6.102, 7.48).

(b) A glance at the last column of Table 3 will show that the etymology of *ἀ.* cannot possibly have any bearing on siblings' parentage. On the four occasions where *ἀ.* refers to half-brothers they are agnatic, not uterine. Homer and Archilochus preserve not the slightest trace of the word's etymology.[34]

(c) The suggestion here is that *κ.* stresses either shared paternity or shared maternity. The fact that *κ.* can be qualified by both *ὄπατρος* and *ὁμογάστριος* makes this a very doubtful proposition in the first place. In Homer *κ.* refers to a sibling who shares both parents with ego 10× (including *αὐτοκ.* 3×); shared father but uncertain maternity 11× (including *αὐτοκ.* 2×); shared father but certainly different mothers 10× (no uses of *αὐτοκ.*); and shared mother but uncertain or problematic paternity 3×. The last category, where shared maternity is stressed, is the most pertinent here. In *Iliad* 24.47, *κ.* appears with *ὁμογάστριος*; *Iliad* 19.293, Briseis refers to her 'three brothers [*κ.*], whom one mother bore along with me'; *Iliad* 3.238, Helen refers to her brothers Castor and Pollux as *αὐτοκασιγνήτω*. The last reference raises problems over paternity because of the legend that the paternity of the pairs of twins Helen/Clytemnestra and Castor/Pollux is divided between Zeus and Tyndareos. *αὐτοκ.* would normally stress the fact that both parents are shared, and Helen's use of the term is the more striking for that. These figures firmly disprove any link between *κ.* and shared maternity. Shared paternity is undoubtedly the most common way of thinking of sibling relationships in Greek; but the fact that a subtle joke about it can be put in Helen's mouth implies that it is a generalization based on social norms, rather than a linguistic necessity.

[30] N.D. Fustel de Coulanges, *The Ancient City*, trr. A. Momigliano and S.C. Humphreys (Baltimore, 1980 [1864]).

[31] *φρήτρη* is paired with *φῦλον* 'race, tribe' at *Il.* 2.362–3 ('so that *φρήτρη* may aid *φρήτρη*, and *φῦλον* aid *φῦλον*'), and *ἀφρήτωρ* appears at 9.63. On the meaning of *φρήτρη* and its obscure relationship with the Attic phratry, see Andrewes (n. 29); Donlan (n. 1); S.D. Lambert, *The Phratries of Attica* (Ann Arbor, 1993), 269–71. On the question of whether **b^{h}réh$_2$tēr* was classificatory or not, see n. 73, below.

[32] Gates (n. 1), 14–16.

[33] Ajax–Teucer 3× (*Il.* 8.330, 12.371, 15.436); Teucer–Ajax 1× (*Il.* 15.466); Aphrodite–Ares 2× (*Il.* 5.357, 359); Hector–Polydorus 1× (*Il.* 20.419); Paris–Lycaon 1× (*Il.* 3.333). The count of 22 does not include cases like Hecuba–Asius, where parentage is given only by later sources; but it does include one heavily ironic use of *αὐτοκ.*, where Helen refers to both Castor and Pollux as her *αὐτοκασιγνήτω* (*Il.* 3.238).

[34] Cf. Part 4, below. Similarly Latin *parens*, literally 'one who gives birth', in the singular normally refers to the father, not mother (I thank James MacNamara for pointing this out).

In any case early Greek had a separate term for 'agnatic brother', ἀμφιμήτωρ. The term is not used in epic but appears in Aeschylus, probably as an archaism; later poets follow his usage.[35]

(d) This is the hypothesis that κ. was originally a classificatory term. However, there is now an overwhelmingly strong consensus *against* the idea that Greece ever had a clan system. In particular, Donlan and Patterson have shown that the tradition of interpreting γένος as 'clan' is without foundation, and that Dark Age kin groups revolved around the οἶκος rather than either clans or nuclear families.[36] The precise referents of φρήτρη and ἀφρήτωρ in Homer are obscure, but since they refer to structures larger than the οἶκος, they have no implication for the meaning of κ.[37] In pairings of κ. with ἔταιι and ἔταρος there can be no presumption of hendiadys: compare κ. ἄλοχόν τε, used 2× of Zeus–Hera, where it is plain that the intent of the formula is to distinguish the two terms sharply, and also the Hesiodic opposition of κ. to ἔταρος.[38] Moreover, some passages that stress co-lineal kin, at the expense of or even to the *exclusion* of collateral kin (*Il.* 6.421–8, *Od.* 6.154–5, and especially *Od.* 16.113–20), choose to use κ. rather than ἀ.[39]

The result is that out of 64 appearances of κ. in Homer, the evidence for a classificatory meaning depends entirely on *Iliad* 15.545. The interpretation of this line is bound up with the question of whether κ. was classificatory in spoken Ionic, and so a dedicated discussion of the point is deferred to Part 3, below.

5. Inheritance

Pro. This hypothesis is based on Kronenfeld's explanation for the overlap of terms for mZ and aSi in the case of the Fanti. In that case, the motivation for the specialized term was a mechanism for inheritance of property from a male to his sister's children; the brother–sister relationship was sufficiently important to offset the cost of the redundancy. Similarly in the Homeric case, we could expect to see some indication of a special relationship between the male and his brother's children, or some evidence of inheritance from a paternal uncle.

Alternatively, the specialized term could refer to a mechanism by which one or both of the brothers inherit property from the previous generation. At *Iliad* 15.187 ἀ. is used of Poseidon's brothers Hades and Zeus, and in a context that discusses how these three gods divided the universe up between them. This is also the only Homeric attestation of a three-way ἀδελφεός relationship.

[35] Aesch. *Heraclidae* fr. 73b Radt; imitated by Eur. *Andr*. 466, [Lycoph.] *Alex*. 19 (the latter uses ἀμφιμήτριον κάσιν of Priam–Tithonus). *Suda* α.1752 gives ἀμφιπάτωρ with the same meaning, possibly an error for ἀμφιμήτωρ (LSJ gives ἀμφιπάτορες as 'uterine brothers', contrary to the *Suda*'s definition).

[36] See e.g. Donlan (n. 1); id., 'Kin-groups in the Homeric epics', *CW* 101 (2007), 29–39; C.B. Patterson, *The Family in Greek History* (Cambridge, MA, 1998), 50–6; R. Sallares, *The Ecology of the Ancient Greek World* (Ithaca, NY, 1991), 197–8.

[37] See Donlan (n. 1), 297–8, with bibliography. Perpillou takes the view that Homeric φρήτρη does indeed refer to siblings, but there is no basis for that (cf. n. 45, below).

[38] Hes. *Op*. 707 opposes them, treating ἔταρος as a more intimate relationship than κ., and *Op*. 328 advises against trusting a κ. On κ. and ἔταρος in Hesiod see M.L. West, *Hesiod: Works and Days* (Oxford, 1978), 200, on *Op*. 183–4.

[39] Gates (n. 1), 15 and 68 n. 51.

Contra. If the first of these alternatives held water, we should expect to find that 'brother's son' and 'father's brother' were important kin terms in Homer. In the Classical period we do find Herodotus routinely using ἀδελφιδέος 'nephew' (= Attic ἀδελφιδοῦς); and, moreover, he consistently uses it to refer – with one exception – to the son of a brother, not the son of a sister. However, the term does not appear at all in Homer, and in fact appears only once in the Archaic period.[40]

The term for 'father's brother', πατροκασίγνητος, does appear three times in Homer; but that is a compound of κ., not of ἀ. Moreover, it appears only in contexts that rule out any possibility of inheritance: the uncle is always Poseidon, and ego is also divine (Apollo at *Il.* 21.469; Athena at *Od.* 6.330, 13.342). Since all parties involved are immortal, succession and inheritance are impossible.

The second alternative, a mechanism for distributing inheritance from the previous generation, would be supported if we were to find that either ἀ. or κ. has a semantic link with passages that discuss division of patrimony. But there is a serious shortage of brothers with a divided patrimony in Homer. The only pair of brothers in the main narrative who could be construed as having a divided patrimony are Agamemnon, who rules over Mycenae, and Menelaus, who rules Sparta. Their contingents are listed separately, though juxtaposed, in the Catalogue of Ships (*Il.* 2.569–90). But Menelaus has not inherited Sparta; rather he married into Tyndareos' family. Moreover, he and Agamemnon are making war on Troy jointly, fighting as a united family unit; if anything they would be evidence of a clan mentality, not of clearly separated nuclear families.[41]

In genealogies and the like we do find a few cases where one brother migrates to a different city. This could represent either a divided patrimony, or one brother migrating because he has not received a patrimony.[42] We find separate dynasties of Assaracus–Capys–Anchises, who rule over Dardania, and Ilus–Laomedon–Priam, who rule Ilios (in Aeneas' genealogy, *Il.* 20.215–40); there is a division between Pelias, who remains ruler of Iolcus, while Neleus migrates to Pylos (*Od.* 11.253–7); and Melampus and Bias both migrate from Pylos to Argos (*Od.* 11.281–97, 15.225–42), though in later traditions each of the two takes a third of Proetus' kingdom. This is sparse evidence. Neither ἀ. nor κ. appears in any of these contexts. Furthermore, in the Catalogue of Ships we have several pairs of brothers who have conspicuously *not* migrated or divided their inheritance: Ascalaphus and Ialmenus (*Il.* 2.511–16); Schedius and Epistrophus (2.517–23); Phidippus and Antiphus (2.676–80); Podalirius and Machaon (2.729–33 and elsewhere); Adrestus and Amphius (2.828–34, killed at 11.329–32); Amphimachus and Nastes (2.867–75). Some of these are minor characters, arguably too minor to tell us anything definite, but not all: Podalirius and Machaon are traditional figures, and Ascalaphus' death (*Il.* 13.518–26, 15.110–42) is an important foreshadowing of Sarpedon's.

In short, the hypothesis relating to inheritance from the previous generation rests entirely on a single reference, *Iliad* 15.187; and in all of the places we might hope to find support, there is none.

[40] Alcm. fr. 88.1 *PMG*.

[41] See hypothesis 4, above, on the thoroughly debunked notion that early Greece had a clan system.

[42] A useful discussion of division of patrimony in historical early Greece is found in Sallares (n. 36), 196–8, 204–5.

We have now exhausted all of the hypothetical explanations that are at all likely. The remaining hypotheses are given *exemplorum gratia*: they are unsupported by any real evidence.

6. Relative age or status

Pro. Relative age is one of the three typical criteria that distinguish sibling terms, as we saw in Part 1. A relative age term is therefore an obvious thing to check.

A possible, but tenuous, alternative is that κ. indicates an inequality in relative status. For example, Paris is consistently Hector's ἀ., while Helenus, arguably of lesser status, is Hector's κ.; Teucer is inferior in combat to his half-brother Ajax, and κ. is the term used of him. Perhaps κ. indicates a situation where the brothers are very unequal, while ἀ. indicates a more equal relationship.

Contra. Both terms are used symmetrically, which would be impossible if relative age were important. ἀ. is used for both Agamemnon–Menelaus and Menelaus–Agamemnon, and Paris–Hector and Hector–Paris (see Table 3). κ. is used for both Ajax–Teucer (*Il.* 8.330, 12.371, 15.436) and Teucer–Ajax (*Il.* 15.466); we also find κ. in other combinations as both oB (Protesilaus–Podarces; Antilochus–Thrasymedes, reciprocal; Pisistratus–Thrasymedes; Telemachus–Eumaeus/Philoetius, metaphorical) and yB (Hecuba–Asius; Coon–Iphidamas; Paris–Lycaon; mistakenly used of Antenor–Archelochus).

We might allow the possibility of more flexibility in a less standard distinction like that of relative status, but there is no consistency there either. Among the gods, the sibling relationship of Apollo–Artemis is that of κ.; likewise Death–Sleep. But these are gods who routinely go together as pairs, without notable or consistent distinctions in status. (Among the gods the only ἀδελφεοί are the trio of Poseidon–Zeus–Hades.) At the mortal level, too, siblings who go together as a pair are κασίγνητοι as often as not: Acamas–Archelochus, Melampus–Bias.

7. Closeness or sentiment

Pro. Perhaps ἀ., as the less frequent term, is used to indicate a particularly close relationship between the two brothers; or, failing that, perhaps it indicates a particularly strong sentiment being expressed.

Contra. Teucer is a κ., but the relationship between him and Ajax is clearly very close. ἀ. certainly is not used at moments of great sentiment: the one occasion on which Agamemnon refers to Menelaus as κ. (*Il.* 4.155) is also the moment where he expresses the greatest affection for him, when he thinks his brother is dying and vows to take vengeance.

8. Upbringing

Pro. The etymology of ἀ. suggests that even if it does not specifically mean two siblings from the same womb, it could be used to stress the common origin of

two brothers who have been brought up separately. Paris and Hector would be a good example of this: Hector was brought up in Troy, while in later legend we hear that Paris was raised by the herdsman Agelaus.[43]

Contra. The example of Agamemnon and Menelaus is sufficient to dispel this hypothesis.

9. Wooing

Pro. This last hypothesis is suggested by the repeated motif in many myths that one brother courts a wife on behalf of another brother. The story of Agamemnon's wooing Helen on behalf of Menelaus is particularly well developed in early epic (*Catalogue* frr. 196–204), and is in addition the basis for the Trojan War. In Paris' case the pattern is adjusted slightly: he courts Helen in the company of a relative, Aeneas.[44]

Contra. Melampus also courts a wife on behalf of his brother, Bias (*Od.* 15.226–40), but the term used is κ. (*Odyssey* 15.237; also *Catalogue* fr. 37.5). Though non-Homeric, κ. is also the term used in the *Catalogue*'s account of Agamemnon wooing Helen on behalf of Menelaus (*Catalogue* fr. 197.5). At this point the hypotheses are starting to look rather desperate, so I shall stop here.

3. LINGUISTIC EVIDENCE

Although there are anomalous distinctions in the usage of κ. and ἀ. (Part 1), these anomalies cannot be explained by chance, or in terms of metrical formulae or meaning (Part 2). We are left with the task of reviewing potentially relevant linguistic evidence.

ἀ. derives from ἀ- copulative (< **sm̥-*) + δελφύς 'womb' + an adjectival termination **-yo-*, hence originally 'uterine, from the same womb'. The essentials of this etymology have been known since antiquity. The Homeric application of ἀ. to agnatic half-brothers demonstrates that ἀ. is not a recent neologism. Perpillou shows that ἀ. is a relic of the collocation *φράτηρ ἀδελφεός.[45] It should be cautioned

[43] See e.g. Eur. *IA* 1284–99; Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.12.5.

[44] See e.g. Proclus' summary of the *Cypria*.

[45] Perpillou (n. 1), especially 213–14. Perpillou shows that Sanskrit *bhrātā sagarbhya-* is cognate with his reconstructed collocation, where *sagarbhya-* and ἀδελφεός are both reflexes of **sm̥-g*^{w}*elb*^{h}*-yo-*. (For the rejection of alternative terminations *-εϝο- or *-εσο- in previous reconstructions, see Chantraine (n. 1).) There are several parallels for the loss of **b*^{h}*réh*$_{2}$*tēr* from a noun-epithet collocation of this type: Perpillou adduces an Ossetian parallel; Gonda (n. 1) cites Latin *germanus*, which displaced both *frater* and *soror* in modern Spanish and Portuguese; cf. also Homeric substantival use of ὁμογάστριος and κουρίδιος, without their usual nouns (*Il.* 21.95, *Od.* 15.22). Perpillou's other arguments are, in themselves, less convincing, though this does not weaken his central point. He suggests that Homer retains the meanings φρήτρ- = 'brother', ἀ. = 'sharing the same mother', and κ. = 'sharing the same father'. The first of these is premised on the common trope of pairs of brothers in the Catalogue of Ships; but, *pace* Perpillou, this trope pervades the whole *Iliad*, not just the Catalogue. Even so, Perpillou is certainly right to connect this trope to the loss of φράτηρ. On the second and third: Perpillou's argument does not appreciate the completeness of ἀ.'s loss of the sense 'uterine' in Homer, as

that Perpillou's argument cannot be separated from two unresolved problems: (1) the meaning of *φρήτρη* in Homer; (2) the Homeric silence about the institution of the phratry.[46] Early variants of *ἀ.* appear in Ionic (Homer, Archilochus), Attic (*ἀδελφός*, second half of sixth century onwards),[47] and Cretan (*ἀδευπιός*, fifth century);[48] later we find Boeotian (*ἀδελφιός*, second century),[49] and Hesychius attests Laconian forms (*ἀδελίφηρ*, *ἀδελφήρ*).

κ.'s origins are less certain, but it most probably derives from **κατί* 'with, also' (< **kṃt*-?) + *γνητος*, hence originally 'also acknowledged, also legitimate'.[50] As Wackernagel and Kuiper pointed out, Thessalian forms in *κατί-* show that *κατίγνητος* was the original form.[51] The current position on **κατί* is laid out by Lejeune, Pisani, Ruijgh and Lüttel.[52] Taken in conjunction, their arguments indicate that (1) *κασι-* is related to *κάς*, the Arcado-Cypriot form of *καί*; (2) both are related to Hittite *katti* 'with'; (3) although **κατί*/*κασί* and *κάς*/*καί* do not appear as discrete words in Mycenaean, the root does appear in Mycenaean *kasikono* 'apprentice, companion'; (4) **κατί* appears in different dialects (4a) with assibilation, in *κασίγνητος* in most dialects, and with additional, subsequent, apocope in Arcado-Cypriot as *κάς*, *κά* 'and'; (4b) as *καί* 'and, also' in dialects other than Arcado-Cypriot, through dissimilation before dental consonants (especially forms of the definite article). Note that in Cyprus *κ.* may well have been the most common term for 'sibling': inscriptions in the Cypriot syllabary use *κ.* exclusively (or rather *kasikenetose*), never *ἀ.*[53]

we have seen above; equally there is no basis for *κ.* = 'sharing the same father' (see hypothesis 4, above).

[46] As an introduction to these issues, see Donlan (n. 1, n. 36); Lambert (n. 29), 245–75. See further Part 4, below, on the meaning of *φράτηρ*. Neither *ἀ.*, *κ.*, nor *φράτηρ* is certainly attested in Bronze Age Greek. However, Perpillou (n. 1), 214–20, conjectures that the Linear B syllabograms *34 and *35 should be read as **pra*. If correct, this would provide Mycenaean attestations of three forms of *φράτηρ* (**34-te φρατηρ*, **35-to φρατ*(*ρ*)*ος*, **35-to-pi φρατο*(*ρ*)*φι*).

[47] e.g. *IG* 1[3].1265 (*c.* 540–530), 1210 (*c.* 530), *SEG* 16:35c (*c.* 500).

[48] *IC* 4.72 (also *IC* 4.51, reconstructed); the form survives into the second century as *ἀδευφιό-*, *IC* 4.208.

[49] *IG* 7.3379 and 3385, both from Chaeronea; also two undated inscriptions, *IG* 7.2795 (from Copae) and 2835 (Hyettus). Pindar's use of the Ionic form is not significant, as he uses the Boeotian dialect little if at all.

[50] *κ.* is certainly not derived from *κάσις* 'brother'; rather the latter is a hypocorism. See Lejeune (n. 1), 21–2. Some Classical poets assumed that *κάσις* was the original form: Aesch. *Sept*. 494, 674; Eur. *Med*. 167, 1334; *Hec*. 361, 428, 943; *Or*. 1255; Soph. *OC* 1440.

[51] *Apud* Chantraine (n. 1), 483–4. Thessalian forms in *κατι-* are attested in *SEG* 31:584 (late fifth c.), 35:575 (second c.), and *IG* 9.2 894 (date uncertain). Assibilated *κασι-* also appears in Thessaly, in *SEG* 35:581 (early second c.) and *SEG* 37:494 (late third c., *κασιέα*).

[52] Lejeune (n. 1); Pisani (n. 1); C.J. Ruijgh, *Études sur la grammaire et le vocabulaire du grec mycénien* (Amsterdam, 1967), 331–3; V. Lüttel, *Κάς und καί: Dialektale und chronologische Probleme im Zusammenhang mit Dissimilation und Apokope* (Göttingen, 1981), especially 42–8; Ruijgh, review of Lüttel, *Kratylos* 26 (1981), 115–20. The development of **κατί* is problematic, with room for further investigation; for example, Ruijgh and Lüttel disagree over whether or not *κάς* appeared in proto-Ionic, and whether *κα*(*τ*)*ί* as adverb ('also') and as coordinative ('and') can be assigned to particular dialects at particular stages.

[53] The suggestion is that of C.M. Bowra, 'Homeric words in Cyprus', *JHS* 54 (1934), 54–74, at 65; cf. also Pisani (n. 1). *κ.* appears in *ICS* 103 and 164 (both sixth c.); 152 (sixth to fourth c.); 217 (the Idalium tablet, early fifth c.); 8, 18f, 92 and 261 (fourth c.). *ἀ.* does not appear in Cyprus until the Hellenistic period, and then only in the mainland alphabet and in the *koinē* form *ἀδελφός*.

In Ionic there is some reason to suppose κ. may have had a classificatory sense, 'cousin' as well as 'sibling'. This supposition is based on two pieces of evidence: (1) *Iliad* 15.545 (mentioned above, hypothesis 4), along with a scholion reporting that κ. had a classificatory sense in Ionic;[54] (2) κ. in Herodotus 4.104.3 seems to point in the same direction.[55] Of these, *Iliad* 15.545 lends itself to alternative interpretations. A second scholion explains the usage as an elided form of the formula καsίγνητοί [τε ἔται τε], where Melanippus would be included among the ἔται. In a similar vein Gates has suggested, on the basis of πᾶσι μάλα in the following line, the interpretation 'Hector ordered his καsίγνητοι, [cousins and] all'. By itself, then, *Iliad* 15.545 is not strong evidence. As for Herodotus, 1.171.6 seems to point the same way as 4.104.3; but in 1.171.6, discussing the arrangements of a temple, it is evident that the context is flavoured with ritual language. These are the only two places where Herodotus uses κ. (he uses ἀ. 125 times); furthermore, κ. does not appear in *any* inscriptions in Ionian Asia Minor until the end of the Hellenistic period.[56] It seems clear that κ. in Ionic was a term associated with high, archaic, ritualized and/or institutional language. When Herodotus uses κ. it is not a kin term, but a marked term for a marked kind of relationship. Gates suggests – but does not himself believe – that the writer of the first Homeric scholion may have been mistakenly generalizing from Herodotus's usage (hence the scholiast's phrase 'some say that …').[57] This suggestion is very likely right.

In brief, there are no firm grounds for supposing that κ. was ever a kin term in Ionic. However, its use in Herodotus – and confinement to Herodotus – provide good grounds for concluding that κ. referred *solely* to ritual and institutional 'brotherhoods'. In its extension from the sense 'brother' to the more institutional sense, the development of κ. exactly mirrors that of φράτηρ in Classical Attic.

In the Homeric use of κ. and ἀ., there are few metrical or formulaic points to note; see *LfgrE* for full details.[58] ἀ. gravitates to a position after a third-foot trochaic caesura, with the exception of *Iliad* 2.586, as seen in Table 3 earlier. ἀ. appears in both early and late contexts: early, shown by the survival of *ἀδελφεόο as ἀδελφειοῦ;[59] late, in one line, *Iliad* 15.187, that has a comparatively late synizesis on Ῥέα.[60] In terms of content, ἀ. appears in a key Cyclic passage at *Iliad* 24.736, where Andromache foresees Astyanax's death in a manner closely echoing a fragment of the *Little Iliad*;[61] Janko also sees *Iliad* 13.694–7 = 15.333–6 as late, because of problems surrounding the character of Medon.[62] κ. is responsible for two of the five (or six) violations of Hermann's Bridge in Homer,[63] and three of its four

[54] Σ bT on *Il*. 15.545: τινὲς δὲ ἔτι καὶ νῦν παρ' Ἴωσι τοὺς συγγενεῖς κασιγνήτους φασὶ καλεῖσθαι.

[55] Hdt. 4.104.3. Chantraine (n. 1), 483–4, interprets Hesychius' glosses on κάσιοι and κασῆς as indicating that these terms had a classificatory use in Laconian too; however, as he also notes, the assibilation cannot be Laconian in origin.

[56] The earliest is McCabe/Lagina 194 (Caria, second c.).

[57] Gates (n. 1), 16.

[58] *LfgrE* s.v. ἀδελφεός (E. Risch, vol. 1.1, 1955); Schmidt (n. 28).

[59] See n. 20.

[60] Janko, *Commentary* (n. 20), 247.

[61] *Little Iliad* fr. 21 Bernabé = 29 West.

[62] Janko, *Commentary* (n. 20), 134.

[63] *Il*. 10.317, *Od*. 18.140. The other three (or four) violations of Hermann's Bridge (i.e. cases of trochaic caesura in the fourth foot) are *Il*. 23.760, *Od*. 1.241, 4.684, and a variant reading at *Il*. 9.394.

occurrences in the vocative require lengthening of -ϵ before a masculine caesura.[64] It is used metaphorically on at least two occasions: *Iliad* 6.430 (Andromache refers to Hector as κ.); *Odyssey* 21.216 (Odysseus promises to make the herdsmen κ. of Telemachus); perhaps also *Iliad* 15.545 (the supposedly classificatory usage, discussed above).[65] None of this is particularly helpful.

The distribution of both terms in the *Odyssey* does call for comment, however. ἀ. appears four times in the *Odyssey*, but only in Book 4. This is not because Book 4 is the only part of the epic to refer to siblings; κ. is spread generously throughout the epic.[66] An Analyst perspective would simply interpret the confinement of ἀ. to Book 4 as evidence that the Telemachy was composed independently of the rest of the *Odyssey*; but the idea that the Telemachy was composed separately has always been far too simplistic a model of the relationship between it and the rest of the epic, given the extremely strong thematic links between both parts of the poem. ἀ. cannot straightforwardly be tied to an *Oresteia* narrative: two of its occurrences are in Menelaus' story (4.91, 4.512) but a third is spoken by Pisistratus (4.199) and the fourth is in the narrator's voice, in the background story to Helen's drugs (4.225). In short, it is not clear what to make of ἀ.'s confinement to Book 4.

As has been stated earlier, it is probably best to look for an explanation of the specialized Homeric use of ἀ. by starting with register: by the Classical period, κ. belongs firmly to elevated language, while ἀ. is the term used in unmarked language. A look at trends in the use of both terms over time shows this clearly. Table 5 shows the use of both terms in a range of poets prior to 400. In general, the higher the ratio of κ. to ἀ., the more elevated or archaic the poetry is in tone. The ratio is high in Homer; by the fifth century, Pindar is using both terms with almost even frequency.

TABLE 5. RATIOS OF *ΚΑΣΙΓΝΗΤΟΣ* TO *ἌΔΕΛΦ(Ε)ΟΣ* IN A SELECTION OF ARCHAIC/CLASSICAL POETS

	κασίγνητος	*ἀδελφ(ϵ)ός*	Ratio of κ. : ἀ.
Iliad	48×	16×	3.00
Odyssey	16×	4×	4.00
Other Archaic hexameter	21×	0×	—
Archaic iambic/lyric	10×	5×	2.00
Pindar	11×	8×	1.38
Aeschylus	8× (incl. 2× *PV*)	22× (1× *PV*)	0.364 (excl. *PV*: 0.286)
Euripides	83× (1× *Rhes*.)	139× (1× *Rhes*.)	0.597 (excl. *Rhes*.: 0.594)
Sophocles	21×	33×	0.636
Aristophanes	1×	24×	0.0417

[64] *Il*. 4.155 *κασίγνητϵ̄ θάνατον*, 5.359 *κασίγνητϵ̄ κόμισαι*, 21.308 *κασίγνητϵ̄ σθένος*; similarly *h.Merc*. 539 *κασίγνητϵ̄ χρυσόρραπι*.

[65] Other kin terms are also used metaphorically: Achilles uses *ἄλοχος* of Briseis at *Il*. 9.336, and Hermes refers to Leto as an *ἄλοχος* of Zeus at *Il*. 21.498; plural *πατήρ* = 'ancestors' at *Il*. 6.209, *Od*. 8.245 and 24.508. *ἄττα* and *μαῖα* are only ever used as terms of respect, and *τέκος* only as a term of affection, never with their original kin senses (see further Gates [n. 1], 13, 32). On metaphorical uses of kin terms in later Greek, see E. Dickey, 'Literal and extended use of kinship terms in documentary papyri', *Mnemosyne* 57 (2004), 131–76.

[66] 6× in *Od*. 3 to 8; 7× in 15–21; 2× in 24. The *Odyssey* also includes what is perhaps the most striking metaphorical use of the word, at 21.216 (see above).

Aeschylus, though the earliest of the Attic tragedians, and in some ways the most archaic in flavour, uses κ. the least; his ratio is lower still if *Prometheus Bound* is excluded from consideration. This reflects a substantial move away from epic language. The poetry of Euripides and Sophocles creates a more self-conscious kind of archaism by using κ. much more frequently: that is to say, this is clearly false archaism, since they are reversing the trend visible in Aeschylus' language. Aristophanes' sole use of κ., at *Thesmophoriazusae* 900, exemplifies its elevated flavour: the entire scene is a parody of Euripides' *Helen*, with Euripides himself as a character and playing the role of Menelaus.[67] In Herodotus, too, one of his two uses of κ. is in a context that suggests ritual language (see above). Another point of note in the tragedians is the occasional use of Ionic/Doric ἀδελφεός for Attic ἀδελφός. ἀδελφεός appears twice in Aeschylus, but both passages are incurably corrupt;[68] it does not appear at all in Euripides; Sophocles uses it twice, both in sung Doric passages (*OT* 160, in a chorus, and *OC* 535, in a *kommos*). The rarity of the Ionic/Doric form even in choral passages perhaps reflects a perception that it was primarily Ionic.

4. A PROPOSED SOLUTION

As we have seen, an explanation must be found in terms of something other than pure semantics. We might have hoped to find a solution in the linguistic and other data presented in Part 3; but these data only reflect the very strong associations of both κ. and ἀ. with particular registers, something that was always known. Later writers of hexameter use both terms, but only in an imitative way. They eagerly build on Homer, but in their efforts at false archaism they end up using it in ways alien to Homeric usage: ἀ. with female ego, ἀδελφειή by analogy with Homeric ἀδελφειοῦ, and at an extreme, Quintus of Smyrna's thoroughly overdone form ἀδελφειοῖο. For reasons which will now become clear, these would not have been admissible in Homer.

As we saw in Part 1, the epic connotations of κ. and unmarked status of ἀ. neatly explain why Archaic hexameter beyond Homer avoids ἀ., and why lyric is equally comfortable with both terms. However, this leaves completely unexplained the frequent Iliadic use of ἀ., and the confinement of ἀ. to male ego. Conversely, explanations of the Homeric use of ἀ., even if they were convincing, would leave unexplained the question of why non-Homeric epic avoids the word so strongly. In short, any explanation needs *both* to account for the anomalies in Homeric usage of ἀ., *and* to allow for the strong association of κ. with epic and ἀ. with prose.

Our evidence shows that in hexameter poetry, ἀ. is concentrated in the earliest texts: most common in the *Iliad*, less so in the *Odyssey*; attested in Archilochus, but not in later elegiac poets. The use of ἀ. in hexameter *decreases* over time, while the use of κ. *increases*. This is, in fact, a reverse of hypothesis 3: our solution lies in the insight that ἀ. is not a newcomer after all, but a very archaic term. Its

[67] αὐτοκ. also appears in Cratinus, in a choral passage (fr. 73.25 Austin).

[68] Aesch. *Sept*. 576 ἀδελφεόν, in trimeter dialogue, probably originated as a scribal gloss to the epic word ὁμόσπορον, which has itself been corrupted to πρόσμορον; *Sept*. 974, in a choral passage, bizarrely juxtaposes the Attic and Ionic forms, ἀδελφαὶ ἀδελφεῶν, with hiatus. See G.O. Hutchinson (ed.), *Aeschylus: Seven against Thebes* (Oxford, 1985) on the relevant lines.

decreasing frequency shows that Homer is not introducing it into epic; rather, epic language is in the process of moving away from it. This would explain why we see ἀδελφειοῦ, remnant of such an early form as *ἀδελφεόο. For this word Janko's linguistic data suggest an extremely early date: on his relative chronological scale, where the *Iliad* and *Theogony* are defined as points 0 and 3 respectively, his data place ἀδελφειοῦ at –6.7.[69]

By itself this insight is not enough, however. It does not solve the problem with which we started: why is ἀ. confined to male ego? And why are some brothers regularly ἀδελφεοί while others are κασίγνητοι, with little overlap?

The solution lies in Perpillou's etymology of ἀ. Since ἀ. has its origins in the collocation *φράτηρ ἀδελφεός 'uterine brother', as a modifier to the gender-specific term φράτηρ < *b^{h}*réh*$_2$*tēr* 'brother', both parties in the relationship must be male; therefore, ego must always be male. In legend, then, we might well see ἀ. associated with old, traditional pairings of brothers, though not necessarily exclusively.

Therefore, the final hypothesis – hypothesis 10, if you like – is as follows. In Homer ἀ. is an archaism nearing the end of its lifespan, not a new term replacing an old term; in the *Iliad* we see a phase where κ. is in the process of displacing ἀ. from epic, rather than the other way round. Conversely, in unmarked (prose) language, ἀ. was already in general usage in spoken language; so while ἀ. became confined to spoken language, κ. became associated with marked speech, namely epic. This explains the affinity of κ. for hexameter verse, the reduction over time that we see in the use of ἀ., and the mixed evidence in lyric/iambic.

The sequence of events must have been something like the following. Originally the term for a brother in a pair of brothers was *φράτηρ ἀδελφεός 'uterine brother' (with the implication of 'full brother': see *Sibling terms prior to the generalization of* ἀδελφεός, below). Both parties, therefore, had to be male. As epic verse became regularized into the Homeric hexameter, formulae involving this collocation became intolerably unmetrical, and so the noun vanished in epic, leaving just the epithet behind to stand in as a substantive.[70] At some point (probably in the Dark Age, but perhaps earlier), as a result of the loss of φράτηρ, ἀ. lost the sense of 'uterine' so completely that it could be used of agnatic brothers without jarring. κ. must have been an import from another dialect; when it became available to epic poets, its exotic character already gave it a status as a marked term. It was therefore ideal for epic usage, and in time, came to displace ἀ. in epic. At the same time, ἀ. continued to be used in spoken Ionic.

In the time of the *Iliad* ἀ. is simultaneously dominant in spoken language, while as a specimen of epic language it is an archaism. This is why it is on the one hand starting to be avoided in hexameter, while on the other hand it retains an association with specific *pairs* of brothers. By the time of the *Odyssey* κ. is almost completely dominant, and ἀ. is used only in one context, Telemachus' visit to Menelaus (perhaps because it is a scene that resonates with a distant past; perhaps because an old *Oresteia* narrative, in which ἀ. was common, has somehow flavoured the episode as a whole; or perhaps for some other, less clear, reason). In later hexameter of the Archaic period, κ. has so strongly elevated a flavour, while ἀ. is so strongly associated with spoken language, that ἀ. is entirely avoided.

[69] See n. 20.

[70] For the loss of φράτηρ, cf. the parallels cited in n. 45, above.

Like hypotheses 1 to 9, this explanation has weaknesses and questions that need addressing. These issues are not nearly as intractable as those that faced the earlier hypotheses, however.

(a) *Mythical content.* The notion that *ἀ.* refers to relatively traditional pairs of brothers leaves a question over Medon, whom Janko regards as a late improvisation;[71] and some Neoanalysts might be unhappy at the notion that Hector and Paris are a traditional pairing, in view of the school of thought that sees Hector as an imitation of Memnon in the *Aethiopis*.[72] Hector does not of course need to be a *late* invention, but the issue is a real one, since **φράτηρ ἀδελφεός* must have been very early indeed. In these cases the problem is not one of linguistic possibilities but of a poetic device. It is conspicuous that Hector and Medon also provide the occasions for the strangely inappropriate – late? – applications of *ἀ.* to agnatic brothers; it could well be that *ἀ.* is used to bolster these characters' status and make them seem more traditional.

(b) *The meaning of φράτηρ.* As observed already, *φράτηρ* and related words in Homer certainly do not refer to brothers. Does this hypothesis have any implications for them, and in particular for what we know of the Athenian phratry?

It has not been satisfactorily settled whether the PIE root **b*^{h}*réh*$_2$*tēr* was classificatory or not;[73] there is no reason to be certain about pre-Homeric *φράτηρ* either. In Kretschmer's view, as reinterpreted by Benveniste, *φράτηρ* was classificatory:[74] in that case, **φράτηρ ἀδελφεός* still means 'co-lineal brother' without ambiguity, and so it makes sense that *ἀ.* came to fill the role of a descriptive term.[75] Classificatory *φράτηρ*, meanwhile, would survive in ritualized language with an institutional sense: 'member of a brotherhood' in Homer, and more specifically 'member of a phratry' in Classical Athens. However, the data make just as much sense if *φράτηρ* was never classificatory. In that case, *φράτηρ* 'co-lineal brother'

[71] See n. 62.

[72] For a survey see M.L. West, '*Iliad* and *Aethiopis*', *CQ* 53 (2003), 1–14, at 1–5.

[73] The root is classificatory in the view of E. Benveniste, *Indo-European Language and Society*, tr. E. Palmer (London, 1973), 169–74; Szemerényi (n. 1), 23–4; and S. Kullanda, 'Indo-European "kinship terms" revisited', *Current Anthropology* 43 (2002), 89–111, at 91–2. On the other side, Gonda (n. 1) is carefully non-committal on whether **b*^{h}*réh*$_2$*tēr* was classificatory; P. Friedrich, 'Proto-Indo-European kinship', *Ethnology* 5 (1966), 1–36, at 8, suggests that **b*^{h}*réh*$_2$*tēr* was descriptive and became classificatory only in Germanic; Perpillou (n. 1), 205, that it became classificatory only in Greek; de Lamberterie, *apud* Chantraine (n. 1), 1365, confines **b*^{h}*réh*$_2$*tēr* to co-lineal siblings; and G.-J. Pinault, 'A star is born: a "new" PIE **-ter-* suffix', in A. Nussbaum (ed.), *Verba Docenti: Studies in Historical and Indo-European Linguistics* (Ann Arbor, 2007), 271–9, at 276–7, interprets the root not only co-lineally, but – even without a modifier – as 'uterine brother'. Both elements of the root are problematic. **b*^{h}*réh*$_2$*tēr* could be analysed as 'member of a **b*^{h}*réh*$_2$-', where **b*^{h}*réh*$_2$- means something like 'phratry' or 'institutional brotherhood'; but that analysis would be a consequence of the classificatory interpretation, not a basis for it. Pinault interprets **b*^{h}*réh*$_2$- as a 'group of males borne by the same mother'. As for the **-ter-* element, Benveniste only describes it as 'the suffix of kinship *par excellence*'; Szemerényi and others implausibly take it as an agentive suffix (see Pinault, 275–6 for discussion and bibliography); Pinault takes **-ter-* as a contrastive suffix also found in **h*$_2$*stér* 'star'. On the whole, current opinion leans towards **b*^{h}*réh*$_2$*tēr* as descriptive, i.e. 'co-lineal brother'.

[74] P. Kretschmer, 'Die griechische Benennung des Bruders', *Glotta* 11 (1910), 201–13; Benveniste (n. 73), 172–3.

[75] Qualifiers are used to specify the sibling relationship in a similar way in Lat. *frater germanus*, Skr. *bhrātā sagarbhya-*, O.Pers. *brātā … hamātā hamapitā*.

would have come to possess an archaic and elevated flavour after being displaced by ἀ.; and so, again, it is easy to see it going on to penetrate institutional, ritual language as 'member of a brotherhood'. This is indeed the precise pattern that we see with κ. in Ionic, after it, too, was displaced: see Part 3, above, on the use of κ. in Herodotus. Since the observed data make perfect sense either way, no assumptions should be made about whether *$b^{h}réh_{2}tēr$ and pre-Homeric φράτηρ were classificatory or descriptive.

(c) *Sibling terms prior to the generalization of* ἀδελφεός. Although in Classical Greek ἀ. came to be the general term for aSi, it cannot always have had that meaning. There must have been a time when it meant what its etymology implies: a pair of male siblings who share the same mother. What purpose would such a term have served? And if ἀ. meant mB, what were the terms for fB, mZ and fZ?

On the first question: it is impossible that ἀ. originally referred to brothers who shared *only* a mother and *not* a father; that would be incomprehensible in the thoroughly patriarchal society of early Greece. As Gonda observes, the term took shared fatherhood for granted, and referred to a brother who shares *both* parents. In other words, ἀ. originally had the same meaning that we see in αὐτοκασίγνητος in Homer.[76]

The second question cannot be answered definitely, but the rough picture is clear. In pre-Homeric Greek, ἀ. was not originally a sibling term in its own right, but a modifier. φράτηρ was the term for B: therefore, there were terms only for B and Z, and the kinship system did not differentiate mB vs. fB, mZ vs. fZ. However, what was the term for Z? On this we may note that the most common PIE root for 'sister', **swésōr*, does appear in Greek, though only in the word ἔορ, which itself appears only once, as a gloss in Hesychius, and is there defined as 'daughter', 'relative'. Presumably ἔορ, or some parallel term, meant 'sister';[77] but, like φράτηρ, it was superseded in spoken language, either by ἀ. or by some other formation that is not currently clear. Note that in view of the Homeric restriction of ἀ. to mB, it is certain that a collocation of the form *ἔορ ἀδελφεή never existed: the ἀ. relationship was specific to males.

(d) **φράτηρ ἀδελφεός in dactylic hexameter*. Could Perpillou's collocation – or rather Ionic *φρήτηρ ἀδελφεός – have existed in epic verse?

ἀ. has a strong affinity to a position after a third-foot trochaic caesura (19 times out of 20). If that was always its normal position, there are three possibilities in a strict hexameter, none of them entirely satisfactory. First, the phrase could sit astride the third-foot caesura, in oblique cases only:

– ⏑⏑ – ⏑⏑ φρήτερ᾽ ἀδελφεόν – ⏑ ⏑ – –
– ⏑⏑ – ⏑⏑ φρῆτρος ἀδελφειοῦ (or ἀδελφεόο) ⏑ ⏑ – –
– ⏑⏑ – ⏑⏑ φρῆτρι ἀδελφεῷ – ⏑ ⏑ – –

However, the nominative (singular and plural) cannot be accommodated, and there are relatively few formulae that can fill the first two feet. A second possibility is

[76] Gonda (n. 1). Similarly Szemerényi (n. 1), 23; Perpillou (n. 1), 213.

[77] Another candidate, though not quite as good, is ὄαρ (= 'wife' in Homer); on ὄαρ see Szemerényi (n. 1), 34 and 37, who takes it as a reflex of **esōr*/**osr̥* 'woman'.

that ἀ. belonged to a class of noun-epithet formulae where an epithet of the rhythm (⏑) ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ sits in the third–fourth feet and a substantive is deferred to line end.[78] This would be possible in the nominative singular and the dative, but not in the accusative or the nominative plural, and the genitive looks unlikely with a single hemipes separating the words.[79] A third possibility is *φρήτηρ at line beginning, in any form. That configuration for noun-epithet formulae is uncommon, but paralleled; for example, although μεγαλήτωρ after a third-foot caesura usually either immediately follows its substantive (27×) or precedes it (19×), it also appears with a line-initial substantive (5×).

The midline formula in the first possibility is relatively inflexible, and the hexameter prefers to avoid the separation seen in the second and third possibilities. If *φρήτηρ ἀδελφεός ever existed in epic verse, *φρήτηρ probably dropped out as it became more difficult to use it in a strict hexameter.[80]

CLOSING REMARKS

There are several problems with the Homeric usage of κ. and ἀ., which revolve around the central issue that ἀδελφεός is only ever used for the male sibling of a male. A lack of economy in the metrical formulaic system could be blamed on poetic artifice; but that will not do for a lack of economy in the sibling terminology system. Even if a lack of economy were admitted, the strange specificity of ἀ. is not paralleled in later Greek and would remain problematic in its own right. Trawling through likely hypotheses yields no satisfactory explanation. In particular, we may be sure that the distinction is not purely one of meaning.

It is of course reasonable to object that the solution suggested here is just one possible explanation. A competing solution may yet present itself. Sherlock Holmes, quoted at the start of this paper, should perhaps have said that 'whatever remains, however improbable, is *possible*.' However, any competing solution has a formidable checklist of facts that it must explain:

- that ἀ. is used only for mB in Homer and Archilochus;
- that ἀ. tends to be associated with specific pairs of brothers;
- that ἀ. is fairly common in the *Iliad* but is rigidly avoided in post-Homeric Archaic hexameter (other than Archilochus, who himself is very early);
- that ἀ. is used freely and in a general sense in lyric poetry and in later prose, contrary to practice in hexameter poetry.

These are the observed data; finding an elegant explanation for *all* of them is no trivial matter. In my suggestion, Perpillou's reconstructed collocation *φράτηρ ἀδελφεός explains the first two points. The third and fourth are explained by the

[78] On this class of separated formulae see J.B. Hainsworth, *The Flexibility of the Homeric Formula* (Oxford, 1968), 94–8.

[79] Other possibilities: syncopated forms (*φρῆτρα, *φρῆτρες) could go at line end; so could the genitive if it were lengthened by analogy with ἀδελφειοῦ, viz. *ἀδελφειοῦ φρήτηρος. It so happens that the latter would be very assonant with the only formulaic use of ἀ. attested, also in the genitive (ἀδελφειοῦ φρένας ἤρως).

[80] M.L. West, 'Greek poetry 2000–700 BC', *CQ* 23 (1973), 179–92, at 188, suggests a 'loose' form of the hexameter *c.* 1100; the demise of *φρήτηρ would be shortly after that.

realization that κ. was in the process of displacing ἀ. from epic at the time of the *Iliad*. Now, it is true that there is a fifth datum that my hypothesis fails to deal with elegantly:

- the fact that the *Iliad* and Archilochus use ἀ. of agnatic half-brothers, contrary to the word's etymology.

As we have seen, this issue can be accommodated by positing either (1) that the *Iliad* uses ἀ. to bolster the status of brothers who are relatively recent inventions (especially Medon), or (2) that ἀ. had completely lost the sense of 'uterine' by the time of the *Iliad*, and its application to agnatic siblings is coincidence. It must be admitted that neither of these explanations is elegant. Even so, the other hypotheses discussed here suffer from exactly the same difficulty; and as difficulties go, this one is minor by comparison with the impossibilities involved in the other hypotheses.

Much uncertainty remains. We cannot know for sure the exact sequence of developments; and there remain problems surrounding φράτηρ. We cannot know whether φράτηρ (or *φρήτηρ) ever appeared in epic, and it is very unclear whether φράτηρ and *b^{h}*réh*$_2$*tēr* were originally classificatory or descriptive terms. We have seen no evidence for a link with the meaning of φράτηρ in Classical Athens, and if such a link exists it can probably only be illuminated by new Athenian evidence. It can at least be stated that *if* prehistoric φράτηρ was a classificatory sibling term, then ἀδελφεός, in its original sense of 'brother sharing both parents', must represent a significant move from a classificatory towards a descriptive kin system; and this move must be very early, certainly no later than the use of *ἀδελφεόο in epic. Conversely, if prehistoric φράτηρ and *b^{h}*réh*$_2$*tēr* were descriptive terms, then the later change in the meaning of φράτηρ is one of a number of parallel transformations, where terms for 'co-lineal brother' develop towards an institutional 'brotherhood' sense: this change in φράτηρ in Attic is paralleled by *b^{h}*réh*$_2$*tēr* reflexes in other languages; it is also parallel to the changes in κασίγνητος in Ionic. However, it is unclear whether such a systematic shift would be due to linguistic or social reasons.

Wellington, New Zealand PETER GAINSFORD
peter.gainsford@gmail.com