98   Eric P. Hamp

Abréviations bibliographiques

Bechtel, HPN = F. Bechtel, Die historischen Personennamen des Griechi-
schen bis zur Kaiserzeit, Halle, 1917 (réimpr. 1964).

Chamoux, Cyrène = F. Chamoux, Cyrène sous la monarchie des Battiades,
Paris, 1953.
Chantraine, Dictionnaire = P. Chantraine, Dictionnaire étymologique de
la langue grecque, Paris, 1968–1974.
Robert, Noms indigènes = L. Robert, Noms indigènes dans l'Asie Mineure
gréco-romaine, I, Paris, 1963.

κρέας in Archaic Cretan

By ERIC P. HAMP, University of Chicago

Lilian H. Jeffery and Anna Morpurgo-Davies have given us[1]
an extraordinarily important inscriptional text from central Crete,
perhaps Lyttos, of ca. 500 B.C. Several forms in the inscription
show the well known change of prevocalic epsilon to iota, as the
authors point out (*Kadmos* 9,126): ϑιοί, Σπενσίϑιος, γενιά, πλίες,
κλεύκιος (= γλεύκεος).

As the authors further point out, none of the cases in this
inscription had an original digamma separating the two vowels in
question. Yet we do have from Axos the form κριος which has been
recognized as a genitive sg. A formulation for this change which
did not need to discriminate the lost non-syllabic and which
covered a maximum geographic spread would certainly be simpler.
But it is not merely on grounds of phonology and geography that
we may find this and associated phenomena in this inscription of
interest.

The authors devote a properly careful discussion to the word
κρεων which occurs in line B 12, and which they recognize shows
a different development from κριος. It seems quite reasonable that
κρεων here is a genitive plural. The authors assume as a pre-form
for κρεων *kreu̯esōn. On the grounds of their reasoning there would
be adequate basis for the contraction product of such a sequence
resulting in a mid vowel either too late or too long to undergo
the raising to iota. But a similar configuration (*kreu̯esos) should

---

[1] *The British Museum Quarterly* 36, 24–9; *Kadmos* 9, 1970, 118–54.

also underlie κριος, thus depriving us of the basis for the observed differentiation.

More important, I believe, as I have stated elsewhere (*Studia Classica et Orientalia Antonino Pagliaro Oblata*, 1969, 3: 7–16), the etymon of κρέας is not a simple -*es/os* stem but rather a base terminating in a laryngeal. If we start, then, from the base *kreuH- which we must minimally assume, it seems to me that we will arrive directly at the observed forms. It should be remembered that the genitive plural, like other oblique plural case forms in the IE noun paradigm, originally showed the phonetic equivalent of word-boundary before the case ending (or postposition).

Thus:

sg. nom.-acc.	**kreu̯H̥(-s)*	>	*kréwə*	>	*κρέ(ϝ)α-ς	
gen.	*kreu̯H̥-os*	>	*kréwos*	>	κρέ(ϝ)ος	
pl. gen.	*kreu̯H̥ + ŏm*	>	*kréwə-ōm*	>	κρε(ϝ)αων[2])	

Then when *κρέος closed its epsilon to yield κριος apparently the sequence or contraction of εα in the gen. pl. was unable to undergo the same closing. The result is thus the more open vowel that we oberserve in κρεων.

Such a development requires no more assumptions than we require for the rules of IE noun formation in general and for the phonetic shape of this etymon in particular. These Cretan forms may well be the most direct evidence we have been bequeathed to date on the original shape of this fundamental noun.

Griech. βραβεύς ‚Kampfrichter,

Von Johann Knobloch, Bonn

Nach dem Urteil von P. Chantraine und Hj. Frisk in ihren maßgeblichen etymologischen Wörterbüchern des Griechischen muß das Wort βραβεύς als noch unerklärt gelten. Wenn sich aber sein Synonym, nämlich αἰσυμνήτης als Ableitung von *αισυμνᾱ ‛Astgabel’ verstehen läßt (s. darüber Antiquitates Indogermanicae, Gedenkschrift H. Güntert, Innsbruck 1974, S. 349), so wäre es

---

[2]) Presumably = κρεάων (Hymn Merc. 130) > Att.-Ion. κρεῶν Hom. κρειῶν. Further, κρέασι (and κρεάεσσι) < *κρέϝασι < **kreu̯H̥* +*su*; pl. κρέα < *κρέϝα < **kreu̯H̥(-H̥)* or **kreu̯H̥-H̥*; gen.sg. κρέως perhaps *κρῆος < *κρῆϝος < *kreHwos with metathesis to preserve paradigmatic *H*.

7*