

## On type *ιερής* forms in Arcadian and Cypriot \*)

By ANTONIO LILLO, Salamanca

This kind of nominatives in *-ης* results from analogical refection from old accusatives in *-ην*. But this change doesn't come from old time, as Masson thinks, but from a recent one, from the 6th/5th century B.C. in Arcadian and the end of the 5th B.C. in Cypriot, i.e., after the fall of intervocalic *-w-*: the Cypriot forms *υερης* and *βασιλης* belong to the 4th century B.C.

So, the change of the nominative *-εύς* in *-ης* is a parallel development in both dialects from the common accusative *-ην*.

Traditionally these nominatives in *-ης* of *\*-ēw-* stem are explained because of analogical refection from old accusatives in *-ην*,<sup>1)</sup> possibly existing yet in Mycenaean.<sup>2)</sup> It is then a post-Mycenaean innovation.

Bosshardt<sup>3)</sup> and Szemerényi<sup>4)</sup> reach similar conclusions, although going different ways. The former explains the innovation as follows: *-ηFa > -ηa > -η*; in this phase a new characterization of the accusative is produced adding *-ν*; the nominative type *ιερης* would be formed from this type of accusative *ιερην*. Nevertheless, it can be pointed out:

a) The sequence *ηa* is not contracted in these dialects, as proved by the forms of Orchomenos *νηαταν*, Schw. *Del.*<sup>3</sup> 664, 10; *χηηα*, *id.* 665 A, 16 and 23, and *Αχηα*, *id.* 665, *passim* (all these forms are dated in the middle of the 4th century B.C.). So Bosshardt's theory goes down in credibility.

b) Intervocalic *-F-* still appears in Arcadian inscriptions about the end of the 6th century B.C. or the beginning of the 5th (*IG* V 2,

---

\*) I am very grateful to professor Catalina Montes for her friendly revision of my English translation of this paper.

<sup>1)</sup> Cf. E. Schwyzler, *Gr. Gr.* II, p. 575–6; J. L. Perpillou, *Les substantifs grecs en -εύς*. Paris 1973, p. 64.

<sup>2)</sup> C. J. Ruijgh, *Etudes du grec mycénien*, Amsterdam 1967, p. 87; M. Lejeune, *RPh* 35 (1961), 195–206.

<sup>3)</sup> *Die Nomina auf -εύς*. Zürich 1942, p. 160.

<sup>4)</sup> "Arcadian and Cypriote(?) *IEPEΣ* and the Mycenaean Antecedent", *SMEA* 6 (1968), 7–13.

75; *SEG XI 1112,4*) and the oldest nominatives in  $-\eta\varsigma$  of  $*-\bar{e}w$ -stem are already found in the same 5th century B.C. (*IG V 2, 262, 26, 30 and 36*). Consequently, it is not long enough for the vocalic contraction, the remodeling of the accusative and, as a result of it, the remodeling of the nominative to be produced.

Szemerényi accepts Bosshardt's theory as far as the  $-\eta\alpha$  phase and thinks that  $-\eta\alpha$  passes to  $-\epsilon\alpha$ ; then, the  $-\epsilon\nu\varsigma$  nominative would have been impossible in a  $-\epsilon\alpha$ ,  $-\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ ,  $-\epsilon\iota$  paradigm where intervocalic  $-f-$  had fallen. This accusative in  $-\epsilon\alpha$ , developed from the early  $-\epsilon f\alpha$ , called forth a new nominative in  $-\eta\varsigma$  by analogy with  $*-s-$  stems. Once this nominative got established, it easily produced an acc.  $-\eta\nu$  on the model of  $-\bar{a}\varsigma|-\bar{a}\nu$ ,  $-\omicron\varsigma|-\omicron\nu$ . This remodeling would have been accomplished, of course, at the end of the 6th century B.C. or at the beginning of the 5th, when intervocalic  $-f-$  fell.

Regarding to this theory it can be pointed out:

a) There is no reason to suppose that  $-\epsilon\alpha$  ( $< -\eta\alpha < *-\bar{e}w\eta$ ) existed in the areas where the  $-\eta\varsigma$  nominative from  $*-\bar{e}w$ -stem is testified.

b) According to Szemerényi,  $-\eta\varsigma$  appeared first, and afterwards,  $-\eta\nu$  was formed by analogy with  $-\bar{a}\varsigma|-\bar{a}\nu$ ,  $-\omicron\varsigma|-\omicron\nu$ . It cannot then be understood how there is not any evidence of the  $-\epsilon\alpha$  accusative in Tegea, where  $-\eta\varsigma|-\eta\nu$  forms of  $*-\bar{e}w$ -stem are well implanted (the evidences of this stem in Mantinea are all nominatives by historic chance), but  $-\eta\nu$  always appears and  $-\epsilon\nu\varsigma$  nominatives are sometimes found.

Let us examine the Arcadian evidences:

In Tegea  $-\eta\varsigma$  nominatives of  $*-\bar{e}w$  stem are very numerous<sup>5)</sup> but there are some remains of  $-\epsilon\nu\varsigma$  forms: *Ιδριευς* (the noms *Φωκευς* and *Μυλασευς*, which Thumb-Scherer<sup>6)</sup> considers "rein arkadische" forms, surely cannot be archaism, we think. They are found in an inscription of the 3rd century B.C. (*IG V 2, 34*) and, accordingly, they are late forms; in addition a non Arcadian  $-\omicron\nu$  genitive appears in the same text. Furthermore, these names are not Arcadian, but derived from non-Arcadian place-names. We are then forced to take these evidences with reservations. The accusative is always  $-\eta\nu$  (by far no  $-\eta$  form has appeared).<sup>7)</sup>

<sup>5)</sup> *IG V 2, 6, 96; 8, 5; 36, 60; 36, 106; 36, 127; 37, 78; 43, 1; 115, 1; 116, 7.*

<sup>6)</sup> *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte II*, Heidelberg 1959, p. 129.

<sup>7)</sup> *IG V 2, 3, 1.*

In Mantinea the nominative of this stem, *-ης*,<sup>8)</sup> is the only one testified.

The situation in Orchomenos is different. There is no evidence of the *-ης* nominative and only two *-εως* forms appear in inscriptions of the 3rd century B.C.<sup>9)</sup> But, in spite of the absence of these evidences, we find a form which justifies the thought that in this country *-ης* nominatives of *\*-ēw* stem did not occur: it is the accusative *Αρηα*, Schw. *Del.*<sup>3</sup> 665 C 7–8; 10; 14; 17; 26–7; 29; 32–3; 35. Although it is a problematic form,<sup>10)</sup> it points out that the desinence of accusative in the singular of the athematic declension is here *-α*, in a context in which *-ν* would appear in Tegea. If type *ιερην* forms would have been generalized in Orchomenos, *Αρην* would have been found by analogy instead of *Αρηα*. So we think that here the forms like *ιερεια* or *ιερηα* probably appeared, instead of *ιερην*. These questions lead us to conclude that the *-εως* nominatives have possibly remained without any change in Orchomenos because there was no *-ην* accusative to force a remodelling. Furthermore, in spite of the influence of other dialects, *-ης* nominatives of this stem are found in Tegea in the 3rd century B.C. and even in the 2nd, but not in Orchomenos.

One accusative form must be mentioned in Lusos, [*Αμ*]φισσα, *IG* V 2, 394, 6, also from an *\*-ēw*- stem, but the inscription is late (200 B.C.) and there is possibly a non Arcadian influence.

In short, the innovation which is the *-ης* remodelling from *-εως* nominative is only testified in Tegea and Mantinea. In Orchomenos there is not any evidence of the *-ης* nominative from old *-εως*, but two *-εως* forms appear in the 3rd century B.C. From these facts and indirect evidences it is possible to deduce that perhaps this innovation was not originated there. If it is so, we must conclude that it is an innovation affecting only a part of Arcadia.

Unlike what is found in that part of Peloponnese, in Cypriot the *-ης* nominative appears only twice (*ιυερης* and *βασιλης*), and *-εως* forms are very numerous. But these evidences are clearer than the Arcadian ones.<sup>11)</sup> The inscriptions in which the *-ης* nominatives appear, are dated in the 4th century B.C., and even that which has the

<sup>8)</sup> *IG* V 2, 262, 26, 30 and 36.

<sup>9)</sup> Schw. *Del.*<sup>3</sup> 666, 7–8; 667, 17–8.

<sup>10)</sup> Cf. P. Chantraine, *Dict. étym.*, I, p. 108.

<sup>11)</sup> Cf. O. Masson, "Sur un problème dialectal arcado-chypriote: les noms en *-ης*", *BSL* 73 (1978), 287–281.

4 Antonio Lillo, On type *ιερός* forms in Arcadian and Cypriot

*βασίλης* form probably belongs to the end of that century.<sup>12)</sup> On the other hand, intervocalic *-f-* begins to fall at the end of the 5th century B.C. in Cypriot: most evidences of *-ηφος* genitive of *\*-ēw-* stem are dated in the 6th and 5th centuries B.C. and few in the 4th, while evidences of the *-ηος* genitive, where intervocalic *-f-* has already fallen, belong to the 4th century B.C. and some to the 5th.<sup>13)</sup> Furthermore, it must be pointed out that the initial *-f-* of *αρασσας* has also fallen in the inscription *ICS* no. 5, where the *υερεης* form appears. This agreement between the appearance of *-ης* forms of *\*-ēw-* stem and the fall of intervocalic *-f-* in the flexion of such a stem induce us to conclude that there is relationship between both facts.

In my opinion, *-ης* nominatives of *\*-ēw-* stems result as a analogical refection from old accusatives in *-ην*. But this change did not occur in old times, as Masson<sup>14)</sup> thinks, but in recent ones, at the end of the 6th century or beginning of the 5th century B.C. in Arcadian and from the end of the 5th B.C. on in Cypriot, i.e., after the fall of intervocalic *-f-*.

That it must be so, is suggested to me by the fact that the Cypriot *υερεης* and *βασίλης* forms are dated in the 4th century B.C., when intervocalic *-f-* has fallen or hardly found in the flexion of *\*-ēw-* stem. In a paradigm N. *-ēw-s*, A. *-ē-n*. G. *-ēw-os*, D. *-ēw-i*, the *-εως* nominative was supported, in spite of *-ēn* accusative, because there was intervocalic *-f-* in the other paradigmatic cases. But when intervocalic *-f-* began to fall this paradigm must have tended to be remodeled, because there was *-εως* nominative with *-w-* phoneme without response in the rest of the flexion. I.e., a paradigm N. *-ew-s*, A. *-ē-n*, G. *-ē-os* (> *-ēos*), D. *-ē-i* (> *-ēi*) would force the appearance of a remodeled nominative in *-ης*.

It is clear from this explanation that the remodelling of *-εως* nominatives in Arcadian and Cypriot must have followed a parallel evolution in both dialects. This coincidence is not surprising if we have in mind the accusative in *-ην* of *\*-ēw-* stem in Proto-Arcadian and Proto-Cypriot. Starting from this stage, the fall of intervocalic *-f-* will be the cause of such a remodelling in either dialect.

<sup>12)</sup> Cf. V. Karageorghis, "Chronique des fouilles et découvertes archéologiques à Chypre en 1977", *BCH* 102 (1978), 899 and O. Masson *ICS*, p. 103-4.

<sup>13)</sup> Cf. Szemerényi's list of forms, *o.c.* p. 8-9.

<sup>14)</sup> *BSL* 73 (1978), 287.