

## HOMERIC WORDS IN CYPRUS

THE difficulty of transcribing words written in the Cypriote syllabary makes our acquaintance with the Cypriote dialect precarious and faulty, and in many cases leaves us uncertain about the exact form of a word, but in spite of this uncertainty it is clear that Cypriote, both in inscriptions and in glosses, shews in its vocabulary a notable similarity to the language of the Homeric poems. Inscriptions discovered since Hoffmann's day have enabled us to increase his already long list of such similarities (*Die Griechischen Dialekte*, I, pp. 278–283), and it is time to examine the evidence and see what bearing these have on the question of the nature of Homeric vocabulary. The problem presented by Homeric words in Cypriote is similar to that presented by their existence in Arcadian, but, though the meaning of Cypriote words is sometimes uncertain, Cyprus is richer in inscriptions than Arcadia and the ancient lexicographers and scholiasts have preserved a singularly large number of Cypriote glosses. The problem is simply stated: how far are we justified in believing that Homeric words in Cypriote are independent of the Homeric poems? Are they indigenous words, naturally used, or are they 'literary' imitations of a well-known poetical style, used for effect in defiance of local dialect usage?

### I.

We may first consider those cases where the Homeric and the Cypriote word are identical in form and usage. In most of these cases the independence of the Cypriote word can only be proved by individual circumstances, and each case must be judged impartially on its merits. The use in Cypriote of ἄνασσα, or more correctly Φάνασσα, is well established. On authority no less than that of Aristotle (*Κυπρίων Πολιτεία* quoted by Harpocration, *s.v.* ἄνακτες καὶ ἄνασσαι), we are told that in Cyprus the sisters and wives of a βασιλεύς were called ἄνασσαι. On so good authority this statement is doubtless true, especially as the other statement made with it, that the king's sons and brothers were called ἄνακτες, fits well with our epigraphic evidence. But actually ἄνασσα is not found in inscriptions with this sense. It is, however, a good Cypriote word. Hoffmann 101, 3 gives τᾶς Φανάσ(σ)ας. So do 102, 2. 103, 4. 104, 2. and 105, 1, while 100 gives τᾶς ἀνάσ(σ)ας without the initial digamma. In every case but the last the digamma is preserved and in every case the title is a religious title of the Paphian Aphrodite. These cases are curiously parallel to the cases of ἄνασσα in the Homeric poems. Homer uses the word once in the *Iliad* and three times in the *Odyssey* (ζ 326. γ 380. ζ 149, 175), and it reappears in the Homeric Hymns (II 75, 440, 492. XXXII 17). On all these occasions it refers to a goddess, to Demeter in the *Iliad*, to Athene in γ 380, to Demeter

in the Hymn addressed to her, to the Moon in Hymn XXXII, and to Nausicaa in 3 149 and 175, whom Odysseus mistakes or pretends to mistake for Artemis. In at least three of these places the metre shows that ἀνασσα begins with a digamma (ζ 326. 3 149. Hymn XXXII 17). So the parallel to Cypriote usage is very close. This use of ἀνασσα lasts till Aeschylus (*Eum.* 235. 443. 892) and Sophocles who use it of Athene (*Ajax* 774). Pindar uses it of his personified goddess of Truth (fr. 205) and Euripides of Athene (*Iph. Aul.* 434), Artemis (*Hipp.* 307) and Earth (*El.* 678). Later literature, however, also used it, as Homer did not, as a title of honour for human beings of royal rank or lineage (Isoc. 9. 72. Arist. fr. 526. Aesch. *Pers.* 155 and 173. Soph. *Trach.* 137. *El.* 666). Greek dialects do not shew much evidence of its use, but it occurs beyond the range of Homeric influence in the semi-barbarous dialect of Pamphylia. The long inscription from Sillyum (Schwyzer 686. l. 29) has the accusative ὠνάσφα(ν), where the subsequent words καὶ Ἀπέλωνα shew that it must refer to a goddess, and a coin from Perga (Head, *Hist. Num.* 702) has the inscription ὠνάσφας Πραιίας, which is taken to mean Ἀρτέμιδος Περγαίας. The occurrence of the word in Pamphylian is important for establishing its independence in Cypriote. Its occurrence in two quite different and geographically separated dialects makes it probable that it was an indigenous word in either or in both.

The Idalian Bronze (Schwyzer 679. l. 3) gives βασιλεὺς Στασίκυπρος κὰς ἃ πτόλις Ἐδαλιέφες ἀνογον Ὀνάσιλον κ.τ.λ.—‘King Stasicyprus and the city of the Idalians ordered Onasilus, etc.’ The word ἀνογον is presumably related to the perfect ἀνωγα itself and is a pluperfect form like ὁμόμοκον (Hoffmann 109, 6). The same word occurs throughout Homer in different forms (e.g. ἀνωγα Κ 120, ἀνωγας Ζ 383, ἀνωγε Λ 646, ἀνώγεμεν Ν 56, ἀνωχθι Κ 67). The influence of Homer may be responsible for its appearance in Hesiod (*Op.* 367, 403, 687. *Th.* 549. *Sc. Her.* 479), in Aeschylus (*Ch.* 735, 772. *Eum.* 902. *P.V.* 947, 1037.), in Sophocles (*O.T.* 96. *El.* 1458. *Phil.* 54, 100. *Trach.* 1247. *O.C.* 904, 1598), and in Euripides (*Or.* 119. *Alc.* 1044. etc.). It does not occur in ordinary Attic prose, though the Ionic Herodotus uses it (III 31 and 81. VII 101 and 104), but his vocabulary is so full of Homeric echoes that this may well be one of them. In Cypriote it looks indigenous both because of its complete adaptation to Cypriote form and because hitherto Cypriote has shown no other word meaning ‘command,’ differing in this from the kindred dialect of Arcadian, which uses κελεύω (*IG.* V<sup>2</sup>. 6, 15).

Homer, twenty-six times in the *Iliad* and seventeen times in the *Odyssey*, uses the word ἄρουρα, both in its singular and plural form. Its sense is clearly ‘tilled or arable land.’ After Homer the word has a long history, mainly poetical, appearing in Hesiod (*Op.* 117, 173, 237, etc.), Pindar (*O.* XII 19. *P.* IV 34. *P.* XI 15, etc.), Simonides (fr. 15), Aeschylus (*Pers.* 595. *Sept.* 754), Sophocles (*Trach.* 32. *Ajax* 1286) and Euripides (*Or.* 552. *H.F.* 369. *Rhes.* 75. *El.* 79). Its epic air doubtless accounts for its appearance in the hexameters at the end of Aristophanes’ *Frogs* (1533 πατρίοις ἐν ἀρούραις) and in the last stages of Plato’s prose style (*Timaeus* 22e, 73c, 91d. *Laws* VIII 839a). It is noteworthy that Aristotle

uses it in his story of Periander—ἀφαιροῦντα τοὺς ὑπερέχοντας τῶν σταχύων δμαλῦναι τὴν ἄρουραν (*Pol.* III 1284a 30), though here he may only be recounting the story in the form in which he found it. All these cases may well be considered as due to Homeric influence, as the authors in each case knew Homer and often used him. The same charge can hardly be levelled at its use by Sappho (Lobel. ε̄ 5, 11 πολυανθέμοις ἀρούραις) in one of her vernacular poems, which, as Mr. Lobel has amply proved, are singularly free of literary influence and written in the every-day speech of Lesbos. So the word was probably indigenous to Lesbos:<sup>1</sup> so too in Cypriote. The Idalian Bronze (ll. 20–21) shows ‘kase to kapone to ni simitose arourai,’ *i.e.* κάς τὸ(ν) κάπον τὸν ἰ(ν) Σίμιδος ἀρούραι, which means ‘and the orchard in the arable land belonging to Simmis.’ This recalls such Homeric phrases as ἀνδρὸς μάκαρος κατ’ ἄρουραν (Λ 68), ἄλις δέ οἱ ἦσαν ἄρουραι πυροφόροι (Ξ 122–123) and τέλσον ἀρούρης (Σ 544). That the word was indigenous to Cyprus is proved by a curious entry in Hesychius, ἄρουρα σωρὸς σίτου σὺν ἀχύροις. Κύπριοι. If ἄρουρα was a good Cypriote word for a heap of corn, its meaning must have been based on local usage.

In Ψ 160 a large body of manuscripts, supported by Aristarchus, read παρὰ δ’ οἱ ταγοὶ ἄμμι μερόντων. This is the only case of ταγός in Homer, but it may well be the right reading, despite the quantity of the first syllable. Hesychius seems to have recognised it in his entry ταγοὶ· προστάται, ἄρχοντες, ἡγεμόνες, and the change to οἱ τ’ ἄγοι is ascribed to Dionysius by Schol. Ven. ταγός is a good Cypriote word. We find on a pot of the early iron age, not later than the seventh century, the inscription ‘teropano to tako,’ *i.e.* Θηροφάνω τῶ ταγῶ (Myres, *Catalogue of the Cesnola Collection* 480. Hoffmann 179 reads Τηλεφάνω), and on a silver bowl, also of very early date, we find ‘iperipo tako,’ *i.e.* Ἰ(μ)περόπω ταγῶ (Myres 4557. Hoffmann 116). Possibly the same word occurs on a votive limestone ear (Hoffmann 170), where Hoffmann reads Ποίτω ταγῶ. Unfortunately we cannot tell from the scanty evidence whether ταγός possessed in Cypriote any special meaning to differentiate it from Φάναξ and βασιλεύς, each of which had its own technical significance. Elsewhere in Greek the uses of ταγός fall into two classes. In the Tragedians it is used of any sort of leader (*Aesch. P.V.* 96. *Pers.* 23, 324. *Ag.* 110. *Soph. Ant.* 1054. *Eur. I.A.* 269). Its literary and tragic air makes it fit matter for parody by Aristophanes, who puts it on the lips of Demos in his welcome to the Sausage Seller in the *Knights* (159), – ὦ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ταγὲ τῶν εὐδαιμόνων. In Thessaly, on the other hand, it had a definitely constitutional meaning, whether applied to the chief prince (*Xen. Hell.* VI 1, 8 and 18. *ib.* 4, 28, 32 and 35) or to the chief local authorities (*GDI.* 1332, 37 ταγοὶ. 345, 10 ταγοῦν. 345, 4 and 26 (letter of Philip) ταγοῖς, 345, 24 and 1329 Ia ταγεύοντων). The word seems to have survived also in the technical sense of the head-official of a phratry, as an inscription of the beginning of the fourth century, found near the Athenian Treasury at Delphi (Schwyzer

<sup>1</sup> It occurs too in Epirus in the sense of ‘ploughland’ (*GDI.* 1365.5), and Herodotus uses it of a

measure of land in Egypt (II 168: ἡ δὲ ἄρουρα ἑκατὸν πήχεων ἔστι Αἰγυπτίων πάντη).

323), in giving the rules of the phratry uses the word (l. 23) in τοὺς ταγούς μὴ δέκεσθαι κ.τ.λ. There is also a trace of its being used for some office in Macedon, as Hesychius has the entry ταγόνονγα Μακεδονική τις ἀρχή. The Homeric ταγός clearly belongs to the first of these classes and has no specialised meaning, but the Cypriote word cannot be fully determined. The probability is that, like Φάναξ and βασιλεύς, it had its own shade of meaning, and in any case it cannot be an imitation of Homer, as Homer only used the word once, and such scantiness of usage would not conduce to the word being understood in a dialect where it was not already indigenous.

An inscription from Rantidi gives the words 'aitetu tumijata,' which its editor R. Meister takes with some probability (*Lpz. Ber.* 62, p. 243) to be αἶθετυ θυμιατά, 'the offerings were burned.' The form presents no difficulties, as αἶθετυ is clearly the imperfect passive of αἶθω. The termination in -υ is common in Cypriote, which gives us forms like ἔφρετάσату (Idalian Bronze 14) and γένοιτου (*ib.* 29). It is clearly from the same verb as the participle αἰθόμενος which Homer commonly uses in one or the other of two senses, either of fire burning (Z 182, Θ 563, Κ 246 κ.τ.λ. πυρὸς αἰθόμενοιο) or of material objects being burned, such as sacrificial victims (Λ 775, μ 362 ἐπ' αἰθόμενοις ἱεροῖσι.). This seems to be the only case in which Homer uses the word of being consumed by fire. This use is imitated, or paralleled, by Hesiod, *Op.* 755 ἱεροῖσιν ἐπ' αἰθόμενοισι, and it finds an echo in Sophocles (*Phil.* 1033), θεοῖς αἶθειν ἱερά. But the ordinary use of the word in post-Homeric literature is the commoner Homeric use of fire burning. This is very common, though the use is not restricted any longer to the participle, and the present and imperfect indicative are used as well (*e.g.* Soph. *Ajax* 286, etc.). There are, however, a few cases where the word is used in the sense of 'consume by fire' and combined with objects other than sacrificial victims. Thus Herodotus uses it of bones being burned (IV 61) and Euripides of the conflagration of Pentheus' palace in the *Bacchae* (l. 624 δώματ' αἶθεσθαι δοκῶν). This is clearly an extension of its rarer Homeric use. The Cypriote use is exactly parallel to this rarer Homeric use, and differs both from the ordinary Homeric use of the word and from the later extended use. There seem two minor arguments in favour of its authenticity. First, if it is really an imitation of Homer, it seems improbable that the imitator would have used a tense, let alone a form, which Homer never used. Secondly, there is some slight evidence of the word existing in dialects other than Cypriote. The list of Γλωσσαι κατὰ Πόλεις (Bekker, *Anec. Graec.* III, p. 1095) has the entry Ἀμβρακιωτῶν. αἶθεται· καίεται. If the word existed in Ambracia as well as in Cyprus, it is probably authentic in both dialects. We might add that so far as we know there is no other word in Cypriote for 'burn.'

Homer uses two aorists of κείρω, the form κείρασθαι (Ψ 46, δ 198) and another form, with an internal σ, in the participle (Ω 450 δοῦρ' ἐλάτης κέρσαντες) and the aorist indicative active (Κ 456 ἄμφω κέρσε τένοντας. Π 393 πρῶτας ἐπέκερσε φάλαγγας). In this form the word had a small history. Hesiod (*Sc. Her.* 419) uses the form ἀποκέρσε, Aeschylus in a

lyric passage uses the form *κερσάμενος* (*Pers.* 952), and the word may have been used elsewhere, as Hesychius has the entry *κέρσαι· κόψαι, τεμείν, κείραι, γαλλίσσαι*, implying more use of it than we now possess. But the usual form in Pindar and the Tragedians is *ἔκειρα*, which occurs too in Attic prose. In Cypriote, however, we find on an inscription from a grotto at Ktima these words, ‘tarapase . . . epipasine to sepose tote . kerese apoloni ulatai,’ *i.e.* *Τάρβας . . . ἐπίβασιν τὸ σπέος τόδε (ἐ)κερσε Ἀπόλλ(λ)ῶνι Ὑλάται*—‘Tarbas cut an entry to this cave in honour of Apollo Hylates.’ The word *ἔκερσε* is, of course, the Homeric word. It is the only word we know for ‘carve’ or ‘cut’ in Cypriote, and it bears, moreover, a slightly different sense from the Homeric word, as the carving of the entrance to a cave is hardly the same sort of cutting as is required for wounding ankles or splitting logs of wood.

Both Homer and Hesiod commonly use the conjunction *αὐτάρ* either to mark a contrast or to emphasise a succession of details. In Cypriote inscriptions we find it certainly twice and probably four times. In Hoffmann 57 we read ‘teo tase papijase e . . . autara me kateteke kesetotemise,’ *i.e.* *(τᾶς) θεῷ τᾶς Παφίγας ἐ(μι)· αὐτάρ με κατέθηκε (Ἄ)κεστόθεις*, in 60, 2. ‘tase . . . o tase pa . . . autara mi kate . . . onasitemise,’ *i.e.* *τᾶς (θεῷ) τᾶς (Παφίγας ἐμι)· αὐτάρ μι κατέ(θηκε) Ὀνασίθεις*. These are two certain cases. Almost equally certain is the fragmentary 61, which begins ‘tase teo tase,’ *i.e.* *τᾶς θεῷ τᾶς . . .*, and goes on ‘aitara me,’ where, assuming the *i* to be a sculptor’s mistake for *u*, we may read ‘αὐτάρ με . . .’ Another possible case is 66, which begins in the same way with a dedication to the Paphian goddess, though the edges of the stone are mutilated and it is not certain how it should go on, but before the name of the dedicator, we can clearly decipher ‘tara me evexe,’ which may be taken to be *(αὐ)τάρ με ἔφεξε*, ‘but I was dedicated by . . .’ Here then are more and less good examples of *αὐτάρ* in Cypriote inscriptions. In each case it is used, as so often in Homer, to mark a contrast (*e.g.* *v* 285–6 *οἱ δ’ ἐς Σιδονίην . . . οἴχοντ’ αὐτάρ ἐγὼ λιπόμην ἀκαχημένος ἦτορ*): here the contrast is between the goddess, to whom the dedication is made and whose name is given in the first line, and the man who makes the dedication whose name is given afterwards. *αὐτάρ*, so common in the Epic, hardly occurs at all elsewhere. An early metrical inscription (*IG. I<sup>2</sup>. 1012*) gives *ἄFυτάρ*, and the word was clearly regarded as a literary peculiarity, as Hermippus (fr. 63, 17) introduced it into his sham epic catalogue – *αὐτάρ ἄπ’ Εὐβοίας ἀπίους καὶ ἴφια μῆλα*, and Aristophanes puts it into a bogus oracle in the *Birds* (l. 983) – *αὐτάρ ἐπὴν ἀκκλητος ἰὼν ἀνθρωπος ἀλάζων κ.τ.λ.* In fifth-century Athens it was a literary word, fit subject for parody. But in Cyprus it kept its ancient meaning of marking a contrast. In doing this it performed a function different from that of *ἰδέ*, which either introduced the conclusion of a condition or a new sentence, and from *κᾶς*, which acted as a conjunction between single words. It has then a proper function in Cypriote and may safely be acquitted of any charge of being imitated from Homer.

## 2.

In Cypriote, as in Arcadian, some words are found with meanings or forms slightly different from those they possess in the Homeric poems, and this slight difference is an argument in favour of the independence of the Cypriote words from influence by the Homeric poems. If the writer of these words in Cypriote had borrowed them from Homer merely to adorn his style and make it impressive, the probability is that he would have borrowed them with their correct Homeric form and construction. If they existed only in the Epic, it is highly unlikely that, in their altered form, they would have been understood by a public to whom they were not already familiar as existing in the vernacular. We may first consider those Cypriote words which differ in meaning from their Homeric counterparts.

In Cypriote dedicatory inscriptions we find a word ἀρά, Hoffmann 83, 'ara tii,' *i.e.* ἀρά Διί, 166, 'are a nao,' *i.e.* ἀρά ἅ Νάῶ, 147, 2, 'toi apolono jara,' *i.e.* τῷ Ἀπόλ(λ)ωνι ἰαρά. As all these dedications occur on votive altars, the meaning of ἀρά is clearly 'vow.' Neither Homer nor Hesiod uses the word quite in this sense. Homer uses it in the sense of 'prayer' in O 378 ἀράων αἰών Νηληιάδαο γέροντος, 598-9 ἕξαισιον ἀρῆν πᾶσαν ἐπικρήνει, Ψ 199 ἀράων αἰούσα, ρ 496 εἰ γὰρ ἐπ' ἀρῆσιν τέλος ἡμετέρησι γένοιτο. The sense of the word is made clear both by the context in each place and by entries like that of the Townleian Scholiast on O 598, ἀρῆν αἴτησιν, Hesychius' ἀρά· εὐχή, and Suidas' εὐχή· ἐπαγγελία θεῶ τῶν κατ' εὐσέβειαν ἀφιερουμένων. Hesiod uses the word in the same sense in *Op.* 726: so do Pindar (*Isthm.* VI 43), and Herodotus VI 63 ἀρῆν ἐποίησατο παῖδα γενέσθαι Ἀρίστωνι. But usually in post-Homeric literature it has the totally different meaning of 'curse.' This is common in Attic prose (*e.g.* Plato, *Critias* 119e, *Laws* 871b, 742b) and imprecatory inscriptions (*e.g.* *IG.* III 1417 sqq.). But the Cypriote meaning is slightly different from both of these.

Homer commonly uses ἄναξ in all its cases, singular and plural. In a great majority of the cases (as, for instance, in A 502 Κρονίωνα ἄνακτα) an initial digamma is required to obtain correct scansion, and in a large number of cases (as in E 546 ἄνδρεσσιν ἄνακτα) the initial digamma could be easily restored by the removal of the preceding νυ ἐφελκυστικόν. The cases where the metre excludes the digamma altogether (as in ω 449 ποίησαν ἄνακτι) are far fewer both in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. The form Φάναξ survives in inscriptions at Argos (Schwyzer 79, 1 τῶν Φανάφῶν) and on several early painted sherds found at Acrocorinth (Schwyzer 123, Φάνακτι). These cases are all early, and by the fifth century the archaic form had disappeared from most of Greece. In Cyprus, however, the existence of ἄναξ or Φάναξ is particularly well authenticated. Aristotle in his *Constitution of Cyprus* (quoted by Harpocration *s.v.* ἄνακτες καὶ ἄνασσαί) says that in Cyprus οἱ μὲν υἱοὶ τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ καλοῦνται ἄνακτες, and Eustathius, perhaps drawing from the same source, says (ad N 582) καὶ τι δὲ, φασί, τάγμα ἔνδοξον ἐν Κύπρῳ ἄνακτες ἐκαλοῦντο, πρὸς οὓς ἀνεφέρετο ἑκάστης ἡμέρας πρὸς τῶν ὠτακουστούτων,

ὄτι ἄν ἀκούωσιν. The existence of the word is confirmed by inscriptions, in which, as late as the fourth century, it keeps the initial digamma. Hoffmann 69, 1 has ‘ο vanaxe satasijase satasikarateose,’ *i.e.* ὁ Φάναξ (ὁ) Στασικράτεος, and the difficult metrical inscription, Hoffman 144, 1, certainly has ‘vanaxe,’ *i.e.* Φάναξ, in its first line. In these two cases it is impossible to say if Φάναξ has the special meaning given to it by Aristotle, but in a marble inscription from Idalium (Hoffmann 134) we find ‘tonatirijatane tote katesetase o vanaxe,’ *i.e.* τὸν ἀνδριάνταν τό(ν)δε κατέστασε ὁ Φάναξ. Here we have the full context and it is clear that Baalram, the son of Abdimilkon, who sets up the inscription, is of inferior rank as Φάναξ to the βασιλεύς, Milcijathon, by whose reign he dates his inscription (*c.* 388 B.C.). So here perhaps may be epigraphic support of Aristotle’s statement, in so far as Φάναξ has a different meaning from βασιλεύς, whatever the precise difference may be. In Homer there is no distinction at all between the two words. Not only is the same person called by the two titles in different places (*e.g.* Agamemnon is ἄναξ in A 7 but βασιλεύς in A 231), but the two words are combined and applied to the same person in υ 194, βασιλῆι ἄνακτι, and there can be no doubt that, so far as meaning is concerned, they are interchangeable. So, by establishing a difference of status between the two titles, Cypriote definitely is in disagreement from Homer.

Homer uses commonly the conjunction ἰδέ in the sense of ‘and,’ to connect either single words or phrases or sentences. Outside Homer the word is not often found, though Hesiod is fond of it, and it always seems to be a Homeric poetical word, when it occurs in the Elegists or once in a chorus of Sophocles (*Ant.* 969). There seems to be no foundation for the statement made by the Scholiast on *Opp. Hal.* I 12 that τὸ ἦδὲ Ἀπτικῶς μὲν διὰ τοῦ η, Ἴωνικῶς δὲ διὰ τοῦ ι. Outside the Epic and its followers there is no evidence for ἰδέ in Ionic. In Cypriote, however, it is found with special functions of its own. It introduces either the conclusion of a condition or a new sentence. Both examples are exemplified in the Idalian Bronze, the first in l. 12 ‘eke sise . . . exe toi koroi exeoruxe itepai o exeoruxe, etc.,’ *i.e.* ἰ κέ σις . . . ἐξ τοῖ χῶροδι ἐξ ὀρύξε ἰδέ παῖ ὁ ἐξ ὀρύξε, πείσει κ.τ.λ., ‘if anyone digs in the place, then indeed for what he digs he shall pay, etc.’ In l. 26 this use recurs, where practically the same form of words is repeated. The other use of ἰδέ occurs in l. 26, ‘ite tatalatone tate . . . pasileuse kase a potolisekatetijane,’ *i.e.* ἰδέ τὰ(ν) δάλτον τὰ(ν)δε . . . βασιλεύς κὰς ἅ πτόλις κατέθιαν—‘this tablet was set up . . . by the King and the city.’ Here ἰδέ introduces a new idea in a new sentence. Neither of these two uses of ἰδέ is the same as its use in Homer as a mere conjunction, and both are too specialised to be imitations from his use.

Homer uses some forms derived from a vanished present in ἀλευόμενον (E 28), ἀλευόμενος (O 223, Π 711, Υ 281, ι 277), ἀλευόμενος (E 444), ἀλεύατο (Γ 360, Η 254, Λ 360, Ξ 462, υ 300), ἀλεύαντο (Η 254, Λ 360, Ξ 462, υ 300, χ 260), ἀλεύασθαι (μ 159, 269, 274), ἀλεύεται (ξ 400, ω 29). The sense is always ‘avoid’ or ‘shun.’ This middle use is continued by Hesiod (*Op.* 505, 535, 798, etc.) and Theognis

(400 ἀλευόμενος) and is doubtless a Homericism. We find, however, the active, unhomeric ἀλεύω occasionally in later verse. Aeschylus uses the forms ἄλευε (*P.V.* 567), ἀλεύσατε (*Sept.* 87), and ἄλευσον (*Sept.* 141. *Supp.* 528), in the sense of 'remove, keep far away.' The same use appears in Sophocles fr. 993 (ἀλεύσω; cf. Hesychius ἀλεύσων· ἀντὶ τοῦ φυλάξων). This rare active form appears in Cypriote. On an alabaster vase, now lost (Hoffmann 161), appeared the words 'vetoko alevotese koo tatepevasa,' *i.e.* Φέθοχο(ς) ἀλέφοντες χόο(ν) τά(ν)δ' ἐπέφασσαν, which means something like '(someone and) Vethochos escaping (or departing) dedicated this vase.' Unfortunately we do not know the exact meaning of ἀλέφοντες, and we cannot be certain whether Hoffmann is right in translating 'bei ihrer Abreise.' But from the context it seems to differ from the late, rare use in being intransitive, from the Homeric use in being active, and from the Homeric form in keeping its internal digamma.

In another case Cypriote uses the middle of a verb of which Homer uses the active. The verb χράω is used by Homer of 'wound slightly,' of a shepherd wounding a lion (E 138 χράση μὲν τ' αὐλῆς ὑπεράλμενον οὐδὲ δαμάσση). Its meaning is given by Hesychius as χράση· καταξύση, and by Schol. Ven. as ξύση, ψάση and θίξη διὰ τὴν ἐπιπολαίαν πληγὴν. It hardly occurs outside Homer, though Herodotus uses a compound form in a description of the violence of Cleomenes (VI 75), ὅπως τεῶ ἐντύχοι Σπαρτητέων, ἐνέχρανε ἐς τὸ πρόσωπον τὸ σκῆπτρον. In Cypriote, however, the word has a different sense. In the Idalian Bronze (l. 9) we find 'tono toī elei tokarauomenone okatose alavo,' *i.e.* τὸν ἰ(ν) τοῖ ἔλει τὸ(ν) χραυόμενον Ὀγκαντος ἄλφο, 'the field in the marsh adjoining the plantation of Oncas.' We need not be disturbed because in the same inscription a little later (l. 18) we find the same word in the form χραυζόμενον. Cypriote often formed familiar verbal roots into terminations in -ζω, if we may judge from well-authenticated forms like βριμάζει (Hesychius), δαματρίζειν (Hesychius) and καλήζω (Herodian I 144). In essentials the word is the same as the Homeric χράω, differing slightly in form and meaning.

The Idalian Bronze also gives 'tone ijaterane,' *i.e.* τὸν ἰjατέραν, 'the doctor.' This is the Homeric ἰητήρ in its Cypriote form, showing j before α and an accusative in -αν. For the first we may compare in the same inscription l. 18 πεδίjαι, l. 20 ἱερέFijαν, l. 29 ἀνοσίjα, and for the second the accusative ἀνδριάνταν (134, 2. 140, 1). Homer uses the form ἰητήρ (Δ 190) with an accusative ἰητήρα (ρ 384, Hymn XVI 1). Outside Homer the word is comparatively uncommon, though used by Pindar (*Pyth.* III 65) and Sophocles (*Trach.* 1209), who probably got it from the Epic. In Cypriote its form and declension indicate that it is indigenous.

## 3.

Important evidence on the independence of Cypriote-Homeric words is to be found in their occurrence in other dialects. Thus some of them occur also in Arcadian, and I have tried elsewhere (*CQ.* XX, pp. 173-

175) to prove that this occurrence in dialects geographically so separated points to the words being indigenous both to Arcadian and to Cypriote. This holds good of αῖσα, βόλομαι, δῶμα and εὐχολά, and there is no need to recapitulate here the arguments about them.<sup>2</sup> Arcadian, however, is not the only dialect which presents similarities to Cypriote in this respect. We find Cypriote-Homeric words also in Cretan.

In historical times we do not find much evidence for intercourse between Crete and Cyprus; in his ethnology of Cyprus Herodotus finds Cypriote origins in Athens, Cythnus, Arcadia, Phoenicia and Aethiopia (VII 90), but does not mention Crete. But in prehistoric and heroic times there is more evidence for intercourse. So it is not surprising that Cypriote and Cretan should show linguistic affinities as well as cultural and racial. In both Zeus has the title Φαλχάνιος: he is called Φαλχάνιος in a Cypriote inscription from Athienu (Meister, *Lpz. Ber.* 62. p. 234), and in Crete Hesychius knew of Φελχάνος, ὁ Ζεὺς παρὰ Κρησίν, and the coins of Phaestus have the inscription Φελχάνος (Head, *Hist. Num.* 401). Other than Homeric words, not found elsewhere, are found both in Crete and Cyprus. Thus ἀγλαός, in the sense of γλαφυρός, was, according to Hesychius, found in both islands, and ἀκεύω in the sense of τηρῶ is reported as Cypriote by Hesychius and guaranteed as Cretan by its use in the Gortyn Code II 17, ἀκεύοντος καδεστᾶ. These slight similarities between the two dialects point to some natural linguistic affinity, and lead us to approach without hostility the few Cypriote-Homeric words which are found also in Cretan.

The Homeric λαῖς, 'stone,' is a familiar word in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. The Scholiast on A 10 says, quite correctly, λαῖς δὲ κατὰ διάλεκτον οἱ λίθοι λέγονται, and his word is borne out by inscriptions. In Cyprus we find the nominative λαῖ(ς) on an inscription from Drimu (Hoffmann 93), which reads 'kyporokorativose emi o lao,' i.e. Κυπροκρατίφος ἐμὶ ὁ λαῖ(ς), 'I am the stone of Cyprocrates.' The word is hardly used in later literature, though Sophocles uses the form λάου in his *Oedipus at Colonus* (198 ἐπ' ἄκρου λάου βραχὺς ὀκλάσας), and there is some evidence for the survival of the word in the lyrics. Corinna (Berlin, *Klass. Texte*, V. ii. p. 28) wrote, as Mr. J. U. Powell has shown (*JPh.* XXXIII, pp. 296-7), ἐμ μου(ριὰ)δεσσι λάυς—'amid an avalanche of stones,' and Simonides (*Ox. Pap.* VIII. no. 1087, l. 39) seems to have written ξύλα καὶ λάους ἐπιβάλλων. In Cretan we find the word at least twice in the genitive λάω (*Laws of Gortyn*, X 36, XI 12, ἀπὸ τῷ λάω); so there is some epigraphic justification for the entry in the Γλωσσαι κατὰ Πόλεις of Κρήτων, λαῖς λίθος. In Attic

<sup>2</sup> We may add to the list of Homeric words common to Arcadian and Cypriote the adjective οἶος, 'alone,' which is vouchsafed for Arcadian by the list of Γλωσσαι κατὰ Πόλεις, in the entry Ἄρκάδων. οἶος μόνος. The word is common in Homer, where it has precisely the same meaning as μόνος, and the Hesiodic poems. Afterwards its appearances are scanty. Pindar uses it three times (*P.* I 93. *O.* I 73. fr. 93, 1), Aeschylus once in the form οἶον (*Ag.* 131), Sophocles twice (*Aj.* 750, fr. 23) and

Euripides once (*Herac.* 743). It does not occur in literary or in epigraphic prose, and is doubtless a poetical word. In Cyprus, however, we find it in the Idalian Bronze (l. 14), which gives 'kase onasiloi oivnoi aneu tokasinetose,' i.e. κᾶς Ὀνασίλοι οἶφω ἄνευ τῶ(ν) κασινέτῶν, 'to Onasilos alone without his brothers.' It is thus Cypriote of a good date, and indigenous because of its use also in Arcadian.

too we find a dative plural λαέσι (*CIG.* 4650, 5724), but the Attic form with its different declension occurs only in verse, and belongs to a separate tradition from the Cretan and Cypriote.

The Homeric form πτόλεμος (*Z* 328, *M* 436, etc.) is probably a good Cypriote word. We do not find it in inscriptions, but Eustathius on *Λ* 255, quoting Heraclides as his authority, says that it is Κυπρίων καὶ Ἀττικῶν λέξις. Of its use in Attic there is not a shred of evidence, and attempts have been made to emend to Ἀρκάδων. But even Arcadia shows no traces of its existence. So we might be inclined to question its existence in Cypriote, if Heraclides did not say in the same passage that πτόλις too was a Cypriote form, a statement abundantly confirmed by the inscriptions. In view of this, we may well believe his word that πτόλεμος is genuinely Cypriote. It occurs elsewhere only in Crete, in an oath formula (*CIG.* 2554, l. 197), οὔτε ἐν πτολέμῳ οὔτε ἐν εἰ(ρ)άνῃ.<sup>3</sup> The form πτόλις, quoted by the same authority, is a common form in Homer, occurring sixteen times in the *Iliad* and fourteen times in the *Odyssey*. It recurs in the Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite (l. 20), but not in Hesiod or the Tragedians, though Pindar uses the Homeric πτολίεθρον (fr. 76 on Athens) and πτολίπορθος (*Ol.* VIII 35). Its literary and artificial character is shewn by its occurring in the pseudo-Sapphic poem on Hector and Andromache (Lobel β 2, 12 φάμα δ' ἦλθε κατὰ πτόλιν), which is almost certainly the work of an Athenian imitator; elsewhere in Lesbian πόλις is the regular form. In Cypriote it is genuine beyond dispute. In addition to the statement of Heraclides, we have the word of the Townleian Scholia, on Ψ 1, πτόλιν· πόλιν. Κυπρίων τῶν ἐν Σαλαμῖνι λέξις, and its occurrence in the Idalian Bronze, in the nominative five times (ll. 4, 7, 15, 16, 27), in the accusative πτόλιν (l. 1) and the dative πτόλιφι (l. 6). Traces of the word can be found in Arcadian and Cretan. In Arcadian the normal form is πόλις (*IG.* V<sup>2</sup>. 443, 6, etc.), but we can see the older form in the archaic name of Mantinea which survived in Pausanias' day as Πτόλις (Paus. 8, 3, 4 ὀνομάζουσι καὶ ἐς ἡμᾶς ἔτι Πτόλιν οἱ Ἀρκάδες. *ib.* 8, 12, 7 καλεῖται δὲ τὸ χῶριον τοῦτο ἐφ' ἡμῶν Πτόλις), and perhaps the form survives in a metrical inscription of the third century from Megalopolis (*IG.* V<sup>2</sup>. 373, 2 ἐνι πτόλ(ι)). In Crete it survives only in the title πτολίοικος, found on a silver stater from Aptaera (Head, *Hist. Num.* p. 386).

Homer presents us with an aorist form ἔρξα and a future form ἔρξω, presumably from a present ἔργω. It is clear from one case where he uses the word that originally it possessed an initial digamma. Metric reveals this in *E* 650, εὔ ἔρξαντα, where the hiatus shows that something has dropped out. But in other places Homer neglects the initial digamma, and presents us with cases like ἀλλὰ μάλ' ᾧδ' ἔρξαι (*ε* 342), ὄσσ' ἔρξαν (*θ* 490), ἀλλὰ μάλ' ᾧδ' ἔρξω (*ε* 360). This inconsistency in the use of the digamma indicates that it was early neglected, and this is what we find on inscriptions. It survives only in Cyprus and the oldest inscriptions of Crete: even in Hesiod it has totally disappeared (*Op.* 708 κακὸν ἔρξης. 710 ἧὲ καὶ ἔρξας· 327 κακὸν ἔρξη). In Cyprus, however, we find (Hoff-

<sup>3</sup> The reading is not certain. Cf. Deiters (P.), *De Cretens. titulis publicis*, Jena, 1904.

mann 146) ‘memanamenoι euverekēsiasē tasa pai eu pote everexa,’ *i.e.* μεμναμένοι εὐΦεργείας τᾶς παι εὖ ποτε ἔΦερξα, ‘remembering the kindness which once I did.’ Here, in ἔΦερξα, is the properly augmented form of the Homeric ἔρξα. The only other place where this form occurs with the initial digamma is in Crete. There we find in the Laws of Gortyn (X 30) αἱ δὲ τις τούτων τι Φέρκοιαι, ‘if anyone does any of these things,’ and in another early inscription from Gortyn we find (Schwyzer 175, 7) αἱ δ’ οἱ τίται μεῖ Φέρκοιεν αἱ ἔγρα(τ)ται, ‘if the authorities do not do what is written.’ The occurrence of the word in Cretan at so early a date points to it being indigenous there, as it must also be in Cyprus.

## 4.

We must now consider a small group of words, found both in Homer and in Cypriote with practically the same form, use and meaning. In consequence of this identity it is hard to say that they are not imitations from Homer. Their authenticity is a matter of more doubt than that of the cases we have so far examined, and their chief claim to be thought indigenous must rest on their being the only words bearing their particular meaning in Cypriote. This is, of course, a precarious claim, as the growth of our knowledge of Cypriote may discover other words with the same meaning but with a better claim to be thought genuine Cypriote.

Homer often uses πόσις in the sense of ‘husband’ (*e.g.* Γ 329 ‘Ελένης πόσις ἠκόμοιο etc.), and his use of it extends to Pindar (*O.* II 85. *N.* X 80. *P.* IV 87, etc.), Aeschylus (*Sept.* 930. *Pers.* 221. *Ag.* 600, 1108, 1405), Sophocles (*O.T.* 459, 639, 934, *Ant.* 906, 1196. *Tr.* 185, 285, 550) and Euripides (*Hel.* 422, 919. *Or.* 588 etc.). It clearly was thought, at least in the fifth century, a poetical word, and as such Aristophanes makes use of it in the *Thesmophoriazusaē* where Mnesilochus three times uses it in his mock-tragic colloquy with Euripides, and says (l. 866) ὁ δ’ ἐμὸς πόσις οὐμὸς Μενέλαος οὐδέπῳ προσέρχεται, or (l. 901) προδοῦσα Μενελέων τὸν ἐμὸν ἐν Τροίᾳ πόσιν, or (l. 914) λαβέ με λαβέ με, πόσι, περιβαλε δὲ χέρας. In the fourth century, however, it seems, like other poetical words, to have passed into prose. Aristotle at least used it more than once (*Pol.* I 3, 1. VII 16, 18). Even then, however, it is eschewed by Plato and the orators. In dialect inscriptions it occurs nowhere outside Cyprus, but in Cyprus it occurs in an inscription from Drimu, which gives us ‘ο μοι ποσιε ονασιτιμοσε τισωνιδασ,’ *i.e.* ὁ μοι πόσις Ὀνασίτιμος Τισωνίδας. We know of no other word for ‘husband’ in Cypriote, and on our present evidence πόσις may well be the regular word.

In Arcadian it is extremely doubtful whether ἄμαρ is the regular word for ‘day,’ but in Cypriote it may well be. It occurs twice on the ostrakon from the Temple of Zeus Epikoinios at the Cyprian Salamis, published by R. Meister (*Lpz. Abh.* 27, 301–332). Here we find (VI 2) the words ‘to veteose ta amata,’ *i.e.* τὸ Φέτεος τὰ ἄματα, and (VII 1) ‘to vetose amati amati,’ *i.e.* τὸ Φέτος ἄματι ἄματι. This differs from the hackneyed Arcadian ἄματα πάντα, and in Cypriote, unlike Arcadian, there seems to be no ἀμέρα. In addition to the phrase ἡματα πάντα, Homer

uses most other cases of ἤμαρ. So it is no surprise to find it in the tragedians, or in the pseudo-Aeolic elegiacs of Balbilla (*GDI.* 323, 7 εἰκόστῳ πέμπτῳ δ' ἄματι μῆνος Ἴθου). But its absence from inscriptions makes its appearance in Cypriote all the more remarkable, and it quite possible that it is indigenous there.

Arcadian uses the enclitic νυ quite differently from Homer. In Cypriote also we find νυ, but its use seems to be the same as Homer's. In Homer νυ strengthens a verb; so too in Cypriote, as in the Idalian Bronze I. 6 εἰ δὲ Φάνοι νυ, and I. 16 εἰ δόκοι νυ . . . This is the use of Homer, and it is also the use of Boeotian, where we find νύ with an imperative on an inscription from Orchomenus (Schwyzer 523, 165) κῆ τῆ οὐπεραμερίν νυ ἔνθω. In Cypriote it is also found with the present indicative (Schwyzer 683, 6), 'itanukeitui,' *i.e.* ἴνθα νυ κεῖται. Elsewhere it does not seem to be found. At present it is impossible to form any opinion on its authenticity.

κασίγνητος is found often both in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. From Homer it found its way into literature, into Pindar (*O.* VII 27. *N.* X 85, etc.), Aeschylus (*P.* V 347. *Sept.* 632. *Ag.* 327), Sophocles (*O.C.* 1184, etc.), and Euripides (*Or.* 73, etc.). But in Attic at least it was not a prose word, and Aristophanes (*Thesm.* 900) puts it, like πόσις, on the pseudo-tragic lips of Mnesilochus—οὐ γὰρ γαμοῦμαι σῶ κασίγνητῷ ποτέ. In some other dialects it seems authentic enough. It is well established in Lesbian both in a vernacular poem of Sappho (Lobel. ᾱ, 3. 2, <τὸν κασίγνητον δότε τυῖδ' ἴκεσθαι) and in a fourth-century inscription from Eresus (Schwyzer 632 D 19, ὑπὲρ τῶν Ἀπολλοδωρείων παιδῶν καὶ τῶν κασίγνητων). In the form κατίγνειτος, it may occur in Thessalian (*IG.* IX 2.894 κατίγν(ειτος)), and some of the *Iliad* Scholia assert dubiously that it is also Ionic (Schol. Ven. B ad O 545 ἔτι γὰρ παρ' Ἴωσι τοὺς συγγενεῖς κασίγνητους φασὶ καλεῖσθαι). So too Eustathius *ad. loc.* In Cypriote the word is often found, whether in the dative singular (76, 2 'toῖ kasi-kenetoi,' *i.e.* τοῖ κασίγνητοι), the nominative plural (106, 3 'kase oi kasikenetoi,' *i.e.* κὰς οἱ κασίγνητοι. 246 . . . sikeneto, *i.e.* (κα)σίγνητοι), the accusative plural (135, 3 and 11 'tose kasikenetose,' *i.e.* τὸς κασίγνητος), the genitive plural (135, 14 'tokasikenetone,' *i.e.* τῶ(ν) κασίγνητῶν), and the dative plural (135, 5, 7, 12 'toise kasikenetose,' *i.e.* τοῖς κασίγνητοῖς). To these we can now add, from Arsinoe (Meister, *Lpz. Abh.* 27, 316 ff), the feminine form also, in the dative singular, 'tai kasinetai,' *i.e.* ταῖ κασινέται. The great frequency of the word in Cypriote, combined with the absence of any use of ἀδελφος, makes it fairly certain that κασίγνητος is the regular Cypriote word for 'brother,' and κασίγνητη the regular Cypriote word for 'sister.'

Homer often uses the word σπέος, whether to describe the home of Poseidon (N 32) or Thetis (Σ 50, 65) under the sea, or of caves on land like that into which a goatherd takes his flock in a storm (Δ 279), or Calypso's (ε 57, 63, 77) or Scylla's (μ 84) or the Cyclops' (ι 182), or the Cave of the Nymphs on Ithaca (ν 549). Hesiod too uses the word of the subterranean cavern in which Echidna dwells (*Theog.* 301). Homer makes no distinction of meaning between it and ἄντρον, and doubtless

Hesychius is right when he explains the word as σπηλαῖον, ἄντρον. After Homer the word is extremely rare. Neither Pindar nor the Tragedians use it, and its only early appearance is in the peculiar dative plural σπεάτεσσι, as if from a nominative σπέας, which Herodian (π.μ.λ. p. 30) says was used by Xenophanes. So it is surprising that the word should occur twice in Cypriote. On a grotto at Ktima we find carved the words ' . . . sine to sepeose,' *i.e.* (ἐπί)βασιν τῷ σπέος (Hoffmann 98, 2) and ' epipasine to sepeose,' *i.e.* ἐπίβασιν τῷ σπέος (Hoffmann 99, 2). The exact transliteration is not clear, but the word is clearly a genitive singular. Hoffmann takes it as σπῆος. If this is correct, the Cypriote form differs from the Homeric, whose only extant genitive is σπέους. In any case, σπέος is the only extant word for 'cave' in Cypriote.

## 5.

If the Homeric words in Cypriote inscriptions may be regarded as indigenous to Cyprus, it is not unreasonable to expect some element of genuineness in the Homeric words which our literary sources state to be Cypriote. But the question here is of a different character. Before we can decide whether such words are indigenous or not, we have first to decide whether the authorities which quote them are in the least trustworthy. In a very few cases, such as the Homeric Scholiast's quotation of πτόλις, the inscriptions prove the genuineness of the gloss, and such cases have already been considered. But the subject-matter of inscriptions is very limited, and overlaps only at a few points the enormous variety of subjects treated by the Homeric poems. So it is inevitable that we should have Cypriote glosses whose meaning makes their appearance in inscriptions highly improbable. In the absence of such epigraphic support, we can only consider the different authorities in turn and try to decide from their general character whether their word can be trusted or not.

Hesychius is so valuable a source and so useful in all matters of lexicography connected with Greek dialects, that his word carries great weight and, short of inscriptions, is our best authority in most matters of dialect vocabulary. His work, as we possess it, is unfortunately not the original book. The result is that he does not give us as much information as we might have hoped, but what he gives is both well substantiated and remarkable in that the Cypriote words quoted are never identical with their Homeric counterparts, but either they are slightly different in form or else they are such as to explain the meaning of some obscure Homeric words. For our purposes, this difference is important, as it proves the genuine Cypriote character of the words quoted. Thus he has an entry κατ' ἔρ' ἔζει· καθέζει, Πάφιοι. This is like the Homeric phrases κατ' ἄρ' ἔζετο (A 68, 101, etc.), but its Cypriote character is indubitable. It is supported by the entry in the Γλώσσαι κατὰ Πόλεις of Κυπρίων. ἔζε· κάθισον, and it displays two regular Cypriote characteristics. The presence of ε instead of α in ἔρ' is perhaps paralleled by a similar vowel gradation in the use of Τιμοκρέτης instead of Τιμοκράτης (Hoffmann 76, 1. 129), and the tmesis ἔρ' . . . ἔζει is paralleled by πὸς . . . ἔηκε

(Hoffmann 161, 2). So, on linguistic grounds, the phrase is good Cypriote. If this is so, we may well add from Hesychius two entries, not ascribed to any dialect but shewn by their form to be Cypriote, κατ' ἔρ' ἔζεο· καθέζου and κατ' ἔρ' ἔζετο· καθέζετο. Again Hesychius' entry μοχοῖ· ἔντος, Πάφιοι is clearly connected with the Homeric use of μυχῶ as a local preposition in phrases like μυχῶ Ἄργεος (Z 152, γ 263), μυχῶ κλισίης (I 659, ω 675), μυχῶ θαλάμοιο (P 36), μυχῶ θαλάμων (Ψ 41), μυχῶ δόμου (X 440, γ 402, δ 304), μυχῶ ἄντρου (ν 363, ω 6) and μυχῶ σπείους (ε 226). The presence of ο instead of υ in μοχοῖ is well paralleled in other Cypriote words, such as θοράνας for θυράνδε, εὐτρόσσεσθαι for ἐπιτρόσσεσθαι, and μοττοφαγία for μυττοφαγία.

Again, Hesychius gives us ἐράτοθεν· ἀνεπαύσαντο. He does not say that the word is Cypriote, but almost certainly it is the Cypriote form of the Homeric ἐρήτυθεν (B 99, 211). Cypriote, as we have seen, has υ for ο. So ἐράτοθεν is almost certainly the Cypriote version of ἐρήτυθεν. The use of α, where Ionic used η, finds its parallels in a dialect which has ζάει for πνεῖ and ιζατήρ for ιητήρ.

The same argument applies to two more glosses, πέπσομαι· ἀκήκοα and σμογερόν· σκληρόν, ἐπιβούλον, μοχθηρόν. The first is clearly the Homeric πέπυσμαι (λ 595), in its Cypriote form with ο for υ, and the second is clearly connected with the Homeric adverb ἐπισμυγερώς (γ 195, δ 672), which Homer uses only in the compounded form. Hesychius also gives us a Cypriote word in his entry μῦθα· φωνή. Κύπριοι. Homer often uses μῦθος in the sense of word or 'speech' (A 25, etc.), but though it is used in this sense by poets, it only passed into prose in its special Platonic sense of 'myth.' The Cypriote form in -α is paralleled by other cases, like βρούκα for βροῦκος and βάλλαι for βηλόι.<sup>4</sup> In all these cases the Cypriote word varies in form from the Homeric, and may for that reason be counted as regular Cypriote.

In other cases Hesychius gives us words which do not themselves appear in Homer but are clearly related to words which do appear. Some help us to give a meaning to a Homeric word which would otherwise remain obscure. Thus he presents us with ἀκοστή· κριθή παρά Κυπρίοις, which gives the only intelligible clue to the meaning of ἀκοστήσας in the Homeric similes of the stalled horse let loose in Z 506 and O 263 - ὡς δ' ὅτε τις στατὸς ἵππος ἀκοστήσας ἐπὶ φάτνῃ κ.τ.λ. In his entry he quotes two opinions, one that it means κριθιάσας, the other, the opinion of the γλωσσογράφοι, that the word is derived ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄκος λαμβάνειν. This second, nonsensical view, so characteristic of ancient philology, is repeated by the Schol. Ven A and by Eustathius. Clearly the first view is right. A stalled horse, fed on barley, is naturally full of high spirits and a fit object of comparison to the young Paris enjoying his youth and armour. ἀκοστή in the sense of 'barley' is not quoted outside Cypriote, though Eustathius (ad Z 506) says, οἱ παλαιοὶ φασὶ καὶ πάσας τὰς τροφὰς παρά Θεσσαλοῖς ἀκοστὰς λέγεσθαι. In Cypriote then ἀκοστή kept a sense which it had lost in Thessalian, and gives us an inevitable interpretation of the

<sup>4</sup> Hoffman 109.

Homeric ἀκοστήσας. The evidence of Hesychius is supported for this meaning by the entry in Lex. Seg. in Bekker's *Anecd. Graec.* p. 213 ἀγοσταί· κριθαί ὑπὸ Κυπρίων· καὶ τὸ ἀγοστήσας ἐκκριθιάσας οἶον ὑψαυχενίσας, and by the Scholiast's ἀκοστήσαι τὸ πολυκριθῆσαι ἤγουν κριθιάσαι. ἀκοσταί γὰρ αἰ κριθαί.

The entry οὔνει· Κύπριοι δρόμον gives, as Bergk saw, the real clue to the meaning of the epithet ἐριούνιος (Υ 72, Ω 457) applied to Hermes. He is the fast traveller, a suitable enough epithet for the messenger of the Gods. The root of the word is an old one, occurring too in the dialect of Arcadia in the imperative οὔνει which Hesychius explains as δεῦρο, δρόμε. Ἄρκάδες. It had too some existence elsewhere, to judge by the entries οὔνης· κλέπτης and οὔνιος· δρομεύς, κλέπτης, though unfortunately we have no dialect ascription for either.

In the vexed line T 87 some of the manuscripts give a variant reading of εἰαρποῶτις for ἠεροφοῖτις, Ἐρινῦς. Hesychius has a number of glosses to enlighten us as to the meaning, of which the chief are εἰαρ· αἶμα, εἰαρπότης· αἰμοπότης, ἱαρ· αἶμα, ἱαρπότης· αἰμοπότης. He does not actually give it as Cypriote, but clearly he is drawing from the same source as the Scholiad T 87, who says οἱ δὲ εἰαρποῶτις ἐγκείμενου τοῦ εἰαρ ὅπερ ἔστι κατὰ Σαλαμίνιους αἶμα. Whatever the original reading was, the alternative εἰαρποῶτις must have been of considerable antiquity to embody in itself so rare a word as εἰαρ. The 'blood-sucking' fury has a more authentic air than the fury 'who walks in the darkness.' Hesychius has three entries, ἀπόγεμε· ἄφελε. Κύπριοι, γέννου· Κύπριοι. καὶ λάβε and ὕγγεμος· συλλαβή. Σαλαμίνιοι. These imply some verb like γέμω, which presumably is also the present of the Homeric γέντο (Θ 43, Ν 25, 241, Σ 476), interpreted by the Schol. Ven. ad Θ 43 as ἀντὶ τοῦ ἔλαβεν. Clearly the root of the two classes of words is the same, whatever the present indicative may have been. The genuineness of the word in Cypriote is shewn by the form ὕγγεμος for σύγγεμος. Initial σ seems often to have become h in Cypriote if we may judge by such forms as ἶγα for σίγα, ὕριγγα for σύριγγα, and ἀγάναν for σαγήνην, all definitely given by Hesychius as Cypriote.

So far then as Hesychius is concerned, it seems fairly safe to say that his quotations are genuine Cypriote, either because they are so different from the Homeric words as to be independent or because they have only their roots in common with the Homeric words which they explain or resemble.

## 6.

The list of Γλῶσσαι κατὰ Πόλεις, printed from an Urbino codex in Bekker's *Anecdota Graeca*, III pp. 1094–1096, is harder to judge than Hesychius. Its origin is unknown. In a few cases its evidence has been confirmed by inscriptions, as for instance in its entry Ἄρκάδων . . . λεύσσει· ὄρᾱ, for which we have now the authority of *IG. V<sup>2</sup>. 16, 10*. This confirmation may dispose us well towards the list, and, in addition to this, it looks as if the compiler had used either an early edition of Hesychius or else one of the sources which Hesychius himself used. Hesychius not

only gives all the Cypriote words which the Γλῶσσαι gives, but in many cases he gives both the same form of the word and an identical explanation of its meaning. This identity may be seen in the cases of ἀλαός· τυφλός, δέπας· ποτήριον, πέδιλα· ὑποδήματα, φάσγανον· ξίφος, and χθών· γῆ· In some other cases the Γλῶσσαι gives the same explanation as Hesychius, but in a slightly different form, quoting a different case for a noun or adjective or a different tense for a verb. Thus it gives ἄλοχος· γυνή, ἔμαρψεν· ἔλαβεν, ἴζε· κάθισον, and ταρβεί· φοβείται, while Hesychius gives ἀλόχου· γυναικὸς γαμετῆς, ἔμαρψα· κατέλαβον, ἴζει· καθίζει and ταρβήσαντες· φοβηθέντες. These differences are only superficial and are due doubtless to both the compilers using fuller books of reference than have survived to our day. In some other respects the two lists are rather more different. First, Hesychius sometimes, as in ποτήριον παρὰ τὸ δέχεσθαι τὸ πῶμα, gives a derivation whereas the Γλῶσσαι is a mere vocabulary. Secondly, in none of these words does Hesychius give any ascription to a dialect, whereas the Γλῶσσαι is avowedly an attempt to do so. But both these differences do not so much point to a difference of origin as to both compilers using the same extensive source. What this source was, it is impossible to say. This explanation would cover a third difference. In some words the two compilers differ in their choice of words to give the meaning. Thus the Γλῶσσαι gives ἄλγος· ὀδυνή, ἡβαιόν· ὀλιγόν, θῆς· λάτρις, while Hesychius gives ἄλγος· πόνος, πένθος, ἡβαιόν· μικρόν, and θῆς· δοῦλος, μισθωτός. These differences, such as they are, are not so great as to outweigh the positive evidence for common origin in the appearance of every Cypriote word of the Γλῶσσαι without exception in Hesychius. If then this common origin or interdependence of the two can be reasonably taken as proved, we may with the more confidence go on to see if there is any evidence for any of the words in the list being thought to be genuine Cypriote and not mere literary usage. Here we are faced with an almost insoluble problem. The words are chosen entirely because they are used by Homer, and all superficial differences are removed. Moreover, we have hardly any other examples of their use outside Homer, and are so debarred from pressing any argument from analogy in other dialects. But in certain cases we can find indications which point to some of the words being indigenous. Thus the entry ὄζε· κάθισον has the strong support of the indubitably Cypriote form κατ' ἔρ' ἔζεαι, though the compiler has adapted the Cypriote form to suit the Cretan usage. The entry ἰός· βέλος may find support in the use of ἰός in this sense in a Cretan inscription (*GDI*. IV, p. 1038 nr. 20), which gives ὄστι(ς) ἀποστερί(δδ)οι τῶν ἰῶν, and, as we have seen, this may be evidence for its being authentic in Cyprus. The entries πέδιλα· ὑποδήματα and ἔμαρψεν· ἔλαβεν both have parallels in Aeolic. For the first we may quote *Etymologicum Magnum* πέδιλλα λέγουσιν οἱ Αἰολεῖς, and for the second Hesychius' καμμάρψαι· καταλαβεῖν, where the form shews the word to be Aeolic, and his κάμμαρψις· μέτρον σιτικόν. Αἰολεῖς. Aeolic is, of course, a literary dialect, and the appearance of a Homeric word in it does not mean that it is free from literary influence, but, as in both these cases the words are adapted to Aeolic usage, in the double λ in πέδιλλα and the shortened form of καμμάρψαι,

they look like genuine words there; moreover, ἔμαρψε appears in a vernacular poem of Sappho (S.1.21). So if it is native in Aeolic, it may well be in Cypriote. Beyond this our evidence does not permit us to go, and we may only indulge the probability that, as the few words which can be tested may well be genuine, the rest may also be founded on some reasonable evidence, even if some others, like ἴζε, have had their forms adapted from Cypriote to Homeric formation.

## 7.

The next group of glosses to be considered are contained in the Homeric commentators, whether the Scholia or Eustathius. They may conveniently be taken together, because on more than one occasion their language is identical, and it is certain that they drew from the same sources, whatever those sources may have been. They are certainly not always negligible, as once at least, in their ascription of πτόλις to Cyprus, inscriptions have confirmed their words. The problem they present is like that presented by the Γλῶσσαι κατὰ Πόλεις, and their genuineness must be tested by similar means.

In the first place, they bear many similarities to Hesychius and their excellent character is witnessed by him. Thus *à propos* of the binding of Ares by Otos and Ephialtes (E 387) – χαλκῆ δ' ἐν κέραμῳ δέετο τρισκαὶ δεκά μῆνας – the Scholiast D and Eustathius agree that one of the meanings of κέραμος is δεσμωτήριον in Cypriote. This statement is repeated in different forms by the Lex. Seg. in Bekker's *Anecdota Graeca*, I p. 202, by the *Etymologicum Magnum* and by Theon, *Progymnasmata* (ed. Spengel, II p. 129, 27). All these writers assert the word to be Cypriote. So there must have been some commonly recognised authority who said that it was. Hesychius gives no dialect ascription to the word, but among the meanings of κέραμος he gives δεσμωτήριον. So he may well be quoting from the same familiar source. What the source was we do not know, and the nearest clue to any identity is Eustathius' designation of it as ἄλλοι. The Townleian Scholiast and Eustathius on N 563 agree that μεγαίρειν is a word from the Cyprian Salamis. The Scholiast gives its meaning as φθονεῖν (μεγαίρειν δὲ τὸ φθονεῖν Σαλαμῖνιοι λέγουσιν), which is the word used by Hesychius in his entry μεγαίρειν· φθονεῖν. Here too identity of explanation may mean that all drew from the same source.

Secondly, Hesychius substantiates by other quotations the Cypriote use of the termination – μωρος in the sense of 'sharp.' Homer uses ἰώμωροι (Δ 242, Ζ 479), ὑλακόμωροι (ξ 29, π 4) and ἐγχεσίμωροι (B 692, 840. H 134, γ 188), and in all these words the termination – μωρος was disputed in antiquity. The explanation 'sharp' is well authenticated, dating back to Aristarchus (Schol. ad ξ 29 on ὑλακόμωροι). Its Cypriote provenance is given by Schol. BT on Ζ 479 (μόρον γὰρ τὸ ὄξύ Κύπριοι) and by Eustathius, who are probably drawing straight from Aristarchus. Hesychius knew the word in his entries μωρόν· ὄξύ, ὑλακόμωροι· ὄξύφωνοι and ἰώμωροι· ἰοὺς ὄξεῖς ἔχοντες, which he too may owe to Alexandrian learning. On X 441 (ἐν δὲ θρόνα ποικίλ' ἔπασσε) both Scholiasts ABT and Eusta-

thus say that πάσσειν is a Cypriote word meaning ποικίλλειν. Here again Hesychius draws from the same source, since though he gives no dialect ascription, he gives the same explanation as the Scholiasts in his entry πάσσε = ἐνεποίκιλλε. The slight difference in using the compound ἐνεποίκιλλε instead of the uncompounded form is no evidence for his using a different source, as Eustathius himself a little later uses the words ἐνεποίκιλλε τῆ διπλακι.

Unfortunately not all these glosses can rest securely under the safe protection of Hesychius. A few remain, whose only title to consideration is that they may well be quoted from unknown authorities equally reputable, and that they make sense of passages which may not otherwise be explained. The most notable is the entry of Schol. BT and Eustathius on the adjective ἀμιχθαλόεσσον in Ω 753, which is described as meaning κατὰ Κυπρίους εὐδαίμονα. Fortunately Eustathius gives a hint of his authority whom he calls οἱ παλαιοί, meaning doubtless somebody old and trustworthy. This explanation is not known to Hesychius, who explains conventionally as ἀπροσόρμιστος ἐκ θαλάσσης καὶ δύσορμος, or to the other authorities quoted by the Scholiasts, who see in the word a variety of ὀμιχλώδης. The first meaning cannot be right as Lemnos was in no way harbourless in Homer's geography. It was as well provided with anchorages then as it is now. Otherwise Achilles would hardly have sold his captives to its king, Evenus (Φ 40-1). The notion of an inaccessible Lemnos is due to a misinterpretation of Sophocles' dramatic isolation of Philoctetes on a corner of the island which was βροτοῖς ἄστιπτος οὐδ' οἰκουμένη. Nor is it clear how the word can be connected with ὀμιχλή, as Cypriote, far from using α for ο, more often uses ο for α. So perhaps there is good reason for trusting the 'ancients' as Eustathius calls them and taking the word to mean 'fortunate.'

Rather a similar case is that of the word τάφος, which the Scholiast T and Eustathius take to mean φόνος in Ψ 29, αὐτὰρ ὁ τοῖσι τάφον μενοεικέα δαίνυ. Unfortunately in this passage it cannot mean φόνος, and is much more likely to mean funeral feast, as Hesychius (τάφος τὸ γιγνόμενον περίδειπνον ἐπὶ τῆ τῶν κατοικομένων τιμῆ) and Scholiasts AB (A. τὸ δειπνὸν περὶ τὴν ταφὴν γιγνόμενον. B. τὴν μετὰ τὸν τάφον εὐωχίαν) would have us believe. Eustathius gives οἱ γλωσσογράφοι as his authority, and presumably they had some reason for their statement. The explanation fits in well with λ 416 and ω 87, πολέων τάφω ἀνδρῶν ἀντεβόλησας, where τάφω cannot mean 'funeral-feast' and may well mean 'slaughter,' as the context refers to the killing of men in battle, when burial is not the question. Our quoters seem to have looked at a list of glosses and made the wrong use of their information.

On Φ 329 (μὴ μιν ἀποέρσειε μέγας ποταμὸς βαθυδίνης) Schol. AT say, of ἀποέρσειε, Κυπρίων ἢ λέξις. Not so Eustathius, who says it is derived from the Aeolic ἔρσω for ἔρρω. Unfortunately the Scholiasts give no interpretation of the word, and it is impossible to say whether they used the same source as Hesychius, who gives ἀπόερσε· ἀπέπνιξε. It is hard to see how any derivation from ἔρρω can make sense, and the Cypriote origin is perfectly possible, but more than that we cannot say.

Even more tantalising is the explanation given by Schol. AB on P 51, the famous κόμαι Χαρίτεσσιν ὁμοῖαι, where the usual interpretation is that of Eustathius – Χαρίτεσσιν ὁμοῖαι, ἀντὶ τοῦ τοιαῦται οἷας ἔχοιεν αἱ Χάριτες. The Scholiasts, however, quite disagree with this, and say, Μακεδόνες καὶ Κύπριοι χάριτας λέγουσι τὰς συνεστραμμένας καὶ οὔλας μυρσίνας, ὅς φαμεν στεφανίτιδας. Hesychius knows nothing of such a meaning for χάριτες, so the Scholiasts must be drawing on some source not used by him. Whatever the source was, the explanation certainly helps to make good sense in a difficult passage. The ordinary solution is to take Χαρίτεσσιν ὁμοῖαι as a compendious comparison. The use is not unknown in Homer, who certainly has it in β 121 ὁμοῖα νοήματα Πηνελοπέειη. But if we feel uneasy about it here, we have Zenodotus on our side, who hoped to solve the difficulty by emending to μελαῖναι. If we take χαρίτεσσιν in the sense of tight ringlets like bundles, it suits the context excellently, as in the following line the hair of Euphorbus is described as πλοχοῖι θ' οἱ χρυσῶ τε καὶ ἀργύρῳ ἐσφήκοντο.

The last case takes us on to more certain ground. In describing the wall of the Achaean camp in M 29 Homer speaks of the foundations being made φιτρῶν καὶ λάων, and on the passage Schol. T and Eustathius say that the words come from the Cyprian Amathus. Eustathius adds that his authority are οἱ παλαιοί. This in itself is good evidence, but λάων, as we have seen, is authenticated by Cyprian inscriptions. So the genuineness of φιτρῶν is practically certain, since it comes from a reputable source.

We may now rapidly consider how far these words, assuming their use in Cyprus to be comparatively well substantiated, may be thought to be indigenous. The evidence is scanty, but not impossibly so. Thus the termination –μωρός seems genuine, because in Cypriote it occurs in an uncompounded form and in Homer always in a compounded form: so it clearly cannot be an imitation. Χάριτες, our authorities say, occurred in Macedonian as well as in Cypriote, and κέραμος in Boeotian. It seems unlikely that words, used in so peculiar a sense, should occur in such remote dialects, unless they were natural to both. Of the remainder, ἀμιχθαλόεις and πάσσω are so rare in Homer that it would be worth no one's while to imitate them, if he wished to be intelligible, and the special sense of φόνος would only create confusion in a district where it possessed its ordinary meaning of 'slaughter.' The other two, μεγάριεν and ἀποέρσειε, are slightly more common and therefore more open to suspicion, though Homer uses the first only four times and the second only three times. Here again their rareness in Homer is an argument for their indigenous character in Cyprus.

## 8.

It remains to consider a few scattered glosses of well-established character in various authors. The first may claim Aristotle as its authority. According to Schol. on Pindar, *Pyth.* II 127, he said that in Cypriote the Pyrrhic dance, πυρρίχη, was called πρύλις. This word is clearly

connected with the Homeric use of the masculine plural *πρύλλες*, which Homer uses (Λ 49, Μ 77, etc.) in the sense of 'men-at-arms,' but the two words are so different in form and meaning that the only connexion which can be claimed for them is that of a common ancestry. In another case our authority is the Scholiast on Theocr. II 59, who says that by *θρόνα* the Thessalians meant τὰ πεποκιλμένα ζῶα and the Cyprians τὰ ἀνθινὰ ἱμάτια. This is clearly connected with the Homeric word *θρόνα* used in the description of the embroidery woven by Andromache in X 441 :

δίπλακα πορφυρέην ἐν δὲ θρόνα ποικίλ' ἔπασσε.

though here *θρόνα* cannot mean exactly τὰ ἀνθινὰ ἱμάτια. Hesychius, however, has an entry, showing that he knew the source of the Scholiast's quotation and giving an intelligible meaning to *θρόνα*, viz. *θρόνα· ἄνθη· καὶ τὰ ἐκ χρωμάτων ποικίλματα*. This meaning makes excellent sense and may well be right. The Cypriote meaning for *ἄνθη* is then a development of the meaning quoted by Hesychius, and used probably by Homer, and, since it is so different, it cannot be plagiarised but must be a natural development of an older use.

The last of these casual cases comes from Athenaeus (XI 483 ff.), who quotes one Simaristus as saying that the word *κύπελλον* was used both by the Cypriotes and the Cretans; by the former in the sense of 'two-handled cup,' by the latter in the sense of both 'two-handled cup' and 'four-handled cup' (Σιμάριστος δὲ τὸ δίωτον ποτήριον Κυπρίου, τὸ δὲ δίωτον καὶ τετράωτον Κρήτας). Homer often uses *κύπελλον* (A 596, Γ 248, Δ 346, I 666, Ω 305, α 142, β 396, δ 58, κ 357, υ 253). We have no final evidence about the number of handles possessed by the Homeric *κύπελλον*. Hesychius indeed seems to have thought that it had none (*κύπελλον· εἶδος ποτηρίου ἄωτου*). Perhaps his opinion was based on its being distinguished from the familiar *δέπας ἀμφικύπελλον*, whose name implies two handles. But such a distinction is not substantiated by Homer's usage. In at least two places, what is plainly the same vessel is called both *κύπελλον* and *δέπας ἀμφικύπελλον*. Thus the cup in which Hephaestus pledges Hera has both names (A 584 and 595), and so have the cups in the house of Odysseus (υ 153 and 253). In these places at least the Homeric word bore the same meaning as the Cypriote and Cretan words. Its Cypriote use is confirmed also by Anicetus (quoted by Eustathius ad ο 120, λέγει δὲ Κύπριοι οὕτω φασὶ τὸ δίωτον ποτήριον). Outside the glossographers the word has little history. Neither Pindar nor the Tragedians use it, but it has some life in hexameter poetry and was used by Antimachus (fr. 20), Nicander of Colophon (fr. 140) and Quintus of Smyrna (VI 345). Ion of Chios too used it in a choric part of his 'Omphale' (fr. 20), ἴτ' ἐκπορεῖτε, πάρθενοι, κύπελλα καὶ μεσομφάλους. In such passages it clearly comes straight from Homer. Athenaeus has so few quotations in his discussion of the word, that it cannot have been in the least common, and anyhow its appearance in both Cypriote and Cretan argues, as we have seen, for its being indigenous in both dialects.

## 9.

We possess then in Cypriote a considerable number of words either similar or related to words used in the Homeric poems. On the whole, these words seem, for different reasons, not to be imitations of the Homeric counterparts as we possess them. The precise importance of their existence in Cypriote cannot yet be estimated, but it points to a high antiquity for some elements in Homer's vocabulary. Cyprus maintained in historic times a dialect of more archaic character than that of any other district in Greece. Cyprus too lay outside the main currents of racial or tribal movements which confounded other Greek dialects. It maintained till a late date the customs of the heroic age, and it traced its Greek colonisation back to a period soon after the siege of Troy. It would be too much to claim that Cypriote was the descendant of the language talked by the Achaeans of Homer, but it certainly was reasonably free of Attic and Ionic influences. Its close connexion with Arcadian shews that it was once part of a more united language, and this language may have provided some of the enormous vocabulary of Homer.

C. M. BOWRA.