

# The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



---

## The Arcado-Cyprian Dialect *The Arcado-Cyprian Dialect*. By Herbert Weir Smyth, Ph.D. Transactions American Philological Association, 1887. Vol. xviii.

Chas E. Bennett

The Classical Review / Volume 3 / Issue 1-2 / February 1889, pp 48 - 52

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00194028, Published online: 27 October 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X00194028](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00194028)

### How to cite this article:

Chas E. Bennett (1889). *The Classical Review*, 3, pp 48-52 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00194028

**Request Permissions :** [Click here](#)

302), and in the same issue (p. 224 *sqq.*) there is an admirable investigation of the 'passive' *r* by Zimmer: both these may well be substituted in the next edition for the views of Brugmann here given. The reduplicated verbs (p. 398) should be divided into nonthematic and thematic, both original classes. 'Skt. *ācinavam*' (p. 401) is imaginary, possibly due to confusion with *ācinavam*. On p. 403 a misprint twice repeated makes the Skt. 9th class form plural in *-ni-*. The note on *āi*, *āiwas* etc. (p. 466n.) gives De Saussure's theory without any reference to its complete refutation by Osthoff and Hübschmann, whose views are taken elsewhere. Monro's explanation of the 1st aorist *a* is certainly not 'simpler than that of Brugmann,' since the latter treating *ἔδειξα*, *ἔδειξαμεν* and *ἔδειξαν* as original makes the extension of the *a* just three times as easy as in a theory which gets all from one form *ἔδειξα*. The treatment of the Imperative is seriously weakened by the small weight given to Thurneysen's extremely acute paper upon the subject (K.Z. xxvii. 172), full of suggestions reaching considerably beyond the immediate point. Brugmann has adopted his account of the suffix *-tōd*, as our authors might have seen in the *Greek Grammar* (p. 91). The printer is evidently responsible for the curious slip which gives Skt. *ihī* as a 'pure verb theme without personal suffix' (p. 434). *vis* (from *volo*) is left as obscure (p. 449), though the identity with Skt. *vési* (cf. *ἴεμαι*) is given by Stolz. '*Bhūva*,' on the next page, is an awkward misprint, as *bhāvati* actually has aorists of that form. Following this, the thematic class

with *nō*, *nē* answers to the unthematic *nā* verbs, not the *neu*. The treatment of the Italic and Keltic *b* forms (p. 469) is rather over-sceptical. Thurneysen's article (B.B. viii. 269 *sqq.*) is suggestive here. The same paper presents a very strong case for the identity *ferētis* = *φέρητε*, which would elucidate the problems of p. 470. On p. 473 the mention of *datūrus* suggests that the denominatives *parturio esurio* from agent nouns ('desideratives') are left unexplained. It might have been added, moreover, that the 'strong stem has penetrated to' the Latin *-tus* participle through the influence of the so-called supine. Two very useful summaries close the book as appendices. P. 480 shows a misprint in Skt. '*cvan*' for *çvan*. The sigmatic aorist should not have been given to ablaut ii. (p. 485) without a reference to the '*vṛddhi*' forms: see Brugmann, *Grundriss*, i. § 314.

Here I may close what will not, I hope, be mistaken for a hostile criticism. Only a strong appreciation of the invaluable service Messrs. King and Cookson have rendered to English scholarship would make it worth while to catalogue these details. My criticisms are from a practical point of view, suggested by the wants of students who have used the book. So while conscious that some of them may be wrong or too exacting, I offer them in the hope that they may be of service in perfecting a work which must greatly advance the scientific study of the classical languages in this country.

J. H. MOULTON.

#### THE ARCADO-CYPRIAN DIALECT.

*The Arcado-Cyprian Dialect.* By HERBERT WEIR SMYTH, Ph.D. Transactions American Philological Association, 1887. Vol. xviii.

THE author of the above article having previously made (*American Journal of Philology*, vol. vii. p. 421 *ff.*) an examination of the inter-relations of the dialects of Thessaly, Boeotia, Lesbos, and Elis, in which he endeavoured to establish the connection of these with the North Greek of Phocis and Locris, undertakes in the present paper an examination of the Arcadian dialect, in the hope of defining with greater precision than hitherto its relations with the other Hellenic dialects. The material collected is designed

to serve as the basis of a further discussion of the question in the author's work on the Greek dialects which is now in preparation.

As the closely related daughter dialect of Cyprus necessarily enters largely into the discussion, the paper is entitled the Arcado-Cyprian Dialect, *i.e.* the Arcadian dialect before Cyprian attained to the dignity of individual existence. The attempt to establish the character of this is undertaken: (1) By noting all those points of agreement which are the exclusive property of Arcadian and Cyprian and are not possessed by any other Hellenic dialect. (2) By collecting all those instances of phonetic and inflectional resemblance which are the joint property of both Arcadian and Cyprian and of other

Hellenic dialects. (3) By noting the occurrence of peculiarities common to Arcadian and other dialects but not found in Cyprian, and similarly of peculiarities common to Cyprian along with other dialects, but not found in Arcadian. This excellent method of procedure, which will hardly fail to commend itself to all students of Greek dialects, has been adhered to with great fidelity in the paper before us. The results are in brief as follows:—

The close relation between Arcadian and Cyprian asserted by the tradition in Pausanias viii. 5, 2: 'Αγαπήνωρ δὲ ὁ Ἀγκαίου ἐς Τροίαν ἠγγήσατο Ἀρκάσιν. Ἰλίου δὲ ἀλούσης . . . χεϊμῶν Ἀγαπήνορα καὶ τὸ Ἀρκάδων ναυτικὸν κατήνεγκεν ἐς Κύπρον καὶ Πάφου τε Ἀγαπήνωρ ἐγένετο οἰκιστής, is well known to be abundantly confirmed by the epigraphic remains of both dialects. Yet exclusive peculiarities shared by these two dialects alone are not numerous. Smyth enumerates only:—

(1) The use of ἀπό and ἐξ with the dative.  
 (2) The genitive sing. of masc. -ᾱ- stems in -av for ᾱo.

(3) The occurrence of the preposition πός as the equivalent of πρὸς.

(4) The development of the primitive verbal ending -ντι to -νσι, though the author freely admits that -νσι for the Cyprian is uncertain. Ante-consonantal ν in the interior of a word is everywhere omitted in the latter dialect, so that it is impossible to determine whether Cyprian ε·κε·σο·σι·σι is to be transcribed ξξωσι or ξξο(ν)σι.

The above array of evidence, though scanty, is nevertheless rightly held to speak with no uncertain voice in confirmation of the Agapenor legend.

Some will doubtless be surprised that use has not been made of the occurrence of the preposition ἰν for ἐν in Arcadian and Cyprian. But this feature, supposed until recently to be the exclusive possession of these two dialects, has recently turned up in Cretan (see Herforth, *De dialecto Cretica*, p. 210), and is therefore omitted from the list. But proper names in -κρέτης for -κράτης (e.g. Cyprian Ἀριστοκρέτης, Arcadian Σωκρέτης) ought to have been included, since so far as we have any evidence or even testimony their occurrence is restricted to these two dialects. The mention by Johannes Grammaticus of 'Aeolic' κρέτος for κράτος has no especial weight, and certainly cannot be held to imply the existence of proper names in -κρέτης in 'Aeolic.'

As regards the relationship of Arcado-Cyprian to the other dialects of the so-called NO. XXI. VOL. III.

Aeolictype (i.e. Thessalian, Lesbian, Boeotian, Elean), Smyth fails to find any single dialectic feature common to all, a fact which clearly shows the unsoundness of postulating a primitive Aeolic unity in the sense in which we have a Doric unity. This is undoubtedly the sense of all careful scholars at present.

Yet, while this is true, Arcado-Cyprian is nevertheless claimed to show vigorous preferences for individual members among the so-called Aeolic dialects. In these claims the author seems to me to go too far, and to base conclusions upon uncertain or too slight data. Thus the points of touch between Arcado-Cyprian and the Homeric dialect are represented as consisting in the possession of the infinitive termination -ῆναι (e.g. Arc. ἀπειθῆναι, Cyp. κυμερῆναι, Hom. φορῆναι) and of the peculiar βόλομαι for βούλομαι. But, to say nothing of other considerations, the Cyprian κυμερῆναι (which is the sole instance of the formation in this dialect) is quite uncertain, and Cyprian βόλομαι rests upon no more certain evidence than the Hesychian gloss σί βόλε·τί θέλεις.

So also the relation between Arcado-Cyprian and Lesbian rests solely upon the occurrence of proper names in -κρέτης in the two former dialects along with the statement of Johannes Grammaticus, above referred to, that κρέτος was used by the Αἰολεῖς.

Between Arcado-Cyprian and Thessalian the relationship exists merely in the occurrence of πτόλις for πόλις (in Thessalian οἱ πολλίαρχοι, i.e. οἱ πολλίαρχοι). But Arcadian πτόλις rests only upon the notice in Pausanias viii. 12, 7: καλεῖται δὲ τὸ χωρίον τοῦτο ἐφ' ἡμῶν Πτόλις, whereas all Arcadian inscriptions have πόλις, e.g. Coll. 1222, 12: 1252, 1; πόλιται 1231, A, 44; so that an Arcado-Cyprian πτόλις cannot safely be inferred.

A firmer link is found between Arcado-Cyprian, Lesbian and Thessalian, viz. in the occurrence of the preposition ἀπί for ἀπό, and of κέ for ἀν. But the special relation of Arcado-Cyprian to Boeotian and Thessalian which is claimed by Smyth on the basis of the treatment of the preposition ἐξ I should regard as extremely uncertain. Smyth would follow Schmidt in reading Cyprian ἔσβασιν, ἔσ τῶι, ἔσ τᾶι, where Deecke reads ξξβασιν, ξξ τῶι, ξξ τᾶι. With this ἔσ for ἐξ before consonants he compares the Arcadian, Boeotian, and Thessalian ἐς for ἐξ in the same situation. But Deecke is to be upheld in reading ἐξ in all cases in Cyprian. The syllabic character in ἐξ τῶι, ἐξ τᾶι is precisely the same as that found in ὁ Φάναξ Coll. 17, where it can represent nothing else than ξ, and in κᾶρυξ Coll. 65, a bilingual inscription,

where we have the express evidence of the accompanying Greek transliteration. The sign in  $\xi\xi\beta\alpha\sigma\omega$  is slightly different, but beyond question. It is true that  $\xi\xi\beta\alpha\sigma\omega$ ,  $\xi\xi\tau\acute{\omega}\iota$  and  $\xi\xi\tau\acute{\alpha}\iota$  all offend against the Greek law concerning triple consonance; but  $\xi\sigma\beta\alpha\sigma\omega$  κ.τ.λ. do not relieve this difficulty.

The point of contact between Arcado-Cyprian on the one hand, and Lesbian, Pamphylian, Thessalian, Boeotian on the other, to which Smyth calls attention, is undoubtedly a significant one, viz. the tendency of  $\sigma$  to become  $\nu$ . But Smyth admits that it is quite doubtful whether Boeotian belongs here, and so far as Thessalian is concerned the only illustration that can be cited is  $\acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{\upsilon}$ , which had already been utilized to show the relationship of Arcado-Cyprian to Lesbian and Thessalian. With these deductions we may hardly conclude more than that Arcado-Cyprian shares the tendency to change  $\sigma$  to  $\nu$  with Pamphylian and Lesbian. The conclusion drawn by Curtius and others as to the relationship existing between Arcado-Cyprian, Lesbian, Pamphylian, Boeotian and Thessalian, on the basis of the retention of the primitive  $\nu$ -sound in  $\nu$ , is properly rejected as of significance only when the fact is proved which it claims to establish.

Smyth's thesis of the vigorous preference of Arcado-Cyprian for dialects of the Aeolic type can hardly be admitted to be well established in the light of the foregoing considerations. The cautious student will not venture to claim more than the existence of a tendency in Arcado-Cyprian, Lesbian, Boeotian, Thessalian and Pamphylian, by which  $\sigma$  in unaccented syllables becomes  $\nu$ ; and the existence of  $\kappa\acute{\epsilon}$  as common to Arcado-Cyprian, Thessalian and Lesbian. As regards the relation of Arcado-Cyprian to Doric, Smyth finds traces of borrowing on the part of the former in the occurrence of  $\eta$  by the compensative lengthening of  $\epsilon$  (e.g. Arcadian  $\phi\theta\acute{\eta}\rho\omega\upsilon$  = Att.  $\phi\theta\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omega\upsilon$ , Cyprian  $\eta\mu\acute{\iota}$ ). The Arcado-Cyprian infinitive ending  $-\epsilon\nu$  (if we read Cyprian  $\xi\chi\epsilon\nu$  in Coll. 60, 10, 22) may be either borrowed from Doric or possibly be pan-Hellenic; most certainly the latter if we read Ionic  $\acute{\omicron}\phi\acute{\epsilon}\iota\lambda\epsilon\nu$  in Cauer, *Delectus*, 527.

As to the relation of Arcadian (apart from Cyprian) to other dialects, Smyth finds a connection with Lesbian, Thessalian, and Boeotian in the tendency of contract verbs in  $-\acute{\epsilon}\omega$  and  $-\acute{\omicron}\omega$  to pass over into the  $-\mu$  class; also an affinity with Ionic in the occurrence of  $\epsilon\iota$  in the Tegean inscription, while connection with the Doric is seen in  $\eta$  for  $\epsilon$  by

compensative lengthening, and probably in such infinitives as  $\iota\mu\phi\acute{\alpha}\iota\nu\epsilon\nu$  (=  $\epsilon\mu\phi\acute{\alpha}\iota\nu\epsilon\nu$ ).

Special connection of Cyprian (apart from Arcadian) with other dialects is maintained in a number of cases. But several of these are shadowy. Thus the special relation of Cyprian to Aeolic, and of Cyprian to Boeotian is not made out. But Cyprian and Thessalian must be admitted to have a point of identity in Cyprian  $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\iota\sigma\alpha\iota$  and Thessalian  $-\pi\epsilon\iota\sigma\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\upsilon$  (i.e.  $-\pi\epsilon\iota\sigma\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega$ ), where we should regularly have  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\iota\sigma\alpha\iota$ ,  $\tau\epsilon\iota\sigma\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega$ . So also Cyprian, Lesbian, and Thessalian have  $\delta\nu-$  for  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\alpha}$  in composition, and Cyprian, Boeotian, Thessalian and Doric agree in changing  $\epsilon$  to  $\iota$  before  $\alpha$ ,  $\omega$ ,  $\omega$  (though this is rare in Thessalian).

Special relation of Cyprian to Ionic-Attic on the basis of the Cyprian genitives  $\acute{\Lambda}\mu\acute{\upsilon}(\nu)\tau\omega$  (from  $\acute{\Lambda}\mu\acute{\upsilon}\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma$ ),  $\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\phi\alpha\gamma\acute{\omicron}\rho\omega$  (instead of  $\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\phi\alpha\gamma\acute{\omicron}\rho\alpha\nu$ , cf. Cyprian  $\acute{\omicron}\rho\alpha\sigma\alpha\gamma\acute{\omicron}\rho\alpha\nu$  and similar genitives) seems doubtful.  $\acute{\Lambda}\mu\acute{\upsilon}(\nu)\tau\omega$  is no longer read by Deecke, and  $\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\phi\alpha\gamma\acute{\omicron}\rho\omega$ , as admitted by Smyth himself (*Addenda*, p. 159), is not a current formation, only a single instance being known where Ionic names in  $-\gamma\acute{\omicron}\rho\eta\varsigma$  form the gen. in  $-\gamma\acute{\omicron}\rho\omega$ , while the formation in  $-\gamma\acute{\omicron}\rho\epsilon\omega$  is frequent. Cyprian  $\delta\tau\epsilon$  and  $\pi\omicron\tau\acute{\epsilon}$  would seem to constitute the only point of special relationship between this dialect and Ionic-Attic.

Between Cyprian and Doric the special relationship claimed by Smyth is contingent, at least in part, upon the interpretation of uncertain dialectic phenomena. Thus if we admit, for Cyprian,  $\omega$  and  $\eta$  by compensative lengthening of  $\sigma$  and  $\epsilon$ ; or if we admit the expulsion of secondary intervocalic  $\sigma$  (in the Cyprian  $\phi\rho\acute{\omicron}\nu\acute{\epsilon}\omega\iota$  for  $\phi\rho\acute{\omicron}\nu\acute{\epsilon}\omega\sigma\iota$  Coll. 68, 4;  $\delta\iota\mu\acute{\omega}\iota\sigma\iota$  69), we shall readily recognize Doric affinities. But, as long as the correct interpretation of the Cyprian forms is so doubtful, it will hardly do to build upon them. Doric influence, however, seems to manifest itself in the rare Cyprian gen. in  $\acute{\alpha}$  for  $-\alpha\nu$ , e.g.  $\acute{\Lambda}\mu\eta\acute{\nu}\iota\alpha$  Coll. 60, 18, and in the contraction of  $\epsilon\sigma$  to  $\omega$  in  $\Nu\mu\acute{\eta}\nu\iota\omicron\varsigma$ , *Berliner Philologischer Wochenschrift*, 1886, no. 42, col. 1323.

A special interest attaches to Smyth's paper from the fact that he has appended to his discussion of the relationship between Arcado-Cyprian and other dialects an outline of the Cyprian dialect itself. This is brief and not designed to discuss theories to any extent or to deal exhaustively with the epigraphic material, yet as the first <sup>1</sup> published

<sup>1</sup> A fuller treatment of the subject is attempted in a paper of my own, *On the Sounds and Inflections of the Cyprian Dialect*, in the *Nebraska University Studies*, I. 2, which was already in press at the time of the appearance of Dr. Smyth's article.

attempt at anything like a systematic summary of the facts of Cyprian grammar it commands attention. I venture to notice in detail several questions touched upon by Smyth in this connection.

1. *Ἰήρω*, Deecke's reading in Coll. 68, 1, which is taken by him for *Ἰείρω* and has generally passed unchallenged, is properly rejected by Smyth (p. 115). The *ει* of *Ἰείρων* is the genuine diphthong, as is shown by Attic inscriptions written in the Old Alphabet, where we have EI. Cyprian *η* cannot stand as the equivalent of this genuine *ει*, but only of that *ει* which arises from compensative lengthening or contraction.

2. *πός*, Coll. 60, 19, 20, 21, which Baunack and Meister wish to explain as derived from *πορί* through the medium of an assumed \**ποσί* (ante-vocalic form), is taken by Smyth (p. 67) after Bechtel (*Bezz. Beitr.* x. p. 287) as for \**πόρς*. The weakness of the view advocated by Baunack and Meister is well characterized by the remark that in their explanation the form \**ποσί*, like the Pelasgians, is there only to be driven away, since it is purely imaginary and found in no dialect or literary monument.

3. Deecke's reading *πότι* (Coll. 68, 1) as voc. sing. of *πότις* (for *πόσις*), 'lord,' is also rejected (p. 68). Deecke's reading would compel us to admit the retention of *τ* before *ι*, in spite of the fact that this is elsewhere regularly assibilated, while Cyprian *πόσις* occurs in a clear instance in Coll. 26, 2. To these phonetic considerations might have been added the fact that the signification 'lord' is foreign to the word in Greek, though Skrt. *patīs* and even Greek *πότνια* point unmistakably to the primitive signification as that of *power, mastery*.

4. *ἦ κε* is Deecke's reading in Coll. 60, 10, 23, i.e. *εἴ κε* (= *ἐάν*). Meyer (*Gr. Gr.* § 113) has rejected this and proposes *ἦ(ν) κε* (*ἦν* for *ἐάν*), the final *ν* being omitted as not infrequently in Cyprian. Meyer compares Homeric *ἐάν κε* as a syntactical parallel. But Smyth (p. 72) rightly defends Deecke's reading in view of Cretan *ἦ* in the Gortynian inscription iv. 31; v. 9, and cites with approval Baunack's explanation of the form as instrumental of the root *svō-* (cf. Laconian *πῆ-ποκα* from root *πο-*). It might be added that Meyer's explanation of Cyprian *ἦν* for *ἐάν* is against the clear laws of the dialect as regards the contraction of *εα*. This combination does not contract, but either remains unchanged or (in Idalian inscriptions) becomes *ια*.

5. *ἱαρός* (as the equivalent of *ιερός*) is evidently claimed for Cyprian (p. 82), especially

on the basis of *ἱγαρώρατος*, Coll. 41, though Deecke (*Bezz. Beitr.* xi. p. 317) has announced that the inscription, which was hitherto read from right to left, is to be read from left to right. Compare also Meister in *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift*, 1887, no. 52, who has further worked out the text. This deprives us of *ἱγαρώρατος*. The other forms cited by Smyth, *ἱαρά* (= *ιαρά*?) and *ἱαρώ(ν)δαν*, cannot authorize the conclusion that *ιαρός* existed by the side of *ιερός* in Cyprian.

6. *ἔφεϊσος* (on the basis of Deecke's reading *ἐφέϊσος*, Coll. 68, 1) is accepted by Smyth (p. 85) as the Cyprian form of *ἴσος*. But the primitive form of this adjective was *ἴσος* (cf. Cretan *ἴσσον*, *ἴσσομοιον* in the Gortynian inscription). Smyth does not explain the precise origin of *ἔφεϊσος*. The *ε* may easily be accounted for as prothetic before the initial *σ*. Cf. Homeric *ἴσσαι* (the correct form—not *ἔσαι*) for \**ε-ἴσσαι*, i.e. \**ε-ἴσσαι*. But *φεϊ-* as the Cyprian resultant of *ἴσφ-* is not conceivable. Possibly we might assume a strong stem *φεϊσ-* by the side of *ἴσφ-*. But the Ionic *η* of the termination cannot be correct, and considering the many difficulties of the context it would seem best to reject the former altogether.

7. So also with the peculiar *ἐπισταῖς* in the same inscription (Coll. 68, 3), which Smyth (following Deecke) accepts (p. 119) without apparent hesitation, as for *ἐπισταίης*, though admitting that the form stands alone.

8. Expulsion of intervocalic secondary *σ* (arising from *τ*), claimed by Deecke in *φρονέω* for *φρονέωσι* Coll. 68, 4 and *διμώσις* for *διμώσις* Coll. 69, and admitted by Smyth (p. 112), should be accepted with caution, as the reading of neither inscription (in spite of Deecke) can fairly be held to be assured until made to yield a better sense than at present. It is true that certain Cyprian glosses preserved in Hesychius do illustrate the disappearance of intervocalic *σ*. But I should be inclined to attribute these to a later stage of the Cyprian than is known to us from inscriptions. Moreover it should be noted that these glosses never exemplify the loss of the secondary *σ* arising from *ι*, which is the case we have to deal with. Hence though the phenomenon in question is not unparalleled (e.g. Laconian *ἐνῆβώσις*, Roehl, *I.G.A.* 79, 15), yet it is exceedingly doubtful for Cyprian.

9. How *σπῆσος* (p. 112) is to be maintained as the contraction of *σπέος* (i.e. \**σπέφεσος*), Coll. 31, 32, is difficult to understand. Cyprian *-εεσ-* regularly becomes *-εσ-* by aphaeresis of the second *ε*, e.g. *Θεοκλέος* for *Θεοκλέεος*, i.e. *-έφεος*. So also in Arcadian.

Hence \*σπέφεσος would become σπέος, which I should read, rejecting Deecke's σπέως, despite the resulting identity of nom. and gen.

10. As to the Cyprian *άλων* (= *άλλων*) in the Bronze Tablet, Coll. 60, 1, and the recently discovered Cyprian *Ἀπειλωνι*, *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift*, 1886, no. 42, col. 1323, Smyth takes these (p. 114) as arising not by epenthesis from \*άλιος, \*Ἀπέλιων, as is commonly done, but as a further Cyprian development of an Arcado-Cyprian *άλλος* and *Ἀπέλλων*. For the former of these he compares Cretan *αὐκά* = *άλική*; *θεύγω* = *θέλγω*. Smyth's view is decidedly preferable to any other. The Arcado-Cyprian form must have been *άλλος* and Cyprian *αλλος* must have developed from this. So with *Ἀπειλωνι*.

11. Smyth seems to share (p. 109) Voigt's suspicion of *κατέθεσαν*, Deecke's reading in Coll. 20. But I see no good reason why this form may not be explained as a contamination of *κατέθιζαν*, found in Coll. 60, 27, and *κατέθεσαν*. The latter though not found may be safely assumed as a current form.

12. As to Smyth's endorsement (p. 68) of *μι(ν) εύξάμενος*, Hall's proposed reading in Coll. 45, where Deecke reads *ευξάμενος* (*ύ = έπί*), it should be borne in mind that *μι(ν)* with omitted final nasal cannot be read before a vowel in Cyprian. Hence the reading is untenable. Voigt's *μιν έθηκε* in the same inscription (where Deecke reads *ινέθηκε*) is no more tenable, since *μιν* for *μέν* (i.e. *μέ-ν = μέ*) is the ante-consonantal form; *μέν* the form employed before vowels. Cf. *μην έστρασαν* Coll. 71. I should therefore retain Deecke's reading in both instances.

13. Smyth is inaccurate in his statement (p. 109) concerning the change of Cyprian *ε* to *ι*. He implies that the *ε* of *εα* or *εο* where these arise from *εσ α*, *εσ ο*, does not be-

come *ι*. Yet the Bronze Tablet has *άρελίζα* for *-έα*, i.e. *-έσα*: *τέρχνηζα* for *τέρχνηα* i.e. *-εσα*. The facts seem rather to be these: in the Bronze Tablet, and in fact in all Idalian inscriptions, *ε* invariably becomes *ι* before *α*, *ο*, and *ω*. Elsewhere it is generally retained.

14. On p. 118, Smyth is correct in insisting (against Deecke, *Bezz. Beitr.* vi, 79) that the Cyprian *κάτι* (*κάτ'* *Ἡδαλίων*, Coll. 59, 3) cannot be taken as the progenitor (through \**κάσι*, \**κάι*) of the vulgar *καί*. Cyprian *κάς*, *κά* (= *καί*) are also to be held separate from both *κάτι* and *καί*.

15. The Cyprian gen. *Εὐφαγόρω* Coll. 153, 154, which Smyth was at first inclined (p. 111) to refer to Ionic influence (following Meyer, *Gr. Gr.* § 345), is admitted in the Addenda, p. 159, to be doubtful. This is unquestionably the more prudent view, as already indicated above.

16. The Arcadian forms in *-ής* (for *εύς*), viz. *ιαρής*, *ιερής*, *γραφής*, are taken (p. 79) along with the solitary Cyprian *ιερής* as representing a primitive *ē* declension. The Boeotian forms in *-ει* (for *-εις*, i.e. *-ης*), e.g. *Μέννει* etc., are referred to the same category. This suggestion is deserving of consideration, though the facts are too scanty to justify more than a bare hypothesis.

17. The Arcadian *δαμοργός*, which is taken (p. 95) as for *δαμιωργός* (contracted from *δαμο(φ)εργός*) with *ω* shortened to *ο*, is explained in the Addenda, p. 158, as for *δαμοεργός* with aphaeresis of the *ε*. The latter view is distinctly preferable since the shortening of a long vowel before liquid consonant is doubtful for a period of the language subsequent to the disappearance of *φ*. In my own paper I have referred *δαμοργός* to *δαμιοργός*, assuming aphaeresis of the first *ο*.

CHAS. E. BENNETT,  
*University of Nebraska.*

## HISTORY OF GREECE.

*A History of Greece*, by EVELYN ABBOTT, M.A., LL.D. Part I. (London, 1888.) 10s. 6d.

A NEW history of Greece written in English and summarizing the results of recent research has long been needed. In Germany during the last thirty years the greatest activity has been displayed in the production of historical works; the labour has been

carefully divided and every branch of historical study has been exhaustively investigated. The results so acquired have been collected and applied to general history, and the works of Curtius, Duncker, Holm and Busolt contain the best evidence of the energy of German historians. On the other hand Sir G. W. Cox is the only English writer since Thirlwall and Grote who has produced a Greek history of any importance.