

MISCELLANEA

ΠΠΟΤΙ ΙΑΙΟΝ ΙΡΗΝ

1. The word *ἰερός* has been the object of much research, both with regard to its form(s) and to its meaning. The last to discuss it was P. Wathélet, in his admirable book *Les traits éoliens de la langue de l'épopée grecque* (Rome 1970), 356 f. As on this point I do not agree with this author and as I think that now at least the problems can be solved in principle, another few pages may be devoted to it.

2. The meaning of the word, which at first embarrassed scholars, is now defined by J. P. Locher, *Untersuchungen zu ἰερός* (Diss. Bern 1963), as "worin sich eine besondere, über dem Menschen stehenden 'Macht' wirksam erweist" (p. 64). A good survey is given by Chantraine, *Dict. étym.*, s.v. This meaning agrees well enough with that of Skt. *īśirá-* 'vigorous, lively'.

3. For *ἰερός*, which is found in Mycenaean (*ijero*), Arcadian, Cyprian, Attic and Ionic (but see below), Doric has *ἰαρός*, while Lesbian and Northern East Ionic have *ἰρος*, *ἰρός*, but Thessalian and Boeotian *ἰερός* and *ἰαρός*, the last form being a loan from NWGreek. This dialectal distribution is probably due to dialectal developments of Greek and must not be ascribed to three Proto-Indo-European (PIE) basic forms (**iseros*, **isaros* < **isros*, **isros*). The last assumption would also exclude (Wathélet seems not to see this) connection with Skt. *īśirá-*, a connection which is now generally accepted, especially on the basis of the agreement between *ἰερόν μένος* and Vedic *īśiréna mánasā* (instr.). Skt. *īśirá-* beside *ἰερός* must derive from **isHro-*, with the second *-i-* of Sanskrit from a PIE laryngeal. My assumption (*Development of the PIE Laryngeals in Greek*, 184 f.) that the form **ish₁ro-* was preserved down to the separate dialects (even to Lesbian) is improbable. A special development **ish₁ro-* > Doric *ἰαρο-* must be rejected, as in all Greek dialects the laryngeals developed in the same way¹). As all East Greek dialects have *ἰερός*, the original form must have been **ish₁ros* > *ἰερός* in all dialects. Doric innovated in changing it into *ἰαρός*²).

It is agreed upon that the form *ἰρο-* originated in Lesbos. A development **ish₁ro-* > **isro-* > *ἰρο-* for Lesbian is improbable, not only because it supposes a special development of the laryngeal in

1) In *Development*, 259-64 I left open the possibility of dialectal differences, but this is improbable. Cf. also Rix, *Kratylos* 14, 183 f.

2) On other forms with *-αρος/-ερος* see *Development*, 184.

Lesbian, but also because **isro-* would have given **ισρο-* (Wathelet, *loc. cit.*, Rix, *Kratylos* 14, 184 n. 1; cf. Lesb. *χερρας* 'χειρας' < **ghesr-*). As Thessalian and Boeotian *ἱερός* is hardly a loan from Attic, the original Aeolic form was *ἱερός*, and Lesbian must have changed this into *ἱρος*, probably through **υρος*. This seems strange in a dialect where *ρi* tends to become *ρε* (though it seems only a "tendance sporadique", Wathelet, 164). Wathelet (356 f.) therefore considers the possibility of an Asianic loan, different from *ἱερός*. This suggestion—it is not new—must decidedly be rejected in the case of adjectives with equal meaning and slightly different forms according to the dialects. The Sanskrit cognate proves PIE origin. We must therefore accept *ἱερός* > **υρος* > *ἱρος* (and try to explain it) ¹⁾.

As regards PIE **ish₁ró-s*, it has zero grade of the element(s) preceding *-ro-* which bears the accent, as is the rule. As a root **eisH-* or **iesH-*, ending in *-sH*, is not probable (*-Hs* does occur, cf. **péh₂s-*, Hitt. *pahs-*, Lat. *pás-tor* etc.), the root **(h₁)eis-/(h₁)ies-* is followed by a morfeme *-h₁-*.

4. The word for 'hawk, falcon', Att. *ἰέραξ*, Dor. *ἰάραξ*, *ἰρηξ* in Homer and Hesiod (*Op.* 203, 212) gives no new point of view,

1) There are some cases where *ε* seems to have become *ι*; cf. Schwyzer, 351 (Att. *χίλιοι* < *χειλ-*; or rather **χεςλ-* > **χισλ-?*; *ἰμάτιον* < *εἶμα-*). *Πίσυρες* is Lesbian according to glosses, but we have only [*πεσ*]υρες*καιδεκοτος* (inscr.), *πέσυρα* Balb. and *πέσσυρες* H. The usual explanation of *πίσυρες* (Wathelet, 69 f.) may well be doubted. Beside a nom. **h^ueti_u-* > *πεσσ-* an acc. **h^u(e)tur-* is assumed, which must have given **τιτυρ-*. The *π-* as well as the *σ* must then have come from the nominative. As the nom. *πέσσυρες* will hardly have *-υρ-* from the accusative, the accusative form need not be assumed to explain *-υρ-*. As **h^uti_ug-* gave *τρα-(πεζα)*, Myc. *torpeza*, we hardly expect another form with a reduced vowel (or an anaptyctic vowel). In Greek there is no other indication for such a form (elsewhere only Lat. *quattuor* might indicate a reduced vowel). Only the single *σ* of *πίσυρες* could be explained in this way, but if *s* for *t* was taken over from the nominative, we should rather expect *σσ* to have been taken over. Therefore I believe that we must assume a Lesbian development *πεσ(σ)-* > *πισ-*, rather than posit a PIE variant to explain it. Yet the single *σ* in Lesbian gives a problem, as *σσ* is always preserved. We do have *πέσυρα* in Balbilla, but this is of limited value. As Boeotian and Thessalian have *πετταρ-*, Homeric *πίσυρες* must be of Lesbian origin (which agrees with the glosses). In a mainland-Aeolic system nom. *πετταρες*, acc. **τιτυρας* no *σ* could occur. (Wathelet does not discuss this problem.) Ernout-Meillet (*Dict. étym.*, 544) posit a nom. **πιτφορες*, but this is based on the wrong assumption that in PIE two successive elements could not have full grade. See KZ 86 (1972), 30-63. I may add that I do not believe that *τροφάλεια* contains 'four'. If it contains *φάλος*, which is not IE (Furnée, *Vorgriech.*, 172), it will hardly have a form of the IE number 'four' otherwise not attested in Greek. If it does not contain *φάλος*, there is no reason at all to assume *τυρ-* 'four'. *Τυρταίος* is certainly pre-Greek.

especially as it might have been influenced by the forms of *ἱερός*. In any case it does not contradict the above picture, rather confirms it. Hesychius' *βείρακες· ἱέρακες* points to **Ἔρακ-*, which may well be the oldest form. That Homer has no sure evidence for *Ἔ-*, is no problem (as suggests the wording in many handbooks; see on this question *Development*, 277, on *ἱδρώς*). Most handbooks connect it with (*Ἔ*)*ἱεμαι*, but this is semantically not too strong and the formation would be difficult to explain. It could well be a substratum word.

5. When we consider the use of *ἱρο-* in Homer, we find that neither *ἱεῦς*, *ἱεῦω* nor the substantivized *ἱρόν* 'sanctuary' or *ἱρά* 'offerings' show any significant formula. This is different with the adjective. In the *Iliad* it is found in Π 658 *Διὸς ἱρά τάλαντα* and further only with *Ἴλιος* (21×) as in the *Odyssey* (2×). With *Ἴλιος* we have five times the nominative, three times the genitive and thirteen times the accusative in the *Iliad*. The accusative is preceded three times by *εἰς* (Λ 196 = O 169, Ω 143; also λ 86, ρ 293), five times by *πρὸς* (H 82, 413, 429, N 657, P 193). This means that the adjective *ἱρός* in Homer is found almost exclusively following *Ἴλιος*, of which the most notable formula has *πρὸς Ἴλιον ἱρήν*. The form *πρὸς* is generally considered an Aeolic feature, because of the *-τι-* preserved, as Mycenaean has *ḫosi* and Ionic *πρός* (Wathelet, 103 f.). The formula must be old. It stands at the end of the verse following the 'hepthemimeris', has 'double short' before the 'bucolic caesura', and the *Ἔ-* of *Ἴλιον* functions. It cannot be wholly excluded that it was made at a late date. In that case, however, we should expect **πρός Ἴλιον ἱρήν* or *εἰς Ἴλιον ἱρήν*, which actually occurs (*Il.* 3×, *Od.* 2×) but most probably is more recent, replacing the old formula. As two elements of it are Aeolic, the whole formula will be so. A difficulty arises from the fact that Lesbian itself has *πρός*, which is generally considered a loan from Ionic (replacing original *πρὸς*). Now there are two possibilities. The formula is Aeolic but not Lesbian, which would imply that (proto-) Aeolic had *ἱρός*, but replaced it by *ἱερός* from Attic. As this is not very probable, we must assume that our formula is Lesbian, but in a time when it still had *πρὸς*. This would mean that our formula is old-Lesbian. However, *πρὸς Ἴλιον* also occurs before the 'bucolic caesura' (14×), followed five times by *ἡγεμόεσσαν*. It is therefore also possible that this last formula is of mainland-Aeolic origin, *πρὸς Ἴλιον ἱρήν* being a variant which originated in Lesbos.

Given the meaning of *πρὸς Ἴλιον ἱρήν* (or rather *ἱρήν*), one is tempted to ask what the implication is. We may be sure that stories from the Trojan War were a theme at Lesbos, a theme which naturally interested them as they lived close to the scene. It is not improbable that they handed the theme over to the Ionians. It

seems sure that the infinitive ending $-\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota$ was a Lesbian contribution to the epic language: it is the only dialect to have it and it is probably an innovation, formed from Aeolic $-\mu\epsilon\nu$ and Ionic $-\nu\alpha\iota$ (Wathelet, 315-24). The Lesbians may have inherited the story from their Aeolic homeland. There is evidence that the expedition to Troy was an Aeolic event: the start at Aulis and the important Boeotian element with which the Catalogue begins, the fact that the Thessalian Protesilaos was the first to land in Troy. . . . Sometimes it seems as if some lines are discernible.