

# MORPHOLOGIE

## Greek Nouns in *-us*, *-uos*.

Cont. 1. Intr. 2. Material 3. Nouns in *-τύς*  
4. Dat. pl. *-υοσι*.

### I.

In *Glotta* 51 (1973) 228-41 I discussed the Greek *u*-stems. It may be useful to devote a few more lines to the words in *-us*, *-uos*, my type 7. (My type 8, *ὄφρῦς* etc., need no more be discussed (1)). The facts are nowhere presented very clearly. The only separate treatment is by W. C. GUNNERSON, *History of the u-stems in Greek* (Diss. Chicago 1905).

We shall consider the relation between long or short *u*, the gender and the accentuation in the oldest Greek.

While the gender and the accent are mostly known, in the other case we are not so well informed. For the length of the *u* only the nominative and accusative singular can be considered, for in the other cases *u* is always short (except in the acc. pl. that has *-ῦς*). Before vowel the long *u*, originating from *u* + laryngeal, became regularly short. Two exceptions are known, *φ* 318 *ἔλῦος*, which is a metrical licence (when used before consonant the *u* must be long; cf. *ἰτέλης* A.R. 4, 1428), and Hes. *Op.* 436 *δρῦός*. (Schwyzer, *Gr.Gr.* 1, 571β mentions *μῦών* as a gen. pl., but it is a nom. sg.) The only case ending beginning with consonant is the dat. pl., which got short *u* from the other cases. (On *-υοσι* see § 4.)

This means that our material for the length of the *u* is very limited. It appears that the handbooks are not very exact in this matter. While it is mostly emphasized that *u* before vowel is short — which is superfluous —, there is often no indication for the nom. acc. sg. Also it appears that many relevant words appear only very late. Or the evidence for the length of the *u* is very late. Not seldom there is contradictory evidence which does not allow of a simple conclusion. In this case there is the

(1) My analysis of *δρῦς* (*KZ* 86 [1972] 36) must probably be given up, as the oldest compounds like *δρῦνόμος* indicate that the *u* was originally short.

possibility of poetical licence (but it is not seldom hard to decide which is the exception). Secondly there is the possibility of dialectal differences. There is a statement of a grammarian to this extent, but we do not know what it is worth; one hesitates to rely blindly on it. And lastly the possibility must be considered that words were transferred from one category to another in the course of time. If this did happen, it would mean that in those cases where our first evidence is (very) late, it is not sure that the quantity was the same earlier.

If we compare the cases with contradictory evidence I think we can draw a conclusion. We have:

<i>στάχυς</i>	<i>ū</i> Eur.	<i>ǔ</i> Call.
<i>βότρυς</i>	<i>ū</i> Att.	<i>ǔ</i> elsewhere
	(according to the gramm. Moiris)	
<i>γένυς</i>	<i>ū</i> Eur.	<i>ǔ</i> elsewhere (also Eur.)
<i>χέλυς</i>	<i>ū</i> <i>hMerc.</i>	<i>ǔ</i> Bion, Call., Opp., Arat.
<i>νηδύς</i>	<i>ū</i> A.P., Nic., Orph.	<i>ǔ</i> A., S., E., Call.
<i>λιγνύς</i>	<i>ū</i> Tryph.	<i>ǔ</i> S., Call.
<i>ἰσχύς</i>	<i>ū</i> Att.	<i>ǔ</i> Pi.

In the case of the barytona the long *u* seems the exception. It is probably a metrical licence (cf. *γένυς* in Eur.), rather than a dialectal difference.

With the oxytona there is a remarkable difference in the Attic treatment. As this is well documented and consistently short in the first two words and long in the last, it seems that Pindar has a metrical licence, and that the other words got long *u* in later poetry.

Compare also the remarks on the separate words.

## 2.

I found the relevant words in GUNNERSON and the reverse indexes of BUCK-PETERSEN (Chicago 1944, pp. 19-22) and KRETSCHMER-LOCKER. I left out of account the glosses, of which mostly the length of the *u*, the inflection and the gender is not known.

I give a survey of the words concerned, and add a few remarks on most of them. The nouns in *-τύς* are discussed later (§ 4).

[...] does not belong to this category in the author's opinion

(?) belongs " " " " " " "

? open to doubt; contradictory evidence, etc.

I/II no evidence for the length of the *u*

(...) root nouns etc. not relevant here

## I -ῦς

A1. *masculine barytona*

ὄλολυς Anaxandr. φῆτυς Lyc.  
 θρηῦλυς Hom. (?) νέκυς Hom.  
 σίνητυς Nic. (?) στάχυς Hom.  
 ἄρτυς Parth. ? βότρυς Hom.

I/II κάνδυς X. σκόλλυς Pamphil.  
 ἄλυς Hp. ὄρυες Hdt.

A2. *masculine oxytona*

I/II ἀττακῦς LXX

B1. *feminine barytona*

κῖκυς Hom. ἀτράφαξυς Hp.  
 ἄρκυς A. γῆρυς Hom.  
 μίμαρκυς Ag. ἴτυς Hom.  
 γένυς Hom. πίτυς Hdn.  
 ἀμάμαξυς Sapph. (?) χέλυς

I/II βρένθυς Phld.  
 κόρθυς Theoc.  
 σίκυς Alc.  
 κρέμυς Arist.  
 ?ἴκυς IV B.C.

B2. *feminine oxytona*

(?) λιγνῦς A.  
 (?) νηδῦς Hom.

νηδῦς Hom.  
 οἰζῦς Hom.  
 πληθῦς Hom.  
 ἰθῦς Hom.  
 ἰσχῦς Hes.  
 ?ἰλῦς Choerob.  
 ?ἀχλῦς Hom.

I/II μαζῦς Zos. Alch.  
 κλεμμῦς Ant. Lib.  
 ἰγνῦς hMerc.  
 ἐλινῦες Plb.

## II -ῦς

A1. *masculine barytona*

[νέκυς]  
 [στάχυς]

A2. *masculine oxytona*

ἀπφῦς Theoc.  
 (ἰχθῦς)

B1. *feminine barytona*

? ἦρυς II B.C.  
 [χέλυς]

ράπυς Speus.  
 ? ὄστρυς Thphr.  
 κάχυς Cratin.  
 μίτυς Arist.

B2. *feminine oxytona*

? λιγνῦς (Tryph.)  
 ?ἰξῦς Hom.  
 ? ἦρῦς  
 (δρῦς)  
 (ὄφρῦς)  
 (σῦς)  
 (ὄσφῦς)

ἀχνῦς Call.  
 μαστῦς Call.  
 καττῦς Ar.  
 δελφῦς Hp.

	I -ῦς	II -ῦς	I/II
A1. masc. baryt.	5-8	0	4
A2. masc. oxyt.	0	1 (+1)	1
B1. fem. baryt.	9-10	1?	7-9
B2. fem. oxyt.	2?	5-10 (+4)	8

## IAI.

*ὄλολος* The accent (Hdn. 2.938) shows short *u*.

*θρήνυς* Same remark.

*σίνηπυς* Nic. *Al.* 533. Also *σίναπυς*, ἤ! (The accent shows short *u*.)

*ἄρπυς* Parth. *Fr.* 9 and Hsch. (*ἄρπυν· ἔρωτα, Αἰολεῖς*). Proper name? (There seems no reason to consider it feminine, as does CHANTRAINE; one would have to read *ἐπιβάσ· Ἄρπυς* instead of *-βάς*.)

*νέκυς* has short *u*, as I demonstrated in *Glotta* 51 (1973) 236-8.

*στάχυς* has long *u* only E. *HF* 5, short Call., A.R. But the accent of the variant *ἄσταχυς* definitely points to short.

?*βότρυς* (but fem. Nic. *Al.* 185) *μακρῶς Ἀττικοί, βραχέως Ἑλληνες* Moiris 193, 10; evidence for short *u* Nonn. *D.* 1, 528, *A.P.* 5, 286, 6 (VI A.D.) (I cannot find *A.P.* 1, p. 41, cited in the Thesaurus). GUNNERSON gives only CIG Ins. II, 781, but this (= IG XII, 1, 1, 781) appears to have long *u* (III A.D.). I suppose occasional metrical lengthening, but we cannot be sure.

## IIAI.

*νέκυς* and *στάχυς* probably belong to IAI; see there.

## I/IIAI.

*κάνδυς* Though it is nowhere explicitly stated, we have no evidence for the quantity of the *u*.

*ἄλυς* No evidence. (Though Suidas says that Attic has *άλύω* for *άλύω*, from which this word seems derived (CHANTR. *Dict.*), there seems no indication for *ἄλυς* as give BUCK-PETERSEN.)

*σκόλλυς*. Hesychius' *σκολλύς* will be a mistake.

*ῥρυες*, an animal in Libya, only Hdt. 4, 192. Is it a Greek word? Cf. *ῥρυξ* with the same meaning. LSJ give *βόρυες* as a *varia lectio*, which I cannot find.

## IIA2.

The only word that belongs here is *ἀπφῶς* (Theoc. 15, 14), a hypocoristic 'daddy'. For the accent Hdn. 2.936, 27.

## I/IIA2.

*ἀττακῦς* is a *varia lectio* in LXX *Le.* 11.22 for *ἀττάκης*; this locust is also called *ἄττακος* Aristeas 145, Ph. 1.85. I do not know how reliable the form (and the accent) is.

BUCK-PETERSEN mention *δοροξῦς* *PTeb.* 278, 4 (not *δορυξῦς* as LSJ have). However, this is evidently a mistake for *δορυξός*.

## IB1.

*κίκυς* Short *u* is proven by the accent.

*ἄρκυς*, in Attic *ᾶ-* according to Paus. Gr. *Fr.* 73.

*μίμαρκυς*; short *u* is shown by the accent.

*γένυς* is generally assumed to have had short *u*, with occasional *ū* m.c. Note that Euripides has *-ūν* in *El.* 1215, but *-ūs* in *Phoen.* 63.

*ἀμάμαξυς* must have short *u* because of the accent.

*ἀπράφαξυς*; same remark.

*γῆρυς*; same remark.

*χέλυς* has long *u* in *hMerc.* 24, 33 and 153. This has been considered old on etymological grounds: RCS *žely* < PSlav. \**želū*-. This is less important since FURNÉE, *Die wichtigsten konsonantischen Erscheinungen des Vorgriech.* (The Hague 1972), 247, has made probable that the word is ultimately of Pre-Greek origin. In all other places the *u* is short: Bion 9.8, Call. *hApollo* 16, Oppianus *H.* 5, 404, Aratos 268. This is also the opinion of Herodianus, 1, 237 and 527. It seems, then, that the long *u* is a metrical licence, as in the case of *νέκυς*, *γένυς*. This was also suggested by GUNNERSON, p. 56.

#### IIB1.

*ῆρυς* is known only from an inscription from Lilybaeum, II B.C. (KRETSCHMER, *Glotta* 15 [1927] 306). (*Μαρια ῆρυς ἀγαθα* parallel to *ῆρωσ ἀγαθος* on another inscription.) That the *u* was long is of course theory only, but a probable one. It may have been accented *ῆρῦς*.

If we neglect this instance, only *χέλυς* was placed in this category, but reasons have been adduced for this word to belong to IB1 (see there).

#### I/IIB1.

*βρένθυς* only Phld. *Vit.* p. 37J, which has *βρένθυος*.

*κόρθυς*. LSJ indicates short *u*, but there is no evidence; see Gow on Theoc. 10, 46.

*σίκυς*. Alc. Z 123 (LP) gives no evidence.

*κρέμυς* Arist., *χρέμυς* Hsch. Probably Pre-Greek, FURNÉE, *Vogr.*, 131. The word is not mentioned by FRISK and CHANTRAINE. See LSJ, who compare *χρόμυς* (with a *v.l.* *χρέμυς*). FURNÉE connects *κλεμμύς*.

*ῖκνυς* on a IV B.C. inscription from Cyrene (BUCK, *Gr.Diall.*, no. 115 § 6), which, of course, has no accent. LSJ and BUCK accent the first syllable, FRISK and CHANTRAINE the last without argument; LSJ Suppl. does not correct it. It must be based on Hp. *Nat. Mul.* 88, where as far as I see *ἴκνυν* is a conjecture for *ἴκνυν*, *ἴκδην* of the manuscripts (I could only consult ERMERINS 1862). We must conclude that both accent and quantity of the *u* are unknown.

*ράφυς* Speusippos, *ράπυς* Glaukos according to Athen. 9.369b. The quantity of the *u* is not known, but there seems no reason to assume that it was long.

*ᾠστρυς*; only Thphr. *HP* 3.10.3. FRISK gives *-ύς* as alternative, I don't know on what basis.

κάχρυσ LSJ indicate short *u*, but I find no evidence. (See FURNÉE, *Voygr.* 277.)

μίτρως only Arist. *HA* 624a.

IB2.

λιγνύς has short *u* S. *Ant.* 1127 and Call. *Fr.* 228, 57Pf<sup>2</sup>, but a long one Tryph. 332 (c. 300 A.D.). It seems probable, therefore, that it was brought over to IIB2 (thus GUNNERSON, p. 53). (Only in Call. *l.c.* is it paroxytonon: it is either simply a mistake or an indication of the instability of this group (IB2; it either went to IIB2, λιγνύς, or to IB1, λίγνυς).)

νηδύς According to Herodian 1, 527 *u* was short only through metrical licence. So it is generally stated that short *u* is secondary, but the facts rather point to the opposite: short A. *Ch.* 757, E. *Andr.* 356, *Cycl.* 574, Call. *Diana* 160; long AP 9, 519 (Alcaeus the Messenian), Nic. *Al.* 416, Orph. L. 276. As Attic in other cases (βότρως, στάχως) rather favours long *u*, it is not probable that the consequent short is due to metrical licence. On the other hand it is easy to understand that the word was brought over to class IIB2, as the better known oxytone feminines belong there.

IIB2.

νηδύς see IB2.

ισχύς has short *u* only in Pi. *N.* 11, 31; it is long A. *Th.* 1080, *Ch.* 721, S. *Aj.* 118, Men. 449. Cf. βότρως! It seems we must consider the short as a licence.

ίλως There is no evidence for short *u*, but for a long one the first testimony is Choerob. *in Theod.* 1.331 (IV/V A.D.). The long *u* in ίλως Φ 318 is evidently metrical (it is short APl. 4.230 (Leon) and A.R. 1.10) and does not mean that the *u* (originally) was long. Short *u* would agree with RCS *ίλσ*.

άχλός is said (FRISK) to have short *u* later, but I can find no evidence for it. It is long Il. *Y* 421, Hes. *Sc.* 264, Kritias 4, 10 D. In *Y* 421, however, we have the verse final formula κατά δ' όφθαλμών κέχυντ' άχλός used (with slight alteration) at the beginning of the verse. After the caesura a consonant should have followed, but this did not happen. It might be, then, a wrong use of a formula. (Note also that long word end is strongly avoided in this place.) The Homeric licence might have been followed in the other two instances. But we have no certainty. Short *u* would agree with OPr. *αglo* (n.) 'rain'.

λιγνύς see IB2.

ίξυς Homer only has verse final disyllabic ίξυι ε 231 = κ 544. CHANTRAINE notes -ύος, which may be a mistake for -ύος. (In *Gr. Hom.* 1.50 CHANTRAINE points out that the datives in -υι are generally monosyllabic. As θρήνυι (νέκυι) indicates, this does not prove that the *u* was long.) Long *u* in nom. acc. sg. is based only on Choerob. *in Theod.* 1.331.

ἡρῶς see IIB1.

I/IIB2.

μαζύς Zos. Alch. p. 216 B.

κλεμμύς Ant. Lib. 32, 2, Hsch.

ἰγνύς There is only an acc. ἰγνύν Arist. HA 494<sup>a</sup>8 (CHANTRAINE'S ἰγνυ must be a mistake).

ἐλινώες Quantity of the *u* unknown.

ἀχνύς Only Call. Fr. anon. 79 (SCHNEIDER) ἀχνύ.

μαστύς Only Call. Fr. 10 P<sup>f</sup>2 μαστύος.

καττύς Though LSJ indicate long *u*, there is no evidence. (The Aristophanes 'fragment' has no (metrical) context.) (The accentuation καττύς in Hesychius has been corrected into καττύς by LATTE.)

δελφύς LSJ, FRISK and CHANTRAINE don't indicate length, which mostly means that they consider it short. GUNNERSON 56 thinks it is long, but without argument. There is no evidence.

*Conclusion.* If we now return to the tabel given above, we can make the following remarks.

Masculines had short *u* and were barytona. An exception is ἰχθύς which was originally a root noun. Ἀπφύς is a hypocoristicon outside the normal pattern. The doubtful cases may therefore safely be attributed to IA1.

Feminine barytona with short *u* are frequent. With long *u* only χέλυς was a candidate, but I think it is a doubtful one. Here again I think the remaining cases belonged to IB1.

Feminine oxytona with long *u* are frequent. The interesting point is whether there existed such with short *u*. I think we must keep open this possibility. From the undecided cases δελφύς might belong here, and ἀχλύς too may have had short *u*.

Finally we may give a survey of those words that have Indo-European cognates. We get this picture (question-mark before a word indicates that it is not sure that it belongs to that group, behind a word that PIE origin could be doubted):

IA1	θρηῆνυς?	IIA1	—
	? νέκυς		
IA2	—	IIA2	(ἰχθύς)
IB1	γένυς	IIB1	—
	γῆρυς		
	ἴτυς?		
IB2	? δελφύς	IIB2	πληθύς (δρύς)
			ιθύς? (όφρυς)
			? ἰλύς? (σύς)
			? ἀχλύς?

I assume that *χέλυσ* is non-IE, see above. On *πίτυς* BENVENISTE made the same suggestion (not cited as such in FRISK or CHANTRAINE); cf. also FURNÉE, *Vorgr.* 260.

## 3.

*-τύς*. The nouns in *-τυς* are often considered together, but this seems not useful. Firstly, there are words of which it is not known whether they have a suffix *-tu-*: e.g. in *πίτυς*, *μίτυς*, *μότυς*, *δίκτυς* the *t* might belong to the root. Secondly, it should be recognized that the words cited and a few more are probably of non-IE origin. Thirdly, the words cited are barytona, as is *ἴτυς*, which is generally considered IE. Fourthly, the words mentioned are not action nouns as are most others; a notable exception is *κλιτύς*.

The most remarkable thing in the type *βρωτύς* is its long *u*. However, on closer inspection this quantity is not too safely established. The evidence comes exclusively from Homer. The only other words alleged to give evidence on this point appear to be non-existent: \**δοιστευτυς* Call. *hAp.* 43 and \**θελεκτυν* A.R. I, 515. In Homer *N* 731 *T* 205 *Ψ* 622 *ε* 470, *π* 294 = *τ* 13 and *σ* 407 testify for long *u*. However, in the first four instances *-τυς/ν* stands before the caesura (penthemimeris); *π* = *τ* has it before the trithemimeris. (In *σ* it is the first word of the verse.) I would not exclude the possibility that in these cases the verse was meant to continue with a consonant. Note that in *T* 234 and 235 we have a noun in *-τυς/ν* at the penthemimeris followed by a consonant. It is known that at the caesura often irregularities are found (at least originally due to uncaredful use of formulas; the words in *-τυς* do not occur in formulas, except *ἐδητύος*). This suggestion finds some support in the fact that *κλιτύς*, which in *ε* 470 has long *u*, has a short one in *S. Tr.* 271, *Ant.* 1145, *E. Hipp.* 227. The fact that both Sophocles and Euripides, and Sophocles twice, use it short means that it can hardly be poetical licence.

The other Indo-European languages have action nouns with *-tu-*, which are masculine, barytonon and have short *u*! GUNNERSON 46 thinks the Greek accent is recent, while the gender may be partly old. RISCH, *Wortbild.*<sup>2</sup> 40, supposes that Greek changed the gender as well. I agree with GUNNERSON that, once the words were feminine oxytona, a change to long *u*, if they really had it, is easy to understand. But I think it is difficult to understand the other two (preceding) changes. Therefore I am inclined to suppose that some words had feminine gender already in PIE, and that both accentuations occurred or that the words had an accent shifting between root and suffix.



## 4.

The dat. pl. *-ουσι*. It is often suggested, e.g. CHANTRAINE, *Gramm. Hom.* 1.222, that *γένουσι*  $\Lambda$  416, *πίουσι*  $\iota$  186, *νέκουσι*  $\lambda$  569  $\chi$  401 =  $\Psi$  45 replace older *-ῶσι*. I think that this is improbable for several reasons.

First, there is no trace in Greek of *-ῶσι* from words that had *u* followed by laryngeal like *ὄφρῶς*.

Secondly, the three words concerned *never* had long *u* (see above), so that it is not to be reconstructed here.

Thirdly, one would like to know why *-ῶσι* would have been replaced by *-ουσι*. If we try to find the origin of *-ουσι*, it appears that there is no reason to assume a basic form in *-ῶσι*. The ending *-ουσι* can be understood as an artificial creation of the epic language. In one instance it seems that we can see this before our eyes.  $\Lambda$  416 has final *μετὰ γναμπ-τῆσι γένουσι*, which seems built on  $\Lambda$  669  $\Omega$  359  $\lambda$  394  $\nu$  398, 430  $\phi$  283 verse final *ἐνὶ γναμπτοῖσι μέλεσι*. Of course, I don't say that the form originated here. It might have first happened in some similar situation (e.g.  $\lambda$  569 *θεμιστεύοντα νεκούσι* for *\*-ων νέκουεσι*?).

It is remarkable that we find both formulas in  $\Lambda$  (416-669), while the formula with *μέλεσι* and the forms in *-ουσι* do further occur only in the Odyssey (the *μέλεσι* formula — slightly less well suited — also in  $\Omega$ , which often has Odyssean expressions). It may be, then, that *-ουσι* originated in the line of tradition in which the Odyssey stood.

It seems, then, that *-ουσι* is an artificial creation of the epic language, not replacing an older *-ῶσι* (at least not in the words from which we find it).

*Oegstgeest, The Netherlands.*

R. S. P. BEEKES.