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](#)

Greek Stems Ending in -ι- and -εν- and Αρης

C. A. M. Fennell

The Classical Review / Volume 13 / Issue 06 / July 1899, pp 306 - 306

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00080616, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00080616

How to cite this article:

C. A. M. Fennell (1899). Greek Stems Ending in -ι- and -εν- and Αρης. The Classical Review, 13, pp 306-306 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00080616

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

Julianus and Gellius it got into commentaries and glossaries and thus it came to be really used by later writers, like Gregory of Tours: see the collections of Max Bonnet,

whose own explanation, that it is due to rhetorical synecdoche, is perhaps hardly sufficient.

F. HAVERFIELD.

GREEK STEMS ENDING IN -ι- AND -ευ- AND *Αρηs.

THE forms *πρεσβήιον*, apparently a derivative—at any rate in the *Iliad*—of *πρέσβυς* (strengthened stem *πρεσβεF-*), and *μαντεύομαι* (*μαντεύομαι*) suggest that *μαντήιον* is a derivative from the Epic and Ionic stem *μαντεν-* for earlier *μαντειν-* and that all forms in -ήιο- allied to substantives in -εύς should be similarly analysed. This conclusion is upheld by Alkaios' *ἀρένιοι*, which contrasted with his *βασιληῖων* separates the forms **Αρηα* κ.τ.λ. from the -ῆα κ.τ.λ. of nouns in -εύς and supports the view that the stems like *βασιλεν-* are for *βασιλειν-* (strengthened form *βασιλειεF->βασιληF-* in some oblique cases of substantives); while **Αρηα* is simply for **ΑρεFα*, as Dr. Leaf contends. I take **ΑρεFος* to come from an earlier **Αρεσvos*, and nom. **Αρεvs* from **Αρεsvs*.

Thus it appears that in Epic and some Aeolic dialects the η of MSS. in the group of forms under consideration stands for -εF- (except as an accented penultimate) -εῖF-, and -εῖεF-, while in some Aeolic dialects -ηF- of inscriptions represents εῖF and -εῖεF-.

In Epic, however, -εF. and -εῖF- are often represented by ε either as a poetic licence or by the use of a different dialect.

There is also a variation in the strengthened cases of πόλις.

We find in the *Iliad* πόλει, πτόλει, (cp. πόσει), once however, *Il.* 3. 50, πόληι, πόληος, ποτ πόλεος (but more often πόλιος), πόληs twice, πόλειs two or three times.

Such forms as ποθήω, κυπρογενήs in Lesbian Aeolic, which gives us πόληος, suggest strongly that the Epic η in cases of πόλις belongs to an Aeolic dialect and represents an earlier Hellenic εῖ, and not a pre-Hellenic ē or ēi.

As for the Attic locative πόλη, it does not follow that because early Attic did not agree with Lesbian in representing εῖ by η before α, ε, ο, ω it did not do so before ι. I think that the combination εῖμ only occurs in the locative of the -ι- declension. It is therefore permissible to assume that in early Attic, ε, that is a short e, was in this

exceptional case lengthened by the absorption of the greater part of the ι and the glide thereto. The early Attic form πόληος, to be inferred from πόλεως, is accordingly to be explained as a new formation on the analogy of πόλη, while πόλει is on the analogy of πόλεως and the nom. gen. and acc. plural and perhaps also of forms like πήχει.

The segregation of **Αρηs*, **Αρεvs* furnishes a likely derivation for the name, viz. that **Αρεvs* (for **Αρεsvs*) is connected with the Skt. root *ras* 'roar.' Cf. Skt. *ru-s* 'cry,' 'noise,' 'war.'

The root *res* without the suffix *v* might account for **Αρηs*, **Αρεs*, unless the nominative **Αρηs* exhibits a similar phonetic development or analogical origin to that of Arcadian and Doric *ιερης*, in which case the different place of the accent accounts for the vocalism of **Αρηs* being different from that of Ζεύς in Epic, Ionic, and Attic. If *ιερης* is for an earlier *ιερήFs*, this may have been a new form based on the analogy of oblique cases which superseded *ιερεύς* (<*ιερείvs*) or it may be a phonetic development from *ιερείvs* comparable with the Attic πόλη. The normal accusative **Αρεν* would be very likely to be displaced by an analogical **Αρηα*, **Αρενα* as was the case. Pindar's *Ισχυς* is a proper name of similar formation to the assumed **Αρεsvs*, an abstract noun used with shifted accent as a proper name. My suggestion that πόλη was the contracted form of a dative πόλεαι is withdrawn.

As for *Il.* 3. 50, πόληί τε πάντι τε δήμω, the words occur in Theognis 1005, and cf. *Il.* 24, 706, μέγα χάρμα πόλει τ' ἦν πάντι τε δήμω. I think *Il.* 3. vv. 46-51 are a late addition, but I do not dispute the existence of πόληι in some dialects before the time of Theognis. It is clear that Greek throws no light on the Skt. locatives exemplified by *agnāu*, *sūnāu* which seem to exhibit compensation for a lost suffix, *agnāu* here going over into the *u* declension.

C. A. M. FENNELL.