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GR. ΛΕΥΣΣΩ AND ΛΕΥΤΟ: AN UNSOLVED PROBLEM

I should like to offer to John Chadwick not a solution but a problem, the sort of problem that he may like to solve. When I was twenty-one I read in one of his articles that 'when the data are insufficient we may form theories, but our conclusions must necessarily be provisional'. I hope that I then learned my lesson—just one of the numerous lessons for which anyone concerned with Greek and with Mycenaean must be indebted to him. Yet this is not my only reason for gratitude: few established scholars can have been so unfailingly generous and supportive towards an unknown stranger landed on their shore as he has been to me during a quarter of a century and more.

The Greek verb λευσσω or λευσσ, 'look, gaze, see' has never caused etymological problems. It is generally derived from the IE root for light, shiny etc., *leuk-, *luk-, for which the comparative evidence is overwhelming, and which is attested elsewhere in Greek (inter alia in the adjective λαυς). The objection that the semantic difference between 'to see' and 'to shine' is difficult to explain has not been taken too seriously; the Skt. verb lokate 'sees, perceives', which ought to be related, is normally connected with Skt. rokate 'shines' and again with the *leuk- root. Also, there is sufficient comparative evidence (Toch. A tkem 'I see', Lith. laik 'to wait', Lett. laik 'to look for', etc.) which justifies attributing to *leuk- a range of meanings which includes 'to see' and 'to shine'. Moreover, parallels have been frequently adduced for a semantic alternation between 'shine' and 'see'.

2 C. Bosonc, Diet. Ét., s.v. λευσσω; Fink, GEw, s.v.; Chamaine, Dictionnaire, s.v.; The etymology is at least as old as the first volume of A. Poll's, Bysiologische Forschungen, Leipzig 1833, p. 232.
3 Bosonc, Diet. Ét., s.v. λαυς has a list of verbal stems which alternate in meaning between 'shining' and 'looking' or 'seeing'. For a lengthy discussion of such alternations see also P. Pernon, Beiträge zur iig. Wortforschung, Uppsal 1912, 1, pp. 356 ff.; cf. E. Frenkel, Sprachkritik. Untersuchung des kahunzeitlichen ägyptischen...
in particular the example of ἀγάλματα, 'view, discern, illumine', which is clearly derived from ἁγάλη 'sun's light, rays' has been mentioned. In view of these facts and of the normal phonological rules of Greek it seems reasonable to derive λαέσσαρος from λαέκαδος and to quote it as one of the standard examples for the treatment of an earlier -άγα-. But λαέσσαρος does not only play a part in exemplifying the phonological rules of Greek; it is also mentioned in a different context. The epic language makes use of a certain number of words and forms which are not normally found in Greek prose. Yet some of these words and forms are also found in non-poetic inscriptions of Cyprus and Arcadia. The phenomenon is normally explained as due to the survival in these regions of an early 'Achaean', i.e. probably Mycenaean, layer of the Greek lexicon which was preserved in the epic language, but not in current usage. Cyprus and Arcadia, two isolated and in a sense marginal areas, would have kept forms which the rest of Greek does not attest. The verb λαέσσαρος belongs of right with this part of the Greek lexicon. It is an eminently poetic word; it is found in Homer and in poetry likely to be influenced by Homer, but is not normally attested in non-poetic texts. Yet an Arcadian inscription contains the form Λαέσσαρος (IG V2 16, 10) and this evidence is confirmed by one of the γλάσματα κατά πόλεως: λαέσσαρος, which is attributed to the inhabitants of the Arcadian town

Kateschne.., Ergheft Z 14, 1947. pp. 47 f.; general considerations in J. Verdiles, CRAL 1932. p. 201 (+ Choix d'études linguistiques et colliques, Paris 1952, pp. 121 ff.); J. Gondola, Lingua 9, 1960. pp. 178 f. (Selected Studies in Arcadian, Leiden 1975, pp. 148 f.) argues that the semantic shift from 'shine' to 'look' can be explained in terms of those ancient views according to which the eye was a sort of lantern from which rays of light issued. Cf. also Bechu quoted below and above all Ch. Magler, Erg 73. 1966. pp. 40 ff. See also F. Budet, Die Sprache 30, 1984, pp. 112 ff.

Cf. F. Beuchel, Lexicon zu Homer, Halle 1914. pp. 74, which starts from a basic meaning of the active σφάλνει as 'throws rays' and of the middle as 'throws rays for himself', i.e. 'sees'; see for more details about the verb A. Prouet, X 95, 1935. pp. 252 f.; Magler, op. cit., pp. 68 f. Lommel, Z 50, 1922, pp. 262 ff. points out that verbs of seeing may become verbs of shining (cf. e.g. the standard usage of the word in the phrase: μάντις ἔρχεται κατά τον ὅραμα, which is used in the sense: the point is elaborated upon by Magler, op. cit., pp. 66 ff., who argues that the Greek poets treat all objects which irradate light as capable of seeing.

The standard introduction to the 'Achaean' component of the Homeric language is J. J. Knaug, L'élément achacn dans la langue épique, Assen 1957 (for λαέσσαρος, p. 132). For the 'Homeric' words in Arcadian it is still worth while to look at M. Bowna, CQ 20, 1925, pp. 168-176 (λαέσσαρος at p. 173).

of Kleitor 6. The conclusion must be that the IE root *leuk-* yielded a verb *leukdo > λαέσσαρος, which was presumably Mycenaean (though it is not attested in the Linear B tablets), and survived in Arcadia and in the language of poetry. This distribution of the verb explains, of course, why, in contrast with the standard alternations of the type Attic φοίνικας, Ion. φοίνικας, for λαέσσαρος we have only -σσ- or -σς- forms; the expected Attic or Boeotian -στ- equivalents simply did not exist.

So much for the received opinion which in this case is admirably consistent and coherent. However, one or two facts which have been known for a long time, but have been oddly neglected, oblige us to reconsider the whole problem.

The manuscripts alternate between the spellings λαέσσαρος and λαέσσαρος and we know that Aristarchus wrote the verb with -σσ-, while Herodatus wrote it with -σσ- (Schol. Hom. A 120 Erbse). In modern editions the -σσ- spelling is normally preferred, though no cogent argument can be produced in favour of one or the other spelling. Even if the sibilant was originally geminated it way have been simplified after a diphthong. Any decision we may take about the correct spelling is probably as arbitrary as, I suspect, was that of Aristarchus 7. The problem need not detain us; more worrying, however, is that the Arcadian material to which I referred earlier is not as consistent as it appears; the gloss quoted fits with the general view, but the inscriptions are not equally helpful.

It has been known for a long time, and is duly recorded in LSJ (s.v. λαέσσαρος) and in Chartraine, Dictionnaire (ibidem), that an

---

6 For the γλάσματα κατά πόλεως (Bekker, Av. Gr. III, pp. 1095-1096), a list of words (mostly poetic) divided according to the supposed town or region of origin, cf. above all K. Latten, Philologie 80, 1925, pp. 136 ff. esp. pp. 136-148. M. Bowna, Glotta 38, 1960, pp. 45 ff. argues, very much on the basis of Latten's evidence, both for an early source of the list and for the validity of most of the information provided (λαέσσαρος is dismissed at p. 31).

7 For a discussion of the spelling cf. A. Dehmeins, IF 21, 1907, pp. 254 and P. Kretschmer, Glotta 22, 1934, pp. 223 f. Epigraphic data of any significance seem to be missing. LSJ refer to CIG 3284 from Smyrna (now I.K. 23, p. 547) which is a late epigram in elegiacs with the form λαέσσαρος (but the text is lost). Still at Smyrna I.K. 23, 54 d 6 (in itambaric) possibly from the third century A.D. has λαέσσαρος, while I.K. 23, 313.7 (in elegiacs), perhaps from the second century B.C., has λαέσσαρος. I.K. 5, 19 from Kyne (elegiacs from the second-first century B.C.) has λαέσσαρος, while the oracle from Kalipolos (I.K. 19, 11.22 in iambics) has λαέσσαρος.
early fourth century B.C. inscription from Tegea (IG V ii 3) includes an obscure form λευτόν. The text reads: Τον διοφθαλμόν τόν θεοῦ δώσει λατρευτος καὶ άκουσμος και άκους και άκους και άκους. Tòv δ' ον καταλάττοιειν, άκουσμον ουκ ον διοφθαλμόν άκουσμον άκουσμον διοφθαλμόν άκουσμον άκουσμον. άκουσμον ουκ ον λατρευτος λατρευτος λατρευτος λατρευτος λατρευτος λατρευτος. Let the priest pasture twenty-five sheep and a couple and a goat. If he goes beyond it (?), let there be inphorisimos. Let the hieromnæmon practice the inphorisimos. If λατρευτος he does not practice inphorisimos, he will pay one hundred drachmai to the people and be accused. It seems superfluous to rehearse here the various interpretations offered for λατρευτος. One which has found some favour takes the word as a present participle λατρευτος from a verb equivalent to λατρευτος; if the hieromnæmon sees the misdeed but does not enforce the law he will pay the penalty. Objections have been raised on semantic grounds but they are not very persuasive. For more serious is the formal problem: why λατρευτος and not λατρευτος(ο)ν? Schwyzter (op. cit.), who first argued for this view, assumed that the τ of λατρευτος stood in front of the ΤΙ sign which in some parts of Ionian was used in the early period for the sound later represented by τ or το. The hypothesis has had some success but it has been frequently and correctly pointed out that there is simply no evidence for the Ionian ΤΙ or for any other letter used in this manner in Arcadia. Some thirty years after the publication of Schwyzter's article M. Guaducci came down again in favour of understanding λατρευτος as 'seeing' on the basis of what looks like a conclusive piece of evidence. In IG V ii 16, 10, the late third century decree from Tegea which is supposed to provide evidence for an Arcadian λατρευτος, Klauffenbach established (at

the request of M. Guaducci, op. cit., p. 61) that the squeeze guarantees a reading λατρευτος instead of the λατρευτος printed in IG. The context is clear; the stele will be put in the agora, δχως καὶ ον λατρευτος τόν τας κύλις εφημερισιον νόμος ἱσακοθ γόνονι, so that the others too seeing the thankfulness of the city may become worthy men. At this stage it is impossible not to connect the later λατρευτος with the earlier λατρευτος and the conclusion must be that Arcadian has a participle λατρευτος, λατρευτος, 'seeing' attested both in the early fourth century and in the late third century B.C. Two facts are established: first, Arcadian offers no epigraphical evidence for λατρευτος(ο)ν; secondly, Arcadian has a verb λατρευτος, 'to see'. On the other hand the status of the gloss λατρευτος δχως mentioned above is now more doubtful. Even if it has some validity, the form may be simply due to a phonetic adaptation of the local word. The compiler of the γλώσσα κατά κολάς, or rather his source, was obviously concerned with linking Homeric glosses to specific regions or towns but had little or no concern for phonetic accuracy (he quotes, for instances, words with final η for dialects where -α was preserved).

The old question so frequently asked about λατρευτος now arises again, but in a somewhat different form. Can Arcadian λατρευτος 'see', derive from 'λατρευτος, the ancestor of λατρευτος(ο)ν? First, two earlier suggestions must be dismissed. The idea that the τ of λατρευτος in IG V ii 3 is a special sign meant to indicate an affricate or the like derived from a cluster of stop and consonantal τ was in any case far-fetched since we know of no parallels in Peloponnesian. Now it must be rejected since such a sign could not have been in use as late as the late third century B.C., the date of IG V ii 16. Secondly, it seems impossible to follow Guaducci (loc. cit.) when she argues that, since λατρευτος- is the Arcadian equivalent of λατρευτος-, this proves that in Arcadian too ο -ο had become τ- or ττ- . As a phonetic change this would be unparalleled in Greek; the -ο forms of early Attic literature are due to Ionic influence and do not represent the local language which regularly used ττ forms. In theory it is possible that in Arcadian an earlier λατρευτος(ο)ν was replaced by *λατρευτος under the influence of another dialect, such as Attic, but in practice this cannot have happened. The earliest of the two inscriptions discussed above shows no signs of heterodialectal influence and, more important, the obvious source, Attic, has no *λατρευτος.
Could -τι be the normal Arcadian treatment of 'λυ- and λαυτ- the normal continuation of 'λευκ-? The answer is negative, because we have sufficient evidence to guarantee an -ς-treatment of the -κ- cluster: καταλικός in IG V 2 3, 2 (the same inscription where λαυτόν occurs), ἄγαρφος(δομα) and δαίσον in IG V 2 6, 17.41 also from Tegea, but somewhat later. Moreover the rule -κ(κ)ύς > -ς is supported by the parallel development of -τ(τ)ύς (βάς, Παυλίδοςαι, etc.) 11.

If λαυτ- cannot derive from 'λευκ-), prima facie two possibilities remain. Either there is no connection between λαυτ- and λευκ(ο)τό or both verbs derive from something different from 'λευκ-. The first hypothesis cannot be rejected out of hand, though it is unsatisfactory; the formal and semantic similarity between the two verbs seems too great to be due to chance.

The second hypothesis might lead to a conclusion which is formally unobjectionable but creates different problems. We could account for the contrast between λαυτ- and λευκ(ο)τό if we started from a stem 'λευκ- and assumed that λευκόνεις is the participle of a simple thematic verb built on that stem. On the other hand λευκ(ο)τό could be a deverbal base on the same stem redetermined with a -ο- suffix. A form such as 'λευκ(-ο)τό is formally a perfect antecedent for λευκ(ο)τό. Morphonologically and phonologically this solution is acceptable and it has the added advantage that it helps to explain two glosses in Hesychius: ἄγαρφος and λαυτατός: ἄγαρφος [ἀγαρφος] and the lexical oddity νιπλατόν of [Theocr.] 

However there are obvious difficulties. It is not easy to find a parallel for a simple thematic verb of the φώτο type which has a -ο- form. Admittedly, both λαυτόμα (Hy. Hom. 16, 5 Aristoph., etc.) and λευκομα (φωτο-γραμ. Homer, etc.) are attested, but the former must be a secondary formation built on the aorist λαυτόμα (Homer). A similar origin is not easy to postulate for λαυτό- since, as far as we know, λευκ(ο)τό was only used in the present and imperfect. Also, the stem 'λευκ- remains wholly isolated in Greek and elsewhere. On the one hand we cannot find any evidence for it in other Indo-European languages; on the other hand it has no other derivatives in Greek 13. We may notice in passing that -τι stems are not frequent in Greek, or, for that matter, in Indo-European. In Greek, when they exist (μακάμα, χάραμα, ἄφωνο, πεταλώμα, πτέρωμα, πτός, etc.) either they have a -τι extension, as the first three instances quoted, or may show unexpected phonological oddities in the inflection (Ion.-Att. Επανος for expected Επανος from ιπταο, or, show a wealth of different formations and re-formations.

Are these objections too powerful that we must dismiss the possibility of deriving Arc. λαυτ- from λευκ-? Certainly not, since λαυτ- exists and cannot be derived from 'λευκ-. We are back to the original problem. Given that we now have evidence, however limited, for a λαυτ- stem it is possible to assume that λευκ(ο)-

11 The appearance of an unexpected form δαίσον in a Lacoian inscription of the fifth century B.C. (SEG XXVI 461) shows that we may still have surprises about the continuation of this type of change, but in contrast with that of Laconian, the Arcadian evidence is too coherent for this to be likely.

12 We cannot exclude of course that λευκόνεις and the like are new formations analogically built to λευκόνεις: cf. Debrunner, H 21, 1907, p. 254.

13 In view of the frequent formal connections between words which mean 'eye' or 'to see' and words which mean 'window' (Back, Dict. of Synonymy in the IE Languages, pp. 469 f.) we could think of the Hittite word for 'window', ḫunu, which, at first sight at least, may point to an original 'leuk-', and if so would rescue the Arcadian λαυτ- from its isolation. However, other etymologies have been suggested for this word. Puhrer (following Sturtevant) connects it with the 'leuk- root for 'light' and derives it from 'leuk-' postulating a shift from ἱτ- to τι (KZ 86, 1972, p. 112 - Aequinota Indo-europaea, Innsbruck 1981, p. 221). More recently, H. C. Melchert, Studies in Hittite Historical Phonology, Ergheft KZ 12, Göttingen 1984, pp. 59 f., follows Eichner in starting from a root 'leuk- - cut, separate' (See: innat).
belongs with this stem? The problem here is that we suffer of an embarras de richesce. There is not one, but many ways in which we can envisage a connection between λευτο- and λευτ(os)()-: difficulties arise because the evidence is too limited to allow us to choose between them.

We have seen that conceivably λαντ(os)- could derive from 'leut-yo- and λαντο- from a simple thematic present. An alternative suggestion — perhaps somewhat unrealistic — is that the Arcadian participle is not in fact the participle of a present but that of a thematic aorist. From a semantic point of view an aorist participle may suit the context better than a present, and indeed the parallel constantly quoted for λευτον of IG V 2, viz. the ισσον of a Chios lex sara (Sokolowski, Lois sacrées, no. 116, II, 6-7, 17-18, 26; cf. Rozwadowski, op. cit. in note 9) speaks for this view. Obviously if λαντον was an aorist participle, one might think of a present λαντ(os) built on the same stem but with a -yo- suffix. In Homer we find an aorist ληπνυντο besides a present ληπνυμ built with a -yo- suffix, and thematic aorists are not unknown in Arcadia. And yet, is it conceivable that this verb had an aorist? At an early period we only have evidence for a present and an imperfect; this may be of course due to the oddities of the epic tradition, but to postulate an early aorist for λαντ(os) is perhaps too daring. Obviously we would feel more inclined to argue for this view if the Arcadian forms were built on a zero grade 'int- rather than on a full grade 14.

Finally, it would also be possible to treat both λαντ(os)- and λευτo- as separate thematicremodellings of an original root present of 'leut-. If we allow for both primary and secondary endings (in the imperfect), presumably we ought to reconstruct an inflection with forms such as sing. *λαυτ-ηι / *λαυτα (<*λευτ-ηι\), *λευτ(os)-οι / *λευτη (<*λευτ-ηι), *λαυτη / (*λευτ-ηι) / *λευτι ( < *λευτ-ηι), plur. *λαυτης-ειν, λευτης-ες (<*ιευτ-ειε), *λευτης-ονιν / *λαυτης-ειου, dual *λευτης-τον (<*ιευτ-ειοιν), *λευτης-τον / *λαυτης-τον ( <*ιευτ-ειοιν), verbal adjective *λαυτης-ος ( <*ιευτ-ειος). Thematization of root presents is not an uncommon fact though we are rarely in a position to decide whether the starting point was the third person plural or the participle of the subjunctive. Homer has both thematic and athematic presents for ἰέναι- and καθαι-: cf. e.g. ἰεναι and κακαιναι. Not do we necessarily expect a new thematic present to be formed on the zero grade of the stem; even in the normal hysterodynamic pattern, the full grade of the indicative singular and of the subjunctive may be generalized 15. As for the consonantism, phonetic change would have led our root to alternate between λευτο- and λευτ- forms in the indicative, with -o- also appearing in the verbal adjective. If so, it is reasonable to expect an eventual generalization of either λευτο- or λευτ-. and the creation of two new thematic presents λευτο- and λευτο-. Nor is it too far fetched to think that whatever dialect is responsible for Homeric λευτο- generalized the -o- form of the stem, while Arcadian preserved the -t- form 16. Indeed, those who attribute to the Arcadian gloss λευτo more credibility than perhaps it deserves may even feel inclined to argue that in Arcadian the participle preserved the old form as an anomaly while the rest of the inflection was remodelled. Yet this explanation can only account for λευεναι, not for λευεναι; why do we have -o- in part of our tradition? The problem is not insoluble. If the tradition has any validity, the -o- spelling may simply mean that the isolated λευεναι was analogically

15 It is worth noticing that Meillet, AI 19, 1915, p. 73, assumed that Gr. λαντ(os) and Skt. *lakatu were both due to secondary remodellings of the original root present built on *leut- (cf. also Meillet, AI 19, 1920, p. 303). Meillet presumably thought of a redetermination with a deverbal -o- suffix in one case and of a simple thematicremodelling in the other.

16 Phoebus meunae (I) suspect that this type of explanation may account for the old problem posed by the verb *leumos (Fiat, Hoc, meunos, Ant. meunos) which in Attic and in Ionic (from Homer onwards) replaced the expected *leumos from *leut-. The split of *meunos: *fly and *meunos fall must be relatively recent and a great deal of reorganization of the various stems took place in Greek. The stem of meunos behave partly as a disyllabic stem ending in layargel (xeinαθα, nxeisio, etc.), partly as a simple pres. (meunos); a number of forms may have been built on either a layargel root or a simple root without layargel. If we could assume that at some stage Greek had a full-grade root *meunos (without layargel) of the type *leut-oso, *leut-so, *leut-so we would be bound to reconstruct an alternation of 'les- and 'let- forms in the stem; eventually this could have led to the generalization of 'les- in the aorist of some dialects. The future meunos, if it was an independent formation built on 'les- with layargel (but it would have to be the first layargel), could have acquired its sibilant from the aorist at a later stage; alternatively it could have been built on the aorist with an analogical -o- formation.
remodeled on the basis of the numerous -σος presents; on the other hand the decision to have an -σο- sequence in the verb may be no earlier than Aristarchus.

At this stage what 'provisional theory' can we formulate? It is not impossible to link Arcadian λεύρ- and Homeric λευρ(ο)-, but the price we must pay is the loss of a plausible and generally accepted etymology for λευρ(ο)-. The stem λευρ-, from which we must start, has no clear parallel elsewhere. Obviously we cannot exclude that it is somehow connected with the stem of Lat. aux; Gr. λευχός etc. and is built with a -s extension on a basic *λευρ- root, for which the doubtful λευρόν λαμπρόν of Hesychius might provide some evidence. Yet the suggestion remains unproven and unproved; λευρ- remains an etymological puzzle, but one which has important consequences for the better known λευρ(ο)-.

ADDENDUM

I am grateful to M. Laurent Dubois who read the manuscript of this article after it had been submitted and reported from his correspondence with Dr E. Erdeben of the Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR in Berlin that a further analysis of the relevant squeezes does indeed confirm the readings λαυρόν and λαυροτές (though in one instance one side of the squeeze, that not normally used by the editors, may speak for λαυρωτές). I also owe to M. Dubois a number of corrections which I have incorporated in the text; I refer to his recent book on Arcadian (ll, pp. 20-34) and to his forthcoming paper in the Proceedings of the 1986 Nancy Colloquium on Greek dialects for a discussion of the Arcadian texts considered above and in particular of the verb ἰενερβολευν.
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