

ANTONIO LILLO

ON THE READING OF IG V 2, 262,23

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 73 (1988) 86–88

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

ON THE READING OF IG V 2, 262, 23

Line 23 of the Arcadian inscription IG V 2, 262 presents great difficulties for reading. Hiller, in IG V 2, reads εἰ δ' ἄλλα Νι[ν] ἔατοι καὶ τὸνν[ν], ἰμενφὲς ἔναι, a reading followed by Schwyzer,¹⁾ although this scholar reveals his doubts as to this interpretation when he suggests an alternative one ἄλλα Νις = ἄλλα ξις, "si mutatio admitatur".

Comparetti²⁾ puts forward the reading εἰ δ' ἄλλα Νις ἔατοι καὶ τὸννύ, ἰμενφὲς ἔναι and specifies afterwards³⁾ that εατοι is a subjunctive form. This is followed by Buck.⁴⁾

Later, Guarducci⁵⁾ makes a new edition of the inscription and proposes the reading εἰ δ' ἄλλα Νις (= ἄλλα ξις) ἔατοι ... based only on "la chiarezza que, con questa lettura, acquista il passo della epigrafe".⁶⁾

Lastly, Dubois⁷⁾ reads εἰ δαλ λά Νι[ς] ἔατοι καὶ τὸνν[ν/ι], ἰμενφὲς ἔναι.

Hiller's reading Νι[ν] cannot be accepted because the photograph published in IG V 2 of the inscription shows the markings of C.⁸⁾ On the other hand, to Comparetti' and Buck's interpretations it may be objected that εατοι is a passive form; accordingly the αλλα form cannot be considered an accusative dependent on εατοι. As a result, Guarducci and Dubois propose different forms. Despite their differences, both interpretations attribute the phonetic value [ks] to this letter san. But this cannot be accepted. It is true that the phonetic sequence [ks] is not testified in our inscription, if we dispense with Guarducci's problematic interpretation, but it does appear in an older one also from Mantinea, IG V 2, 261, 10 and 14, of the 6th.c. B.C., with a letter † (= ξ), in the forms εξαιτοι and ποινιξαθαι. Furthermore, some tesseræ found in the town, dated between 425th. and 386th. B.C., IG V 2, 323, written in local alphabet, show the forms Ξανθιαυ (n.3), Ζευξιαυ (n.15), Πραξינוοο (n.17), with the spelling † for [ks]. Thus, it is nonsense to propose that the epichoric alphabet of Mantinea used two letters, † and Ν, to

1) Dialectorum Graecorum exempla epigraphica potiora. Leipzig 1923, n.661.

2) "La iscrizione arcaica di Mantinea", Annuario della Regia Scuola Archeologica di Atene 1 (1914), 1-17.

3) Op.cit., p.12.

4) The Greek Dialects, Chicago 1968, p.198.

5) "Un giudizio del santuario di Alea a Mantinea", Studi e materiali di storia delle religioni 13 (1937), 57-67.

6) Op.cit., p.60.

7) Recherches sur le dialecte arcadien II, Louvain-la-Neuve 1986, p.95.

8) Surprisingly Dubois edits this texts as εἰ δαλ λά Νι[ς], instead of λά Νις or λά Νις, because, as he points out, "la hasté oblique qui suit l'iota dans √ ne peut être que celle d'un sigma"; p.108. On that score, despite his claim to have seen the inscription, the photograph which appears in IG V 2 allows the reading C, and as such it features in the reproduction of this stone made by Guarducci.

represent the phonetic sequence [ks], when it is clear there was a single specific letter. On the other hand, and without entering into a linguistic debate, the fact that the letter \mathbb{N} appears in the inscription in forms for which it is possible to propose an old labiovelar, at the same time as in the word $\alpha\upsilon\mathbb{N}\epsilon\delta\omicron\mu\iota\nu[\omicron\varsigma]$, instead of δ , and taking into account the fact that a palatalization of dentals had not yet taken place, and that a dissimilation of the sequence $\delta - \delta$ in $\mathbb{N} - \delta$ cannot be adduced since it has no parallel in Greek, it is reasonable to think that the letter \mathbb{N} represented a sound close to a dental. Moreover, the fact that the evolution from labiovelar⁹⁾ to dental appears already in other Arcadian inscriptions of the 5th. century B.C. precludes the possibility of a sound [ks] of \mathbb{N} , but of one closer to dental. As a result, despite the fact that an interpretation of the sequence in question as $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\alpha\zeta\iota\varsigma$ proposed by Guarducci, is very tempting, it cannot be accepted.

Far more objections can be made to Dubois' interpretation. Besides what has already been stated concerning the phonetic value of the letter \mathbb{N} , a word division $\epsilon\iota\delta\alpha\lambda (= \delta\alpha\nu)$ $\lambda\alpha\mathbb{N}\iota\varsigma (= \lambda\acute{\alpha}\zeta\iota\varsigma$, "parcelle de territoire", "lot", "allotissement") seems highly unlikely since a sequence $\epsilon\iota\delta'\alpha\nu$ ¹⁰⁾ appears only in Tegea and the only evidence of it outside that town would be this problematic text segmented ad hoc. On the other hand, in an Arcadian inscription from Mantinea recently edited¹¹⁾ the equivalent sequence $\alpha\nu\delta\epsilon\tau\iota\varsigma$ ¹²⁾ appears.

In my opinion, a new reading of this line is possible without a strained linguistic argument, as is the case in Guarducci' and Dubois' interpretation.

The reading I propose is the following:

$\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta'\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\ \mathbb{N}\iota\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\iota\ \kappa\acute{\alpha}\ \tau\omicron\nu\nu[\nu],\ \iota\nu\mu\epsilon\nu\phi\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\iota$

where $\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha$ is not a neuter accusative of plural, as has sometimes been proposed, but a feminine nominative singular in agreement with $\mathbb{N}\iota\varsigma (= \tau\iota\varsigma)$ and referring to $\gamma\nu\delta\acute{\omicron}\iota\alpha$ in the 15th. line. But let us consider the whole paragraph:

$\acute{\omicron}\ \mathbb{N}\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\iota\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\ \chi\rho\epsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\nu\ \kappa\alpha\kappa\rho\acute{\iota}\nu\acute{\epsilon}$
 $\acute{\epsilon}\ \gamma\nu\delta\acute{\omicron}\iota\alpha\ \kappa\alpha\kappa\rho\iota\theta\acute{\epsilon}\epsilon\ \tau\omicron\nu\ \chi\rho\epsilon\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\nu,$
 $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\ \tau\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \phi\omicron\iota\kappa\iota\acute{\alpha}\tau\alpha\iota\langle\varsigma\rangle\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\iota,$ ¹³⁾

9) Cf. $\tau\iota\varsigma$ in IG V 2, 429,5.

10) Dubois proposes the existence of three modal particles in Arcadian, $\alpha\nu$, $\kappa\alpha\nu$, $\delta\alpha\nu$, all available at the same time, but this has no parallel in Greek. It is not my intention to discuss this question here, but only to point out that I prefer the segmentation $\delta'\alpha\nu$, followed by all the scholars; in fact, Dubois gives no valid reason why the segmentation $\delta'\alpha\nu$ is not to be retained.

11) G.J.M.J. te Riele, "Hélisson entre en sympolitie avec Mantinée: une nouvelle inscription d'Arcadie", BCH 111 (1987), 167-190.

12) Te Riele (op.cit., p.188) "s'étonne de l'influence attique à cette époque", but in fact there is no other trait by which the presence of an Attic influence may be adduced.

13) TACAIVOΔEACAC has had various interpretations. Kühner-Gerth, in Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache II/1, Hannover 1898, p.241-2,

κα φοικία δάσασθαι τὰς ἄνδ' ἑάσας.
 εἰ τοῖς φῶφλεκόσι ἐπὶ τοῖδ' ἐδικάσαμεν,
 ἅ τε θεὸς καὶ οὐ δικασταί, ἀπυιεδομίν[ος]¹⁴⁾
 τὸν χρῆμάτων τὸ λάχος, ἀπεχομῖνος
 καὶ τῶρρέντερον γένος ἔναι
 ἅματα πάντα ἀπὸ τοῖ ἱεροῖ, ἴλαον ἔναι·
 εἴ δ' ἄλλα τις ἔᾶτοι καὶ τὸν[υ], ἰμενφῆς ἔναι.

"Whomsoever the oracle condemns or by judicial investigation is condemned to forfeit his property, this together with the serfs shall belong to the goddess, and his household goods above (?) shall be distributed. If the goddess and the judges brought in a verdict of guilty on them as follows, then they <the guilty>, after having sold their inheritance, would forever be excluded from the temple in the male line, it shall be propitious. But if another <judicial investigation> upon these <persons> is authorized, it shall be liable to censure".

Consequently this last paragraph is a legal clause read at the close of a trial which protects the condemned from a subsequent re-opening of the case.

Universidad de Murcia

Antonio Lillo

C.D.Buck, in *The Greek Dialects*, Chicago 1968, p.198, and more recently R. Hiersche, in *Glotta* 56 (1978), 202 fl., have segmented it as τὰς ἀνὸδ' ἑάσας. Schwyzer, in *Griechische Grammatik I*, München 1977, p.625, n.1, segments it as an it appears in our text and considers ἀνὸδ' as an adverbial form. Lastly Strunk, in *Glotta* 56 (1978), 206-12, proposes a segmentation τὰς ἀνὸδ' ἑάσας, where ο is οὐ or οὐ; this text, reworded in a personal construction, would be δάσασθαι τὰς οἰκίας, αἴπερ ἂν αὐτοῦ ὦσιν or αἴ ἂν αὐτοῦ δὴ ὦσιν. It is an attractive interpretation. Nevertheless, because it is not the purpose of the paper, we follow the segmentation proposed by Schwyzer, though not necessarily in agreement with it. In consequence we will place a question mark in our translation.

14) Despite the fact that Te Riele's proposal that ἀπυιεδομιν[.] should be considered as a nominative form ἀπυιεδομιν[οι], is not unreasonable, an accusative form ἀπυιεδομιν[ος] may be better explained from the syntactic point of view.