



HAL
open science

Linguistic Notes on the Spartan *ἀγωγή*: *βουα* and *βουαγς/βοαγς*
Alcorac Alonso Déniz

► **To cite this version:**

Alcorac Alonso Déniz. Linguistic Notes on the Spartan *ἀγωγή*: *βουα* and *βουαγς/βοαγς*. *Glotta*, 2012, 88, pp.9-30. ⟨halshs-04725084⟩

HAL Id: halshs-04725084

<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-04725084v1>

Submitted on 8 Oct 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire HAL, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



HAL Authorization

Linguistic Notes on the Spartan ἀγωγή: βούα and βουαγός/βοαγός

By ALCORAC ALONSO DÉNIZ, Paris

Abstract. This paper deals with the origin of βούα ‘herd’ and βουαγός ‘leader of the βούα’, two terms of the Roman and Imperial Spartan ἀγωγή. The recent view that βούα can be explained as a back-formation of a hypothetical *βουσο(=)έω > *βουσέω ‘drive cows’ is unlikely on several grounds. Furthermore, the author claims that, despite the striking resemblance, βούα is not equivalent to the gloss βουόα < βουσόα. On the contrary, βούα can be easily accounted for as *βόϝα ‘group of cows’ > ‘herd’ and βουόα must have meant ‘path for cows’, like Rhodian μηλοσόη ‘path for sheeps’ and Thessalian διεξόα = Attic διεξόδος. Finally, the origin of βουαγός is investigated in order to account for the variant βοαγός.

1. The Spartan ἀγωγή

Young boys enrolled in the Roman and imperial Spartan ἀγωγή were given military, sportive, and musical training.¹ Although the question is a matter of dispute, there is evidence that Spartan ἔφηβοι were admitted to the ἀγωγή within their own ὠβά (Πιτανάται, Μεσοάται, Λιμναεῖς, Κονο(η)ουρεῖς and Νεαπολίται) and divided into five groups according to age: μικ(κ)ιχιζόμενοι (16), πρατοπάμπαίδες (17), ἀτροπάμπαίδες (18), μελλείρενες (19), and εἴρενες (20) (Kennell 1995: 38ff., Ducat 2006: 74ff.).

¹ This paper is part of the research project FFI 2009–07645 (“Interdialectal Contact in Ancient Greek”) of the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation (MICINN). I thank Julián Méndez Dosuna and Enrique Nieto Izquierdo for their invaluable comments and suggestions on an earlier version.

Hesychius records the general term for these groups of boys, βούα· ἀγέλη παιδῶν <Λάκωνες> (β 865 Latte),² and also the name of the member of the βούα acting as leader, the βουαγός. This annual appointment was of some importance, for it was held only by boys belonging to the most prominent families and βουαγός was retained as an honorific title throughout adult life. Similarly to the Athenian κοσμηταί (Pelekides 1962: 275f.), the βουαγοί were probably in charge of certain expenses related to the ἀγωγή (Cartledge and Spawforth 2002: 202–205).

2. The origin of βούα: the gloss βουόα and Arcadian βουσόα

Lac. βούα bears an extraordinary resemblance to the gloss βουόα, attested twice in the *Etymologicum Magnum* (208.5–6 and 391):

1. Βουόα· ἀλγεῖ τις τάχα † θ' αἱ βουσόαι <***> τὰ νῶτα. ἔλλειψις τοῦ <σ> καὶ πνεῦμα προσήλθε τὸ δασύ. οὕτως Ἡρωδιανὸς Περὶ παθῶν (Herod. vol. II, p. 1252, fr. 435¹)
2. [...] δασείαν χαράττουσι τοῖς ἐπιφερομένοις φωνήεσιν, ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ ποιῆσαι ποιῆαι· καὶ Βουσόα, Βουόα [*sic*]· καὶ μουσικὰ, μωικά. Κέχρηται τούτῳ τῷ εἶδει τῆς δασείας καὶ Δέρκυλλος.

According to T. Hemsterhusis (*apud* Alberti and Ruhnken 1746–1766, vol. II, p. 1294, n. 19, s. v. συμβουάδδει), βούα and βουόα are in fact the same word, and he accordingly corrects the corruption of the first fragment: βούοα· ἀγέλη. “τετάχαθ’ αἱ βούοαί” ἀντὶ τοῦ βούσοαι. This scholar interprets τετάχαθ’ αἱ βούοαί as “*in ordinem compositi sunt puerorum greges*” and attributes the fragment to Alcman. As far as accentuation is concerned, Hemsterhusis considered βούα to be a contraction of

² The gloss is *adespotos*, but Pearson (1844: 179) and independently Schmidt (1858–1868 *ad loc.*) reasonably considered that Λάκωνες, appearing in the previous entry (βου· τὸ μέγα καὶ πολὺ δηλοῖ. Λάκωνες), belonged in fact to βούα.

βούα. Some years later, Valckeaner (1773: 270)³ accepted Hemsterhuis' emendation, but preserved the paroxytonic accentuation βούα of the *EM*. In his *editio maior* of Hesychius, Schmidt (1858–1868) followed Hemsterhuis and Valckeaner, changing βούα to βούα, in order to match the accentuation of βουόα.⁴ This interpretation was later accepted as the *communis opinio* by *LSJ* (s. v. βουσόη [*sic*] 'herd').

Viredaz (1992) must be credited for the updating of this question in a well-informed paper on the origin of Arc. βουσός (ἰν τῷ βουσοῖ, *IPArk* 14.15 and .18, Orchomenos, 365–361 BC?, ἀπ' Ἀρίαι τῷ βουσοῖ, *ib.* 23). Bechtel (1921: 332) linked this noun to the literary adjective βουσόος (for references, cf. § 5),⁵ but Viredaz contends that this view, although substantially correct, does not explain satisfactorily Arc. βουσός. As it happens, compounds in ὀσόος, like βουσόος, lit. 'making cows to move', and equally λαοσόος, δορυσόος, etc. (cf. Sans. *bhuvana-cyavá-* 'causing the creatures to move', vid. Mayrhofer, *EWAla* I, p. 552), have an active force and, always according to Viredaz, do not match the meaning of Arc. βουσός, a type of path.⁶

Viredaz proposed an alternative explanation based on a hypothetical verb *βουσοφέω 'lead the cows' (Fr. 'mener les vaches'). Hyphaeresis of /o/ allegedly led to *βουσέω, of which

³ This author also proposed the slightly different variant ἐτεράχθ' αἰ βουόαι.

⁴ For the sake of simplicity, I adopt this accentuation throughout this paper.

⁵ According to Bechtel, -σ- instead of the expected -σσ- is due to the influence of the verb σέομαι/σεύω.

⁶ 'Rindertrift' (Bechtel 1921: 388, Thumb and Scherer 1959: § 264.19, *GEW* s. v. βουσόος), 'cattle-run' (Buck 1955: § 45), 'piste de vaches' (*DÉLG* s. v. βουσόος), 'sentier à boeufs' (Dubois 1986: I, p. 76), 'chemin' (Viredaz 1992: 222), 'cañada o camino de bueyes' (*DGE* s. v. βουσόος). Viredaz (1992: 221, n. 35) correctly rejects the interpretation 'pâturage à boeufs' (Plasart 1915: 56; cf. also 'ager pascuus bobus' in *Schwyzler Index*, p. 421, 'pasture for oxen' in *LSJ*, and 'Rinderweide' in *IPArk*, p. 128, n. 11), not suitable in a text dealing with boundaries. Schwyzler (1923: 5 n.1) and (Fraenkel 1953: 22) think that βουσόος is an Arcadian spelling for Hom. βουσόος, but this is also unlikely.

βουσός ‘path (for the cows)’ was a back-formation. In addition, Viredaz claims that Hemsterhusis’ βουόα and βούα ‘herd (of cows)’ are also to be interpreted as back-formations of *βουσοφέω and *βουσέω respectively. Seemingly, this evolution is paralleled by βοαθός/βοηθός, a back-formation of βοαθέω/βοηθέω, which results in turn from the hyphaeresis of *βοαθο(φ)έω.

In Alonso Déniz (2008: 143–147), I embraced Viredaz’s explanation with unrestrained enthusiasm, regardless of the doubts expressed by various scholars concerning the equivalence βούα = βουόα (Ahrens 1843: 72, n. 4, Bechtel 1923: 368, Kretschmer 1929: 242, Latte 1953–1966, s. v. βοῦα, Frisk *GEW* s. v. βοῦα and ‘Nachträge’, p. 54, Chantraine *DÉLG* s. v. βοῦα, Bettarini 2003: 35f.). The aim of this paper is to show that Viredaz’s view is unfounded both formally and semantically and that the connection between βουόα and βούα must be abandoned altogether.

3. The hyphaeresis *βουσο(φ)έω > *βουσέω

The explanation of βούα as back-formation of *βουσέω is based on the hypothetical hyphaeresis of /o/⁷ in *βουσο(φ)έω, which, despite Viredaz’s claims to the contrary, remains unparalleled.

3.1. Significantly enough, there are no traces of this hyphaeresis in the inflection of (°)σοφέω,⁸ as showed by the

⁷ ‘Hyphaeresis’ is used to describe the complete deletion of one vowel in a sequence of two or three, the quality and quantity of the other(s) remaining unaffected.

⁸ Viredaz remains undecided in this point. After admitting that “on peut penser au verbe σοφέω”, he also thinks that *βουσοφέω could well be “le dénominatif d’un plus ancien *g^wou-kyowo-” (p. 218). According to Wackernagel (1955–1979, I, p. 221), Greek σοέω/σοέομαι is a denominative of σοῦς· ἡ πόρευσις (Hsch. σ 1360 Hansen, cf. Pl. *Crat.* 412b, Democ. 68 A 62), but the Iranian evidence is compelling (cf. Sans. *cyāvati*, Av. *šāuuaiieiti*) and points to an original factitive *k^(w)iou-eiō/e- (García Ramón 1994: 56 and *LIV*² p. 394f.). Aor. ἔσσευα < *e-kiey-s- and pres. σεύω are secondary Greek developments (cf. Harðarson 1993: 190f.).

imperf. σόει (B. fr. 17.90 Maehler). Even though Attic forms as σοῦνται (A. *Pers.* 25), imper. σοῦ (Ar. *V.* 209), etc., could be seen as resulting from hyphaeresis of /o/ (*σοφέονται > *σοέονται > *σέονται and *σόφεο > *σόεο > *σέο), contraction in σοῦσθω (S. *Ai.* 1414), σοῦσθε (Ar. *Th.* 31, etc.), σοῦσθαι, etc. (< *σο(ε)ε-, cf. § 3.2) precludes this interpretation.⁹

3.2. Generally speaking, the alleged hyphaeresis /o/ > /eo/ in *βουσο(φ)έω > *βουσέω contradicts the normal evolution of three vowel groups in Ancient Greek, where only the second or the third vowel is deleted: Hom. 3rd sg. γόν < γόεον, Eub. Χαίριω < Χαίριέω (del Barrio Vega 1987: 336), βοηγιῶν καὶ λαμπαδαρχιῶν < -ιέων (SGDI 5633.3, Teos, IV BC),¹⁰ παιῶν < *παιέων (cf. hom. παιήων, mic. *pa-ja-wo-ne* Παγῶνε), Τειχισσέων (*Didyma* 228, I BC) vs. Τειχιούσσα (T. VIII, 26+), δαμιεργός and δαμιοργός < δαμιοεργός, Κλεέμπορος (cf. LGPN II, s. v. Κλεέμπορος and Masson *OGS* III, p. 84) and Κλεομπόρῳ (SGDI 5624, Lampsakos, IV BC) < *Κλεοέμπορος, Lac. Ἄριοντίας (*IG* V.1: 213.24, ca. 403 BC) < Ἄριο(φ)εντίας (Bechtel 1923: 314f.).¹¹

More specifically, in -έω verbs /e/-loss occurs after /oj/ or /o/: Att. ποιόντι < ποιέοντι, ποιόντων < ποιέοντων (cf. Thraette 1996: 462f.), El. ἐνποῖδν < ἐνποιέδν, ἐνποῖοι < ἐνποιέοι (cf. Minon *IÉD*, p. 314),¹² Corcy. ὁμονοοῖεν (Lhôte *LOD* 3.5, 400–

⁹ Attic forms (with **ki* > σ- word-initially) could be considered ionisms, if ἐτευμήσατο, τευμάται, from *τευμάω, denominative of *τεῦμα, is to be linked to the same origin (cf. García Ramón 1994: 56, *contra* Peters 1980: 291). To my mind, Lac. σώμαι (Epil. fr. 4 K.-A.), σώμαι ἔρω. Δωριεῖς (Hsch. σ 3073 Hansen), σῶται ὄρμάται, ἔρχεται, πορεύεται (Hsch. σ 3096 Hansen) and σοῶμην ὄρμῶμην (Hsch. σ 1375 Hansen) are also a poetic fabrication, since we would regularly expect *σοφέομαι > *σο(φ)ίωμα in Laconian (cf. § 3.5).

¹⁰ It is completely irrelevant for our argumentation whether -ιέω > -ιῶ, -ιέων > -ιῶν, etc. are to be seen as the result of contraction.

¹¹ *Pace* Lejeune (1972: §§276–277), Ion. -κλεος, -κλεα (< *κλεεος, < *κλεεα), νηλέα (νηλέεα < νηλέεα), μυθέαι (< μυθέεαι), etc., could be considered the outcome of hyphaeresis of the second vowel. However, hyphaeresis has been challenged as the origin of these forms (cf. Brugmann 1898 and Crespo 1999: 176).

¹² Whether contraction is responsible for some of these developments is again of little importance to the question under investigation.

350 BC) and Ion. ὁμονόοντες (*IG* XII.7: 15, Amorgos, 300–250 BC; cf. Bechtel 1924: 100f.). Accordingly, under similar circumstances *βουσοέ- should have developed into *βουσόο- rather than into *βουσέο-.

3.3. The evidence for /oeo/ > /eo/ in Ancient Greek is also inconclusive. Despite the general belief (Schwyzer 1939: 381), hyphaeresis is not the only possible explanation for βοηθέω/βοαθέω, and certainly it is not the most convincing. After contraction had taken place in βοηθός/βοαθός, nom. βοηθοῦς (or -ῶς) could have been easily supplanted by -ός, after the analogy of ἀγαθοῦ (or -ῶ): ἀγαθός :: βοηθοῦ (or -ῶ) : x, where x = βοηθός (cf. Ruijgh 1991: 533). A new verb βοηθέω/βοαθέω was created on the basis of βοηθός/βοαθός, and this ousted the older βοαθο(=)έω. Unlike /oeo/ > /eo/, the replacement of -ος for -οος is not unparalleled: Cret. ἀπλόος vs. ἀπλός (Bile 1988: 199), Hom. ἐύξοος, Delph. διαξόος vs. δορυξός (Ar. *Pax* 447+), δικρόα (X. *Cyn.* IX, 19) vs. δίκρος (Call. fr. 177.2 Pfeiffer), etc.¹³ Although Viredaz (1992: 220) is not seduced by the idea, this is the most plausible origin of Arc. βουσός.¹⁴ This notwith-

¹³ Phonological hyphaeresis of /oo/ in *βουσσός > βουσός (Dubois 1986: I, p. 71) is unlikely. The alleged parallels Lac. Δόρυσσοσ (Hdt. VIII, 204) and Aeg. Δαμόσσο (SEG 23: 169, VI/V BC) are not compelling evidence: they can be explained also as analogical after the contraction or just clippings, which is usual in personal names (cf. Σθένελοσ for Σθενέλαοσ, Ἀγοράλλοσ for Ἀγοράλαοσ, etc.). In fact, nom. sg. -οσ for expected -οοσ is attested elsewhere: Cor. Εὔνοσ (*NAGVI* COR 40a) for Εὔνοοσ, Cret. Πάνθοσ for Πάνθοοσ/Πάνθουσ, etc. Of course, gen. sg. Δαμόσσο could be the result of contraction (Nieto Izquierdo 2009: 118).

¹⁴ Although further evidence for -οοσ inflection in Orchomenos besides βουσοῖ is lacking, personal names from other Arcadian cities with uncontracted (or decontracted) /oo/ in the nominative might contradict this hypothesis: Βοάθοοσ (*IG* V.2: 323B, Mantinea, III BC), [E]ὔνοοσ (*IG* V.2: 323.2, Mantinea, 425–385 BC), Πραξίνοοσ (*IG* V.2: 323.17, Mantinea, 425–385 BC), Ἐρμάξοοσ (Pheneos, *BMC Pelop.* p. 196 no. 25, 146–141 BC), perhaps Οἰόνοοσ (*SEG* 31: 348 I.3, Mantinea, 425–400 BC; but vid. Dubois 1986, II, p. 123f., with the reading Θῖόνοοσ, an Argive name). But under the influence of the vocative (*Βοάθοε, *Εὔνοε, etc.) personal names could have remained uncontracted more easily than other vocabulary. Similarly, regular nom. *κλήσ is replaced in Attic and Euboean by *κλέήσ after gen. *κλέουσ, acc. *κλέα (vid. Threatte 1996: 183, Barrio Vega 1987: 175–8). As for Arc. Ἀμφίροοσ (*SEG* 36: 336.16, Argos, IV BC), toponyms are known for pre-

*βουσφέω > *βουσέω. But this is to be rejected, since, like any other consonant, /w/ is an impediment to hyphaeresis, contraction or any other change involving contact between vowels. In addition, the two parallels presented by Viredaz lack plausibility. First, quantitative metathesis before /w/-deletion as suggested by Ruijgh (1991: 318), was convincingly rejected by Crespo (1977: 190 f.). Additionally, the development in Lac. σιειδής < *θεοφειδ- (Alc. fr. 21.71 *PMG*), σιείκελος < θεοφείκελος (Ar. *Lys.* 1252 Blaydes; ms. θείκελος)¹⁶ and probably Χαλκίοικος (*Lys.* 1300) < Χαλκεο-φοικος (Schulze 1892: 39) is parallel to Σι-δέκτας < Θεοδέκτας, Σιχάρης < Θεοχάρης, Σίδαμος < Θεόδαμος. In both cases, the fact that /eo/ is antecorsonantic is crucial to /o/-deletion.

3.5. Finally, *βουσοφέω- should have regularly evolved into *βουσοφιο- in Laconian (cf. Méndez Dosuna 1993). In the new *βουσοιο-, the sequence <οιο> would not have met the conditions for hyphaeresis of the first /o/.

*4. The back-formation *βουσοφέω → βουσόα /
*βουσέω → *βούσα and the meaning of βούα and βουόα*

In addition to the formal arguments discussed in the previous sections, Viredaz's proposed derivation fits inadequately the meaning of βούα 'herd', as transmitted by Hesychius and attributed as well by Hemsterhuis to βουόα.

Viredaz (1992: 221, n. 30) affirms that -ᾱ in βουσόα (> βουόα) had a collective meaning (cf. § 7), but -ᾱ cannot alone stand responsible for the meaning 'herd of cows' in βουσόα/βούα if originated from *βουσοέω/*βουσέω 'drive the cows'.¹⁷ If

¹⁶ Meineke proposed σιο(φ)είκελος (without /o/-hyphaeresis) after the scholion θεοείκελοι, and this has been defended by Page (1951: 100, n. 1) and Colvin (1999: 175).

¹⁷ Viredaz (1992: 218) also thinks that μηλοσόη is to be taken as a back-formation of *μηλοσοέω 'drive the sheeps', but inexplicably the meaning of μηλοσόη is not 'herd (of sheeps)', as he proposes for βουσόα.

Viredaz's thesis were correct, we would have expected 'group driving cows', and not 'herd of cows'.

Although he remains unclear on this point, Viredaz has perhaps in mind inherited ἀγέλα 'herd', derived from ἄγω 'drive'.¹⁸ But in ἀγέλα the notion 'herd' (sc. 'something which is driven') is not attributable to 'collective' -ᾱ, but probably to the passive meaning appearing in other *-lo- derivatives, like περὶ κηλός 'completely dry' (: καίω 'burn'), βηλός 'threshold' (: βαίνω 'go'), ἀ-εἶδελος 'invisible' (: εἶδω 'see'), etc.¹⁹

5. *βουσοφέω, Arc. βουσόος and the adjective βουσόος

As it is easily deduced from the preceding paragraphs, we consider that positing an ancient *βουσοφέω 'drive the cows' is not prerequisite for Arc. βουσόος. The substitution of βουσόος for βουσόος has parallels (cf. § 3.3). As far as the meaning is concerned, it is likely that βουσόος '(something) causing the cows to move' was applied metaphorically to paths.

The adjective βουσόος shows up for the first time in Hellenistic poetry referring to the gadfly which makes the cows frantic and 'causes them to move', cf. βουσόον ὄν τε μύωπα βοῶν καλέουσιν ἄμορβοί (Call. fr. 301 Pfeiffer),²⁰ βουσόω μύω[πος] (Cerc. fr. 6(a).2 Lomiento), which surely echoes Aeschylus' βοηλάτην μύωπα (*Supp.* 307; cf. Hollis 1990: 303). As known, in Greek compounds with a verbal stem in *o*-grade as second element (κουροτρόφος), the first element is interpreted as a direct object (Meissner and Tribulato 2002: 299). Therefore,

¹⁸ Cf. Lat. *agolum, pastorale baculum* (< *age-lo-, cf. de Vaan *ELD*, p. 31, s. v. *ago*). A connection with ai. *ajirá-* is commonly acknowledged, but other origins have been proposed for this adjective (cf. Wackernagel and Debrunner 1957, II, 2, p. 73). Lat. *agilis* is an inner Latin creation after *mobilis* < *movi-bilis (cf. Leumann 1917: 43).

¹⁹ Probably with an active meaning in Lat. *agolum* (cf. n. 18).

²⁰ This adjective is used later in combination with other nouns, but always with the same meaning: ἐφέποντο / αἰζηοὶ μετὰ τοῖσι βοοσσόα κέντρα φέροντες (Q.S. V, 63–4).

βουσόος mirrors the syntax of sentences²¹ like σόει / νιν βορεὰς ἐξόπιν πνέουσ' ἀήτα (B. fr. 17.90–91 Maehler), ἀνήρ [...] συναίρεται ἵππους, / σεύας ἐκ πεδίοιο μέγα προτὶ ἄστν (Il. 15.679–681), ληισταὶ κακομάχανοι... μέλων σεύοντ' ἀγέλας βία; (B. 18.8–10 Maehler), or συνέσευε βοῶν ἴφθιμα κάρηνα (*h.Merc.* 94), etc.²²

To my mind, βουσόος ‘causing the cows to move’ could be easily used to indicate someone ‘driving the cows’, as shown by the following facts.²³ First, we have already seen that both Callimachus and Cercidas used βουσόος as a *variatio* for βοηλάτης in Aeschylus,²⁴ which means ‘cattle-lifter’ (S. fr. 314.123 *TrGF*) or simply ‘herds-man’ (Pl. *Plt.* 261d). Second, Hesychius attested also the meaning ‘herds-man’ for βουσόος: βοοσσόος· μάστιξ καὶ βούτης (β 810 Latte).

Due to a common crosslinguistic tendency to represent paths fictionally as ‘agents’ transporting or driving the moving entities who actually walk through them (fictive motion; vid. Méndez Dosuna 2009), βουσόος ὁδός could have easily meant ‘path driving the cows’. This metaphor is not unparalleled in some Ancient Greek names for ‘road’: λαοφόρος ὁδός (Il. 15.682) (: φέρω, cf. ἡ ἐξ Θήβας φέρουσα ὁδός, Th. III, 24.1), the old participle ἄγνια (: ἄγω, cf. τᾶς ἠοδῶ τᾶς ἀγώσας ἐκ τε πόλιος καὶ ἐκ Πανδοσίας διὰ τῶν ἠαρῶν χώρων, *IG* XIV: 645.63–64, Heracleia, IV BC)²⁵ and probably κέλευθος, if it is to be related

²¹ For the syntax in right-oriented synthetic compounds, cf. Bauer (2009: 353f.).

²² The factitive meaning of aor. ἔσσευα and ἐσσευάμην and pres. σεύω are Greek innovations (cf. García Ramón 1994: 71f.).

²³ Dubois (1986: I, p. 76) suggests a semantic change ‘chase’ > ‘drive’, similar to Lat. *minor* ‘menace’ > *mino* ‘drive’ (cf. Fr. *mener*, It. *menare*).

²⁴ For the equivalence of ἐλαύνω and σεύω, cf. ἡ μὴ τις σευ μῆλα βροτῶν ἀέκοντος ἐλαύνει; (*Od.* 9.405).

²⁵ Cf. also **h₂óǵ-mo-* > Ai. *ájma-* ‘path’: *samānām ájmaṃ páry eti jāgriṇih* ‘he goes around the same path still watchful’ (*RV* 3.2.12d).

to κελεύω (cf. τοὺς [sc. ἵππους] δὲ γέρον ἐφέπων μάστιγι κέλευε, *Il.* 24.326).²⁶

All things considered, Arc. βουσός can also be explained without the hypothetical *βουσοφέω.

6. °σόᾱ ‘path’ and βουσόα > βουόα ‘path for cows’

We have seen that Viredaz’s hypothesis cannot account for βουόα as ‘herd’ (cf. § 4).²⁷ In fact, the link of βουόα to βούα proposed by Hemsterhuis (cf. § 2) is exclusively based on the resemblance of the two glosses.²⁸ There is evidence that βουσόα > βουόα should be interpreted quite differently.

Two compounds attest for the meaning ‘way’, ‘path’ of the infrequent second element °σόᾱ:

a) μηλοσόη· ὁδὸς δι’ ἧς <τὰ> πρόβατα ἐλαύνεται. ‘Ρόδιοι (Hsch. μ 1197 Latte). Significantly enough, Bechtel related μηλοσόη to Arc. βουσός. Obviously, the expected Rhodian form would be *μηλοσόα, which probably underlies μαλόσα· ὁδὸς ἧ τὰ πρόβατα βαδίζει (Hsch. μ 206 Latte), whose first -ᾱ- is a Hyper-Doricism also attested in Theocritus’ poems (cf. Gow 1952,

²⁶ If my interpretation of βουόα is correct (cf. § 6), βουσός and βουσόα are parallel to couples like οἰνοχόος and χοή, κεραοζόος and °ξοά, κουρότροφος and τροφή, etc.

²⁷ Bechtel (1923: 368) believes that βουόα can be a mistake for βούα, but <o> is confirmed twice in the *EM* (cf. § 2). Ultimately, to judge from μῶα (<*μῶσα), Κονουρεύς (<Κυνοσουρεύς), etc. with intervocalic /s/ deletion and no contraction at all, βούα can hardly be a contraction of βουόα (cf. Alonso Déniz 2010).

²⁸ Gaisford (1848: 597 n. 6) and Lasserre and Livadaras (1976) record only Hemsterhuis’ emendation, but others solutions have been put forward. Ahrens (1843: 77 n. 4) suggested Βουόα· Ἀργεῖα τις, ταχεῖα, θοή, where Βουόα allegedly stands for an Argive personal name (grammarians misinterpreted it as resulting from βουσόα, in light of other instances of /s/-aspiration in Dercyllus, cf. Cassio 1989: 263 n. 2). On the other hand, Preger (1897: 341 n. 1) accepted Hemsterhuis’ emendation, but interpreted βουόα as an epithet of Artemis, comparable to ἵπποσόα (cf. Λατοῦς ἵπποσόα θυγάτηρ, *Pi. O.* 3.26 and apparently [ἵπ]ποσόα θυ[γάτηρ], *P.Oxy.* 1792, fr. 51.3, cf. d’Alessio 1997: 29). Accordingly, αἱ βουόαι should be the girls appointed to the worship of Artemis.

move' (cf. § 5) is parallel to that of μηλοσθή 'path (for sheeps)' and the adjective μηλοσσός lit. 'causing sheeps to move', cf. μηλοσσόε, Μαιιάδος Ἐρμᾶ (Leon. *HE* III.2 = *AP* 6.334.2).³¹

7. βούα = *βόϝᾱ 'group of cows' > 'herd'

In previous sections we have discarded the equivalence βούα = βουόα < βουσόα (< *βουσοϝέω?). Therefore, we must search an alternative explanation for Hesychius' gloss.³²

Meister (*ad SGDI* IV, p. 143) laconically proposed that βούα must be understood as βόϝᾱ. To my knowledge, this idea had not been put forward before, although Boeckh (*ad CIG* p. 612) had suggested that in βουᾶ (*sic*) <υ> represented in fact <ϝ>. Meister probably drew inspiration from Preger (1897: 330): "[D]er immerhin sonst auffällige Name βουᾶ erklärt sich [...] leicht. Βούκολοι als Thiassos der Göttin sind uns sonst bezeugt [*sc. Sch. Theoc. Proleg. Ba*]; warum sollen Knaben, wenn sie der Artemis dienten, nicht βόες geheissen haben?"

Despite having gone almost completely unnoticed,³³ Meister's brief note is appealing. Indeed, βούα can be readily explained as a ᾱ-derivative of athematic βουῶς, whose meaning would be 'group of cows' > 'herd'. The collective meaning of the suffix -ᾱ, already suggested by Viredaz (cf. § 4), appears in other derivations, cf. πάτρα (: πατήρ), φρήτηρ (: φράτηρ), ἄλαι (: ἄλός), Locr. πρέιγα (: πρέιγυς), etc. (for 'collective' -ᾱ, cf. Chantraine 1933: 24f., Sommer 1932: 369, n. 1, 1937: 258f.; for some examples in Mycenaean, cf. Leukart 1994: 149–157).

³¹ Cf. οιοπόλος (*h.Herm.* 314) and βοηλάτης (Lucill. *AP* 11.176.2), also referring to Hermes as shepherd. Pace García Ramón (2007: 102), μηλοσσός in Nonnus (*Par.Eu.Io.* X, 28) is ambiguous ('saving the sheeps?'), as ᾱ-σός adjectives often are in this author (cf. Livrea 2000: 199, Caprara 2005: 317).

³² According to von Blumenthal (1930: 9), βούα is a loan from Illyrian φυή, but this view simply explains *obscura per obscuriora* and avoids resolving the problem.

³³ Bettarini (2003: 37f.) proposes the same derivation without further reference to Meister.

As far as the form is concerned, other examples of intervocalic /w/ in Hesychius, cf. Lac. ὠβά, ἀβήρ (: ἀήρ), ἀβώρ (lesb. αὔως, hom. ἠώς), etc. (cf. Masson 1990: 207f.) make us expect a form *βόβα. We could explain the <υ> in βούα as a spelling of intervocalic <ɸ>, but this is only attested word-initially, cf. ὑήν· τὴν ἄμπελον (cf. Lat. *vitis*), ὕεσ<τ>ι· στολή. Πάφιοι (cf. Lat. *vestis*), or Ἰελη (Lat. *Velia*, Hdt. 1.167, etc.).

It seems more likely that the preconsonantal variant of the root (βούς, dat. βουσί, βού-κολος, etc.) inspired the spelling (and perhaps also the pronunciation) βούα for *βόḃā. The same analogy underlies Boeotian βουῶν (*IG* VII: 3171.45, Orchomenos, 250–200 BC) and βούεσσι (*ib.*38; cf. Bechtel 1921: 272), instead of βοῶν and βόεσσι, and certainly Arg. Ἑκατομβούοις (*Schwyzler* 91.19–20, Argos, 249–244 BC) instead of Ἑκατόμβοια (cf. Nieto Izquierdo 2009: 250). Similarly, Att. παύω, ἀπολαύω, etc. have preserved the diphthong under the influence of ἔπαυσα, ἀπέλαυσα, etc.

Finally, βούα = βόḃα ‘herd of cows’ goes hand in hand with another term related to the education of youth in the Doric area, ἀγέλα ‘herd’, mainly attested in Crete (cf. Kennell 2006: 138), cf. ἀγέλα (Ephorus, *FrGrHist* 70 F 149), ἀγελάοι (*ICr* I: 9, n° 1.11, Dieros, III–II BC), ἀγελάτας (*ICr* II: 12, n° 64.4, II BC), etc.³⁴

8. βούα and βουαγός/βοαγός

The hypothesis βούα = βόḃā agrees also with the denominative συμβουάδ(δ)ει· ὑπερμαχεῖ. Λάκωνες (Hesych.) and is pertinent to βουαγός/βοαγός.³⁵

³⁴ On the Cretan ἀγωγή, vid. now Seelentag (2009).

³⁵ Schmidt’s emendation συμβούαι· συνωμόται for † συμβόται †· συνωμῶται is uncertain, since it contradicts alphabetical order. A mistake for σύμβουλοι· συνωμόται, found in Photius, is more likely (cf. Hansen 2005 *ad loc.*).

It is almost universally admitted that βουαγός is a compound of βούα + ἀγός (e.g. Schulze 1892: 55 n. 2., Tillyard 1905–1906: 391f., Buck 1955: 272, *Schwyzer Index*, p. 421 s. v. βουαγός, Bechtel 1923: 369, Bourguet 1927: 6, Woodward 1929: 290, Frisk, *GEW*, Chantraine, *DÉLG* and Beekes, *EDG*, s. v. βούα).³⁶ The form is attested under two variants in Hesychius (βουαγόρ· ἀγελάρχης, ὁ τῆς ἀγέλης ἄρχων παῖς. Λακῶνες [β 867 Latte] and μούσαξ· ὁ ὑπὸ τοῦ βοαγοῦ τρεφόμενος... [μ 1704 Latte]) and also epigraphically in Sparta from the first century AD onwards, in inscriptions related to the παιδικὸς ἀγών (βουαγοί, *IG* V.1: 289.6, βουαγόρ, *ib.*: 294.1, βοαγόρ, *ib.*: 292, βοαγός, *ib.*: 276) and in other documents of different kinds (βουαγός, *IG* V.1: 36, βοαγός, *ib.*: 523, βοαγοῦ, *ib.*: 527, etc.).³⁷

Bourguet was of the opinion (1927: 6 and 99, n. 4) that, since Laconian pronunciation of <υ> was /u(:)/, βοαγός illustrates an allophone of /u/ close to /o/. But this rising of /u/, although possible, would be unique in the dialect. On the one hand, some of the examples cited by Bourguet (1927: 99 n. 4) are poorly chosen: δαμιοργός derives from δαμιο(=)εργός and πόρ· ποῦς. Λάκωνες (Hsch. π 3008 Hansen) is to be related to Hom. τριπός, etc. (cf. Sihler 1995: § 116.1). On the other hand, the explanation of the gloss μούσαξ· ὁ ὑπὸ τοῦ βοαγοῦ τρεφόμενος... (Hsch. μ 1744 Latte) as μόθαξ is open to discussion (cf. Latte 1953–1966 *ad loc.*) and there is no reason for the attribution of τοῦμα· στόμα (Hsch. τ 1200 Hansen and Cunningham) to Laconian. More importantly, Bourguet's explanation does not account for the short /o/ attested in metrical inscriptions (βοαγός, *IG* V.1: 257 and βοαγοῖς, *ib.*: 258.6).

According to Schulze (1892: 55, n. 2, cf. also Bechtel 1923: 368, Bettarini 2003: 38), βοαγός is the product of intervocalic

³⁶ Boeckh (*ad CIG* I, p. 83 and 612) considered that the second element of βουαγός was βάγος· κλάσμα ἄρτου <ῆ> μάξης καὶ βασιλεὺς καὶ στρατηγός (Hsch. β 26 Latte). But βαγός = βασιλεὺς καὶ στρατηγός is an invention of lexicographers, which have mingled up (=)ἄγος and ἀγός (cf. Schmidt 1858–1868 and Latte 1953–1966 *ad loc.*).

³⁷ Contrary to Chrimes' statement (1948: 84 n. 5), there is no evidence in inscriptions of βουαγός standing as dialect variant of *koiné* βοαγός.

/w/ loss resulting from the syllabication βο.φαγός. *Pace* *Hinge* (2006: 114), Greek poetry shows evidence of this syllabification in diphthongs in /u/, cf. λεύειν (Hipp. fr. 37 West), θερεύει (Hipp. fr. 43 West), ἰγνέων (Pi. *P.* 8.35), etc., which must be scanned as λέ.φειν, θερέ.φει, ἰγνέ.φων (cf. West 1982: 12, Allen 1987: 82).³⁸ Unfortunately, further deletion of secondary intervocalic /w/ is only documented for prevocalic <ευ> in Attic *defixiones*, cf. παρασκευάζεται (*IG* III.3: 94.9, ca. 400 BC?), καταπαταλέω (*TDA* 15.18–19, ca. 300 BC; -λεύω *corr.*),³⁹ in Lesbian inscriptions, cf. κατασκευάσαντα (*IG* XII Suppl.: 125.17–18, Eressos, III BC; cf. Hodot 1990: 68), and particularly in Hellenistic papyri, cf. βασιλέοντος, ἔπεωνιζούσας (Mayser and Schmoll 1970: 94). Moreover, Schulze's hypothesis dispenses with the monophthongization of /ow/ in βούᾱ, which is presumable in the light of Laconian evidence: Κονοηούρες (*SEG* 50, 348A.1, III BC), with <ου> for the result of compensatory lengthening (not autochthonous), and <ου> for <υ> in διέλουσαν (*IG* V.1: 1336, III–II BC), πουρόφορος (*IG* V.1: 997, imp.).

We believe that βοαγός is easily explained as a compound of βούς + ἄγός, formally similar to βοηγός (*Didyma* 199.5, 16), βοηγία (*SGDI* 5633.3), and βοᾱγίδης (*Lyc. Alex.* 652). This view is not completely new, since Chrimes (1949: 84) and Legras (2002: 20) translated βοαγός as 'leader of the bull calves' and 'bouvier' respectively. On the other hand, the variant βοαγός was modelled on βούᾱ and other compounds in βου^ο before a consonant. As a matter of fact, analogy can

³⁸ The ambisyllabicity of /w/ in the diphthong /aw/ explains why Aristophanes choose <αυ> in παραυιδών (*Lys.* 152, Meineke, ms. παρευιδών) to represent the epichoric form παραφιδών (with a light second syllable, cf. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1927: 132f., Colvin 1999: 174). Syllabification is also responsible for Lac. πρόκροον < προέκροφον (*Ar. Lys.* 1252, Ahrens, mss. προκροον) and Hom. κροαίνω vs. Att. impf. ἔκρουον.

³⁹ Attic examples in inscriptions can be regarded as mistakes (Threatte 1980: 348).

explain βου^ο in Laconian βουαγετόν· ὑπὸ βοῶν εἰλκυσμένον ξύλον. Λάκωνες (Hsch. β 866, Latte).⁴⁰

9. Conclusions

Let us sum up the main conclusions of our study:

1. βούα ‘herd’ cannot be explained either phonetically or semantically as a back-formation from a hypothetical *βουσο(φ)έω > *βουσέω ‘drive cows’.

2. In spite of appearances, βουόα < βουσόα (EM) is not equivalent to βούα. Most probably, it belongs with other compounds in °σόα (Rhod. μηλοσόη and Thess. διεξόα). Its original meaning was ‘path for cows’.

3. βούα can be explained as *βόφᾱ ‘group of cows’ > ‘herd’ (with ‘collective’ -ᾱ), with <ου> after the analogy of βούς, βουσί, etc.

4. Finally, βουαγός is a compound of βούς + ἄγός while βουαγός ‘leader of the βούα’ was created after the analogy of βούα and other compounds in βου^ο before consonant.

Bibliography

- Ahrens, H. L. (1843): *De graecae linguae Dialectis. II. De dialecto Dorica*. Göttingen.
 Alberti, J. and D. Ruhnken (1746–1766): *Hesychii Lexicon*. Leiden.
 d’Alessio, G. B. (1997): «Pindar’s *Prosodia* and the Classification of Pindaric Papyrus Fragments», *ZPE* 118: 23–60.

⁴⁰ Coulton (1986: 82f.) claims that the building known as βουκονιστήριον in Oinoanda (*IGR* III: 484.3, II AD) is in fact a compound of Lac. βούα and κονιστήριον = κόνιστρα ‘wrestling arena’, i. e. ‘koinisterion of the βοῦαι or ἀγέλαι’. Seemingly, this term was coined in the strongly pro-Spartan milieu of this period. Since *βουακονιστήριον is expected, Coulton suggests that the compound was modelled on βου-αγός.

- Allen, W. S. (1987): *Vox Graeca. A Guide to the Pronunciation of Classical Greek*. Cambridge.
- Alonso Déniz, A (2008): *Estudios sobre la aspiración de /s/ en los dialectos griegos del I milenio*. Madrid. [<http://eprints.ucm.es/7894/1/T30236.pdf>]
- (2010): «ΔΙΟΗΙΚΕΤΑ ΔΙΟΛΕΥΘΕΡ[–] IG V.1, 700», *Emerita* 78: 103–127.
- del Barrio Vega, M. L. (1987): *El dialecto de Eubea*. Madrid.
- Bauer, L. (2009): «Typology of Compounds», in R. Lieber and P. Štekauer (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Compounding*. Oxford: 343–356.
- Bechtel, F. (1921): *Die griechischen Dialekte. I. Der lesbische, thessalische, böotische, arkadische und kyprische Dialekt*. Berlin.
- (1923): *Die griechischen Dialekte. II. Die westgriechischen Dialekte*. Berlin.
- (1924): *Die Griechischen Dialecte. III. Der Ionische Dialekt*. Berlin.
- Bettarini, L. (2003): «Arcadico βουσοῖ, laconico βοῦᾶ», *ARF* 5: 29–40.
- Bile, M. (1988): *Le dialecte crétois ancien. Étude de la langue des inscriptions. Recueil des inscriptions postérieures aux IC*. Paris.
- von Blumenthal, A. (1930): *Hesych-Studien. Untersuchungen zur Vorgeschichte der griechischen Sprache nebst lexikographischen Beiträgen*. Stuttgart.
- Bourguet, É. (1927): *Le dialecte laconien*. Paris.
- Brugmann, K. (1898): «Die sogenannten unechten Diphthonge εἰ und οὔ», *IF* 9: 343–346.
- Buck, C. D. (1955): *The Greek Dialects. Grammar. Selected Inscriptions. Glossary*. Chicago.
- Caprara, M. (2005): *Nonnus. Parafrasi del Vangelo di San Giovanni. Canto IV*. Pisa.
- Cartledge, P. and A. Spawforth (2002): *Hellenistic and Roman Sparta: a Tale of Two Cities*. London.
- Cassio, A. C. (1989): «Storiografia locale di Argo e dorico letterario: Agia, Decillo ed il Pap. Soc. Ital. 1091», *RFIC* 117: 257–275.
- (ed.) (1999): *KATA DIÁLEKTON. Atti del III Colloquio Internazionale di Dialettologia Greca*. Napoli.
- Chantraine, P. (1933): *La formation des noms en grec ancien*. Paris.
- Chrimes, K. M. (1949): *Ancient Sparta. A Re-Examination of the Evidence*. Manchester.
- Colvin, S. (1999): *Dialect in Aristophanes. The Politics of Language in Ancient Greek Literature*. Oxford.
- Coulton, J. J. (1986): «Oinoanda: The Agora», *AS* 36: 61–90.
- Crespo, E. (1977): «La cronología relativa de la metátesis de cantidad en jónico-ático», *CFC* 12: 187–219.

- (1999): «Cronología de los segundos alargamientos compensatorios en jónico-ático», in Cassio (ed.): 161–186.
- DÉLG = Chantraine, P. (1999): *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. Histoire des mots. Nouvelle édition mise à jour*. Paris.
- DGE = Rodríguez Adrados et al. (1980–2009): *Diccionario Griego-Español. I–VII*. Madrid.
- Dubois, L. (1986): *Recherches sur le dialecte arcadien. I. Grammaire. II. Corpus dialectal. III. Notes, index, bibliographie*. Louvain-la-Neuve.
- Ducat, J. (2006): *Spartan Education: Youth and Society in the Classical Period*. Swansea.
- EDG = Beekes, R. S. P. (2010): *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*. Leiden-Boston.
- ELD = de Vaan, M. (2008): *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the Other Italic Languages*. Leiden.
- EWAia = Mayrhofer, M. (1986–2001): *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*. Heidelberg.
- Fraenkel, E. (1953): «Zur griechischen Wortbildung», *Glotta* 32: 16–33.
- Gaisford, T. (1848): *Etymologicum Magnum*. Oxford.
- García Ramón, J. L. (1994): «Indogermanische Wurzelpresentia und innere Rekonstruktion», in G. E. Dunkel et al. (eds.), *Früh-, Mittel-, Spätindogermanisch. Akten der IX. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 5. bis 9. Oktober 1992 in Zürich*. Wiesbaden: 53–75.
- (1999): «Cuestiones de léxico y onomástica tesalios», in Cassio (ed.): 521–552.
- (2007): «Zur Problematik des thessalischen Dialekts», in I. Hajnal (ed.), *Die altgriechischen Dialekte. Wesen und Werden. Akten des Kolloquiums Freie Universität Berlin 19.–22. September 2001*. Innsbruck: 91–111.
- GEW = Frisk, Hj. (1960–1972). *Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Winter.
- Gow, A. S. F. (1952): *Theocritus. I. Introduction, Text, and Translation. II. Commentary*. Cambridge.
- Hansen, P. A. (2005): *Hesychii Alexandrini lexicon. Pi-Sigma*. Berlin.
- Harðarson, J. A. (1993): *Studien zum urindogermanischen Wurzelarist und dessen Vertretung im Indoiranischen und Griechischen*. Innsbruck.
- Hinge, G. (2006): *Die Sprache Alkmans*. Wiesbaden.
- Hodot, R. (1990): *Le dialecte éolien d'Asie. La langue des inscriptions VII^e s. a. C.–IV^e s. p. C.* Paris.
- Hollis, A. S. (1990): *Callimachus. Hecale*. Oxford.
- IÉD = Minon, S. (2007): *Les inscriptions éléennes dialectales (VI^e–II^e siècle avant J.-C.). I. Textes. II. Grammaire et vocabulaire institutionnel*. Genève.

- Kennell, N. M. (1995): *The Gymnasium of Virtue. Education and Culture in Ancient Sparta*. Chapel Hill-London.
- (2006): *Ephebeia. A Register of Greek Cities with Citizen Training Systems in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods*. Hildesheim.
- Kretschmer, P. (1929): «Literaturbericht für das Jahr 1926. Griechisch», *Glotta* 17: 191–271.
- Lagercrantz, O. (1905): «De Hesiodi *Op.* 465–469», in *Commentationes Philologiae in honorem Iohannis Paulson*, Gotteburg: 190–193.
- Lasserre, F. and N. Livadaras (1976): *Etymologicum Magnum Genuinum*. Roma.
- Latte, K. (1953–1966): *Hesychii Alexandrini lexicon. Alfa-Omicron*. Copenhagen.
- Legras, B. (2002): *Education et culture dans le monde grec*. Paris.
- Lejeune, M. (1972): *Phonétique historique du mycénien et du grec ancien*. Paris.
- Leukart, A. (1994): *Die Frühgriechischen Nomina auf -tās und -ās. Untersuchungen zu ihrer Herkunft und Ausbreitung (unter Vergleich mit den Nomina auf -eús)*. Wien.
- Leumann, M. (1917): *Die lateinischen Adjektiva auf -lis*. Strassburg.
- LGN II = M. J. Osborne and S. G. Byrne (1994): *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names. II. Attica*. Oxford.
- LIV² = Rix, H. et al. (2001): *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben (LIV). Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstambildungen*. Wiesbaden.
- Livrea, E. (2000): *Nonnus. Parafrasi del Vangelo di San Giovanni: canto B*. Bologna.
- LOD = Lhôte, É. (2006): *Les lamelles oraculaires de Dodone*. Genève.
- LSJ = Liddel, H. G., R. Scott and S. Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 9th ed. (1996). Oxford.
- Missailidou-Despotidou, V. (1993): «A Hellenistic Inscription from Skotoussa (Thessaly) and the Fortifications of the City», *ABSA* 88: 187–217.
- Masson, O. (1990): «Remarques sur la transcription du w par bêta et gamma», in H. Eichner and H. Rix (eds.), *Sprachwissenschaft und Philologie. Jacob Wackernagel und die Indogermanistik heute. Kolloquium der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 13. bis 15. Oktober 1988 in Basel*. Wiesbaden: 202–212.
- Mayser, E. and H. Schmoll (1970): *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit. Bd. 1. Laut- und Wortlehre. I Teil. Einleitung und Lautlehre*. Berlin.
- Meissner, T. and O. Tribulato (2002): «Nominal Composition in Mycenaean Greek», *TPhS* 100 [Special Number. Nominal composition in Indo-European Languages. Part 2]: 289–330.

- Méndez Dosuna, J. (1993): «El cambio de <ε> en <ι> ante vocal en los dialectos griegos: ¿una cuestión zanjada?», in E. Crespo *et al.* (eds.), *Dialectologica Graeca. Actas del II Coloquio Internacional de Dialectología Griega*. Madrid: 237–259.
- (2009): «Movimiento ficticio en griego antiguo: tras las huellas del viajero (in)visible», *RSEL* 39: 5–32.
- NAGVI = Wachter, R., *Non-Attic Greek Vase Inscriptions*, 2001. Oxford.
- Nieto Izquierdo, E. (2009): *Gramática de las inscripciones de la Argólida*. Madrid. [<http://eprints.ucm.es/8475/1/T30692.pdf>]
- OGS III = Masson, O. (2000): *Onomastica Graeca Selecta. III*. Paris.
- Page, D. L. (1951): *The Partheneion*. Oxford.
- Pearson, J. (1844): *Adversaria Hesychiana*. Oxford.
- Pelekides, C. (1962): *Histoire de l'éphébie attique des origines à 31 avant Jésus-Christ*. Paris.
- Peters, M. (1980): *Untersuchungen zur Vertretung der indogermanischen Laryngale im Griechischen*. Wien.
- Plassart, A. (1915): «Orchomène d'Arcadie. Fouilles de 1913. Inscriptions. II», *BCH* 39: 53–127.
- Preger, T. (1897): «Muische Knabenwettkämpfe in Sparta», *MDAI(A)* 22: 334–342.
- Ruijgh, C. J. (1991): *Scripta minora ad linguam Graecam pertinentia. I*. Amsterdam.
- Schmidt, M. (1858-1868): *Hesychii Alexandrini lexicon*. Jena.
- Schulze, W. (1892): *Quaestiones Epicae*. Gütersloh.
- Schwyzler, E. (1923): «Onomatologisches aus griechischen Dialektinschriften», *Glotta* 12: 1–29.
- (1939): *Griechische Grammatik. I. Allgemeiner Teil. Lautlehre. Wortbildung. Flexion*. München.
- Seelentag, G. (2009): «Der Abschluß der Ephebie im archaischen Kreta. Bemerkungen zu einer Gesetzesinschrift aus Dreros», *ZPE* 168: 149–160.
- Sihler, A. L. (1995): *New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*. New York-Oxford.
- Sommer, F. (1932): *Die Aḥḥijavā-Urkunden*. München.
- (1937): «Aḥḥijavā und kein Ende?», *IF* 55: 169–297.
- Threatte, L. (1980): *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions. I. Phonology*. Berlin-New York.
- Threatte, L. (1996): *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions. II. Morphology*. Berlin-New York.
- Thumb, A. and A. Scherer (1959): *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte II*. Heidelberg.
- Tillyard, H. J. W. (1905–1906): «Inscriptions from the Artemisium», *ABSA* 12: 351–393.

- Valckenaer, L. C. (1773): *Theocriti Decem eidyllia*. Leiden.
- Virédaz, R. (1992): «Arcadien βουσοσ, laconien βουα», *MH* 49: 217–222.
- Wackernagel, J. (1955–1979): *Kleine Schriften*. Göttingen.
- Wackernagel, J. and A. Debrunner (1957): *Altindische Grammatik*. Göttingen.
- West, M. L. (1978): *Hesiod. Works and Days*. Oxford.
- (1982): *Greek Metre*. Oxford.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. (1927): *Aristophanes. Lysistrate*. Berlin.
- Woodward (1929): «Chapter X. Inscriptions», in R. M. Dawkins (ed.), *The Sanctuary of Artemis Orthia at Sparta*. London: 285–377.