A Greek Exploitation of Morphological Contrasts

By Ọbafẹmi Kujọrẹ, Ibadan

The functional histories of Modern English 'hale' and 'whole', the northern and southern representatives respectively of Old English '*hāl*', attest an exploitation in English of phonetic contrasts [*heil*]/[*houl*]. In this paper we are concerned with a somewhat similar but much more sharply defined phenomenon on the morphological plane.

From the beginning of our literary tradition the Greek verbal system exhibits hosts of polymorphic presents, presents with identical or related bases but different terminations or formations: ἄγαμαι ἀγάομαι ἀγαίομαι ἀγάζομαι, ἀλύσκω ἀλυσκάνω ἀλυσκάζω, *ἄνυμι (pass. ἄνυμαι) ἀνύω ἄνω ἀνύτω, ἀρύω ἀρύτω ἀρύσσομαι, ἐρίζω ἐριδαίνω ἐριδμαίνω, ἐρύκω ἐρυκάνω ἐρυκανάω, κοναβέω κοναβίζω, μένω μίμνω, οἰνοχέω οἰνοχεύω, ὀνομαίνω ὀνομάζω, στένω στενάχω στεναχίζω, etc.[1])

These collateral present forms have been developed by various procedures, some of which are as follows:

I. Presents belonging to different morphological classes or having different nominal bases: $-y^e/_o$- presents βλάπτω (< *(μ)βλαπ-ιω), αἰδέομαι (cf. αἰδώς) beside primary root presents βλάβομαι αἴδομαι; -σκω presents φάσκω βάσκω (< *$g^w m$-$s\acute{k}^e/_o$-) beside primary root or $y^e/_o$- presents φημί βαίνω (< *$g^w m$-$y^e/_o$-); denominatives ἀγωνίζομαι (: ἀγών, -ῶνος), χλιδαίνομαι (: χλιδανός) beside other denominatives ἀγωνιάω (: ἀγωνία), χλιδάω (: χλιδή); full-grade primary κλέω στείχω beside nil-grade κλύω στίχω; reduplicated presents ἴσχω (< *σι-σχ-), ἴζω (< *σι-ζδ-) beside primary root or $-y^e/_o$- presents ἔχω (< *σεχ-), ἕζομαι (< *σεδ-$ι^e/_o$-).

II. Different classes of denominative presents based on the same nouns: ἀρτύω ἀρτύνω (: ἀρτύς), βιάω -άομαι βιάζω -ομαι (: βία), ἡβάω ἡβάσκω (: ἥβη), λυσσάω λυσσαίνω (: λύσσα), ὁπλέω ὁπλίζω (: ὅπλον). But see under (iii) below.

III. One form being a mere extension or transformation of the other: ἀφάσσω κλητσκω χρητσκομαι transformed from ἀφάω/ἀφ-

---

[1]) Polymorphism in the verbal system is not an ancient Greek peculiarity: Sanskrit offers many examples (*pṛṇáti pṛṇáti píparti* : *pṝ-*, *bhárati bíbharti* : *bhṛ-*, etc.) which are often not functionally differentiated. See Verkerdi, 'On polymorphic presents in the Rgveda', Acta orientalia academiae scientiarum Hungaricae, XII, 1961, fasc. 1–3, pp. 249ff.

(: ἀφή), κληΐζω (: κληῖϝός[2])), χρηΐζω (: χρή). Some rival formations
under (II) above, e.g., -άζω (beside -άω), -ίζω (beside -έω), even with
nominal bases available, may, in fact, be deverbatives and belong
here.

IV. Analogy: To analogy, operating within functionally related
groups, is largely due in general the existence of rival formations,
but the immediate models are in many cases no more clear. ἀρύσσομαι
(: ἀρύω, -ομαι) is possibly formed after ἀφύσσω, βαρύθω (: βαρέω)
after μινύθω φθινύθω, στενάχω (: στένω) after ἰάχω. Parallel forma-
tions are found in semantic groups: κλάζω κλαγγάνω κλαγγαίνω,
κράζω κραγγάνω κραγγαίνω; κοναβέω -βίζω, καναχέω -χίζω, ἀμφαρα-
βέω -βίζω, etc.

In a number of cases morphological patterns have been brought
into play. New present forms have thus sometimes been created to
older non-present forms: -ίπταμαι (περι-, ἐξ-, possibly ἀπο-), beside
πέτομαι, is newly formed to ἔπτην πτήσομαι after ἔστην στήσομαι:
ἵσταμαι[3]); after verbs in -έω, fut. -ήσω, aor. -ησα (e.g. φιλέω φιλήσω
ἐφίλησα) have been formed ἑλκέω (beside ἕλκω) from the fut. ἑλκήσω,
aor. ἑλκῆσαι, which show an -η- extension to the stem[4]), and
possibly μαχέομαι (beside μάχομαι) from the fut. μαχήσομαι if it is
not a denominative (to μάχη)[5]).

The aorist seems particularly to have been the source of many
such creations: ἀγαίομαι (beside ἄγαμαι), κεραίω (beside κίρνημι) are
possibly formed from the aorists ἀγάσσασθαι, κεράσσαι after the
paradigmatic relation ναίω : aor. νάσσαι[6]). The new nasal presents
in -ά-ννῡμι, πετάννῡμι (beside πίτνημι, aor. πετά-σ(σ)αι), σκεδάννῡμι
(beside σκίδνημι, aor. σκεδά-σαι), etc. have been drawn from the
aorists after the old pattern ἕ-ννῡμι : ἕ-σ(σ)αι, σβέ-ννῡμι : σβέ-σ(σ)αι[7]).
The analogical spread of the present type with both nasal infix and
nasal suffix τυγχάνω (beside τεύχω), λανθάνω (beside λήθω), etc. may
have followed the proportion aor. πυθόμην : πυνθάνομαι (old) = aor.
ἔτυχον (to τεύχω) : x (= τυγχάνω), etc.[8])

_____

[2]) Schulze, Quaest. epic., 283f.

[3]) Cf. Brugmann-Thumb, Griech. Gramm.[4], 324; Schwyzer, Griech.
Gramm. I, 681.

[4]) On such futures and aorists, see Risch, Wortbild. der hom. Sprache,
217 ad fin., 296 ad fin.; Chantraine, Gramm. hom. I, 415f., 446; Schwyzer,
op. cit., 752, 782.

[5]) See Frisk, Griech. etym. Wörterbuch II (Lfg. 12), s.v. μάχομαι.

[6]) Cf. Risch, op. cit., 284.

[7]) On this type, see Lejeune, Phonétique grecque, 105; Schwyzer, op. cit., 697.

[8]) See Risch, op. cit., 237.

A few of the formation types, particularly nasal and -ζω, are very productive, and collateral forms of these types occur very frequently. Noteworthy are the forms in -άζω (collateral with -άω) and -ίζω (collateral with -έω) whose development falls under (I)–(IV) above[9]).

The functional implication

In a number of cases, so far as we can establish from our literary tradition, no functional differentiation is observed between the rival forms, although the original state of affairs in such cases may have been different. Where the forms are functionally distinguished no consistent pattern is observed within a class, and the functional relations exhibited by forms in any class in question can be very widely varied. In the former case this polymorphism seems to have become a very useful instrument in the hands of the epic poets, who employed the rival forms as mere metrical variants.

How the choice between two rival forms may be determined by metrical considerations can be seen in, e.g., the Homeric phrases χεῖρας ὀρεγνύς (Il. i. 351, end of verse) beside χεῖρας . . . ὀρέγοντας (Od. xii. 257, middle of verse) where, with their positions in the verse maintained, ὀρέγων and ὀρεγνύντας would have been impossible, and μακρὰ βιβάσθων (Il. xiii. 809, etc., always end of verse) beside μακρὰ βιβάς (Hom. Il. vii. 213, middle of verse) where the latter would have been impossible at the end of the verse. It can further be seen in the employment of one formation in certain forms to the exclusion of the other. For example, in Homer both κραδάω and κραδαίνω are found only in participles: the former only in the active (κραδάων Il. vii. 213, xiii. 583, etc.), the latter only in the passive (κραδαινομένη Il. xiii. 504, etc.). It is quite obvious here that κραδαινόμενος serves as a very useful variant for the metrically impossible κραδάομενος. Again, beside the imperfect σμερδαλέον κονάβιζε (Il. ii. 466, etc.) is found regularly the aorist σμερδαλέον κονάβησε (Il. ii. 334, etc.). Cf. μοχθίζοντα (Il. ii. 723) but μοχθήσειν (Il. x. 106). Also, the aorist ἀντίασα (cf. Il. i. 67) and the future ἀντιάσω (cf. Od. xxii. 28) are attested in Homer, but the metrically unsuitable present ἀντιάζω (note present form in Pind. N. 1. 68, Soph. Aj. 492, etc.) is not; on the other hand, the present ἀντιάω (ἀντιόω with 'diectasis') is found (cf. Il. vi. 127, etc.).

This being the situation, we now find that the metrical usefulness of certain forms has led to new creations. Such new creations are

---

[9]) See Schwyzer, Mél. Pedersen, 63[ff.] with literature.

202   Obafẹmi Kujọrẹ

some nasal presents created under the influence of uncontracted -άω forms and attested usually with 'diectasis': ἐρυκανάω(:ἐρυκάνω), ἰσχανάω(:ἰσχάνω), παμφανάω(:παμφαίνω)[10]. Metrical suitability has also been partly responsible for the spread of -ιάω forms where the uncontracted termination -ιάω (-ιόω) is preceded by a heavy syllable: ἀντιάω(:ἄντομαι), δηριάομαι(:δηρίομαι), μητιάομαι(:μητίομαι), etc. To it has also been due the formation of some -εύω compounds: οἰνοχοεύω(:οἰνοχοέω), ποντοπορεύω(:ποντοπορέω)[11]). Cf., beside βιβάσθων artificially created to βιβάς, by-forms in -έθω: φαέθω(:φάω), θαλέθω(:θάλλω), νεμέθομαι(:νέμομαι), ἠγερέθομαι(:ἀγείρομαι), etc. which frequently offer an anapaestic rhythm very easily accommodable in the epic verse. This is a metrical exploitation of these forms.

However, the chief interest of this paper lies in the functional distribution observed within a small but important group of presents in the -έω/-ίζω class. As has been noted above -έω/-ίζω collateral forms occur very frequently. In Homer the following sets are found: αἰνέω -ίζομαι, αἰτέω -ίζω, δειπνέω -ίζω, καναχέω -ίζω, κομέω -ίζω, κοναβέω -ίζω, μοχθέω -ίζω, οἰκέω -ίζω (ἀπο-), ὁπλέω -ίζω, ὀχλέω -ίζω, προκαλέομαι -ίζομαι, χατέω -ίζω, *ἀκαχέω (?) -ίζω. The -ίζω forms are mostly not functionally distinguished from the -έω ones. But two sets, δειπνέω 'have dinner, eat' — δειπνίζω 'give dinner to, entertain with dinner', οἰκέω trans. and intrans. 'inhabit, settle in (a place)' — ἀπ-οικίζω trans. 'cause to settle away from (a place), i.e. in another place, emigrate (a person)', exhibit a striking functional differentiation[12]). Now, the type of semantic opposition shown by these two Homeric sets is further evidenced by a number

---

[10]) Cf. also ἐστιχόωντο; -τάω forms: ἐρχατόωντο εὐχετόωντο, εὐχετάασθαι, λαμπετόωντι, ναιετάουσι, ἐσχατόωντα, ἐσχατόωσα, etc., on which see Leumann, Hom. Wörter, 178ff.

[11]) Cf. further μυθολογεύω νηπιαχεύω ἐπιδημεύω etc. These verbs are chiefly poetic and mostly confined to the present tense. On their development, see Chantraine, op. cit., 368; Fraenkel, Griech. Denom., 177. In the group where rival forms in -έω are available, this development must be seen not as a device for avoiding contraction (so Fraenkel, ibid.)—cf. contracted impf. οἰνοχόει Hom. Il. i. 598, etc.—but as due to the rhythmical shape of the -εύω forms.

[12]) This sharp differentiation contrasts with the fine distinctions of aspect that have been established within some classes, e.g., in -θω (see Chantraine, Mél. Vendryes, 93ff.; cf. Laroche, La racine nem-, 12), -κω/-γω/-χω (see Meillet, BSL 26, 1925, 1ff.; Chantraine, BSL 33, 1932, 77ff.), reduplicated— type μίμνω (see Vendryes, MSL 20, 1918, 117ff.), and some nasal forms (see Vendryes, Ἀντίδωρον, 266ff.). Even in these cases, it must be admitted that the distinctions are by no means rigid.

of sets in the post-Homeric classical period. The Homeric sets thus seem to witness a new development which, however, was not thoroughgoing, but which nevertheless seems clearly to show how functional necessity or an exploitation of morphological contrasts can break down a system of functionally indistinguishable binary forms.

Of the denominative -έω/-ίζω collateral forms listed in the post-Homeric classical period, 40 per cent show this development, the -ίζω presents functioning as (quasi-)causatives to the -έω ones: σιτέομαι : σιτίζω -ομαι, ἀνθέω : ἀνθίζω, ἠρεμέω : ἠρεμίζω [13]), εὐμενέω : mid. εὐμενίζομαι, πλουτέω : πλουτίζω, στοιχέω : στοιχίζω, ἀνα-χωρέω : ἀναχωρίζω, εὐδαιμονέω : εὐδαιμονίζω, νοστέω : νοστίζω, σφαραγέομαι : σφαραγίζω [14]).

These -ίζω formations are, of course, subject to analogical influences, and one or two verbs are clearly seen to belong to some semantic groups. σιτέομαι σιτίζω (:σῖτος), cf. ἀριστίζω, belong to the same semantic eategory as δειπνέω δειπνίζω (:δεῖπνον); with ἠρεμίζω (:ἠρεμέω) may be mentioned the semantic opposite σφαραγίζω (:σφαραγέομαι). In many cases, however, the models are no more clear. What is clear is that when once such a functional contrast attendant upon a morphological opposition is established in some words, it can easily be exploited to meet speakers' needs when they arise.

If the post-Homeric classical sets are new (as indeed they may be), one of the earliest models is certainly δειπνίζω (after ξε(ι)νίζω 'entertain as a guest'?) : δειπνέω [15]).

---

[13]) ἠρεμίζω = ἠρεμέω also occurs in Xenophon (Lac. 1. 3), and, if secondary, can be accounted for by such a development as 'cause oneself to rest, etc.' > 'rest, etc.'

[14]) Note also in this period other causatives in the -ίζω class: beside primary root presents, γεμίζω ἐθίζω; beside -εύω, partially ἁγνίζω; beside -άω, partially λοχίζω; beside -ιάω, βεμβῑκίζω νοτίζω φλογίζω. A few -άζω verbs also function as causatives to the verbs beside which they occur: εἰκάζω beside εἴκω, δεκάζω beside δέχομαι/δεκ- and the uncertain δεκάω (see Ath. Mitt. 18, 1893, 229), βιβάζω beside *βιβᾱμι βιβάω, σιγάζω beside σιγάω. These, however, present much less striking or significant patterns.

[15]) This paper gives some of the substance of my doctorate thesis, 'A study in the changes in the Greek present formations,' University of London, 1966.