

## A Tocharian - Greek Isogloss: Toch. B *ñor* 'below' ~ Gk. *νεῖαιρα* 'lower'

By JÖRUNDUR HILMARSSON, Reykjavík

West Tocharian *ñor* is used both as an adverb and as a postposition in the sense "beneath, under; beside", cf. e.g.

3 b3 *nigrot (s)t(ā)[m] ñ[o]r ʃek su mäskīträ*  
'He always dwelt beneath the nyagrodha-tree'

The etymology of this word has not been cleared beyond doubt. Van Windekens (1962: 508–509; 1964: 224) suggested an association with Russ. *ponúryj* 'lowered (head), downcast (eyes)', deriving B *ñor* from \**nur-* < I.-E. \**neur-*. Since, however, a motivation for the change of \**u* to B *o* is lacking (Van Windekens' proposal that this happened in the context of *r* seems not appropriate, cf. Hilmarsson 1984) and the word formation is not clear, this suggestion remains unconvincing.

Later, Van Windekens (1976: 328), following Meillet (apud Lévi in Hoernle, Manuscript Remains (1916), p.380), connects B *ñor* with Gk. *ἔνερθε(ν)* 'beneath', *ἔνεροι* 'inferi' etc. He takes B *ñor* as a borrowing from East Tocharian, for (in his opinion) *ñor* must derive from \**ñaru-* (< I.-E. \**nēr-u-*) through *u*-umlaut which operated in East but not in West Tocharian. The intermediate stage \**ñar-*, Van Windekens finds preserved in A *ñare* 'hell'. Isebaert (1980: 140) accepts the derivation of B *ñor* from I.-E. \**nēr-u-* through A \**ñor*, but A *ñare*, he shows (p.172), is a borrowing, reflecting Pkt. \**nyar-aya-* (with *-ya-* for *-i-*, inverse samprasāraṇa, cf. Skt. *niraya* 'hell').

Semantically, the association of B *ñor* 'below' with the family of Gk. *ἔνερθε(ν)*, *νέρθε(ν)* 'id.' fits perfectly. And since, in the opinion of the present author, *u*-umlaut operated in West as well as in East Tocharian (i. e. presumably already in Common Tocharian), B *ñor* would not have to be understood as borrowed from East Tocharian, but could derive directly from an I.-E. \**nēr-u-*.

However, in terms of morphology and word formation, this association does not have a solid base. The Indo-European root in ques-

tion appears not to be attested elsewhere with a lengthened grade, and the stem form in *-u-* is also quite singular. The pre-form *\*nēr-u-*, therefore, being entirely unmotivated and posited merely in order to explain B *nōr*, must be regarded with scepticism. An etymological connection with Gk. *ἔνεργε(ν)* etc., attractive though it is semantically, must therefore be considered unproven.

It is commonly accepted that Toch. B *ṣnōr* 'sinew' somehow represents I.-E. *\*snēy̯* (cf. e.g. Av. *snāvara*). In a recent article<sup>1)</sup>, I have endeavoured to show that a parallel to B *ṣnōr* might be found in A *kror*, B *krorīyai* (obl. sg.; with a secondary *-īya / īyo* suffix) 'crescent, horn of the moon'<sup>2)</sup>. I.-E. *\*ghrēy̯*<sup>3)</sup> 'horn' and *\*snēy̯*<sup>4)</sup> 'sinew' yielded Common Toch. *\*kræwār / \*ṣnæwār* resp. Being in an unaccentuated position, *\*-wār* changed into *\*-wur* (cf. Krause/Thomas 1960: 49–50 for examples of B *kwä > ku*, *pwä > pu*) with the result that *\*kræwār / \*ṣnæwār* became *\*kræwur / \*ṣnæwur*. Through *u*-umlaut, these forms changed into *\*krowur / \*ṣnōwur*, and later they contracted into *\*krowr / \*ṣnōwr*. Finally, assuming that B *\*-owr* was reduced to *-or* (as *-oy-* was sometimes reduced to *-o-* before a tautosyllabic *-m-*, cf. *som̄ske* 'little son': *soy* 'son', *tom̄* (nom. obl. pl. fem. of *su* 'he') : *toy* (cf. Klingenschmitt 1975: 150)), the forms *\*krowr / \*ṣnōwr* became B *kror(īyai) / ṣnōr* regularly<sup>5)</sup>.

Since B *nōr* rhymes so neatly with B *kror-* and *ṣnōr*, one might wonder whether these three words do not represent parallel formations. Is it possible that B *nōr* reflects an I.-E. *\*nēy̯* in the same manner as *kror-* and *ṣnōr* reflect *\*ghrēy̯* and *\*snēy̯* resp.?

A thus reconstructed pre-form *\*nēy̯* would, of course, remain quite hypothetical, unless confirmed from another source. Such confirmation might perhaps be found in Greek. Here, it might be suggested, the fem. adj. *νείαира* 'lower'<sup>6)</sup> represents *\*νηφαργα*, a deriva-

<sup>1)</sup> Hilmarsson 1985.

<sup>2)</sup> Actually, the meaning "horn" should probably be assigned to B *krorīyai*, for as I have just recently noticed, this word once (in B 580 b 4) occurs adjacent to the word *tarnene* (loc. sg.) "on the skull, on the top of the head". Although the context as a whole is not intelligible, *tarnene krorīyai* translates naturally as "the horn on the top of the head."

<sup>3)</sup> Yielding Arm. *eljīwr* 'horn', Hitt. *karayar* 'horn' as suggested by Normier 1980.

<sup>4)</sup> It is irrelevant here, whether the *\*ē* of *\*snēy̯* is understood as reflecting a laryngeal or not.

<sup>5)</sup> For a broader discussion, I refer to Hilmarsson 1985. Note that in the plural B *ṣnāura* derives from CT *\*ṣnæwrā* through *ā*-umlaut.

<sup>6)</sup> All Greek forms and bibliographical abbreviations are quoted from Liddell/Scott 1961 unless otherwise stated.

tion from \**νηφαρ* < I.-E. \**nēy̆r*. Formally, such underlying \**νηφαρ* would fit B *ñor* in every respect, and semantically, the association of this Tocharian word with Gk. *veíaipa* (also subst. *ἡ veíaipa* 'abdomen') (Germ. 'Unterleib') is perfect, cf. also such related Greek forms as *veíaτος* 'lowest', *veióθε(ν)* 'from the bottom', *veióθι* 'at the bottom, under, beneath'.

Although *veíaipa* could be a formation unconditioned by a heteroclititic base, as pointed out by Peters (1980: 223), the opposite is generally assumed (also by Peters op. cit., p. 193, 224) to be the case<sup>8</sup>). Thus Benveniste (1962: 112) posits a basic \**vei-φαρ* 'fond, partie inférieure' (apparently accepted by Chantraine 1974: 740). Peters (loc. cit.) posits \**nēy̆r* 'fond, partie inférieure' / 'in der Tiefe, unterhalb'. Peters justifies the adverbial sense that he suggests for \**nēy̆r* by the frequency of heteroclitics expressing local or temporal concepts combined with the frequency of case-forms in \*-y̆, \*-ōr used as local or temporal adverbs (for which he refers to Benveniste (op. cit., p. 87 sq.) and Schindler (personal communication), cf. \**dhgh(e)my̆/l̥* 'in, auf der Erde'). Toch. B *ñor*, used only as an adverb or a postposition, substantiates Peters' suggestion in this respect.

In order to account for the derivative *veíaipa*, Benveniste posited a pre-form \**vei-φαρ*, indicating an I.-E. \**neiuy̆r*, whereas Peters postulated \**nēy̆r*. On the other hand, Toch. B *ñor* requires an I.-E. \**nēy̆r* as shown above.

Benveniste (loc. cit.), justifying his derivation of *veíaipa* from \**vei-φαρ*, referred to *vei(φ)ός* 'fallow field'. The association of *veíaipa*, *veióθε(ν)* etc. with *veióς* is generally taken for granted, e. g. by Pokorny (1959: 313), Chantraine (1974: 740) and Connolly (1977 a: 194). This is also accepted by Frisk (1973: 297–298), although he states his position more cautiously: "Wenn ... überhaupt verwandt ..."

It is perhaps conceivable that *veióς* originally had the meaning 'low field, land that lies low', developing later the sense 'land that can be cultivated, fallow field', but there is nothing compelling or particularly convincing about that assumption. Certainly *veioio βαθείης* (Il. 18.547), cited by Chantraine, proves nothing in this respect, for

---

<sup>7</sup>) Cf. Toch. B *ñoriya kātso* (FW 14 a 6) 'the lower abdomen' in the interpretation of Winter 1984: 214. However, *ñoriya* is probably a recent formation and not directly comparable to Gk. *veíaipa*.

<sup>8</sup>) Specht (1947: 110) is wrong that *veíaipa*, because of Lat. *nuntius*, *noverca*, demands a basic \**véfaw*.

here *βαθείης* refers to the deep and rich soil of the field rather than to its lying low in the terrain.

That is to say, there are no intrinsic semantic reasons compelling us to associate *veíaipa*, *veióθε(v)* etc. with *veióς*. Furthermore, there is actually a formal problem that makes such association dubious. The reconstruction of *veióς* as *\*veifos*<sup>9)</sup> would indicate that *veía-τος*, if related derives from *\*veifatos*. However, in the Arcadian dialect of the town of Orchomenos (IV. century B.C.), this word is attested in the form *vḥatos*. Chantraine (loc. cit.) finds this form surprising, and Frisk (loc. cit.) remarks that the *vḥ-* of *vḥatos* has not been satisfactorily explained. Indeed, *\*veifatos* should have yielded Arc. *\*veíaτος*, cf. Lejeune 1972: 233 for the development of *\*ē* and *\*ei* in the Greek dialects. If one accepts the testimony of this Arcadian form (and there seems no reason not to), it would preclude a derivation of *veíaipa*, *veíaτος* etc. from an I.-E. *\*neiy-*, as well as a direct association of these words with *veióς* < *\*neiyos*<sup>10)</sup>.

However, I.-E. *\*nēy-* or *\*nēj-* would regularly account for the *vḥ-* of Arc. *vḥatos* (and would also explain such forms as *veíaτος*, *véατος*<sup>11)</sup> no worse than *\*neiy-* would, cf. discussion below). It will therefore be assumed that the pre-form was not *\*neiy-*.

On the other hand, it seems that on the basis of the attested Greek forms, there is no way to determine whether the original form was *\*nēy-* or *\*nēj-*, for in Greek both would turn out the same in antevocalic position. Since, however, Toch. B *nōr* can derive only from I.-E. *\*nēy* and not from *\*nēj*, one might prefer to derive Gk. *\*veiaip*, the basis of *veíaipa*, from *\*nēy*. The Tocharian word would thus have a perfect match in the Greek one, not only semantically, but also phonologically and morphologically, cf. further discussion below.

Before determining further Indo-European connections, we shall now run through a list of all the Greek forms, relevant to the matter

---

<sup>9)</sup> Gk. *veióς*, reconstructed as I.-E. *\*neiyos*, is usually associated with OCS. *nīva* 'field' (Skr. *njīva*, Russ. *nīva*) in spite of the problematic palatal *n̄-* of the Slavonic form, cf. Fasmer 1971: 72 with lit.; see however, also Meillet 1965: 101.

<sup>10)</sup> Cf. however the discussion further on in text, where it will be seen that although an immediate association of *veióς* with *veíaipa*, *veíaτος* etc. cannot be upheld, these words might still be related.

<sup>11)</sup> A parallel case might be Arc. (Orchomen. IV. century B.C.) *χηατα* vs. Ep. *χεῖος*, *χεός* < *\*χρηφος* 'debt', if correctly interpreted by Lejeune 1972: 255, cf. however, Frisk 1973: 1118 (*χηα* < *\*χεεα* < *\*χεφεσα*).

under discussion here, to see whether they yield to an explanation based on the proposed underlying \*νηF-.

νεΐαιρα 'placed below, lower' (νεΐαιρη δ' ἐν γαστρί 'in the lower part of the belly' Il. 5.539,616) is primarily a Homeric and Epic form (Nic. *Al.* 270). It is used besides in the medicinal works of Hippocrates, where, furthermore, the substantive ἡ νεΐαιρα 'abdomen' is attested (also in Callimachos *Epicus*). An original \*νηΨαιρα > \*νηαιρα would be shortened to νεΐαιρα regularly, as attested in a work of the Ionian poet Simonides Lyricus (VI.-V. century B. C.). In νεΐαιρα the original length of \*νη- is either metrically preserved in the form νει-, or the regular νεΐαιρα has been lengthened to νεΐαιρα for metrical reasons. For such alternation of Hom., Ep. (Ion.) -ει-α- : -ε-α- from -ηΨα-, cf. furthermore Ep. φρεΐαρ 'well', Hom., Ep. pl. φρεΐατα versus Ep. dat. sg. φρεΐτι (but Att. φρεΐαρ, φρεΐατος) from \*φρηΨαρ, cf. Arm. *albiwr*. Hom. pl. ἀλείατα 'wheat groats' versus ἀλέατα of an Ionian inscription from Miletos; the sg. forms ἄλειαρ and ἄλεαρ quoted by Herodianos (2.472, 12) represent \*ἀληΨαρ, cf. Arm. *aliwr*.

Contracted, \*νηΐαιρα yielded \*νηΐρα, whence νεΐρα (cf. Liddell / Scott 1961: 1164), which gave rise to the masc. form νεϊρός 'lowest'.

νειόθε(ν) 'from the bottom, from beneath', attested in Homer, is an Epic (Ion.) word, and so is νεϊόθι 'at the bottom, under, beneath'. Both have metrical νει- for \*νη-, whereas a regularly shortened νεόθεν is attested in Nic. *Al.* 211, 411, and νεόθι in Nic. *Al.* 520.

With the superlative suffix -ατος, as in ἔσχατος, πύματος, the following forms are attested: νεΐατος and νεΐατος are both Homeric and primarily used in Epic poetry, but rare in prose (Hippocrates *Medicus*). Again νει- stands for \*νη-, and νε- reflects the regular shortening of \*νη- before a vowel (α, ο). Arc. νήατος was explained above as a regular Arcadian form from \*νηΨατος. Contracted νήτος is attested in Hesychios.

Finally, a superlative νήιστος 'lowest' is attested in the Hesych. gloss νήιστα· ἔσχατα, κατώτατα; hence probably the name of the πύλαι Νήισται at Thebes. In the Boeotian dialect of Thebes, one would rather have expected \*νεΐιστος. However, with Walde / Pokorny 1927: 335, Pokorny 1959: 313, it might perhaps be assumed that original \*ē, which in Boeotian developed into a close /ē/, written ει, was realized here as η in the position before a palatal vowel, i. e. νήισται for \*νεΐισται < \*νήΨισται, cf. also discussion in footnote 12 below.

Now, if Gk. *\*veiaq* is identical with Toch. B *nōr* in formation, deriving from I.-E. *\*nēyǵ* and not from *\*nēiǵ*, the question of further Indo-European connections arises. For a preform *\*nēiǵ*, as proposed by Peters (1980: 193), with a root form *\*nēi-*, would seem more easily accommodated in the known stock of Indo-European roots (*\*nei-* / *\*ni-* 'down', cf. Pokorny 1959: 312–313) than *\*nēyǵ*, whose root form *\*nē-* or *\*nēu-* might at first seem unmotivated in Indo-European.

However, Connolly has argued (esp. 1977 a: 193–194, cf. also 1977 b: 349–351 and 1979: 27) that OHG. *nest* 'nest' indicates that the Indo-European root listed by Pokorny as *\*nei-* / *\*ni-* 'down' must be reconstructed as *\*neH<sub>1</sub>i-* / *\*nH<sub>1</sub>i-*. Connolly reaches this conclusion in the course of his investigation of the development of I.-E. *\*i* in Germanic. He asserts that I.-E. *\*i*, in the neighbourhood of a laryngeal, yielded Gmc. [ɪ] which thereupon appeared as *e* (and sometimes as *i* under conditions which Connolly is unable to specify). Connolly names several examples of this development, one of which is OHG. *nest*. Here, the traditional *\*ni-zd-o-* cannot account for the Old High German vocalism, whereas a *\*nH<sub>1</sub>i-zd-o-* would do so perfectly<sup>12</sup>).

Connolly (1977 a: 194) finds a confirmation of this reconstruction in OCS. *gnězdo* 'nest'. Whatever the origin of the initial *g-*, the *-ě-* of the stem would plausibly reflect an I.-E. *\*-ē-* or *\*-ēi-* that could rep-

---

<sup>12</sup>) As further evidence for a laryngeal in the Indo-European root meaning "down", Connolly (1977 a: 194) adduces OCS. *nīva* 'field', accepting Pokorny's derivation of this word from I.-E. *\*nēiμā*. He traces Lith. *néivoti* 'quälen' to an I.-E. *\*neEi-μ-* and Gk. *veióς* to *\*neHiμos*. However, it was pointed out above that there are no intrinsic semantic reasons compelling us to associate words meaning "field" with words meaning "down, low". At all events, such an association, although conceivable, cannot be taken as hard evidence. Also the derivation of Lith. *néivoti* 'quälen' (and Latv. *niēvāt* 'treat with disrespect, depress') from "down, low" seems conceivable, but not compelling.

Connolly also names Gk. *νήιστ-* (as found in *Νήισται πόλαι* and *νήιστα* (Hes.)), which he derives from either *\*neEi-w-ist-* or *\*neE-w-ist-*, rejecting Walde/Pokorny's explanation of this form (cf. above). However, Connolly's rejection is based on his assumption that this form is Attic, whereas it seems far more likely, in view of the location of *Νήισται πόλαι*, a gate at Thebes, that *νήιστ-* is a Boiotian form. A preform *\*neEi-w-ist-* > *\*nei-w-ist-* would therefore seem excluded, for *\*ei* appears as *ι(ῖ)* in Boiotian (cf. Lejeune 1972: 233), whereas a *\*neE-w-ist-* might be an acceptable preform, if one assumes (with Walde/Pokorny, cf. above) that *\*ē*, which in Boiotian developed into a close [ɛ̄], written *ει*, was realized here as *η* in the position before a palatal vowel.

resent *\*-eH<sub>1</sub>-* or *\*-eH<sub>1</sub>i-* resp., whereas an *\*-ei-* or *\*-i-* would be excluded.

The long vocalism of the so-called “long-diphthong” roots in Indo-European is now generally understood as reflecting the effect of a laryngeal. These roots can appear in a variety of forms, depending on their environment. Picking as an example the root that concerns us here, a full grade *\*nēi-* might alternate with the full grades *\*nei-* and *\*nē-*, and a zero grade *\*ni-* might alternate with the zero grade *\*nī-*. The assumption of a laryngeal explains all these forms. Thus *\*nēi-* derives from *\*neH<sub>1</sub>i̯-* (originally in the position before a vowel), *\*nei-* < *\*neH<sub>1</sub>i-* (before consonant), *\*nē-* < *\*neH<sub>1</sub>-* (cf. below), *\*ni-* < *\*nH<sub>1</sub>i-*, *\*nī-* < *\*niH<sub>1</sub>-* (with laryngeal metathesis). The alternant of the type *\*nē-* < *\*neH<sub>1</sub>-* is attested in many “long diphthong” roots, although its conditioning factor, i.e. the cause of the loss of root final *-i-*, has not yet been determined with certainty. J.E. Rasmussen has suggested to me (private communication) that *-i-* in such cases, being consonantic at the time, was lost before a tautosyllabic consonant, whereas it was retained before a heterosyllabic consonant, cf. Vedic injunctives of the type *pāt* < *\*poH<sub>3</sub>-t* from *\*peH<sub>3</sub>i-* ‘to drink’, *sāt* < *\*saH<sub>2</sub>-t* from *\*seH<sub>2</sub>i-* ‘to bind’.

Whatever the cause of *CeH-* beside *CeHi/u-*, the fact remains that such forms alternate<sup>13</sup>). For our purposes it is interesting to note that the shorter form is quite common in neuter nouns before the suffix *\*-m̥n̥*, cf. *\*deH<sub>1</sub>i-* ‘to bind’, but Ved. *dāman-* n. ‘string, cord’, Gk. (ὄπo-)δημα ‘sandal’, *\*peH<sub>1</sub>i-* ‘to revile, damage’, but Av. *pāman-* n. ‘skin disease’, Gk. πῆμα ‘suffering’, *\*poH<sub>2</sub>i-* ‘to protect’, but Gk. πῶμα ‘lid, cover’, *\*seH<sub>1</sub>i-* ‘to sow’, but Lat. *sēmen* ‘seed’, *\*peH<sub>3</sub>i-* ‘to drink’, but Gk. πῶμα ‘drink’ etc.

The reduction of the root form *\*neH<sub>1</sub>i-* to *\*neH<sub>1</sub>-* before the neuter suffix *\*-m̥n̥* would fit that pattern, so that B *ñor* ‘under, beneath’, Gk. *\*veiaq* from I.-E. *\*nēym̥n̥* (i.e. *\*neH<sub>1</sub>ym̥n̥*) could be tied up with I.-E. *\*neH<sub>1</sub>i-* / *\*nH<sub>1</sub>i-* ‘down’. Admittedly, the Greek form could still reflect I.-E. *\*nēiym̥n̥* (i.e. *\*neH<sub>1</sub>iym̥n̥*), but this would now seem unlikely for two reasons: a) the direct connection with Toch. B *ñor* would be broken, and b) the word formational pattern (short form before a neuter suffix) would be violated<sup>14</sup>).

<sup>13</sup>) Therefore *veioç*, if from *\*neH<sub>1</sub>iym̥n̥-* could still be related to *\*veiaq* < *\*neH<sub>1</sub>ym̥n̥*.

<sup>14</sup>) I would like to thank J.E. Rasmussen for bibliographical references and for discussing the contents of this paper with me.

## References

- Benveniste, E. (1962): *Origines de la formation des noms en indo-européen*. Troisième tirage. Paris.
- Chantraine, P. (1974): *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. Histoire des mots*. Tome III. *L-P*. Paris.
- Connolly, L. A. (1977 a): *Indo-European I > Germanic E: An Explanation by the Laryngeal Theory*. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* (Tübingen) 99, 2, p. 173–205.
- . (1977 b): *Indo-European I > Germanic E: An Explanation by the Laryngeal Theory (Continued)*. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* (Tübingen) 99, 3, p. 333–358.
- . (1979): *ēz and the Laryngeal Theory*. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* (Tübingen) 101, 1, p. 1–29
- Fasmer, M. (= M. Vasmer) (1971): *Étimologičeskij slovar' russkogo jazyka*. *Perevod s nemeckogo i dopolnenija O. N. Trubačeva*. Tom III.
- Frisk, H. (1973): *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Band II: *Kr-Ö*. Zweite unveränderte Auflage. Heidelberg.
- Hilmarsson, J. (1984): *Toch. A se, B soy 'son' = GK. υῖός 'son', -another Mirage?* *Indogermanische Forschungen* 89, p. 29–38.
- . (1985): *Tocharian B krorīyai (obl. sg.), A kror 'crescent, horn of the moon' ~ Hitt. karāuar 'horn' ~ Arm ełjiwr 'horn' < I.-E. \*ghrēuṛ*. *Die Sprache* 31, p. 40–47.
- Isebaert, L. (1980): *De Indo-Iraanse bestanddelen in de Tocharische woordenschat. Vraagstukken van fonische productinterferentie, met bijzondere aandacht voor de Indo-Iraanse diafonen a, ā*. Leuven.
- Klingenschmitt, G. (1975): *Tocharisch und Urindogermanisch*. Flexion und Wortbildung. Akten der V. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Regensburg, 9.–14. September 1973. Herausgegeben von H. Rix. Wiesbaden. P. 148–163.
- Krause, W./Thomas, W. (1960): *Tocharisches Elementarbuch*. Band I. Grammatik. Heidelberg.
- Lejeune, M. (1972): *Phonétique historique du mycénien et du grec ancien*. Paris.
- Liddell, H. G./Scott, R. (1961): *A Greek - English Lexicon*, Reprint of the 9<sup>th</sup> Edition. Oxford.
- Meillet, A. (1965): *Le slave commun*. Seconde édition revue et augmentée. Nouveau tirage avec le concours de A. Vaillant. Paris.
- Normier, R. (1980): *Beiträge zur armenischen Etymologie. I*. *Annual of Armenian Linguistics* 1, p. 19–22.
- Peters, M. (1980): *Untersuchungen zur Vertretung der indogermanischen Laryngale im Griechischen*. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Klasse. Sitzungsberichte, 377. Band. Wien.
- Pokorny, J. (1959): *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. I. Band. Bern/München.
- Specht, F. (1947): *Der Ursprung der Indogermanischen Deklination*. Göttingen.
- Van Windekens, A. J. (1962): *Études de phonétique tokharienne III*. *Orbis* 11, p. 504–513.



- . (1964): *Études de phonétique tokharienne VI*. Orbis 13, p. 223–233.  
-. Le tokharien confronté avec les autres langues indoeuropéennes. Volume I. La phonétique et le vocabulaire. Louvain.  
Walde, A./Pokorny, J. (1927): *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der indogermantischen Sprachen*. II. Band. Berlin/Leipzig.  
Winter, W. (1984): *B stauka-*. *Studia tocharica*. Selected writings. Poznań. P. 212–216.

## ΕΙΛΗΦΑ

By S. R. SLINGS, Amsterdam

In his *Grammar of Attic Inscriptions*<sup>1)</sup>, Leslie Threatte records three forms that seem to prove that in Classical Attic, the perfect of λαμβάνω was εἴληφα rather than εἴληφα: ἀφειληφότας<sup>2)</sup>; καθειληφότων<sup>3)</sup>; καθειληφότος<sup>4)</sup>. There are no instances to show that εἴληφα occurred side by side with εἴληφα<sup>5)</sup>.

Scholars normally explain this phenomenon as due to Attic substandard assimilation of aspirates (cf. *χαριθμός*, *Θεμισθοκλῆς* and the like). The alternative explanation as a relic of the pre-Grassmann period is rejected. Threatte subscribes to this view, if hesitantly: he points to the absence of counter-examples (which one should expect to be found with substandard phenomena in general and with this one in particular). He also notes that two examples are unusually late: indeed, the assimilation of aspirates virtually ceases to exist around 300 B.C.

I think the *communis opinio* is wrong and the initial aspiration original. To explain my thesis it is necessary to establish that εἴληφα is *not* an ancient verb form that goes back directly to a prehistoric \**se-slāg*<sup>w</sup>-*a*. Indeed, in archaic Greek no perfect active of λαμβάνω is attested. When it turns up, it has a remarkable variety of forms: εἴληφα in Attica and (with -*ā*-) occasionally elsewhere<sup>6)</sup>, λέλονβα in

<sup>1)</sup> I, Berlin-New York 1980, 463; cf. 505 f.

<sup>2)</sup> *IG I*<sup>2</sup> 108, 20 = *IG I*<sup>3</sup> 101, 29; 410/9 B.C.

<sup>3)</sup> *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 687, 14; 265/4 B.C.

<sup>4)</sup> *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 682, 10; after 256/5 B.C.

<sup>5)</sup> I disregard *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 3194 from the second century AD.

<sup>6)</sup> The earliest literary instance in Attic is *S. OT* 643; cf. *OC* 729; fr. 596. *εἴλαφα*: *IG IX* 1, 36, 7 (Stiris; first half 2<sup>nd</sup> cent. B.C.; North-West Greek Koine and probably an adaption of Attic Koine *εἴληφα*).