-. (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 indogermanischen Sprachen. II. Band. Berlin / Leipzig.

Winter, W. (1984): *B* staukka-. Studia tocharica. Selected writings. Poznań. P. 212-216.

ΕΙΛΗΦΑ

By S. R. Slings, Amsterdam

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

Scholars normally explain this phenomenon as due to Attic substandard assimilation of aspirates (cf. *haριθμός, 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 **seslāg^w-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[6]), λέλουβα in

---

[1]) I, Berlin-New York 1980, 463; cf. 505 f.

[2]) *IG* I² 108,20 = *IG* I³ 101,29; 410/9 B.C.

[3]) *IG* II² 687,14; 265/4 B.C.

[4]) *IG* II² 682,10; after 256/5 B.C.

[5]) I disregard *IG* II² 3194 from the second century AD.

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

Crete[7]), λελάβηκα in most other places[8]). None of these forms is attested, either in inscriptions or in literary texts, before the second half of the fifth century[9]).

The type of formation seems to support a fifth-century date for the coming-to-be of εἴληφα: synchronically speaking, at any rate, εἴληφα is an aspirated perfect, created from a stem λαβ- and aspirated perfects are not found before the fifth century. The irregular reduplication is easily explained when one assumes that the mediopassive counterpart εἴλημμαι (originally, in my opinion, *εἴλημμαι), although not attested before the fifth century either[10]), is in fact the direct descendant of an original *se-slāg^w-mai. It is a well-known fact that many Greek active perfects were modelled on the corresponding middles: ἔσταλκα after ἔσταλμαι, ἀλήλιφα after ἀλήλιμμαι etc.[11]).

If this hypothesis is correct, the initial aspiration of εἴληφα is accounted for: *se-slāg^w-mai develops phonetically into *εἴλημμαι[12])

---

[7]) GDI 5087 b1 (Gortyn; 3rd cent. B. C. or later). Cf. Th. Baunack, Philol. 49, 1890, 594. Formed after λέλογχα (Hom. etc.), just as in Attic *εἴληχα was modelled on εἴληφα, cf. n. 9.

[8]) Hdt. III 42,4 etc.; IG 4² 121,59 and 68 (Epidaurus, second half 4th cent. B. C.); IG V 2,6,14 (Tegea; 4th cent. B. C.); IG V 2,443,48 (Megalopolis; 2nd cent. B. C.; Doric Koine); Archim. Aren. 4,20 (II 157,1 Mugler); quoted (without context) for Eupolis, fr. 426 K.

[9]) But given the early attestation of *εἴληχα (A. Th. 376 – εἴληφε as a variant reading –; 423; 451) it is possible that εἴληφα existed already in the first half of the 5th cent. as the reduplication and vocalism of *εἴληχα *εἴληγμαι were borrowed from εἴληφα εἴλημμαι (the original perfect of λαγχάνω is λέλογχα). On the other hand, it is equally possible that the borrowing originated in the perfect passive, in other words that *εἴληχα was modelled not on εἴληφα but on *εἴληγμαι (εἴληγμαι is first attested in E. Tr. 296). The problem is complicated by λέλημμαι, for which cf. n. 12. See below and n. 18 for a dubious attestation of εἴληφα in Archilochus.

[10]) First occurrence: S. Ant. 732. I should point out that while the passive perfect is on the whole rarer in Greek than the active, there are no restrictions on passive perfects before the 5th cent. as there are on active perfects. Therefore, if one finds neither εἴληφα nor *εἴλημμαι before the 5th cent., it is a priori more likely that the passive form is the older one (and one of the two must be considerably older given the reduplication εἴλ- < *σε-σλ-).

[11]) If the active forms were original, we should have had *ἔστολα (or *ἔστ-), *ἀλήλοιφα. Cf. e. g., P. Chantraine, Morphologie historique du grec, Paris 1961³, 198 f.

[12]) Not attested in inscriptions before the Roman era; in MSS., only εἴλημμαι is found. In Ionic, we find λέλαμμαι instead, e. g. Hdt. III 117,2. See F. Bechtel, Die griechischen Dialekte, III, Berlin 1924, 175; 213. In Attic tragedy, λέλημμαι is preferred to εἴλημμαι, e. g. A. Ag. 876 (textually uncertain); S. fr. 750; E. Io 1113

in Ionic-Attic; εἴληφα was created after this model in the fifth century, long after Grassmann's Law hat ceased to operate[13]). (On the question how the forms came to lose their initial aspiration, see below).

Traditionally, εἴληφα is explained as a hybrid form of two originally separate stems: *slag^w- and *lab^h-. Though the latter is obviously present in OI lábhate 'to seize', it should be stressed that the only possible reflexes of the stem in Greek are two isolated words: λάφυρον 'booty' and ἀμφιλαφής 'growing thickly; abundant' – neither of them can be said to provide positive proof for the existence of λαφ- < *lab^h- in Greek[14]). Consequently, the assumption of a crossing of *slag^w- and *lab^h- is a hazardous one, the more so when one takes into account the variety of perfect forms of λαμβάνω: these suggest that before the fifth century, no active perfect of this verb was needed, a suggestion that fits in, of course, with the general history of the Greek perfect[15]).

---

etc. (but εἰλ- S. Ant. 732; E. Pir. 33); Ar. Eccl. 1090 is paratragic (cf. Van Leeuwen ad loc.). Add An. Ox. I 268 λελήφαται (probably from a tragedy); cf. also Phot. Lex. δ 367 διαλεληφότες (ditto; see C.J. Ruijgh, Mnem. IV 38, 1985, 429). I take it these forms are a compromise between Ionic λέλαμμαι and Attic *εἴλημμαι; perhaps the latter was felt to be too 'provincial' to be used in tragedy.

[13]) As we find aspirate assimilation already on the François vase (Θρόφος, haφροδίτε; cf. Threatte, I 460), the terminus ante quem for this sound change (which may very well have been a structural rule of Greek phonology for many centuries) is 550 B.C. in Attic. The terminus post quem remains uncertain, cf. my remarks Mnem. IV 32, 1979, 258 n. 52.

[14]) I do not wish to imply that the connection of λάφυρον ἀμφιλαφής with lábhate is wrong, but it is certainly not very strong. For λάφυρον (which has an unusual suffix), pre-Greek origin may be suggested by the alternation observed in λαφύσσω 'to swallow greedily', λάβρος 'turbulent' and especially λαμυρός 'greedy'; cf. E. J. Furnée, Die wichtigsten konsonantischen Erscheinungen des Vorgriechischen, The Hague-Paris 1972, 177; 216. ἀμφιλαφής is used as an attribute of trees originally; hence its original meaning must be something like 'growing to both (> all) sides', and the connection with a stem meaning 'to grasp' (via 'to extend') is but one of the various possibilities – if it is correct, it could just as well go back to *slag^w- with secondary aspiration from its virtual antonym ἀμφιδρυφής.

The question may be raised if *slag^w- itself is IE, as the only connection outside Greek seems to be AS laeccan 'to seize'; may it not rather be pre-Greek as well and thus connected with the words quoted above? For apophony within pre-Greek stems, cf. θαμβέω: τέθηπα.

[15]) I avoid the term 'resultative' in this connection because I do not agree with Wackernagel, Chantraine and others that the 5th-century expansion of the perfect is adequately explained by the coming-to-be of a new value 'indicating the

Recently, D. A. Ringe[16]) has postulated an old date for the creation of εἴληφα, which he too considers a hybrid form, in order to account for the phenomenon of aspirated perfect in itself; this whole class is said to have been modelled by analogy on εἴληφα. Since my hypothesis is contradictory to his, I shall now have to account for the origin of the aspirated perfect.

In itself, the derivation of an entire flexion class from one particular word is not unparalleled: in Greek, one may think of the Attic genitive singular in -εως of nouns in -ις, for which πόλεως < πόληος is generally considered to have been the starting-point. But in that case, one expects such a focal word-form to have a relatively high frequency: in Homer, we find 13 instances of πόληος (as against 21 of Ionic πόλιος)[17]). For εἴληφα, all Ringe can point to is a highly dubious occurrence in Archilochus, where the form εἴληφας has been postulated on the basis of a non-verbatim paraphrase in Lucian[18]).

But Ringe's explanation must be considered wrong for a more important reason. Any account of the aspirated perfect has to answer a question asked already in Antiquity[19]): why do we find aspirated perfects only for stems ending in labials and dorsals, not in dentals? Ringe's explanation that most dental stems are derivatives in -ίζω and -άζω is not to the point, and his contention that these verbs did not start forming perfects until relatively late is patently false: νενόμικα is found quite often in Herodotus, γεγύμνακα in Aeschylus[20]) and so on – these formations are precisely as old as the aspi-

---

state of the object'. Cf. A. Rijksbaron, Lampas 17, 1984, 403–419, whose argumentation is thoroughly insufficient: the crucial point is, to my mind, the development of new perfects of intransitive verbs side by side with that of new transitive perfects.

[16]) 'εἴληφα and the Aspirated Perfect', Glotta 62, 1984, 125–141.

[17]) πόληος itself probably replaced *πολεις < *pl̥h₃éis after the locative πόληι < *pl̥h₃ēi; given the meaning of the noun, it was only to be expected that the locative would play a crucial part in later development. So rightly Chantraine, *o. c.,* 88; H. Rix, *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen,* Darmstadt 1976, 146.

[18]) Fr. 223 West. On the basis of Luc. *Pseudolog.* 1 τέττιγα τοῦ πτεροῦ συνειληφας and *ibid.* τέττιγα ἔφη τὸν ἄνδρα εἰληφέναι τοῦ πτεροῦ Bergk (fr. 143) reconstructed an Archilochean line τέττιγα δ' εἴληφας πτεροῦ. Diels (Hermes 23, 1888, 279), comparing a passage from the Byzantine author Constantinus Rhodius, proposed τέττιγος ἐδράξω πτεροῦ. Both start from the entirely gratuitous assumption that the line must be an iambic dimeter. Cf. my *Study sugli Epodi di Archiloco* I 12, to appear in QUCC.

[19]) Choeroboscus in *Gramm. Gr.* IV 2, 66,8–68,5.

[20]) Hdt: e. g. I 142,3; III 38,2; IV 27; VII 153,4; VIII 79,1. A. *Pr.* 586.

rated perfect. Therefore, when we find τέτροφα (from τρέπω) in Sophocles and πέπομφα in Herodotus[21]), we should be told why we do not also find *νενόμιϑα and *γεγύμναϑα.

There are two hypotheses that can tell us why. The first one is the received opinion[22]), according to which the aspirated perfect active was introduced on the analogy of the stem-final aspiration in the third plural middle, i.e. before the endings -αται and -ατο. As this phenomenon is much older than the aspirated perfect active (it is firmly established in Homer) and is limited to labial and dorsal stems, it is logical that an explanation is looked for in this direction. Secondly, there is Meillet's ingenious proposal[23]) to start from the sigmatic future and aorist: here -ψω, -ξω, -ψα, -ξα were pronounced [pʰsɔː] [kʰsɔː] etc. in most dialects. This may have led to the segment [+ asp.] being added to stem-final labials and dorsals (not dentals as in their sigmatic forms the dental was lost altogether); this segment may have functioned as perfect suffix for stems ending in labials and dorsals.

This is not the place to choose between these hypotheses; besides, they are not mutually exclusive. For the purpose of this paper, it is sufficient to point out that Ringe has not succeeded in proving that εἴληφα existed before the fifth century; there is nothing to prevent us from assuming that εἴληφα was indeed created in that century after *εἴλημμαι.

As opposed to the active perfect, the middle never had two aspirates, so Grassmann's Law did not apply to it. There was no reason why *εἴλημμαι should lose its initial aspiration at the time this phonetic change took place, any more than εἵμαρται < *se-smr̥- did.

Incidentally, it should be pointed out that even those who wish to derive εἴληφα/εἴλημμαι from a stem *labʰ- have a problem here. As

---

[21]) S. *Tr.* 1009; Hdt. I 85,1.

[22]) J. Schmidt, KZ 27, 1884, 309–314. Ringe (127f.) counters this hypothesis with an argument borrowed from Curtius, *Zur Kritik der neuesten Sprachforschung,* Leipzig 1885, 62–64: "we expect to find that the earliest aspirated perfects occur beside contemporary 3 pl. mediopassive forms with root-final aspiration. No such correlation appears in our data." But our corpus of 5th-cent. Greek texts is not large enough to exclude the possibility that such a correlation did in fact exist. Besides, some verbs naturally lend themselves more easily to passive perfects than others, and the same goes for active perfects. Thus, it is not surprising that τετάχαται is quite frequent in 5th-cent. texts, whereas τέταχα is not found at all: in the perfect, it is more natural to say "the soldiers have (had) been drawn up" than "X has (had) drawn up the soldiers."

[23]) MSL 13, 1906, 52.

14   S. R. Slings

I have shown elsewhere²⁴), Grassmann's Law did not operate on per-
fect passive forms if their stem ended in a labial, cf. τέθραμμαι (stem
*dʰrebʰ-) as opposed to τέτυγμαι (stem *dʰeugʰ-).

When, therefore, Attic inscriptions present the active perfect with
an initial /h/, this is the historically correct form. Rather than
explaining it away as substandard, we should ask why its aspiration
did not find its way into our medieval MSS. of Attic authors, and
why papyri do not show forms comparable to the ἀφειληφότας etc.
of the inscriptions (the same question must be put with regard to the
Attic perfect of λαγχάνω, which was formed after that of λαμβάνω:
it is a reasonable inference that Attic had *εἴληχα, but we are not
sure; unfortunately ϝλεχότον²⁵) is inconclusive, since the stone has
forms both with and without initial heta).

More than one answer to the question is possible, but the most
plausible course is to start from the other perfects in which ει
(whether representing /e:/ or /ei/) served as reduplication. With the
exception of εἵμαρται, these have εἱ- not εἰ-: εἴρηκα, εἴωθα, διείλεγ-
μαι, εἴρυμαι etc. (of course, εἵλκυσμαι, εἵλικτο do not belong here:
their εἱ- was felt as part ot the verbal stem).

Presumably, εἴληφα (and likewise *εἴληχα) lost its initial aspira-
tion because εἱ- came to be interpreted as a regular allomorph of the
reduplication. If so, the change from εἱ- to εἰ- is an easily imaginable
analogical change. There is some support for εἰ- as an allomorph of
the reduplication in the later perfect form εἴσχηκα²⁶). Perhaps the
tendency to get rid of εἱ- in the perfect helps explain the vagaries in
the pluperfect of ἕστηκα, where forms which εἱ- (mostly in the sin-
gular) and ἑ- (normally in the plural) alternate.

The explanation does not account for εἵμαρται, but that was a
rare, poetic word, not current in Attic; one may wonder if it was
often felt as a perfect. Therefore, it cannot count as an argument
against the explanation proposed here.

The preservation in Attic inscriptions of a correct εἴληφα lost in
papyri and MSS. is not an isolated case: we know from inscriptions
that Attic had the correct forms αὔριον, ἀκούσιος etc.²⁷). We cannot
be sure when εἴληφα lost its initial aspiration in Attic: it is possible
that a substandard εἴληφα existed side by side with it for some time
and that it was this latter form that found its way into Koine Greek.

---

²⁴) Mnemos. IV 32, 1979, 257f.
²⁵) *IG* I² 97,13 = *IG* I³ 60,13.
²⁶) Cf. E. Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik*, I, München 1939, 650.
²⁷) Cf. Threatte, *o. c.*, 501–503.