Inhalt

GLOTTA

Zeitschrift für
griechische und lateinische Sprache

INHALT

Ionic κῶς, ὅκως, ὅπως, Thessalian κις: a phonetic problem of analyzable compounds*)

By Antonio Lillo, Murcia

The development of Indo-European labiovelars to Greek is one of the most problematic questions of Greek historical phonetics owing to their special treatment before *e, i* vowels, in contrast with the other Indo-European languages. But within Greek, the double development to κ and to π of *k^w in the interrogative-indefinite pronoun stem *$k^w o$- in Ionian is also a very difficult question to be explained, because it would appear to infringe even one of the cornerstones of historical linguistics, the phonetic law, since two different developments of the same labiovelar in the same phonetic context appear, (-)κ- and (-)π-.

Let us consider the evidence of the *$k^w o$- stem forms with κ. The forms appearing in the inscriptions are the following:

– a form οκοσσον, *Schw. Del*[3]. 644,8, appears in an inscription from Aigai written in Lesbian. It should be pointed out that a form οττι (l. 10) appears in the same inscription and that the remaining evidence of the *$k^w o$- stem forms in this dialect show the development to labial of the labiovelar.

– the Ionic evidence is very scarce and restricted to the area of Asia Minor and some colonies so far. These have been the following:

1) οκοια, in Erythrae, H. Engelmann & R. Merkelbach, *Die Inschriften von Erythrai und Klazomenai I–II*, Bonn 1972–3, n. 205, 11, dated in 380/360 B.C. As an additional trait it should be noted that a form ιρος appears in this inscription. Nevertheless, the labial development appears in other inscriptions from the same place:

-n. 13,4 ὅπως, 4th/3th century B.C., in a very fragmentary text.

-n. 15,18 ποῦ, second half of 4th century B.C., although another interpretation of the sequence has been proposed.

-n. 21,15 ὅπως, 334/332 B.C., without a clear dialectal mark.

-n. 27,16 ὅπως, 274 B.C., without a clear dialectal mark.

-n. 28,22 ὅπως, 275 B.C., written in *koiné.*

-n. 31 ὅπως, 270/260 B.C., written in *koiné.*

-n. 35 ὅπως, middle of 3th century B.C., written in *koiné.*

-n. 36 ὅπως, written in *koiné.*

-n. 111 ὅπως, 160 B.C., written in *koiné.*

-n. 112 ὅπως, 2nd century B.C., written in *koiné.*

-n. 113 ὅπως, 1st century B.C., written in *koiné.*

-n. 122, 27, 38 and 52 ὅπως, at the beginning of the 2nd century B.C., in an inscription written in Lesbian.

-n. 224, 27 ποτ᾽, 162 A.D., in a metrical and very late inscription (elegiac distich).

In the light of these forms the "dialectal authenticity" of the -κ-form is beyond all doubt, but equally evident is the generalization of the Ionic-Attic form ὅπως as the common form to Ionian and Attic. However, we will come back to this question.

2) οκοσο in Ampurias, a Phocaean colony, E. Sanmartí – R. A. Santiago, *ZPE* 68 (1987), 121–2, 1.12, in an inscription dated in the first half of the 5th century B.C. In the same inscription a κ is restored in the sequence ο[.]ως, 1.1.

3) οκο in Pech-Maho, M. Lejeune – J. Pouilloux, "Une transaction commerciale ionienne au Vᵉ siècle à Pech-Maho," *Académie des Inscriptions & Belles Lettres* 1988, p. 533, 1.7.

4) [ο|κο]σαι, in Chios, *Schw. Del*³. 687 B 11–12, dated ca. 600 B.C., a reconstruction proposed by Schwyzer.

In contrast to the epigraphical sources, the literary evidence is more abundant in this type of documentation. The development of *kʷ* to κ in the *kʷo-* stem is widely documented in Ionic authors. But the problem raised by this type of document is the transmission of the text, since it is sometimes hard to assess the degree to which the copyist changed these forms due to prejudices concerning this dialectal trait or concerning the exact nature of what literary Ionian was or must be is sometimes difficult. We will revise these problems as they appear in each author in order to determine as far as possible

their use of forms with κ or/and π.[1]) As for Archilochus, West regularizes all these forms with (-)π-, despite the fact that the transmission of the text does not allow so clear-cut a position. He has pointed out before[2]) that Archilochus ordinarily uses π and that κ appears only in fr. 131 and 132, where the influence of a scribe knowledgeable of the dialect can be assumed. On the other hand, Scherer[3]) considers it as a rule that κ appears in forms beginning with ο-, whereas π does in those in which *kʷ is at the beginning of the form, a rule accepted later by Hiersche.[4]) The evidence is the following: πώ 19,2; ποτ' 23,18; πῇι 88; πού 127; ὁποίην 131,2; ὁποίοις 132; ποῖον 172,1; ὅ]πως 196 a, 33; ὅπως 196 a 39; πῶς 237. Concerning ὁποίην, all the transmitted forms except one take κ and, with regard to ὁποίοις, the -π- form is Wilamowitz's proposal, although the manuscripts show the form with κ. All this provides a sufficient basis on which to defend the forms with κ, ὁκοίην and ὁκοίοις. The remaining forms take (-)π- in their transmission. Merkelbach–West's edition of the papyrus from Cologne[5]) presents a form with -π-, ὅπως, which transgresses the previous rule. If this form is to be considered as archilochean, and not the work of a copyist, one would have to talk of a fluctuating system in a still incipient process of regularization where π results from the development of *kʷ before ο at the beginning of the word and κ in the forms beginning with ό-, but with the possibility of analogical interferences.

For his part, Callinus from Ephesus, dated also in the middle of 7th century B. C., presents a totally different situation. Even though the fragments of this poet are very few, *kʷo- has developed to κο- in all of them and there is no evidence of a ὁπόσος type form, with the exception of ὁππότε κεν, fr. 1,8, of clear homeric inspiration.[6]) The remaining evidence is: κότ' 1,1; κως 1,12; κοτε 2 a. There is only divergence in the transmission of the form κως, fr. 1,1, where one manuscript presents πως, unlike the others, which present κως.

---

[1]) The numeration of fragments by the elegiac and jambograph poets followed is that of M. L. West in his *Delectus ex Iambis et Elegis Graecis*, Oxford 1980; for Anacreon, that of D. L. Page, *Poetae Melici Graeci*, Oxford 1962; and for the philosophers, that of H. Diels – W. Kranz, *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, Zürich – Berlin 1951–52⁶.

[2]) M. L. West, *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus*, Berlin 1974, p. 90.

[3]) "Die Sprache des Archilochus," in J. Pouilloux et alii, *Arquiloque*, Vandoeuvres – Genève 1964, p. 100 (Fondation Hardt X).

[4]) *Grundzüge der griechischen Sprachgeschichte*, Wiesbaden 1970, p. 112.

[5]) "Ein Archilochos-Papyrus," *ZPE* 14 (1974), 97–112.

[6]) Cf. Hiersche, *op. cit.*, p. 106.

There are only three instances in Mimnermus and they are more problematic, because one of them is transmitted with *κ*, *κοτ᾽αν*, 11,1, whereas the other two both take *π*, *ποτ᾽*, 12,2, and *ποτε*, 14,5; the edition of both these forms with *κ*- followed by Hiersche[7]) is a mere conjecture. It is our contention that the use of a form *ποτε*, 14,5, with *π*-, may be inspired on *Od.* 11,528, as contrasted with *κοτ᾽*, 11,1, whose formal context, apart from the metre, seems non-homeric. Finally *ποτ᾽*, 12,2, appears in a pentametre and in the preceding verse there are two clear homerisms, *ἠέλιος* and *ἤματα πάντα*. In consequence, we feel that Mimnermus must have been reflecting the local dialect, excepting in 12,2 and 14,5, where he used the homeric form for poetic reasons.

Likewise, Xenophanes from Kolophon has only three forms, all with *π*, *οὔποτε* 1,5; *ὁπόσον* 1,17; *ποτε* 7 a, 1, and the transmission of these texts never varies between forms with *κ* and *π*, in such a way that it is reasonable to think that this poet generalized the solution with (-)*π*-.

The evidence of Semonides from Amorgos is something more abundant: *ὅκηι* 1,2; *ὅκως* 1,5; 7,82; *ὅκου* 7,91; 7,106; *κοτ᾽* 7,9. Only the *κ* forms are conjecture in 1,2 and 7,82, although reasonable, because the remaining evidence always gives the *κ* solution in some of the variants of the texts transmitted. Hence, this poet generalized the *κ* forms from the *k^wo*-stem.

Hipponax' evidence is also quite clear. Five forms relevant to the question have appeared up till now: *κω* 34,1; *ὅκου* 79,18; *κοτ*[103,9; *κώ* 117,7; *ὅπως* 128,3; *πῶς* 129. The *π* forms can be explained through homeric influence due to their appearance in hexameters[8]) and the rest pose no special problems concerning transmission,[9]) so that these forms with *κ* are the ones acceptable for this poet.

In Anacreon, there are as yet four instances: *κου* (PMG 348,4), *ὅκως* (356,2), *κω* (384), and *πῶς* (SLG 313 b). The *κ*- of *κου* in 348,4 is despite the several variant readings unanimously transmitted. The *κω* is preserved in sch. Pind. Isth.2,13 by cod.B (in the sequence *κ῀κοτε*, i.e. *κωσκοτε*, *κω τότε* ci. Bergk), while cod.D, apparently less trustworthy in such minutiae, has *πω* (*ποτε*). The *ὅκως* is preserved in Athen. 427 a, while in 475 c codd. ACE have *ὅπως* (unde Eust.).

---

[7]) *Op. cit.*, p.107.

[8]) Cf. O. Masson, *Les fragments du poète Hipponax,* Paris 1962, p.30; M.L. West, *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus,* Berlin 1974, p.90.

[9]) With the exception of *κω* of the fr.34,1, which is a conjecture.

The πως, on the other hand, is given by a very incorrect 15th century ms. of what seems to be a late byzantine version of the Tractatus de barbarismo et soloecismo ascribed to Herodian. Given that in the late medieval transmission of these words there is a tendency to alter κ- into π- rather than π- into κ-, we may conclude that Anacreon belongs to the group of poets who generalized the (-)κ- solution in the forms of the *kʷo-* stem.

Heraclitus' evidence is also quite clear and shows the same distribution of forms as in Archilochus, namely, π in the *kʷo-* stem forms without ό- and κ when the forms begin with ό-, all without special problems of transmission. The evidence of π forms is: ποτε πῶς 16, ὁπόταν 67. The latter is the only exception to the rule and, oddly enough, a form ὅκωσπερ appears in the same fragment. Nevertheless we consider that this exception does not invalidate the rule, as it is the only one, and, as we pointed out in relation to Archilochus' forms, the existence of similar forms, some with and some without ό-, must have shaped a system permeable to remodellings in favour of the (-)π- forms or of the (-)κ- ones; in any case, the fact that there is only one exception to the rule leads us to consider Heraclitus' system of distribution of these forms as a still stable one. Heraclitus' evidence of κ forms is: ὁκοίων, ὅκως, ὁκόσα, ὅκωσπερ, ὁκόσα 1; ὁκοῖον 5; ὁκοίοις 17; ὁκόσα, ὁκόσα 21; ὅκωσπερ 29; ὁκοῖος 31; ὅκωσπερ 44; ὅκως, ὅκωσπερ 51; ὅκωσπερ 67; ὅκωσπερ 79; ὅκωσπερ 90; ὁκόσων 108; ὁκόσα 110; ὅκωσπερ, ὁκόσον 114; ὁκόταν, ὅκη 117.

Democritus for his part offers a form with π, οὐδέποτε 209, in a context *kʷo-* type, where the development to labial was to be expected. The remaining evidence is of the ὁκο-type: ὁκόσα 175; ὅκως, ὁκόσωι 191; ὁκόσον 198; ὁκόσα 223; ὁκόσον, ὁκόταν, ὁκοίων 235; ὁκόσον 251; ὅκως 252; ὁκόσωι 254; ὅκωσπερ 259; κως,[10]) ὅκως 266; ὅκως 285; ὅκωσπερ 288. In short, it is the same distribution of forms, πο-/ὁκο-, as in Heraclitus.

Two authors, Hippocrates and Herodotus, remain. But the importance of their writings has as a consequence that these texts have been transmitted with many changes, which render difficult the study of some traits of their language. Concerning the forms in question Hippocrates' texts vary between the ὅκως and ὅπως type forms, and to decide between one form and another is very difficult.

---

[10]) Nevertheless, this form presents problems of transmission; in consequence, is will not be considered in this study.

Herodotus, on the contrary, would appear to present always the
development *ϰ* in the *ϰο-* as well as in the *όϰο-* type forms, with the
exception of the form *όποδαπός*.[11]) We do not, therefore, feel it
worth studying both authors in detail, as their forms add nothing
new to the question put forward.

It is equally pointless to make reference to Alexandrian authors,
such as Herodas, because the forms which appear in these authors,
with both (-)*ϰ-* and (-)*π-*, cannot be considered local traits, but lit-
erary uses of old local traits already introduced into literary lan-
guage. We have, in other words, an artificial use of the (-)*ϰ-* and
(-)*π-* forms and, in consequence, to analyze the problems of trans-
mission of these texts is not relevant; this documentation is of no
interest to our question.

The development to *ϰ* of the the old labiovelar *$*k^w$* has usually
been explained as a result of dissimilation of the labial appendix of
the labiovelar when it was preceded by the *o* vowel, although no
example can be used plainly in support of this proposal.[12]) A form
άρτο-ϰόπος, where a metathesis from an old form *$*άρτο-πόϰος$*
coming from a stem *$*pek^w$-* would have been taken place, has been
adduced as a parallel development. But, as Lejeune himself points
out[13]), this loss of the labial appendix has not taken place in the
-ωπος type forms, as it does in *άνθρωπος*, an old composed form
with *$*-ok^w$-*, which casts doubt over such an explanation. On the
other hand, the development of *$*k^w$* before *o* to labial is a fact
plainly documented and beyond all doubt. Consequently, any expla-
nation of *ϰ* as coming from *$*k^w$* must start from *όϰως, όϰόσος* type
forms and not from those of the *πώς, πόσος* type, and, obviously,
this *ϰ* cannot be a result of the phonetic development of the labio-
velar in a *$*-ok^w$-* context type. Although analogical levelling in this
group of forms to the (-)*π-* or (-)*ϰ-* types did take place, given that
there are forms beginning with *ό-* and also corresponding ones with-
out *ό-*, such as the couples *πόσος / όπόσος, πότε / όπότε, ποῖος /
όποῖος*, etc., this analogy does not, in our opinion, interfere with the
explanation of the origin of such an anomalous development of the

---

[11]) Cf. M. Untersteiner, *La lingua di Erodoto*, Bari 1949, p. 71–2; H. B. Rosén,
Eine Laut- und Formenlehre der herodoteischen Sprachform, Heidelberg 1962, p. 53;
R. Hiersche, *op. cit.*, p. 203.

[12]) Cf. M. Lejeune, *Phonétique historique du mycénien et du grec ancien*, Paris
1972, p. 45–6.

[13]) Cf. *op. cit.*, p. 45, note 12.

labiovelar *k^w to κ: if we start from the premise that the develop-
ment of *k^w before *o* is π, and accordingly, that that of *k^wo- is πο-,
and, on the other hand, that the κ development from *k^w appears
only in some forms of this *k^wo- stem, it is reasonable to think that
this development to gutural of the labiovelar is to be found through
an adequate explanation of the ὀπο- / ὀκο- type couples. Following
this line of argument, the distribution of Archilochus' evidence, πο-
against ὀκο- type forms, is significant.

A form type ὀκόσος has its origin in a construction *$yodk^w$o-. The
usual explanation of these forms is to consider that *yod-k^wo- devel-
oped to *yod-po- > ὀππο-.[14]) But this explanation is not the only
possible one, because it implies that *-*d*- was not assimilated to the
labiovelar and that the assimilation took place only after this labio-
velar developed to π, which is nonsense. In our opinion, there are
two facts to bear in mind:

  – As a general rule, the weakness of the consonant closing the syl-
lable and, consequently, its easy assimilation to the consonant which
stands at the beginning of the next syllable.[15]) For example, a
sequence *-*dph*- developed to -*pph*-, *ποδ-φι > Myc. *po-pi* [ποπ-
φι],[16]) or -πτ- to -ττ- in ἀρχιττολιαρχεντος, *IG IX* 2, 1233, 2.

  – The forms involved are compound ones and the compound ele-
ments can be analysed independently down to a very late period,
given that there are couples without ὀ-: ὀπόθεν / πόθεν, ὀπόθι /
πόθι, ὄποι / ποι, ὀποῖος / ποῖος, ὀπόσος / πόσος, ὀπότε / πότε, ὀπό-
τερος / πότερος, ὅπως / πως. Another important aspect of other
forms with compound elements which can be analyzed independ-
ently is the complete assimilation of the final consonant of the for-
mer element of the compound to the first consonant of the second
element, as in the homeric forms κάββαλε, κὰπ φάλαρα, καδδῦσαι,
κακκείοντες, etc.

On the basis of these considerations a sequence *-*dk^w*- had neces-
sarily to develop to *-*kk^w*-, the resultant form being *$yokk^w$o-. As
parallel facts can be adduced two glosses, ὄκκον and ἵκκος. The for-
mer is explained from a root *ok^w- with expressive gemination,
*okk^wo-.[17]) The latter has not the same, but a similar, phonetic con-
text: a form *$ekwos$ > *$ikwos$ with expressive gemination also,

[14]) Cf. Lejeune, *op. cit.*, p. 311.

[15]) Cf. Lejeune, *op. cit.*, 68–9 and 311 fl.

[16]) Cf. Lejeune, *op. cit.*, p. 69, note 57–4.

[17]) Cf. Lejeune, *op. cit.*, p. 83, note 72–1.

ikkʷos.[18]) So then, it is reasonable to propose a couple type *hoϰϰo-*
(< **yokkʷo-*) / *πo-* (< **kʷo-*), where *hoϰϰo-* is analyzed as *ho-ϰϰo-*
from *πo-* and from the existence of a pronominal form *ő*. In a conse-
quence, *hoϰϰo-* could be remodelled to *hoππo-* on the analogy of
πo-, just as the remodelling of the *πo-* forms in *ϰo-* ones can be
explained from the segmentation *ho-ϰϰo-*, because the *πo-* forms
were considered *hoϰϰo-* forms without *ho-*. For the same reason, a
form *όπo-* can be explained as a remodelling of *ho-ϰϰo-* on the
model of *πo-* forms, and a *όϰo-* form, from the consideration of *ho-*
as an independent element, a fact which causes the loss of the gemi-
nate *-ϰϰ-*.

This explanation enables us to understand Archilochus' distribu-
tion of forms, of the *πo-* (< **kʷo-*) / *όϰo-* (< **yokko-* < **yokkʷo-*
< **yodkʷo-*) type. This distribution would have been the old one.
The spread of the (-)*π-* solution, usual in Greek, or the (-)*ϰ-* one in
some Ionic authors, to all these types of forms must be considered a
result of the analogy of some forms on others. It is clear that the
Greek of Asia Minor, specially Ionian, preserved an archaic stage
longer, owing to the coexistence of both solutions, (-)*π-* and (-)*ϰ-*. At
a later stage a *πo-* / *όϰo-* system generated the appearance of inter-
changeable *πo-* and *ϰo-*, *όπo-* and *όϰo-* type forms, and their distri-
bution can perhaps be explained on the basis of levels or types of
language, owing to the documents where either one or another of
the solutions appear. The language of the inscriptions used the
standard solution, *πo-* and *όπo-*, in contrast to the literary language,
and perhaps the spoken language, with the maintenance of the old
solution (*ό*)*ϰo-* together with (*ό*)*πo-*. Nevertheless, this does not
prevent us from thinking that the form of one level or type of lan-
guage can be used in another. In this way, the appearance of the
(-)*ϰ-* solution in a very small number of inscriptions can be
explained.

On the other hand, the fact that (-)*π-* appears in the literary lan-
guage in contexts of clear homeric reference proves that the develop-
ment to *ϰ* of the labiovelars was considered a characteristic trait of
the spoken language which was entering the literary. But we con-
sider that this explanation allows us to take our conclusion a step
further. Herodotus 1, 142, 3–4 speaks of four χαϱαϰτῆϱες γλώσσης
in Ionian: those of Caria, of Lydia, of Chios and Erythrae, and

---

[18]) Cf. Lejeune, *op. cit.*, p. 83, note 72-1.

Samos. Despite this, the inscriptions, with the exception of those from Chios, show a homogeneous dialect. The differences in question would have to be of secondary importance, which would justify their non-appearance in the inscriptions, because to refute the veracity of Herodotus' assertion is completely unjustified. Such differences would have to be placed on the level of spoken language and it is possible that some of them did not have a so firmly-established geographic distribution as Herodotus states. Perhaps the trait in question could be one of these χαρακτῆρες γλώσσης.

A related question is the same development as in Ionian of the labiovelar *k^w in the Thessalian interrogative-indefinite pronoun κις, instead of the form τις, despite a different phonetic context from that in Ionian. The development in both dialects has been explained differently although there is always reference to one of the forms when another one is being discussed.

Evidence of κ coming from the development of the old labiovelar *k^w before i appears only in the forms of the interrogative-indefinite pronoun κις from Pelasgiotis and Perrhaebia, in contrast with the usual development to τ, also appearing in the form Τιμουννιδα[19]), IG IX 2,517, end of the 3rd century B.C., from Pelasgiotis, as well as evidence of this pronoun in Thessalian of Thessaliotis and Histiaeotis. Thessalian evidence of these forms is:[20])

> κις   IG IX 2, 1226, 4, 5th century B.C. (sg. masc. or fem. nominative)
> κις   IG IX 2, 515, 12, 2nd century B.C. (sg. masc. or fem. nominative)
> κις   IG IX 2, 517, 22, ca. 214 B.C. (sg. neuter nominative)
> κις   McD, 337, 31, 2nd century B.C. (sg. masc. or fem. nominative)
> κι   SEG XXVII, 202, 12, 220–210 B.C. (sg. neuter nominative)
> κινες   IG IX 2, 517, 41, ca. 214 B.C. (plural masc. nominative)
> διεκι   IG IX 2, 517, 11, ca. 214 B.C.
> διεκι   IG IX 2, 1229, 36, beginning of 2nd century B.C.

---

[19]) If it is accepted that τ- of τιμή and its derived forms, such as this proper name, have to be explained from *k^w-.

[20]) Cf. W. Blümel, *Die aiolischen Dialekte. Phonologie und Morphologie der inschriftlichen Texte aus generativer Sicht*, Göttingen 1982, p. 269 and 132 (only ποκκι).

διεκι   *McD* 330, 9/10, second half of 3rd century B.C.
ποκκι   *IG IX* 2, 517, 12, ca. 214 B.C.

Evidence from Thessaliotis and Histiaeotis is very scarce:

τις   *IG IX* 2, 257, 7, 5th century B.C. (sg. masc. nominative)
τις   *BCH* (1970), 161 ss, second half of 3th century B.C. (sg. masc. nominative)

Forms type ὅστις have not appeared to date in Thessalian, but κις is sometimes used with the same value as ὅστις in other dialects.[21] Such is the case in:

– *IG IX* 2, 517, 22: και ταν οναλαν, κις κε γινυειτει εν τανε, ...
– *IG IX* 2, 515, 12: [τ]αν οναλαν, κις κε γινυει[τ]ει, ...
– *McD* 337, 31: ταν οναλαν, κις κ[ε γ]ινυειτει, ...
– *SEG XXVII* 202, 12: φιλος εουν και ευεργετας τας τουν Λαρισαιουν πολιος εν παντι καιρου, κι κ'εχει χρεισιμον τα πολι, φανερος εστι πρασσουν ...
where, although the sentence introduced by κι can be seen as an indirect interrogative, it is also possible to consider κι as equivalent to ὅτι.[22]

As can be seen, both values of κις, indefinite and equivalent to ὅστις, can appear in the same inscription, as is the case in *IG IX* 2, 517. The Thessalian evidence of τις involves entirely indefinite pronouns and in the remaining Eolian dialects, Lesbian and Boeotian, the uses, and consequently the forms, of τις and ὅστις are different.[23]

Although there is as yet no explanation common to Ionic and Thessalian forms, whenever the forms of one of the dialects are mentioned, reference to those of the other is also made. This is because, although the phonetic contexts are different in both dialects, the development of the labiovelar is the same. Both dialects

---

[21] Cf. A. Thumb – A. Scherer, *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte II*, Heidelberg 1959, p. 68.
[22] On the occasional difficulty of distinguishing between the use of τις as a relative, equivalent to ὅστις, and an indirect interrogative cf. P. Monteil, *La phrase relative en grec ancien*, Paris 1963, p. 154 ss.; E. Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik II*, München 1950, p. 644, 10.
[23] Cf. evidence in W. Blümel, *op. cit.*, p. 268–70.

share the fact that κ cannot be explained as the regular development of *kʷ- before o and i. But let us assess the explanations of the Thessalian forms.

Solmsen[24]) and Schulze[25]) start from a compound *oukʷis (Hom. οὖτις) > *oὖκις, where the labiovelar has lost its labial appendix due to dissimilation with the preceding u. But, as Dunnet[26]) points out, there is no parallel of this type of form in Greek, whereas evidence to the contrary can, indeed, be found, as in Myc. o-u-qe > οὖτε. For our part, we think it odd that the development before a negative particle, a context not necessarily the most frequent, should have prevailed.

Dunnet[27]) also deals with the question and explains this odd κ-development as a consequence of the remodelling within the paradigm of *kʷis, owing to the developments of the labiovelar *kʷ-within the paradigm in different phonetic contexts. According to Dunnet, the forms *kʷies *kʷia caused the appearance of the byforms *kįes *kįa, in contrast to *kʷis *kʷisi, which obviously had no byforms. The existence of these byforms would have been more relevant when the labiovelars began their development to dentals (or bilabials), as opposed to a sequence *kį-, which followed a different path. Attic spread the development of the labiovelar to dental to all forms of the paradigm, but in Thessalian κ- would have been spread to all the other forms of the paradigm. In other words, κις is explained from the plural form *kįes, which caused the remodelling of *kʷis to κις; later, *kįes would have developed to *σες or *τες, but, on the analogy of κις, the plural form would have been replaced by κινες.

This is doubtless an ingenious explanation but, in our opinion, it cannot be admitted. If the proposal of the byforms *kįes *kįa is accepted, these *kį- byforms would not have taken place in singular, where the phonetic context was favourable to the maintenance of *kʷ-, but only in plural, and not in all its forms; so then, the -κ-forms would have been very scarce[28]) and, accordingly, it is difficult to imagine a general remodelling on the analogy of these. In any

---

[24]) *KZ* 13 (1892), 299 and *RhM* 58 (1903), 606.

[25]) *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen,* 1897, p. 907 fl.

[26]) "Thessalian κις", *Glotta* 48 (1970), 88–91.

[27]) *Op. cit.*

[28]) If Dunnet's explanation is admitted, *kį- forms would have appeared only in nominative plural masculine-feminine and neuter forms and in accusative plural ones.

case, a form *σες or *τες[29]) from *kjes would have to be remo-
delled to *kʷes on the analogy of the forms of singular and plural
with *kʷ-. Indeed, following Dunnet's explanation, we believe that,
for the same reason that *kjes would have remodelled *kʷis to κις, a
later form *σες[30]) from *kjes would have had to cause the remodell-
ing of κις to **σις. Given that this did not take place, Dunnet's
explanation cannot be accepted.

In short, we have here the forms κις, κι, κινες, διεκι, ποκκι, in
which κ from *kʷ can by no means be explained from the *kʷis
paradigm, because we would have had to find forms of the τις type.
But, following our previous argument, the idea of a compound form
of *kʷis as the origin of the odd development of the labiovelar is˙
attractive, the compound in question being ὅστις. The development
of *yoskʷis to ὅστις raised no problems,[31]) because there is no rea-
son to think that an interference of s of *yos- in the development of
*kʷ- of *kʷis took place, since there is no possibility of assimilation
of both phonemes in a sequence *-skʷ-; moreover, *kʷis is also an
independent form with its own development. But a different ques-
tion is raised by a sequence *yod-kʷid, where the development to
ὅττι begs an explanation based on a stage of assimilation. The tradi-
tional explanation *yod-kʷid > *ὅδ-τι > ὅττι[32]) cannot be accepted
because, as we have pointed out when dealing with the forms type
*yod-kʷo-, it implies that *-d- was assimilated only after *kʷ devel-
oped to τ. But, for the reason given before, a sequence *yod-kʷid
must have developed to *yokkʷid, so that, the paradigm of the pro-
noun would have been *yoskʷis *yokkʷid, which developed to *ὅστις
*ὅκκι, where ὅστις is analyzed as ὅσ-τις and, consequently, *ὅκκι as
*ὅ-κκι from the existence of the pronominal forms ὅς ὅ. From this
segmentation ὅσ-τις *ὅ-κκι would have been remodelled to ὅστις
ὅττι in Lesbian on the analogy of τις τι, and later, ὅστις replaced by
ὅττις on the analogy of ὅττι. But what happened in Thessalian of
Pelasgiotis and Perrhaebia? It should be borne in mind that the type
forms ὁποῖος were replaced by those of ποῖος in this dialect,[33]) the
forms without the relative ὁ-. A parallel fact is that, instead of ὅτι,

---

[29]) σ- or τ- here represent any stage of development of *kj-
[30]) Cf. the preceding note.
[31]) If we dispense with the question of the development to dental of the labio-
velar, which is not relevant here.
[32]) Cf. Lejeune, op. cit., p. 311.
[33]) Cf. Thumb-Scherer, op. cit., p. 68.

διότι, the form which appears is διεκι, whose analysis is, of course, διε-κι. So then, a paradigm *ὅστις *ὅκκι would have been remodelled to *τις *κι after the loss of ὅσ- ὅ-. It is reasonable to think, then, that τις was remodelled on the basis of κι. In the same way, a form ποκκι, equivalent to Attic ὅτι, can be explained from *kʷodk ʷid, with assimilation of -dkʷ- in -kkʷ- > -κκ- as a result of the remodelling of *ὅκκι (< *yodkʷid) once ὁ- disappeared in all these compound forms and the πο- type forms became equivalent to the ὁπο- ones. This explanation of ποκκι in relation to ὅτι, which appears in the *koiné* translation of this text of the same inscription, yields a better understanding of the form. Against the more usual explanation of ποκκι as ποτ (= πρός) + κι³⁴) it can be argued that the use of a ποτ (= πρός) form does not fit into a context where the *koiné* version takes ὅτι.

---

³⁴) Cf. C. D. Buck, *The Greek Dialects,* Chicago 1968, p. 102.

The Distribution of Aorist and Present Tense Stem Forms in Greek, Especially in the Imperative[1])

(Part I)

By C. M. J. SICKING, Leiden

Status quaestionis

In the literature devoted to Greek the value[2]) of forms of the aorist stem (hereafter: AS) as opposed to corresponding forms of the present stem (hereafter: PS)[3]) has given rise to various opinions, which may be reduced to three main types.[4])

– An 'action pure et simple' is opposed to an 'action en cours de développement:'[5]) in PS an action is presented by a speaker while paying attention to its character as a process in time ('durative'), in AS it is presented as an occurrence which is not recognized as a process but is as it were rolled up into one point ('punctual'). On this view the aspect value has to do with the 'internal temporal constituency'[6]) of the action referred to by the aspect form:[7]) 'perfectivity indicates the view of a situation as a single whole, without distinc-

---

[1]) Translation of the text by J. M. van Ophuijsen. It will be clear to those readers of the following who are acquainted with what I have published on this subject in Dutch in 1971 (*Hoofdstukken uit de Griekse 'syntaxis'* 61-91) that I no longer subscribe to most of the views defended there.

[2]) For the semantic terminology, borrowed from A. Reichling, see Dik 1968, 251-58.

[3]) *Ind. imperf.* as opposed to *ind. aor.; coni./optat./imp. praes.* as opposed to *coni./optat./imp. aor.; inf./part. praes.* as opposed to *inf./part. aor.* Szemerényi's statement that, in Greek, the aspectual opposition 'is confined to the past tenses' (Szemerényi 13) is, of course, a simplification. Whether or not he is right in positing that the Greek variant of aspect presupposes the existence of the tenses present-preterite, 'which then by bifurcation of the past created the basis for the emergence of aspect' (16) is a (diachronically orientated) topic I will not attempt to cover.

[4]) For doxography see Gonda (7-53); Hettrich (141 ff.); Porter (17-33); Szemerényi 1987. Also Ruijgh (1985, 3 ff. and 10 ff.), who deals extensively with the views of ancient grammarians.

[5]) Thus Meillet (39) and Chantraine (1963, 183). Cf. Goodwin (16).

[6]) The phrase in Comrie (3).

[7]) Champions of this view tend to regard PS as the marked term in a (privative) opposition, since the choice of PS is motivated by a consideration which is not operative in the choice of AS.

tion of the various separate phases that make up that situation; while the imperfective pays essential attention to the internal structure of the situation.'[8]) Alternatively,

– AS denotes a completed action, whereas the value 'non-completed' may be assigned to PS. Common terms in this connection are 'confective' as opposed to 'infective'[9]), and 'perfective' as opposed to 'imperfective'[10]). One declared proponent of an interpretation of this type is Ruijgh, who, in conscious association with ancient grammarians, emphatically regards aspect as a 'catégorie d'ordre temporel': '(…) il faut conclure (…) que les grammairiens grecs de l'Antiquité ont eu raison en disant que les formes en question expriment χρόνοι, c'est-à-dire des rapports temporels.'[11]) In his opinion AS expresses that an action is completed ('achevée,' 'finie'[12]) in relation to a 'moment donné,' while PS expresses that an action is in process ('en cours'[13]) at the 'moment donné.' This temporal point of reference may be established explicitly in the context, but it may just as well be given with the situation, or be presupposed in the mind of the speaker.

– In a third and final type of interpretation[14]) the relevant distinction is supposed to be whether an action is or is not presented in relation to, or in the perspective of, a different action: 'l'imparfait (…) établit toujours une référence à un autre énoncé verbal, de sorte que les deux se situent l'un à l'égard de l'autre.'[15])

---

[8]) Comrie (16).

[9]) Schwyzer-Debrunner (280).

[10]) E.g. Lyons (314).

[11]) Ruijgh (1985, 3).

[12]) Ruijgh 1971 and, with some modifications and elaborations, 1985 (9–10). Cf. Rijksbaron (1984, 1), who employs the terms 'completed' and 'not completed.' For some implications of 'completed' see Comrie (18 f.).

[13]) This phrase obviously establishes a kinship between the present view and that which finds the value of the aspect distinction in the contrast between durative and punctual. Cf. Hettrich (19), who in summarizing the views of Ruijgh observes that the aspect choice in main clauses really depends on whether 'der Vorgang an sich verlaufend *oder punktuell* ist' (my italics).

[14]) There is no need to deal separately with the various amalgams of the two preceding views, such as that found in Kühner-Gerth (I, 130): 'Die Formen des Präsensstammes schildern den Vorgang in seiner Entwicklung, ohne Rücksicht auf den Abschluß dieser Entwicklung.'

[15]) Quotation from Seiler (113), who is speaking of modern Greek; in the opinion of Bakker (reviewed by Strunk, Gnomon 42, 1970, 623–25) (21–27), this applies to ancient Greek as well.

Problems

The interpretations cited above have in common that they derive from attempts to define just one basic value for the contrast between AS and PS, by means of which it should become possible to understand, or at least account for, the variety of actual usage. It must be confessed that no consensus about this basic value has so far been reached, even though the hypothesis of a contrast between 'durative' and 'punctual' has fewer and fewer supporters among scholars outside the French-speaking world who concentrate on the Greek material. Moreover, each proposal has left a residue of instances which prove difficult or even impossible to explain – quite apart from the more fundamental questions it raises.[16])

With all the explanations offered the following type of instances in particular causes problems:

(1) Ἐλθόντων μὲν γὰρ Περσῶν καὶ τῶν σὺν αὐτοῖς παμπληθεῖ στόλῳ ὡς ἀφανιούντων τὰς Ἀθήνας, ὑποστῆναι αὐτοῖς Ἀθηναῖοι τολμήσαντες ἐνίκησαν αὐτούς. (...) Ἔπειτα, ὅτε Ξέρξης ὕστερον ἀγείρας τὴν ἀναρίθμητον στρατιὰν ἦλθεν ἐπὶ Ἑλλάδα, καὶ τότε ἐνίκων οἱ ἡμέτεροι πρόγονοι τοὺς τούτων προγόνους καὶ κατὰ γῆν καὶ κατὰ θάλατταν. (Xen. *An.* 3.2, 11–13), and

(2)   (...) καὶ τὸ κατθανεῖν
        δεινὸν νομίζω· τῷ δ' ἀναγκαίῳ τρόπῳ
        ὃς ἀντιτείνει σκαιὸν ἡγοῦμαι βροτόν.
        ἡμᾶς δ' ἐπειδὴ δεῖ θανεῖν, θνῄσκειν χρεὼν

---

[16]) It is difficult to explain in terms of the first view cited in what sense it is possible to recognize duration in the case of a single punctual action of the type 'arrive.' It is conceivable that a speaker may, for reasons of his own, abstract from the actual duration of a durative action of the type 'reign,' or of a terminative action of the type 'persuade;' it is harder to see how he could represent as 'durative' an action whose characteristics in reality exclude any internal articulation into phases or duration.

Those who prefer the contrast between completed and non-completed are faced with a problem when PS has been chosen for referring to an action which the context proves to be antecedent. Hettrich (63) assumes that there are verbal lexemes which may denote 'nicht nur eine zeitlich eng begrenzte Handlung (...), sondern auch deren Fortwirkung.' Thus whenever the actual relation in time between two actions will not fit in with the value attributed to the aspect contrast, the meaning ascribed to the lexeme involved is adapted so as to yield the desired simultaneousness, with no explanation forthcoming of why speakers realize now the one and now the other option. And even so Hettrich is forced to reckon with a 'vorzeitige Verwendung des PSt.,' as in Hdt. 9. 19. 2 (ὥς σφι ἐκαλλιέρεε, MSS. ἐκαλλιρέετο).

μὴ πυρὶ καταξανθέντας, ἐχθροῖσιν γέλων
διδόντας, οὐμοὶ τοῦ θανεῖν μεῖζον κακόν.[17]) (Eur. *Her.* 281–6).

In the French literature especially it is frequently acknowledged
that it may be difficult or impossible to trace the motives determin-
ing the speaker's choice by means of the contrast between durative
and punctual.[18]) But even with the interpretation of Ruijgh, who
finds the 'raison d'être' for the contrast between AS and PS in the
opportunity it offers for noting temporal relations, instances like (1)
above force one to assume that the speaker takes a different view of
the relation between the action and some 'moment donné' for each
of the two actions involved, and that he does so for reasons known
to himself alone.[19])

Method

The argument which follows is guided by the assumption that,
from the viewpoint of scientific method, identifying the motives
which have led speakers to adopt one of the two contrasting forms
AS and PS in any instance, should he prior to postulating a semantic
concept supposed to underlie this 'distribution.'[20])

---

[17]) Quoted here for the two underlined verb forms. For an explanation of the
act of dying being referred to three times in AS and just once in PS see below 28.
For the explanation proposed by Ruijgh (θνῄσκειν 'mourir immédiatement') see
Ruijgh 1985, 43. Champions of the contrast between durative and punctual will
be inclined to explain the use of PS as though the speaker is paying attention to
the way in which death will occur. If this were true, we might expect PS instead
of καταξανθέντας to specify the manner of dying.

[18]) See e.g. Humbert 144: 'il y a des cas dans lesquels on ne peut rendre
compte de l'emploi fait des deux temps à la fois, à moins que le changement de
thème ne soit dû au désir d'éviter une répétition, de donner de la variété à
l'expression', and 177 (referring to Ar. *Ran.* 1379–81, on which see Part II):
'Cette liberté est si grande que, dans un certain nombre d'exemples, la différence
entre le présent et l'aoriste finit par devenir imperceptible.' Cf. Chantraine 1966,
40 ff.

[19]) Schwyzer–Debrunner (278) discuss some instances of the type exemplified
by (1) above in their treatment of the way in which iterative actions are
expressed. The imperfect according to them conveys 'daß die vorhergehende
aoristische Handlung von der gleichen oder einer anderen Person wiederholt
wird.' However, iterativity as such as not decisive in the choice between AS and
PS: see p. 35 below.

[20]) As I shall use the term for the present purpose.

Most attempts to define a central value for this 'aspect'[21]) contrast have so far been made on the basis of *a priori* convictions with regard to the field or sphere in which such a value should be found,[22]) and consequently have a 'monolithic' character. All the same the inadequacy of the various existing proposals in explanatory power makes one suspect that the distribution of the two contrasting forms in Greek was affected by more than one type of criterium.[23])

Furthermore the 'aspect' contrast cannot be said to have been explained until it becomes possible to specify under which conditions, and for what reason, the use of one form or the other was accepted as correct by a Greek speaker.

All explanations offered so far are deficient in that they indicate tendencies, but in the final resort cannot avoid the assumption that a speaker was free to deviate from these tendencies for reasons which cannot be made explicit. It is true that the distribution actually found suggests that the choice of the speaker is not predictable, in the sense that it is not determined by compelling 'rules' which, in any single context, allow only one of the two available forms to be correct; but even if this is accepted we are still obliged to indicate which motives, as distinct from sheer arbitrariness, have affected any choice. It will not do to assume that the speaker in contexts which are otherwise similar considers the same action now as 'durative' and now as 'punctual' if it cannot be specified which communicative aims are served by his choice: 'An aspect theory that emphasizes this freedom could, in the end, force us to see the verb-forms concerned as being in free variation, which would make it pointless to set up any semantic difference between these forms.'[24])

A third guiding principle is that the final interpretation of an aspect form depends, in addition to the value of the aspect marker as such, on at least two other factors: 1) the *actio*[25]) of the action mentioned by the verb of or verb phrase, and 2) the context and/or situation in which the verb form appears. Obviously the relevant context may extend far beyond the sentence which contains the aspect form – a possibility too little acknowledged by those who have looked for

---

[21]) The notion of aspect is here applied to the semantic difference that is inherent in the morphological difference between *corresponding* (compare note 3 above) verb forms of the present and the aorist stem, without any definition being as yet given of the content of this semantic difference. Compare Stork 24 ff.

[22]) Compare the approach of Comrie (6), who considers the contrast between perfective and imperfective to be a 'general semantic opposition' which in different languages may be realized in different (grammatical or lexical) ways.

[23]) Compare Stork 1982.

[24]) Rijksbaron 1979, 225.

[25]) For an explanation of my use of this term see Appendix below.

the value of the aspect contrast in the sphere of the reference of expressions.[26])

Objective

Bearing these basic assumptions in mind the argument which follows has two aims:
- to define the considerations which guided the Greek speaker in his choice between AS and PS in every single instance. These considerations regard, in this order, (a) the factual *information* which is communicated, (b) the *structure* of the communication, and (c) the *pragmatic function* of the verbal constituent in question (part I); and
- to show how the three criteria thus found are operative in the distribution of AS and PS in the *imperative* (part II). This choice is motivated by the observation that explaining the distribution of AS and PS has so far proved especially arduous as far as the imperative is concerned.[27]) I suggest this is because in studies of the Greek material the importance of the criterion under (c) has not been recognized.

It should be made clear that I do not pretend that the considerations relevant to the distribution of AS and PS are hereby exhausted. The purport of the argument is merely to show that, and how, the considerations mentioned are relevant to explaining this distribution; it cannot be excluded *a priori*, though it seems unlikely, that other criteria may have played a part in the choice of an aspect form. More importantly, it has not been attempted to trace all the distinctions

---

[26]) It should be pointed out that it makes sense to posit semantic distinctions between AS and PS chiefly in those cases where the material proves that the author did in fact have two options. Thus it is useless to inquire for what reason Herodotus at some point has chosen PS for the medio-passive of πείθω, simply because in his work no forms of the aorist ἐπιθόμην corresponding to present πείθομαι are attested beyond doubt. (In 1.124,2, 1.126,5, and 9.3,1, MS. R alone offers AS as a variant for PS, the form adopted by Hude; in 6.80 πιθομένων is a conjecture by Cobet for the πυθομένων and πειθομένων of the MSS.; in 6.140,2 ἐπίθοντο is a varia lectio (ἐπύθοντο SV, ἐπείθοντο eDP), and finally, πίθεσθαι in 8.77,1 is in a hexameter quoted by Herodotus and is again a variant (πείθεσθαι B, τίθεσθαι C, πίεσθαι Duentzer). A passive aorist of πείθω is found only twice: 2.121 β and 2.121 δ 4). The presence or absence of such an option may itself be a legitimate and worthwile subject for inquiry. This principle of method is frequently disregarded. A conspicuous exception is Stork 19.

[27]) On the imperative see, in addition to the standard works of reference, Louw 1959, Bakker 1966, and Ruijgh 1985; also McKay 1986.

and functions which may be encoded, so to speak, by means of the distribution based on these criteria.[28])

Aspect choice and the informational content of the utterance

In

(3) τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ἔπειθον αὐτοὺς ἀφεῖναι, διδάσκοντες ὡς οὐκ ἐπιεικὲς εἴη τῶν πολιτῶν τινας διὰ τὰς ἔχθρας ἀναγράφεσθαι, ἀπο-ροῦντες δὲ μεταπεῖσαι αὐτοὺς (...) ἔκριναν (...) (Lys. 9,7) as well as in

(4) (...) ἐκαινόμην ξίφει· ἀλλ᾽ ἐξέκλεψεν (...) Ἄρτεμις (Eur. IT 27–8) a choice of AS instead of PS would alter the factual informa-tion which is communicated: AS in (3) would have signified that the aim of the terminative action of persuading was in fact realized, in (4) that the punctual action of being killed was actually accom-plished.[29]) In each case the context makes it clear that this is not the speaker's intention. In interpreting these sentences the hearer is guided by the combination of the choice of PS with data supplied by the context (and/or situation). The 'conative' interpretation of the

---

[28]) Another question which might repay investigation is the possibility that a difference in aspect form is accompanied by a difference in lexical meaning, as illustrated by certain uses of λέγειν and εἰπεῖν (cf. (40) below), or by a restric-tion to the effect that a verb which in PS has both literal and metaphorical uses, such as προφέρειν, is found with only one of these classes of applications in AS.

[29]) This is the proper context for explaining Dem.21,34: χρὴ δ᾽, ὅταν μὲν τιθῆσθε τοὺς νόμους, ὁποῖοί τινές εἰσι σκοπεῖν, ἐπειδὰν δὲ θῆσθε, φυλάττειν καὶ χρῆσθαι: the situation in which the audience is going to establish laws, is bal-anced by that in which they have done so. In the opinion of Ruijgh (1985,7) 'il est évident que le TPr τιθῆσθε exprime la simultanéité par rapport à σκοπεῖν, le TAo θῆσθε l'antériorité par rapport à φυλάττειν καὶ χρῆσθαι'; hence 'la substitu-tion de θῆσθε à τιθῆσθε et inversement produirait un contresens.' It is no doubt true that substitution of AS for PS or vice versa is here impossible, but the reason for this is not that such a substitution would affect the relation in time between the actions, but that AS would lead to an interpretation in which the (punctual) action involved is not on the verge of taking place but has taken place. It may be noted that the actions of establishing and of considering cannot strictly be said to be simultaneous by Ruijgh's own definition (1985, 15: 'la simultanéité implique donc qu'il n'y a pas d'intervalle entre A et B, c'est-à-dire que A et B ont en commun au moins un seul moment'); actually the considering is prior to the establishing.

one and the 'infective' interpretation of the other are not given with the aspect form as such and do not therefore belong to the value of that form in the strict sense, as may be gathered from

(5) ταὐτὸν δὴ καὶ τὸν ποιητικὸν ὁ ὀρθὸς νομοθέτης ἐν τοῖς καλοῖς ῥήμασι καὶ ἐπαινετοῖς <u>πείσει</u> τε, καὶ ἀναγκάσει μὴ <u>πείθων</u> (Pl. *Leg.* 660 A 3–5),[30])

(6) (…) ἐξέτεισε τὴν δίκην, καθ' ὅ τι <u>ἔπειθε</u> (Lys. 23. 14),[31])

and

(7) ὀλίγοι δέ τινες <u>ἔθνῃσκον</u> (Hipp. *Epid.* 1. 34): in (5) a 'conative' interpretation is required for a future tense, in (6) and in (7) PS is used to refer to a terminative action which has reached its goal and to a punctual one which has actually been accomplished respectively.[32])

In both cases, then, we have to do with an *interpretation* which is reached with the help of data derived from the context and is not, therefore, inherent in any value of PS as such. The character of this interpretation is bound up with the *actio* of the actions in question. With terminative actions the indicative of AS implies that the action has reached its goal, and the choice of PS may, but does not have to, point the way to an interpretation in which this is not so. With punctual actions the aorist indicative invariably characterizes an action as having actually been accomplished, while PS may, but does not have to, refer to an action which was on the verge of taking place, or which the agent intended to perform, but which has not actually been accomplished.

---

[30]) πείσει in the quotation is parallel to πειρῶνται (…) προσφέρειν in 660 A 1. Cf. Ar. *Arch.* 203 [cf. 177]: ἐγὼ δὲ φευξοῦμαί γε τοὺς Ἀχαρνέας 'I shall try to escape the Acharnians.'

[31]) Cf. Hdt. 2. 150, 2: οἱ δὲ ἔφρασάν μοι ἵνα ἐξεφορήθη καὶ εὐπετέως ἔπειθον.

[32]) Although the conative and infective interpretations have occasionally been referred to the aspect form as such (e. g. by Gildersleeve (93): 'the imperfect is used of attempted and interrupted, of intended and expected actions'), the prevailing view is that these are mere interpretations which are due either to the character of the lexeme involved (thus Kühner-Gerth I, 140: 'wenn man in solchen Fällen von einem *Präsens* und *Imperfectum de conatu* spricht, so ist zu beachten, daß diese Sondererscheinung nicht auf einer besonderen Gebrauchs-weise der beiden Tempora beruht, sondern auf der unbestimmten Bedeutung der so verwandten Verben') or to the context (thus Schwyzer–Debrunner 259): 'Die Ansetzung des Gebrauches *de conatu* beruht lediglich auf der beim Übersetzen in andere Sprachen notwendigen oder erwünschten Verdeutlichung, während im Griechischen die richtige Auffassung gewöhnlich dem Zusammenhang über-lassen wird').

The implications for the distribution of AS and PS are that in contexts of types (3) and (4), truth conditions remaining the same, AS is excluded; in such cases as (6) and (7), on the other hand, AS may be chosen rather than PS without any consequences for the reality evoked by the speaker.

Aspect choice and structure of the narrative or other communication

It has been argued by Rijksbaron[33]) that in narrative contexts the imperfect tense, owing to the value of 'not completed' which he ascribes to it, creates 'a temporal framework (...) by establishing temporal cohesion between the various events that make up a given narrative unit,'[34]) and may thereby be of some importance to the way in which a story is told: 'the imperfect creates a certain expectation on the part of the reader/hearer: what else happened?.' His example for this use of the imperfect is

(8) καὶ ὅτε δὴ ἦν δεκαέτης ὁ παῖς, πρῆγμα ἐς αὐτὸν τοιόνδε γενό-μενον ἐξέφηνέ μιν. *ἔπαιζε* ἐν τῇ κώμῃ (...) μετ᾽ ἄλλων ἡλίκων ἐν ὁδῷ. καὶ οἱ παῖδες *παίζοντες* εἵλοντο ἑωυτῶν βασιλέα εἶναι τοῦτον δὴ τὸν τοῦ βουκόλου ἐπίκλησιν παῖδα. ὁ δὲ αὐτῶν *διέταξε* τοὺς μὲν οἰκίας οἰκοδομέειν (...) (Hdt. 1.114,1-2): 'At the beginning *ἐξέφηνε* sums up the event, which is, in the following, related in detail. The story proper begins with *ἔπαιζε.* In the course of the game (note also *παί-ζοντες*) the children choose little 'Cyrus' to be their king. Then 'Cyrus' gives his 'subjects' a number of tasks. Both of these actions, one (*εἵλοντο*) anterior to the other (*διέταξε*), are enclosed within the framework given by *ἔπαιζε.* In other words: the '*παίζειν*' continues when the '*ἑλέσθαι*' and '*διατάξαι*' take place.'[35])

On this view the 'discourse function' of PS is a corollary or a side-effect of the central value assigned by the author to the aspect contrast between PS and AS, which is temporal: its *value*[36]) of 'not completed' is supposed to make the imperfect tense apt, not just for placing a sequence of actions temporally, against the background of

---

[33]) 1984, 12-13, and 1988, 250 ff.
[34]) Rijksbaron 1988, 250.
[35]) Rijksbaron 1984, 13.
[36]) It is remarkable that the wording of Rijksbaron's explanation includes some elements which might seem to be more at home in the context of the contrast between durative and punctual, e.g. 'as a mere event' and 'has simply occurred.' Cf. note 12 above.

one continuing action, but at the same time for making connections within a story explicit: 'on the level of the small-scale narrative units it serves as the time anchor for other states of affairs; on the level of large-scale narrative units it establishes cohesion between different (...) parts of a given narrative (...)'.[37])

While it is true that in cases of this type we often have a continuing, therefore by definition durative action, expressed in PS, providing a background[38]) and/or framework for occurrences happening in the course of it or in the same connection, there are nevertheless numerous instances in which the relationship between the actions referred to in PS and in AS respectively cannot be characterized in this way, e.g.

(9) Ἑσπέρα γὰρ ἦν, ἧκε δ᾽ ἀγγέλλων τις ὡς τοὺς πρυτάνεις ὡς Ἐλάτεια κατείληπται. καὶ μετὰ ταῦθ᾽ οἱ μὲν εὐθὺς ἐξαναστάντες μεταξὺ δειπνοῦντες τούς τ᾽ ἐκ τῶν σκηνῶν τῶν κατὰ τὴν ἀγορὰν ἐξεῖργον καὶ τὰ γέρρ᾽ ἐνεπίμπρασαν, οἱ δὲ τοὺς στρατηγοὺς μετεπέμποντο καὶ τὸν σαλπικτὴν ἐκάλουν καὶ θορύβου πλήρης ἦν ἡ πόλις. τῇ δ᾽ ὑστεραίᾳ (...) οἱ μὲν πρυτάνεις τὴν βουλὴν ἐκάλουν εἰς τὸ βουλευτήριον, ὑμεῖς δ᾽ εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἐπορεύεσθε, καὶ πρὶν ἐκείνην χρηματίσαι καὶ προβουλεῦσαι πᾶς ὁ δῆμος ἄνω καθῆτο. καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ὡς ἦλθεν ἡ βουλὴ (...) ἠρώτα μὲν ὁ κῆρυξ 'τίς ἀγορεύειν βούλεται;' παρῄει δ᾽ οὐδείς. πολλάκις δὲ τοῦ κήρυκος ἐρωτῶντος οὐδὲν μᾶλλον ἀνίστατ᾽ οὐδείς, ἁπάντων μὲν τῶν στρατηγῶν παρόντων, ἁπάντων δὲ τῶν ῥητόρων, καλούσης δὲ τῆς πατρίδος τὸν ἐροῦνθ᾽ ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας (...). ἐφάνην τοίνυν οὗτος ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐγὼ καὶ παρελθὼν εἶπον εἰς ὑμᾶς (...) (Dem. 18.169–72),

and

(10) ἐννῆμαρ μὲν ὁμῶς πλέομεν νύκτας τε καὶ ἦμαρ.
τῇ δεκάτῃ δ᾽ ἤδη ἀνεφαίνετο πατρὶς ἄρουρα,
καὶ δὴ πυρπολέοντας ἐλεύσσομεν ἐγγὺς ἐόντας
ἔνθ᾽ ἐμὲ μὲν γλυκὺς ὕπνος ἐπήλυθε κεκμηῶτα (κ 28 ff.),

in which sequences of actions expressed by PS (some of them differing in actio) are concluded by an action referred to in AS. In such cases there can be no question of PS actions literally continuing at the same time that the AS action occurs. In

(11) ἐπειδὴ δέ μοι παιδίον γίγνεται, ἐπίστευον ἤδη καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐμαυτοῦ ἐκείνῃ παρέδωκα (Lys. 1.6) there is a connection between

---

[37]) Rijksbaron 1988, 254.
[38]) See e.g. Hopper Aspect and Foregrounding, 213 ff.

the two actions mentioned in coordinated clauses: παρέδωκα pre-
supposes ἐπίστευον, which should be given an ingressive interpreta-
tion: 'after my child was born I gained faith in her and so entrusted
to her all that was mine.'

Aspect and actio

If we try to define the common denominator of the uses of AS
and PS exemplified above, the possibility suggests itself that the
speaker chooses PS if he wishes to convey that the communication
contained in the verb form involved does not pretend to be complete
in itself, in the sense that it requires further questions to be asked in
connection with it. The nature of these questions is related to the
actio of the actions concerned:
    – if PS has been used to refer to a *punctual* action the two ques-
tions are: 1) 'was the action in fact accomplished?' (thus ἐκαινόμην
in (4) above), and – if the context proves this to be the case – again 2)
'what happened next?' (thus ἀνεφαίνετο in (10) above);
    – if PS has been used in referring to a *terminative* action, then
there are two possible questions: 1) 'did the action reach its end
(both in the sense of aim and of termination)?' (thus e.g. ἔπειθον in
example (3) above), and – on condition that the context proves the
answer to 1) to be affirmative – 2) 'what happened next?' (thus ἐνε-
πίμπρασαν in (9) above);
    – With *durative* actions the choice of PS is motivated, other
things being the same, by the sequel supplying an answer to ques-
tions of the second type: 'what happened in the course of this dura-
tive action?' (e.g. ἔπαιζε in (8) above), 'which action terminated and
succeeded to this durative action?' (e.g. διαιτᾶτο, ἐπόθεον, and
ἐπένθεον in (21) below) or 'what happened next?,' – the latter type
more rarely, owing to the peculiar character of durative actions.[39]) In
many, but by no means in all cases the result will be that the (dura-

---

[39]) This also applies to durative actions which are accompanied by an adjunct
defining their duration in the context. The statement 'he was king for *n* years' in
AS is complete and self-contained; in PS it will normally suggest the question
'and what happened during (or after) this period?' The presence or absence of
the temporal adjunct does not by itself, then, affect the aspect choice (Cf. Strunk
201, Hettrich 28, and Gildersleeve 90: 'With definite numbers, the aorist is
employed, but when there is a notion of interruption or of continuance in
another stage the imperfect is used.').

tive) action expressed in PS provides the background against which, or the framework within which, actions which are subsequently mentioned should be viewed.[40])

The role of the meaning of the lexeme in determining the content of the further questions prompted by the choice of PS is clearly seen in

(12) οἱ μὲν Ἕλληνες πάντες τὸν Ὅμηρον ἐκέλευον στεφανοῦν, ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς Πανήδης ἐκέλευσεν ἕκαστον τὸ κάλλιστον ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων ποιημάτων εἰπεῖν. (...) θαυμάσαντες δὲ καὶ ἐν τούτῳ τὸν Ὅμηρον οἱ Ἕλληνες (...) ἐκέλευον διδόναι τὴν νίκην. ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς τὸν Ἡσίοδον ἐστεφάνωσεν εἰπὼν (...) (Cert. Hom. et Hes. 176-9, 205-7) and in

(13) (...) ἐδεόμην αὐτοῦ ἐφόδιά μοι δοῦναι, ὁ δ᾽ ἀγαπήσειν με ἔφασκεν, εἰ τὸ σῶμα σώσω (Lys. 12,11): here again PS prompts the question 'what next?,' which in view of the meaning of the verbs involved here[41]) comes down to the question whether the person to whom the request was addressed did in fact comply with it; a question which in the sequel of (12) is answered in AS. However, from

(14) ὁ δὲ αὐτὸν ἐκέλευσεν (...) τὰς ναῦς παραδοῦναι (...) οὐ φαμένου δὲ τοῦ Λυσάνδρου πολυπραγμονεῖν ἄλλου ἄρχοντος (...) (Xen. Hell. 6.2,3) and

(15) Θηβαίους δὲ χρήματα ᾔτησαν καὶ Φλειασίους, Ἠλείους δὲ ναῦς τε κενὰς καὶ χρήματα (Thuc. 1,26,2) it appears that the question whether a request is or is not met does not by itself decide the aspect choice, since AS is applied to a request that is not met in (14), but to one that is in (15).[42])

Ingressiveness

Ingressive interpretation is an option only with durative actions. In the great majority of cases in which it applies we find AS, yet the ingressive interpretation does not follow from the value of AS as such, as may be seen in

(16) αἰσθόμενος τὸ πραχθὲν ὑπετοπούμην εὐθέως ἐπὶ μηδένι ὑγιεῖ κατειλέχθαι (Lys. 9,4),[43]) where the speaker chooses PS because he wishes to prompt a question as to the sequel, but otherwise envisages the beginning of the action just as much as in, e.g.,

---

[40]) The cases referred to by Rijksbaron (cf.p. 22 above) therefore form part of the set of cases in which PS is used to denote durative actions.

[41]) For literature on verbs of this type see Schwyzer-Debrunner 277. A description of them as verbs 'die ihr Ziel und ihre Vollendung im Tun eines Andern haben' is due to Blass (RM 44,406 ff.).

[42]) An amusing instance is Lys. 13,8: ἀπιέναι ἐκέλευσεν (ἐκέλευεν C) ἐς κόρακας, where one of the two transmitted readings has AS used for an order which it is literally impossible to execute.

[43]) Cf. (11) above, where ἤδη performs the function of εὐθέως in (16). Cf. in English: 'At four o'clock I *all at once* had a headache.'

(17) καὶ τότε δὴ θάρσησε καὶ ηὔδα μάντις ἀμύμων (Α 92).

Even in the case of 'ingressive interpretation' of durative[44])
actions, then, the choice between AS and PS is to be explained by
considerations regarding the structure of the narrative: in narrative
texts a statement to the effect that an action subsisted *from* a given
moment onwards ('at that time he fell ill') is more likely than not to
be a self-contained statement, whereas the statement that an action
subsisted *at* a given moment ('he was ill at the time') is more likely to
be used in creating a framework or supplying background informa-
tion. Compare

(18) καὶ ὁ ἐνιαυτὸς ἔληγεν ἐν ᾧ μεσοῦντι Διονύσιος (...) ἐτυ-
ράννησε, μάχῃ μὲν πρότερον ἡττηθέντων ὑπὸ Συρακοσίων Καρχηδο-
νίων, σπάνει δὲ σίτου ἑλόντων Ἀκράγαντα, ἐκλιπόντων τῶν Σικε-
λιωτῶν τὴν πόλιν (Xen. *Hell.* 2.2,24) with

(19) Ὀρέσται δὲ χίλιοι, ὧν (at the time) ἐβασίλευεν Ἀντίοχος,
μετὰ Παραυαίων ξυνεστρατεύοντο (Thuc. 2.80,6): in (18) Διονύσιος
ἐτυράννησε is a self-contained statement, integral to Xenophon's
account of that year; in (19) ὧν ἐβασίλευεν Ἀντίοχος is subsidiary
information.

This is sufficient to account for the prevalence of AS in contexts
to which an ingressive interpretation applies, which has led to an
association of the choice of AS with 'ingressiveness.'[45])

On the other hand, if an indication of duration is contained in the
context, the speaker is free to realize his preferred narrative struc-
ture. Cases in point are

(20) ὡς δέ οἱ παντελέως εἶχε τὸ οἴκημα, ἐκ μὲν τῶν Θρηίκων ἠφα-
νίσθη, καταβὰς δὲ κάτω ἐς τὸ κατάγαιον οἴκημα διαιτᾶτο ἐπ' ἔτεα
τρία. οἱ δέ μιν ἐπόθεόν τε καὶ ἐπένθεον ὡς τεθνεῶτα· τετάρτῳ δὲ ἔτεϊ
ἐφάνη τοῖσι Θρῇξι (Hdt. 4.95,4-5).

(21) ἐπολέμησε Μιλησίοισι, παραδεξάμενος τὸν πόλεμον παρὰ
τοῦ πατρός. ἐπελαύνων γὰρ ἐπολιόρκεε τὴν Μίλητον τρόπῳ τοιῷδε·
(...) ταῦτα ποιέων ἐπολέμεε ἔτεα ἔνδεκα, ἐν τοῖσι τρώματα μεγάλα
διφάσια Μιλησίων ἐγένετο (...) (Hdt. 1.17,1-18,1), and

---

[44]) That there can be no question of an ingressive interpretation with any
other than durative actions is not, to my knowledge, a matter for controversy.

[45]) See Arist. *EN* 1173 a 34, where ἡσθῆναι is glossed as μεταβάλλειν εἰς τὴν
ἡδονήν, and ἥδεσθαι as ἐνεργεῖν κατ' αὐτήν. An attempt at a diachronic explana-
tion of ingressive aorists such as θάρσησε is offered by Ruijgh (1985, 56, note
106); synchronically he considers the ingressive use of AS as an 'emploi second-
aire,' to be explained as though 'l'achèvement qu'il exprime n'est pas celui de
l'état mais celui de sa phase préparatoire' (p 57), and as a 'metaphoric' use.

(22) ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ Λυκίην ἷξε Ξάνθον τε ῥέοντα,
    προφρονέως μιν τῖεν ἄναξ Λυκίης εὐρείης.
    ἐννῆμαρ ξείνισσε καὶ ἐννέα βοῦς ἱέρευσεν.
    ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ δεκάτη ἐφάνη ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἡώς (...) (Z
    172-5).

In (20) the question what came next has been left unanswered by διαιτᾶτο, ἐπόθεον, and ἐπένθεον, and is answered by the clause last quoted. In (21) ἐπολέμεε takes up an earlier ἐπολέμησε, and lacks focus-function.[46] In (22) the two underlined verbs in verse 174 represent two autonomous ingredients of the story, followed by a new episode beginning in 175. Interchanging AS with PS in (20)–(22) would make no difference to the reality evoked.[47]

Aspect choice and pragmatic function

In addition to the classes recognized so far it is possible to distinguish a third main class of uses, which may be exemplified by the following:[48]

(23) Μαρδόνιος δὲ (...) μετὰ ταῦτα ἔπεμψε ἄγγελον ἐς Ἀθήνας Ἀλέξανδρον (...) ἅμα μὲν ὅτι οἱ προσκηδέες οἱ Πέρσαι ἦσαν (...), ἅμα δὲ ὁ Μαρδόνιος πυθόμενος ὅτι πρόξεινός τε εἴη καὶ εὐεργέτης ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος ἔπεμπε (Hdt. 8. 136, 1);

(24) ὣς ἄρα φωνήσας δῶκε ξίφος ἀργυρόηλον (...)
    Αἴας δὲ ζωστῆρα δίδου φοίνικι φαεινόν. (H 303 ff.);[49]

(25) Τί οὖν, ὅσα τε ὁμοίως καὶ ὅσα διαφόρως περὶ μαντικῆς λέγετον τὼ ποιητὰ τούτω, πότερον σὺ κάλλιον ἂν ἐξηγήσαιο ἢ τῶν μάντεών τις τῶν ἀγαθῶν;

---

[46] For the implications this has for the aspect choice see p. 28 below.

[47] The temporal relation in (20) between διαιτᾶτο, ἐπόθεον, and ἐπένθεον on the one hand, and ἐφάνη on the other hand, is similar to that between ξείνισσε, ἱέρευσεν, and ἐφάνη in (22) and cannot therefore provide the motive for the distribution of PS and AS over these passages.

[48] Cf. also (1) and (2) above.

[49] Kühner–Gerth (I, 144) reckon with metrical grounds for the alternation of δῶκε with δίδου. It is true that the distribution of the two over the hexameter in the whole of Homer is strictly complementary. However, this fact by itself is not sufficient to explain cases like (24), since the poet cannot, to meet the demands of the verse form, adopt any solutions which run counter to the rules of grammar or, specifically, to the value of the verb forms employed. So any relevance which the metrical considerations just referred to may have is at the level of vocabulary, where there are synonymous expressions to choose between.

– *Τῶν μάντεων.*

– *Εἰ δὲ σὺ ἦσθα μάντις, οὐκ, εἴπερ περὶ τῶν ὁμοίως λεγομένων οἷος τ' ἦσθα ἐξηγήσασθαι, καὶ περὶ τῶν διαφόρως λεγομένων ἠπίστω ἂν ἐξηγεῖσθαι;* (Pl. *Ion* 531 B);

(26) *ἀλλ' εἴ τι καὶ σύ, ὦ παῖ Σωφρονίσκου, ἔχεις τῷδε τῷ σαυτοῦ δημότῃ ἀγαθὸν* συμβουλεῦσαι, *χρὴ* συμβουλεύειν. *δίκαιος δ' εἶ·*[50]) (Pl. *Lach.* 180 D); and

(27)   (…) *καὶ τὸ κατθανεῖν*
    δεινὸν νομίζω· τῷ δ' ἀναγκαίῳ τρόπῳ
    ὃς ἀντιτείνει σκαιὸν ἡγοῦμαι βροτόν.
    ἡμᾶς δ' ἐπειδὴ δεῖ θανεῖν, θνῄσκειν *χρεὼν*
    μὴ πυρὶ καταξανθέντας, ἐχθροῖσιν γέλων
    διδόντας, οὑμοὶ τοῦ θανεῖν μεῖζον κακόν[51]) (Eur. *Her.*
    284–5).

What these examples have in common is that in each of them the same speaker in one context uses first AS and then PS. This phenomenon has proved hard to explain in terms of the contrasts between durative and punctual and between infective and confective: anyone who would place the criterion deciding aspect choice in the temporal structure of the action or in the speaker's view of it, or in the relation between the action and some moment given in the context or situation, has to face the question why such criteria work out differently for the first and for the second of the aspect forms in each of these examples.

The most natural assumption is that the aspect choice is not in such cases motivated by considerations of reference: replacing AS by PS or vice versa, if it is idiomatically possible at all, will not demonstrably affect either the factual information communicated by the statement or the temporal relation between the actions, or between any action and some 'moment donné.' One observation may put us on the trace of the consideration which *is* operative: in all the examples quoted above it is possible – and sometimes it is actually prefer-

---

[50]) Dr. P. Stork informs me that in Herodotus the ratio between PS and AS for infinitives following *οἷός τε εἰμι* and – *γίνομαι* is 27 to 28; for infinitives after *ἐπίσταμαι* it is 12 to 1, after *ἔχω* 20 to 72, and after *χρῆ* 29 to 9.

[51]) Cf. Ruijgh 1985, 43: 'Mégara constate qu'elle même et ses enfants doivent mourir prochainement (…): Lycos veut faire périr les suppliants près de l'autel au moyen d'un bûcher. Cette constatation l'amène à la conclusion (*ἐπειδή*) qu'il vaut mieux mourir immédiatement (*θνῄσκειν*), c'est à dire prendre le chemin qui mène à la mort en quittant l'asyle, plutôt que de mourir plus tard après avoir souffert des douleurs physiques épouvantables.'

able – to give a paraphrase in which the PS form has either been replaced by an anaphoric reference or disappeared completely:

  – 'Mardonius sent Alexander as a messenger; both because (...) (*parenthesis*) and because it had come to his ear (...) did Mardonius *do so*[52]) (23);

  – 'Ajax was given a sword by Hector, Hector (∅) a belt by Ajax' (24);

  – 'If you were a seer, wouldn't you, given that you were capable of explaining about the ὁμοίως λεγόμενα, be capable of *doing so* about the διαφόρως λεγόμενα as well?' (25);

  – 'If you are in a position to offer someone from your own deme good advice, *that* is what you should *do*,' or '(...) you should *do so*' (26);

  – 'If die we must, *it* must not *be* by fire,' or '... *this* must not *be* ...' (27).

Here the relevant difference between AS and PS seems to be that the constituent expressed in AS has 'focus' function,[53]) while that in PS does not:[54]) ἔπεμψε, δῶκε, ἐξηγήσασθαι, συμβουλεῦσαι, and θανεῖν[55]) each contain the answer, or part of the answer, to a question such as 'what did he do? (did he have to do, was he able to do, etc.)' which is presupposed or evoked by the speaker on the part of the person addressed; by contrast ἔπεμπε, δίδου, ἐξηγεῖσθαι, συμβουλεύειν, and θνῄσκειν subsequently, in the examples given, form part of the *topic* of the clauses in which they occur. Thus e.g. in (24): (*'What* did Hector do?') – 'He *gave a sword.*' (What did *Ajax* give?') – 'A *belt.*' Similarly, in the apodosis of (25) the 'focus' has shifted to the *subject* the addressee can offer advice *about*, in (26) to

---

  [52]) The repetition of both subject and verb is motivated by a parenthesis, not quoted above, of four lines (in the Oxford text).

  [53]) I use the term in the sense accorded to it e.g. by Dik (1979, 149): 'Focus will be assigned to those constituents which present information bearing upon the difference in pragmatic information between Speaker and Addressee.'

  [54]) The first attempts to exploit such distinctions as those between *thema* and *rhema*, and between *topic* and *focus*, for explaining the distribution of perfective and imperfective aspect forms in Slavonic languages have been made by Birkenmaier and by Forsyth (84): 'The aspectual neutrality of a verbal predicate expressed by an imperfective past form permits its use also in sentences in which the main logical emphasis is put not on the verb itself, but on some other element in the sentence (...). In such sentences the imperfective verb in its minimal 'naming' function is reduced to acting as a kind of link or *copula* between two important items of information.'

  [55]) The same applies, *mutatis mutandis,* to the other two AS forms in (27).

the claim that the addressee is *obliged* to *use* the ability mentioned in the protasis. In (27) the focus shifts from the *fact* of dying to the *way* in which this death occurs. The mechanics of the process here described is well illustrated in

(28) Ἐγὼ (...) ὁμολογῶ <u>παῖσαι</u> δὴ ἄνδρας ἕνεκεν ἀταξίας (...). Ἤδη δὲ δὲ καὶ μαλακιζόμενόν τινα (...) <u>ἔπαισα</u> (...). Ἄλλον δέ γε ἴσως ἀπολειπόμενον (...) <u>ἔπαισα</u> πύξ, ὅπως μὴ λόγχῃ ὑπὸ πολεμίων <u>παίοιτο</u> (...). Ὅτι δὲ δικαίως <u>ἔπαιον</u> αὐτούς, καὶ ὑμεῖς κατεδικά-σατε. (Xen. *An.* 5. 8, 13–21): Xenophon recounts how he has justified his own severe measures in difficult circumstances. He acknowl-edges that he has used violence (παῖσαι) and recalls two situations in which the answer to the question *what* he did must be that he hit certain people. In the second of these he offers the excuse that they would otherwise have been hit by an enemy spear: in the final clause ὅπως μὴ ... παίοιτο the instrumental adjunct λόγχῃ ὑπὸ πολεμίων has focus function. Likewise in the sentence which concludes the section the point is no longer the *fact* that he hit someone, but the question whether he was *justified* in doing so.[56]) Compare

(29) ἀλλὰ δίκην γέ τοι διδόασιν οἱ παραβαίνοντες τοὺς ὑπὸ θεῶν κειμένους νόμους, ἣν οὐδενὶ τρόπῳ δυνατὸν ἀνθρώπῳ <u>διαφυγεῖν</u>, ὥσπερ τοὺς ὑπ' ἀνθρώπων κειμένους νόμους ἔνιοι παραβαίνοντες διαφεύγουσι τὸ δίκην διδόναι (...). Καὶ ποίαν, ἔφη, δίκην, ὦ Σώκρατες, οὐ δύνανται <u>διαφεύγειν</u> (...) (Xen. *Mem.* 4. 4, 20–22): δια-φυγεῖν has focus function; afterwards διαφεύγειν takes it up to make its object into a new topic: 'So what precisely *is* this punish-ment which transgressors cannot escape?;'

(30) τῆς πόλιος ἐούσης δύο φαρσέων (..) ὅκως τις ἐθέλοι ἐκ τοῦ ἑτέρου φάρσεος ἐς τοῦτερον <u>διαβῆναι</u>, χρῆν πλοίῳ <u>διαβαίνειν</u> (Hdt. 1. 186, 1): 'anyone who wished to cross from one quarter to another had to *do so* by boat,' and

(31) (...) ὅπως οἱ οἰκονόμοι οἱ ἐνεστηκότες <u>ἀγοράσωσιν</u> ταῦρον, καὶ οἱ ἀεὶ καθιστάμενοι <u>ἀγοράζωσιν</u> ταῦρον ὡς κάλλιστον (Inscr. Magn. 98 Kern).[57])

---

[56]) It is worth noting that ἔπαιον is unmistakably prior to κατεδικάσατε in time. Just so in the preceding sentence, not quoted above: Ἀπλοῦς μοι, ἔφη, ὁ λόγος· ἐγὼ γὰρ εἰ μὲν ἐπ' ἀγαθῷ ἐκόλασά τινα, ἀξιῶ ὑπέχειν δίκην, οἵαν καὶ γονεῖς υἱοῖς καὶ διδάσκαλοι παισί· καὶ γὰρ οἱ ἰατροὶ καίουσι καὶ τέμνουσιν ἐπ' ἀγαθῷ· εἰ δὲ ὕβρει νομίζετέ με ταῦτα πράττειν, ἐνθυμήθητε (...), the anaphoric expression equivalent to κολάζειν which resumes ἐκόλασα, is prior to νομίζετε.

[57]) I owe this example to Chantraine (1966, 42–3), who explains the choice of PS by the fact that the second occurrence of the verb concerns a repeated action.

What makes examples (23) to (31) particularly telling is that in them in one context there appear successively a form with focus function and one without focus function. Still, the relevance of the pragmatic function of a verbal constituent for the aspect choice is obviously not restricted to this type of context, as may be seen in

(32) τῇ γάρ που ὑστεραίᾳ δεῖ με <u>ἀποθνῇσκειν</u> ἢ ᾗ ἂν ἔλθῃ τὸ πλοῖον (Pl. *Crito* 44 a 2–3), and

(33) οἱ (sc. οἱ κύκνοι) ἐπειδὰν αἴσθωνται ὅτι δεῖ αὐτοὺς <u>ἀποθα-νεῖν</u>, (...) τότε δὴ πλεῖστα καὶ κάλλιστα ᾄδουσι, (...) (Pl. *Phaedo* 84 e 4–6). In (32) Socrates' impending death has been referred to several times in the preceding context (τελευτᾶν, τεθνάναι, τελευτᾶν). In each case, as here, the point at issue is not the fact *that* he must die, which is known to all participants in the conversation, but the time *when* this will take place. In (33), on the other hand, the infinitive contains the reply to the question *what* the swans perceive, and therefore has focus-function.[58]

The forms with and without focus function appearing in one such context may derive from different lexemes. An example is

(34) αὐτίκα ἀπεπειρᾶτο τῶν μαντηίων (...) διαπέμψας ἄλλους ἄλλη (...) ταῦτα μέν νυν τὰ Ἑλληνικὰ μαντήια ἐς τὰ <u>ἀπέπεμψε</u> μαντευσόμενος Κροῖσος· Λιβύης δὲ παρὰ Ἄμμωνα <u>ἀπέστειλε</u> (ἀπέστελλε Ac) ἄλλους χρησομένους. <u>διέ-πεμπε</u> δὲ πειρώμενος τῶν μαντηίων ὅ τι φρονέοιεν, ὡς εἰ φρονέοντα τὴν ἀληθείην εὑρεθείη, ἐπείρηταί σφεα δεύτερα πέμπων εἰ (...) (Hdt. 1.46,3): ἀπέπεμψε concludes the preceding paragraph of the story, while ἀπέστειλε has focus function in a statement containing new information, and διέπεμπε resumes both διαπέμ-ψας and ἀπέστειλε in order to specify the purpose behind the actions mentioned by them: one might paraphrase '(he did) *all this* (because he ...).' Compare also

(35) ἐς τοῦτον δὴ τὸν χῶρον ἐβουλεύσαντο <u>μεταναστῆναι</u> (...)· <u>μετακινέεσθαί</u> τε ἐδόκεε τότε ἐπεὰν τῆς νυκτὸς ᾖ δευτέρη φυλακή (Hdt. 9.51,3): in the second of these clauses we find the PS form of a lexeme which is more appropriate there, because it has already been made clear that there will be some kind of transport, and the question now is just *when* this will have to be set in motion.

---

[58] Cf. Ruijgh 1985, 46: 'Au premier abord on est tenté d'interpréter 'après qu'ils se sont aperçus que la mort est proche,' ce qui ferait attendre le TPr (cf. Eur. *Alc.* 669–672). Cependant les animaux ne savent en général pas ce qu'est la mort. Font exception les cygnes, qui, à un certain moment, s'aperçoivent qu'ils doivent mourir. Après cette découverte, ils ont largement le temps de chanter (πλεῖστα), si bien que la mort, tout en étant prochaine, n'appartient pas au futur immédiat.' As though he conceded that this is a trifle far-fetched, Ruijgh mentions some additional factors which might help to explain the choice of AS: the fatal nature of the death awaiting them, and the circumstance that Socrates attributes their song to joy at the prospect of meeting their god, so that 'c'est l'achèvement du procès de mourir qui importe.'

In (24) to (35) the question whether the AS en PS constituents involved have focus function can be answered with an unequivocal yes or no. Things may be more complicated: in

(36) ὡς οἱ κεκλήγοντες ἐπ' ἀλλήλοισιν ὄρουσαν
      ἔνθ' ἤτοι Κύκνος μέν, ὑπερμενέος Διὸς υἱὸν
      κτεινέμεναι μεμαώς, σάκει ἔμβαλε χάλκεον ἔγχος ([Hes.]
      Asp. 412-4)

on the face of it the parenthesis ὑπερμενέος ... μεμαὼς provides the question 'what did Cycnus want?' with the answer 'he wanted to *kill Heracles*'. Within this answer, however, the name of Heracles has focus function to a higher degree than the constituent 'to kill;' therefore AS would invest the infinitive with an informational prominence which the author, in this context, does not feel called to bestow on it. In

(37) ὣς ἔφατ'· ἀλλ' οὐ πεῖθ' Ἄρεος μεγαλήτορα θυμόν,
      ἀλλὰ μέγα ἰάχων φλογὶ εἴκελα τεύχεα πάλλων
      καρπαλίμως ἐπόρουσε βίῃ Ἡρακληείῃ
      κακκτάμεναι μεμαώς (...) ([Hes.] Asp. 450-453), on the

other hand, AS is found because the author is using this infinitive to answer the question *what* Ares wanted.[59]) The difference may also be illustrated by a comparison of

(38) οἴμοι κακοδαίμων· τί γὰρ ἐγὼ οὐκ ἐναυμάχουν; (Ar. Ran.
      33) with

(39) – ποῖ γῆς ἀπεδήμεις; – ἐπεβάτευον Κλεισθένει.
      – κἀναυμάχησας; (ib. 48-9): in (38) ἐναυμάχουν is indis-

pensable for understanding the question, yet it is not the most important constituent: the background to the question in its context is that other slaves by taking part in the sea-fight have attained freedom, and what the speaker actually conveys with his question ('why didn't *I* take part?') is his regretful conscience of the fact that, had he done so too, he would not now be forced to toil and slave as he does. In (39), on the other hand, there is a question of fact: *whether* the person questioned, when on board with, or boarding, Cleisthenes *did* or did *not* join battle, or 'come to grips,' 'have a good romp:' in the first context the constituent bearing the focus function is ἐγώ, in the second it is ἐναυμάχησας.

The pragmatic function of the constituent involved often plays a role when a predication expressed in AS is provided with a negative later in the same context, as in

_____

[59]) Cf. E 301: τὸν κτάμεναι μεμαώς, ὅς τις τοῦ γ' ἀντίος ἔλθοι.

(40) εἰ τῶν πολιτῶν οἷσι νῦν πιστευόμεν
   τούτοις ἀπιστήσαιμεν, οἷς δ' οὐ χρώμεθα
   τούτοισι χρησαίμεσθ', ἴσως <u>σωθεῖμεν</u> ἄν.
   εἰ νῦν γε δυστυχοῦμεν ἐν τούτοισι, πῶς
   τἀναντί' ἂν πράττοντες οὐ <u>σῳζοίμεθ'</u> ἄν; (Ar. *Ran.*
   1446-50),

(41) εἰ μὲν γὰρ <u>προσδέξαιτο</u> Φωκέας συμμάχους (...) εἰ δὲ μὴ
   <u>προσδέχοιτο</u> ὥσπερ οὐ προσίετο (...) (Dem. 19, 318),

(42) μάτην ἄρ' οἱ γέροντες εὔχονται <u>θανεῖν</u>
   γῆρας ψέγοντες καὶ μακρὸν χρόνον βίου·
   ἢν δ' ἐγγὺς ἔλθῃ θάνατος, οὐδεὶς βούλεται
   <u>θνῄσκειν</u>[60]), τὸ γῆρας δ' οὐκέτ' ἔστ' αὐτοῖς βαρύ (Eur. *Alc.*
669-72)[61]), and

(43) ἐὰν γάρ τί σε φανῶ κακὸν πεποιηκὼς ὁμολογῶ ἀδικεῖν· ἐὰν
μέντοι μηδὲν φαίνωμαι κακὸν πεποιηκὼς μηδὲ βουληθείς, (...) (Xen.
Cyr. 5.5, 13).

In each of these examples actions are negated which have been
identified earlier. Compare

(44) ταῦτα πάντα <u>ἐλάλησεν</u> ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν παραβολαῖς τοῖς ὄχλοις·
καὶ χωρὶς παραβολῆς οὐδὲν <u>ἐλάλει</u> αὐτοῖς (Matth. 13, 34).

An example in which AS and PS seem to be used indiscriminately is offered by
Chantraine[62]):

(45) ὁ δ' οὐ γὰρ ἡττίκιζεν, ὦ Μοῖραι φίλαι,
   ἀλλ' ὁπότε μὲν χρείη "διῃτώμην" <u>λέγειν</u>
   ἔφασκε "δῃτώμην", ὁπότε δ' <u>εἰπεῖν</u> δέοι
   "ὀλίγον" "ὀλίον" ἔλεγεν. (Pl. com. Fr. 168 K = 183 K.-A.): here the
choice of λέγειν and εἰπεῖν respectively seems to be motivated, rather than by
any of the considerations mentioned so far, by the circumstance that with this
particular lexeme the choice between AS and PS in common usage functions at
the same time as a *lexical* distinction: it is relevant to note that διῃτώμην, in
Greek parlance, is a ῥῆμα, while ὀλίγον is an ὄνομα. So the effect is that of 'if he
had to *make* the *statement* διῃτώμην' balanced by 'if he had to *speak* the *word*
ὀλίγον.'[63])

---

[60]) There is a variant θανεῖν (BO and gV).
   [61]) Cf. Ruijgh 1985, 43: 'Les vieillards prient les dieux de les faire mourir bien-
tôt, mais quand la mort est bien proche, personne ne veut de bon cœur mourir
immédiatement, c'est à dire prendre le chemin qui va aboutir à une mort désor-
mais certaine. Noter que dans ce passage, l'opposition entre le TAo et le TPr
s'applique au contraste entre 'prochainement' et 'immédiatement.'
   [62]) Chantraine (1966, 44): 'Il est clair que le choix entre εἰπεῖν et λέγειν est
indifférent et que de façon évidente l'opposition d'aspect se trouve neutralisée. Il
serait déraisonnable d'en tenter l'analyse.'
   [63]) Thus Dr. J. M. van Ophuijsen (oral communication). Cf. Ruijgh (1985, 48,

Iterativity

With regard to *iterative* actions (defined as actions repeated by a singular or plural subject), and for *distributive* actions (defined as actions repeated by more than one subject, whether simultaneously or successively), it has often been assumed that PS is somehow the 'natural' choice for expressing these[64]), although AS is not thereby excluded.

The ambivalence obtaining here is clearly seen in Rijksbaron (1984),[65]) who states, first, that the 'absolute' imperfect 'often expresses repeated actions (and may be accompanied by an iterative modifier),' and secondly that Greek 'also disposes of grammatical means with which the iteration in the past may be explicitly expressed, e. g. the particle ἄν,' adding that this iterative ἄν is also found in conjunction with AS; lastly he recalls that there is a suffix (σκο/ε-) in Ionic which is capable of marking both AS ans PS for 'iterativeness.' This is similar to the treatment in Schwyzer-Debrunner.[66]) 'Eine iterative oder gewohnheitsmäßige Handlung (...) im Ind. Präs. kann durch Ipf. oder Ind. Aor. in die Vergangenheit versetzt werden. Beim Aor., der auch hier den Abschluß betont, wird das iterative Moment, das sich aus dem Zusammenhang ergibt, *gewöhnlich* auch im Zeitadverb *verdeutlicht* (my italics). (...) Ohne weitere Verdeutlichung kann das aoristische Iterativ auf -σκον (...) stehen."

The situation may be illustrated by the following examples:

(46)   – τί δ' ἦν ὅτι σου μάλιστ' ἐδεῖθ' ἑκάστοτε;
       – οὐ πολλά· καὶ γὰρ ἐκνομίως μ' ᾐσχύνετο.
       ἀλλ' ἀργυρίου δραχμὰς ἂν ᾔτησ' εἴκοσιν
       εἰς ἱμάτιον, ὀκτὼ δ' ἂν εἰς ὑποδήματα·
       καὶ ταῖς ἀδελφαῖς ἀγοράσαι χιτωνίον
       ἐκέλευσεν ἂν τῇ μητρί θ' ἱματίδιον·
       πρῶτον τ' ἂν ἐδεήθη μεδίμνων τεττάρων. (Ar. *Pl.* 980-6),

(47)   ἀναλαμβάνων οὖν αὐτῶν τὰ ποιήματα (...) διηρώτων ἂν αὐτοὺς τί λέγοιεν, ἵν' ἅμα τι καὶ μανθάνοιμι παρ' αὐτῶν. (Pl. *Ap.* 22 B),

---

note 90): '(...) le TPr λέγειν s'explique par attraction temporelle: la protase est remplaçable par ὁπότε ... λέγοι 'chaque fois qu'il s'efforçait de dire ...' A relevant factor may be that the author has striven for variation (χρείη/δέοι, ἔφασκε/ἔλεγεν). – It may be noted that the first main clause has a finite verb marked for iterativity while the second has the unmarked imperfect: it could be that the pattern here described has implications for other distinctions besides the aspectual contrast.

   [64]) Ruijgh 1985 (*passim*) seems to regard iterativity as an independent motive for the choice of PS.
   [65]) p. 15-6.
   [66]) II, 278.

(48) ὧδε δέ τις εἴπεσκεν ἰδὼν ἐς πλησίον ἄλλον· (Hom. Δ 81),

(49) ἡ δὲ γυνὴ (...) κλαίεσκε ἂν καὶ ὀδυρέσκετο· ποιεῦσα δὲ αἰεὶ τὠυτὸ τὸν Δαρεῖον ἔπεισε οἰκτῖραί μιν (...) (Hdt. 3.119,3),

(50) τῆς θαλάσσης τῆς καθ᾽ ἑαυτοὺς ἐκράτησαν ἡμέρας περὶ τεσσάρας καὶ δέκα, καὶ ἐσεκομίσαντο καὶ ἐξεκομίσαντο ἃ ἐβούλοντο (Thuc. 1.117,1),

(51) οἱ δ᾽ ὡς ἔγνωσαν ἐξηπατημένοι, ξυνεστρέφοντό τε ἐν σφίσιν αὐτοῖς καὶ τὰς προσβολὰς ᾗ προσπίπτοιεν ἀπεωθοῦντο. καὶ δὶς ἢ τρὶς ἀπεκρούσαντο (Thuc. 2.4,1–2),

(52) ὡς αἰεὶ Ἀχιλῆα κιχήσατο κῦμα ῥόοιο (Hom. Φ 263), and

(53) πολλάκις, ἃ πρὸ αὐτοῦ τις οὐκ ἐξειργάσατο, ταῦτα ὁ φίλος πρὸς τοὺς φίλους ἐξήρκεσεν (Xen. Comm. 2.4,7).

In (46) ᾔτησ(ε) has focus function[67] ('he had the cheek to demand twenty drachmas'). In (47) διηρώτων, like the preceding ἀναλαμβάνων, forms part of a series of actions which only reaches its conclusion with ἔγνων at 22 B 8: 'I took up their most careful compositions (ἀναλαμβάνων) and asked them one by one (διηρώτων) what they meant, hoping at once to derive some instruction (μανθάνοιμι) from them. It turned out that almost anybody was better at explaining (ἔλεγον) their intentions than they were. So I understood (ἔγνων) that it is not σοφία, but some natural capacity that they owe their poems to.' In (48) εἴπεσκεν has focus function; in (49) κλαίεσκε ἂν καὶ ὀδυρέσκετο leaves the question open what the woman will achieve by behaving thus, and this question is subsequently answered by ἔπεισε. In (50) both aorist forms mention terminative actions which have been completed and have focus function, in (51) ἀπεωθοῦντο cannot be replaced by AS because a conative interpretation is intended; ἀπεκρούσαντο, by contrast, calls for a 'confective' interpretation. The aorist forms in (52) and in (53) both of them have focus function and require a confective interpretation.[68]

Consideration of these examples leads to the conclusion that iterativity *as such* does not decide the choice of the aspect form: that actions are to be understood as iterative actions is made clear by grammatical means (the iterative suffix with the indicative, an optative) and/or by contextual indications.

---

[67]) In contradistinction to ἐδεῖθ᾽ in 980.

[68]) As is shown by the simile preceding (52), and by the contrasting object clause in (53), respectively.

Gnomic aorist

The question of the so-called *gnomic* aorist may be illustrated by such examples as

(54) ὅταν δὲ ὁ μετὰ τῆς ὕβρεως Ἔρως ἐγκρατέστερος περὶ τὰς τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ὥρας γένηται, <u>διαφθείρει</u>[69]) τε πολλὰ καὶ <u>ἠδίκησεν</u> (Pl. *Symp.* 188 A 7-8) and

(55) ἀλλ' αἰεί τε Διὸς κρείσσων νόος αἰγιόχοιο,

ὅστε καὶ ἄλκιμον ἄνδρα <u>φοβεῖ</u> καὶ <u>ἀφείλετο</u> νίκην (*P* 176-77), which prove, first, that both AS and PS may serve to express a general truth, and secondly, that both may appear in coordination in one context.

In contexts like these AS was not conceived as a past tense, as is shown by the fact that the subordinate temporal clause features the conjunctive rather than the optative, as witness γένηται in (54) and

(56) ἦν ἄρα του καὶ πείρᾳ <u>σφαλῶσιν</u>, ἀντελπίσαντες ἄλλα <u>ἐπλήρωσαν</u> τὴν χρείαν (Thuc. I. 70, 7).

To explain this situation it is helpful to recall that the only difference separating (53) from acknowledged instances of the gnomic aorist is the presence of the adjunct πολλάκις. The transition between, on the one hand, cases like (53) and

(57) ἀθυμοῦντες ἄνδρες <u>οὔπω</u> τρόπαιον <u>ἔστησαν</u> (Pl. *Crit.* 108 C), and, on the other hand, cases like

(58) οὐθεὶς <u>ἐπλούτησεν</u> ταχέως δίκαιος ὤν (Men. *Kol.* 43), is gradual:[70]) the fact that a thing repeatedly, or always, or never was so in the past, may be taken to imply that it repeatedly, or always, or never, *is* so in general; this implication may suggest itself to the hearer, and thus lead to the intended interpretation of the statement, independently of any explicit signs like πολλάκις and οὔπω.

---

[69]) A variant διέφθειρεν is transmitted which is a *lectio facilior.* Cf. ἥκει (...) καὶ οὐδὲν ἠδίκησεν immediately preceding the sentence quoted (188 A 5-6).

[70]) Cf. Rijksbaron (1984, 32): 'From the gnomic aorist we should distinguish the use of the constative aorist indicative for repeated actions in the *past* (so-called *empiric* aorist: it is used in utterances based on experience). This type of aorist is usually modified by words like πολλάκις 'often,' ἀεί 'always' and the like (...). In cases like this it may be implied that the action is not restricted to the past but that it is generally true. Thus the empiric aorist may have played a role in the development of the so-called generic aorist.' To the same effect Goodwin (54).

The conclusion must be that in Greek *both* present *and* aorist indicative may be used to express general truths,[71]) and that their distribution is determined by the same criteria which decide the choice between PS and AS in other contexts; the only difference is that PS is represented by the present tense, *the imperfect being unsuitable for statements which are complete and self-contained.*[72]) The aptness of the augmented aorist for the expression of general truths is a corollary of the fact that the use of a past tense lends itself to an iterative interpretation, and thus may be taken to imply that we are dealing with a fact of common experience. The transition between what are in fact positions on a gliding scale may once more be illustrated by comparing

(59) μεγάλοι δὲ λόγοι μεγάλας πληγὰς τῶν ὑπεραύχων ἀποτείσαντες γήρᾳ τὸ φρονεῖν ἐδίδαξαν (Soph. *Ant.* 1352) with

(60) μέλλων γ' ἰατρὸς, τῇ νόσῳ διδοὺς χρόνον, ἰάσατ' ἤδη μᾶλλον ἢ τεμὼν χρόα (Eur. Fr. 1057): the single difference between the two is that the intended 'gnomic' interpretation in (60) rests on ἤδη, in (59), which forms the conclusion to a play, on general characteristics of the context and situation.[73])

Summary

Combining the three considerations discussed above which affect the choice between AS and PS, we arrive at the hypothesis that AS is appropriate to a verbal constituent which performs an *independent informative function.* This has two important consequences. One is that PS is adopted if the speaker wishes to suggest questions as to

---

[71]) Leaving aside the use of the perfect in this type of context. One observation which may be made is that the perfect in statements of general truth may alternate with the aorist as well as with the present, as witness ἀποδέδωκεν and κατέθηκεν in Pl. *Prot.* 328 B.

[72]) It is conceivable that the situation we know was preceded by one in which there existed, side by side with the aorist indicative *with* an augment, an aorist indicative *without* an augment, which in statements of general truths, such as proverbs, competed with the present indicative. This, however, cannot be verified. For one thing, the number of augmented aorists in statements of general truths and in similes in Homer is greater than that of unaugmented aorists: see Chantraine 1958, 483–4. It is not possible, then, to support statistically a claim that I 320 (κάτθαν' ὁμῶς ὅ τ' ἀεργὸς ἀνὴρ ὅ τε πολλὰ ἐοργώς) represents the earlier state of the language.

[73]) Cf. D. H. Roberts, *Parting Words: Final Lines in Sophocles and Euripides,* CQ 37 (1987), 51–64.

what he further has to say. With terminative and with punctual actions respectively he is free to choose AS *only* when referring to actions which have reached their end and which have been accomplished respectively. In these cases the choice of AS by itself has implications for the reality which the expression refers to, whereas the interpretation of PS is even here determined by the context: the choice of PS *by itself* does not imply that a 'conative' or 'infective' interpretation is intended.

The questions suggested by using PS may regard either the action under consideration or the sequel. In the latter case PS will incidentally make for cohesion and continuity, while AS may mark incisions and 'paragraphs;' but it must be borne in mind that these are no more than applications of the aptness of PS to suggest further questions in general for the purpose of articulating the information the author wished to convey.

The second main consequence is that PS is chosen if the constituent in question plays no part, or only a subordinate part, in informing the hearer. In this case the decisive consideration is the *pragmatic function* of the constituent involved.

It is important to note that the choice of PS is compulsory only if and when AS would alter the factual information conveyed by the statement. Apart from this, the speaker is free whether to impose connections or to refrain from imposing them, whether to divide his discourse into paragraphs or rather to adopt a 'staccato' narrative style, and so forth, all without affecting the content of his statement, provided only that no ambiguity should ensue. With regard to the third criterion it is at least possible to observe a marked tendency for the incidence of AS to decrease in proportion as the verbal constituent in question has focus function to a lesser extent.[74]

There is a hierarchy among these criteria only in so far as the first criterion takes precedence over the other two, since the choice

---

[74] Further systematic investigation of the material is required for defining the conditions in which AS is chosen for constituents which are merely anaphoric. It may at any rate be pointed out that Herodotus, in particular, frequently uses AS for subordinate clauses and participles concluding and summarizing what has gone before: one of many instances is 1.30,1 αὐτῶν δὴ ὧν τούτων καὶ τῆς θεωρίης ἐκδημήσας ὁ Σόλων εἵνεκεν ἐς Αἴγυπτον ἀπίκετο παρὰ Ἄμασιν καὶ δὴ καὶ ἐς Σάρδις παρὰ Κροῖσον. *ἀπικόμενος* δὲ (...). The common assumption that priority in time of the action mentioned in the dependent clause or participle is here decisive fails to explain why PS is found in similar contexts, as in 4.139,1: οὗτοι ὧν ἐπείτε τὴν Ἱστιαίου *αἱρέοντο* γνώμην, ἔδοξέ σφι(...).

of AS may in the case of terminative and punctual actions be excluded by the information which is to be communicated. Here, then, the first criterion is applied before either of the other two comes into play.

Appendix

It may be worth explaining the term *actio* as it has been used above. It is customary to use the term *Aktionsart* for semantic distinctions which have been 'lexicalized,' especially by a process of derivation such as the formation of compound verbs, e.g. *καταλαμβάνειν* from *λαμβάνειν*,[75]) and to use *aspect* for distinctions which have been 'grammaticalized.'

An important contribution to the debate over the distinctions involved was made by Vendler.[76]) His aim was to trace 'the particular way in which verbs presuppose and involve the notion of time,' and to classify verbs accordingly. He thus distinguishes four groups of verbs according to whether these denote an 'activity' (e.g. 'to run,' 'to push a cart'), an 'accomplishment' (e.g. 'to run a mile'), an 'achievement' (e.g. 'to reach a top'), or a 'state' (e.g. 'to rule,' 'to smoke'). The difference between these groups is primarily, according to Vendler, in the 'time schemata' presupposed by the verbs concerned:

'For activities: *A was running at a time t* means that time instant *t* is on *a* time stretch throughout which A was running. For accomplishments: *A was drawing a circle at time t* means that *t* is on *the* time stretch in which A drew the circle. For achievements: *A won a race between t¹ and t²* means that the time instant at which A won the race is between t^1 and t^2. For states: *A loved somebody from t¹ to t²* means that at any time between t^1 and t^2 A loved that person.'[77]) Another relevant consideration is that some verbs may be, and other verbs may not be, combined with modal adverbs like 'deliberately' and 'carefully.'

By comparable means Dik[78]) arrives at a 'typology of states of affairs,' to which end he applies the parameters 'dynamism' and 'control.' He distinguishes between 'state' (− dynamism, − control), process (+ dynamism, − control), position (+ control, − dynamism), and 'action' (+ control, + dynamism).'

Observation bears out that characteristics of the type referred to by Vendler and Dik are indeed operative in actual usage: thus they may help to explain why it makes good sense to inquire 'how long did it take to push the car uphill?,' but not to inquire 'how long did it take to push the cart?'.

---

[75]) Cf. Comrie 6, note 4. The Greek language shows some scattered beginnings of a formalization of distinctions in 'Aktionsart,' such as composition (e.g. *φεύγω* vs. *καταφεύγω* in Xen. *Hell.* 1.6.16 (*Κόνων δ' ἔφευγε ταῖς ναυσὶν εὖ πλεούσαις, καὶ καταφεύγει εἰς Μυτιλήνην*); cf. Brugmann–Thumb 548, and Brunel 1939. The existence of different types of present tense forms (such as durative *-io*praesentia of the type *χαίρω*, *μαίνομαι*) might be connected with such distinctions: cf. Brugmann–Thumb 542.

[76]) Vendler 1967.

[77]) Vendler 106.

[78]) Dik 1978, 32. Cf. Rijksbaron 1989. See also Stork 33.

In many accounts, however, it is left unclear whether the proposed distinctions have reference to the meaning of verbs or to states of affairs in reality. Vendler's expressions on this point are ambiguous. His claim is that 'all *verbs* (my italics) can be analyzed in terms of these four time schemata,'[79] but his discussion does not address the question whether 'to run' and 'to run a mile' are two 'verb phrases' differing in *Aktionsart* or whether the one verb 'to run' has two 'senses' according as it denotes either an 'activity' or an 'accomplishment.' Dik appears to take a clearer stand: he expressly classifies 'states of affairs.' When, however, he states that 'the differences involved may be (but are not necessarily) determined by properties of the predicates as such,' but may equally result from an 'interaction between the predicate and the term to which it is applied,' his position, too, turns out to be less clear-cut than it might seem to be.[80]

The view taken above is that selection restrictions of the type specified do not follow from the meaning, in the sense of the denotation, of the verbs or verb phrases involved, but from their *connotation*, i.e. from properties which belong to the referent of the verb or verb phrase in question in reality.[81] So the fact that 'he ran for half an hour' mentions an 'activity,' but 'he ran the mile in half an hour' an 'accomplishment,' is not part of the lexical meaning of the words in themselves, but is a consequence of differences which may be recognized in the state of affairs referred to. This view has the advantage of accounting for the fact that one and the same lexeme may be used in different contexts to refer to actions whose *actio* is different: e.g., the *actio* of *'he drank water'* is durative, but that of *'he drank a glass of water'* is terminative.

The term 'actio' in the above, then, denotes such properties of the states of affairs referred to by verbs or verb phrases as are relevant to a correct interpretation, on the understanding that the distinctions used make no claim whatsoever

---

[79]) Vendler 107.

[80]) Cf. Ruijgh 1985, 4 ff. (and cf. 20 ff.), who on the one hand defines *actio* as a property of the action referred to ('le caractère (...) de l'action exprimée par le thème verbal lui-même'), but on the other hand speaks of 'verbes nettement duratifs' and hold that 'de très nombreux lexèmes verbaux sont neutres quant à l'actionalité,' so that e.g. πίνειν in πίνειν ὕδωρ can have a durative *actio* but in πίνειν τὸ ὕδωρ a terminative one. Similarly Comrie (41 ff.), who discusses distinctions like that between durative and punctual in a chapter entitled 'Aspect and inherent meaning,' speaks of 'inherent aspectual (i.e. semantic aspectual) properties of various classes of lexical items' (p. 41), but elsewhere uses expressions which leave room for doubt as to what his distinctions are supposed to refer to, e.g., 'although it is difficult to find *sentences* that are unambiguously telic or atelic, this does not affect the general *semantic* distinction made between telic and atelic *situations*' (p. 46; my italics).

[81]) For this use of 'connotation' cf. Leech (14): 'connotative meaning is the communicative value an expression has by virtue of what it *refers to*, over and above its purely conceptual content.' In other words, the term applies to attributes of the referent which are not numbered among the 'contrastive features' the sum of which makes up the 'conceptual meaning' of the expression referring to it.

to universality:[82]) I am solely concerned with those properties of the actions referred to which are *demonstrably* relevant to the distribution of AS and PS in ancient Greek.[83]) These properties primarily regard the way in which these actions are effected in time.

By 'durative' actions I understand those actions of which it is characteristic that they are capable of continuing for some time ('he reigned from t^1 to t^2'), by 'punctual' those of which it is not (*'he arrived from t^1 to t^2'). With punctual actions a temporal adjunct 'at moment t' defines the moment at which the action is effected, with durative actions it defines either a moment at which the action is in progress, or the moment at which it begins.

Within the class of durative actions it is possible to distinguish between 'terminative'[84]) and 'non-terminative' actions. An action is terminative if its end is determined by and implied in its nature: 'the situation described by 'make a chair' has built into it a terminal point, namely the point at which the chair is complete.'[85]) It is a mark of terminative actions which distinguishes them from durative actions in general, that the adjunct 'at moment t' may not just refer to a time at which the action subsists ('at moment t he was in the process of persuading: ἔπειθεν), but may equally refer to the moment at which the change[86]) envisaged by the action is effected, and the action is thereby brought to its natural end ('at moment t he succeeded in persuading:' ἔπεισεν[87]). If a terminative action is accompanied by an adjunct of the form 'from t^1 to t^2' it is implied that the end of the action was not attained within this period ('from t^1 to t^2 he was in the process of persuading:' ἔπειθεν).

In the opinion of Ruijgh the 'Aktionsart' ('actionalité') can play a limited role at most in explaining aspect usage, both because it is impossible in his view to ascribe one definite *Aktionsart* to each verbal lexeme, and because the attribution of an *Aktionsart* in a given instance must necessarily remain tentative in the case

---

[82]) Contrast Dik (1978, 36), who claims 'that these distinctions are indeed quite generally relevant for the description of natural languages.'

[83]) It seems to me that as far as Greek is concerned Dik's parameter 'control,' i.e. the distinction between actions subject to, or whose continuation is subject to, the will of some 'agent,' and actions which are not conditional on this, is relevant only to the use of the *perfect* tense where it competes with the present and aorist. I intend to come back to this.

[84]) Called 'telic' by Comrie 44 ff.

[85]) Vendler 104. Cf. Comrie 44.

[86]) The above shows that is is possible to define the distinctions relevant to the distribution of AS and PS exclusively in terms of the two types of temporal adjunct mentioned above ('at t;' 'from t^1 to t^2') and of the interpretations of them which are appropriate to the various types of action. This implies that the notions of 'dynamism' and 'change' introduced by Rijksbaron can be dispensed with in the present connection, even though it is in itself true that terminative actions (e.g. 'finishing the wine,' 'persuading') will always involve a change in the sense he means (Rijksbaron 1989, table on p. 15).

[87]) I know of no instances in Greek of 'at moment t' with a terminative action referring to the beginning of this action, so that e.g. ἔπεισε would require' to be interpreted as 'he began to persuade.'

of a language no longer spoken: 'il faut donc conclure qu'il y a sans doute inter-action entre l'actionalité de l'expression verbale et le choix du TPr ou du TAo, mais que le critère de l'actionalité n'est guère opérationnel.'[88]) The first of these objections would seem to be met by assigning *actio* not to the verb or to its lexical meaning, but to properties of its referent, as proposed above. As for the second objection, we are forced by observable facts of language to accept that differences in *actio* as defined above do indeed affect the distribution and interpretation of aspect forms. It need not worry us that the *actio* of an action cannot always be unequivocally established, since it is characteristic of the contribution of connotations to the interpretation that they are relevant only when they are indispensable to the successful interpretation of a statement. Thus an acquaintance with the lexical meaning of 'father' is sufficient for a correct interpretation of the question 'who is the father of these children,' whereas a knowledge of the connotations adhering to the word 'father' is an essential requirement for understanding the statement that 'he is a father to his children,' since without these connotations this statement yields a pointless tautology. In the same way the knowledge that πείθω is a terminative action is indispensable for the adequate interpretation of ἔπειθον in example (3) above.

Bibliography

Amigues, S.: *Les temps de l'impératif dans les ordres de l'orateur au greffier,* REG 90 (1977), 223–38.
Bakker, W.F.: *The Greek Imperative.* (Amsterdam 1966).
Birkenmaier, W.: *Thema-Rhema Gliederung und russischer Verbalaspekt,* IRAL XV (1977), 209–220.
Brugmann, K. – Thumb, A.: *Griechische Grammatik.* (München 1913).
Brunel, J.: *L'aspect verbal et l'emploi des préverbes en grec, particulièrement en Attique.* (Paris 1939).
Chantraine, P.: *Traité de morphologie historique grecque.* (Paris 1964³).
Chantraine, P.: *Grammaire homérique, II, Syntaxe.* (Paris 1963).
Chantraine, P.: *Questions de syntaxe grecque,* RPhil XL (1966), 40–45.
Comrie, B.: *Aspect. An Introduction to the Study of Verbal Aspect and Related Problems.* (Cambridge 1981³).
Dik, S.C.: *Coordination.* (Amsterdam 1968).
Dik, S.C.: *Functional Grammar.* (Amsterdam 1979²).
Forsyth, J.: *A Grammar of Aspect. Usage and Meaning in the Russian Verb.* (Cambridge 1970).
Gildersleeve, B.L.: *Syntax of Classical Greek.* (Groningen 1980 = Reprint of 1900).
Gonda, J.: *The Function of the Ṛgvedic Present and Aorist.* (Den Haag, 1962).
Goodwin, W.W.: *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb.* (London 1889).
Hettrich, H.: *Kontext und Aspekt in der altgriechischen Prosa Herodots.* (1976).

---

[88]) Ruijgh 1985, 21.

Hopper, P. J.: *Some Observations on the Typology of Focus and Aspect in Narrative Language,* Studies in Language 3.1 (1979), 37-64.

Hopper, P. J.: *Aspect and Foregrounding in Discourse,* Syntax and Semantics Vol. 12: *Discourse and Syntax* (1979), 213 ff.

Humbert, J.: *Syntaxe grecque.* (Paris 1960³).

Kühner, R. - Gerth, B.: *Griechische Grammatik* I, II. (Leipzig 1898, 1904).

Leech, G.: *Semantics.* (Penguin Books 1974).

Louw, J.P.: *On Greek Prohibitions,* Acta Classica 2 (1959), 43 ff.

Lyons, J.: *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics. (Cambridge 1969).*

McKay, K. L.: Aspects of the Imperative in Ancient Greek. Antichthon 20 (1986), 41-58.

Meillet, A.: *Aperçu d'une histoire de la langue grecque.* (Paris 1965⁷).

Porter, S.E.: *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament, with Reference to Tense and Mood.* (New York; Bern; Frankfurt a.M.; Paris 1989).

Poutsma, A.: *Over de tempora van de imperativus en de coniunctivus hortativus-prohibitivus in het Grieks.* (Amsterdam 1910).

Ruijgh, C. J.: *Autour de τε épique. Études sur la syntaxe grecque.* (Amsterdam 1971).

Ruijgh, C. J.: *L'emploi 'inceptif' du thème du présent du verbe grec,* Mnemosyne Ser. IV, Vol. XXXVIII (1985), 1-61.

Rijksbaron, A.: *A Review of: H. Hettrich, Kontext und Aspekt in der altgriechischen Prosa Herodots,* Lingua 48 (1979), 223-257.

Rijksbaron, A.: *The Syntax and Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek.* (Amsterdam 1984).

Rijksbaron, A.: *The Discourse Function of the Imperfect,* in: ed. A. Rijksbaron, H. A. Mulder, G. C. Wakker, *In the Footsteps of Raphael Kühner,* (Amsterdam 1988), 237-254.

Rijksbaron, A.: *Aristotle, Verb Meaning and Functional Grammar.* (Amsterdam 1989).

Schwyzer, E. - Debrunner, A.: *Griechische Grammatik II, Syntax und syntaktische . Stilistik.* (München 1959).

Seiler, H.: *L'aspect et le temps dans le verbe néo-grec.* (Paris 1952).

Stork, P.: *The Aspectual Usage of the Dynamic Infinitive in* Herodotus. (Groningen 1982).

Strunk, K.: *Historische und deskriptive Linguistik bei der Textinterpretation,* Glotta 49 (1971), 191-216.

Szemerényi, O.: *The Origin of Aspect in the Indo-European Languages,* Glotta LXV (1987) 1-18.

Vendler, Z.: *Verbs and Times,* in: *Linguistics in Philosophy* (Ithaca 1967), 97-121.

Verbaute lokale Genetive im Griechischen:
ἔραζε, θύραζε, χαμᾶζε; Ἐρέβευσφι; φόωσδε

Von Michael Meier-Brügger, Hamburg

Seit den homerischen Epen sind drei Adverbien auf -αζε belegt: ἔραζε „in Richtung Erde", θύραζε „in Richtung Türe", χαμᾶζε „in Richtung Erde". Während sich ἔραζε nur als obsoleter Poetismus halten konnte (so Aischylos fr. 159 Radt und Theokrit VII 146), sind θύραζε und χαμᾶζε bis in hellenistische Zeit lebendig geblieben, beide eingebunden in Adverbialreihen: So steht neben allativem χαμᾶζε ein lokales χαμαί und ein separatives χαμᾶθεν, bei θύραζε sind u.a. lokales θύρᾱσι und separativ-lokales θύρᾱθεν zu nennen[1]). Alle drei Adverbien bieten Schwierigkeiten für ein morphologisch ein- wandfreies Verständnis. Am einfachsten erscheint θύραζε: „latif θύ- ραζε ... pourrait être, soit un accusatif pluriel athématique (*θύ- ρασδε), soit un accusatif pluriel de thème en ᾱ. Les autres formes se rattachent nettement à θύρᾱ: locat. θύρηθι (Od. 14,352), instr. de sens locat. θύρηφι (Od., Hés.), locat. θύρᾱσι (Ar., etc.) ..."[2]). Kom- plexer wird die Problematik beim archaischen ἔραζε: „Rien n'auto- rise à rapporter ἔραζε à un neutre ἔρας, et il faut supposer que le mot a pris la place d'un *ἔρανδε d'après l'analogie de θύραζε, χαμᾶζε, χα- μᾶζε ..."[3]). Und als noch schwieriger erweist sich χαμᾶζε: „χαμᾶζε [var. des mss -ᾰζε] ... analog. de θύρᾱζε, etc. ... mais acc. périspo- mène att. (analog. de χαμᾶθεν), enseigné comme seul correct (Hdn. Gr. 2,951) ..."[4]).

P. Chantraine hat 1966 mit Nachdruck auf die Wendung ἐν Ἄγρας „dans la région de A." aufmerksam gemacht[5]). Wie er aus-

---

[1]) Vgl. M. Lejeune, Les adverbes grecs en -θεν, Bordeaux 1939, 95 ff. (zu χαμ-), 163 f. (zu θυρ-) und passim (vgl. Index); denselben „Sur l'accentuation attique de χαμᾶζε" in REA 42, 1940, 227–233.

[2]) So P. Chantraine, DELG s.v. θύρα.

[3]) Chantraine s.v. ἔρᾱ.

[4]) So O. Masson bei Chantraine s.v. χαμαί, mit Verweis auf Lejeune (a.O. in Anm. 1).

[5]) RPh. 40, 1966, 39 mit Lit. Chantraine insistiert auf der Auffassung als abso- luter Genetiv mit erst sekundärer Empfindung als Ellipse (sc. „Haus" u.a.). Eine klare Übersicht über diesen Genetivgebrauch bieten u.a. K. Brugmann/ A. Thumb, Gr. Gr., München 1913, 452 und E. Schwyzer/A. Debrunner, Gr. Gr. II, München 1950, 120. Lokal ist wohl auch der Genetiv im Syntagma uridg. *dems pot- (woraus griech. δεσπότης u.a.) „Herr im Hause".

führt, gehört sie zusammen mit althergebrachten Ausdrücken wie
homerisch ἐν Ἀλκινόοιο (η 132) „beim Alkinoos", εἰν/εἰς Ἄϊδος,
Ἄϊδός δε u. ä. „im/zum Bereich des Hades"[6]). Speziell letztere ma-
chen deutlich, daß es in alter Zeit offenbar geläufig war, lokale Ge-
netive bei Richtungsangaben zu verwenden: lokativisch Gen. mit ἐν,
μετά u. a., allativisch Gen. mit εἰς (älter ἐν) oder postponiertem δε.
Diese Sprachpraxis kann bereits mykenisch belegt werden mit TH
Of 37,1 qa-ra₂-to-de „zu Q.": Wie dativisches qa-ra₂-te in TH Of 38
zeigt, ist qa-ra₂-to- eindeutig Genetiv und dokumentiert damit den
Typ Ἄϊδός δε. Aus TH Of 33,1 kommt bestätigend o-*34-ta-o do-de
„zu O." hinzu (diesmal mit einem klaren Genetiv eines maskulinen
-ā-Stammes), ferner aus TH Of 26,2 qi-de̯-wa-o do-de[7]).

Ich vermute, daß der offensichtlich alte Typ Ἄϊδός δε auch den
obigen Adverbien zugrunde liegt. Folgende Hypothese schlage ich
vor: neben dem ererbten χθών und dem etymologisch unklaren γῆ
(seit Homer, dazu auch γείτων?) besaß das Frühgriechische für
„Erde" zwei weitere feminine -ā-stämmige Singularia tantum: ἔρα
und χαμά. Wie deren Herkunft zu beurteilen ist, steht auf einem an-
dern Blatt: ἔρα bildet wohl mit althochdeutsch ero „Erde" eine per-
fekte Gleichung, χαμά (so bereits myk. als ka-ma in wohl kollektiv-
neutraler Verwendung, so auch in der Hesychglosse χαμάν· τὸν
ἀγρόν) ist eine Rückbildung aus dem alten, zu χθών gehörigen Adv.
χαμαί und zwar zu einer Zeit, als die kurzvokalischen Lokative auf
-αι noch lebendig gewesen sein müssen[8]). Adverbiales χαμαί gehört
bekanntlich eng mit lateinisch humī u. a. m. zusammen[9]). Zu ἔρα lau-
tete der lokale Genetiv ἔρᾱς, so verstanden und festgehalten bei He-

---

[6]) Beispiele für ἐν + lokaler Genetiv finden sich bei *LSJ* s. v. A I 2 oder bei
K. Meisterhans/E. Schwyzer, *Grammatik der att. Inschriften*, 1900, 214 f. Zu den
Hades-Formeln ist F. Scholz im *LfgrE* I Sp. 275–277 zu vergleichen.

[7]) Die Texte aus TH nach L. Godart/A. Sacconi, Rom 1978. Zum Problem
(do)-de, δε, δῶ u. a. vgl. G. E. Dunkel in *ZVS* 96, 1982 (1983), 190–192 (mit älte-
rer Literatur).

[8]) Die seit Homer bekannten Restformen (verbaut u. a. in Vordergliedern von
Komposita wie μεσαιπόλιος und Πυλαιμένης, eventuell auch in ἀχυρμιαί) be-
spricht H. Dürbeck in *MSS* 37, 1978, 39–57. Im Mykenischen waren aller Wahr-
scheinlichkeit nach Lokativ und Dativ noch geschieden, s. A. Heubeck (a. O. wie
Dürbeck) 75 Anm. 3. Gut zu χαμά C. J. Ruijgh in *Res Mycenaeae*, Göttingen 1983,
404 (der Ansatz eines -s-Stammes in χαμᾶζε ist aber unnötig, s. sogleich).

[9]) Vgl. u. a. Verfasser „Lat. *humī* and *domī*" in *ZVS* 91, 1977, 159–165 (eine
Modifikation bei M. Peters in *Sprache* 30, 1984, in *Idg. Chronik* 30 a p. 118* Nr.
785). Zuletzt zu χαμαί I. Hajnal in den (leider bisher noch nicht erschienenen)
Akten der VIII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft in Leiden 1987.

sych (E 5629 Latte) mit ἔρας· γῆς, dazu allativisch *ἔρᾱς δε bzw. (in späterer Tradition univerbiert) ἔραζε. Entsprechend galt zu χαμαί allativisches *χαμᾶς δε bzw. χαμᾶζε, zu θύρᾱ allativisches *θύρᾱς δε bzw. θύραζε. Alle drei Wendungen blieben längere Zeit in Gebrauch, das Wissen um deren Herkunft verdunkelte sich aber: ἔρᾱ schied aus dem alltäglichen Wortschatz aus, θύραζε dagegen wurde dauernd an der lebendigen Wortfamilie von θύρᾱ gemessen. Unter dem Einfluß von eindeutig akkusativischen Wendungen wie Θήβασδε und Ἀθήναζε (i.e. Ἀθήνασδε) wurde es als pluralisches *θύρα(ν)ς δε reïnterpretiert. Dieser Umdeutung kam Vorbildfunktion zu. Sie bewirkte, daß χαμᾶζε und ἔραζε in seinem Schlepptau blieben: sie behielten zwar den alten Akzent, wurden aber dank pluralischem Verständnis nicht vom ionisch-attischen Lautwandel ᾱ > η̣ berührt.

Wenn mein „Scenario" richtig ist, so sind die zu Eingang zitierten Überlegungen modifikationsbedürftig, auf den Ansatz von -s-Neutra kann verzichtet werden. Der Akzent von χαμᾶζε muß als echt homerischer Archaismus betrachtet werden und darf nicht als Ausweis für einen Attizismus gelten. Die Variante χαμάζε ist dagegen lectio facilior.

Neben ἔραζε, θύραζε und χαμᾶζε sind aus Inschriften und Prosaisten mehrere Richtungsangaben auf -αζε zu femininen Ortsnamen bekannt. Hier ist zu überlegen, ob nicht neben eindeutig pluralischen Akkusativformen und neben analogischen Bildungen auch ein ursprünglich singularisch lokal-genetivisches -αζε mit verbaut sein kann. Zu denken ist speziell an die von Herodian zitierten Adverbien auf -ηζε, über die es heißt: „sur des nominatifs en -η-, on en est venu à construire des adverbes en -ηζε: Ἀθμονῆζε (Ἀθμόνη), Κεφαλῆζε (Κεφαλή), Οἰνόηζε (Οἰνόη), etc."[10]). Neu zu „durchforsten" sind auch die homerischen und mykenischen -de/-δε-Formen[11]). So ist zum Beispiel bei pa-ki-ja-na-de PY nachzutragen, daß neben -ᾱs de und -ᾱn de zusätzlich -ᾱs de die richtige Interpretation sein kann.

Von Ἀϊδός δε kann vielleicht auch die problematische Form Ἐρέβευσφι h. Cer. 349, I 572 (so vulg.), Hes. Theog. 669 (-ευσφι Π, -εσφι Q) Licht empfangen. Sie ist sicher eine poetische Kunstbil-

---

[10]) So Lejeune (REA a.O. in Anm. 1) 233. Vgl. auch E. Schwyzer, Gr. Gr. I, 1939, 625. Jeder Ortsname muß aber für sich geprüft werden. Ein eigenes Problem bildet das Adverb τὰ μέταζε, das laut Herodian in Hes. Op. 394 für handschriftliches τὰ μεταξύ eingesetzt werden soll, s. West z. St. und vgl. auch W.J. Verdenius in Mnemosyne 33, 1980, 381. Ist μεταξύ trotz allem hesiodeisch?

[11]) Das Material bietet M. Lejeune, Mémoires II, 1971, 253-265.

dung, aber von verständlicher Struktur, wenn dem separativen Ausdruck ein lokal-genetivisches Ἐρέβευς (so h. Cer. 409 mit ἐξ) zugrunde gelegt wird, erweitert um das als Partikel empfundene -φι im Sinn von „vom Bereich des E. her". Die „Partikelhäufung" ἐξ Ἐρέβευσφι in I 572 ist nichts Ungewöhnliches, vgl. ἐς πατέρος δῶ in λ 501. Die Handschriftenvarianten mit Ἐρέβεσφι bei Homer und Hesiod stammten dann von Abschreibern, die Obiges nicht mehr verstanden haben.

Lichtvoller kann schließlich auch φόωσδε (B 309, Π 188, Τ 103, 118; λ 223; Hes. Th. 669 im selben Vers wie Ἐρέβευσφι!) werden. Ich neige dazu, φόωσδε im Sinn von „zur Region des Lichtes" zu übersetzen, vgl. speziell λ 223 mit ἀλλὰ φ. τάχιστα λιλαίεο „du aber strebe nun schnell zur Region des Lichtes". Sofern korrekt, bezeugte φόωσδε indirekt den bis jetzt vermißten[12]) Genetiv von φάος: urgriechisch *pháu̯ehos > *pháu̯eos > *pháeos > *pháọ̄s > *phȫs (episch zerdehnt dann φόως). Die damit vorausgesetzte Kontraktion ἐŏ > ọ̄ ist attisch, im Hiat aber auch ionisch: vgl. aus Homer speziell ἀλόω ε 377 „irre!" < *ἀλάọ̄ < *ἀλάεο und Genetiv σπείους < *spéọ̄s < *spéΧehos[13]).

Homeric μίμνω, ἴσχω, ἴζω and πίπτω: a semantic approach

By Georgios Giannakis, University of California, Los Angeles

Summary: This paper presents the results of a study on the semantic value of some reduplicated present stems of the thematic type, based on material drawn primarily from Homeric Greek. The basic conclusion is that reduplication assigns to these verbs various nuances, turning them into intensive, iterative, terminative, completive or perfective, depending on the specific environment where each of them occurs. Such a function is best seen in those instances where we have doublets of a reduplicated and a non-reduplicated stem of the same root, as is the case with μίμνω/μένω, ἴσχω/ἔχω, ἴζω/ἕζομαι and πίπτω/πέτομαι.

1.0 In Homer μένω/μίμνω in many cases stand in clear opposition: μένω means 'to stay, to remain', whereas μίμνω could more accurately be translated by 'stand firm(ly), stand successfully'.[1] In many of its usages this verb has a perfective function, that is to say it appears to emphasize the completion or the conclusion of the verbal action.[2]

In *P* 718–21:   αὐτὰρ ὄπισθε
νῶϊ μαχησόμεθα Τρωσίν τε καὶ Ἕκτορι δίῳ,
ἶσον θυμὸν ἔχοντες ὁμώνυμοι, οἳ τὸ πάρος περ
μίμνομεν ὀξὺν Ἄρηα παρ' ἀλλήλοισι μένοντες,

---

*) In this study I am using the English translation of Richmond Lattimore as a standard for my comparison.

[1]) Holt, *Études*, p. 34 translates μίμνω with 'demeurer', and μένω with 'rester'; cf. also next footnote.

[2]) Cf. Vendryes, *MSL* 20 [1916], pp. 117–23; Meillet-Vendryes, *Traité*, p. 235; Schwyzer-Debrunner, *Gr. Gr.* II, p. 260; Specht, *KZ* 62 [1934], p. 49; Brunel, *BSL* 42 [1946], p. 65 ff.; Debrunner, *IF* 58 [1942], p. 286; Hol, *op. cit.*, pp. 36–37, thinks that ἴσχω and μίμνω express the idea of an endless process; thus, ἴσχω means 'je tiens et je ne lâcherai jamais', and μίμνω 'je reste et je ne partirai jamais'. Kuryłowicz, *Categories*, p. 104, and also 86 ff., 103 ff., 107 ff., claims that such forms are the result of the renewal of the present system by iteratives or inchoatives; this was caused primarily by the functional ambiguity of some present forms, as they shifted to a new semantic sphere, in the case of ἔχω and μένω to punctual meaning, but I cannot see such a shift in our case. For a general discussion, with further references, see Ruipérez, *Estructura*, pp. 119–24.

it is not metrical or prosodic reasons[3]) that require the one form or the other in the particular position in the verse. It is a known fact, of course, that initial and final position in the verse carry most emphasis. Despite this, the two forms μίμνομεν and μένοντες cannot have an identical meaning in this context; they cannot be stylistic variants, as they occur next to each other. In fact, they serve two different functions: μένοντες means 'staying, abiding,' it is intransitive, and thus neutral as regards what may or may not follow; it has no effect on the overall situation, and we have no change of the state of affairs whatsoever.[4]) μίμνομεν, on the other hand, expresses the result of the action that has taken place earlier, and the whole line must mean something like 'we have been successful in standing in the fierce battle by abiding next to each other.' The difference between the two forms is one of aspect, i.e., the simple verb making a mere statement with no further connotations, while the reduplicated stem gives the state of success,[5]) and this is given by the form marked by reduplication. This implies change in the state of affairs: up to a point fighting was not successful, but when the conditions changed, the result changed too.

1.1 Perhaps, the function of reduplication here is transitivization. The accusative ὀξὺν Ἄρηα may be taken as the direct object of μίμνομεν, or as an internal accusative, as is common with verbs of 'flying, fleeing' and 'remain, wait for,'[6]) but this does not have to be so. μίμνομεν can be intransitive 'stayed firm,' and ὀξὺν Ἄρηα can be taken as a temporal accusative, or an accusative of a locatival nature.

---

[3]) This has been often invoked as the explanation of such variants in the Homeric epic diction. Morphological variants, besides the convenience of the situation, most often serve purely expressive and semantic purposes, as will be seen throughout the course of this study.

[4]) Change of state or fall into a new state seems to be one of the features of the perfective verbs. Such change of state is, by definition, excluded for the imperfective verbs, since they express a continuous process and not a transformation into a new state. This difference led Ruipérez (*Estructura*, p. 53) to the division between "transformative" and "non-transformative" semantemes. Schwyzer uses the term "metaptotisch" for both the ingressive aorist and the inchoative formations, since these express the beginning (but not as yet the completion) of a change of state or condition. Cf. *Gr. Gr.* II, p. 221 note 1 and p. 261.

[5]) After Leaf-Bayfield, *Iliad* 428, μίμνομεν with πάρος 'have been wont to abide' as a customary action.

[6]) Cf. Chantraine, *Gr. hom.* II p. 39 "Les verbes signifiant 'fuir' (φεύγω, etc.), ou ‚'attendre de pied ferme' (μένειν, μίμνειν, etc.), sont suivis d'un complément à l'accusatif."

In 14 instances out of a total of 34, μίμνω comes with an accusative, seemingly as direct object; in 6 out of the 14 cases, this accusative is the word for the 'dawn' (ἠῶ), which is rather a temporal accusative, and not the object of μίμνω. These comments do not mean that reduplication does not have a transitivizing force. Simply, in a given context the reading and the meaning can lead to different conclusions. Generalizations are not easy to make and, as far as text-linguistics is concerned, are hardly possible.

1.2 In *Odyssey* μ 160–61:   ἀλλά με δεσμῷ
      δῆσατ' ἐν ἀργαλέῳ ὄφρ' ἔμπεδον αὐτόθι μίμνω,

μίμνω expresses the state resulting from the previous binding of Odysseus on the ship by his comrades. The reduplicated present in this case is of the perfective aspect. What concerns Odysseus it to overcome one of the most difficult tests of his voyage, and the poet chooses the present marked with reduplication to denote the prospective successful completion of this task and effort. The focal point is not a process (expressed by the simple unmarked present), not even a general statement (which could be expressed by the general present, i.e. unreduplicated), but the result, the consequence of what precedes, the successful completion of one more of the "endurance" tests for the main hero.

1.3 In ω 394–6:

        ὦ γέρον, ἵζ' ἐπὶ δεῖπνον, ἀπεκλελάθεσθε δὲ θάμβευς·
        δηρὸν γὰρ σίτῳ ἐπιχειρήσειν μεμαῶτες
        μίμνομεν ἐν μεγάροις, ὑμέας ποτιδέγμενοι αἰεί,

μίμνομεν is part of a string of reduplicative forms: ἵζε (redupl. pres.), ἀπεκλελάθεσθε (redupl. aor.),[7] μεμαῶτες (perf. pple). It is noteworthy that μένω generally tends to express time relations, whereas μίμνω seems to put emphasis on the verbal action per se and on its results, in other words, it emphasizes aspectual considerations rather than temporal ones. Probably this is an indication of the transitional period of the language from a system based on aspect to a mixed system,[8] where both aspect and tense have to be accounted for, a system which develops in post-Homeric and later Classical and

---

[7] A *hapax* in Greek; the preverb ἀπό reinforces ἐκλελάθεσθε 'forget completely;' cf. Heubeck et alii, *Odissea* Vol. 6, 384; also L[exicon des] f[rüh]gr[iechischen] E[pos], p. 1083.

[8] Cf. Kuryłowicz, *Categories*, pp. 90–135; Lehmann, *PIE Syntax*, p. 139 ff., and 189.

Modern Greek.⁹) The fact that μίμνω, even in this relatively late pe-
riod (compared to the time depth of the hypothetical P[roto]-
I[ndo]-E[uropean]), preserves functions that might be attributed to
the proto-language points to its archaic nature. In later Greek only
the simple form continues to be productive.¹⁰)

    1.4 In *O* 726-29:

> Ὣς ἔφαθ᾽, οἱ δ᾽ ἄρα μᾶλλον ἐπ᾽ Ἀργείοισιν ὄρουσαν.
> Αἴας δ᾽ οὐκέτ᾽ ἔμιμνε· βιάζετο γὰρ βελέεσσιν·
> ἀλλ᾽ ἀνεχάζετο τυτθόν, ὀϊόμενος θανέεσθαι,
> θρῆνυν ἐφ᾽ ἑπταπόδην, λίπε δ᾽ ἴκρια νηὸς ἐΐσης,

οὐκέτ᾽ ἔμιμνε registers the single fact of Aias' inability to bear the
Trojan attack amidst the many shafts thrown against him. This
single fact is explained further by λίπε in line 729: Aias could not
stand there any longer, and he withdrew from the battle-field. The
verbs ἔμιμνε and λίπε, as far as the mode of action is concerned, op-
erate on the same semantic level, i. e. their meaning is punctual-aoris-
tic. On the other hand, the imperfects βιάζετο and ἀνεχάζετο, in-
serted between the two parallel actions denoted by ἔμιμνε and λίπε,
are employed in order to express the gradual withdrawal, the actual
process of withdrawing of the Greeks under the pressure exercised
upon them by the attacking forces of the Trojans. Therefore, the use
of punctual verbal forms for the important central facts of the with-
drawal, and progressive forms for the process and the persisting rea-
sons of withdrawal, constitute an impressive picture of opposition.¹¹)

---

⁹) For a comprehensive treatment of the category of aspect (and its relation to
tense) in Biblical Greek, cf. Robertson, *A grammar of the Greek N. T.*, pp.
821-910; Blass-Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the N. T.*; Burton, *Syntax*. For
the language of the non-literary papyri, cf. Mandilaras, *The Verb*. For Mod.
Greek, cf. the account in Seiler, *L'aspect et le temps;* Mirambel, *La Langue grecque
moderne,* pp. 132-42; Thumb, *Handbook,* pp. 111-51.

¹⁰) Some survivals of the reduplicated type, like Mod. Greek δίδω, are fossi-
lized unproductive relics of an older system and not felt as reduplicated forma-
tions any longer.

¹¹) One might think of the so-called "Inzidenzschema," i. e., when one action
falls within the range of another activity, so in this case the aorist λίπε falls
within the process expressed by the series of the imperfects, starting with ἔμιμνε.
On the "Inzidenzschema," cf. Dressler, *Studien,* p. 44 ff., with further references,
especially to Pollak; Strunk, *Glotta* 49 [1971], p. 201, and Chantraine, *Gr. hom.*
II, pp. 193-94 with examples from Homer. I, however, would interpret this pas-
sage in a different way which from a structural and functional point of view
looks more efficient. It is interesting to note the arrangement of the particular

Besides, οὐκέτ' ἔμιμνε ... λίπε δέ stand in a complementary or appositive way, as they each give the same fact in a negative and a positive fashion respectively. I. e., λίπε is the reasonable implication of οὐκέτ' ἔμιμνε, or, conversely, λίπε implies that Aias did not stay. Such polar opposite constructions are not unusual in Homer. In fact, they constitute a frequent means of strengthening the already emphatic meaning conveyed by the positive pole. Redundancies or pleonasms are, as a rule, avoided, but when used they serve expressive purposes. Thus, the expressions οὐκέτ' ἔμιμνε and λίπε δέ semantically convey the same message, but their syntactic structure is different.

1.5 In *Iliad I* 662 ἔνθ' ὁ γέρων κατέλεκτο καὶ Ἠῶ δῖαν ἔμιμνεν, the imperfect ἔμιμνεν stands next to the aorist κατέλεκτο;[12] the two verbs belong to conjoined structures which are connected paratactically, a first indication for possible similarity in the type of their action. Parallel constructions and coordination are not, however, always a safe criterion for such an analysis, as καί may assume different functions, not only coordinatory.[13] But, at any rate, ἔμιμνεν Ἠῶ δῖαν seems to mean not 'waited for bright Dawn,' as Lattimore translates it, but rather 'and (there) abode until the bright Dawn,' i. e., ἔμιμνεν has terminative meaning.

This seems to be the construction of μίμνω + *designation of time*, most often with Ἠῶ δῖαν or εὔθρονον Ἠῶ, as e. g. in σ 318–19, etc. In Σ 254–56:

> ἀμφὶ μάλα φράζεσθε φίλοι· κέλομαι γὰρ ἔγωγε
> ἄστυδε νῦν ἰέναι, μὴ μίμνειν ἠῶ δῖαν
> ἐν πεδίῳ παρὰ νηυσίν· ἑκὰς δ' ἀπὸ τείχεός εἰμεν,

---

verbs here; the important events (ἔμιμνε, λίπε) occupy the two extremes, whereas the explanatory-descriptive verbs function as "fillers," and thus occupy the middle, i. e. the ordering is of the scheme 1-2-2-1, the whole complex giving the impression of an elaborately worked X-figure. Cf. also Humbert, *Syntaxe*, p. 143.

[12] Even if κατέλεκτο is not aorist but imperfect (see the aporia at Liddell-Scott-Jones, *Lexicon*, s. v. καταλέχω), it is still perfective by virtue of its lexical meaning and the perfectivizing force of the preverb κατά, which reinforces the inherent meaning of the verb.

[13] Cf. Denniston, *Particles*, pp. 289–327. For the different functions of the particle τε, cf. ibid., pp. 495–536; for the use of τε in the epic, cf. ibid., pp. 520–35, and also Ruijgh, *Autour de "τε épique."* For the use and function of coordinate conjunctions in Vedic Sanskrit, see the interesting study of Klein, *Discourse Grammar;* especially for ca (etymological cognate of Gk. τε), see Vol. I, pt. 1, pp. 46–292.

μίμνειν is clearly intransitive, and ἠῶ is a temporal accusative.[14]) I find extra support for the intransitivity of μίμνειν in the use of the prepositional phrases which accompany the two infinitives: ἰέναι is modified by ἄστυδε, an accusative + the particle -δε, to express the goal or direction, but μίμνειν takes the preposition ἐν with πεδίῳ, specified even further by παρὰ νηυσίν, both being in the dative case in a locative (= stative) function. Therefore, I would rather translate '(and) not abide in the plane beside the ships *until* the divine dawn,' not as Lattimore renders it 'and not wait for the divine dawn.' Cf. also Σ 263 μίμνειν ἐν πεδίῳ.

1.6 On the other hand, there are instances where designation of time is not expressed by an accusative (with or without preposition), but, instead, by a full temporal clause, as e.g. in B 331–32:

ἀλλ' ἄγε, μίμνετε πάντες, ἐϋκνήμιδες Ἀχαιοί,
αὐτοῦ, εἰς ὅ κεν ἄστυ μέγα Πριάμοιο ἕλωμεν.

Compare this example with Σ 254–6 discussed above, where ἐν πεδίῳ παρὰ νηυσίν corresponds functionally to αὐτοῦ, and ἠῶ to the temporal clause εἰς ὅ κεν ... ἕλωμεν. If we wanted to venture a rephrasing of this clause in the shape of a "direct" complement to the verb μίμνετε of the principal clause, we would perhaps end up with something like μίμνετε αὐτοῦ ἅλωσιν ἄστεως (!), and conversely for μή μίμνειν ἠῶ δῖαν ἐν πεδίῳ ... we would probably get a clause μή μίμνειν ἐν πεδίῳ εἰς ὅ κεν ἠὼς δῖα ἵκηται, or the like. These two (and probably more) possibilities are different options and, depending on the situation and stylistic or other needs, the poet uses the one or the other as variants of an underlying basic notion of time terminus. In the same way, cf. T 188–91 μίμνετε ..., ὄφρα κε ... δῶρα ἕλθῃσι καὶ ὅρκια πιστὰ τάμωμεν 'and remain ... until the gifts come and while we cut the oaths of fidelity;' β 97–8 μίμνετ' ... εἰς ὅ κε

---

[14]) An interesting parallel is provided by the verb ἰαύω (aorist ἄεσα) with the accusative νύκτας as e.g. in τ 340–42 ἀΰπνους νύκτας ἴαυον· πολλὰς γὰρ δὴ νύκτας ... ἄεσα καί τ' ἀνέμεινα ἐΰθρονον Ἠῶ δῖαν. The construction is identical with that of μίμνω + temporal accusative, but of course the difference is that with μίμνω we have a final time-point 'up to, until,' whereas with ἰαύω no such point is implied. Notice also the use of the aorist ἀνέμεινα with Ἠῶ in the same function with μίμνω + Ἠῶ. However, it may be argued that the accusative νύκτας is an "internal" object of ἴαυον and ἄεσα, but I believe, along with Schulze (*Quaest. epicae* 73) who cites the similar passage I 470, that "νύκτας non accusativum objecti (ut in νύκτας ἄγειν noctem degere) sed temporis esse."

φᾶρος ἐκτελέσω 'wait, until I finish this web,' and many other examples.[15])

1.7 The next passage from the *Iliad I* 607-10 & 616-19:

> Φοῖνιξ, ἄττα γεραιέ, διοτρεφές, οὔ τί με ταύτης
> χρεὼ τιμῆς· φρονέω δὲ τετιμῆσθαι Διὸς αἴσῃ,
> ἥ μ' ἕξει παρὰ νηυσί κορωνίσιν, εἰς ὅ κ' ἀϋτμὴ
> ἐν στήθεσσι μένῃ καί μοι φίλα γούνατ' ὀρώρῃ.
>
> . . . .
>
> ἶσον ἐμοὶ βασίλευε καὶ ἥμισυ μείρεο τιμῆς.
> οὔτοι δ' ἀγγελέουσι, σὺ δ' αὐτόθι λέξεο μίμνων
> εὐνῇ ἔνι μαλακῇ· ἅμα δ' ἠοῖ φαινομένηφι
> φρασσόμεθ' ἤ κε νεώμεθ' ἐφ' ἡμέτερ' ἤ κε μένωμεν,

is a good example demonstrating the fact that no generalizations can be made about the function of these verbal forms without first consulting the specific context within which each form occurs. On the one hand, the verbs μένῃ and ὀρώρῃ must belong to the same level as regards the mode of action they each carry; they are both subjunctives and are coordinated with καί. The only difference that I can see is that μένῃ is present, whereas ὀρώρῃ is perfect. Two possibilities exist: either (a) that the aspectual opposition between present and perfect stems is neutralized[16]) in favor of the perfect, that is to say μένῃ is morphologically a present but semantically behaves like a perfect, or (b) that μένω and μίμνω are simply variants of the same verb with no semantic distinction. The latter possibility is not likely, since there are enough cases which prove the semantic distinction of the two verbs, and so they cannot be taken as stylistic variants. I am inclined towards the idea that μένῃ functionally is identical with ὀρώρῃ. On the other hand, the participle μίμνων in line 617 seems to carry a similar mode of action with λέξεο, so that the whole could be rephrased as σύ δ' αὐτόθι λέξεο καὶ μίμνε or something like that. In line 619 the verbs νεώμεθα and μένωμεν again must express similar

---

[15]) Cf. parallel use in modern Greek of the verb περιμένω 'wait' + accusative (with or without a preposition): Περίμεναν την αυγή/περίμεναν ως την αυγή 'they waited for the dawn/they waited until the dawn,' but also with a full temporal clause, as e.g. in (περίμεναν [ως] το ξημέρωμα/) περίμεναν (μέχρι) να ξημερώσει 'they waited until the break of the day/they waited until the day breaks.' Perhaps this is so, because ἠώ, αυγή, ξημέρωμα, all meaning 'dawn, break of the day,' are not just a point in time, but something with a certain length of time, and thus these accusatives are of the extent of time.

[16]) On the process of neutralization on the semantic level, see 3.8 below.

types of action. I would rather translate this line as '(and at break of day) we will take counsel whether to get going back to our own or to stay on;' in other words νεώμεθα means something like 'depart, get into my way back.'[17])

1.8 In *I* 351-55 we have this passage:

> ἀλλ' οὐδ' ὣς δύναται σθένος Ἕκτορος ἀνδροφόνοιο
> ἴσχειν· ὄφρα δ' ἐγὼ μετ' Ἀχαιοῖσιν πολέμιζον
> οὐκ ἐθέλεσκε μάχην ἀπὸ τείχεος ὀρνύμεν Ἕκτωρ,
> ἀλλ' ὅσον ἐς Σκαιάς τε πύλας καὶ φηγὸν ἵκανεν·
> ἔνθα ποτ' οἶον ἔμιμνε, μόγις δέ μευ ἔκφυγεν ὁρμήν,

where we find ἔμιμνε next to the aorist ἔκφυγεν, and both verbs express similar types of action. This was pointed out by Chantraine,[18]) who observes that in some cases the imperfects of certain verbs, such as ἔμιμνε, ἴσχε, ἔτικτε, etc., have a meaning similar to that of the aorist. ἔμιμνε is here simply 'awaited' in an aoristic sense, a meaning supported by ποτέ, and also by the aorist ἔκφυγεν of the next clause, the two clauses being construed antithetically.[19]) As for the meaning of ἴσχειν, I take it as perfective. Reduplication here has a double function: turn the simple stem ἔχ- (PIE *seǵh-) into transitive (or, at least, reinforce its transitivity)[20]) and perfectivize it. Such a meaning of ἴσχειν becomes even more likely, when one takes into consideration the aorists occurring in the immediately preceding lines, πονή-σατο, ἔδειμε, ἤλασε, and κατέπηξεν, which stand in relation to the clause containing ἴσχειν in an antithetical way. The sense is that he did what the aorist verbs denote, but as yet has not been successful in withstanding Hektor's strength.

1.9 The following example from Euripides *Med.* 355 νῦν δ', εἰ μέ-νειν δεῖ, μίμν' ἐφ' ἡμέραν μίαν 'Now, if you have to stay on, abide for

---

[17]) On the relation of νέομαι to νίσ(σ)ομαι, cf. Meillet, *BSL* 27 [1927], p. 230; Chantraine, *Gr. hom.* I, p. 440; Schwyzer-Debrunner, *Gr. Gr.* I, p. 690; Wackernagel, *Kl. Schr.* I, p. 639; Leeuwen, *Enchiridium*, p. 272 and 365; Ruipérez, *Estructura*, p. 119. Between νέομαι and νίσ(σ)ομαι I find a semantic difference, the simplex is ingressive and the reduplicated form has terminative or perfective value. Cf., for instance, M 118-9, where νίσοντο does not refer to a habitual or a continuous activity, but to the successful completion of an effort. In other words, νίσοντο is a "perfective imperfect" (see 4.2 below).

[18]) *Gr. hom.* II p. 190.

[19]) The alternative of taking ἔμιμνε as conative 'tried to stand up to me' can not be ruled out in this case. Monro (*Iliad* 347) takes it as a customary or habitual imperfect but, I think, this is clearly wrong.

[20]) Cf. also footnote 2 above for Kuryłowicz's position on these formations.

one day,' constitutes a classical case of semantic difference between the two stems and has occupied scholars who dealt whith the question of aspect of the Greek verb. The phrase ἐφ' ἡμέραν μίαν delimits the sense of μίμνε to a specific length, so we can say that its meaning is terminative.[21]) In fact, the structure here is the same with the cases where an accusative like Ἠῶ δῖαν appears to be the object of the verb but in reality it is only a temporal accusative (see above). In Euripides we have a prepositional phrase (as is common in Classical and later Greek), whereas in Homer we still find the usage of the bare case in a temporal sense.[22])

---

[21]) Cf. also B 299 τλῆτε, φίλοι, καὶ μείνατ' ἐπὶ χρόνον, ξ 244 μῆνα γὰρ οἶον ἔμεινα τεταρπόμενος τεκέεσσι (notice the striking similarity of the use of the accusative μῆνα οἶον and the accusative ἠῶ with μίμνω, discussed in 1.5–1.7 above). In these examples, the aorist of μένω is used with an adverbial complement of time which strengthens even more the perfective value of the verb. We must, however, admit that this criterion is not absolute, and, in fact, may be misleading at times. To be true, not only aorists (or perfective-terminatives) but quite frequently the imperfects too of the simple verb occur with such "delimiting" temporal phrases. The central point is that in all cases we must look very closely into the specific context in order to determine to precise function of these verbs. For a discussion on this, see Strunk, *Glotta* 49 [1971], p. 208 ff. On the other hand, I think that, at least in η 259–63, ξ 285–88, τ 199–202, discussed by Strunk, the imperfects are in direct contrast to the aorists that follow, i. e., μένον expresses the continuous residing for the specified period of time, whereas the aorists express the break of this continuity. The imperfects in these passages bring in only a secondary, "fill-in" piece of information, while the aorists are used for the main event which will carry the narrative forward. To put it in modern discourse-analysis terms, the aorists represent the *focus* or *topic* and the imperfects the *comment* in the sequence of thoughts and clauses. One gets the impression that the poet wants to stress the important fact by means of the antithesis between the contrasting tense-stems. Cf. also note 11 above.

[22]) Such analytic tendencies whereby morphologically compact forms are replaced by either prepositional phrases or more descriptive and analytic constructions are not uncommon in the languages of the world. In the Indo-European languages, in particular, this develops into a general phenomenon. Cf., for instance, the reduction of the rich PIE case system to two or three grammatical cases, or sometimes, like in English, its virtual disappearance. The new grammatical process, as a rule, is preposition + accusative. E.g., in Modern Greek, we witness today the gradual elimination of the genitive case and its replacement by a prepositional phrase, so that what a few decades ago would be ποταμοί αἵματος 'rivers of blood,' today has become ποταμοί από αίμα, the genitive αίματος being replaced by prep. από + accus. case αίμα. The examples can be easily multiplied from many other languages. For the situation in Homer, cf. Chantraine, *Gr. hom.* II, p. 84; Palmer, *Companion*, pp. 139–45, and for the use of cases, pp. 129–36; Ruijgh, *Autour*, pp. 109–10. Horrocks, *Space and Time in Homer*, p. 192

2.0 In the pair ἔχω/ἴσχω the semantic contrast is probably more clearly visible than in that of μένω/μίμνω. ἴσχω seems to be always transitive in the active,[23]) and a great deal of effort on the part of the agent is involved. In E 811-12:

> ἀλλά σευ ἦ κάματος πολυάϊξ γυῖα δέδυκεν,
> ἦ νύ σέ που δέος ἴσχει ἀκήριον,

the use of ἴσχει next to the perfect δέδυκεν in parataxis points to similar modes of action, as was the case with μίμνω in several instances. The present meaning of ἴσχει has been neutralized by the perfect δέδυκεν, and thus is pulled up to the same semantic level with it.

2.1 δ 556-58:

> τὸν ἴδον ἐν νήσῳ θαλερὸν κατὰ δάκρυ χέοντα,
> νύμφης ἐν μεγάροισι Καλυψοῦς, ἥ μιν ἀνάγκη
> ἴσχει· ὁ δ' οὐ δύναται ἣν πατρίδα γαῖαν ἱκέσθαι.

Here we have another instance where the perfective value of the verb ἴσχει is apparent. This study stresses throughout the importance of the context as a whole for the semantic analysis of some

---

observes that Homeric epic represents a language state in transition in which there is a preference for such prepositional phrases (locational or directional expressions containing a particle), but this is just a tendency not yet a general rule. He further states that this kind of development is one stage in the shift of the semantic burden from the original case ending to the particle, and thus the syntactic change of particles from their role as particles to that of prepositions.

[23]) In the middle normally it is intransitive or, if transitive, it is construed with the genitive case. Cf., for instance, ἴσχεο κλαυθμοῖο γόοιό τε (ω 323), λώβης ἴσχεσθαι (σ 347 = υ 285), ἴσχεσθε πτολέμου (ω 531), etc. In such constructions, the verb tends to have a terminative meaning, which may be due partly to the function of the genitive case as a "closed," non-directional case, as opposed to the accusative, which we may call an "open," directional, end/goal-pertaining case. Confusion of cases, of course, especially with verbs of motion, is not unusual, even in Homer; cf., for instance, I 588-89 τοὶ δ' ἐπὶ πύργων // βαῖνον Κουρῆτες, where the genitive is used, but in Z 386 ἀλλ' ἐπὶ πύργον ἔβη μέγαν Ἰλίου the accusative is used, i.e. the accusative denotes the goal/direction in Z 386, whereas the genitive in I 588 is used for "true" location, the surface upon/from which something was (going) to take place (see also footnote 53). In the case of ἴσχω, however, as with all other verbs meaning 'cease, pause, release, restrain, give up, etc.,' the genitive signifies separation, and in this respect it is the "ablatival" genitive (cf. Smyth, Greek Grammar, § 1392; Schwyzer-Debrunner, Gr. Gr. II, p. 92). This means that the genitive which appears as the object of the verb ἴσχεο is not the object, but an original ablative whose function was taken over by the genitive in historical Greek. Therefore, ἴσχεο may not be transitive, but a "true" middle intransitive, accompanied by a locative adverbial complement.

verbal forms, and this passage does not fall short in this respect. Kal-
ypso is successful in holding Odysseus back and preventing his re-
turn home. This fact needs to be pointed out clearly, and it is done
by using the marked verbal stem ἴσχει. The overall context supports
this interpretation. My feeling, however, is that there is an intimate
connection between the name of the goddess Kalypso, the means of
holding Odysseus her prisoner, i.e. ἀνάγκη, and the verbal forma-
tion that is used in order for this complex association to come out
clear.[24]

2.2 In *P*746–51:

> ὣς οἵ γ᾽ ἐμμεμαῶτε νέκυν φέρον. αὐτὰρ ὄπισθεν
> Αἴαντ᾽ ἰσχανέτην, ὥς τε πρὼν ἰσχάνει ὕδωρ
> ὑλήεις, πεδίοιο διαπρύσιον τετυχηκώς,
> ὅς τε καὶ ἰφθίμων ποταμῶν ἀλεγεινὰ ῥέεθρα
> ἴσχει, ἄφαρ δέ τε πᾶσι ῥόον πεδίονδε τίθησι
> πλάζων· οὐδέ τί μιν σθένεϊ ῥηγνῦσι ῥέοντες,

ἰσχανέτην and ἰσχάνει from the morphological point of view are ex-
tensions of the stem ἰσχ-, and the suffix - ανω may serve as rein-
forcement of the already punctual meaning of ἴσχω. It might also be
the case that at least the imperfect ἰσχανέτην can have conative
meaning, and ἰσχάνει can very well be a perfective present, like ἴσχει
a few lines down. This passage becomes even more interesting, as far
as the semantics of the verbal forms used is concerned, when we
place on the same semantic level τίθησι which is paratactically con-
strued with ἴσχει.[25]

2.3 There is an interesting collocation of ἔχω/ἴσχω with ἵππους
as object, occurring only in the *Iliad*, and, although a semantic dis-
tinction is not always easy to detect, at least a slightly higher degree
of emphasis is discernible in the case of ἴσχω. In fact, I would rather
see in this pair the same semantic differences that we saw in μένω/
μίμνω. In *P*501–2, Ἀλκίμεδον, μὴ δή μοι ἀπόπροθεν ἰσχέμεν
ἵππους,//ἀλλὰ μάλ᾽ ἐμπνείοντε μεταφρένῳ, as opposed to Λ759–60,
αὐτὰρ Ἀχαιοὶ // ἂψ ἀπὸ Βουπρασίοιο Πύλον δ᾽ ἔχον ὠκέας ἵππους,
ἰσχέμεν seems to emphasize the success of the effort, does not give

---

[24]) For more on Kalypso, cf. Hainsworth's introductory note on Book V of
the *Odyssey* and his comments in V.57, as well as I.14, in Heubeck et alii, *Odys-
sey*.

[25]) This implies that τίθησι, too, is of the perfective aspect, but this I will leave
for a more thorough study, as the specific contexts have to be looked on an one-
to-one basis.

the duration or repetition of the act of holding the horses back. ἔχον, on the other hand, underlines neither the successful completion nor the end of the process, but simply means 'they drove/ directed the horses towards Pylos.' Perhaps, the meaning of ἔχον here is ingressive 'they began to/they turned the horses towards Pylos.'" Leroy[26]) says that these reduplicated presents "envisagent le procès sous l'aspect déterminé." The same with P 501-2 above can be said about O 455-57:

> τοὺς μὲν ὅ γ' Ἀστυνόῳ Προτιάονος υἱέϊ δῶκε,
> πολλὰ δ' ἐπότρυνε σχεδόν ἴσχειν εἰσορόωντα
> ἵππους,

where a rather intensive sense of ἴσχειν is strengthened even more by the etymologically cognate σχεδόν.

2.4 When speaking of respect, Homer uses σέβας μ' ἔχει as in γ 123, but for fear δέος μ' ἴσχει is used, cf. E 812, 817, N 224, etc. Clearly, between these two expressions there is a difference at least of degree in emphasis. δέος μ' ἴσχει, as far as the feeling expressed is concerned, is, in comparison to σέβας μ' ἔχει, semantically doubly reinforced by using forms or lexical items marked by a higher degree of emphasis, and thus an extreme intensification and probably perfectivization of the situation takes place.[27]) σέβας μ' ἔχει expresses the general feeling of respect, like σέβομαι, and there is no indication of a break in the activity that was/is taking place. With δέος μ' ἴσχει, on the other hand, beside the abrupt strong feeling of fear or terror, a break in the action is implied: this expression has the restraining power of putting a hold to any activity at the time, and in this respect it may be paraphrased with δείδω, a perfect with present sense. Cf. for instance the following passage from the Iliad O 655-58:

> Ἀργεῖοι δὲ νεῶν μὲν ἐχώρησαν καὶ ἀνάγκῃ
> τῶν πρωτέων, αὐτοῦ δὲ παρὰ κλισίῃσιν ἔμειναν
> ἀθρόοι, οὐδὲ κέδασθεν ἀνὰ στρατόν· ἴσχε γὰρ αἰδὼς
> καὶ δέος,

---

[26]) RBPhH 36 [1958], p. 134.

[27]) For a possible relationship between intensive meaning and perfective aspect, cf. Herbig, IF 6 [1896], p. 212 "Die Intensität einer Handlung oder eines Zustandes geht sehr leicht in den Begriff der Perfektivierung über;" Mutzbauer, Grundlagen, pp. 38-39.

where the three preceding aorists ἐχώρησαν, ἔμειναν and (οὐδὲ) κέδ-
ασθεν furnish further proof for the perfective value of ἴσχε. shame
and fear are successfully holding back the Argives. One should not
fail to notice the striking similarity of the syntax here with that in Σ
254–56 and B 331–32 discussed in sections 1.5 and 1.6, respectively.
Locative adverbs and/or prepositional phrases are often used in or-
der to "localize," i.e., give to the verb a more concrete and specific
meaning, or even completely change it.

3.0 The verb ἵζω 'sit, take a seat; to seat s.o.,' is a very common
verb, attested in almost all the Indo-European languages, in most of
them with reduplication. It goes back to the PIE root *sed-, and its
cognates in several other languages include Skt. sádas- (n.) 'seat,
place,' Gk. ἕδος 'id.,' ἕζομαι,[28]) (probably a yo-present *sed-yo-mai,
like ON sitia, OHG sizzen, etc.), ON setr 'seat, place, residence,' etc.
To this root, which normally has intransitive-stative meaning and is
mostly associated with the aorist[29]) (cf. Skt. a-aorist ásadat 'he sat'),
there is the much more common present formation with reduplica-
tion, as Gk. ἵζω, (PIE *si-sd-ō), Lat. sīdō, Umbr. sistu, Skt. sídati, etc.
This present with reduplication is, according to Frisk,[30]) „ein termin-
atives reduplipliziertes" formation; he further states that the only cer-
tain present-stem formation of ἕζομαι in Homer is ἕζεαι (χ 378).

3.1 Thus, in B 53–4:

Βουλὴν δὲ πρῶτον μεγαθύμων ἷζε γερόντων
Νεστορέῃ παρὰ νηὶ Πυλοιγενέος βασιλῆος,

it seems that ἷζε is either causative 'made the council to sit,'[31]) or sim-
ply transitive, the function of reduplication simply being transitiviza-
tion. At any rate, one thing is certain, namely that the imperfect ἷζε is

---

[28]) Very frequently compounded with the "terminative" preverb κατά in
καθέζομαι 'sich niedersetzen, sitzen' (Frisk. GEW). Purdie (IF 9 [1898], p.137)
believes that the early development of a perfective compound may have been fa-
cilitated by the lack of an aorist to ἕζομαι, and thus modelled on the analogy of
ἵζω : καθίζω.

[29]) Cf. Specht, KZ 62 [1934], p. 48 ff., where he, too, sees an aoristic function
of ἕζομαι; also Frisk, op. cit.

[30]) op. cit.; also Herbig, IF 6 [1896], pp. 221–22; Purdie (op. cit., p.136) con-
jectures an originally perfective reduplicated present ἵζω, and cites as parallels
Lat. sīdō and OCS sědatĭ. Cf. also the compound καθίζω which carries mostly
perfective meaning.

[31]) Cf. Murray; Mazon renders 'Agamemnon invite le Conceil ... à siéger;' cf.
furthermore, Kirk, The Iliad 120, for a variant reading and interpretation by an-
cient grammarians; Monro, Iliad 262.

neither durative nor progressive. It is obvious that no process is expressed here, but rather the single act of setting the council up into session, and in this respect reduplication can be said to have terminative function, behaving exactly like the terminative preverb κατά in καθέζομαι.[32])

3.2 *I* 87–88:

> κὰδ δὲ μέσον τάφρου καὶ τείχεος ἷζον ἰόντες·
> ἔνθα δὲ πῦρ κῆαντο, τίθεντο δὲ δόρπα ἕκαστος.

This is a brilliant example of how important reading-in-context is for digging out the very fine nuances and shades of meaning that these verbs have. In the sequence of stems imperfect (ἷζον)-aorist (κῆαντο)-imperfect (τίθεντο), to me it is extremely difficult to discern a difference in the type of action of the three verbs. A close grammatical transferance from Greek to English would give the awkward 'they were sitting … they kindled … they were preparing(!)'. The only explanation I can think of is that we have another case of semantic neutralization,[33]) yielding thus identical modes of action. All three stems are marked, in structural terms, as [+ past (tense), + perfective (aspect)]. As for the past tense used in this passage, its sole significance is to place the action in time anterior to that of the moment of speaking.[34]) Therefore, the distinctive feature [+ past] can be ignored as irrelevant for the point under discussion. Now, the morphological markers which are used to carry the [+ perfective] value of the three verbs are: [+ reduplication], [+ root aorist], [+ reduplication], features with heavy morphological and semantic load. The implication here is that τίθεντο, too, has perfective meaning.[35]) Is reduplication the marker of perfectivity, in general? Certainly, with the reduplicated aorist and perfect, we can

---

[32]) Cf. again Frisk, *op. cit.*

[33]) Cf. 3.8 below.

[34]) The interaction between the categories of tense and aspect is not of any special significance for the type of action per se (perfectivity does not have to coincide with past tense, see for instance perfective presents. Or, on the other hand, imperfectivity does not necessarily go with present tense, cf. the imperfect as opposed to the aorist). On this, see Comrie, *Aspect,* pp. 120–21, and footnote 45 below.

[35]) The other possibility, of course, is to take τίθεντο as ingressive 'each began to prepare his supper.' But, for a better insight on this verb, cf. discussion of ε 192–200 in section 3.6.

safely associate a punctual, perfective or stative meaning, but for the present stem this is not always easy.[36])

3.3 *T*50, κὰδ δὲ μετὰ πρώτῃ ἀγορῇ ἷζοντο κιόντες 'and came and took their seats in the front rank of those assembled.' To my knowledge, there is general agreement about the form and meaning of κιόντες; it is aorist participle of a verb which in Homer is attested only in the preterite.[37]) Now, it seems that participle κιόντες + finite verb constitute a unit, and the meaning is 'to go and ...'[38]) This is the case in *T*50. We have the imperfect ἷζοντο with the participle κιόντες, the types of action of which both are identical: 'came and took their seats,' i.e. they both have perfective value.

3.4 Another context with particular interest for the semantics of ἷζω is *I*218-20:

> αὐτὸς δ᾽ ἀντίον ἷζεν Ὀδυσσῆος θείοιο
> τοίχου τοῦ ἑτέροιο, θεοῖσι δὲ θῦσαι ἀνώγει
> Πάτροκλον, ὃν ἑταῖρον· ὁ δ᾽ ἐν πυρὶ βάλλε θυηλάς.

Obviously, ἷζεν has in this context perfective meaning 'he sat, took a seat,' a meaning which is of similar mode to that of ἀνώγει (a pluperfect, derived from the perfect ἄνωγα, whose meaning is present, like that of οἶδα).[39]) In Homer, the present ἀνώγει is in competition with the perfect ἄνωγε, and the imperfect ἄνωγε with the pluperfect ἀνώγει.[40]) I am taking ἀνώγει here as pluperfect, since all other verbs are preterites, and the general context requires a past tense. The difference in tense between the imperfect ἷζεν and the pluperfect ἀνώγει is

---

[36]) A perfective function of the reduplication is surely documented in many cases in this paper, where the context works in favor of this interpretation. Herbig (*IF* 6 [1896], p. 210 ff.) discusses this question in relation to the perfect stem, but his conclusion is that, like the perfect itself, reduplication had originally iterative-intensive meaning. Or, if reduplication behaves like preverbs in composition, then in those cases, at least, where it seems to substitute for perfectivizing preverbs, reduplication can certainly claim general perfectivizing force regardless of the context (cf. the interesting distribution between ἀποθνῄσκω: τέθνηκα, ἀπο-μιμνῄσκω: μέμνημαι, mentioned in footnote 50 below).

[37]) That κιόντες is aorist is supported by its accentuation, κιών like λαβών, ἐλθών, etc. κίω, to be sure, is attested later, and is considered to be a formation based on the aorist ἔκιον, probably from a PIE root *kēi- 'in Bewegung setzen, in Bewegung sein,' with a heavy basis *kiə-, and possible cognates Lat. *cieō, citus*, etc. (cf. Pokorny, *Ig. Etym. Wört.*).

[38]) Cunliffe, *Lexicon*; cf. also Chantraine, *Gr. hom.* II, 188.

[39]) Schwyzer-Debrunner, *Gr. Gr.* I, p. 767 ff.

[40]) Chantraine, *Dictionnaire Étym.*

explained as another case of neutralization of the narrow temporal distinction. What matters is the precise meaning to come out, and this is done by using the perfective verbs. Past tense, because the entire situation refers to a time anterior to that of the present situation, and its realization has taken place in time past. In fact, this example offers an excellent illustration of the major aspectual opposition of the Greek (and the Indo-European, for that matter) verbal system, namely that of perfective vs. imperfective.

3.5 Σ 421–23:

> αἱ μὲν ὕπαιθα ἄνακτος ἐποίπνυον· αὐτὰρ ὁ ἔρρων
> πλησίον, ἔνθα Θέτις περ, ἐπὶ θρόνου ἷζε φαεινοῦ,
> ἔν τ' ἄρα οἱ φῦ χειρὶ ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε.

Lattimore's translation of this passage is faulty in that Θέτις is taken as the subject of ἷζε. For our purposes, it makes a big difference if the subject of ἷζε is ὁ (viz. Hephaistos). This difference is the fact that ἷζε must be construed with the following preterites φῦ, ἔφατο (aorists), and the imperfect ὀνόμαζε. This being made clear, we, then, may argue that the meaning of ἷζε must be of identical mode with that of the two aorists, in other words, it must be perfective. The actions of ἷζε, φῦ, and ἔφατο are punctual, they lack duration, and they involve no process. As for ὀνόμαζε, its value is clearly ingressive.[41] Cf. also ε 333–38, where the construction is similar, and this function of ἷζε perhaps becomes even more visible.

3.6 ε 192–200:

> Ὣς ἄρα φωνήσασ' ἡγήσατο δῖα θεάων
> καρπαλίμως· ὁ δ' ἔπειτα μετ' ἴχνια βαῖνε θεοῖο.
> ἷξον δὲ σπεῖος γλαφυρὸν θεὸς ἠδὲ καὶ ἀνήρ,
> καί ῥ' ὁ μὲν ἔνθα καθέζετ' ἐπὶ θρόνου ἔνθεν ἀνέστη
> Ἑρμείας, νύμφη δ' ἐτίθει πάρα πᾶσαν ἐδωδήν,
> ἔσθειν καὶ πίνειν, οἷα βροτοὶ ἄνδρες ἔδουσιν·
> αὐτὴ δ' ἀντίον ἷζεν Ὀδυσσῆος θείοιο,
> τῇ δὲ παρ' ἀμβροσίην δμωαὶ καὶ νέκταρ ἔθηκαν.
> οἱ δ' ἐπ' ὀνείαθ' ἑτοῖμα προκείμενα χεῖρας ἴαλλον.[42]

---

[41]) On the formulaic expression ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε, cf. Jacobsohn, KZ 62 [1934], pp. 132–40. Also Heubeck et alii, Odyssey I, comment on V. 181.

[42]) The collocation χεῖρας ἰάλλειν may be very old and probably attributed to the proto-language (PIE) since we find the Vedic Sanskrit equivalent bāhávā sísarti 'stretch out the arms.' ἴαλλον too is a reduplicated present, but I will not deal with it here (but, see note 62).

This passage from the *Odyssey* may prove of the utmost impor-
tance, for it seems to furnish an eloquent answer for a number of is-
sues raised in this investigation, such as the function of reduplication
in Greek and Indo-European, the semantic value of presents with redu-
plication, and the overall attitude towards a text-linguistic approach
of the question of the semantics of particular grammatical forms.

First of all, we have a portion of text consisting of a number of
subsets or subunits. For our purposes, what matters primarily is the
set of clauses which contain the verbs καθέζετο and ἐτίθει πάρα, on
the one hand, and ἶζεν and (παρά) ἔθηκαν, on the other. As far as
the aspectual value is concerned, all possible evidence suggests that
these verbs have similar modes of meaning. A couple of issues, con-
cerning the form and meaning of καθέζετο and ἔθηκαν, have been
settled by scholarship in the past. The former is an imperfect, from
present ἕζομαι, with clear and undeniable semantic affinities to the
aorist.[43]) ἔθηκαν is a κα-aorist, from the well-known PIE root
*dheE- 'to put, to place,' and has a punctual-terminative meaning.
The parallelism between the verbs of the two subunits of text
is striking, and turns easily into an aspectual equation: [καθέζετο:
ἐτίθει πάρα] = [ἶζεν: παρά ἔθηκαν], and, if we replace the terms of
the parallelism with structural distinctive features, the above equa-
tion looks like:

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
+\ imperfect\,(\text{tense}) & +\ imperfect\,(\text{tense}) \\
+\ perfective & : +\ X\,(\text{aspect}) \\
\quad \text{or} \quad (\text{aspect}) & \\
+\ terminative &
\end{bmatrix}
=
\begin{bmatrix}
+\ imperfect\,(\text{tense}) & +\ aorist\,(\text{tense}) \\
+\ Y\,(\text{aspect}) & : +\ perfective \\
& \quad \text{or}\,(\text{aspect}) \\
& +\ terminative
\end{bmatrix}
$$

The next step, I think, is purely elementary mathematics. All the
terms of our equation are equal. The terms + X and + Y, which
represent the feature of aspect of the verbs ἐτίθει πάρα and ἶζεν, can-
not but coincide on the type of their action.[44])

What primarily concerns us here is ἶζεν and its similar usage with
παρά ἔθηκαν. The parallelism with καθέζετο: ἐτίθει πάρα was made
only for the sake of the argument and in order do draw the reader's
attention to the underlying principle of this study, namely that a se-
mantic analysis of a particular form in a particular place in the text

---

[43]) On this, cf. 3.0 above.
[44]) The tense features [+ imperfect] and [+ aorist] are neutralized for the
general notion of past time by the aspect feature [+ perfective/+ terminative].
Therefore, the tense term can be left out of our consideration as irrelevant to the
point under discussion.

needs a broader viewing of the specific environment of its occur-
rence.[45])

3.8 We have emphasized several times thus far that linear or
coordinate constructions tend to convey similar types of action, re-
gardless of the morphological or phonological shape of the individ-
ual verbs used in these. Semantic neutralization[46]) is not unusual in
Homer, the most frequent being that of present stem vs. aorist or
perfect stem. In such cases, the rule tends to be that the unmarked
form (viz. the present stem in this case, as opposed to the aorist or

---

[45]) The question of aspect is a multifaceted one, and has puzzled philo-
sophers, philologists and linguists since the ancient times (the Stoics had already
realized that beside tense the verb in ancient Greek denoted also the mode of ac-
tion, and they used the terms χρόνοι παρατατικοί or ἀτελεῖς and χρόνοι τέλειοι
or συντελικοί for the tempora infecta and tempora perfecta respectively; cf.
Schwyzer-Debrunner, Gr. Gr. II, p.249). In contrast to tense which is an "objec-
tive" category, defined and determined by objective criteria, aspects are consid-
ered to be "subjective," and reflect the author's or the interpreter's philosophical
views on the matter (cf. Jespersen, Philosophy of Grammar, pp.286-89; Hermann,
IF 45, pp.207-228). In the traditional view about aspect, however, the labels ap-
ply in the reverse order, i.e. tense is considered as "subjective" and aspect as "ob-
jective" category, cf. Prokosch, Comp. Gmc. Grammar, p.146, also Jakobson, in
his study Shifters, Verbal Categories, and the Russian Verb. For the problems
caused by the terminological confusion of the terms 'Aktionsart' and 'aspect,' cf.
Ruijgh, Gnomon 51 [1979], pp.217-27, especially 220-23, with an outline of the
history of the question and references; also Strunk, Glotta 49, pp.197-98, with
many references to the relevant literature. The literature on this problem is im-
mense and readily available, and thus there is no need to repeat it here. One
question, however, which is immediately relevant to this study is the fact that
aspects in general are treated as composite rather than single semantic elements.
In this respect, aspects cannot and should not be associated with the verb alone,
but they extend to other features of the proposition, including temporal features
as well as features pertaining to manner of action (cf. Lehmann, PIE Syntax, p.
189; on the composite nature of aspects, see Dressler, Studien, and Verkuyl,
Comp. Nature). In other words, aspects are tightly connected to the discourse in
general, they are not abstract features of descriptive grammars. In this respect,
the importance of the text becomes evident, and this is what the present study in-
tends to make clear.

[46]) I intend to elaborate on this process in a fuller study in the future. For the
present, I refer the reader to Comrie, Aspect, p.116; Ruipérez Neutralization, p.
245 ff. and Estructura, pp.101-115; Kuryłowicz Categories, p.15 ff. and 24 ff.; Ly-
ons, Semantics I, pp.306-7; Greimas, Structural Semantics, pp.185-89. Hettrich
(Kontext und Aspekt, pp.49-51 and 78-81) deals with similar cases of different
tense-stems in polar constructions of the type A ... non B, where there is a se-
mantic "attraction" by the verb of the main clause. Kiparsky (see note 50 below),
is to a certain extent relevant to this process.

perfect, which in the opposition present stem/aorist or prefect stem
are the marked terms) is neutralized by the marked form: it is se-
mantically pulled up into the semantic level of the marked member
of the opposition, and thus losing its basic function of "presentness,"
i. e. the progressive aspect, in general. Or, to put it in a different way,
the unmarked member of the opposition, i. e. the present stem, in
certain contexts assumes values similar or identical to those of the
marked term, i. e. of the aorist or the perfect stems. This phenome-
non, of course, is a well-known concept in structural linguistics, es-
pecially in phonemics where it was first applied by the Prague
School linguists, but can be applied successfully in other levels of
linguistic analysis as well.

   The application of this process in the passage under consideration
is the semantic neutralization of ἵζεν by the aorist ἔθηκαν. ἵζεν is
drawn up into the plane of the semantic function of ἔθηκαν and thus
acquires a perfective value.

   4.0 πίπτω/πέτομαι is another doublet of the same type with the
meaning 'fall, drop' for the reduplicated stem and 'fly' for the sim-
plex. πίπτω seems to emphasize the end of the process of falling, it
denotes the completion of the verbal action rather than the actual
process; a final goal is implied in πίπτω, but not in πέτομαι, as in Π
633 ἡμῖν δ' αὔτως πᾶσιν ἐτώσια πίπτει ἔραζε. In this passage πίπτει
refers to the result, the final point that the understood βέλεα 'shafts'
reach; it does not describe the process of falling/dropping, but a
completed action or a state attained. Therefore, I should rather
translate πίπτει with the perfect "have fallen." Similarly in Λ 69.

   4.1 ξ 87–88:

> πλησάμενοι δέ τε νῆας ἔβαν οἰκόνδε νέεσθαι,
> καὶ μὲν τοῖς ὄπιδος κρατερὸν δέος ἐν φρεσὶ πίπτει.

Because I find Lattimore's translation very obscure, I use that of A.
Cook for comparison: 'When they fill up the ships and go to return
home – even on their minds does a strong fear of the surveillance
fall.'

   The expression δέος πίπτει reminds us of δέος ἴσχει in the sense
'fear possesses s. o.,' the difference, of course, being that ἴσχει is
transitive, whereas πίπτει is intransitive. On the semantic side,
though, the two expressions are very similar, and, depending on the
situation, I would translate both of them with 'fear possesses/holds
s. o.' Thus, my translation of line 88 above is 'and a strong fear of
surveillance possesses/holds their minds.' The difference between

my rendering of the text and that of Cook is that mine intends to make another possibility of the semantic value of πίπτει a bit clearer, namely that this verb can be taken either as intensive (seen in Cook's translation), or as perfective, which is the meaning of 'possess, hold,' and which is the prevalent meaning in Homer.[47])

4.2 Λ 155-59:

> ὡς δ᾽ ὅτε πῦρ ἀίδηλον ἐν ἀξύλῳ ἐμπέσῃ ὕλῃ,
> πάντῃ τ᾽ εἰλυφόων ἄνεμος φέρει, οἱ δέ τε θάμνοι
> πρόρριζοι πίπτουσιν ἐπειγόμενοι πυρὸς ὁρμῇ·
> ὡς ἄρ᾽ ὑπ᾽ Ἀτρείδῃ Ἀγαμέμνονι πῖπτε κάρηνα
> Τρώων φευγόντων.

This passage is interesting in two respects: first, we have the use of the same verb πίπτω in both the present and the preterite tense, and any aspectual distinctions could probably reveal themselves relatively easily, and the interaction between the categories of tense and aspect could perhaps be seen and determined more clearly in such a situation. Secondly, we may be able to find some support for the idea that, at least for some verbs, the opposition between perfective/imperfective meaning, this depending on the context, extends even to tenses which traditionally would seem to contradict a perfective function, namely the imperfect. On the other hand, there are languages, like Bulgarian, where the aspectual opposition perfective/imperfective runs along the entire tense system. It seems that πῖπτε in Λ 158 is exactly what in Bulgarian grammatical theory is called "perfective imperfect." The function of this tense is to describe a situation which in itself is perfective,[48]) but at the moment of speaking it appears to have an element of repetitiveness or imperfectivity or, to put it in a different way, for a case where "each subevent is closed while the macroevent is open."[49]) The sense of πῖπτε, then, is that they kept falling (the iterative or repetitive element), but each occurrence of falling is in itself a complete event. Cf. also M 156, Σ 552, etc. In some languages, such as Bulgarian or Georgian, this category has distinct morphological markers, but in Greek such marking is

---

[47]) Notice the figure καθ᾽ ὅλον καὶ μέρος, in τοῖς ... ἐν φρεσὶ 'in them ... in their hearts,' which may add to the expressive function of the reduplicated verb. Cf. also ψ 308-9.

[48]) πίπτω is by definition terminative or perfective. Cf. opening remarks in section on πίπτω.

[49]) Cf. Timberlake, *Invariance and Russian Aspect*, p.318. For a more detailed discussion of this, see Comrie, *Aspect*, pp.31-32.

lacking. Instead, we must rely on the context and, wherever possible,
a combination of the context and the inherent meaning of the spe-
cific verb.

4.3 In Λ 497–500:   οὐδέ πω Ἕκτωρ
    πεύθετ᾽, ἐπεί ῥα μάχης ἐπ᾽ ἀριστερὰ μάρνατο πάσης,
    ὄχθας πὰρ ποταμοῖο Σκαμάνδρου, τῇ ῥα μάλιστα
    ἀνδρῶν πῖπτε κάρηνα, βοὴ δ᾽ ἄσβεστος ὀρώρει,

πῖπτε could mean "kept falling," i.e. to be taken as intensive or itera-
tive; the scene itself favors such a meaning as we have a dramatic de-
scription of a violent battle. But the arrangement of the verbs in this
line favors the idea of taking πῖπτε on a par with the pluperfect ὀρώ-
ρει which is perfective anyway. Therefore, I translate πῖπτε as plu-
perfect 'had fallen,' contrary to Lattimore's 'were dropping.' But at
any rate this passage shows us the alternative possibilities that we
have when translating or interpreting the meaning of a word or a
particular form in a given context.

4.4 In the next example χ 279–80:

    Κτήσιππος δ᾽ Εὔμαιον ὑπὲρ σάκος ἔγχεϊ μακρῷ
    ὦμον ἐπέγραψεν· τὸ δ᾽ ὑπέρπτατο, πῖπτε δ᾽ ἔραζε,

πῖπτε is used next to the aorists ἐπέγραψεν and ὑπέρπτατο.[50]) I
think, this alone is enough to convince us that the actions of all three

---

[50]) Sometimes, the change ot tense in conjoined structures, may be explained
as an effort to avoid repetition of forms marked by the same feature. In other
words, Kiparsky's "conjunction reduction" rule seems to offer an adequate ex-
planation in many such cases. The application of this rule in strings of verbs in
the same context has effects similar to those found by Kiparsky in his relevant
study (cf. *Foundations of Language*, Vol. 4 [1968]), i.e. delete "shared constitu-
ents in coordinate structures." As illustrations of this process may serve the fol-
lowing examples: Xen. Cyr. 5,5,13 ἐὰν γὰρ τί σε φανῶ κακὸν πεποιηκώς, ... ἐὰν
μέντοι μηδὲν φαίνωμαι (instead of φανῶ) κακὸν πεποιηκώς...; Operation of this
rule may be triggered by a temporal adverb, as in η 201 αἰεὶ γὰρ τὸ πάρος γε θεοὶ
φαίνονται ἐναργεῖς, where the present φαίνονται is used under the "dissimila-
tory" pressure of the preterital adverb πάρος 'before,' instead of the preterite
verb (ἐ)φαίνοντο. Cf. also Humbert, *Syntaxe*, p. 144, Strunk, *Glotta* 49, p. 206.
πῖπτε, then can be seen as the result of application of this rule on the level of se-
mantics, or the functional level of the specific verbal forms occurring in this pas-
sage. Therefore, πῖπτε is morphologically an imperfect (i.e. a present-stem for-
mation) but functionally stands for an aorist. For a different view, see Schwyzer-
Debrunner, *Gr. Gr.* II, pp. 260–61, where Δ 482 χαμαὶ πέσε "schlug im Fall auf
dem Boden auf" is contrasted with Μ 156 πῖπτον ἔραζε "waren in der Fallbewe-
gung zum Boden hin begriffen." The context, however, of Μ 156 is entirely dif-
ferent from that of χ 279–80 or ω 534–35, and perhaps this is what makes the

verbs must be of similar modes. In this, we get an outstanding demonstration of the primacy of a contextual analysis over abstract linguistic speculations or any ad hoc generalizations, when it comes down to interpreting texts.[51]) Besides, the significance of symmetry

---

biggest difference, regarding the differing semantic values that πίπτω (and other verbs) assumes in various contexts. Cf. also Heubeck et alii, *Odissea*, Vol. VI, p. 245. Here, of course, we witness perhaps the interaction of two different linguistic processes, namely semantic neutralization and reduction conjunction, operating on the semantic and syntactic component respectively. Possible candidates for either or both these processes are *E* 811–12, I 355, 610, 660–66, and ω 354–55, all discussed in this paper. The examples from both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* can be multiplied easily. In the same way, we can probably see the phenomena of complementary distribution of certain verbal forms, such as, for instance, the presence of preverb in some tenses, but absence of it in tenses where reduplication is involved, as e.g. ἀποθνῄσκω (pres.), ἀπέθανον (aor.), but perfect always τέθνηκα, never *ἀποτέθνηκα; also the perfect of ἀπομιμνῄσκομαι is not *ἀπομέμνημαι but μέμνημαι. Cf. Stahl, *Kritisch-Historische Syntax*, p.75, where he claims that in such cases reduplication has assumed the function of the preverb in composition. Cf. also Bader, *Recherches de Linguistique*, pp.26–27. On the other hand, the issue of forming perfective verbs by means of composition with certain preverbs is well-known and has been treated extensively by scholars in the past. It is interesting though to see the case at work and the way in which the perfectivizing function of these preverbs is manifested. From post-homeric literature, a good example may be Hdt. 2, 121 d, 4 (discussed by Ruijgh, *Gnomon* 51, p.226) κελεύειν μετ' ἑωυτῶν μείναντα συμπίνειν· τὸν δὲ πεισθῆναί τε δὴ καὶ καταμεῖναι. ὡς δέ μιν παρὰ τὴν πόσιν φιλοφρόνως ἠσπάζοντο κτλ. Ruijgh does not touch upon the question of the use of the simple and compound form of the verb; he simply states that "μείναντα et καταμεῖναι désignent ici la décision de rester qui est antérieure au procès de συμπίνειν et à celui de ἠσπάζοντο." This may be true, especially within the frame of Ruijgh's theory of the temporal use of the present and aorist stems, but there is more than that in it. μείναντα being an aorist indeed refers to an action anterior to that of συμπίνειν, but καταμεῖναι has nothing to do with the following ἠσπάζοντο. I think that the function of the preverb κατά here is to perfectivize the situation, i.e., since the aorist assumes more and more temporal rather than aspectual functions (cf. also 1.3 above), this and other preverbs in composition with the verb have taken over this value which was originally that of the aorist stem, namely perfective (cf. particularly Purdie, IF 9 [1898], pp.63–153). That this is the case here gains extra support from the presence of the particle δή which in the combination τε ... δή ... καί has an emphatic-additive function, giving the climax of the sequence of events: not only was he persuaded, but decided to stay for good. In this respect, I do not think that there is a temporal priority involved in the use of καταμεῖναι, but simply the same mode of action with the one that the conjoined πεισθῆναι carries, namely perfective. Cf. Denniston, *Particles*, p.204 ff., and especially p.256.

   [51]) We must admit that ἔραζε is a directional preverb, and as such one should expect it to accompany a verb that denotes a process rather than a completed/finished act. But, once again, these are different alternatives, and the "right" so-

should not be overlooked. Grammatical similarity normally tends to imply semantic similarity (just as polymorphy usually implies polysemy).[52]) It is not merely a stylistic device with no value, but serves a purpose and fulfils a definite function. The same analysis applies in the case of ω 534–35, where πῖπτε is used next to the aorist ἔπτατο. Notice the prepositional phrase ἐπὶ χθονί in the dative case, in a locatival function, putting a hold on any further movement after the action of πῖπτε has been completed.[53]) The sense of ἐπὶ χθονὶ πῖπτε is 'fell on the ground and remained there.'

---

lution must be left to the discretion of the reader. Aspects in general, like aesthetic considerations, are a matter of taste and individual judgement, whereas the category of tense on the other hand is a matter of direct and objective experience, measurable with more objective criteria.

[52]) The question whether morphologic differences imply semantic differences was taken up by Delbrück (*Grundlagen*, p. 100), who concluded that the Sanskrit root *bhṛ*, for instance, has two present stems, the reduplicated *bíbharti* with intensive meaning, and the *a*-present *bhárati* with terminative value. After a more conservative position in his *Altindische Syntax*, he returned to his earlier concept (cf. *Grundriß*, Vol. IV, pp. 18–19, and also *Vergl. Syntax* Vol. II, pp. 13–94 and 119), where he finds semantic differences in the different present stem formations. A similar investigation by Bloomfield (*Differences of Use*) concluded that among the reduplicated doublets from the *Rigveda*, only *bhṛ* yields two present forms with different meanings. Cf. also Vekerdi, *Acta Orientalia* 12 [1961], p. 251. But, on the other hand, cf. Joachim, *Mehrfachpräsentien*, where semantic differences are detected in more verbs.

[53]) In Homer, there seems to be no distinction in the usage of ἐπί + dative and that of ἐπί + genitive; both constructions indicate the end-point of the verbal action, as for instance in Ζ 431 καὶ αὐτοῦ μίμν' ἐπὶ πύργῳ, or Ζ 473 καὶ τὴν μὲν κατέθηκεν ἐπὶ χθονί but Γ 293 καὶ τοὺς μὲν κατέθηκεν ἐπὶ χθονός, or Υ 345 ἔγχος μὲν τόδε κεῖται ἐπὶ χθονός but Σ 461 ὁ δὲ κεῖται ἐπὶ χθονὶ θυμὸν ἀχεύων. Cf. also Thuc. 1, 56 οἳ οἰκοῦσιν ἐπὶ τῷ ἰσθμῷ τῆς Παλλήνης. However, in an Ionic inscription we find both cases used next to each other in clearly different functions: παιωνίζεται ἐπὶ λειμῶνι ἐπ' ἄκρου, "wo der allgemeine Bereich des Vorgangs durch den Gen., die genaue Örtlichkeit durch den Dat. bezeichnet wird" (Brugmann-Thumb, *Gr. Gr.*, p. 506); also in the *Iliad* Α 485–86 νῆα μὲν οἵ γε μέλαιναν ἐπ' ἠπείροιο ἔρυσσαν // ὑψοῦ ἐπὶ ψαμάθοις, where, as in the previous example, the general idea of direction is given with the prep. + genitive, and the actual location through the prep. + dative. But, on the other hand, already in Homer, the distinction between a genitival construction with verbs of motion, as e. g. in ἐπὶ νηός ἔβαινεν, etc., where the genitive originally conveyed the motion 'in the direction of, towards,' and a more regular accusatival construction that implies that the destination is reached, has been blurred (cf. Palmer, *Companion*, p. 142). For a parallel use of the preposition *ápi* + dative in a locative sense in Sanskrit, cf. *RV* v, 46.7 *yáḥ párthivāsō yá apām ápi vraté* "welche (Göttinnen) irdisch und welche im Bereich des Wassers sind" (cf. Brugmann-Thumb, *Gr. Gr., p. 505*).

4.5 πέτομαι, on the other hand, with its meaning 'fly' is used for a progressive, ongoing activity; it expresses a process which, of course, has a linear-durative character, in contrast to πίπτω which lacks such linearity. This does not mean that the contrastive feature of the two verbs is durativity. What we have, instead, is a close functional connection of the reduplicated πίπτω with the perfect, and the "basic notion" (in Ruipérez's terms),[54]) or "distinctive feature," the more common term used in structural linguistics, of the opposition is "perfectivity" vs. "non-.perfectivity" (or "completion" vs. "non-completion"). Thus πίπτω gives us not only the end or completion of the verbal action, but also the implicational relations for the state of things after this completion has been arrived at; with the simple verb πέτομαι we have no such implication, the activity of flying continues at the moment of speaking with no change implied.

5.0 A number of other thematic reduplicated presents with or without a simple counterpart often seem to have the same meaning with the verbs discussed above. Such are τίκτω, γίγνομαι, νίσ(σ)ομαι (vs. νέομαι), ἰάλλω (vs. ἄλλομαι?),[55]) ἰάχω, probably ἰάπτω (vs. ἵπτομαι?), ἰαύω, and, of course, several other formations, like those in -σκ-, as γιγνώσκω, διδάσκω, etc. All these stems seem to insist on the result of the verbal action.[56]) To τίκτω, for instance, corresponds OCS roditi which is perfective,[57]) to γίγνομαι in the futuristic sense

---

[54]) For a definition of this term, cf. Ruipérez, *Estructura*, p. 12.

[55]) Schwyzer-Debrunner (*Gr. Gr.* I, p.690) include also ἴλλω and μίσγω, on ἴλλω (< *ϝι-ϝλ-ω, root *ϝελ-), cf. also Solmsen, *Untersuchungen*, p.229; Petersen, *Lg.* 2 [1926], p.15. On μίσγω (< *mi-mzg-ō, strong stem *mezg-, as in Lat. *mergō*), see Wackernagel, *KZ* 33, p.39 (= *Kl. Schr.*, p.718). Perhaps also ἐνίσπω (Vendryes, *MSL* 20, pp.117-18); Risch, *Wortbildung*, p.235 and pp. 210-16; Leeuwen, *Enchiridium*, pp.271-72.

[56]) Vendryes, *op. cit.*, believes that these presents have a punctual value, either ingressive or terminative. But, cf. Chantraine, *Morphologie historique*, p.247 ff.; Meillet-Vendryes, *Traité*, p.235. For a completely opposite view, cf. Debrunner, *Mélanges Boisacq* I, p.261 ff., who believes that the reduplicated presents generally have an iterative or intensive meaning. Cf. also footnote 2.

[57]) Herbig, in his famous treatise *Aktionsart und Zeitstufe* (*IF* 6 [1896], pp. 157-269), finds some striking parallels between the reduplicated presents of Greek and perfective presents of Old Church Slavic: "man bedient sich dort der iterierenden Reduplikation, um vorwiegend perfektive d.h. aoristische Begriffe, also solche die im Abg. durch 'ihre natürliche Bedeutung' perfektiv sind, bei der Ausbildung des Verbalsystems in die durativ-imperfektive Aktionsart des Präsens überzuleiten. Den iterativen Präsentien der abg. Perfektiva bǫdǫ, damъ, padǫ, sędǫ, roždǫ, vrъgǫ, lęgǫ, also Formen wie byvaiǫ, daiǫ, padaiǫ, sědajǫ usf. entsprechen im Griechischen semasiologisch und funktionell, dem Stamm nach

"to become"[58]) we have the Go. *waírþan,* to ἵζω corresponds Lat. *sīdō, ἰάλλω* seems to have a resultative meaning. The same might be true for ἰάπτω 'hurt, mar,' and ἰαύω 'pass the night,'[59]) but a more detailed study of these verbs is needed before arriving at any definite conclusions.

5.1 N. van Brock[60]) finds similar functions for some reduplicated verbs in Hittite and notes that in order to define the function of reduplication in the Hittite verb "trois termes, au moins, sont necessaires: il constitue des thèmes itératifs, perfectifs et, quoique rarement, duratifs."[61]) In her view, only the iterative can be considered as the original function of the reduplicated forms.

5.2 As is evident from the kind of analysis employed in this paper for the study of these Homeric verbs,[62]) only a close analysis of the text can offer a more accurate account of the semantic range of particular forms in a given language. Whether general statements about the entire Indo-European domain can be made depends solely on evidence from more dialects, adduced with the help of the familiar tools of the comparative method, in combination with a true philological approach of the earliest surviving texts from the various Indo-European dialects.

---

z.T. auch etymologisch, die *reduplizierten* (his emphasis) Präsensformen γίγνο-μαι, δίδωμι, πίπτω, ἵζω, τίκτω, ἵημι, τίθημι ... Da diese reduplizierten Präsentia z.T. proethnisch sind, lassen sie sich wohl zur Altersbestimmung jenes Begriffes verwerten" (*op. cit.* pp.221–222). Cf. also Purdie (*op. cit.* pp.80–81), where she states about ἵσταμαι 'more frequent, however, are the present stem occurrences to which it seems arbitrary to deny the semi-perfective meaning of 'sich stellen,' 'to (gradually) take up.'"

   [58]) Cf. Risch, *Wortbildung,* p.235 and 299.

   [59]) Cf. Barton's remarks on ἰαύω, in *Die Laryngaltheorie,* pp.49–58. Also Vendryes, *op. cit.* For an etymology of ἰάπτω, and also ἰαύω, cf. Beekes, *Development,* p.129 and 168; Beekes also talks of a reduplicated present ἰχανάω, relating it to Skt. *íhate* 'to crave, yearn;' cf. Gk. ἀχήν 'poor,' Av. *azi* 'craving' from PIE **heh₂ǵh-,* and thus *íhate* must go back to **hihh₂ǵh-,* but his reconstructions are not always very clear to me.

   [60]) Cf. *Revue Hittite et Asianique* 75 [1964], pp.119–65. Also Ambrosini, *Ricerche;* Bader, *op. cit.,* pp.21–40.

   [61]) *op.cit.,* p.145.

   [62]) The semantic value of all these verbs in Homer is the subject of my doctoral dissertation.

References

Ambrosini,.R.: Ricerche ittite. *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa,* No. 28 [1959], pp. 285–302.

Bader, F.: Présents moyens hittites à vocalisme -e-, et formations de presents indo-européens. In *Recherches de Linguistique,* Hommage à Maurice Leroy. Bingen-Coupez-Mawet (Eds.). Bruxelles 1980.

Barton, Ch. R.: Gk. *aesa,* Arm. *agay* and PIE *h₁. In *Die Laryngaltheorie und die Rekonstruktion des indogermanischen Laut- und Formensystems.* Edited by Alfred Bammesberger. Heidelberg 1988.

Beekes, R. S. P.: The Development of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Greek. Mouton. The Hague-Paris 1969.

Blass, F., Debrunner, A.: A Greek Grammar of the New Testament, and other Early Christian Literature. Translated by R. B. Funk. The University of Chicago Press. Chicago and London 1961.

Bloomfield, M.: On Differences of Use in Present-Systems from the same Root in the Veda. Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of The American Oriental Society, Oct. 1882, New York, pp. CXXVI-CXXIX.

van Brock, N.: Les thèmes à redoublement du hittite et le verbe indo-européen. *Revue Hittite et Asianique* 75 [1964], pp. 119–65.

Brugmann, K., Delbrück, B.: Grundriß der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen. Vol. II 3 a, and Vol. IV. Straßburg 1916 and 1897.

Brugmann, K., Thumb, A.: Griechische Grammatik. München 1913.

Brunel, J.: L'aspect verbal et l'emploi des préverbes en grec, particulièrement en attique. Paris 1939.

–: L'aspect et "l'ordre de procès" en grec. *BSL* 42 [1946], pp. 43–75.

Burton, E. de Witt: Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek. 3rd Edition. T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh 1898 (Impression of 1976).

Chantraine, P.: Grammaire homérique. Two Volumes. Paris-Klincksieck 1958 and 1963.

–: Morphologie historique du grec. 2nd Ed., Paris 1961.

–: Dictionnaire Étymologique de la Langue Grecque. Histoire des Mots. Paris-Klincksieck 1968–75.

Comrie, B.: Aspect. An Introduction to the Study of Verbal Aspect and Related Problems. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1976.

Cook, A.: Homer, The Odyssey. Translated and Edited; W. W. Norton & Company Inc., New York 1974.

Cunliffe, R. J.: A Lexicon of the Homeric Dialect. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press 1963.

Curtius, G.: Das Verbum der griechischen Sprache. Leipzig. Verlag von S. Hirzel. 1. Band 1873, 2. Band 1876.

Debrunner, A.: Review of Brunel J. "L'aspect verbal et l'emploi des préverbes en grec, particulièrement en attique." *IF* 58 [1942], pp. 284–87.

–: διδάσκω. *Mélanges Boisacq,* Vol. I, pp. 251–65.

Delbrück, B.: Die Grundlagen der griechischen Syntax. Halle 1879.

–: Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen. Straßburg 1897.

Denniston, . D.: The Greek Particles. Oxford, at The Clarendon Press 1934.

Dressler, W.: Studien zur verbalen Pluralität. Wien 1968.

Frisk, H.: Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch. Three Volumes. Heidelberg 1960–72.

Goodwin, W. W.: Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb. London: Macmillan 1897.

Greimas, A.-J.: Structural Semantics. An Attempt at a Method. (Translated from the French.) University of Nebraska Press 1983.

Herbig, G.: Aktionsart und Zeitstufe, *IF* 6 [1896], pp. 157–269.

Hermann, Ph.: Objektive und subjektive Aktionsart, *IF* 45 [1927], pp. 207–228.

Hettrich, H.: Kontext und Aspekt in der altgriechischen Prosa Herodots. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht in Göttingen 1976.

Heubeck, A., West, S. & Hainsworth, J. B.: A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey, Vol. I, Introduction and Books I–VIII. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press 1988.

– & Hoekstra, A., Russo, J. (et alii): Omero *Odissea;* Introduzione, testo e commento. Volumes III–VI. Fondazione Lorenzo Valla 1983–86.

Hirt, H.: Indogermanische Grammatik, Vol. IV and Vol. VI. Heidelberg 1928 and 1934.

Holt, J.: Études d'aspect. *Acta Jutlandica* XV, 2 [1943].

Horrocks, G. C.: Space and Time in Homer. Prepositional and Adverbial Particles in the Greek Epic. Ayer 1984.

Humbert, J.: Syntaxe grecque. Paris 1954.

Jacobsohn, H.: Zum homerischen ἔπος τ᾽ ἔφατ᾽ ἔκ τ᾽ ὀνόμαζε. *KZ* 62 [1934], pp. 132–40.

Jakobson, R.: Shifters, Verbal Categories, and the Russian Verb. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press 1957.

Jespersen, O.: The Philosophy of Grammar. London: Allen and Unwin 1929.

Joachim, U.: Mehrfachpräsentien im Rgveda. Verlag Peter Lang GmbH, Frankfurt am Main 1978.

Kiparsky, P.: Tense and Mood in Indo-European Syntax. *Foundations of Language* 4 [1968], pp. 30–57.

Kirk, G. S.: The Iliad: A Commentary. Vol. I: Books 1–4. Cambridge University Press 1985.

Klein, J. S.: Towards a Discourse Grammar of the Rigveda. Vol. I, pts. 1&2. Heidelberg 1985.

Kuryłowicz, J.: The Inflectional Categories of Indo-European. Heidelberg 1964.

Lattimore, R.: The Iliad of Homer. Translated with an Introduction. The University of Chicago Press. Chicago and London 1951.

–: The Odyssey of Homer. Translated with an Introduction. Harper & Row 1965.

Leaf, W. & Bayfield, M. A.: The Iliad of Homer. Two Volumes. Macmillan 1898.

van Leeuwen, J. J. F.: Enchiridium Dictionis Epicae. Lugduni Batavorum 1918.

Lehmann, W. P.: Proto-Indo-European Syntax. University of Texas Press. Austin and London 1974.

Leroy, M.: L'aspect verbal en grec ancien, *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire* 36 [1958], pp. 128–138.

Liddell, H. G., Scott, R., Jones, H. S.: A Greek-English Lexicon. Oxford 1940.

Lyons, J.: Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics. Cambridge University Press 1968.

Mandilaras, B. G.: The Verb in the Greek Non-Literary Papyri. Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sciences, Athens 1973.

Mayrhofer, M.: Kurzgefaßtes Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen. Heidelberg 1956-67.

Mazon, P.: Homère, Iliade. Texte Établi et Traduit. Four Volumes. "Les Belles Lettres," Paris 1937 and 1938.

Meillet, A.: Sur grec λιλαίομαι, λελίημαι. BSL 27 [1927], pp. 230-31.

Meillet, A., Vendryes, J.: Traité de grammaire comparée des langues classiques. Paris 1963.

Mirambel, A.: La langue grecque moderne. Description et analyse. Paris 1959.

Monro, D. B.: A Grammar of the Homeric Dialect. Oxford, at The Clarendon Press 1891.

-: Homer, Iliad. Books I-XII. Oxford 1884.

Murray, A. T.: Homer, The Iliad. Two Volumes. With an English Translation. [Loeb Classical Library], William Heinemann Ltd. Harvard University Press 1924-25.

-: Homer, The Odyssey. Two Volumes. With an English Translation. [Loeb Classical Library], William Heinemann Ltd. Harvard University Press 1919.

Palmer, L. R.: The Language of Homer. In A Companion to Homer. Wace-Stubbings, (Eds.). London-Macmillan & Co Ltd 1963.

Petersen, W.: The Vocalism of Greek Verbs of the Type πίτνημι, Language 2 [1926], pp. 14-24.

Pokorny, J.: Indogermanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch. Bern und München 1959.

Prokosch, E.: A Comparative Germanic Grammar. Linguistic Society of America (William Dwight Whitney Linguistics Series), Baltimore 1938.

Puhvel, J.: The Provenance of Greek ἰάλλω. Analecta Indoeuropaea, pp. 252-56. Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, Vol. 35. Innsbruck 1981.

Purdie, E.: The Perfective 'Aktionsart' in Polybius, IF 9 [1898], pp. 63-153.

Risch, E.: Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache. Walter de Gruyter & Co. Berlin und Leipzig 1937.

Robertson, A. T.: A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the light of historical research. Broadman Press, Nashville 1934.

Ruijgh, C. J.: Autour de "τε épique." Études sur la syntaxe grecque. A. M. Hakkert, Amsterdam 1971.

-: Review of Hettrich, "Kontext und Aspekt in der altgriechischen Prosa Herodots," Gnomon 51 [1979], pp. 217-227.

-: L'emploi 'inceptif' du thème du présent grec, Mnemosyne 38 [1985], pp. 1-61.

Ruipérez, M. S.: The neutralization of morphological oppositions as illustrated by the neutral aspect of the present indicative in Classical Greek. Word 9 [1953], pp. 241-52.

-: Estructura del sistema de aspectos y tiempos del verbo griego antiguo. Análisis functional sincrónica. Salamanca 1954.

Schulze, W.: Quaestiones epicae. Gütersloh 1892.

Schwyzer, E., Debrunner, A.: Griechische Grammatik. Three Volumes. München 1950.

Seiler, H.: L'aspect et le temps dans le verb néo-grec. "Les Belles Lettres," Paris 1952.

Smyth, H. W.: Greek Grammar. Harvard University Press. Cambridge, Mass. 1956.

Snell, B. & Erbse, H. (Eds.): Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos. Göttingen 1955-.

Solmsen, F. S.: Untersuchungen zur griech. Laut- und Verslehre. Straßburg 1901.

Specht, F.: Zur Geschichte der Verbalklasse auf -ē. *KZ* 62 [1934], pp. 29–115.

Stahl, J. M.: Kritisch-Historische Syntax des griechischen Verbums der klassischen Zeit. Georg Olms, Hildesheim 1965 (reprint of 1907).

Stanford, W. B.: The Odyssey of Homer. Two Volumes. Macmillan 1967.

Strunk, K.: Nasalpräsentien und Aoriste. Heidelberg 1967.

–: Historische und deskriptive Linguistik bei der Textinterpretation, *Glotta* 49.3-4 [1971], pp. 191–216.

Thumb, A.: Handbook of the Modern Greek Vernacular. Grammar, Texts, Glossary. T. & T. Clarc, Edinburgh 1912.

Timberlake, A.: Invariance and the Syntax of Russian aspect. In *Tense-Aspect: Between Semantics and Pragmatics*. Paul J. Hopper Editing. John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia 1982.

Tischler, J.: Zur Reduplikation im Indogermanischen. Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, No. 16. Innsbruck 1976.

Vekerdi, J.: On Polymorphic presents in the Rigveda. *Acta Orientalia* 12 [1961], pp. 249–87.

Vendryes, J.: Type thématique à redoublement en indo-européen. *MSL* 20 [1916], pp. 117–23.

Verkuyl, H. J.: On the Compositional Nature of the Aspects. D. Reidel, Dordrecht 1972.

Wackernagel, J.: Vorlesungen über Syntax. Verlag Birkhäuser Basel 1950.

–: Miszellen zur griechischen Grammatik. 12. Über die Behandlung von σ in Verbindung mit ϱ, λ, ν, μ. *Kleine Schriften* I, pp. 627–640. 27. ἔσχατος, βλασφημεῖν, ibid. 717–722. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen 1953.

On the Transcription of Sibilants
in Etruscan: a New Proposal

By Rex E. Wallace, Amherst

1. The Etruscan sibilants and transcription

The letters of the Etruscan alphabet are transcribed according a system that was consolidated by the publication of the first important Etruscan language studies in the last quarter of the 19th century, and then given prominence by the publication of CIE in 1893–1902. The criteria for transcription are epigraphic and as such do not necessarily regard the phonetic or phonological values of the signs. For the most part, however, this system of transcription does not impede the understanding of the value of the alphabetic signs. In cases where there is allography, as for example in the representation of /k/, the phonology is relatively transparent.[1]) The only real problem with the traditional system of transcription has to do with the sibilants /s/ and /š/.[2])

The difficulty lies in the fact that there is regional and chronological variation in the way the sibilants are represented, and this can contribute to confusion about the phonological value of the signs. The basic facts are as follows.[3])

In the territories of the north (e.g., Rusellae, Vetulonia, Populonia, Volaterrae), the postdental sibilant is noted by *tsade* ›M‹ and the palatal sibilant by 3-stroke *sigma* »ξ«. In the territories extending from Volsinii southward, the phonemes represented by these same signs are inverted so that 3-stroke *sigma* represents /s/ and *tsade* represents /š/. At Caere and Veii, however, the picture is somewhat more complex. In the archaic inscriptions (7th–6th c.) from these communities, /s/ is represented not only by 3-stroke *sigma*, but also

---

[1]) The phoneme /k/ is often spelled "phonetically" on archaic inscriptions from south Etruria. Gamma is written before epsilon and iota, kappa before alpha and consonantal signs, and qoppa before ypsilon.

[2]) The value of the second Etruscan sibilant is almost certainly a palatal /š/. For discussion and references see De Simone 1976: 63–64; Durante 1969: 295–306; Rix 1984: 220–221; Agostiniani 1986: 26–29.

[3]) A more detailed discussion of the representation of sibilants in Etruscan can be found in Cristofani 1972.

by 4-stroke *sigma*, by *xi,* and in several inscriptions by *sigmas* with 5 and 6 strokes. At Caere the variation in the spelling of /s/ is levelled out in favor of 3-stroke sigma by the period of the Pyrgi tablets (c. 500). The Pyrgi tablets also mark the point at which Caere diverges from the rest of the south in the spelling of /š/. The palatal sibilant is spelled by 4-stroke *sigma.*

The geographical and chronological variation may be represented diagrammatically as in (1). For the sake of completeness, I include the letter samekh, which appears rarely if at all in inscriptions[4]) but is found in early *abecedaria* (indicated by A).[5])

(1)   <u>Archaic Etruscan</u>

	North	South	Caere, Veii
Ϻ	/s/	/š/	/š/
Ƨ	/š/	/s/	/s/
Ϟ			/s/
Χ			/s/
⊟		A	A

<u>Neo-Etruscan</u>

	North	South	Caere
Ϻ	/s/	/š/	
Ƨ	/š/	/s/	/s/
Ϟ			/š/

The traditional system of transcription is given in (2), as emended by Pallottino (1967):[6])

(2) Archaic Etruscan	/s/	/š/	abecedaria
North	ś	s	
South	s	ś	ş
Caere, Veii	s, ŝ, ṡ	ś	ş
Neo-Etruscan	/s/	/š/	

---

[4]) In TLE² there are two inscriptions containing words with samekh, TLE² 58, Caere *ϑannursiannas*₊ and TLE² 341, Cosa *s_M upelnas*₊. Whether in fact *s*₊ is the correct reading in these cases seems questionable. Agostiniani 1982: 83, 110 reads TLE² 58 as *ϑannursiannas* and TLE² 341 as *s_M upelnas_x*

[5]) See, for example, the Tablet from Marsiliana d'Albegna, the Alphabet from Formello (TLE² 49), the flask from the Regolini-Galassi tomb (TLE² 55), etc.

[6]) This system, as emended by Pallottino 1967, is now used in the major publications on Etruscan. It is found, for example, in TLE², ThLE, and SE.

North	ś	s
South	s	ś
Caere	s	ṡ

The problem with this system is that there are several potential sources of confusion. Due to the geographical and chronological variation in the spelling of the sibilants, the phonemic value of sibilants in words cited without geographical or chronological information is indeterminate. For example, given the spelling of the praenomen *śeθre*, it is impossible to determine the phonemic value of the *ś*, unless the geographical area from which the citation derives is known. Similarly, the phonemic value of the sign *ṡ* in *ṡuθi* 'tomb' is indeterminate unless one knows the chronological period (as well as the location) from which the citation derives.[7])

2. Revisions by Lejeune and Rix

There have been two attempts to make the phonological value of the sibilants more clear.

In an article published in 1981, Michel Lejeune presented a system in which the sibilants are transcribed by the signs *s* (for the postdental sibilant) and *sˢ* (for the palatal).[8]) The particular letter used to represent the sibilant sounds are then to be indicated in an apparatus criticus appended to the inscription in question.

The practical value of this system is open to criticism. It can only prove cumbersome in discussion of textual matters where reference to the alphabetic sign, rather than the sign's phonemic value, is considered important. In such cases each Etruscan word cited, or each reference to one of the sibilants (*s* or *sˢ*), requires a note indicating the letter in question. This is certainly an unfortunate situation. For Etruscan it is desirable to have a system that marks both orthography and phonemic value.

Helmut Rix, in his chapter on the Etruscan alphabet and language in *Gli Etruschi. Una nuova immagine* (1984), revises the traditional system by introducing an additional letter (Greek σ) and diacritic (ˋ) into transcription. Rix's system looks like this (3):

---

[7]) These are the standard complaints levelled at this system (see Lejeune 1981: 80 and Rix 1984: 214).

[8]) Lejeune chooses to represent /š/ by *sˢ* because he is unsure about the articulatory value of this sound. But see note 2.

(3)   South Etruria   North Etruria

  ϡ, ζ   s   /s/   M   ś   /s/
   M   σ   /š/   ζ   s   /š/ < /s/
   ϡ   σ̇   /š/   ζ   σ̇   /š/
   X   ş   /s/

Rix's system has two weaknesses. First, four stroke *sigma* is not distinctly marked when it represents the postdental phoneme /s/. Second, for northern Etruscan dialects that show a sound change /s/ > /š/,[9]) this secondary /š/ is transcribed differently than original /š/, namely as *s*. This move could be justified if secondary palatals were still underlying postdentals. But this does not appear to be the case. According to Rix (1984: 221), the sound change shifting postdentals to palatals is a prealphabetic one (before c. 700). Consequently, in words where there are no morphophonemic alternations (e.g. the gentilicium *spurina*), it is difficult to believe that these secondary /š/s have not merged with original /š/. There is then no reason to transcribe secondary /š/ in any way differently than primary /š/.

Of course Rix's system can easily be mended: all realizations of the /š/ phoneme in north Etruria can be transcribed as σ̇; a diacritic can be added to s in order to distinguish »ζ« and »ϡ« when they represent the postdental spirant /s/ in south Etruria (e.g. s → ş). Revised Rix is given in (4).

(4)   South Etruria   North Etruria

   ζ   s   /s/   M   ś   /s/
   ϡ   s̀   /s/   ζ   σ̇   /š/
   M   σ   /š/
   ϡ   σ̇   /š/
   X   š   /s/

Although this system, as revised, makes the necessary phonological and orthographical distinctions, it is important to consider the potential for confusion here, particularly given the discrete differences between the symbols. In my judgement, Rix's system is difficult to keep straight; and this is confirmed, I believe, by a read through his discussion of Etruscan in *Gli Etruschi*, where one must periodically leaf back through the text in order to insure that the correct phonemic value has been assigned to the sibilant in question.

---

⁹) For a brief overview of this change see Rix 1984: 221.

3. A new proposal

I propose here a system of transcription that clearly indicates the phonemic value of the sibilants as well as the alphabetic signs used to represent them. Moreover, because this system iconically represents the Etruscan letter-forms, it is easily memorized but not easily confused.

I mark the phonemic status of the sibilant by means of phonetic symbols commonly used to represent post-dental and palatal sibilants, namely *s* and *š*.[10]) I consider 3-stroke *sigma* to be the basic sign (as all systems used to write Etruscan do) and transcribe it by *s*. *Tsade*, 4-stroke *sigma, xi* (and *samekh*) are transcribed by appending a subscript to the basic sibilant sign. So, for example, *tsade* is spelled by attaching an iconographic subscript to the basic sign *s* and thus giving s_M for the postdental and $š_M$ for the palatal. Similarly, 4-stroke *sigma* is spelled by adding a subscript that marks the number of bars involved in the production of the sign: s_4 and $š_4$.[11])

The system advocated here is layed out more clearly in (5).

(5)   <u>South Etruria</u>   <u>North Etruria</u>

𐌑	s	/s/	𐌑	š	/š/
𐌔	s_4	/s/			
𐌔	$š_4$	/š/			
M	$š_M$	/š/	M	s_M	/s/
X	s_x	/s/			
𐌚	s_+				

(6) provides examples of inscriptions with sibilants spelled according to the system of transcription advocated here.

(6) Sample inscriptions.
a)   TLE 769 *mi licines_x i mulu hirsunaies_x i*
b)   TLE² 868 *mi aranϑ ramuϑas_4 i ves_4 tiricinala muluvanice*
c)   TLE² 867 *mi hirumesi mulu*

---

[10]) The symbol *š* is not the IPA symbol for the palato-alveolar fricative, but it is a symbol that is commonly used. At any rate, the use of *š* rather than the IPA symbol [ʃ] is preferable in this case because it more closely represents the symbol already in use for the transcription of Etruscan sibilants.

[11]) All *sigmas* with 4 bars or more are transcribed here by means of s_4. However, if there were some need to indicate the number of bars on 5- or 6-stroke *sigmas*, then this can easily be accomplished. See, for example, *SE* 42 (1974) 261-2, 216, where *sigmas* with 4, 5, and 6 strokes are attested: *mi s_4 panti s_4 qulinas_5*.

d) TLE² 861 *ś₄uϑi*

e) TLE 482 *mi špuriaza muluvanike kuritianas$_M$*

f) TLE 433 *[m]i lariša ʃ[...]krnas$_M$ anainal*

The system used to transcribe the Etruscan sibilants proposed above may appear somewhat exotic at first glance, especially because of the use of the numerical subscript to represent 4-stroke *sigma*. Nevertheless, this system is functionally superior to the traditional system and to that proposed by Lejeune, and is more user-friendly than that offered by Rix. Since this system can be incorporated rather easily into the system of transcription now in use in major publications, it is my hope that Etruscologists will give it due consideration.

4. Addendum: The Lemnian Sibilants

The method of transcription proposed here may also be profitably extended to the description of the sibilants found on the so-called Stele of Lemnos (Lemnian = dialectal Etruscan).

It is generally agreed that there are two sibilant sounds in Lemnian. One is represented variously by 3- and 4-stroke *sigmas,* the other by a sign that has no obvious Greek ancestor »�ↄ«. Although the precise values of these signs cannot be determined with great assurance, comparison with Etruscan indicates that »�ↄ« represents a postdental sound /s/ and that the *sigmas* represent a palatal spirant /š/.[12]

Generally (Agostiniani 1986; Rix 1968), the Lemnian sign »�ↄ« is transcribed by means of *ś,* while the sigmas are written with *s,* presumably following the system for transcribing sibilants in Etruscan.[13] But this method of transcription makes the phonetic value of the sibilant utterly opaque. The only way to determine the quality of *ś* or *s* in Lemnian is by way of comparison with Etruscan. The system proposed here can easily be adapted to the Lemnian alphabet, so that both the phonemic value – at least the approximate value – and the type of *s*-sign are clearly indicated. The only change re-

---

[12]) For discussion see Agostiniani 1986: 25–34.

[13]) The Lemnian sibilants have been transcribed in other ways, e.g. Heurgon (1980: 578) and Pallottino (1968: 99), but they are no more insightful than that used by Agostiniani et al. in terms of accommodating both the phonemic value and the orthography of the signs.

quired is in the notation of the diacritic indicating the orthography of the sign for /s/, which can be written as s_z. The Lemnian sibilants are transcribed as in (7).

(7)   Lemnian sibilants.

$\check{s}$ /š/

$\check{s}_4$ /š/

s_z /s/

References

Agostiniani, L.: *Le "iscrizioni parlanti" dell'Italia antica.* (Firenze, 1982).

Agostiniani, L.: Sull'etrusco della Stele di Lemno e su alcuni aspetti del consonantismo etrusco. *AGI* 71 (1986) 15–46.

Cristofani, M.: Sull'origine e la diffusione dell'alfabeto etrusco. *ANRW* 1, 2 (1972) 466–489.

De Simone, C.: Il sistema fonologico. *L'etrusco arcaico* (Firenze 1976) 56–73.

Durante, M.: Le sibilanti dell'Etrusco. *Studi linguistici in onore di Vittore Pisani. Vol. 1.* (Brescia 1969) 295–306.

Heurgon, J.: A propos de l'inscription "tyrrhénienne" de Lemnos. *CRAI* (1980) 578–600.

Lejeune, M.: Notes de linguistique italique. XXXIII. Les six premiers numéraux étrusques. XXXIV. Un nom étrusque de l'alphabet? XXXV. Comment translitérer les sifflantes étrusques? *REL* 59 (1981) 69–82.

Pallottino, M.: Sul valore e sulla trascrizione del sigma a quattro tratti nell'alfabeto etrusco. *SE* 35 (1967) 161–173.

Rix, H.: Eine morphosyntaktische Übereinstimmung zwischen Etruskisch und Lemnisch: die Datierungsformel. *Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft und Kulturkunde. Gedenkschrift für Wilhelm Brandenstein* (Innsbruck 1968) 213–222.

Rix, H.: La scrittura e la lingua. *Gli Etruschi, una nuova immagine* (Firenze 1984) 210–238.

SE = *Studi Etruschi* (Firenze, since 1927).

ThLE = *Thesaurus linguae etruscae I* (Firenze 1978).

TLE² = *Testimonia linguae etruscae* (Firenze 1968²).

On the Problematic *f/h* Variation in Faliscan*)

By Rex E. Wallace, Amherst/Mass.
and Brian D. Joseph, Columbus/Ohio

Abstract: PIE *bh/dh regularly give *f* word-initially in Oscan-Umbrian and Latin, and *gh gives *h,* suggesting these as Common Italic developments. However, in Faliscan, Latin's most immediate sister, etymological *bh, dh, and *gh unexpectedly show both *f* and *h* as reflexes (e.g. *hileo* 'son,' alongside expected *filea* 'daughter,' vs. Latin *filius* 'son;' *fe* 'here,' alongside expected *hec,* vs. Latin *hic*). The source of this *f/h* variation has not as yet been satisfactorily explained, although there have been numerous attempts at solutions (e.g. early dialect split [Meillet 1933, Giacomelli 1979]; Etruscan influence [Pfiffig 1969, Pisani 1978], phonetic confusion [Hiersche 1963]). We propose that a reexamination of the relevant data points to a sound change (*f* → *h*) and subsequent hypercorrection as the source of this Faliscan *f/h* variation. Since the oldest Faliscan inscriptions (7th–4th c.) show the expected Italic developments, Faliscan forms (post 4th c.) with *h* for earlier *f* (e.g. *hileo*) must have resulted from a sound change of *f* → *h*. Words with *f* for etymological *h* (e.g. *fe*) are then the result of hypercorrection. Dialects of Faliscan itself as well as Urban Latin dialects with a distinction between *h* and *f* word-initially provide a likely model for hypercorrection (note, for instance, that not all Faliscan words are affected by the sound change *f* → *h*). This proposal therefore clarifies the nature of the development of the aspirates in Latino-Faliscan and moreover suggests a parallel explanation for similar variation in the aspirate developments between Rural Latin and Urban Latin.

1. Introduction

In the Italic branch of Indo-European, the Proto-Indo-European (PIE) voiced aspirated stops develop regularly to fricatives in word-initial position. The labial *bh and the dental *dh aspirates appear as *f* in Oscan-Umbrian (O-U) and Latin[1]) (*bher- 'bear, carry' > Latin

---

fero:, Umbrian **fertu** 3 SG IMPV [Ve IIa 17], Volscian *ferom* INF [Ve 222], Marrucinian *feret* 3 PL SUBJ [Ve 218]; **dheyg'h-* 'form, mold' > Latin *fingo:,* Oscan **feíhúss** 'walls' ACC PL [Ve 1 b 5]; **dhH₁s-no-* > Latin *fa:num* 'shrine;' **dheH₁s-neH₂-* > Paelignian *fesn(am)* ACC SG 'shrine' [Ve 216], Oscan **fíisnú** NOM SG [Ve 1 24], Umbrian **fesnafe** ACC PL [Ve IIb 16]); the palatal **g'h* and the velar **gh* aspirates develop to *h* (**g'her-* 'enclose' > Latin *hortus* 'garden,' Oscan **húrz** NOM SG [Ve 147 b 23]; **ghe-* (deictic element) > Latin *hic* 'this,' Umbrian **(era)hont** 'in the same way' FEM ABL SG [Ve I b 23]). Examples of the labiovelar aspirate in word-initial position are lacking for Oscan-Umbrian, but we note that this sound also develops to *f* in Latin (PIE **gʷhen-* 'strike, kill' > Latin *(de:)fendo:* 'ward off').

In contrast with what is generally believed to be the regular developments of the PIE aspirates in Latin and O-U, Latin's closest sibling and neighbor, Faliscan, shows the following "unexpected" developments: both *f* and *h* appear as reflexes of the PIE aspirates **bh/*dh* and **gh* (e.g. **filea** 'daughter' [GG 67] – **hileo** 'son' [GG 97] vs. Latin *fi:lius* < PIE **dhiH₁lyo-*;[2]) **fe** 'here' [GG 123 II] – **hec** [GG 121 II] vs. Latin *hi:c* < PIE **ghey-ke*).

We realize, of course, that there are similar developments in dialectal Latin, i.e. unexpected *h*'s and *f*'s for expected *f* and *h* respectively (e.g., PIE **bher-* > Latin *horda* 'pregnant cow' Varro *RR* 2.5.6; PIE **ghaydo-* 'goat' > Latin *fedus* Paul. Fest. 84 M).[3]) But this evidence consists primarily of a handful of glosses cited by Roman grammarians and has little substantive inscriptional support; while we believe these forms represent a real phenomenon, in terms of trying to understand what is going on with *f/h* in Italic, it seemed best to focus on Faliscan because the inscriptional evidence available here, though not plentiful, is more likely to provide a clearer picture of the developments.[4]) Hence we here examine the Faliscan material, first reviewing previous accounts and then proposing what we believe to be a better solution.

---

[2]) **fileo/filea** may derive from the root **bhewH-*, from a suffixed form **bhwi:lyo-*. For discussion of the etymology see Lejeune 1967: 78–86 and Hamp 1972: 219–20.

[3]) The forms in question can be found in Conway 1897: 359, 384–86 and Campanile 1961 3–6.

[4]) We note that only a small number of Faliscan inscriptions exists and that consequently this material must be approached with some caution.

2. Earlier Accounts

The "irregular" developments of the aspirates in Faliscan have been approached from several different angles:[5])

(1) It has been argued (G. Giacomelli 1963: 126, 1978: 515; Pfiffig 1969: 44; Pisani 1978: 45) that these developments are the result of contact with Etruscan speakers who had a sound change $f > h$.

(2) It has been suggested (Hiersche 1965) that the developments in Faliscan arose by phonetic confusion in a period with two opposing sound changes, $f > h$ and $h > f$.

(3) Finally, another account (Campanile 1961; R. Giacomelli 1978, 1979) has seen the f/h variation here as the result of an early dialect split in Latino-Faliscan.

We briefly review these proposals in order to point out what we believe to be some of their more serious deficiencies.

2.1 Etruscan Influence

Contact with Etruscans appears at first glance to offer a possible source for the f/h variation in Faliscan because the *Ager Faliscus* is bounded on the west by Etruscan territory and because there is evidence for a sound change of $f > h$ in Etruscan. But the Etruscan contact hypothesis contains several flaws.

First, if Etruscans were the source of the variation, we would expect the Etruscan inscriptions that are found in the *Ager Faliscus* to show evidence of a sound change $f > h$. However, there is no such evidence. Etruscan inscriptions in the *Ager Faliscus* do not attest this change. Moreover, Etruscan inscriptions in Etruscan territories adjacent to the *Ager Faliscus* do not have such a change. In fact the locus of the Etruscan sound change is the community of Clusium, which is centrally located in north Etruria, some 60 to 70 kilometers on the

---

[5]) There is one additional account, namely J. Untermann's suggestion (1964: 178) that Faliscan underwent a merger of f and h that was generally represented orthographically by f, and infrequently by h. We note however that there is a certain vagueness in this proposal that makes it difficult to evaluate. For example, it is not made clear what the outcome of the merger was. Even so, though, Untermann's account would lead one to expect more cases of etymological [h] being spelled with ‹F›, since for him ‹F› is the usual representation for the outcome of the merger. As the forms in (2) indicate, there are instead 5 ‹H› for [f] words in (2 a), but only 2 ‹F› for [h] words in (2 b).

fly from Città Castellana, the major Faliscan urban area.[6]) Second, if Etruscan responsibility for the *f/h* variation in Faliscan is indicated by the Etruscan sound change *f* > *h*, then we would expect the sound change in Etruscan to be chronologically prior to the *f/h* variation in Faliscan. But, as far as we have been able to determine, the change of *f* to *h* in Etruscan is to be attributed to the latest layer of Etruscan inscriptions, c. III-I B.C., and thus is found after the earliest examples of the change in Faliscan, which can be assigned to the IV century B.C.

In sum, then, geographical and chronological considerations militate against the hypothesis of Etruscan interference.

2.2 *Phonetic Confusion*

In an article published in 1965, Rolf Hiersche argued that the *h/f* variation in Faliscan was to be understood in terms of an "interchange" of *f* and *h*, entailing two sound changes of *f* > *h* and *h* > *f* operating simultaneously. Crucially for Hiersche, the Faliscan letters ‹F›[7]) and ‹H› do not have values customarily assigned to them for Italic, namely labiodental fricative [f] and glottal fricative [h]; instead, they represent for him bilabial and velar spirants respectively. The interchange of the two spirants would then be motivated by the fact that they are similar acoustically. In essence, misperception of acoustically similar sounds is given as the motivation for these changes that are the reverse of one another.

We do not find Hiersche's account of the Faliscan evidence very convincing for several reasons. First, all the relevant evidence suggests that ‹H› was actually phonetically [h] and not [x], based on its weakness all throughout Italic (e.g., it is lost invervocalically in Latin, it serves as a hiatus marker in Latin, Oscan and Umbrian, and it is lost initially in Latin). Moreover, the source of the letter ‹H› in Italic alphabets (Faliscan, Latin, Oscan, Umbrian) comes via Etruscan from the West Greek sign standing for pure aspiration.[8]) Thus, the burden of proof for ‹H› as [x] falls on Hiersche, and we see no compelling reason to adopt his interpretation.

---

[6]) A note on this change can be found in Rix 1984: 221.

[7]) Our sign ‹F› is merely intended to indicate a reference to the Faliscan orthographic symbol for *f*, namely ‹↑›.

[8]) See Cristofani 1978 for a discussion of the introduction of the West Greek alphabet into Italy and diffusion throughout the peninsula.

Further, the evidence that Hiersche (1965: 117–118) adduces for
an interchange of *f* and *h* all involves either loan phonology or con-
text sensitive changes of one sort or another. But the context sensi-
tivity of the Faliscan development with *f/h* is limited to position in
the word (only word initially and never medially), and crucially does
not seem to depend on the surrounding phonetic environment; in
particular the Faliscan *f/h* interchange is found before both *e* and *o*.
Whether a context-free change of [x] to [φ] – as Hiersche's account
would require for Faliscan – is even possible is therefore open to
question.

Finally, one can wonder if a language would really ever have two
competing sound changes that involved the same segments but dif-
fered as to which was the input and which the output.

2.3 *Early Dialect Split*

In recent publications Enrico Campanile (1961) and Roberto
Giacomelli (1978, 1979), adopting a scenario first proposed by Meil-
let (1933: 98), suggest that Latin dialects belonging to different (so-
ciolinguistic and regional) levels of speech split into two groups ac-
cording to the treatment of PIE aspirates. According to this view, the
rural level of Latino-Faliscan, which for them includes Faliscan and
those Latin dialects outside the city of Rome, and the urbane level,
which is for all intents and purposes Classical Latin, diverge in their
treatment of the aspirates in the following way. In the rural dialects,
the labials and dentals, via an intermediate stage of (Proto-Italic) *f,
developed to *h*, while in the urban dialect, Proto-Italic *f remained
as *f*. The palatal and velar aspirates, on the other hand, develop to *f*
in the rural dialects, via an intermediate stage with a (Proto-Italic)
velar spirant *x, while in urban Latin, *x yielded *h*. Faliscan (and ru-
ral Latin dialectal) forms with etymologically incorrect *f* and *h* must
then result from "dialect mixing" and borrowing, presumably via
contact with the prestige varieties of urban Latin.

But this scenario does not stand up when the Faliscan evidence is
arranged into chronological layers (see below §3 and (1)).[9] The

---

[9] Another possible objection to this analysis is the assumption that Faliscan is
merely a colloquial/informal/rustic variety of Latin. This is an issue that needs
careful attention, beyond what we can do in this paper, but we note that there are
some fundamental differences in the verb systems of Faliscan and Latin – both

earliest Faliscan inscriptions, which date to the 7th century B. C. and hence well before the period of Latin influence on Faliscan (not well before contact though), show that the developments offered by Campanile and Giacomelli are simply mistaken. The earliest evidence for the development of PIE aspirates in Faliscan, which comes from the *Ceres*-inscription (GG 1) and dates to the middle of the 7th century, reflects the typical Italic developments for aspirates (*bhars > **far** 'spelt, grain' NOM SG [GG 1, c. 650); *dheyg'h- > **f[if]iqod** 'fashioned' 3 PL PERF [GG 1, c. 650]; *g'hu-ti- > **huti[c]ilom** 'small vessel' NOM SG [GG 1, c. 650]).[10] For this reason, we cannot attribute the "irregular" developments in Faliscan to an early dialect split along the lines suggested by Campanile and Giacomelli, at least not without entirely disregarding the Archaic Faliscan evidence and the chronology of the *f/h* variation altogether.

3. Our Solution

We begin our explanation of the developments in Faliscan with a note on the chronology of Faliscan inscriptions. The epigraphical evidence in Faliscan is generally divided into three periods: an Archaic Faliscan (AF) period covering the 7th/6th centuries B. C., a so-called Medio-Faliscan (MF) period dating from the 5th century down to the destruction of *Falerii veteres* by Rome in 241 B. C., and finally a Neo-Faliscan (NF) period covering all inscriptions composed after the population of *Falerii veteres* was relocated to the less formidable site of *Falerii novi*, west of the old city.[11]

The Faliscan evidence relevant to our discussion is presented in (1) and (2). In (1) are listed the forms which we take to show the regular developments of the aspirates, in AF, MF, and NF. It is significant that AF has only these regular developments. Taking this chronological fact then as the basis for establishing the original treatment of these sounds in Faliscan, we can say that Faliscan is in line with the other Italic languages in terms of the treatment of the PIE aspirates.

---

rural and urban – that may yield significant innovations distinguishing the two languages.

[10]) If this is the right etymology for **huti[c]ilom**, then Faliscan does not show the sound change *g'h > f/ _____ u that is found in Latin *fundo:*, but rather seems to have taken PIE *g'h to *h* in all contexts.

[11]) See G. Giacomelli 1978: 510–511.

(1) Evidence from Faliscan, regular developments:
  a. Archaic Faliscan period:
  *bh > f: *bhars > far 'spelt, grain' NOM SG [c. 650 (GG 1)];
  *dh > f: *dheyg'h- > f[if]iqod 'fashioned' 3 PL PERF [c. 650
           (GG 1)], fifiked 3 SG PERF [c. 550 (GG 11)], fita
           NOM SG [c. 650 (GG 1)] (if from PPP *fikto- <
           *dhig'h-to-);
  *g'h > h: *g'hu-ti- > huti[c]ilom 'small vessel' NOM SG [c.
           650 (GG 1)].
  b. Medio-Faliscan period:
  *dh > f: *dhiH₁lyo- > filea 'daughter' [c. 300 (GG 67)];
  *dh > f: Gentilicium firmio [IV/III (GG 71 V)] (if from PIE
           *dher-);
  *gh > h: *ghey-ke > hec 'here' [(GG 85), IV/III (GG 86 V),
           IV? (GG 97), (GG 99)].
  c. Neo-Faliscan period (post 241 B.C):
  *dh > f: *dhiH₁lyo- > file[ai] [(GG 144 III)], abbreviations f
           [(GG 61)], fi [(GG 121 III), (GG 123 II)];
  *dh > f: Gentilicium fir‹.›mia [(GG 143 I)] (if from PIE
           *dher-);
  *gh > h: *ghey-ke > he [(GG 121 I), (GG 121 V)], hec [(GG
           121 II)].

This leaves two groups of forms showing "unexpected develop-
ments," both of which are restricted to MF and NF: *h* for expected *f*,
given in (2 a), and *f* for expected *h*, given in (2 b):

(2) Evidence from Faliscan, unexpected developments:
  a. *h* for expected *f* (MF and NF):
  hileo 'son' [MF IV?, (GG 97)];
  hirmia (Gentilicium) [MF, (GG 66 V)] (cf. MF firmio);
  hirmio (Gentilicium) [NF, (GG 61)] (cf. MF firmio);
  holcosio (Gentilicium) [NF, (GG 123 III)], if same name as (ear-
  lier?) folcozeo [NF, (GG 123 II)];
  haba 'bean' < *bhabo- [cited as Faliscan by Terentius Scaurus
  VII 13, 9 *GLK*].
  b. *f* for expected *h* (MF and NF):
  foied 'today' [MF, (GG 5)] (< *gho:d d(i)e:d);
  fe 'here' [NF, 2 x (123 III), (144 I)] (< *ghey-ke).

For the forms in (2 a), we propose that the most efficient solution
is simply to posit a sound change by which an earlier *f* became *h* in

MF (and thus with effects showing up in NF as well). We believe that the assumption of such a sound change is an uncontroversial move since this change is found in other languages and so must be seen as a "natural" sound change. It is necessary to point out that this change in all likelihood did not affect all Faliscan dialects or else was lexically diffuse and did not affect all possible "candidates" in Faliscan that could have undergone the change, since there are Medio- and Neo-Faliscan forms that show the etymologically appropriate reflexes.

The remaining Medio- and Neo-Faliscan forms in (2b) show *f* in place of *h*: **foied** (GG 5) and **fe** (GG 144 I).[12]) Since we have argued (in our discussion of Hiersche's proposal, above § 2.2) that a sound change *h* > *f* is not feasible in this case, we hypothesize that the only real explanation for these forms is *hypercorrection*, i.e. that in a period of Faliscan in which some *f*s were becoming *h*, some speakers falsely "restored" *f* in forms that had an etymologically correct *h*.

In our account, it must be assumed that Faliscan dialects that lost initial *f* were in contact with speakers who maintained an *f/h* distinction. Such speakers could have provided a model by which some Faliscan speakers might have introduced *f* into contexts in which *h* was expected on etymological grounds. Two such groups of speakers suggest themselves:

(i) If the change of *f* to *h* in Faliscan did not affect all Faliscan dialects (or alternatively all forms within Faliscan), then we can suppose that the forms with unetymological *f* are attempts on the part of speakers of *f*-less Faliscan varieties to reintroduce a distinction that existed in other, presumably more prestigious, varieties of the language.

(ii) Another possible source that could have played an important role as a hypercorrective model is urban Latin.[13]) In the fourth century Rome began to extend its influence across the Tiber into territories in southern Etruria. So it is natural to seek to place at least part of the hypercorrective pressure on Faliscan dialects to Latin speakers that maintained an *f/h* distinction in initial position.

---

[12]) We here take **foied** at face value, even though we are aware that there are some problems with the inscription in which one of its occurrences is found. Note that even if **foied** is disregarded, there is still the form **fe** that must be accounted for.

[13]) Untermann (1964: 178) notes that Neo-Faliscan abbreviations of the word **fileo** on Faliscan funerary inscriptions point in all likelihood to Latin influence.

By way of conclusion, we note that the similar *f/h* variation attributed to dialectal Latin by Roman grammarians and referred to above is probably to be attributed to a similar set of changes to that posited here for Faliscan. The same hypercorrective pressures are likely to have been operative between rural Latin dialects and the prestigious urban variety, though this entire issue clearly deserves a more extensive treatment.[14]) The Faliscan situation thus seems to point the way to a resolution of this longstanding problem in other areas of ancient Italy.[15])

References

Campanile, Enrico (1961): Elementi dialettali nella fonetica e nella morfologia del Latino, *SSL* 1.1-21.

Cristofani, Mauro (1978): Rapporto sulla diffusione della scrittura nell'Italia antica, *Scrittura e civiltà* 2.5-33.

Conway, R. S. (1987): *The Italic Dialects.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Giacomelli, Gabriella (1963): *La lingua falisca.* Firenze: Leo S. Olschki.

- (1978): II Falisco, in Aldo S. Prosdocimi (ed.), *Popoli e civiltà della Italia antica. Lingue e dialetti.* VI. Roma: Biblioteca di Storia Patria, pp. 507-539.

Giacomelli, Robert (1978): *Problemi di storia linguistica del latino dialettale. 1. Ricerche falische.* Firenze: La Nuova Italia.

- (1979): Written and spoken language in Latin-Faliscan and Greek-Messapic, *JIES* 7.149-175.

Hamp, Eric (1972): "Fils" et "fille" en italique: nouvelle contribution, *BSL* 66.213-227.

Hiersche, Rolf (1965): Der Wechsel zwischen anlautendem f und h im Lateinischen, *Glotta* 42.103-108.

Lejeune, Michel (1967): "Fils" et "fille" dans les langues de l'Italie ancienne, *BSL* 62.67-86.

Meillet, Antoine (1933): *Esquisse d'une histoire de la langue latine.* Paris: Hachette.

Pfiffig, Ambros (1969): *Die etruskische Sprache.* Graz: Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt.

Pisani, Vittore (1978): Le lingue preromane d'Italia. Origini e fortune, in Aldo S. Prosdocimi (ed.), *Popoli e civiltà della Italia antica. Lingue e dialetti.* VI. Roma: Biblioteca di Storia Patria, pp. 17-77.

---

[14]) In Wallace & Joseph (forthcoming) we explore the consequences of a hypercorrective explanation for the Latin *h/f* variation.

[15]) We point out that unexpected *f/h* alternations are not just additionally a problem for Latin. Rix (1984: 221), in his discussion of *f > h* in Etruscan, notes that sporadic forms occur with *f* in place of expected *h* (e. g., **ferclite** vs. **herclite**, from Greek Ἡρακλείδης). Interestingly, he suggests that these forms are probably to be explained by hypercorrection.

Rix, Helmut (1984): La scrittura e la lingua, in *Gli Etruschi. Una nuova immagine.* Firenze: Giunti Martello, pp. 210–237.
Vetter, Emil (1953): *Handbuch der italischen Dialekte.* Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
Untermann, Jürgen (1964): Review of Gabriella Giacomelli. 1963. *La lingua falisca.* Firenze: Leo S. Olschki. *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen* 216.171–182.
Wallace, Rex E. and Brian D. Joseph: Forthcoming. What is "Rural" Latin?

The Uses of *neco* II*)

By J. N. ADAMS, Manchester

V. *Deprivation of a life support*

An attempt will be made here to refine the rather too vague notion which has gained some hold that *neco* came to indicate killing without a weapon.

Examples of *neco* were seen earlier in Plautus (*Poen.* 1026) and Livy (4.50.4) applied to execution by drowning/smothering, and it was also pointed out that newborn infants, whose extermination is regularly expressed by *neco,* were also sometimes drowned. Having perhaps taken on an association with this form of death in the legal language, *neco* was sometimes used in the same way outside legal contexts. Examples will be set out below; here it is enough to cite Varro *Rust.* 1.63 'in sole ponere oportet aquae catinos, quod eo conueniunt, ut ipsi se necent, curculiones' (*curculiones* gather at bowls of water and kill themselves there, by drowning).

Superficially rather different from this example is a case such as that at Col. 3.12.2, where plants (rather than an animal) are said to be killed not by water, but by absence of water *(siccitas):* 'rursus nimiam siccitatem destituere plantas naturali alimento, aut in totum necare, aut ...'. This passage in turn can be contrasted with others in which plant-life is killed (*neco*) not by dryness, but by excessive moisture: e.g. Plin. *Nat.* 17.247 'cupressus et aquas aspernatur ..., quin etiam necatur riguis' (the cypress is killed by watery land). As Pliny observes soon after, some plants are killed by water, others thrive on it (*Nat.* 17.250 'mirumque, herbae aqua illa necantur, fruges aluntur').

These few examples, different though they appear to be, and very many examples which seem to be different again, can be put in a single general class. *Neco* constantly expresses killing (plant or animal life) by depriving the victim of something which is essential to the support of life. When an animal is surrounded by water, it is de-

---

*) Teil I, enthaltend die Abschnitte I–IV, wurde in Glotta 68, 1990, 230–255 veröffentlicht [Anm. d. Herausg.].

prived of air and may die. A plant on the other hand may need a watery environment to sustain its life; moisture is its *naturale alimentum*, as Columella (3.12.2) states. Killing the plant by depriving it of this life support does not differ in essence from the killing of animal life by depriving it of air. It does not matter by what means an animal might be deprived of air. Whether it is covered with water, rocks or some other substance, suffocated by smoke or strangled, it loses an essential support to life, and its killing is expressed by *neco*.

The examples of *neco* which can be placed in the general category outlined above are of the most diverse kinds. Take, for instance, Vitr. 1.4.11 'quaeque (bestiae palustres) de superioribus locis natando proxime litus perueniunt, inconsueta salsitudine necantur.' The *bestiae palustres* here are killed by the uncharacteristic saltiness of the water in which they find themselves. They are deprived of an environment (fresh water) which is needed to support their life. This passage might be contrasted with Plin. *Nat.* 9.128 'aquae dulcedine necantur.' The proper environment for the shell fish (*conchylia*) here is not fresh water but salt; they are killed by the absence of salt water. In these two passages the victims are killed not merely by deprivation of their life-sustaining environment, but by being plunged into an environment which is in effect the opposite of that which they need. This is often the implication of *neco*. If, for example, a plant requiring moisture has dry conditions, it is in an environment the opposite of the one it requires.

The seeds for the semantic developments summarised in this section seem already to be present in various uses of *neco* 'execute.' The Vestal Virgin who is interred is deprived (perhaps) of air, and also of sustenance. More strikingly, the newborn infant which is put to death may be either deprived of air (by drowning or strangling) or (perhaps more commonly) of the food, warmth and protective environment which it requires to survive: it is exposed in a hostile environment, in which all of its needs are lacking. The criminal who is buried beneath rocks or strangled with the *laqueus* is deprived of air.

An obvious question must be posed here. Might not *neco* always have carried an idea of killing by deprivation (as distinct from with a weapon)? If so, it would readily have attached itself to certain types of execution (those carried out by drowning, strangling etc.). Against this possibility stands the fact that *neco* 'execute, murder' could be used (though it is so used only sporadically) of deaths inflicted with a sharp instrument, and is also often very general in meaning, conveying no information about the method of killing en-

visaged or employed (as for example in the expressions *hospitem/ patrem neco*). On the other hand the case of *enectus* serves as a warning against assuming too glibly that the common Imperial use of *neco* (indicating death by deprivation of a life support) derives *in the historical period* from certain uses of *neco* = 'execute.' The form *enectus* (as distinct from *enecatus*, which is also attested) is old (cf. Av. *našta-*). *Neco* was probably in origin a primary verb (rather than a denominative), which might have been expected to be in the third conjugation.[1]) To the (original) third conjugation form *enectus* there is attached from early in the historial period the idiomatic meaning 'deprived of sustenance' (for details, see V. 4). The possibility obviously cannot be ruled out that this specialised meaning of *enectus*, like the form itself, dates from much earlier than the period of recorded Latin. The relative age of *enectus* 'deprived' and *neco/eneco* 'execute' cannot of course be determined from the evidence available, and it is therefore impossible to arrive at a definitive view of the early history of *neco/eneco*.

If one takes into account the historical period alone, some such sequence of events as that proposed here is plausible enough. *Neco* was originally a general term for a premeditated killing. When applied to execution, it was all but excluded from the description of killing with an axe, and more closely associated with certain other types of death. The associations which attached to it in this way coloured its use when it was employed outside the sphere of legalistic execution, and led to a proliferation of examples under the Empire expressing killing by the removal of any life support.

But it must be admitted that this may not be the whole story. It cannot be denied that legalistic examples of *neco* in the early period can readily be related to non-legalistic examples, particularly in the Imperial period, describing drowning, strangling, starving etc. But what cannot be established is the connection, if any, in the prehistoric period between the meanings 'execute' and 'kill by deprivation.' The history of *eneco* is particularly puzzling. Not only does its participle have the idiomatic sense discussed above. In Plautus it is usually *eneco* rather than *neco* which is used in non-legal contexts of strangling and the like: it seems to have acquired these general uses earlier than *neco*. *Eneco* is also rather more common than *neco* in the early Republic (see the Appendix).

---

[1]) See M. Leumann, *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*[6] (Munich, 1977), 544.

I now classify examples falling into the general category identified at the start of this section.

1. *Deprivation of air: drowning*

Varro *Rust.* 1.63 in sole ponere oportet aquae catinos, quod eo conueniunt, ut ipsi se necent, curculiones.
Rust. 3.16.38 ut solet similiter fieri in muscis aqua necatis.
Ovid *Tristia* 1.2.36 dumque loquor, uoltus obruit unda meos. / opprimet hanc animam fluctus, frustraque precanti / ore necaturas accipiemus aquas.[2])
Sen. *Dial.* 6.26.6 inundationibus quicquid habitatur obducet necabitque omne animal orbe submerso (death caused by flood).
Plin. *Nat.* 8.184 non est fas eum (bouem) certos uitae excedere annos, mersumque in sacerdotum fonte necant.
Nat. 19.182 praecipue tamen imbres alunt, nam et bestiolae innascentes necantur (on the benefits of rain water, which kills the creatures which breed on plants, presumably by overwhelming them).
Nat. 29.101 quin et necantur catuli statim in aqua.
Nat. 30.141 in urina uirili enecata lacerta.
Nat. 31.2 terras deuorant aquae, flammas necant (of water quenching flames).
Tert. *Bapt.* 5.4 nam et esietos et lymphaticos et hydrophobas uocant quos aquae necauerunt aut amentia uel formidine exercuerunt.
Lact. *Mort. Pers.* 38.2 si qua detrectauerat, in aqua necabatur.
Jul. Val. p. 97.21 ingressosque submergit omnesque, quos alueo acceperat, necat.
id. p. 130.14 ob fraudis meritum eiusdem aquis praecipites dari necarique praecepi.
Amm. 17.13.15 quorum plerique summersi necati sunt.
Amm. 22.14.7 necatur choragio pari bos femina (the sacrifice of a cow, by drowning; cf. *ib.* 'bos ... sacro fonte immersus uita abierit').
Amm. 26.10.18 relapsa enim aequorum magnitudo cum minime speraretur, multa milia necauit hominum et submersit.
Aug. *Ciu.* 1.26 in rapturum atque necaturum se fluuium proiecerunt.[3])

Sall. *Hist.* frg. 2.101 ('ictu eorum, qui in flumen ⟨se⟩ ruebant, necabantur') is impossible to interpret, because of its fragmentary character. Were the victims killed by blows, or submerged in the river by the force of the charge?[4]) Also difficult to classify is Col. 6.6.4 'nam consistens in semiplenis scrobibus nimius humor, antequam conualescant, semina necat' (moisture standing in planting holes may kill seeds). This is not so much a case of drowning in the strict sense (i.e. of submerging in liquid and thereby preventing the victim from

---

[2]) On this passage, see Schulze, *Kleine Schriften,* 157.
[3]) There are numerous other examples in late and medieval Latin.
[4]) Wölfflin, *ALL* 7 (1892), 278 took the passage as referring to hindrance to breathing.

breathing), as of immersion in an environment contrary to that needed to sustain life (see below p. 108).

2. *Drowning, poisoning or immersion in a hostile environment?*

In the above passages the victim is killed in water (or in one case *urina*). There are many other passages, particularly in medical and technical prose, where animals, particularly small creatures, insects, parasites and the like, are killed in liquids other than water. It is usually not made clear what precise cause of death is envisaged. The liquid either surrounds the creature and prevents it from breathing, or surrounds it and provides it with a hostile environment, or (by a slight extension) surrounds it and poisons it. Strictly examples of this third type belong with those cases of the word indicating poisoning (an important category which will be discussed separately below), but the cause of death is so rarely identifiable that I have lumped together all cases of killing in liquids. Only occasionally does a writer offer any hint of his view about the cause of death. At *Nat.* 32.114 Pliny uses not *neco* but *strangulo* of frogs killed in oil ('sunt qui strangulatas in oleo ipsas clam adalligent oleoque eo perunguant'). There may therefore be passages where animals killed (*neco*) in oil were thought of as stifled, drowned (e. g. Col. 6.17.5 [?]: see below).

Scrib. Larg. 80 marini lepores oleo uetere necati.
Celsus 6.7.5 ubi uero uermes orti sunt, si iuxta sunt, protrahendi oriculario specillo sunt: si longius, medicamentis enecandi.
Col. 5.9.14 si uermes atque alia suberunt animalia, hoc medicamento necantur (worms infesting the roots of olive trees are killed by lees of oil, *amurca*).
Col. 6.17.5 animal ipsum (mus) oleo mersum necatur (taken over by Pel. 279.1, and from there by Veg. *Mul.* 2.146.1).
Plin. *Nat.* 9.66 M. Apicius ... in sociorum garo ... necari eos praecellens putauit atque e iecore eorum allecem excogitare (of the killing of mullet in *garum;* cf. *Nat.* 32.138).
Nat. 17.266 multi et has et talpas amurca necant (of the killing of ants and moles with *amurca,* which was presumably poured into their tunnels, cf. Vitr. 10.16.10).
Nat. 20.256 sucus et auribus instillatur uermiculosque in his necat.
Nat. 23.85 oleum amygdalinum ... prodest et auribus ... uermiculosque in his necat.
Nat. 24.18 (cedri sucus) uitam auferat spirantibus defunctisque pro uita sit. uestes quoque corrumpit et animalia necat.
Nat. 32.76 Meges psilotrum palpebrarum faciebat in aceto (ranas) enecans putrescentes et ad hoc utebatur multis uariisque per aquationes autumni nascentibus.
Nat. 32.93 scorpio marinus in uino necatus (cf. *Nat.* 32.102).

Nat. 32.113 hippocampi necantur in rosaceo.
Nat. 32.135 eadem uis pulmonis marini, leporis marini sanguine et felle uel si in oleo lepus hic necetur.
Nat. 32.138 mullus in uino necatus (cf. *Nat.* 9.66).
Marc. 4.19 aqua uel suco herbae cyclaminis ... caput lauato; hoc pacto lindines necati ultra non renascuntur.
Marc. 9.20 hoc medicamen tepidum auriculae infusum pus optime purgat, uermes necat.
Marc. 9.77 cannabis foliorum sucus auriculae instillatus uermes innatos necabit (based on Plin. *Nat.* 20.259, but *neco* does not occur there).
Marc. 9.79 cepae sucus cum melle permixtus et auriculae instillatus ... uermes enecat.
Marc. 27.136 fasianum uiuum in uino necabis.
Med. Plin. 2.3, p.9.12 lendes et alia capitis taetra animalia quae nocent lotione aquae marinae necantur (cf. Plin. *Nat.* 31.65 'lendes quoque et taetra capitis animalia hac curantur;' taken over by *Phys. Plin. Bamb.* 5.9).
Diosc. 2, p.245.1 peduculos negat sucus radicis eius.
Phys. Plin. Bamb. 10.4 cepe afre sucus cum melle bene subactus stillatus auricule ... uermes negat.
Phys. Plin. Flor.-Prag. 3.24.3 cantharidas uiuas in oleo necabis.

Sometimes a liquid is taken by mouth to kill *(neco)* an internal parasite. Such examples are not greatly different from those listed above; again it is impossible to determine how the cause of death was interpreted.

Col. 6.18.2 si tamen uel stomachum uel intestinum tenet, calido aceto per cornu infuso necatur (a leech swallowed by oxen is killed by hot vinegar).
Col. 6.25 marrubii quoque sucus et porri ualet eiusmodi necare animalia (the juice of certain plants kills worms, *lumbrici,* in calves).
Plin. *Nat.* 23.113 radix decocta sucum remittit, qui taenias necat.
Marc. 4.21 cornum ceruinum in scobem limatum et cum uino potum lindines enecat.
Marc. 28.9 ad tineas necandas remedium ... haec omnia trita dantur ieiuno cum aquae mulsae hemina.
Marc. 28.10 mali Punici sucus radicis uel foliorum eiusdem aqua decoctus potuique cum sale datus tineas necat.
Marc. 28.28 radix inulae in uino decoquitur, deinde sucus eius exprimitur potuique datur ad tineas enecandas.
Mulomedicina Chironis 441 hoc uermes necat (of a drink).
Veg. *Mul.* 1.45.3 diutissime autem in talibus locis post potionem animal retinetur, ut facilius necentur uel eiciantur pestes internae.

3. Deprivation of air: suffocation, strangling, stifling etc.

It is in practice sometimes difficult to say whether a death is caused (in the terminology of English) by suffocation or drowning.

How would one describe the death of a person buried in mud? A
Latin speaker was faced by no dilemma, because *neco* was equally
appropriate of drowning and suffocation. Suffocation can, of
course, take many forms. The victim might be buried, throttled,
covered, or forced to inhale something (such as smoke) which pre-
vents the intake of oxygen. A substance inhaled might be regarded
as poisonous; a writer's motives in using *neco* might therefore be dif-
ficult to determine. I list various such applications of *neco* sepa-
rately. Not all of the examples cited in the following pages involve
deprivation of air in the literal sense (as, for example, when a plant is
said to be stifled), but there is always an idea present of covering, en-
circling, squeezing, constriction, *sim.*

(i) death caused by burying, covering, crushing, overwhelming in
various ways

On Plaut. *Amph.* 1056, *Poen.* 1026 and Livy 4.50.4, see above. Cf.-

B. Afr. 84.1 elephas ... sub pede subditum ... premeret atque enecaret.
Vitr. 10.16.10 perfundendo qui in eo opere fuerunt hostes omnes necauit (over-
whelming men who are tunneling into a city with a mixture of water, pitch, sand
and dung).
Ovid *Met.* 4.243 nec tu iam poteras enectum pondere terrae / tollere, nympha,
caput corpusque exsangue iacebas.
Ibis 315 atque necatorum Darei fraude secundi, / sic tua subsidens deuoret
ora cinis (of victims of Darius who fall into and are overwhelmed in a pit
of ash: cf. Val. Max. 9.2. ext. 6 'saeptum enim altis parietibus locum cinere
conpleuit superpositoque tigno prominente benigne cibo et potione excep-
tos in eo conlocabat, e quo somno sopiti in illam insidiosam congeriem decide-
bant').
Livy 1.11.7 accepti obrutam armis necauere (of Tarpeia buried by weapons).
Val. Max. 9.6.1 armis obrutam necauit (see above).
Col. 2.17.2 neutrum tantum prodest quantum si cinerem saepius ingeras. ea res
muscum enecat (a covering of ash kills moss; cf. *Ibis* 315).
Lucan 9.434 puluere Bacchum / enecat (of a climate which causes vines to be
smothered with dust; the temperate climate which is necessary to life is lacking:
435 'temperies uitalis abest').
Plin. *Nat.* 11.106 in Lemno insula certa mensura praefinita est, quam singuli
enecatarum ad magistratus referant (on the island of Lemnos it is compul-
sory that each inhabitant should bring a certain quantity of dead locusts to
the magistrates; the verb used of killing the locusts in the previous sentence
is *obtero,* 'crush;' *neco* is used later in the same section of killing locusts: see
below).
Nat. 11.106 necare et in Syria militari imperio coguntur (of locusts).
Nat. 29.73 ob hoc in unguento necant eum insidiantes paelicum formae (killing a
stelio in unguent).

Tac. *Ann.* 12.47.5 proiectos in humum et ueste multa grauique opertos necat.[5])
Amm. 16.12.53 intactis ferro corporibus aceruis superruentium obruti necabantur (of unwounded men buried beneath others who fall on top of them: note *obruo,* and cf. Livy 1.11.7 above).
Amm. 17.7.5 quid collo tenus aggeribus obruti … auxiliorum inopia necabantur (of men buried beneath fallen debris; they die because there is no-one to help them: note *obruo* again).
Iul. Obs. 42 canente tibicine angues nigri aram circumdederunt, desinente cantare dilapsi postero die exorti a populo lapidibus enecati.
Heges. p. 240.13 alii lacero corpore uix semineces eruebantur, plerosque puluis necabat.
Heges. p. 325.19 repente cecidere muri atque exusta ciuitas est et omnes necati (death caused by crushing, suffocation, burning).
Rufin. *Hist.* 2.19.1, p. 159.4 qui in foribus templi constipatione populi necati sunt (cf. 9.8.9, p. 825.7 'praefocatus multitudine eorum').
Rufin. *Hist.* 7.11.25, p. 665.9 squalore carceris et catenarum ponderibus enecando (death is partly caused by the weight of the chains).

(ii) death caused by *fumus* or the fumes of burning substances

Col. 9.14.2 uermiculi quoque, qui tineae uocantur, item papiliones enecandi (the *uermiculi* and *papiliones* found in honeycomb must be killed by burning dung mixed with *medulla bubula*).
Plin. *Nat.* 20.155 flos recentis incensus pulices necat odore.
Nat. 20.184 colligitur sucus eius ut hyoscyami similiterque largior uenenum est … aiunt et clauis in pedibus mederi tritum in urina, culices suffitu necare, item muscas.
Nat. 22.157 fumus crematorum culices necat.
Nat. 24.116 taxi arboris fumus necat mures.
Nat. 29.64 rursus his aduersatur scolopendra suffituque enecat (the *scolopendra,* a type of venomous centipede, kills bugs – *cimices* – by fumigation).
Nat. 32.124 natura earum aduersatur cimicibus, suffitu necat eos.
Apul. *Met.* 9.27 nec … sulphuris te letali fumo necabo (death from the smoke of sulphur contemplated as a punishment for an adulterer; for *neco* associated with sulphur, see Plin. *Nat.* 10.195, 31.49, below, V.3.iii).
SHA, Av. Cass. 4.3 incensisque aliis alios fumo, cruciatu, timore etiam necaret (a form of execution).[6])
SHA, Alex. Sev. 36.2 fumo adposito, quem ex stipulis atque umidis lignis fieri iusserat, necauit (the same type of execution inflicted on Turinus).
Amm. 24.4.30 unde fumus angustius penetrans, ideoque spissior, quosdam uitalibus obstructis necauit (with some details about the effects of smoke on breathing).
Rufin. *Hist.* 8.12.1, p. 767.13 ubi Christianos suini tergoris more singulis manibus pedibusque suspensos amarissimo fumo subter ingesto indignis cruciatibus enecabant.

---

[5]) See Löfstedt, *Late Latin,* 192, Adams, *Glotta* 51 (1973), 287 n. 57.
[6]) On this and the next passage, see Linderski, *Glotta* 65 (1987), 142 f.

(iii) death caused by *odores* or vapours of various types

The vapour may be seen as preventing the intake of air, but it is not always possible to distinguish such cases from those in which the vapour is poisonous. I make no attempt to separate poisonous from suffocating vapours here.

Lucr. 6.787 est etiam magnis Heliconis montibus arbos / floris odore hominem taetro consueta necare.

Ovid. *Met.* 3.49 hos morsu, longis complexibus illos, / hos necat adflatu funesti tabe ueneni (of a snake which kills by its bite, by squeezing, and by its breath; *neco* suits all these methods of killing).

Ovid *R.A.* 808 lenis alit flammas, grandior aura necat (the stifling effect of strong wind on flames).

Plin. *Nat.* 8.78 necat frutices, non contactos modo, uerum et adflatos (again of a snake, which can kill plants by its breath; I include in this section cases of plant, as well as animal, life killed by vapours).

Nat. 8.79 necant illae (mustellae) simul odore moriunturque (weasels kill a type of snake by their smell).

Nat. 10.195 (odore) origani aut calcis aut sulpuris formicae necantur.

Nat. 17.232 quaedam temporum causae aut locorum non proprie dicantur morbi, quoniam protinus necant, sicut tabes cum inuasit arborem aut uredo uel flatus alicuius regionis proprius (of a wind, among other things, which may kill a tree; the causes of death here are environmental and climatic: see further below, V. 8).

Nat. 17.239 quorundam natura non necat quidem, sed laedit odorum aut suci mixtura (of plants which may harm others by their *odores* or *sucus;* the vine, one such victim of other plants, is said to have a sense of smell).

Nat. 23.63 ergo uini faecibus tanta uis est, ut descendentes in cupas enecet (the lees of wine may kill off (by suffocation) those who descend into wine vats; that deprivation of air is at issue here is clear from the test recommended in the next sentence (lowering a lamp into the vat to see if it is extinguished)).

Nat. 27.9 quoniam procul et e longinquo odore mures necat (of aconite which can kill *mures* by its smell).

Nat. 29.66 basilisci, quem etiam serpentes ipsae fugiunt alias olfactu necantem (of a snake which kills others by its smell).

Nat. 29.101 hac etiam per se reposita in arcis armariisque tineas necant.

Nat. 31.49 depressis puteis sulpurata uel aluminosa occurrentia putearios ·necant (of well-diggers killed by sulphurous and other fumes which they encounter).

Tac. *Ann.* 14.64.2 praeferuidi balnei uapore enecatur.[7])

Amm. 19.4.6 terrarum halitu densiore crassatum aera, emittendis corporis spiraminibus resistentem, necare nonnullos (of death caused by a plague; a theory

---

[7]) See Linderski, 144 n. 27, comparing Val. Max. 9.6. ext. 2 'fumo et uapore balnearum *strangulando.*'

that the air is made thick by exhalations from the earth, and normal emissions from the body prevented).
Diosc. 2, p. 194.22 inponis super caccabum, ubi acetu bulliat, et bapore aceto bullientis easdem inclusas necet.

(iv) death caused by strangling

Various examples of *neco* referring to execution in prison (e.g. Val. Max. 5.4.7), and others referring to the putting to death of the newborn, will have implied strangulation (see Part I, II.4). Cf. Plaut. *Most.* 219, *Amph.* 1119, *Truc.* 781 (p. 249). Note too:

Plin. *Nat.* 8.182 Thessalorum gentis inuentum est equo iuxta quadripedante cornu intorta ceruice tauros necare (a method of killing bulls by twisting back the neck with the horns).
Nat. 11.102 et tam friuola ratione morientes serpentem, cum libuit, necant singulae, faucibus eius adprehensis mordicus (of a belief that a *locusta* can kill a snake if it wishes by seizing onto its throat).
Nat. 22.47 suco scabiem et quadripedum sanant. et ricinos canum necat, iuuencos quoque anginae modo (presumably the ticks which infest dogs are surrounded by the *sucus* of the plant chamaeleon and killed; since an *angina* 'strangled' (see p. 249), *iuuenci* must have been killed by the plant as if by strangulation).
Amm. 29.5.55 ipse camelo necati cadauer impositum ferens (cf. §54: the man had hanged himself, *funiculo*).
Rufin. *Hist.* 8.6.5, p. 751.4 laqueo adpensos necari iussit.

(v) death caused by squeezing, encircling, embracing etc.

Ovid *Met.* 3.49 hos morsu, longis *complexibus* illos, / hos necat adflatu funesti tabe ueneni (see above V.3. iii).
Col. 9.11.1 sed nonnumquam idem necandus est (the killing of the king-bee; on the method, see *ib.* 'nouus rex *eliditur;*' for this use of *elido*, see *TLL* V. 2.372.25 f.).
Plin. *Nat.* 8.30 sed cancellata cutis, et inuitans id genus animalium odore. ergo cum extentis recepere examina, artatis in rugas repente cancellis comprehensas enecant (of the elephant, which can squeeze to death swarms of flies with the creases in its skin).
Nat. 8.216 itaque magna ex parte complectendo necant (pet monkeys kill their young by embracing them excessively).
Nat. 11.65 cum praeualuere (aranei), ut intexant, enecant aluos (of spiders entwining a beehive with their web).
Nat. 26.121 ignis sacri plura sunt genera, inter quae medium hominem ambiens, qui zoster uocatur, et enecat, si cinxit (*zoster*, presumably shingles, if it encircles the waist, kills; *eneco* was motivated by the fact that the disease killed by encircling).

(vi) death inflicted by one plant on another, by encircling, stifling, depriving of sustenance etc.

Neco is often used of plants which kill other plants. These examples are again difficult to classify, not least because a writer may have had no precise idea of the way in which the death was brought about. The victim may be deprived by the more aggressive plant of sustenance, in which case the use of *neco* belongs in that large group of examples denoting killing by starvation (see below, V. 4). Sometimes, if the aggressor entwines the victim, as in the case of ivy, the image of strangulation no doubt motivated the use of *neco;* indeed *strangulo* is also used in such contexts (Plin. *Nat.* 16.152).[8]) Pliny is more precise at *Nat.* 16.151, where he speaks of white ivy taking away the *sucus* of the victim; its life blood, as it were (for the passage, see below). This group of examples therefore combines the ideas of stifling, strangulation, and the deprivation of something which is needed by the plant to sustain its life. Although the category is a disparate one, I make no attempt here to subdivide the examples.

Laberius 122 ut hedera serpens uires arboreas necat, / ita me uetustas amplexu annorum enecat.
Col. 5.6.18 si uetustae (ulmo) uitem applicueris, coniugem necabit.
Col. 11.3.38 runcareque (rutam) donec conualescat, ne herbis enecetur.
Sen. *Epist.* 90.21 collectas manu herbas ne quid fortuitum et agreste succrescat quod necet segetem.
Plin. *Nat.* 16.151 arbores autem necat candida (helix) omnemque sucum auferendo tanta crassitudine augetur, ut ipsa arbor fiat.
Nat. 16.243 hedera necari arbores certum est.
Nat. 17.144 namque inter se radices serpunt mutuoque discursu necantur (of the roots of reeds which may become intertwined and kill one another).
Nat. 17.203 maritare nisi ualidas inimicum, enecante ueloci uitium incremento (vines may kill a tree to which they are wed, presumably by stifling).
Nat. 17.239 necant iniucem inter sese umbra uel densitate atque alimenti rapina (densely packed plants deprive one another of nourishment and also of light).
ib. necat et hedera *uinciens.*
ib. necatur eo, quod halimon uocant Graeci.
Nat. 18.155 est herba, quae cicer enecat et eruum *circumligando* se; uocatur orobanche.[9])
ib. et hae *conplexu* necant.
ib. circa Philippos ateramum nominant in pingui solo herbam, qua faba necatur.

---

[8]) See Schulze, 156.
[9]) See Schulze, 156.

Nat. 18.196 itemque festinata satione densum spargi semen, quia tarde concipiat, serotina rarum, quia densitate nimia necetur (seed is killed if it is sown too closely, presumably by stifling or lack of sustenance).

Nat. 19.176 et necatur cuminum αἱμοδώρῳ, nisi repurgetur.

Nat. 22.161 miliaria appellatur herba, quae necat milium (of a plant which kills millet).

Nat. 22.162 orobanchen appellauimus necantem eruum et legumina (cf. 18.155 above).

Symmachus p. 283.8 secuta est hoc factum fames publica et spem prouinciarum omnium messis aegra decepit. non sunt haec uitia terrarum, nihil inputemus austris, nec rubigo segetibus obfuit, nec auena fruges necauit.

I mention here also Plin. *Nat.* 17.108 'ne hiscat nimium rima laxeque capiat, aut ne parum et exprimat aut compressum necet' (of grafting; the hole for the scions should not be too small, lest it kill them by stifling).

Sen. *Phaedr.* 454 displays an extension of the usages seen above: 'quid te coerces et necas rectam indolem?'. *Necas* is metaphorical (of stifling one's nature); the imagery is agricultural (cf. lines 455–8).

(vii) miscellaneous

At *Nat.* 8.209 ('adhibetur et ars iecori feminarum sicut anserum, inuentum M. Apici, fico arida saginatis ac satie necatis repente mulsi potu dato') Pliny uses *neco* of the killing of sows by over-feeding them with dry digs; they are then given a drink of *mustum*. On the face of it the example is an inversion of the more common use of the word of killing by starvation (see below; for another apparent case of contrary causes of death both expressed by *neco,* see Col. 3.12.2 / Plin. *Nat.* 17.247, above p. 94). It is not unlikely that the stuffing of the animal was thought to hinder breathing. There is a somewhat similar example at Sen. *Dial.* 1.3.2 'simillima cruditatibus ebrietatibusque et ceteris quae necant per uoluptatem' (of death caused by over-indulgence in both food and drink and other dangerous pleasures).

At *Nat.* 23.29 ('(mustum) a balneis raptim et sine interspiratione potum necat') *sine interspiratione* perhaps suggests that the breathing was believed to be affected, but equally Pliny may have meant that *mustum* could be poisonous.

4. Deprivation of sustenance

We have seen that *neco* (*eneco*) might have been used of starvation when applied to the putting of unwanted infants to death. Vestal

Virgins guilty of *stuprum* were also executed *(neco)* by starvation. In Plautus *enico* is used with *fame* at *Pers.* 318.

Attention has also been drawn to the use of the past participle *enectus* in a weakened sense 'starved, deprived of sustenance, weakened by deprivation' (cf. Eng. 'I am starved, starving'). This usage is not exactly equivalent to Eng. 'starved,' because the earliest example extant refers to deprivation of water (*Inc. inc. fab.* 111 Ribbeck, *ap.* Cic. *Tusc.* 1.10, 'mento summam aquam [*amnem* Bücheler] attingens, enectus siti' (of Tantalus)): its range of reference was obviously wider. The steps by which *enectus* took on this meaning cannot be traced in recorded Latin. But death by starvation or thirst is not a momentary event but a lingering process. A transitive verb applied to killing by starvation might often be used of depriving of food with the *intention* of killing at some indeterminate time in the future; if the intended victim is still alive, it is in theory possible that the verb will be taken to mean simply 'deprive of sustenance.' In the following list I quote examples both of the full and the weakened meanings:

Plaut. *Pers.* 318 emitte sodes, ne enices fame.

Cic. *Verr. a. pr.* 13 socii nostri atque amici, fame necati.

Cic. *Att.* 6.1.2 ut si medicus, cum aegrotus alii medico traditus sit, irasci uelit ei medico qui sibi successerit si quae ipse in curando constituerit immutet ille, sic Appius, cum ἐξ ἀφαιρέσεως prouinciam curarit, sanguinem miserit, quicquid potuit detraxerit, mihi tradiderit enectam, προσανατρεφομένην eam a me non libenter uidet (of the weakening of a province to the point of ruin. Cilicia under Appius is compared to a patient treated by a doctor who employs deprivation, ἀφαίρεσις, *detractio;* Cicero will feed it up again. The literal sense of the word which lies behind this metaphorical usage is slightly wider than 'starved;' the patient in the comparison has not only been deprived of food, but has had blood let, and indeed Appius has taken away *quicquid potuit*).

Cic. *Att.* 9.9.2 cum parentis non alere nefarium sit, nostri principes antiquissimam et sanctissimam parentem, patriam, fame necandam putent (of starving one's country to death, the act being compared to parricide).

Cic. *Q. Fr.* 2.3.2 qui plebem fame necaret.

Cic. *Diu.* 1.61 ea parte animi, quae mentis et consili est, agitata et erecta saturataque bonarum cogitationum epulis, eaque parte animi, quae uoluptate alitur, nec inopia enecta nec satietate affluenti (Cicero is here freely translating a passage from Plato's *Republic;* with the clause 'eaque parte animi, quae uoluptate alitur, nec inopia enecta nec satietate affluenti', cf. *Rep.* 9.571 d-e τὸ ἐπιθυμητικὸν δὲ μήτε ἐνδείᾳ δοὺς μήτε πλησμονῇ; the passage deals with the effects of starvation and repletion on dreams, and the clause in question refers to the starving or feeding up of that part of the mind which is the seat of desires).[10]

---

[10] See A. S. Pease, *M. Tulli Ciceronis de Diuinatione Liber Primus,* Part II (*University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature* VI (1920)), 201.

Cic. *Diu.* 2.73 nunc uero inclusa in cauea et fame enecta, si in offam pultis inua-
dit ('starved,' but not to death; of a bird).

Cic. *Diu.* 2.142 nam medici ex quibusdam rebus et aduenientis et crescentis mor-
bos intellegunt, nonnullas etiam ualetudinis significationes, ut hoc ipsum, pleni
enectine simus, ex quodam genere somniorum intellegi posse dicunt (doctors can
deduce from dreams whether we are 'full' or starved of nourishment;[11]) here, as
at *Att.* 6.1.2 above, the participle *enectus* needs no complement such as *fame:* the
idiom was obviously well-established).

Cic. *Fin.* 5.82 qui in potestate hostium uigiliis et inedia necatus (of Regulus, who
was executed by the Carthaginians by deprivation of both food and sleep).

Livy 21.40.9 effigies immo, umbrae hominum, fame, frigore, inluuie, squalore
enecti (= 'weakened,' not only by hunger: a widening of usage).

Val. Max. 9.2. ext. 6 iure iurando obstrictus ne … aut ueneno aut ferro aut ulla
ui aut inopia alimentorum necaret ('kill,' but lack of food is only one of a num-
ber of possible causes of death).

Col. 4.24.19 deinde soli quoque pinguitudinem, quae nisi adest, quamuis ualidis-
simam uitem celeriter necabimus procerioribus emaciatam flagellis (a vine may
be killed if its branches are allowed to grow longer than the quality of the soil
will support; the long branches deprive the tree of sustenance).

Plin. *Nat.* 8.134 adprehensusque pes alter a posterioribus suspendiosa fame necat
(the killing of hedgehogs by starvation when they are suspended by one of the
hind feet).

Nat. 17.239 necant inuicem inter sese umbra uel densitate atque *alimenti rapina*
(cf. sect. 3 (vi) above).

Quint. 3.6.27 hinc est adulter loris caesus uel fame necatus.

Suet. *Tib.* 54.2 iudicatos hostis fame necauit, Neronem in insula Pontia, Drusum
in ima parte Palatii (both died, Nero by suicide, Drusus because his hunger be-
came so acute that he was forced to eat the stuffing from a cushion or mattress
(culcita); starvation can be said to have been the cause of death, but it was an in-
direct cause).

Suet. *Nero* 36.2 damnatorum liberi urbe pulsi enectique ueneno aut fame (defini-
tely = 'killed,' though *fames* is only one cause of death).

Tert. *Ieiun.* 7.4 satis enim paenitentia scelerum commendauerat ieiunium triduo
functam, etiam pecudibus enectis, quibus iratus deus non erat (among examples
of fasting from the Old Testament, = 'starved, deprived;' see further *Nat.*
1.10.35, *Apol.* 14.1 for *enectus* used thus in Tertullian).

P. Amh. 2.26, I.4 ipse … esuriens et luppus enectus uer⟨o⟩ rediuit (a crude rendi-
tion of Babrius 16.6 αὐτὸς δὲ πεινῶν καὶ λύκος χανὼν ὄντως/ἀπῆλθε, with *enec-
tus* = 'starving, deprived of food').

Amm.31.6.5 adiectis plurimis quos primo transgressu necati inedia uino exili uel
panis frustis mutauere uilissimis (here it is the past participle of *neco* which has
the weakened sense).

Rufin. *Hist.*10.8.13, p.897.5 multitudines in carcerem retrusae inedia necabantur.

In addition to the examples quoted here, there are examples in
sect.3 (vi) (of plants killing one another off) of *neco* indicating kill-
ing by deprivation of sustenance.

---

[11]) See Pease *ad loc.* (*Illinois Studies* VIII (1923), 572).

5. Deprivation of water or moisture

Inc. inc. fab. 111 Ribbeck (*ap.* Cic. *Tusc.* 1.10): see above V.4.
Col. 3.12.2 rursus nimiam siccitatem destituere plantas naturali alimento, aut ...
Col. 4.7.2 aestiuis caloribus falce uulnus penitus inpressum et ⟨iam⟩ latius inares-
cit, ita ut non minimam partem de ipso matris corpore necet (a deep wound made
by a pruning knife may dry up in summer heat and kill part of the vine; the vine
is deprived of some of the moisture which it usually retains).

6. Deprivation of light (of a tree)(?)

Plin. *Nat.* 17.65 natura et plantaria demonstrauit multarum radicibus pullulante
subole densa et pariente matre, quas necet: eius quippe umbra turba indigesta
premitur (a 'mother' tree may kill her progeny by her shade).
Nat. 17.89 (umbra) necat gramina et pinus.
Nat. 17.150 de cetero ipsa se colit umbra stolones superuacuos enecante (of
shade killing shoots).
Nat. 17.239 necant inuicem inter sese umbra ...

Although the classification of these four passages might seem
straightforward, Plin. *Nat.* 17.91 suggests an alternative interpreta-
tion. There the shade of certain trees is said to be 'poison' *(uene-
num):* 'iuglandum quidem pinorumque et picearum et abietis quae-
cumque attingere non dubie uenenum.' Pliny seems to have believed
that it was not absence of light which kills a plant, but the poisonous
qualities of certain types of shade. The four passages might there-
fore be classified with those in which *neco* expresses death by poi-
soning.

7. Deprivation of bark (of a tree)

A tree may be killed if it is deprived of part of its bark (by ring-
barking):

Plin. *Nat.* 17.234 cortice in orbem detracto necantur.

8. Deprivation or reversal of the proper environment

It was pointed out above (p. 95) that *neco* can denote the de-
struction of animal or plant life by deprivation of the environment
which sustains it; the animal or plant might indeed be surrounded by
an environment which represents a reversal of that needed. Some-
times it is the nature of the climate which is hostile to life (partic-
ularly a sudden and unexpected change of climate), sometimes the

physical conditions of soil, water etc. in which the animal or plant finds itself unexpectedly.

Vitr. 1.4.11 (bestiae palustres) inconsueta salsitudine necantur.
Scrib. Larg. 80 marini lepores oleo uetere necati (this example has already been quoted with those passages (see V. 2) describing the immersion of small creatures in liquids which either prevent them from breathing or poison them. I quote the passage again because it is comparable with Plin. *Nat.* 9.128, where salt-water creatures are said to be killed by fresh water. The environment here is not exactly the opposite of that required, but is nonetheless hostile; cf. also Plin. *Nat.* 32.93, above, V.2).
Col. 2.11.1 frumenti radices sarculo detegantur, aliquae etiam succidantur ac, si frigora incesserint post saritionem, gelu frumenta enecentur (the roots of *frumentum* are exposed by hoeing, and the grain might be killed by a sudden frost).
Col. 3.12.2 (see above, V.5).
Col. 5.5.4 nam consistens in semiplenis scrobibus nimius umor, antequam conualescant, semina necat (excessive moisture standing in planting holes may kill seeds).
Sen. *Epist.* 73.16 non aliter quam humus sterilis ac palustris necat (of seeds killed by an unsuitable environment, i.e. sterile and marshy ground).
Plin. *Nat.* 5.42 mox Gaulos, Galata, cuius terra scorpiones, dirum animal Africae, necat (the soil of a certain area offers a hostile environment which will not support the scorpions normally found in Africa).
Nat. 9.128 aquae dulcedine necantur (see p. 95).
Nat. 17.233 si protinus editis fructibus gelatio magna consecuta est, etiam paucis diebus necat (of a frost killing *fructus*).
Nat. 17.247 cupressus et aquas aspernatur..., quin etiam necatur riguis (see p.94).
Nat. 17.250 mirumque, herbae aqua illa necatur, fruges aluntur (see p.94).
Nat. 18.208 aestiuasque alites praeposteri aut praeproperi rigores necant, hibernas aestus (of climate; unexpected cold kills summer birds, while heat kills winter birds; it is the reversal of the proper climate which is destructive).
Nat. 31.52 ter accidit in Bosporo, ut salsi deciderent necarentque frumenta (of salt rainwater which kills crops; fresh rainwater would sustain them).
Nat. 35.202 ex Galata insula et circa Clupeam Africae scorpiones necat (terra), Baliaris et Ebusitana serpentes (see *Nat.* 5.42 above).
Plin. *Epist.* 5.6.4 (caelum) laurum tamen patitur atque etiam nitidissimum profert, interdum sed non saepius quam sub urbe nostra necat (of excessive cold killing the *laurus*).
Arnob. *Nat.* 1.20.3 possunt nos, si uoluerint, aestu, possunt nocentissimo frigore, possunt auris pestilentibus, possunt morborum obscurissimis causis enecare (the gods can kill by extremes of climate, and also by obscure diseases).

An example of *neco* in the *Panegyricus Messalae* can be seen as analogous to, and an extension of, those examples above in which inappropriate climatic conditions are said to kill: 168 'alter et alterius uires necat aer.' Here the victim is not a living creature. Two contrary climatic zones, the frozen poles and the hot equatorial zone,

are described as neutralising (*neco*) each other, and producing temperate zones between themselves.

9. Deprivation of sleep

Cic. *Fin.* 5.82 uigiliis et inedia necatus est (of Regulus).
Cic. *Off.* 3.100 uigilando necabatur.
Cic. *Pis.* 43 M. Regulus quem Carthaginienses resectis palpebris inligatum in machina uigilando necauerunt.
Cf. Val. Max. 9.2 ext. 1 Atilium Regulum palpebris resectis machinae in qua undique praeacuti stimuli eminebant inclusum uigilantia pariter et continuo tractu doloris necauerunt.

The basic sense is 'execute, put to death,' but the association which *neco* had with the idea of death by deprivation made it particularly suitable to the killing of Regulus.

VI. Poisoning

Though *neco* was a generic term for 'murder,' whatever the means by which the act was perpetrated, from the late Republic the word becomes particularly common of murder by poison, either accompanied by *ueneno* or with such a complement implied by the context. The applicability of *neco* to poisoning can be illustrated from two speeches of Cicero. In the *pro Roscio,* which deals with murder by a weapon, *occido* is found 44 times, compared with only 2 examples of *neco,* both of them, as we have seen, in generalising references to the crime of parricide. In the *pro Cluentio,* on the other hand, *neco* (14 times) outnumbers *interficio* (9 times) and *occido* (4 times) put together. The speech dealt largely with cases of poisoning, and most examples of *neco* refer either explicitly (for *ueneno neco,* see 30, 61, 169) or by implication to murder by poisoning. This use of the verb needs no further illustration here.[12])

After the late Republic when used of poisoning *neco* was by no means restricted to homicide. Its usage widened, and by the early Empire it had become the *vox propria* for the killing of humans, animals or plant life by poison which might be swallowed, breathed in or injected (see Plin. *Nat.* 9.155). I quote a selection of passages here to illustrate the diversity of its use:

---

[12]) Cf., e. g. *Her.* 2.8, 2.44, 3.33 twice, Cic. *Cael.* 31, *Off.* 3.86, Val. Max. 6.5.1, 8.1. ambust. 1, Suet. *Nero* 43.1, Gell. 12.7.4, Apul. *Met.* 10.28, Amm. 29.2.19, 30.1.22, Schol. Iuu. 6.620, 628, 638.

Vitr. 8.3.16 conseruare autem eam (aquam) et continere nihil aliud potest nisi mulina ungula, qua etiam memoratur ab Antipatro in prouinciam, ubi erat Alexander, per Iollam filium perlata esse et ab eo ea aqua regem esse necatum (of the water of the Styx, which killed Alexander; on such waters as *uenena*, see Sen. *Nat. Quaest.* 3.25.1).

Ovid *Met.* 3.49 hos morsu, longis complexibus illos, / hos necat adflatu funesti tabe ueneni (of a snake, which kills by its venomous bite and breath, among other means).

Ovid. *R.A.* 421 parua necat morsu spatiosum uipera taurum (again of a snake).

Col. 2.9.9 ubi uel uligo uel alia quae pestis segetem enecat (of *uligo*, 'ooze,' described as a *noxius umor*, which kills off crops).

Col. 5.8.7 quercus etiam excisa radices noxias oliueto relinquit, quarum uirus enecat oleam (the roots of an oak which has been cut down are poisonous to the olive).

Sen. *Dial.* 7.18.2 ne uirus quidem istud, quo alios spargitis, quo uos necatis, me impediet, quominus perseuerem laudare uitam, non quam ago, sed quam agendam scio (metaphorical, of *malignitas*).

Plin. *Nat.* 8.78 necat frutices, non contactos modo, uerum et adflatos (of a venomous snake which kills plants by its breath: see above V.3.iii).

Nat. 8.136 ergo corpus eius exustum adspergunt aliis carnibus polentae modo insidiantes ferae necantque etiam cinere (the ashes of the animal leontophonos are sprinkled on meat and this kills the lion).

Nat. 9.155 arbores infixus radici necat (the *radius* of a stingray if attached to the roots of trees kills them by its poison).

Nat. 18.45 sucus enim ex ipsa defluens necat radices (the sap of the *filix* kills the roots of plants).

Nat. 19.178 sed efficacissime heliotropio herba necantur (of a plant which kills ants).

Nat. 20.94 necari quoque canes ea, si detur ex carne (of *brassica*, which kills dogs).

Nat. 20.172 medetur (cunila) utraque contra serpentes ex uino uel aceto, pulices etiam contritae cum aqua sparsae necant (of fleas either killed in a liquid or poisoned; cf. *Nat.* 22.27, 22.49, 24.53).

Nat. 21.182 nec illud praeteribo, aspidum naturae halicacabum in tantum aduersam, ut radice eius propius admota soporetur illa sopore enecans uis earum (referring to the power of asps to kill by *sopor*, stupefaction; cf. *Nat.* 29.65).

Nat. 22.46 hic sucus ... contrahit in se mures ac necat, nisi protinus aquam sorbeant.

Nat. 24.53 foliorum decocto si locus spargatur, muscae necantur.

Nat. 24.98 apocyni semen ex aqua ... canes et omnes quadripedes necat in cibo datum.

Nat. 24.183 camelos necare traditur in Babylonis regione id, quod iuxta uias nascitur (a plant which kills camels).

Nat. 25.48 nigro equi, boues, sues necantur, itaque cauent id, cum candido uescantur (of the effects of a type of hellebore on certain animals; presumably it was regarded as poisonous, but Dioscorides talks of the suffocating effect of excessive quantities of one type on man: Diosc. Lat. 2, p.65.11 'plus accepta hominem offocat').

Nat. 27.7 tangunt carnes aconito necantque gustatu earum pantheras.

Nat. 27.9 quoniam procul et e longinquo odore mures necat (aconite again).
Nat. 31.26 in Arcadia ad Phrenum aqua profluit e saxis Styx appellata, quae ilico
necat (cf. Vitr. 8.3.16).
Nat. 31.27 necare aquas Theopompus et in Thracia apud Cichros dicit.
Suet. *Gramm.* 3.3 cuius inpatiens ueneno sibi perunxit pedes et enicuit ita ut parte
ea corporis quasi praemortua uiueret (a sufferer from gout smears his leg with
poison and 'kills' that part of the body).
Suet. *Cal.* 49.3 quibus (uenenis) mox a Claudio demersis infecta maria traduntur
non sine piscium exitio, quos enectos aestus in proxima litora eiecit (the sea
is poisoned, and dead fish are washed up; in this case the environment of the
fish is made unsuitable for supporting life. This passage should be compared
with Plin. *Nat.* 20.58 'lactucae sponte nascentis primum genus est eius, quam ca-
prinam uocant, qua pisces in mare deiecta protinus necantur, qui sunt in pro-
ximo').

There are numerous other examples in Pliny the Elder of *neco* ap-
plied to poisoning of diverse types, which there is no need to quote
in full here (cf. *Nat.* 25.61 twice, 25.113, 25.122, 27.80, 28.160, 29.65,
29.74 twice, 32.25, 32.53).

The frequency of poisoning in late Republican society (as evi-
denced by the *pro Cluentio*) will have caused *neco* 'murder' to occur
often in the expression *ueneno neco,* with *ueneno* tending to be omit-
ted in contexts in which it was implied. Once (*ueneno*) *neco* was
established as the standard designation for murdering by poison, it
was no great extension for the verb to be applied to poisonings of
other types, not readily classifiable as murders.

The observable (or imagined) effects of some poisons on the body
will also have assisted *neco* to establish itself as the proper term for
killing by poisoning. Pliny speaks of poisons which kill by strangling
(*strangulando*): *Nat.* 20.63 'aliis quoque uenenis resistunt, exceptis
quae strangulando necant.' Since, as we have seen, *neco* was often
linked with strangling, it was inevitable that it should have been ap-
plied to killing by poisons which had, or were believed to have, this
effect. Some poisons were thought to kill by their fumes (see Ovid
Met. 3.49, Plin. *Nat.* 8.78, 27.9 above). Any method of killing which
seemed to impede the intake of air was bound to attract *neco* (see V.
3 (ii), (iii)). Other poisons had a chilling effect: Plin. *Nat.* 24.24 'ad-
uersatur uenenis, quae frigore necent, ideo et cicutae,' 24.61 'aduer-
santur uenenis [serpentium], maxime quae frigus inferunt,' 25.151
'semini et foliis refrigeratoria uis; sic et necat: incipiunt algere ab ex-
tremitatibus corporis' (of hemlock), 29.74 'nam si (salamandra) ar-
bori inrepsit, omnia poma inficit ueneno et eos, qui ederint, necat fri-
gida ui, nihil aconito distans.' Again *neco* will have been the approp-

riate verb, given that it was readily applied to death by exposure (to cold). The poison hemlock, according to Pliny, killed partly by thickening the blood: *Nat.* 25.152 'necat sanguinem spissando ... ideo sic necatorum maculae in corporibus apparent.' Constriction of the blood, like constriction of the breath, would perhaps have been suggestive of stifling.

One or two other factors may have played a part in the emergence of this specialised usage. It was felt that a foetus might be killed by *uenena* (see II.5). Since *neco* was the established term for killing the foetus, the verb in this context will sometimes have been suggestive of poisoning. Depriving an animal or plant of its natural environment may be tantamount to poisoning: the unnatural environment may be considered 'poisonous' (e.g. salt water to a fresh water animal). Again, in some cases it is difficult to say whether a death is caused by drowning or poisoning (when a small creature is surrounded by a liquid intended to kill it: see V.2). Those 'drownings' (habitually referred to by *neco*) which were alternatively classifiable as poisonings would have helped broaden the associations of *neco*.

VII. Bestiolae

There is a large group of examples of *neco* indicating the killing of small *bestiolae,* whether household pests (e.g. mice, fleas, ants, flies), or parasites infesting humans or animals, either externally or internally (*uermes, uermiculi, tineae, lumbrici* are some of the creatures mentioned). Many of the examples fit readily into the categories discussed above (and indeed they have already been quoted): the animal is killed by deprivation of a life support. It is sometimes drowned (e.g. Varro *Rust.* 1.63 *curculiones, Rust.* 3.16.38 *muscae*) or suffocated, for instance by *fumus* or an *odor* (e.g. Col. 9.14.2 *uermiculi / tineae,* Plin. *Nat.* 10.195 *formicae, Nat.* 20.155 *pulices, Nat.* 22.157 *culices, Nat.* 24.116 *mures*). It may be surrounded by a liquid which works by suffocation, poisoning or by imposing a hostile environment.

Comparable with examples in which a small creature is either put in or surrounded by a liquid, are examples in which it is covered by a substance which is not a liquid, such as an unguent. The cause of death may be looked upon as similar, but it is also similarly ambiguous: was the animal stifled, or poisoned? The dividing line between

such cases and those listed in V. 2 is a fine one, because the consist-
ency of the *medicamentum* might vary imperceptibly. I list some ex-
amples in which the external application of a soft substance is said to
kill (*neco*) *bestiolae*:

Celsus 6.6.15 B super ipsos uero peduculos alia, quae necare eos et prohibere, ne
similes nascantur, possint.
Col. 6.16.2 id celerrime necat praedicta animalia (pounded *marrubium* or *porrum*
mixed with salt kills the worms which form in sores).
Plin. *Nat.* 22.108 mel auribus instillatur cum rosaceo, lendes et foeda capitis ani-
malia necat.
Nat. 31.117 capitis animalia et lendes necat cum Samia terra inlitum ex
oleo.
Marc. 4.65 ad peduculos necandos hoc medicamine uteris: oleum cum puluere ci-
neris cuiuslibet de foco, sed bene creti, pariter miscebis et ita teres, ut sit ad spis-
situdinem mellis, atque inde ... caput unge.
Marc. 4.66 ad peduculos in omni parte corporis necandos ... ellebori radicis un-
cia, stafidos agriae uncia simul trita adiectoque oleo totum corpus perunctum
etiam in tunicis necabuntur (cf. ps.-Theod. Prisc. p. 268.15).
Marc. 4.67 ... simul terito ac decimo die in balneo corpus fricato; omnes peducu-
los necabis.
Marc. 28.12 farina lupinorum decocta ex aqua et more cataplasmatis uentri inpo-
sita lumbricos uel tineas necat.
Diosc. 4, p. 69.6 trita peduculos necat uncta, scabia et plurigines tollet (the chok-
ing effect of the plant is mentioned in the previous sentence: 'offocationes citius
prestat et gula exasperat bibita').
Phys. Plin. Bamb. 86.5 item centaurie herbe: sicca tusam in puluerem et lupino-
rum eque farina melle mixta super umbilico inponis, et tineas negat.

Although it is possible to relate the above passages loosely to the
use of *neco* indicating stifling, poisoning, deprivation in one form or
another, it must be a matter of doubt whether in each and every case
the writer reflected on the method of killing before committing him-
self to *neco*. It seems likely that by the Empire it was not so much
the means of death which motivated the choice of verb, as the nature
of the victim. Starting from cases in which small creatures were un-
ambiguously stifled or drowned or poisoned, *neco* probably became
established as the *vox propria* for the extermination of parasites and
pests, by whatever means. This is admittedly a difficult view to
prove, because in many cases the method of killing would have been
appropriately described by *neco* anyway. An interesting passage is
Col. 11.3.64 ('Democritus ... affirmat has ipsas bestiolas enecari, si
mulier, quae in menstruis est, solutis crinibus et nudo pede unam-
quamque aream ter circumeat'), where *erucae*, caterpillars, also called
bestiolae in the sentence quoted, and *uermiculi* in the next sentence,

are said to be killed, *enecari,* if encircled three times by a menstruat-
ing woman. The (magical) cause of death here is quite unlike that in
the other passages quoted in this section, and in V.2 above. What
eneco shares with the other examples in these sections is the general
character of its object.

One final class of examples which I cite here are those describing
the killing of internal parasites by means of solid (or relatively solid)
medicamenta which are swallowed by the patient. It is again impos-
sible to say how the *medicamenta* were regarded as operating, and un-
likely that those recommending such measures had any clear idea
themselves. They were presumably using *neco* because of its estab-
lished connection with *bestiolae:*

Scrib. Larg. 140 ad taenias necandas, eiciendas per triduum alium quam pluri-
mum edat et betaceos, caseum mollem (cf. Marc. 28.1).
Marc. 28.8 ad lumbricos necandos ... ex aqua fiunt globuli fabae magnitudi-
nis...
Marc. 28.29 aleum in oenomeli decoctum et uoratum proderit lumbricis uel tineis
necandis.
Phys. Plin. Bamb. 86.3 camomeli herba cum aceto edita lumbricos negat.

I list below some of the creatures of whose killing *neco (eneco)* is
used, particularly in technical writings. The extermination of pests is
more commonly spoken about in everyday life than the killing of
humans; the usage discussed in this section was therefore probably
one of the most frequently heard applications of this verb.

animal, bestia, bestiola, pestis (Vitr. 1.4.11, Col. 6.17.5, 6.25, 11.3.64,
    Plin. *Nat.* 19.182, 24.18, Veg. *Mul.* 1.45.3)
cimex (Plin. *Nat.* 29.64, 32.124)
culex (Plin. *Nat.* 20.184, 22.157)
curculio (Varro *Rust.* 1.63)
eruca (Col. 11.3.65)
formica (Plin. *Nat.* 10.195, 19.178)
hirudo, sanguisuga (Col. 6.18.2, Veg. *Mul.* 4.24.2; note Plin. *Nat.*
    8.29 'hirudine, quam sanguisugam uulgo coepisse appellari ad-
    uerto')
insecta (Plin. *Nat.* 11.279)
lens (Plin. *Nat.* 31.117, Marc. 4.19, 4.21, *Phys. Plin. Bamb.* 5.9; cf.
    perneco at Diosc. 1, p.47.9 M.)
locusta (Plin. *Nat.* 11.106)
lumbricus (Col. 6.25 (by implication), Marc. 28.8, 28.12, 28.29, *Phys.
    Plin. Bamb.* 86 tit., 86.3)

mus (Col. 6.17.5 (by implication), Plin. *Nat.* 22.46, 24.116, 27.9, 30.108, Pel. 279.1, from Columella; also Veg. *Mul.* 2.146.1, from Pelagonius)

musca (Varro *Rust.* 3.16.38, Plin. *Nat.* 20.184)

papilio (Col. 9.14.2, 9.14.8)

peduculus (Scrib. Larg. 8, 166, Celsus 6.6.15 B, Marc. 4.65, 4.66 twice, 4.68, Diosc. 2, p. 245.1, 4, p. 69.6)

pulex (Plin. *Nat.* 20.155, 20.172, 22.27, 22.49)

ricinus (Plin. *Nat.* 22.47)

taenia (Scrib. Larg. 140, Col. 9.14.2, Plin. *Nat.* 23.113, 29.101, Marc. 28.9, 28.10 (taken from Pliny), 28.12, 28.28, 28.29, *Phys. Plin. Bamb.* 86 tit., 86.5)

uermis, uermiculus (Celsus 6.7.5, Col. 6.16.2, Plin. *Nat.* 20.256, Marc. 9.20, 9.77, 9.79, *Mul. Chir.* 441, Pel. 179, and from there Veg. *Mul.* 2.66.1, *Phys. Plin. Bamb.* 10.4)

uruca (Plin. *Nat.* 19.180)

VIII. Miscellaneous

In this section I discuss various passages or groups of passages which are difficult to classify.

(1) At Ennius *Ann.* 573 Skutsch *neco* is used of a plague, *pestis*, which kills: 'hos pestis necuit, pars occidit illa duellis.' This is the earliest example of *neco* which does not refer to death inflicted by a human agent. *Enico*, however, is used a number of times by Plautus with a non-personal agent: *Amph.* 1056 'ita mi uidentur omnia, mare, terra, caelum, consequi iam ut opprimar, ut enicer,' *Curc.* 236 'lien enicat, renes dolent,' *Merc.* 114 'simul enicat suspiritus,' *Most.* 219 'ut ueneficae illi / fauces prehendam atque enicem scelestam stimulatricem.' In the first and the last of these passages the verb has its full force 'kill,' and in both the potential victim is imagined as having his breathing impeded (by crushing or strangling). In the fourth the agent is an illness (*angina*), which is personified. In the second and third passages *enico* is used hyperbolically rather than literally, but in one of these too the sufferer experiences breathing difficulties.

It would be pointless to be dogmatic about how Ennius regarded his *pestis* as working, but it is not difficult to imagine ways which might have been appropriately described by *neco*. If, for instance, he

thought of the *pestis* as hindering breathing, he might have chosen *neco* for the same reason that Plautus used *enico* of an *angina*. At a later date Ammianus' account of the causes of plague (called *pestilentia* and *pestis,* and said to 'kill,' *necare*) mentions thick exhalations from the earth which impede bodily emissions: 19.4.6 'terrarum halitu densiore crassatum aera, emittendis corporis spiraminibus resistentem, necare nonnullos.' Cf. Col. 2.9.9 'alia quae pestis segetem enecat;' also Sen. *Epist.* 94.31 'si tamen illam diutina pestis non infecit nec enicuit' (metaphorical).

(2) At Cic. *Leg.* 2.57 ('itaque in eo, qui in naue necatus, deinde in mari proiectus esset, decreuit P. Mucius familiam puram, quod os supra terram non extaret'), though *necatus* should strictly be given the sense 'killed,' it suggests nothing about the cause of death, and is virtually replaceable with *mortuus* (cf. later in the same section, 'si in mari mortuus esset'). Similarly *enectus (enecatus)* is sometimes used of a dead foetus, without implying that it had been deliberately killed (= *mortuus, emortuus:* see Part I, II.5). Note too Plin. *Nat.* 18.127 'quadripedes et fronde eorum gaudent, et homini non minore rapiciorum suis horis gratia quam cymarum, flauidorum quoque et in horreis enecatorum uel maiore quam uirentium' (of turnip-tops which have died in granaries; the sense 'killed' is scarcely appropriate, since it is natural decay which causes them to die: the participle is close to *mortuus* in meaning). What makes (*e*)*necatus* susceptible of this sort of vagueness is the fact that it implied no particular instrument of death, and no necessary human agent. A person could be 'killed,' *necatus,* by overeating, for instance, in which case one might equally say of him that he 'died' from overeating.

Twice in Sallust *necatus* is used in contrast to *uiuus,* but the sense (in the context of someone wanted 'dead or alive') is obviously 'put to death, murdered:' *Jug.* 46.4 'multa pollicendo persuadet, uti Iugurtham maxume uiuom, sin id parum procedat, necatum sibi traderent,' 61.4 'si Iugurtham uiuom aut necatum sibi tradidisset.' Note too *Epit. Caes.* 1.28 ('igitur mortuum seu necatum multis nouisque honoribus senatus censuit decorandum'), where *necatum* is contrasted with *mortuum* and must mean 'killed.'

(3) At Hor. *Sat.* 2.3.293 ('casus medicusue leuarit / aegrum ex praecipiti: mater delira necabit / in gelida fixum ripa febrimque reducet') a mother promises to Jupiter that if he removes a fever from her child, she will place the child naked on the bank of the Tiber on a feast day. The mother's way of killing the child (unintentionally) is obviously similar to the exposing of an infant.

(4) At Ovid *Fasti* 4.648 *neco* is applied to the death of a ewe in giving birth, killed, as Ovid puts it, by the lamb as it is born; 'agnaque nascendo saepe necabat ouem.' *Eneco* is used in much the same way at Plin. *Nat.* 7.47: 'auspicatius enecta parente gignuntur, sicut Scipio Africanus prior natus.' It is possible, at least in the second passage, that the formulaic expression *parentem neco,* normally used of parricide (note too the variant *matrem neco,* of matricide, at Cic. *Inu.* 1.18, Suet. *Otho* 3.1) was transferred to another context. Cf. Plin. *Nat.* 13.37 'robustas deputant crassitudinis gratia, semipedales ramorum truncos relinquentes, qui decisi alibi necant matrem' (of trees, and of course having no connection with birth; here it is either the association of *neco* with plants, or the formulaic character of *matrem neco* in another context, which lies behind the choice of phraseology). Alternatively one might see the example in Ovid as the outcome of an extension by association: *neco* is first applied to the (intentional) killing of the infant at birth, and then, through its association with birth, it is further applied to the (unintended) death of the mother.

(5) At Col. 2.9.10 certain underground *pestes* are said to destroy the roots of crops, and this in turn kills the crops: 'quaedam etiam subterraneae pestes adultas segetes radicibus subsectis enecant.' This example could readily be fitted into the scheme proposed in this article, because the roots are a necessary support to the life of the plant. There are however a few cases of *neco* with *radices* as object which resist such classification. Columella in one place mentions the killing of the roots of plants by ploughing (2.4.1 'sic omnes radices herbarum perruptae necantur'), and in another place by digging (11.3.11 'ut ... radices herbarum necentur'). Here *neco* could not be accommodated even within the theory that the verb denoted killing *sine uulnere, sine ictu,* because the roots would be cut through with a sharp implement in both cases. These are further instances of the victim rather than the method of killing selecting the verb *neco*. *Neco* had established itself as the term for the killing of plants or parts of plants, just as it was felt to be appropriate of *bestiolae*. *Eneco* also has *radices* as object at Col. 3.17.4 'quicquid ex uetere materia relictum erat, depressum atque obrutum celeriter umore putrescebat, proximasque radices teneras et uixdum prorepentes uitio suo enecabat' (old rotting wood kills new roots which are next to it). At Plin. *Nat.* 18.45 *radices* is object of *necat,* but the method of killing is poisoning (see VI).

(6) At Plin. *Nat.* 30.144 *neco* is used of a potion suppressing a disease: 'pthiriasim et totius corporis pota membrana senectutis anguium triduo necat.' This example could be interpreted as a metaphorical application of the meaning 'stifle.'

(7) *Neco* is used by Martial of an unarmed dwarf killing a boar: 1.43.9 'nudus aper, sed et hic minimus qualisque necari / a non armato pumilione potest.' The dwarf would have to kill the boar with his bare hands, and to do that he would presumably have to strangle it, but one cannot be certain that an image of strangulation was intended.

(8) At Stat. *Theb.* 9.828 *neco* is used of men offered for slaughter in battle: 'utque acies audax et Martia signa / temperet? en etiam donat praebetque necandos / tot nostra de gente uiros.' This passage displays a poetic extension of usage: *neco* (unlike *occido*) is not normally used of indiscriminate slaughter in battle. There is a comparable example in Livy: 7.23.10 'cum ipsa cunctatio et his animos minuisset et auxisset hosti, impulsi retro ruere alii super alios stragemque inter se caede ipsa foediorem dare; adeo praecipiti turba obtriti plures quam ferro necati.'

The most distinctive negative feature of the use of *neco* is that it is not as a rule applied to slaying in battle. The one work known to me in which this restriction is not observed is the fourth-century translation of Josephus' *Bellum Iudaicum* whose author is usually referred to as 'Hegesippus.' There *neco* is often applied to mass slaughter: e.g. p. 31.1 'necatis ferme tribus milibus suorum, ceteris captis aut dilapsis, uix Alexandro pauci superfuere,' 162.27 'qui circumfusos adorsi maximam per totam urbem stragem fecere, cum alios resistentes, alios in domibus suis latitantes necarent,' 172.7 'necatisque VIII milibus uirum et CCCC ferme amplius, ubi praeda rapinae cessit, exusta ciuitas,' 172.18 'neque peditem comminus potuerunt latrones pati et fugientes ab equitibus facile circumuenti necantur,' 179.31 'incautis et dormientibus uis inlata decemque et tribus milibus hominum necatis quaecumque etiam habuerunt direpta sunt,' 291.16 'Mucianus et Antonius cum exercitu pariter ingressi uix finem necandi furentibus militibus inposuere' (cf. pp. 15.26, 246.27, 261.22, 289.26).

(9) At Rufinus, *Hist.* 5.1.28, p. 413.24 ('illi denique erant, qui paedoris horrore et conclusionis tenebris necabantur') the cause of death of some prisoners is said to be the stench and darkness to which they are submitted, but there is a general idea present that they are unable to support their confinement (Eusebius τὸ βάρος οὐκ

ἔφερον τῆς συγκλείσεως). This example is at no great remove from those applied to the execution by interment of Vestal Virgins.

IX. Conclusion

In Columella there are 31 examples of *neco* and *eneco,* and in Pliny the Elder 133 (see *Appendix*). In these writers the two words are hardly ever used of homicide (but see Plin. *Nat.* 7.53); they usually refer to the killing of small animals, or the destruction of plants. *Neco* had taken over a significant area of the semantic field 'kill.' It is true that these acts were not as a rule carried out by cutting implements, because often the victim was such that the employment of a sharp instrument would have been inappropriate. But the use of *neco* of killing with a weapon was not in theory impossible; Columella himself has the expression *ferro neco* at 7.7.2. It is therefore unlikely that *neco* became established in these contexts for the entirely negative reason that sharp instruments were usually not required. A more positive reason must be sought, in the associations which the verb had acquired.

I reiterate here the views which I have offered in various places above of the semantic development of *neco,* glossing over some of the problems which have been acknowledged earlier (p. 96). The verb underwent extensions of usage by association. It must once have been applicable to premeditated acts of killing, the methods of which I would suggest were originally insignificant. As such it came to be used of execution and murder, and these may have been its main uses for a time. In the sense 'execute' it did not catch on in reference to beheading with an axe, because of the persistence of the old formula *securi ferio / percussi.* Hence it developed a particular connection with drowning (from its use of the putting to death of unwanted infants, and of the submerging of criminals with the help of a *cratis*), strangling and smothering (from its use of execution with the *laqueus,* of burying under stones, of interring Vestal Virgins alive, and again of certain methods of killing infants), and the deprivation of food and warmth (from its use of killing infants by starvation and exposure; cf. the method of putting Vestal Virgins to death). It was also used quite readily of cudgelling to death (note the expression *fusti neco,* applied to decimation, and the frequent juxtaposition of the verb with *uerbero*), but for reasons which cannot be explained its connection with starving, covering, suffocation and ex-

posure became more marked than that with beating, and its use of killing with a blunt instrument, as that of killing with a sharp instrument, receded into the background. In early Latin (Plautus) *eneco* and to a lesser extent *neco* were showing a tendency to move beyond the legalistic language. When used generally, they sometimes seem to have retained the associations which they had taken on when designating forms of execution. Thus we find one or the other verb in Plautus used of throttling (snakes), 'strangling' (of the effects of a throat disease), killing birds by forcing an object into their nostrils, and starving. In Plautus *neco / eneco* is used sporadically of killing by deprivation of certain things vital to life (air, food), but from the early Empire it comes to be used far more widely of killing by the deprivation of any life support, from (e.g.) air in the case of humans and other animals, to moisture in the case of plants, bark in the case of trees, salt water in the case of salt-water animals, and so on. Alongside these uses the old senses 'murder' and 'execute' still survived.

Within this general pattern certain special usages are noteworthy. From the late Republic *neco* is frequently used of poisoning, perhaps partly because murder by poison (motivating the verb-phrase *ueneno neco*) was common at the time, and partly because of the strangling effects observed in certain poisons. We have also suggested a tendency for *neco* to be associated with various categories of victim. Most notable is its application to the killing of *bestiolae*. Certain methods of killing employed in such cases (drowning, poisoning, stifling) may originally have established the association, but by the Imperial period it was probably the victim rather than the method which determined the choice of verb.

The changing emphasis of *neco* can be illustrated from its use in historians and narrative prose. In Tacitus (8 examples) it is used exclusively of execution. In Livy (26 examples) it is used mainly of execution and occasionally of murder; there are also a few miscellaneous examples. In Sallust (15 examples) the meaning 'murder' is common, and 'execute' accounts for most of the remaining examples. In Ammianus, on the other hand (19 examples), while the senses 'murder,' 'execute' are still well-represented (14.1.4, 14.11.21, 15.5.8, 16.10.19, 27.7.5, 29.3.3, 30.6.4, 31.6.7), seven examples indicate smothering, drowning, crushing, strangling (16.12.53, 17.13.15, 19.4.6, 22.14.7, 24.4.30, 26.10.18, 29.5.55), and three (29.2.19, 30.1.22, 31.6.5) poisoning or starving. Two of the three examples in Julius Valerius refer to drowning. And in Rufinus' translation and

continuation of Eusebius' *Ecclesiastica Historia,* two of the 11 examples of *neco* and *eneco* are applied to crushing (2.19.1, 7.11.25), two to strangling or choking (8.6.5, 8.12.1), one to death caused by confinement (5.1.28), and one to starving (10.8.13). The sense 'execute' is also found (e. g. 5.1.59, 9.6.3). The legalistic use still had some currency in the fourth century, but it was strongly rivalled by uses sharing an idea of deprivation.

The pattern of usage discussed in this article makes it far from predictable that *neco* should ultimately have become restricted to the sense 'drown.' The word is often used of killing in liquids from as early as the Republic, but other usages such as those expressing starvation, stifling and poisoning are at least as common. What factor caused one specialised use of the verb to overwhelm the other specialised uses remains unclear, though it should certainly be sought in the very late period (after the fourth century). Any attempt to derive the meaning 'drown' from the related sense 'stifle, choke' is misguided, because the application of the verb to stifling by drowning is as early as that to stifling in other ways.

Appendix: The distribution of neco *and* eneco

	neco	eneco		neco	eneco
Ennius	4	–	Horace *Serm.*	2	–
Plautus	8	29	*Epist.*	–	1
Terence	–	1	*Corpus Tibullianum*	2	–
Lucilius	–	–	Propertius	–	–
Varro *Rust.*	2	–	Ovid *Met.*	3	–
Men.	1	–	*Fast.*	5	–
Ad Herennium	7	–	*Am.*	3	–
Cicero *orat.*	58	–	*Rem.*	2	–
phil.	20	3	*Her.*	1	–
epist.	2	1	*Trist.*	1	–
rhet.	10	–	*Ibis*	1	–
Catullus	–	–	Livy	26	1
Lucretius	1	–	Vitruvius	3	–
Laberius	1	1	Velleius	2	–
Caesar	7	–	Valerius Maximus	16	1
Sallust	15	–	Celsus	1	1
Nepos	1	–	Scribonius Largus	4	–
Virgil	1	–	Seneca *phil.*	6	1
Horace *Carm.*	1	–	*trag.*	2	–

	neco	eneco		neco	eneco
Curtius Rufus	9	–	Florus	–	–
Columella	17	14	*Historia Augusta*	7	–
Lucan	–	1	Julius Valerius[14])	3	–
Persius	–	–	Justin	3	–
Petronius	1	-	Origo Gent. Rom. [15])	2	–
Pliny *Nat.*	116	17	*Vir. Ill.* [16])	4	–
Valerius Flaccus	-	–	Aurel. Vict.[17])	2	–
Silius	–	–	*Epit. Caes.* [18])	5	–
Martial	1	–	Rufus Festus	1	–
Frontinus	3	–	Symmachus	2	–
Juvenal	3	–	Ammianus	19	–
Tacitus	8	–	Schol. Iuu.	7	–
Plin. *Epist.*	2	–	Pelagonius	2	–
Suetonius	10	4	*Mulomedicina Chironis*	1	
Fronto	–	–	Hegesippus[19])	50	–
Ampelius	–	–	Rufinus, *Hist.* [20])	9	2
Gellius[13])	8	–	Marcellus	15	4
Apuleius	8	2	Arnobius	–	1
Tertullian	6	6	*Physica Plin. Bamb.*	5	–

---

[13]) 3.8.1, 4.5.4, 10.3.7, 10.23.4, 10.23.5 (Cato), 12.7.4, 17.21.17, 17.21.24 (Nepos).

[14]) pp. 79.25, 97.21, 130.14.

[15]) 21.1 (twice).

[16]) 21.3, 36.2, 73.9, 81.6.

[17]) 14.11, 26.6.

[18]) 1.28, 8.4, 41.11, 41.18, 48.6.

[19]) pp. 5.2, 5.25, 15.26, 19.6, 31.1, 45.18, 61.18, 73.12, 76.1, 76.7, 95.10, 121.19, 125.6, 130.21, 133.17, 139.1, 140.6, 158.13, 162.27, 172.7, 172.18, 179.31, 180.24, 187.4, 200.6, 238.4, 240.14, 246.27, 248.14, 253.26, 254.19, 258.25, 261.22, 265.17, 273.24, 289.26, 290.26, 291.16, 296.24, 299.7, 299.16, 322.16, 325.19, 335.26, 338.8, 346.19, 367.18, 371.13, 381.12, 413.6.

[20]) *neco* 2.19.1, 5.1.28, 5.1.59, 8.6.5, 9.6.3, 10.8.13, 10.26, 11.22, 11.24; *eneco* 7.11.25, 8.12.1.

Die deverbalen Adjektive auf -*bilis* in den Werken des Plautus*)

In memoriam Professor Mariner

Von María del Carmen Arias Abellán, Sevilla

1. Es gibt noch immer keine allgemein akzeptierte, endgültige Meinung darüber, welche Funktion dem lateinischen Suffix -*bilis* zuzuschreiben ist, und so scheint mir der erneute Versuch gerechtfertigt, eine zufriedenstellende Klärung der – meines Erachtens nur scheinbaren – Verschiedenheit der kontextuellen Bedeutungen der mit diesem Suffix gebildeten Adjektive möglich zu machen. Die Belege im Werk des Plautus sollen in Gestalt einer synchronen Strukturierung ihrer Bedeutungen als Zeugnisse eines einheitlichen Funktionsträgers verständlich gemacht werden.

In früheren Arbeiten spiegelt sich die Uneinheitlichkeit der Bedeutungen von -*bilis* in den uneinheitlichen terminologischen Formulierungen wider. So sieht F. Hanssen[1]) neben der Funktion ‚passive Möglichkeit‘, die wiederum unterteilt ist in die Bedeutungen ‚wirkliche Möglichkeit‘ und ‚moralische Möglichkeit‘, an einigen Textstellen (Typ *ludi ludificabiles* ‚Spiele, die zum Lachen dienen‘ und *orator impetrabilis* ‚ein Redner, mit dem man alles erreichen kann‘) die Reflexe von ‚instrumentalen‘ oder sogar ‚kausalen‘ Bedeutungen, und da es unmöglich ist, *orator impetrabilis* absolut passivisch zu deuten, siedelt er diese Verwendungen auf einer Mittelstufe zwischen Aktiv und Passiv an[2]). M. Leumann[3]) geht von einer ursprünglich instrumentalen Funktion aus, mit der er neben der instrumentalen auch zwei weitere Bedeutungen erklärt, die er in diesem Suffix zu finden meint: die sogenannten *adiectiva verbalia facultatis* –

---

[1]) F. Hanssen, Die Aktivbedeutung der Adjektiva auf -*bilis* im archaischen Latein, Philologus 1, 1889, 274–277.
[2]) F. Hanssen (o. Anm. 1), 280–285.
[3]) M. Leumann, Die lateinischen Adjektiva auf -*lis*. Straßburg 1917, 131–137.

also Indikatoren der ‚passiven Möglichkeit‘ – und den Typ *stabilis* mit aktivischer Bedeutung:

‚Das Suffix *-bilis* [...] verleiht bereits von Anbeginn drei verschiedene, ganz klare Bedeutungen, die instrumentale, die der passiven adj. verb. fac., und bei *stabilis* usw. eine aktive. Sie alle aus einander, d.h. aus der einzigen instrumentalen abzuleiten, wird nicht unmöglich scheinen: ein *argumentum credibile,* instrumental verstanden, ist ein Beweismittel, durch das man zum Glauben bekehrt (wird); das mochte gegebenenfalls zur passiven Auffassung ‚Beweismittel, das geglaubt wird, geglaubt werden kann‘ führen und zum verneinten *argumentum incredibile* ‚ein nicht geglaubter Beweis‘. Noch eher dürfte man *stabilis* aus instrumentalem Gedanken heraus erklären in Verbindungen wie *stabilis res* ‚eine Sache, auf (bei) der man feststeht‘ > ‚eine Sache, die fest steht‘. Die passiven adj. verb. fac. wären danach nur ein Seitenstrang der instrumentalen, ebenso auch die aktiven‘[4]).

An anderer Stelle[5]) sucht er eine formale Verknüpfung zwischen den Adjektiven auf *-bilis* und den Instrumentalnomina auf *-bulum:*

‚Ein funktionaler Zusammenhang zwischen den lat. *-bilis*-Adjektiven und den ererbten Instrumentalnomina auf *-bulum* [...] ist erkennbar bei den „instrumentalen“ (*exora-bilis* und *-bulum*) und den „aktiven“ *(sta-bilis -bulum),* nicht aber bei den „passiven“ *(laudabilis).* Formal bleibt also der Zusammenhang zwischen dem *-i-*Adjektiv und dem *-o-*Substantiv zu bestimmen. Nun zeigt nur der Kompositionstypus *inermis* ein adjektivbildendes Suffix *-i-;* und privatives *in-* spielt auch bei *-bilis* eine gewichtige Rolle. So läßt sich *stabilis* ‚feststehend‘ als Muster der „aktiven“, von negiertem *in-stabilis* ‚ohne *stabulum* (Standplatz)‘ aus erklären. Für die „passiven“ sehe ich das Vorbild in *i(n)-gnobilis* ‚unbekannt, unedel‘: mit einem postulierten **g'nō- -dhlom* > **gnōbulum* ‚Erkennungszeichen, Merkmal‘ folgt für *i(n)-gnobilis* eine ursprüngliche Bedeutung ‚ohne Merkmal‘, d.h. ‚unerkennbar, unbekannt‘ (so noch Plt. Psd. 591 u. 964), daraus ergab sich *gnobilis* ‚erkennbar‘ [...] durch Rückbeziehung auf *ignotus* und *gnosco,* und weiter *(g)nobilis* ‚vornehm‘.‘

Ganz anders C. di Meo[6]), der eine instrumentale Bedeutung ablehnt und statt dessen eine ‚kausative‘ Grundfunktion vorschlägt: *orator impetrabilis* ‚ein Redner, der Erfolg bewirkt‘, *puella amabilis* ‚ein Mädchen, das Liebe hervorruft‘. Auf der anderen Seite hat man eine passivische Bedeutung (ausgehend von Belegen wie *stultitiam sepelibilem,* Cist. 62) vermerkt[7]), – so kürzlich E. Woytek[8]), der nach einer Untersuchung des Gebrauchs der Adjektive auf *-to-* in der Be-

---

[4]) M. Leumann (o. Anm. 3), 131.

[5]) M. Leumann, Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre, München 1977, 349.

[6]) C. di Meo, Note semantiche sulle formazioni latine in *-bilis*, Bologna 1972, 47 ff.

[7]) F. Hanssen (o. Anm. 1), 277–279).

[8]) E. Woytek, Bemerkungen zur plautinischen Verwendung einiger Adjektiva auf *-bilis* statt eines Participium Perfecti Passivi. Rh. Mus. 115, 1972, 249–260.

deutung der Adjektive auf *-bilis* und der Verwendung der Adjektive auf *-bilis* in der Bedeutung eines PPP. bei Plautus und späteren Autoren die Austauschbarkeit dieser beiden Suffixe nachzuweisen vermag.

2. Ich glaube indessen, daß die Belege bei Plautus solche Diversifikationen nicht bestätigen. Im folgenden bespreche ich zunächst die positiven (nicht-negierten) Adjektive, danach die durch Komposition mit *in-* negierten; unterschiedslos für beide Gruppen gehe ich von der These aus, daß die Adjektive auf *-bilis* beinhalten, daß die durch das zugrundeliegende Verb bezeichnete Aktion erfolgen ,kann'; d.h. sie deuten eine Art ,Fiktion' im Gegensatz zu einer ,Realität' an, wie sie in anderen deverbalen Adjektiven übermittelt wird, – so etwa in *prudens, fidus, pudicus, doctus, conspicuus.* Für das durch das Adjektiv auf *-bilis* determinierte Substantiv kommen dabei zwei verschiedene Rollen in Betracht:

a) Es kann das passive Subjekt (jedenfalls *nicht* der Agens) der im Adjektiv ausgedrückten verbalen Handlung sein:

Exorando, haud aduersando, sumendam operam censeo.
Gratiam a patre si petimus, spero ab eo impetrassere;
aduersari sine dedecore et scelere summo haud possumus,
neque equidem id factura neque tu ut facias consilium dabo,
uerum ut exoremus. Noui ego nostros: <u>exorabilest</u> (Stich. 70–74)
Hic ille est dies, cum nulla uitae meae salus <u>sperabilest</u> (Capt. 518)

Petulans, proteruo, iracundo animo, indomito, incogitato,
sine modo et modestia sum, sine bono iure atque honore
incredibilis imposque animi, inamabilis, inlepidus uiuo
maleuolente ingenio natus; postremo id mihi est quod uolo
ego esse aliis. <u>Credibile</u> hoc est?
Nequior nemost neque indignior, quoi
di bene faciant neque quem quisquam
homo aut amet aut adeat (Bacch. 612–618)

und ebenso Trin. 466, Stich. 392, Merc. 1005, Mil. 613, Trin. 748, Men. 983, Pseud. 525, Capt. 302 und Bacch. 159.

Für diese Belege setze ich eine Bedeutung ,passive Möglichkeit' an; denn wenn wir hier das Adjektiv in einen Relativsatz umwandelten, müßte dieser lauten: *pater qui exoretur, salus quae speretur, hoc quod credatur.* In den Periphrasen steht der Konjunktiv, der – im Gegensatz zum Indikativ – das ,Fiktive' zum Ausdruck bringt, den Bereich also, dem der Potentialis zuzuordnen ist.

b) Es kann das aktive Subjekt der verbalen Handlung sein:

Nam equidem hau sum annos praeter quinquaginta et quattuor
clare oculis uideo, pernix sum pedibus, manibus mobilis (Mil.
629–630)

Profecto stabilest me patri aurum reddere (Bacch. 520)

Neutrubi habeam stabile stabulum, si quid diuorti fuat (Aul. 233)

Quae patria aut domus tibi stabilis esse poterit? (Merc. 653)

Inter nos fuisse ingenio haud discordabili (Capt. 402)

Ita uincunt illud conducibile gratiae,
quae in rebus multis opstant odiossaeque sunt
remoramque faciunt rei priuatae et publicae (Trin. 36–38)

Reperiamus aliquid calidi conducibilis consili (Epid. 256)

Atque ad eam rem conducibile (Epid. 260)

Non ego istuc facinus mihi, mulier, conducibile esse arbitror (Bacch. 52)

Amicum castigare ob meritam noxiam
inmoenest facinus, uerum in aetate utile
et conducibile (Trin. 23–25)

Fuit conducibile hocquidem mea sententia (Epid. 388)

Matronae magis conducibilest istuc, mea Selenium,
unum amare et cum eo aetatem exigere (Cist. 78–79)

Hier kann man von ‚aktiver Möglichkeit' sprechen, – als Periphrasen
bieten sich an *stabulum quod stet, ingenium quod discordet* usw.
    Es scheint also, daß die Adjektive auf -*bilis* nicht auf eine Dia-
these festgelegt sind[9]). Ihr einziges distinktives Merkmal ist die
‚Möglichkeit', die je nach dem Charakter (transitiv, intransitiv) des
zugrundeliegenden Verbs realisiert wird, – natürlich schließt ein
Wort wie *stabilis*, das von einem intransitiven Verb abgeleitet ist,
eine passivische Deutung von vornherein aus.
    3. Um diese These für die -*bilis*-Adjektive bei Plautus insgesamt
zu beweisen, müssen nun noch einmal die Belege geprüft werden,

---

[9]) S. dazu die Anmerkungen von J. Marouzeau: Quelques aspects de la forma-
tion du latin littéraire, Paris 1949, 37.

auf denen die eingangs zitierten Gelehrten ihre abweichenden Deutungen gegründet haben.

3.1. In einer Gruppe von Beispielen sieht F. Hanssen[10]) eine Konnotation, die er als ‚moralische Möglichkeit' bezeichnet; sie unterscheiden sich von dem soeben beschriebenen Typ (in Hanssens Einteilung als ‚wirkliche Möglichkeit' definiert) dadurch, daß die Adjektive auf *-bilis* die Komponente ‚einer Sache würdig' anzunehmen scheinen:

Hoc memorabilest: ego tu sum, tu es ego; unianimi sumus (Stich. 731)

A. *Fraudis, sceleris, parricidi, periuri plenissimus,*
   legirupa, impudens, impurus, inuerecundissimus
B. *Edepol infortunio hominem praedicas donabilem* (Rud. 651–652, 654)

Nullam ego me uidisse credo magis anum excruciabilem
quam illaec est (Cist. 653–654)

Quid uidisti aut quid uidebis magis dis aequiparabile? (Curc. 168)

und ebenso Trin. 931, Epid. 225, Curc. 8, Capt. 684, Asin. 674, Stich. 736 und Trin. 44.

Es handelt sich um Fälle, in denen eine positive oder negative Intentionalität im Spiel ist, in der sich die Idee der ‚Möglichkeit' dem von Leumann[11]) ‚Wünschbarkeit' genannten Merkmal annähert.

Dieses Merkmal erfordert jedoch keine Aufspaltung der übergeordneten ‚fiktiven' Bedeutung, der sowohl die Übermittlung einer reinen ‚Möglichkeit' wie die Angabe eines ‚Wunsches, daß sich diese Möglichkeit erfüllt' untergeordnet werden kann; *amabilis* deckt also folgende Bedeutungsvarianten ab: ‚jemand, der geliebt werden kann', ‚jemand, der gewiß geliebt werden kann' > ‚jemand, der würdig ist, geliebt zu werden'. Diese Bedeutung ‚Möglichkeit' kann sich ausdehnen, da bei den deverbalen Adjektiven sonst ein spezifischer Träger der Funktion ‚desiderativ' und ‚obligatorisch' fehlt: das Adjektiv auf *-ndus* nimmt diese – nicht ursprüngliche – Bedeutung erst sekundär an[12]). Ich hebe noch einmal hervor, daß ich diese Gruppe als beispielhaft für eine ‚modal-fiktive' Bedeutung betrachte.

---

[10]) S. Anmerkung 1.
[11]) M. Leumann, Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre, 348.
[12]) S. A. Ernout – F. Thomas, Syntaxe latine, Paris 1953, 263.

3.2. Die sogenannten ‚instrumentalen' Verwendungen von Adjektiven auf -*bilis:*

Vos modo porro, ut occepistis, date operam adiutabilem (Mil. 1144)

Pro di immortales, mi hunc diem dedistis luculentum,
ut facilem atque impetrabilem! (Epid. 341–342)

Edepol dedisti, uirgo, operam adlaudabilem,
probam et sapientem et sobriam (Pers. 673–674)

Neque ullum uerbum faciat perplexabile,
neque ulla lingua sciat loqui nisi Attica (Asin. 792–793)

Ne hic tibi dies inluxit lucrificabilis.
Nam non emisti hanc, uerum fecisti lucri (Pers. 712–713)

                               Saluos sum; immortalitas
mihi data est. Hic emit illam; pulchre os subleuit patri.
Impetrabilior qui uiuat nullus est (Merc. 603–605)

Non potuit uenire orator magis ad me impetrabilis
quam tu (Most. 1162–1163)

Nec pol ego Nemeae credo, neque ego Olympiae,
neque usquam ludos tam festiuos fieri
quam hic intus fiunt ludi ludificabiles
seni nostro et nostro Olympioni uilico (Cas. 759–762)

Hanssen schließt, vielleicht ausgehend von sprachhistorischen Überlegungen (vgl. die bereits angedeutete Verbindung mit dem Suffix -*bulum,* die Leumann vorgeschlagen hat), in Fällen wie *date operam adiutabilem* (Mil. 1144) die Möglichkeit aus, *opera* könne aktives oder passives Beziehungswort zu *adiutabilem* sein. Statt dessen ordnet er *opera* in einen besonderen Typ der ‚Passivität' ein, den er ‚instrumental' nennt. Er fügt also der nominalen Substantiv-Adjektiv-Gruppe ein ‚fremdes' Element hinzu und spricht nicht von einer *opera quae adiutet* sondern von einer *opera qua adiutetis* und schreibt dem Suffix -*bilis* eine ‚instrumentale' Bedeutung zu, die er auf alle in diesem Abschnitt aufgeführten Textstellen überträgt[13]).

    Unabhängig davon, welche ursprüngliche Beziehung zu dem Suffix -*bulum* besteht, die aus synchroner Perspektive gesehen nicht als besonders relevant gilt, vermag diese Erklärung, die sich einer Kom-

---

[13]) S. F. Hanssen (o. Anm. 1), 280–281, (besonders 281).

ponente bedient, die dem determinierten Substantiv fremd ist, um damit jene vermeintliche ‚instrumentale' Bedeutung zu legitimieren, nicht zu überzeugen, vor allem deshalb nicht, weil es genügt anzunehmen, daß in all diesen Belegen nichts anderes als die ‚Möglichkeit' gemeint ist. In den folgenden Beispielen sehen wir dieses Merkmal mit einer ‚passiven' Bedeutung verbunden:

> *operam adlaudabilem* (Pers. 673) ‚ein Werk, das gelobt werden kann'
> *ludi ludificabiles* (Cas. 761) ‚Spiele (zwischen dem *senex* und Olympio), die Gegenstand der Heiterkeit sein können'
> *dies lucrificabilis* (Pers. 712) ‚ein Tag, der zum Objekt des Gewinnes gemacht werden könnte'[14])
> *diem impetrabilem* (Epid. 342) ‚ein Tag, der das Objekt der Erfüllung aller Pläne sein könnte',

mit einer ‚aktiven' Bedeutung verbunden:

> *operam adiutabilem* (Mil. 1144) ‚eine Unterstützung, die mir helfen kann'
> *impetrabilior ... nullus* (Merc. 605) ‚niemand, der mehr erreichen kann'
> *orator impetrabilis* (Most. 1162) ‚ein Redner, der etwas erreichen kann'
> *uerbum ... perplexabile* (Asin. 792) ‚ein Wort, das verwirren kann'.

3.3. Die sogenannten ‚rein passiven' Verwendungen (Typ *nobilis*).
Es besteht kein Zweifel, daß das Adjektiv *nobilis* in der lateinischen Sprache nach Plautus nur noch mit passiver Bedeutung verwendet wird. Es unterscheidet sich von *notus* allein durch eine semantische Verengung mit lobender Konnotation (‚berühmt', ‚gefeiert') oder mit juristischer Bedeutung (‚von vornehmer Herkunft', ‚vornehm')[15]):

---

[14]) F. Bader, La formation des composés nominaux du latin, Paris 1962, 212, wo sie die Passivbedeutung von *lucrificabilis* unterstreicht.

[15]) S. A. Ernout - A. Meillet, Dictionnaire Etymologique de la langue latine. Histoire des mots, Paris ⁴1959, s. v. *nosco*. M. Leumann, Die lateinischen Adjektiva auf *-lis*, 86 ff. erklärt den juristischen Inhalt von *nobilis* und des gegenteiligen *ignobilis* (im konkreten Bereich des Besitzes oder Nicht-Besitzes bestimmter Rechte), indem er ihn mit dessen sprachwissenschaftlicher Erklärung verbindet, d. h. mit dem Besitz oder Nicht-Besitz eines **gnobulum* oder eines distinktiven äußerlichen Zeichens, das auf eine determinierte legale Situation hindeutet. Vgl. zu diesem Gesichtspunkt: H. Volkmann, in: Der kleine Pauly, IV, 142 f.

Adulescens quidam hic est adprime <u>*nobilis*</u> (Cist. 125)

Atque hanc tuam gloriam iam ante auribus acceperam et <u>*nobiles(t)*</u>
apud homines
pauperibus te parcere solitum, diuites damnare atque domare (Trin.
828–829)

Die festo celebri <u>*nobilique*</u> (Poen. 758)

(in Cist. ,von vornehmer Herkunft', in Trin. und Poen. ,gefeiert')

Daneben bringt *nobilis* bei Plautus noch eine ,potential-passiv' ge-
färbte Modalität zum Ausdruck:

Cum his mihi nec locus nec sermo
conuenit, neque is umquam <u>*nobilis*</u> *fui* (Pseud. 1111–1112)
,Weder Ort noch Gespräch brachte uns zusammen, so daß ich des-
wegen nicht bekannt wurde' bzw. ,so daß es keine Möglichkeit gab,
bekannt zu werden'.

Vindicate, ne impiorum potior sit pollentia
quam innocentum, qui se scelere fieri nolunt <u>*nobiles*</u> (Rud. 618–619)
,... die, die nicht wollen, daß sie durch das Verbrechen bekannt wer-
den könnten'.
Wir haben oben (S. 125) gesehen, daß Leumann dieses Adjektiv als
Ausgangspunkt für die ,passive' Bedeutung betrachtet und es für jün-
ger hält als *ignobilis*, das er aus einem nicht belegten Wort *gnobu-
lum* ,Erkennungszeichen' herleitet. Die soeben zitierten Stellen las-
sen aber deutlich eine ,potentiale' Bedeutungskomponente erkennen.
Nun ist weiter zu beobachten, daß bei Plautus der ,rein passive' In-
halt von *notus* übernommen wird,

Quamquam ad ignotum arbitrum me appellis, si adhibebit fidem,
etsi ignotus(t), <u>*notus*</u>*; si non,* <u>*notus*</u> *ignotissimust* (Rud. 1043–1044)

(vgl. ferner Curc. 280, Mil. 901 und Trin. 63)

während *nobilis* die oben beschriebenen Konnotationen (vgl. beson-
ders Trin. 828, Poen. 758) oder die juristische Bedeutung (vgl. Cist.
125) beinhaltet, wenn es seine *notio facultatis* verliert. Daher schlage
ich vor – unabhängig von der Richtigkeit der Erklärung Leu-
manns[16]), die für unsere synchronische Perspektive unwichtig ist, da

---

[16]) S. zu dieser Erklärung A. Meillet, Bulletin de la Societé de Linguistique,
Nr. 68, Vol. XXII, 138 und J. Marouzeau (o. Anm. 9), 36–37.

sie in erster Linie die diachrone Entstehung dieser Wörter betrifft –, mit einer Verschiebung des ‚potentialen' Bereichs in den ‚passiven' (aber nicht von Konnotationen freien) zu rechnen. Diese Verschiebung wird hervorgerufen durch Kontexte, in denen die ‚potentiale' Bedeutung des Suffixes mit einer ‚desiderativen' Färbung oder mit der der ‚Notwendigkeit' einhergeht: ‚jemand, der bekannt sein muß (wegen etwas)' > ‚berühmt', ‚gefeiert' oder ‚vornehm'. Dabei kann man diese ‚desiderative' Färbung verantwortlich machen für die Lexikalisierung lobender oder technischer Bedeutungen oder auch für die Opposition zum rein denotativen Adjektiv *notus*.

Hanssen – ebenso Woytek[17]) für Cist. 62–63, Stich. 391–392 und andere Stellen, die ich später behandeln werde –, rechnet die folgenden Wörter zum Typ *nobilis* hinzu[18]):

A. *Indidem unde oritur facito ut facias stultitiam sepelibilem*
B. *Quid faciam? A. In latebras abscondas pectore penitissumo* (Cist. 62–63)

Te mihi dicto audientem esse addecet, nam hercle absque me
foret et meo praesidio, hic faceret te prostibilem propediem (Pers. 836–837)

Immo uenisse eum simitu aiebat ille; ego huc citus
praecucurri, ut nuntiarem nuntium exoptabilem (Stich. 391–392)

Es handelt sich in allen drei Fällen um ‚fiktive' Prozesse, in die verbale Angaben (*ut* + Konjunktiv in Cist. und Stich., *faceret* in Pers.) eingeschoben werden, die einen nicht realen, ‚nicht-erfüllten' oder ‚eventuellen' Charakter der Adjektive voraussetzen, also ihre Interpretation als genaue Entsprechungen von PPP nicht zulassen. In Cist. 62–63 rät die *meretrix* Gymnasium der verliebten Selenium, ihr möglichstes zu tun, um ihre Verliebtheit zu verbergen, damit ‚ihre Dummheit begraben werden könne'. Der Beweis dafür, daß die Handlung nicht erfüllt ist, daß also *stultitiam sepelibilem* nicht das Äquivalent zu *stultitiam sepultam* bildet, ist die Antwort der Selenium: ‚Was kann ich machen?'. In Pers. 836–837 wird auf die gleiche Weise die in *prostibilem* (in Verbindung mit dem Irrealis *faceret*) genannte verbale Handlung eingeschoben, der Sklave Toxilus sagt zur *meretrix* Lemniselenis: ‚Ohne mich und meinen Schutz würde jener bewirken, daß du dich gleich prostituieren könntest'. Ebenso läßt

---

[17]) S. E. Woytek (o. Anm. 8), 250–252.
[18]) S. F. Hanssen (o. Anm. 1), 277–279).

sich Stich. 391–392 erklären, wo der Knabe Pinacium sagt: ‚Ich rannte voraus, um dir etwas anzukündigen, was sehr wünschenswert für dich sein könnte'.

Darüber hinaus führt Woytek[19]) noch die folgende Textstelle als Beispiel dafür an, daß ein mit dem Suffix -bilis gebildetes Adjektiv die gleiche Funktion haben kann wie das PPP:

Scio quid erres: quia uestitum atque ornatum inmutabilem
habet haec (Epid. 577–578)

Hier antwortet der alte Perifanes der Frau Philippa, die in dem Mädchen Acropolistis nicht ihre gemeinsame Tochter, die sie lange nicht gesehen haben, wiederzuerkennen vermag: ‚Ich weiß, was dich zu einem Irrtum verleiten kann: sie trägt Kleidung und Schmuck, die vielleicht verändert worden sind.' Perifanes weiß nicht, wie seine Tochter gekleidet war, als sie der Frau (Philippa) entführt wurde, und aus diesem Grunde kann er keine andere als eine ‚eventuelle' Aussage machen; deshalb sagt er *inmutabilis* und nicht *inmutatus*.

4. Privative Adjektive auf -bilis.

Aus der Besprechung abweichender Deutungen und aus den bis hierher behandelten Texten ergibt sich, wie ich glaube, daß die Adjektive auf -bilis in der Sprache des Plautus als einziges funktionales Merkmal die Angabe der ‚Möglichkeit' oder der ‚Fiktion' aufweisen, mit der die durch das Wurzellexem benannte verbale Handlung im Kontext realisiert wird. Dieses funktionale Merkmal setzt die Adjektive auf -bilis in Opposition zu anderen deverbalen Adjektiven, die im Bereich der ‚Nicht-Fiktion,, der ‚Realität', anzusiedeln sind.

Dieser Befund bestätigt sich bei der Analyse der Adjektive auf -bilis, denen das Privativ-Präfix in- vorangestellt wird: bei allen handelt es sich um dieselbe ‚Möglichkeit' der Durchführung der Verbalhandlung, jetzt unter negativem Vorzeichen[20]).

Diese kann sich im Passiv

Incredibilis imposque animi, inamabilis, inlepidus uiuo (Bacch. 614)

Miroque modo atque incredibili hic piscatus mihi lepide euenit (Rud. 912)

Incommoditates sumptusque intolerabiles (Aul. 533)

---

[19]) S. E. Woytek (o. Anm. 8), 251.

[20]) Die Negation oder Privation ist bekanntlich die Hauptfunktion des Präfixes in- (vgl. u. a. F. Bader (o. Anm. 14), 353).

Virginem habeo grandem, dote cassam atque inlocabilem,
neque eam queo locare quoiquam (Aul. 191–192)

Edepol ne tu, si equos esses, esses indomabilis (Cas. 811)

oder im Aktiv darstellen:

                                 Nunc demum scio
me fuisse excordem, caecum, incogitabilem (Mil. 543–544)

A. *Et si intestatus non abeo hinc, bene agitur pro noxia.*
B. *Quid, si id non faxis?* A. *Ut uiuam semper intestabilis* (Mil.
   1416–1417)

A. *Semper curato ne sis intestabilis.*
B. *Quid istuc est uerbi?* A. *Caute ut incedas uia!*
   quod amas amato testibus praesentibus (Curc. 30–32)

Da diese Adjektive nicht durch die Diathese, sondern nur durch die Bedeutung des ‚Fiktiven' charakterisiert sind, lassen sich Fälle aufzeigen, in denen ein Adjektiv bald eine aktivische, bald eine passivische Verbalhandlung impliziert, im Aktiv:

Anum sectatus sum clamore per uias;
miserrumam habui. Ut illaec hodie, quot modis
moderatrix (linguae) fuit atque immemorabilis! (Cist. 536–538)

im Passiv:

Neque spurcidici insunt uersus immemorabiles (Capt. 56)

Und schließlich *ignobilis*, das ich durch ‚nicht erkennbar' übersetzen würde in

Sed hunc quem uideo? Quis hic est qui oculis meis obuiam ignobilis
obicitur? (Pseud. 592)

Quis hic homo chlamydatus est? Aut unde est? Aut quem quaeritat?
Peregrina facies uidetur hominis atque ignobilis (Pseud. 963–964),

während in

Ubi ego Sosia nolim esse, tu esto sane Sosia.
Nunc quando ego sum, uapulabis, ni hinc abis, ignobilis (Amph.
439–440)

eine andere Interpretation gefordert ist: hier spielt Plautus anschei-
nend auf die Bedeutung ‚ohne Namen‘ an, die Ernout-Meillet[21]) als
Produkt einer volksetymologischen Umdeutung erklären, bei der
noscere mit *nomen* in Zusammenhang gebracht wird.

Auch hinsichtlich der mit privativem *in-* zusammengesetzten Ad-
jektive sind Deutungen vorgebracht worden, die mit meiner Hypo-
these nicht übereinstimmen. So verteidigt Leumann[22]) für die Ver-
wendung von *incogitabilis* in Mil. 544 eine mit *incogitatus* gleichwer-
tige passive Bedeutung. Woytek[23]) interpretiert *inlocabilis* (Aul. 191)
als rein passivisch und beharrt auf der Austauschbarkeit von *intesta-
tus* und *intestabilis* (Curc. 30–32); er verweist dabei auf das Wort-
spiel bei Plautus, in welchem dieser die beiden Adjektive sowohl zu
testis ‚Zeuge‘ als auch zu *testis* ‚Hoden‘ in Beziehung setzt: Woytek
meint, daß dieses Wortspiel nicht nur auf der Zweideutigkeit des
Grundworts *testis,* sondern auch auf der Ambivalenz beruht, die er
für die beiden Suffixe postuliert.

Ich möchte dagegen annehmen, daß *incogitabilis* die ‚Unfähigkeit
zur Reflexion‘ bezeichnet, die zusätzlich durch die voraufgehenden
Adjektive *excordem* und *caecum* gekennzeichnet wird, und daß *inlo-
cabilis* (Aul. 191–192) nichts anderes wiedergibt als der nachfolgende
Satz *neque eam queo locare quoiquam.*

In *intestatus, intestabilis* kann die Zweideutigkeit auch so erklärt
werden, daß *intestabilis*[24]) ‚jemand, der nicht als Zeuge aussagen
kann‘ (zum Verbum *testari*), auch als Denominativum auf -*bilis,*
‚ohne Hoden‘, verstanden werden könnte. Letzteres könnte mit dem
Adjektiv *intestatus* (als Denominativum interpretiert und mit glei-
cher Bedeutung) synonym geworden sein, wobei nun nur noch die
Bedeutungskomponente ‚Möglichkeit‘ des deverbativen *intestatus*
zu klären bleibt (bzw. die Funktion von -*to-* anstelle von -*bilis*),
nicht aber ein umgekehrter Funktionswandel; denn offensichtlich
kommt *intestatus* mit der Bedeutung ‚Möglichkeit‘ (‚jemand, der

---

[21]) S. A. Ernout – A. Meillet (o. Anm. 15) s. v. *nosco.* Auch Leumann, der von
einem denominativen Ursprung dieses Adjektivs ausgeht, rechnet damit, daß
es früh in die verbale Sphäre verschoben wurde (s. M. Leumann, Die lateini-
schen Adjektiva auf -*lis,* 91, und, zu Kontamination zwischen *nosco* und *no-
men,* 87).

[22]) S. M. Leumann, Die lateinischen Adjektiva auf -*lis,* pp. 116–117.

[23]) S. E. Woytek (o. Anm. 8) 252–253.

[24]) S. M. Leumann. Die lateinischen Adjektiva auf -*lis,* p. 127, wo er *intestabilis*
als deverbal erklärt.

nicht als Zeuge aussagen kann') in plautinischen Texten vor[25]), wie etwa in

Iuppiter te ... perdat, <u>intestatus</u> uiuito (Curc.622),

während *intestabilis* nie an die Stelle von *intestatus* als Bezeichnung einer vollzogenen Handlung (,jemand, der nicht als Zeuge ausgesagt hat') tritt, jedenfalls nicht in dem von mir zugrunde gelegten Textkorpus.

5. Die Untersuchung hat, wie ich meine, gezeigt, daß das Suffix *-bilis,* wenn es deverbale Adjektive bildet, die Aufgabe hat, auf eine ,Eventualität' oder ,Möglichkeit' in der Realisierung der verbalen Handlung hinzuweisen. Daraus ergibt sich weiter, daß das Suffix *-bilis* mit zwei anderen Suffixen konkurriert, einerseits mit *-ndo-* insofern, als das Suffix *-bilis* an einigen Stellen die ,Notwendigkeit' zum Ausdruck bringt, und zum anderen mit *-to-,* da dieses ein Merkmal ,Eventualität' oder ,Fiktion' annehmen kann.

Dieses Konkurrenzverhältnis läßt sich auf folgende minimale Oppositionen als Ausgangssituation reduzieren:

A. Privative Opposition: *-to-* (—)/*-bilis, -ndo-* (+), durch das Merkmal ,Nicht Fiktion'/,Fiktion'.

B. Äquipollente Opposition: *-bilis* (+)/*-ndo-* (+), durch die Merkmale: ,Fiktion + Möglichkeit'/,Fiktion + Notwendigkeit'.

Die privative Opposition ermöglicht es den nicht charakterisierten Ausdrucksweisen, jeweils mit ihren eigenen Bedeutungen aufzutreten, ebenso aber auch mit der der charakterisierten Partner, und damit erklärt sie die Verwendung der Adjektive auf *-to-* mit dem Merkmal ,Möglichkeit' oder ,Fiktion'. Die äquipollente Opposition erläutert den Gebrauch der Adjektive auf *-bilis* mit dem Merkmal ,Verbindlichkeit' oder ,Notwendigkeit' und die Verwendung der Adjektive auf *-ndo-,* die eine mit *-bilis* ähnliche Bedeutung erst im späteren Latein angenommen haben[26]).

---

[25]) *Intestatus* ist nicht das einzige von Plautus verwendete Adjektiv auf *-to-* mit einer *notio facultatis,* vgl. z.B. *inuictus,* Mil.57 und Poen.1190.
[26]) S. A.Ernout–F.Thomas (o. Anm.12) 287.

A Mysterious Verse in John Tzetzes

By Barry Baldwin, Calgary

In his characteristically belligerent note on Aristophanes, *Clouds* 966, John Tzetzes declares that this is a real song, not something that is κάπηλον, ἀγοραῖον, ἀσωτίας καὶ ἀναιδείας ἀνάμεστόν τε καὶ βάρβαρον. To illustrate these dubious qualities, he tosses in without further ado or explanation a single line of political verse, τὰ χέρια τοῦ κλωστόμαλλου νὰ θάψουν τὴν τζερδέλαν. His modern editor, Holwerda,[1]) says of this only "*e carmine populari sumptum, ut videtur; sensus non liquet.*" This judgement is reproduced by Michael Jeffreys[2]) who, after oddly mis-ascribing the Aristophanic song to Strepsiades (it belongs, of course, to the personified Right or Just Reason), observes: "Tzetzes is moved to quote an example of twelfth-century decadence. It is obviously an extract from a vernacular song. The sense, however, is not so apparent. Unless I am missing some subtlety, perhaps an obscenity, the line reads, 'The hands of the tangle-fleeced one are to bury the sardine'."

First, the Aristophanic context should be clarified. It is the beginning of the *Agon* or contest between Right and Wrong Reason. In the speech in question, Right waxes nostalgic over the good old days when children were properly educated and so well behaved. The precise phrase which provokes Tzetzes' comment is τὼ μηρὼ μὴ ξυνέχοντας, "not pressing their thighs together," explained thus by Dover:[3]) "No doubt it was a schoolboy joke to push the genitals up, or to try and push the foreskin back, by movements of the thighs." Later on, Right betrays ambivalence when his moral thunderings are interspersed (vv. 977–8) by a salivating paean on the succulent, peachlike qualities of young male genitals with their velvety texture and tasty secretions.

Tzetzes' own gloss, ἀνειμένους καὶ ἀφέτους καὶ μέσως διεστῶτας καὶ μὴ ξυνεστῶτας καὶ συνεσφιγμένους ἔχοντας τοὺς μηροὺς καὶ συνθλίβοντας τὰ μόρια, shows that he understood the erotic nuance of not pressing the thighs together. It might therefore be presumed that the line he quotes in the context of sexual *double-entendre*

---

[1]) D. Holwerda, *Scholia in Aristophanem* 4. 2 (Groningen and Amsterdam, 1960), 599, n. 1.

[2]) 'The Nature and Origins of the Political Verse,' *DOP* 28 (1974), 161.

[3]) K. J. Dover, in his edition (Oxford, 1968), 214.

should itself contain such an allusion, a contention reinforced by his own description of it as "vulgar, full of filth and shamelessness."

Assuming for the moment the correctness of Jeffrey's translation, what obscenity can be expiscated from "the hands of the tangle-fleeced one are to bury the sardine?" It may be subjoined that there is no talk of fish in Right's speech, although near its conclusion (vv. 981–2), he regrets the passing of a time when boys did not grab the radishes, dill, and parsley at dinner. One immediate thought is to understand κλωστόμαλλος as vagina and τζερδέλα as penis, with χέρια meaning either actions[4]) or, more figuratively, suggesting the contractions of the vagina during intercourse; the "tangle-fleeced one" could be understood as referring to a vagina with luxuriant and/or styled pubic hair.[5]) The word τζερδέλα is not found in *LSJ*, Stephanus, or Sophocles; Du Cange adduced one Ptochoprodromic example, τοπῶς νὰ ζήσω ἐξαπορῶ μηδ' ἐν αὐτὰς τὰς τζερδέλας. One can adduce the Albanian *sardele* (plural, *sardelja*). Fish imagery is both appropriate and attested for the genitalia.[6])

Recurring for a moment to χέρια, an often overlooked meaning of the word is ointment, which might handily comport the notion of vaginal secretion,[7]) and has the added advantage of picking up Aristophanes' own joking on δρόσος[8]) at *Clouds* 978.

The problem with all this, however, is that the only known Byzan-

---

[4]) A regular sense, exemplified in both *LSJ, s. v. iv,* and *Lampe's Patristic Greek Lexicon,* s. v. 14.

[5]) Cf. the account by Nicetas Choniates (*Hist.,* p. 10 Van Dieten) of Anna Comnena's deliberately violent vaginal contractions, designed to induce vaginismus and so subject her husband to penile servitude in revenge for his failing to seize the throne. The old notion that Greek women always underwent depilation to appease the Ruskinesque phobias of Greek men has been exploded by M. F. Kilmer, 'Genital phobia and depilation,' *JHS* 102 (1982), 104–13. I doubt there is much evidence for Byzantine pubic hair styles, and in all cases personal preference must be allowed for, but the literary associations are what count the most here.

[6]) See J. Henderson, *The Maculate Muse* (New Haven and London, 1975), 20, 142. For obscene connotations of food in the Ptochoprodromic poems, and for the sophisticated knowledge of Aristophanes evinced in the attested poems of Theodore Prodromos, see M. B. Alexiou, 'The poverty of *écriture* and the craft of writing: towards an appraisal of the Prodromic poems,' *BMGS* 10 (1986), 19–21.

[7]) Cf. R. J. Littman, 'The Unguent of Venus: Catullus 13,' *Latomus* 36 (1977), 123–8; J. P. Hallett, 'Divine Unction: Some Further Thoughts on Catullus 13,' *Latomus* 37 (1978), 747–8.

[8]) In the sense of what is modernly called Cowper's secretion; cf. Dover *ad loc.*

tine sense accorded to κλωστόμαλλος is in Eustathius, p.1638, 17, where it is said to be synonymous with στρεψίμαλλος. *LSJ* and Stephanus adduce only this passage for κλωστόμαλλος, overlooking the Tzetzes line in cause here; the word is absent from Sophocles. στρεψίμαλλος seems otherwise unique in literary texts to Aristophanes (a point here worth stressing, for obvious reasons), Frag. 682 K.-A.: καὶ στρεψίμαλλος τὴν τέχνην Εὐριπίδης. *LSJ* take this to allude, *à la Frogs*, to Euripides' convoluted phrases.[9]) However, without a context, στρεψίμαλλος and so κλωστόμαλλος could be taken in other ways, including the sexual.[10])

If a sexual connotation be rejected, it would be best to understand the line as part of a stock Ptochoprodromic routine on hunger and food.[11]) This would suit the presence of τζερδέλα since, as earlier noted, its only other appearance is in a Ptochoprodromic verse. As to κλωστόμαλλος, there is a modern Greek word κλωστοκούφι, defined by the dictionaries as "one who gets kicked around." Taken along these lines, κλωστόμαλλος would denote a hungry mendicant (the stock Ptochoprodromic persona) grabbing at a sardine and burying it in his hands; there could also be a parody on how the hands were positioned to receive the eucharist.[12]) Fish were a specially prized gift in the Constantinople of Tzetzes, on the evidence of Byzantine epistolography, albeit the term τζερδέλα does not seem to occur in the relevant texts.[13]) And lexical support for this interpretation can be had from the *Etymologicum Magnum* where (729, 53) στρεψίμαλλος is defined as ταλαίπωρος, κακοπαθής.

---

[9]) Cf. *Frogs* 775, 957.

[10]) Cf. Aeschylus' accusation in *Frogs* 850, 1044; τέχνην would obviously fit this interpretation. On both explicit and implicit sex in Ptochoprodromic poetry, see (in addition to Alexiou, *loc. cit.*) P. Magdalino, 'The Literary Perception of Everyday Life in Byzantium,' *Byzantinoslavica* 47 (1987), 36, n. 50. For στρέφειν in sexual *double-entendre*, cf. Henderson 176, 180, 197.

[11]) See R. Beaton, 'The Rhetoric of Poverty: the Lives and Opinions of Theodore Prodromos,' *BMGS* 11 (1987), 1–28; M. J. Kyriakis, 'Satire and Slapstick in Seventh and Twelfth Century Byzantium,' *Byzantina* 5 (1973), 291–306.

[12]) Cf. Lampe, s. v. 7.

[13]) See A. Karpozelos, '*Realia* in Byzantine Epistolography X–XII c,' *BZ* 77 (1984), 23–5, 34–7, for discussion, bibliographical repertory, and glossary of terms.