

## Greek ἔβλην

By E. D. FRANCIS, New Haven

*Ἐβλην* is commonly cited as the athematic root aorist of βάλλω and many scholars also interpret it as evidence for a regularly inherited State II formation: “zu dem vorausgesetzten Nasalpräsens \**gʷl̥nēti* ‘wirft’ gibt es im Griechischen Belege eines formal aktiven set-Wurzelaoristes ἔβλην . . . Dieser Aorist enthält die set-Wz. in der für das singularische Aktivsystem maßgeblichen VS. II \**gʷleʷa*<sub>1</sub>-, \**gʷlē*-.”<sup>1)</sup> There is, however, no consensus regarding its voice. Some scholars analyze ἔβλην as active,<sup>2)</sup> but others consider it passive.<sup>3)</sup> Schwyzzer<sup>4)</sup> expresses caution: “-βλεῖς, ἔβλης unklar, vielleicht ist die Bedeutung doch überall passiv” (cf. id., 762: \**ēblēhēmān*, *ēblēthēs*, *ēblēto* usw. [neben gleichbedeutendem ἔβλην, ἔβλης, ἔβλη usw.]’), while Chantraine<sup>5)</sup> avoids commitment by referring to an aorist stem βλη- “au sens généralement intransitif”. The purpose of this article is to investigate the evidence for Gk. ἔβλην, to determine as nearly as possible the voice of the attested forms, and to evaluate their implications for Proto-Indo-European ablaut patterns in the root aorist.

Greek attests the athematic aorist stem βλη- with both medio-passive and active personal suffixes. In the language of Epic, the

---

<sup>1)</sup> K. Strunk, *Nasalpräsentien und Aoriste*, Heidelberg 1967, 45; cf. J. Kuryłowicz, *Indogermanische Grammatik II: Akzent, Ablaut*, Heidelberg 1968, 221; R.S.P. Beekes, *The Development of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Greek* (= *Janua Linguarum, Ser. pract.* 42), The Hague 1969, 278; C. Watkins, *Indo-European Origins of the Celtic Verb I*, Dublin 1962, 100. The symbols \**E*, *A*, *O* denote the non-, *a*-, and *o*-colouring laryngeals respectively and are equivalent to alternative notations such as \**a*<sub>1</sub>, *a*<sub>2</sub>, *a*<sub>3</sub> (e.g., Kuryłowicz, Strunk) and \**h*<sub>1</sub>, *h*<sub>2</sub>, *h*<sub>3</sub> (e.g., Beekes). I gratefully acknowledge Warren Cowgill’s helpful comments on a previous version of this article.

<sup>2)</sup> E.g., *LSJ* 304; H. Hirt, *Handbuch der griechischen Laut- und Formenlehre*<sup>2</sup>, Heidelberg 1912, 513; Strunk, loc.cit.

<sup>3)</sup> E.g., H.L. Ahrens, *De graecae linguae dialectis II: de dialecto dorica*, Göttingen 1843, 338; W. Veitch, *Greek Verbs*<sup>4</sup>, Oxford 1879, 127 (“for ἐβάλην”, cf. n. 17); J.M. Edmonds, *Lyra graeca III* (*Loeb Classical Library*), London 1940, 434; G. Fatouros, *Index verborum zur frühgriechischen Lyrik*, Heidelberg 1966, 71.

<sup>4)</sup> E. Schwyzzer, *Griechische Grammatik I*, München 1939, 743 fn. 2.

<sup>5)</sup> P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*, Paris 1968, 161.

root aorist middle (ἐ)βλητο, βλήμενος, βλήσθαι etc. is regularly used as a passive meaning "was hit":

ὅς δέ κ' ἀριστεύησι μάχῃ ἐνι, τὸν δὲ μάλα χρεὼν  
ἐσταμέναι κρατερῶς ἦτ' ἔβλητο ἦτ' ἔβαλ' ἄλλον

"whoever is to achieve excellence in battle, he indeed must steadfastly stand his ground whether he himself is struck or strikes down another" (*Il.* 11.409–10)

βλήτο γὰρ ὦμον δουρὶ, πρόσω τετραμμένος αἰεὶ

"for he, ever turning forward to the attack, was hit in the shoulder by a spear" (*id.*, 17.598)

πρὶν βλήσθαι Μενέλαον ἀρήιον, Ἀτρεὺς υἱόν

"before the warrior Menelaos, son of Atreus, had been hit"  
(*id.*, 4.115) etc.

Ἐβλητο etc. coexists with the descriptively thematic aorist formations of (ἐ)βαλε "threw, hit" (*act.*, cf. *Il.* 11.410, *cit. supr.*) and (ἐ)βάλετο "gird oneself":

ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρ' ὤμοισι βάλετο ξίφος ἀργυρόηλον

"and across his shoulders he slung the silver-studded sword"  
(*id.*, 2.45 etc.)

The *θη*-passive ἐβλήθη is first attested in the fifth century (e.g., *Hdt.* 1.34, *Thuc.* 8.84; cf. *-βληθήσομαι*, *E. Hec.* 863). Thus, within the context of Greek linguistic history, ἔβλητο etc. clearly represents a residual archaism. The pattern of an athematically inflected medio-passive (ἐβλητο) beside a thematicized active (ἐβαλε, cf. *ps. βάλλω*) is further exemplified by *άνώ* : ἦντο, *τανύω* : τάννται, *σεύω* : ἔσσντο.

Evidence for the inflection of the aorist stem *βλη-* with active endings derives from a variety of sources, including Homer and a Homeric scholion, quotation fragments of Old Comedy, a Coan *lex sacra*, and the Greek lexicographers:

1. *ξυμβλη-* "met": in Homer there are two occurrences of *ξυμβλη-* with active endings, (a) 3 du. *ξυμβλήτην*:

τὼ δ' ἐν Μεσσήνῃ ξυμβλήτην ἀλλήλουιν

"these two had met each other in Messene" (*Od.* 21.15)

(b) inf. *ξυμβλήμεναι*:

... πρὶν γ' ἢ ξυμβλήμεναι ἢ δαμῆναι

before meeting [*scil.* at close quarters](?) or being subdued"  
(*Il.* 21.578)

The meaning of *ξυμβλήμεναι* ("met" or "was met by") is not immediately obvious from the context. Chantraine<sup>6)</sup> considers the form transitive and thus analyzes the clause in which it occurs as an antithesis. On the other hand, the view that the verbs are parallel and not antithetical might find slight support in a similar construction two verses earlier:

εἴ περ γὰρ φθάμενός μιν ἦ οὐτάση ἢ ἐβάλῃσιν

"even if he [scil. the hunter] wounds her first with spear or arrow" (v. 576)

This second hypothesis is, however, seriously weakened by the fact that Homer does not elsewhere use the paradigm of *ξυμβάλλω* in a passive sense. Moreover, to analyze the clause as antithetical seems to offer better sense: 'the leopard will not relax her effort before she either comes to grips with the hunter at close quarters (and thereby overwhelms him) or is herself subdued' (compare the similar contrast at *Il.* 11.409–410, cit. supr.). For these reasons, both *ξυμβλήτην* and *ξυμβλήμεναι* are best interpreted as active formations. Compare (c) *ξύμβλητε· συνετύχετε*, Hsch.<sup>7)</sup> There is, however, no direct textual evidence for a singular formation of the type \**ξυν(έ)βλην*.

2. ἀποβλην- : Coan *ΑΠΟΒΛΗ* (3. sg. subj.):

The interpretation of *ΑΠΟΒΛΗ* is hampered by the incomplete state of its context. The inscription in which the form occurs is a *lex sacra*, containing a list of cult prescriptions for the worship of Artemis, discovered at the Asklepieion on Cos in 1903 and dated on epigraphical grounds to the first half of the third century B.C.<sup>8)</sup>

<sup>6)</sup> P. Chantraine, *Grammaire homérique I*, Paris 1958, 380.

<sup>7)</sup> So Latte; Schmidt suggested "*ξύμβληται* (al. *ξύμβληται*)· *συνέτυχε*? Sic certe *Odyss. η 204*". *ξύμβλητο· συνέτυχε* is also conceivable, but neither emendation is necessarily justified. Note that *ξύμβλητην* may also be listed by Hesychius in the following gloss (*Ξ*109, Latte): *ξύμβληντο· συνήντων, συνέβαλλον*, where *ξύμβληντο*, the reading of the *Kyriilli libri*, stands in Latte's edition against *ξύμβλητον* of the *codex Marcianus*, for which Schmidt proposed *ξύμβλητην*, comparing the Homeric passage. Schmidt's emended lemma is certainly preferable to the codical reading (2 du. indic., 2/3 du. subj.?) and has the limited merit of restoring the alphabetical sequence (on which, however, see K. Latte, *Hesychii . . . Lexicon I*, xxix f.). Acceptance of *ξύμβλητην* might also require the addition of *δ(νικῶς)* to the gloss.

<sup>8)</sup> R. Herzog, „Aus dem Asklepieion von Kos II“, *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 10 (1907), 400f., republished in "Heilige Gesetze von Kos",

It is cut on both sides of a marble *stèle*, broken irregularly down the centre with only the left half extant. In his first edition of the inscription, Herzog printed the relevant passage (B III 7–8, op.cit. 402) as follows:

[. . .] αἰ· κατὰ ταῦτά δὲ εἴ κα καὶ τὰν τράπεζάν τις  
[. . .] αἰ· ἥ ἀποβλήῃ ἥ καταγῇ ἥ τὸ ξίφος τὸ ἱερὸν . . .

In 1928, however, Herzog republished a corrected text along with extensive restorations cogently supported by parallels drawn from comparable temple inventories:

κατὰ ταῦτά δὲ εἴ κα καὶ τᾶν τραπεζᾶν τις  
[ἥ ἄλλο τι ἀνάθημα ἐπισκευᾶς δέητ]αἰ ἥ ἀποβλήῃ ἥ καταγῇ ἥ τὸ  
ξίφος τὸ ἱερὸν  
[ἀμβλυνθῇ, ἐπισκευασθῶ . . .]<sup>9)</sup>

In 1907, he had analyzed *ΑΠΟΒΛΗΙ* as an “intransitive oder passive Aoristform” (404), but, in 1928, together with *ΚΑΤΑΓΗΙ*, simply as an aorist passive (24), and accented them accordingly (i.e., ἀποβλήῃ and καταγῇ). Bechtel and Schwyzer, on the other hand, apparently regarded *ΑΠΟΒΛΗΙ* as an active formation.<sup>10)</sup> Although the full subject of *ΑΠΟΒΛΗΙ* and *ΚΑΤΑΓΗΙ* cannot be finally determined, τᾶν τραπεζᾶν τις may reasonably be taken as part of it and the intent of Herzog’s restoration seems plausible. Under these circumstances, it makes more sense to analyze *ΚΑΤΑΓΗΙ* as the aorist passive subjunctive of κατάρνυμι (i.e., καταγῇ) than as the present active of κατάγω (i.e., κατάγη). This inference is supported by the fact that κατάρνυμι is frequently used of shattering material objects (cf. *LSJ* 887, s.v. κατάρνυμι and n. 9, supr.) and that aorists, rather than presents, are relatively frequent in the surrounding passage. While the interpretation of *ΚΑΤΑΓΗΙ* as an aorist passive does not necessarily

*Abh. d. preuß. Akad. d. Wiss. (Phil.-Hist. Kl.)* 6, Berlin 1928, 20f. (hereafter abbreviated as Herzog 1907 and *id.* 1928, respectively). For the dating, see Herzog 1907, 401; *id.* 1928, 20.

<sup>9)</sup> *Op. cit.* 22; Herzog (*ibid.*, 24f.) compares κατεαγότα uaria (Delos, iv B.C. init.), τράπεζαι μικραὶ ΔΔΔΔΙΙΙΙ, τούτων ἐπισκευῆς δεόμεναι ΔΙΙΙ (*ibid.*); ἀντὶ τῆς Θηρικλείου τῆς ἀποβληθείσης . . . [ἔσχα]ρίον μικροῦ ἡμυσν κατεαγός (Delos, 279 B.C.); ὅσα μὲν ἂν δοκῇ ἐπισκευῆς προσδεῖσθαι, ἐπισκευασάτωσαν (Oropos, c. 250 B.C.). He also corrects τὰν τράπεζαν (acc. sg.) to τᾶν τραπεζᾶν (gen. pl.).

<sup>10)</sup> F. Bechtel, *Die griechischen Dialekte II*, Berlin 1923, 587; Schwyzer, *op.cit.*, 743.

require that *ΑΠΟΒΛΗΙ* be analyzed in a similar way, it is not easy to see what a supposedly active form of ἀποβάλλω might mean in the present context, which seems to imply that 'if some material object relating to the cult has been lost (or discarded as worthless)<sup>11)</sup> or broken, then certain restitutions need to be made.' The available evidence thus suggests that *ΑΠΟΒΛΗΙ* must be explained as an aorist passive (i.e., ἀποβλήῃ) representing either a genuine dialect form or an engraver's error (probably for ἀποβλήθη).

The remaining evidence for an aorist stem βλη- with active endings is restricted to quotations and commentary by grammarians, lexicographers, and the Venetus A scholiast to *Il.* 13.288:

3. ἔβλης (2 sg. indic.): πόθεν † δὲ ὠλκός †  
εὐπετές ἔβλης (*EM* 199.54 = *Epich. fr.*  
177 K[aibel]).<sup>12)</sup>
4. βλείης (2 sg. opt.): (a) βλεῖο· βληθείης.  
ἔστι δὲ ἀκόλουθον μετοχῇ τῇ βλέμενος·  
κέχρηται Ἐπίχαρμος καὶ τῷ ἐνεργητικῷ  
"αἶ κα τυ βλείης σφενδόνα" [= *fr.* 219 K.],  
ὥς οὖν θέμενος θεῖο οὕτω βλέμενος βλεῖο·  
τὸ δὲ βλείης τῇ βλείς παράκειται (*Ven. A Schol.*  
*ad Il.* 13.288, x A. D.).  
but contrast (b) βλείης· βληθείης καὶ  
βλεῖο ὅτι † (*Hsch.*, ed. Latte; codd. βλείεις:  
βλείης *Ahrens*).
5. (-)βλείς (ptc.): (a) Ἐπίχαρμος τυροβλείς  
(*EM* 199.51 = *Epich. fr.* 176 K.).  
(b) Cf. *Ven. A Schol. ad Il.*  
(loc. cit.).
6. A general mention of the formation occurs at *EM* 199.51f.  
and includes (-)βλείς and ἔβλης (5a and 3, respectively):  
βλείς· [*Epich. fr.* 176 K.]. Φασὶν οἱ μὲν ἀπὸ

<sup>11)</sup> Cf. *LSJ* 193, s.v. ἀποβάλλω 2a and 3, also ἀπόβλητος "thrown away as worthless" (*Il.* 3.65 +), -τέος (*Pl.* +).

<sup>12)</sup> In an article on this fragment (*The Classical Review* N. S. 23 [1913], f.), I suggest the following tentative restoration: πόθεν δὲ θοδλκος εὐπετές / ἔβλης (metr., iambic trimeter). I also argue that although the context scarcely warrants any specific ascription (cf. *Ahrens*), what evidence does exist indicates that the fragment may more plausibly be attributed to Epicharmus (cf. *Kaibel*) than to Sappho, Alcaeus, Anacreon or an anonymous lyric poet (as *Bergk*, *Diehl*, *Edmonds*, *Page* and others have supposed).

τοῦ βληθείς καὶ κατὰ συγκοπήν τοῦ η καὶ θ  
 βλείς· ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ βλήμι· ὁ δεύτερος ἀόριστος  
 ἔβλην [Epich. *fr.* 177 K.], ἡ μετοχή βλείς.  
 κίνημα γὰρ καὶ οὐ συγκοπή. οὕτως Ἡρωδιανὸς  
 περὶ Παθῶν [= I 265.23 Lentz].

- (7. Forms like ps. βλήμι and ptc. βλέμενος—“participium . . . in grammaticorum cerebris natum” [Dindorf]—seem to exist merely as a grammarian’s fiction dependent on ἔβλην).

Note that βλείης (4a) and τυροβλείς (5a) are ascribed to Epicharmus by the writers who cite them, while the quotation in which ἔβλης occurs is not specifically attributed (cf. n. 12). While this evidence establishes that an aorist stem βλη- with active endings was known to Greek grammarians and lexicographers, at least two facts remain unclear, namely, the voice of ἔβλην and the relation, if any, between its literary and apparent epigraphical use.

Not only modern scholars have disagreed about the voice of ἔβλην for, as the *Etymologicum Magnum* (loc. cit.) reports, this issue was already debated in antiquity, a fact which may in part reflect both the rarity and the restricted dialectal occurrence of the formation. On the basis of his gloss (4b, *supr.*), Hesychius may tentatively be counted among those who considered ἔβλην to be passive. Although this mutilated entry was plausibly emended by M. Schmidt as βλεῖο· βληθείς καὶ βλείης Ἐπίχαρμος, emendation may be unnecessary in light of the existence of a grammarian’s dispute regarding the voice of ἔβλην. The Venetus A scholiast (ad *Il.* 13.288), our source for Epich. *fr.* 219 K. (4a, *supr.*), also compares βλεῖο and βλείης. Since, however, he explicitly states that the latter is active (τῷ ἐνεργητικῷ) it is perhaps surprising that Latte refers Hesychius’ apparently passive βλείης to Epich. *fr.* 219.

The three literary fragments recorded by the grammatical tradition in order to illustrate the paradigm of ἔβλην may now be considered in terms of the evidence they offer regarding its voice. The text of both fragments cited at *EM* 199.51f. is, however, not only devoid of its original context but too corrupt to permit them to determine any firm conclusions concerning the voice of ἔβλην. Nevertheless, to interpret the pertinent verb forms (-βλείς and ἔβλης) as actives yields adequate sense (cf. n. 12). In the Homeric scholion, βλείης occurs in the protasis of a conditional clause but analysis of its voice is rendered ambiguous by the omission of the

apodosis or any further context. While the meaning of σφενδόνα in this quotation ("with a sling" [*LSJ* 1740a, s.v. σφενδόνη I] or "with shot from a sling, etc." [ibid. III]) has no bearing on the voice of βλείης ("[if] you were to hit with" [act.] or "[if] you were hit by" [pass.]), σφενδόνη in its instrumental use is characteristically constructed with active and middle verbs, rather than with passives (cf. *Il.* 13.600, *E. Ph.* 1142, *Ar. Nu.* 1185 etc.) and this distribution may lend weight to an interpretation of βλείης as active. There is at least no contextual reason which necessarily supports Ahrens' view (followed by Lorenz)<sup>13</sup> that "βλείης . . . passivam potestatem habere videtur." Indeed, the scholiast's whole point in citing this clause is to illustrate the active counterpart of βλεῖο (mid.) and βληθείης (pass.). Moreover, from a formal standpoint, the most obvious analysis of βλείης is as an active optative, corresponding to a middle βλεῖο, a pattern descriptively parallel to that exemplified by monosyllabic roots such as θείης : θεῖο. On balance, therefore, Epicharmus' βλείης appears to be more plausibly explained as an active than as a passive and, in the absence of contrary evidence, we may likewise interpret -βλείς and ἔβλης as active forms.

Direct testimony regarding the voice of ἔβλην nevertheless remains somewhat inconclusive and contradictory. Homeric ξυμβλήτην and ξυμβλήμεναι (cf. Hesychius' ξύμβλητε), though doubtless themselves active, do not necessarily indicate the existence of an active simplex ἔβλην. While Coan ἀποβλή is most plausibly interpreted as a passive, the *Etymologicum Magnum* (citing the authority of Herodian) and the Venetus A scholiast consider ἔβλην active. The *Etymologicum Magnum* mentions controversy on this point and Hesychius' gloss (4b, supr.) might thus appear to reinforce the Coan evidence for a passive formation. On the other hand, it is hard to argue with confidence that Hesychius and Coan provide valid independent testimony for the existence of a passive ἔβλην: the textual transmission of Hesychius' gloss is open to question and Hesychius may himself have misinterpreted βλείης in the passage from which he was presumably quoting (Epich. fr. 219?). The relatively explicit entries of the *Etymologicum Magnum* and the Homeric scholiast appear more reliable than Hesychius' gloss and this judgement is well supported on typo-

<sup>13</sup>) Ahrens, op.cit., 338; cf. A. O. F. Lorenz, *Leben und Schriften des Koers Epicharmos*, Berlin 1864, 292: „es scheint Aor. II optat. pass. zu sein.“

logical grounds by the fact that all other Greek aorists with a stem shape (s)C(C) $\bar{V}$ - (e.g.,  $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\nu}\omega$ ,  $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\tau\eta$ ,  $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\eta$ ,  $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\lambda\eta$ ,  $-\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\kappa\lambda\eta$ ,  $\acute{\epsilon}\varphi\upsilon$  etc.) represent active, not passive, formations.

Against this conclusion, the Coan *lex sacra* (cit. supr.) offers the only secure attestation of  $-\acute{\epsilon}\beta\lambda\eta\nu$  as a passive and, at this point, we may mention a descriptively similar form,  $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\rho\tilde{\omega}$ , which occurs on the *recto* of this same inscription (A 24):  $[\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \alpha\acute{\iota}] / \kappa\alpha\ \gamma\upsilon\nu\acute{\alpha}\ \tau\epsilon\kappa\tilde{\eta}\ \tilde{\eta}\ \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\rho\tilde{\omega}$  . . . This is the first attested occurrence of an athematic root aorist to  $-\tau\iota\tau\rho\acute{\omega}\sigma\kappa\omega$  and it cannot be explained simply as an intransitive counterpart of  $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\rho\acute{\omega}\sigma\eta$ , according to the pattern  $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\eta$  (intr.) :  $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\eta\sigma\epsilon$  (tr.), since the sigmatic aorist was already used intransitively.<sup>14)</sup> On the other hand, one can readily understand why a form like  $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\acute{\epsilon}\tau\rho\omega$  might be created from  $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\acute{\epsilon}\tau\rho\omega\sigma\epsilon$  with the intention of characterizing more explicitly its intransitivity.<sup>15)</sup> There is no need to insist that  $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\rho\tilde{\omega}$  in this inscription is synonymous with  $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\rho\omega\theta\tilde{\eta}$  ‘‘may be aborted’’:<sup>16)</sup> the passage just seems to refer to the house ‘in which a woman either gives birth or has a miscarriage’ (cf. Hp. *Morb.* 1.5:  $\gamma\upsilon\nu\alpha\acute{\iota}\kappa\alpha\ \tau\acute{\iota}\kappa\tau\upsilon\sigma\alpha\nu\ \tilde{\eta}\ \tau\iota\tau\rho\omega\sigma\kappa\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta\nu$ ).

<sup>14)</sup> Cf. Hdt. 3.32 fin.:  $[\varphi\alpha\sigma\acute{\iota}]$  . . .  $\mu\acute{\iota}\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\rho\acute{\omega}\sigma\alpha\sigma\alpha\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\theta\alpha\nu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ . The earliest attested transitive use  $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\iota\tau\rho\acute{\omega}\sigma\kappa\omega$  ‘‘abort’’ is at D.S. 3.64 (i B.C.), according to *LSJ* ad loc. (Note, however, that  $\tau\acute{o}\ \beta\rho\acute{\epsilon}\varphi\omicron\varsigma$  in this construction may represent not a direct object but an accusative of respect; such collocations suggest a transitional ambiguity at which the switch from intransitive to transitive usage might have occurred). A transitive form may also be implied by Hesychius’ gloss  $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\acute{\epsilon}\tau\rho\omega\sigma\epsilon\nu$ ·  $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\acute{\eta}\mu\beta\lambda\omega\sigma\epsilon\nu$ ,  $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\tilde{\rho}\iota\psi\epsilon\ \tau\acute{o}\ \beta\rho\acute{\epsilon}\varphi\omicron\varsigma$ . (Since Phrynichus 184 reports that  $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\iota\tau\rho\acute{\omega}\sigma\kappa\omega$  was the Ionic and Koinē form for Attic  $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\alpha\mu\beta\lambda\acute{\omega}$ , it is unclear whether Coan  $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\rho\tilde{\omega}$  should be attributed to Koinē influence or whether, as is more likely, Phrynichus is emphasizing the Atticist definition of  $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\alpha\mu\beta\lambda\acute{\omega}$  rather than the non-Attic dialect distribution of  $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\iota\tau\rho\acute{\omega}\sigma\kappa\omega$ .)

<sup>15)</sup> A remodelling of  $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\acute{\epsilon}\tau\rho\omega\sigma\epsilon$  as a long vowel athematic root aorist in order to hypercharacterize its intransitivity might have been further motivated by the fact that simplex  $\tau\iota\tau\rho\acute{\omega}\sigma\kappa\omega$  and the synonymous  $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\alpha\mu\beta\lambda\acute{\omega}$  were used transitively at this period, and a sigmatic  $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\acute{\epsilon}\tau\rho\omega\sigma\epsilon$  could conceivably be interpreted as a transitive, as Hesychius’ gloss (cf. n. 14) perhaps suggests.

<sup>16)</sup> This conclusion is not necessarily contradicted by the somewhat ambiguous entry at *EM* 347.48:  $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\acute{\epsilon}\tau\rho\omega$ ·  $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\epsilon\beta\lambda\acute{\alpha}\beta\eta$ ,  $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\epsilon\kappa\acute{\omicron}\pi\eta\ \tilde{\eta}\ \kappa\acute{\upsilon}\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$ , which does not require that  $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\acute{\epsilon}\tau\rho\omega$  be taken as a passive since the two indisputable passives in the gloss,  $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\epsilon\beta\lambda\acute{\alpha}\beta\eta$  and  $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\epsilon\kappa\acute{\omicron}\pi\eta$ , may indicate nothing more than that  $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\acute{\epsilon}\tau\rho\omega$  is not a transitive active formation. ( $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\epsilon\beta\lambda\acute{\alpha}\beta\eta$  is not listed by *LSJ* but, on the analogy of  $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\beta\lambda\alpha\varphi\theta\tilde{\eta}\nu\alpha\iota$ , probably means, euphemistically, that ‘she underwent an abortion’;  $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\epsilon\kappa\acute{\omicron}\pi\eta\ \tilde{\eta}\ \kappa\acute{\upsilon}\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$  implies that ‘the pregnancy was terminated’ rather than that ‘the foetus was aborted’ which, strictly speaking, would require  $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\eta\mu\alpha$ ).



For this active intransitive use, compare *ἀπέσκη* “withered” (: *σκελετός*) etc.

The apparent parallel between *ἐκτρῶ* and *ἀποβλή* is thus somewhat misleading since an active form of *ἀποβάλλω* would be unlikely to mean “is lost, discarded” which seems to be the required sense in this context, and it is therefore not clear that a paradigm of the type *-έτρω* (intr.) : *-τέτρωμαι* : *-τρωτος* provided an appropriate model by which *\*ἀπέβλη* “disappeared” (: *-βέβλημαι* : *-βλητος*) could have been generated. Moreover, *ἀποβλή* cannot be analyzed as the direct continuation of a pre-Greek *ē*-aorist formation since the expected outcome of a form such as 3 sg. *\*e-g<sup>w</sup>!E-eE-t* would be an otherwise unattested *\*ἐβάλη* (cf. *ἐδάμη*). *Ἀποβλή* thus represents a unique case of a *CRV̄*-root aorist employed as a passive and no straightforward model for its analogical creation is available. At best, it might be somewhat arbitrarily explained as a nonce-form thought to represent the equivalent of *ἀπόβλητον* ἦ and based on the extension of the *ἀποβλη*-allomorph from such forms as *ἀπόβλητος*, *ἀποβλητέος*, or a residual *\*ἀπέβλητο* (cf. the somewhat inexact parallel of *ξυμβλήτην*, discussed below) so that *\*ἀπέβλη* (act. intr.) came to mean “disappeared” by contrast with *ἀπεβλήθη* (pass). “was lost, discarded”. While this line of argument might be pursued even further, it seems neither particularly convincing nor, for that matter, preferable to dismissing the form as an engraver’s error.

While this inscription was cut with reasonable care, the engraver did commit errors (e.g., *ἀεραια* for *ἰέραια* A 34, *θστεον* for *ὀστέον* B 17, and *νομιό[μενα]* for *νομιζό[μενα]* B 24). The explanation of *ἀποβλή* may likewise be epigraphical rather than linguistic since the presence of *ἀποβλή* for *ἀποβληθή* could have resulted from confusion due to the number of *eta*’s in the line and the possible influence of the following (*theta*-less) athematic passive form *καταγῆ*. *Ἀποβλή* thus represents either an isolated and anomalous nonce-form, unparalleled by any other attested form and at odds with a relatively widespread morphological pattern, or it is simply an engraver’s error. In my judgement, the epigraphical explanation is preferable to one which accepts *ἀποβλή* as an unmotivated dialect variant of passive *ἀποβληθή* or an active intransitive meaning “disappeared” of equally unaccountable origin.<sup>17)</sup> In any

<sup>17)</sup> Nothing is gained from restoring a residual middle form *ἀποβλήται* or a putative *ἀποβαλή* as an otherwise unattested aorist passive, a formation needlessly assumed by Kuryłowicz (*Idg. Gramm.* II, 222; cf. Veitch, n. 3). Note that *καταβαλέτω* (act. impv., tr.) occurs six lines below (B 14).

case, a Coan ἀποβλήῃ cannot be safely used as evidence against conclusions otherwise suggested by the forms of ἐβλήν already discussed and has no bearing on Proto-Greek or PIE reconstructions of the verbal paradigm of βάλλω.<sup>18)</sup>

Before we discuss the origin of these formations from the paradigm of ἐβλήν and the morphological implications of their frequent citation in the literature of Indo-European studies, two mutually exclusive hypotheses must be distinguished: (1) reconstruction of a PIE formation (3 sg.) *\*e-g<sup>w</sup>leE-t* (act., or *\*e-g<sup>w</sup>leE-to*, mid.) is unambiguously supported by Greek (and comparative) evidence. *Bλη*-allomorphs which can be convincingly explained as either the continuation of zero-grade formations or derived analogically from such formations cannot serve as evidence for this hypothesis. (2) Members of the paradigm of ἐβλήν, attested in Greek texts, result from innovation within Greek. The first hypothesis can be substantiated only on the following conditions: (1) if no good evidence exists for a PIE State I root *\*g<sup>w</sup>elE-* or (2) given such evidence, (a) if, as many scholars suppose, Schwebelaut can be invoked as a sufficiently productive PIE morphological process to account for a reconstructed alternation of State I *\*g<sup>w</sup>elE-* : State II *\*g<sup>w</sup>leE-*, or (b) if good reason exists for supposing that the appropriate analogical remodelling occurred in PIE rather than in the history of the Greek language. In this context, it is important to recall that Greek athematic root aorists, like ἐβλήν, with a descriptive stem shape *CRV̄-*, have often been thought to reflect an archaic feature of PIE morphology. Thus, according to Kuryłowicz,

wenn . . . auch in Einzelfällen, ja sogar in der Mehrzahl der Fälle, das Nebeneinander von *-ERT* u. *-RET* auf einer Neuerung des Ablauts beruht . . . , muß doch festgestellt werden, daß gewisse morphologische Erwägungen einen archaischen Ablaut *-ERT* : *-RET* postulieren. Besonders im Falle der set-Wurzeln, also *-ERə* :: *-RĒ*, bildet die Form II (*-RĒ*) im Gr. oft den Wurzel-aorist und das Mediopassiv des Perf., während das Präs. die Form I (*-ERə*), eventuell ihre Schwundstufe voraussetzt, vgl. ἐβλήν, βέβλημαι : βάλλω<sup>19)</sup>.

<sup>18)</sup> On account of the dubious status of ἀποβλήῃ and the considerable semantic and chronological discrepancies involved, no argument can be based on the striking coincidence, pointed out by Herzog (1907, 404), that ἐβλήν might be restricted to the language of Epicharmus and Cos and the fact that, according to one tradition, Epicharmus migrated to Sicily from Cos at an early age (cf. A. W. Pickard-Cambridge, *Dithyramb, Tragedy and Comedy*<sup>2</sup>, Oxford 1962, 235f.). (Note, however, Herzog's parallel comparison of the phrase παρ' ἡρώνα A 23 with Sophron's παρ' ἡρώνεσσι, fr. 154 Kaibel).

<sup>19)</sup> Kuryłowicz, *op.cit.*, 221.

When we consider the comparative evidence for the underlying PIE root shape, OIr. *atbaill* “dies”, subj. *atbela* would support a State I root though its semantic connection with *βάλλω* is unclear (orig. “throw [the vital spirit] out”?). Skt. *glāyati* “is exhausted” and Toch. A *klā(w)-*, B *klāy-* “fall” have often been compared with Gk. *βλην*- and thought to continue a State II root but Anttila has rightly questioned this etymology on semantic grounds.<sup>20)</sup> Likewise MW *blif* “catapult”, an isolated technical term in a mediaeval Indo-European language, can hardly be said to provide secure evidence for a PIE State II root shape in a construct such as *\*g<sup>w</sup>leE-mo-*.<sup>21)</sup> A rare Avestan form *niyrāire* has also been traditionally cited as a cognate of Gk. *βάλλω* and in support of a State II root shape.<sup>22)</sup> Insler, however, has argued convincingly in favour of Windischmann’s suggestion that *niyrāire* represents a corruption of *niynāire* from the PIE root *\*g<sup>w</sup>hen-* “smite”.<sup>23)</sup> This conclusion is important to the present discussion in that the most plausible comparative support for a PIE State II *\*g<sup>w</sup>leE-* is thus shown to have an entirely different explanation. The possibility that either MW *blif* or Skt. *glāyati* is etymologically connected with the root of *βάλλω* remains too remote to hold any weight in the absence of more straightforward evidence for a State II formation. In summary then the comparative evidence is scanty and indecisive: there are no plausible cognates which require the reconstruction of a State II root and while OIr. *atbaill*, subj. *atbela* reflects a State I formation, its etymology remains in doubt.

Greek, on the other hand, offers strong support for the reconstruction of a State I root shape *\*g<sup>w</sup>elE-*; compare formations such as *βέλος* (Il. +), *βέλεμνον* (Il. +), *ἐκατηβελέτης* (Il. +), and Arc. *ἐζελε*<sup>24)</sup> (: Att.-Ion. *ἐβαλε*, Il. +). I include *ἐζελε* as evidence for

<sup>20)</sup> Cf. R. Anttila, *Proto-Indo-European Schwebeablaut* (= *University of California Publications in Linguistics*, 58), Berkeley and Los Angeles 1969, 138.

<sup>21)</sup> It has also been suggested that *blif* might be a loan-word from Greek *βλήμα* (cf. Ph. 2.431; Max.Tyr. 9.8) but, in default of any direct evidence, this possibility remains entirely conjectural (cf. Anttila, loc.cit.; on the curious history of Lat. *ballista*, see G.P. Shipp, *Glotta* 39 [1960], 149f.).

<sup>22)</sup> Cf. HJ. Frisk, *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* [abbr. GEW] I, Heidelberg 1960, 217.

<sup>23)</sup> S. Insler, “Avestan *niyrāire*”, *KZ* 81 (1967), 259f.

<sup>24)</sup> Though Hesychius does not specifically attribute the glosses *ἐζελεν*· *ἐβαλεν*, *κάζελε*· *κατέβαλε* to any dialect, their affinity with Arcadian is assured

State I despite Beekes' recent proposal<sup>25</sup> that the root vocalism of ἔζελε (and Att. ἔτεμε) results from laryngeal Umlaut. Arc. ἔζελε has often been interpreted as the regular continuation of a State I full grade *\*e-g<sup>w</sup>elE-t*<sup>26</sup> (: 3 pl. *\*e-g<sup>w</sup>lE-ent*, cf. ἔτεμε < *\*e-temE-t* : 3 pl. *\*e-tmE-ent*<sup>27</sup>). According to this view, Arc. ἔζελε (< *\*ēdele*) reflects the inherited root vocalism of a full-grade *\*e-g<sup>w</sup>elE-t* and the vocalism of the corresponding present δέλλω is analogical to that

by phonological and morphological evidence, as Porson (ad E.Ph. 45) already recognized in 1799 (cf. Ahrens, op.cit. I: *de dialectis aeolicis et pseud-aeolicis*, Göttingen 1839, 232). The sound change of δε- to ζε- is paralleled in Arc. δέρεθρον > ζέρεθρον (: Hom. βέρεθρον). Moreover, an inscription from Tegea (IG V 2.6 = Schwyzler, *Delectus*<sup>3</sup>, no. 656.49, iv B. C.) clearly attests the corresponding present ἐσδέλλοντες (: Att. ἐκβάλλοντες). Hesychius lists ζέλλειν· βάλλειν (cf. ζέλλω τὸ βάλλω, EM 408.42). (Note that εR/Rε vocalism appears to have been generalized elsewhere in Arcadian, cf. A. Thumb-A. Scherer, *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte II*, Heidelberg 1959, 118f.).

<sup>25</sup>) Beekes, op.cit., 221f., esp. 227.

<sup>26</sup>) For the view that ἔζελε (cf. ἔτεμε) continues on old athematic root aorist, see F. Specht, KZ 59 (1932), 98; Schwyzler, *Griech. Gramm. I*, 746 fn. 7; GEW. loc.cit.; Anttila, op.cit., 77, 81; cf. J. Wackernagel, *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer*, Göttingen 1916, 14 (= Glotta 7, 174); G. Cardona, „Greek kámnō and támnō,” *Language* 36 (1960), 503 fn. 6, 506; B. Forssman, „Τέμνω und τάμνω,” *Glotta* 44 (1967), 5f. The *\*E*-laryngeal in *\*g<sup>w</sup>elE* can be reconstructed on the basis of Greek evidence (cf. 3 pl. βέβληνται, Pi. N. 1.8; cf. Forssman's arguments against an interpretation of Pindaric τέτμηνται as an Ionicism, *Untersuchungen zur Sprache Pindars [Klass.-Philol. Stud.* 33], Wiesbaden 1966, 160 fn. 3).

<sup>27</sup>) For *\*temE-*, not *\*temA-*, see Forssman, *Glotta* 44 (1967), 5f. Note that τμητή at Theocr. Id. 25.275 cannot be used as Doric evidence for PGk. *\*τμη-*, as Beekes (op.cit., 221) seems to imply, since *Idyll* 25 is written in the Epic dialect (cf. A.S.F. Gow, *Theocritus II*<sup>2</sup>, Cambridge 1952, 439f.; indeed, the ascription of this *Idyll* to Theocritus is open to serious question, see Gow, loc.cit.).

Greek evidence strongly supports the reconstruction of the PIE third person plural suffix as *\*-ent*, not *\*-ont* (cf. G. Cardona, *The Indo-European Thematic Aorists*, Yale diss. 1960, 68–70). The attested 3 pl. *-ov* does not reflect a PIE *\*-ont*, but results from innovation within Greek due to the leveling of the inherited distinction between *-ent* as the suffix of the third person plural and *-ont-* in the corresponding stem of the participle. This change would have received strong support from *O*-final roots such as *\*perO-* since a 3 pl. *\*e-prO-ent* would regularly develop in Greek as *\*e-par-on*; compare *\*e-mal-on* (: *blō-*), *\*e-tar-on* (: *trō-*), and especially ἔπιον from *\*e-piO-ent* (on laryngeal colouring across morphological boundaries and the absence of laryngeal umlaut, see notes 28 and 32 below).

of the aorist.<sup>28</sup>) In other dialects the analogy of the present stem *βαλλ-* (← *\*g<sup>w</sup>l-ne-E-*) and the participial *βαλόντ-* influenced the extension of the stem of the third person plural *ἐβαλον* throughout the rest of the aorist paradigm.<sup>29</sup>) (The stem shape *βαλ-* also spread to the future *βαλῶ*). The evidence of Arc. *ἐζελε*, combined with the inference that the third person plural form (e.g., Att.-Ion. *ἐβαλον*) provided the specific source for the subsequent generalization of *βαλ-*, supports a reconstruction of the Proto-Greek paradigm with 3 sg. *\*eg<sup>w</sup>ele* : 3 pl. *\*eg<sup>w</sup>lon*.

Beekes, however, suggests that the inherited third person plural form (i.e., *\*e-g<sup>w</sup>lE-ent*, cf. n. 27) would regularly develop as pan-Greek *\*ἐδελον* by phonological change (likewise *ἐτεμον* from *\*e-tmE-ent*). According to Beekes, either the umlauted forms spread from the third person plural or the thematicization of an earlier athematic root aorist and the spread of zero-grade to the singular occurred before the loss of prevocalic laryngeals (op. cit., 216 and n. 108). (Beekes' second suggestion, open to question on several grounds, does not seem essential to his argument and thus requires no discussion at this point.) Moreover, Beekes (op. cit., 223) supposes that the root vocalism of Lesb. *τόμοντες* (Alc. G 1.15 Lobel-Page) was derived by analogy from a hypothetical Aeolic present *\*τόμνω* just as the *βαλ-* in *ἐβαλον* is analogical to *βάλλω*. Beekes' reconstruction of *\*tm-n-eḥ<sub>1</sub>-mi* (with subsequent thematicization) is, however, unlikely to represent the direct phonological source of *\*τόμνω* as preconsonantal syllabic nasals became Proto-Greek *\*-a-*.<sup>30</sup>) Moreover, Cardona has argued that the thematic

<sup>28</sup>) Beekes presents no evidence which exclusively requires the operation of laryngeal umlaut and Greek thematic aorists like *ἐθανον*, *ἐμολον* etc. can be at least as convincingly explained as the result of 'vowel timbre levelling' by analogy to paradigmatically corresponding *CRV̄*-allomorphs (cf. E. D. Francis, *Greek Disyllabic Roots*, Yale diss. 1970, 131f.). Beekes' claim that "in Greek nothing suggests an aorist of the type *\*étemh<sub>1</sub>-t* (224) . . . *ἐτεμε* cannot derive from an aorist *\*étemh<sub>1</sub>-t*" (278) is certainly overstated. (His view is apparently based at least in part on the assumption which, as I shall argue below, is an erroneous one, that PIE athematic root aorist actives from disyllabic roots were characteristically derived from State II stem forms). On *δέλλω*, see n. 24 and *GEW*, loc. cit.

<sup>29</sup>) Francis, op. cit., 125f.; on the process by which inherited root aorists were thematicized in Greek, see Cardona, *Thematic Aorists* (cf. n. 27), 55f.

<sup>30</sup>) According to Beekes (op. cit., 279), however, pre-Greek *\*CRR-* developed regularly as Greek *CVRR-*, regardless of the identity of *\*R*. This sound law extends the traditional proposition that syllabic nasals developed in Greek as *V<sup>n</sup>/m* before the semivowels *\*y* and *\*w* (cf. Schwyzler, op. cit., 342f.)

presents *τάμνω/τέμνω* and *κάμνω* were formed by analogy to their corresponding thematic aorists.<sup>31)</sup> If a Lesbian present *\*τόμνω* ever existed, it thus probably owed its vocalism to the corresponding aorist, not *vice-versa*, and Lesb. *τόμοντες*, in these terms, provides evidence against, rather than support for, Beekes' theory of laryngeal umlaut. The existence of forms like 3 sg. *έάλω* (< *\*e-wlO-eE-t*),<sup>32)</sup> never *\*έόλω*, also argues strongly against Beekes' hypothesis. Under these circumstances and especially in default

to include any pre-resonant environment. In Beekes' view, *\*τόμνημι* thus represents the expected Aeolic outcome of *\*tmneh<sub>1</sub>mi* (id., 223). Because of other arguments which render Beekes' account of *έζελε* and *ετεμε* unlikely, extensive discussion of the phonological and morphological implications of a putative *\*τόμνημι* is unnecessary at this point. Not only is little gained by accepting Beekes' sound law, but his analysis needlessly requires the use of 'schwa secundum' to explain forms like *τανύω* (from *\*t<sub>2</sub>-nu-*, rather than *\*tmnew-*, id., 236; on this type, see W. Cowgill, *Language* 39 [1963], 252f., esp. 257), revises the standard account of forms like *μέμαμεν* (from *\*me-mh<sub>2</sub>-me<sub>2</sub>/n*; on *μεμαώς*, see Schwyzler, op. cit., 343 fn. 1), and does not explain why sequences like *\*CyR-/CwR-* did not in turn become Gk. *\*CVyR-/CVwR-*. On Beekes' evidence, I see no reason to modify the traditional view that pre-consonantal syllabic nasals became *\*-a-* in Proto-Greek, except perhaps before *\*y* and *\*w*. (The remodelling of *\*δάνāμι* → *δάμνāμι* from pre-Greek *\*dm<sub>2</sub>-ne-A<sub>2</sub>mi*, is thus explained by analogy to an aorist formation such as *εδάμνην*). In any case, it is by no means clear that Lesb. *-o<sup>u</sup>/v-* and *-o-* necessarily represent the regular outcome of PGk. *\*-m<sup>(R/v)</sup>-* and *\*-m(T)-*, respectively, since forms like *όν* (for *άνά*) and *δέκοτος* which at first sight appear to support such a sound law may well be secondary (on *δέκοτος*, see Cowgill, "Italic and Celtic Superlatives and the Dialects of Indo-European", in *Indo-European and Indo-Europeans* ed. G. Cardona et al., Philadelphia 1970, 148 n. 25). While *τόμοντες* might possibly represent a Lesbian development of pre-Greek *\*tmE-(o)nt-*, *o* for Attic *a* occurs elsewhere in the dialect where a pre-Greek syllabic nasal is not at issue (e.g., *γνόφαλλον*, *κόθαρος*, *πόμμος*, Thumb-Scherer, op. cit., 88; cf. Beekes, op. cit., 292). The *-o-* in (the etymologically related? *GEW* II, 850) *τομίαις* (Alc. ζ 1.1. L.-P.) cannot be invoked to strengthen the view that the *-o-* of *τόμοντες* is genuine since its own status is highly precarious (cf. Lobel-Page ad loc.: "*το.μ.αις* [ut videatur *τα.μ.αις* fuisse] . . . Cod. A, *τομίαις* v.l. ap. Bekker). It is not impossible that the *-o-* of *τόμοντες*, like the geminate *-μμ-* in the first person singular of active athematic presents, represents a hyperlesbianism (for *τάμοντες*; cf. Sapphic *δάμεισα*, and Alcaeus' *δάμναι*) on the part of the tradition.

<sup>31)</sup> *Language* 36 (1960), 504f., esp. 507.

<sup>32)</sup> Francis, op. cit., 65f.; cf. Alc. *χόλαισι* (Z 2.9 L.-P., 3 pl. ps., from *\*khlAenti* : *χλᾱρός\**, cf. Francis, "Chiron's laughter", *Classical Philology* 67 [1972], 288f.), not *\*χάλαισι*, with laryngeal umlaut. Beekes' judgement that a "laryngeal root is not entirely certain" in *χόλαισι*, despite the evidence of *εχάλασσα* (h. Ap. 6 +), *χαλάσσομεν* (Alc. D 12.10 L.-P.), and Pindaric *χλᾱρόν* avoids rather than explains its probable implications.

of evidence which unambiguously supports the operation of laryngeal umlaut in Greek, I regard  $\beta\alpha\lambda-$  (as in 3 pl.  $\varepsilon\beta\alpha\lambda\omicron\nu \leftarrow *e-g^w\check{l}E-ent$ ), not  $\delta\epsilon\lambda-$ , as the expected prevocalic continuation of pre-Greek  $*g^w\check{l}E-V-$  and therefore, *pace* Beekes, accept the traditional explanation of the Arcadian form according to which it constitutes major evidence for a pre-Greek State I  $*g^w\check{l}E-$ .

The history of Greek forms with a root shape  $\beta\lambda\eta-$  can now be discussed. Since, from a phonological standpoint, Gk.  $\beta\lambda\eta-$  can continue both preconsonantal  $*g^w\check{l}E-$ <sup>33)</sup> and  $*g^w\check{l}eE-$ , morphological arguments must be introduced to evaluate the prehistory of  $\beta\lambda\eta$ -allomorphs.  $\beta\lambda\tilde{\eta}\tau\omicron$  (Hom. 9 ti.), with its residual passive meaning "was hit", can readily be interpreted as the normal Greek development of a zero-grade formation (viz.,  $*e-g^w\check{l}E-to$ ) characteristic of most athematic root aorist middle formations built to monosyllabic roots.<sup>34)</sup> Nevertheless, the imperfects  $\varepsilon\kappa\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron$ ,  $\varepsilon\sigma\tau\omicron$ ,  $\eta\sigma\tau\omicron$ ,  $\varepsilon\delta\kappa\tau\omicron$ ,  $\sigma\tau\epsilon\tilde{\upsilon}\tau\omicron$  imply the possibility of a full-grade form in the aorist middle<sup>35)</sup> and I have elsewhere suggested comparative support for Szemerényi's analysis of  $\varepsilon\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\tau\omicron$  as an inherited full-grade formation.<sup>36)</sup> On the other hand, it is arbitrary, in the absence of unambiguous comparative or internal corroboration, to invoke a proterotonic formation of this type and thus interpret  $\beta\lambda\tilde{\eta}\tau\omicron$  as an

<sup>33)</sup> Kurylowicz's opinion that  $*CRH-C$  developed as  $CR\bar{a}-C$  in Greek regardless of the colour of the laryngeal involved is widely influential (cf. Cowgill in *Evidence for Laryngeals*<sup>2</sup>, ed. W. Winter, The Hague 1965, 149; Anttila, op.cit., 67). Thus Cardona (*Language* 43 [1967], 765) considers Gk.  $*\beta\lambda\tilde{\alpha}\tau\omicron$  the probable phonological outcome of  $*g^w\check{l}E-to$ . Beekes, however, has rightly shown that  $CR\bar{e}-$  and  $CR\bar{o}-$ allomorphs are not necessarily analogical to the  $*A$ -final type but continue preconsonantal  $*CR\check{E}-C$  and  $*CR\check{O}-C$  by phonological change. These arguments are now accepted by Cowgill in *Indo-European and Indo-Europeans* (cf. n. 30, *supr.*), 148 n. 30; cf. Francis, "Pindar fr. 104b Snell", *Classical Quarterly* 22 (1972), 40f.

<sup>34)</sup> Cf.  $\varepsilon\delta\omicron\tau\omicron$ ,  $\varepsilon\theta\epsilon\tau\omicron$ ,  $\varepsilon\omicron\sigma\sigma\tau\omicron$  etc. and  $\sigma\epsilon\tau\ \varepsilon\pi\tau\alpha\tau\omicron$  ( $< *e-ptA-to : *petA-$ ; for State I cf.  $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\tau\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ ), the only Greek root aorist built to a root of the shape  $CeCH-$  in which the second consonant is an obstruent (on the corresponding, but secondary, active formation, see n. 51, *infr.*).

<sup>35)</sup> Cf. J. Narten, "Zur 'protodynamischen' Wurzelpräsens", in *Pratidānam* [Festschrift Kuiper], The Hague 1969, 9f.; S. Insler, "On Proterodynamic Root Present Inflection", *MSS* 30 [1972], 55f.

<sup>36)</sup> Op.cit., 103f.; O. Szemerényi, *Syncope in Greek and Indo-European*, Naples 1964, 179f. (The objections raised by Cardona, *Language* 43 [1967], 766, and endorsed by Anttila, op.cit., 130, are not decisive, cf. Francis, loc.cit.). Beekes' suggestion (op.cit., 224f.) that  $\varepsilon\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\tau\omicron$  either continues an imperfect or a thematic " $\acute{g}n\check{h}_1-o-$ " with laryngeal umlaut (cf. nn. 28 and 32, *supr.*) is not supported by the available comparative evidence.

inherited full-grade State II<sup>37)</sup> rather than as a continuation of the zero-grade more generally characteristic of the aorist middle. The Homeric 3 pl. *ἔβληντο* (cf. *πλήντο* : *πέμπλημι*, *πλήντο* : *πίλναμαι*) results from generalization of the stem *βλη-* rather than representing the regular outcome of *\*g<sup>w</sup>lE-nto* (> *\*βάλατο?*).

The Homeric active forms *ξυμβλήτην* (3 du.) and *ξυμβλήμεναι* (inf.; cf. *ξύμβλητε*, Hsch.) might in principle be explained in one of three ways, (1) as inherited zero-grade formations, (2) as State II full-grades, and (3) as the result of generalizing the stem form *ξυμβλη-* from the aorist middle. (Note that Homer uses the stem form *ξυμβλη-* solely in the sense of “fall in with someone”.) Karl Hoffmann has recently disputed the traditional account of the distribution of root grades in the PIE athematic root aorist according to which the active singular is characterized by full-grade of the root with zero-grade in the active plural and dual, and throughout the middle.<sup>38)</sup> Hoffmann argues on the basis of Greek and Sanskrit evidence that full-grade existed throughout the active formation with the exception of the third person plural. In these circumstances, the Homeric dual *βάτην* (beside *βήτην*) becomes hard to explain. Despite the relative marginality of the dual, the attestation of *βάτην* slightly favours the view that *\*eg<sup>w</sup>ame<sup>n</sup>-/s* (I pl.) etc. should be reconstructed for Proto-Greek and that active root aorist stems with the pattern *-V̄-* (sg.) : *-V̇-* (du., 1/2 pl.) were levelled to *-V̄-* in all persons except the third plural independently in the dialects.<sup>39)</sup> As models for such levelling, we may cite paradigms exemplifying a situation in which, at least in Greek terms, the stem of the singular is identical to that of the first and second persons plural (e.g., *ἔφυν* : *ἔφυνμεν*; *ἔγνω* : *ἔγνωμεν*).<sup>40)</sup> From this discussion we conclude that *-βλήτην* need not be interpreted as a full-grade formation and that *ξυμβλήτην* might even continue an inherited zero-grade formation (cf. *βάτην*). *Ξυμβλήτην* can thus provide no evidence for a pre-Greek full-grade *\*g<sup>w</sup>leE-*. On the other hand, it is hard to argue that *ξυμβλήτην* represents a residual unthematicized zero-grade in the active since its most plausible explanation is as a nonce-form built to the

<sup>37)</sup> E.g., P. Chantraine, *Morphologie historique du grec*<sup>2</sup>, Paris 1961, 162; Strunk, op.cit., 43f.

<sup>38)</sup> K. Hoffmann, “Zum Optativ des indogermanischen Wurzelaorists”, in *Pratidānam* [Festschrift Kuiper], The Hague 1969, 1f.

<sup>39)</sup> Francis, op.cit., 28f.

<sup>40)</sup> The verb ‘to be’ may also have played a role in this generalization.



middle ξύμβλητο,<sup>41)</sup> with possible influence from the active inflection of semantically compatible verbs like ἔτυχε and ἔκικε (cf. *κικήτην*, *Il.* 10.376). The aorist active infinitive ξυμβλήμεναι has also been cited<sup>42)</sup> as evidence for State II but comparable forms like δόμεναι (: ἔδοτο) etc. would, in any case, point to an original zero-grade formation. There is, however, no compelling reason to consider ξυμβλήμεναι archaic and Risch (loc. cit.) plausibly regards it as a poetic creation based on βλήμενος. The Hesychian gloss ξύμβλητε· συνετόχετε likewise seems to exemplify another extension of the stem ξυμβλη- “fall in with”, a connection underlined by the meaning of συνετόχετε. Since ξύμβλητε was doubtless inspired by the Homeric formations, it has no independent status as evidence for the pre-Greek shape of the underlying root. Ptc. βλητός, aor. pass. ἐβλήθην, and pf. pass. βέβλημαι all continue zero-grade formations (cf. βλήσις, βλήδην, etc.) and the pf. act. βέβληκα is patently secondary beside the inherited type γέγονα, δείδω (< \*dédwoga), μέμονα etc. We may therefore conclude that, apart from the possible exception of forms like ἔβλης and βλείης from the paradigm of ἔβλην, Greek provides no unambiguous evidence for an inherited State II root shape \*g<sup>w</sup>leE-.

As we have argued, an active indicative formation ἔβλην is implied by the attestation of ἔβλης, βλείης and -βλείς. Outside the tradition of grammatical commentary, evidence for the paradigm is derived first, and perhaps exclusively, from the literary language of Epicharmus. The origin of βλείης is obscured by the fact that the exact derivation of a descriptive root shape CRV̄- in optative formations from disyllabic roots has not yet been determined: Homeric βλεῖο, for example, cannot represent the straightforward phonological outcome of \*g<sup>w</sup>leE-iE-so (> \*βάλιω?). On the other hand, if it can be argued that the pre-Greek loss of intervocalic \*-y- preceded that of intervocalic \*-s- and that long vowel sequences resulting from pre-Greek \*-V̄yV̄- developed regularly as -V̄V̄-, then a pre-Greek \*g<sup>w</sup>lē-(y)ē (3 sg. opt. < \*g<sup>w</sup>leE-yeE-t) might become \*g<sup>w</sup>lē-ē by phonological change. This development, potentially shared by all inherited disyllabic roots, may have occurred early enough to have taken part in the partial levelling of anit̄ \*thē-ē, \*thi- to thei-ē-, thei-, “no doubt under the influence of εἶη, εἴμεν,

<sup>41)</sup> Cf. E. Risch, *Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache*, Berlin-Leipzig 1937, 207.

<sup>42)</sup> E.g., by Strunk, op.cit., 45.

*ελεν* from pre-Greek *\*esyēt*, *\*esīmen*, *\*esiyeŋt*".<sup>43</sup>) As a result, the athematic optative stem *CRV̄i-* would be generalized throughout the active plural and dual, and also the middle, thus replacing the inherited *\*CRi-* (or *\*CVRi-*) shape on the analogy of the monosyllabic type. On the other hand, even if it can be shown that optatives of the type *γνολήν*, *τλαλήν* etc., derived from disyllabic roots, represent the analogical remodelling of an inherited formation, we are not therefore obliged to regard Epicharmus' *βλείης* as necessarily archaic. Conversely, given the existence of *ἔβλης*, it is unnecessary to explain *βλείης* as a nonce-form built to *βλεῖο* on the model of *θελής* (act.): *θεῖο* (mid.). In my judgement, the most plausible account of *βλείης* (cf. ptc. *-βλείς*) is one which derives it, according to productive patterns of Greek morphology, from the indicative paradigm of *ἔβλην*.

It is now possible to test the important hypothesis that, in Proto-Greek, the athematic aorist stem *\*g<sup>w</sup>lē-* was still confined to the medio-passive. This hypothesis depends in part on the fact that *ἔβλην* can be economically explained as an analogical creation within the history of the language, based on the corresponding perfect *βέβληκα* and conforming to the pattern attested by *κατέβρω*s (*h. Ap.* 127): *βέβρωκα* and *ἔτλην* : *τέτληκα* (*Il.* +).<sup>44</sup>) So far, no evidence has been developed which supports the view that *ἔβλην* represents the relic of an inherited State II or a zero-grade formation to a root shown by forms such as *βέλος*, *ἔζελε* etc. to have characteristically existed in State I. Scholars have, however, long attempted to correlate a paradigmatic relationship of *CVRV-* : *CRV̄-* root allomorphs with a functional distribution and Mahlow had already suggested at least a descriptive basis for this correlation in 1879: „Betrachtet man die vedische und griechische Flexion der Wurzeln *par* und *prā*, so ergibt sich, daß sie sich gegenseitig ergänzen; *par* liefert das Präsens . . . und einige Verbalnomina . . . *prā* das Perfectum und der Aorist.“<sup>45</sup>) In 1888 Johansson suggested the term 'Schwebeab-

<sup>43</sup>) W. Cowgill, *Language* 39 (1963), 270. I discuss the evidence on which these proposals are based more fully in a forthcoming article.

<sup>44</sup>) Cf. Francis, "Epicharmus *fr.* 177 Kaibel," *CR N. S.* 23 (1973), 3, and *GEW II*, 849.

<sup>45</sup>) G. H. Mahlow, *Die langen Vokale AEO in den europ. Sprachen*, Berlin 1879, 163. Since Greek *CRV̄-C* can derive phonologically from either *\*CRH-C* or *\*CRēH-C* and allomorphs of the shape *CeRC-* and *CRēC-* sometimes coexist in Indo-European languages, many scholars have attributed this type of alternation to PIE. De Saussure, for example, distinguished terminologically between the root shapes *CeRC-* and *CRēC-*, referring to

laut'<sup>46</sup>) to describe the alternation of *CeRC*- and *CReC*-shapes (including *CVRV*- : *CRV*-shapes from set roots of the type *CeRH*- : *CReH*-) within a given root. The alleged evidence for PIE Schwebeablaut has, however, recently been reviewed by Anttila (op.cit.) and it now seems likely that the widespread proposition of a systematic relationship between State I and State II shapes of the same PIE root in full-grade formations still advocated or implied by many Indo-Europeanists<sup>47</sup>) should either be rejected or at least treated with considerable scepticism.<sup>48</sup>)

In particular, the class of Greek athematic root aorists formed from disyllabic roots with a descriptive stem shape *e*-(*s*)*CCV*- has frequently been presented as a canonical example of the operation of Schwebeablaut within the verb paradigm<sup>49</sup>). On the other hand, of the Greek aorists which attest this type, middles such as  $\beta\lambda\eta\tau\omicron$ ,  $\pi\lambda\eta\tau\omicron$  etc. are most plausibly explained as the continuations of zero-grade formations and, with the exception of forms like

them as 'premier cas' and 'deuxième cas', respectively. Hirt and Kuryłowicz posited roots with potentially two full-grades, States I and II, and this distinction formed the basis of Benveniste's influential theory of PIE root formation (*Origines de la formation des noms en indo-européen*, Paris 1935, 147f.).

<sup>46</sup>) For a brief history of attempts to account for the relationship of *CVRV*- : *CRV*-root shapes, see Anttila, op.cit., 1f.

<sup>47</sup>) E.g., Chantraine, *Morphologie*<sup>2</sup>, 9f.; Strunk, op.cit., 26, 29 et passim; Cardona, *Language* 43 (1967), 765; Watkins, *Celtic Verb I*, 100; Kuryłowicz, *Idg. Gramm.* II, 221f.; Beekes, op.cit., 187f.; Szemerényi, *Einführung*, 84f.; Wyatt, *Indo-European /a/*, 59.

<sup>48</sup>) Cf. Cowgill, *EfL*<sup>2</sup>, 166; Anttila, op.cit., esp. 170f. Excepted from this conclusion are the well-known cases of *\*doru* : *\*draws* "tree", *\*gonu* : *\*gnews* "knee" etc., a few forms which, already in PIE, developed analogically to this type, and examples of sporadic metathesis comparable with the ME *brid*/*bird*-type. A few alternations (e.g., Skt. *vr̥dh*-/*vardh*- : *vr̥ādh*- on which see Anttila, op.cit., 65; Gk.  $\alpha\upsilon\tilde{\xi}\omega$ / $\acute{\alpha}\tilde{\xi}\omega$  : Lat. *augeō*/*uegeō* : Goth. *aukan*/*wahsjan*) remain incompletely explained but offer insufficient evidence for the construction of Schwebeablaut-theory as it is commonly accepted.

<sup>49</sup>) E.g., Bechtel, *Hauptprobleme*, 190f.; Hirt, *Hbh. d. gr. Spr.*<sup>2</sup>, 512f. (cf. *Idg. Vokal.*, 212); Meillet, *Intr.*<sup>8</sup>, 165, 200f.; Kuryłowicz, *ÉI*, 61f. (cf. *Apophonie*, 131f., *Idg. Gramm.* II, 221f.); Ammer, *Die Sprache* 2 (1962), 213f.; Watkins, *Celtic Verb I*, 100; Lindeman, *NTS* 20 (1965), 64, 84 (cf. *Einführung in die Laryngaltheorie*, 55); Strunk, op.cit., 29 n. 23; Beekes, op.cit., 226f.; cf. Anttila's criticisms of this view, op.cit., 75f. (The frequent inclusion of  $\xi\beta\lambda\omega$ , e.g., by Meillet and Beekes, cf. *GEW I*, 238, as evidence for a State II formation is, in any case, erroneous since the form most probably continues an  $\tilde{e}$ -aorist zero-grade formation *\*e-g<sup>wi</sup>O-eE- $\eta$* , cf. Francis, *Disyllabic Roots* 76f.).

ἐγνω, <sup>50</sup>) derived from characteristically State II roots, actives such as ἐτλη, -έβρω, ἐβλω etc. represent analogical formations based on the root shape of the corresponding perfect according to the model of the monosyllabic type ἐστη : ἐστηκε. <sup>51</sup>) We are therefore no longer justified in citing this aorist class as an example of PIE Schwebe-ablaut. In particular, while we do not know that the paradigm of ἐβλην was originally coined by Epicharmus, it may indeed have been an innovation of his comic idiolect. <sup>52</sup>) At any rate, we are certainly not entitled to cite it as evidence for a Proto-Greek aorist \*ἐg<sup>w</sup>lēn, let alone an alleged PIE morphophonemic alternation, especially in the face of good evidence for a Proto-Greek State I \*ἐ-g<sup>w</sup>ele. This conclusion underlines the importance of judging as accurately as possible the antiquity of both a specific form and the morphological pattern it exemplifies, and thereby establishing relative chronologies for grammatical change so that patently secondary developments are not mistaken for a more archaic inheritance.

<sup>50</sup>) From \*e-ǵneO-t, cf. Lat. [co]gnōscō, OP xšnāsātīy (subj.), OE cnāwan; Anttila (op.cit., 132, 169) has nicely shown that the fullgrade of Lith. žėnklas "sign" with apparent State I, beside the expected žinklas, can be secondarily derived from the žin-forms. Compare ἐπλω < \*e-pleO-t (GEW II 565f., but note Schwyzler, *Griech. Gramm.* I, 743 fn. 5; -έδρα, cf. Skt. drāti.

<sup>51</sup>) Cf. Francis, op.cit., 52f., where these developments are discussed in detail. Since, however, no perfect formation of the type \*πέπηκα : \*πέπιμεν is attested in Greek, the explanation of ἐπτην (: πέτομαι) may be slightly different (though still dependent on the model of anit̥ ἐστην): a PIE athematic root aorist formation

1 sg. *e-petA-ṃ	pl. *e-ptA-me <sup>s</sup> /n
3 sg. *e-petA-t	pl. *e-ptA-ent

would have developed in Greek by regular sound change as

1 sg. *ἐπετα	pl. *ἐπταμε <sup>v</sup> /ς
3 sg. *ἐπετα	pl. ἐπταν

(with laryngeal colouring across the morphological boundary). A singular stem \*πτā- could then have been derived from the plural stem \*πτā- on the analogy of anit̥ στā- : στā-, perhaps already in Proto-Greek, but certainly prior to the replacement of Proto-Greek \*ἔσταν (3 pl.) by Attic-Ionic ἐστησαν.

A late present formation βλήσκω\* (cf. βλησκομένην, cj. at Zos. Alch. 207.6, *LSJ Suppl.* 31a) represents a further generalization of the βλη-allomorph on models of the type βλώσκω (: ἔμολον) : μέμβλωκα, -θνήσκω (: -έθανον) : τέθνηκα etc. :: x (: ἔβαλον) : βέβληκα, where x = βλήσκω.

<sup>52</sup>) Epicharmus elsewhere parodied the Homeric tradition in both theme and diction (cf. L. Berk, *Epicharmus*, Groningen 1964, 76f. et passim; W. Schulze, *Quaestiones Epicae*, Gütersloh 1892, 391f.; Bechtel, *Griech. Dial.* II, 212f.). At any rate, ἐβλην cannot be convincingly argued to represent a Doric dialect form as, for example, Bechtel (op.cit., 261) suggests.