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Abstract

This thesis examines Ancient Greek verbs such as βάσκω, which are suffixed (mainly in the present tense) with -σκω. They present both morphological and semantic problems. Firstly, it is not clear why, beside simple -σκω, we have formations with reduplication such as γί-γεν-σκω, and in -ίσκω as εύπ-ίσκω. Secondly, the presents in -σκω have been attributed four different meanings: causative, inchoative, iterative and zero. These functions are found separately for descendants of *-skel- in other Indo-European languages, but Greek seems unique in showing all four at the same time.

After a brief review of earlier scholarship (Chapter 1) and a summary account of the evidence for *-skel- in other Indo-European languages (Chapter 2), this thesis offers a thorough examination of Greek verbs in -σκω in two well-defined corpora: Homer and Plato. Chapters 3 and 4 concentrate on the morphology and semantics of -σκω in Homer, and Chapters 7 and 8 concern these subjects in Plato. Chapter 5 discusses the so-called ‘iteratives’ in -(ε)σκον, found mainly in Homer and Herodotus. Two short sections (Chapters 6 and 9) summarise the situation in early and Classical Greek respectively. The detailed analysis highlights the distinctions between the early and Classical period. Although the Iliad and the Odyssey preserve features of the original formations, they also provide evidence for specific innovations, most notably presents with reduplication and in -ίσκω. It is possible, and even likely, that the iteratives in -(ε)σκον have a common origin with presents in -σκω; but even in Homer they must be treated as a separate class. It emerges that semantically the forms in -(ε)σκον form a coherent category, probably marked by the feature ‘+REPEATED’; apparent contrasts in meaning are largely lexically determined. However, the main function of -σκω in Homer is that of creating presents from roots which originally yielded root aorists; the apparent causative / inchoative value is in fact based on the active / medio-passive contrast. In the Classical period, morphology and semantics move towards more regular patterns. The choice between reduplication, -ίσκω and -σκω is determined by stem-type, and we find two classes of minimal pairs: those of the form causative active μεθύσκω ‘make drunk’ : inchoative medio-passive μεθύσκομαι ‘become drunk’ : unmarked stative μεθύω ‘be drunk’, where the action is ‘externally caused’; and those of the type inchoative active γενειάσκω ‘become bearded’ : stative γενειάω ‘be bearded’, where there is no causative alternant and the action is ‘internally caused’.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

1. Introduction

Verbs in -σκω and its variant -ισκω, such as βόσκω, γιγνώσκω, μιμήσκω and εὑρίσκω, are part of the basic vocabulary of Greek. They are characterised by a present stem in -σκ- beside non-present forms which are almost always without this suffix. Yet, despite their prominence, in-depth scholarship into Greek presents in -σκω is remarkably scarce. This is presumably because the suffix is not especially productive; yet the problems it presents mean that a study is very much required. Whilst much work has been done on cognate productive suffixes in Hittite, Latin and Tocharian, and to a lesser extent on the more disputed relatives in Armenian,1 that relating to Greek -σκ- has been almost entirely restricted to the dialectally productive ‘iterative’ suffix -(ε)σκον, a formation apparently quite separate from the presents in -σκω.2 On the function of Greek -σκ-, only one work (Giacalone Ramat 1967) exists; the same can be said of work on the morphology of verbs in -ισκω (Schmidt 1904), and no single article or monograph concerns the general subject of Greek presents in -σκω at all, bar Tsiapera’s (1988 [1989]) very brief history of these forms from Ancient to Modern Greek. And yet the presents in -σκω are consistently mentioned in Indo-European and Greek grammars, and also in various monographs and articles.3

---

1 For bibliography on these see Chapter 2 §§ 2.1, 2.4, 2.5 and 2.3 respectively.
2 Such material is reviewed in Chapter 5, with bibliography listed at § 1 n. 1.
Greek present-forming -σκω is held to be inherited from Proto-Indo-European *-skelo- (see Chapter 2), and several Greek forms seem to have been inherited. From here, the suffix continues to be used; and we might expect, from its antiquity, that it could go on in Ancient Greek either to be highly productive or to fall out of use. The former situation occurs for the inherited -σις / -τις suffix, which comes to be the standard way of forming abstract nouns in Ancient Greek; the latter is almost the case for -εις (as ὄδυστις 'of roses'), used in Homer and Mycenaean but thereafter almost entirely restricted to the isolated adjective χαριτις 'graceful' and to use in poetic vocabulary. But neither of these is the case with present-forming -σκω, which continues to be used only moderately frequently.

From Homer to Aristotle we find 62 verbs in -σκω; this thesis tries to reconstruct the suffix's development. Rather than attempt to examine all the data from Ancient Greek, however, I have examined two cross-sections of Ancient Greek. These two limited corpora, taken synchronically, are as follows. Firstly, there is Homer, which we may take to represent early Greek, despite the problems which the epic dialect raises. Secondly, Plato is taken as representative of Classical Greek, presenting as he does a large corpus of Greek prose, almost all in the form of

summaries are found at Wathelet 1973: 384-5; Ruijgh 1985: 141-5; and Keller 1992: 179-84 (σκω), 282-3 (τικ-). On Herodotean usage see Rosén 1962: 126. For works on Proto-Indo-European *-skelo- and its reflexes, which often mention Greek -σκω, see Chapter 2 § 1 and n. 2.

4Glosses in this chapter are adapted from L.S.J.

5Cf. the respective entries in e.g. Schwzyer and Debrunner 1939-71: 1.504-6, 526-8; Chantraine 1968: 275-89; 270-4; and Buck and Petersen 1944: 674-608, 460-3. On -σις / -τις see also Long 1968: 14-18, with further bibliography.

6Cf. Puhvel's (1991: 16) remarks that, unlike the preterites in -(ε)σκον (frequent in Homer), 'in Greek -σκε- verbs are notoriously limited, having never advanced beyond an embryonic and tentative productivity', a 'stunted state' that was also the case for *-skelo-; Rix (1992: 214) makes a similar comparison, but Meillet and Vendryes (1948: 241; cf. Vendryes 1911: 173-4) rather have Greek -σκω as productive.

7This total is made up of 28 verbs from Homer (Chapter 3 § 1.1.2), twelve new to Plato, including φύσκου (Chapter 7 § 1.1.2) and 22 more in Classical Greek (Chapter 9 § 1).

philosophical dialogues; other Classical verbs in -σκω are given after examination of Plato has been completed (Chapter 9 § 2).

The structure of this thesis is therefore as follows. This chapter forms an introduction to the study of Greek -σκω, briefly detailing the scholarship produced so far and the problems which the suffix poses. Thereafter the background to the Indo-European origins of *-skel/o- is given (Chapter 2), after which analysis of the Greek data proper begins.\(^9\) Firstly, there are four chapters on early Greek: Chapters 3 and 4 concern respectively the morphology and semantics of Greek presents in -σκω in Homer; Chapter 5 examines the so-called iteratives in -(ε)σκονυ, which are almost exclusive to Homer and Herodotus; and Chapter 6 gives a summary of the use of -σκ- in early Greek, with reference also to Mycenaean. Chapters 7 and 8 are the Classical counterparts to Chapters 3 and 4, detailing the morphology and semantics respectively of Greek verbs in -σκω in Plato; Chapter 9 summarises and concludes the subject of Classical Greek -σκω. Chapter 10 concludes the thesis.

2. Morphology

2.1. Outline: towards a categorisation of presents in -σκω

The suffix -σκω, also found as -ισκω, is almost entirely confined to the present stem.\(^{10}\) Several scholars give detailed morphological categorisations of different types of verbs in -σκω;\(^{11}\) none of these attempts are recent, and new work is

---

\(^9\) Although it is a matter of some relevance and no little interest, there is unfortunately no room here to deal with the tense-aspect system of Greek. This has been much discussed of late: cf. most recently, with further bibliography, Binnick 1991: 158-69; Rijksbaron 1994: 1-6; Giannakis 1997: 30-4; and Hewson and Bubenik 1997: 24-45.

\(^{10}\) Apart from the extension of the stems from ἀλλεσκ-ω 'escape' (Chapter 3 § 3.1.1), βόσκ-ω 'feed' (Chapters 3 § 3.1.2, 7 § 5.1), διδάσκ-ω 'teach' (Chapters 3 § 4.2.1, 7 § 5.2) and μισγ-ω 'mix' (Chapter 3 § 2.3), there is also the Doric perfect πέποσχα, formed after present πάσχω 'suffer' (cf. LSJ s.v. πάσχω).

evidently required. A fault more noticeable in the earlier attempts is that these
classifications place too great an emphasis on the final element of the verbal stem
before -σκ-; hence, for example, Curtius' (1846: 117) category of verbs with velar
stems, which involves grouping reduplicated πιτωσκομαι 'make ready; aim' (from
τυκ-/τυχ-) with unreduplicated λάσκω 'shout, scream' (from λακ-). A second
problem is that in all cases too wide a chronological range of verbs in -σκω is
brought together; thus Schwyzer (Schwyzer and Debrunner 1939-71: I.708) groups
inherited βάσκω 'go, come' in the same class as Hesychius' κλώσκω· κλώθω.

Nonetheless, it is evident from such work, as it is indeed from more recent but
much less detailed accounts,12 that there are three common types of these verbs: verbs
in -σκω (βά- σκω 'go, come', ἰφρ- σκω 'please'), verbs in -ισκω (ἐὑρ- ισκω
'find, find out', ἀμβλ- ισκω 'cause to miscarry'), and verbs in -σκω with
reduplication in -ι- (γι- γνω- σκω 'come to know, know', τι- τρω- σκω 'wound').
Such an analysis ignores peculiarities such as other types of reduplication – for
example, the difficult δει- δι- σκομαι 'greet, welcome'; ἰφρ- ἰφρ- ισκω 'fit
together', with 'Attic reduplication'; and ισκω 'make like, etc.', apparently from
*fee- φι- σκω. It also ignores combinations of features, as with μι- μησκω
'remind' and ἰφρ- ἰφρ- ισκω 'fit together', both with -ισκω combined with different
types of reduplication.

Nothing has yet been said here about the evolution of verbs in -σκω. The
various accounts referred to above list to a greater or lesser degree which forms seem
to have been inherited in Greek: the pattern of zero-grade of the root followed by
*-skel/o- is that generally cited, as in βάσκω 'go, come'.13 For the history of Greek
itself, we might like to know which types of verbs in -σκω occur in the various
periods, making divisions such as Homeric Greek, Classical Greek, and post-Classical

12Cf. the list of further works on -σκω given at § 1 n. 3 above.
13Cf. Vedic gācchati. See further Chapter 2 § 3.3.
Greek; and in what proportion they are found. Here the only account of help is that of Kujore (1973), who does have these three chronological categories; but he only deals with forms in -σκω which show collateral presents.

2.2. Current morphological problems

We thus stand very much in need of a detailed, diachronic, morphological analysis of Greek verbs in -σκω. It is clear that, as the ancient pattern of zero-grade of the root with *-skelo-* fell out of use, -σκ- came to be used to derive presents from other stems: cf. e.g. Koine κοπέσκω 'satiate', apparently from aorist ἐκόρεσσα, as cited by Chantraine (1991: 224). It is unclear from the literature whether denominative verbs were also formed: Ruijgh (1985: 140) states that -σκω 's’ajoute normalement à un thème verbal', but Duhoux (1992: 336) derives γενειάσκω 'begin to get a beard' from γενειάς ‘beard’ and γηράσκω ‘grow old’ from γηρας ‘old age’, not the method of derivation normally given for these forms.14 Leaving this aside, and also the difficulties raised by such aberrant forms as δειδίσκομαι, our two major problems are the morphological categories of forms with reduplication in -τ- and those in -ισκω. Nor are they mutually exclusive: μιμήσκω ‘remind’ apparently shows both these features.

2.2.1. Reduplication

A small group of forms in Homer show both -σκω and reduplication in -τ-, and this type of formation may in fact go back at least to Mycenaean.15 The problem is twofold: we do not know the origin of this set of verbs, and no convincing

14Scholars tend to derive γενειάσκω from γενειάω ‘get a beard; have a beard’ (§ 3.3 below) and γηράσκω from aorist γηρά (Chapter 3 § 7.2). Another possible example is μεθύσκω ‘make drunk’, from either μεθύω ‘be drunk’ or μέθυ ‘wine’.

15On the Mycenaean forms di-da-ka-re and de-di-<da>-ku-ja see Chapter 6 § 2.1.
explanation has yet been offered which accounts for the group as a coherent synchronic whole within Greek.

The problem of the origin will probably never be solved. It is generally said that this type may have begun with γνωσκω 'come to know, know' arising from a combination of two older forms, *gnōskō and *gignomi, a theory which may perhaps also be extended to further forms such as διδάσκω 'teach' and ἱλάσκομαι ‘appease’ (cf. Chapter 3 § 4.3).

Prehistoric developments aside, however, we are still left with the problem of Classical Greek. Here we find seven new formations, such as ἐμ-πιπάσκομαι ‘acquire’ and πιπίσκω 'make drink'. The type is still productive, therefore. What connects all these forms – some morphological or semantic factor?

Debrunner (1937: 261-3) argued that similarity in meaning between reduplication and -σκω was responsible for these creations. Similarly, Chantraine (1991: 224) says that ‘ces présent à redoublement sont expressifs et soulignent la valeur du suffixe: ils semblent exprimer une action que l’on répète pour réussir’; examples include διδάσκω ‘enseigner par les leçons répétées’. Yet this view is hardly acceptable. The interpretations of the forms given seem forced; moreover, as Niepokuj (1997: 191) notes in her criticism of Chantraine, such verbs as γνωσκω ‘come to know, know’ and διδάσκω ‘teach’ are not in contrast with any other (unmarked) forms: as she says, ‘it is difficult to see what other meaning a verb like didasko [sic] “teach” might have which did not involve some notion of repetition’.

---

16First of all at Leumann and Hofmann 1928: 314; see further Chapter 3 § 4.1.1.
17For this view cf. also Porzig 1927: 164; Kujore 1970: 72; and Bendahman 1993: 69. Debrunner has both markers as indicating iterative-intensive meaning; on this interpretation of reduplication, see Giannakis 1997: 12-14, with bibliography.
18Cf. also e.g. Meillet and Vendryes 1948: 189; and Chantraine 1968-80 s.v μιμήσκω, 1986-8: I.318.
19Cf. e.g. Debrunner’s (1937: 262) translation of οὗ γὰρ ἔγω γε / εὖ διδαγγωσκω (II. 23. 469-70) as ‘ich vermag ihn trotz wiederholter Anläufe nicht genau zu erkennen’, where Idomeneus is saying of Diomedes ‘I do not discern him clearly’.

6
Hence, διδάσκω apart, such forms do not have reduplication or -σκ- in non-present tense stems. Lastly, what of those verbs in -σκ- which show no such reduplication? Are they somehow less ‘iterative-intensive’ than those which do, so that we must gloss μεθύσκω as ‘make drunk with repeated attempts, but not as many as we would mean if we had said μμμεθύσκω instead’?

Nor does the view that reduplicated verbs in -σκω tend to be causatives seem to hold much water. Although often mentioned, it clearly fails on several levels: neither does it explain reduplicated forms that are not causative (as γινώσκω ‘come to know, know’), nor does it account for apparently causative unreduplicated forms (cf. μεθύσκω ‘make drunk’). Leumann (1957: 79-80) deals with reduplicated causative forms by reconstructing a model *ιτάσκω : έστησα : έστην, thus explaining the causative value of -βιβάσκω ‘make go’, ένδιδύσκω ‘put on’ / έκδιδύσκω ‘strip’ and πιπίσκω ‘make drink’ beside aorists έβησα : έβην, έδυσα : έδυν, έπίσα : *έπιν (see further § 3.2 below).

Two recent works on reduplication have not brought us closer to a solution. Niepokuj (1997), studying verbal reduplication in Indo-European, claims that, in Greek as in Sanskrit, present reduplication ‘seems to have little or no effect on meaning’ (1997: 9), being ‘a formal device with little or no semantic value’ (1997: 217); her solution is to try to link its original use with roots which ended in laryngeals in the parent language (cf. Niepokuj 1997: 165-97, especially 184-95). Whilst it is true that four of the seven forms in Homer which show both reduplication in -τ- and

---

20 Cf. Curtius 1846: 117; Wackernagel 1916: 18-19 n. 2; Debrunner 1937: 263; Schwyzer and Debrunner 1939-71: 1.710; Kronasser and Neu 1966-87: 1.576; Klingenschmitt 1970: 77 and 84 n. 5; Chantraine 1991: 224-5; Puhvel 1991: 17; and also Rix 1998: 480 n. 3, where the causative meaning of ἵλασκομαι ‘appease’ is said to be either from the aorist or the reduplication. Kujore (1970) and Keller (1992: 117) are critical of this view.

21 These two theories, of reduplicated verbs in -σκω as either iterative-intensives or causatives, are brought together by Giacalone Ramat (1967: 107-9), who attempts to link the two meanings.
-σκ- do derive from set roots, it must be noted that Niepokuj’s account of reduplicated verbs in -σκω (1997: 188-91) takes no note of which forms are inherited: she discusses Homeric and Classical Greek data together. In fact, the only inherited reduplicated set forms are apparently γιγνώσκω from *γνήθσκελο- and perhaps ἵλασκομαι from *σθσκελο-, which only show reduplication in Greek; little evidence, then, for an inherited pattern, as she herself notes – the reduplication is ‘possibly... a way of hypercharacterizing the forms’ (1997: 191). There are further problems for her theory due to thematic reduplicated presents, which tend not to be derived from laryngeal roots (cf. Niepokuj 1997: 188-9).

Giannakis (1997), on the other hand, examining the syntax and semantics of reduplication in Homer and Indo-European, comes to a different conclusion: present reduplication, he argues, indicates perfectivity in Homeric Greek. He deals in detail with the reduplicated forms in -σκω (1997: 229-254), concluding that ‘no single meaning can be established for the verbs of the -σκω class’ (1997: 290), some being perfective (as γιγνώσκοω), others causative (διδάσκοω). He adds that the transitive nature of some of the verbs may be due to the reduplication but that ‘intensive, conative, and habitual meanings are also seen’. He suggests that inherited iterative meaning, as is commonly reconstructed for *-skeλo- (Chapter 2 § 4.2), became ‘neutralized’ in the majority of these verbs which ‘tend to express mental or spiritual activities’. This account is however lacking on several levels. It apparently treats perfectivity and causativity as mutually exclusive phenomena, which they are not: one involves aspect, the other lexical Aktionsart and argument structure. Secondly, the list of various meanings is similar to that generally given for -σκω itself, meaning that the reduplication seems to have no role at all – which is intuitively unsatisfying. Lastly, the view that Homeric presents in -σκω showing reduplication in -τ- indicate

22 That is, γιγνώσκω, ἱλάσκομαι, κικλήσκω and μυθήσκω; cf. Chapter 3 § 4.1.
23 On causativity, see § 3.2 below, and on aspect and Aktionsart Chapter 5 § 5.1.
mental activities, also expressed by Risch (1974: 276), accounts for γιγνωσκο 'come to know, know', μιμησκο 'remind' and perhaps διδάσκο 'teach', but surely not ηλασκοματ 'appease', κικλησκο 'call, summon', πιφασκο 'make manifest, declare' or τετυσκοματ 'make ready; aim'; nor does it hold for Classical Greek (cf. e.g. ἀπο- διδασκο 'run away'). And in any case, could reduplication actually indicate mental activity in a verb? The reason for the combination of the two formants in reduplicated presents in - σκω therefore remains obscure.

2.2.2. The alternant - ἵσκω

As with reduplication combined with - σκο, two problems plague - ἵσκω: 25 we do not know its origin and cannot yet explain its use within Greek.

On the one hand, this suffix has been of especial interest in the comparative field because, apparently inexplicable within Greek itself, - ἵσκω is often taken as evidence (along with data from Hittite, Avestan, Armenian and Latin) of a proto-form *-iske/o-. Yet, as we shall see, such reconstruction is far from assured, with the only possibly inherited correspondence uncertain (cf. Chapter 2 § 3.4). Are we therefore to explain - ἵσκω as an innovation within Greek? Three explanations have been offered in this field. Two rely on the fact that three of the four Homeric presents in - ἵσκω show thematic presents in - ρ- as the last element of the verbal stem (as ἀραρ- ἵσκω : ήραρ- ον): Klingenschmitt (1982: 73-7) explains the suffix’s origin via a pre-Greek form *egriške/o-; 26 and Vine (1993) uses controversial reflexes of

24 Nonetheless, Giannakis attempts to extend this theory to κικλησκο (1997: 244-5) and πιφασκο, glossed as ‘illuminate’ (1997: 250) as well as εἷσκο ‘make like; think’ (1997: 242). The latter is especially unconvincing, not on morphological grounds (a preform *ἐῤῥίσκω is possible; cf. Chapter 3 § 5.2), but semantic: the oldest meaning is surely ‘make like’ (cf. Chapter 4 § 3.2.3).

25 We cannot know whether we are dealing with ι or ι: cf. further Klingenschmit 1982: 75-6 n. 17.

26 This would be from h.griske/o- or *h.grisheko-., found in Avestan fraēris.mnō 'awakening' (intransitive), Latin expergiscor 'awaken' (intransitive) and perhaps Albanian ngrhem 'rise up'; but on this correspondence see Chapter 2 § 3.4.
laryngeals to explain the origin of the -τ-, involving Strunk's (1969 [1970], 1970) suggested change of *TRh[C to TΩtC. Thirdly, Ruijgh (1985: 140, 148-9) has verbs that are already suffixed with *-ye/o- acquiring iterative *-sk/e/o-, leading to the peculiarly Greek -ιςκω from *-i-sk/e/o-.27 All three theories are, however, very dubious: see Chapters 2 § 3.4, 3 § 6.5 for discussion.

It is therefore not unusual for scholars to remark that the origin of -ιςκω is obscure.28 The obvious solution would surely be that it is a post-consonantal variant of -σκω. This was however not always the case in Homeric Greek (cf. πάσχω, not **παθιςκω) nor in the Classical period (cf. κυιςκομαι, not **κυςκομαι). In addition to the aforementioned pattern of present in -ιςκω beside thematic present, there is also a noticeable tendency for the former to appear beside non-present forms in -η- and -ω-: hence Homeric ἐπαυρ-ιςκομαι : ἐπαυρ-ήσομαι 'partake of, etc.', Classical ἀλ-ιςκομαι : ἀλ-ώσομαι 'be taken'.29 If the type of present in -ιςκω beside thematic aorist is ancient, however, as Klingenschmitt and Vine argue, then the occurrence beside -η- and -ω- presumably began later. Can we then chart its development? And what can the results of such study tell us about -ιςκω?

Lastly, there is the frequently noted extension of -ιςκω to verbs whose stems end in a long vowel: hence for example θυηςκω and μιμηςκω rather than θυηςκω and μιμηςκω.30 Since Schmidt's (1904) theory concerning such forms is out-of-date and unsupportable (cf. Chapter 2 § 3.4), the reason for the extension of this suffix to certain forms remains unexplained.

27Hence e.g. *wrg-ye/o- 'be at work, work' would give iterative *wrg-i-sk/e/o- 'work from time to time, habitually'.
29For data and discussion cf. Schmidt 1904, especially 26-33; Chantraine 1928: 17-19; and also e.g. Keller 1992: 282-3.
30Cf. e.g. Brugmann 1904: 520; Schwyzer and Debrunner 1939-71: 1.709-10; and Chantraine 1991: 225.
3. Semantics

3.1. Outline: the many meanings of -σκω

The problem of the semantics of -σκω is that no satisfactory value has yet been found which accounts for all the data; nor, despite work most notably by Ruipérez (1954: 130-5) and Giacalone Ramat (1967) on the function of -σκ-, has any detailed analysis yet been performed to discover what the solution might be. At first sight, we seem to be dealing with four different meanings for our suffix: causative, inchoative, iterative and zero. A further option is that -σκω actually shows none of these; the scholars who advocate this view have a reconstructed meaning for Indo-European *-σκε/ο- which they claim also to be that of Greek -σκω.31

3.2. Causative

Several scholars cite causative meaning32 for certain forms of Greek -σκω, such as μεθοσκω ‘make drunk’ (beside μεθω ‘be drunk’) and πιτισκω ‘make drink’ (beside πινω ‘drink’);33 there seems, however, to be good evidence that -σκω did not actually have this meaning. As noted above (§ 2.2.1), Leumann (1957: 79-80) argues that such reduplicated causative forms as -βιβσκω ‘make go’, πιτισκω

31Two further suggestions have not gained acceptance. Firstly, Curtius (1846: 116) argued for desiderative meaning for certain forms, because he linked Latin -sc- and Greek -σκ- with the Sanskrit desiderative suffix (Curtius 1846: 115-16) rather than the later accepted -ccha- (cf. e.g. Curtius 1877-80: I.271-3, and in general Chapter 2 § 2.2). Secondly, Puhvel (1991: 16) suggests that some cases ‘may have a durative tinge beside alternative present stems’: he cites χασκω ‘be agape’: χαινω ‘yawn’; and γανύσκωμαι ‘be glad’: γάνυματι ‘rejoice’. However, χαινω seems to be a post-Classical replacement of the earlier χάσκω (cf. Veitch 1887 s.v. χάσκω; Kujore 1973: 212 n. 10; and LSJ s.v. χάσκω); and, conversely, γανύσκομαι is apparently a late variant of Homeric and Classical γάνυματι (cf. Veitch 1887 s.v. γάνυματι; LSJ s.vv. γάνυματι, γανύσκομαι).

32A causative is said to denote that someone is caused to perform an action: an extra argument is added as causer, and placed in subject position; cf. e.g. Comrie 1992; and Palmer 1994: 214.

'make drink', and ἐκδιδόσκω 'put on' / ἐκδιδόσκω 'strip' derive their meaning from their respective causative sigmatic aorists. He is followed by Szemerényi (1964: 67-8), who in turn derives unreduplicated causative actives in -σκω from their medio-passive\textsuperscript{34} counterparts in -σκομαί: hence μεθύσκω 'make drunk' from μεθύσκομαι 'become drunk'. Kujore (1970: 73-4) notes both these possibilities, and adds that some verbs in Greek are both transitive and intransitive, as ἰζω, ἰζάνω, both 'sit' and 'make to sit', claiming this as the reason for the double use of βάσκω, apparently both 'go' and 'make go'.\textsuperscript{35}

Leumann's postulated model of *ιστάσκω (§ 2.2.1 above) is required on morphological grounds, because we cannot explain the reduplication: from aorist ἔπισκα we would expect a present in -σκω to be **πίσκω. Szemerényi's method of derivation is also semantically acceptable, although the reason for forming medio-passives in certain contexts is left unclear: κυίσκομαι 'conceive, become pregnant' and various other forms in -σκομαί are said to be linked with 'the notion of personal involvement' (1964: 67-8), whence the formation of causative actives.\textsuperscript{36} In fact, these are instances of the so-called 'causative alternation', where we find pairs of the form 'cause to become X': 'become X', as in English he broke the vase : the vase broke. In English, the two verbs in such pairs are often formally identical, as in the latter example.\textsuperscript{37} In Greek, voice is used to distinguish the alternants, so that we find

\textsuperscript{34}The term 'medio-passive' is used throughout this thesis to indicate jointly the (traditionally differentiated) middle and passive; the terms 'middle' and 'passive' are retained to indicate morphological distinctions, as between aorists in -σάμην and -θην and futures in -σομαι and -θησομαι, following Rijksbaron (1994: 131-2). On the problems of the middle / passive distinction see also Duhoux 1992: 103-4.

\textsuperscript{35}On causativity as secondary for -σκω cf. also Kujore 1973: 258; and Keller 1992: 184.

\textsuperscript{36}For the observation that causative actives may be formed off intransitive medio-passives, see Benveniste 1950, followed by e.g. Bader 1968: 50; Jacquinod 1989: 197; and Keller 1992: 118-19.

\textsuperscript{37}For an introduction to the subject of the causative alternation, see e.g. Parsons 1990: 105-7; Haspelmath 1993, especially 90-96; Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1995: 79-80; and also Palmer 1994: 143. English is often ambiguous between stative and inchoative interpretations: so, although the
causative active beside medio-passive inchoative, the latter having a morphologically passive aorist; examples include causative τῆκω 'melt, make molten': inchoative τῆκομαι, ἐτάκτην 'melt, become molten'; and ῥῆγνυμι 'break, make broken': ῥῆγνυμαι, ἔρραγην 'break, become broken'. Hence it is not surprising to find causative actives in -σκω beside inchoatives in -σκομαι, as μεθύσκω 'make drunk': μεθύσκομαι 'become drunk'. Yet this observation has never been mentioned in the context of verbs in -σκω, and although there is abundant evidence for this pattern it leaves unexplained such anomalies as ἄναβισκομαι (which means both inchoative 'come back to life' and causative 'bring back to life') and inchoative actives such as γηράσκω 'grow old'.

3.3. Inchoative

Inchoative meaning is most commonly cited for -σκω regarding the three forms γηράσκω 'grow old', ἥβασκω 'come to puberty' and γενειάσκω 'begin to get a beard'; the first of these, found since Homer, is said to be the source of the others, which occur beside the stative ἥβασσω 'be in the prime of youth' and γενειάω 'get a beard; have a beard'. There are, in fact, more cases than these: also quite

---

*door is open* is clearly stative and *the door is opened* inchoative, the *vase is broken* can mean either 'the vase becomes broken' or 'the vase is in the state resulting from getting broken'.

38 In the aorist, where morphologically 'middle' and 'passive' forms are formally distinct, inchoatives therefore take the latter form, being in -θῆν; aorists in -σάμην tend to be transitive. For earlier discussions cf. e.g. Schwyzer and Debrunner 1939-71: II.230, 233-4; Popescu 1962: 30-1; and more recently Klaiman 1991: 92-5; Duhoux 1992: 109-10; Bakker 1994: 30-2, 38-9; and Rijksbaron 1994: 148-52. The matter is connected with the function of the medio-passive, which may be to indicate that the event denoted by the verb affects its subject in some way: cf. Klaiman 1991: 92, 315; Bakker 1994: 24; Palmer 1994: 150; and Rijksbaron 1994: 150.

39 Inchoativity involves entrance into a state for the subject: cf. Bybee 1992: 145, who opposes it to inceptivity (onset of a dynamic rather than stative situation), and § 3.2 above on the causative-inchoative alternation.

40 Cf. e.g. Curtius 1846: 114; Schwyzer and Debrunner 1939-71: I.708; Giacalone Ramat 1967: 114-15; Berrettoni 1971: 95-6; Kuiper 1973: 254, 258-9; Wathelet 1973: 385; Ruijgh 1985: 145; Chantraine
commonly cited are κυσκοματι ‘conceive, become pregnant’ and μεθύσκομαι ‘make drunk’;⁴¹ Kujore (1973: 259) adds αναβίωσκοματι ‘come back to life’, -φαύσκω / -φώσκω ‘shine’, and less certainly οίδισκοματι ‘swell’.

As with the causatives, the inchoatives in -σκω seem to form a rather small set, and the meaning can in some cases at least be ascribed to voice. Despite inchoative meanings for reflexes of *-skel-o- in Latin and Avestan, it does not seem that the meaning was inherited;⁴² hence the occasional attempts to ascribe inchoative value to Greek -σκω⁴³ have not been accepted.⁴⁴

3.4. Iterative

Iterative meaning⁴⁵ is usually claimed for the set of forms in -(ε)σκον, as in θέσκον ‘ran repeatedly’ (II. 20.229). Forms showing it count as part of another verb’s paradigm rather than verbs in their own right: that is, θέσκον is the ‘iterative’ of θέω ‘run’ (II. 13.141, etc.). The suffix -(ε)σκον is productive in Homer and also Herodotus, and hence is normally said to be of Ionic provenance.⁴⁶ Some scholars have attempted to extend iterative meaning to present-forming -σκω, most notably Giacalone Ramat (1967), who has -σκω denoting ‘un’azione intensiva ed iterativa’ (1967: 106-7).⁴⁷ However, the presents in -σκω and the preterites in -(ε)σκον differ

---

⁴¹Scholars who cite either of these are Vendryes 1911: 173-4; Meillet and Vendryes 1948: 290; Allen 1980: 34; Ruijgh 1985: 145; Chantraine 1991: 225; and Puhvel 1991: 16.
⁴²The difficulty is that, in languages where inchoative meaning is found for reflexes of *-skel-o-, the oldest forms never show it: cf. Chapter 2 § 4.2.
⁴⁵Scholars who cite either of these are Vendryes 1911: 173-4; Meillet and Vendryes 1948: 290; Allen 1980: 34; Ruijgh 1985: 145; Chantraine 1991: 225; and Puhvel 1991: 16.
⁴⁶Cf. Stolpe 1849: 9; Brugmann and Delbrück 1893-1916: IV.61; and Allen 1980: 34.
⁴⁷An iterative indicates that ‘the action of the verb is repeated’ (Bybee 1992: 145), so that the iterative of ‘do X’ is ‘do X repeatedly’.
⁴⁸On these forms see further Chapter 5.
⁴⁹Cf. also Stolpe 1849; and, following Giacalone Ramat, Berrettoni 1971: 96-7 n. 10, 98 and n. 13.
markedly in form -(ί)σκ- beside -(ε)σκ-); in function (the latter are very clearly ‘iterative-(intensive)’); and in level of productivity (so that presents in -σκω may acquire their own iteratives, as βοσκέσκονθ’ ‘they used to graze’ (Od. 12.355)).

The preterites are therefore a very different phenomenon, and it seems inadvisable to ascribe iterative meaning to -σκω on their account.

3.5. Zero meaning

Zero value is also said to occur for -σκω, when it appears to function merely as a present formant. Scholars who cite this function as occurring for a subset of forms, however, include, along with such instances as φάσκω ‘say’ and εὑρίσκω ‘find, find out’, others where -σκω could be argued to have some meaning: hence Curtius (1846: 114) cites τιτρώσκω ‘wound’ (causative), and Puhvel (1991: 16-17) κτέσκω ‘make like, etc.’ (causative) and θησκω ‘die’ (inchoative) as examples of ‘zero’ -σκω.

One school of thought, begun by Ruipérez (1954: 130-5), assigns ‘zero’ present-forming value to -σκ- in all its forms. He argues that the meaning of -σκ- is ‘claramente durativo’ (1954: 135), for both presents in -σκω and ‘iteratives’ in -(ε)σκον. He comes to this conclusion after a brief discussion of four minimal pairs where a present with -σκ- is found beside a present without it: γενειάσκω : γενειάω; γηράσκω : γηράω; ήβάσκω : ήβαω; and στερίσκω, στερίσκομαι : στερέω, στέρομαι. Regarding the forms in -(ε)σκον, Ruipérez argues that the frequent iterative meaning is a realisation of the durative meaning, emphasising the so-called ‘intensives’ such as ναίεσκον ‘used to live’. A similar claim for durative meaning for -σκ- is made by Duhoux (1992: 336), and Ruipérez is followed by Keller (1992: 184-5).

This account is, however, unsatisfactory. Giacalone Ramat (1967: 114-15) criticises Ruipérez’s analysis of the minimal pairs for not taking account of changes
which took place in Greek from Homer to the Hellenistic period: γηράσκω, she claims, meant (inchoative) ‘become old’ not (stative) ‘be old’ in Homer, whereas in the same period ἡβάσκω was (stative) ‘be young’. Berrettoni (1971: 96-7 n. 10), following Giacalone Ramat, claims in addition that Greek did not show the same stative / inchoative pairs as Latin examples such as seneō ‘be old’ : senēscō ‘grow old’, so that γηράσκω could show both meanings. Yet it was noted above that many cite ἡβάσκω as the inchoative of ἡβάσκω (§ 3.3). Ruipérez’s conclusion that - (e)σκον is a marker of durativity is also unconvincing, based as it is on the small number of so-called ‘intensive’ forms – which are, conversely, usually explained as a subset of the ‘iteratives’. Further examination, especially of the minimal pairs, is therefore required.

3.6. Other suggestions: -σκω from *-skelo-

We have seen that some scholars ascribe inchoative meaning to -σκω on the basis of Latin; others have similarly used external data in their reconstructions, giving the same value to -σκω as they do for their version of reconstructed *-skelo-. In this vein, Delbrück (Brugmann and Delbrück 1893-1916: IV.61) has inherited forms βάσκω and ἐρχομαι as ‘terminative’, but he cannot extend this meaning to all other forms in -σκω. Similarly, Chantraine (1986-8: I.318) claims that older forms in Homer show ‘déterminé’ meaning, which he regards as inherited, as in βάσκω ‘se mettre en route’; he elsewhere cites this form in connection with the statement that *-skelo- ‘souligne la durée de l’action, en même temps qu’il en envisage l’aboutissement’ (Chantraine 1991: 223).

On the other hand, Porzig (1927: 161-4) extended his definition that ‘das verbale sko-Formans meint Handlungen oder Vorgänge als sich ruckweise in

48 Cf. e.g. Giacalone Ramat 1967: 117, and further Chapter 5 § 5, especially 5.2.2.
49 For not dissimilar criticisms of Ruipérez’s treatment of the pairs μιμω : μενω and ισχω : ἔχω, see Giannakis 1997: 16-17.
The lack of a recent overview of the possible functions of Proto-Indo-
European *-skel-o- makes it difficult to comment on these proposals: are such claims 
concerning inherited meaning justified? In fact, as we shall see (Chapter 2 § 4), the 
problem of the semantics of *-skel-o- is fraught with difficulty: many different 
suggestions have been made, but we can be certain of none. To ascribe a value to 
Greek -σκω on account of a doubtful reconstructed value of *-skel-o- is therefore a 
methodologically unsound procedure; to back up this conclusion, detailed evidence 
from Greek would be required.

3.7. Summary: the meaning of -σκω

Given four apparently attested meanings and further suggestions owing to 
reconstruction, it is no surprise that there is much confusion concerning the function 
of -σκω. Some scholars simply say that no one overall meaning can be discerned.50 
It is often implied that we must accept them all: so, for example, Szemerényi (1964: 
67) states that ‘The suffix -σκ- was exploited with an intensive, frequentative and 
even inchoative function’; Kujore (1970: 72, 1973: 96) lists iterative, intensive and 
inchoative functions; and Allen (1980: 3) has iterative-intensives and a few 
inchoatives. Also comparable is Giannakis’ (1997: 290) remark that reduplicated 
verbs in -σκω are causative, intensive, conative and habitual. As Kujore (1973: 96) 
notes, the meanings which Greek -σκ- shows occur in the other Indo-European 
languages for reflexes of *-skel-o-; in fact, if we take the four main meanings listed 
above, we see that each occurs in a language where *-skel-o- becomes productive: 
causative in Tocharian, inchoative-progressive in Latin, iterative-durative in Hittite

50 Cf. Curtius 1846: 114; Risch 1974: 276; Puhvel 1991: 17, who refers to ‘tentative semantic nuances’; 
and Sihler 1995: 506, who compares the problem to that of Sanskrit -ccha-. 
and zero in Armenian. Are we then dealing with an inherited variety, or has Greek innovated? If the latter, then to what extent can we trace the developments?

4. Conclusion: the problem of -σκω

We may summarise as follows. There has been little work on Greek presents in -σκω, a fact which seems all the more remarkable when one considers the formidable series of both morphological and semantic problems set out here: on neither level does the suffix seem to be at all predictable.

Regarding form, there are two evident added factors, reduplication and presuffixal -τ-. Hence, while our Indo-European data lead us to expect βάσκω (Vedic gáchati, etc.), we should be surprised to find that *γνώσκω (Latin (g)nōscō, etc.) has been reformed to γιγνώσκω, a member of a sub-group of other reduplicated verbs in -σκω found from Homer (and apparently Mycenaean) onwards. Nor is the addition of -τ- into a new form -ίσκω explicable, since the positing of Indo-European *-is£e/o- is quite a dubious proposition (Chapter 2 § 3.4), and it seems that we cannot claim that -ίσκω was a postconsonantal variant. The combination of both perplexing factors in μιμήσκομαι can only make matters worse, even if the further reduplicated forms in -ίσκω ἀποφιάσκω ‘cheat’ and ἀροφιάσκω ‘fit together’ are simply derived from their own reduplicated aorists (cf. e.g. Chantraine 1991: 225).

The semantic problems seem even more perplexing. Broadly speaking, Hittite, Latin, Tocharian and Armenian show *-skel(o- as a productive formant with the prevalent meanings respectively of iterative-durative, inchoative-progressive, causative and zero – that is, one each. Yet Ancient Greek -σκ- shows all four meanings: for example, Homeric iterative preterite θέεσκον ‘used to run’ (II. 20.229; cf. θέω ‘run’); inchoative γενειάσκω ‘begin to get a beard’ (γενειάω ‘get a beard; have a beard’); causative μεθόσκω ‘make drunk’ (μεθύω ‘be drunk’); and zero εὑρίσκω ‘find’ (future εὑρήσω ‘will find’). Can it be reasonable to assume that all
these meanings existed for *-skel/o- in the parent language, and that only Greek has continued the situation? Or has Greek innovated? Iterative meaning seems restricted to an apparently dialectal phenomenon (the Ionic iterative preterites), unless we accept it for the reduplicated formations also (διδάσκω ‘teach’); the other three occur for -σκ- as present suffix (cf. γηράσκω ‘grow old’, μεθύσκω ‘make drunk’ and εὑρίσκω ‘find’).

A detailed historical account is therefore clearly required, both for the morphology and the semantics of -σκω.
Chapter 2
The Indo-European Background

1. Introduction

Before proceeding to an examination of the Greek data, it is first of all necessary to review the role of the ancestor of -σκω, Proto-Indo-European *-skel/o-. In this chapter, I shall first of all give a brief overview of the evidence for *-skel/o- outside Greek (§ 2). Due to the recent in-depth morphological study of pre-classical Latin verbs in -scō by Keller (1992), a full analytical review of Indo-European *-skel/o- is not needed. She gives a thorough account of reflexes of the inherited suffix outside Latin (1992: 169-90), also dealing with the evidence for the less certain suffix *-iske/o- in Armenian, Avestan, Greek and Hittite (1992: 279-87); for further research, reference may also be made to her copious bibliography (1992: 450-78). (General views of the Greek data have already been given in Chapter 1, and will be further discussed in the remainder of this thesis.) Thereafter, I shall turn to the subject of the morphology of *-skel/o- (§ 3), with details of possible reconstructions, the internal morphology of *-skel/o- and the controversial subject of *-iske/o-; here again, Keller’s summaries are invaluable. Lastly (§ 4), I shall review the subject of the meaning of *-skel/o-., a detailed account of which has not lately been given.

1Occasional items are omitted, and there has of course been further research since Keller; these will be referred to as they arise.
This chapter therefore consists of a review of what is currently assumed. Although it thus contains nothing new, it is a necessary precursor to the study of the Greek evidence. On the other hand, as will be seen from the examination of Greek data offered in Chapters 3-9, it is clear that any attempt at a thorough analysis of Indo-European is premature: even in a language such as Ancient Greek, which is among the most studied ancient languages, a number of facts are unknown and a number of currently held assumptions wrong. Consequently, although it is necessary to have some idea of the possible background, not much faith can be put in any set of data which have not been freshly explored.

2. The data: reflexes of *ske/o- outside Greek, and their usage

Reflexes of the deverbal suffix *ske/o- are to be found in all well-preserved branches of the Indo-European language family. Apart from its use in Greek, it is productive in Hittite, Armenian, Latin and Tocharian, and to a more limited degree in Iranian. A few verbs use the suffix to form presents in Old Indic. Traces of the suffix also appear to occur in Albanian, Baltic, Slavic, Celtic, Germanic and further Anatolian and Italic languages; in all such cases, reflexes of *ske/o- occur rarely and show no specific function, generally becoming extended to the whole conjugation of the verbs on which they are found.3

In order to assess in what way Ancient Greek -ske/o- relates to Indo-European *ske/o-, an overview of this suffix’s reflexes within the individual languages is required. As mentioned above, the following account will make reference most of all to the overviews already made by Keller (1992) of *ske/o- and *iske/o-. I deal firstly with those branches where *ske/o- becomes a productive suffix (Anatolian, 3Cf. Keller 1992: 169. This situation appears to have a parallel in the descendants of Latin -sc- in Romance: Allen (1980: 5) notes that they are used to indicate present, durative and inchoative when restricted to the present system, whereas in Spanish the suffix has spread throughout the paradigm and tends to lack these meanings.
Indo-Iranian, Armenian, Latin and Tocharian); and then, more briefly, with languages where traces of *-ske/o- are found. Evidence for *-iske/o- is considered under the relevant group.

2.1. Anatolian⁴

Hittite shows a deverbative and denominative thematic suffix of the form -ški/a-, also occurring as -iški/a-. This may be added to almost any verb,⁵ often on the zero-grade. Hence we find azzik(k)i/a- (via *ad-ški/a-) from ed- 'eat' and akkuški/a- from eku-/aku- 'drink'; the suffix is used in both the present and the preterite. The literature on this productive formation is very large, with several individual studies and all grammars of Hittite discussing the formation.⁶ Inherited verbs are hard to detect: possibly of such antiquity are āraskizzi 'arrive repeatedly' (perhaps related to Vedic recchāti, Greek ἐρχόμοιτα, etc.) and uški/a- 'see' (perhaps related to Vedic ucchāti 'shine', etc.).⁷

A notable morphological feature is the association of -sk- with reduplication, which at first sight appears to indicate a connection with similar formations in Greek. In Hittite, however, it seems that the suffix was used to recharacterise already reduplicated forms, where the old affix had lost its meaning; hence such forms as memiški/a- from mema-/-iya- 'say', both found in Old Hittite.⁸

According to some, Hittite shows evidence for a related suffix *-iske/o-.⁹ Here the situation is complicated by the fact that it is often impossible to know where we should read /-esk-/ and where /-isk-/. Most forms in -iški/a- are formed off stems in

⁴Cf. further Keller 1992: 186-9 (on *-ske/o-), 285-7 (*-iske/o-).
⁵For exceptions see Oettinger 1979: 329.
⁷On these etymologies see further § 3.1 below.
⁹Cf. in general Keller 1992: 285-7, with further bibliography.
-(i)ye- (Old Hittite) and -(i)ya- (New Hittite), such as anniški/a- (as well as anneški/a- and annieški/a-) from an(n)iya- ‘work, perform’, with forms in -anniški/a- deriving from duratives in -anna-; the same type of formation occurs in Latin, where forms in -isco(r) are formed off ones in -io(r), as scisciō from sciō. Other forms show -i-, however, where the stem before the suffix ends in a velar, labial or laryngeal, such as appiški/a- from ep(p)-/ap(p)- ‘take, seize’. There have been several suggestions as to the origin of -isk/a-: that it arose due to spelling problems, that it included an anaptyctic vowel, and that it began with those forms derived from ones in -iya-.

Melchert (1984) has argued, however, that these data are to be explained within Hittite, via three phonological developments: ai became e, and ye was syncopated to i before -šk- (i.e. -aišk- > -ešk- (hatrai-šk- > hatrešk-), -yešk- > -išk-, 1984: 102), and an anaptyctic vowel i arose between a consonant and following -šk- (*-C-šk- > -Cišk-, 1984: 133). The differences were still felt in Old Hittite, but in New Hittite -ešk- and -išk- were confused, so that there verbs in -ye- can show -ešk- as well as -išk- (1984: 147-8).10

The Hittite forms are usually referred to as iteratives, although in fact the situation is much more complicated than this: scholars are principally divided between ascribing the Hittite suffix durative or iterative meaning, and dissent has also been expressed over these.11 This difference of opinion is parallel to the debate over the Ionic Greek preterites in -(e)aKOV.12 Puhvel (1991: 16), however, notes that there also seem to be relics of non-iterative-durative meaning in Hittite, such as iški- ‘salve’ (*is-ske-) and duški- ‘be glad (*tus-ske-).

---

10 Keller (1992: 286-7), however, is in favour of linking Hittite -išk- with possible relics of *-iške/o- found in other languages.

11 For the former cf. e.g. Bechtel 1936, and for the latter Dressler 1968; see further the summary at Keller 1992: 187-8, with bibliography; and also Szemerényi 1996: 274 n. 6.

12 On the possible connection between these formations, see further Chapter 5 § 7.
Apparently related iterative formations also occur in other Anatolian languages. Keller (1992: 188-9) states that Palaic shows -šk-, but Luvian -s(s)- and Lycian -s-, and that the latter two suffixes may not be descendants of *-ššelo- but instead related to a separate suffix, realised as -šš- in Hittite (as in īšš(a)-, ešš(a)- from īya-/i-‘make’). The matter is disputed: Oettinger (1979: 507-511) links -šš- with desiderative *-šel/o-.

There may be further evidence for the former view in Melchert’s (1987) observation that inherited *k gives, at least before a front vowel, Luvian z, so equating Luvian -za- with Hittite -ške-, and Luvian -s(s)- with Hittite -šš-; Melchert (1987: 198-201) also suggests that the Tocharian suffixes show a parallel. In this case, Hieroglyphic Luvian verbs such as IRA-laza- ‘(be)come angry’ and asaza- ‘speak’, and Cuneiform Luvian kappilazza- ‘become angry’, would show -za- via *-sza- from *-ššelo-.

2.2. Indo-Iranian

Indo-European *-ššelo- gives Old Indic -(c)cha- and Old Iranian -sa-. Six forms are shared by both branches, occurring in Vedic Sanskrit and at least one Iranian language: Vedic prccháti, Old Avestan praxa- ‘ask’, Old Persian prsāmiy ‘punish’; Vedic iccháti, Young Avestan isaiti ‘seek’; Vedic gácchati, Young Avestan jasaiti ‘come’; Vedic ṛcháti, Old Persian -rsatiy ‘come’; Vedic uccháti ‘shine’, Young Avestan usaiti- ‘the shining one’; and Vedic yácchati, Young Avestan -yasaiti ‘hold’, Old Persian āyasatā ‘take for oneself’. Of these, all are deverbatives and all

---

13We also find forms such as ešššik-, where the productive suffix -šk- is added to the non-productive -šš-.

14On the postulated link between *-s- and *-šk-, see further § 3.2 below.


16On the two variants -cha- and -ccha- see Burrow 1973: 94; and also Keller 1992: 176 n. 56.
but the last appear to be Indo-European formations.\textsuperscript{17} In addition, we find the inherited Old Persian \textit{x\texttheta n\texttheta s\texttheta a-} (Greek \textit{γιγῳςκω}, etc.); the Iranian pair of Young Avestan \textit{tar\texttheta s\texttheta a\texttheta i\texttheta i} and Old Persian \textit{tars\texttheta a\texttheta i\texttheta i};\textsuperscript{18} and lastly the Vedic participle \textit{micch\texttheta m\texttheta \texttheta na-}, of uncertain meaning but perhaps cognate with Greek \textit{μιςγω}, etc.\textsuperscript{19} It has also been claimed that Young Avestan shows evidence for inherited \textit{*-is\texttheta e/o-} in the form \textit{f\textgamma r\textnu is\texttheta m\textnu n\texttheta o} ‘awakening’ (intransitive) beside Latin \textit{expergiscor} ‘awaken’ (intransitive) from \textit{*h\textnu gr-s\texttheta e/o-}.\textsuperscript{20}

Sanskrit only shows half a dozen verbs in \textit{-(e)cha-} in addition to those already listed.\textsuperscript{21} The Indic forms are split between two of the ten Sanskrit verb classes: only some have the accent on the suffix, as expected, others showing it, apparently by analogy, on the root instead.\textsuperscript{22} Hence for example \textit{pr\texttheta c\textnu \texttheta h\texttheta a\texttheta i\texttheta i} ‘ask’ (Class VI) but \textit{g\textacute{a}c\texttheta c\texttheta a\texttheta i} ‘go’ (Class I). The suffix \textit{-(e)cha-} is sometimes extended to other parts of the verb (as with \textit{pr\texttheta c\textnu \texttheta h\texttheta a\texttheta i\texttheta i}, perfect \textit{papraccha}).\textsuperscript{23}

Some scholars have ascribed a specific function to Indic \textit{-(e)cha-}: Thumb and Hauschild refer to the forms as ‘Inchoativbildungen’ (1953-9: I/1.308; cf. also I/2.232-3), while Renou (1952: 271) and Gonda (1971: 89-90) have them as iterative-intensive.\textsuperscript{24} On the other hand, several other scholars find no semantic link between these verbs at all.\textsuperscript{25}

\textsuperscript{17}On the five inherited formations, see § 3.1 below, and on \textit{y\textacute{a}c\texttheta c\texttheta a\texttheta i} and \textit{-yas\texttheta a\texttheta i\texttheta i} see Mayrhofer 1986-s.v. \textit{YAM}; and Rix 1998: 276.
\textsuperscript{18}On the former, see § 3.1; on the latter, § 3.1 n. 111.
\textsuperscript{19}Cf. Chapter 3 § 2.3.
\textsuperscript{20}Cf. Keller 1992: 281-2; on this etymology see further §§ 3.1, 3.4 below.
\textsuperscript{21}See further Keller 1992: 178, and 178 n. 84 for other possibly connected forms.
\textsuperscript{22}Cf. especially Bartholomae 1907: 162-4 and Gotô 1987: 73 n. 45, as well as e.g. Renou 1952: 271; Gonda 1971: 89; Burrow 1973: 329, 330; and Keller 1992: 195 n. 188.
\textsuperscript{23}Cf. further Keller 1992: 179.
\textsuperscript{24}For these and other opinions on \textit{*-s\texttheta e/o-} see § 4.2 below.
Common Indo-Iranian verbs have been mentioned above; also notable in the Iranian branch is a set of mostly later Avestan verbs in the suffix -sa-, usually derived from statives; these are (usually active) inchoatives. Hence from tap- ‘be hot’, tafsaiti ‘become hot’; in this case, as often, there is a contrast with a causative form (tāpāitā-). From this set, there later occurred an extension of the inchoative suffix -sa- in Middle Iranian.

2.3. Armenian

The situation in Armenian is complicated. Here, the expected continuation of *-sk- and -sk- is generally acknowledged as -c‘- and *-skē/o- and *-iskē/o- have been suggested as responsible for a variety of supposed Armenian reflexes: present indicative suffixes -c‘- and -c″-, the aorist indicative suffix -c‘-, the causative suffix -oyc‘- and the present and aorist subjunctive formant -ic‘-.

In the present, the only correspondence with a form in *-skē/o- is hayc‘em ‘seek, ask, demand, want’, cognate with Vedic icchāti, etc., apparently with secondary full-grade and ultimately from *h₂is-skē/o-; we also find harc’anem ‘ask’, aorist (from the imperfect) eharc‘ (Rix 1998: 442 and n. 5), related to poscō from *pṛk-skē/o-; luc’anem ‘ignite, burn’ may also be connected with an inherited present in *-skē/o-. The type in -c’anem is apparently continued by further forms in Armenian, but the similarity to Greek -σκόμω seems to be a coincidence.


Cf. Kellens 1984: 179 n. 88, with further bibliography. According to Kellens (1984: 150), there is also a small class of verbs expressing the notion of exchanging, e.g. ḍrā- ‘offer’, present ṛāsa-.

Cf. further Keller 1992: 185-6 (on *-skē/o-), 284 (*-iskē/o-).


On the problem of the root-grade here see § 3.3 below.

On this form, however, see § 3.1 n. 111 below.

Cf. Keller 1992: 185-6. For details of reconstructions see § 3.1 below, and on the possible combinatory uses of *-skē/o- § 3.3 below.
It has also been suggested that another present-forming suffix, -c'-, is a realisation of a combination of *-sk£e/o- and *-ye/o-, or perhaps of *-sk- alone;\(^ {33}\) in this case, present čanač'em ‘know’ would ultimately be, via assimilation from *canac'em, from *ghan-sk£e/o-, and alač'em ‘suppress, pray’ might be from *s[h]-sk£e/o-.\(^ {34}\) Middle suffix -č'i- is taken by Klingenschmitt (1982: 69-83) from *-č'ih'i-, in turn derived from *-č-sk£e/o-—that is, the stative suffix *-č- followed by *-sk£e/o-—in preference to an Indo-European *-is£e/o-.\(^ {35}\) He links middle form hangč'i- ‘rest’ with Latin quiēscō, deriving the former from *k'ih₁-sk£e/o- (1982: 69-70), but the etymology is not accepted by Keller (1992: 138-9).

The suffix *-sk£e/o- is also usually linked with the aorist formant -c'-, the only type of suffixed aorist in Armenian,\(^ {36}\) comparison often also being made with the Ionic Greek iterative preterites in -(e)σκού.\(^ {37}\) The only dissenter has been Klingenschmitt (1982: 286-7), who derives this use of -c'- from *-ss-, a form of the sigmatic aorist suffix *-s-; but this is not at all certain.\(^ {38}\)

It has also been argued that the productive Armenian causative suffixes -uc'αnem (present), -uc'i (aorist, with third person singular -oyc') are connected with *-sk£e/o-,\(^ {39}\) but this has been disputed.\(^ {40}\) Therefore, despite the fact that reflexes of *-sk£e/o- sometimes show causative sense (most notably in Tocharian, and perhaps also in Greek), no link with Armenian can be established here.


\(^ {34}\) For the former, cf. § 3.1 below; for the latter, perhaps ultimately the source of Greek Ἴλασκομι, see further Chapter 3 § 4.1.5.

\(^ {35}\) On *-č-sk£e/o- see further § 3.3 below.


\(^ {37}\) The most recent work on this subject is by Clackson (1994: 75-83), who argues strongly against it; see further Chapter 5 § 3.


Lastly, there is the Armenian subjunctive, which almost always shows the suffix -ic' (-yc') cf. berem 'bear', aorist subjunctive beric', present beric'em.\textsuperscript{41} Keller (1992: 284) follows Godel in finding the origin of the aorist subjunctive in present suffix *-iske/o-, and de Lamberterie in forming the present subjunctive off the latter by analogy with the present indicative, with the suffix acquiring modal force. Other suggestions to account for the data do exist, however: Meillet (1936: 122) has the Armenian subjunctive created from the athematic form of the Indo-European optative marker *-i- followed by *-skē/o-;\textsuperscript{42} and, more recently, Klingenschmitt (1982: 42-4) has suggested a derivation from *-se/o-, again with a doubled *-ss-, which he extends to the present subjunctive to explain -c' there also.

2.4. Italic

In Latin, the inherited suffix *-skē/o- also becomes productive. A thorough and largely morphological study of Latin verbs in -scō up to 100 BC was undertaken by Keller (1992); there is also further recent work on the subject, and in addition she omits a doctoral thesis by Allen (1980), which details the development of Latin -isc/-ESC- into Romance.\textsuperscript{43}

The Latin suffix -sc- is almost always restricted to the infectum, with only rare occurrences in the perfectum (peposcī / poposcī from poscō and compescū from compescō); indeed, some verbs, such as glīscō, show no perfectum at all.\textsuperscript{44} Scholars have hence debated whether Latin verbs in -sc- therefore either share the perfectum of

\textsuperscript{42}Cf. also Keller 1992: 284 n. 26.
\textsuperscript{43}For earlier brief accounts see Meillet and Vendryes 1948: 280-1; Ernout 1953: 132-3; and Leumann et al. 1965-79: I.535-539, II.298, with bibliography; on denominatives in -sc- see Mignot 1969: 145-228.
\textsuperscript{44}On these rare types see Keller 1992: VII-VIII, 439-40. Allen (1980: 11) also cites perfect callīscērunt from callēscō 'get thick skin, become insensitive'.
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their base or simply do not have perfectum forms. In one case, a verb in -scō comes to be in -sceō, the 'regular' misceō, miscuit.\(^{46}\)

Latin shows at least four forms in -sc- which seem to be the descendants of inherited forms: (g)nōscō 'get to know', misceō 'mix', escit / escunt from sum 'be', pāscor / pāscō 'feed' and poscō 'demand'.\(^{47}\) A few further forms show -scō added directly to the stem.\(^{48}\)

It has also been claimed that there is evidence for a suffix *-iskeo- in Latin. Here the most important form is expergiscor 'awaken' (intransitive), which has been linked to Young Avestan frayrisannō 'awakening' (intransitive); see further §§ 3.1, 3.4 below. There are many more Latin forms in -isc-.\(^{49}\) According to Keller (and contrary to the general view), the -i- of -isc- is not uniformly long; rather, the forms of this set seem to come from various sources (Keller 1992: 202-4). They are only sometimes evidently derived from other Latin form in -i-, as scīscō from sciō (1992: 205-27); more usually, they apparently do not have such a base, as ulcīscor from *ulc-tus (which gives ultus) (1992: 229-65). Lastly, some verbs apparently show a suffix -nīsk-.\(^{50}\)

\(^{45}\) Hence e.g. scīscō and sciō beside sceūi, but nanciscor, with no non-sc-present beside it, has its own perfect nactus, nāctus sum. On the relationship between forms in -sc- and the perfectum, see Keller 1992: 439-42. Haverling (1994: 41-2) gives a review of the debate, with bibliography.

\(^{46}\) We expect inherited *miscō: see § 3.1 below.

\(^{47}\) On inherited forms see § 3.1 below. For Keller's conclusions on the less certain forms hiscō 'gape', uescor 'feed on, enjoy, etc.', gliscō / gliscor 'swell' and discō 'learn', see Keller 1992: 167-8, and for further details the individual chapters (1992: 95-101, 103-107, 109-16). On the relationship between discō and ðiðkscō see Chapter 3 § 4.2.1; on quiūscō 'rest', which Klingenschmitt argued was inherited, see § 2.3 above.

\(^{48}\) On these see Keller 1992: 121-65; there is also obliscor 'forget', on which see Keller 1992: 250-5. Cf. also her conclusion, 1992: 421-4.

\(^{49}\) Cf. in general Keller 1992: 199-298.

\(^{50}\) On these forms, -quiniscō 'crouch down, stoop' (from -queclg-niscō) and frūniscor 'enjoy' (from frūl(g)-niscor), see Keller 1992: 267-77, 424-6.
The remaining Latin formations are in -āscō and -ēscō.\textsuperscript{51} The former make up a small group of forms largely derived from verbs in -ā-; from such derivations as grauis → grauō → adegrauāscō, however, directly denominal forms came to be possible (such as repuerāscō ‘become a boy again’ from puer ‘boy’). In such formations the last vowel in the stem before -āsc- was always -e-; but the productivity of -ēsc- often brought about the substitution of -ēsc- for -āsc- in manuscripts.\textsuperscript{52}

The suffix -ēscō produced fifty presents before 100 BC, and Keller devotes a large section of her monograph to this extensive set of forms, which are generally active and intransitive.\textsuperscript{53}

Most forms in -ēscō can be easily classified into one of two groups.\textsuperscript{54} The greater part is made up of deverbatives, of which most are derived from verbs in stative -ē-: hence, for example, flaccēscō ‘languish, droop, flag’ from flaccēō ‘be faint, languid, weak’ (in turn derived from flaccus ‘drooping’) and calēscō ‘grow warm, hot’ from calēō ‘be warm, hot’. This formation continues to be productive after the pre-classical era. The second class, of at least fifteen forms, is of denominatives, formed by the same pattern of analogy as those denominatives in -āscō: hence a progression such as flaccus → flaccēō → flaccēscō gives rise to such forms as mūlescēre ‘become soft, mild’ from adjective mūtis ‘soft, mild’ (the more usual type) and remorbēscō ‘fall ill again’ from noun morbus ‘illness’.\textsuperscript{55} The forms fragēscō ‘become subdued’ and dispālēscō ‘be spread abroad’, only found in the pre-

\textsuperscript{51}On the evidence for the length of the pre-suffixal vowel in these types see Keller 1992: 301 n.1 and 335 n. 1 respectively.

\textsuperscript{52}For more detail on forms in -āsc- see Keller 1992: 299-332, concluded at 426-7.


\textsuperscript{54}Cf. especially Keller 1992: 411.

\textsuperscript{55}Following Watkins (1971), Keller (1992: 381-2, 412) compares this to a similar method of derivation found in Hittite; this would give the prehistoric derivation of nominal *leuk(o)- → stative *leuk-ē- (Latin lūcē-) → *leuk-ēs(ū)- (Hittite lukkeš-, Latin lūcēscē-).
classical era, are the most certain primary formations showing a compound suffix -ēsc-, connected with the complex question of the origins of the set of forms in -ēscō. 56 Although the formation in -ēscō is clearly the most productive in the pre-Classical era, there is later influence on these forms from -īscō. 57 Forms in -ēscō are active without deponent alternants (cf. misereō / misereor beside miserēscō); they often have preverbs; and they show less of a tendency to be transitive than their bases. 58

The next stages of evolution after 100 BC involved a greater use of -sc- on adjectival and then nominal stems; the largest proportion of forms is made up of active inchoatives in -ēscō, but transitive uses also begin to arise. 59 From here, the suffixes -īsc- and -ēsc- survive as formative elements into Romance languages, spreading to different parts of the verbal conjugation in different languages; these developments have been studied by Allen (1980). 60 Hence, for example, beside Latin flōr-ēsc-it we find Old French flor-ist (Modern fleur-it, but cf. plural fleur-iss-ent), Spanish flor-ec-e, Italian fior-isc-e, Portuguese flor-esc-e, and so on. 61

Keller prefers to describe -sc- as 'transformatif', rather than the more traditional 'progressif'; it is said to denote 'l'instauration (progressive) d'un état'. 62 Hence such minimal pairs as scīō 'know' : scīscō 'get to know, ascertain', hiō 'be

59Cf. Allen 1980: 57-85. His first two appendices list Latin forms in -sc- chronologically and by derivation respectively (1980: 280-8 and 289-308). Haverling (1994: 42) states that there were around 700 Latin verbs in -sco in all, of which about half were already found in Early and Classical Latin.
60Older bibliography on the subject of the Romance descendants of -sc- is cited by Keller (1992: IX n. 16), and more recent work is given by Allen 1980. For an introduction to the subject see especially Allen 1980: 11-28.
61Data are from Allen 1980: 16.
62See Keller 1992: 320-2, 432-3, with bibliography at 433 n. 54; on the semantics of -āsc- see 328-30 and on -ēsc- 336-8, 414. For further bibliography on the semantics of Latin -sc- see Keller 1992: X-XI.
wide open' : hiāscō ‘open out’ and āreō ‘be dry’ : ārēscō ‘become dry’ (cf. Keller 1992: 432-5). Keller attempts to extend this meaning to account for other forms, claiming that some earlier cases indicate not so much a transformation as a process (poscō, misceō, -pescō, apīscor, nancīscor, pacīscor, ercīsc-, frūnīscor), with only escit not fitting at all. 63

Such an interpretation seems forced, however; as Haverling (1994: 41) notes, such verbs do not indicate the beginning of an action. 64 Given the tendency of verbs in -scō to show preverbs (cf. Keller 1992: 435-9), Haverling (1994, 1996a, 1996b, forthcoming) has suggested the following semantic pattern for those verbs which indicate a change of state: Latin verbs in -scō without preverbs once only had progressive meaning (albēscō ‘grow white gradually, get more and more white’), while those with them were inchoative (exalbēscō ‘turn white (from fear)’); in later times, the distinction became blurred.

Forms in -sc- thus most commonly denote entrance into a state or acquisition of a quality. 65 Keller (1992: 383-4, 386, 416-17) notes the tendency for causatives to occur beside forms in -ēscō (e.g. calēscō, cal(e)fīō ‘become hot’, cal(e)faciō ‘heat’, calefactō ‘heat, warm’). In these cases we are presumably dealing with the causative alternation, where one stem is used to form both a causative and an inchoative; 66 it is thus no surprise that we later find Latin forms in -scō with causative meaning, such as dulcēscō ‘make soft’ (cf. Ernout 1953: 133; Mignot 1969: 211; and Keller 1992: 146

---

64 Cf. in addition Allen 1980: 6, who also remarks on these relics. Haverling (1994) does not comment on Keller's theory because her paper was given (orally) in 1991, before Keller 1992 was published.
65 Allen uses the term inchoative morphologically, to denote Latin -sc- even where no such meaning is shown; cf. Allen 1980: 1.
66 See Chapter 1 § 3.2, with further discussion and bibliography especially with reference to this phenomenon in Greek.
n. 38, with further bibliography). The origin of the 'inchoative' meaning of Latin -sc- has often been ascribed to crescō 'increase' (intransitive). 67

Other Italic languages show fragmentary reflexes of *-skel/o- that are often hard to interpret. Keller (1992: 174-5) cites as most notable Venetic vesk- (apparently connected with Latin uescor), Oscan future perfect comparascuster (Latin poscō, etc.) and the difficult Umbrian future perfect eiscurent (Vedic icchāti, etc.). The instances outside the present lead her to suppose that, as in other languages where evidence for *-skel/o- is only fragmentary (see § 2.8 below), the suffix has no specific semantic function in these languages. 68

2.5. Tocharian 69

Tocharian shows *-skel/o- as a productive suffix. In Tocharian B this takes the form -sk- (palatalised -ss-), the most frequently found present-forming suffix in the language; it is also found on preterites. 70 In Tocharian A, lexicalised instances aside, 71 we find -s- (-s-) rather than -sk- (-ss-). It could be that the reason for the difference is morphological, with the suffix -s- spreading at the expense of -sk- in Tocharian A, 72 but it seems rather that a phonological merger of *-skel/o- and desiderative *-se/o- took place in the latter language. 73 Here gemination was lost, resulting in the merging of Proto-Tocharian -sā- and -ssā- (from Proto-Indo-European *-se- and *-skē-.

70 Cf. Keller 1992: 189, and now Clackson 1994: 216 n. 104, who emphasises the difference between these forms and the Greek and Armenian preterite use of *-skel/o-.
71 For these see Hackstein 1995: 210.
respectively); also, *-s- and *-s- (from *-ske-) merged before *t- into -s-. This led to the generalisation of -s- for expected *-sk-. 74

In some Tocharian verbs, the suffix descended from *-sk/e/o- is lexicalised, becoming part of the verbal root; these forms seem to follow an inherited formation which shows zero-grade of the root. The most likely inherited forms from this group are A pās- B pask- ‘protect’ from *ph₂-ske/o-, with palatalisation of -sk- in certain forms showing the ancient thematic vowel alternation (as in third person singular middle pāstār), and B star-, skentar- ‘be’; 75 whether the place of the accent is inherited is more problematic. 76 Tocharian developments give rise to three classes of forms: in -āsk-, -āšk-, -sk- (Hackstein 1995: 203-84); in -nāsk-, -nāšk- (Hackstein 1995: 285-326); and in -sāsk-, -sāšk- (Hackstein 1995: 327-54).

It is normally stated that the Tocharian descendants of *-sk/e/o- are causative-forming. 77 So, for example, in the case of the root A ritw-, B ritt-, we have, beside present middle intransitive-passive A ritwatār B rittetār ‘be joined’, the present active causative A ritwās, B rittāssām ‘join’. When the base form is transitive, the ‘causative’ has the same meaning: so, from tāl-, Tocharian B tallām ‘lift’ has a ‘causative’ talāssām ‘id.’. In some cases, a verb has both types of present, which is possible since the non-causative and causative forms are distinguished by the placing of the accent: hence from kālp- ‘obtain’ we find both non-causative presents kālp-n-ā-tār (from kālp-ā-) and kālpāskau (from *kālp-ā-sk-), and the causative kālpāskau (from *kālp-āsk-). 78 According to Hackstein (1995: 3-4), it is the initial

74 Keller (1992: 190), however, compares Anatolian iterative formations in *-s-, implying an inherited pair of suffixes *-se/o/*-ske/o-. On this see further § 3.2 below.

75 On these etymologies see further § 3.1 below. Keller (1992: 190 n. 167) cites also A mlusk-, mlosk-(βλώςκω) and A kumās, B kānmasām (*g'm-sk/e/o-), but both are controversial: see Chapter 3 §§ 3.2.1 and 2.1 respectively.

76 On such lexicalised forms in -sk- see in general Hackstein 1995: 167-202; on the problem of accentuation see further Penney 1998: 94, 95.


accent which indicates causativity, not -sk-, the latter being merely a present marker. These presents may be formed from existing stems, or are alternative or replacement forms; in these cases, the older form often remains as a subjunctive (cf. Hackstein 1995: 282-4). The oldest class of forms, the lexicalised verbs in -sk-, do not show causative meaning, but are perhaps rather iteratives; hence Tocharian is not to be taken as evidence for causative meaning for *-sk(e/o-), since the existence of non-causative forms in -sk/-s- surely indicates that this use is secondary (cf. Keller 1992: 189). The suffix is apparently the only causative formant in Tocharian, but Hackstein does not discuss the origin of the use, which he believed was an innovation of Tocharian.  

2.6. Other traces of *-sk(e/o-)

Albanian appears to show *-sk- as -h-, most notably in the form njoh 'I know'; other forms have also been compared.  

In Baltic, we find *-st- rather than *-sk-. Despite such apparent correspondences as Lithuanian -žjst and Lettish -žist with Greek γτ- γνώσκω, etc., there is much doubt concerning whether *-sk- evolved into *-st- or *-šk-. The only possible inherited formation is that which gives Lithuanian ieškau, ieškójau, ieškoti, comparable to Slavic isko, iskati 'ask'. In the latter branch the suffix comes to be used to form verbs in -šte-, -skati and those in -s(k)noti.

---

81 Cf. further Keller 1992: 175.  
82 The argument is summarised by Keller (1992: 170); but cf. also Hamp 1973, with further bibliography at 177 n. 5.  
83 Cf. Keller’s (1992) table between pages 168-9; on the difficulties with the forms, however, see Kronasser and Neu 1966-87: I.581.  
Celtic shows cognates of at least Latin posco and Greek μισσω, Latin miscεο; reflexes of *h₂is-ske/o- in Old Irish escaid ‘search for lice’, and less certainly of an ancient *luk-ske/o-, may also be apparent. A handful more verbs show the suffix, and loans from Latin are also to be found. Celtic data for the existence of *-iske/o- (Welsh -ych-) are questionable.

Germanic may also show correspondents of various verbs in *-ske/o-, although these present problems. For example, Old High German miskan may be cognate with Latin miscεο if the former is not the result of a borrowing of the latter; another type of difficulty arises with such cases as eiscōn and forscōn, which may be derived from the nouns eisca and forscα respectively, and so may not be the direct descendants of inherited verbal forms.

2.7. Nominal *-ske/o- and *-iske/o-

Some have argued for a common origin for nominal and verbal *-ske/o-, which may mean that the ancient set of verbs showing this suffix was in fact once a group of denominatives; others are non-committal, or have argued against it. Even if there were once such a link, however, it must have been lost too early to be of any relevance to Ancient Greek.

---

85 On the etymologies of these forms see further § 3.1 below; on *luk-ske/o- see § 3.1 n. 111.
88 On these particular instances see Rix 1998: 385 n. 8, 231 n. 1 and 442 n. 4 respectively; in general, see further Keller 1992: 171-2.
Evidence for nominal *-skelo- is in any case not very common, and the suffix is often found on nouns related to verbs in *-skelo-. Such nominal-verbal pairs as Sanskrit icchā : icchāti could result from the later derivation of deverbal nouns, as Greek forms such as βοσκή ‘food’ from βόσκω ‘feed’. Also, some forms even point to *k rather than the expected *k. There is on the other hand a greater range of evidence for an inherited suffix *-iske/o-, apparently found in Celtic, Greek, Latin, Germanic, perhaps Balto-Slavic and more debatably Anatolian, nonetheless, although some reconstruct it for the proto-language, others have doubts concerning whether even this nominal suffix was in fact inherited. In Greek, nominal -ισκό- can apparently be traced back to Mycenaean times.

2.8. Summary: reflexes of *-skelo- outside Greek

To sum up, it follows from the evidence collected above that *-skelo- is productive in a limited number of languages: iterative-durative -śk- in Hittite; apparently aorist and subjunctive marker -c‘- in Armenian, also found in the present indicative as -c‘- and also perhaps -ɛ‘-; causative -sk- in Tocharian B and, merged

---

93 Cf. Hirt 1921-37: IV.233; Porzig 1927: 164-6; Schwyzer and Debrunner 1939-71: I.541; and Keller 1992: 193. For examples from Greek, cf. as well as extended βοσκ- (Chapter 7 § 5.1) the examples of μισγ- (Chapter 3 § 2.3) and διδασκα- (Chapter 3 § 4.2.1, 7 § 5.1).
94 Cf. Brugmann and Delbrück 1893-1916: II/1.477, II/3.351; and Porzig 1927: 165-6. On the possibility of *-skelo- with a non-palatal velar see § 3.2 below.
95 On nominal *-iske/o- in general see Brugmann 1893-1916: II/1.501-3; and Petersen 1913: 141. On the suffix in Greek see especially Schwyzer and Debrunner 1939-71: I.541-2; and Chantraine 1968: 406-13, with further bibliography at 405 n. 1.
96 Cf. Melchert 1987: 201, who argues that *-iske/o- could give Luvian -iza- via *-isza-.
97 For the former, see Chantraine (1968: 406), who reconstructs the meaning ‘du genre à, qui ressemble à’; and Petersen (1913: 141-7, with bibliography), who derives the suffix from comparative *-is- followed by adjectival / substantival *-ko-. For the latter view, see Vine 1993: 52-3.
with *-se/o-, A -s-; Latin inchoative-progressive -sc-; and inchoative -sa- in Middle Iranian. Certain relics also occur in Sanskrit, where there is a rare present-forming suffix -(c)cha-. There are also a few attestations in Albanian, Baltic, Slavic, Celtic and Germanic, as well as further Anatolian and Italic languages. In a number of these languages, reflexes of *-skे/o- are linked with the present stem: Latin, Indo-Iranian, Tocharian. There is therefore no doubt that *-skे/o- is a common Indo-European feature. The existence of an Indo-European suffix *-is£e/o- is more doubtful; it may appear in Armenian, Hittite, Latin and also Avestan, less certainly in Celtic; there is also apparently Greek evidence for this suffix (cf. § 3.4 below). In the languages where *-skे/o- becomes productive, it shows a particular meaning; where it is merely a relic, the suffix appears usually to have become part of the verbal stem concerned.

3. Verbs in *-skे/o-: the forms

3.1. Reconstructed forms

The precise number of forms in *-skे/o- which may be reconstructed for the parent language is by its very nature debatable, and indeed two recent attempts seem at first sight to differ quite wildly concerning the inherited data. The earlier, part of Keller’s work on Latin -scо (1992: tableau I, between pages 168 and 169), lists fifteen correspondences. Among these, however, many forms are marked with a question mark; also, two correspondences only show reflexes in one language branch, leaving only thirteen likely reconstructions. There are on the other hand a few further possibly inherited forms, mentioned elsewhere in her work.

99Cf. also the analysis at Klingenschmitt 1982: 64-5.

100Vedic yacchati, Young Avestan -yasaiti and Old Persian āyasatā; and Latin uescor, Venetic vesk-. Such as Greek ἀλάσκωμαι with Armenian aλαց em and the unlikely Greek βλωκω with Tocharian A mlosk-, mlusk- (Keller 1992: 180 nn. 94, n. 93 respectively; see further Chapter 3 §§ 4.1.5 and 3.2.1).
More recent is the *Lexicon der indogermanischen Verben* (Rix 1998). Here, apparently independently of Keller’s work, there is a list of 70 possible reconstructed presents in *-ske/o-*, of which 21 are listed as doubtful. Of all these forms, however, only sixteen can be shown to have reflexes in more than one branch of the daughter languages.

Assuming a zero-grade root for the inherited forms (cf. § 3.3 below), the most likely reconstructions are the following six; as in Rix, the symbol ‘[‘ indicates that a form is not a direct reflex of the reconstruction. Forms and glosses are adapted from Rix 1998.

*gnh 3-ske/o- > [Old Persian subjunctive xšnāsātiy ‘recognise’; Armenian čanač’em ‘recognise’; [Greek γνωσκω ‘recognise’; [Latin (g)nōscō ‘recognise’; and Albanian njoh ‘know’.

*gm-ske/o- > Vedic gacchati ‘go, come’, [Young Avestan jasaiti ‘go, come’; Greek βάπτω ‘go’; and perhaps also [Tocharian A kumnās, B kānmaśām ‘come’.

*h2is-ske/o- > Vedic icchāti ‘seek’, Young Avestan isaiti ‘seek’; [Armenian hayc’em ‘seek, beseech, ask for’; Umbrian future perfect eiscurrent ‘call for, get’; [Old Irish escaid ‘search for lice’; [Old Lithuanian iesku ‘seek’; [Old Church Slavonic iskō ‘seek’; and also Germanic forms such as [Old High German eiscōn ‘demand, beseech, ask’. 104

*mik-ske/o- > Vedic middle participle micchamāna- ‘nimble / in turmoil’; Greek μίσγομαι ‘be mixed’; Praenestine Latin imperative misc ‘mix’, [Latin misceō

---

102 Cf. Rix 1998: 19, with list at 653-4. In both these locations there are only 20 dubious forms mentioned, but also doubtful is *wr-ske/o-, listed thus in the body of the dictionary (1998: 626). The figures for Rix include the one possible present in *-iske/o-; those for Keller do not, as it is not included on her table.

103 For further discussion of and bibliography on *gnh 3-ske/o-*, *gm-ske/o- and *mik-ske/o-*, which all show reflexes in Greek, see further Chapter 3 §§ 4.1.1, 2.1 and 2.3 respectively.

‘mix’; [Old Irish *mescaid ‘mix, confuse’, Welsh (cy-)mysgaf ‘mix’, and other Celtic forms; and also [Old English miscian, Old High German miscen ‘mix’.

*ph₂-ske/o- > [Latin pásco(r)105 ‘let pasture, feed’; and Tocharian B paskentrā, [A pāsantār ‘be protected/protect oneself’.106


One must note, however, that even on these most certain forms opinion varies: the two reflexes of *gnh₃-ske/o- which Keller in her table finds doubtful, Albanian njoh and Armenian čanač’em, are to Rix the only reflexes which show no remodelling of the stem.

More debated are the following three reconstructions, the first two of which are often cited:108

*h₁r-ske/o- > Hittite āraškizzi ‘arrive repeatedly’; Vedic rccháti ‘reach, meet’; Old Persian -rsatiy ‘come’; and Greek ἔρχομαι ‘go, come’.

*h₁s-ske/o- > Palaic imperative iska ‘be’; Ionic Greek ἔσκον ‘repeatedly was, used to be’; [Old Latin escit ‘be’; and Tocharian B star-, skentar- ‘be’.

---

105 On the problem of the root vocalism of this form see § 3.3 below.
107 On the root see further Mayrhofer 1986- s.v. PRAS; and Rix 1998: 442-3.
108 For more on these first two forms (and so ἔρχομαι and ἔσκον), see Chapters 3 § 2.2 and 5 § 6.1.1 respectively.
These nine formations are the most notable ones. This leaves four possible cases in Keller (1992) and seven in Rix (1998), all of which bar one are different and all of which show a reflex in more than one language branch.\footnote{Three of the four listed by Keller in her table (1992, between pages 168 and 169), do appear in Rix 1998; but for these he does not list as many possible reflexes as she does, so that his data have the forms as occurring only in one language branch. These are Latin hiscō beside various Germanic forms (such as Old High German gischen) (the former at Rix 1998: 153-4); Old Indic vāṇchati ‘desire, wish’ with Old High German wunscen ‘wish, desire’ (the former at Rix 1998: 623-4; cf. also Klingenschmitt 1982: 64, and on the problem of the root vocalism Jasanoff 1988: 237 n. 22); and Young Avestan tarsaiti ‘be afraid’, Old Persian tarsatiy ‘be afraid’ beside Lithuanian trisu ‘tremble’ (the former pair at Rix 1998: 590-1). Keller’s one remaining possibly inherited form is Armenian luc ‘anew ignite, burn’ and Old Church Slavonic lustati (se) ‘shine’ beside such Celtic forms as Old Irish lisc- ‘burn’, but here it seems that -c’- may well be from *-ky- (cf. Godel 1975: 82; Klingenschmitt 1982: 194; and Rix 1998: 376; but on the other hand cf. Meillet 1936: 107). Of all these, there are many doubtful forms; see further her table.

The six remaining possible forms in *-ske/o- listed by Rix which may have reflexes in more than one language branch are to be found at Rix 1998: 76-7 (Lithuanian brėkšta (brēkšti) ‘dawn’; Polish o-brzasknac ‘become light’); 117-19 (Hittite zikkizzi ‘put repeatedly’, Tocharian A middle participle tāskmām ‘being like’); 274-5 (Young Avestan yāsaiti ‘ask’, Tocharian B subjunctive yāstār ‘will/should beg, request’); 352-3 (Armenian hangē‘em ‘have a rest’, Latin quiēscō ‘rest’); 480 (Greek ἔλαυσκοματι ‘propitiate’, Armenian alac’em ‘supplicate, pray’); and 552 (Young Avestan xísat ‘break into a sweat’, Lettish svīstā (svīst) ‘sweat’). On the last two pairs cf. also Klingenschmitt 1982: 65, and on Greek ἔλαύσκοματι beside Armenian alac’em see further Chapter 3 § 4.1.5. In addition, Klingenschmitt (1982: 64) cites Greek θυσίκω ‘die’ along with Avestan duqṣa- fly’, on which see further Chapter 3 § 3.2.2.

\footnote{It is no surprise, therefore, that Puhvel (1991: 16) comments on the ‘stunted state’ of the productivity of verbs in *-skē/o-, comparing its frequency to that of Greek presents in -σκω, in contrast to that of iteraties in (e)σκων. Nonetheless, comparison with the number of forms which Rix (1998: 14-20) reconstructs for the other various present forms make *-skē/o- look productive: only four of his remaining twenty categories show more than *-skē/o-’s number of seventy forms, and of these two are remarkably productive (full-grade root plus *-elo- with 425 forms (In), nasal infix with 237 (Ik)).


\footnote{These nine formations are the most notable ones. This leaves four possible cases in Keller (1992) and seven in Rix (1998), all of which bar one are different and all of which show a reflex in more than one language branch.\footnote{Three of the four listed by Keller in her table (1992, between pages 168 and 169), do appear in Rix 1998; but for these he does not list as many possible reflexes as she does, so that his data have the forms as occurring only in one language branch. These are Latin hiscō beside various Germanic forms (such as Old High German gischen) (the former at Rix 1998: 153-4); Old Indic vāṇchati ‘desire, wish’ with Old High German wunscen ‘wish, desire’ (the former at Rix 1998: 623-4; cf. also Klingenschmitt 1982: 64, and on the problem of the root vocalism Jasanoff 1988: 237 n. 22); and Young Avestan tarsaiti ‘be afraid’, Old Persian tarsatiy ‘be afraid’ beside Lithuanian trisu ‘tremble’ (the former pair at Rix 1998: 590-1). Keller’s one remaining possibly inherited form is Armenian luc ‘anew ignite, burn’ and Old Church Slavonic lustati (se) ‘shine’ beside such Celtic forms as Old Irish lisc- ‘burn’, but here it seems that -c’- may well be from *-ky- (cf. Godel 1975: 82; Klingenschmitt 1982: 194; and Rix 1998: 376; but on the other hand cf. Meillet 1936: 107). Of all these, there are many doubtful forms; see further her table.

The six remaining possible forms in *-ske/o- listed by Rix which may have reflexes in more than one language branch are to be found at Rix 1998: 76-7 (Lithuanian brēkšta (brēkšti) ‘dawn’; Polish o-brzasknac ‘become light’); 117-19 (Hittite zikkizzi ‘put repeatedly’, Tocharian A middle participle tāskmām ‘being like’); 274-5 (Young Avestan yāsaiti ‘ask’, Tocharian B subjunctive yāstār ‘will/should beg, request’); 352-3 (Armenian hangē‘em ‘have a rest’, Latin quiēscō ‘rest’); 480 (Greek ἔλαυσκοματι ‘propitiate’, Armenian alac’em ‘supplicate, pray’); and 552 (Young Avestan xísat ‘break into a sweat’, Lettish svīstā (svīst) ‘sweat’). On the last two pairs cf. also Klingenschmitt 1982: 65, and on Greek ἔλαυσκοματι beside Armenian alac’em see further Chapter 3 § 4.1.5. In addition, Klingenschmitt (1982: 64) cites Greek θυσίκω ‘die’ along with Avestan duqṣa-fly’, on which see further Chapter 3 § 3.2.2.}
Finally, there is one possible form in \(*\text{-Is\(\epsilon\)e/o-}\), listed with reservations as an ‘ungewöhnlicher Stammbildungstyp’ in Rix (1998: 219), who gives no reconstruction for what would be \(*h,gr\text{-Is\(\epsilon\)e/o-}\):\(^{112}\)

Young Avestan \(\text{fra-\(\gamma\)ris\(\alpha\)mno}\) ‘awakening’ (intransitive); Latin \(\text{ex-per-giscor}\) ‘awaken’ (intransitive) (< \(*\text{-per-griske-}\)); and Albanian \(\text{ngrihet}\) ‘get up’.

3.2. The internal morphology of \(*ske/o-\)

The suffix is to be reconstructed as \(*ske/o-\) if we hold that there were three sets of velars in the parent language.\(^{113}\) There is apparently no evidence for a by-form \(*s\(\ddot{e}\)h-\) (cf. Keller 1992: 190 n. 168, with bibliography).

The suffix \(*ske/o-\) has in turn often been broken down into its constituents \(*s-\) and \(*k-\); this would mean that it was once related to other Indo-European suffixes in \(*s-\).\(^{114}\) The most recent proponent of this view has been Keller (1992: 191-93), who began her explanation with such base forms as \(*\text{gn\(\ddot{o}\)t}\) (Greek \(\varepsilon\text{-}\gamma\nu\omega\)). From these, tense stems came to be formed with various ‘élargissements’ or

\(^{112}\)On the root see further Rix 1998: 218-19; on the etymology, and on Latin \(\text{expergiscor}\) in general, see Keller 1980, 1992: 238-41; and also Klingenschmitt 1982: 73-7 and nn. 17, 18. On the problem of the correspondence see § 3.4 below.

\(^{113}\)If we only reconstruct two \((*k, *k\(\ddot{e}\))\) rather than three \((*k, *k, *k\(\ddot{e}\))\) then the suffix is instead \(*skelo-\).

For the former view see Meillet 1937: 91-5, and for the latter Brugmann at Brugmann and Delbrück 1893-1916: I/1.542-622; and Mayrhofer at Kuryłowicz 1968-86: I.102-6. A problem is that Balto-Slavic data could indicate \(*skelo-\) rather than \(*ske/o-\), although the forms concerned could be otherwise explained; see further Kronasser and Neu 1966-87: I.581. For older bibliography on this subject see Mignot 1969: 180 n. 2.

extensions (*w, *s, *k [sic], *t, *dh, *p), such as *gno-w (Vedic (ja)ñau). Relics of such forms, which had no personal endings, are said to be seen within the old Latin paradigm gnōu(t): gnōs(t). Some forms in *-s- acquired an extra *-k- or *-t- (whence Baltic -st-), whilst *-s- came to be used to denote past time. Keller’s examples thus include *gnes- (Hittite, Tocharian A) beside *gnōsk- (in at least Latin, Greek, Old Persian), and *pās- (Hittite, Tocharian A) beside *pask- (Latin, Tocharian B). Within each language, however, the use in relation to other tense stems is very different. Indeed, as Keller notes, sometimes languages within a family alternate between the two suffixes: Hittite and Palaic *-skē/o- beside Luvian *-se/o-,116 Tocharian B *-skē/o- beside A *-se/o-.

On the other hand, there is no conclusive evidence that the suffix is made up of other morphs, and one must remember that all that we can say about this stage of the parent language is necessarily hypothetical. Hence, far from emphasising the importance of *-se/o- and *-ste/o-, as Keller does, Rix only reconstructs one form for the former, and does not mention the latter at all. A very different suggestion concerning the evolution and function of *-skē/o- will be discussed in § 4.3 below.

3.3. The morphology of presents in *-skē/o-

The form generally reconstructed for inherited presents in *-skē/o- is that of zero-grade of root plus suffix *-skē/o-, with latter’s vowel accented. This would

---

116 On a possible relic of Luvian *-skē/o-, however, see § 2.1 above.
117 Most notably against the proposal is Porzig (1927: 166).
119 The number of scholars who have commented on the zero-grade of the root is numerous: Brugmann and Delbrück 1893-1916: II/3.352; Schmidt 1904: 31; Hirt 1921-37: IV.232; Bechtel 1936: 10-11; Schwyzer and Debrunner 1939-71: I.707 and n. 4; Schmitt 1964-5: 275, 281; Leumann et al. 1965-79:
therefore accord with the accepted patterns of accentuation generally reconstructed for Proto-Indo-European, where the thematic vowel is stressed.  

Other interpretations have been offered, however. Klingenschmitt (1982: 66-7) argues that presents in *-*ske/o- with an accented full-grade root would be theoretically possible; he claims that, in parallel, one can find beside the usual hysterotonic causative type (such as *wortēye/o-) rhizotonic ones (as *swōpye/o- from pre-Proto-Indo-European *swōpeye/o-) as well. A possible case would be Armenian hayc'e- 'seek', if it is from *h₂ais-ske/o-; but in the absence of further evidence for this stem, he acknowledges that it is more likely that the form which we find is either denominative or a remodelling of the zero-grade present *h₂is-ske/o- (Vedic icchāti, Young Avestan isaiti). More recently, Keller (1992: 194-6) has argued that, if forms in *-*ske/o- began in the way she suggests, then the formation in *-*ske/o- is secondary and deverbative and did not show a particular grade of the root; they merely continued the form of the root from which they were derived. She claims that divergences from the commonly postulated pattern are numerous, but only cites the problem of Vedic forms which show accented roots. Apart from the difficult case of Greek γιγνώσκω, Latin (g)nōscō, etc. (on which see Chapter 3 § 4.1.1), the only problem case among forms which may be reconstructed with certainty appears to be

---

120 Cf. Szemerényi 1996: 111-13, and on the verb 250-2, with bibliography.
121 Cf. also now Rix 1998: 231 n. 2, following Klingenschmitt. On the other hand, Jasanoff (1988: 237 n. 22) suggests explaining related Germanic and Balto-Slavic data via contamination from an s-present *h₂ēis-s-/*h₂ēis-s-.
122 On these forms see § 2.2 above.
Latin *pascō, where we would expect **pascō from *ph₂-ske/o-; for this, various explanations have been offered. Rather, it is forms in *-se/o- which do not consistently show zero-grade. Criticisms of the standard theory therefore appear to have little foundation; moreover, if we accept zero-grade for the Proto-Indo-European formation, then the case for Keller’s theory of the origin of presents in *-ske/o- is weakened: if forms in *-ske/o- are extensions in *-k- based on ones in *-se/o-, then why do they show different grades of the root?  

Risch (1965) emphasises the importance of *-ske/o- in the origin of the thematic conjugation. He states that the latter was secondary in Proto-Indo-European; its gradual replacement of the athematic one is clearly visible in the descendants of the parent language. He argues that in the conjugation of a verb in *-ske/o-, the first and second persons plural, with the suffix in the zero-grade, would once have been effectively athematic: hence (in the case of *gʷem-) *gʷm-sk-mēs, *gʷm-sk-tē. Such forms would have developed vowels for ease of pronunciation (*gʷm-skʷ-mēs, *gʷm-skʷ-tē); according to Risch, such a progression, combined with a first person singular voluntative in *-ō, led to the creation of the thematic conjugation. All this is of course uncertain; but it is interesting to note that the -sk- forms of Hittite are among the most frequent source of thematic verbs. 

Concerning the original voice of the inherited formations, there is little agreement. Watkins (Kuryłowicz 1968-86: III/1.74) has claimed that there is a link between forms in *-ske/o- and the middle voice. Keller, however, has criticised Watkins’ view; following Meillet’s (1900: 311-12, 1937: 221) statement that *-ske/o- and *-ye/o- are secondary, she gives the same description of voice as she gives for

---

123 For these suggestions, with further bibliography, see Hackstein 1995: 177.
124 On Keller’s theory see further § 3.2 above.
grade of the root: the voice of a form in *-ske/o- merely matches that of the form from which it was derived.\textsuperscript{125}

Mention should also be made of comparative evidence for the claimed combinatorial use of *-ske/o- with other affixes.\textsuperscript{126} It has already been seen that the use of reflexes of *-ske/o- together with reduplication in both Hittite and Greek appears to be a coincidence (see § 2.1 above). The same, it seems, may be said of the use of *-ske/o- and nasal suffixes, which occurs in both Armenian and Greek: the occurrence of -c'anem in the former and -σκάνω in the latter is due to the productivity of nasal formations in both, but in quite different conditions.\textsuperscript{127}

More controversial is the case of *-iske/o- which, if indeed it is to be reconstructed, may be made up of a combination of *-yle/o- and *-ske/o- (cf. § 3.4 below); in addition, Keller adds a combination with the nasal infix, *-nǐsk-. It has also been argued that *-ske/o- was combined with the stative suffix *-ē- (*-ėh₁-) to give *-ēsk- beside *-ēs-, the latter giving Hittite -ēš- and Greek -ησα-;\textsuperscript{128} indeed, a suffix *-ē-ske/o- could, as Klingenshmitt (1982: 69-83) argues, be the source of Armenian -c'i- (cf. § 2.3 above). Lastly, there is the possible suffix *-esk-; although advocated by some, it does not seem supportable.\textsuperscript{129}

\textsuperscript{125}Cf. Keller 1992: 194-6, esp. 195 n. 189, on *-ske/o-, and also 296-8 on *-iske/o-, concluded at 431-2.
\textsuperscript{126}That is, Keller's 'aptitudes combinatoires': cf. further her discussion at Keller 1992: 196-7, concluded at 430-1.
\textsuperscript{127}Cf. further Keller 1992: 197.
3.4. Inherited *-iske/o-?

There has been much debate over whether a suffix *-iske/o- may also be reconstructed for the parent language. Keller (1992: 279 n. 1, 280 n.3) is against Osthoff's and Kronasser's assertions that suffixes of the form *-isk- spread as innovations in Latin and Hittite respectively; she claims that *-iske/o- is especially required to explain the Greek data (1992: 280 n. 3), and that it is not a postconsonantal variant of *-ske/o- (1992: 280 n. 4). The suffix is used as a functionally identical form of *-ske/o- in Hittite, Avestan, Latin and Greek, but the length of the *i cannot be determined (1992: 279-80).

Keller (1992: 287-92) summarises three influential theories. Schmidt (1904) postulated an alternance of -\(\tau\)- with -\(\eta\)- and -\(\omega\)-. This is found in Greek in such present : non-present pairs as \(\alpha\lambda\iota-\sigma\kappa-\omicron\omega\iota\) : \(\alpha\lambda\omega\)- and would continue an ancient long diphthong alternation of the form *\(i\) : *\(\varepsilon\iota\) / *\(\delta\iota\); the second element of the diphthong was lost in Greek before all consonants bar -\(\sigma\)-. Greek forms in -\(\zeta\sigma\kappa\omega\), -\(\eta\sigma\kappa\omega\) and -\(\omega\sigma\kappa\omega\) are thus claimed to show the old diphthong, with links being made between Greek \(\mu\mu\nu\dot{\sigma}\kappa\omega\) and Latin -\(\textit{miniscor}\); the only parallel for the postulated vocalic pattern outside Greek is Young Avestan fra\(\gamma\rho\iota\sigma\alpha\text{-}\text{ann\(\eta\)}}\ 'awakening' (intransitive), which indicated to Schmidt an alternation between present fra\(\gamma\rho\iota\sigma\alpha\text{-}\text{a}\) and non-present fra\(\gamma\rho\iota\sigma\alpha\text{-}\text{o}\), from a stem *\(\gamma\rho\iota\sigma\alpha\text{-}\text{i}\). The theory is, however, no longer tenable, not only because it involves long diphthongs, which are no longer postulated for the parent language, but also because the data are not easily accounted for by Schmidt's theory: forms in -\(\zeta\sigma\kappa\omega\) etc. seem to be due to the extension of -\(\iota\sigma\kappa\omega\); the alternation -\(\iota\sigma\kappa\)- : -\(\eta\)- / -\(\omega\)- does not seem to be ancient; and \(\mu\mu\nu\dot{\eta}\sigma\kappa\omega\) and -\(\textit{miniscor}\) do not seem to be linked.131

130 For scholars who have followed Schmidt's account, see Keller 1992: 283 n. 19, 287 n. 46; the most recent is apparently Allen (1980: 18, via Leumann et al. 1965-79: I.539).
131 On all these points see Keller 1992: 288; cf. also Keller 1980: 318-19; and Vine 1993: 53. For further discussion of the Greek data, see Chapter 3 § 6, 7 § 3.
Secondly, Watkins (Kuryłowicz 1968-86: III/1.56-7) parallels *-s-k̑ with *-is-k̑ (here with short -i̯-), finding the same *-is- in the Latin perfect (as in eōistī) and the Hittite preterite ending -iš (Kuryłowicz 1968-86: III/1.55-6, 155-6). There seems to be little likelihood, however, that the element *-is- ever existed, and the division *-is-k̑ is far from certain. Nor is Keller (1992: 289) satisfied with Watkins’ supposed parallels (e.g. Armenian dic’- from *dhē-is-k̑ beside Hittite dāiš from *dhē-is, from *dhē- ‘put, place’), especially that of the Armenian aorist subjunctive in *-iske/o- beside the comparatively late Latin future perfect in -ise/o-.

Lastly, Meillet derived *-iske/o-, which he used to account for Greek -ίσκω, Latin -iscō and Young Avestan fraγrismannō, from the stative suffix *-r̅, said to be found in Baltic and Slavic, together with *-sk̑e/o-. Forms where a non-present was found in -η- or -ω- in Greek seemed to him to be particularly close to the Balto-Slavic data, where the present shows *-r̅ and the infinitive and the aorist *-ē-. Where Greek showed *-γε/o- and *-σκε/o-, Baltic and Slavic seem to show *-r̅, so that the former appears to be a thematicisation of *-r̅, and the latter a combination of *-r̅ and *-sk̑e/o-. Keller (1992: 291, 293) notes that -miniscor could in this case show the same suffixed zero-grade stem *m°n-r̅ which is found in Baltic (Lithuanian mini) and Slavic (Old Church Slavonic minitu), and which is thematicised in Celtic (Old Irish do-muiniur), Greek (μοῦμιοῦμι) and Indo-Iranian (Vedic mányate, Old Avestan mainyete).

However, Keller (1992: 291-2) does not accept that the suffix *-iske/o- could have been linked to statives in *-r̅, pointing out that Meillet’s supposed connection of the former with states is due to the voice of the form concerned. Moreover, she follows Kuryłowicz (1964: 79-84, followed by Watkins in Kuryłowicz 1968-86: III/1.222-3) in deriving the Balto-Slavic stative suffix *-r̅ ultimately from the old

132 Cf. Meillet 1900, esp. 311-12; and also 1908: 109-113, esp. 110; 1937: 221; and Meillet and Vendryes 1948: 241-2.
133 For further details, and more bibliography, see Keller 1992: 289-91.
perfect ending *-ei from *-e-i. She therefore adapts Meillet’s theory into one in which *-iske/o- is made up of *-ye/o- and *-ske/o-, the former taking the athematic form of *-i- or *-i-. She notes the tendency of *-ye/o- to combine with the nasal infix, as in Lithuanian jungiu beside Latin iungō and in Latin nancior (-iō) beside nactus, and uses a suffix *-nisko- (said to be common in Hittite) to explain the difficult Latin forms -quinsō and frūniscor (Keller 1992: 292, 293-4). In fact, this theory of *-ye/o- and *-ske/o- coming to be combined, albeit for Greek rather than Proto-Indo-European, has also been suggested by Ruijgh (1985: 140, 148-9).

Noting the convenience of this suffix in preserving final consonants of roots (1992: 197), Keller (1992: 293) reconstructs *-iske/o- as a suffix that is continued by Latin -isc-, Hittite -isk-, Greek -ισκ- and the Armenian subjunctive formant -ic‘-, as well as being found in the one cognate pair of Young Avestan fraγrismnō and Latin (ex)perg(r)iscor. This inherited situation then becomes complicated by the fact that Latin and Hittite also produce forms in -sc- off those in -ī-, a productivity which may mean that the apparent correspondences apiscor / appiški/a- and ertoisc / arkiški/a- are in fact coincidental (cf. Keller 1992: 294-5).

Keller is not alone in reconstructing inherited *-iske/o-: Hackstein (1995: 301, following Rix 1992: 74, 213) has ἀλλασκωματ from *wlh3-iske/o- (found beside Hittite hulliški- from hulla), although he says the Greek form could be from the aorist ἠλων. Not all agree, however, that *-iske/o- is to be postulated: Klingenschmitt (1982: 73-7) sheds doubt on the reliability of such a reconstruction, and his work was more recently continued by Vine (1993). The one supposed correspondence of fraγrismnō and expergiscor is doubtful for several reasons (1993: 49-50), and the various languages could easily show individual innovations which resulted in an apparent correspondence. Hence the Latin forms are said to arise from verbs in

---

134Cf. also Porzig 1927: 160; and Kellens 1984: 157 n. 8, 324 n. 2, who suggests that the Avestan form is a mistake for *fraγrasmnō or *fraγaraasnō; he has more recently changed his view, however (cf. Kellens 1995: 19 and n. 2).
*ye/o-: Armenian presents in *ic⁶- are, with Klingenschmitt, taken from *eh₁-ske/o-, subjunctives in *ic⁶el/o- perhaps (after Meillet/Mariès rather than Klingenschmitt) from optative *-oih₁- giving *-oi- recharacterised with a ‘*-ske-preterite’; the Hittite formation, following Melchert, can be the result of anaptyxis and of syncope (1993: 50-2; and § 2.1 above). This leaves Greek -ισκω, for which Klingenschmitt, Vine and Ruijgh have all offered solutions; these will be discussed when the Homeric data for -ισκω have been reviewed (Chapter 3 § 6.5). Regarding inherited *isko/o-, therefore, we may note that scholars are divided, and the proposition in doubt.¹³⁵

4. The function of *ske/o-

The role of *ske/o- in the parent language is of fundamental importance to a study of one of its reflexes, but at the same time impossible to visualise with any certainty. In this section, I shall first review the role which the descendants of *ske/o- had in the daughter languages, and then discuss the suggestions of scholars which have been put forward to account for these facts.

4.1. The reflexes of *ske/o-

In those languages where *ske/o- is not lexicalised but becomes productive, we have seen that the use of the suffix is as follows: iterative-durative in Hittite; present- and perhaps also aorist- and subjunctive-forming in Armenian; inchoative in Iranian; inchoative-progressive in Latin; and present- and causative-forming in Tocharian. There is good evidence, however, that the earliest role of *ske/o- in Iranian, Latin and Tocharian was not what it later became in its productive form: the oldest evidence in all these languages does not show these causative-inchoative uses.

¹³⁵ Cf. also Clackson 1994: 215 n. 76 and Rix 1998: 219 n. 7, who cite Klingenschmitt’s discussion (1982: 73-7) against reconstruction of *isko/o-.
As already seen, Greek at first blush seems to reflect all the data from other languages at once (Chapter 1 § 3), although there causativity is most likely secondary and the iteratives in -(ε)σκόπος seem isolated.

4.2. Suggested reconstructions

Reconstruction of the original sense of *-ske/o- is therefore far from certain; but it will be useful briefly to review the different opinions of various scholars on this subject, whilst bearing in mind that these are all necessarily hypothetical.

It now seems to be most common to believe that *-ske/o- was once linked in some way to iterative meaning; other views are varied. French scholars used to say that *-ske/o- gives an emphasis to the development of the action and/or has 'déterminé' meaning. This is the view of Meillet;136 one may also compare Delbrück,137 followed by Kuijper (1970: 71) and Barton (1982: 38), who have *-ske/o- as perhaps originally punctual. Iterative meaning may also be linked with this idea, however: Meillet (1937: 221) adds that the Hittite meaning of 'un procès accompli avec force ou répété' would have been the inherited sense, comparing Latin poscō.

Also quite popular as a reconstruction is inchoative or progressive meaning.138 Keller (1992: 435) does consider this possibility, noting the 'transformatif' sense found in Avestan and Latin, as well as the Tocharian factitives (causatives);139 as just noted (§ 4.1 above), however, the oldest formations in each language do not speak for this interpretation.140

---

137Cf. Brugmann and Delbrück 1893-1916: IV.59; and Brugmann 1904: 520.
138For the former, cf. Vendryes 1911; Burrow 1973: 329; and also Curtius 1846: 114; 1877-80: I.271, 289-91; for the latter, Létoublon 1985: 257 n. 64.
139On the relatedness of these meanings, see Chapter 1 § 3.2.
Another alternative is that we cannot tell what meaning to ascribe to the suffix: Brugmann (Brugmann and Delbrück 1893-1916: II/3.353-4) simply says that it was not inchoative; Keller (1992: 442-3) and Beekes (1995: 230) also give no set meaning. Occasionally, future meaning is ascribed to *-skē/o-*, but the view is founded on little evidence and does not seem supportable.  

Some acknowledge the existence of iterative meaning for *-skē/o-* without wishing to say that this was the only possibility. Couvreur (1938: 90) has iterative-causative meaning; less certainly, Krause (1952: 82-3) is uncertain whether causative, iterative, durative and inchoative meanings should all be ascribed to *-skē/o-*.

Leumann (1941: 1; cf. also Leumann et al. 1965-79: I.536) is undecided between two basically iterative meanings: ‘einen allmählchen Übergang, ein aktweise oder stoßweise vor sich gehendes Geschehen zu bezeichnen’ (following Porzig 1927); and ‘iterativ-intensiv’ (following Benveniste 1936: 231). Not dissimilarly, Haverling (1994: 51 n. 3) emphasises the iterative, intensive and durative meanings in the reflexes of *-skē/o-*. Giacalone Ramat (1967: 110-11, 123) has some forms as apparently having no specific meaning for *-skē/o-*, while others show ‘l’insistenza sull’intensità’, as prccháti, poscō, glossed as ‘prego insistentemente’; not dissimilarly, Puhvel (1991: 16-17) plays down the role of iterative meaning, which in his account is secondary in Hittite, implying that the meaning of the suffix is intensive: *prk-skē/o-* is glossed as perhaps ‘ask insistentely’ or ‘be inquisitive’. To Ruijgh (1985: 143), ‘La valeur originale du suffixe -sk-élô- consistait sans doute à exprimer que le procès désigné par le thème verbal se réalise pas à pas, peu à peu’ (italics thus).

Some scholars have tried to link the inchoative and iterative meanings, often attempting to derive the former from the latter without detailing how. Hence Couvreur (1938: 90) explains matters from his postulated iterative-causative meaning

---

by simply saying that ‘Du sens itératif résulte le sens inchoatif’; in contrast, Adams (1988: 76) says ‘What the mechanism was that led some at least of the early Tocharian iterative-intensives to be interpreted as causatives is not clear’. Kronasser (Kronasser and Neu 1966-87: I.575-6) has iterative become inchoative and then causative, but produces little evidence for the first development. Wathelet (1973: 381-3) also attempts this method: he says, ‘Le sens originel du suffixe -skelo- dans les verbes reste matière à discussion, il semble néanmoins que la valeur itérative y soit essentielle’ (1973: 381) and claims that causative was close to iterative in the Indo-European languages,\(^{142}\) as was iterative to inchoative (1973: 383-4 n. 32); his tentative proto-meaning is ‘“tension avec répétition vers une réalité”’. Similarly, Risch (1974: 272) claims that *-skelo- first of all expressed ‘ein schrittweises Vorwärtskommen’, whence its inchoative uses in Latin and Iranian, and the iterative ones in Greek and Hittite. Rix (1992: 214) derives inchoative meaning from iterative, glossing adolēscit as ‘wächst Schritt für Schritt heran’; Sihler (1995: 507) has an original meaning of perhaps iterative-durative, with the Latin inchoative perhaps deriving from forms in *-eh₁-skelo-: calēscō ‘keep getting warm’ becomes ‘become warm’. Hackstein (1995: 2-3) cites iterative Aktionsart for *-skelo-, whence duratives and then presents; inchoative meaning is said to be late Indo-European or an independent development. Most recently, Bubeník (Hewson and Bubeník 1997: 242) reconstructs ‘iterative (-inchoative)’ meaning.

On the other hand, there is also well-considered work in the ‘iterative-inchoative’ school, firstly by Kuryłowicz (1964: 106-9). Although he refers to the original meaning of *-skelo- as iterative (along with the nasal affix and reduplication), used to form denominal verbs, he explains the inchoative and durative meanings as ‘semantic variants depending on the opposition of the new present form as against the

\(^{142}\)On this point Wathelet cites Pedersen 1941: 168, whose one example is Greek ἕρπω (‘bear along; bear constantly, wear’) beside σκέπω (‘scare away; drive away’).
old ones' (1964: 107; see further § 4.3 below). This method of integration of the two meanings does not seem distant from that of Back (1991): he has *-skê/o- (reconstructed as iterative or inchoative at 1991: 282) related to an ancient telic suffix *-s- which gives inchoatives on atelic roots and iteratives on telic ones. Jasanoff (1988: 235), on the other hand, links inchoative meaning to desiderative (comparing the expressions ‘the sun is wanting to come out’ and ‘es will Nacht werden’ to Latin lúcēscit and Hittite nanakûši respectively), and then the latter to iterative (citing Modern English will beside would).

A further variant is to join iterativity with intensive meaning. Also frequent is iterative-durative, as claimed by many scholars. This latter definition is hardly to be distinguished, it seems, from ‘straight’ iterativity: scholars such as Kuryłowicz (1964: 106-9) and Cowgill (1979: 36) seem to use the terms interchangeably. Although he avoids the term (1927: 159 n. 1), Porzig’s famous definition that ‘das verbale sê-formans meint Handlungen oder Vorgänge als sich ruckweise in einzelnen Absätzen vollziehende’ (1927: 159) is generally cited by exponents of the view that *-skê/o- indicated iterativity. Kronasser (Kronasser and Neu 1966-87: I.575) thinks iterativity the most probable reconstruction; Lehmann (1974: 188) claims that the inherited suffix had the same various functions which it shows in Hittite, probably with iterative meaning; and Rix (1992: 213-14) makes a similar comparison between iterative *-skê/o- and the Ionic Greek preterites in -(e)sê/KÔV.

---


145 Cf. e.g. Kronasser and Neu 1966-87: I.575, or Szemerényi’s (1996: 274 n. 8) translation of Porzig’s words as ‘iteration proceeding by fits and starts or act by act’. Porzig is also followed by e.g. Debrunner 1937: 261, Kujore 1970: 71 and Schwzyzer and Debrunner 1939-71: I. 707 n. 1, but criticised by Giacalone Ramat 1967: 110.
citing iterative meaning for the suffix elsewhere (Rix 1986: 8, 13). On the other hand, Kujore (1973: 92 n. 1) cites Porzig as having *-skelo- *denoting a process of intermittent or jerky actions*; similar is Risch’s (1974: 272) ‘ein schrittweis es Vorwärtskommen’, cited above.

It is therefore popular opinion that *-skelo- was at a prehistoric stage in some way linked with iterative meaning. Hittite and the Greek iteratives in -(e)σκον seem to be the major reasons for this view; morphological reconstruction of the individual forms explained above (§ 3.1) tells us little about their meaning. The point is reasonable enough: is it merely a coincidence that the oldest attested Indo-European language shows the same meaning for *-skelo- as that shown by a notably peculiar phenomenon of Homeric Greek? This question, particularly regarding the latter formation, will be taken up in Chapter 5; for now, it will suffice to review the role that *-skelo- may have had in the Indo-European verbal system.

4.3. The role of *-skelo- in Proto-Indo-European

Many languages show *-skelo- as a present formant; it seems therefore to have had this role in the parent language, accompanied by several other present-forming affixes (of which reduplication, the nasal formations and *-ye/o- were the most notable); by contrast, the only major aorist formant seems to have been *-s-. Yet the parent language could also form presents and aorists without the addition of any affix at all to the root.

---

146 See especially Chapter 5 § 7.
147 For some recent general discussions of the very complicated subject of the Indo-European verb, with further bibliography, see Barton 1982: 35 and n. 12; Rix 1986; Back 1991; Szemerényi 1996: 230-2; and Giannakis 1997: 22-30.
148 Cf. e.g. Rix 1998: 15-20.
149 Cf. e.g. Rix 1998: 20-1.
150 Cf. e.g. Rix 1998: 14-15 (present), 20 (aorist).
There are two possibilities which may account for this state of affairs. The major question is, in the oldest situation that we can reconstruct, was the major verbal distinction temporal or aspectual? Opinion is divided. Kuryłowicz (1964: 90-135) has argued that the present stem of ancient pairs of the type present *dheti : imperfect *(e)dhét acquired ‘a semantic shade of punctuality’ (1964: 98), so that they are replaced with earlier iterative forms such as *didhéti (or *dedhéti) : *(e)didhēt; the old ousted imperfect *(e)dhét then becomes an aorist (1964: 104-5). In this schema, *-ske/o- is said to join certain other affixes (such as the dental formant found in Latin fundō, Gothic giutan, and the guttural in ἰπυχω, Slavic gryz). In being originally denominative, and only secondarily deverbal (Kuryłowicz 1964: 105). Like the nasal affix and reduplication, *-ske/o- was once an iterative-forming affix, which came to be understood as durative beside an ousted punctual present or inchoative beside a stative one — whence the various meanings in the daughter languages (1964: 106-9). The various different present-forming affixes pertain to different renovations of the ancient verbal system.\footnote{151}

According to Szemerényi (1996: 302-5), however, present : aorist pairs such as *bheugeti ‘flees’ : *(e)bhuget ‘fled’ acquire an imperfect *(e)bhugetet, so that an aspectual distinction arises in the past; competing paradigms of the form *yunég-ti ‘yokes’ : *yuneg-t beside *yeug-s-ti : *yeug-s-t merged into *yunégti : *yeugst.

Another possibility takes into account the fact that the parent language seemed to show either a root present or a root aorist for a given verb, but never both: perhaps there were two classes of roots, one aorist-forming and the other present-forming, with affixes required to fill the gaps.\footnote{152} In this case, aorist-forming roots might have been originally ‘telic’ in meaning (*deh₃- ‘give’, *dheh₃- ‘place’) and present-forming ones ‘atelic’ (*es- ‘be’, *ey₃- ‘go’); affixes were used to create the required missing

\footnote{151}This latter idea seems first to have been put forward by Brunel: cf. Giannakis 1997: 15.
'imperfective' and 'perfective' forms respectively. So from the root aorist of *deh₂-
'give', which produced Vedic á-dā-t and Greek ἔ- δο- μέν 'gave', came a
reduplicated present (whence Vedic dā-dā-ti and Greek δί- δο- σί 'gives'); whereas
*wegr- 'convey' gave a root present (Vedic vāh-ati 'conveys'), from which there was
formed a suffixed aorist (Vedic á-vāk-s-ur 'they have conveyed'). This means that
some forms must be reinterpreted: *peh₂-, which gives Vedic á-pāt, must then mean
'take a swallow/sip' rather than 'drink', and *geweh₂/*gewem- 'take a step' and not 'go'.
The affix *-ske/o- would thus have been one of several present-forming affixes, all
presumably with different meanings. This reconstructed system has typological
support from Russian and also from child language.

Cowgill (1974, 1979), arguing in favour of the Indo-Hittite hypothesis, proposes a role for the present-forming affixes which might explain their function. In
his view (Cowgill 1979: 33-6), the parent language once had two types of verbs,
which he defines as 'verbs proper' and 'nominal verbs'; there was only tense
distinction, not aspect. When Proto-Indo-Hittite split up, the former type of verbs
gave Proto-Indo-European present and aorist forms in both voices, and Anatolian the
mi-conjugation and the medio-passives; the latter gave the Indo-European perfect and
the Anatolian hi-conjugation. At about the time that the split occurred, two events
must have happened: aspect was introduced, and the present tense forms of telic stems
were lost. The result was that aorists were left behind, which were used as perfective
forms. In this way a contrast in aspect was created, and to fill the gap in Proto-Indo-

153The terminology used here is that of Cowgill, which does not seem consonant with Binnick's (1991)
explanation of the various terms and their role in the different types of aspect, distinguishing as he does
between grammatical and lexical aspect (Chapter 5 § 5.1 and n. 50); see further Chapter 5 § 8.
154Cf. Hewson and Bubenik 1997: 30 and 33-4 respectively.
155According to this theory, Pre-Anatolian and Proto-Indo-European both came from a common
ancestor, Proto-Indo-Hittite. On the history of the question, see especially Cowgill 1974: 557-8, 1979:
25-8; and Back 1991: 280.
156For more details on Cowgill's class of nominal verbs, which find a good typological parallel in
Semitic, see Cowgill 1979: 34.
European, imperfectives were formed on telic roots by means of such affixes outlined above (most notably reduplication, the nasal infix, *-skê{o}- and *-ye/o-). In Proto-Indo-Hittite these had had mutually distinct meanings, rather than being mere imperfective markers, as they became in Proto-Indo-European. Hence we find such pairs as the Vedic root aorist ādhāt beside present dádhāti (reduplication), and Greek root aorist βλητο beside present βαλλω (either nasal infix, where λλ comes from *λν, or suffixed with *-ye/o-, in which case λλ derives from *λγ).157 At this stage too, perfectives of atelic roots were formed from the lengthened grade of the root suffixed by the morpheme *-s-, as in the case of Vedic ávakṣur beside vāhati. In pre-Anatolian, however, it was the nominal verb formations that were used as imperfectives for telic verbs: hence *dhōh₁-e gave Hittite da-a-i ‘places’. Later, Anatolian lost its aspectual distinctions, and so its perfective stems of both atelic and telic formations.

Hence, according to Cowgill’s account, we find affixes which are used only to mark imperfective aspect in Indo-European languages but which have a more clearly distinct function in Anatolian: in this way the nasal infix has transitive function, and *-skê{o}- an iterative one, in Hittite. If this theory is correct, it also explains why *-skê{o}- seems to have such a wide range of meanings in languages other than Hittite, which preserves its meaning best: in which case, the sense of *-skê{o}- found in Hittite, iterative-durative, is closest to the earliest meaning that can be reconstructed for our suffix.158

Although we shall probably never be able to discern the true meaning of *-skê{o}-, the multiplicity of present formants which we may reconstruct for Proto-Indo-European – Rix lists as many as twenty-one (1998: 14-20) – implies that there

157 For the former interpretation of the suffixation here see Cowgill 1979: 35 and Rix 1998: 185, 186 n. 4; and for the latter Chantraine 1968-80 s.v. βαλλ and Lejeune 1972: 208 n. 5.
158 For a recent different view of the development of tense and aspect in the Indo-European verbal system, with bibliography, see Hewson and Bubenik 1997: 46-7, 229-48.
were once many roles to be filled. The Hittite and Homeric Greek iterative-durative may, therefore, be the answer for *-ske/o-.

5. Conclusion: Proto-Indo-European *-ske/o-

These, therefore, are the matters about which we can be reasonably certain concerning *-ske/o-. It is an inherited Indo-European present-forming suffix which once took the zero-grade of the root; not only can we reconstruct the suffix itself, but also several of the verbal stems in which it was used.

Other matters are more open to discussion. Morphologically, further analysis of the suffix itself must remain doubtful, although it has been argued for by several scholars. The validity of the reconstruction of a further suffix *-iske/o-*, which would have occurred in complementary distribution with *-ske/o-*, is also debatable. Nor is a connection with formally similar nominal suffixes certain. Semantically, the situation is complicated. There are numerous theories, and it is tempting to say that *-ske/o-* was iterative-durative, but it is advisable to remain sceptical: one needs to have a particular theory of the Indo-European verb to ascribe to, and to know what period of the proto-language one is referring to, in order to place *-ske/o-* in context. This whole analysis is of course affected by the fact that the data from Greek have been omitted – to which we now shall turn, beginning with four chapters on -σκ- in early Greek, largely that of Homer.
Chapter 3
The Morphology of Verbs in -ṣkω in Homer

1. Introduction

The earliest form of Greek which gives sufficient data to analyse verbs in -ṣkω is that of Homer. This is not to say that the language of the Iliad and the Odyssey is to be viewed as an unquestionably coherent whole; but we may say that it dates roughly to the eighth-seventh centuries BC, and it is therefore of undoubted philological importance. Different layers of composition in Homer can result in confused and confusing data; but the epic language is a necessary bridge between the Indo-European reconstructions already discussed and the more easily interpretable patterns of Classical Greek yet to come.

Four chapters on the analysis of -ṣk- in early Greek begin here with an examination of the morphology of presents in -ṣkω in Homeric Greek. Chapter Four will concern the semantics of these same forms, and the iteratives in -(ε)ṣkον will be dealt with in Chapter Five. In conclusion to this part of the thesis, Chapter Six will summarise what can be said about -ṣk- in early Greek.

1.1. Homer's works: corpus and data

1.1.1. The corpus

The corpus to be used comprises the Iliad and the Odyssey, the two Ancient Greek epics generally referred to as Homeric. The text used throughout is that of the Oxford Classical Text of Homer's works: for the Iliad, Monro and Allen 1920, and for the Odyssey, Allen 1917-19. Use was also made of the recent editions of the Iliad and the Odyssey by van Thiel (1996, 1991), and of West's (1998) new Teubner edition of Iliad 1-12. Data were collected from Gehring 1891, and checks were made with the

1On the scanty evidence to be found in Mycenaean Greek, see Chapter 6.
2. Glosses are taken (and sometimes adapted for the sake of brevity) from Cunliffe 1924.

1.1.2. The data

Twenty-three verbs are found in the work of Homer which clearly end in the suffix -σκω: ἀλλῆσκω ‘grow, increase’; ἀλύσκω ‘escape’ (with variants ἀλυσκάζω ‘escape; play the shirker’ and ἀλυσκάνω ‘escape’); ἀπαφίσκω ‘trick’; ἀφαίσκω ‘fit together’; ἐπ- αφίσκομαι ‘touch; incur’; βάσκω ‘come, go’; -βλάσκω ‘go, come’; βόσκω ‘feed’; γηράσκω ‘grow old’; γιγνώσκω ‘know, perceive’; δειδίσκομαι ‘welcome, greet’; διδάσκω ‘teach, instruct’; δίσκω ‘make like; compare with; think’; εὐρίσκω ‘find; find out; incur’; ἡλάσκω ‘rove, flit about’ (with variant ἡλασκάζω ‘wander aimlessly about; skulk’); θυήσκω ‘die’; θρόσκω ‘leap, spring’; ἵλασκομαι ‘propitiate’; ἵσκω ‘make like; liken to; speak feigningly; guess’; κικλήσκω ‘summon; call’; μιμήσκω ‘remind’; πιθυσκόω ‘make manifest; declare’; and τιτύσκομαι ‘make ready; take aim’.

In addition to these forms, there are five further verbs which need to be studied here. Firstly, there are those presents which may show the reflex of Indo-European *-skel/o- in a different form due to phonological change. Two of these are generally held to have been formed in this way, and are uncontroversial: μισγω ‘mix together; bring together’ and πάσχω ‘suffer; encounter’. The origins of ἐρχομαι ‘go; come’

---

2The latter, however, uses Monro and Allen’s (1920) text for the Iliad and Von der Mühll’s (1962) for the Odyssey, which do not always agree with Gehring’s readings (from La Roche’s editions). Spot checks have been made to verify that this makes little difference to this study.

3Figures do not include the Homeric Hymns, but material from both these poems and also Hesiod is discussed where relevant; they contain no presents in -σκω which do not also occur in the Iliad or the Odyssey, apart from ἐβιβάσκε at h.Ap. 133 (on which see § 4.3 and n. 166 below).

4I have adopted the practice in this thesis of citing forms which may show -t- added to long vowel stem as follows: θυήσκω, θρόσκω, but γιγνώσκω, κικλήσκω, μιμήσκω. This is also done by e.g. LSJ (s.v.) and Chantraine (1986: I. 317, although the headword for θρόσκω in his etymological dictionary is θρῶσκο (1968-80)), but is necessarily arbitrary: see further § 3.2.5 below.
and ὀρχεῖμαι ‘dance’ as verbs in -σκω rest on less certain phonological grounds. One further verb, πτωσκάζω ‘cower’, shows the suffix -σκάζω but apparently never -σκω. There are thus twenty-eight forms to be analysed here. Two further instances which could arguably have been included will be discussed in Chapter 5, because in Homer they are apparently iterative preterites: ἔσκον ‘be’ (perhaps inherited; cf. Chapter 5 § 6.1) and (ἦ)φασκόν ‘say, assert’ (later the imperfect of φάσκω; cf. Chapter 5 § 6.2).

1.2. Morphological Classification

These verbs may be classed into six different morphological groups as follows. Firstly, there is the set which shows the ancient formation of zero-grade root with *-ske/o-: here we find three presents in original -σκω which may have cognates in *-ske/o- elsewhere (βάσκω, μίσγω, ἐρχόμαι); the iterative preterite ἔσκον might also fall here. The second class will be divided in two. Firstly, there are five verbs which appear to follow the same pattern as the inherited forms (ἄλυσκω, βόσκω, ἱσκω, ὀρχεῖμαι, πάσχω); (ἦ)φασκόν, if not an iterative, would belong in this category. Secondly in this class, there occur the only other verbs in Homer which also have a monosyllabic root followed by -σκω; these show a long vowel before the suffix and appear to have set roots (-βλόσκω, θυήσκω, θρούσκω). The third class is the largest, and comprises those verbs in -σκω which show reduplication in -τ-; I shall deal first of all with those derived from set roots (the apparently inherited γιγνόσκω, the perhaps inherited ἓλάσκομαι, κικλήσκω, μιμήσκω) and then with the remaining three, which show originally non-vocalic stems (διδάσκω, πιθαύσκω, τιτύσκομαι). There are also two verbs which apparently have reduplication in -ἐ- (δειδίσκομαι, ἔίσκω), and these form the fourth class. The fifth is comprised of four verbs which show the suffix -ίσκω where the -τ- does not belong to the root (ἀπαφίσκω, ἀφαίρεσκω, ἐπαυρίσκομαι, εἴρισκω). Lastly,
there is a miscellaneous group of three further verbs in -σκω which do not fit with
the others (άλθησκω, γηράσκω, ἦλάσκω); the one form found only in -σκάζω
(πτωσκάζω) will also be classed in this category.\footnote{There are a few further possible relics of Indo-European -skelo- in Homeric Greek. A possible loan which shows -σκω is ἀσκέω 'work on, etc.;' this occurs with present stem only as third person singular imperfect ἔσκειν at II. 3.388, but has an aorist ἔσκησα (five times in the Iliad, three in the Odyssey) and perfect medio-passive ἔσκησα (II. 10.438), also appearing once as ἔπησκησα 'it was finished with' (Od. 17.266); there is also ἀσκητός 'prepared or fashioned with art' (Od. 4.134, 23.189). Chantraine (1968-80 s.v.) gives no likely etymology, but Szemerényi (1972: 252-3) has suggested that this present shows *-skelo- as a borrowing from Hittite anisk- iterative of aninya- 'work' via *anik-. The non-present stem ἀσκητός probably occurs in Mycenaean, in the form a-ke-: cf. Aura Jorro 1985-93 s.vv. a-ke-te, a-ke-ti-ra.}

In the following six sections of this chapter I shall examine these six classes of
twenty-eight verbs, from the presents derived from zero-grade roots, as reconstructed

\footnote{There are a few further possible relics of Indo-European -skelo- in Homeric Greek. A possible loan which shows -σκω is ἀσκέω 'work on, etc.;' this occurs with present stem only as third person singular imperfect ἔσκειν at II. 3.388, but has an aorist ἔσκησα (five times in the Iliad, three in the Odyssey) and perfect medio-passive ἔσκησα (II. 10.438), also appearing once as ἔπησκησα 'it was finished with' (Od. 17.266); there is also ἀσκητός 'prepared or fashioned with art' (Od. 4.134, 23.189). Chantraine (1968-80 s.v.) gives no likely etymology, but Szemerényi (1972: 252-3) has suggested that this present shows *-skelo-, as a borrowing from Hittite anisk- iterative of aninya- 'work' via *anik-. The non-present stem ἀσκητός probably occurs in Mycenaean, in the form a-ke-: cf. Aura Jorro 1985-93 s.vv. a-ke-te, a-ke-ti-ra.}

There are also three possible instances of nominal relics of old presents in -σκω in Homer.
Firstly, there is λέσχη 'public lounge or gathering place' (gloss from Heubeck et al. 1988-92: III.69), found at Od. 18.329; this form, from *λέχ-σκω, may come from a present *λέχ-σκομαι (as βοσκητι: βόσκω; cf. Frisk 1960-72 s.v. λέσχη; and Chantraine 1968-80 s.v. λέσχη); the root would be *legh- 'lie down' (cf. Rix 1998: 357-8). Secondly, φάσγανον 'sword' (fifteen times in the Iliad, ten in the Odyssey; cf. Mycenaean pa-ka-na, Aura Jorro 1985-93 s.v.) may show, according to Isebaert (1985), that there was once a present *φάσγω or *φάσγομαι from *bhega-skelo-, beside the aorist ἐφαγόν 'ate; devoured' (suppletive to the present ἐθῖω, and found four times in the Iliad and twenty in the Odyssey); on the root cf. Rix 1998: 51. Although there is no other evidence for a Proto-Indo-European form, a present *φάσγον is morphologically possible in Greek, since it could well have been derived from the thematic aorist ἐφαγόν (cf. e.g. ἀφαρίσκω from ἐφαρμόν, and further § 8 below); on these forms see further Frisk 1960-72 s.vv. φαγεῖν, φαγεῖν; and Chantraine 1968-80 s.vv. φαγεῖν, φαγεῖν. Lastly, in δίσκος 'quoit' (twice in the Iliad, four times in the Odyssey), we may have a derivative from *δικόσκος; on the other hand, the noun could represent an earlier *δίκσκος from δικεῖν 'throw', found in Pindar, Aeschylus and Euripides (cf. Porzig 1927: 165; Frisk 1960-72 s.vv. δίσκος; and Chantraine 1968-80 s.v. δίκεῖν).

A further lost present in -σκω may be *ἀκεχισκω, which Schulze (1910: 186), followed by Risch (1974: 299), expected to find rather than attested ἀκεχίζω (aorist ἀκεχιζεῖν), on account of the Homeric pattern of present in -ισκω beside thematic aorist, as ἀφαρίσκω: ἀφαρεῖν (cf. § 6.5 below); the form in -ισκω would have been avoided to prevent a series of three gutturals. Indeed, non-present forms also occur in ἀκακέ- η-, showing the expected later pattern beside a present in -ισκω (cf. Homeric ἐποιούρισκοι: ἐποιοῦρ- ἡσματι, and further Chapter 7 § 3, especially 3.1). For a list of forms see Gehring 1891 s.v. ἀκακήσείς, and for discussion of the reduplicated aorist see Bendahanman 1993: 84-7.
for the proto-language, to all the uses of this suffix as present formant in Homeric Greek.

2. Inherited formations

Inherited presents in *-skelo- in Greek should, according to the evidence presented above (Chapter 2 § 3.3), show a zero-grade root before an original suffix *-skelo-, with the accent once on the thematic vowel. There are at most six verbs inherited from such forms in Ancient Greek: most clearly, βάσκω and μίσγω; ἐπρομιμαί, which may or may not show a reflex of *-skelo-; ἐσκοῦ, which may be inherited; γιγνόσκω, the Greek form of Proto-Indo-European *gñh₁-skelo-; and in addition ἱλαικομοιαί, perhaps from *sjh₁-skelo-. Only the first three of these forms will be discussed in this section.6

2.1. βάσκω

βάσκω 'come, go' is found eight times in the Iliad and never in the Odyssey.7 Of these, six are instances of the imperative, and the other two are problematic: ἐπιβασκέμεν (II. 2.234) 'bring within the pale of, involve in' and παρέβασκε (II. 11.104) 'act as παραξιβάτης, go beside'. The former, oddly, shows causative meaning; the latter is morphologically ambiguous, thought by some to be an iterative preterite in -(ε)σκοῦ, and not part of βάσκω: for both, see further Chapter 4 § 2.1.1.

6For reconstructions see also Chapter 2 § 3.1. On ἐσκοῦ, which presents morphological and semantic difficulties, see Chapter 5 § 6.1; on γιγνόσκω and ἱλαικομοιαί, whose expected Greek reflexes are not found, see §§ 4.1.1 and 4.1.5 below respectively.

7It will be noted that, in many cases, many of the figures used in this thesis for verbs of movement do not agree with those of Létoublon (1985). It has proven impossible to reconcile the data, not least because she is herself inconsistent in this matter (listing 117 instances for ἐπρομιμαί at p. 22, but 111 at p. 60). Differences would also be due to her inclusion of the Homeric Hymns, which she does refer to and cite (as at e.g. pp. 10, 124, 135), although she elsewhere implies they are not included (p. 17).
Bάσκω is in competition with βαίνω 'go', which occurs frequently in Homer: the latter's stem, in both present and imperfect tenses, in simple and compound forms, is found 44 times in the Iliad and 64 in the Odyssey. Non-present forms of this verb are mostly in βη-, but forms showing the old zero-grade βα- also appear. The future occurs in the active once as causative in the compound ἐπιβήσω 'cause to embark' (II. 8.197), but more usually as intransitive βήσομαι (simple at II. 2.339, and in compound form six times in the Iliad). There are several different aorists. A sigmatic causative ἐβήσα exists (simple six times in the Iliad and once in the Odyssey, with preverbs four times and twice in the respective epics) beside the intransitive ἐβήν,8 with causative middle ἄναβησάμην 'cause to embark' (Od. 15.475). There is also a 'mixed' aorist9 ἐβήσομην (five times in each epic in simple form, and, with various preverbs, twenty and ten times in compound form respectively). The root aorist ἐβήν is most frequent of all: in simple form alone it occurs 163 times in the Iliad and 136 in the Odyssey; the wide variety of compounds of this aorist occur 67 and 87 times respectively. It also shows the widest range of archaic forms, with third person plural occurring as both ἐβησάν and ἐβαν, and also with subjunctive βετώ, optative βαίνω and participle βάς. The perfect βέβηκα, first person plural βέβαμεν, participle βεβαώς, βεβαυία, is found seven times in the Iliad and twice in the Odyssey, with compounds occurring thirteen and three times respectively; there is also a pluperfect found as third person singular ἐβεβήκει, plural βεβασκαν (seventeen times in the Iliad and eighteen in the Odyssey, with occasional compounds three times and once in the respective epics).

Verbal forms in βα- are not restricted to the few given above. There are occasional reduplicated participial forms: βιβάσθων 'striding, striding along' (II. 13.809, 15.676, 16.534); from *βιβημι, βιβάς 'id.' (II. 3.22, 7.213, 13. 371,

8Cf. Létoublon 1985: 255 n. 15.
9On this type of formation see Chantraine 1986-8: I.416-17.
15.307, 686, *Od.* 9.450, 11.539), sometimes found in the manuscripts as βιβδὼν,10 there are also compound forms προβιβάς ‘striding along forwards’ (*Il.* 13.18, 158, *Od.* 17.27, 15.555); and προβιβών ‘advancing’ (*Il.* 13.807, 16.609).11 Nominal forms mostly show βά-, but βη- is also found.12

The verb βάσκω is generally held to be cognate with Vedic गच्छति and Old, Young Avestan jasaiti; it would thus be derived from the stem *gʰm-ske/o-*,13 from the root *gʰem-*. The latter base is found in a variety of forms in a range of languages (cf. Rix 1998: 187-8); it is very common in Sanskrit, from Vedic onwards14 but in Greek is only elsewhere certain in βαίνω, and at that only if this form is directly cognate with Latin *veniō* from *gʰm-ye/o-*.15 The alternative is to derive βάσκω

---

11On these forms see further Chantraine 1968-80 s.v. βαινω; and Léoutbion 1985: 124.
12In βά- we find ὀμβατός ‘capable of being scaled’ (*Il.* 6.434, *Od.* 11.316) and καταμπατός ‘affording access for descent’ (*Od.* 13.110); ὀμῆφισις ‘defence of a fallen body’ (*Il.* 5.623) and ἔκβασις ‘a means of escape from’ (*Od.* 5.410); παραβάτης ‘he that goes beside [i.e., the fighter] (in a chariot)’ (*Il.* 23.132); χαλκοβατής ‘based on, with floor of, bronze’ (four times in the *Iliad*, twice in the *Odyssey*); ἔπερβασις ‘trespass; wrongdoing’ (three times in the *Iliad*, four in the *Odyssey*); ἐπιβαθρόν ‘return made for a passage in a ship’ (*Od.* 15.449); and ‘absolutives’ βάδην ‘step by step’ (*Il.* 13.516) and ἔμπαδων ‘by stepping, by land’ (*Il.* 15.505). In βη-, Homer has apparently only ἐπιβήτωρ ‘one who mounts’ (three times in the *Odyssey*), ἐπιμεταβήτης ‘made to go or stand upon the fire’ (*Il.* 23.702) and βηλός ‘threshold’ (*Il.* 1.591, 15.23, 23.202). Also related are προβάτα ‘cattle, flocks and herds’ (*Il.* 14.124, 23.550; cf. Chantraine 1968-80 s.v. πρόβατα) and πρόβασις ‘id.’ (*Od.* 2.75). On the perhaps related ήλιβατος (three times in each epic), see Chantraine 1968-80 s.v. A related proper noun is the Phaeacian Ἀυρβάνσινεως (*Od.* 8.113); there is also Ἐρυβάτης (three times in the *Iliad*, once in the *Odyssey*).
13Whether Tocharian A kumnās, B kännassām ‘come’ is also connected is controversial: see Klingenschmitt 1982: 64 and n. 3; and Hackstein 1995: 306-7.
14Cf. Mayrhofer 1986- s.v. GAM.
15This depends on the change of *my to *ny in Greek, for which there are apparently only two possible further examples: that of κοινός ‘common’, perhaps derived from an earlier *kom-yos – although Lejeune (1972: 155-6) states that this is doubtful since *kom (Latin cum) shows no other possible reflexes in Greek; and that of βασίνω ‘chatter with one’s teeth’ (*Il.* 10.375), which may derive from an earlier *bas-βασιν- (cf. Hock 1984: 92). On the etymology of βατόν and its link with veniō see also Léoutbion 1985: 142-3. Hackstein (1995: 306) finds it unlikely that a root would have presents in both *-ske/o- and *-ye/o- in the proto-language, and suggests that the latter pair results from a common innovation of Latin and Greek.
from \(*g^\prime h_2\)-skel/o-, with the zero-grade of the by-form \(*g^\prime e h_2\)-, which is also found in Vedic, among other languages (cf. Rix 1998: 183). This is is the preform reconstructed by Ruijgh (1985: 141), but it calls into question the equation with gáčchati, leading us to expect **jicchati. Hence, beside the many forms in Greek showing \(\beta\eta\)- from full-grade \(*g^\prime e h_2\)-, the cases of \(\beta\chi\)- are ambiguous between \(*g^\prime h_2\)- and \(*g^\prime m\)-; Mycenaean a-pi-going-to, however, seems to imply a base containing a vocalic nasal.16

2.2. ἔρχομαι

If it is indeed derived from a verb in \(-skel/o-\), then ἔρχομαι ‘go, proceed; etc.’ is by far the most common of all these verbs to be found in Homer; it is also the only verb from this first category which was common in later Greek. The simple present occurs 51 times in the Iliad and 64 in the Odyssey; eight different compound forms occur,17 totalling fifteen and eighteen instances for the respective epics. It shows no imperfect, although all other parts of the present system occur bar the optative; the gap for the former is filled by ἥμα (including compound forms, over 100 times in both epics combined), the imperfect of ἔμι ‘go, proceed; depart; come, etc.’ (over 400 times).18

No related non-present forms occur for ἔρχομαι. Several suppletive forms are found instead, apparently from a root \(*h_2\)-leudh-, glossed by Rix as ‘steigen, wachsen’ (cf. Rix 1998: 221-2).19 The future is ἐλεύσομαι, found in simple form

---

16Cf. Lejeune 1972: 192 n. 6; and Aura Jorro 1985-93 s.v. a-pi-going-to, with further bibliography.
17These are: ἀνέρχομαι ‘go up; come back’; ἀπέρχομαι ‘depart’; διέρχομαι ‘pierce; pass through’; ἐπέρχομαι ‘go to; enter, etc.’; ἐπέρχομαι ‘approach; come to; etc.’; κατέρχομαι ‘go or come down; put in’; μετέρχομαι ‘go to see, etc.’; and παρέρχομαι ‘pass; outwit’.
18For the etymology of this verb, see Rix 1998: 207-8; for related forms, see Chantraine 1968-80 s.v. ἕμι.
19Cf. also Létoublon 1985: 251 n. 116 (root \(*h_2\)-el-, with various extensions). For bibliography on the possibly connected ἐλεύθερος, Ἑλευσίς and Ἐιλείθυς, see Létoublon 1985: 248 n. 44.
ten times in the *Iliad* and 30 in the *Odyssey*, and in various compound forms four times in the former and twice in the latter. The extremely frequent aorist ἤλθον, also found as ἤλθον, in all occurs over 250 times in the *Iliad* and over 300 in the *Odyssey* as a simple verb, and 54 and 85 times respectively in its many compound versions. Lastly, there is a perfect εἰληλούθα, also occurring as the usually compounded εἰληλούθα, found as simple eleven times in the *Iliad* and fifteen in the *Odyssey*, with occasional compounds ἀπεληλούθα (II. 24.766, Od. 19.223, 24.310) and ἐπεληλούθα (Od. 4.268); the pluperfect is εἰληλούθετα (six times in the *Iliad*).

Further forms are also linked with ἐρχομαι semantically. There is a future εἰσομαι (including compound forms, four times in the *Iliad* and twice in the *Odyssey*), with aorist εἰσάμην (eleven, twice); imperfect ἐκιον ‘go, come, etc.’ (twelve times in the *Odyssey*), and stative present σειχομαι ‘go, come, etc.’ (34 and 62 times in the respective epics, with compounds in ἀπο-, ἐπι-, ἐκ-, μετα- and παρα- totalling 27 and 29 occurrences respectively).

The origin of the present ἐρχομαι is still controversial, there being two possibilities. Firstly, as Meillet (1929) argued, this form may have come from *ser-gh-*, being then linked with such forms as Vedic *sisarti* ‘rush’, Armenian *ert’am* ‘come’ and Greek ἐρπω ‘move’; the aspirate in the suffix could have caused the loss of the old initial *s*- by dissimilation after it became *h*, with *ἐρ- χε/ο- becoming

---

20 See further Chapter 4 § 2.1.3.
21 These forms are not etymologically related to εἰμι, although they were felt to have been; hence Gehring (1891) lists them s.v. εἰμι, but Cunliffe 1924 s.v. ἣμι. See further Chantraine 1968-80 s.v. εἰσομαι, 1968-8: I.293-4, 412; Létoublon 1985: 80-1; and Rix 1998: 609-10.
22 On this form see further Chantraine 1968-80 s.v. κιο; Létoublon 1985: 88; and Rix 1998: 309.
24 For criticism of the further view that a form *ἐρθ- σκομαι led to ἐρχομαι, see Szemerényi 1964: 4-5.
25 On this form see Mayrhofer 1986- s.v. *SAR.*
An alternative view which goes back to Fick (1874-6: I.20) is that it shows an earlier *ἐρσκομαί; in this case it is to be compared with Vedic *rechāti ‘reach, meet’, Old Persian -rsatiy and Hittite āraškizzi ‘arrive repeatedly’. This requires that we accept Rix’s Law, by which initial laryngeals ʰ₁, ʰ₂ and ʰ₃ are vocalised before a directly following liquid or nasal as ʰ-, ʰα- and ʰδ- respectively, and derive ἐρχ- from *ʰ₁ʰ₃sk-. ²⁸

Even if Rix’s Law is accepted, however, it is debatable whether or not the change of the inherited cluster *-rsk- to -ρχ- is phonologically plausible. Rix’s only example of this development is ὑρχέομαι from *ʰ₃ʰ₃sk/ᵉο-ἀ-, which is equally doubtful (cf.§ 3.1.4 below); there are, however, several examples of *s aspirating a previous consonant when followed by a further one (cf. Rix 1970: 98-9). Such are, with velar, πλοκμός from *πλοκσμος, λύκνος from *λυκσνος and ἐχθρός from *ekstros; and, with labial, ἐθθός from *ἐπστός. The phoneme *s is apparently retained after a nasal or dental (as in e.g. πάσχω from *παθσκω, δεσπότης from *δεμο-πότης), but after a liquid the same change seems to take place as that after a labial or velar: the loss of *s in πτέρνη from *pērsnā (Gothic fairzna, Vedic pārṣni-) ²⁹ occurs by way of *h, since we also find ὑρμή beside ὑρνμι and ὑρμός, ὑρμα beside ἀρφίσκω – thus showing that the combination -ρ-σμο- became first *-ρʰμο- before then -ρμο-. Hence Rix believes that the aspiration could have been carried over in the

²⁶The connection with Armenian եր’m is however apparently doubtful: cf. Clackson 1994: 181, with bibliography.
²⁷Cf. Mayrhofer 1986- s.v. AR² on the Indo-Iranian forms and Puhvel 1984- s.v. ar-, er- on the Hittite. How the Old Persian datum should be read has been debated: Schmitt (1964-5, followed by Rix 1970: 98 and 109 n. 88) argued for rsattiy, but this has since been disputed: in his criticism of Weber’s view that rasattiy was modelled on jasattiy, Schmitt (1975 [1977]: 47) was not followed by Szemerényi (1996: 273 n. 2).
²⁸Cf. Rix 1970, especially 98-100; Mayrhofer in Kuryłowicz 1968-86: I/1.129-130, both with further bibliography; and Hoenigswald 1993: 462.
²⁹On the latter cf. now Mayrhofer 1986- s.v. pārṣni-.
cases of ἐρχομαι and ὕρχεόμαι, even though here the aspirated velar follows, rather than precedes, *s: thus *ρσκ > *ρηκ > ρχ.30

The most recent suggestion for the etymology of ἐρχομαι is to be found in a work edited by Rix himself (Rix 1998: 212 n. 8): ἐρχομαι could have come from a thematicisation of the root present from *h₁ergʰ- 'ascend' (on which cf. Rix 1998: 212), and the Greek form could therefore be a result of *h₁ergʰ-e/o- and *h₁tske/o-falling together.

Létoublon (1985: 71-2) comes to a mixed conclusion as to the correct origin of ἐρχομαι. Her analysis of the use of ἐρχομαι in Homer as durative (on which see Chapter 4 § 2.1.3) favours a link with the same root as that of ἐπισω and sisarti, and more distantly that of forms in *sr-ew- (πέω 'flow, run' and σράβατι 'flow'). On the other hand, she feels that the durative and sometimes iterative value of the form could well come from *-ske/o-. Therefore no morphological, phonological or semantic argument has been adduced to show conclusively that ἐρχομαι does or does not continue an inherited present in *-ske/o-; it is not unconventional, however, to believe that it does.31

2.3. μίσγω

The simple verb μίσγω 'mix together; mix with; bring together (in fight)', medio-passive 'mingle with, join, reach; associate with; have sexual intercourse, etc.' is rarely found in the active (infinitive at Od. 20.203, imperfect at Il. 3.270, Od.

30In his section on the consonant combination of stop plus *s, Lejeune states that, except in cases where dissimilation occurs, a labial or guttural stop followed by *s became φ or χ respectively before a consonant (1972: 74). Especially notable in this connection is αἵμη, which is attested in Mycenaean as a₁-ka-sa-ma: this reveals an earlier form *αἷκυμα (cf. Aura Jorro 1985-93 s.v. a₁-ka-sa-ma). Further details on the possible combinations are given under the subject of *s between consonants (1972: 137-8). Lejeune does not mention ἐρχομαι in this connection, however, deriving it from *ser-gh- (1972: 93).

31Cf. e.g. Oettinger 1979: 329; and Sihler 1995: 505-6.
1.110). The simple medio-passive μίσγομαι occurs six times in the Iliad and four in the Odyssey, with imperfect twice and four times respectively. Non-present forms show -γ-, devoiced -κ-, and the combinatory -ξ-. The aorist in the active is thus ἐμείξα (I. 15.510, Od. 4.41), in the medio-passive μέκτο (I. 11.354, 16.813), ἐμείκτο (Od. 1.433) and in the morphological passive ἐμίχθην (eleven times in the Iliad and once in the Odyssey) and ἐμίγην (seventeen each in the Iliad and the Odyssey). The perfect is only found as medio-passive participle μεμιγμένος (once in the Iliad and five times in the Odyssey), with pluperfect ἐμέμικτο (I. 4.438).

Future passive meaning is found both for μιγῆσομαι (I. 10.365) and for the morphological middle μιγώμαι (Od. 6.136, 24.314). There are also the iterative forms μισγέσκετο (Od. 18.325) and ἐμισγέσκοντο (Od. 20.7). Compounds are ἀναμίσγω ‘mix up’ (Od. 10.235), aorist participle ὑμιμείξας (I. 24.529); ἐπιμίσγομαι ‘mingle with, have dealings or intercourse with’ (twice in each epic); μεταμίσγω ‘lump with; set or place among’ (Od. 18.310), future active μεταμιέξω (Od. 22.221); aorist passive προμιγήναι ‘have sexual intercourse with in anticipation of another’ (I. 9.452); and συμμίσγομαι ‘mingle with’ (I. 2.753).

A nominal derivative from μίσγω itself is seen in μισγ-ἀγκεία ‘place where two glens join their streams’ (I. 4.453); there is also a further present μιγάζομαι ‘have sexual intercourse’ (Od. 8.271).34

32For the aorist and future forms with stem ending in -ξ-, the Oxford Classical Text is inconsistent regarding whether to read μιξ- (Allen’s (1917-19) text of the Odyssey) or μείξ- (Monro and Allen’s (1920) text of the Iliad); I follow Chantraine (1968-80 s.v. μείγνυμι, 1986-8:1.13) in writing μείξ- here.

33The second element of the compound is ἀγκός ‘bend; glen, valley’ (three times in the Iliad, twice in the Odyssey); Chantraine (1968-80 s.v. μείγνυμι) supposes an earlier μισγ-ἀγκής.

34Also related are the adverbs μιγάθα ‘mingled, in one mass, with’ (I. 8.437, Od. 24.77) and ἐπιμίξ ‘mingled together, etc.’ (four times in the Iliad, once in the Odyssey); cf. Chantraine 1968-80 s.v. μείγνυμι. On the perhaps related feminine adjective ἐμιχθαλόεσσα (I. 24.753), see his entry s.v. ἐμιχθαλόεις.
Although μίσγω appears to have come from *μιγ-σκο, other languages show relics of a present *μίκ-σκελο-, with zero-grade of a root *μεικ- (cf. Rix 1998: 385). In Italic we apparently find Praenestine Latin misc (CIL 560) and Latin miscēd, as well as various Celtic forms and several Germanic ones. There may also be a correspondent in Vedic, the middle participle micchāmāna-. According to Keller (1992: 69-71), Sanskrit forms from this root in *-s- and Baltic ones in *-st- are also to be connected. The root aorist whose present was *μίκ-σκελο- is preserved in (έ)μικτο, reformed in ἐμείξα (cf. Rix 1998: 385 and n. 2).

Regarding the problematic phonological development within Greek from earlier μίγ-σκο, there are two possibilities. It could be that root μίγ- (as found in other Greek forms) gave *μίγσκ-, with the γ voicing the following group and then becoming lost. On the other hand, perhaps first of all devoicing occurred, so that *μίγ-σκο > *μίκσκο > *μίσκο; the form μίσγω would then result from the influence of other forms in μίγ-.

---


36 Rix (1998: 385 n. 1) explains Greek μίγ- as deriving from a voiced variant *μείγ- / *μειγ-, generalised at the expense of *μεικ-; Keller (1992: 68-9), on the other hand, reconstructs *μει-κ/γ-, an extended form of a root *μει-, which expresses the notion of contact.

37 Exceptionally, the verb has become part of the -eō, -ēre conjugation; the one instance of misc, if it is not short for miscē, is the only relic of the older form. On this verb in Latin see Keller 1992: 65-8, 74-7; for bibliography on the form misc see also Rix 1998: 385 n. 5.

38 These include Welsh (cy)msgaf 'mix' and Old Irish mescal 'mix, confuse', although the latter is problematic; see further Keller 1992: 72-3.

39 Such as Old English miscian, Old High German miscen, which however may be the result of the loaning of Latin miscēd into western Germanic *miskan; see further Keller 1992: 73-4.

40 Cf. Mayrhofer 1986- s.v. MEKS; and Rix 1998: 385 and n. 3, with bibliography; the former glosses 'rückig', the latter 'aufgewühlt (?). The form is used descriptively, in praise of snakes: cf. further Scheftelowitz 1906: 87, 1928: 95-6.

Although historically a form in -σκ-, it would seem that μίσγω was no longer understood as such by the time of the later epic. An interesting parallel for the forms in μισχεσκ-, also from the Odyssey, is afforded by the only other instance of -σκ- added to a stem already in -σκω or *-σκε/ο-: for we find from βοσκω the form βοσκέσκουθ' (Od. 12.355). In the case of μίσγω, this lack of recognition of *-σκε/ο- is shown both by nominal μισχάγκεια and by the change of *-σκω to -σγω; in βοσκω, it is clear that -σκω was no longer seen as a present formant since it is found in the future βοσκήσω, first at Od. 17.559.

2.4. Summary: inherited formations

Homeric Greek therefore shows good evidence for *g"m-σκε/ο- (βάσκω), probably *μικ-σκε/ο- (μίσγω) and quite possibly *h₁-σκε/ο- (ἐρχομαι), all with the expected zero-grade of the root. In addition to the reformed *APH-σκε/ο- apparently found in γιγνώσκω (§ 4.1.1 below), there may also be relics of *h₁σ-σκε/ο- (ἐσκον, Chapter 5 § 6.1) and *s/h₂-σκε/ο- (ιλάσκομαι, § 4.1.5 below).

3. Formations which continue the ancient pattern

In addition to these perhaps inherited forms, the Indo-European pattern of zero-grade root with *-σκε/ο- is continued in Greek in two further ways, which will be dealt with separately in this section. In the first place, four verbs seem to show the zero-grade in exactly the same way as those listed in § 2 above. These are ἀλύσκω, βόσκω, ἴσκω and πάσχω; the roots of all four show vocalic alternations which imply that they are ancient, but there are no corresponding forms in other languages.

42 Cf. similarly Schwyzer and Debrunner 1939-71: I. 710.
43 On βοσκήσω, and later noun βοσκημα, see below, § 3.1.2. The formation of a non-present stem from the present without removal of the latter's distinctive formant(s) seems to indicate misinterpretation of that stem, as is clearly the case with διδάσκω (giving adjective αὐτοδιδάκτος 'self-taught' and various verbal forms: cf. § 4.2.1 below).
Additionally, (ἐ)φάσκον could be classed here, apparently an iterative preterite which later shows a present (cf. Chapter 5 § 6.2). None of these five bar the latter, however, has a good Indo-European etymology.

Secondly, there are three verbs which show presents in -σκω of a form that is regular for set roots, but none of which has a certain etymology. These are
- βλάσκω, θυγισκω and θρψκω, which show the same phonological development as the expected *γνώσκω from *γνησκοσκοσκοσκο.

3.1. Formations with zero-grade of the root

3.1.1. ἀλύσκω

'Ἀλύσκω 'escape’ is found only at Od. 22.363, 382; it also has the collateral suffixed presents ἀλυσκάζω ‘escape; play the shirker’ (II. 5.253, 6.443, Od. 17.581) and imperfect ἀλύσκαυς ‘escape’ (Od. 22.330). There is a rare future ἀλύξω (II. 10.371, Od. 17.547, 19.558) and a quite common aorist Ἡλυξα (eight times in the Iliad, sixteen in the Odyssey), also found in the compound form ὑπ- Ἡλυξα ‘keep away from; get away; escape’ (twice and three times respectively); this same stem is found in nominal ὑπάλυξις ‘a possibility or the means of escape’ (II. 22.270, Od. 23.287). Related are the present ἀλέσματι ‘escape, avoid’ (II. 18.586), also ἀλεύματι (Od. 24.29), which has an aorist ἀλεάσθαι, ἀλεύσθαι (25 times in the Iliad, sixteen in the Odyssey); there are also compound aorist forms ὑπαλεύματος ‘escape (from the power of)’ (Od. 15.275) and ὑπεξαλέασθαι ‘keep away from the reach of’ (II. 15.180).

44On the authenticity of this form, see § 4.1.1 below.

45On the use of the suffixes -αζω and -ανω to create collateral forms in Homer, cf. Chantraine 1986-8: I.315-16 and 337-8 respectively; cf. also ἡλύςκω / ἡλύσκαζω (§ 7.3 below), and further Chapter 4 § 2.2.

46Connected forms are ἀλέη ‘means of escape’ (II. 22.301), ἀλέωρη ‘shrinking from the foe; means of defence’ (three times in the Iliad) and present ἀλευκων ‘escape, etc.’ (eighteen times in the Iliad,
The present ἀλύσκω, although apparently a formation peculiar to Greek, could have been derived via the ancient pattern from an earlier *h₂lu-ske/o-; hence one can reconstruct a root *h₂lew-, which also occurs in Tocharian (cf. Rix 1998: 248). In this case, the non-present forms in ἀλυζ- are from *ἀλυσκ- σ-, a result of the extension of the present stem; this also occurs in Homer with forms in διδαξ-, which seems to be from διδασκ- σ-.\(^{47}\)

The present ἀλέοματι can be derived from the same root, via *ἀλέφοματι from an ancient thematic present *h₂lew-e/o-. Rix (1998: 248) has ἀλεύματι as possibly due to the aorist ἀλευξθατι, itself perhaps from ἀλευσ- / ἀλέω-.\(^{48}\) Hackstein (1995: 216) notes that Tocharian B alăsk-, A ālās- 'keep away, ward off' could be cognate with ἀλύσκω, but argues against this possibility on morphological grounds. Given the lack of correspondences outside Greek, therefore, inherited origin for this present in -σκω is doubtful.

### 3.1.2. βόσκω

The present active βόσκω 'feed, tend; nourish, support' is found eight times in the Odyssey, with the imperfect occurring once in the Iliad; the medio-passive βόσκοματι ‘feed, graze’ occurs five times in the earlier epic and six in the later one, nearly all instances being participial. Two forms occur in the Odyssey which imply that by this time the stem βοσκ- has been misinterpreted as not showing the present formant -σκ-: one case of an iterative imperfect in -σκ-, βοσκέσκονθ (Od. 12.355);\(^{49}\) and a future which retains the -σκ- of the present, βοσκ- ήσω (Od. 17.559). The latter is formed by addition of the suffix -ήσω to the present stem, as

---

\(^{47}\)See § 4.2.1 below, and cf. also the extension of present μισγ- and βοσκ- (§§ 2.3, 3.1.2 respectively).

\(^{48}\)Alternatively, the aorist could be a root formation: cf. Hackstein 1995: 215-16.

\(^{49}\)Cf. iteratives μισγέσκετο and ἐμισγέσκοντο beside μίσγω, § 2.3 above.
also occurs for e.g. future ἀλέξ- ἔσω from present ἀλέξω; a closer morphological parallel, but one from outside Homer, is aorist δίδασκ- ἔσα (cf. § 4.2.1 below). The stem βοσκη- is extended to form the noun βόσκη- μα ‘beast, food’ by the time of Aeschylus.51

Most related forms in Homer, however, show the stem βω- / βο-, apparently found first of all as second element in Mycenaean forms such as qo-u-qo-ta = *Γ"ουγ"ότάς (cf. βουβότας ‘herdsman’, Pindar 1. 6.32) and su-qo-ta = *συνω/ότας = συβώτης, συβότης.53 In the pair βω- / βο- we appear to have an ancient vocalic alternation of a full-grade *g"eναι- beside zero-grade *g"hαι-.

3.1.3. ἰσκω

The verb ἰσκω ‘make like; liken to, deem like, take for; speak feigningly; conjecture, guess’ occurs in Homer in participial form at Il. 11.799, 16.41 and Od. 4.279; the imperfect is found at Od. 19.203 and 22.31. It is generally accepted as

50 Cf. further Chantraine 1986-8: I.446-7.
51 On the later use of the stem βοσκη- in verbs and nouns, see Moussy 1969: 14, 21-2 respectively. We also find nominal forms in - βοσκός and verbs in - βοσκέω: cf. Moussy 1969: 19-20. On the stem in Plato see Chapter 7 § 5.1.
52 Simple nominal forms found in βο- in Homer are βοτά (plural) ‘grazing beasts, beasts of the herd’ (Il. 18.521), βοσίς ‘food’ (Il. 19.268), βοτάνη ‘food; feeding-place’ (Il. 13.493, Od. 10.411) and βοτήρ ‘herdsman’ (Od. 15.504), with compound nouns μηδοβοτήρ ‘shepherd’ (Il. 18.529) and συβόσιον ‘herd of swine’ (Il. 11.679=Od. 14.101). Compound adjectives are οὐκιβότος ‘browsed on by goats’ (Od. 4.606, 13.246), βουβότος ‘grazed by cattle’ (Od. 13.246), εὐβότος ‘having goodly cattle’ (Od. 15.406), ἐπιβότος ‘grazed by horses’ (eight times in the Iliad, seven in the Odyssey) and σουλιβόσειρα ‘that feeds many’ (fourteen times in the Iliad, three in the Odyssey). Forms in βω- are rarer: nouns βο- τώρ ‘herdsman’ (Il. 12.302, Od. 14.102, 17.200), επιβότωρ ‘shepherd or goatherd’ (Od. 13.222) and συβότης ‘swineherd’ (70 times in the Odyssey), with adjective βουτάνειρα ‘feeding men, rich in food’ (Il. 1.155). On related nominal forms in βο / βω- in general, see Moussy 1969: 21-5.
53 Cf. Aura Jorro 1985-93 s.vv. qo-u-qo-ta, su-qo-ta respectively.
54 Chantraine (1968-80 s.v. βόσκω) uncertainly links Lithuanian gūotas ‘herd’ and gaujā ‘herd, horde’ (and perhaps also βος); cf. also Frisk 1960-72 s.v. βόσκω; and Moussy 1969: 11-13. A root *g"eνα- is not listed in Rix 1998. βόσκω is no longer thought to be related to Latin uescor ‘feed on’: cf. Keller 1982: 86-7.
having come from an earlier *fikσkω, the phonology of the change *- kσk- to -σk- between vowels being in little doubt. For the parallel form eiσkω, seemingly reduplicated in -e- from *fe- fik-, and the imperfect ἔισκον, see § 5.2 below.

"ισκω therefore comes from the root *feik-, perhaps ultimately from *weik-, if an inherited root is to be reconstructed (cf. Rix 1998: 612). It is thus related to the perfect έικω 'seem to be; resemble; be fit, etc.', from *fe- foik-; this form occurs 70 times in the Iliad and 62 in the Odyssey in simple form, along with pluperfects active ἐφικευν (nine times and eight respectively); also traditionally pluperfect is medio-passive ἔικτο (four times in the Odyssey), ἔικτο (II. 23.107).

There is in addition a compound perfect, the third person singular ἐπέικε 'be fitting, be seem' (six times, five), with pluperfect also (Od. 24.295). There is therefore an ancient vocalic alternation present in these forms: έικω- is from o-grade *fe- foik-, with ἐικ- from zero-grade *fe- fik. The form ἐίκε 'seemed likely' (II. 18.520) is taken by some as also related, being from a present *feίκω (cf. Bechtel 1914: 182, followed by Kujore 1973: 93).}

55On the old suggestion that ισκω is a reduplicated form from *sek’- ‘say’, see Giannakis 1997: 241.
57This reconstruction does not take account of certain occasions when the text implies there is no initial p- in this form. See § 5.2 below.
58Schulze (1910) took ἔικτο to be an aorist; cf. Chapter 4 § 3.2.3.
59Chantraine notes that this form could be from either *ηεικτο or *εεικτο (1986-8: 1.479; 1991: 190). On the sequence *εεικτ-, however, see further § 5.2 below. Hoekstra (Heubeck et al. 1988-92: II.181) prefers to take δ’ ἔικτο (as it always occurs) from *δε εεικτο.
60Cf. the pluperfect medio-passive, perfect active δικτόν (Od. 4.27), pluperfect δικτύν (Il. 1.104, 21.285, 23.379, Od. 4.662) and the participial forms δικώς (Il. 21.254) and δικυία (eleven times in the Iliad, nine in the Odyssey). One instance of διοικυία (Il. 18.418) is apparently to be corrected (cf. Chantraine 1986-8: 1.129). For further discussion in general see Chantraine 1968-80 s.v. διοικε; and Bader 1969.
61Είκε is listed by Gehring (1891 s.v. είκοσι) together with other forms which come under Cunliffe’s (1924) heading of είκοσι ‘retire, give way; yield; etc.’ (from root *weig-; cf. Rix 1998: 608-9). Cunliffe (1924 s.v. είκοσι), however, classes the one instance of present stem (είκε) and one instance of the aorist optative είκε (II. 22.321) together with διοικα; see further Chapter 4 § 5.2.3.
Chantraine (1968-80 s.vv. ἐῖκω, ἔσικκα) is not certain of the link of ἐῖκε with ἔσικκα, although the index to volume I of his *Grammaire homérique* lists the former as the latter’s headword (1986-8: I.525).62

### 3.1.4. ὑρχέομαι

The case of ὑρχέομαι is a controversial one. Using the same phonological assumptions as he does in deriving ἐρχόμαι from *h₁gerskewo-* (§ 2.2 above), Rix (1970: 98) has suggested that ὑρχέομαι ‘dance’ was connected with ὑρνύμαι ‘stir, stir up’ from root *h₂er- ‘move’ (on which cf. Rix 1998: 266-7) and was an intensive from a lost present *h₁kte/ske/o-*. The imperfect of this verb occurs at *Iliad* 18.594 and *Odyssey* 8.379, with aorist ὑρχήσασθαι at *Odyssey* 8.371, 14.465; there are several related nominal forms, all in ὑρχη-. 63 There are other possibilities, however: some link ὑρχέομαι with Vedic rghaya- ‘quiver, rage’, although Germanic data do point to *-gh-* (cf. Mayrhofer 1986- s.v. rghaya-0-). Alternatively, the Greek form could derive from *h₁orgh-éye/o-*, iterative of *h₂ergh- ‘ascend’ (cf. Rix 1998: 212), which could mean a connection with ἐρχόμαι (§ 2.2 above).

---

62Further related forms are as follows. Also with zero-grade is the nominal form ἱκελός ‘like, resembling’ (ten times in the *Iliad*, seven in the *Odyssey*), with the secondary doublet εἰκελός (ten times in the *Iliad*, six in the *Odyssey*), ἐπιεικελός ‘id.’ (eight, four); there is also θεοεικελός ‘godlike’ (two, three). A further group shows an s-stem: ἐπιεικής ‘fitting, suitable’ (seven times in the *Iliad*, three in the *Odyssey*), ἐπιεικής ‘unseemly; grievous; etc.’ (21 and 28 times respectively) and μενοεικής ‘satisfying, etc.’ (six, nine). Lastly, there is ὀκικός ‘in unseemly wise’ (II. 22.336), along with ἄκεικλός ‘shabby; grievous; etc.’ (once, nine times), also found as ἀκεκλίους ‘baneful’ (II. 18.577), with adverb ἄκεικλιος (three times in the *Odyssey*), ἀκεικίην ‘causing marring, etc.’ (II. 24.19, *Odyssey* 20.308), ἀκεικίζο ‘treat in unseemly wise’ (seven times in the *Iliad*, once in the *Odyssey*), and perfect medio-passive κατήκιστα ‘has been marred, spoiled’ (Od. 16.290=19.9). On the complicated vocalic alternations found in these forms, see Chantraine 1968-80 s.v. ἔσικκα.

63These are ὑρχηθμός ‘dancing, the dance’ (once in the *Iliad*, four times in the *Odyssey*), ὑρχηστής ‘dancer’ (II. 16.617, 24. 261), ὑρχηστήρ ‘id.’ (II. 18.494) and ὑρχηστός ‘the dance; skill in the dance’ (once in the *Iliad*, four times in the *Odyssey*).
3.1.5. πάσχω

Πάσχω 'suffer; encounter, etc.' also shows clear vocalic alternations. Its present tense occurs five times in the Iliad and 31 in the Odyssey, with the imperfect being found three and five times respectively. The future πέλεσματι (once in the Iliad, three times in the Odyssey) shows an old e-grade, coming from the earlier stem *πεν(θ)σε/ο-. The thematic aorist ἐπαθων (28 times in the Iliad and 36 in the Odyssey), on the other hand, can be derived from an old zero-grade παθ-. Lastly, the perfect πέπωδον (once, five times) shows the o-grade in its indicative forms, as also seen in the pluperfect form ἐπεπώνθετι (Od. 13.92); in the one instance of the feminine perfect participle we find the zero-grade form πεπωδονία (Od. 17.555).

The second person plural perfect form is read as both πέπωσθε (II. 3.99, Od. 10.465) and πέπωσθε (Od. 23.53) in Monro and Allen 1917-19 and Allen 1920; cf. further Chantraine 1986-8: I.25. Nominal formations usually show (- )πενθ-, and once - παθ-. 64

The present πάσχω may therefore be derived from *παθ- σκω. According to Lejeune (1972: 75 and § 64 n. 1), the aspiration must have spread to the guttural first, so that θσκ became θσχ, and then the cluster was simplified to σχ. 65 Miller (1977: 368-9), however, argues that there is a second possibility: he takes πάσχω, among other forms, as evidence of Bartholomae’s Law in Indo-European.

64 There is an s-stem noun πένθος 'sorrow, grief; cause of sorrow or grief' (twenty times in the Iliad, fifteen in the Odyssey), also found as the second element of compounds Μεγαπένθης (four times in the Odyssey), νεκαπένθης 'in new sorrow, fresh-mourning' (Od. 11.39), νήπενθης 'banishing pain or sorrow' (Od. 4.221), πολυπένθης 'full of sorrows, sorrowful' (II. 9.563, Od. 14.386, 23.15) and ταλάκενθης 'bearing up against trouble' (Od. 5.222). There is in addition a verb πενθέω 'mourn, grieve', found twice in each epic in the present tense and in the aorist at II. 19.225. The one form in παθ- is αἰνωπαθής 'suffering dire ills' (Od. 18.201).

65 Cf. similarly Rix 1992: 78.
The root from which these forms originated may have been ultimately *kʷendh- (cf. Rix 1998: 349-50). Such a root violates the Indo-European root structure constraints, which disallow, among others, roots beginning in a voiceless stop (without preceding *s) and ending in a voiced aspirate: *steigh- is permitted, but not **tegh-. The root for πάσχω may perhaps then be *kʷenth-, with voiceless aspirate (cf. Rix 1998: 349 n. 1); the problem is avoided differently if we postulate a root *bhendh- 'bind', linking πενθερός 'father-in-law' (cf. Frisk 1960-72 s.v. πάσχω).

The form πάσχω could also have been derived from its thematic aorist ἔπαθον; and this is especially worthy of note given the tendency for presents in -σκω to occur beside thematic aorists in Homer, both for forms in -ισκω (ἄφρισκω : ἄφρασον) and for present: aorist pairs with reduplication on both parts (διάσκω : δέδασε); cf. further § 8 below. Alternatively, the pair *παθσκω : ἔπαθον could in fact have been used as a model for further such formations.

3.1.6. Origin and development: formations with zero-grade of the root

The origins of these five presents are therefore difficult to ascertain. They appear to have been formed on the old Indo-European ablaut rules, but there are no Indo-European parallels for them. Thus all that can be said is that these forms were probably created early, on the old pattern of zero-grade root + *-skelo- → *-skelo- present; whether they are very early Greek or in fact Indo-European remains uncertain.

3.2. Set formations

The forms -βλῶσκω, θυησκω and θρῶσκω, apart from the added -ι-, apparently found in the last two forms, seem to have been created in the same way as

---

66 Instances of the sequence *kʷe-, however, must have been altered or replaced, from earlier *τε- to πε-: cf. Rix 1998: 349-50 nn. 5, 6.

67 Cf. e.g. Miller 1977; and in general Szemerényi 1996: 99-100, with further bibliography at nn. 1 and 3.
the verbs of § 3.1: they appear to represent ancient zero-grade forms, although no other languages show cognate presents.68

3.2.1. -βλώσκω

The present -βλώσκω 'go, come' is only ever found in compound form, and only in the *Odyssey*: three times as προ-βλώσκω 'go or come forward or forth' (*Od. 19.25, 21.239=21.385*) and once as κατα-βλώσκω 'go down through' (16.466). It has a thematic aorist, μόλον, not found with augment (four times in the *Iliad* and twice in the *Odyssey*), with compounds ἐκμολοῦν 'came out' (*Il. 11.604*) and πρόμολον 'went or came forward or forth' (three times in each epic). This gives, in all, eight instances of this aorist in the *Iliad* and five in the *Odyssey*. A perfect μέμβλωκα is found (*Od. 17.190*), with compound παρμέμβλωκα 'go beside' (*Il. 4.11, 24.73*). The only other related form in Homer is ἀγγίμολον 'near; closely following', which clearly shows the same stem as the aorist; it is generally held to be an old absolutive.69 In fact, few other forms from this root are to be found in Greek; there are occasional nominal derivatives in the classical era, such as ἐπίμολος

---

68To use standard notation (where C denotes any consonant, R any liquid or nasal, H any laryngeal and V any vowel; cf. MAYR Hofer in Kuryłowicz 1968-86: I/1.178-9), the view of the phonology here can be described as follows: the sequence CRH before a consonant develops to CRF, where the resulting long vowel depends on the colour of the laryngeal. Thus CRH gives Cρη (*γνητός 'legitimately born', as in κασίγνητος 'brother', from *γνήθος), CRH gives Cρα (Doric τλάτος 'patient, to be endured' from *τλῆς), and CRH gives Cρω (στρωτός 'spread' from *στρῆς); cf. further Beckes 1969: 203-5, 210-16 and 218-20; and Mayrhofer in Kuryłowicz 1968-86: I/1.128, 139 and 144-5. In the case of secondary stress on the syllable in question, however, there is evidence that at least CRH, here gives Cερε and CRH2 gives Cαρα (γένεσις, θάνατος). Cf. Mayrhofer in Kuryłowicz 1968-86: I/1.129; and Hardarson 1993: 164-5.

69This form is found thus three times in the *Iliad* and thirteen in the *Odyssey*, with one instance of the phrase ἐκ ἀγγίμολον 'from close at hand' at *Il. 24.352*. Cf. further Wackernagel 1944: 226-229; and Chantraine 1968-80 s.v. ἀγγί.
'stranger' or 'invader' and οὐτόμολος 'deserter'; we also find a future μολοῦμαι occasionally in Classical tragedy.\footnote{On related forms see further Chantraine 1968-80 s.v. βλῶσκω, and also Veitch's (1887 s.v. βλῶσκω) list. Hesychius gives the gloss ἐβλῶν ἐφάνη, φέχτο. ἔστη, where a link with the stem of βλῶσκω and μέμβλωσκα seems certain; whether the form is of any antiquity, however, is doubtful (cf. Strunk 1970: 113 and Peters 1980: 30 (n. 19); but nonetheless Hardarson 1993: 162-3).}

We are dealing, therefore, with a root beginning *μλ-, βλῶσκω having developed from *μλῶσκω via *μβλῶσκω (cf. Lejeune 1972: 154). Létoublon (1985: 116, 117) argues that the form belonged to the Achaean element of Homer, and was later adapted in Doric poetry; a possible cognate within Greek is μέλλω 'be about to; be destined to, etc.'\footnote{Cf. Létoublon 1985: 117, with bibliography.} Rix (1998: 390), reconstructing a root *meldh3-, lists Serbo-Croatian and Slovene cognates; he reconstructs an ancient desiderative *meldh3-s- / *meldh3-s-, which (following Ruipérez 1950: 403-4) gives future μολοῦμαι via *molesomai, with metathesis from *melosomai. We may thus derive - βλῶσκω ultimately from *meldh3-ske/o-.. There does not, however, seem to have been a link with Tocharian A mlosk-, mlusk- 'escape'.\footnote{Cf. Frisk 1960-72 s.v. βλῶσκω; Chantraine 1968-80 s.v. βλῶσκω; and Keller 1992: 180 and n. 93, with bibliography.}  

3.2.2. \( \theta νήσκω \)

The present \( \theta νήσκω \) 'die' occurs in simple form four times in the \textit{Iliad}, and twice in the \textit{Odyssey}; there is also an instance of the imperfect at \textit{Il.} 1.383. Other tenses are formed from the stems \( \theta νη- \) and \( \theta αν- \). The future is the uncommon \( \theta ανείσθακα \) (\textit{Il.} 4.12, 15.728, \textit{Od.} 20.21), the aorist the thematic \( \epsilon θακων \) (35 times in the \textit{Iliad}, 36 in the \textit{Odyssey}). In \( \theta νη- \) we find perfect \( τε\theta νηκα \) (33 times in the \textit{Iliad}, 25 in the \textit{Odyssey}). Of the compound forms, \( \alpha ποθνήσκω \) 'die' is found in the present (\textit{Od.} 11.424, 21.33) and perfect (\textit{Il.} 22.432); this verb shows the one instance of a pluperfect form: \( \alpha ποτεθνασσαν \) (\textit{Od.} 12.393). \( \kappa αταθνήσκω \) 'die' occurs in
the present (II. 22.355), aorist (II. 9.320, 21.107) and perfect (eleven times in the Iliad, ten in the Odyssey); there is also a form ἐκθαυνυν ‘died’ (Od. 18.100). Except for the imperfect instance, and the one case of the present indicative (Od. 12.22), the present stem is on all occasions only found in the participle. Related nominal forms show stems θνη- and θανυ(α)-.73

This alternation θνη- : θανυ- indicates a set root,74 but again there is no good Indo-European etymology. Chantraine (1968-80 s.v. θάνυατος) compared Vedic ādhanātī and dhvanta-, which he glossed respectively as ‘il s’éteignit, disparut’ and ‘sombre’. However, Narten (1964: 155-7) has shown that the basic meaning of the Vedic root is ‘give off smoke, fume’.75 Hence Hollifield (1978: 182, with bibliography), rejected the connection both on grounds of meaning, and because a present in *-skē/o- on this root would rather be expected to yield **θυνάσκω.

A second suggested comparison is between θυήσκω and the Avestan -sa-present duuasa-, from the Iranian root dvan- ‘fly’: both have been supposed to continue a zero-grade formation *dhwnh-skē/o-. But there are phonological problems with this comparison, in that it is necessary to assume remodelling of the zero-grade form of the root in Avestan,76 and it is impossible to be sure (in the absence of Sanskrit cognates) that Iranian dvan- continues an Indo-Iranian root *dhvan- rather than *dvan-.77

A third alternative is to compare the root of the Vedic u-present dhánvati ‘run, flow’, causative present dhanáyan ‘make run’ (injunctive), with dhanáya- from

---

73With the former, there are θυητός ‘mortal’ (28 times in the Iliad, sixteen in the Odyssey) and κόστοθητός ‘id.’ (four and six times respectively); in the latter, θάνυατος ‘death; kind or mode of death’ (78 times in the Iliad, 59 in the Odyssey), ἄθανατος ‘immortal’ (106 times in the Iliad, 92 in the Odyssey) and δισθανης ‘dying twice’ (Od. 12.22).

74On the development of the laryngeals here see § 3.2 n. 68 above.

75Cf. Mayrhofer 1986- s.v. DHVAN-

76Cf. Klingenschmitt 1982: 64.

77Unless it is identical with dhvan- ‘give off smoke’: Kellens (1984: 157 n. 12) suggests a popular etymology.
According to Hollifield (1978) and Rix (1998: 125), Greek θφσκω therefore derives from *dhnh₂-ευ/ο-.* This comparison has the advantage that the Greek perfect stem seen in τέθνακεν may find a correspondent in the Vedic participle ḍadhanvāms.-

This present is one of several forms which are often found with added -t- before the -σκω suffix; see further § 3.2.5 below.

3.2.3. θρόσκω

Nearly half the instances of the verb θρόσκω ‘leap, spring, bound, dart’ are of its various compound forms. Its distributional pattern is similar to that of θνήσκω. The simple present occurs four times in the Iliad, and there is one instance of the imperfect (II. 15.314); the only other tense occurring in simple form is aorist ἔθορον (seventeen times in the Iliad, three in the Odyssey). As well as these 25 cases of the verb, there are 22 instances of eight different compound forms. Only occurring in the present are ἀνοθρόσκω ‘leap or bound up’ (II. 13.140), ἀποθρόσκω ‘leap from, rise from’ (II. 2.702, 16.748, Od. 1.58) and ἐπιθρόσκω ‘leap upon; leap or bound over’ (II. 4.177, 5.772, 8.515); aorist only are ἔσθορον ‘leap or spring at, into’ (II. 12.462, 21.18), ἐνθόρον ‘leap into, in among, against’ (three times in the Iliad, once in the Odyssey) and πρόθορον ‘leap or spring forward’ (II. 14.363, 17.522, 523). The remaining two are ἐκθρόσκω ‘leap or spring forth; jump out of’ (present at II. 10.95, aorist at II. 16.427, 21.539) and aorist ὑπέρθορον ‘leap or spring over’ (II. 9.476, 12.53, 16.380), the verb which gives us our one instance of the future stem in ὑπερθορέσμαι (II. 8.179). Of our total 48 instances, only four occur in the Odyssey.

Cf. in Iranian perhaps Old Persian danu[vatiy ‘flows’, Modern Persian dan- ‘run, rush’.

The connection proposed by Hollifield with Vedic dhāvati ‘run, flow; rinse’ and Tocharian A tsnān- ‘flow’ is more difficult, however: see Mayrhofer 1986- s.v. DHAV; and Rix 1998: 125 and n. 2.

Assuming that -θνό- is analogical for -θνό-: cf. Rix 1998: 126 n. 7. On the Indo-Aryan forms see further Mayrhofer 1986- s.v. DHAN.
The only cognate in ὀπο- found in Homer is the noun ὀποςμός, which occurs only in the phrase ἐπὶ ὀποςμῷ πεδίου, glossed by Cunliffe as ‘a piece of ground rising from, and somewhat above the general level of, the plain’ (II. 10.160, 11.56=20.3). In ὀφ- we find the adjective which has masculine ὀφόρος (always of Ares), feminine ὀφόρις, ‘rushing, impetuous, eager for the fray’ (38 times in the Iliad, once in the Odyssey), perhaps from *ὀφό-φος – that is, from a secondary formation either rebuilt on the aorist or on a reconstructed noun *ὀφό- υ-ς.81

We may reconstruct a set root *ὐηρ-, with Rix (1998: 127), who has as perhaps cognate Old Irish *-dair ‘mount’ (attested as no-daired). As with μολόθματι, he postulates for the future form a possible ancient desiderative -ὐηρ-, which would be *ὐηρ-, / *ὐηρ-, although he ascribes the vocalism of the Greek form here to ὑηροῦ, -ὐηρ-, which could equally come from *therosomai as μολέοματι may have from *melosomai.82 As with θυήσκω, we find this present form with added -υ-, as θρόσκω; on this phenomenon, see § 3.2.5 below.

3.2.4. Origin and development: set formations

The occurrence of forms is summarised in the following table, where simple and compound instances have been added together; in each case, the first figure refers to the number of occurrences in the Iliad and the second to those in the Odyssey. The one bracketed form is not found until after Homer.

---

82 Cf. Ruipérez 1950: 403-4, and § 3.2.1 above.
In these verbs we find, in each case, two basic stems: \( \beta \lambda \omega - : \mu \alpha \lambda - ; \nu \gamma - : \tau \alpha \nu - ; \theta \rho \omega - : \theta \rho \omega - \). In each case, the \( CR\overline{V} - \) variant is used for the present and the perfect, and the \( CVR - \) alternant forms future and aorist stems. Future forms are very rare, as would perfect forms be were it not for the frequency of \( \tau \epsilon \theta \nu \eta \kappa \alpha \). With the latter excepted again, the aorist is the most frequently found part of each verb.

- \( \beta \lambda \omega \kappa \omega \) is rare and \( \theta \rho \omega \kappa \omega \) gives the impression of being radically in decline; hence, it seems, it is only \( \nu \gamma \sigma \kappa \omega \) which has both a future and a perfect in Homer.

These data imply that the aorists are well-established and presumably ancient. The presents were not formed from them in the historical period – rather, the vocalic alternations seen in these stems are unusual and seem archaic. Their interpretation, however, is beset by problems. Since we find suffixed presents, we would expect that in each case a root aorist was once formed from each root, with later thematicisation of the old athematic forms.\(^3\) An example of this phenomenon is shown by the third person plural thematic aorist form \( \varepsilon \beta \omega \lambda \zeta \), which seems to continue an older \*\( e-g^\text{W}l\theta_{-}\text{ont} \) (earlier \*\( e-g^\text{W}l\theta_{-}\text{-ont} \)),\(^4\) the \( o \) of the ending is interpreted as the thematic vowel and extended to other forms, so that the old full-grade singular form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Future</th>
<th>Aorist</th>
<th>Perfect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \beta \lambda \omega \kappa \omega ) (0, 3)</td>
<td>( \mu \alpha \lambda \mu \alpha i ) (8, 5)</td>
<td>(-\mu \lambda \nu ) (2, 1)</td>
<td>(-\mu \epsilon \mu \lambda \omega \kappa \alpha )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \theta \nu \gamma \sigma \kappa \omega ) (6, 4)</td>
<td>( \tau \alpha \nu \omega \mu \alpha i ) (2, 1)</td>
<td>(-\tau \alpha \nu \omega \nu ) (37, 37)</td>
<td>(-\tau \epsilon \theta \nu \eta \kappa \alpha ) (45, 36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \theta \rho \omega \kappa \omega ) (12, 1)</td>
<td>( \tau \rho \varepsilon \omega \mu \alpha i ) (1, 0)</td>
<td>(-\tau \rho \varepsilon \omega \nu ) (30, 3)</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^3\)On the subject of affixed present forms beside root aorist ones see Chapter 2 § 4.3. The thematic forms we find here certainly cannot be inherited as such if the usual view of such formations is accepted, whereby the thematic aorist is a fairly late formation: cf. Hardarson 1993: 155; and Rix 1998: 20.

*e-gWélh-t, whose stem is found in the Arcadian gloss ŝε̇ςε̇λε̇,85 is lost in favour of ŝε̇βαλε̇. It is already accepted that CRh₂ before a vowel became CαR,86 this derivation of ŝβαλον also requires that we accept Peters’ argument (1980: 27-31 n. 19) that the sequence CRh₁ before a vowel also gives CαR, and indeed his evidence seems conclusive.

Thus the zero-grade of the plural is generalised throughout the paradigm.88 Since the three verbs we are dealing with here are also set roots, we might therefore expect the zero-grades of our roots to be respectively *mlh₁, *dhph₂ and *dhph₂, so that we could reconstruct the following third person plural forms: *(e)mlh₁-ōnt, *(e)dhph₂-ōnt, and *(e)dhph₂-ōnt. Here at least the form (e)θαυνον, and so by thematicisation (e)θαυνε, is easily explained by the rule that CRh₂V gives CαR.

If the α had been due to the colour of the laryngeal in the cases of θαυνον, then we might expect the o in (e)μολε / (e)μολον and (e)θορ / (e)θορον to be due to h₂; this was indeed the view of Strunk (1969 [1970], 1970), who believed that CοR was also the result of both CRh₁ and CRh₂ before a vowel. This view has been rightly criticised by Peters, however, who, in view of his opinion that CRh₁ before a vowel also gives CαR, has argued for this result from CRh₂; thus we would now expect CRH before a vowel always to become CαR in Greek, no matter which laryngeal occurs in the sequence.89 This therefore raises the problem that we would expect inherited forms of our set roots in -h₁, *mlh₂ōnt and *dhph₂ōnt, to give thematicised stems in *μολε/ο- and *θορε/ο- respectively. Since it is morphologically unlikely

85This form is found, for example, in Hesychius' Ε̃ζε̇ςε̇λε̇ν Ε̃βαλε̇ν; for further forms showing this stem see Hardarson 1993: 157 nn. 48, 50. A comparable pair of thematic aorist forms showing zero-grade beside full-grade is that of Attic ξε̇με̇ beside non-Attic ξομε̇ε: cf. further Hardarson 1993: 155-157.
86For the notation cf. § 3.2 n. 68 above.
89Cf. further Hardarson 1993: 158-60; and, with further examples, Peters 1980: 30-1 n. 19.
that we have o-grade aorists here, these forms are usually accounted for by postulating full grades *melh₃- and *dherh₃- which, in athematic third person singular forms *melh₂-t and *dherh₂-t, underwent a metathesis of *-ελo- into -ολε- and *-ερo- into -ορε-; hence the resulting *εμελο and *εθερο became εμολε and εθορε respectively.⁹⁰ This change is also valid in the second person singular, where we would expect εμολες and εθορες from *εμελος and *εθερος in turn.⁹¹ The suggestion is supported by the parallel of εστόρεσα, which surely derives from an older e-grade *ε- στέρο- σα from *e-sterh₃-s-; and by that of λειτρον ‘bath’ from *λοφετρον, beside Mycenaean re-wo-to-ro-ko-wo = *λεφτροχοφοι (cf. Homeric λεφτροχοeos), re-wo-te-re-jo = *λεφτρειω/- οι.⁹² A further point in this regard has been made by Hardarson (1993: 169-170), who argues that the metathesis must have been helped in these forms (in the case of the root *terh₃-, which gave Greek έτορον) by the change of the first and second person plural forms *tηρ₃-me(m) and *tηρ₃-te into *τορο-μεν and *τορο-τε:⁹³ for this makes the change of the stem *τερο- (from *terh₃-) into *τορε- more likely.

According to the rule given in § 3.2 n. 68 above, the presents from these roots are regular: *mlh₃-skê/ô- gives *mlôskê/ô-, *dhnh₃-skê/ô- *dnôskê/ô- and

*dhρh₃-skê/ô- *dhrôskê/ô- — this requires us to assume with Hardarson (1993: 166-7) that the accent did not move back from the suffix to the root in these forms until the

---

⁹⁰On this metathesis in future forms μολούματι and -θορέματι, as first suggested by Ruipérez (1950), see §§ 3.2.1, 3.2.3 above. The same explanation is also used for aorists ἐπορον and ἐτορον; on their roots, *perh₃- and *terh₃-, cf. Rix 1998: 427-8 and 577 respectively.


⁹³This development takes into account the rule that secondarily stressed CRh before a consonant gave CeRe and CRh, gave CaRo, not CRV, as described in § 3.2 n. 68 above. Here it is extended by Harðarson to the case of CRh, for which Aeolic εστόροτας has also been taken as evidence (cf. Harðarson 1993: 169-170 and n. 104; and also Rix 1992: 73).
The only thorough attempt to ascertain why the unexpected I is found in these forms was undertaken by Schmidt as part of his study of verbs in -ίσκω (1904: 36-51). He begins his enquiry (Schmidt 1904: 36-9) by listing evidence from grammarians and manuscripts for the forms θυήσκω, θρόσκω and μιμνήσκω, and manuscript evidence for κικλήσκω. The further example of Delphic συμπρηίσκεν 'burn together' was already in Schmidt's time recognised as a false reading of συμπιτίσκεν; there are in addition the unexplained χρηίσκομαι 'need' (Herodotus 3.117) and κλήσκομαι 'be called' (Hippocrates Cord. 8). Of interest are the Aeolic forms Γξαίσκω and μιμνάίσκω, and there is some evidence as well for a form γιγνώσκω (Herodas 5.21).

We have already seen that Schmidt's theory concerning the origins of -ίσκω is no longer to be accepted (Chapter 2 § 3.4). His view affects his examination: for example, it suits him to reject the form θρόσκω because he wished to have the -ί- spread from the sigmatic aorist, a stem which θρόσκω did not have (1904: 48). He

94 On these forms see also Chapter 9 § 2.1.
95 Schmidt cites these forms from Herodian; cf. also the citations at Hoffmann 1891-8: II.421 and LSJ s.v. θυήσκω.
96 Cf. Hoffmann 1891-8: III.444; and Schmidt 1904: 48-50.
could explain θυησκω by analogy, however (1904: 47), and so found this form acceptable.

Much more important is the fact that Schmidt’s enquiry rests largely on evidence from manuscripts and grammarians. Since - ήσκω and - ωσκω could have come to be written as - ήσκω and - ωσκω at any period without any metrical problems resulting, data found by this means are of little use; and what the grammarians tell us is necessarily late. Scholars and texts tacitly disagree with each other, without discussion: hence, as Keller (1992: 283 n. 20) notes, Chantraine (1986-8: 1.317) and Risch (1974: 274) diverge over whether to write θυησκω and θρώσκω with or without the - τ-, as do Bergk and Diehl’s respective versions of Anacreon’s μυησκεται / μυησκεται (Anacreon 94 Bergk = 96 Diehl). The recent editions of Homer’s works by van Thiel (1991, 1996) and West (1998) show a parallel discrepancy.97 What we need is the latest evidence from inscriptions and papyri, much more of which is available to us now than was to Schmidt. Can we now say more about these forms than Schmidt could?

There are several secondary sources for such data. Meisterhans (1900: 177) lists γιγνωσκω but θυησκω as occurring in Attic inscriptions (fourth century BC onwards). In Ptolemaic papyri, Mayser (1926-70: I/1.99, 103 respectively) has parts of θυησκω (three times in the third century BC) and later θυησκω (once in the third century, three in the second and first together) but never finds Attic θυεισκω (1926-70: I/1.100); he also cites parts of μυησκω (third century BC once, second-first once) and the form μεμνησκόμενος [sic] (first century BC) (1926-70: I/1.103). Much more recently, Threatte (1980-96: I.372, II.739) gives θυησκω as usual in Attic inscriptions in the fourth century BC, beside Attic θυεισκω (with change of ηι

---

97West reads θυησκω (e.g. II. 2.106) and θρώσκω (e.g. II. 5.772, with preverb ἐπι-) but γιγνωσκω (II. 5.815) and κικλησκω (II. 11.606); there is no instance of μυησκόςκω in his edition because this stem does not occur in the first half of the Iliad. Van Thiel, on the other hand, in all these cases reads forms without iota.
to ei); he also cites μνησκεσθαι (end of second century AD) as probably an error for μνησκεσθαι beside μμνησκε[το (Roman era) (1980-96: 1.412). The later data of the Roman and Byzantine periods given by Gignac (1976-81: I. 184, II.277) are for the stems θνη- and μμνη- without -ι-. Some citations are also given by LSJ (s.vv.) which take the forms θνησκω and μμνησκω back to the third century BC.

A thorough search of inscriptions could produce a wealth of data which might help solve the problem of the added -ι-. A brief search using the Packard Humanities Institute CD-ROM #7 (Greek Documentary Texts; 1991-6) found 84 instances of θνησκω and seven of θνάσκω beside eighteen of θνησκω. No other forms with added -ι- were as common: forms in (μι)μνησκ- occur 21 times and (μι)μνασκ- twice, with only one instance of a form with an iota, which is the same attestation as Threatte's one instance (IG II² 13173.30). Nine cases of κικλήσκω occur; a search for the stem -κλησκ- produced six citations, but these appear to indicate only three separate instances of a form κικλήσκω. There is one case of ἀποθρώσκω in Caria and one of παραθρωσκω in Macedonia, too little information from which to draw any conclusion. No instances were found for a stem γνωσκ-, although there were seventeen instances of γνυώσκω (and none of *γνώσκω).

In sum, it seems that Classical forms in -η- gave way to ones in -ι- in the case of θνησκω, but there is little data for any other verbs with added -ι-. This is presumably because the combination of a long vowel followed by ι came to be pronounced the same as the vowel itself at some stage in Ancient Greek – a change which could also have been responsible for earlier θνησκω and θρόσκω coming to be written as θνησκω and θρόσκω in the first place. Yet we cannot be certain when any of this occurred. Teodorsson (1974: 187-91) has [E:i] first coming to be monophthongised to [ε:] around 500 BC, with the development complete in the fifth

\footnote{No examples were found for θνασκ- or μνασκ-.}
century; accompanying this or following it, there occurred a narrowing of the first part of the diphthong, so that [ε:i] ultimately became [e:], probably before 400 BC. A further development is that ηι may perhaps have come to be pronounced as [i:] as early as 400 BC (1974: 189-91, 288). ηι would therefore have been confused with η, which according to Teodorsson (1974: 183-6) probably underwent the change from [ε:] to [e:] during the sixth century BC, then on to [i:] from around 350. Regarding ωι for ω, he concludes (1974: 215-16) that [ɔ:i] first became monophthongised to [ɔ:] in the fifth century, the change probably being complete before the middle of the fourth.\(^9\)

Threatte, however, has developments happening later. As he says, the tendency with long diphthongs is to 'delete the second and shorter element' (1980-96: 1.352), and this occurs for ζι, ηι and ωι by the end of the Hellenistic period. Hence ηι, originally pronounced [ε:i], passes via [ei] (with shortening of first member) to [e:] by early in the fourth century, wherever not an inflectional ending or augment, and perhaps even in those cases too by around 350 BC (1980-96: 1.369).\(^10\) Here, the sound represented by η moves from [ε:] to [e:] after 370 BC in 'fairly crude texts' (1980-96: 1.159), and then to [i:] only after 150 AD (1980-96: 1.159-71). The monophthongisation of ωι is said to have occurred not much before 150-100 BC (1980-96: 1.358-62).

Duhoux (1987) summarises these different versions, and points out that the two authors are not attempting to study the same group: Teodorsson is dealing with the unrefined majority, Threatte the cultivated elite (1987: 179-88). Duhoux’s own version of events involves hypercorrection following on from [ε:] becoming [i:] --

\(^9\)For data detailing the confusion in Attic both between ηι and ζι and between ω and ωι, see Teodorsson 1974: 92-3 and 123-4 respectively.

\(^10\)Cf. also Mayser (1926-70: 1/1.99, 103-8), who has many examples of η being found for ηι, and ηι for ηι, at first in the third century BC and increasingly in the second and first; on ω for ωι and ωι for ω see 1926-70: 1/1.111-14.
surely an unnecessary extra complication, and one which relies on dubious evidence (1987: 188-98). 101

A possible conclusion, therefore, is that η was written for η in certain instances due to confusion between the two. We may, as is traditional and also current, ascribe this to the influence of -ίςκω. 102 But why did it appear on only certain verbs, and which?

The evidence given above indicates that the addition of i could be due to the increasing similarity of η with η and of ω with ω in ancient times. Perhaps, especially in the case of θνηςκω, this combined with the spread of the new suffix -ίςκω to create a new form. Even given this added factor, however, a problem remains: it is still unclear why this occurred only for certain verbs, but not for others which showed -η- and -ω- before -σκ-, such as άλδηςκω and γιγνώςκω. A perhaps related phenomenon, outside the scope of this thesis, is that of Homeric σώζω or σφίζω 'preserve, keep' (Od. 5.490). 103 Here we might perhaps be able to ascribe the added -ι- to the influence of the suffix -ίζω; but in this case non-present forms occur in both σω- and σω- 104. We should also note that both the confusion of sounds and the spread of -ίςκω are post-Homeric developments; in this case, our manuscripts of Homer should show forms without the iota, such as θνηςκω rather than θνηςκω.

To conclude, therefore, we may say that, against the most sceptical view, forms in -ηίςκω and -ώιςκω had some reality: they were not merely a late

101 For criticisms, see the discussion at Duhoux 1987: 198.
104 Cf. Schwzyzer and Debrunner 1939-71: 1.736; Threatte 1980-96: II.508, 528, 581; and LSJ s.v. σφίζω.
invention only to be found in manuscripts. On the other hand, the number of such forms was probably very limited, and the exact distribution remains obscure. It is thus almost impossible to recover the various stages of development.

4. Formations with reduplication in -i-

This class will also be divided into two sections. Here, as has already been mentioned above, we find at least one more inherited present, the reflex of Indo-European *gînh₃-ske/o-, but with added reduplication: γιγνώσκω. This verb will be analysed beside two others which are based on inherited set roots and which show similar patterns of related forms (κικλήσκω, μιμήσκω); also to be classed with these is ἔλασκομαι, possibly inherited from a proto-form *sÎnh₂-ske/o-. These four forms will be examined as a first group. The remaining three verbs will be analysed next; of these, one is probably based on an s-final root (διδάσκω), one apparently on a w-final one (πιθαύσκω) and one on a k(h)-final one (τιτύσκομαι).105

4.1. Set formations

4.1.1. γιγνώσκω

Γιγνώσκω106 ‘perceive, know, etc.’ is the most commonly found reduplicated present in -σκω in Homer. In the Iliad, it is found nineteen times, and twice in the imperfect; in the Odyssey it occurs nine times, and four in the imperfect.107 Non-present parts of this verb are found in γνω- : future γνώσομαι (seven times in the Iliad, twice in the Odyssey) and root aorist ἔγνων (41 times in

105 For the added -1- in μιμήσκω and perhaps γιγνώσκω and κικλήσκω, cf. § 3.2.5 above.
106 The form θιγνώσκω, found in most dialects in the historical period, is the result of the change of gigno- via *gigno- and then *gīno-, whence gīno-. This is also seen in γίνομαι from γίγνομαι: see further Schwyzer and Debrunner 1939-71: 1.215; and Lejeune 1972: 78-9.
107 Giannakis (1997: 233-4) apparently misses one instance of the imperfect (Od. 8.299) and counts another as present (Od. 22.501), coming to a total of 34 instances including that of διαγιγνώσκω at ll. 23.470 (missing that at ll. 23.240).
each epic). Compound forms are infrequent: present διαγινώσκω ‘distinguish, discern’ (II. 23.240, 470), aorist διέγγων (II. 7.424); and aorists ἀνέγγων ‘recognised; knew well’ (once in the Iliad, seven times in the Odyssey) and ἔπεγγων ‘looked upon, watched, saw; recognised’ (Od. 18.30, 24.217). Various adjectival forms are also based on the stem γνω-. A stem γνο- also appears in the aorist ἴγνοιησα ‘failed to know or recognise, etc.’ (three times in each epic), with iterative ἄγνωσσακε (Od. 23.95).

The present γιγνώσκω derives ultimately from the root *ghan_; which is found in an exceptionally wide range of languages (cf. Mayrhofer 1986- s.v. ΝΑ; Rix 1998: 149-50). Moreover, it is one of the few forms in -σκω which Greek has in common with another Indo-European language: apparently Albanian njoh ‘know’, and Armenian չանաց‘em ‘recognise’, and more certainly Latin (g)nóscó ‘recognise’ and Old Persian subjunctive xšnásatiy ‘recognise’.

The correspondence between these forms is problematic for Greek γιγνώσκω for two reasons, however. Firstly, we expect inherited presents in *-sē/o- to show the zero-grade of the root (cf. Chapter 2 § 3.3); we then require *ghan_<sê/o-, not

---

108 These are: γνωτός ‘easy to know’ (II. 7.401, Od. 24.182), with γνωτός ‘kinsman; brother’ (eight times in the Iliad), unless the latter is rather related to γίγνομαι ‘be born, etc.’ (cf. Chantraine 1968-80 s.v. γίγνομαι), ἄγνως ‘unknown’ (Od. 5.79), ἄγνωστος ‘unknown; not to be known’ (Od. 2.175, 13.191, 397), ἀλλόγνωτος ‘known to be other: strange, foreign’ (Od. 2.366), ὄργνωτος ‘easy to be known or recognised; notorious, infamous’ (twice, five times) and γνώριμος ‘(well-)known; a friend or acquaintance’ (Od. 16.9).


110 Baltic data are, however, apparently not to be compared; cf. Keller 1992: 19-20.

111 On this difficult form, see Keller 1992: 20, with bibliography.

112 This form derives by assimilation from an earlier *canac‘em, but the development of -ε’- from *-sk- is controversial: see Chapter 2 § 2.3.

113 On the simplification of the initial gn- to n- see Keller 1992: 7-8, with further bibliography. On the morphology, syntax and semantics of (g)nóscó and its preverbs see Keller 1992: 7-18.

114 Apparently with full-grade after the aorist (cf. Rix 1998: 150 n. 11); cf. Keller 1992: 23 for the phonological developments involved, and also for the use of the forms in context, with further bibliography.
The usual explanation is that the expected Latin *gnasco* was reformed to *(g)nosco* to differentiate it from *nascor* 'be born', which derived from zero-grade root *gnh₃*-.*₁¹₅* Further, there is also evidence for an ancient present *gneh₃*- / *gneh₅*-.*₁¹₆* Jasanoff (1988) argued that this preform shows relics in Germanic *knōjan* 'know', Hittite *ganes*- 'find, recognise, identify' and Tocharian A *kñasāstu (= kñasāst tu) 'du kennst dich aus', as well as perhaps the Armenian aorist *caneay* 'I knew' and more debatably Albanian *njoh* 'I know' (if not from *gph₅*-ske/o-).*₁¹₇* The second difficulty here is the presence of the reduplication in Greek; and in this connection the Epirotic form γνώσκω is usually cited, also sometimes (apparently due to a misunderstanding of an abbreviation) referred to instead as Epidaurian,*₁¹₉* it is said to be evidence of a dialectal form in Greek which shows the earlier formation without the added initial syllable. This form, however, was probably never in use; it has been shown by Forssman (1968: 14-18) that it was used by grammarians as a link in a pseudo-etymological route intended to explain how γνώσκω was derived from νοῶ, on account of a supposedly Epirotic tendency to add prothetic γ-. It is thus merely a grammarian's invention and not the direct

*₁¹₅* On the phonology involved for the former explanation for Greek, see § 3.2 n. 68 above.
*₁¹₇* In this case, *ē* must have resisted laryngeal colouration not only before *h₂* (by Eichner's Law), but also before *hᵢᵢ*; cf. further Jasanoff 1988: 227-9.
*₁¹₉* Cf. also Keller 1992: 24-5, with bibliography; and, most recently, Hardarson 1993: 76-82. On the question of the relationship between *gēnh₃*- 'know' and *gēnhᵢᵢ*- 'be born', with bibliography, see Keller 1992: 25-7. On Hittite *ganes*- see further Puhvel 1984- s.v. *ganes(s)-*.
descendant of an Indo-European *gʰn-,skeo-. Even without this direct evidence, however, we might still reasonably reconstruct a pre-Greek form *γνώσκω on the strength of the Latin and Old Persian evidence.

Whether we have attestations of *γνώσκω or not does not solve the problem of how the reduplication came about. It is often said that *gndsš came to be ‘crossed’ with a form *gignōmī. This theory has been criticised, however, and there have been other suggestions. Hence, to Giacalone Ramat (1967: 107-8), γιγνώσκω is a hypercharacterisation of *γνώσκω; similarly, Rix (1992: 213; 1998: 149 and 150 n. 13) merely has the reduplication as secondary. Keller (1992: 22) suggests that both γιγνώσκω and βιβάσκω were formed by the addition of reduplication to older stems, the inverse of the process by which reduplicated forms in Hittite were recharacterised by -(i)šk.-

4.1.2. Κικλήσκω

The present tense form κικλήσκω ‘summon; call by such and such a name, name so and so’ occurs in the present active seven times in the Iliad and three in the Odyssey, with imperfect twice and once respectively. There are also instances of a medio-passive present (Od. 15.403) and imperfect (Il. 10.300). It has a collateral present, active κολέω ‘call, summon, etc.; invite to one’s house, etc., call, name, etc.’ (fourteen times in the Iliad, eleven in the Odyssey), with imperfect also (four times and six respectively); there is a medio-passive κολέομαι ‘bear the name of, be known as, etc.’ (four times in the Iliad and six in the Odyssey, with imperfect once

---

121 Cf. e.g. Sihler 1995: 507.
122 Not including the instance of κολέομαι at Il. 9.461: on the passage concerned see Hainsworth in Kirk et al. 1985-93: III.123.
in the former). The future καλέω occurs in participial form only (once in the Iliad, three times in the Odyssey). Also in καλε- is the aorist active ἐκάλεσσα (seventeen times in the Iliad and twenty in the Odyssey), transitive middle ἐκαλεσσάμην (eight times in the Iliad and five in the Odyssey). Perfect forms are, like present κικλήσκω, in -κλη-: medio-passive κεκληματι (six times and once); pluperfect form κεκλησατο (II. 10.195); and future perfect κεκλησσματι (II. 3.138). There is also an iterative preterite active καλέσσεκε, -ον (II. 6.402, 9.562), medio-passive καλέσκετο (II. 15.338). The occasional compound forms are: aorist active ἐκκάλεσσα ‘call forth, summon’ (II. 24.582, Od. 10.471) and imperfect medio-passive ἐξεκαλεόμην (Od. 24.1); aorist middle προκαλεσσάμην ‘summon or invite to a fight or contest, challenge, defy, dare’ (six times in the Iliad and once in the Odyssey), and also ἐκπροκαλεσσάμην ‘summon and cause to come forward out of’ (Od. 2.400); and aorist συγκάλεσσα ‘call together, invoke’ (II. 2.55=10.302). A further present, προκαλίζομαι (four times in the Iliad, twice in the Odyssey) apparently acts as the present of προκαλεσσάμην. Also in κλη- is an ‘absolutive’ in -δην, found both as κληδην ‘by name’ (II. 9.11) and in ὄνομακληδην ‘by name’ (Od. 4.278) and ἐξονομακληδην ‘id.’ (II. 22.415, Od. 12.250). There are nominal forms in κλη- and καλη- besides,123 as well as further, less certainly related forms.124

123In κλη- we find verbal adjective κλητός ‘invited, made welcome; called or chosen for a mission’ (II. 9.165, Od. 17.386), with compound πολύκλητος ‘called together from many quarters’ (II. 4.438, 10.420); and ἐπίκλητος second name; by name, nominally’ (five times in the Iliad, once in the Odyssey). In καλη- there is καλητορ ‘one who summons, a crier’ (II. 24.577), also found as a proper noun (II.15.419), and the further names Καλητορίδης (II. 13.541) and Καληστος (II. 6.18).
124On κλαγγή ‘cry’ (for the meaning cf. Cullifc 1924 s.v.) and related forms, see Chantraine 1968-80 s.v.; for ὄμοκλη ‘rebuke, etc.’ and its cognates, see Chantraine 1968-80 s.v. Less certainly related is the group of forms in κέλας: beside κέλαδος ‘noise, din, disturbance’ (II. 9. 547, 18.530, Od. 18.402), we also find κέλαδεινός ‘blustering’, aorist κέλαδησα ‘shouted in approval or applause’ and κέλαδου ‘blustering’, the latter also as proper noun. Cf. further Chantraine 1968-80 s.v. κέλαδος; and Beekes 1969: 192.
In addition, there is the aorist ἐκέκλετο ‘call to’ (36 times in the Iliad, six in the Odyssey), also found once in compound form ἐπεκέκλετε ‘call upon, summon, invoke’ (Il. 9.454). This is generally cited under κέλωμαι ‘command; exhort; call’ (27 times in each epic), which also has a future κελήσωμαι (Od. 10.296). According to Bendahman (1993: 110), however, there is a semantic difference between the aorist and other parts, and it should rather be linked to the forms listed above; see further Chapter 4 § 4.4.

We can reconstruct a root *kleh₁- for these forms, also found in Germanic and Italic (cf. Rix 1998: 321-2). According to Rix (1998: 321), καλέω derives from an ancient present *klh₁-évš/ο- along with Umbrian kařetu ‘he must call’. We may perhaps take ἐκέκλετο as ultimately from ἑκέ-klh₁-évš/ο-, with loss of *h₁ before a vowel. The present κέλωμαι may then derive from earlier *kelh₁-évš/ο- (Bendahman 1993: 115); alternatively, it could come from a separate root *kel- ‘urge’ (cf. Rix 1998: 311-12).

The origin of κικλήσκω itself is uncertain. There is no other evidence for a preform *klh₁-skéνš/ο-, and the reduplication also implies that the form is not so ancient. On the other hand, the Hittite form kalleš- ‘lure, summon up’ gives a pattern of κικλήσκω : kalleš- :: γιγνώσκω :: ganes-, which could well speak for the possible link between *-s- and *-sk- (cf. Chapter 2 § 3.2); on these forms see further Puhvel 1984- s.vv. kalles(s)-, ganes(s)-.

---

125 On this reduplicated aorist see further Bendahman 1993: 110-15.
126 Further apparently related forms in κέλ- include κέλεω ‘command, order, etc.’, aorist form ἐκέλοσσα ‘bring (a ship) to shore; come to shore’ and κέλησ ‘riding (horse)’: see further Chantraine 1968-80 s.v. κέλλαω; and Bendahman 1993: 112.
4.1.3. μμνήσκω

The simple active μμνήσκω 'remind' is found once in the imperative form μμνήσκε (Od. 14.169); the present medio-passive μμνήσκομαι occurs three times in the *Iliad* and four in the *Odyssey*, with one instance of an imperfect (II. 13.722). Other tenses are formed with the stem μνη-. There is a transitive future μνήσω (II.15.31, Od. 12.38), intransitive μνήσομαι (four and three times in the respective epics); a transitive aorist ἔμμνησα (II. 1.407, Od. 3.103, 14.170), intransitive ἐμμνησόμην (31 times in the *Iliad* and 20 in the *Odyssey*); perfect μέμνημαι 'recall or bear in mind, remember, etc.; tell or speak about' (seventeen and fourteen), with occasional pluperfect (II. 17.364, Od. 24.195); future perfect μεμνήσομαι (II. 22.390, Od. 19.581, 21.79); and, lastly, a rare aorist passive ἐμμνήσθην 'told or spoke about' (Od. 4.118). An iterative occurs for the aorist middle in the form μμνήσκετο (II. 11.566). Compound forms are rare: we find aorist active ἀνέμμνησα 'reminded' (Od. 3.211); aorist middle ἐπεμμνησόμην 'remembered a favour' (II. 24.428); aorist middle ἐπεμμνησόμην 'remembered; spoke about' (II. 17.103, Od. 4.191), with passive ἐπεμμνήσθην 'remembered, thought of' (Od. 1.31, 4.189); and future ὑπομνήσω 'will remind' (Od. 15.3), with aorist also (Od. 1.321). Active forms therefore make up a tiny proportion of this verb's instances.

There is also a related present μνάσμαι 'recall, remember; turn one's mind to, etc.' and, via specialisation,128 'woo, court, seek to debauch', which by diectasis appears to have a stem μνω/ε/-; in present and imperfect together it is found four times in the *Iliad* and twenty in the *Odyssey*, with aorist stem iterative μνάσκετ(ο) at Od. 20.290.

---

128Cf. Chantraine 1968-80 s.v. μμνήσκω, with bibliography.
Nominal forms from this root are in μνη-: most relating to the notion of remembrance show the stem μνημ-, whereas those without - μ- are related to 'woo'. The root occurs in Greek first in Mycenaean ma-na-si-we-ko = *Μνασίφργος (Attic Μνησίφργος; cf. Auro Jorro 1985-93 s.v. ma-na-si-we-ko).

We may reconstruct a root *mneh₂- (cf. Rix 1998: 403), also found in many Sanskrit forms, from Vedic onwards, and perhaps in Cuneiform Luvian; as in the case of κικλήσκω, however, some other analogy must have played its part for the reduplication to have arisen. Gignac (1976-81: II.277 n. 2) cites several instances of unreduplicated μνήσκομαι, the earliest of which occurs in Anacreon (94.4). A search of Classical inscriptions on the Packard Humanities Institute CD-ROM #7 produces eight different attestations, but none are early, and it seems that μνήσκομαι developed from μμνήσκομαι rather than the reverse; a search of Christian inscriptions gives eight instances of μνήσκ- but only one of μμνήσκ-. Giannakis (1997: 247) has μνήσκομαι as secondary, and derives μμνήσκομαι from perfect μέμνημαι, via such a parallel as κικλήσκω: κέκλημαι. Further evidence that this affixed present in - σκ- is secondary is that, according to Rix (1998: 403), *mneh₂- formed a root present *mnēh₂- / mēh₂- (whence ultimately μνάμαι, late Vedic a-manati 'mention' and perhaps Cuneiform Luvian manāti 'sees') and affixed aorist *mnēh₂-s- / mnēh₂-s- (Doric ἐμνάσα, perhaps Sanskrit -mnāsisur); this is the opposite of the expected pattern of root aorist beside affixed present which we would normally have for a present in *-skē/o- (cf. Chapter 1 § 4.3).

---

129Cf. μνήμα: 'memento, remembrancer' (Il. 23.619, Od. 15.126, 21.40), μνημοσύνη 'thought or care for' (Il. 8.181) and μνήμον 'having a good memory, mindful' (Od. 8.163, 21.95). The one exception is μνήστης 'thought or care for' (Od. 13.280).
130Hence μνηστή (of ἀλοχος) 'wooed (and won), wedded' (four times, twice), πολυνηστή 'wooed by many' (three times in the Odyssey), μνηστεύω 'court, etc.' (Od. 4.684, 18.277), μνηστήρ 'wooer, suitor' (232 times, only in the Odyssey) and μνηστύς 'wooing, courting' (three times in the Odyssey).
131Cf. Mayrhofer 1986- s.v. MAN⁺.
132For bibliography see Gignac 1976-81: II.277 n. 2. On the other hand, Rix (1998: 403 and n. 5) seems to count the attestation from Anacreon as evidence of an earlier unreduplicated form.
As noted above (§ 3.2.5), a further -1- was in some cases added to the η of the stem of this form.

4.1.4. Origin and development: γιγνώσκω, κικλήσκω and μιμήσκω

The forms discussed so far in this section show interesting morphological patterning. Including compound forms together with simple ones, and putting imperfects together with presents and pluperfects with perfects, the data can be displayed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Future</th>
<th>Aorist</th>
<th>Perfect</th>
<th>Future Perfect</th>
<th>Contracted Verb</th>
<th>Iterative Preterite</th>
<th>Verbal Adjective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(-γιγνώσκω) (23, 13)</td>
<td>γιγνώσκαι (7, 2)</td>
<td>(-έγιγνω) (43, 50)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(-γω) (8, 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κικλήσκω (9, 4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κικλήσκομαι (1, 1)</td>
<td>κικλέω (1, 3)</td>
<td>(-έκέκλετο) (37, 6)</td>
<td>κέκλημαι (7, 1)</td>
<td>κέκλησμαι (1, 0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(-κλητός) (3, 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καλέω (18, 17)</td>
<td>καλέω (18, 17)</td>
<td>(-έκαλεσσα) (20, 21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-καλέσκομαι) (5, 7)</td>
<td>(-καλέσκομαι) (14, 7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μιμήσκω (0, 1)</td>
<td>(-μιμήσω) (1, 2)</td>
<td>(-έμιμησα) (1, 4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μιμήσκομαι (4, 4)</td>
<td>μιμήσομαι (4, 3)</td>
<td>(-έμιμησάμην) (33, 21)</td>
<td>μέμιμησαι (18, 15)</td>
<td>μεμιμήσαι (1, 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(-έμιμησήθη) (0, 3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is thus apparent that a conjugation has arisen for forms in $CR\overline{V}-$, where presents show both reduplication and the suffix -σκω; hence -τησκω alternates with non-present forms which end in -η-, and -ωσκω with ones in -ω-. The most
frequently found form is the ancient root aorist ἐγνώον, where one would expect sigmatic ἐγνωσσα (parallel to ἐμνησσα beside μιμνήσκω); in fact, this form only occurs, with causative meaning, in the Classical period in the Ionic compound form ἀνέγνωσσα. For one verb there are two stems, κλη- and καλε-, both from the root *kleh-; the latter of the two gives present καλέω, future καλέω and aorist ἐκάλεσσα. There is also aorist ἐκεκλετο. The present κικλήσκω could be an ancient formation involving this stem before the laryngeal was lost, or could equally have been created from an analogy such as γυνώτος : γιγνώσκω :: κλητός : X, or even μέμνημαι : μιμνήσκομαι :: κέκλημαι : X. It is frustrating that the frequencies of the data here are not sufficient to tell us which of these forms was certainly oldest. The present γιγνώσκω seems to have been inherited in some form, but even if it did acquire its reduplication first out of this set in the way described above, we cannot be sure how this feature spread.

Also of interest are the iterative formations: we find the sets κικλήσκ- : καλέ(σ) : καλέ(ε)σκ- and μιμνήσκ- : μνη(σ)- : μνησασκ-, which demonstrate the independence of -σκω and -(ε)σκον.

4.1.5. ἀλάσκομαι

Also apparently from a set root is ἀλάσκομαι ‘propitiate, seek to win favour or grace from (a divinity)’. At first glance this present differs to a very great extent from the three forms just discussed. It is found four times, all in the Iliad, where the alternative form ἀλάσσονταί ‘id.’ also occurs (Il. 2.550). The aorist is ἀλασσάμην, found three times in Iliad I and once in the Odyssey; its initial vowel is twice short (Il. 1.100, 147) but otherwise long. Other verbal forms are the imperative ἀληθί (Od. 3.380, 16.184) and the perfect subjunctive ἀληκησί (Od. 21.365), both defined by

---

133Cf. Veitch 1887 s.v. ἀνέγνωσσα.
134That is, at Il. 1.444 and Od. 3.419, and in its rare occurrences in later Greek: cf. Chantraine 1968-80 s.v. ἀλάσκομαι.
Cunliffe as ‘be propitious, lend a gracious ear’ (1924 s.vv. ἴληκω, ἴλημι). The one nominal form found in Homer is the adjective ἴλας ‘propitious, gracious, benign’ (II. 1.583, 9.639, 19.178). Further early forms are a present ἴλαμα, with the same meaning as ἴλασκομα and ἴλανται (h.Hom.19.48=21.5), and stative perfect optative ἴληκοι (h.Ap. 165).

A thorough study of these and other forms from this root was undertaken by Klingenschmitt (1970, with much discussion and further bibliography), whose explanation is as follows. It had already been observed that the Aeolic imperatives ἐλλαθί (Bacchylides 11.8 S.-M.) and ἐλλατε (Callimachus Fr. 7.13 Pf.), both meaning ‘be propitious’, show the regular Aeolic development from of ἐλλα- from *he-hl- with perfect reduplication; also perfect are ἴληκησι and ἴληκοι, which must represent forms in ἴλα-, similarly from *he-hl-. The stem of ἴλασκομα thus comes from earlier *hihl-ske/o-, while the aorist ἴλασζαμην from earlier *hela-s(s)- shows the influence of the present in its root vocalism; later, when the initial -i- in the present became long due to the loss of the following -h-, the aorist was also sometimes found with the same initial quantity. The forms ἴλανται and ἴλαμα are perhaps secondary on the aorist in ἴλας- after a parallel such as ᾧγας- : ᾧμα-; the imperative ἴληθί represents an old perfect. In this way Klingenschmitt derived all the above forms as ultimately from *selh₂-, which he thought was causative ‘gnädig machen’, i.e. ‘propitiate’; he postulated a link with Armenian alač’em ‘propitiate’ which he derived from *slaš-ske/o- (1970: 79-82). We may therefore derive all these forms from a root *selh₂- (cf. Rix 1998: 480).

On the evidence of the adjective ἴλας, derived from *hihlwos, Klingenschmitt also postulated a reduplicated present from this root in Greek,

135For these forms and later developments see Chantraine 1968-80 s.v. ἴλασκομα; and Klingenschmitt 1970: 75, with both a list of attestations and citations of relevant passages from Hesychius and Herodian.
The Greek present *hihlāskομαί, from *hihlāskē/o-, could thus, via *si-s[hl]₂-skē/o-, be an amalgamation of the Indo-European present *s[hl]₂-skē/o- and a further form *si-s[hl]₂. Klingenschmitt (1970: 82) compares this derivation of *iλάσκομαί with that of γιγνόμαι from *gignōmi beside *gnōskō; and if he is correct, then there is a good explanation for two of the cases of set-root reduplicated presents in -σκω in Greek. Klingenschmitt points out that more reduplicated presents in -σκω could have been created on this model, and cites the same origin as possible for διδάσκω (cf. § 4.2.1 below). The difference between the root vowel lengths is problematic: why do we have *gnō- but *hlā-? The answer is perhaps that the ā in *hihlāskomai is due to the aorist *helas(s)-.

Clackson (1994: 173-4) has criticised Klingenschmitt's interpretation, claiming that his etymology of atac'em is dubious both in the treatment of -c' - from *-sk- and also in having ala- supposedly from *[hl]₂-. Less compellingly, Clackson notes that the semantic link between the two words is not quite as sound as it might seem, since in its earliest use *iλάσκομαί refers to a god, but this is only a derived sense in Armenian, where alač'em is first used of people. He thus prefers to state that there is no certain direct connection between the two forms, one between the roots being more likely.

Nonetheless, Klingenschmitt's interpretation of the Greek data is persuasive. Moreover, it shows that *iλάσκομαί was once close in form to the other Homeric reduplicated verbs in -σκω from set roots: beside present : perfect pairs κικλησκ- : κεκλη- and μμηνησκ- : μμεμη- there was once *hihlᾶσκ- : *hehλᾶ-.

---

136 There is further evidence for this reconstruction if *iλάμαί represents an ancient reduplicated present *si-s[el]h₂- / si-s[hl]₂-, although the Greek form's short vowels are unexpected and must be ascribed to analogy (cf. Rix 1998: 480 and n. 2).

137 He is followed by Giannakis (1997: 244). A slightly different view of events is held by Rix (1998: 480), who largely follows Klingenschmitt but has *selh₂- as inchoative 'gnädig werden'.
4.2. Consonant-stem formations

4.2.1. διδάσκω

The present form διδάσκω 'teach, instruct' is found in the active infinitive (II. 9.442, 23.308) and also the indicative (Od. 1.384); as medio-passive participle, meaning 'gain knowledge of, learn', it is found at II. 16.811. Non-present forms are aorist ἑδιδαξα (three times in each epic) and perfect medio-passive δεδιδάχθαι (II. 11.831),138 with the same stem is αὐτοδιδάκτος 'self-taught' (Od. 22.347).

Two possible origins have been argued for these forms. It was once thought that διδάσκω derived from an earlier *dı- δακσκω;139 this form, together with Latin disco 'I learn', was then derived from *di-dak-sk-e/o-, despite the phonological problem which arises from the Greek - ακσκω. In this theory, the future and aorist stem διδαξ- is formed from *dıδακσκω: ἑδίδαξα comes from *ε- διδακσκω, διδαξαι from *διδακσκω from *διδακσκω.

The alternative theory links διδάσκω not with disco, but with Homeric forms of the verb 'get to know, know, learn' from *δακσκω; in all, there are 25 verbal parts from this stem in Homer. These are future δαθεαται (Od. 3.187, 19.325); aorist indicative ἑδαταιν, subjunctive δατεω, δατομεν, infinitive δαμεναι, δαημαι (in simple form eight times in the Iliad and five in the Odyssey), with compound participle προ- δατεις 'having known beforehand' (Od. 4.396); reduplicated causative thematic aorist active δεδαεθαι 'taught' (four times in the Odyssey), medio-passive δεδαεσθαι140 'have oneself taught; get to know, acquire knowledge of' (Od. 16.316),141 and perfect indicative δεδαθηκαι 'have practical knowledge or skill in' (Od. 8.134, 146), participle δεδαως, δεδαθηκοτες (Od. 2.61, 17.519), with medio-
passive δεδαχμένος at h.Merc. 483. Occasional nominal forms also occur. There are only a few later derivatives from this stem in Greek, which falls radically into decline. The productive διδαξκ-, on the other hand, is in this theory responsible for non-present forms in διδαξ- (from *διδασκ- σ-)^143 and also many other derivatives besides: perfect medio-passive δεδιδάχθα, nominal - διδακτος and, later, the rare aorist διδασκήσα (Hesiod Op. 64, Pindar P. 4.217) and many nominal forms in διδακ-, such as διδάσκαλος.144

Debrunner, in a thorough study of the evidence (1937, with further bibliography at 1937: 251-2) showed that derivation of διδασκαλω from the Greek root δα(σ)- is more reasonable both morphologically and semantically. The latter derives from a Proto-Indo-European root *dens-, which may also be found in Greek δήνεξα (plural) 'wiles; thoughts' (II. 4.361, Od. 10.289, 23.82), apparently ultimately from *δευσός and inherited beside Vedic dāmsas- 'miraculous power' and Young Avestan daŋhah- 'skilfulness'. Debrunner (1937: 261) thus derives διδασκαλω from δι- δας- σκω, although in fact we could equally well be dealing with *δι- δας- σκω; as Giannakis (1997: 238) notes, this brings the pair δι- δας- σκω : non-present δα- neatly in line with γνωσκω : γνω- and μμησκω : μην-. Since our earliest

---

^142These are δαχμου 'skilled, experienced' (twice in the Iliad, three times in the Odyssey), ἄδαχμου 'ignorant of, not experienced or versed in' (twice in each epic) and ἄδαχμοντι 'ignorance, want of experience or skill' (Od. 24.244). Also connected perhaps is δαχφρων (38 times in the Iliad, 21 in the Odyssey) in some of its occurrences: cf. Chantraine 1968-80 s.v.

^143Cf. also ἄλοχω : ἄλυξ-, and further § 3.1.1 above.

^144For further data detailing the history of δα- and διδασκω from Homer to Classical Greek, see Debrunner 1937: 257-61; and also Chantraine 1968-80 s.v. διδασκαλω. On forms in Plato see Chapter 7 § 5.2.

^145Hence there is no longer any need to postulate an inherited reduplicated form in *-skel-o- for Latin disco. This is an advantage, since reduplicated presents in -σκω do not seem to have been an inherited formation; cf. Chapter 2 § 2.1 on this type in Greek and Hittite. On the Latin form, cf. Keller 1992: 109-16, with bibliography.

texts, the forms in δα(σ)- fell into decline; hence they came to be replaced by a new stem, taken from the present διδάσκω.

It is thus still current to believe that διδάσκω is derived from the same root as the other forms in δα-, ultimately from a root *dens-, which also occurs in Indo-Iranian (Mayrhofer 1986- s.v. DAMS; Rix 1998: 102).147 Given the sense of διδάσκω as opposed to that of the other forms, it seems best to suppose that it was derived from the causative reduplicated aorist δέδαιε, as was noted by Jacquinod (1989: 197). The reduplication in the present may therefore have been felt to be the 'complement' of that found in the form from which it was derived, as Tichy (1976: 76 n. 11) implies. A morphologically similar case could be ἵζω from *σίζω beside ἐζητο from *σεζητο (cf. Risch 1974: 243), although the latter derivation may not go back far in time (cf. Rix 1998: 465 and 466 n. 4). One may also compare Κικήσκω : ΕΚΕΚΛΕΤΟ, if from *κι-κήσει/εο- : *κε-κήσει/εο-.148 On the other hand, Klingenschmitt (1970: 84 n. 5) suggests that there was an inherited reduplicated present, which he reconstructs on the basis of διδάσκω beside the Old Avestan reduplicated present stem found in active injunctive didgs (*di-dans-t) 'he teaches, he professes' and present middle didafhe (*di-dans-ai) 'I learn';149 if he is correct, the

147Cf. also Frisk 1960-72 s.v. διδάσκω; Chantraine 1968-80 s.v. διδάσκω; Kujore 1970: 71 n. 4; Lejeune 1972: 118 and n. 4, 208 n. 1; Jacquinod 1989: 194-5; and Keller 1992: 113-15. Hamp (1968: 286-7) apparently attempts a cross between the two theories, where διδάσκω from base δα(σ)- comes to replace earlier *δισκω or *διχθω, which he finds are the possible reflexes of inherited *di-dskε/εο-. A further suggestion was made by Lejeune (1976), who wished to link discό and διδάσκω by postulating a root *διδο(κ)- rather than *dens-, but this theory does not seem to have been accepted: cf. Rix 1998: 101-2, who lists only *denκ- 'bite', and διδάσκω under *dens-; and also the criticism at Keller 1992: 115.

148Keller's (1992: 117-18 n. 5) criticism that we would expect **(δι)δεδάσκω is unfounded: cf. also the parallel of τιτωσκοματ : τιτωκεσθοι, §§ 4.2.3, 4.3 below.

149On this interpretation of these forms cf. similarly Kellens 1984: 185; Kellens and Pirart 1988: 146; Humbach 1991: II.141; and also Bendahman 1993: 70. Insler's (1975: 237) emendation to perfect middle *dadaijhe ‘I was instructed’ is more controversial.
present διδάσκω could have been formed by the analogy of such a pair as
\(*si-slh_2-skē/ö*- beside \(*si-slh_2*\) (cf. § 4.1.5 above).

It is also worthy of note that διδάσκω is probably our oldest attested present
in -σκω.\(^{150}\) Mycenaean gives us the forms di-da-ka-re and de-di-ku-ja
(de-di-<da>-ku-ja), at least the former of which probably includes some form of
(-)διδασκ-.\(^{151}\)

4.2.2. πιθαύσκω

The present active πιθαύσκω ‘make manifest, display; tell of; give a signal;
bring forward; set forth, etc.’ occurs twice in the Iliad and three times in the Odyssey;
the imperfect is found at II. 10.202, 478 and Od. 12.165. The medio-passive ‘id.’ is
found five times in the Iliad and seven in the Odyssey. The t of the reduplicatory
syllable is lengthened when the form occurs in the first half of the hexameter, all
active voice instances (II. 10.478, 502, 18.500); the same is true in the Homeric
Hymns (πι- at h.Merc. 500, πι- at h.Ap. 444).\(^{152}\) A related verbal form is the aorist
φάε (Od. 14.502), glossed as ‘broke’ (of the dawn) by Cunliffe (1924 s.v. φάον) and
as ‘briller’ ou “apparaître” by Chantraine (1968-80 s.v. φάε); the stem must have
ended in a f, with this form deriving from earlier *(e)(|)a⟨⟩ov. Kujore (1973: 60),
however, cites φάε as an imperfect from a present *φάω, comparing Aeolic φαύω =
φάω. The latter is cited by grammarians and apparently existed in Cypriot also
(Kafizin 47);\(^{153}\) its relation to πιθαύσκω is obscure. The range of related forms in
Ancient Greek is very large, with several different types occurring in Homer.\(^{154}\)

150This does not include the dubious te-ra-pi-ke = *θεραπισκει, for which see Chapter 6 § 2.2.
151On these forms see Chapter 6 § 2.1.
152Cf. LSJ s.v. πιθαύσκω, and also Giannakis 1997: 250.
153Cf. LSJ s.vv. φαύω, ϕούω
154There is the participle φαέθων ‘bright, resplendent’ (once in the Iliad and four times in the
Odyssey), also as masculine and feminine proper noun (Od. 23.246, 12.132 respectively). An
important nominal form is φαος ‘light of the day, etc.’, with diectasis and before a consonant φος (in
The etymology of πιθαύσκω is problematic. Rix (1998: 54-5) lists two homonymous roots of the form *bheh₂-. One, meaning 'speak, say' gives such derivatives as Greek φημί 'say', Latin for, fārī 'speak' and Vedic bhānati 'speaks', as well as occurring in other languages besides. The other means 'gleam, flash, shine': its root present is the source of Vedic bhātī 'gleam, shine' (cf. Mayrhofer 1986- s.v. BHĀ) and Hesychius' φάντα: λάμποντα among other formations. Greek φαίνω 'cause to appear, etc.' and πεφήσεται 'will appear' (II. 17.155) also come from this root, and other languages show further reflexes.

Chantraine (1968-80 s.v. φάε) links the forms from the latter root with our forms in φαυ-/ φαε-, which therefore appear to derive from a zero-grade stem *bhh₂-; hence also φάος 'light of the day, etc.' from φάος. He cites as possibly connected Vedic vi-bhāv-a- and vi-bhāv-an- 'shining, brilliant'; however, these examples are ambiguous, and could actually be instances of suffixes beginning with -v-. We could reconstruct a pre-form *(bhi-)bhh₂-še/o-, but this would give **(πι-)φόσκω, through loss of the laryngeal before vocalic *u. If, with Beekes (1969: 178), we derive φαυ-/ φαε- from the extended root *bhh₂-eu-, then we may derive πιθαύσκω from *(bhi-)bhh₂-eu-sh/e/o-.

There are two further possibilities. The easier is that πιθαύσκω was simply derived from the aorist *(ε)φαεφον, although there is admittedly neither any direct analogy nor direct evidence that the aorist ever had a digamma. Alternatively, we could reconstruct the same method of derivation for πιθαύσκω as was given above all 30 times in the Iliad, 27 in the Odyssey; cf. further Chantraine 1968-80 s.v. φάε C.5). From this comes φαεινός 'bright, shining' (64 times in the Iliad and eighteen in the Odyssey, frequently in formulae) and verb φαεινω 'give light, shine' (five times in the Odyssey) with intransitive aorist φαεινη, φαεινην (II. 1.200, 17.650), also found compounded with εξ- (three times in the Iliad, once in the Odyssey); on the derivation of this verb, see Chantraine 1968-80 s.v. φάε C.5.b. There is also φαεάντατος 'very bright' (Od. 13.93), proper noun Φαεσταδής (II. 11.578) and adjective φαεσιμπρος (II. 24.785, Od. 10.138, 191), meaning 'that brings or gives light to men', or perhaps 'looking at men': cf. further Chantraine 1968-80 s.v. φάε D.3; and von Kampfz 1982: 117.
for γιγνώσκω and (more debatably) for διδάσκω and ἱλάσκομαι. The full-grade part of a reduplicated present *bhi-bheh₂-u- / *bhi-bheh₂-w- would give πιφαυ-/ πιφάγ- (the former before a consonant, the latter before a vowel), whilst the expected present in *-skelo- would be, as just seen, *φύσκω. If these two presents came to be mixed in the same way as is assumed for *γιγνωμι and *γυνώσκω, then *πιφαυμι and *φύσκω could give πιφαυσκω. Yet matters are confused further by the existence of Classical unreduplicated intransitive -φαύσκω, first found in Herodotus as διαφώσκω 'dawn'.155 Giannakis (1997: 249) points out that reduction could have occurred in composition,156 or that πιφαύσκω could have been built on *φαύσκω. In this case, however, from where could the latter have originated, and what was the model?

4.2.3. τιτύσκομαι

Τιτύσκομαι 'make ready; take aim; thrust; be eager' is found eleven times in the Iliad and six in the Odyssey. Cognate with it is a large group of words which derive from a stem *τευχε/ο- / *τευχε/ο-, comprising two senses: 'make ready' (τεύχω) and 'aim at' (τυγχάνω). Τεύχω 'construct; make ready; plan, etc.' is found thirteen times in the present and imperfect in the Iliad, five in the Odyssey, with medio-passive imperfect τεύχοντ' (ο) at Od. 10.182. It also shows futures τεύξω (once, eight times) and τεύξομαι (II. 5.653, 19.208); aorists ετευξα (ten times, twelve) and, oddly with unaspirated κ, reduplicated thematic aorist τετυκέιν (Od. 15.77=94), more usually medio-passive τετυκέσθαι (three times in the Iliad, eight in the Odyssey).157 There is also a perfect τετευχώς (Od. 12.423), comparable to

---

155On the Classical forms see further Kujore 1973: 251; and Giannakis 1997: 249.
156Cf. e.g. Latin didō : condō.
157On these reduplicated aorist forms, see further Bendahman 1993: 74-8.
Mycenaean te-tu-ko-wo-a, te-tu-ko-wo-a, = *te-tu-ko-wo-a; more usual is the medio-
passive te-tu-ko-wo-a 'be' (26 times in the Iliad, 27 in the Odyssey), with pluperfect
te-tu-ko-wo-a (nineteen times in the former, fourteen in the latter) and future perfect
te-tu-ko-wo-a (four times in the Iliad). There is also an aorist passive etu-ko-wo-a (ten
times in the former, seven in the latter). The only compound is the perfect medio-
passive προετυχθαι 'be gone forth’ (Il. 16.60, 18.112=19.65). Related nominal
forms occur both with zero-grade τυχ- and full-grade τευχ-. There is also a
perfect medio-passive τετυχη- σθαι 'have one's harness on' (Od. 22.104).

Τυγγάνω 'light or fall upon; reach, hit; have success in; get; fall to one's lot;
chance to, etc.', though showing fewer forms, has nonetheless quite a wide range of
tense stems. The present simple stem is only found in the imperfect, at Od. 14.231.
The future to this verb too is τευξομαι (Il. 16.609, Od. 19.314), and it also has both
thematic and sigmatic aorists: more usually ἔτυχον (fifteen times in the Iliad, five in
the Odyssey), but also ἔτυχα (six times, three). The perfect, similarly with stem
extension - η-, is τευχηκα (Il. 17.748, Od. 10.88). The one compound form is an
imperfect of παρατυγγάνω 'be present with' (Il. 11.74).

The ultimate root for all these forms is *dheugh-,' glossed by Rix as 'nutzbar
machen, (Ertrag) produzieren'; it is also found in Vedic, Germanic and perhaps Celtic
(cf. Rix 1998: 129-30). It is usual to state that τιτυσκομαί is derived from either

158 Cf. Chantraine 1968-80 s.v. τευχω; and Aura Jorro 1985-93 s.v. te-tu-ko-wo-a. For further related
Mycenaean derivatives see Aura Jorro 1985-93 s.vv. a-te-u-ke (= ἀτευχής 'unequipped, unarmed'),
to-u-ka (which perhaps = *τουχά).

159 Forms in τυχ- are τυχτος, identical in meaning to perfect participle τετυχμένος 'wrought' and so
'thorough, perfect' (twice in the Iliad, three times in the Odyssey), ἐτυχτος 'well made or
constructed' (four times in the Iliad, three in the Odyssey) and proper noun Τυχίος (Il. 7.220). Those
in τευχ- are νετυχτος 'newly wrought' (Il. 21.592), νετευχής 'newly made or constructed,
new' (Il. 5.194) and τευχος, usually plural τευχεσα 'armour, etc.' (161 times in the Iliad, 31 in the
Odyssey).

160 On this form see Chantraine 1968-80 s.v. τευχο.
The latter is surely preferable, however, since, on the evidence of πάσχω from *παθσκω, we might rather expect a preform *τι- τυχ- σκο- μαι to give rise to **τιτύσχομαι. The obvious origins for this form are thus the parts of the root which show τυκ- — that is, the reduplicated thematic aorist forms τετυκειν and τετύκαντο. Indeed, semantic evidence is also in favour of this derivation, in addition, forms in τετυσκ- found in Hesychius point to a connection being felt between τιτύσχομαι and τετυκειν.

However, the existence of the aorist forms in unaspirated - κ- itself requires explanation. Bendahman (1993: 76-7), discussing and rejecting the earlier suggestions of Osthoff and Tichy, favours the influence of unaspirated forms such as τυκτός, τεδξαι and τιτύσκομαι as responsible for the change of - τυχ- to - τυκ-; we must discount the role of the latter, however, if we wish to say, conversely, that τετυκειν / τετυκέσθαι was its very source. Despite the problems involved, however, we may nonetheless say at the very least that we have a pair of present and aorist forms showing reduplication in - τ- and - ε- respectively, as we do with διδάσκω : δεδωκε and κικλήσκω : ἐκέκλετο.

---

162 Ruijgh (1985: 143 n. 138) expects *τιτύσχομαι or *τιτύσκομαι, the latter on account of Hesychius’ ενθύσκει (on which see e.g. Kujore 1973: 252). Giannakis (1997: 251), however, derives τιτύσκομαι from ἔτυχον.
163 See Chapter 4 § 3.1.5.
164 The glosses are τετύσκετο: κατεσκευάζετο and τετύσκων : ἐμφανίζων. On the other hand, dissimilation of - τ- το - ε- το- could also be the reason for the e-reduplication: cf. Giannakis 1997: 251.
165 Cf. also Ruijgh’s (1985: 143 n. 138) suggestion that expected *τιτύσχομαι was substituted with τιτύσκομαι, which led to *τετυκείν being replaced by τετυκείν.
4.2.4. Origin and development: consonant-stem formations

There are thus three Homeric verbs in -σκω which have reduplication in -τι- and consonantal stems. Of these, two also have a reduplicated thematic aorist (διδάσκω: δέδαε, τιτύσκομαι : τέτυκείν, τετυκέσθαι); it would be reasonable to suppose that the presents are built directly off these aorists, although the only possible parallel for such 'morpheme replacement' of reduplication in Greek seems to be *σιζδω : *σεζδετο (cf. § 4.2.1 above). The problem of πιφαύσκω remains open: aorist φάε may come from *(ε)φαφον, but there is no evidence of *πέφαφον. Could perhaps an analogy of the form ἔτυγχον : τιτύσκομαι 'aim' : *(ε)φαφον : X give rise to inchoative *πιφαύσκομαι 'become light', whence causative πιφαύσκω?

4.3. Summary: formations with reduplication in -τι-

In conclusion, we may say that the two subsets of verbs in -σκω which show reduplication in -τι- have some common features: indeed, in both sets, one verb is reinterpreted, so that reduplication in -τι- occurs in tenses other than the present (ιλάσκομαι, διδάσκω). The difficult question, of course, is the origin of the reduplication. As we have seen, a standard theory is that there is some sort of contamination between a reduplicated present and a present in -σκω: this could be the case with γιγνώσκω, διδάσκω, ιλάσκομαι and πιφαύσκω, and has in fact also been suggested for the form βιβάσκω (h.Ap. 133). We may note, incidentally, that this theory works best for set roots: *γι-γνηθ-μι and *γηθ-σκο both result in Greek forms with stem (-)γνω-, because the groups *CRehC and *CRhC both result in CRωC. An alternative hypothesis is that the starting-point of the

---

166 Cf. Ruigh (1985: 143), who derives βιβάσκω from *βιβημι (cf. βιβάς) and βάσκω. On the other hand, in this instance βιβάσκω could be an iterative formation: cf. Kjørgen 1973: 95, and further on this form Chapter 4 § 2.1.1.

167 Cf. § 3.2 n. 68 above.
reduplication is a reduplicated aorist in -ε- which would be matched with a
reduplicated present in -ι-: there is evidence for this for διδάσκω and
tττύσκομαι. Beside these instances, κικλήσκω : ἐκέκλετο could also provide a
parallel at a very early stage: we would have *ki-klh₁-ske/o- : *ke-klh₁-e/o-. There is
in addition the possibility that the reduplicated perfect (frequent for κικλήσκω and μμνήσκω, and also found for ἑλάσκομαι) played a similar role. It would seem to
be impossible to decide between these options.

5. Formations with reduplication in -ε-

The pattern of reduplication in -ε- only gives two forms, neither of which
occurs very frequently; both are morphologically problematic.

5.1. δειδίσκομαι

Δειδίσκομαι 'pledge in drinking; welcome, greet' is found three times in the
Odyssey: twice in the imperfect form δειδίσκετο (18.121, 20.197) and once as the
participle δειδίσκομενος (3.41). It is also found with different reduplication in the
form δειδίσκομενος (Od. 15.150). It is related to the present forms δεικνυόμενο
'id.' (Il. 15.86, Od. 18.111, 24.410) and δεικνύμενος 'pledge in drinking (app. from
a custom of pointing to the person whose health was to be drunk); welcome, greet' (Il.
9.196, Od.4.59) and also to δειδέχομαι (Od. 7.72), δειδέκτω (Il. 9.224) and
δειδέχοτο (Il. 4.4, 9.671 and 22.435).

There is no doubt that these forms belong together; problems arise, however,
when we try to understand their exact structure and their links with other verbal roots.
Firstly, why do we have two different types of reduplication, δε- and δει-, and how
do we explain the latter? Secondly, on what root are these forms built – should we
think of deikh-, dikh-, dek- or dekh-?
The various hypotheses try to establish a link with one of two other sets of verbs, both of which are well-attested in Homer: firstly δείκνυμι 'manifest, show', and secondly δέχομαι 'receive'.

The attestations for the first group are as follows. There is a present active δείκνυς 'manifest, show, etc.' (II. 13. 244), medio-passive δείκνύμενος (23.701), with future δείξω (five times in the Odyssey), aorist ἔδειξα (six times in the Iliad, eight in the Odyssey) and compound future ἐνδείξομαι 'will open one's mind, declare oneself' (II. 19.83). There is also the apparently connected ἀριθδείκτετος 'distinguished, renowned; conspicuous, exalted' (twice in the Iliad, seven times in the Odyssey).168

In the second group, we have present δέχομαι 'receive, etc.' (five times in the Iliad, three in the Odyssey), with future δέχομαι (four times in the Odyssey) and sigmatic aorist ἐδέξαμην (24 times in the Iliad, eighteen in the Odyssey). There are problematic athematic forms: δέχαται (II. 12.147), ἐδέγμην (Od. 9.513, 12.230), δέκτο (II. 2.420, 15.88, Od. 9.353), with imperative δέξο (II. 19.10), infinitive δέχθοι (II. 1.23, 377) and participle δέγμενος (three times and once respectively).169 Perfect forms are imperative δέδεξο (II. 5.228, 20.377, 22.340), participle δεδεγμένος (six times in the Iliad) and future perfect δεδέξομαι (II. 5.238). Cunliffe also lists a perfect participle δεδοκήμενος here (II. 15.730). Several different compound forms occur.170

168 On this form see Frisk 1960-72 s.v.; and Chantraine 1968-80 s.v.
169 On these forms see Chantraine 1986-8: 1.296.
170 We find aorists ἀνεδέξάμην (II. 5.619) and ἀνεδέγμεθα (Od. 17.563) 'receive, etc.'; aorist ἀπεδέξαμην (II. 1.95) 'accept'; imperfect ἔξεδέχοντο (II. 13.710) 'receive from one, relieve one of'; παρεδέξαμην (II. 6.178) 'receive from another'; participle ποτεδέγμενος (six times in the Iliad, nine in the Odyssey) 'wait for, etc.'; and lastly future ὑποδέξομαι (II. 18.59, 89, 440, Od.19.257), with aorists ὑπεδέξαμην (II. 7.136, 18.398, Od. 22.140, 16.70) and ὑπέδεξο, ὑπέδεκτο, ὑποδέχθοι (in all twice in the Iliad and five times in the Odyssey), meaning 'receive, etc.'; with participle ὑποδέγμενος (Od. 13.310, 16.189) and pluperfect ὑπέδεκτο (Od. 14.275) 'submit to, etc.'.
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For the first group, the comparative evidence clearly supports an inherited root *deik-, which gives Vedic diś-, Latin dicō and also further Iranian, Sabellic and Germanic forms (cf. Mayrhofer 1986- s.v. DEŚ; and Rix 1998: 92-3); Rix (1998: 92) glosses this as ‘zeigen, weisen’. For the second, we may reconstruct a root *dek- (where the -kh- is an innovation within Greek), meaning ‘(an-, auf-)nehmen, wahrnehmen’, also attested in a number of other languages (Rix 1998: 93-5), which yields in Vedic an acrostic root present dāṣi (cf. Mayrhofer 1986- s.v. DĀŚ).

Within Greek, it is difficult to decide on a semantic basis to which of these groups our verbs belong; and it seems impossible to reduce one to the other on phonological grounds. The question posed by the reduplication may perhaps be relevant, however. The older view is that we have here metrical lengthening from δεί- to δεί-, as first suggested by Meyer (1878: 262-3) and also argued for by Tichy (1976); this was rejected by Wackernagel (1878: 268-9) and more recently by Forssman (1978). Indeed, it is not clear why there should be metrical lengthening here at all, since the forms in question do not have a series of short syllables.

The alternative view is that the length of the reduplication is inherited. Forssman attempts to start with a root deik- ‘show’ and a reduplicated dei-dek-, later altered to deidek(h)-; the short syllable of δείσκόμενος would be due to metrical shortening. This would clinch the question in favour of deik-, but in fact the whole hypothesis has flaws which were brought out by Harðarson (1993: 63 n. 19); above all, why should we have a dei- reduplication, and why if we had it would it shorten to de-?

We are left with the possibility that our verb is based on a dek- root. This was argued as early as 1878 by Wackernagel, who believed that we ought to restore δηδείς(ε)ικ- in the tradition, while attributing the -ει- spelling to confusion with δείκνυμι. If this is possible, then we can compare this long reduplication with that of the Vedic intensive found in e.g. bābhade (where the short ā of the root syllable is
secondary) from bādh- 'oppress' (cf. Wackernagel 1878: 269); indeed, this view seems to be that currently accepted by most scholars.\textsuperscript{171} The level of uncertainty, however, is such that we are unlikely to learn much from these forms about the -ε- reduplication or about the final suffixation. The forms in δείδισκαι and δεδισκ-, if from *δεκ-, presumably have a secondary -τ- after verbs in -ίσκω, as indeed is usually said.\textsuperscript{172}

\textbf{5.2. ἔἰσκω}

Rather more common is ἔἰσκω 'cause to take the likeness of, make like; liken to, deem like, compare with; think, fancy, suppose, conjecture' (four times in the \textit{Iliad}, eight in the \textit{Odyssey}). This would appear to be a reduplicated from of ίσκω (§ 3.1.3 above), from *φε- φίκ- σκω.\textsuperscript{173} In some cases, however, ἔἰσκω seems to be from ίσκω with a prothetic vowel, unless conversely ίσκω represents ἔἰσκω with aphaeresis of initial ε-.\textsuperscript{174} This is because, on two occasions, the metre will not allow for an initial φ-: hence ἀμμες ἔἰσκομεν at \textit{Od.} 9.321 and οὐ τι σ᾽ ἔἰσκομεν at 11.363 (cf. Chantraine 1986-8: I.129). On the other hand, at e.g. \textit{II.} 5.181 the φ- is required by the metre. The two problematic cases may be in late passages, where the digamma fails to make position; alternatively, as Kujore (1973: 93 n. 5) suggests, in


\textsuperscript{172} Cf. Meyer 1878: 263; Bechtel 1914: 96; and more recently Kujore 1973: 94 n. 10; Chantraine 1986-8: I.303 n. 3, 317-18; and Giannakis 1997: 237.

\textsuperscript{173} Cf. e.g. Ruijgh 1972: 229, who cites only this case as evidence for present reduplication in -ε- in Greek.

the former case of εἰσκω we may have an augmented imperfect of ἵσκω, and in the latter we could read σε ἕἰσκομεν.175

One possible explanation for the origin of ἕεφίσκω is that it results from dissimilation of earlier *£-£ικ-σκω.176 Another is Bader’s (1969: 79-80) suggestion that the present reduplication in - ε- is to be ascribed to the influence of the frequent perfect (f)£(f)σικα,177 she cites several parallel passages, of the type πάντα εἰσκω beside πάντα ἐσικως (II. 5.181, 21.600).178 Tichy (1983: 232) cites both factors together: she compares Homeric δειδίσεο- from *de-dwik-yelo-, ‘das aus dissimilatorischen Gründen die e-vokalische Reduplikation des Perfektstamms δειδοικ(α)- übernommen hat’.

The imperfect ἦἱσκον (II. 21.332, Od. 4.247) is listed under εἰσκω both by Gehring (1891 s.v.) and Cunliffe (1924 s.v.); this assumes that it is descended from *£-£-£ισκ-ου.179 Given that from *(e-)we-wk-e/o- we have ἕειπον and then ειπον,180 however, we might rather expect ε-£ε£ισκ- to result in imperfect stem **εισκ-. Two alternatives are that ἦἱσκον could have been formed with a long augment from ἵσκω, as *η-£ισκον; or from ε-£(f)ισκον, with augment preceding prothetic ε-.181

175 Cf. similarly Bader (1969: 79-80), who also explains the two instances of apparent ἕσικω as representing *£ισκω.
176 Cf. Schulze 1910: 185, followed by e.g. Kujore 1973: 95 n. 11.
177 Cf., independently, Ruijgh 1985: 143 n. 136.
178 In addition, Giannakis (1997: 241) suggests the development of a reduplicated full grade stem *wi-weik-sk- > *£ιεικ-sk- > εισκω, but himself rejects it as unparalleled.
180 Cf. e.g. Rix 1998: 614.
181 For the former possibility see Chantraine 1968-80 s.v. ἕσικα; and Giannakis 1997: 241; and for the latter Schwyzser and Debrunner 1939-71: I. 653 n. 8; and Chantraine 1986-8: I.317 n. 2.
5.3. Summary: formations with reduplication in -e-

We cannot be certain about the origin of reduplication in -e- in these two forms. The only certain evidence for reduplicated verbs in -σκω in Homer is, in fact, for those with -τ-; the cases of so-called Attic reduplication only occur with -ισκω (ἀραφίσκω, probably ἀπαφίσκω and perhaps εὑρίσκω), and appear to be taken over from the aorists concerned (cf. §6.1 below).

6. Formations in -ισκω

In Homer, only four verbs are found in -ισκω. All are uncommon, and all have thematic aorists. Two seem to show Attic reduplication (ἀπαφίσκω and ἀραφίσκω), but no division of the group will be made on this account because the origin of ἀπαφίσκω is too uncertain, and because we do not know whether εὑρίσκω is also derived from a reduplicated form.

6.1. ἀπαφίσκω

'Ἀπαφίσκω 'trick, cheat, beguile' is only found once in the present in Homer, at Od. 11.217. The thematic aorist ἡπαφιέον occurs both in the active (Od. 14.488) and the medio-passive (Od. 23.226). There is a compound aorist ἐξηπαφιέον 'trick, cheat, beguile, deceive' in the active (Od. 14.379, 23.79) and the medio-passive (Il. 9.376, 14.160), as well as παρηπαφιέον 'beguile, trick' (Il. 14.360). Found in the Homeric Hymns is a non-present stem ἀπαφη- (first in h.Ap. 376 in the form ἐκαπαφησε 'deceived'), which is to be expected of a verb in -ισκω in post-Homeric Greek (see Chapter 7 §§ 3.1, 6).

182This does not include δειδισκωμει or ἵσκω and εἵσκω, where the -τ- is not part of the suffix; nor those cases where the -τ- has been added later, on which see § 3.2.5 above.
The ultimate etymology of ἀπαφίσκω is uncertain, though it may be related to the Homeric adjective ἀποφώλιος (four times in the Odyssey). It is common to derive ἀπαφίσκω from its thematic aorist, as is also done with ἀραφίσκω. Dunkel (1981: 228-9), however, suggests that ἀπαφίσκω derives from ἀπ- ἀπ- ἵςχω 'keep off, keep away (repeatedly)', with 'preverbal ōmredita' and metathesis of aspiration; Vine (1993: 58-60) has criticised this view, which makes ἀπαφίσκω the archaic form beside the supposedly innovatory aorist ἡπαφέω - the opposite of what the Homeric data imply. Rather, Vine argues that ἀποφέιν may in fact show an old present ἀποφέω (as found in Hesychius' ἀποφέιν), which was assimilated to ἀπαφέω, and this gave the aorist we find first in εξαπαφήσα at h.Ap. 376. The old present ἀποφέιν was reanalysed as reduplicated aorist ἀπαφέιν, and a new present ἀπαφίσκω created. In this case the aorist in - ἴ- is in fact ancient, and it is of great interest for Classical developments that we have a very old pair of forms showing present - ἴσκω beside non-present - ἴ-; but Vine's suggested etymology is far from certain.

6.2. ἀραφίσκω

The form ἀραφίσκω 'fit together; provide, etc.' is also found only once in Homer, at Od. 14.23. This apparently only occurs on one other occasion in Greek literature: at Theocritus 25.103, written in imitation of the Odyssey passage where it is first found. In both cases it is in the imperfect. Other forms either show the above

---

183 Cunliffe's (1924) glosses for this word include 'ineffectual' and 'not sagacious'; Hockstra (Heubeck et al. 1988-92: II.208), however, states that ἀποφώλιος is unrelated to verbal forms in ἀπαφ-, and rather means 'unsound, sans valeur, unauglich', being probably from ἀπο- and ὀφελ-. Cf. also Frisk 1960-72 s.v. ἀποφώλιος (I.126, III.35).


185 Cf. Chapter 7 §§ 3.1, 6.

transitive meaning, or are intransitive 'be fitted, etc.', and most are not much more frequent: transitive are sigmatic aorist ἤρσα (once in the Iliad and four times in the Odyssey) and most instances of the thematic aorist ἤρπαν (five times in each epic),\(^{187}\) in two cases intransitive (II. 16.214, Od. 4.777), as are aorist passive ἤρθην (II. 16.211 only) and aorist participle ἀρμενος (II. 18.600, Od. 5.234, 254).\(^{188}\) The intransitive perfect ἀρηκα, however, is rather more common. In finite form it only occurs at Od. 5.361; participle ἀρηκως is found, in masculine and neuter together, seven and three times in the Iliad and the Odyssey respectively; there is a pluperfect also (four times in the Iliad and once in the Odyssey). The feminine of the perfect participle, ἀρηκεια, is quite frequent (twenty times in the Iliad and fourteen in the Odyssey). Compound forms are rare: there is an aorist επηρσα 'fit to' (II. 14. 167, 339), with pluperfect επηρησει 'be fitted on' (II. 12.456), and two more instances of perfect participles: εναρηκως 'being fitted into its place' (Od. 5.236) and προσαρηκως 'being fitted to' (II. 5.725).\(^{189}\)

Further evidence for the great antiquity of the perfect comes from Mycenaean, where we find it as a-ra-ru-ja (ἀρηκεια), and also as a-ra-ru-wo-ja (*ἀραρφσω) and a-ra-ru-wo-a (*ἀραρφσα; all mean 'provided with').\(^{190}\) Unlike the other three verbs in this group, ἀραρισκω does not show non-present forms in -η- in later

---

\(^{187}\) On this reduplicated aorist, see further Bendahman 1993: 79-84.

\(^{188}\) On this form see Chantraine 1986-8: I.383; and Harðarson 1993: 199-200.

\(^{189}\) Nominal forms are πυλαρτες 'gate-fastener, gate-keeper', also as a proper noun (in all, four times in the Iliad, once in the Odyssey); and, from ἄρθυς 'bond, league, friendship' (first at h.Merc. 524), ἄρθυς 'joined in friendship or alliance' (Od. 16.427) and ἄρητες 'having formed a friendship or alliance' (II. 7.302). From ἄρτως, only found in glosses in Greek but occurring in other Indo-European languages as e.g. Latin artus 'joint, limb', Vedic rtu- 'fixed time, right time, etc.' (cf. Chantraine 1968-80 s.v. ἀραρισκος; Mayrhofer 1986- s.v. ῥτι-) we find ἄρτως 'fashion, form; make ready, prepare' (once in the Iliad, five times in the Odyssey), ἐπαρτώς 'fit or fix on' (Od. 8.447) and ἄρτως 'make ready, prepare; set in order; etc.' (found in various tenses, in all seven times in each epic); hence also ἐπαρτης 'equipped, ready' (three times in the Odyssey). Further possibly related forms are listed by Chantraine 1968-80 s.v. ἀραρισκω.

\(^{190}\) See further Aura Jorro 1985-93 s.v. ar-ar-u-ja.
Greek: this may be both because it is effectively a nonce-formation, and also as it has a well-established conjugation comprising many other forms already in the pre-Classical period.

This verb is built on an inherited root \(*h_2er- 'fit (together)', also found in Armenian and perhaps Vedic and Young Avestan (cf. Rix 1998: 240-1). The so-called Attic reduplication is striking, but it is highly unlikely that it arose in the present in -ισκω. Rather, the latter is built on the aorist ήραρων,\(^{191}\) which is generally linked with Armenian \(arari 'I made'\) (cf. Clackson 1994: 101-2; Rix (1998: 241 n. 7) has it as either a Graeco-Armenian innovation or a renewing of inherited \(*h_2\dot{e}-h_2r-e/o- into ar-ar-.\(^{192}\) Hence it is not generally held that άραρισκω is cognate with Armenian \(araric.\(^{193}\)

6.3. ἐπαιρίσκομαι

The present ἐπαιρίσκομαι 'touch; incur, have benefit from' is only found once in Homer, at \(Il. 13.733\). Its future is ἐπαιρήσομαι (\(Il. 6.353\) only) and it also shows thematic aorists active ἐπαύρον (six times in the \(Iliad\) and once in the \(Odyssey\)) and middle ἐπαυρόμην (\(Il. 1.410, 15.17, Od. 18.107\)). The form ἐπαυρεῖ, apparently indicating a present ἐπαυρέω, is found at Hesiod \(Op. 419\), and probably at \(Op. 240\) as well.\(^{194}\) The future in -ησ- is, according to Chantraine (1986-8: 446), derived from the thematic aorist: some of the parallels he cites are ἀμαρτ- ήσω from ἡμαρτ- ον and κιχ- ήσομαι from έκιχ- εν.

The etymology of ἐπαιρίσκομαι is problematic: the form is not listed in Pokorny (1959-69) or Rix (1998); Frisk (1960-72 s.v. ἐπαιρίσκομαι), though he cites

192 For further discussion on the origins of this form, see Bendahanan 1993: 83-4.
193 Cf., on the other hand, Godel 1975: 117.
194 On the alternative reading ἀπηύρα for the latter line, see Chantraine 1968-1980 s.v. ἀπούρας; and West 1978: 217.
Schwyzer's (Schwyzer and Debrunner 1939-71: 1.709 n. 3) suggestion of a link with ἐφρίσκω (via *ἐπ- ἀ- ἕπ-) describes it as ‘ohne Etymologie’. Peters (1980: 21-31) begins by deriving this present from its thematic aorist, but finds further reconstruction less certain. He points out that -αὐρέω could be formed from the aorist -αὐρον after the pair στυγέω: ἐστυγον, but could equally be from an ancient *h2urēye/o-. Indeed, back-formation of present ἐπαυρεῖ from the future in -ησ- would surely also be possible, and indeed seems more likely than West’s (1978: 263) suggestion that the former is secondary after aorist ἐπαυρεῖν. Peters concludes that both ἐπαυρίσκομαι and ἐφρίσκω could indeed come from the one root *(h)werh₁-, although such a connection would be very far back in time; since both the Greek forms in -ικω seem fairly recent in Homer, this would then imply that their similarity in the present is coincidental.

6.4. ἐφρίσκω

Ἑφρίσκω ‘find, light or come upon; find out, discover; incur, etc.’ is only found in Homer at Od. 19.158, but its thematic aorist ἐφροῦν is very frequent. The latter occurs, in the simple active, 32 times in the Iliad and 44 in the Odyssey; there is an aorist middle ἐφρόμην also (once in the Iliad, three times in the Odyssey). Compound forms are aorists ἐξεφροῦν ‘found, discovered’ (II. 18.322) and ἐφεφροῦν ‘found, etc.’ (four and five times respectively). The earliest non-present form in ἐφρη- is an instance of ἐφρήσω at h.Merc. 302. This present in -ισκω also appears to have been derived from its thematic aorist, as Taillardat (1960: 232) notes.

The aorist would appear to be ancient, although the exact nature of its etymology is contested. Taillardat (1960) argued against earlier theories that ἐφροῦν came from a root *wer-, and instead postulated *swer-, which would give reduplicated *se-su-re/o-. More recently, Peters (1980: 52), whilst acknowledging this possibility, suggests that alternatively third person singular ἐφρε could derive from *werh₁-t, or
ultimately from *h₁ur-e from the root *werh₁- by metathesis of *wr₁h₁ to *h₁ur. The latter is the etymology given by Rix (1998: 637) under the root *wreh₁- 'find', which is also found in Armenian and Old Irish. In this case the aspiration might come by analogy from ἐλείν. Rix also lists as possible not *se-sur- but *we-wp(h₁)-, ultimately an old suggestion which works if we say that perfect ἐὑρηταί / *ἐὑρηταί 'has been found' was differentiated from ἐὑρηταί 'has been said'. Both derive ultimately from *fₑ- eᵀ-, but *fₑᵀ- apparently gave *fₑᵀ-. Given the fact that ἀραφίσκω and perhaps ἀποφίσκω (as well as — less immediately relevant and less certain — such reduplicated presents as διδάσκω) seem to have been derived from reduplicated thematic aorists, a similar origin for ἐὑρίσκω is especially tempting.

6.5. Origin and development: formations in -ίσκω

The origin of the suffix -ίσκω, which becomes quite productive in later Greek, is entirely uncertain. It has been shown that it is doubtful whether there ever was an Indo-European suffix *-isko- (Chapter 2 § 3.4). Yet if we do not subscribe to the theory that -ίσκω is an inherited suffix, the only option left is that it developed within Greek. This problem, however, admits of no easy solution. The first attempted explanation was that of Klingenschmitt (1982: 73-7), who notes the pattern of Homeric Greek presents in -ίσκω beside thematic aorists, where the stem is usually in -ρ: ἀραφ-ίσκω : ἀραφ-ον, ἐὑρ-ίσκω : ἐὑρ-ον, ἐπαυρ-ίσκομαι : ἐπαὐρ-ον beside the one exception of ἀποφ-ίσκω : ἅποφ-ον. He suggests that this pattern may be due to an inherited form *h₁griskelo- or *h₁grihskelo-, found in Avestan frayrisəmnō 'awakening' (intransitive), Latin expergiscor 'awaken' (intransitive) and perhaps Albanian ngrihet 'get up', as opposed to a thematic stem in

195 As εὑρίς from *wṛh₁-: cf. further Peters 1980: 31.
196 Cf. Schwyzer and Debrunner 1939-71: I.709 n. 2.
197 Hence also εἰπον from *e-weuk-, albeit a case of 'triple' *w / *u; cf. Lejeune 1972: 228.
Old Indic jára- ‘awaken’ (intransitive middle) and Greek ἑγερεῖος- ‘awaken’. In this case we are dealing with a root *h₁ger- (cf. Rix 1998: 218-19), perhaps in the extended form *h₁gr-ey- or *h₁gr-eyh- (cf. Klingenschmitt 1982: 77 n. 18). The parallel of ἑγεῖο- : *egriske/o- then gives rise to ἐφισκῶ beside ἐφον, and so on.

Such reconstruction is very dubious: the lack of evidence for an -ισκω form of this type in Greek does not speak well for Klingenschmitt’s view, and in addition Vine (1993: 54) has criticised this theory on the grounds that a phonetic restriction could hardly be imposed in such a way. In his version of events (Vine 1993: 52-6), he does nonetheless follow Klingenschmitt in noting a ‘predilection for liquids’ (1993: 54) as the stem-final element both in Homeric verbs in -ισκω and also in Classical Greek (such as ἄλ-, ἴσκομα and στερ-ίσκω). Vine attempts to use Strunk’s (1969 [1970], 1970) suggestion that there were certain cases where *-lhl- after a stop gave Greek -oAl- before a consonant but -oL- elsewhere: hence πολις from *plhl-s, δολιχός from *dlhghó- and ἀμβολῇ(εργός showing *-gw lh₁-, but πολυ from *plh₁-ú-. Given the postulated rules concerning secondary stress on sequences of the form CΡHC, we would therefore expect two different realisations of the laryngeal depending on where the stress was on the form concerned: for in the case of *ΤRh₁-σκέ/ό- , *-klhl-σκέ/ό- would give the -κλή-σκε/ό- of κικλήσκω, but secondarily stressed, *ΤRh₁-σκέ/ό- could give *ToRiske/o-, then remodelled to TaRiske/o- due to the thematic aorist in TaRe/o- from *ΤRh₁-έ/ό-. In this way, according to Vine, the resegmented present TaR-iske/o- appears as counterpart to thematic aorist TaR-e/o-, whence the Homeric forms. It is difficult to accept this explanation in toto, however, not least because Strunk’s proposals have not found much acceptance.

198 On this etymology see further Chapter 2 §§ 3.1, 3.4.
199 For further bibliography on this subject see Vine 1993: 55 n. 25.
200 Cf. § 3.2 n. 68 above.
A very different theory has been put forward by Ruijgh (1985: 140, 148-9), which involves -ισκε/o- being derived from a combination of *-ye/o- and *-skel/o-. Here, verbs already suffixed with the former (as *wrg-ye/o- ‘be at work, work’) also acquired the latter as iterative suffix (*wrg-i-skel/o- ‘work from time to time, habitually’), resulting in a suffix found to be convenient on consonant stems in general (hence αμβλακισκω, etc.). Ruijgh finds relics in Classical χρή-ι-σκο-νται (Herodotus 3.117.4, said to be an iterative of χρέωνται from *χρή-γο-νται) and κυίσκομαι (beside κώ from *κύγω ‘be pregnant’); he uses this theory to explain Mycenaean te-ra-pi-ke as θεραπίσκει, which he glosses as ‘il fonctionne habituellement (de temps en temps) comme θέραψ’. The last example is of very dubious interpretation (cf. Chapter 6 § 2.2), and we shall see that κυίσκομαι is in fact an inchoative best explained as deriving from non-present forms in κυη- (cf. Chapter 7 § 3, especially 3.1.3, 8 § 2.2.2). Ruijgh’s proposal sets out a pattern for iteratives in -(ε)σκον which we do not find in Homer despite their prolific use there; this theory is therefore highly conjectural, and the problem of Greek -ισκω remains decidedly open.

We are therefore left with four single instances of verbs in -ισκω beside four much more common thematic aorists, of which three have stems in -ρ-. Is all this due to chance? If not, then, as Vine notes, the facts require a phonological explanation. A solution could perhaps begin with Ruijgh’s observation (1985: 142) that -ισκω was used to prevent the verbal stem being obscured when merged with -σκω. To say that -ισκω is the postconsonantal variant of -σκω is in itself inaccurate not only in Homeric Greek, where the suffix -ισκω was obviously rare (cf. for example πάσχω, not **παθίσκω), but also in the classical era, where we find such forms as κυίσκομαι, not **κύσκομαι. Yet the Homeric evidence points

201 On Keller’s similar theory of inherited *-iske/o- as a combination of these suffixes, see Chapter 2 § 3.4.

to the conclusion that -ισκω began as a variant of -σκω after certain consonants, it being used three times after -ρ- and once after -φ-.

Taking εὐρον as an example, it being the only frequent form discussed in this class of presents, we might say that if one derived a present in -σκω from aorist εὐρον, the result would be *εὐρσκω. The consonant cluster -ρσκ- would not be tolerated in Greek, and a solution for the problem might well have taken the form of an anaptyctic vowel. Such an insertion would be unusual, but not unparalleled. Firstly, one should note forms such as ἵσθι 'be!', ἱκτίνος ‘kite’ and ἵχθος ‘fish’, which indicate that the standard supporting vowel in Greek is i (cf. Lejeune 1972: 211 and n. 5). Secondly, we may also observe that initial clusters of σ- followed by a consonant tend to develop initial i- (cf. ἵσθι, and also late Greek ἵστατοιωτης). It is thus quite possible that the -ι- of -ισκω also developed as a supporting vowel, to prevent the sequence of resonant plus -σκ-, which would presumably have resulted in loss of -σ-.

Of course, other forms from pre-Classical times show a consonant before -σκ-: instances such as διδάσκω, πᾶσχω, πιθαύσκω and τιτύσκομαι, all of which seem to have been formed within Greek. Yet none of these cases has a stem in -ρ-. That we do not find **ἀπασχω (or **ἀπάσκω?) from an earlier *ἀπαφ- σκω should not concern us: if *εὑρ- σκω gives εὐρίσκω, then ἀπαφίσκω could be formed on the analogy εὑρ- ου : εὑρ- ἵσκω :: ἵπαφ- ου :: Χ.

The new suffix -ισκω then later came to be used on other stems where there were no difficulties in forming a present in simple -σκω: hence in the Classical period we find, as mentioned above, κυίσκομαι; yet that **κύ- σκομαι would be a possible form is evidenced by the formation of μεθύ- σκομαι in the same period. If this suggestion is correct, Klingenschmitt and Vine are right in noting the relevance

---

201 Cf. Grammont 1956: 360-1.
204 The solution to this problem is to be found in Classical Greek: see Chapter 7 § 6.
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of the fact that all but one of the presents in -ισκω in Homer have stems in -ρ-, but
wrong in the conclusions they draw from it: this feature was responsible for the added
-τ-, but it is not ancient. Rather, it is a Greek innovation, without which stems in
certain consonants could not have formed presents in -σκω.

7. Miscellaneous cases

7.1. ἀλδήσκω

Ἀλδήσκω 'grow, increase' is found in Homer only at II. 23.599. A related
causative form ἡλδανε 'cause to wax or fill out' occurs also (Od. 18.70=24.368),
which may be an imperfect of a present ἀλδάνω or a thematic aorist.205 There are
also two forms in ἀλθ-: aorist ἀλθετο 'became whole or sound' (II. 5.417) and
future ἀπολθήσεσθον 'will be healed or cured' (II. 8.405=419). A related nominal
form is ἄναλτος 'not to be filled out, insatiable, greedy' (Od. 17.228, 19.114, 364).

The ultimate root for forms in ἀλ- is *h₂el- 'feed, bring up', also found in
Latin, Old Irish and Germanic (cf. Rix 1998: 233-4). Rix (1998: 234) lists ἀλθετο under *h₂eldh- 'achieve successfully', but acknowledges that it may represent an
extension in *-dh- of *h₂el- (1998: 234 n. 3).206 Hence both ἀλθ- and ἀλδ- could be
extended forms of one root; if so, we could segment the present in -σκω as
ἀλ- ἰ- ἰσκω. This is the only early Greek evidence for a possible Indo-European
suffix *-ε-σκω (cf. Chapter 2 § 3.3). On the other hand, Ruiggh (1985: 144)
suggests deriving ἀλδήσκω from stative *ἀλδ- ἰ- μι 'be well nourished', with the
same ultimate etymology of ἀλ- ἰ- as extended form of *h₂el-.

205 For the former, cf. Chantraine 1968-80 s.v. ἀλδάνωω, and also Shipp 1972: 85; Risch (1974: 271,
276) tentatively favours the latter.
7.2. γηράσκω

The only easily explicable verb from this group is present γηράσκω 'grow old, (of fruit) mellow' (three times in each epic); its aorist is ἔγηρᾶ (II. 7.148, 17.197 (twice), Od. 14.67). A compound form καταγηράσκω 'pass one's days and reach old age; show signs of age' occurs once (Od. 19.360), with aorist κατεγηρᾶ (Od. 9.510). Other cognate forms in Homer show the stems γηρ- and γέρ-. There seems to be at least one related Mycenaean form, ke-ro-si-ja = *γερουσία (Classical γερουσία 'Council of Elders').

It has been held for some time that γηράσκω was probably derived from ἔγηρᾶ. This form has been explained by Barton (1982) as ultimately from the old inherited s-aorist *e-gerät-s-t, also found in Vedic ḫari-s-: after replacement of *s-t by pre-Greek -s-e(t), we would then have *gerät(e(t) > *gerahe > *gerae > ἔγηρᾶ (Barton 1982: 43). It therefore shows the lengthened grade of a root *gerh2-, which is found in several languages, most notably Vedic (cf. Mayrhofer 1986- s.v. JAR; Rix 1998: 146-7). Barton pairs this inherited derived aorist with a thematic root present *ğerh2-e/o-; we thus expect *γέρω, as found in the preserved participle γέρων,

---

207 In γηρ- are γήρος 'the period of old age' (seventeen times in the Iliad, eighteen in the Odyssey) and the adjective γήρως, contracted from γήρῃς, 'not subject to old age' (four and five times respectively). Γῆρος is a doublet of the specialised γέρας 'meed of honour, etc.' (30 times in the Iliad, eleven in the Odyssey), whence ἀγέρας 'meedless' (II. 1.119); and we also find in γερ-γεραῖος 'old man, etc.' (28 times in the Iliad, six in the Odyssey); γέρων 'old man, etc.' (132 times in the Iliad, 84 in the Odyssey) and γεροῦσιος, meaning (of an oath) 'taken by the elders or councillors' (II. 22.119) and (of wine) 'such as is served at assemblies of councillors' (II. 4.259, Od. 13.8). Apparently from *γέρων is γεραῖος 'of dignified bearing, majestic' (II. 3.170, 211, with feminine γεραῖα apparently to be read at II. 6.87, 270) and the denominative verb γεραῖο 'honour' (II. 7.321, Od. 14.437, 441). Compounds are δημογέρων = γέρων (4) 'councillor, etc.' (II. 3.149, 11.372), ὄμοιογέρων 'in green or lusty old age' (II. 23.791). On these forms in general, see further Chantraine 1968-80 s.vv. γέρας, γέρων and γήρας.

208 Cf. Aura Jorro 1985-93 s.v. ke-ro-si-ja. Also apparently connected is γηρῆς 'old woman'; for more on related forms in general, see Barton 1982: 32-3.


210 That is, the expected Indo-European pattern of root present beside derived aorist, and vice versa; cf. Chapter 2 § 4.3.
The old aorist underwent a change of Aktionsart from durative to punctual, the root shifted from durative 'age' to stative 'be old', and a new present γηράσκω 'become old' was created (1982: 37-43). With εγήρα was reinterpreted as a root aorist akin to εβη, new forms were created in γηρα- (1982: 43-5).

This is the only case so far encountered where it seems certain that a present in -σκω has been formed from an aorist in -σα. Formation of a sigmatic aorist from a present is in fact an already productive type in Homeric Greek, as in εδιδαξα (*εδιδασκ- σα) from διδάσκω and εκλίνα (*εκλίν- σα) from κλίνω. Here the aorist stem appears to have formed a present in -σκω: γηράσκω could have been derived from *ε- γηρα- σα / *ε- γηρα- ἀο (before it contracted into εγήρα), or created on the analogy of βάσκω : εβα. This type of formation of verbs in -σκω is in fact much more productive in Classical Greek: all Barton's (1982: 39) examples for formation of such a present from a sigmatic aorist come from this period or later.

7.3. ηλάσκω

The present ηλάσκω 'rove, flit about' is found twice in Homer (II. 2.470, 13.104); there is an additional collateral present ηλασκάζω 'wander aimlessly

211Cf. Barton 1982: 34. There is also Armenian cerown 'old, old man' (cf. Hardarson 1993: 73) and Avestan thematic present *zara- (Mayrhofer 1986- s.v. jārant-; Hardarson 1993: 73 n. 50).

212Other suggestions have been made to explain these data: Ruijgh (1985: 145) has prehistoric Greek *γωράσκω 'become old' reformed to γηράσκω after γηρας; and Jasanoff (1988: 232) cites Nussbaum's suggestion that εγήρα is analogical on γηράσκω after the pair βάσκω : εβα. For criticism of Peters' (1980: 314) view that εγήρα derived from an acrodynamic root aorist *γερ-τ, see Hardarson 1993: 72-3. Barton's view of εγήρα's origin is largely followed by Hardarson (1993: 72-6) and Rix (1998: 146 and 147 n. 8); but Rix reconstructs a tentative root aorist (found in Vedic jūrātam) and has jāris- and εγήρα as separate innovations.


214That is, the opposite of Nussbaum's method of deriving εγήρα from γηράσκω: see n. 212 above.

about; go about, skulk in order to avoid (danger)' (II. 18.281, Od. 9.457). These forms seem to be related to ἀλαζοματι ‘wander, rove’, found in the present especially in the participle (in all, three times in the Iliad and sixteen in the Odyssey), along with imperfect ἀλαζωμην (once and three times respectively), aorist ἀλαζημην (four times in simple form in the Odyssey, and another four as ἐπαλαζημην ‘wandered or roved over or among’) and perfect ἀλαζηματι (once in the Iliad, fifteen times in the Odyssey). As well as the related noun ἀλη ‘(incessant) wandering’ (four times in the Odyssey), there are further derivatives in ἀλη. The root may be *h2elh2- ‘wander aimlessly’, with ἄλαζοματι perhaps ultimately deriving from an ancient thematic present also found in Italic (cf. Rix 1998: 235).

Also apparently cognate is the adjective ἥλεος ‘crazed, distraught; that takes away one’s wits or discretion’ (II. 15.128, Od. 2.243, 14.464). Later on, we see the same initial vocalic alternation in the forms ἄλαζινω ‘wander about’ (Aeschylus, Euripides) and ἥλαζινω ‘wander, stray’ (Theocritus, Callimachus), perhaps due to contamination from ἄλαζκω. The reason for the difference in length of the initial vowels is disputed: Risch (1974: 276) and Shipp (1972: 87) suggest that it is perhaps due to metrical lengthening; Kujore (1973: 94) and Chantraine (1968-80 s.v. ἥλεος) cite the parallel of the alternation in Lettish dl’a ‘half-mad’ and aluot ‘wander, roam’.

216 These are nouns ἄληκτον ‘vagrant’ (Od. 17.376, 19.74) and ἄλητις ‘wanderer, vagrant’ (once in the Iliad, twelve times in the Odyssey), and also denominative verb ἄλητευω ‘wander, rove; go to and fro’ (six times in the Odyssey).


218 Cf. Frisk 1960-72 s.v. ἥλαζκω; and Chantraine 1968-80 s.v. ἥλαζκω. Perhaps also related to ἥλεος are ἄλαζοφρονεών ‘dazed, “silly”’ (II. 23.698) and ‘troubled or dashed in spirit’ (Od. 10.374); and ἥλιοσ, found in the expression ἥλιοσ πολλος ‘follement grande’ (once in the Iliad, four times in the Odyssey). The latter gloss is from Chantraine. On these two unusual forms, see Chantraine 1968-80 s.v. ἥλεος; and Frisk 1960-72 s.v. ἥλεος.
7.4. πτωσκάζω

Πτωσκάζω 'cower or crouch in fear or in cowardice, shrink from the fray' is found only in the infinitive πτωσκάζεμεν at II. 4.372. A related present πτώσσω has the same meaning, as well as 'cringe in humility, go about begging' (five times in the Iliad, once in the imperfect, and three times in the Odyssey); there is also a compound present κατα-πτώσσω 'crouch down, cower in fear' (four times in the Iliad). Unlike πτωσκάζω, πτώσσω is also used in Classical Greek.

Non-present forms of this verb in Homer show stem πτη-. There is aorist ἔπτηξα 'crouch, cower; strike with dismay' first in Homer (II. 14.40), also with preverb κατα- 'crouch down or cower in fear' (II. 8.136 (dual καταπτήτην), 22.191, Od. 8.190); and perfect participle πεπτησός (three times in the Odyssey), also found compounded with ὑπό- 'cower under' (II. 2.312) and perhaps as feminine ποτιπεπτησύα 'crouching down towards' (Od. 13.98), unless in the latter case we are dealing with the perfect of πιπτω 'fall'. A related noun πτώξε is used as the adjective 'cowering, timid' to describe a hare (II. 22.310), and meaning 'hare' itself (II. 17.676); we also find πτωχός 'beggar' (22 times in the Odyssey), with denominative πτωχεύω 'go about begging, beg (one’s bread)' (in all five times in the Odyssey).

Chantraine (1931: 125, 1968-80 s.v. πτησσώ, 1986-8: 1.338) compares the pair ἀλύσκω : ἀλυσκάζω, suggesting that πτωσκάζω implies an earlier *πτώσκω. This form is perhaps indirectly attested, if πτώσσω is from *πτωσκύω rather than *πτωκύω. On the other hand, Rix (1998: 446-7) derives πτώσσω either from a possible iterative ?*πτό,ετ-, or from πτησσώ with secondary -ω-.

---

219The variant reading πτωσκαζεμεν is mentioned by Chantraine (1931: 125), but is not listed in the editions of Monro and Allen (1920), van Thiel (1996) and West (1998).
220Cf. LSJ s.v. πτώσσω. None of the compounds listed by Kretschmer and Locker (1944 s.v.) appear to have been used as early as the Classical period.
221For the former, cf. Schwzyzer and Debrunner 1939-71: I. 709 n. 2; for the latter, Kujore 1973: 78.
after πτωξ *‘who cowers’, or as a denominative of the latter. He reconstructs a root *pteh₂k- *‘cower’, also present in Armenian, Latin and Old High German: in this case, ἐπτηξα (Doric ἐπταξα) might derive from an aorist ?*pteh₂k-s- / *pteh₂k-s-.

8. Conclusion: the morphology of verbs in -σκω in Homer

It is now clear that, by the time the epic language was fixed, the old system of verbs in *-skelo- built on the zero-grade of the root had been widely extended. Homer preserved two types which reflect either old forms or at least the old pattern. 

βάσκω, μίσγω seem to be inherited, and so may ἔρχομαι; γιγνώσκω and (if inherited) ἱλάσκομαι have been recharacterised, and there is also ἥσκον (Chapter 5 § 6.1.1). Although we lack exact pairs to guarantee the Indo-European origin of βόσκω, ἵσκω and πάσχω, these forms too follow the old pattern; ὁρχέομαι may also fall here. Nor can we produce adequate evidence to suggest that βλῶσκω, θυησκω and θρόσκω are inherited (the added -τ- apart); but these also appear to go back to zero-grade stems, provided we accept the view that the colour of the vowel is determined by the laryngeal that follows the resonant (whence *mjh₃- gives *mlō-, *dhnh₂-*dhnā- and *dhρh₃-*dhrō-). The main point is that these presents differ from their corresponding aorists in such a way that it is impossible to derive one form from the other; in itself this speaks either for inherited forms or for an inherited pattern.

The pattern obviously cannot simply be zero-grade root plus -σκω, because synchronically βάσκω and βλῶσκω seem to have little in common. In other words, the forms in -σκω of the set roots can only imitate the pattern of other set roots, and some of these must have been inherited.

Not everything is ancient, however. It seems likely that the variant -ίσκω which appears in θυησκω, θρόσκω and also perhaps γιγνώσκω, κικλήσκω and μμησκω was not Homeric. When the -τ- really appears in these forms is obscure, but the Attic inscriptions have θυησκω from the fourth century BC; the only
clinching evidence for an earlier innovation would be epigraphical, but does not seem to be available. Nor is it entirely clear in which verbs this intrusive -ι- appeared.

Another type of innovation is the Greek type of presents in -σκω with reduplication in -ι-. In addition, there are two verbs which appear to have reduplication in -ε-, but which are difficult to analyse; and several presents in -ισκω, a variant of -σκω found on stems in -ρ- and, on one occasion, -φ-. There are also four verbs with disyllabic stems, of which three are problematic; lastly, there is one form which is found only in -σκάζω. Especially notable is the tendency to form presents in -σκω from thematic aorists. The best examples of this formation encountered so far are those in -ισκω: probably ἀπαφίσκω from ἡπαφόν, and also ἀρωρίσκω from ἡραρόν, ἐποιρίσκομαι from ἐπούρον and εὑρίσκω from εὑρόν. Other possible such formations are διδάσκω from δέδαε and τιτύσκομαι from τετυκέιν, beside in addition κικλήσκω: ἐκέκλετο; *παθσκω beside ἐπαθον may also be parallel.

This chapter has been devoted to a diachronic analysis of presents in -σκω found in Homer, and so has differed greatly from the accounts given by Curtius, Brugmann and Schwyzer.222 A synchronic analysis of the Homeric data would give a different pattern. Here a first category might be verbs built on monosyllabic stems with -σκω, first of all with a short vowel (βάςκω, βόςκω, ισκω, μίσγω, πάςχω, φάςκω)223 and then with a long one (βλάςκω, θυήσκω, θρώςκω). Presents in -σκω with disyllabic stems might come next (ἀλόδησκω, ἀλύσκω, γηράςκω, ἡλάςκω), since from this point of view they seem similar to the monosyllabic ones. The reduplicated verbs in -ι- (γιγνώσκω, διδάσκω, ἱλάςκομαι, κικλήσκω, μμυνήσκομαι, πιθαύνσκω, τιτύσκομαι) and -ε- (δειδίσκομαι, ἔισκω) would form a further set, as would those in -ισκω

222 Cf. Chapter 1 § 2.1.
223 Ἐφαςκον would here be included as φάςκω on the grounds that it appears later with other forms, and so synchronically does not appear to have been a preterite in -(ε)σκον first of all.
(ἀπαφίσκω, ἀραρίσκω, ἐπαυρίσκομαι, εὑρίσκω). Such an analysis, however, would omit certain forms (ἐρχομαι, ἔσκον, πτωσκάζω) and fails to distinguish inherited and non-inherited forms; additionally, it seems to give excessive prominence to the disyllabic stems, which are historically a miscellaneous set of verbs.
Chapter 4
The Semantics of Verbs in -σκω in Homer

1. Introduction

We have seen that Homer shows twenty-eight verbs with either -σκω or (more or less certainly) relics of *-skel-o-, and that these fall into six morphological categories. It is, however, difficult if not impossible to classify these forms semantically. In what follows, therefore, the intuitive groups used are not entirely comparable. For each verb, I have deliberately chosen to report Cunliffe’s (1924) glosses, even when they initially appear to contradict the facts, in order to prevent yielding to subjective reactions.

Firstly, there is a class of verbs whose stems indicate movement. A first subclass of this set is those verbs which simply mean ‘come’ and ‘go’: these are βάσκω ‘come, go’; -βλάσκω ‘go, come’; and ἔρχομαι ‘go; come’. A second (morphological) subgroup is formed by verbs in -σκω with what we shall see are apparently frequentatives in -σκάζω:1 ἀλύσκω / ἀλυσκάζω ‘escape’ beside ἀλυσκάζω ‘escape; play the shirker’; and ἡλάσκω ‘rove, flit about’ beside ἡλασκάζω ‘wander aimlessly about; skulk’. In addition to these, there is πτωσκάζω ‘cower’. Thirdly, there are verbs of fast movement: θρόσκω ‘leap, spring’ and ὑπέρσκομαι ‘dance’.

Secondly, there is a class where forms in -σκω are used with a causative-inchoative contrast. Most verbs which show both meanings follow the pattern of causative in -ω and inchoative in -σκάζω, with occasional causatives in -σκάζω also being found. These are βόσκω ‘feed’ / βόσκομαι ‘get fed’; Διδάσκω ‘teach,

---

1The ‘frequentative’ appears to emphasise the continuation of the action involved: cf. also the pairs μίμων ‘remain, stay’ (II. 13.747, etc.) : μιμοκάζω ‘tarry, loiter’ (II. 2.392, 10.549) and βίπτω ‘throw’ (with preverb ἀνα-, Od. 7.328, etc.) : βιπτάζω ‘throw to and fro’ (II. 14.257). Cf. Kujoře 1973: 77-8, who however only finds frequentative meaning in the latter case.
instruct' / διδάσκωμαι 'learn'; μμυνήσκω 'remind' / μμυνήσκομαι 'remember'; μίσγω 'mix together' / μίσγομαι 'get mixed, mingle'; and also ττύσκομαι, causative 'make ready', inchoative '[get ready,] take aim'.

Slightly more numerous are those verbs whose presents in -σκ- only have causative meaning. Here we find causative actives ἀποφίσκω 'trick'; ἀφαίρεσκω 'fit together'; ἔισκω 'make like; compare with; think'; ἵσκω 'make like; liken to; speak feigningly; guess'; πιθαύνεσκω 'make manifest; declare'. In one instance there is a benefactive causative medio-passive with no active: ἰλάσκομαι 'propitiate'.

A small number of verbs have inchoative meaning alone. One of these is medio-passive: ἐπαυρίσκομαι 'touch; incur'. Most, however, are active: ἀλλήσκω 'grow, increase'; γναφάσκω 'grow old'; γνωρίσκω 'perceive, know, etc.'; θνήσκω 'die'.

Thirdly, some forms are covered by neither of these groups. These are δεισκομαι 'welcome, greet'; εὑρίσκω 'find; find out; incur'; κικλησκω 'summon; call'; and πάσχω 'suffer; encounter'.

This grouping is, therefore, necessarily intuitive; it is merely used here in order to be able to examine these forms in a thorough manner.

---

2 In the benefactive use of the medio-passive, the agent of the action denoted by the verb is what Riksbaron (1994: 132) calls the 'Beneficiary': he/she in some way benefits from the action denoted by the verb. Future and aorist forms of such medio-passives tend to be morphologically middle forms in -σκοι and -σκην; in general, see further Rijksbaron 1994: 144-7, who terms this use 'indirect-reflexive'.

3 For the semantics of ἐσκόν 'be' and (ἐ)φασκόν 'say; assert', morphologically ambiguous between imperfects of presents in -σκω and iteratives in -(ἐ)σκόν, see Chapter 5 §§ 6.1.2 and 6.2.2 respectively.
2. Verbs of movement

2.1. Verbs of coming and going

2.1.1. βάσκω

Of the eight occurrences of βάσκω ‘come, go’, all in the Iliad, six are found in the phrase βάσκ’ ιθι, ‘go! away!’. Four such instances are found in the formula βάσκ’ ιθί τοχεία ‘go, swift Iris!’, always said by Zeus (II. 8.399, 11.186, 15.158, 24.144). The other two occurrences of βάσκ’ ιθι are also at the command of Zeus: to a dream sent to Agamemnon (II. 2.8) and to Hermes (II. 24.336). In contrast, the second person imperative of the alternative present βαίνω is not found in simple form, although there is one instance of dvdpcuve 'go up; embark, etc.' This occurs when Nestor says to Telemachus:

σπουδή νῦν ἀνάβαινε κέλευε τε πάντας ἐταίρους (Od. 15.209)

In haste now go on board, and order all your comrades [to do the same].

Létoublon (1985: 135) says that in the expression βάσκ’ ιθι, ιθι probably shows ‘un sens vide d’exhortation’, like French ‘allons’, and that βάσκ’ is used as an iterative; she glosses the expression ‘allons, marche!’ . It has also been claimed that the expression βάσκ’ ιθι may reflect an inherited formula, found in e.g. Sanskrit ehi...gaccha.4 Létoublon also claims iterative meaning for the reduplicated participial forms βιβάσθων, βιβάς and βιβῶν ‘striding, striding along’, compounds προβιβάς ‘striding along forwards’ and προβιβῶν ‘advancing’ (Létoublon 1985: 135-6).5 These, however, are of a different nature to the form in -σκω: it is their frequent use with accusative plurals such as μακρά (whence ‘marcher à grands pas’) that brings Létoublon to the conclusion that ‘faire des pas, marcher’ is the iterative of

---

5 Létoublon’s data are different, since she does not cite the compound forms at II. 13.807, 16.609, Od. 15.555, but does also take into account instances from the Homeric Hymns.
'faire un pas', the meaning she ascribes to βοινo (Létoublon 1985: 123-43). She has βη as an 'aorist inchoatif renvoyant à l'instant de départ' (Létoublon 1985: 136-8), so that the source root *gʷa- is 'se mettre en marche, partir', 'faire un pas' (1985: 140-3).

Other occurrences of the stem βαςκ- in the Iliad are more controversial. The form ἐπιβαςκέμεν 'bring within the pale of, involve in' is causative in sense, being an extension of the meaning 'make go'; it is used when Thersites shouts at Agamemnon:

οὐ μὲν ἔοικεν
ἀρχὸν ἑόντα κακῶν ἐπιβαςκέμεν ὑπας Ἀχαϊῶν. (II. 2.233-4)

It is not becoming for one who is leader to involve the sons of the Achaians in evils.

On account of this causativity, Wackernagel (1916: 18-19 n. 2) claimed that the stem ἐπιβαςκ- was here dissimilated from ἐπ- βαςκ-. This is based on the assumption that βιβάςκω is the causative form of βάςκω, and required Wackernagel, who did not accept that βάςκω could be causative in sense, to read Erotian's gloss (64.4) διέβαςκον· διεβιβάζον as διε<βι>βαςκον. It has already been seen that the often quoted theory that reduplicated verbs in -σκω tend to show causative meaning does not adequately explain the data (Chapter 1 § 2.2.1). Moreover, as scholars have noted, βιβάςκω is not always causative; and there are no parallels for the derivation of an Ancient Greek causative merely by adding reduplication to an earlier non-causative form. Why, therefore, should βάςκω on

---

6Wackernagel is followed by Schwyzer (Schwyzer and Debrunner 1939-71: I. 707 n. 2) and Giacalone Ramat (1967: 109 n. 9).

7Cf. Leumann 1957: 79-80; Kujore 1970: 70-74, 1973: 92 n. 2, 255-6; Shipp 1972: 86-7; and Létoublon 1985: 123, 125, 255 n. 7. The problem of Homeric causative πιφωςκω beside Classical non-causative -φωςκω, -φωςκω is the reverse, in that there it is the causative form which is earlier; on the latter see Chapter 3 § 4.2.2.
one occasion be causative? Leumann (1957: 79-80) explained causative βιβάσκω as derived from ἔβησα and ἔβην on the same model as -διδύσκω : διδύσα : διδύν (cf. further Chapter 1 §§ 2.2.1, 3.2), in which case it is not connected to βάσκω.

Kujore (1970: 74) suggests that βάσκω was both transitive and intransitive, as ἤζω, ἤζανω, both ‘sit’ and ‘make to sit’.

A possible solution for the problem involves Létoublon’s (1985: 125) observation that the same metaphorical sense that we find here in ἐπιβάσκω, with complement of ‘place’, is shown in two instances of the aorist ἐπέβησα. Firstly, when Agamemnon says to Teucer, encouraging him:

τὸν καὶ τὴλὸθ’ ἐόντα ἐυκλείης ἐπίβησον. (II. 8.285)

bring him [your father] to honour, although he is far away.

And when Penelope tells her nurse, who has just revealed that Odysseus has come back and killed the suitors:

μαία φίλη, μάργην σε θεοῦ θέσαν, οί τε δύνανται
ἀφρονα ποίησαι καὶ ἐπίφρονα περ μάλ’ ἐόντα,
καὶ τε χαλιφρονέοντα σαφοφροσύνης ἐπέβησαν (Od. 23.11-13)

Dear nurse, the gods have made you mad, they who can make foolish even one who is very wise, and who involve the simple-minded in good sense.

It therefore seems that causative ἐπιβάσκω is present to aorist ἐπέβησα, both meaning ‘make go, bring within the pale of, involve’ (Cunliffe 1924 s.v. ἐπιβαίνω). Further causative forms in ἐπι- are literal in meaning: future ἐπιβήσσω ‘cause to embark (upon a ship)’ (II. 8.197) and aorist ἐπέβησα ‘set on shore, cause to mount [a chariot], etc.’ (twice in the Iliad, once in the Odyssey). There are also other non-
present causative forms in (-)βησ- : ἔβησα ‘made go, made embark’ (six times in the Iliad and once in the Odyssey), ἔκβησαντες ‘set on shore’ (Od. 24.301) and middle ἀναβησόμην ‘caused to embark’ (Od. 15.475). Although Cunliffe lists ἐπέβησα under ἐπιβαίνω, not ἐπιβάσκω, it is clear from his gloss (1924 s.v. ἐπιβαίνω II.2), as cited a few lines above, that this aorist is used like the σκω-present. It would therefore seem that causative ἐπιβάσκω is simply the present of causative ἐπέβησα. As Létoéblon (1985: 126) notes, further related causative forms in βη-/βα- are found in Classical Greek, most notably βιβάζω, given as the causative of βαίνω by LSJ s.v.8

The final instance of βάσκω occurs in the form παρέβασκε ‘acted as παραιβάτης, went beside’ . It is used when Agamemnon goes to kill Isus and Antiphus,

υίε δύω Πριάμοιο, νόθον καὶ γνήσιον, ἄμφω
εἶν ενὶ διφρῳ ἐντασιν· ὦ μὲν νόθος ἡμιόχευεν,
“Ἀντιφός αὖ παρέβασκε περικλυτός’ (Ili. 11.102-4)

two sons of Priam, one a bastard and one legitimate, both being in the one chariot; the bastard was holding the reins, and on the other hand glorious Antiphus was going / used to go beside him [as fighter].

This form is held by some scholars to be an imperfect iterative in -(ε)σκον;9 as in other cases, we could read an augmentless form here and the line would still scan.10 Chantraine (1968-80 s.v. βαίνω) and Kujoé (1973: 92), however, analyse the form

8For occurrences of βιβάζω cf. Veitch 1887 s.v.; on Homeric causative forms related to βαίνω in general, see Létoéblon 1985: 124-6.
10That is, reading παράβασκε; on the occasional use of augmented iteratives in -(ε)σκον see Chapter 5 § 2 n. 6.
as a compound of βάσκω. From the same compound verb in Homer we twice find
perfect participle παρβεβαώς; Cunliffe glosses its assumed present παραβαίνω
(1924 s.v.) as ‘take one’s way beside’, whence the stative meaning for this participle
of ‘standing by’: so Ἐκτορι παρβεβαώς ‘standing [being] by Hector’s side’ (II.
11.522), and:

ως τῷ παρβεβαῶτε μᾶλ’ ἐστασαν ἀλλήλουν. (13.708)

Thus they [they two Ajaxes], standing [being] beside, stood by each other.

If παρέβασκε is indeed a finite form of βάσκω it is one of few: for it is obvious
that βάσκω was in decline already in Homer’s time, and in later literature also it is
almost exclusively the imperative forms that are found.11 The ‘iterative’ meaning
‘used to stand beside’ fits well here, as has been argued by Delbrück (Brugmann and
Delbrück 1893-1916: IV.63); on the other hand, the form could simply be an
imperfect.12

In all, we are dealing with a diverse set of forms. The imperative βάσκε only
occurs in formulae. Present infinitive ἐπιβασκέμεν is a nonce-formation used as a
causative present to aorist ἐπέβησα. With imperfect παρέβασκε we cannot be
sure if we have an iterative preterite of a present which we do not find (presumably
παραβαίνω) or an imperfect of a present παραβάσκω – which we also do not
find.

---

11Hence βάσκε in a lyric refrain at Aeschylus Pers. 663, 671, and βάσκετ in a lyric passage at
Aristophanes Thes. 783. It is finite in the form διαβάσκει ‘strut about’ (Aristophanes Av. 486); cf.
διαβαίνω ‘stride’.

12If iterative, then the form represents a rare instance of the ‘serial’ type derived from an aorist stem but
used without defining circumstances: cf. further on οὐδήσασκε, Chapter 5 § 5.2.1.
2.1.2. -βλώσκω

The present -βλώσκω 'go, come' (Cunliffe 1924) is only ever found in Homer in compound form, and only in the Odyssey. It occurs three times as προ-βλώσκω 'go or come forward or forth'. Eurycleia says to Telemachus:

άλλ' ἄγε, τίς τοι ἔπειτα μετοιχομένη φάος οἴσει;
δμωάς δ' οὐκ έίας προβλώσκεμεν, οἳ κεν ἔφαινον. (Od. 19.24-5)

But come, who then, going to get a light, will carry it for you? For you did not allow the female servants, who would have given light, to go in front of you.

The other two instances are in a repeated passage of Odysseus’ instructions on what to do as the suitors are being killed:

ὣς δὲ τις ἡ στοναχῆς ἢ κτύπου ἐνδον ἀκούσῇ
ἀνδρῶν ἡμετέροισιν ἐν ἑρκεσί, μὴ τι θύραξ
προβλώσκειν, άλλ' οὐτόῦ ἀκήν ἔμεναι παρὰ ἑργῷ.

(Od. 21.237-9=383-5)

And if anyone hears groaning or the din of men within the walls, do not let them come out, but remain in silence there at work.

Lastly, there is one case of κατα-βλώσκω 'go down through'. This occurs when Telemachus asks Eumaeus if there is news from the city, and the latter replies:

οὐκ ἐμελέν μοι ταῦτα μεταλλήσαι καὶ ἐρέσθαι
ἀστυ καταβλώσκοντα. (Od. 16.465-6)

I did not take the trouble to ask and inquire this, as I was going down through the city.
On the other hand, the thematic aorist μόλον does occur in simple form, four times in the *Iliad* and twice in the *Odyssey*. All simple instances are participial bar one. Lé toublon (1985: 114) notes that, of these five participial examples, one at least is clearly translatable with the idiomatic expression ‘go and do (something)’, as when Hector has just spoken to his mother:

\[
\delta \varepsilon \phi \alpha \theta ', \ \eta \ \delta \varepsilon \ \mu \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \sigma \sigma \sigma \sigma \alpha \ \pi \omicron \tau \iota \mu \acute{e} \gamma \alpha \rho ' \ \alpha \mu \phi \iota \pi \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \sigma \iota \iota \iota \iota \\
\kappa \epsilon \kappa \lambda \eta \tau \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron . \ \textit{(II. 6.286-7)}
\]

He spoke thus, and she, having gone to the hall, called to her handmaidens.

The other four may also be interpreted this way.\(^\text{13}\) She notes that the usage is just like that of ἐλθὼν, although the rare -βλώσκω is never found to be used in the same way as the equivalent present participle of ἐμι.

The finite instance pertains to the passage of time, again a use of ἡλθον (cf. Lé toublon 1985: 114). Here, Priam says to the Trojans, on ordering them to collect wood for Hector’s funeral pyre and informing them that they should fear no attack:

\[
\eta \ \gamma \omicron \ ' \acute{A} \chi \iota \ll \\ \\
\pi \acute{e} \mu \mu \omega \nu \mu \ ' \ \delta \delta ' \ \epsilon \acute{e} \pi \acute{e} \tau \epsilon \ell \lambda \epsilon \mu \acute{e} \nu \acute{e} \omega \omega \nu \ \\
\mu \acute{e} \pi \acute{r} \iota \nu \ \pi \zeta \mu \alpha \nu \acute{e} \epsilon \epsilon \iota \nu \ \\
\pi \acute{r} \iota \nu \ \delta \omega \delta \epsilon \kappa \alpha \tau \eta \mu \omicron \lambda \eta \ \eta \omicron \omicron . \ \textit{(II. 24.779-81)}
\]

For indeed Achilles promised thus, when he sent me from the black ships, that he would not attack us, before the twelfth dawn comes.

\(^{13}\text{These are II. 11.173, 15.720, Od. 3.44, 24.335.}\)
Also common is πρόμολον ‘went or came forward or forth’ (three times in each epic), aorist to προβλώσκω; and there is as well the aorist ἐκμολούν ‘came out’, used when Achilles calls Patroclus:

ο δὲ κλισίτθεν ἄκοισας
ἐκμολεν ἰσος ὑπὸ Ἀρη, κακοῦ δ᾿ ἀρα οἱ πέλεν ἀρχή. (Iliad 11.603-4)
And having heard, he came out from his hut, equal to Ares, and for him it was the beginning of woe.

A simple perfect μέμβλωκα is found once, when Eumaeus says to Odysseus:

δὴ γὰρ μέμβλακε μάλιστα
ἡμαρ, ἀτὰρ τάχα τοι ποτὶ ἔσπερα ρίγιον ἔσται. (Odyssey 17.190-1)
For now the day has mostly gone, and soon you will find it cold towards evening.

There is also a compound form παρμεμβλωκα; this means ‘have gone beside’ and so ‘stand by’, being used of Aphrodite helping Agamemnon at Iliad 4.11 and similarly of Hector being assisted by his mother at Iliad 24.73.

Despite Cunliffe’s occasional use of ‘go’ in glossing these forms there is, as Létoublon (1985: 114-15) notes, only one instance of a part of simple -βλώσκω showing centrifugal (‘centrifuge’) movement rather than the centripetal (‘centripète’) or neutralised kinds:14 that of the perfect μέμβλωκα at Odyssey 17.190. This, she notes, is probably because when a point in time (unlike a person) has arrived, it then becomes the past, and so has gone; the use of παρμεμβλωκα ‘have come, stand by,

14Centrifugal movement implies movement away from the place of the speech-act (‘un mouvement s’éloignant du lieu-repère de l’énonciation’), centripetal towards it (‘un rapprochement par rapport au même repère’): cf. Létoublon 1985: 47 and, on these concepts in general, Létoublon 1985: 42 ff.
be present for', which she apparently does not notice, seems to confirm her thesis. She suggests (1985: 115-16) that the present from the same root is only available with preverb because durative 'come' is hardly needed, the addition being used to neutralise the form or render it centrifugal; and it is rare because it is so unnecessary. Preverbs are used with aorist forms in the same way. Other verbs with similar problems simply acquire suppletive presents, such as ἡλθον (εἰμι) and ἔδρομον (θέω).

In short, ἐμολοῦ seems to have been synonymous with ἡλθον, its present -βλάσκω being equivalent to -εἰμι.\(^{15}\)

2.1.3. ἔρχομαι

The frequent ἔρχομαι is given a range of glosses by Cunliffe (1924): 'go, proceed; move; depart; come; approach, present oneself; return; etc.'\(^{16}\) It has been most recently studied by Létoublon, who contrasts its use in Homer with that of εἰμι (1985: 59-72). Her examination begins with a syntactic analysis, which shows the forms to be almost identical; hence, most remarkably, we find εἰμι γὰρ ὄψωμένη πολυφόρβου πείρατα γαῖης 'I am going to see the limits of the all-nurturing earth' (II. 14.200), and also τοὺς εἰμί ὄψωμένη... (II. 14.205=304), beside ἔρχομαι ὄψωμένη πολυφόρβου πείρατα γαῖης (II. 14.301).

Next, deictic divisions are attempted (Létoublon 1985: 63-5), firstly for place and secondly for time. For the former, Létoublon’s criteria concern whether a verb of movement is centrifugal or centripetal.\(^{17}\) She had already shown that εἰμι was normally neutral as regards spatial deixis, indicating motion away when marked

\(^{15}\)The use of ἀγχιμολοῦ with ἡλθον, as well as the later αὐτόμολος, give further strength to this view: cf. Létoublon 1985: 117-18.

\(^{16}\)For details of compounds see Chapter 3 § 2.2 and n. 17.

\(^{17}\)On these terms cf. § 2.1.2 n. 14 above.
(1985: 42-58). ἐρχομαι is very similar, but may be used for either direction. Hence Eurypylus says, when explaining to Patroclus that he is rushing to Achilles with a message:

ἐρχομαι, δφρ’ Ἀχιλῆι δαιφρονι μῆθοι ενίςπω,
δν Νέστωρ ἐπέτελλε Γερήνιος, οὔρος Ἀχαιῶν’ (Il. 11.839-40)
I am going [there] to tell valiant Achilles a message which Gerenian Nestor, guardian of the Achaeans, charged me with.

On the other hand Meriones, caught by Idomeneus away from the battle and by the huts, explains to him:

ἐρχομαι, εἰ τι τοι ἔγχος εἰνι κλισίησι λέειπται,
οἰςόμενος’ (Il. 13.256-7)
I am coming to get a spear, if by chance one has been left in the huts.

Létoublon’s argument is backed up by two more facts: Meriones clearly got near the hut (ἔγγυς ‘near’, v. 247); and Idomeneus asked τίπτ’ ἡλθες; ‘why did you come?’ (v. 250), with ἡλθον indicating motion towards the location of the speech-act.18

Regarding time, there would seem to be something of a difference. εἰμι has, according to Létoublon (1985: 64-5), ‘une orientation temporelle vers l’avenir’, as when Patroclus says:

νῦν δὲ ἐπος ἔρεων πάλιν ἄγγελος εἴμ’ Ἀχιλῆι. (Il. 11.652)
And now I shall go back again as a messenger, to tell Achilles.

On the other hand, ἐρχομοιτί‘prolonge et clôt le passé’ (and, in theory, the future too);19 hence Andromache says of Hector:

νῦν δὲ σὺ μὲν 'Αἵδαο δόμους ὑπὸ κεύθεσι γαῖης
ἐρχετί, αὐτὰρ ἐμὲ στυγερῷ ἐνὶ πένθει λείπεις
χῆρην ἐν μεγάροισι: (II. 22.482-4)

Now you are departing to the house of Hades beneath the depths of earth, but you leave me in bitter grief, a widow in my halls.

Therefore εἴμι pertains to the time which runs from νῦν to ἔπειτα, whereas ἐρχομοιτί goes from πάρος to νῦν.

Létoublon turns next to the pragmatics of ἐρχομοιτί and εἴμι. She begins with the first and second persons [singular] (1985: 65-8), though comparisons of the latter turn out not to be possible. With the one exception of II. 18.333, the first person form εἴμι ‘exprime une décision de se mouvoir vers l’ailleurs, valable à partir de l’instant où elle est énoncée’ (1985: 66); it is ‘modalement marqué’ (1985: 67). On the other hand, the first and second persons singular of ἐρχομοιτί express the opposite (‘je suis en train d’aller’, 1985: 68). This may involve habitual movement, as when Achilles says to Agamemnon:

αὐτὰρ ἂν ποτε δασμὸς ἱκνητί,
σοι τὸ γέρας πολὺ μεῖζον, ἐγὼ δὲ ὀλίγον τε φίλον τε
ἐρχομ’ ἐχῶν ἐπὶ νῆας, ἐπεὶ κε κάμῳ πολεμίζων. (II. 1.166-8)

But if ever an apportionment comes, your prize is much greater, and I go to my ships with some small thing of my own, when I have grown weary with fighting.

19Cf. Létoublon 1985: 247 n. 16.
Alternatively, it may be a movement in progress; hence Telemachus says:

οἱ γὰρ ἐγὼν ὡς
νοστήσας ἸΘάκηνδε, κιχὼν ὁ 'Οδυσσή' ἐνι οἴκῳ,
εἶποι' ὡς παρὰ σεῖο τυχῶν φιλότητος ἀπάσης
ἐρχομαι, ... (Od. 15.156-9)

And would that I, having returned to Ithaca, might find Odysseus in his house,
to tell him how I came having met with every hospitality from you.

The former of the above two passages is also used to illustrate the contrast between
ἐρχομαι and εἰμι in context: for Achilles goes on to say:

νῦν δ' εἰμι Φθίηνδ', ἔπει ἢ πολὺ φέρτερόν ἐστιν
οἴκαδ' ἵμεν σὺν ἦνοι κορωνίστιν, ... (II. 1.169-70)

And now I [shall] go back to Phthia, since it is much better to go home with
my beaked ships.

The only other passage Létoublon finds where both verbs appear involves
contrasting the following verse (which contains the one instance of first person εἰμι
not expressing the decision to move), when Achilles says:

νῦν δ' ἔπει οὖν, Πάτροκλε, σεῦ ὃστερος εἰμ' ὑπὸ γαίαν, ...

(II. 18.333)

And now therefore since I, Patroclus, shall go after you beneath the earth...

with the above-quoted passage of Andromache saying of Hector:
In these passages regarding the journey to Hades, εἴμι seems to act as future to ἐρχομαι, which Létoublon (1985: 66, 68-70) finds is the beginning of its evolution into a future tense form.

Létoublon also deals with the use of negatives with the two presents (1985: 67-8). She notes that εἴμι with οὐ indicates refusal, as when the suitors will not leave until Penelope chooses one of them:

ημεῖς δὲ οὔτ' ἐπὶ ἔργα πάρος γ' ἵμεν οὔτε πὴ ἄλλη, ...

(Ωδ. 2.127=18.288)

And we will not go either to our [own] lands or elsewhere...

But ἐρχομαι with οὐ indicates that one is not in the process of going, usually realised as habituality; hence Eumaeus says:

αὐτὰρ ἐγώ παρ' ἰεσσιν ἀπότροπος· οὐδὲ πόλινδε ἐρχομαι, εἰ μὴ ποὺ τι περίφων Πηνελόπεια
ἐλθέμεν ὄτρύνησιν, ...

(Ωδ. 14.372-4)

But I live apart with the pigs; and I do not go to the city, unless by chance prudent Penelope calls upon me to come...

Létoublon claims that the only case of a durative use of ἐρχομαι with a negative is when the suitors say οὐδὲ μετ' ἄλλας / ἐρχόμεθα 'we do not go after other
women [than Penelope]' \((\textit{Od.} 2.206-7)\); yet iterative interpretation of this sentence seems quite acceptable.

Hence, returning to the passage cited above where \(\textit{e}i\text{m}i\) and \(\textit{er}c\text{h}\text{omai}\) seemed identical, Létoublon (1985: 68) finds an interpretation: Hera expresses her intention when she says to Aphrodite:

\[
\textit{e}i\text{m}i \gamma\alpha\'r \textit{d}\text{v}o\mu\varepsilon\nu\pi\nu \textit{p}o\lambda\nu\phi\acute{r}b\nu\pi \textit{p}e\acute{i}r\alpha\tau\alpha \gamma\acute{a}i\nu\tau\acute{a}\ldots
\text{to}\acute{u}c\ \textit{e}i\text{m}i' \textit{d}\text{v}o\mu\varepsilon\nu\nu, \kappa\acute{a}i \sigma\varphi' \acute{a}k\acute{r}i\tau\acute{a} \nu\acute{e}i\acute{k}\acute{e}\acute{a} \lambda\acute{u}s\omega\ (\textit{Il.} 14.200, 205)
\]
I am going to see [intending to go and see, shall go and see] the limits of the all-nurturing earth... I am going to see them [Oceanus and Tethys] and I shall settle their endless strife for them.

On the other hand, she is already en route when she answers Zeus' question of why she is coming down from Olympus:

\[
\textit{e}r\textit{c}h\text{omai} \textit{d}\text{v}o\mu\varepsilon\nu\pi \textit{p}o\lambda\nu\phi\acute{r}b\nu\pi \textit{p}e\acute{i}r\alpha\tau\alpha \gamma\acute{a}i\nu\tau\acute{a}\ldots
\text{to}\acute{u}c\ \textit{e}i\text{m}i' \textit{d}\text{v}o\mu\varepsilon\nu\nu, \kappa\acute{a}i \sigma\varphi' \acute{a}k\acute{r}i\tau\acute{a} \nu\acute{e}i\acute{k}\acute{e}\acute{a} \lambda\acute{u}s\omega\ (\textit{Il.} 14.301, 304)
\]
I am on my way to see the limits of the all-nurturing earth... I am going to see them [Oceanus and Tethys] and I shall settle their endless strife for them.

In the third person, Létoublon (1985: 68-9) finds that \(\textit{e}i\text{m}i\) still shows its origin as an old Indo-European present: this is the meaning that, in simple form, it shows in similes and four further locations (\(\textit{Il.}\) 7.98, 23.226, \(\textit{Od.}\) 4.401, 10.191) and, for compound forms, at \(\textit{Il.}\) 13.482. The last of these instances is said to be analogical, the remainder isolated cases of the old present \(*eiti\). Use in non-indicative moods is slightly different (1985: 70): parts of \(\textit{er}c\text{h}\text{omai}\) appear as marked beside those of \(\textit{e}i\text{m}i\) (without modal meaning now that it is not in the indicative), sometimes used for their
durativity and sometimes just stylistically. The participle ἐρχόμενος seems to show the expected durative meaning, but is rare in the nominative, apparently for stylistic reasons; the infinitive ἐρχεσθαι is rare, no equivalent of the phrase βῆ δ᾿ ἵναι being found; and imperative ἐρχεσθαι is quite frequent, perhaps owing to the ‘weakness’ of ἵνα (as in such uses as βάσκε τοίς).

Regarding the other tense stems, Léoublon’s study basically holds that the future ἐλεύσομαι, aorist ἠλθόν and perfect ἐπιλήλουθα are to be regarded as the non-present forms of ἐρχόμαι20 – in the sense that all these involve ‘rapprochement par rapport à ici’.21 Indeed, ἐλεύσομαι and ἠλθόν are usually centripetal, therefore normally being translatable ‘I will come (here)’, ‘I came (here)’ respectively; and ἐπιλήλουθα only ever means ‘I have come (here and am present here now)’, never being centrifugal. An example of each is as follows: for the future, when Telamonian Ajax says:

αὐτάρ ἐγὼ κεῖσ᾿ εἶμι καὶ ἀντίδω πολέμοιο·
οἰσα δ᾿ ἐλεύσομαι αὕτης, ἐπὴν εὐ τοῖς ἐπαμύνω. (Il. 12.368-9)
But I shall go there and confront the war; and I shall come back again quickly, when I have fully come to their rescue.

An example of the aorist ἠλθόν occurs when Odysseus says to Polyphemus:

ἡμεῖς τοι Τρόιηθεν ἀποπλαγχθέντες Ἀχαιοὶ
παντοίοις ἀνέμοισιν ὑπὲρ μέγα λαίτμα θαλάσσης,

20 For comparison between ἐλεύσομαι and ‘future’ εἰμι, as well as εἶσομαι and εἰσάμην, see Léoublon 1985: 73-81; on ἠλθόν and imperfect ἡκα, as well as κίνον, 81-8; and on ἐπιλήλουθα and present ὁξιμοί, 88-108. For the difference between ἐρχόμαι, εἰμι and ἐλεύσομαι see in particular Léoublon 1985: 77-8.
We are from Troy, Achaeans, driven from our course by all the winds over the
great gulf of the sea; heading for home, we came by another way, by other
paths.

Lastly, Achilles uses the perfect when he says to Athene:

τίπτ' αὐτ', αἰγιόχοιο Διὸς τέκος, εἰλήλουθας; (II. 1.202)

Why have you come again, daughter of Zeus who bears the aegis?

Whether any of this discussion can help us with the semantics of -σκω, or
indeed even to decide whether ἔρχομαι was ever a verb in *-sk/o/-σκ-, is
however debatable. For even if we are dealing with the relics of a verb once
synchronically felt as a verb in -σκω within Greek, there is no evidence that it was
felt as such in Homer's time.

2.2. Verbs with frequentatives

2.2.1. ἀλύσκω

The present ἀλύσκω 'escape' occurs twice; both instances are in Od. 22, in
close proximity to the one of the imperfect ἀλύσκαυε 'escaped'. On all three
occasions, the verb has κῆρα μέλαιναν as object. Firstly, when Odysseus has killed
Leiodes, Homer says:

Τερπιάδης δ' ἔτ' οὖν ὁ ἀλύσκαυε κῆρα μέλαιναν,
Φήμιος, δ' ἤειδε μετὰ μνηστήρσιν ἀνάγκη. (Od. 22.330-1)
And the son of Terpes, the bard, still tried to escape black fate – Phemius, who sang by force amongst the suitors.

Telemachus advises Odysseus to spare Phemius; and he also says that Medon the herald should not be killed. We then learn that the latter is in hiding:

\[\text{πεπτηως γ\' έκειτο ίπ\' θρόνου, ἀμφι δε δέρμα} \]
\[\text{ἐστο βοῦς νεόδαρτον, ἀλύσκων κηρα μέλαιαν. (Od. 22.362-3)} \]
For he lay crouching under a chair, and had clothed himself in the newly stripped skin of an ox, escaping black fate.

He is indeed spared. They leave the hall, and then the phrase recurs:

\[\text{πάπτημεν δ' Ἡδυσεύς καθ' ἐσθν δόμον, εἰ τις ἐτ' ἀνδρῶν} \]
\[\text{ζωὸς ὑποκλοπέοιτο, ἀλύσκων κηρα μέλαιαν. (Od. 22.381-2)} \]
And Odysseus looked about throughout his house, to see if anyone living was hiding, escaping black fate.

The suffix -άνω seems to add nothing to the meaning, therefore; but the same may not be said of -άξω in the present ἀλυσκάξω. This verb is found three times. Cunliffe (1924 s.v.) gives two meanings: ‘escape’, once in the Odyssey, and ‘play the shirker’, twice in the Iliad. Firstly, the form occurs when Diomedes, in response to Sthenelus’ suggestion to leave their chariot, says that he will not:

\[\text{οὐ γάρ μοι γενναίου ἀλυσκάξωντι μάχεσθαι} \]
\[\text{οὐδὲ καταπτώσειν ἔτι μοι μένος ἐμπεδὸν ἔστιν (II. 5.252-3)} \]
For it is not honourable for me to fight skulking or to cower down: my strength is still steadfast.

The second instance in the *Iliad* occurs when Hector says to Andromache that he cannot stay in the city, but must fight:

\[ \text{ἄλλα μάλ'} \text{ αἴνῶς} \]
\[ \text{αἰδέσομαι Τρώας καὶ Τρώαδας ἐλκεσιπέπλους,} \]
\[ \text{αἳ κε κακὸς ὡς νόσφιν ἀλυσκάζω πολέμοιο.} \]  
\[ (II. 6.441-3) \]
But I very deeply have the shame of the Trojan men and the Trojan women with trailing robes, if like a coward I skulk apart from the battle.

Presumably, therefore, the form in -\( \acute{\alpha}z\omega \) is a frequentative: 'to avoid repeatedly' is 'to skulk'. In the *Odyssey* we have the meaning 'keep from, shun', found when Eumaeus says of the unrecognised Odysseus, who has just spoken to him against the suitors:

\[ \text{μυθεῖται κατὰ μοῖραν, ἃ πέρ κ' οἴοιτο καὶ ἄλλος,} \]
\[ \text{ὕβριν ἀλυσκάζων ἀνδρῶν ὑπερηνορεύοντων.} \]  
\[ (Od. 17.580-1) \]
He speaks rightly – things which any other man would also think – in keeping from the insolence of arrogant men.

Again, the meaning is frequentative.

There is a future \( \acute{\alpha}lǔ\acute{\acute{\omega}} \), found three times in all, as when Diomedes calls to Dolon:

\[ \text{ἡ μὲν', ἡ σὲ δουρὶ κιχήσομαι, σουὲ σὲ φημι} \]
δηρὸν ἐμὴς ἀπὸ χειρὸς ἀλύξειν αἰπών ὀλεθρον. (II. 10.370-1)
Stand, or I shall reach you with my spear, and I do not think you will long escape sheer destruction at my hand.

In the two occasions in the Odyssey, ἀλύξω is used concerning the suitors in the phrase οὐδὲ κὲ τις θάνατον καὶ κῆρας ἀλύζει ‘not even one will escape death and the fates’ (Od. 17.547=19.558).

The aorist ἥλυξα occurs eight times in the Iliad and fifteen in the Odyssey. In the earlier epic, most instances are of the infinitive or the participle, although the indicative occurs once, as does the subjunctive. Hence, when Menelaus and Ajax go to rescue Odysseus, attacked by Trojans:

Then they found Odysseus, dear to Zeus; and round about the Trojans set upon him, like tawny jackals in the mountains around a horned stag that has been wounded, whom a man struck with an arrow from his string; fleeing from him on his feet the stag escaped, as long as the blood is warm and his knees move quickly.

Similarly, Odysseus says to Diomedes, having spotted Dolon:

Similarly, Odysseus says to Diomedes, having spotted Dolon:
έγχει ἐπαίσσων, μή πως προτί ἀστυ ἀλύξῃ. (II. 10.346-8)

And if he gets ahead of us by [speed of] foot, always drive him in towards the ships away [and] from the army, darting with your spear, in case he in any way escapes towards the city.

The other instances in the Iliad are also all of escaping from danger: infinitive three times\(^{22}\) and participle ἀλύξας three times.\(^{23}\)

In the Odyssey, the aorist shows the same meaning of 'avoid, escape from'. We also have there the only two instances of this verb used figuratively in Homer: χρέος καὶ δεσμὸν ἀλύξας 'having avoided the debt and the bond' (Od. 8.353); and ἡλυξα ἐταίρους 'I had got away from my comrades' (Od. 12.335). There is also a compound form ὑπ- ἡλυξα 'keep away from; get away; escape' (twice and four times).

The present ἀλε(ύ)ομαι 'escape, avoid' occurs only twice; it is not found in repeated expressions or in similes, unlike ἀλύσκω. In the Iliad, it is used in a description of herdsman's dogs witnessing their bull being eaten by lions:

οἱ δ' ἕτοι δακέειν μὲν ἀπετρωπῶντο λεόντων,

'ιστάμενοι δὲ μάλ' ἐγγύς ἠλάκτεον ἐκ τ' ἀλέουντο. (II. 18.585-6)

But they [the dogs] shrank from biting the lions, but standing nearby they barked and avoided them.

It is also found in the Odyssey, when the dead Achilles says to the dead Agamemnon:

ἡ τ' ἄρα καὶ σοι πρῶι παραστήσεσθαι ἐμελλε

\(^{22}\)II. 8.243, 21.565, 22.201.

\(^{23}\)II. 12.113, 13.395, 15.287.
μοίρ' ὀλοή, τὴν οὗ τις ἀλεύεται ὡς κε γένηται. (Od. 24.28-9)
And indeed deadly fate was to come early on you also, which no one who is
born avoids.

Like ἀλύσκω, therefore, ἀλε(ὐ)ομαι is used of escaping fate and death.

The aorist form ἀλε(ὐ)οσθαι (25 times in the Iliad, sixteen in the Odyssey)
is, as ἀλύσκω and ἀλυσκάνω, used with the formula κηρά μέλαιναν (four
times), as in:24

... 'Εκτωρ ἐμπρόσθε, καὶ ἄν ἐς διήφων ὄροὺςας
ἐξέλασ' ἐς πληθὺν, καὶ ἀλεύατο κηρα μέλαιναν. (II. 11.359-60)
Hector came to, and having leapt back into his chariot drove into the throng,
and escaped black fate.

It therefore seems that ἀλύσκω (non-present ἀλυξ-) acts as collateral to
ἀλε(ὐ)ομαι (aorist ἀλε(ὐ)οσθαι): there seems to be no distinction between the
two sets.

2.2.2. ἡλάσκω

The present ἡλάσκω 'rove, flit about' is found twice, on both occasions of
animals in similes. Firstly, of the Greeks, Homer compares:

ἡὔε μυιάων ἀδινάων ἐθνεά πολλά,
οἱ τε κατὰ σταθμὸν ποιμνήσουν ἡλάσκουσιν
ἀρη ἐν εἴαριῃ, ... (II. 2.469-71)

24Cf. also II. 3.360=7.254, 14.462; compound form ὑπαλευάμενος 'escape (from the power of)' is
also used in this way (Od. 15.275).
Just as the many tribes of swarming flies that wander about throughout the herdsman’s farmstead in the season of spring...

And secondly, in a speech made by Poseidon, ἡλάσκω is used of the Trojans:

Τρώως ἐφ’ ἡμετέρας ἴναι νέας, οἱ τὸ πάρος περ φυζακινῆς ἐλάφοισιν ἑοίκεσαν, οἱ τε καθ’ ὑλὴν θώων παρδαλίων τε λύκων τ’ ἥια πέλουται αὐτῶς ἡλάσκουσαι ἀνάλκιδες, οὔδ’ ἐπὶ χόρμη.[II. 13.101-4]

[And it is a marvel that] the Trojans are moving against our ships, who formerly were like panic-stricken hinds which throughout the wood become the prey of jackals, leopards and wolves, merely wandering cowards, and there is no fight in them.

The collateral present ἡλασκάζω, glossed by Cunliffe as ‘wander aimlessly about; go about, skulk in order to avoid (danger)’, occurs once in each epic. As with ἀλυσκάζω, the extra suffix gives a frequentative meaning: ‘wander about’, in effect. In the earlier instance, Polydamas says that Achilles will not last in the next day’s fighting:

ἀψ πάλιν εἰσ’ ἐπὶ νῆς, ἐπεὶ κ’ ἐρισκένας ἵππους παντοίου δρόμου ἁσε ὑπὸ πτόλιν ἡλασκάζων.[II. 18.280-1]

Back again to his ships will he go, when he has given his horses, with high-arched necks, their fill of running in every way, as he wanders about beneath the city.
The other instance is used by Polyphemus to the ram that in fact bears Odysseus; it is here that it is glossed as ‘skulk’.25

εἰ δὴ ὁμοφρονεῖς ποτιφωνήεις τε γένοιο
εἰπεῖν ὀππὶ κείνος ἔμοι μένος ἡλασκάζειν. (Od. 9.456-7)
If only you could feel as I do, and could become endowed with speech to tell me where he skulks away from my wrath.

These forms are related to ἀλάομαι ‘wander, rove’, found three times in the Iliad and sixteen in the Odyssey.26 An example occurs when Odysseus, awakened by Nestor, says:

τίφθ’ οὕτω κατὰ νῆας ἀνὰ στρατῶν οἰοὶ ἀλάσθε
νύκτα δ’ ὀμβροσίην, δ’ τι δὴ χρειῶ τόσον ἵκει; (Il. 10.141-2)
Why do you thus wander alone by the ships throughout the camp through the immortal night? What need so great has come upon you?

The perfect ἀλάλημαι apparently also has present meaning; Chantraine (1968-80 s.v. ἀλάομαι) says that it ‘équivaut à un présent intensif’. Hence Patroclus’ ghost says to Achilles:

ἀλλ’ αὕτως ἀλάλημαι ὁν’ εὐρυπυλές “Αἴδος δῶ. (Il. 23.74)

25 The reading ἡλασκάζει is accepted by Allen (1917-19) and van Thiel (1991). Chantraine prefers the variant ἡλασκάζει in his etymological dictionary (1968-80 s.v.), although he accepts it at 1986-8: 1.338.

26 Of these occurrences, two and thirteen instances respectively are found in the participle, which is always used to complete the third foot and fill the fourth foot of its verse. This present has beside it past tense forms: imperfect ἠλάωμην, aorist ἠλήθην ‘wandered’ and ἐπαλήθην ‘wandered or roved over or among’; hence, for example, ἐπὶ πολλὰ ὦ ἠλήθην ‘and I wandered far’ (Od. 14.120).
But I vainly wander through the wide-gated house of Hades.

We therefore find four forms for 'wander' here: ἡλάσκω, ἡλασκάζω beside ἀλάσμαι and ἀλάλημαι. ἡλασκάζω is the frequentative to ἡλάσκω, which itself only occurs in similes; these facts aside, there seems to be little difference between these forms.

2.2.3. πτωσκάζω

Πτωσκάζω 'cower or crouch in fear or in cowardice, shrink from the fray' is in its one occurrence found in close proximity to an instance of the related πτώσσω:

οὐ μοι, Τυδέος ὑπὲ δαίφρονος ἵπποδάμῳ,
τί πτώσσεις, τί δ' ὀπιπεύεις πολέμου πετφύρας;
οὐ μὲν Τυδεὶ γ' ὤδε φίλον πτωσκαζέμεν ἥνεν, ... (II. 4.370-2)

Ah me, son of valiant Tydeus, tamer of horses, why do you cower, and why do you [only] gaze at the bridges of war? It was not customary for Tydeus to cower thus...

If there is any difference between the two verbs, it is presumably that πτωσκάζω is the frequentative of πτώσσω: 'cower around'. Chantraine's (1931: 125, 1968-80 s.v. πτήσσω) statement that πτωσκάζω is an expressive form created after ἀλυσκάζω (cf. Chapter 3 § 7.4) supports this suggestion.

The meaning of πτώσσω seen above is also found in all its other occurrences in the Iliad (II. 5.634, 7.129, 20.427, 21.14 and imperfect at II. 21.26) and at Od. 22.304. It is not only used of people; hence, for example, in a simile used of the Trojans in the Xanthus:
And as when, beneath the onrush of fire, locusts take wing to flee to a river;
and the unwearied fire burns them, rising suddenly, and they shrink down into
the water.

An extended meaning of ‘cringe in humility, go about begging’ is found twice for
πτώσσω, on both occasions in the *Odyssey*. It occurs when Melanthius the goatherd
meets and insults the stranger – who is, in fact, Odysseus:

άλλα ἐπεὶ σὺν δὴ ἔργα κάκ’ ἐμμαθεῖν, σὺν ἑθελῆσει
ἔργον ἐποίχεσθαι, ἄλλα πτώσσων κατά δήμον
βούλεται αὐτίζων βοσκεῖν ἢν γαστέρ’ ἀναλτοῦν. (Od. 17.226-8)

But since he has learned bad things, he will not wish to do work, but rather
wants, going skulking through the land, to feed his insatiable stomach.

These lines are repeated in slightly different form and in the second person by
Eurymachus to Odysseus at *Od*. 18.362-4. We also find a compound present
κατὰ-πτώσσω, which only shows the literal meaning ‘crouch down, cower in fear’
(four times in *Iliad* 4-5).

Beside the present forms in πτωσσ- and πτωσκ-, there are non-present ones
in πτη-. It is a moot point whether we are entitled to attribute to the same verbal
paradigm the forms in πτω- and the other verbal forms with similar or identical
meanings built on a stem πτηκ-. In any case, there is little doubt that the roots
belong together; we should thus mention the aorist ἔπτηξο, which is used in simple
form transitively in the one passage where it occurs in the *Iliad*, meaning ‘strike with dismay’. Hence:

\[
\text{ό δὲ ξύμβλητο γεραιός,}
\]

\[
\text{Νέστωρ, πτηξε δὲ θυμὸν ἐνὶ στήθεσσιν Ἀχαῖων. (II. 14.39-40)}
\]

And the old man, Nestor, met them, and made the spirits cower in the breasts of the Achaeans.

Elsewhere it is intransitive ‘crouch, cower, etc.’ (Cunliffe 1924 s.v. ἔπτησσω). So, with preverb κατα-, ‘crouched down, cowered in fear’: κατὰ δ’ ἐπτηξαν ποτὶ γαῖῃ ‘and they [the Phaeacians] crouched down to the earth’ (*Od*. 8.190); two further instances of this compound aorist occur at *II*. 8.136 and 22.191. The perfect, found only in the participle, is stative: so ὑπὸ τεῦχεσι πεπτηκότες κείμεθα ‘we lay crouching beneath our arms’ (*Od*. 13.474-5). There are two more instances of the perfect in simple form (*Od*. 13.354, 22.362); with preverb we find πετάλοις ὑποπεπτηκότες ‘cowering under the leaves’ (*II*. 2.312) and perhaps also λιμένος ποτιπεπτηκότα ‘sloping down towards the harbour’ (*Od*. 13.98).27

There is a parallelism with the use of βάσκω, where we also find a contrast of intransitive (βάσκ’ ίθι, παρέβασκε) and transitive (παραβασκέμεν). However, the similarity is very superficial, since in this case the transitive form is simple, not a compound. It could therefore be that the sigmatic aorist is responsible for transitivity here, although this is not true for the compound form.

---

27Unless this form is from πιπτω: see Chapter 3 § 7.4 above.
2.3. Verbs of quick movement

2.3.1. \( \text{θρώσκω} \)

Nearly half the instances of the verb \( \text{θρώσκω} \) ‘leap, spring, bound, dart’ are of its various compound forms. The simple present occurs four times in the \textit{Iliad}.

When Helenus’ arrow bounces off Menelaus’ armour, the following simile occurs:

\[ \text{ός δ' ὅτ' ἀπὸ πλατέος πτυόφιν μεγάλην κατ' ἀλωὴν} \]
\[ \text{θρώσκωσιν κύσμοι μελανόχροες ἀ ἐρέβινθοι,} \]
\[ 	ext{πνοηὴ ὑπὸ λιγυρῆ καὶ λικμήτηρος ἔρωθ, ... (II. 13.588-90)} \]

And as when dark-skinned beans or pulses leap from a broad shovel across a great threshing-floor, before the shrill wind and the winnower’s effort, ...

Similarly, Teucer speaks of his arrow’s string bearing \( \text{θαμά θρώσκοντας ὀιστοῦς} \) ‘quickly leaping arrows’ (\textit{II.} 15.470). Ajax, striding up and down the decks of the ships as he calls out to the Greeks, is compared to a man driving four horses to a city,

\[ \text{ὁ δ' ἔμπεδον ἀσφαλές αἰει} \]
\[ \text{θρώσκων ἀλλοτ' ἐπ' ἄλλον ἀμείβεται, οἷ δὲ πέτονται.} \]

(\textit{II.} 15.683-4)

And, always leaping without stumbling, he passes from one [horse] to another, and they fly on.

Lastly, when Achilles has killed Priam’s son Lycaon:

\[ \text{θρώσκων τις κατὰ κῦμα μέλαιαν φρίχ' ὑπαίξει} \]
\[ 	ext{‟ιχθύς, ὅς κε φάγησι} \text{Λυκάονος ἀργήτα δῆμον. (II. 21.126-7)} \]
Many a fish, leaping among the waves, will dart up from under the black ripple [on the water] to eat the white fat of Lycaon.

There is also one instance of the imperfect: ἀπὸ νευρῆς δ’ οἴστωι / ἑρῴσκον ‘and the arrows leapt from the bow-string’ (II. 15.312-13).

The only other tense occurring in simple form is the aorist ἔθορον (seventeen times in the Iliad and three in the Odyssey). Of these, eight and one occasions respectively are in the participle, and three are repetitions (II. 8.320=23.509; II. 8.252=14.441; II. 11.70=16.770). For example:

ως Τρῶες καὶ Ἀχαιοὶ ἔπ’ ἀλλήλοις θερόντες
dησουν, οὐδ’ ἔτεροι μενῶντ’ ὀλοοίο φόβοιο. (II. 11.70-1=16.770-1)

Thus the Trojans and Achaeans, having leapt on each other, were killing [each other], and neither of the two took thought of ruinous flight.

We also find 22 instances of eight different compound forms,28 these all show the addition of a preverb with spatial meaning, as e.g. when Hector is compared to a rolling stone of which it is said ὡς ἄναθρῴσκων πέτεται ‘and it flies leaping up high above’ (II. 13.140). The one case of the future tense of θρῴσκω in Homer is a compound form: ὑπερ-θρῷόματι ‘will leap or spring over’, which occurs when Hector calls out that he will reach the Greek ships:

τὰ δ’ οὐ μένος ἀμόν ἑρῴξειν
ἱπποὶ δὲ ρέα τάφρον ὑπερθρῷονται οἰρκτήν. (II. 8.178-9)

And they [the walls] will not withhold our might; and our horses will lightly leap over the dug ditch.

28Cf. Chapter 3 § 3.2.3.
We therefore here have a paradigm ὑφίσκω ‘leap’, future - ὑφέσμαι ‘will leap’ and aorist ἔθορον ‘leapt’.

2.3.2. ὑφέσμαι

The imperfect of ὑφέσμαι ‘dance’ occurs twice in Homer. In the Iliad, it is found when the dancing-floor on the shield of Achilles is described:

ἐνθα μὲν ἠθεός καὶ παρθένοι ἀλφεσίβοιαί
ὑφεῦντ’, ἀλλήλων ἐπὶ καρπῶι χείρας ἐχοντες. (II. 18.593-4)
There young men, and maidens bringing their parents many cattle, were dancing, holding their hands on each others’ wrists.

In the later epic, we find:

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ σφαίρῃ ἀν’ ἴθὺν πειρήσαντο,
ὑφείσθην δὴ ἐπείτα ποτὶ χθονὶ πουλυβοτείρη
ταρφε’ ἀμειβομένω. (Od. 8.377-9)
But when they [Halius and Laodamas] had tried their skill in throwing the ball straight up, then they danced on the earth that feeds many, constantly throwing to and fro.

In the Odyssey we also find the aorist ὑφήσασθαί, directly before the above passage:

’Αλκίνοος δ’ ’Αλιον καὶ Λαοδάμαντα κέλευσε
μουνάξ ὑφήσασθαί, ἐπεὶ σφίσιν οὗ τις ἐρίζεν. (Od. 8.370-1)
And Alcinous told Halius and Laodamas to dance alone, since no one could compete with them.

This also occurs when Odysseus, as beggar, says the following before he tells the story of how Odysseus supposedly got him a cloak when he was cold:

οἴνος γάρ ἀνώγει

ἡλέος, ὅς τ' ἐφέηκε πολύφρονά περ μάλ' ἀείσαι
καὶ θ' ἀπαλῶν γελάσαι, καὶ τ' ὁρχήσασθαι ἀνήκε,
καὶ τ' ἐπος προείηκεν ὅ πέρ τ' ἀρρητον ἀμείνου. (Od. 14.463-6)

For wine, that takes away one’s wits, bids me – wine which sets even a very wise man to singing and laughing for little reason, and urges him to dance, and brings out a word which is better unsaid.

The paradigm of this verb is therefore ὁρχέομαι ‘dance’, aorist ὁρχήσασθαι ‘danced’.

2.4. Summary: verbs of movement

It is not at first sight easy, from the above analysis, to find any internal consistency in Homer’s use of verbs of movement in -σκω. A historical point which is of interest, however, is that several of these verbs appear to be ancient formations: βάσκω and (if it does show a reflex of *-skelo-) ἐρχομαι are inherited;29 ἀλύσκω, -βλύσκω, θρύσκω and ὁρχέομαι (if in *-skelo-) are surely to be interpreted as ancient formations;30 and the remaining forms, ἠλάσκω and πτώσκαζω, are unexplained and therefore could be of some antiquity also.31

29 Cf. Chapter 3 §§ 2.1 and 2.2 respectively.
30 Cf. Chapter 3 §§ 3.1.1, 3.2.1 and 3.2.3 respectively.
31 Cf. Chapter 3 §§ 3.1.4, 7.3 and 7.4 respectively.
3. Causatives and inchoatives

The causatives and inchoatives in -σκω and -σκοματι represent a large group of Homeric forms. As already seen, however, their existence could rather be a feature of Greek voice than of the meaning of -σκ- (Chapter 1 § 3.2). The important question, therefore, is this: is the suffix responsible, or is the meaning of these presents rather a feature of the verbs themselves, no matter what suffix they show? It would be possible to compare other types of verbs in Homer, to see if other presents (whether suffixed or not) were used in this way; the alternative, followed in this section, is to compare presents in -σκω with the non-present forms found beside them.

3.1. Causative-inchoative pairs

3.1.1. θόσκο / θόσκοματι

Active θόσκο beside medio-passive θόσκοματι form a causative-inchoative pair in Homer (cf. Moussy 1969: 14-16). In the active, which is transitive, we can distinguish, following Cunliffe (1924 s.v.), a first meaning of the type ‘feed, tend, pasture’. Used of animals, this is found twice: once in the Ilia (the only occurrence of active θόσκο in this epic) when Hector is telling off Melanippus, a man of whom it is said that

ο δ' δφρα μεν ειλιποδας βους
θόσκεν ην Περκώτη, δηλων άπονόσιν εόντων. (Il. 15.547-8)

he for a time had been feeding his shambling cattle in Percote, while the enemy were far away.

A similar construction occurs in the Odyssey, when Eumaeus says of Odysseus:

30On the word ειλιποσις see Chantraine 1968-80 s.v.
δώδεκ' ἐν ἡπείρῳ ἀγέλαι· τόσα πώεα σιών,
tόσα σιών συβόσια, τὸς' αἰπόλια πλατέ' αἰγῶν
βόσκουσι ξείνοι τε καὶ αὐτοῦ βύτορες ἀνδρεῖς. (Od. 14.100-2)
He has twelve herds [of cattle] on the mainland; as many flocks of sheep, as
many herds of swine, as many huge herds of goats do herdsmen, both
foreigners and from his own people, tend.

There are, however, seven more instances of present active βόσκω in the
Odyssey, where the verb can refer to humans and the meaning must be 'feed, nourish,
support' (Cunliffe 1924 s.v. (2)); that is to say, the verb may now be used of humans.
For example, it is said of Odysseus' wealth that it is so great that:

καὶ νῦ κεν εὶς δεκάτην γενεῆν ἐτερὸν γ' ἐτι βόσκου·

(Od. 14.325=19.294)
it would indeed still feed another [owner, and then another] for ten
generations.

The medio-passive βόσκομαι (five times in the Iliad, six in the Odyssey) is
intransitive and used of animals only. Moreover, the meaning 'feed, graze' is really
inchoative 'get fed' beside βόσκω 'make fed'. For example, immediately after the
instance of βόσκω quoted above from Odyssey 14 we find:

ἐνθάδε δ' αἰπόλια πλατέ' αἰγῶν ἐνδέκα πάντα
ἐσχατῆ βόσκοντ', ἐπὶ δ' ἀνέρες ἐσθλοὶ ὄρονται. (Od. 14.103-4)
And eleven roving herds of goats all graze there in the most remote part [of the
island], and good men keep watch over them.
Apart from one further instance of βόσκονταί (Od. 12.128), this medio-passive is always participial; and it is always used of cattle, except when Hector is compared to an eagle attacking a flock of birds ποταμὸν πάρα βοσκομενάων 'feeding by a river' (Il. 15.691).

Also in the medio-passive is the one case of an iterative in -(ε)σκον of this verb, seen when Odysseus narrates how his men took the cattle of Helios, which were nearby:

οὐ γὰρ τίλε νεός κυναοπρόφοροι
βοσκέσκουν’ ἐλικες καλαί βοες εὐρυμέτωποι (Od. 12.354-5)
for the fair cattle, with twisted horns and broad brows, used to graze not far from our dark-prowed ship.

A further tense-stem is found in the future βοσκῆσω 'will feed'. This occurs when Eumaeus says to Odysseus that he will be allowed to beg as he pleases if Penelope finds he is telling the truth: σῖτον δὲ καὶ αἴτιζων κατὰ δῆμουν / γαστέρα βοσκῆσεις 'and as for food, going begging throughout the land you will feed your stomach' (Od. 17.558-9).

It would in theory be possible to translate the active as ‘feed’ or ‘graze’, and the medio-passive as ‘be fed, be grazed’ with a ‘passive’ meaning, but this becomes more difficult when the verb is used of birds in Il. 15.691. The obvious interpretation is therefore that the basic meaning is ‘graze, eat’ (originally of animals), and that, next to the medio-passive, an active was created with the causative meaning ‘cause to graze, pasture, cause to eat, feed’. The inchoative value which may originally have been characteristic of the verb (‘get fed, get to eat’?) seems to be yielding to a straight durative value, but the active is certainly causative. The future βοσκῆσω must thus
have been built on the present βόσκω with the developed meaning 'tend to, nourish'. The important point to retain is the contrast between active and medio-passive, which is to be taken as a contrast between causative and inchoative or durative.\textsuperscript{33}

3.1.2. διδάσκω / διδάσκομαι

The present tense διδάσκω is given four meanings by Cunliffe (1924 s.v.).\textsuperscript{34} The first three differ only in the objects they take. We have firstly (1) 'teach, instruct (a person)' (present at II. 23.308, aorist at II. 11.832, \textit{Od.} 8.488), and then (2) 'teach, impart knowledge of (something)' (present at II. 9.442 and 23.307, aorist at \textit{Od.} 22.422). The two are supposedly combined in one passage when Nestor says to his son:

\begin{quote}
'Αντίλοχ', ἦτοι μὲν σε νέον περ ἑόντα φίλησαν Ζεὺς τε Ποσειδάων τε, καὶ ἵπποσύνας εὐδιδαξαν παντοίας; τῶ καὶ σε διδασκέμεν ὃ τι μάλα χρεώ' (\textit{II.} 23.306-8)
\end{quote}

Antilochus, although you are young, Zeus and Poseidon indeed loved you and taught [you] all about horsemanship; and there is therefore not much need to teach you anything.\textsuperscript{35}

Clearly, both are variants (with one of the two objects understood) of (3), where διδάσκω is used ‘with double acc. of person and thing’ (aorist at \textit{Od.} 8.481) and 'with infin. of what is taught' (present at \textit{Od.} 1.384, aorist at \textit{II.} 5.51). Hence Antinous says to Telemachus:

\begin{quote}
\end{quote}

\footnotesize
\begin{enumerate}
\item On the use of βόσκω in later Greek, see Moussy 1969: 16-18, and also on Plato Chapter 8 § 3.1.3.1.
\item On the syntax of διδάσκω and related forms, see Jacquinod 1989: 185-96; and Giannakis 1997: 240.
\item On the problem of τι here, see Jacquinod 1989: 185.
\end{enumerate}
Truly, Telemachus, do the gods themselves teach you to talk boldly and to speak bravely.

The fourth meaning is reserved for the two medio-passive instances; it is given as 'gain knowledge of, learn'. This occurs once in the present:

καὶ γὰρ δὴ τὸτε φῶτας ἐκέικοσι βῆσεν ἀφ’ ἵππων,

πρῶτ᾽ ἐλθὼν σὺν δχεσφί, διδασκόμενος πολέμωιο (II. 16.810-11)

For indeed he [Euphorbus] had by then sent twenty men from their horses [i.e., their chariots], having come for the first time with his chariot, learning of war.

We thus have an inchoative present διδάσκομαι ‘learn, come to know’ beside causative διδάσκω ‘make learn, teach’. In the other medio-passive instance for this verb, there is an agent: it is the one example of the perfect δεδιδάχθαι in Homer, used with an unusual instance of προτί.36 This occurs when Eurypylus asks Patroclus to help him:

ἀλλ᾽ ἐμὲ μὲν σὺ σάωσον ἄγων ἐπὶ νῆα μέλαιναν,

μηροῦ δ᾽ ἐκταμί’ διστόν, ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ δ’ αἰμα κελαινόν

νίζ’ ὑδατὶ λιαρῷ, ἐπὶ δ’ ἥπια φάρμακα πάσσε, ἐσθλά, τά σε προτὶ φασιν Ἄχιλλῆς δεδιδάχθαι,

ὅν Χεῖρων ἐδίδαξε, δικαίοτατος Κενταύρων. (Il. 11.828-32).

36As is noted by Hainsworth (Kirk et al. 1985-93: III.310), the use of προτί with genitive is exceptional (Cunliffe (1924 s.v. (II)(3)) only notes this one instance), as is the occurrence of the form where πρός could stand instead.
But help me, leading me to my black ship, and cut the arrow from my thigh, and wash the black blood from it with warm water, and sprinkle on it good, kindly drugs, which they say you know from [have learnt from, have been taught by] Achilles, whom Cheiron, the most righteous of Centaurs, taught.

The meaning of this perfect is therefore stative 'know, have been taught'.

Homeric forms of the verb 'get to know, know, learn' from *δακτο- number 25 in all. Cunliffe (s.v. *δάκτω) has three meanings for the simple forms, divided by tense stems. Firstly there is 'get to know, know, learn', which applies to the two instances of the future δακτέσαι 'will learn' and the thirteenth of the aorist εδάθην. In fact, however, there are no instances where we must understand the stative meaning 'know'; rather, the forms are inchoative 'get to know, learn'. Hence, for the future stem, we find Nestor saying to Telemachus:

οδαν passwords καθήμενος ἡμετέροισι
πεύθωμαι, ἡ θέμις εστί, δακτέσαι, οὕδε σε κεύσω. (Od. 3.186-7)
But you will learn all the things which I have heard while sitting in our halls, which is right, nor shall I hide [anything] from you.

And so the aorist indicative εδάθην means 'came to know, learnt':

ei δ' ἑθέλεις καὶ ναύτα δακτέμεναι, δφρ' εὖ εἰδής
ἡμετέρην γενέθν, πολλοὶ δὲ μιν ἄνδρες ἵσασιν

(Ill. 6.150-1=20.213-4)

If we read δεδόκοιμα for δεδιδόκοιμα here with West (1998) following Zenodotus' reading, then we have an aorist 'learnt, got taught'. Van Thiel (1996), however, also reads the perfect form.

On this root and its connection with διδάσκω, see Chapter 3 § 4.2.1.
But if you wish to learn also these things, so that you may know my lineage well; and many men do know it.

Secondly, Cunliffe has ‘acquire practical knowledge of or skill in’. Under this heading he has only the perfect δεδάηκα, which he glosses (in all four instances from the Odyssey) as ‘have such knowledge of or skill in’. In our terminology, this means that the perfect δεδάηκα has the expected stative meaning ‘be in a state of having learnt, know’. Hence Alcinous invites Odysseus: πείρησαί ἀέθλων, ἐὰν τινά που δεδάηκας ‘make trial of the contests, if you know any’ (Od. 8.146).39

Lastly, there is, for the reduplicated thematic aorist active δέδαε(ν), the causative meaning (3) ‘teach (something)’ (four times in the Odyssey), as for example said by Penelope concerning the daughters of Pandareus, tended by the gods:

εργα δ᾿ Ἀθηναίη δέδαε κλινά εργάζεσθαι. (Od. 20.72)
And Athene taught them to do excellent handiwork.

The other occurrences are all of the form δν...δέδαε(ν), and take a double object of the person and the thing taught. Also under this heading comes the medio-passive δδάσσθαι, which Cunliffe has as ‘have oneself taught; hence, get to know, acquire knowledge of’. It is used when Telemachus says to Odysseus, regarding what they are to do with the suitors and others in his palace and the farms:

άλλι’ ἡ τοίς γυναικας ἑγὼ δδάσσθαι ἁνωγα,
οἱ τὲ σ᾿ ἀτιμάζουσι καὶ οἳ νηλιτιδές εἶσιν. (Od. 16.316-17)

39A medio-passive perfect form occurs in the Homeric Hymns in τέχνη καὶ σοφίη δεδαμένος ‘having learnt / knowing with skill and wisdom’ (h.Merc. 483).
But indeed, regarding the women, I urge you to learn who dishonour you and who are guiltless.

This form can therefore be interpreted as simply the inchoative counterpart ('learn') to causative δὲδαε (‘made learn, taught’). It is the same in meaning as the inchoative aorist δαὴνατι 'learn'.

The compound form προδαείς is given by Cunliffe (1924 s.v. †προδάω) as meaning ‘know beforehand’. It occurs when Menelaus, recounting how Eidothea advised him to catch Proteus, says to her:

αὐτὴ νῦν φράζευ σὺ λόχον θείου γέροντος,
µὴ πῶς µε προιδῶν ἥ προδαεῖς ἀλέηται: (Od. 4.395-6)

You yourself devise an ambush for the divine old man, in case, having by chance seen me beforehand and learnt beforehand, he avoids me.

This form also, therefore, fits our pattern if taken as ‘learn’.

The meanings of all these different formations, along with their respective frequencies, form an interesting pattern. The old forms in δα- η- with the inchoative meaning ‘come to know, learn’ (δαησεατι ‘will learn’, ἐδάην ‘came to know, learnt’, with προ- δαείς ‘having learnt beforehand’, and δεδάηκα ‘have learnt, know’) account for eight occasions in the Iliad and ten in the Odyssey. A causative reduplicated aorist δεδαε(ν) ‘taught’ (four times in the Odyssey) is also formed, and this once shows an inchoative medio-passive δεδαςθατι ‘get taught, learn’. It is presumably from here that our present in -σκω is formed – δτ- δα- σκω (or

---

40 Bendahman (1993: 71), however, argues that δεδαςθατι is an active ‘sich in Erfahrung bringen, sich kundig machen’ and δαὴνατι a passive ‘erkennen, erfahren’.
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*δι- δάσσ- σκω* 'make learn, teach, instruct' (twice in the *Iliad* and once in the *Odyssey*). This too once has its own inchoative medio-passive, διδάσκομαι 'come to learn, get taught'. Reinterpreted as διδασκ- ω, it is used to form a new aorist εδιδακτα 'taught' (meaning the same as δέδωκε(v)) and stative perfect medio-passive δεδιδαχθατ 'have been taught' (meaning the same as δεδήκα). In this way derivations from διδάσκω come to take over from all the forms in δα-, which almost never occur in Ancient Greek prose.

3.1.3. μιμήσκω / μιμήσκομαι

The parts of this verb are divided by Cunliffe (1924 s.v. μιμήσκω) into active and medio-passive. The six active instances all come under (1) 'remind'. The active μιμήσκω is found once in Homer, when Eumaeus says to Odysseus concerning the possibility of the latter's return (of which he is not yet aware):

![Greek text](image)

But drink in peace, and let us turn our thoughts aside to other things, and do not remind me of these ones; for the heart in my breast is grieved whenever anyone reminds me of my good master.

---

41 Cf. Chapter 3 § 4.2.1
42 For parallelism between forms in δα- and forms in διδασκ- / διδαξ-, see especially the examples given by Jacquinod (1989: 191).
43 According to Veitch (1887 s.v. (δόκω)), in Classical prose, we only find one instance of any of these forms (δεδήκα at Herodotus 2.165).
Other active forms are rare. We find the future μνήσω ‘will remind’ (once in each epic), as in τῶν σ’ αὐτίς μνήσω ‘I shall remind you of these things again’ (II. 15.31). For the aorist active ἐμνησάα ‘reminded’ (once in the Iliad, twice in the Odyssey), the Iliadic example occurs when Achilles tells Thetis to remind Zeus how she had helped him before, when the other gods wanted to tie him up:

τῶν νῦν μιν μνήσασα παρέξεο καὶ λαβὲ γούνων, ... (II. 1.407)

Having reminded him of these things, sit by his side and take hold of his knees...

Cunliffe’s second heading accounts for all other parts of this verb; it has three subdivisions: (a) ‘recall or bear in mind, remember, recollect, bethink oneself of’; (b) ‘remember or bear in mind so as to put in practice or use or bring about, not to neglect, bethink oneself of, turn one’s mind to’; and (c) ‘tell or speak about’. The first two are frequently found and occur for a wide range of tense stems: present μμνήσκομαι (three times in the Iliad and four in the Odyssey, with imperfect at II. 13.722), future μνήσομαι (four and three times in the respective epics), aorist ἐμνησάμην (31 times in the Iliad and 20 in the Odyssey), perfect μέμνημαι (seventeen and fourteen times), pluperfect μέμνητο (once in each epic) and future perfect μεμνήσομαι (three times in all). It is clear that there is overlap between meanings (a) and (b) from the fact that ‘bethink oneself of’ is listed under both meanings.

Hence for μμνήσκομαι ‘remember, recollect; turn one’s mind to, etc.’ we find, for the first meaning, τῶν μμνησκόμενος θαλερὸν κατὰ δάκρυναν ἔβεβην ‘as he remembered these things [concerning Patroclus] he [Achilles] would shed great tears’ (II. 24.9); and, for the second, Achilles saying to Hector, παντοίης ἄρετῆς μμνησκεό ‘turn your thoughts to every kind of valour’ (II. 22.268). The verb is
inchoative, indicating entrance into the state of remembering, and so too of changing the subject of one’s thoughts.

For future μνήσομαι, we find for example, for meaning (a), Achilles saying to Ajax:

\[ \text{άλλα μοι οίδανεται κραδίῃ χόλῳ, ὃποτε κείνων μνήσομαι, ὡς μ' ἀσύφηλον ἐν Ἀργείοισιν ἔρεξαν 'Ατρείδης, ὡς εἰ τιν' ἀτίμητον μετανάστην. (Il. 9. 646-8) } \]

But my heart swells with anger whenever I remember how the son of Atreus did me an indignity among the Argives, as if [I were] a refugee with no rights.

For the second meaning, one can compare when Alcinous says, έπειτα δὲ καὶ περὶ πομηθῆς / μνησόμεθ’ (α) ‘and then we shall turn our thoughts to his [Odysseus’] sending’ (Od. 7.191-2).

For the common aorist εμνησάμην, an example for the meaning ‘remembered’ is when Nestor cries,

\[ \text{μνήσατο γὰρ κατὰ θυμὸν ἀμύμωνος Ἀντιλόχου, ... (Od. 4.187) } \]

for he remembered in his heart illustrious Antilochus.

The similar second meaning is found in the phrase μνήσαντο δὲ χάρμης ‘and they thought of war’ (Il. 4.222, 8.252=14.441, 15.380, 16.357).

The perfect μέμνημαι is stative: beside μμηνήσκομαι ‘come to remember, be in the act of recalling; turn one’s thoughts to’, it means ‘have remembered, [now] have in mind; have turned one’s thoughts to, be mindful of’. When Hera and Athene are saying that Hector must be stopped in his successes against the Greeks, the latter of the two says of Zeus:
owde ti twv memnetai, o' oi mala pollakies vion
teirome bon sweskon up' Eurythtos aethlwn. (II. 8.362-3)
And he does not remember that I very often used to save his son when he was
exhausted by Eurystheus' tasks.

An example of the second meaning occurs when Diomedes says to Athene:

oute ti me deos ischei akirion outhe tis oknos,
alla' eti seon memnemai efetmemen, d' epeteilaq. (II. 5.817-8)
Neither at all does spiritless terror nor any hesitation restrain me, but I am still
mindful of your charge, which you laid upon me.

The pluperfect acts as the past of memnemai; found twice in all, it only ever
means 'was mindful of', as when Agamemnon's ghost says: wos e' memnht'
'Odysohos, / andros kouritzou 'thus was she [Penelope] very mindful of
Odysseus, her wedded husband' (Od. 24.195-6).

The future perfect memnesomai shows meaning (a) 'remember'. As future of
memnemai, it means in its three instances 'will remember, will be in the state of
remembering'; so Penelope says of her house, if she should lose it:

tou pota memnesethai dioymai en per theirop. (Od. 19.581=21.79)
I think I shall remember it even in my dreams.

There is no implication of forgetting and remembering again later; rather,
memnesomai indicates that what the speaker has in mind now will be remembered in
future.45

45In the other instance, Achilles uses it of remembering Patroclus (II. 22.390).
In addition, we find an iterative of the aorist middle in the form μνησάσκετο ‘would be mindful’: 46

Αἴας δὲ ἄλλοτε μὲν μνησάσκετο θούριδος ἀλκῆς αὔτις ὑποστρεφθεὶς, καὶ ἐρητύσασκε φάλαγγας Ἰρών ἵπποδάμων ὀτὲ δὲ τρωπάσκετο φεύγειν. (II. 11.566-8)

And Ajax would at one time be mindful of his furious valour, and having turned round upon them would hold back the ranks of the horse-taming Trojans; but at another he would turn to flee.

Lastly, there is Cunliffe’s meaning 2(c) ‘tell or speak about’. This occurs for the one instance of the aorist passive ἔμνησθην ‘told or spoke about’, found when Menelaus sees that Telemachus starts to cry when his father is praised,

μεμηρίζετο δ’ ἐπειτὰ κατὰ φρένα καὶ κατὰ θυμὸν ἦν μὲν αὐτὸν πατρὸς ἐάσειε μνησθῆναι, ἢ πρῶτ’ ἐξερεύνοτο ἐκαστὰ τε πειρήσαιτο. (Od. 4.117-9)

and then he considered in his mind and heart whether he should let him speak of his father himself, or first question him and test him in each thing.

The meaning ‘speak about’ is also given by Cunliffe (1924 s.v. μιμηθέκω (2)(c)) for three more instances of parts of μιμηθέκω in Homer (II. 2.492, Od. 8.244, 14.168); but his examples are ambiguous at best, and in these cases we may equally read ‘remind’. 47 From the Iliad he lists the following usage, when Homer says:

46 On this use of the iterative, which falls into the syntactic class ‘at one time X would happen, at another time Y would happen’, see Chapter 5 § 5.2.1.

47 LSJ cite in addition μνησατι at Od. 4.331, which is also ambiguous.
πληθῦν δ' οὐκ ἂν ἔγω μνημοσυμαι σοῦ ὅνομήνω,
os'd' εἰ μοι δέκα μὲν γλώσσαι, δέκα δὲ στόματ' εἶεν,
φωνή δ' ἄρρηκτος, χάλκεον δὲ μοι ἦτορ ἑνείης,
eἰ μὴ Ὀλυμπιάδες Μούσαι, Δίὸς αἰγιόχοιο
θυγατέρες, μνησαίαθ' ὅσοι ὑπὸ Ἡλιον ἠλθον'. (II. 2.488-92)
But I would not tell or name the common people, not if I had ten tongues, and
ten mouths, and not if I had in me an unwearying voice, and a heart of bronze,
if the Muses of Olympus, daughters of aegis-bearing Zeus, would not tell /
remind me of all those who came below Ilium.

Here, either 'remind' or 'tell' makes sense. Secondly, when Alcinous says to
Odysseus, we find:

ἀλλ' ἄγε νῦν ἐμέθεν εὐνίει ἔπος, δόρα καὶ ἄλλῳ
εὔπης ἡρῴων, τοι κεν σοίς ἐν μεγάροισι
δαινὴ παρὰ σῇ τ' ἀλόχῳ καὶ σοῖς τέκεσοιν,
ημετέρης ἀρετῆς μεμημένος, σία καὶ ἲμιν
Zeüs ἐπὶ ἐργα τίθησι διαμπερῆς ἐξετὶ πατρῶν. (Od. 8.241-5)
But come now, hear my words, so that you may tell another hero, when you
are feasting in your halls with your wife and children, remembering our skill,
what feats Zeus has continually bestowed on us even from the time of our
fathers.

Here 'remembering' seems better than 'having spoken of'; but in this case the act of
remembering involves telling others, so that either meaning works. Cunliffe's final
passage has already been quoted above for μιμνήσκω: there we find a case of
μεμνώμεθα, which I gloss as 'let us turn our thoughts', but Cunliffe has as 'change
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our discourse'. The meaning ‘speak about, tell of’ is therefore for the simple verb only certainly found once in Homeric Greek: for the aorist μνησθηναι. A further instance, however, occurs for a compound sigmatic aorist middle form, ἐπεμνησάμην, ‘spoke about’ in ὅτι ἐπιμνησάμεθα σείο ‘whenever we spoke about you [Nestor]’ (Od. 4.191). This then fits in with later Greek usage: for it is clear from LSJ (s.v. μμνησκω B.II) that this meaning is almost entirely restricted to the aorists middle and passive in Ancient Greek. The meaning presumably evolved because to remind someone of something is to mention it; ἐμνησθην appears to be the later Classical equivalent of Homeric ἐμνησάμην.49

There is also a related present μνάομαι (four times in the Iliad and twenty in the Odyssey). This form shows the two main meanings of intransitive μμνήσκωμαι, ‘remember, recollect, etc.’ and ‘turn one’s mind to, etc.’; most frequently, however, it has the specialised meaning ‘woo, court, seek to debauch’.50 In the Iliad, however, only the meaning ‘turn one’s mind to’ (four times) is attributed to this verb. Hence, for example:51

ἄλλα’ οἱ γ’ οὐ πολέμοιο δυσηχέος ἐμνώντο·
oī γὰρ ἔτην δς τίς σφιν ἐπὶ στίχας ἴησαίτο. (II. 2.686-7)
But they [Achilles’ men] did not turn their thoughts to woe-bringing war, for there was no one to lead them into the ranks.

μνάομαι means ‘remember, think of’ twice in the Odyssey, as when Menelaus says of Odysseus.52

48All other compound forms show the meaning ‘remember’, including those of the aorist passive; for forms see Chapter 3 § 4.1.3.
49Cf. the use in Plato, where ἐμνησάμην only appears in quotation (Chapter 7 § 2.3, 8 § 3.1.1.3).
50Cf. Chantraine 1968-80 s.v. μμνήσκω.
51Cf. also ll. 11.71=16.771, 16.697.
52The other instance is at Od. 15.400.
Out of all the men I do not mourn so much, although I do grieve, as for one man who makes both sleep and food hateful for me when I think of him...

The meaning of this present is in these six cases therefore like μιμνήσκομαι ‘come to remember; turn one’s thoughts to’. On all other occasions, however, the meaning is ‘woo’, as where Nausicaa recounts what local people will say when they see her with Odysseus and assume she is to marry him:

\[\text{η γὰρ τούσδε γ’ ἀτιμάζει κατὰ δῆμον Φαίηκας, τοῖς μιν μνώνται πολέες τε καὶ ἐσθλοί. (Od. 6.283-4)}\]

For indeed she scorns the Phaeacians here throughout the land – who, many and noble, woo her.

There is also an iterative aorist μνάσκετ’(o), used of Ctesippus, a suitor,

\[\text{δὲ δὴ τοι κτεῖτεσσι πεποιθῶς θεσπεσίοις μνάσκετ’ Ὀδυσσῆος δὴν οἰχομένου δάμαρτα. (Od. 20.289-90)}\]

who, trusting in his abundant wealth, used to woo the wife of Odysseus, who had been gone for a long time.

---

51In one instance, Cunliffe has rather ‘make illicit suit to’ (Od. 1.39); but this too can be taken as ‘woo’.
52A compound ὑπομνάσκομαι ‘woo, court’ (Od. 22.38) is also found.
53Here a situation (‘wooing’) takes place repeatedly over an undefined length of time: see further on this type Chapter 5 § 5.2.1.
Here we have a very full system of causative, inchoative and stative, with each type having a present, past and future form available. Causatives are infrequent: present μιμνήσκω ‘remind’, future μνησώ and aorist ἐμνήσσα are all quite rare. More common is the inchoative μιμνήσκομαι ‘come to remember’, μνήσομαι, ἐμνησάμην; and lastly there is the stative, represented by perfect μέμνημαι ‘have remembered, be in the state of remembering’, pluperfect μέμνησα, future perfect μεμνήσομαι. Aorist passive μνησθήναι ‘tell or speak about’, to judge from the similar meaning found in ἐπεμνησάμην ‘spoke about’ and also the aorist ἐπεμνήσθην ‘remembered, thought of’, is merely an alternant for ἐμνησάμην. The present μικάμαι appears once to have had the same meaning as μιμνήσκομαι, but then to have been specialised in a very different sense. To generalise, it is a pattern of causative active and inchoative medio-passive in all tenses, bar the stative perfect forms.

3.1.4. μίσγω / μίσγομαι

Μίσγω is given seven meanings by Cunliffe (1924 s.v.). The first three, which are all active uses, are variants on ‘mix’, both literally and metaphorically: (1) ‘mix together’; (2) ‘mix with’; (3) ‘mix together in confusion or without distinction’. There is the apparently also active (4) ‘bring together (in fight)’ – in fact only found once in this voice, and more usually occurring as the medio-passive ‘come together in fight’. The remaining meanings, which he gives as found in the ‘passive’ only, are more metaphorical: (5) ‘mingle with, take one’s place or stand, join, reach, etc.’; (6) ‘associate or be intimate with’; (7) ‘have sexual intercourse’.

Cunliffe only gives one instance for his first meaning – one of only three instances of the simple present active stem of μίσγω. It occurs in the following description of Athene’s visit to Odysseus’ palace:
κήρυκες δ’ αὐτοῖς καὶ ὀτρηροὶ θεράποντες
οἱ μὲν ἄρ’ σῖνον ἐμίσγον ἐνὶ κρητῷρσι καὶ ὕδωρ, ... (Od. 1.109-10)
And some of the heralds and the deft servants were mixing together wine and
water for them [the suitors] in bowls...

The other two instances of this form are ascribed to meaning (2) ‘mix with’. In the
earlier instance, Cunliffe has the phrase ‘with water’ understood:

αὐτὰρ κήρυκες ἀγαυοι
δρκια πιστὰ θεῶν σύναγον, κρητηρὶ δὲ σῖνον
μίσγον, αὐτὰρ βασιλεύσιν ὕδωρ ἐπὶ χεῖρας ἐχευαν. (Il. 3.268-70)
And the noble heralds brought together the sure oath-offerings for the gods,
and mixed the wine in a bowl, and poured water on the hands of the kings.

In the last case we have a metaphorical ‘mix with’ – found when Philoetius, on first
seeing Odysseus, says of Zeus:

οὐκ ἔλεαρεις ἄνδρας, ἐπὴν δὴ γείνεαι αὐτὸς,
μισγέμεναι κακότητι καὶ ἀλγεσὶ λενγαλέοισιν. (Od. 20.202-3)
You do not pity men when you yourself begat them, so as not to mix them
with misery and wretched pains.

Further forms also come under this meaning. So, for one of our two instances of
aorist ἐμείξα:

πάρ δ’ ἐβαλον ζειάς, ἀνὰ δὲ κρί λευκὸν ἐμιξαν (Od. 4.41)
And they [Menelaus' servants] threw grain before [the horses], and mixed white barley with it.

Similarly, the frequent aorist passive ἐμίγην means 'get mixed with', although in this instance no dative of the object being mixed in is found; it occurs when Helen puts a drug in the wine:

οὗ κεν ἐφημερίος γε βάλοι κατὰ δάκρυ παρειὼν, ... (Od. 4.222-3)
... whoever drinks it down, when it gets mixed in the bowl, will not let a tear fall down his cheeks for that day, ...

So far we have therefore seen causatives μίσγω and ἐμείξα 'make mixed' beside inchoative aorist ἐμίγην 'got mixed'. The remaining instances listed by Cunliffe under this meaning are of perfect medio-passive μεμιγμένος (II. 10.424, Od. 8.196, 11.123=23.270); this has the stative meaning 'having been mixed in, being in the state of having been mixed'. Hence, for example, Τρώεσσι μεμιγμένοι ἱπποδάμοισιν 'mixed with the horse-taming Trojans' (II. 10.424). In effect, the division between Cunliffe's first and second meanings is slight: μίσγω, ἐμείξα means causative 'mix (with), make mixed (with)', with inchoative ἐμίγην 'got mixed (with)', stative μεμιγμένος 'having been mixed (with)'.

Similar meanings are found for (3) 'mix together in confusion': here we see ἐμίγην (II. 2.475); the remaining occurrences of the perfect μεμιγμένος (Od. 4.230, 19.175); and the one instance of the pluperfect ἐμέμικτο 'had got mixed together, was mixed':

οὐ γὰρ πάντων ἦν ὁμός θρόος οὐδ' ἰα γῆρυς.
For they [the Trojans] did not all have one speech the same or one voice, but their language was mixed, and the men were called from many lands.

The fourth meaning ‘bring together (in fight)’ (only in the *Iliad*) is only found in the active once, in the one remaining case of aorist ἐμείξα:

ἡμῖν δ' οὖ τις τούδε νόος καὶ μῆτις ἀμείνων,
ἡ αὐτοσχεδίη μείξαι χεῖρας τε μένος τε. (*Il. 15.509-10*)
And for us there is no plan or device better than this – than to bring [mix] our hands and might [together with theirs] in close combat.

All other instances are medio-passive ‘come together in fight’: present μίσγομαι and aorists ἐμίχθην and ἐμίγην occur twice each. Hence, after a simile in which the clashing Greeks and Trojans are compared to winter torrents in flood, Homer says:

ὡς τῶν μισγομένων γένετο ἱαχῆ τε πόνος τε. (*Il. 4.456*)
Thus did shouting and toil arise from them coming [getting mixed] together.

The other instance is more metaphorical; when Odysseus is about to be shipwrecked, Homer says:

μέσου δὲ οἱ ἱστόν ἔξε
δεινὴ μισγομένων ἀνέμων ἐλθόσσα θύελλα, ... (*Od. 5.316-7*)
And the fierce storm of winds coming together came and broke the mast in the middle...

The aorist ἐμίχθην means the same as ἐμίγην ‘got mixed’:
He [Hector], urging [them] on, spoke thus, and the Trojans, facing [the enemy], lifted their spears; and their fury came [got mixed] together, and the battle cry arose.

Cunliffe’s fifth meaning shows a wide range: ‘mingle with, set oneself, take one’s place or stand, find or get oneself among, visit, join, reach’. For this he cites references to μιγγύσαι (II. 13.797, 24.91, Od. 18.49; the uncited II. 18.216 and 23.73 would appear to belong here as well); futures μείξεσθαι (Od.6.136) and μιγγύσσω (II. 10.365), and aorists μίξτο (II. 11.354, 16.813), ἐμιχθην (nine of its eleven occasions in the Iliad and its only one in the Odyssey) and ἐμίγγηθαι (five times in the Iliad and the Odyssey each). Hence, for the present:

οἱ δ’ ἰσαν ἀργαλέων ἀνέμων ἀτάλαντοι ἄελλη,
ἡ ρά θ’ ὑπὸ βροντῆς πατρός Διὸς ἔσει πέδουδε,
θεσπεσίω δ’ ὁμάδω ἀλλ’ μίσγεται, ...
(II. 13.795-7)

And they [Hector and Paris] came on like the blast of destructive winds that go down to the ground beneath the thunder of father Zeus, and which, with a deafening roar, mingles with [gets mixed with] the sea, ...

The one instance of the future ‘passive’ μιγγύσσω in Homer occurs when Diomedes and Odysseus are chasing Dolon, and the former catches up ὅτε ἥ τάχ’ ἐμελλέ μιγγήσσθαι φυλάκεσσι / φεύγων ἐς νῆας ‘when he [Dolon] was now about to reach [get mixed with] the guards, fleeing towards the ships’ (II. 10.365-6). The future ‘middle’ μείξεσθαι is the Odyssean equivalent, showing the same meaning:
Thus Odysseus was about to mingle with the fair-tressed young women, although he was naked...

The three aorists are also equivalent to each other in meaning. Both instances of μίκτω occur in the phrase ἀνέδρωμε, μύκτω δ' ομίλω 'he ran back and mingled with the crowd', of someone who has thrown a spear. The aorist ἐμίχθην most often occurs at the end of a verse, in the phrase προμάχοσιν ἐμίχθη 'he mingled with the foremost fighters' (II. 5.134, 8.99, 13.642, 15.457). For ἐμίγην one can compare the phrase προμάχοσι μιγέντα 'mingled with the foremost fighters' (II. 4.354).

The sixth meaning 'associate or be intimate with' is a further extension of 'mingle with', found only in the Odyssey. It usually occurs for μίσγομαι (Od. 1.209, 4.178, 6.288, 7.247) – as when Menelaus says, while expressing his hope that Odysseus could have come and lived in Argos, καὶ κε θάμ' ἐνθάδ', κόντες ἐμισγόμεθα 'and being there we would have met together often' (Od. 4.178). It is also found for the second of the two instances of μείξομαι, when Odysseus, pretending he is someone else, is claiming to Laertes that he had hoped to visit Odysseus:

...θυμός δ' ἔτι νωϊν ἐώλπει
μίξεσθαι κατή ὡδ' ἀγαλαδ' δῶρα διδώσειν. (Od. 24.313-14)

And our hearts yet hoped that we two would meet as host and guest and give [each other] fine gifts.

The seventh and final meaning given by Cunliffe is 'have sexual intercourse'. This is found mostly for μίσγομαι (II. 2.232, 14.295, 24.91, Od. 15.430, 22.445) and
aorist ἐμίκτο (never ἐμίχθη) (nine times in the Iliad and eleven in the Odyssey, out of seventeen in each in all). So, for example, we have ὅς ἐμίσγετο λάθρη ‘who had had intercourse [got mixed] [with her] in secret’ (Od. 15.430); and φιλότητι μιγήμεναι ‘to have intercourse [get mixed in love]’ (Il. 6.161, 165). A few further forms occur with this meaning. There is the one Odyssean instance of ἐμίκτο – when, in the Odyssey, it said of Laertes and Eurycleia:

ἐνυνὴ δὲ οὐ ποτ’ ἐμίκτο, χόλον δ’ ἀλέεινε γυναικός’ (Od. 1.433)

but he never had intercourse in bed [with her], and he escaped the anger of his wife.

Lastly, there are the two iterative forms. One occurs when the handmaid Melantho Ἐυρυμάχῳ μισγέσκετο καὶ φιλέσκεν ‘used to have intercourse and sex with Eurymachus’ (Od. 18.325); the other is found when Odysseus sees the women αἱ μυηστήρσιν ἐμισγέσκουσσί πάρος πειρ ‘who used to have intercourse with the suitors’ (Od. 20.7). In its one instance, the related μιγάζομαι shows the same meaning as μίσγομαι here, in μιγαζομένους φιλότητι ‘having sexual intercourse [getting mixed in love]’ (Od. 8.271).

Hence this verb also shows the causative alternation. We have an infrequent causative active μίσγω, ἐμείζα ‘mix, make mixed’; and beside it an inchoative medio-passive μίσγομαι (apparently also μιγάζομαι), μισγέσκετο, μίζομαι / μιγήσομαι, ἐμίγην / ἐμίχθην / ἐμίκτο ‘get mixed, mingle (with)’; the perfect medio-passive forms μεμιγμενός, ἐμέμικτο are thus statives ‘having been mixed,  

56In these iteratives, the action is repeated over a non-specific period of time: see further Chapter 5 § 5.2.1.
being in a mixed state'. The only unexpected factor – apart from the fact that there are three medio-passive aorists – is the use of future 'middle' μείξομαι with inchoative rather than causative meaning; it is therefore identical in meaning to the morphologically passive μηγήσομαι, which as expected is inchoative. Comparable is the use of ἐμνησάμην beside ἐμνησθην (§ 3.1.3 above).

3.1.5. τιτύσκομαι

Τιτύσκομαι, found eleven times in the Iliad and six in the Odyssey, appears to show two different sets of meanings: 'make ready' (as the related τεύχω) and 'take aim' (as τυγχάνω). 58

The former set is the rarer, occurring only three times, always in the Iliad; it is glossed by Cunliffe (1924 s.v.) as (1) 'make ready, prepare'. Its object is once fire, in + Ηφαιστός δὲ τιτύσκετο θεσπιδαές πῦρ ‘and Hephaestus made ready god-lit fire’ (II. 21.342), said when the god is about to burn the trees on the banks of the Scamander. The other two instances concern the harnessing of horses: we find the phrase ο’ δεξαί τιτύσκετο χαλκόποδ’ τηγός ‘he made ready [harnessed] his bronze-footed horses beneath his chariot’, first of Zeus (II. 8.41) and later of Poseidon (II. 13.23). In all these cases, therefore, we may understand benefactive 'make ready for oneself'.

All other instances show a meaning related to what Cunliffe gives as (2) 'take aim, direct one's weapon, shoot, throw'. Of the latter, he lists eleven instances. 60 In the Iliad we find two examples of the verb used absolutely:

---

57The compound forms already listed (Chapter 3 § 2.3) show the same active / medio-passive alternations as the simple forms.
59That is, what Chantraine (1968-80 s.v. θεσπέσιος) glosses as 'allumé par les dieux (comme présage)'.
60Giannakis (1997: 252) has 12; but there is no instance at II. 21.591.
But the long-haired Achaeans tried to shoot him [Hector], aiming with their arrows, and to strike him with stones.61

But he [Antilochus], aiming amongst the battle-throng, did not fail to notice Adamas, son of Asius, who struck him in the middle of his shield with his sharp bronze.

More frequently, it occurs with the genitive of what is being aimed at, and with various verbs of striking62 as in e.g. ἐγχέιη δ' οὖτοί τιτύσκετο 'and he [Agenor] aimed at him [Achilles] with his spear' (II. 21.582); this occurs four times in the Iliad and once in the Odyssey.63 Lastly under this heading, we find in the Odyssey on three occasions a new expression, with the participle τιτυσκόμενος 'aiming' being used with ἀντα 'straight'; hence ἤκε δ' ὀιστὸν / ἀντα τιτυσκόμενος 'he let the shaft fly, aiming straight' (Od. 21.420-1).64

For a use that is clearly an extension of (2), Cunliffe creates a meaning (3) 'direct the course of something, thrust it in a specified direction'; this is to account for θυρίων δ' ἀνέχοπτεν ὀχής / ἀντα τιτυσκόμενη 'and she [Penelope], aiming straight, thrust back the bolts of the doors' (Od. 21.48).65

---

61 Giannakis (1997: 252) seems rather to ascribe the conative meaning here to the participle τιτυσκόμενοι.
63 Cf. also II. 11.350, 13.370, 498-9, Od. 22.118.
64 Cf. also Od. 22.266, 24.181.
65 Giannakis (1997: 253) unnecessarily suggests rather that τιτυσκόμενη is acting here as an inchoative or desiderative of τεύχω, meaning 'seek to find or attain'.
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Lastly, a further extension is to be found in (4), given by Cunliffe as ‘be set
[on doing something], be eager [to do it]’, found once in each epic. This is really just
a metaphorical use of ‘aim’ – indeed, the first occurrence comes two lines before the
literal use of the same verb (Il. 13.560, quoted above):66

τιτύσκετο δὲ φρέσιν ἡσιυ

ἡ τευ ἀκοντίσσαί, ἡ ἕ σχεδὸν ὀρμηθήναι. (Il. 13.558-9)

and he [Antilochus] ever aimed [intended] in his heart either to throw his spear
at some [enemy], or attack him at close quarters.

On a second occasion, this meaning occurs when Alcinous says, before explaining
that Phaeacian ships make their own way, on autopilot:

εἴπε δὲ μοι γαῖάν τε τεὖν δῆμον τε πόλιν τε,

ὅφοι γε τῇ πέμπωσι τιτυσκόμεναι φρεσὶ νῆες; (Od. 8.555-6)

And tell me your country and people and city, so that our ships, aiming [their
course] through knowledge, may take you there.

Trümper (1950: 110-11) summaries the uses of τιτυσκόματι as intellectual
(i.e., ‘intend’), for war (literal ‘aim’) and ‘make ready’. Since he cannot see that
‘make ready’ can come from ‘aim’ as a metaphor, he concludes that this present had
first of all what he terms an ‘indirect’ middle ‘I make ready for myself (repeatedly)’
and a direct ‘I make myself ready (repeatedly)’; from these, he says, came the use of
‘aim’ in war.67 In the terminology used here, we recognise a case of benefactive
causative τιτυσκόματι ‘I make ready’ beside inchoative τιτυσκόματι (*) ‘I get

67He inserts ‘(repeatedly)’ in his glosses because he follows Debrunner (1937: 261-3) in ascribing
iterative meaning to Greek -σκω; on Debrunner’s view see further Chapter 1 § 2.2.1.
ready’ and so ‘I aim’. The peculiarity in this case is that we do not have the usual contrast of medio-passive inchoatives beside causative actives.68

What of this verb’s origin? As we have seen, there is a large group of cognate forms which derive from a stem *τευχε/ο- / *τυχε/ο-, each of which shows one of the two senses of τιτυσκομαι: for ‘make ready, prepare’ there is τεύχω and for ‘aim at’ τυγχάνω. Presumably τιτυσκομαι is more closely related to the former, if it was once a causative-inchoative verb meaning ‘make ready’ / ‘get ready’; moreover, as we have already seen,69 deriving τιτυσκομαι from τεύχω’s causative thematic aorist (τετυκεῖν / τετυκέσθαι) is a phonologically and perhaps morphologically sound option. Hence of especial interest are the forms given by Cunliffe (1924 s.v. τεύχω) as occurring for the fourth of his eight meanings of τεύχω: ‘make ready, prepare (a meal or the like)’: under this heading, most of the instances are of the reduplicated aorists of τεύχω, τετυκεῖν (twice in the Odyssey) and τετυκέσθαι (three times in the Iliad and eight in the Odyssey). Indeed, all Homeric instances of these aorists are accounted for by this meaning.

The aorist τετυκεῖν occurs in one repeated line. Menelaus says:

άλλα μέν' εἰς ὅ κε δῶρα φέρων ἐπιδίφρω θεῖω
καλά, σὺ δ' ὠφθαλμοίσιν ἢδης, εἶπω δὲ γυναιξί
dείπνου ἐνὶ μεγάροις τετυκεῖν ἄλις ἐνδον ἑόντων. (Od. 15.75-7)

But stay, until I, bringing fine gifts, put them on my chariot, and you see them with your eyes, and until I tell the women to make a meal ready in the halls from what is abundant within.

---

69 Cf. Chapter 3 §§ 4.2.3, 4.3.
And when he does do this, the last of these lines is repeated (Od. 15.94). The more common medio-passive τετυκέσθαι shows a similar, but not the same, meaning: usually, the difference is that the latter is benefactive. In the Iliad, this verb is only used as part of a passage that is repeated (Il. 1.464-9=Il. 2.427-432) and later adapted (cf. Il. 7.318-20). Hence we find:

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ παύσαντο πόνου τετύκουντο τε δαίτα, ...

(Il. 1.467=2.430=7.319)

Then when they had ceased from their labour and had made the meal ready, ...

Another version of this line – beginning οἱ δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν rather than αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ – is to be found at Od. 16.478=24.384. In all cases but the very last, the next line always begins δαίνωντ’(ο) ‘they feasted’. The form τετύκουντο is also found with δαίτα as object at Od. 8.61, and with δεῖπνον (as τετυκεῖν was in the Iliad) at Od. 20.390. In the remaining four instances (Od. 12.283, 307, 14.408, 21.428) the object is always (λαρόν) δόρπον ‘(pleasant) supper’.

In summary, therefore, the causative aorist τετυκεῖν, τετυκέσθαι means ‘make ready’, always of a meal. As Fernández-Galiano notes (Heubeck et al. 1988-92: III.205), we only ever find τετυκεῖν used of ordering servants to make a meal and τετυκέσθαι of making one’s own meal, except in one instance. Here, Odysseus, just before he kills Antinous, says to Telemachus:

νῦν δ’ ὀρη καὶ δόρπον Ἀχαιόσιν τετυκέσθαι
ἐν φάει, αὐτὰρ ἐπεῖτα καὶ ἀλλως ἐσπιάσσθαι
μολπῇ καὶ φόρμιγγι τὰ γάρ τ’ ἀναθήματα δαιτός. (Od. 21.428-30)

Comparable is the use of ἑτύνων, once ‘make ready, prepare’, of a δέπας for others (Il. 9.203), but more usually in the medio-passive of preparing a meal for oneself: see further Cunliffe 1924 s.v.
But now it is time ... [?] while there is light, and then to play otherwise, with song and the lyre; for these are the accompaniments of the feast.

There are several possible interpretations of δόρπον Ἀχαιόσιν τετυκέσθαι here, and Fernández-Galiano (Heubeck et al. 1988-92: III.205) gives two: Odysseus could mean that it is time either 'for the Achaeans to get their dinner prepared' (which he calls the 'factive middle'); or, alternatively, the ironic 'to prepare dinner for the Achaeans'. The latter is possible if the usually benefactive τετυκέσθαι 'prepare for oneself' is here used for active τετυκεῖν 'prepare', of which this would therefore be the only instance; the former interpretation is a change from the usual benefactive causative meaning of 'make ready (for oneself)' to 'get (someone else) to prepare' — also not found elsewhere. There is another option: a third interpretation, 'for dinner to get prepared for the Achaeans'. There is no other evidence for this either, but it is backed up by the fact that τιτύσκομαι 'aim' must, as noted above, have developed from 'get ready'; thus τετυκέσθαι could, in this instance, be its inchoative aorist 'got ready' rather than the usual benefactive causative 'made ready (for oneself)'. On the other hand, the thematic aorist is morphologically middle, and would be unusual as a 'passive' inchoative. We in any case have a system as follows: causative present τιτύσκομαι 'make (horses, fire) ready', with aorists active τετυκεῖν 'made (food) ready (for others)' and benefactive medio-passive τετυκέσθαι 'made (food) ready for oneself'; inchoative present τιτύσκομαι '[get ready,] aim'.

There are seven more examples of this meaning listed by Cunliffe, found for presents τεῦχω and τεύχομαι and futures τεῦξω and τεῦξομαι. The difference in meaning between forms of different voice, as already seen between τετυκεῖν and τετυκέσθαι, is again clear. Hence we find active forms used three times of a κυκέων, roughly translatable as 'potion', being prepared for another — as in:72

---
71See further Chantraine 1968-80 s.v. κυκάω.
72Cf. also Od. 10.290, 316. On two further occasions, the verb is found meaning 'prepare' with reference to servants grinding grain; cf. Od. 20.108, 119.
κοινό επικλήσιμος ᾨκαμήδη, ... (II. 11.624)

And lovely-haired Hecamede prepared a potion for them, ...

In the remaining examples, we find the use of a medio-passive form with the causative meaning ‘make ready, prepare’. As with τετυκέσθαι, the meaning is ‘prepare oneself (a meal)’; in the active, there was no benefactive implication in the use of the verb. The present medio-passive τεύχομαι, only found once in Homer, is used in this way when Odysseus says of his men after seeing the great stag he had caught:

χείρας νησάμενοι τεύχοντ' ἐρικυδέα δαίτα. (Od. 10.182)

Having washed their hands, they prepared themselves a splendid feast.

Similarly, one of only two73 instances of the future middle τεύξομαι in Homer occurs with this meaning when used in the phrase τεύξεσθαι μέγα δόρπον ‘to prepare themselves a great meal’ (II. 19.208).

It seems odd that, in the three occasions on which τιτύσκομαι means ‘make ready’, it is only used of fire and of horses, never of food. Nonetheless, it seems that beside a system active τεύχω : τεύξω : τετυκεῖν ‘make ready (for someone else)’, benefactive medio-passive τεύχομαι : τεύξομαι : τετυκέσθαι ‘prepare for oneself’, a further specialised present τιτύσκομαι was formed from the latter, apparently equivalent to τεύχομαι ‘make ready for oneself’ in meaning.

A factor that does not come out of this analysis, however, is the role of the perfect forms of τεύχω. We find in Homer an active τετευχῶς (Od. 12.423; cf.

---

73In the other instance, at II. 5.653, it acts as a ‘passive’, meaning ‘will occur’ (Cunliffe’s meaning (6)).
Mycenaean te-tu-wo-a), used like the passive τετυγμένος 'made, fashioned'.

But it is the simple perfect medio-passive which is frequent: the perfect τετύχθαι occurs 26 times in the Iliad and 27 in the Odyssey, the pluperfect τετύγμην nineteen and fourteen times respectively, making 86 in all. Of these, 54 are listed by Cunliffe under meaning (8), where the perfect basically means 'be'. But since it is effectively 'have been built, have been made', it may also mean 'be ready'. In the following quotation, the verb is classed by Cunliffe as coming under (7) 'plan, contrive, plot', where a suitor says of Penelope: οὐδὲ τι σίδεν δ’ οἱ φόνος υἱὶ τετυκται 'but she does not know at all that death has been contrived / is ready for her son' (Od. 4.770-1). We therefore have a stative perfect τετύχθαι which may mean 'be ready'.

But what of the occasions when τιτύσκομαι does not mean 'make ready'? Chantraine (1968-80 s.v. τιτύσκομαι) states that 'les deux sens franchement différents que présente ce verbe confirment le lien étymologique que l'on admet entre τεύχω et τυγγάω'. It has been argued here that the evidence favours a link with τεύχω (cf. also Chapter 3 § 4.2.3). Is there a connection with τυγγάω too? This verb is much less frequently found than τεύχω: most of the various tense-stems - present active, future middle and perfect active - only occur once or twice each, with the two aorists the only at all commonly found parts: these are έτυχον (fifteen times in the Iliad, five in the Odyssey) and έτυχησα (six times, three).

Cunliffe gives this verb seven meanings, most of them very infrequently found: (1) 'light or fall upon, come into contact with; fall in with or encounter' (έτυχον in the Iliad, έτυχησα in the Odyssey); (2) 'reach, hit, strike' (τεύξομαι, έτυχον, once each in the Iliad); (4) 'have success in doing something, do it successfully' (έτυχησα once in the Iliad); (5) 'get, obtain, have granted to or bestowed on one' (τεύξομαι once, and έτυχον

---

74 There is also a future perfect τετύξομαι (four times in the Iliad), 'will build' at II. 21.322 and three times 'will occur' (II. 12.345, 358, 21.585).
twice, in the *Odyssey*); (6) ‘fall to one’s lot’ (ἐτυχοῦ once in the *Iliad*, τυγχάνω once in the *Odyssey*); (7) ‘chance or happen to be somewhere or to be doing something’ (ἐτυχοῦ twice in the *Iliad* and once in the *Odyssey*, ἐτύχησα twice in the *Odyssey*), perfect τετύχηκα ‘be, lie, be set, in a specified position’ (once in each epic). There is also one compound form, an imperfect of παρατυγχάνω ‘be present with’ (II. 11.74). One meaning of the simple verb, however – (3) ‘hit one’s mark, make good one’s aim, get one’s blow or thrust home’ – occurs in the thematic aorist ten times in the *Iliad* (of which seven are participial) and twice in the *Odyssey* (once participial) and in the sigmatic aorist five times in the *Iliad* (of which four are participial). It is this meaning that seems closest to that of τιτύσκομαι: for in many of the twelve participial instances we may read ‘having aimed’ as well as ‘having hit home’. Especially notable is one instance where τυχών follows τιτύσκετο ‘he aimed’:

'Iōmeneuς δ’ αὐτόιο τιτύσκετο δουρὶ φαεινῷ,
καὶ βάλεν ὑψι βιβάντα τυχών· οὐδ’ ἥρκεσε θώρηξ
χάλκεος, δὲν φορέεσκε, μέση δ’ ἐν γαστέρι πῆξε. (II. 13.370-2)
And Idomeneus aimed at him with his shining spear, and, having hit home / having aimed, struck him as he strode proudly along; nor was the bronze breastplate that he used to wear sufficient, but the spear became fixed in the middle of his belly.

But a connection is not always so clear. For example, in the following passage it is hard to read ‘having aimed’ because Athene has already apparently already aimed Diomedes’ spear for him before we reach τυχών:

ἐπέρεισε δὲ Πάλλας Ἀθήνη
And Pallas Athene thrust it [Diomedes’ spear] against the lowest part of his [Ares’] flank, where he was girdled with his mitra, having hit home he struck him there, and he tore his fair skin, and he drew the spear back out.

The link between ἀντίσκομαι ‘aim’ and ἔτυχων / ἔτύχησα ‘hit home’ (i.e. τυχάνω) is therefore not as strong as the morphological and semantic connection between ἀντίσκομαι ‘make ready; get ready, aim’ and τężυκεῖν ‘make ready (for someone else)’, τężυκέσθαι ‘make ready for oneself’. If ἀντίσκομαι derives from one of these forms in τężυκ-, then what is the link with ἔτυχων / ἔτύχησα? There are two possibilities, not mutually exclusive: perhaps these two aorist forms meaning ‘hit home’ did genuinely influence ἀντίσκομαι into meaning ‘aim’; and perhaps a secondary synchronic link was established between the two verbs. Chantraine, cited above, seems to imply an etymological link between this ἀντίσκομαι ‘aim’ and τυχάνω ‘hit home’, but in fact there is no need for this: the influence of the latter could have been enough. The meaning ‘aim’ surely merely developed from ‘get ready’.

In summary, the data are as follows. We have ἀντίσκομαι ‘make ready (for oneself); take aim’ and aorists τężυκεῖν ‘make ready (for another)’, τężυκέσθαι ‘make ready (for oneself)’; stative perfect is τężυχθαι ‘be ready’ (as early as Mycenaean). There is also the possible influence of the aorist ἔτυχων / ἔτύχησα ‘aimed, hit home’. Although at first this seems an odd system, a combination of morphological and semantic analysis sheds light on the relationship between these

75See Kirk 1985-93: 1.345 for this word.
forms. Present τιτύσκομαι 'make ready (for oneself)' could well have been formed from aorist τετυκέσθαι 'made ready (for oneself)'. The meaning of such a medio-passive present may be not only a benefactive causative 'middle', as we have here, but also an inchoative 'get prepared, get ready', this accords with Trümpy's view that this verb's original meaning was not the literal 'aim'. And, since 'get ready' and 'take aim' are so semantically close, it would have been an easy step for this present to be viewed also as related to ἔτυχον and ἔτυχησα 'aimed, hit home', as is implied by II. 13.370-1. The actual fact that they really are cognate could be a coincidence. We do indeed find active τιτύσκω, meaning 'make, make ready', in later Greek (though rarely in the Classical period): it occurs first in Bacchylides, meaning 'make' in ἔται νεόκροτον / νίκαν Ἰέρων φιλοξείνων τιτύσκων 'he darts [onward], making a victory greeted by new applause for hospitable Hieron' (5.48-9).

3.2. Causatives

3.2.1. ἀπαφίσκω

Ἀπαφίσκω 'trick, cheat, beguile' is only found once in the present in Homer. This occurs when Odysseus cannot hug his mother in the Underworld, and she explains:

οὐ τί σε Περσεφόνεια, Διός θυγάτηρ, ἀπαφίσκει, 
ἀλλ' αὕτη δική ἑστὶ βροτῶν, ὅτε τίς κε θάνησιν. (Od. 11.217-8)

In no way is Persephone, daughter of Zeus, deceiving you, but this is the way for mortals when one dies.

76 The same is true of Classical ἀναβιώσκομαι: cf. Chapter 8 § 2.2.1.
77 Cf. further Veitch 1887 s.v. τιτύσκω; Chantraine 1968-80 s.v. τιτύσκομαι; LSJ s.v. 
tιτύσκομαι I, s.v. προτιτύσκω. 
The thematic aorist active ἢπαφευ is found in simple active form once, when Odysseus, posing as a beggar, is telling the story of how he supposedly said to Odysseus:

σὺ γὰρ ἐξω χλαίναντι παρά μ’ ἢπαφε δαίμων
σίχίτων’ ἐμεναι’ (Od. 14.488-9)

For I have no cloak; some god deceived me to be only in my tunic.

Its middle occurs once too, with benefactive sense. Penelope, on recognising Odysseus, says:

ἀιεὶ γὰρ μοι θυμὸς ἐνι στήθεσσι φίλοισιν
ἐρρίγει μὴ τίς με βροτῶν ἀπάφοιτο ἐπεσσιν
ἐλθὼν’ (Od. 23.215-17)

For the heart in my breast always dreaded that someone of mortals might come and beguile me with words.

There is a compound aorist ἐξῆπαφεν ‘trick, cheat, beguile, deceive’ found in the active twice. So Eumaeus, untrustingly to Odysseus as beggar, speaks of a time when μ’ Αἰτωλός ἀνήρ ἐξῆπαφε μῦθο ‘an Aetolian deceived me with his story’ (Od. 14.379). Similarly, Odysseus says to Penelope:

αὐτὰρ ἐγὼν ἐμέθεν περιδώσομαι αὐτῆς,
αἱ κέν σ’ ἐξαπάφω, κτείναι μ’ σικτίστῳ ὀλέθρῳ. (Od. 23.78-9)

But I will stake my life that, if I deceive you, you slay me with a most pitiful death.
The middle form ἐξαπάθοιτο is found twice; and, as with the simple ἀπάθοιτο, it is only found in the optative. The meaning again seems to be benefactive; hence:78

μερμήριξε δ' ἐπειτὰ βοῶπις πότνια Ἡρη
ὁπώς ἐξαπάθοιτο Διὸς νόον οἰγιόχοιο. (II. 14.159-60)

And then ox-eyed lady Hera considered how she might deceive the mind of aegis-bearing Zeus [for her own purposes].

On the other hand, a second compound παρηπαφων 'beguile, trick' is used in the active in reference to the same event of Hera tricking Zeus – despite the fact that, just above, the medio-passive was used. Hera says to Poseidon:

'Ἡρη δ' ἐν φιλότητι παρηπαφεῖν εὐνηθήναι. (II. 14.360)

And Hera has tricked Zeus to lie down [with her] in love.

It therefore seems that there does not need to be a distinction between active and medio-passive here: both are causative 'deceive'.

In conclusion: we might expect to find here causative ἀπαφίσκω 'deceive' beside inchoative ἀπαφίσκομαι *'get deceived'; but in fact the medio-passive present is only used transitively in Homer. Aorists active and middle show the same meaning as the present forms.

78Cf. also ἐξαπάθου (o) at II. 9.376.
3.2.2. ἀραφίσκω

Cunliffe (1924 s.v.) has two main subdivisions for the uses of ἀραφίσκω.

Firstly, under (I), come all the transitive parts, which show a range of seven meanings – basically ‘fit together, supply, contrive’ – and these are present ἀραφίσκω (once only), aorists active ἤρσα (once in the Iliad, four times in the Odyssey) and ἤραρον (four times in each epic) and aorist passive ἤρθην (once in the Iliad). Secondly, there is (II), made up of the nine meanings of the intransitive forms, which may be summarised as ‘be fitted, be supplied, be pleasing’: two instances of aorist ἤραρον, the three occurrences of the aorist ‘middle’ participle ἀρμενος and all those of the frequent perfect and pluperfect ‘active’.

The transitive present ἀραφίσκω occurs with causative meaning, as follows:

αὐτὸς δ' ἀμφι πόδεσσιν ἑσίς ἀραφίσκει πέδιλα
tάμηνων δέρμα βοείου ἑυχροές. (Od. 14.23-4)

And he himself [Eumaeus] was making sandals fit onto his feet, cutting an ox-hide that was of fresh colour.

Cunliffe classes this occurrence under (4) ‘make fitting or suitable’, a meaning which only occurs once more, for aorist ἤρσα, when Agamemnon says to Achilles:

ἀλλ' εἰ μὲν δῶσοσι γέρας μεγάθυμοι Ἀχαιοί,
ἀρσαντες κατὰ θυμόν, ὅπως ἀντάξιον ἔσται. (II. 1.135-6)

But if the great-hearted Achaeans give me a special prize, having made it fit, to my mind, so that it is of equal worth...

The other aorist, ἤραρον, usually shows causative meaning, like ἤρσα. In describing how Pandarus acquired his bow, Homer says:
And from its [the goat’s] head the horns grew to a length of sixteen palms; and the craftsman working in horn, having wrought them, fitted them [made them fit] together, and skilfully smoothed all and set a golden tip on top.

On one occasion, transitive ἡραρον is closely followed by an example of its intransitive use, when we find Homer saying of the Greeks:

And as when a man puts [makes fit] together the wall of a tall house with close-set stones, avoiding the strength of the winds – thus the helmets and bossed shields became fitted together.

Bendahanman (1993: 80-1) discusses other scholars’ interpretations of this passage: we could be dealing with an unusual pluperfect form, or a transitive form in an elliptical construction. On the other hand, Janko (Kirk et al. 1985-93: IV.346) suggests that influence of the intransitive perfect has led to this unusual use of the aorist; after all, the transitive ἡραρον was replacing the thematic form. The other intransitive instance, given by Cunliffe as the only place where the verb means ‘be pleasing’ (1924 s.v. ἀραρίσκω (II)(6)), occurs when Antinous says to the other suitors:

ἀλλ’ ἄγε σιγή τοῖον ἀναστάντες τελέωμεν
μὴθον, ο δὴ καὶ πᾶσιν ἐνὶ φρεσίν ἡραρεν ἡμῖν. (Od. 4.776-7)
But come, let us arise in silence and accomplish our plan, which pleased us all in our hearts.

Noting the unusual sense, West (Heubeck et al. 1988-92: I.241) here suggests that perhaps a form of ἀρέσκω was intended. This present stem is never found in Homer; but the sense seems to require an imperfect if intransitive aorist forms of this verb are, as is expected, inchoative in meaning. Bendahman (1993: 81-2) suggests emendation of ἰποτεν ἡμῖν to ἰποτετ’ ἡμῖν.

The aorist passive ἰποτεν is classed as the one instance of the meaning (I)(7) ‘be formed into close array’. After Achilles has made a speech to the Myrmidons (and directly before the simile of the wall and the troops quoted above), it is said:

μᾶλλον δὲ στίχες ἀρθεν, ἐπεὶ βασιλῆς ἀκουσαν. (II. 16.211)

... and their ranks became serried closer when they heard their leader.

Although Cunliffe classes this as a passive form of an active, we might also categorise it as inchoative ‘became fitted’.

In Cunliffe’s intransitive use (II), we find the expected stative meaning for the perfect ἀρῆρα. So, in the one instance of the simple perfect in finite form, we find Odysseus on his raft saying:

διφ’ ἄν μὲν κεν δούρατ’ ἐν ἀρεινήσιν ἀρῆρη,
τόφ’ αἵτω μενέω καὶ τλήσωμαι ἀλγεα πάσχον’ (Od. 5.361-2)

As long as the timbers are fitted in their fastenings, I shall remain here and endure suffering distress.
One would expect the medio-passive aorist participle ὄρμουν to have the inchoative meaning 'having got fitted'; but the sense appears ambiguous between this and 'being well-fitted'. It is used of a potter’s wheel in a simile, ὄρμουν ἐν παλάμησιν 'fitted in his hands' (II. 18.600), as he tries it out. The same phrase is later used of an axe that Calypso gives to Odysseus to use (Od. 5.234); and, lastly, the form occurs in the description of his raft:

ἐν δ’ ιστὸν ποίει καὶ ἐπίκριν ὄρμουν αὐτῷ. (Od. 5.254)
And on it he made a mast and a yard-arm fitted to it.

For this verb we thus have the causative present ὀραῖσκω, aorists ἰποροῦν and ἰπα ‘make fitted’; beside these there are infrequent inchoative aorists ἰποροῦν (once or twice), ἰπθην (once) and ὄρμους (three times) ‘got fitted’; and lastly there is the stative perfect ὄρησα ‘be fitted’.79

3.2.3. ἵσκω and ἐἳσκω

These two verbs show interesting semantic developments. Chantraine (1968-80 s.v. ἐἳσκα) notes that ἵσκω (found twice in the Iliad and three times in the Odyssey) originally meant 'rendre semblable, juger semblable, confondre'; that is to say, it must have been a causative 'make like', which indeed Cunliffe (1924 s.v. ἵσκω) gives as the first meaning of this verb. He cites the following passage, where Menelaus says to Helen:

τρίς δὲ περιστείξας κοῖλον λόχου ἄμφαφωσα,

---

79 The occasional compound forms in ἐν-, ἐπι- and προς- also fit this pattern: for forms see Chapter 3 § 6.2 above.
And having walked round the hollow ambush three times, putting your hands on it, you called by name the chiefs of the Danaans, making your voice like the wives of all the Argives.

In the *Iliad* we see a progression to Cunliffe's (2) 'liken to, deem like, take for' (found twice), when Nestor says to Patroclus:

καὶ τοι τεύχεα καλὰ δότω πόλεμόνδε φέρεσθαι,
αἱ κέ σε τῷ ἵσκουντες ἀπόσχωνται πολέμοιο

Τρώες, ... (*II*. 11.798-800)80

And let him give you his fine armour to bear to the war, in the hope that the Trojans, taking you for him, might cease from battle...

At *II*. 16.41-2 we find an almost exact repetition of 11.799-800, in the scene where Patroclus says these words about himself to Achilles.

In the next stage, we have the one instance of the meaning which Cunliffe (1924 s.v.) gives as 'speak feigningly'; Chantraine has it as 'imaginer, inventor', in conjunction with λέγων. After Odysseus, posing as a beggar, has told Penelope the untrue story of how he met Odysseus:

Ωκε ψεύδεα πολλὰ λέγων ἑτύμοισιν ὁμοία: (*Od*. 19.203)

Speaking, he made false things [seem] like true ones.

---

80 I here read ἵσκουντες with van Thiel (1996) and West (1998) rather than ἰσκουντες with Monro and Allen (1920); the latter themselves have ἰσκουντες at the parallel passage at *Iliad* 16.41. As Hainsworth (Kirk et al. 1985-93: III.309) notes, we expect the trisyllabic form ἵσκω, not ἰσκω.
The last stage is the reinterpretation of this passage, since the syntax is ambiguous. Re-reading the above verse and taking ἵσκε as intransitive, we may understand it as ‘he spoke feigningly (ἵσκε), uttering (ἀλγὼν) false things like true ones’; one can thus understand why Cunliffe gives his gloss of ‘speak feigningly’ for this verse.

For the remaining instance, Cunliffe glosses ‘conjecture, guess’; Chantraine has it as ‘conjecturer faussement’. Odysseus has killed Antinous, and the suitors curse him; after they have spoken, Homer says:

\[
\text{ἵσκεν ἐκαστός ἄνηρ, ἔπει ἦ φάσαν σφικ \ θέλοντα}
\]
\[
\text{ἀνδρα κατακτείναι. (Od. 22.31-2)}
\]

Each man spoke wrongly / guessed wrongly, since they thought that he had not wilfully killed the man.

In this passage, however, ἵσκω can be reinterpreted as meaning ‘say’, referring to the previous speech; hence, in such forms as imperfect ἵσκοψ and participle ἵσκων, we find this verb meaning ‘conjecture’ in Simonides and ‘say’ in Alexandrian poetry. On the other hand, Russo (Heubeck et al. 1988-1992: III.87) interprets the data slightly differently. For him, the last two occurrences show the development in the opposite order. The cross-over of meaning occurs at Od. 22.31, where ἵσκεν meant ‘conjectured’ (an extension from ‘thought like’, as seen below with εἴσκω at Od. 4.148) but was instead taken as equivalent to ὁς φάτω due to its position after a speech.

The present εἴσκω, found five times in the Iliad and nine in the Odyssey, undergoes a similar development. The first meaning ascribed to it by Cunliffe (1924 s.v.) is ‘cause to take the likeness of, make like’, Chantraine’s ‘rendre semblable’

---

(1968-80 s.v. ἐσίκκο), which it means on two occasions. In one instance it is close in location to the one place where ἵσκω has this meaning (Od. 4.279). Helen, describing Odysseus secretly entering Troy, says of him:

άλλω δ’ αὐτὸν φωτὶ κατακρύπτων ἥσικε
δέκτη, δὲ συδὲν τοῖος ἔτην ἐπὶ νησίν Ἀχαιῶν. (Od. 4.247-8)
And he, hiding, made himself like another man, a beggar, who was not at all such as he was at the ships of the Achaeans.

Similarly, Odysseus says to Athene later on in the same epic: σὲ γὰρ αὐτὴν παντὶ ἐσικεῖς ‘for you [can] make yourself like everything [i.e., anything]’ (Od. 13.313).

Again as with ἵσκω, ἐσικέω means (2) ‘liken to, deem like, compare with’ (‘comparer à’ in Chantraine), but much more frequently: this occurs three times in the Iliad and four in the Odyssey. Hence, for example, Priam, seeing Odysseus from the wall, says to Helen:

ἀρνεῖό μιν ἔγωγε ἐσίκκω πιγεσιμάλλω,
δὲ τ’ οἷὼν μέγα πῶν διέρχεται ἄργενναύν. (II. 3.197-8)
I deem him like a thick-fleeced ram, who passes through a great flock of white ewes.

Lastly, there is the meaning given in Cunliffe’s third gloss, ‘think, fancy, suppose, conjecture’ (twice in the Iliad, three times in the Odyssey), which Chantraine gives as ‘supposer que, penser que’. Idomeneus, after killing three Trojans when Deiphobus has killed only one Greek, taunts his enemy:

Δηφοβ’, ἥ ἄρα δὴ τι ἐσικομεν δέιον εἶναι
Deiphobus, do we now think perhaps that it is fair that three men have been killed for one?

Russo (Heubeck et al. 1988-1992: III.87), supporting his argument that ἵσκω at Od. 22.31 meant ‘conjectured’, points out that the change of meaning in ἥσκω from ‘deem like’ to just ‘deem’ can apparently be seen in one particular passage in the Odyssey. Helen says of Telemachus:

οὐ γὰρ πώ τινὰ φημὶ ἐοικότα ὅδε ἱδέσθαι
οὔτ' ἀνδρ' οὔτε γυναῖκα, σέβας μ᾽ ἔχει ἐἰσορώσαν,
ὡς ὅδ' ὁ Ὅδυσσῆος μεγαλήτωρος ὑπὶ ἑοικε, ... (Od. 4.141-3)

For I declare that I have never yet seen either a man or a woman to be so like [another] – amazement holds me as I look – as this man is like the son of great-hearted Odysseus...

Menelaus begins his reply with:

οὔτω νῦν καὶ ἐγὼ νοεώ, γύναι, ὡς σὺ ἐἰσκεῖς. (Od. 4.148)

I thus also observe it myself, my wife, as you deem him like / as you conjecture.

In this case, the developments of ἵσκω and ἥσκω would be almost exactly parallel.82

The related and very frequent simple perfect ἐοικα (70 times in the Iliad and 62 in the Odyssey in simple form), pluperfect active ἐφικέν (nine times and eight

82On the syntax of ἥσκω see Giannakis 1997: 242-3.
respectively) is given four meanings by Cunliffe (1924 s.v. ἐικώ) (II)): (1) ‘seem (to be)’, only at II. 24.258; (2) ‘resemble, be like’; (3) ‘be fit or worthy (to do something)’; (4) impersonal ἐοικε ‘it is fitting, right, seemly’. The verb thus has two main meanings: ‘be like’ and ‘be fit’. For the former of these, one may compare the following line, spoken by Diomedes:

καὶ νῦν οἱ πάρα κεῖνος Ἀρης, βροτῷ ἀνδρὶ ἐοικὼς. (II. 5.604)

And now beside him [Hector] there is Ares, resembling a mortal man.

For the other meaning, there is the passage where Athene says to Zeus concerning Aegisthus:

καὶ λίπη κεῖνος γε ἐοικότι κεῖται ὀλέθρω. (Od. 1.46)

and truly does that man lie in fitting destruction.

Cunliffe’s one instance of this verb meaning ‘seem [to be]’ is surely an extension of ‘be fit to’; it occurs when Priam describes Hector as a man

ὅς θεὸς ἔσκε μετ’ ἀνδράσιν, οὐδὲ ἐφκεὶ ἀνδρός γε θυτοῦ πάις ἐμεναί, ἄλλα θεοῖο. (II. 24.258-9)

... who was a god among men, and he did not seem to be [was not fit to be] the son of a mortal man, but of a god.

Indeed, the pluperfect active ἐφκεῖν always means ‘was like, was fit’ in Homer, acting as preterite of ἐοικε; thus, after Achilles has called out to Zeus, overpowered by the Scamander:
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The compound perfect third person singular, ἐπέοικε ‘be fitting, be seem’ (six times in the Iliad, five in the Odyssey), is used like ἐσικα; it has a pluperfect active too in ὡς ἐπεώκει ‘as was fitting’ (Od. 24.295).

There are also the forms ἔικτο and ἱκτο. The former, occurring in the Iliad, seems to be a pluperfect meaning the same as ἔώκειν, ‘was like’, when Achilles says:

In the Odyssey we have instead ἱκτο (four times), whose meaning seems to vary. It always occurs in the line-final phrase δέμας δ’ ἱκτο γυναικί, and always involves Athene; it hence seems related to the use of active pluperfect ἐικτην with δέμας at II. 21.285 quoted above. In one case, we find Athene changing from a man to a woman:
δέμας δ' ἥικτο γυναικί
καλὴ τε μεγάλη τε καὶ ἁγιαὶ ἐργα ἰδυτή' (Od. 13.288-9)
she [Athene] became like a woman in form, comely and tall, and skilled in
glorious handiwork.

The meaning is surprising: a supposed pluperfect, acting as imperfect and supposedly
stative, with inchoative meaning. This passage also appears at Od. 16.157-8, where
the verb may be interpreted either as inchoative or alternatively as a stative, in the
description 'and she was like a woman...'; the same may be said of the occurrence at
Od. 20.31. To further complicate matters, it is, on one last occasion, not even Athene
who changes; the line is as follows:

εἶδωλον ποίσε, δέμας δ' ἥικτο γυναικί (Od. 4.796)

If Athene is the subject of ἥικτο, then the latter is a medio-passive causative, and the
line means 'she made a phantom, and made [it] like a woman in form'; this could be
through re-analysis of the above δέμας δ' ἥικτο γυναικί from 'and she became
like a woman in form' to 'and she made her form like a woman'. Alternatively, the
subject has changed for the second verb and the meaning is either inchoative 'and it
became like a woman in form' or stative 'and it was like a woman in form'.

But even with the latter interpretation, we still have one case of an 'inchoative'
pluperfect at Od. 13.288; as Schulze (1910: 185 n. 2) notes, Athene resembled a man
at Il. 13.222, and line 288 describes her change. He therefore takes ἥικτο as an
aorist, glossed 'machte sich ähnlich', from ἐφῄκτο, and compares the further
reduplicated aorists τετυκεῖν, τετυκέσθαι and δέδαν, δεδάσθαι; also
comparable is κικλῆσκω : ἐκέκλετο (Chapter 3 § 4.3). All have corresponding
reduplicated presents in -τ-, since he takes ἐίσκω from, ultimately, *ἐψίσκω (cf.
Chapter 3 § 5.2 above); Chantraine (1986-8: 1.384), however, insists that these forms are pluperfects. But the problem is the same as Tichy’s (1976) derivation of δειδίσκομαι from a postulated *δεδέχθαι.\(^{83}\) we expect a reduplicated causative aorist to be thematic, meaning that here we need **ἐφεφίκετο. A further possibility is that ἡίκτο is an intransitive root aorist like ἐμίκτο ‘became mixed’; or that it was an old pluperfect reanalysed as an aorist after such a pair as μίσγω ‘make mixed’ : ἐμίκτο ‘became mixed’.

Εἰκέ ‘seemed likely’ may also be connected to these forms.\(^{84}\) It occurs when, on the shield Hephaestus makes for Achilles, Ares and Athene are leading a group of men from a besieged town to make an ambush:

οὐ δέ ὅτε δὴ ἐκανον δὴι σφίσιν εἰκε λοχήσαι,
ἐν ποταμῷ, δὴι τ’ ἀρδμός ἐν τοῖς πάντεσσι βοτοίσιν,
ἐνθ’ ἄρα τοι γ’ ἰζοντ’ εἴλιμένοι οἴθοπι χαλκῷ. (II. 18.520-2)

But when they came to the place where it seemed good to them to set their ambush, in a river-bed where there was a watering-place for all herds, they sat down there, covered in gleaming bronze.

The relationship between these forms is controversial; in ἐικῶ, we could have a collateral present to causatives ἵσκω and ἐισκω. It has also been argued that one instance of aorist ἐξειεῖ fits here also.\(^{85}\)

---

\(^{83}\) For criticisms of this latter theory see Forssman 1978; and Hardarson 1993: 62-3 n. 19.

\(^{84}\) See Chapter 3 § 3.1.3 above.

\(^{85}\) See further Leaf (1900-2: II.307), who states that ἐικῶ was indeed the present of ἐφεικέω, and compares two passages where it is more usual to read ἐιχει (II. 7.217, 17.354), ἐξειεῖ at II. 22.321 and Attic παρεῖκει ‘it is practicable’. Cunliffe also connotes ἐξειεῖ, but it is more usually linked with ἐκω ‘retire, give way; yield; etc.’; cf. Richardson in Kirk et al. 1985-93: VI.138, who only gives the latter interpretation.
We therefore have here two presents, ἵσκω and ἐῖσκω, which are extended from their meaning ‘make like’ to ‘deem like’, ‘think’ and, in the former case, to ‘conjecture, say’. Beside them there is a related stative perfect έοικα ‘be like; be fit’; this has pluperfects active ἐῴκειν and medio-passive ἐίκτο, ἕικτο. The latter seems at some point to have been reinterpreted as an aorist to ἵσκω / ἐῖσκω, giving it the meaning ‘became like’. There are therefore no forms for aorist causative ‘made like’ and present inchoative ‘become like’, leaving us with a very incomplete system. How a possible present : aorist pair ἐίκω : ἐῖξα ‘seem likely, be opportune’ might fit into this causative : stative : inchoative set is most uncertain.

3.2.4. ἴλασκομαι

The verb ἴλασκομαι is defined by Cunliffe (1924 s.v.) as ‘propitiate, seek to win favour or grace from (a divinity)’ and by Chantraine (1968-80 s.v.) as ‘chercher à se rendre favorable, à se concilier’, in Homer always of a god. The present is found four times in Homer, all in the Iliad, in two pairs of instances. Firstly, Achilles tells Thetis that, after Apollo had started to kill the Greeks,

αὐτίκ’ ἔγω πρῶτος κελόμην θεὸν ἴλασκεσθαι. (II. 1.386)

Straightaway I was first to bid propitiate the god.

Later all the Greeks do so, when Chryses’ daughter has been returned:

οἱ δὲ πανημέριοι μολπὴθεὸν ἴλασκοντο
καλὸν ἀείδοντες παίηνα κοῦροι Ἄχαιῶν,

Giannakis (1997: 242-3) produces a good example to show the contrast between present and perfect: οὐ γὰρ σ’ οὔδε, ξεινε, δεσμονι φοτι ἵσκω / ἀθλοῦν ‘no, stranger, for I do not liken you to a person skilled in contests’ (Od. 8.159-60) beside οὐδ’ ἀληθητηρί ἐοικάς ‘but you do not look like an athlete’ (Od. 8.164).

This is not always the case in later Greek: cf. Giannakis 1997: 244.
μέλποντες ἐκάεργον· ὁ δὲ φρένα τέρπετ' ἀκούων. (II. 1.472-4)
And all day long the sons of the Achaeans were appeasing the god with song, singing the beautiful paean, honouring the god that works afar; and he was glad in his heart as he heard.

The second pair of occurrences involves a conversation begun when Hector comes home to find Andromache not there and asks:

ηὲ πὴ ἐς γαλῶν ἢ εἰνατέρων εὑπέπλων,
ἡ ἐς Ἀθηναίης ἐξαίχεται, ἐνθα περ ἄλλαι
Τρωαὶ εὑπλόκαμοι δεινὴν θεὸν ἱλάσκονται; (II. 6.378-80)
Is she gone to the house of [one of] her sisters or her brothers’ fair-robed wives, or to the temple of Athene, where the other fair-tressed women of Troy are propitiating the terrible goddess?

In reply (from a τομίη), Hector is told he is wrong, and v. 380 is repeated as v. 385.

The present ἱλάσκομαι therefore clearly means ‘propitiate, make propitious’, and is a benefactive causative medio-passive. In the first pair of instances, this is obvious; in the latter, one could read the less obviously causative ‘seek the favour of’. In this connection it is worth noting that Athene is δεινὴ ‘terrible’ and known to be on the Greek, not the Trojan, side: indeed, this passage comes shortly after her refusal to grant the prayer of the old Trojan women for Diomedes to die (II. 6.311). In these instances, therefore, ἱλάσκομαι is a causative ‘make peaceful’; hence Klingenschmitt’s (1970: 75) gloss of ‘gnädig machen, gnädig stimmen’.
The alternative present found as ἴλασονται 'id.' (Cunliffe 1924 s.v. ἴλάομαι) occurs when Athene is described as having nurtured Erechtheus in her temple:

ἐνθα δὲ μν ταύροις καὶ ἀρνείσις ἴλασονται
κούροι Ἀθηναίων περιτελλομένων ἐνιαυτῶν’ (II. 2.550-1)
and there the youths of the Athenians propitiate him with bulls and rams as the years roll on in their courses.

The aorist ἴλασσάμην occurs four times, of which three concern the events involving Chryse’s return. For example, Calchas prophesies that the deaths will continue,88

πρὶν γ’ ἀπὸ πατρὶ φίλω δόμεναι ἐλικώπιδα κούρην
ἀπριάτην ἀνάποιουν, ἀγεὶν θ’ ἱερὴν ἐκατόμβην
ἐς Χρύσην’ τότε κὲν μὲν ἰλασσάμενοι πεπίθωσιμεν. (II. 1.98-100)
... until we give the quick-glancing maiden back to her father, without payment, without ransom, and lead a sacred hecatomb to Chryse; then we, having propitiated him, might persuade him.

We also find this form once in the Odyssey when, in the morning, Nestor says:

καρπαλιμάς μοι, τέκνα φίλα, κρηνήνατ’ ἐέλδωρ,
δφρ’ ἢ τοί πρῶτιστα θεών ἰλάσσομ’ Ἀθήνην,
ἡ μοι ἑναργῆς ἕλθε θεοῦ ἐς δαίτα θάλειαν. (Od. 3.418-20)

---

88Cf. similarly II. 1.147, 444.
Quickly, my dear children, fulfil my desire, so that first of all the gods I may propitiate Athene, who came to me in visible presence to the rich feast of the god.

Imperative ἰἀηθι (twice in the Odyssey) and subjunctive ἰἀηκησι (once) mean 'be propitious, lend a gracious ear' (cf. Cunliffe s.vv. ἰἀηκω, ἰἀημι); they all represent old perfect forms. For example, ἰἀηθι is used when, after Athene has left, Nestor says:

οलλα, ἀνασσ', ἰابتι, διδωθι δε μοι κλεος ἐσθλον,
αυτω και παιδεσσι και αιδοη παρακοτι (Od. 3.380-1)

But, queen, be gracious, and grant me fair renown, to me and my sons and my honoured wife.

The form ἰἀηκησι occurs when the suitors try to stop Eumaeus taking the bow from the hall:

tαχ' αυ σ' εφ' ζεσσι κυνες ταξεες κατεδονται
οιων απ' ανθρωπων, ους ετρεφες, ετ' κεν 'Απόλλων
ημην ἰἀηκησι και οθανατοι θεοι άλλοι. (Od. 21.363-5)

Soon the swift dogs you reared will devour you by the swine, alone from men, if Apollo is gracious to us, and the other immortal gods.

89See further Chapter 3 § 4.1.5.
90Cf. similarly Od. 16.184.
We therefore have causative medio-passive present ἵλασκομαι, aorist ἱλασσόμην ‘make propitious’, beside stative perfect forms ἰληθί and ἵληκησι ‘be propitious’. An alternative present ἵλασμαι is also causative. The Homeric Hymns show a further causative present ἰλαμαί (h.Hom.19.48=21.5) and stative perfect optative form ἰληκοι (h.Ap. 165). Much later, there is an instance of an aorist inchoative form: ἔξιλασθέν ‘having been atoned for, having been made right’ (Plato Lg. IX 862c).

3.2.5. πιθαύσκω

The present πιθαύσκω (nine times in the Iliad, eleven in the Odyssey) occurs in both active and medio-passive forms, but is always causative in sense. Cunliffe (1924 s.v.) gives seven meanings: (1) ‘make manifest to the sight, display, show’; (2) ‘tell of, indicate, point out’; (3) ‘give a signal’; (4) ‘bring forward, propose, tender’; (5) ‘set forth, communicate, disclose, make known, declare’; (6) ‘set forth or utter’; (7) ‘make declaration, state one’s case, one’s wishes, what one sees or knows’.

Of these, only the first does not necessarily involve making a sound, and this is also the most obviously causative meaning: ‘make manifest’ is said to occur three times, always in the medio-passive and always in the Iliad. Hence ἄνθρωποι πιθαυσκόμενος τά ἃ κῆλα ‘[Zeus] showing to men the arrows which he has’ (II. 12.280); and when Hera tells Hephaestus, πιθαύσκεο δὲ φλόγα πολλὴν ‘and show much flame’ (II. 21. 333). For the third instance, Cunliffe cites διὰ Ζεὺς κακὰ ἔργα πιθαύσκεται (II. 15.97), which seems rather to indicate a verb of speaking; this would give the translation ‘what sort of evil deeds Zeus declares’.

Cunliffe’s third meaning may or may not imply a sound is made: he has it as ‘give a signal’, since there is no direct object.91 It occurs only once:

---

And [Odysseus] whistled, making a sign to illustrious Diomedes.

In all other cases, πιφαύσκω means, in some way, ‘make known, speak’; this accounts for the five remaining meanings. Perhaps on the borderline is (4), given as ‘bring forward, propose, tender’ (once), perhaps rather ‘mention, speak of’; this is found when Achilles says to the suppliant Lycaon:

νήπιε, μή μοι ἄποινα πιφαύσκεο μηδ’ ἀγόρευε. (II. 21.99)
Fool, do not tender / do not mention or speak of ransom to me.

Clearer is (2) ‘tell of, indicate, point out’, found once in the active and once in the medio-passive in the two epics. In the earlier, active instance, Odysseus says:

οὕτος τοι, Διόμηδες, ἄνηρ, οὕτωι δὲ τοι ἵπποι,
oûtos toî, Dîômēdes, ánēr, oûtoi dê toi îppoi,
οὗς νῦν πιφαύσκει Δόλων, ὃν ἐπέφυομεν ἡμεῖς. (II. 10.477-8)
Here, Diomedes, is the man, and here are the horses which Dolon, whom we killed, told us of.

Secondly, Telemachus uses the medio-passive when he says to Theoclymenus:

ἀλλὰ τοι ἄλλον φῶτα πιφαύσκομαι δὲν κεν ἰκοιο, ... (Od. 15.518)
But I tell you of another man to whom you may go.

A similar meaning is to be found in (5) ‘set forth, communicate, disclose, make known, declare’ (six times). This only occurs in the active when, in Odysseus’ story to the Phaeacians, Agamemnon advises him:
μὴ δ’ οἱ μύθοι ἀπαντὰ πιθαυσκέμεν, δόν κ’ ἐς ἐιδής,
ἀλλὰ τὸ μὲν φάσθαι, τὸ δὲ καὶ κεκρυμμένον ἐσται. (Od. 11.442-3)
And do not declare to her [your wife] every thought which you really perceive,
but tell some, and let some be hidden.

The remaining five instances are found in the medio-passive (one in the Iliad, four in
the Odyssey). So, for example, ἢ τί Μυρμιδόνεσσει πιθαυσκέσαι ‘Do you
[Patroclus] have something to declare to the Myrmidons...?’ (II. 16.12).

There seems to be hardly any distinction between this meaning and (6) ‘set
forth or utter’, which is said to occur three times in the active. Hence:

ἐνθα καθεξόμενοι ἐπε’ ἀλλήλοις πιθαυσκοῦν (II. 10.202)

Sitting down there, they spoke words to each other.

Elsewhere, it could as well be ‘declare’ as ‘utter’:

tοῖς δ’ Ἀγέλεως μετέειπεν, ἐπος πάντεσσι πιθαυσκὼν (Od.
22.131=247)

And Agelaus spoke among them [the suitors], uttering his word to all.

Lastly, there is (7) ‘make declaration, state one’s case, etc.’. This, according
to Cunliffe, is found four times, once in the Iliad and three times in the Odyssey; in
fact, the difference between this meaning and (5) ‘make known, declare’ is again
slight. First of all, it occurs in a passage describing how, on Ares’ shield for Achilles,

... δύο δ’ ἀνδρες ἐνείκεον εἰνέκα ποινῆς
ἀνήρος ἀποφθιμένου· ο μὲν εὔχετο πάντ’ ἀποδοῦναι

223
δήμω πιφαύσκων, ... (II. 18.498-500)

... and two men were arguing about the blood-price of a dead man: one was claiming [to be able] to pay everything, declaring to the people...⁹²

So, as Odysseus is about to make his leaving speech to the Phaeacians, Homer says:

'Αλκινώθεν δὲ μᾶλλον πιφαύσκομενος φάτο μῦθον' (Od. 13.37)

and declaring to Alcinous especially he said [this] speech: ...

In the other two instances, the translation 'make known' is equally appropriate.

Hence Halitherses the seer, after the omen of the eagles, says:

κέκλυτε δὴ νῦν μεν, 'Ἰθακῆσιοι, οτί τινε ἠπώ
μνηστήρσιν δὲ μᾶλλον πιφαυσκομένος τάδε ἔφρω (Od. 2.161-2)

Listen now to me, Ithacans, in what I am to say; and to the suitors especially do I declare / make known and announce these things.

Similarly, Odysseus, telling his men the things that Circe had told him about the next part of their journey, says:

ἡ τοι ἐγὼ τὰ ἐκαστὰ λέγων ἐτάρασι πιφαυσκόν. (Od. 12.165)

Stating all these things, I declared them / made them known to my companions.

⁹²On this important passage, see the commentary by Edwards (Kirk et al. 1985-93: V.214-16), who indirectly refers to Linear B parallels.
The meaning of both active πιθαύσκω and medio-passive πιθαύσκομαι in Homer is therefore basically 'make known; make known by sound; speak, declare';\(^93\) active and medio-passive are not always to be differentiated in Homer.\(^94\)

The apparently related aorist φάε 'broke' (of the dawn) – translated "‘briller" ou “apparaitre'” by Chantraine (1968-80 s.v.), only occurs once in Homer:

εγὼ δὲ εἰμι κεῖνοι
κείμην ἀσπασίως, φάε δὲ χρυσόθρωνος Ἡώς. (Od. 14.501-2)

And I gladly lay in his [Thoas'] garment, and golden-throned Dawn broke / appeared.

This is an inchoative aorist, therefore, meaning 'come to light', beside πιθαύσκω '[bring to light], make known'; one might rather expect *(£- )φαε-συν 'came to light' beside inchoative present *πι- φαύ-σκομαι 'come to light', whence causative πιθαύσκω 'bring to light'; but the inchoative present is not found.\(^95\)

Other related verbal forms in Homer are also of interest. As already mentioned (Chapter 3 § 4.2.2), we only find the verb *φαέθοω in the form of the adjective φαέθων 'bright, resplendent', and as a proper noun; hence e.g. ἡλιώς φαέθων 'the bright sun' (II. 11.735, Od. 5.479, 19.441, 22.388). The denominative verb φαείνω 'give light, shine' (active only, found five times in the Odyssey) does

\(^93\)Chantraine (1968-80 s.v. φάε) has the expected literal sense of 'bring to light' ('faire luire') occurring in Aeschylus; he is presumably referring to ἡμερήσιον / φῶς πιθαύσκων '[signal-fire] making the light of day shine' (Ag. 23). Italie (1964 s.v. πιθαύσκω) and LSJ (s.v. πιθαύσκω) disagree, translating here 'ostendere' and 'shewing forth' respectively.

\(^94\)Cf. further on this use of voice Chantraine 1986-8: II. 175.

\(^95\)There is some further use in (especially hexametric) poetry (see Veitch 1887 s.v. πιθαύσκω), but apparently the only instances of intransitive πιθαύσκομαι in Ancient Greek are in Nicander (Th. 411, 637, 725), always in the form πιθαύσκεο 'learn of'. Classical Greek has unreduplicated inchoative - φαέθω: cf. Chapter 3 § 4.2.2.
have finite forms: hence Helios says to Zeus, on learning that his cattle have been slaughtered:

εἰ δὲ μοι οὖ τίσουσι βοῶν ἐπιεική' ἀμοιβήν,
δύσομαι εἰς 'Αιδαο καὶ εὖ νεκύεσσι φαεῖνω. (Od. 12.382-3)
And if they [Odysseus’ companions] do not pay me adequate atonement for the cattle, I shall go to Hades’ [home] and shine among the dead.

There is also the intransitive aorist ϕαάνθη, ϕάανθεν (twice in the Iliad); these forms are listed by Cunliffe under ϕαεῖνω, although they are now thought to be related to ϕαεῖνω.96 The meaning can be ‘shone, came to shine’ but, taking the simple forms together with the four found with the preverb εκ-, it is more usually ‘became apparent’.97 Hence, when Athene catches Achilles by the hair before he can attack Agamemnon, he turns round and recognises her, δείνω δὲ οἵ δόσει ϕάανθεν ‘and her eyes shone [appeared] terrible at him’ (II. 1.200). The other occasion of the simple form is found when Zeus answers Ajax’s prayer for a clear sky, and we have:

ηέλιος δ’ ἐπέλαμψε, μάχη δ’ ἐπὶ πᾶσα ϕαάνθη. (II. 17.650)
And the sun shone upon them, and then all the battle shone / became apparent.

We therefore have a stative active present with an inchoative aorist ‘passive’; this is expected, although the difference in voice seems odd.98

96See Chapter 3 § 4.2.2 n. 154.
97See further Prévot 1935: 39-42.
98But cf. the comparable pair of μεθύω / ἐμεθύσθην, Chapter 8 § 2.2.3. ϕαεῖνω and ϕαεῖνομαι are both used intransitively by later authors (such as Apollonius Rhodius, Callimachus, Aratus), with the exception of apparently only one instance of causative ϕαεῖνω ‘bring to light’ (Nicander Th. 390).
To sum up: we have a causative present \( \pi\phi\alpha\upsilon\sigma\kappa\omega \) / \( \pi\phi\alpha\upsilon\sigma\kappa\omega\mu\mu\alpha \) 'make known', with inchoative aorist \( \phi\alpha\epsilon\nu \) 'came to light, began to shine, appeared'. A related stative is found in the denominative present \( \phi\alpha\epsilon\iota\nu\omega \) 'shine, be shining', whose inchoative aorist passive \( \phi\alpha\alpha\nu\theta\upsilon\upsilon \) 'came to shine, became apparent' overlaps in meaning with \( \phi\alpha\epsilon\nu \). In both verbs, the use of voice is unusual: \( \pi\phi\alpha\upsilon\sigma\kappa\omega \) apparently shows no difference in meaning between its active and medio-passive forms, with both voices being found for meanings (2), (5) and (7); and the stative active \( \phi\alpha\epsilon\iota\nu\omega \) has its inchoative in the medio-passive.

3.3. Inchoative medio-passives

3.3.1. \( \epsilon\pi\alpha\upsilon\rho\iota\sigma\kappa\omega\alpha \)

For \( \epsilon\pi\alpha\upsilon\rho\iota\sigma\kappa\omega\alpha \), Cunliffe (1924 s.v. \( \tau\epsilon\pi\alpha\upsilon\rho\iota\sigma\kappa\omega \)) gives two main meanings. Firstly there is 'touch or graze', which is found absolutely, with the accusative and with the genitive. This meaning accounts for all but one of the six Iliadic occurrences of the aorist active \( \epsilon\pi\alpha\omega\rho\omicron \) (the only active tense form of this verb found in Homer) and no other forms. Three times it is used with \( \chi\rho\alpha\alpha \) 'skin' as object: hence, for example, \( \mu\nu \ \tau\iota\varsigma \ \chi\rho\alpha\alpha \ \chi\alpha\lambda\kappa\omega \ \epsilon\pi\alpha\omega\rho\omicron \) 'in case someone should graze his [Pylaemenes'] skin with bronze' (II. 13.649). With the genitive we have, before the chariot race, the phrase \( \lambda\iota\theta\omicron\upsilon \ \delta' \ \alpha\lambda\epsilon\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota \ \epsilon\pi\alpha\omega\rho\epsilon\iota \) 'avoid touching the stone' (II. 23.340). The absolute use is found when Diomedes is hit by an arrow from Paris and says to him: \( \kappa\alpha\iota \ \epsilon' \ \kappa' \ \delta\lambda\iota\gamma\omicron\nu \ \pi\epsilon\rho \ \epsilon\pi\alpha\omega\rho\omicron, \ / \ \delta\xi\upsilon \ \beta\epsilon\lambda\omicron \ \pi\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\tau\omicron \) 'even if it [only] touches slightly, the spear is sharp' (II. 11.391-2).

The remaining instances of parts of this verb come under (2), given by Cunliffe initially as 'with notion of deriving from contact'; then, with various examples, different, more exact meanings are listed. One would expect all such forms to be in the medio-passive - a benefactive 'touch for one's own gain' - but there are

\(^{99}\)Cf. also II. 11.573=15.316.
still two more examples of the active aorist επαύρουν, in the form ἔπαυρέμεν (one in each epic), to be found under this heading. It means ‘have benefit or profit from’. Hence Hector, disagreeing with Polydamas, says:

Τρώων δ’ ὡς κτεάτεσσιν ὑπερφιάλως ἀναζει,  
συλλέξας λαοῖσι δότω καταδημοβορήσαι,  
tῶν τινὰ βέλτερον ἔστιν ἐπαυρέμεν ἢ περ Ἀχαιοὺς. (II. 18.300-2)

And let whoever of the Trojans feels excessively worried about his possessions gather them together and give them to the people to consume in common; it is better for someone of them to benefit [from them] than for the Achaeans to!

Secondly, when Peiraeus asks Telemachus for women so that he can send on Menelaus’ gifts, the latter replies that he may be killed by the suitors before he receives them:

αὐτὸν ἔχοντά σε βούλομ’ ἐπαυρέμεν, ἣ τινα τῶνδε. (Od. 17.81)

I would wish you yourself to benefit [from them] rather than one of these men.

LSJ (s.v. ἐπαυρέω 1) gloss both these two instances of ἐπαυρέμεν as ‘share’, and indeed this meaning is possible here — although it seems to fit with the former instance better than with the latter.

The present ἐπαυρίσκομαι shows the same meaning as ἐπαυρέμεν in its one occurrence in Homer, when Polydamas, advising Hector, says that one cannot be good at everything:

ἄλλω μὲν γὰρ δῶκε θεὸς πολεμία ἔργα,
For to one man does the god give the deeds of war, to another the dance, to another the lyre and song, and to another does far-sounding Zeus place understanding in his breast, which many men benefit from, and he saves many men, and also he realises it especially himself.

The concept of ‘benefit from’ may also be rendered as ‘become better off’ or, in worse English, ‘become profited, become benefited’. We thus seem to be dealing with an inchoative present here as well.

The one occurrence of the future ἐπαυρήσωμαι is better translated in context as ‘will reap the fruits of’, as Cunliffe has it; it is found when Helen says to Hector:

But this man’s [Paris’] understanding is not stable now, and it will not be thus in future either; and so I think that he will reap the fruit [of this].

The aorist middle ἐπαυρόμην is found twice in the Iliad: firstly when Achilles, in his message to Zeus via Thetis, asks for the Greeks to be caught and killed beside their ships, ἵνα πάντες ἐπαυρώνται βασιλῆς ‘so that all [the Greeks] may benefit from their king [Agamemnon]’ (II. 1.410). Secondly, Zeus says to Hera:

οὐ μὰν οἶδ᾽ εἰ αὗτε κακορραφίης ἀλεγεινῆς

100 For the meaning of ἐφύσσεια see Chantraine 1968-80 s.v.
Indeed I do not know if, in the future, you are to be the first to reap the fruits of your pain-causing contriving of evil, and I shall lash you with blows.

There is a possible third instance in Homer, depending on our reading of the text; Cunliffe glosses it as ‘bring on oneself, incur’, and it thus means ‘reap the fruit of’. Odysseus, after defeating Irus, says to him:

\[\text{ενταυθαί νῦν ἧσο σύας τε κύνας τ’ ἀπερύκων, μηδὲ σὺ γε ξείνων καὶ πτυχῶν κοίρανος εἶναι λυγρὸς ἔων, μὴ ποῦ τι κακὸν καὶ μεῖζον ἐπαύρη. } (\text{Od. 18.105-7})\]

Now sit there and, scaring pigs and dogs away, do not be lord of strangers and beggars, being pitiful, in case you by chance reap something bad and greater.

Following the texts of Allen (1917-19) and van Thiel (1991), and also on semantic grounds, it seems preferable to read benefactive medio-passive ἐπαύρη than active ἐπαύρης; nor does the contraction in the final syllable present a problem. On the other hand, the accusative object in this case is unusual.

For this verb we thus have active aorist ἐπαυρεῖν, ἐπαύρη ‘touch, graze’ beside medio-passive present ἐπαυρισκομαι ‘benefit from, reap the fruit of’, the latter with future ἐπαυρῆσομαι, and aorist middle ἐπαυρόμην, but oddly with active infinitive ἐπαυρέμεν. There are two ways of interpreting these data. One is the traditional view: the active forms usually mean ‘touch, graze’, the medio-passive (and the two remaining active) ones being their benefactive ‘touch for one’s own profit / loss’. The alternative is that ἐπαυρισκομαι and the other medio-passive forms represent an inchoative ‘get affected by (for good or ill), get better off, become
profited’. This, however, leaves the problem of the two cases of ἐπαυρέμευν — as well as the use of this form in later Greek, where it seems to mean ‘share in’. Here we would have to understand that the older meaning of the active of this verb moved from causative ‘affect’ via ‘touch, graze’ to the Classical meaning ‘share’, perhaps with medio-passive forms reinterpreted as benefactive; and that this phenomenon began with the aorist infinitive in Homer.102

3.4. Inchoative actives

3.4.1. ἀλθῆσκω

'Ἀλθῆσκω ‘grow, increase’ is found once, in a simile concerning Menelaus:

τοῖο δὲ θυμὸς

ιάνθη ὡς εἰ τε περὶ σταχὐσσιν κέρση

ληστὸν ἀλθῆσκοντος, ὅτε φισσοῦσιν ἀρουραί (Il. 23.597-9)

And his heart was gladdened like dew on the ears of corn as it grows, when the fields are bristling.

Richardson (Kirk et al. 1985-93: VI.234) has ἀλθῆσκοντος here rather as ‘ripening’, since ‘the early morning dew on the corn is warmed and evaporated by the increasing force of the sun’; the form is, in any case, inchoative. This present apparently does not recur until Theocritus, where it is a causative:

μυρίαν ἀπειροῖ τε καὶ ἑθνεὰ μυρία φωτῶν

101 Of the active examples cited by LSJ which show the meaning ‘partake, share’, only the earliest (πλεῖον δὲ τε νυκτὸς ἐπαύρει [Sirius] enjoys a greater share of the night’, Hesiod Op. 419) is open to reinterpretation as ‘affect’.

102 In this case, a comparable verb would be δινήμη: in the active this verb means ‘to be of service to, confer benefit upon, benefit, profit, help’, and in the medio-passive ‘get good, benefit, profit, help or enjoyment from something, be the better for it’; cf. Cunliffe 1924 s.v.
Countless are the lands and countless the nations that make the crops grow under aid of the rain of Zeus.

In Homer, a related causative form ἠλدافع ‘cause to wax or fill out’, of uncertain tense, is found in one passage, which occurs twice:

αὐτῷρ Ἀθήνη
ἀγχι παριστημένη μέλε’ ἠلمαυνε ποιμένι λαών.

(Od. 18.69-70=24.367-8)

But Athene, standing nearby, made the limbs of the shepherd of the people [i.e., Odysseus] greater.

With the same base ἄλ- we also find two related verbal forms in ἄλθ-:
firstly, aorist ἄλθετο, listed under ἄλθομαι ‘become whole or sound’ by Cunliffe (1924 s.v.):

ἡ ἄσα, καὶ ἀμφοτέρησιν ἅπ’ ἵχω χείρος ὁμόργινν:
ἀλθετο χειρ, ὅδυνα δε κατηπιώντο βαρεῖαι. (II. 5.416-7)

She [Dione] spoke, and with both [her hands] wiped the ichor from her [Aphrodite’s] hand; the hand became healed, and the dire pain was assuaged.

Secondly, there is the future ἀπαλθῇσεσθον ‘will be healed or cured’. Zeus sees Hera and Athene leaving for the war, and says that he will throw a thunderbolt at their chariot.
οὐδὲ κεν ἐς δεκάτους περιτελλομένους ἐνιαυτοῦς
ἔλκε' ἀπαλθήσεσθοι, καὶ κεν μάρπτησι κεραυνός·
(I. 8.404-5=418-9)

and not for ten circling years will they become healed of the wounds which the
thunderbolt will make by seizing them.

These forms therefore present an unusual system: the present in -σκω is
inchoative ἀλδήσκω 'grow, become bigger', and beside it there is a causative form
ηλδανε 'caused to grow, made bigger'. Related non-present forms, in ἀλθ-, show a
slightly different sense, both inchoative: these are aorist ἀλθομην 'became whole,
became healed' and future -αλθησομαι 'will become whole, healed'.

3.4.2. γηράσκω

The simple present γηράσκω 'grow old' is found three times in the Iliad and
three in the Odyssey. Hence:

Τληπόλεμος δ' ἐπεί οὖν τράφ' ἐνι μεγάρῳ εὐπήκτῳ,
αὐτίκα πατρός κόσμο φίλον μήτρωα κατέκτα
ἡδη γηράσκοντα Λικύμνιον, δεξον ἂν Ἀρης· (II. 2.661-3)
And therefore when Tlepolemus had grown up in the well-built palace, he
straightaway killed his own father's dear uncle, Licymnius, companion of
Ares, then growing old.

We also find the participle when Achilles says to Priam about his father, who is so far
away: οὐδὲ νῦν τόν γε / γηράσκοντα κομίζω 'and I cannot take care of him as
he grows old' (II. 24.540-1). The imperfect occurs when Apollo goes to Aeneas in the
form of Periphas,
κήρυκι Ἰησοῦ Ιωάννου, δος οἱ παρὰ πατρὶ γέροντι
κηρύσσων γῆρασκε, φίλα φρεσίν μηδεα εἰδὼς. (II. 17.324-5)
a herald, the son of Epytos, who had been growing old while being a herald in
the house of his old father, knowing kindly counsels [i.e., being of kindly
mind] towards him.

In the Odyssey, we find Menelaus saying:

 órg νῦν Νέστορι δόκε διαμπερές ἡματα πάντα
αὐτόν μὲν λυπαρῶς γηρασκέμεν ἐν μεγάροισιν (Od. 4.209-10)
... since he [Zeus] granted to Nestor continuously throughout all his days
gently to become old in his halls.

Eumaeus says that, on the island of Syria, there is no famine or illness;

ἀλλ’ ὅτε γηράσκωσι πόλιν κατὰ φύλ’ ἀνθρώπων,
ἐλθὼν ἀργυρότοξος Ἅπολλων Ἀρτέμιδι ξῦν
ὅς ἁγανοὶς βελέσσιν ἐποιχόμενος κατέπεφυεν. (Od. 15.409-11)
... but when the tribes of men grow old throughout the city, Apollo of the
silver bow, coming with Artemis, attacking them with shafts that bring a
painless death, kills them.

In one instance, when Odysseus is at Alcinous’ palace, Cunliffe (1924 s.v.) has
γηράσκω mean ‘mellow’ of fruit, as indeed seems to be the case:

tάων οὐ ποτὲ καρπὸς ἀπόλλυται οὐδ’ ἀπολείπει
χεῖματος οὐδὲ θέρευς, ἐπετήσιος: ἀλλὰ μάλ’ οἰεί
The fruit of these [trees] never perishes nor fails in winter or summer, lasting throughout the year; but indeed the west wind, always blowing, makes some fruits grow, and others ripen. Pear upon pear mellows [becomes ripe], apple upon apple, cluster of grape upon cluster, fig upon fig.

We thus have an inchoative present meaning ‘become old, enter the state of old age’. The aorist *ἐγέρσα* is found three times in the *Iliad* and once in the *Odyssey*, and also has inchoative meaning. After Nestor has recounted how Lycurgus acquired Areithous’ armour, he proceeds to say:

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ Λυκόσφοιος ἐνὶ μεγάροις ἐγέρα,
δῶκε δ’ Ἑρευθαλίωιν φίλῳ θεράποντι φορῆναι. (*II. 7.148-9*)

But when Lycurgus had grown old in his halls, he gave it to his dear squire Ereuthalion to wear.

The other two instances in the *Iliad* occur in the same line. When Hector changes his own armour for that which used to belong to Achilles, Homer says:

ἵτινοι ὁ μὲν τὰ & δῶκε φέρειν προτὶ Ἡλιον ἵρην
Τρωσὶ φιλοπτολέμοισιν, ὃ δ’ ἀμβροτα τεῦχεα δῦνε
Πηλείδεω Ἀχιλῆος, & ὃ θεὶ Οὐρανίωνες
πατρὶ φίλῳ ἐποροῦν ὃ δ’ ἄρα ὃ παιδὶ ὀπασσε
γηράς: ἀλλ’ σὺχ ύιός ἐν ἐντεσὶ πατρὸς ἐγήρα. (*II. 17.193-7*)
He, indeed, gave his own to the warlike Trojans to carry to sacred Ilium, and put on the immortal armour of Achilles, the son of Peleus, which the heavenly gods had given to his father; and he, having grown old, had presented it to his son; but the son did not become old in his father’s armour.

The Odyssean example of this aorist occurs when Eumaeus says about – and unknowingly to – Odysseus:

τῷ κε μὲ πόλλ’ ἀναζεν ἀνοξ, ε’ι αὐτόθι γήρα·
ἀλλ’ ὀλεθ’– (Od. 14.67-8)
Therefore my master would have rewarded me well, if he had grown old here; but he perished.

The compound καταγηράσκω is given two meanings by Cunliffe, although in fact it does not differ semantically from the simple form. For the one instance of the present, we have (2) ‘show signs of age, age’, which occurs when Penelope compares the stranger who she does not know to be Odysseus with Odysseus himself:

αἰγα γὰρ ἐν κακότητι βροτοί καταγηράσκουσιν. (Od. 19.360)
For quickly do mortals grow old in bad fortune.

Cunliffe’s gloss gives a slightly different emphasis to the sentence; but in fact there is no reason not to read inchoative ‘grow old’ here, as we shall also see when we encounter this verb again in Plato (Chapter 8 § 2.3.2). Secondly, there is aorist καταγηρᾶ, classed as (1) ‘pass one’s days and reach old age’. This is found when the Cyclops Polyphemus, on discovering Odysseus’ identity, recounts a prophecy of his blinding given by one Telemus,
... who excelled in the art of prophecy, and grew old prophesying among the Cyclopes.

The meaning is as for ἑγήρα: for to have passed one’s days and reached old age is the same as to have (inchoatively) grown old.

Homer therefore in this case presents us with an active inchoative verb:

(κατα-)γηράσκω ‘become old’, with inchoative aorist (κατ-)ἐγηρά.

3.4.3. γιγνώσκω

Γιγνώσκω has six meanings in Cunliffe’s lexicon (1924 s.v.): (1) ‘perceive, mark, remark, note, find, see, know’; (2) ‘gain knowledge of, get to know, learn’; (3)(a) ‘have knowledge of, know’, (b) in the aorist, ‘know’; (4) ‘distinguish, discern’; (5) ‘know (a person or thing) for what he or it is, know the nature of, know’ (6) ‘know again, recognise, know’. Yet these glosses do not show that we are dealing with momentaneous ‘perceive’ rather than stative ‘know’ for this present.

In the Iliad, the present γιγνώσκω is found nineteen times, and twice in the imperfect; in the Odyssey it occurs nine times, and four in the imperfect. Of these, nine instances in each epic show the meaning (1) ‘perceive, mark, remark, note, find, see, know’ as when, after Bellerophon has performed many deeds for him, the King of Lycia comes to a realisation:

\[\delta \varepsilon \mu \alpha \nu \tau \sigma \sigma \nu \nu \eta \varepsilon \kappa \varepsilon \kappa \alpha \sigma \tau \eta \]
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But when he [the King of Lycia] perceived that he [Bellerophon] was the noble child of a god...

There are three and one instances respectively of (3)(a) 'have knowledge of, know'; although this gloss implies stative use, we may in fact always read the momentaneous 'perceive' – as when Diomedes chases after Aphrodite:

\[\text{o \ de \ Kύπριν \ ἐπώχετο \ νηλέι \ χαλκῷ,} \]

\[\gammaιγνώσκων \ δ’ \ αὐτής \ ἐν \ θεός, \ ... \ (II. \ 5.330-1)\]

and he had gone after Cypris with his pitiless bronze, perceiving that she was a cowardly goddess...

Once we find (4) 'distinguish, discern', when Athene says to Diomedes:

\[\text{ἀχλών \ δ’ \ αὖ \ τοι \ ἀπ’ \ ὀφθαλμῶν \ ἔλον, \ ἢ \ πρὶν \ ἐπῆν,} \]

\[\text{δοφ’ \ εὖ \ γιγνώσκης \ ἡμέν \ θεόν \ ἥδε \ καὶ \ ἀνδρα. \ (II. \ 5.127-8) \]

And I have taken the mist from your eyes, which was there previously, so that you can distinguish well both god and man.

The meaning (5) 'know (a person or thing) for what he or it is, know the nature of, know' is deemed to occur for the present once in each epic; but here too we are simply dealing with 'perceive'. So, when Odysseus tells Eumaeus that he came from Crete, saying that once he had a wife, property and...

\[\text{νῦν \ δ’} \ \text{ἡδη \ πάντα \ λέοιπεν-} \]

\[\text{ἀλλ’ \ ἔμπης \ καλάμην \ γέ} \ \text{σ’ \ δίομαι \ εἰσορόωντα} \]

\[\text{105Cf. also \ II. \ 5.433, 13.223, Od. \ 21.209.} \]
Now all these things have left; but even so I think that you, in seeing the straw after its reaping, may judge (perceive) [it]; for indeed very much misery holds me.

Thus too, apparently, when the dying Hector prophesies to Achilles, who has denied his request not to be left out to be eaten by dogs:

\[
\text{\(\text{\textit{\textgreek{x}}\text{\textgreek{n}}\text{\textgreek{w}sk} \text{\textit{\textgreek{n}}} \text{\textit{\textgreek{p}rwti\textgreek{w}skomai, ou\text{\textgreek{d}}\text{\textgreek{e}} \text{\textit{\textgreek{e}}} \text{\textit{\textgreek{m}el{\textit{\textgreek{l}}}}\text{\texti{\textgreek{n}}}}\text{\textit{\textgreek{p}e}\text{i}\text{\textgreek{s}e}i\text{\textit{n}}. (II. 22.356-7)\)}\)

Truly, perceiving you well, I saw my fate in advance, and I was not destined to persuade you.

Lastly, there is (6) ‘know again, recognise, know’, which is found for the present tense seven times in the \textit{Iliad} and twice in the \textit{Odyssey}. Hence, for example, Diomedes begins a speech to Athene:106

\[
\text{\(\text{\textit{\textgreek{y}n\text{\textgreek{w}sk}w \text{\textit{\textgreek{s}e}}, \text{\textgreek{t}e}\text{\textgreek{a}}, \text{\textgreek{t}h\textgreek{y}n} \text{\textit{\textgreek{a}t\textgreek{e}}} \text{\textit{\textgreek{D}i\text{\textgreek{o}}} \text{\textit{\textgreek{t}i\textgreek{g}i\textgreek{o}i}}. (II. 5.815)\)}\)

I recognise you, goddess, daughter of aegis-bearing Zeus.

Giannakis (1997: 234-5) claims ‘perfective’ meaning for 27 instances of \textit{\textgreek{y}n\text{\textgreek{w}sk}w}, with three further cases having added ‘intensive’ meaning (probably due to \textit{\textgreek{e}}\text{\textgreek{u}}) at \textit{II}. 14.475, 22.356 and 23.470 (for \textit{\textgreek{d}i\textgreek{a}y\textgreek{y}n\text{\textgreek{w}sk}w}). Four instances he finds problematic. At \textit{II}. 13.223 and \textit{Od}. 14.215 he ascribes the difficulty to uncertainty on the part of the speaker, who uses \textit{\textgreek{o}t\textgreek{o}m\textgreek{i}t ‘I think’. At \textit{Od}. 3.166 and the similar 12.295, the meaning may in fact be inchoative: the former passage is \textit{\textgreek{f}e\textgreek{\textgreek{y}n}o\text{\textgreek{v}}, \text{\textit{\textgreek{e}}}\text{\textgreek{p}e}\text{i}}
γιγνωσκον, ὃ δὴ κακὰ μὴδετο δαιμον 'I fled, when I realised that the god was devising evils'. The total of instances of the stem -γιγνωσκ- is however 36, not 34; and the two instances he omits fit his meaning also (imperfect at Od. 8.299 and διαγιγνώσκω at II. 23.240).

Out of Cunliffe’s glosses, this leaves one full meaning and one sub-meaning unaccounted for; both only occur for the aorist. One is inchoative (2) ‘gain knowledge of, get to know, learn’ (four times in the Iliad, seven in the Odyssey). Sometimes this merely seems to represent further cases of ‘perceive’, or ‘notice’, however: hence Hermes says to Priam, wondering how he will get him out of the Greek camp:

καὶ νῦν μὲν φίλου υἱόν ἐλύσαο, πολλὰ δὲ ἐδωκας·
σείο δὲ κε ζωοῦ καὶ τρὶς τόσα δολεν ἄποινα
παῖδες τοί μετόπισθε λελειμένοι, οἶ κ’ Ἀγαμέμνων
γνώη σ’ Ἀτρείδης, γνώσει δὲ πάντες Ἀχαῖοι. (II. 24.685-8)
And now indeed you have ransomed your dear son, and you gave much [for him]. But your sons, those left behind by you, would [have to] give three times as great a ransom for your life, if Agamemnon, Atreus’ son, perceives / notices you, or [if] all the Achaeans perceive / notice you.

And, as they do leave, Hermes drives quickly (ῥήμφα), οὐδὲ τις ἡγνω 'and nobody perceived / noticed (them)' (II. 24.691).

On the other hand, there is more of an inchoative meaning when Odysseus says to Telemachus:

ἀλλ’ οἶοι σὺ τ’ ἐγὼ τε γυναικῶν γνώσομεν ἵθον. (Od. 16.304)
but by ourselves you and I will learn (come to know) the disposition of the women.

One may similarly compare when it is said of Iphitus and Odysseus: \( \text{συδὲ τραπέζη / γυνώτων ἀλλήλων} \) 'but they did not get to know one another at the table' \((\text{Od. 21.36})\).\(^{107}\)

The other meaning not found for the present is (3)(b) 'know' (once in each epic), where the aorist apparently acts as a stative. This first instance occurs when Zeus says to Poseidon:

\[ \text{ἐγνως, ἐνυσίγαε, ἐμὴν ἐν στήθεσι βουλὴν, ... (II. 20.20)} \]

You know, earth-shaker, the intention in my breast...

Secondly, it is found when the disguised Odysseus asks Eumaeus about himself:

\[ \text{εἰπὲ μοι, αἷ χὲ ποθὶ γνῶ ὁιοῦτον ἐὸντα. (Od. 14.118)} \]

Tell me, in case perhaps I know him, a man like that.

This use of \( \text{ἐγνως} \) seems odd, although the phenomenon of aorist for present does occur in Homer;\(^{108}\) but then, the present \( \text{γνῶσκω} \) does not have stative meaning, and we rather expect perfect forms here.

The remaining instances of the root aorist \( \text{ἐγνως} \) (41 times in the \textit{Iliad}, 41 in the \textit{Odyssey}), and all those of the future \( \text{γνῶσμαι} \) (seven times in the \textit{Iliad}, twice in the \textit{Odyssey}) show the same range of meanings as the present, except that the future is never listed as showing meaning (3)(a) 'have knowledge of, know, [perceive]'. So,

---

\(^{107}\) For this meaning cf. also \textit{II. 22.382}, \textit{Od. 1.3}, 411, 15.537=17.164=19.310.

\(^{108}\) For this use of the aorist, cf. \textit{Chantraine 1986-8: II.184}.
for example, with (4) ‘distinguish, discern’, we find Achilles telling Ajax and Idomeneus to wait for the horses,

\[
tōte\, dē\, γυνώσεσθε\, έκαστος\,
\]

\[\text{ίππους\, 'Αργείων, οἱ\, δεύτεροι\, οἱ\, τε\, πάροιθεν. (ΙΙ. 23.497-8)}\]
And then you will each discern the horses of the Argives, which are behind and which in front.

In summary, it seems that Homer usually uses the present γινώσκω with telic meaning ('perceive; recognise'); although one could argue that stative meaning is used in occasional instances, I can find no instance where it is certain. For example, the imperfect seems to mean ‘perceived’ in the following example, when Ares and Aphrodite go to bed:

\[
άμφι\, dē\, δεσμοί
\]

\[\text{τεχνήμεντες\, έχοντο\, πολύφρονος\, 'Ηφαίστοιο,}\]
\[\text{οὐδὲ\, τι\, κίνησαι\, μελέων\, ἦν\, οὐδ'\, άναείραι.}\]
\[καὶ\, tōte\, dē\, γίγνωσκον,\, ὃ\, τ'\, οὐκέτι\, φυκτά\, πέλοντο. (Οδ. 8.296-9)}\]
And the skilfully fashioned bonds of ingenious Hephaestus spread around [over] them, and they could not in any way move or raise any of their limbs. And then at length they perceived that there was no longer any means of escape.

On the other hand, in the following passage, interpretation is more open. Here, Polydamas has killed Prothoënor; Ajax tries to kill him, but accidentally slays Archelochus, and calls out to Polydamas that it was a fair exchange.

242
'Consider, Polydamas, and tell me truly, was this man not worthy to be slain in requital for Prothoenor? He did not seem to me to be of mean birth, nor from mean ancestors, but a brother of horse-taming Antenor, or a son; for he is very closely like him in family.'

He spoke [thus], perceiving well, and sorrow seized the Trojans in their hearts.

Here Janko (Kirk et al. 1985-93: IV. 219) says that Ajax "'knew full well'"; giving the verb stative meaning; but, given the use of γινώσκω in Homer, it seems more likely that we should rather translate the above with 'perceiving well'.

The momentaneous nature of this verb is even clearer in the compound forms. So, for example, Helen says: ἐγὼ δὲ μιν οἵ ἀνέγνων τοῖν εὖντα 'I alone recognised him as being such [i.e., in this disguise]' (Od. 4.250). An interesting contrast between this verb and the stative οἶδα is shown by the following example, when Telemachus says:

"My mother says that I am his [Odysseus'] [child], but I do not know this; for never yet did any man [come to] know his parentage of his own knowledge."
In this case, therefore, we have γινώσκω 'perceive', future γνώσομαι 'will perceive' and aorist ἔγνω 'perceived' but also twice stative 'know'. It can be argued that, as 'perceive' is close to 'come to know', we have an inchoative verb here; unlike in many other cases, however, there is no stative perfect for this verb in the Homeric period, the aorist ἔγνω occasionally being used with this meaning.

3.4.4. θησκω

The present θησκω has four main meanings in Cunliffe (1924 s.v.). Firstly, it is simply 'die'; this is listed as occurring for all but one of the seven instances of the present, all three of the future and eighteen of the 71 occasions that the aorist appears. For example, we find participle θησκων after a verb of seeing in:111

κήδετο γὰρ Δαναῶν, δὴ μα θησκοντας ὑάτο. (II. 1.56)

For she [Hera] felt troubled for the Danaans, because she saw them dying.

Another example of the participle occurs, for example, when Homer details how Agamemnon's sceptre, made by Hephaestus, reached the Greek leader, at one point saying:112

Ατρεὺς δὲ θησκων ἐλιπεν πολύαριν Θυέστη, ... (II. 2.106)

... and Atreus, on dying, left it to Thyestes rich in sheep...

The indicative occurs when Circe says to Odysseus and his men, just back from the Underworld:

111 Cf. similarly Od. 8.526.
112 Cf. also II. 24.743.
σχέτλιοι, οἱ ζώοντες ὑπῆλθετε δῶμ' Ἀϊδαο,
δισθανέες, ὅτε τ' ἄλλοι ἀπαξ θυνήσκουσ' ἄνθρωποι. (Od. 12.21-2)

Foolhardy men, who have gone down alive to the house of Hades – twice
dead, when other men die once!

This is the only time the present θυνήσκω, simple or compounded, is found in non-
participial form in Homer. There is, however, also the imperfect, used when Achilles
is recounting events to Thetis, concerning the Greeks’ problems:

τοῖο δ' Ἀπόλλων
εὐξαμένου ἥκουσεν, ἔπει μάλα οἱ φίλος ἦν,
ἡκε δ' ἔπ' Ἀργείοις κακὸν βέλος· οἱ δὲ νῦ λαοὶ
θυνήσκον ἐπασσύνεροι, τὰ δ' ἐπώχετο κήλα θεοῖο
πάντη ἀνὰ στρατὸν εὐρὴν Ἀχαιῶν' (Il. 1.380-4)

... and Apollo heard him [Chryses] praying, since he was very dear to him, and
he sent a baneful shaft against the Argives; and the men were dying (began to
die) one after another, and the god's missiles ranged on every side throughout
the wide camp of the Achaeans.

The future θανέομαι 'will die' is only ever found in the expression
dioμενος θανέεσθαι 'thinking he would die'. Hence, Zeus says to Hera:113

καὶ νῦν ἐξεσάωσεν διομένου θανέεσθαι. (Il. 4.12)

And just now she [Aphrodite] saved him [Menelaus], when he thought he
would die.

113The other two instances are at Il. 15.728 and Od. 20.21.
For the aorist ἔθανον with this meaning, we have, for example, Helenus saying to Hector:

 오히려 πώ τοι μοῖρα θανεῖν καὶ πότμον ἐπιπείν (II. 7.52)
For it is not yet your fate to die and meet your doom.

Meaning (2) is simply the use of the first meaning 'in a quasi-passive sense of being slain in battle', found once in the present and twice in the aorist. So Achilles says to Agamemnon:

ἡ ποτ' Ἀχιλλῆς ποθῆ ἰξεταί υἱας Ἀχαίων
σύμπανται· τότε δ' οὐ τι δυνήσεαι ἀχνύμενός περ
χραίσμειν, εὖτ' ἀν πολλοὶ ψφ' 'Εκτορός ἀνδροφόνοιο
θυήσκοντες πίπτωσι. (II. 1.240-3)
Indeed, a longing for Achilles shall come upon all the sons of the Achaeans together; and then you will in no way be able to protect [them] even though you will be grieved, when many fall dying at the hands of man-slaying Hector.

So too Thoas says of Hector:

ἡ θην μιν μάλα ἐλπετο θυμός ἑκάστου
χερσίν ὑπ' Αἰαντος θανείν Τελαμωνιάδαο. (II. 15.288-9)
Indeed each man’s heart very much hoped that he had died at the hands of Ajax, the son of Telamon.

Listed last for this meaning is the occasion when we find Priam saying of Hector, ὡς δῆθεν θανείν ἐν χερσίν ἐμήσι 'would he had died in my arms' (II. 22.426).
seems odd that this instance is classed here; in the other two, it is clear that we have ‘die at the hands of’, which is equivalent to ‘be killed by’.

The third heading is given as ‘in aor. indic.’, and accounts for all remaining 51 instances of ἔθανον. It is divided into two parts. Firstly, there is (a) ‘in strict aor. sense’, found nine times, all in the *Odyssey* and always in the indicative; here Cunliffe means the momentaneous ‘did die’, as when Telemachus says to Nestor:

\[\pi\omega \varepsilon \tau\alpha\nu \nu \; \text{Ατρείδης εὐρυκρέιτων 'Αγαμέμνων;} \; (Od. 3.248)\]

How did wide-ruling Agamemnon, the son of Atreus, die?

The difference between the two different meanings given so far for the aorist therefore seems minimal.

Thus far, we have had θυησκω ‘die, become dead’ and ἔθανον ‘died, became dead’ – clearly an inchoative verb, where the new state entered is that of death. In its remaining 42 occurrences (25 in the *Iliad* and seventeen in the *Odyssey*), however, ἔθανον is used rather differently; Cunliffe’s heading is (3)(b) ‘have died, be dead’. So, we learn that the Aetolians were led by Thoas, the son of Andraemon:

\[\sigma\nu \gamma\alpha \rho \xi\epsilon\tau \; \text{Οινής μεγαλήτορος \ψιε\epsilonς \τίσιν,} \]
\[\sigma\nu\delta \alpha\rho \xi\epsilon\tau \; \text{αὐτός \τήν, \θάνε \ δὲ \ξανθός \Μελέαγρος.} \; (II. 2.641-2)\]

For the sons of great-hearted Oeneus were no more, nor did he still live, and fair-haired Meleager was dead.

Here we may also read ‘had died’, an expected use for the aorist; but in many other cases there is no ambiguity. Nearly all instances of this use of ἔθανον are participial – 21 and twelve of them in the respective epics. For example, Patroclus’ ghost begins his speech to Achilles as follows:
You are sleeping, and have forgotten me, Achilles. You were not unmindful
of me while [I was] alive, but now [you are] while [I am] dead!

On five occasions we find the plural of the participle used absolutely to mean ‘the
dead’, always in the expression ὃ (or τὸ) γὰρ γέρας ἐστὶ θανόντων ‘for this is
the honour of the dead’ (II. 16.457–675, 23.9, Od. 24.190, 296).

This use of the aorist is unexpectedly frequent for this form. We have already
seen ἔγνων acting as stative perfect (§ 3.4.3 above). Rather than the present stem
‘dying’, we here have the aorist denoting the perfect ‘being dead’.

This leaves the perfect τέθνηκα, of whose 58 occurrences Cunliffe places all
but two under (4)(a) ‘be dead’; it thus shows stative sense. Hence, before Achilles
knows of Patroclus’ death, it is said:

τὸ μιν οὐ ποτὲ ἐλπέτο θυμῶ
τεθνάμεν, ἀλλὰ ζωὸν ἐνιχριμφθέντα πύλησιν
ἀυ ἀπονοστήσειν, ... (II. 17.404–6)

And so he [Achilles] never thought in his mind that he [Patroclus] was dead,
but that he would come back alive after coming near to the gates...

The other two instances come under (4)(b) ‘in strict pf. sense’ – that is, where
τέθνηκα means ‘have died’. So a disguised Athene says to Telemachus:

οὐ γὰρ πω τέθνηκεν ἐπὶ χθονὶ δίος Ὀδυσσεύς (Od. 1.196)

For illustrious Odysseus has not yet died on the earth...
The same words are said by Agamemnon of Orestes at *Od.* 11.461. The supposed distinction between the two types of perfect is slight, since to have become dead is to be dead.

Compounds of θυήσκω show parallel meanings to the simple forms, except that compound parts of ἔθανον never mean stative ‘be dead’.\(^{114}\) We have here an inchoative active verb θυήσκω ‘die, become dead’, future θανῶμαι ‘will die’ and aorist ἔθανον ‘died, became dead’, with unexpected stative meaning also found for the latter. The perfect denotes the state ‘be dead’.

3.5. Summary: causatives and inchoatives

Verbs discussed in this class fall into several groups. In four cases we clearly have causative actives beside inchoative medio-passives (βόσκω ‘feed’ / βόσκομαι ‘get fed’; διδάσκω ‘teach, instruct’ / διδάσκομαι ‘learn’; μιμησκω ‘remind’ / μιμησκομαι ‘remember’; μίσγω ‘mix together’ / μίσγομαι ‘get mixed, mingle’). In one further instance, an inchoative medio-passive appears to be found beside a causative medio-passive (τιτύσκομαι ‘make ready; [get ready,] take aim’).

In all cases but βόσκω, there is a stative perfect found beside these forms. There are also apparently causatives in - σκω and - σκομαι (ἀπαφισκω, ἀπαφισκομαι ‘trick’; ἀφορίσκω ‘fit together’; ἔισκω and ἵσκω ‘make like, etc.’; ἱλάσκομαι ‘propitiate’; πιθαύνοσκω, πιθαύνοσκομαι ‘make manifest; declare’). We may have one inchoative in the medio-passive (ἐπιατρίσκομαι ‘get profited’), but others are in

\(^{114}\) The present participle ἀποθνησκω has the expected meaning ‘dying’ (*Od.* 11.424, 21.33), and the perfect participle means ‘having died, being dead’ (II. 22.432); this compound also shows the one instance of a pluperfect form, found when Odysseus says of Helios’ cattle θῶς δ’ ἀποτέθνασαν ἡσθ ‘the cattle had already died’ (*Od.* 12.393). The parts found of καταθνησκω ‘die’ and also aorist ἔθανον ‘died’ (*Od.* 18.100) similarly show meanings parallel to those of the simple forms.
the active, without causative alternants (ἄλλησκόω ‘grow, increase’; γηράσκω ‘grow old’; γιγνώσκω ‘perceive’; θυήσκω ‘die’).

In all these cases of apparently causative-inchoative -σκ-, however, non-present stems are also found with the same meaning as the present: for example, ἄπαφίσκω and ἰπαφον both mean ‘deceive’, and μίσγω and έμειξα both ‘mix, make mixed’; so too μίσγομαι is as inchoative as its morphologically passive aorists, and γηράσκω and ἐγήρα are both inchoative. It would therefore seem that, in these cases at least, Homeric -σκω / -σκομαι does not ‘make’ a verb causative or inchoative. In the case of the causative actives beside inchoative medio-passives, the contrast depends on a feature of voice; admittedly we find inchoative actives, but these pertain to a peculiarity of Greek voice, the unexpected set of intransitive actives, which will be discussed further in Chapter 8 §§ 2.3, 2.6-2.7.

4. Remaining forms

4.1. ἐφίσκω

Εφίσκω has four meanings according to Cunliffe (1924 s.v.): (1) ‘find, light or come upon’; (2) ‘find or come upon in a specified place or condition or doing something specified’; (3) ‘find out, discover, hit upon, devise, contrive, etc.’; and (4) ‘bring upon oneself, incur’. It is the second meaning that is by far the most frequent: since Cunliffe’s citations for meanings (1), (3) and (4) number respectively seventeen, eleven and two occasions, and parts of simple ἐφίσκω occur 81 times in Homer in all, this meaning must occur 51 times in the epics. These are all instances of the aorist ἐφισκων, since the other parts of ἐφίσκω are scarce and are all cited as occurring for the last two meanings alone. Hence, when Penelope is forced to finish her web, the only use of present ἐφίσκω in Homer means (3) ‘devise’:

νῦν δ’ οὐτ’ ἐκφυγέειν δύναι μοι γάμον οὗτε τιν’ ἄλλην
μὴτιν ἐθ’ εὐρίσκω (Od. 19.157-8)

And now neither can I escape marriage nor do I yet devise any other skillful device.

Three of the four instances of the aorist middle εὑρόμην also show this meaning, as when Odysseus says:115

αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ βούλευν ὡς δὲν ἀριστα γένοιτο,
ἐπὶ τῶν ἐπαιροσκιν θανάτου λύσιν ἡδ’ ἔμοι αὐτῷ
εὑρόμην. (Od. 9.420-2)

But I considered how all might be [for] the very best, if I might devise some way of escape from death for my comrades and for myself.

One can compare the use of aorist εὑρὸν with this same meaning (seven times), when Eidothea says to Odysseus:

ὡς δὴ δὴθ’ ἐνὶ νῆσῳ ἐρύκεαι, σοῦ δὲ τὸ τέκμωρ
εὑρέμεναι δύνασσι, μιν ὕθει δὲ τοῖ ἠτορ ἐταῖρων. (Od. 4.373-4)

You have been kept on this island for such a long time, and cannot devise an end [to it], and the spirit of your companions has become weak.

The difference between the active and middle seems slight, especially given the similar sentiment expressed by the active aorist here and the middle aorist at Od. 9.422 above.116

---

115Cf. also Il. 16.472, Od. 19.403.
116The active with this meaning is also listed as occurring at Il. 2.343, 7.31, 9.49, 9.250, Od. 4.466-7, 12.393.
occurs again on one last occasion, in one of the two instances of Cunliffe's fourth meaning 'bring upon oneself, incur'. Antinous says to Odysseus, on how the Centaur Eurytion's drunkenness was responsible for the feud between the Lapiths and the Centaurs:

εξ οὗ Κενταύρωσι καὶ ἄνδρας νεῖκος ἔτύχθη,
οἱ δ' αὐτῷ πρῶτω κακὸν εὕρετο σινοβαρεῖων. (Od. 21.303-4)

And from this the feud between Centaurs and men began, but he [Eurytion] brought evil on himself first, being heavy with wine.

The other instance of this meaning occurs for εὕρον, when Halitherses advises the Ithacans not to try to avenge the deaths of the suitors:

μὴ ἱομεν, μὴ ποῦ τις ἐπίσπαστον κακὸν εὕρη. (Od. 24.462)

Let us not go, in case someone incurs a bane which he has brought on himself.

The use of active εὕρον here, where the subject is obviously affected by the action, again implies that the difference between the two aorists is negligible.

Cunliffe's very frequent first two meanings for ἐφησκόω, all for cases of the thematic aorist εὕρον, are very similar: both basically mean 'find'. Hence, for example:

εὕρ' υἱὸν Πριάμου δαίφρονος, 'Εκτορα διον,
ἐσταότ' ἐν θ' ἱπποσι καὶ ἄρμασι κολλητοῖσιν' (ll. 11.197-8)

She [Iris] found illustrious Hector, son of valiant Priam, standing in his horse and jointed chariot.
The earliest non-present form in ἔφη- is an instance of ἔφησω in ἔφησω καὶ ἐπείτα βοῶν ἱθίμα κάρηνα / τούτοις οἴωνοις 'I shall find the strong cattle presently by these omens' (h.Merc. 302-3).

In summary, we have present ἔφησκω 'devise' and aorists ἐφοῦν 'found, devised, incurred', ἕφρομην 'devised, incurred'.

4.2. δειδισκομαι

Δειδισκομαι is given two meanings by Cunliffe. Firstly there is (1) 'pledge in drinking = δείκνυμι (5)', found once, after Odysseus has defeated Irus:

'Ἀντίνους δ' ἀρα οἱ μεγάλην παρὰ γαστέρα θῆκεν, ἐμπλείην κλήσις τε καὶ αἰματος; Ἀμφίνομος δὲ ἄρτους ἐκ κανέωτο δῦω παρέθηκεν ἄειρας καὶ δέπαι κρυσέω δειδισκετο φώνησέν τε; "χαίρε, πάτερ ὦ ξείνε- ..." (Od. 18.118-22)

And Antinous set in front of him the great stomach, filled with fat and blood; and Amphinomus took two wheat cakes from the basket and set them in front of him, and pledged him with a gold cup, and said: 'Hail, sir, stranger...'

The differently reduplicated δειδισκόμενος is said to mean the same. So Menelaus is described as:

οἴνον ἔχων ἐν χειρὶ μελίφρονα δεξιτερῆφι, ἐν δέπαι κρυσέω, δόρα λειψαντε κιοῖτην.

117The compound aorists ἐξεὑρόν 'find, discover' and ἐφεὑρόν 'find, light upon, etc.' show meanings parallel to those of the simple forms.
holding in his right hand honey-hearted wine in a gold cup, so that they might proceed [only] after having made libations. And he stood in front of the horses, and pledging them [Telemachus and Peisistratus] he said: ‘Farewell/hail, young men...’

Secondly, Cunliffe has (2) ‘welcome, greet’; Peisistratus takes Athene and Telemachus by the hand and sits them down,

and he gave them portions of the entrails, and poured wine in a gold cup; and, pledging / greeting her, he addressed Pallas Athene, the daughter of aegis-bearing Zeus: ...

From this example it is evident that there is some overlap between the two meanings: a gold cup has been involved in all three examples so far cited, and a speech always follows the passage quoted. No cup is however present for Cunliffe’s second example of the latter meaning, although a speech does occur after the following lines. Here, Philocteus, after asking Eumaeus who the stranger is, says:

“χαίρε, πάτερ ὃ ζείνε...” (Od. 20.197-9)
And, having come and stood by him [Odysseus], he greeted him with his right hand, and having spoken uttered winged words: ‘Hail, sir, stranger...’

The related present form δεικανόωντο is glossed once as (1) ‘pledge in drinking = δείκνυμι (5)’ (Cunliffe 1924 s.v. ἃδεικιανάμαι), when Hera says:

And she came to steep Olympus, and went to the immortal gods gathered together in the house of Zeus; and having seen her they all quickly got up and pledged / greeted her with cups of welcome.

On two further occasions the verb is given by Cunliffe as meaning (2) ‘welcome, greet’. Firstly, Odysseus leaves Irus outside,

and, going back to the threshold, he sat down; and they [the suitors] went inside, laughing merrily, and they greeted him with words: ...

Secondly, after Dolius has welcomed Odysseus home, his sons follow suit:

Secondly, after Dolius has welcomed Odysseus home, his sons follow suit:
And so in the same way the sons of Dolius, [gathered] around renowned Odysseus, greeted him with words and clasped [his hands] in their hands, and sat down in order beside Dolius, their father.

There are also certain forms listed by Cunliffe as part of the medio-passive of δεικνύωμι which show the same meaning (1924 s.v. ἡδεικνύωμι). With this sense we find present δεικνύμενος once in each epic, as well as δειδέχαται (once in the Odyssey) and δειδέκτο (once in the Iliad), δειδέχατο (three times in the Iliad).

Cunliffe splits the forms into two. Three Iliadic examples of the forms in δειδεκ- / δειδεχ- are cited as meaning (5) ‘pledge in drinking (app. from a custom of pointing to the person whose health was to be drunk)’:

... μετὰ δὲ σφισὶ πότνια Ἡβη
νέκταρ ἐφονοχέι τῷ δὲ χρυσέοις δεπάεσσι
δειδέχατ’ ἀλλήλους, Τρώων πόλιν εἰροφώντες. (II. 4.2-4)
... and among them [the gods] lady Hebe poured them nectar; and they pledged one another with golden cups, looking upon the city of the Trojans.

When Phoenix, Ajax and Odysseus have eaten with Achilles and Patroclus:

νεῦσ’ Ἀιας Φοίνικι· νόησε δὲ δίος Ὀδυσσεύς,
πλησάμενος δ’ οἰνοῖς δέπας δειδεκτ’ Ἀχιλῆα·
χαῖρ’, Ἀχιλεῖ...” (II. 9.223-5)
Ajax nodded to Phoenix; and illustrious Odysseus noticed, and having filled a cup with wine he pledged Achilles: ‘Hail, Achilles...’

---

118Cf. Chapter 3 § 5.1.
Later, when they return, Homer says:

τούς μὲν ἄρα χρυσέοις κυπέλλοις ὑπὲς Ἀχαίων
deidéxat' ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος ἀνασταθόν, ἐκ τ' ἐρέοντο·

priótos δ' ἐξερέεινεν ἀναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων' (II. 9.670-2)

the sons of the Achaean stood up, some from one side, others from another, and pledged them with gold cups, and questioned them; and Agamemnon, king of men, was the first to inquire: ...

Cunliffe's meaning for the remaining four forms is (6) 'welcome, greet'. So, when Ajax and Odysseus arrive at Achilles' hut:

τω καὶ δεικνύμενος προσέφη πόδας ὕκυς Ἀχιλλεύς·

"χαίρετον· ..." (II. 9.196-7)

And swift-footed Achilles, greeting them, addressed them. 'Hail, ...'

Secondly, when Hecabe speaks of Hector after his death:

d μοι νύκτας τε καὶ ἤμωρ
εἰχωλὴ κατὰ ἄστυ πελέσκεο, πάσι τ' ὄνειραρ
Τρωσι τε καὶ Τρώησι κατὰ πτόλιν, οἱ σε θεόν ώς
deidéxat' (II. 22.432-5)

You who were my boast night and day throughout the city, a benefit to all the Trojan men and women throughout the town, who greeted you as a god.

The third instance occurs when Telemachus and Peisistratus enter Menelaus' palace and are served with food:
and a carver lifted up and placed before them platters of all kinds of meats, and before them placed gold cups. And fair-haired Menelaus, greeting the two, addressed them: 'Take food, and rejoice/hail.'

Lastly, Athene says of Alcinous' wife Arete:

Thus she has been and is honoured, by her children and by Alcinous himself and by the people in their hearts, who, looking upon her as a goddess, greet her with words when she goes through the city.

As has been already discussed, the relationship between the various forms given in the above fourteen passages is obscure (Chapter 3 § 5.1). It is evident from examining them in context, however, that various elements are repeated in various passages, as was noticed by Forssman (1978: 8). These are cups (δέπαξ, κύπελλον, usually golden); words (μύθος, ἔπος); a verb of speaking (προσέφη, προσημόθα), a part of χαίρω 'hail, farewell' (χαίρε, χαίρετον) and lastly a situation in which wine is being drunk. It is thus clear that Cunliffe's division of forms is arbitrary.

---

119 Cf. further Forssman 1978: 8, with index to his list of passages (1978: 4-5).
As Russo (Heubeck et al 1988-92: III.54) notes, the idea expressed by these verbal forms does not translate well into English, since they ‘share an idea that extends from offering formal greeting with words to doing so with a cup of wine in hand (15.50), like our own ritual toasts, or simply with a hand gesture, as at 20.197’. The etymological problems are such, however, that the role of -σκ- in these forms remains obscure.

4.3. πάσχω

Πάσχω is given three meanings by Cunliffe (1924 s.v.), all very similar. It is only the first, ‘suffer, endure, undergo, have laid upon one, be called upon to bear’ that is very frequently found. Here we find cited all eight Iliadic instances of the present stem and all but one of the 31 cases found in the Odyssey. So the Trojan leaders, on seeing Helen, say:

οὗ νέμεσις Τρώας καὶ ἐυκνήμιδας Ἀχαιόν
τούτῳ ἄφις γυναικὶ πολὺν χρόνον ἀλγεὰ πάσχειν’ (II. 3.156-7)
Small blame [to them] that the Trojans and the well-greaved Achaeans suffer troubles for a long time on account of such a woman.

And thus Eurymachus says to Halitherses, after the latter has foretold Odysseus’ return:

ὡ γέρων, εἰ δ’ ἄγε δὴ μαντεύεο σοὶ σετεσσιν
οίκαδ’ ιὼν, μὴ πού τι κακὸν πάσχωσιν ὀπίσσω’ (Od. 2.178-9)
Come now, old man, go home and prophesy to your children, in case perhaps in time to come they suffer something ill.

120See further Russo in Heubeck et al 1988-92: III.54, with bibliography.
All instances of the future πεισομαι (once in the Iliad, three times in the Odyssey) also come under this heading, the form meaning ‘will suffer’.\textsuperscript{121}

πάντες δ’ Οὐλύμπιοι κατήλθομεν ἀντιώντες
tήσδε μάχης, ἵνα μή τι μετὰ Τρέσσεσι πάθησι
σήμερον ὦστερον αὖτε τά πείσεται ἄσσα οἱ Αἴσα
gιγνομένῳ ἐπέννησε λίνῳ, ὥστε μιν τέκε μήτηρ. \textit{(Il.} 20.125-8)\textit{)}

And we all came down from Olympus to take part in this battle, so that he [Achilles] may not suffer anything among the Trojans today; but in future he will suffer whatever fate spun for him with her thread as he was born, when his mother bore him.

The thematic aorist ἐπαθοῦν occurs for this meaning eighteen times in the Iliad and 28 in the Odyssey.\textsuperscript{122} So Phoenix says to Achilles:

ως ἐπὶ σοι μάλα πόλλ’ ἐπαθοῦν καὶ πόλλ’ ἐμόγησα \textit{(Il.} 9.492)\textit{)}

Thus it was for you that I suffered very many things and toiled much.

So too do all instances of the perfect πέπονθα (once in the Iliad, five times in the Odyssey). This form is usually used of the μάλα πολλά ‘very many things’ or κακά πολλά ‘many ills’ that Odysseus and those connected with him have suffered. Hence Circe says to Odysseus’ men.\textsuperscript{123}

\textit{νῦν δ’ ἀσκελέες καὶ ἀθυμοὶ,}

\textsuperscript{121}Cf. also \textit{Od.} 2.134, 7.197, 18.132.

\textsuperscript{122}This is because there are 28 and 36 occurrences in the respective epics, of which two in the Iliad and three in the Odyssey are accounted for by meaning (2), and eight and five by meaning (3).

\textsuperscript{123}Other examples of this perfect occur at \textit{Il.} 3.99, \textit{Od.} 13.6, 17.284, 555, 23.53.
... but now you are worn out and spiritless, always mindful of your difficult wandering; and your hearts are never joyful, since you have truly suffered very many things.

There is also a pluperfect, also of Odysseus, used when he sleeps, λελασμένος ὁσσ' ἐπεπόνθηει 'having forgotten all the things he had suffered' (Od. 13.92).

The second meaning is given as (2) 'have (something) come upon, happen to, or befall one'. It is listed as occurring five times; only one instance is in the present, which occurs when Theoclymenus, narrating his vision to the suitors, says: ἀ δειλοί, τί κακὸν τόδε πάσχετε; ‘ah, wretched men, what ill is this that you suffer?’ (Od. 20.351). The others are in the aorist, as when Odysseus has to explain his wound from the boar:124

Then his father and lady mother rejoiced at him when he had returned, and asked him everything [about] how he got [suffered] his scar.

Lastly, there is (3) ‘with indefinite object, to have (something evil) come upon one, encounter (mischance), meet (one’s death)’; this is only found in the aorist, eight times in the Iliad and five in the Odyssey. So Menelaus says, on hearing the shouts of the trapped Odysseus:

124It is also found at ll. 11.313, 404, Od. 19.464, 24.106.
δείδω μή τι πάθησιν ἐνι Τρώεσσι μονωθεῖς,

ἔσθλος ἑών, μεγάλη δὲ ποθὴ Δαναοῖς γένησαι. (II. 11.470-1)

I fear in case he should suffer something while left alone amongst the Trojans, although he is skilful [i.e. at fighting], and a great longing should come upon him for the Danaans.

Here we have πάσχω 'suffer, undergo', future πεῖσομαι ‘will suffer’, aorist ἔπαθον ‘suffered’ and perfect πέπονθα ‘have suffered, be in the state resulting from having suffered’. The same meaning of ‘suffer’ is thus found throughout the verb, but without any causative or inchoative meaning.

4.4. κικλῆσκω

The present active κικλῆσκω is given two meanings by Cunliffe: ‘summon (=καλέω (1))’, which occurs six times in the Iliad and once in the Odyssey; and ‘call by such and such a name, name so and so (=καλέω (3))’, found three times each in the Iliad and the Odyssey. This gives nine instances of this verb in the earlier epic and four in the later one, of which two and one cases respectively are imperfects.

The first of these meanings occurs, for example, when Agamemnon

φοίτα κηρύκεσσι λιγυφθόγγοις κελεύων
κλήδην εἰς ἄγορήν κικλῆσκειν ἀνδρὰ ἐκαστὸν,
μηδὲ βοῶν. (II. 9.10-12)

went this way and that, ordering the clear-voiced heralds to summon each man by name to the assembly-place, but not to shout.

For the meaning ‘call, name’, there is:
Now, there is a certain island in the much-surfing sea in front of Egypt, and men call it Pharos.

There are two instances of the medio-passive present, which show two uses of the medio-passive – and the two different meanings of *κικλήσκω*. In the earlier case, we have what is traditionally termed a ‘middle’: here, the difference from the active meaning ‘summon’ is minimal.

Nor did Hector allow the bold Trojans to sleep, but he summoned all the noblest together, as many as were leaders and rulers among the Trojans; and having called them all together he devised a cunning plan: ...

Giannakis (1997: 245) suggests that both *κικλήσκετο* and *ἀρτύνετο* are used benefactively here. In the second instance of medio-passive *κικλήσκομαι*, however, we have what is traditionally termed a ‘passive’: so, beside *κικλήσκω* ‘name’, we have *κικλήσκομαι* ‘be named’:

A certain island is called Syria, if perhaps you have heard of it, above Ortygia, where the turning-places of the sun are.
The meaning is apparently stative, not inchoative: 'be known as, have been named'.

There is also a collateral present κολέω, to which Cunliffe (1924 s.v.) assigns four meanings: (1) ‘call, call to, summon, etc.’; (2) ‘bid or invite to a feast or a meal or to one’s house’; (3) ‘call by such and such a name, name, call etc.’; and (4) ‘passive’ ‘bear the name of, be known as, have the reputation of being’. Meanings (1) and (3) have already been given for κικλήσκω; in fact, meanings (2) and (4) are merely submeanings of these respective two. That this is the case is evident from the semantics involved: ‘invite to a feast’ is a specialisation of ‘summon’ as ‘be known as’ is of ‘be called’. The dividing line between (1) and (2) and between (3) and (4) is, in fact, not always clear. The following instance of the future κολέω is categorised by Cunliffe as (2), since it concerns Aegisthus inviting Agamemnon for dinner; one can see how the meaning of κολέω is extended from ‘summon’.

αὐτὰρ ὁ βῆ κολέων Ἀγαμέμνωνα, ποιμένα λαῶν,
ἵπποισιν καὶ ὄχεσθιν, ἀεικέα μερμηρίζων. (Od. 4.532-3)
But he [Aegisthus] went with horses and chariot to call Agamemnon, shepherd of the people, considering baneful things.

The following example is classed by Cunliffe under (3), when it could equally well be placed under (4) as ‘be known as’. Here, Achilles says to Agamemnon:

ἡ γὰρ κεν δειλὸς τε καὶ ουτιδανὸς καλεΐμην,
εἰ δὴ σοι πᾶν ἔργον ὑπείξομαι δττι κεν εἵπης. (II. 1.293-4)
For I would be called cowardly and worthless, if indeed I am to yield to you in everything which you say.

125 For the syntax of the two meanings of κικλήσκω, see Giannakis 1997: 245 and 246 respectively.
The meanings given by Cunliffe for the parts of καλέω do therefore correspond to those of κικλήσκω, for there are the same two main meanings 'summon' and 'name'; καλέω merely shows a wider range of shades of meaning than the present in -σκω. Cunliffe’s data, however, put together all the various tense stems, which obscures some of the details of this verb’s usage.

The present active καλέω occurs fourteen times in the Iliad and eleven in the Odyssey; there is also an imperfect, four times and six respectively. In both epics we find many examples of the two main meanings for this verb, ‘summon’ and ‘name’. Hence, respectively: 'Αλέξανδρος σε καλεί οίκονδε νέεσθαι ‘Paris calls you to go home’ (Il. 3.390); and when the constellation of the Bear is said to be that ἤν καὶ 'Αμαξαν ἐπίκλησιν καλέουσιν ‘which men also call by the additional name of the Wagon’ (Od. 5.273). The present medio-passive occurs four times in the Iliad and six in the Odyssey, with imperfect found once in the former epic; but the simple verb never shows either the theoretically possible meaning ‘be summoned’ or, as κικλήσκωσι did, transitive ‘summon’ – but only ever meanings (3) and (4): ‘be named, be known as’. Hence the example of καλεοίμην just quoted above, and, for example:

ομυε δ’ ώς ἐκέλευε, θεοὺς δ’ ὄνομηνεν ἄπαντας
toὺς ὑποταρταρίους, ὁ τιτῆνες καλέονται. (Il. 14.278-9)

And she [Hera] swore when he [Sleep] had requested, and invoked by name all the gods below Tartarus, who are called Titans.

It is not the case, however, that the one instance of κικλήσκωσι ‘summon’ is the only time this meaning occurs for the medio-passive present stem; for once we find the imperfect medio-passive ἐξεκαλεόμην ‘call forth, summon’:
And Cyllenian Hermes summoned the souls of the suitors.

Taking this into account, therefore, there is apparently no difference in the meanings of καλέω and κικλήσκω.

The future καλέω (once in the Iliad, three times in the Odyssey) only ever shows meanings (1) and (2), always being ‘summon, invite’, as καλέων quoted just above (Od. 4.532). The same is true of the frequent aorist active ἐκάλεσσα 'summoned' (seventeen times in the Iliad and twenty in the Odyssey) and also of its transitive middle counterpart ἐκαλεσάμην (eight times in the Iliad and five in the Odyssey) – both only show meaning (1). Hence Menestheus says:

ἐρχεο, διε Θεῶτα, θέων Αιαντα κάλεσσον,
ἀμφοτέρω μὲν μάλλον. (Il. 12.343-4)

Go, illustrious Thoötès, run and summon Ajax, or rather both of them.

The meaning of the middle ἐκαλεσάμην is apparently the same. So Alcinous says, καλέσασθε δὲ θεῖον ἀοιδήν / Δημόδοκον 'and summon the divine minstrel Demodocus' (Od. 8.43-4). This is the same use as seen above with the transitive instances of medio-passive κικλήσκωμαι (Il. 10.300) and ἔξεκαλεδήμην (Od. 24.1); active and morphologically middle forms can both mean ‘summon’.

Perfect forms are medio-passive only. The perfect κέκλημαι (six times and once) shows the same restricted set of meanings as simple present καλέομαι, meaning only ‘be called’; hence, for example, when Nausicaa says of Odysseus:

οἶ γὰρ ἐμοὶ τοιόσοδε πόσις κεκλημένος εἶη
Would that such a man might be called my husband, living here, and that it might please him to remain here.

The pluperfect form κεκλήσατο, unlike any other perfect or intransitive medio-passive forms of καλέω in Homer, belongs to Cunliffe’s meaning (1) ‘summon’:

οὗς εἰπὼν τάφροι διέσυντον τοι δ’ ἄμε ἐποντο

'Ἀργείων βασιλῆς, δόσι κεκλήσατο βουλήν. (II. 10.194-5)

Having spoken thus he [Nestor] rushed through the trench; and the kings of the Argives followed along with him, as many as had been called to the council.

The future perfect κεκλήσομαι means ‘will be called’; it occurs when Iris says to Helen:

τῷ δὲ κε νικήσαντι φίλη κεκλήσῃ ἀκούτις. (II. 3.138)

And you will be called dear wife by whoever wins [i.e., Paris or Menelaus].

There is also on two occasions an active iterative preterite καλέσκον ‘used to call’:

τὼν ἃ’ Ἐκτωρ καλέσκει Σκαμάνδριον, αὐτὰρ ὁ ἄλλοι

'Αστυάνακτ’ (II. 6.402-3)

Hector was accustomed to call him [his son] Scamandrius, but others called him Astyanax.

Cf. also the similar use at II. 9.562; on the meaning of these forms see further Chapter 5 § 5.2.2.
Once there is a medio-passive 'used to be called':

"Ἰασώς αὐτ' ἀρχὸς μὲν Ἀθηναῖων ἔτετυκτο,
υἱὸς δὲ Σφήλοιο καλέσκετο Βουκολίδαο. (Il. 15.337-8)

And Iasus was a captain of the Athenians, and used to be called the son of Sphelus, son of Bucolus.

Also apparently to be associated with καλέω and κικλήσκω is the reduplicated aorist ἐκέκλετο. The 42 instances of simple forms of this aorist are listed by Cunliffe s.v. κέλομαι, which is glossed as nearly always meaning 'command, order, bid, enjoin, give orders or injunctions'. Bendahman (1993: 110-15), however, finds that the reduplicated aorist means 'call out to' ('zurufen') and the other parts of the verb 'order' ('fordere auf etwas zu tun, rate, befehle'). In this case, we should associate ἐκέκλετο more closely with καλέω and κικλήσκω. An example of ἐκέκλετο is as follows:


καλέστε Ἰ’ Ἀπώλλων
Περγάμου ἐκκατιδών, Τρώεσσι δὲ κέκλετ' ἀύσας’ (Il. 4.507-8)
and Apollo, looking down from Pergamus, became indignant, and called with a shout to the Trojans: ...

On one occasion it shows a different meaning, given as 'call, call to, summon (= καλέω (1))' by Cunliffe, although Bendahman’s (1993: 111) gloss of ‘treiben’ seems closer:

ἀντικρὺ δ’ ἄρα τάφρον ὑπέρθορον ὀκέεσ ἵπποι
ἀμβροτοι, οὕς Πηλήν θεοὶ δόσαν ἄγλαα δώρα,
And the swift horses – the immortal horses that the gods gave as fine gifts to Peleus – leapt right over the trench, rushing onward, and his heart urged him against Hector.

Also comparable is the one compound form ἐπεκέκλετο, glossed as ‘call upon, summon, invoke’ (II. 9.454) by Cunliffe (s.v. ἔπικέλομαι), which occurs when Phoenix says:

τῇ πιθόμην καὶ ἔρεξα· πατὴρ δὲ ἐμὸς αὐτίκ’ δίσθεις πολλὰ κατηράτω, στυγερὰς δὲ ἐπεκέκλετ’ Ἐρινύς,
μὴ ποτὲ γούνασιν οἴσιν ἐφέσσεσθαι φίλον υἱὸν ἔξ εἰμέθεν γεγαώτα· (II. 9.453-6)

I obeyed her [my mother] and did the deed; but my father immediately suspected and cursed me greatly, and summoned the dreadful Erinyes, so that a dear child begotten by me should never sit upon his knees.

κέλομαι, on the other hand, seems rather to mean ‘bid, order’. One of the many examples is as follows, when Hera says to Apollo and Iris:

Zeús σφω ἓις ἵδην κέλετ’ ἐλθέμεν ὅτι τάχιστα· (II. 15.146)
Zeus orders you both to go to Ida as quickly as possible.

The future κελήσομαι only occurs once, with the same meaning as κέλομαι, when Hermes says to Odysseus:

ἡ δὲ σ’ ὑποδείσασα κελήσεται εἰσηθήναι· (Od. 10.296)
And she [Circe] will be afraid, and will bid you lie with her.

There are also occasional compound forms of καλέω, all showing the meaning ‘summon’.127 A further present, προκαλιζομαι ‘summon or invite to a fight or contest, challenge, defy, dare’ (four times in the Iliad, twice in the Odyssey) apparently acts as the present of προκαλεσσάμην (six times in the Iliad, once in the Odyssey); hence, for example, it is said of Paris:

'Αργείων προκαλίζετο πάντας ἀρίστους ἀντίβιον μαχέσσασθαι ἐν αἰνῇ δηιστητὶ. (II. 3.19-20)

he [Paris] challenged all the best of the Argives to fight with him face to face in dread battle.

The parallelism is clear since latter line is elsewhere repeated with προκαλέσσεται, at II. 7.39-40.

In conclusion, we may say that the different tense stems of the forms in καλε- and κλη- are used in different ways. The meaning ‘summon’ is the only one available for future καλέω, aorists εκαλεσσα and εκαλεσσάμην, pluperfect κεκλήσατο and the verbal adjective forms; perfect κεκλημα, along with its future κεκλήσωμαι, the iterative preterite formations and the absolutive, are restricted to 'name' / 'be named'. In the present, the situation is different: καλέω means both 'summon' and 'name', καλέομαι intransitive 'be named' and, once, there is transitive εξεκαλεόμην 'summon'; similarly, κυκλήσκω is both 'summon' and 'name' too, and κυκλησκομαι means both 'be named' and 'summon'. The

127For a list of these forms see Chapter 3 § 4.1.2.
transitive medio-passive presents occur beside aorist middle ἐκαλεσάμην ‘summoned’, as προκαλίζομαι does beside προκαλεσασάμην.

This would seem to mean that there is no semantic difference between καλέω and κικλήσκω. Also relevant to this conclusion is that both forms are used in passages concerning the language of gods and men. There are six such instances, in only four of which we find both the gods’ and men’s term given; in two of these κικλήσκω is used (II. 2.813-14, 14.290-1) and in the other two καλέω (II. 1.403, 20.74); where only one term is given, the form is also καλέω (Od. 10.305, 12.61).

4.5. Summary: remaining forms

In the case of these four verbs, therefore, we find no causative-inchoative alternations, nor indeed any one defining quality. Although πάσχω may be contrasted with its perfect, κικλήσκω seems to be identical in meaning to καλέω and also, in the ‘passive’, to κέκλημαι. The only other tense shown for εὐρίσκω is aorist εὑρον, which has a middle εὑρόμην; and δείδισκομαι remains obscure.

5. Conclusion: the semantics of verbs in -σκω in Homer

This excessively lengthy chapter may leave the reader with an impression of disorganised confusion. The minute description of each verb in its context is deliberate, because other alternatives are not available. In Homer, it does not seem possible to define a simple semantic pattern which distinguishes forms in -σκω from other forms. We could of course attempt to find an explanation by appealing to the incoherence of poetic language, of traditional language, and so on, but in fact there are other ways forward: it is possible to exploit this very situation in order to reach a

---

128 On this topic see Watkins 1970, with further bibliography; and also Bader 1989: 258-61; Giannakis 1997: 247 n. 319.
general statement, but we first need to highlight some general points. The fact that they are negative points does not detract from their importance.

Firstly, even when in Homer we have minimal pairs which contrast a present in -\(\sigma k\omega\) with a simple present built on the same stem, we do not find a semantic distinction. The presents \(\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma k\omega\) and \(\kappa\alpha\lambda\varepsilon\omega\), both ‘summon; name’, appear to be used in the same contexts with identical function, and there is even a third present -\(\kappa\alpha\lambda\xi\zeta\mu\omega\), also used beside an aorist in \(k\alpha\lambda\varepsilon\sigma(\sigma)\). The same lack of distinction seems to be true of the pairs \(\alpha\lambda\upsilon\sigma k\omega : \alpha\lambda(\upsilon)\mu\omega\mu\) ‘escape’; \(\nu\lambda\sigma k\omega : \nu\lambda\sigma\mu\mu\) ‘rove, wander’; \(\nu\lambda\sigma\kappa\sigma\mu\omega\mu\) : \(\nu\lambda\sigma\eta\sigma\eta\omega\mu\) ‘propitiate’; \(\mu\mu\nu\eta\sigma\kappa\sigma\mu\omega\) : \(\mu\mu\nu\sigma\omega\mu\) ‘remember’ (although the latter becomes semantically specialised as ‘woo’); and \(\mu\sigma\gamma\omega\mu\omega\) : \(\mu\gamma\alpha\xi\zeta\omega\mu\) ‘become mixed’.

A second point concerns the causative-inchoative pairs which have been discussed at length. We noticed \(\beta\sigma\sigma\kappa\omega\) ‘tend, feed’ : \(\beta\sigma\kappa\sigma\mu\omega\) ‘get fed’; \(\delta\delta\sigma\kappa\omega\) ‘teach, cause to learn’ : \(\delta\delta\sigma\kappa\sigma\mu\omega\) ‘learn, get taught’; \(\mu\mu\nu\eta\sigma k\omega\) ‘remind’ : \(\mu\mu\nu\sigma\kappa\sigma\mu\omega\) ‘remember’; \(\mu\sigma\gamma\omega\) ‘mix’ : \(\mu\sigma\gamma\sigma\mu\omega\) ‘get mixed’; and, with both alternants in the medio-passive, \(\tau\tau\upsigma\kappa\sigma\mu\omega\) ‘make ready; get ready’.

There are also causatives which have no inchoative alternant (\(\alpha\sigma\omega\phi\sigma\xi\kappa\omega\) ‘trick’; \(\alpha\sigma\rho\sigma\kappa\omega\) ‘fit together’; \(\epsilon\sigma\sigma\kappa\omega\) and \(\iota\sigma\kappa\omega\) ‘make like, compare’; \(\nu\lambda\sigma\kappa\sigma\mu\omega\) ‘propitiate’; and \(\pi\phi\omega\upsigma\kappa\omega\) ‘make manifest’) and inchoatives which have no causative alternant (\(\epsilon\phi\alpha\sigma\rho\sigma\kappa\sigma\mu\omega\), if ‘become profited’). Next to the standard medio-passive inchoatives and causative actives there are also active inchoatives (\(\alpha\lambda\nu\sigma\kappa\kappa\kappa\omega\) ‘grow’, \(\gamma\nu\rho\alpha\sigma\kappa\kappa\kappa\omega\) ‘become old’, \(\gamma\nu\nu\nu\sigma\kappa}
make scattered' (e.g. in *Il. 5.526*, of Boreas scattering the clouds) : inchoative σκιδνωμαι ‘scatter, get scattered’ (e.g. of a crowd which scatters away in *Il. 1.487*). This is a feature of voice rather than of formations in -σκ-. The active inchoatives, on the other hand, have specific lexical features, which explain their lack of voice contrast (cf. Chapter 8 § 2, especially §§ 2.6-2.7).

The third crucial point, which confirms the previous conclusion, is that the same semantic contrast of causative / inchoative, which seems typical of the -σκω/ -σκομαι presents, also appears in non-present tenses. Beside μιμησκω ‘remind’ / inchoative μιμησκομαι ‘remember’, we have the aorist pair εμνησα ‘reminded’ / εμνησάμην ‘remembered’. Thus too the aorist εγιρά has inchoative value, exactly as the present γηράσκω.

This combined evidence shows that in Homer it is impossible to attribute to -σκω a specific function other than that of forming a present from stems which do not have -σκω in other tenses. If we define the contrast present : aorist in aspectual terms, then we may want to argue that, in some verbs, -σκω defines the aspectual characteristics of the present. The presence of -σκω in the miscellaneous verbs listed in the previous sections which have no inchoative, causative or iterative meaning may support this view, but more important perhaps is a morphological, rather than semantic, observation. The vast proportion of the verbs considered shows a root aorist or a thematic aorist presumably derived from the former;130 in other words, presents in -σκω pattern with root aorists or thematic aorists based on root aorists. Three inherited presents in -σκω have root aorists (βάσκω : εβην, γιγνόσκω : εγνων and μίσγομαι : (Ε)μικτο); thirteen or possibly fourteen in -σκω or -ισκω

---

129 Cf. Chamtraïne 1986-8: II.179, whose pairs of "un actif causatif avec un moyen intransitif" include the phrase ὀλλύντων τε καὶ ὀλλυμένων, meaning "of those who kill and those who get killed" (*Il. 4.451*).

130 Cf. Hardarson 1993: 155-7, and also Chapter 3 § 3.2.4.
have thematic aorists. Of these, four verbs at least show alternations which are

*clearly* old (πάσχω : ἐπαθὼν; - βλάσκω : ἐμολούν, θυνήσκω : ἔθανον and

θρόσκω : ἔθρον), but other verbs too from this group are not new creations. If so,

the pattern is significant. Following on from the view of the Indo-European verb
given in Chapter 2 § 4.3, we may assume that a verbal root yielded either a root aorist
or a root present depending on its meaning, and on the way in which this interacted
with the aspectual character of the tense in question. Verbs which yielded root aorists

either had a suppletive present, or more complex presents characterised by nasal

infixes or special affixes. The *-skelo- suffix was one of the affixes; insofar as it was

contrasted with other suffixes, it must also have a specific meaning, very possibly

iterative. This is no doubt true for Proto-Indo-European; but by the time of Homer,

the situation is different. The suffix still forms presents, but does not seem to define

their meaning in a more specific manner.

Indeed, we may occasionally wonder whether, in Homer, *-skelo- has even

lost its original aspectual function. The coexistence of simple presents like

κικλήσκω and καλέω with no apparent semantic distinction points us in that
direction, but even more important is the existence of verbs in which *-skelo- / - Sokw

appears outside the present, as in ἀλύσκω, βόσκω and μύσγω. The well attested

διδάσκω, which seems to go back to Mycenaean (cf. Chapter 6 § 2.1), belongs here

too. There are parallels for this extension of *-skelo- beyond the present: we have

seen in other Indo-European languages that, when a reflex of *-skelo- had no value, it

tended to be extended to non-present forms; hence the Sabellic future perfect forms

Oscan comparascuster, Umbrian eiscurent, but productive Latin inchoative -scē. In

Greek, if formations like βόσκω and so on were resegmented and yielded non-

131 These are πάσχω (*παθ- σκω) : ἐπαθὼν; - βλάσκω : ἐμολούν, θυνήσκω : ἔθανον, θρόσκω :

ἔθρον; διδάσκω : δέδαε, κικλήσκω : κέκλετο, τιτύσκομαι : τετυκέσθαι; ἄπαφισκω :

ἥφασον, ὄφρισκο : ἑρωρον, ἐπουρισκομαι : ἐπαύρον, ἐφύσκο : ἑφύρον, ἔχομαι :

(suppletive) ἠλθον; πιθαύσκω : φάε; and, more problematically, ἀλήσκω : ἀλθετο.
present forms which included -σκ-, then presumably -σκ- was no longer felt as a
suffix tied exclusively to a present formation. The four verbs which show extended
-σκ- are all zero-grade formations which must be old – except διδόσκω, which is
found in Mycenaean. In other words, we are dealing either with inherited verbs or, at
least, old pre-Homeric verbs which have suffered a process of semantic and
morphological attrition. This need not be true for all verbs, but is indicative for some
pre-Homeric developments. The question that any linguist is likely to ask is: What
happened next? Did -σκω disappear altogether, did it become a useless
morphological doublet, or did it acquire a new function?

An answer to this question will have to wait for the final conclusion, and a
study of the later evidence. Meanwhile, we need to consider whether the proposals
made above fit all the data which we have been considering. It has been argued that,
in Homer, -σκω is simply a present marker; and that this pattern goes back to an
earlier period when the roots which yielded root aorists and secondarily thematic
aorists also needed modified presents. There are two powerful counter-arguments at
least against the second point. Firstly, how do we explain those verbs which have
*-skelo- in the present but have no root aorist or thematic aorist? Secondly, how are
we to deal with forms like εσκων and (ἔ)φασκον, which clearly are not built on
roots of the ‘telic’ type, but rather on those which yield root presents, such as εἰμί
‘be’ and φημί ‘say’?

The first difficulty is not insurmountable. On the one hand, we have in Homer
a handful of presents in -σκω which have no aorists: βόσκω, δειδίσκομαι, ἵσκω,
ἐίσκω and πτωσκάζω are such, as are ἀλύσκω and ἡλάσκω, whose collateral
presents have aorists (ἀλέ(υ)ομαι / ἀλε(υ)ασθαι, ἀλάομαι / ἀλήθην). These
can simply be isolated survivals – i.e., we can predicate the existence of an earlier
aorist. Secondly, we find some presents in -σκω with aorists in -σα rather than an
expected root or thematic aorist. However, this pattern is rare and seems secondary.
Two cases are from problematic verbs: ἔλασκομαι has ἔλασσόμην, and ὁρχέομαι has ὁρχήσασθαι. In κικλήσκω : ἔκαλεσσα we have a complicated and not properly understood group of set forms; if, with Rix, we derive καλέω from a present in *-ένεω/-, then ἔκαλεσσα must be a secondary replacement of an old root aorist. This leaves only two instances: γηράσκω : ἕγνρα and μιμνήσκομαι : ἐμιμήσα, ἐμμηνάσσαι. In both, the aorist seems to be of some antiquity, and the present does not. For the former case, it seems that γηράσκω is best explained as deriving from ἕγνρα (Chapter 3 § 7.2). Regarding μιμνήσκομαι, we may say that, on the one hand, this form is from the same class as διδάσκω, our only form found with any certainty in Mycenaean; but it could easily have been derived from one of its own non-present forms in μνη-, and in fact we will see in Classical Greek that it is part of an expanding group of reduplicated presents in -σκω with roots of the type CRV- (Chapter 7 § 2). In other words, we have a set of innovations which is interesting in its own right, because it shows the way in which Greek is developing.

However, the two forms ἐσκοῦν and (ἐ)φοσκοῦν do create a problem, not so much for our ‘synchronic’ interpretation of the Homeric data, as for the diachronic explanation given above. There are two alternatives: either these are indeed imperfects of presents in -σκω, or they are instances of ‘iteratives’ in -(ε)σκοῦν. In the latter case, different problems would arise; but for these we must turn to the next chapter.

Chapter 5

The ‘Iteratives’ in -(e)σκου

1. Introduction

A group of so-called ‘iteratives’ showing the suffix -(e)σκου (e.g. δόσκου, ἔχεσκου) occurs in Greek, almost entirely distinct from those forms with the present suffix -(ι)σκω. The suffix is productive in Homer, where Bottin (1969: 116) describes it as ‘un outil grammaticale’, but is only elsewhere at all frequent in Herodotus. This implies that the formation is peculiar to Ionic, as is generally accepted – unless Herodotus is epicising when he uses the forms. As will be seen, his use does not entirely follow the epic pattern (§ 5.2.3 below). For different reasons, the forms ἔσκου and (ε)φασκοῦ could either be imperfects of presents in -σκω or iteratives in -(e)σκου, and their status has been much debated. From a historical point of view, the formations in -(e)σκοῦ are of paramount importance, especially if, as is normally assumed, they show iterative meaning. Are they historically related to the Hittite iteratives in -sk-? Does this mean that *-skelo- had iterative meaning? Within Greek itself they are also mysterious: how does this use of the suffix relate to


2The two sets are generally accepted by scholars as being ultimately linked in some way (in spite of Negri 1976).

3Thus Brugmann (1902: 270-1), disputed by Schwyzner (Schwyzner and Debrunner 1939-71: I.710 n. 9); cf. also Kluge 1911: 43.

4See further § 6 below. The nature of the hapax παρέβασκε is also disputable; cf. Chapter 4 § 2.1.1.
that of -σκω? In this chapter, I shall first of all give a brief overview of what has already been said concerning the formation’s origin, followed by an examination of its morphology and use. The forms εσκον and (ε)ϕασκον will then be discussed, and the chapter concludes with a comparison of -(ε)σκον with Hittite -šk-.

2. General features

Iteratives in -(ε)σκον show secondary, indicative endings, i.e. are conjugated as if they are imperfects.5 The forms found in Homer almost never show the augment; the one major exception is (Ε)ϕασκον.6 Homer uses any person, singular or plural (e.g. ἐχεσκεζ, νικάσκομεν), although the third person singular is very much the most frequent.7

The iteratives are nearly always formed off base verbs that are found in Homer.8 Many of these base verbs are poetic and indeed peculiar to epic.9 The starting point is usually a present stem (as κτείνεσκον), though it may be (more

---

5 Other endings are rare: Wathelet (1973: 392 n. 83) cites τροπασκέσθω (Hesychius) and τεσκόμενοι (CIG 3538.12).
6 On this form see further § 6.2 below. For early discussions on the subject of the augment in these forms, see Stolpe 1849: 40-4; and Curtius 1877-80: II.408-9. Generally, wherever the augment is found, the verb may be read as augmentless without spoiling the metre, or there are textual variants, or both; cf. Wathelet 1973: 385-6 and 386 n. 43. It would seem that, apart from (Ε)ϕασκον, only ημισγέσκοντο (Od. 20.7) actually requires the augment for the metre, and this form has been attributed to Attic influence: cf. Clackson 1994: 76 and 215 n. 81, following Wackernagel 1916: 118-19.
7 For forms organised (within each epic) by person, see Kluge’s lists (1911: 22-6, 30-2). Bottin’s figures (1969: 117-18) are not correct (as comparison with Kluge and also with Stolpe 1849: 7 shows), but are a good guide: he lists 10 occurrences for the first person singular and eight for the second, with one also for first person plural (νικάσκομεν, Od. 11.512); in the third person, the figures cited are 253 for the singular and 34 for the plural. In Kluge, however, there are sixteen examples of the first person singular, and there is in fact one instance of the second person plural also (ἐφόσκεθε', Od. 22.35).
rarely) from an aorist one (ίδεσκον): Homer shows 126 different forms, of which 31 are on aorist stems; the total number of occurrences is 250, of which 140 are found in the Iliad and 110 in the Odyssey.10 Wathelet (1973: 393-4) lists 69 different iteratives which occur in Homer as only being found once each. Occasionally the suffix -(e)sκον is found added to verbs which already have a *-ske/o- affix.11 Most forms in -(e)sκον are simples, although compounds do occur.12 In five cases, one verb gives forms from both its present and aorist stems.13 Three pairs of cognate forms also occur.14

The forms in -(e)sκον are also well-known to show a strong tendency to occur in series of, usually, two or three forms; differing lists of roughly twenty examples for the Iliad and ten for the Odyssey are given by Bottin (1969: 118-21), Wathelet (1973: 394-5) and Puhvel (1991: 14-16). This grouping is non-formulaic in nature,15 and indeed appears to be more frequent in later books.16 Clackson (1994: 78)

---

10 Data were adapted from the list given in Risch (1974: 277-8), whose only omission seems to be ἰδεσκον; citations were taken from Gehring (1891). These were checked against the data given by Kluge (1911: 22-6, 30-2), Bottin (1969: 121-4) and Chantraine (1986-8: 1.321-5). These figures do not include ἐσκον, (ε)φασκον and παρέβοσκε, and count forms in κολε(ε)- as one verb. See further the morphological analysis in § 4 below. For criticisms of Bottin’s (1969: 121-4) data see Clackson 1994: 215 n. 78.

11 The instances are βοσκέσκονθ' (Od. 12.355) and μισγέσκετο (Od. 18.325), εμισγέσκοντο (Od. 20.7); see further Chapter 3 §§ 3.1.2 and 2.3 respectively.

12 As e.g. επιρρήσειςκον ‘used to thrust home’ (Il. 24.454, 456) beside ρήσοντες ‘beating time’ (Il. 18.571); cf. Wathelet 1973: 389.

13 These, as noted by Delbrück (Brugmann and Delbrück 1893-1916: IV.63) and Risch (1974: 276) are ἵστάςκε / στάςκε; σπενδέςκον / σπελάςκον; φαίνεσκετο / φάνεσκε; φεύγεςκε / φύγεςκε; and ὠθέςκε / ὀθάςκε. On the difference between the aorist and present types, which apparently mirrors that of non-iterative forms, cf. Tyn’s conclusion, 1859: 694-5; Brugmann and Delbrück 1893-1916: IV.62; Kluge 1911: 26; Chantraine 1986-8: 1.323-4; Ruijgh 1985: 146 n. 147; and Rijksbaron 1994: 15.

14 The pairs are ναιέςκον / ναιετάςκον, διέκεςκε / ἀπόλέσκετο and στάςκε / ὀστάςκε.


16 Cf. Chantraine 1986-8: 1.325, followed by Clackson 1994: 78 and 215 n. 82. The former notes especially the instances at Il. 24.11-24 and Od. 11.585-600.
claims that almost half all occurrences of iteratives are found within three lines of another iterative; in fact, all such groups together only account for 36 instances of the 138 in the *Iliad*, and for 20 of the 109 in the *Odyssey*. He states that all but six σα-forms are found in conjunction with other iteratives.17

Homeritic iteratives in -(ε)σκον are therefore generally augmentless third person indicatives, with a tendency to occur in series. According to Bottin (1969, especially 116-24), these facts are all connected: the meaning of the iteratives lends them naturally to narrative, and it is in narrative passages that Homer usually omits the augment most, whilst he tends to use it with verbs which describe general actions. Hence their use in the past indicative, describing ‘real’ past actions. The tendency for neologisms may be due to the extended use of the suffix in series.18

The sense of the verbs is generally held to be iterative or ‘iterative-intensive’.19 Ruipérez (1954: 132-5), however, as has been noted (Chapter 1 § 3.5), maintains that the suffix is basically durative in sense, with the forms generally realised as iteratives. Similarly, Puhvel (1991:13) states that the suffix gives the verbs a sense of ongoing action; he emphasises the importance of both the role of the sense of the original verb and of the context in which it is realised: ‘kept smiling until the face muscles got tired’ is durative, but ‘kept smiling in various situations’ is iterative. Even in Homer, it is not necessary to use a form in -(ε)σκον to indicate the type of action which these verbs show.20

---

17Clackson 1994: 77. I find as isolated instances of sigmatic forms ἔρηπτασκε (*II. 2.189*), ἐξερῆσσακε (*II. 10.490*), ἀποκεινήσασκε (*II. 11.636*), στρέψασκον (*II. 22.197*) and ἀζάσσακε (*II. 23.369*). The intended sixth instance is probably ἀνθήσασκε (*II. 5.786*), which is not linked with the iteratives which follow in vv. 788-90.


Attestations in authors other than Homer are rare and usually in imitation of epic, the one exception is Herodotus, whose usage (both morphologically and, as we shall see, semantically) is more limited than Homer's. Here, nearly all forms are formed from present stems; iteratives from aorists are only derived from thematic stems, indicating that Homer's use of iteratives from aorists in -σα- (and, on one occasion, in -ην) was probably a peculiarly epic innovation. Only the third person is used, and base forms are never athematic. Here also, the forms are used to narrate past actions, and are often used in groups.

3. Origins

The origin of the iteratives in -(ε)σκου has been the subject of much debate, although their 'iterative' meaning was apparently not noticed by the ancient grammarians. Fantini (1950: 333-5) reviews the early suggestions of Curtius, Herbig and Delbrück, all of whom linked the preterites in -(ε)σκου to presents in -σκω. He prefers that of Brugmann (1902), however, who postulates that they originated from periphrastic forms, such as φάσκου from *φανς *σκου. This theory has been much criticised, first of all by Schwyzer, who noted the difficult

---

21Cf. the data discussed by Curtius (1877-80: II.406) and Wathelet (1973: 391-2); the morphological categories given by Curtius (1877-80: II.409-12), Schwyzer (Schwyzer and Debrunner 1939-71: I.711) and Fantini (1950: 320-30) contain further forms from other authors, and some dialectal forms are given by Bechtel (1921-4: I.85, III.215). Usage in Hesiod and the Homeric Hymns is discussed by Kluge (1911: 40-1)


23On iteratives in Herodotus, see Stolpe 1849: 44-50; Kluge 1911: 42-8; Rosén 1962: 125-6; Bottin 1969: 116-17 (whose list of forms is, however, unreliable); and Wathelet 1973: 392-3. See further § 5.2.3 below.


25Cf. also Meillet and Vendryes 1948: 242-3, similarly following Brugmann.
phonetic changes involved; Schwyzer similarly dismisses Schulze's hypothesis, by which \( \lambda\beta\sigma\epsilon\kappa\epsilon \) derived from earlier \( *\lambda\beta\epsilon\tau\ k\epsilon. \)

The prevalent alternative theory finds the origin of the forms in -(e)\( \sigma\kappa\nu \) in one or more of the three forms which appear to cross the boundary between -\( \sigma\kappa\omega \) and -(e)\( \sigma\kappa\nu \): \( \epsilon\sigma\kappa\nu, \pi\alpha\rho\beta\epsilon\alpha\sigma\kappa\epsilon\kappa \) and (e)\( \phi\alpha\sigma\kappa\nu \). Indeed, these three forms all have interesting and potentially archaic qualities: \( \epsilon\sigma\kappa\nu \) and \( \beta\alpha\sigma\kappa\omega \) both apparently have cognates in other languages, and (e)\( \phi\alpha\sigma\kappa\nu \) is the only iterative form which later acquires non-imperfect forms. But the link between \( \beta\alpha\sigma\kappa\omega \) and \( \pi\alpha\rho\beta\epsilon\alpha\sigma\kappa\epsilon\kappa \) is uncertain (cf. Chapter 4 § 2.1.1); and \( \epsilon\sigma\kappa\nu \) and (e)\( \phi\alpha\sigma\kappa\nu \) may simply be expressive imperfect forms, of no greater antiquity than any other form in -(e)\( \sigma\kappa\nu \) (cf. § 6 below).

Ruijgh (1985: 147) tries to find evidence for the relatively ancient nature of the formation both in the lack of augment, a Mycenaean feature, and in the existence of iteratives formed from athematic verbs already by Homer's time. Yet there may be internal evidence which points to a local Greek development, and Wathelet argues

---

27 On this theory see further Kluge 1911: 35 ff.
28 Thus Delbrück (Brugmann and Delbrück 1893-1916: IV.63-4) has the formation first occurring for \( \epsilon\beta\alpha\sigma\kappa\nu, \epsilon\phi\alpha\sigma\kappa\nu \) and \( \epsilon\sigma\kappa\nu \); Chantraine first (1931: 127) cited \( \epsilon\sigma\kappa\nu \) and later (1986-8: I.319, 321; 1991: 226) both \( \epsilon\sigma\kappa\nu \) and (e)\( \phi\alpha\sigma\kappa\nu \) as the origin; Negri (1976: 236) claims these two forms are obviously the most ancient part of the formation; Risch (1974: 277) has \( \epsilon\beta\pi\nu : \beta\alpha\sigma\kappa\nu \) originating the formation by giving rise to \( \phi\alpha\sigma\kappa\nu \) beside \( \epsilon\beta\pi\nu \); Rix (1992: 229) has \( \epsilon\sigma\kappa\nu \), (e)\( \phi\alpha\sigma\kappa\nu \) and \( \kappa\alpha\lambda\epsilon\sigma\kappa\epsilon\kappa \) as old zero-grade formations; and Ruijgh (1985: 146) has the iteratives from present and aorist stems beginning with an imperfect such as \( \phi\alpha\sigma\kappa\nu \), reinterpreted as the iterative of the present in \( \phi\alpha/-/\phi\alpha \), and one such as \( *\gamma^\alpha\sigma\kappa\nu \) as the iterative of \( \gamma^\alpha/-/\gamma^\alpha \). Cf. also Hackstein 1995: 279, following Chantraine and Rix.

Giacalone Ramat (1967: 121-2), however, is less precise concerning which forms came first: she argues that old imperfects in -\( \sigma\kappa\nu \) showing iterative-intensive meaning (her preferred meaning for Greek -\( \sigma\kappa\nu \)) could be the source of the formation, such as, she claims, \( \kappa\alpha\lambda\epsilon\sigma\kappa\epsilon\kappa \) ("summoned") at \( \Pi. \) 10.300.
29 As well as \( \kappa\alpha\lambda\epsilon\sigma\kappa\nu \) from athematic \( *\kappa\alpha\lambda\epsilon\mu \), he also derives \( \epsilon\sigma\kappa\nu \) from \( *\epsilon\alpha\mu \).
that Homeric forms show a variety of recent and Ionic features. Nonetheless, Wathelet himself uses external evidence to reconstruct an inherited suffix *-esk-.

Externally, comparisons are commonly made with Armenian, where a reflex of *-skə/o- is claimed by some to be used in the aorist; and with Hittite, where the suffix -šk- shows iterative meaning. Regarding Armenian and Greek, the most recent work has been Clackson's thorough analysis (1994: 75-83). He concludes that, on the one hand, such forms as δόσκον, δύσκε, παρεβασκέ and στάσκε could be inherited, and notes that insertion of a vowel before the suffix, like -ε- in Greek, also occurs in Armenian, Hittite and Tocharian. Yet this similarity could easily be an independent innovation to keep the suffix distinct from the root, and Armenian and Greek do not seem to show the same formation: morphological differences occur in root vocalism, suffixation and use of augment.

The similarity between the Greek iteratives in -(-ε)σκον and the productive Hittite formation in -šk- has also been quite recently discussed by Puhvel (1991: 13-20). He claims that we find in these two languages both the same sense of an action that is ongoing and the occurrence of strings of forms, as noted above for Greek (§ 2). Rather than postulating a common inheritance, he is of the opinion that this is merely a linguistic feature that came to be shared due to contact between the Hittites and eastern speakers of Late Mycenaean Greek in the thirteenth century BC (1991: 20).

In short, the evidence as to whether Greek shows an inherited formation may point either way: the apparently recent features are in contrast to frequent Iliadic usage

---

30 Cf. Wathelet 1973: 391-403, citing such properties as non-formulaic usage and metrical features (e.g. lines that will not scan if Ε is inserted, or ιν ephelcysticon omitted). Cf. also Chantraine 1986-8: I.325.


32 On the Hittite and Greek correspondence see further § 7 below.
and evidence from other languages. Hence, despite his own scepticism regarding the proximity of the Greek and Armenian formations, Clackson (1994: 78-80) suggests that the formation could show relics of the Indo-European formation with *-skel/o-: forms such as δόσκων could be ancient ‘imperfectives’.

The suffix -σκων then came to be used both with present stems (a pair such as ἐσκων beside ἐστι could provide a parallel for such an extension, since they appear to show the same stem) and also aorist ones (since a form such as δόσκων could be reinterpreted as showing an aorist stem).

The morphological extension of -σκων into thematic -εσκων (as in μένεσκων) is also difficult to explain. Wathelet’s reconstructed *-esk- does not seem to be supportable; it seems more likely that we are dealing with a common innovation (cf. Chapter 2 § 3.3 and n. 129). Both Kimball (1980) and Rix (1992: 229) propose that the -ε- in the ending -εσκων came about through the redivision of such a form as κόλε-σκων (where the -ε- is from the root) as κόλλ-εσκων, which then led to forms such as πωλ-εσκων. Clackson (1994: 79), however, criticises the suggestion that set forms could be the origin of the -ε- (as this would mean *κλησκ-ετο when we would expect a stem **κλησκ-); nor, he maintains, could κολέω : κολέσκετο give rise to ἐχεσκε beside ἐχω. He has the suffixes -(ε)σκ- and -(α)σκ- originally deriving from a mixture of verbs in *-ye/o- and athematic formations, with the resulting two possibilities coming to be used as was metrically convenient.

The matter, therefore, is far from clear. The evidence leaves us uncertain regarding both to what extent the formation is inherited, and in what way it is linked with Greek verbs in -σκω and/or Proto-Indo-European *-skel/o-.

34On the metrical usage cf. § 4.1 below.
4. Morphology

The following breakdown is based on that of Chantraine (1986-8: I. 321-5) and Clackson (1994: 76-8); comparable also is that of Schwyzer (1939-71: I. 711). As in the figures given above (§ 2), ἐσκοῦ, (ἐ)φασκοῦ and παρεβασκε are not included.

4.1. Present stem formations

We find 95 different iteratives formed from present stems in Homer, giving a total of 173 instances; they fall into four categories.

Firstly, there is a small group of forms derived from athematic verbs with zero-grade of the stem vowel; hence e.g. ἵστασκε from ἵστημι. There are six such formations in Homer, not including καλέσκετο, all, bar the problematic κέσκετο, occur only once, giving seven instances in total.

Iteratives on thematic stems are derived by keeping the thematic vowel - ε- (never - ο-) of the present stem and adding the suffix - σκ- and secondary endings; hence μέν- ε- σκοῦ from μέν- ω. This is the largest category: 59 different forms occur, giving 101 instances in total.

Thirdly, there are contracted presents. Iteratives of - ἑω and - αω verbs are quite frequently found, with one case in - ὰω: σωεσκοῦ. In some cases, the final vowel of the stem is doubled (ισχονώσκον, ποθέσκε) and in others it is not (νικάσκομεν, μυθέσκετο). Wathelet (1973: 387-9) ascribed the difference to a combination of factors (occurrence of contraction of vowels and diectasis, and

35Chantraine lists all forms belonging to each category, except that of contracted verbs which show - ee-. The forms were categorised differently by Curtius (1877-80: II.409-12), Kluge (1911: 22-6, 30-2) and Fantini (1950: 320-30).
36On forms in καλέ(ε)- see § 3 above.
38For the other forms see Chantraine 1986-8: I.322; and Clackson 1994: 76.
39Cf. the list at Chantraine 1986-8: I.322.
existence of athematic forms). As is often observed,\textsuperscript{40} the ultimate reason seems however to be metrical: the disyllabic version of the suffix follows a light syllable, and the monosyllabic version a heavy one: hence \textit{φιλέσκον} beside \textit{ώθεσκε}. The one exception (\textit{καλέσκετο} beside \textit{καλέςκον}) could perhaps be from an athematic stem (cf. § 3 above). The series - \textit{αςκ-} is presumably from *-\textit{αςκ-} by diectasis.\textsuperscript{41} We find 26 different forms from contracted verbs in Homer (counting \textit{καςκε} together with \textit{ειςκον}, and \textit{καλέσκετο} with \textit{καλέςκον}), giving a total of 59 instances of such forms. Six and five occur in - \textit{αα-} and - \textit{α-} respectively (totalling eleven occurrences for each type), nine and seven in - \textit{εε-} and - \textit{ε-} (26 and ten occurrences, including \textit{καλέςκετο}), and there is also \textit{σωςκον}.\textsuperscript{42}

Lastly, the suffix - \textit{αςκον}, as found in both iteratives from \textit{ςαλ-} aorists (§ 4.2 below) and from contracted stems, is itself extended to three other stems which are generally now classed with present-stem formations: \textit{ιςάςκετο} from \textit{ιςάζω}, \textit{κρύπτωςκε} from \textit{κρύπτω} and \textit{πρύταςκον} from \textit{πρύτω}, \textit{πρυτάζω}.\textsuperscript{43} The latter iterative is found five times, the other two only once each.

4.2. Aorist stem formations

Iteratives from aorist stems form a much smaller category: there are only 31 different forms, totalling 77 different instances; of these, nearly half are accounted for by \textit{ειπεςκε}. Two categories of these forms are parallel to the first two types of present-stem formations listed in § 4.2.1 above. Four athematic formations give a

\textsuperscript{40}Cf. Stolpe 1849: 4; Shipp 1972: 89; Chantraine 1986-8: I. 322-3; and Kimball 1980, followed by Clackson (1994: 76).
\textsuperscript{42}For lists of forms in - \textit{ε-}, - \textit{αα-} and - \textit{α-} see Chantraine 1986-8: I.323. The figures given here do not agree with those of Clackson (1994: 76-7), who states that there are fourteen stems and 30 forms in -\textit{(ε)εςκον}, and eleven stems and 24 forms in -\textit{(α)αςκον}, but there is no means of checking his data.
\textsuperscript{43}Cf. Curtius 1877-80: II.410-11; Chantraine 1986-8: I.323, 324; and Clackson 1994: 77. Risch (1974: 277) is less certain whether these forms are to be categorised as showing present or aorist stems. For further discussion of their origins see Wathelet 1973: 390.
total of nine occurrences, as δύ-σκον from ἔ- δύ-ν. Secondly, there are also seven thematic forms, as in φύγ-ε-σκον from ἐ- φύγ-ον; with ἐΙπεσκον occurring 28 times, these total 38 occurrences in all.

In addition, Homer also has iterative formations for the other types of Greek aorist. Iteratives of sigmatic aorists may be derived by adding -σκον to the aorist stem, inclusive of the -α- which occurs in all forms but the third person singular: thus θρέξα-σκον from ἡθρέξα. Nineteen such forms occur, giving 26 instances, of which all but six are found in the Odyssey. Lastly, there is one instance of a form in -(ε)σκον for the aorist passive: the presumably analogical φάν-ε-σκον, taken from ἐφάνην, found four times.

5. Semantics

As already seen (§ 2), the meaning of the suffix -(ε)σκον is disputed, opinion being divided between durative/ongoing action and iterative-intensive. The double nature of the latter interpretation is unsettling, as its exponents have tended to imply that -(ε)σκον does not show one consistent meaning – it is iterative here, but intensive over there. Hence Giacalone Ramat (1967: 117) claims intensive sense for -(ε)σκον with verbs ‘che esprimono sentimenti, desideri ecc.’, citing such examples as φίλεσσκον and ποθεσσκον, and even links this supposed use with ἡλάσκομαι. The concept that the suffix might randomly show different meanings with different verbs is intuitively unsatisfying, and it is the aim of this section to

\[\text{Including οὐτσοκον (II. 15.745), on which see Chantraine 1986-8: I.325, who also lists the other athematic aorist-stem forms.}\]
\[\text{For a list see Chantraine 1986-8: I.324.}\]
\[\text{Outside Homer, the only such example is apparently ἀλδησακε at Orphica L. 370.}\]
\[\text{Cf. Chantraine’s list (1986-8: I.324-5); he omits ὦσασκον, however.}\]
\[\text{On this form see Chantraine 1986-8: I.325, with addendum at I.517; and Wathelet 1973: 390.}\]
\[\text{Cf. also Brugmann’s (Brugmann and Delbrück 1893-1916: II/3.357) remark that such forms ‘nicht durchgängig iterativen Sinn zeigen’.}\]
explain the various meanings of -(ε)σκου. Its function could be of paramount importance to our understanding of the meaning of Greek - σκο, although this of course depends on what we understand the relationship between the two formations to be.

5.1. Aristotelian aspect and recent analyses

The general impression given by the literature discussed so far is that the iteratives in -(ε)σκου are in fact a category with very little coherence. Before we tackle this problem, it may be worthwhile to turn to some more general considerations; in particular, we must discuss 'Aristotelian aspect'. Also known as Vendlerian aspect, this is only part of the larger category of aspect in general. The latter is a notoriously complex concept: Comrie states that 'aspects are different ways of viewing the internal temporal constituency of the situation' (1976: 3; cf. also Bybee 1992: 145), but matters are much more complicated than this, and a full discussion of these and other views is given by Binnick (1991: 207-214), who concludes that the category should in fact be divided into three parts – of which Aristotelian aspect is one.50

Aristotelian aspect is a lexical phenomenon, which involves the categorisation of situations into categories as described by Vendler.51 Situations52 are first of all

50Cf. in general the main body of Binnick's monograph on tense and aspect (1991: 135-214), and his summary of his own conclusions (1991: 456-8). The two other categories which have been referred to as 'aspect' are as follows. Firstly, there is aspect itself, a term best used only to refer to whether an action is viewed imperfectively or perfectly (cf. Binnick 1991: 135-169, concluded at 207-214 and summarised at 457); this category is further defined by Binnick as 'the temporal relationship of a situation to the reference frame against which it is set' (1991: 458). Secondly there are the Aktionsarten, 'kinds of action'. To Binnick (1991: 197-207, summarised at 458), these involve the phases of the development of situations: hence they concern the starting, stopping and pausing of the action.


52We are here dealing not with isolated verbs, but with verb phrases; if we do not draw this distinction, then we cannot differentiate between the Aristotelian aspect of, for example, 'run' and 'run a mile'.
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divided into states (non-dynamic; e.g. 'desire, want, love') and non-states (dynamic); the latter are divided into activities (atelic; e.g. 'run, swim') and performances (telic); and the latter are further subdivided into achievements (momentaneous; e.g. 'recognise, find, win the race, die') and accomplishments (durative; e.g. 'run a mile, walk to school, grow up'). These categories may be neatly represented in a tree diagram as follows, with examples given below each type:

A slightly different interpretation of these categories is given by Moens and Steedman (1988). They attribute to non-states, which they label 'events', two features: atomic / extended and +/- consequent state. Including states, this gives five, not four, different types of situations: Vendler's class of activities is divided into two groups, points and processes. In the version of their table (1988: 17) reproduced below, I have added the traditional Vendlerian terms in brackets:

---

33See Binnick 1991: 189-197 for a discussion of telicity (which he calls 'telicness'); according to his definition, it does not involve 'the achievement of a goal, not the potentiality of such an achievement, but the inferences of such a potentiality in the characterisation of the situation' (1991: 192).

So far we have not considered repetition of situations. Freed (1979) accounts for these by dividing situations into 'single' and 'series'.\textsuperscript{55} The former are classed as either durative, as in \textit{he is sleeping}, or ‘iterative’, a different use of this term with which Freed denotes a set of uninterrupted subevents making up a whole event, as in, for example, \textit{she is sneezing}. Series are repetitions of situations which may themselves be taken as single situations, and are similarly divided into two, serials and generics; all serials are said to be also generics, but generics are not all serials. Serials indicate that a series of self-contained events takes place over a period of time, to which specific reference is made; hence \textit{he smokes a lot}. Generics do not make reference to repetition of a specific situation, and may hence be realised as regular repetitions or as general states: habitual occurrences (\textit{he smokes a lot}), occupations (\textit{she teaches college}) and general states (\textit{they own a house}). Only imperfective situations are said to be able to occur in series, although in fact this generalisation does not seem to be true.\textsuperscript{56} Series may be formed from any other Vendlerian categories.

\textsuperscript{55}Cf. Freed 1979: 32-6, summarised by Binnick 1991: 182-3 (although his page numbers differ).

\textsuperscript{56}Cf. Hewson and Bubenik 1997: 15, where Hewson cites Russian imperfective \textit{pît} ‘to drink’, perfective \textit{popît} ‘to have a drink’, iterative \textit{popîvat} ‘to keep having drinks’; and Dahl (1995: 419-20), who quotes an example from Serbo-Croatian but refers to the phenomenon as ‘deviant behavior, since
A different way of viewing series may be inferred from the work of Moens and Steedman (1988), who note that the addition of different features to different Vendlerian categories has various consistent effects; they produce a diagram of movements between the different areas of their table to map the various possibilities (1988: 18). They give the following example for the progressive state expressed by *Sandra is hiccupping:*

\[
\text{(point (Sandra hiccup))}
\]

\[
\downarrow
\]

\[
\text{(process (iteration (point (Sandra hiccup))))}
\]

\[
\downarrow
\]

\[
\text{(progressive (process (iteration (point (Sandra hiccup))))}
\]

That is to say, the predicate *hiccuped* (in *Sandra hiccupped (once)*) is to be classed as a point (activity), whereas *was hiccupping* (in *Sandra was hiccupping (all day long)*) is a progressive (a type of state), and the latter involves iteration of the former. In Moens and Steedman’s terminology, the point has been ‘coerced’ into a state.

In this case, a series may therefore not be an individual verb-type, but merely the result of adding a feature to a situation – a feature we may variously call iteration, plurality of action or ‘+REPEATED’. We see in the above example what happens when this feature is added to the category point.

Much further work has been accomplished in recent years on the syntax and semantics of generic phenomena. These relate to both the noun and to predicates, but the former do not concern Greek forms in -(ε)σκον. The relevant topic of verbs is more complicated, and involves the division of categories of types of sentences.

aspectual distinction[s]... tend to be neutralized in generics'. On the difference between forms in -(ε)σκον from present and aorist stems, see also § 2 n. 13 above.

57For a general introduction, see Krifka et al. 1995.
The most fundamental distinction is between characterising (i.e. generic) sentences, which denote a property, and particular or episodic ones, which denote a specific situation. A further division depends on whether the verb is dynamic or stative: it seems that, in the former case, a predicate may be used episodically and generically (the latter being termed the ‘habitual’ type), whereas any given stative predicate may be used either episodically or generically, but not as both (the latter being called the ‘lexical’ type of characterising verb). Hence, in the table below, ‘roar’ is used in both characterising and episodic sentences, but in the stative column there are two different predicates, ‘weigh’ and ‘be’.\(^58\) Hence:\(^59\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characterising predicates</th>
<th>‘Dynamic’ situation</th>
<th>Stative situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Habitual sentences</td>
<td>Simba roars when he smells food</td>
<td>Lexical characterising sentences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A lion (usually) weighs more than 200 lbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episodic predicates</td>
<td>Episodic dynamic sentences</td>
<td>Episodic stative sentences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Simba roared</td>
<td>Simba is in the cage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reason for the inverted commas around ‘dynamic’ is that, when such a verb is used in a habitual sentence, the sentence is deemed to be stative: it does not refer to a specific situation, but to a general property of the subject. In the characterising predicate we are again dealing with the addition of repetition. We saw above:

\[
\text{point (Sandra hiccupped) + repetition } \rightarrow \text{ progressive state (Sandra was hiccupping).}
\]

So here we can have the following:

\(^{58}\)For the criteria which lead to these divisions, see Krifka et al. 1995, esp. 1-18, 36-9.

\(^{59}\)The following table does not take account of the different types of NPs, but only of types of sentence; the total number of possible combinations is actually twelve (cf. Krifka et al. 1995: 18).
process (Simba roared) + repetition → habitual state (Simba used to roar [whenever he smelled food]).

In fact, when the feature +REPEATED is added to any dynamic situation, the result is to be regarded as a state. What happens when we try to repeat a state, however? The result is a state, but one of two types, depending on context: either the existence of one continuous state is emphasised, or the situation is reinterpreted as a repeated momentaneous event. So beside stative 'I resemble Tom', repeated 'I keep resembling Tom' seems either to mean continuous 'I keep resembling (continue to resemble) Tom (e.g. as we both grow older)' or discontinuous 'I keep resembling Tom (and then not resembling him again, in repeated sequence, e.g. due to a magic spell)'. Context is thus of importance here.

It is useful to note, before proceeding, a feature of the English tense system which illustrates this pattern. The English episodic sentence 'I am writing a letter (today)', with progressive present, describes a culminated process, whereas the characterising 'I write books (for a living)', with simple present, denotes a habitual state. The past of the former is 'I wrote a letter (yesterday)', whereas that of the latter is 'I used to write books (for a living)', with past habitual marker 'used to'. With a characterising stative verb such as 'know' or 'resemble', a progressive present is rare, as it must be episodic and indicate the present moment alone: 'I am resembling Tom (at the moment, but will change in a second)' is possible, but *'I am knowing Tom' is as unlikely as un-knowing him is; the simple presents 'I resemble' and 'I know' are of the characterising type, and are standard. In other words, English has the following paradigm:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>‘Dynamic’</th>
<th>Stative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>I write books</td>
<td>I resemble Tom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past</td>
<td>I used to write books</td>
<td>I resembled/used to resemble Tom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episodic</td>
<td>I am writing a letter</td>
<td>[I am resembling Tom]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
<td>I resembled Tom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the past habitual of the dynamic event ‘I used to write books’, we understand a series of repeated incidents of book-writing; on the other hand, the past habitual ‘I used to resemble/know Tom’ seems to be as continuous in meaning as simple past ‘I resembled/knew Tom’. So, addition of ‘used to’ to a dynamic predicate gives a repeated series of events that make up a state, whereas addition to a stative results in a continuous state. This marker of habituality coerces different Vendlerian types with different effects, a vital concept for understanding Greek -(e)σκόν.

5.2. Analysis of Greek iteratives in -(e)σκόν

If we assume that -(e)σκόν is a marker of repetition, we should expect two different results from addition of this suffix to a stem; and this is exactly what we find. It has already been noted above that several scholars have labelled -(e)σκόν as 'intensive' on certain verbs (§ 2); it is now clear that this meaning merely results from a marker of iterativity being added to a stative predicate: from νοίμω ‘live’ we expect continuous νοίμεσκόν ‘used to live’, the serial ‘lived repeatedly’ being pragmatically unlikely.60 Certain recent scholars have recognised, and mentioned briefly, that it is the meaning of the verb in question that is the important element here;61 but in fact the best and most productive work that has been done in this field is also some of the very

---

60 Serial meanings are of course possible in context: cf. e.g. the examples of φιλέσκόν, both non-serial ‘used to love’ and serial ‘used to have sex with, used to entertain’ in § 5.2.2.

61 Cf. § 5.3 below.
earliest work on -(ε)σκον – that of Stolpe (1849) and Týn (1859), and also Kluge (1911).

These scholars all classified iteratives in -(ε)σκον with an emphasis on syntactic and semantic criteria and, although their analyses are different, there are some consistently noted features. Stolpe (1849: 28-40) has four classes of forms, divided according to semantic and syntactic criteria; Týn (1859) deals first with forms derived from aorist stems and then those from presents; and Kluge (1911: 22, 26-30, 33-6), who had read Stolpe's work, discusses data from the Iliad and the Odyssey separately.

In what follows, forms in -(ε)σκον will be divided into two classes. The first category corresponds to Freed's category of serials, and to Krifka et al.'s class of characterising 'dynamics': these are instances where -(ε)σκον is added to a dynamic predicate, and involve an evidently repeated action. There are several sub-types within this class, and in these Stolpe's and Týn's detailed analyses will be followed. The second class comprises non-serials, or characterising stative cases, where -(ε)σκον is found on a stative predicate.

5.2.1. Serial situations in Homer

Serial situations involve repetition of a dynamic situation, whether telic (achievements, accomplishments) or atelic (activities); once the situation has occurred, it happens again, although not necessarily immediately. Homer shows four different syntactic classes for serial situations. Of these four, the first three are easily classed, showing distinctive features which were noticed and discussed separately by Stolpe and Týn.⁶²

Firstly, we find a major class of serials, where, when a situation occurs, one or more others follow, and this whole sequence of events is then repeated. In these

cases, the earlier event is usually rendered by an optative in a subordinate clause, and the others by forms in -(ε)σκον; the form may therefore be summarised as ‘whenever X happened, then Y would happen’. Stolpe (1849: 36) describes these instances as ‘frequentativa’. Hence, from an aorist stem:

οὖν τινα Τυδείδης ἄορι πλήξειε παραστας,
tόν δ’ Ὅδυσεὺς μετόπισθε λαβὼν ποδὸς ἔξερύσασκε, ...

(Π. 10.489-90)

But whoever the son of Tydeus stood beside and struck with his sword, him would Odysseus seize by the foot from behind and drag aside...

This type of construction is extremely frequent. Occasionally, the verb denoting the earlier action occurs in the simple imperfect, the participle or as a second iterative. In one very different instance we must understand the expression ‘each time’, when Odysseus fails three times to hug his mother:

τρίς μὲν ἐφορμήθην, ἐλέειν τέ με θυμὸς ἀνώγει,
tρίς δὲ μοι ἐκ χειρῶν σκιή εἰκελον ἥ καὶ ὄνειρῳ ἑπτὰτ’ ἐμοὶ δ’ ἀχος ὥ γενέσκετο κηρόθι μᾶλλον, ...

(Od. 11.206-8)

Three times I rushed forward, and my heart bade me clasp her, and three times she flitted from my arms like a shadow or a dream; and [each time] there would come a sharp pain in the bottom of my heart.

---

⁶³This use of the optative is referred to by Tyn as the ‘Optativus frequentiae’, and by Debrunner as the ‘optativus iterativus’ (Schwyzer and Debrunner 1939-71: II.335-6); it was also noted by Delbrück (Brugmann and Delbrück 1893-1916: IV.63) and Wathelet (1973: 403).

⁶⁴Cf. Stolpe 1849: 36-8; Tyn 1859: 678-80, 688-9; and also Kluge 1911: 27, 33.
Our second group is much smaller; here, indefinite adverbs of time are used to mark a repeated series of situations: rather than the ordered sequence of 'whenever X happened, then Y would happen' we have the random 'at one time X would happen, at another time Y would happen'. In these cases, therefore, the connection between the situations concerned is generally looser, as:

\[
\text{άλλοτε μὲν τε Νότος Βορέη προβάλεσκε φέρεσθαι,}
\]
\[
\text{άλλοτε δ' αὖ Ἐβρός Ζεφύρῳ εἶξασκε διώκειν. (Od. 5.331-2)}
\]

At one time the South Wind would throw it [the raft] forward to the North Wind to be carried along, and at another the East Wind would yield it to the West Wind to drive.

Sometimes the second situation of the pair is hard to understand as occurring without the first having also happened. In these cases, this second syntactic class seems close to the previous one: the difference is that equal emphasis is laid on both actions, rather than the earlier one being subordinated. As in the above example, both forms show -(e)σκον. Hence, in the following description of ball-throwing, Homer says 'the one would throw, the other would catch' rather than 'when one had thrown, then the other would catch':

\[
\text{τὴν ἔτερος ῥίπτασκε ποτὶ νέφεα σκιόντα}
\]
\[
\text{ιδνοθεῖς ὁπίσω· ὃ δ' ἀπὸ χθόνος υψός ἄερθεῖς}
\]
\[
\text{ῥηδίως μεθέλεσκε, πάρος ποσίν σύδας ἰκέσθαι. (Od. 8.374-6)}
\]

... the one having bent back would toss it toward the shadowy clouds; and the other having leapt up from the ground would skilfully catch it in turn before his feet reached the ground.

---

65Cf. Stolpe 1849: 38; Týn 1859: 680-2, 689; and also Kluge 1911: 26, 33.
These two main types are, therefore, very much alike. In the third category, however, it is the subject, and not the time of the situation, which is varied: the form therefore is ‘someone would do X’. Almost all instances are accounted for by the twenty-eight occurrences of εἶπεσκε, as in:

\[ \omega \delta \varepsilon \delta \tau iς \varepsilon Ιπεσκευν ιδην ες πλησιον αλλου ... \]
\[ \omega ις \phiασαυ ι πληθυς \]  
\( (I I . 2.271, 278) \)

And thus one, having looked at his neighbour, would say [to him]:... So the multitude spoke.  

Apart from this, occurrences of this type are rare. An example of a present-stem form is found when Odysseus repeatedly binds together three rams as cover for his men’s escape, and Homer says ὁ μέν ἐν μέσῳ ανδρας φερεσκε ‘the one in the middle would bear a man’ (Od. 9.429).

The above three groups are brought together by Stolpe and Tyn, giving as they do instances of repeated action in context. This leaves one remaining group of serials to be discussed here, which indicate repeated action but not at any specific moment in time. The different treatments of Stolpe and Tyn result in a different arrangement of remaining forms in -(ε)σκου for these scholars. Tyn’s analysis works on the basis of the distinction between iteratives from present stems and those from aorist ones: the above three types all occur for both tense stems, and this leaves him a group of forms in -(ε)σκου formed from present stems only, which he subdivides into two. One subset, made up of obviously serial formations, is our fourth syntactic class (see below); in the other there is no interruption in the situation described, and these are in fact our stative forms (1859: 692-4; cf. § 5.2.2 below). Stolpe, however, begins with

\[ 66 \text{Cf. Stolpe 1849: 38-9; and Tyn 1859: 682-3, 689-90.} \]
\[ 67 \text{The first verse given here is repeated at } II . 4.81 = 22.372, \text{ where it is picked up with a line of the form} \]
\[ \omega \delta \varepsilon / \omega ις ... tiς ειπεσκε (II . 4.85, 22.375). \]
what we call statives (1849: 30-3) and splits what comprises our fourth class, serials which indicate repeated action at an unspecified point in time, into those which largely indicate ‘vel consuetudo ac mos vel munus et officium’ (1849: 33; cf. Stolpe 1849: 33-6) and those where the action was repeated over some length of time, as indicated by the use of such adverbs as πολλά, πολλάκις and αἱεί (1849: 39-40).

Following Stolpe and Týn, we therefore have left two sub-types of serials, which have in common the property that the situation concerned is repeated but not at a specific point in time. Examples of these two types of our fourth class are as follows. For that where there is no indicator such as πολλά, we for example hear of Thetis described as she

\[ \text{η οί ἀπαγγέλλεσκε Δίος μεγάλοιο νόημα. (Il. 17.409) } \]

who used to bring him [Achilles] news of the purpose of great Zeus.

For the other type, we have e.g.:

\[ \text{o δ' εὐκήλος μυχῶ ᾦ Ἀργεὸς ἱπποβότοιο πόλλ' Ἀγαμέμνονέν ἀλοχον θέλγεσκεν ἐπέσσιν. (Od. 3.263-4) } \]

but he [Aegisthus], at ease in a nook of Argos that is grazed by horses, often used to cajole Agamemnon’s wife with words.

Semantically, we may note that all three categories of Vendlerian dynamic situations occur for serial events. For example, we have the momentaneous telic situation ‘kill’, an achievement, when Hermes says of Hector:

\[ \text{τὸν μὲν ἐγὼ μᾶλα πολλὰ μάχῃ ἐνι κυδιανείρῃ φθαλμοίσιν ὄπωπα, καὶ εὕτ' ἐπὶ νησίν ἐλάσσας } \]
I have very often seen him with my eyes in battle that brings men honour, even when after driving the Argives to the ships he used to slay them, tearing [them] with the sharp bronze.

Similarly, a durative telic situation (accomplishment), when iterated in a generic fashion, reaches its culmination and is then repeated at a later time, as with πλύνω 'wash (clothes)' when Homer speaks of the πλυνότι 'washing-troughs'

... δι' εἶματα σιγαλῶντα πλύνεσκον Τρώων ἀλοχοὶ καλαὶ τε θύγατρες (II. 22.154-5)
... where the wives and fair daughters of the Trojans used to wash bright clothing.

With an atelic dynamic situation (activity), the action is understood as occurring at various points in time in the same way as a telic action is:

tὸ δὲ θαυμάζεσκον ἀπαντες,
ὡς ὁι χρύσειοι κόντες ὁ μὲν λάε νεβρὸν ἀπάγχοι, ... (Od. 19.228-9)
And at this all men used to marvel how, though they were gold, the hound was strangling the fawn and pinning it...

The group of atelic situations where we find -(e)σκον is especially notable since, although many forms in -(e)σκον only occur once, we repeatedly find verbs of wearing (φορέσκε occurs seven times; cf. also ζωνύσκετο at II. 5.857); and of
allowing (ἐκσκοῦν and ἐκασκοῦν are found four times each, nearly always with a negative).  

In classifying forms in -(ε)σκοῦν from aorist and present stems separately, Tyn highlights the difference between serial and non-serial forms. A drawback to his approach, however, is that his breakdown only allows for forms in -(ε)σκοῦν from aorist stems which fall into one of the first three categories given in this section. Yet in theory an aorist stem formation in this fourth category is possible, and in fact the one instance which Tyn finds unclassifiable surely belongs here: it is αὐθῆσασκε (cf. Tyn 1859: 683). Hera shouts like Stentor,

ος τόσον αὐθῆσασχ' ὀσον ἄλλοι πεντῆκοντα: (II. 5.786)
who used to shout as loudly as fifty other men...

This, however, is apparently the only such instance, unless – as is tempting – one classifies παρέβασκε (II. 11.104) as the iterative of aorist ἐβῆν rather than as part of present βασκω.  

The lack of aorists in this category is surprising; presumably it is related to the semantics of the aorist itself, and its use for denoting single actions.  

5.2.2. Non-serial situations in Homer

We are left with the non-serials, the class of forms in -(ε)σκοῦν which derive from verbs expressing states – that is, in our interpretation, the so-called ‘intensives’ where repeated action is not found. As noted above, Tyn observed that these forms only occur on present stems; this is to be expected, as the situations they describe are by definition durative and atelic – we are not to understand that the state broke off and

---

68 That is, seven times out of eight this verb is found with a negative, meaning ‘not allow’; cf. Chantraine 1986-8: 1.319.
69 Cf. Chapter 4 §2.1.1.
70 On the difference between the meaning of the aorist and present forms, see §2 n. 13 above.
was repeated later, but that it was once constantly the case, and is so no longer.

Obvious examples are the verbs of dwelling, ναίεταοσκόν (five times) and ναίεσκον (three), both 'used to dwell, live (in)'. Hence:

Μαχνήτων δ' ἤρχε Πρόθοος Τευθρηδόνος υἱός,
οἱ περὶ Πηνείων καὶ Πήλιον εινοσίφυλλον
ναίεσκον. (II. 2.756-8)

And Prothous, son of Tenthredon, was leader of the Magnetes, who used to live around Peneius and Pelion, covered with trembling leaves.

Another frequent example is φιλέεσκον (eight times), which can usually be interpreted as a stative 'used to love', as in καὶ ἐ μάλιστα / δμωάων φιλέεσκε (Od. 1.434-5) 'and she especially of all the handmaids used to love him [Telemachus]'. In two examples, however, this form appears to be used as an accomplishment 'have sex with',71 and on one occasion the accomplishment 'entertain', when Diomedes kills Axylus, described as φιλος... ἀνθρώποις 'dear to men',

πάντας γὰρ φιλέεσκεν ὄνει ἐπὶ σίκια νοίων. (II. 6.15)

for, living in a house by the road, he used to give entertainment to all.

Sometimes, both dynamic and stative interpretations are possible. So ἄριστεεσκόν (six times) is interpreted as stative 'used to be the best' (rather than accomplishment 'used to perform feats of valour') by Cunliffe (1924 s.v. ἄριστεύω), who lists all instances of the iterative under the meaning 'excel', literally (II. 6.460, 11.746, 16.292, 551, 17.351) or metaphorically (II. 11.627). Yet in the former set of

71II. 9.450 and Od. 18.325; cf. Cunliffe 1924 s.v. φιλέω (2).
cases it is ambiguous, as when Hector says to Andromache that, once he is dead, people will say of her:

"Εκτορος ἦδε γυνὴ, δός ἀριστεύεσθε μάχεσθαι
Τρώων ἵπποδάμων, ... (Il. 6.460-1)

There's the wife of Hector, who of all the horse-taming Trojans used to be preeminent in war / used to perform feats of valour...

Stolpe (1849: 30-1) and Tyn (1859: 693) also cite καλέεσκον as a member of this set, although in fact it too may be ambiguous, as in:

τὴν δὲ τὸτ' ἐν μεγάροις πατήρ καὶ πότνια μήτηρ
'Αλκυόνην καλέεσκον ἐπώνυμον, ... (Il. 9.561-2)

And in their halls her father and her lady mother used to call her Halcyone by name...

If we mean that her parents called aloud 'Halcyon!', then we have a dynamic serial; on the other hand, the predicate is stative in the sentence 'I am called (known as) Halcyon'.

5.2.3. Iteratives in -(e)σκον in Herodotus

Since data from Herodotus are commonly used to argue that Homer's use of -(e)σκον on σα- aorists is a poetic extension, one may wonder how similar Herodotus' syntactic and semantic usage is. Here, serials of the type 'whenever X happened, then Y would happen' are again frequent, with the subordinate clause

---

72The text used here is that of Rosén (1987-97).
showing aorist optative. Hence, for example, Herodotus says that the Egyptian priests told him:\textsuperscript{73}

\[ \ldots \ \text{ὡς ἐπὶ Μοῖριος βασιλέας, δικως ἔλθοι ὁ ποταμὸς ἐπὶ ὀκτὼ πῆχεας τὸ ἐλάχιστον, ἀρδέσκε Ἀῖγυπτον τὴν ἑνερθε Μέμφιος.} \]

(Herodotus 2.13.1)

when Moeris was king, whenever the river rose as least eight cubits, it would water [all] Egypt below Memphis.

Also common is use of a serial after a participle:\textsuperscript{74}

\[ \text{ἐπείτε δὲ ταῦτα διεκόσμησε καὶ ἐκράτυνε ἐωτὸν τῇ τυραννίδι, ἤν τὸ δίκαιον φυλάσσων χαλέπος· καὶ τὰς τε δίκας γράφοντες ἔσω παρ' ἐκεῖνον ἐςπέμπεσκον, καὶ ἐκεῖνος διακρίνων τὰς ἐσφερομένας ἐκπέμπεσκε.} \]

(1.100.1)

When he had ordered all these matters and strengthened himself with sovereign power, he [Deioces] was a hard man when observing justice: and they, writing down their lawsuits, would send them to him, and he, deciding on those [lawsuits] brought to him, would send out [in reply].

There are also occasional examples of the second class of serials, the unordered ‘at one time X would happen, at another time Y would happen’, found in

\textsuperscript{73}Cf. also 1.186 ὀπαίρεσκον, ἐπιτείνεσκε; 1.196 ἐσάγεσκον, πωλέσκε; 2.13 ἀρδέσκε; 2.174 ἄγεσκον, κλέπτεσκε; 4.42 σπείρεσκον, μένεσκον; 4.43 φεύγεσκον; 4.78 λάβεσκε, κατελίπεσκε; 4.129 ἔσκον; 4.130 ἐλάβεσκον; 6.12 ἔχεσκε; 7.41 μετεκβαίνεσκε; 7.119 σπεύδεσκον, ἐσκε (once or twice), ποιεσκετο, ἔχεσκον, ἀπελαύνεσκον; 7.211 φεύγεσκον; 9.74 βαλέσκετο.

\textsuperscript{74}Cf. also 1.36 διασκεφείρεσκε, ποιεσκον; 1.148 ἄγεσκον; 3.117 ἀρδέσκε; 3.119 κλαίσεκαν, ὀπαίρεσκετο; 7.33 ἀρδέσκε; and 9.40 ἔσκον.
Herodotus’ explanation of how the people of Barce found the besieging Persians’ mines:75

τὰ μὲν νῦν ὄρυγματα ἀνὴρ χαλκεὺς ἀνεῦρε ἐπιχάλκῳ ἀσπίδι ὅπε ἐπιφάσασθεὶς: περιφέρων αὐτὴν ἐντὸς τοῦ τείχους προσίσχε πρὸς τὸ δάπεδον τῆς πόλιος: τὰ μὲν δὴ ἄλλα ἔσκε κωφά, πρὸς ἀ προσίσχε, κατὰ δὲ τὰ ὀρυσσόμενα ἤχεσσε ὁ χαλκὸς τῆς ἀσπίδος. (4.200.2)

As for the mines, a smith discovered them by means of a bronze shield, having devised thus: carrying it around within the wall he held it against the ground of the city; some places at which he held it would be [would sound] dull, but along the mines the bronze of the shield would ring.

There are no examples of the Homeric type ‘someone would do X’, but serials do also occasionally occur in Herodotus without limiting context, as when Mardonius tries to persuade the new king to march against Athens next:76

οὗτος μὲν οἱ ὁ λόγος ἦν τιμωρός, τοῦτον δὲ τοῦ λόγου παρενθηκὼν ποιέσκετο τῇνδε, ὡς ἡ Εὐρώπη περικαλλὴς χώρη καὶ δένδρα παντοία φέρει τὰ ἡμέρα ἀρετὴν τε ἄκρη βασιλεῖτε τε μούνῳ θυρήτων ἄξις ἐκτῆσθαι. (7.5.3)

This was an argument for vengeance; but he would repeatedly make an addition of the argument, that Europe was a very beautiful country, and it bore all kinds of cultivated trees, a land high in excellence, worthy to be owned by the king alone of mortals.

75Cf. also 1.196 ἔσκε, ἔσκε; 4.128 πρέπεσκε.
76Cf. also 4.78 ποιέσκε; 7.5 ποιέσκετο; and 7.106 πέμπεσκε.
Non-serials in -(e)σκον may be non-existent in Herodotus: there are only two possible examples. Firstly, there is one occasion when ἐσκον may be translated as stative ‘used to be’; one may also read serial sense here, however, in its use with ἕκαστοτε ‘each time, on each occasion’:

οἱ δὲ Πάριοι ὅκως μὲν τι δώσουσι Μιλτιάδην ἀργύριον, οὐδὲ διενοεῦντο, οἱ δὲ ὅκως διαφυλάξωσι τὴν πόλιν, τούτο ἐμηχανώντο ἄλλα τε ἐπιφρασσόμενοι, καὶ τῇ μάλιστα ἔσκε ἕκαστοτε ἐπίμαχον τοῦ τείχεος· τούτῳ ἀμα νυκτὶ ἐξήρετο διπλήσιον τοῦ ἄρχαιον. (6.133.3)

And the Parians did not at all intend to give money to Miltiades, but to guard their city carefully, and they contrived this and other things, and blocking up that part of the wall where on each occasion it used to be vulnerable; while it was night, it was raised to double its old [height].

Of the remaining instances of ἐσκον, all seem to show iterative meaning, as is often noted. Secondly, we may also understand ἐθέλεσκον as stative in the following passage:

ταῦτα ἔλεγαν, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα αὐτικὰ πείθεσθαι οὐδεὶς ἤθελε, ἄλλα, οἰa στρατηγὸς, σκηνάς τε πενάμενοι ἐν τῇ νύσῳ ἐσκινησφέοντο καὶ ἐσβαίνειν οὐκ ἐθέλεσκον ἐς τὰς νέας οὐδ’ ἀναπειράσθαι. (6.12.4)

77 Cf. Stolpe 1849: 45-6; Tyn 1859: 693; Brugmann 1902: 272; and Giacalone Ramat 1967: 119-20 n. 27. With a total of eight or nine instances, ἐσκον is the most frequently found ‘iterative’ in Herodotus, as it is in Homer: 1.196 (three times), 4.129, 200, 6.133, 7.119 (once or twice), 9.40. On ἐσκον as iterative in Homer, see § 6.1.2 below.
They [the Ionians] said these things, and after this no man was willing to obey; but, having pitched themselves tents on the island, as though they were an army, they kept from the sun, and were not willing to embark in their ships, nor to exercise them.

On the other hand, ἐθέλεσκον could denote a serial situation: the suffix - (ε)σκον could be being used to indicate that the men are repeatedly being asked to board their ships, and are repeatedly refusing.

Occasionally, we find ἑν used with iteratives in Herodotus (2.174, 3.119, 4.42, 78, 130), presumably a development which reflects the classical usage of simple aorists and imperfects with ἑν instead of iterative forms in - (ε)σκον.78

Herodotus, therefore, uses forms in -(ε)σκον perhaps entirely with serial meaning, and especially with the aorist optative; entirely absent is the type ‘someone would do X’, and also expressions of the atelic activities type ‘used to wear’, quite common in Homer (§ 5.2.1 above). This could be because Herodotus liked to use -(ε)σκον to mark serial situations, of which the ‘when X happened, then Y would happen’ is the most frequent type both in his work and in epic. Alternatively, it could indicate that, as is the case with forms in -(ε)σκον derived from σα- aorists, non-serial use of -(ε)σκον is a poetic innovation on the part of Homer.

5.3. Conclusion: the semantics of forms in -(ε)σκον

It is now clear that stative forms in -(ε)σκον have given rise to much confusion and often prevented the formations in -(ε)σκον from being seen as a coherent whole. Stolpe (1849) argued that both presents in -σκω and preterites in

78For this use cf. Ruijgh 1985: 147 and Rijksbaron 1994: 14-15. For forms not in -(ε)σκον but with past iterative meaning in Herodotus and Thucydides, see Kluge 1911: 45-8 and 48-50 respectively; for those found in Homer, Kluge 1911: 35-40; and for those in Classical Greek in general, Curtius 1877-80: II.406; and Rijksbaron 1994: 14-16.
-(ε)σκον showed iterative meaning; although this view does not seem acceptable (cf. Chapter 1 § 3.4), his argument for coherence within the latter group is now backed up by modern theory. The explanation that differences arise from the meanings of the verbs involved was noted by Wathelet (1973: 403), Puhvel (1991: 13) and Sihler (1995: 506), but none of these scholars attempts to classify the verbs semantically.

Is our suffix therefore to be described as iterative, durative, or iterative-durative? It primarily seems to denote iteration of the action concerned, which is realised as repeated (serial) in dynamic situations and usually as continuous (non-serial) in stative ones. Indeed, the latter use is so rare in Herodotus that the former would seem to have been regarded as fundamental, in the Classical era at least.

Data from other languages parallel the Greek usage. English used to, which also indicates repeated/continuous action in the past, cannot be used to denote serial situations which occur in a limited time-frame, as -(ε)σκον frequently does in both Homer and Herodotus: hence we would translate ‘Three times I rushed forward,... and [each time] there would come/**used to come a sharp pain’ (for Od. 11.206-8).79 A suffix with a wider range still than Greek -(ε)σκον is West Greenlandic Eskimo -sar/-tar-.80 This suffix, unlike -(ε)σκον, is used in the present:

allakkanik allapoq ‘he is writing / was writing / wrote letters’
allakkanik allattarpoq ‘he (usually) writes letters’
arfinermut makittarpunga ‘I get up at six o’clock’
miaartortarput ‘they (i.e. cats) meow’.

It is also used, like -(ε)σκον, to mark the second event in serial situations of the type ‘when X happened, then Y would happen’:

79 On English used to, see further Quirk et al. 1985: 140.
80 Data are taken from Dahl 1995: 422-3; cf. also Dahl 1985: 100-2.
In addition to these data, also of interest from Dahl’s (1995) typological account is the statement that generics tend to be ‘minimally marked for tense-aspect’. Is the absence of the augment therefore to be connected with the characterising properties of the suffix?

If the preceding account is correct, the function of Greek -(ε)σκον is no longer as isolated as it once seemed; though long regarded as an unusual formation within Greek, it clearly fits well within a much wider picture.

6. Ambiguous forms: ἔσκον and (ἐ)φασκον

With this revised semantic analysis in mind, the ambiguous forms ἔσκον and (ἐ)φασκον, which have been the subject of much discussion, require re-examination.

6.1. ἔσκον

6.1.1. Morphology

The form ἔσκον (22 times in the Iliad and 23 in the Odyssey) shows contradictory evidence as to its origin: in some ways it appears to be an iterative form, but in others a relic of an old present *ἔσκω. It is related to ἔμιτ ‘be’, which shows imperfect ἔμιτ and future ἔσμικι; this verb is extremely frequent in Homer – Gehring (1891 s.v. ἔμιτ) lists nearly four pages of forms, and Kahn (1973: 87 n. 4) states that there are 562 instances in Iliad 1-12 alone. We may postulate a root *h₁es- ‘be’, which shows reflexes in a wide range of languages (cf. Rix 1998: 214-15).
We may perhaps then derive εσκο from an inherited zero-grade form

\( *h_s\text{-skelo} / o- \); possible correspondents from other languages, reviewed by Keller (1985, 1992: 83-6), are Old Latin escit, Armenian icaem, Middle Indic acchati, acchāi, Thracian ἰσκο and Tocharian B star-, skentar-. Keller, however, discards three of these forms, producing evidence that the Thracian form is too doubtful to be taken into account, the Indic not connected with the others at all and the Armenian a later, secondary development. This leaves the Greek, Latin and Tocharian forms. Of these, the Latin must be from full-grade \( *h_1es- \) and the Tocharian from zero-grade \( *h_s;^- \); the Greek could certainly be from \( *h_1es- \), but perhaps also \( *h_s;^- \). Keller argues that, although these data are contradictory, the fact that only these rare and residual forms occur indicates that a form in \(-skelo-\) from \( *h\text{-es}^- \) is inherited. As already seen, we would expect a zero-grade here, making the Latin form the problem; and regarding voice, Keller opts for the Tocharian type, stating that it is more likely for the verb 'be' in Indo-European to show medio-passive endings (1985: 43 and n. 128, 1992: 86). More recently, Hackstein, in his section on the Tocharian forms (1995: 272-82), performed a separate study of the evidence for an inherited pre-form. Also citing the Palaic imperative iska 'be', he comes to the same conclusion as Keller, and reconstructs Indo-European \( *h_s\text{-skelo} / o- \), which gives \( *h_s\text{skelo} / o- \) and could be at the

---

84 The treatment of initial laryngeals before stops and sibilants is controversial; see Beekes 1969: 91; Mayrhofer in Kuryłowicz 1968-86: I/1.124-5; and Keller 1992: 85 n. 37.
85 Unless we are rather dealing with \( *h_1(es)- \) with \(-skelo-\); cf. Keller 1985: 27 n. 2, 1992: 83 n. 27.
87 Cf. Hackstein 1995: 277-82, with bibliography. His study is apparently independent of Keller's, although Keller 1992 is cited in his bibliography.
88 For discussion and bibliography on this form see Hackstein 1995: 279.
The features which εσκον shares with the iterative class are, however, notable. It is always found without augment and always in the third person imperfect, except for one first person singular instance (II. 7.153). Its usage in later literature is severely limited: it is only at all frequent in Herodotus, where it is found eight or nine times; it also occurs in the Ionic Greek of Mimnermus.

6.1.2. Semantics

This history of Greek εσκον, whatever its ultimate origin, has been the subject of much discussion. Chantraine (1986-8: I.320-1) argued that, due to the morphological awkwardness of the old imperfect of εμι, εσκε came to be used instead of older ης, and was metrically convenient because it scanned in identically the same way as εστι. He found in εσκε a durative emphasis in comparison with ην, which approached aoristic meaning, although the two forms were sometimes equivalent. The former observation should be no surprise given the above semantic analysis of forms in -(ε)σκον: the 'iterative' past of stative 'be' is stative 'used to be'.

Keller (1985: 36-8) claims that, although εσκον has iterative meaning in Herodotus, its frequency and use as a durative in Homer set it apart from the other forms in -(ε)σκον (1985: 36, 1992: 84). She follows Jacquinod (1978) in assuming

---

89On the latter cf. Penney 1998: 95. Hackstein has inchoative meaning for the reconstructed form, but this seems less likely given the fact that the oldest Latin forms do not have the meaning he ascribes them (cf. n. 86 above). A form *h_s-σκο- is similarly reconstructed by Rix (1998: 214-15).
90Cf. Keller 1985: 34-5. She also cites further occurrences in Alcman (augmented ηςκε), Pindar and Sappho, but the list is not exhaustive; Veitch (1887 s.v. εμι) also refers to an occurrence in a chorus of Aeschylus (Pers. 656).
91For a comparison of copulative and existential uses of εσκον in Homer, see Hackstein 1995: 280.
92Kluge (1911: 26) thought εσκον an old imperfect which gradually took on iterative meaning; but see further Shipp 1972: 88, who noted that Chantraine underestimated the convenience of the form.
that φημι', having lost its aorist and finding itself with only one past tense form – the morphological imperfect ἔφην / ἔφωμην, used as both imperfect and aorist – acquired as new imperfect (ἐ)φασκόν, leaving ἔφην as the aorist (see § 6.2.2 below).

The same happened to the aoristless εἰμί, with its old imperfect ἥξα often approaching aorist sense (as at Il. 3.180). But ἔσκόν is never integrated to the extent that it is found with the augment in Homer, and indeed never, as it were, ‘took off’ as part of the verb’s conjugation, as (ἐ)φασκόν did with φημι'; it was merely an ‘imparfait expressif’ of εἰμί. She suggests that the aorist ἐγερόμην was used beside the imperfect ἥξα, leaving no real role for ἔσκόν to take. Hence, as Clackson (1994: 78) says, ἔσκόν and (ἐ)φασκόν are used as marked imperfects beside old imperfects acting as aorists, and ‘in the case of ἔφην the transfer is complete.’93 We shall see below, however, that (ἐ)φασκόν may indeed show ‘iterative’ meaning in Homer.

The origins of ἔσκόν as an iterative are nonetheless clearly evident in the Homeric epics.94 Especially notable is the following instance, when Eumaeus says of Odysseus’ mother:

δόρα μὲν οὖν δὴ κεῖνη ἔπην, ἀχέουσα περ ἐμπησ,
τόφρα τί μοι φίλον ἔσκε μεταλλήσαι καὶ ἐρέσθαι, ...

(Od. 15.361-2)

As long as she was [alive], though she was in sorrow, it used to be a pleasure to me to ask and inquire after her...

Týn (1859: 693) notes the use of δόφρα in connection with iteratives in -(ἐ)σκόν which denote repetition outside his three categories that occur for both present and aorist stems (cf. § 5.2.1 above). Here the subordinate clause δόφρα... ἔτην indicates

93 Cf., similarly, Sihler 1995: 506.
94 On the use of ἔσκόν in Herodotus see § 5.2.3 above.
that the main verb pertains to an non-specific period of time in the past; the serial 
\( \varepsilon \sigma \kappa \omicron \nu \) indicates that \( \mu \varepsilon \tau \alpha \lambda \lambda \eta \sigma \sigma \alpha \iota \) καὶ \( \varepsilon \rho \varepsilon \sigma \theta \alpha \iota \) was repeatedly \( \phi \iota \lambda \omicron \nu \) for 
Eumaeus.

From a stative verb, however, we expect a form in -(ε)σκον to have non-
serial, stative meaning; in nearly all of the remaining 44 instances, this use is indeed 
found. The largest group of such forms involves \( \varepsilon \sigma \kappa \omicron \nu \) 'used to be' being used of 
someone who is dead, about to die or assumed dead: eleven instances of this copular 
usage occur in the \textit{Iliad} and seven in the \textit{Odyssey}. All the latter involve Odysseus, in 
all but one case with his name preceded by \( \sigma \iota \omicron \varsigma \) / \( \sigma \iota \omicron \nu \), as when Telemachus says to 
Aegyptius:95

\begin{quote}
\( \sigma \iota \upsilon \gamma \dot{a} \rho \varepsilon \pi \upsilon \; \alpha \nu \dot{h} \rho \),

\( \sigma \iota \omicron \varsigma \; \text{O} \delta \upsilon \sigma \sigma \varepsilon \upsilon \varsigma \; \varepsilon \sigma \kappa \epsilon \nu \), \( \alpha \rho \dot{h} \iota \nu \; \alpha \pi \delta \; \sigma \iota \kappa \omicron \nu \; \dot{a} \mu \dot{n} \nu \alpha \nu \).
\end{quote}

\( (\text{Od. 2.58-9} = 17.537-8) \)

For there is no man here, such as Odysseus used to be, to ward off harm from 
the house.

In four of the Iliadic instances, \( \varepsilon \sigma \kappa \omicron \nu \) is used predicatively with a superlative, as 
when Zeus says to Hera:96

\begin{quote}
\( \dot{a} \lambda \lambda \alpha \; \kappa \alpha \iota \; \text{Eκτωρ}

\phi \iota \lambda \tau \alpha \omicron \varsigma \; \varepsilon \sigma \kappa \epsilon \iota \sigma \iota \beta \rho \sigma \tau \omicron \nu \; \sigma \iota \nu \; \text{I} \lambda \iota \omega \; \epsilon \iota \sigma \iota \nu \) \( (\text{Il. 24.66-7}) \)

But Hector also used to be the dearest to gods of the mortals who are in Ilium.
\end{quote}

\footnote{95Cf. also \textit{Od.} 4.270, 689, 19.315, 21.94; the instance without \( \sigma \iota \omicron \varsigma \) is at \textit{Od.} 19.240.}

\footnote{96\( \phi \iota \lambda \tau \alpha \omicron \varsigma \) also at \textit{Il.} 18.118, 20.410; \( \nu \varepsilon \o\dot{w} \tau \alpha \omicron \varsigma \) at \textit{Il.} 20.409.}
This leaves seven instances of ἐσκον with the dead in the Iliad. One case, however, is only really an extension of this usage. Homer says of Medon after he has been killed:

ητοι δ’ μὲν νόθος υἱὸς Ὀιλήνος θείοιο
ἐσκε Μέδων, Άιαντος ἀδελφεὸς. (II. 15.333-4)

Indeed Medon used to be the bastard son of godlike Oileus, [and] brother of Ajax.

These two lines are also found when Medon is mentioned earlier on, before he died: here it is hard to gloss ἐσκον as ‘used to be’, as the words are re-used to describe him when alive (II. 13.694-5).97

In a second set of instances (once in the Iliad, six times in the Odyssey), ἐσκον is used to introduce a new character. Once in each epic, this is someone who is about to die, as in:98 Ἐλπήμωρ δὲ τις ἐσκε νεώτατος, ... ‘there was a certain man, Elpenor, the youngest’ (Od. 10.552). Twice more in the Odyssey, others are introduced in this way (Od. 9.508, 15.417). With a less obviously ‘iterative’ non-serial sense, ἐσκον is used three times in the Odyssey to introduce in the phrase ὄνομ’, ἐσκε, as in Ἠἰρυβατῆς δ’ ὄνομ’ ἐσκε ‘and he was Eurybates by name’ (Od. 19.247).99

As well as those already mentioned above, there are three further instances of ἐσκον with superlative in the Iliad, as when Nestor says concerning Ereuthalion:100

ἀλλ’ ἐμὲ θυμὸς ἀνὴκε πολυτλήμων πολεμίζειν
θάρσεῖ δ’ γενῄ δε νεώτατος ἐσκον ἀπάντων. (II. 7.152-3)

97 Other instances of ἐσκον with the dead are: II. 5.536, 6.19, 16.550, 24.258, 739.
98 Cf. also II. 17.575.
99 Cf. also Od. 18.5, 20.288.
100 Cf. also πιστότατος at II. 16.147 and φιλτατος at II. 17.584.
But my much-enduring heart urged me on to do battle with him with confidence; and in years I was (used to be) the youngest of all.

In a similar use to that found in the latter instance, ἐσκόν is used to emphasise past youth, in one line from the Iliad that is almost exactly repeated twice in the Odyssey (Od. 11.394, 21.283); it is first said by Nestor:

οὐ γὰρ ἐκὴ ἵς
ἐσθ’ ὅν πάρος ἐσκέν ἐνὶ γναμπτοῖσι μέλεσιν. (II. 11.668-9)

For my strength is not such as it was (used to be) of old in my supple limbs.

Thirteen instances remain. In most, we may understand characterising force as at least an option. Usually, people or animals are being discussed; such cases number three times in the Iliad and five in the Odyssey. Particularly striking is the continuous non-serial action found in the description of Odysseus’ treasure-chamber (θάλαμος):

ἐν δὲ γυνῇ ταμίῃ νύκτας τε καὶ ἤμωρ / ἐσχ’ ‘and a stewardess was (used to be) in it night and day’ (Od. 2.346). On the other hand, the most notable example of ἐσκόν co-ordinated with ἦν falls into this category, when Diomedes says of his father Tydeus, who married one of Adrastus’ daughters and lived wealthily:101

ἄλις δὲ οἱ ἦσαν ἄρουραι
πυροφόροι, πολλοὶ δὲ φυτῶν ἔσαν ἄρχατοι ἁμφίς,
pολλά δὲ οἱ πρόβατ’ ἔσκε. (II. 14.122-4)
and he had wheat-bearing fields in abundance, and had many rows of trees round about, and he had (used to have) many sheep.

101 Other instances with people or animals are: II. 3.180, 6.153, Od. 14.222, 227, 17.308, 21.145.
Descriptions of places occur three times in the *Iliad* and once in the *Odyssey*. In these cases, glossing as ‘used to be’ seems forced; hence in the following lines, first used of Agamemnon and later of Eris.\(^{102}\)

\[\text{στῇ δ’ ἐπ’ Ὀδυσσῆος μεγακήτει νη ἡ μελαίνη,} \]
\[\text{ἡ α’ ἐν μεσσάτῳ ἔσκε γεγωνέμεν ἀμφότερωσε, ...} \]
\[\text{(*Il. 8.222-3=11.5-6*)} \]

and he/she stood by Odysseus’ capacious black ship, which was (used to be?) in the middle, to shout in both directions...


In one last instance, ἔσκον is used descriptively, not as a characterising ‘iterative’. Perhaps significantly, this case occurs in the later epic, when Hermes gives Odysseus a special φάρμακον, called μῶλυ,\(^{103}\) to make him immune to Circe:

\[\text{ῥίζῃ μὲν μέλαν ἔσκε, γάλακτι δὲ εἶκελον ἀνθὸς.} \]
\[\text{(*Od. 10.304*)} \]

At the root it was black, but its flower was like milk.

Therefore, although many of these uses of ἔσκον may be regarded as durative, nearly all instances fit with the analysis of verbs in -(e)σκον given in § 5 above: ἔσκον can usually be understood as having characterising force.

6.2. (ἐ)φάσκον

6.2.1. Morphology

The imperfect (ἐ)φάσκον, listed by Cunliffe as being from present φάσκω ‘say, assert, declare; say, promise, undertake; think, deem, expect’ is found twice in

\(^{102}\text{Cf. also *Il. 16.225, Od. 22.126.*} \]
\(^{103}\text{On this term see further Heubeck in Heubeck et al. 1988-92: II.60; and Frisk 1960-72 s.v. μῶλυ.} \]
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the *Iliad* and fifteen times in the *Odyssey*. As in the case of ἔσκον, this form has been taken as an iterative since it only occurs in the past tense; in fact, it is found with the augment on thirteen occasions, in three of which it is required by the metre.104

Also unusually for an iterative form, we find several instances outside the third person: first person singular ἐφασκον (*Il. 13.100, Od. 5.135*) and second persons singular ἐφασκες (*Il. 19.297*) and plural ἐφασκεθ (Od. 22.35) all occur.

Furthermore, as Chantraine (1986-8: 1.319) notes, (ἐ)φασκον is the only iterative which comes to show a present – although it is a later, Classical one. Wathelet (1973: 402) notes recent features in its use in Homer.

The present form of the verb of which (ἐ)φασκον may be the iterative, and to which it is related, is φημί ‘speak, say; assert, declare; etc.’ (85 times in the *Iliad* and 57 in the *Odyssey*). This is first found in Mycenaean as pa-si = φασί (probably third person singular).105 There is a rare future φησω (Il. 8.148, 153), but remaining forms are morphologically ambiguous.106 The past active is ἐφην (33 times in the *Iliad* and 75 in the *Odyssey*). In the medio-passive, there is finite φάσε (Od. 6.200, 10.562), surely a present stem form; the imperatival (φάσο, φάσθω), infinitival (φάσθαι) and participial (φάμενος) forms which occur nine and fourteen times in the respective epics, however, are used with aorist meaning. The past tense ἐφάμην is also used thus; it occurs 275 times in the *Iliad* and 282 in the *Odyssey* (264 and 234 instances respectively being of the third person singular (ἐ)φακο). It would seem that all our past tense forms here are old imperfects, since they have the same stem as the present, but that they have come to be used as aorists beside the more durative (ἐ)φασκον.107

---

104 On three occasions an elided vowel may be read instead of the augment; in seven a spondee is changed to a dactyl if the augment is inserted, of which four instances are in the fifth foot; cf. Wathelet 1973: 402 n. 130.

105 Cf. Aura Jorro 1985-93 s.v. pa-si.

106 On the morphology of the following forms see Fournier 1946: 18-19 and Jacquinod 1978: 50-1. The question is also tied up with that of their semantics, on which see § 6.2.2 below.

107 See § 6.2.2 below.
There are several compound verbal forms, as well as a wide variety of nominal forms, both simple and compound, in φη- and φα-. Morphologically, (Ε)φασκων is as ambiguous as εσκων, since it could be either the iterative of φημι or the imperfect of a present φασκοω. As with the forms discussed in Chapter 3 § 3, it follows the ancient model of zero-grade of root and *-skelo-, although it has no correspondents in other languages. The ultimate root is *bheh₂- 'speak, say', also found in Armenian, Latin, Indo-Iranian, Slavic and perhaps Germanic (cf. Rix 1998: 55).  

108 These are as follows: present άποφημι 'speak out' (II. 7.362), medio-passive άποφορθε 'deliver plainly' (II. 9.422, 649); έκφάσῃται 'utter, etc.' (Od. 10.246, 13.308); aorist μετέφην 'speak among' (five times and nine times in the respective epics, third person singular only); present active παράφημι 'give advice' (II.1.577), with medio-passive 'persuade, etc.' (twice in the Iliad, three times in the Odyssey); and aorist προσέφην 'address, etc.' (117 and 97 times respectively, always in the third person singular), with medio-passive προσφάσθαι (Od. 23.106).

109 We find Φήμη 'prophetic utterance' (Od. 2.35, 20.100, 105), φήμις 'speech, etc.' (once, six times), πολύφημος 'where many voices are heard; knowing many tales or songs' (Od. 2.150, 22.376), also a proper noun (once in the Iliad, four times in the Odyssey) and ύποφήτης 'interpreter, prophet' (II. 16.235). There is a derived verb found in the aorist ἐπευφημήσατι 'give one's voice in approval or assent' (three times in the Iliad). Further proper nouns are Φήμιος (four times in the Odyssey), Εὔφημος (II. 2.846), Εὐφήτης (II. 15.532), Περιφήτης (twice, never) and Πολυφήτης (once, never).

110 These are φάτις 'talk, report, rumour' (perhaps at II. 9.460, and three times in the Odyssey), and compounds ἀμφασία 'speechlessness' (II. 17.695, Od. 4.704), ἀδύσφατος 'portentous, terrible, etc.' (twice in the Iliad, six times in the Odyssey), πάρφασις, παραφάσις 'persuasion' (II. 11.793= 15.404, 14.217), πρόφασις 'profession or declaration, etc.' (II. 19.262, 302) and πολαφάσις 'put forth long ago; of old renown' (Od. 9.507, 13.172, 19.163).

111 On the homonymous root *bheh₂- 'gleam, flash, shine', source of Greek φαίνω and other forms, see Chapter 3 § 4.2.2.
6.2.2. Semantics

The ambiguous origins of (e)(|)aaKOV have caused debate, with some scholars apparently classifying it as both iterative in -(e)σKOV and present in -σKω; others have even argued for two different forms.

Fournier (1946: 20-4) thought that ἔφην was used as an aorist when found in formulae preceding and following direct speech but that, before an infinitival complement, it was found with durative sense; (e)(|)aaKOV was used as the imperfect of ἔμε. Jacquinod (1978: 50-1), however, argues that in fact the meaning of ἔφην was neutralised – it had neither especially durative nor momentaneous meaning.

Regarding the introduction of (e)(|)aaKOV into the system, Jacquinod (1978: 52-3) wonders why this was done rather than forming a new aorist, as occurred later with ἔφησσα; and he argues that in fact ἔφην is left indifferent to duration, the unmarked member of the pair, beside (e)(|)aaKOV, which was marked for duration – hence its use with the augment and outside Ionic Greek. Keller (1985: 36-8) largely follows Jacquinod, but notes that, despite other similarities between ἤσκου and (e)(|)aaKOV, the latter becomes integrated in the verbal system of ἔμε in a way that ἤσκον does not with ἔμε. Hence Clackson (1994: 78, 215 n. 86) follows Keller, stating that by Homer’s time ἔφην was already felt to be an aorist beside the imperfect (e)(|)aaKOV; in this way, presumably, further forms in φοσκ- could be created in the Classical period (see Chapter 7 § 4.1.3, 8 § 2.4).

Examination of the data implies that (e)(|)aaKOV did indeed begin as an iterative formation. Most notably, we on one occasion find (e)(|)aaKOV occurring in an expression of the form ‘whenever X happened, then Y would happen’ with δέ and the optative, when Peisistratus says to Menelaus:

---

Son of Atreus, old Nestor used to say that you were understanding above [other] men, whenever we made mention of you...

Serial meaning is also clear in two further instances. Firstly, when Briseis, on seeing the dead Patroclus, says:

σοῦ δὲ μὲν σοῦ δὲ μ’ ἔασκες, ὅτ’ ἀνδρ’ ἐμὸν ὦκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς ἐκτεινεν, πέρσεν δὲ πόλιν θείου Μύνητος, κλαίειν, ἀλλὰ μ’ ἔφασκες Ἀχιλλήνος θείου κουριδίην ἀλοχον θήσειν, ἄξειν τ’ ἐνὶ νησίιν ἐς Θηήν, δαίσειν δὲ γάμον μετὰ Μυρμιδόνεσσι. (Il. 19.295-9)

But you, when swift Achilles killed my husband, and laid waste the city of godlike Mynes, would in no way allow me to weep, but would say that you would make me the wedded wife of Achilles, and that he would take me in his ships to Phthia, and make me a marriage-feast among the Myrmidons.

Co-ordination with the iterative ἕασκον makes the repetition evident. The imperfects after ὅτε indicate the point in time after which the generic action was repeated: it is not that every time X occurred, then Y would, but that after the one occasion on which X had happened, Y occurred repeatedly.

Secondly, there is serial meaning for (ἕ)ϕασκον when Circe says:

ἡ σὺ γ’ Ὠδυσσεύς ἔσσι πολύτροπος, δὲν τέ μοι οἶει

114 Cf. Stolpe 1849: 25. There are also examples of ἕσκον being found in proximity to other forms in -(ἕ)σκον (Il. 16.225-7, 20.408-10), but here it does not share the same subject as them.
Surely you are resourceful Odysseus, who Argeiphontes of the golden wand always used to say to me would come here...

Here it is the use of ὀτεί that makes the repetition evident.

Of the remaining fourteen instances of (ἐ)φασκοῦν in Homer, the one other case in the Iliad and ten of those in the Odyssey are ambiguous, and may be interpreted either as ‘iterative’ non-serials or as simple imperfects. The Iliadic instance occurs when Poseidon says to the Greeks, as the Trojans reach the Greek ships:

οὐ πότει, ἢ μέγα θαύμα τὸ δ’ ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὁρῶμαι,
δεινόν, ὅ σοι ποτ’ ἔγνω τελευτήσεσθαι ἐφασκοῦν, ... (Il. 13.99-100)

My, this is indeed a great wonder that I see with my eyes, a terrible thing that I never thought / used to think would come to pass, ...

In one such case, we find (ἐ)φασκοῦν used with a part of ἔφην, when Alcinous says, concerning the fact that Phaeacian ships work on autopilot:

ἀλλὰ τὸ δ’ ὡς ποτὲ πατρὸς ἔγων ἐπόντος ἄκουσα
Ναυσιθόου, ὅς ἐφασκε Ποσειδάων’ ἀγάσεσθαι
ἡμῖν, οὕνεκα πολλοὶ ἀπήμονες εἶμεν ἀπάντων.

φη ποτὲ Φαιήκων ἀνδρῶν εὐεργέα νῆα
ἐκ πομπῆς ἄνιούσαν ἐν ἡροειδεὶ πόντῳ
ραίσεσθαι, μέγα δ’ ἡμῖν δρος πόλει ἀμφικαλύψειν. (Od. 8.564-9)

But thus I once heard this from my father Nausithous, speaking, who said / used to say that Poseidon would become indignant with us because we give
safe convoy to all. He said that one day, as a skilfully made ship of the Phaeacians was returning from escorting on the misty deep, he [Poseidon] would strike her, and would put a great mountain round our city.

Verse 565 is repeated at Od. 13.173, and the following four lines are repeated there.115

Four more occurrences of (ἐ)φασκοῦν, all found in the Odyssey, do not seem to show characterising meaning at all; rather, they appear to be simple imperfects. Hence Telemachus says to Penelope:116

\[\text{αὐτὰρ Ὄδυσσῆς ταλασίφρονος οὐ ποτ᾽ ἐφασκε,}
\text{ζωοῦ οὐδὲ θανόντος, ἐπιχθονίων τεύ ἄκούσαι, ...} \quad (Od. 17.114-15)

But he [Nestor] said he had never heard about stout-hearted Odysseus, living or dead, from any man of those living on earth.

Like ἐσκοῦ, therefore, (ἐ)φασκοῦν shows signs of generic use, although it is also used as a simple imperfect.

6.3. Conclusion: ἐσκοῦ and (ἐ)φασκοῦ

Nearly all evidence for ἐσκοῦ and (ἐ)φασκοῦ therefore indicates an earlier status as originally iterative in formation. The former almost always keeps its old meaning, and in later Greek is hence as rarely used as other iterative formations; the latter, even in Homer, is most frequently ambiguous between characterising non-serial and imperfect meaning, and even shows the augment; in Classical Greek its original value as an iterative comes to be lost.

115The other eight ambiguous instances are: Od. 5.135-6 (adapted at 7.256-7 and 23.335-6), 256-7, 10.331, 11.306, 12.275, 24.269.
116The remaining three instances are Od. 14.321, 19.191, 24.75.
Is εσκού therefore an inherited form? Clackson’s (1994: 78) objection to its antiquity is that it does not always show iterative meaning; as we have seen, however, εσκού is almost as much an iterative as any form in -(ε)σκού taken from a stative source. Was εσκού therefore inherited with iterative meaning? If so, we would have here as certain an indication as is possible that the meaning of the proto-form *-skelo- is directly continued in the iteratives in -(ε)σκού. On the other hand, if we accept the hypothesis that *-skelo- was used to create stems from telic roots (Chapter 2 § 4.3), then both εσκού and (ε)φασκού, which were formed from atelic, present-forming roots, must have been created within Greek.

Before this chapter is concluded, a closer look at data from the one other language where a reflex of *-skelo- shows iterative meaning is therefore required: Hittite.

7. Iteratives in -(ε)σκού and Hittite -šk-

The formations in -(ε)σκού appear to have a semantic parallel in Hittite -šk- (Chapter 2 §§ 2.1, 4.3). A quite recent comparison was made between the two formations by Puhvel (1991: 13-20). The dispute over the iterative or durative meaning of the Hittite suffix has already been noted (Chapter 2 § 2.1); Puhvel claims that the Greek and Hittite formations show certain similarities, with the same meaning of ‘ongoing or open-ended action’ occurring in both languages (1991: 17). He also notes a parallel use of forms in strings, as was noted above as common for Homeric and Herodotean Greek (§ 2). Of Puhvel’s examples (1991: 17-19), there are two instances which clearly fall into the common Homeric and Herodotean category of ‘whenever X happened, then Y would happen’. These are [nu] UNUTUM kuit kuedani peškit n-at UL šiyaeskit ‘what(ever) tool he gave to someone he did not seal(-stamp)’ (KUB XIII 35 I 4); and INIM... kuit GIM-[an] ištamaškiši n-at-mu iya[...] ḫatreški ‘when you hear some matter... write it to me!’ (KUB XXVI 90 IV 1-3).
Puhvel’s other examples are also serial; hence the mortuary ritual for royalty, which he compares to the description of Patroclus’ funeral pyre at Il. 23.252-4:

\[\text{nu ḫaštai IŠTU lappa KÜ.BABBAR daškanzi}\]
\[n-at-kan ANA YÁ.DUG.GA ḫūpar KÜ.BABBAR anda zikkanzi\]
\[IŠTU YÁ.DUG.GA-ma-at-kan šarā daškanzi\]
\[n-at-kan GAM-ta ANA^GAD gazzarnuli zikkanzi (KUB XXX 15 Vs. 3-6)\]

the bones with silver tongs they take,
and into the good fat in a silver bowl they put them;
but out of the fat they take them up,
and down on a fine cloth they put them.

The type of characterising non-serial -šk- is also found:¹¹⁷

\[\text{UR.MAH maḥan arḥa tarkuwalliškinun (KBo X 2 III 1-2)}\]

I kept glowering like a lion.

Puhvel (1991: 20) claims that Greek used the same formation shown by Hittite to indicate ongoing action in the imperfect, although in Hittite it was not thus restricted. In Greek, the iterative use of *-skê/o- was not needed: there was a differentiation in aspect between the present and the aorist, and in the indicative there were two past tenses; Hittite had no such aspect system, and only one preterite. Hence Puhvel suggests that this formation was useful in Hittite, but of only limited value in Greek, and so specialised in East Ionic Greek to form a strengthened imperfect used in narrative style. Puhvel suggests that the formation is evidence of

¹¹⁷For a detailed account of the uses of Hittite -šk-, see Dressler 1968: 162-96.
Hittite-influenced linguistic conventions in Greek epic dialect." The alternative is that both Hittite -šk- and Ionic Greek -(e)σκοῦ have a common source: as noted above (Chapter 2 § 4.3), Hittite appears to show meanings for suffixes which became mere present formants in other languages. In this case, -(e)σκοῦ could be an ancient relic of the inherited meaning of *-skelo-, which would then be, given the serial and non-serial realisations, 'iterative-durative'.

8. Conclusion: the 'iteratives' in -(e)σκοῦ

In sum, Ionic Greek shows the inherited suffix *-skelo- in a set of forms in -(e)σκοῦ, which indicate repeated action in the past, with states realised as continuous situations. The suffix is productive, and appears to act as a 'mood' of the verb concerned. Its use is of importance for our understanding of both inherited *-skelo- and of Greek -σκοῦ.

Although the use of the forms in Homer indicates many late features, we may still say that their basis could be ancient, for several reasons: a handful of the verbs may show the ancient zero-grade, and one is apparently found in other languages (έσκοῦ ‘used to be’); their number is greater in the older Iliad; and their use in later literature is severely restricted, implying an archaic phenomenon.

Iterative meaning is also found for the Hittite relative of *-skelo-, -šk-. Both languages use *-skelo- with 'iterative-durative' meaning, i.e. serial and non-serial value. It is therefore tempting to suppose a connection. As seen, it has been argued that the role of inherited *-skelo- was once to form 'imperfective' stems from 'telic' roots (Chapter 2 § 4.3). In the interpretation of the various facets of 'aspect' used here, however, Greek -(e)σκοῦ does not seem to interact with the perfective / imperfective distinction, but rather with lexical aspect: it creates atelic, durative forms. The Indo-European verb is by its very nature a mystery, and we cannot say

---

\[^{118}\text{Cf. similarly Allen 1980: 3.}\]
with certainty what distinctions it showed, nor at what periods; it is interesting to note, however, that in its use on aorist stems, Greek -(ε)σκον parallels (at least roughly) the supposed inherited use of *-skel-o-. On the other hand, the use in έσκον seems to be an innovation, if we say that it ultimately derives from the root *h₁es- 'be', for this is a present-, not aorist-yielding root.

So, is the use commonly inherited, or a shared innovation, or only present in Greek due to Hittite influence? If the formation is late to Homer, the former seems unlikely. On the other hand, the later disappearance of forms in -(ε)σκον speaks against this. Therefore the traditional reconstruction of *-skel-o- as an iterative marker, used to form present stems from 'telic' roots, is still very tempting.
Chapter 6
Verbs in -σκω in Early Greek: a Summary

1. Introduction

The preceding three chapters have given a new examination of, respectively, the morphology of -σκω in Homer, the semantics of -σκω in Homer, and the role of -(ε)σκον in (mostly Homeric) Greek. Homer is, however, not the earliest Greek we have. This chapter comprises first of all a brief overview of the earlier data, followed by a summary of conclusions reached so far.

2. Mycenaean Greek

Our earliest Greek is that of the Mycenaean period, written on clay tablets in the Linear B script between the 15th and 13th centuries BC. The texts, however, basically comprise lists of people and objects, and by their nature are therefore largely lacking in verbs.1 We find only three forms which have been argued to indicate Mycenaean forms in -σκω: two perhaps related to διδασκω, and one a verb in -ισκω not found elsewhere.

2.1. di-da-ka-re and de-di-ku-ja

The Mycenaean evidence for διδάσκω comprises two forms: di-da-ka-re and de-di-ku-ja.2

The form di-da-ka-re is generally accepted as being related to διδάσκω, although the exact nature of the relation is obscure. It occurs quite frequently in the Ak tablets from Knossos, in reference to the nouns ko-wa (*κόρεα) 'girl' and ko-wo (*κόρος) 'boy', and is also found abbreviated as di. Most scholars hold that the

1For some examples of the few forms found, see Ventris and Chadwick 1973: 88-9; and for a list of present stem forms, Plath 1992.

2For the passages where these forms occur, cf. especially Lejeune 1976: 402-6.
form is nominal: it could be an old locative singular *διδασκαλεῖ, perhaps to be interpreted as 'at the school-master's' or 'at school', although we do not expect a locative in -e from a thematic stem; or an abbreviation of, for example, διδασκαλεῖον 'school' (Ventris and Chadwick 1973: 162). Few have tried to maintain that di-da-ka-re represents a verbal form.3

Much more disputed is ἱδε-δι-κυ-ja (KN Ak 611.1), which seems to define a category of women. This is to be taken as a perfect active nominative feminine form. If it can be corrected to de-di-<da>-ku-ja then we could have a perfect participle from διδασκω. Ventris and Chadwick (1973: 163, 539) suggest it represents *
δεδιδακτυρά 'having completed their training', 'instructed'; Chantraine (1957: 243) would rather prefer the unaspirated *
δεδιδακτυρά, however, and Lejeune (1976: 410) has *
δεδιδακτυρά. On the other hand, the form could represent *
δεδεκυρά, which would be a perfect participle from δεκυρύμ, perhaps meaning 'qui ont été assignées, designées' (Chantraine 1957: 243-4). There is also an abbreviation de.4

Although there is doubt in the latter case, therefore, it does seem that Mycenaean di-da-ka-re shows evidence for the stem διδασκ-. What is so surprising is that this stem was almost certainly extended to use in nominal forms at such an early stage, when all we see in Homer is non-present verbal διδασκ- and one instance of - διδακτος in the Odyssey (cf. Chapter 3 § 4.2.1).

2.2. te-ra-pi-ke

Less certain is the form te-ra-pi-ke. The two parallel passages where it appears are difficult to interpret; they are as follows:

---

3 For further details and bibliography, see in general Aura Jorro 1985-93 s.v. di-da-ka-re.
4 For further bibliography on these theories see Aura Jorro 1985-93 s.v. ἱδε-δι-κυ-ja.
Ventris and Chadwick (1973: 262) gloss the latter line as ‘S. holds a lease as a kama-holder, and in return for this he serves; so much seed: 180 l. wheat’; they interpret te-ra-pi-ke as reflecting a third person singular *θεραπίσκει, derived from the same stem as θεράπω and equivalent to θεραπεύω ‘do service’ (1973: 263). Indeed, Aura Jorro (1985-93 s.v. te-ra-pi-ke) states that this interpretation is still currently accepted. There has been much debate, however, with suggestions often having been offered that would have this form quite unconnected with any verb in -(i)σκω at all;5 the most recent discussion is that of Vine (1993: 56-7). Since the pair to-e / to-me is unexplained, te-ra-pi-ke could actually be a noun; Vine, therefore, following on from Lejeune’s (1976: 405) interpretation of the latter as locative singular therapiskei ‘chez le θεραπίσκος’ suggests that it be interpreted as nominal terabiskei ‘in a shed/hut/?granary (*τεραβίσκος)’.

Indeed, the results of this study of Homer do not speak for an early productive -ίσκω; as Vine (1993: 56-7) says, a form *θεραπίσκω would be ‘alien to the profile of most other -ίσκω verbs’, and ‘morphologically aberrant’. To derive such a present we would here expect as origin a thematic aorist **ἐθέραπον. Apparently the only way to rescue the form as a verb in -σκω would be to accept one of Ruijgh’s (1985: 136-40, 148-9) suggestions: *θεραπίσκω would either be a denominative from a lost diminutive *θεραπίσκος; or further evidence that the suffix -ίσκω originated from iteratives of stems in *-yelo-, giving us a verb *θεραπίσκει ‘il fonctionne habituellement (de temps en temps) comme θέραψ’, iterative of

5For bibliography cf. Aura Jorro 1985-93 s.v. te-ra-pi-ke.
*θεράπτης ‘fonctionner comme θέραπτς’ and parallel in formation to Classical χρησικονταί (Herodotus 3.117.4) and κυδισκομαί. But the former is unparalleled and the latter too hypothetical to be sure of; the subject must therefore remain open.

2.3. Summary: Mycenaean Greek

Evidence for verbs in -σκω in Mycenaean Greek is therefore scanty in the extreme. The most reliable datum indicates the spread of διδασκαλ- to nominal stems at an early period. Yet neither does this evidence for fossilised -σκ- indicate that the suffix was falling out of use (as Classical data will show), nor should the paucity of forms be taken as indication that -σκω was not in use at this period, since so few verbs are to be found in the texts: we simply cannot know how -σκ- was used at this time.

3. Conclusions: Early Greek -σκω

The development and role of Greek -σκω in early Greek was therefore as follows.

The inherited suffix *-ske/o- may appear only once in Mycenaean, and is much more notable in Homeric Greek. In its function as present formant, it is not very productive: we find only twenty-eight verbs.

Morphologically, some of these present tense forms show the expected pattern of zero-grade root and may be reconstructed for the parent language, with varying degrees of certainty (βάσκω, μίσγω, ἔρχομαι; cf. also γιγνώσκω, ἔσκον and ἰλάσκομαι); others also show this pattern, but have no corresponding forms elsewhere (άλυσκω, βόσκω, ισκω, perhaps ὀρχέομαι, πάσχω; βλώσκω,

---

6On Ruijgh’s theory of -ισκω from *-ye/o- followed by *-ske/o-, see further Chapter 3 § 6.5.

7As Keller (1992: 181) remarks, the existence of around thirty presents in -σκω in Homer ‘témoigne de la vitalité de - (τ)οσκ- dans le domaine grec à l’époque préhistorique et fait apparaître l’absence de tout représentant en mycénien comme le résultat du hasard’.
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There are several cases of verbs in -σκω also showing reduplication in -τ- (γιγνώςκω, ἱλάςκομαι, κικλήσκω, μμμήσκω, διδάσκω, πιθαύςκω, τιτύςκομαι); this phenomenon could perhaps have originated from forms in -σκω occurring beside reduplicated presents, or could alternatively be connected with the fact that some of the forms concerned could have been derived from reduplicated aorists in -ε-; patterning with perfects reduplicated in -ε- is also notable. Four cases occur of verbs in -ισκω, all of which occur only once, and all derived from thematic aorists (ἀποφίςκω, ὀραφίςκω, ἐποιρίςκομαι, εὐρίςκω); the addition of -τ- to create such forms as θυήσκω rather than expected θυήσκω appears to have occurred only later. Other verbs either show reduplication in -ε- (δειδίςκομαι, apparently είςκω) or fall into a miscellaneous category (ἀλδηςκω, γηράςκω, ἡλάςκω, πτώςκάζω). The suffix -σκω is only productively extended to non-present forms in the case of διδάσκω, a development which appears to go back to Mycenaean; occasional other instances also occur (non-present / nominal ἀλυσκ-, βοσκ-, μισς-). Present stems in -σκ- behave as other present stems do, forming present participles, imperfects, and so on, as expected.

Semantically, -σκω does not seem to have any well-defined meaning; rather, evidence strongly indicates that it was merely a present-forming suffix. Presents in -σκω do not seem to differ from collateral unmarked forms (as κικλήςκω beside καλέω). Although we find causatives and inchoatives in -σκω, these meanings occur throughout a verb’s paradigm (as μμμήσκω, ἐμμησα ‘remind’ : μμμήσκομαι, ἐμμησάμην ‘remembered’); and one does not require -σκω to form a causative-inchoative pair, as with for example διοςκίδυμι ‘make scattered’ : σκίδωμαι ‘get scattered’. Also instructive are formations where no causative or inchoative meaning is perceptible (verbs of movement such as θρόςκω ‘leap’, and miscellaneous verbs, as εὐρίςκω, find’). Lastly, the extension of -σκ-
into non-present forms, most notably in διδάσκω (first in *di-da-ka-re) and also in the apparently ancient forms ἀλύσκω, βόσκω and μισγω, indicates that at a pre-Homeric stage the suffix had apparently even lost the aspectual characteristics which made it suitable to form presents alone. The frequent appearance of a present in -σκω beside a root or (more usually) thematic aorist (as βάσκω : ἔβην, πάσχω : ἔπαθον) is evidence of an ancient opposition between suffixed present and unsuffixed aorist.

The 'iteratives' in -(ε)σκον, created off both present and aorist stems, form a separate group. Morphologically, this is evidenced both by use of the latter suffix on reinterpreted presents in -σκω (βοσκεσκ-, μισγεσκ-); and also by the instances of -(ε)σκον added to stems related to presents in -σκω (κικλησκ- : καλε(σ)- : καλε(ε)σκ- ; μιμησκ- : μνη(σ)- : μησασκ-). Semantically, the group forms a unity, quite separate from the presents in -σκω: for a dynamic situation, addition of the suffix gives repeated meaning, but in a stative one the result remains stative: hence φιλεσκον when dynamic in context means 'used to entertain / used to have sex (repeatedly)', but when stative is 'used to love (continuously)'. The original relationship between presents in -σκω and iteratives in -(ε)σκον is uncertain. In (ε)φασκον we merely seem to have an iterative that was in the process of becoming an imperfect; with ἕσκον, we may have an inherited form *h₁s-ské/o-, although its use in Homer largely conforms with that of the iteratives in -(ε)σκον: apparent formation from a 'telic' root may also speak against antiquity.

The next stage in this investigation is an examination of Classical Greek, centering on the use of -σκω in Plato.
Chapter 7
The Morphology of Verbs in -σκω in Plato

1. Introduction

An analysis of verbs in -σκω in Classical Greek can be performed in two different ways: diachronically and synchronically. By the former method, new formations peculiar to Classical Greek are examined, and the development from the earlier state of affairs (i.e. Homer) is made clear. In the latter case, the set of data does not comprise new formations alone, but a cross-section of Classical usage: we should need to know what forms one author used (or, if this is not possible due to the scantiness of the data, what forms are found in one set of writers of preferably uniformly similar material).

It is the purpose of this chapter and the following one to examine Classical Greek data synchronically, to which end the set of Greek verbs in -σκω found in Plato will be examined. This author was selected partly because his works are in prose, and so presumably more representative of the language of the time than if they were in verse. In addition, despite the fact that Plato’s works were written over the course of an extended period of time – he lived from 428/7 to 348/7BC, although he probably did not begin to write until 3991 – there is a certain degree of uniformity of language in them. In fact, it would appear that all his works survive – no mention is made anywhere of any others2 – and, of these, all bar the Apology and the dubious Epistles are in the form of dialogues. An additional help is that the manuscript tradition of Plato’s works is quite a sound one. Since Plato is the author of an atypically large corpus of still extant Classical Greek works, we can therefore expect that, if we find few verbs in -σκω, it will not be because too small a corpus has been used.

1.1. Plato’s works: corpus and data

1.1.1. The corpus

Before collecting the data, it is necessary to define one’s corpus. I have chosen to regard as genuine only those 27 works of Plato generally held as authentic: in the earliest group, Apology, Charmides, Crito, Euthyphro, Hippias Minor, Ion, Laches and Protagoras, followed by the second set of Cratylus, Euthydemus, Gorgias, Hippias Major, Lysis, Menexenus, Meno, Phaedo and Symposium; the third group comprises Parmenides, Phaedrus, Republic (although perhaps Republic I belongs in the second group) and Theaetetus; and, lastly, there are Critias, Laws, Philebus, Politicus, Sophist and Timaeus. Taken here as suspect, although defended by some, are the Epinomis and the Epistles (of which VI, VII and VIII are the most likely to be Plato’s own), as well as seven further dialogues listed as Plato’s in Thrasyllus’ tetralogies: Alcibiades I, Alcibiades II, Amatores, Clitopho, Hipparchus, Minos and Theages. Seven works which are found in the manuscripts but not included by Thrasyllus are taken, as is usual, as spurious; these are Axiochus, Definitions, Demodocus, Eryxias, On Justice, Sisyphus and On Virtue. In addition there is the Halcyon, also held to be spurious and usually published with the works of Lucian.3 There is a speech delivered by Lysias in the Phaedrus (230e.6-234c.5, 262e.1-4 and 263e.6-264a.3), although it is probably in fact by Plato; nonetheless, forms found here are also noted as being perhaps not Plato’s own.4

---

3This is a more severe view than that of Brandwood, who does not list the Epinomis or the Epistles in his suspect and unauthentic list (1976: xvii). See further Brandwood 1990, 1992; Lesky 1966: 511-12; Skemp 1976: 9 ff.; and Rutherford 1995: 3-7. In fact, many of the doubtful works are themselves probably contemporary (as the Epinomis); and, since this is a study of a synchronic period of Greek language, such problems of authenticity may be of very minor importance here. Throughout, I follow the text of the Oxford Classical Text of Plato (Volume I: Duke et al. 1995; Volumes II-V: Burnet 1901-7).

Plato's work is such that he often quotes other authors, and where a form is only found in the corpus as a quotation, it is duly noted as such.

1.1.2. The data

A total of nineteen verbs found in Plato's prose show in the present the suffix -σκω. Listing them in the first person singular indicative citation form (though in fact many of these verbs are not found in the indicative at all), these are, with traditional meanings from LSJ: ἀλίσκομαι 'be taken' (active ἀναλίσκω 'use up, spend'); ἀμβλισκό 'cause to miscarry'; ἀφέσκω 'please'; ἀνα- βιώσκομαι 'come back to life; bring back to life'; θάυσκομαι 'feed, graze' (intransitive); γενετόσκω 'begin to get a beard'; γνώρισκω 'grow old'; γνωρύσκω 'come to know, perceive, know'; διδάσκω 'instruct, teach'; ἀπο-διδράσκω 'run away, flee from'; εὑρίσκω 'find, find out'; θυμάσκω 'die'; κυϊσκομαι 'conceive, become pregnant'; μεθύσκω 'make drunk, intoxicate' ( medio-passive μεθύσκομαι 'get

I omit from this discussion those forms which are not synchronically verbs in -σκω and do not clearly show the suffix, even if diachronically they certainly are. Into this group fall μίσγω 'mix' and πάσχω 'suffer'. The evidence is against the assumption that the Greeks identified μίσγω with the other -σκω verbs, as we find an extended use of the present stem in the noun μισγάγγκεια (see Chapter 3 § 2.3; the form is found in quotation from Homer at Phlb. 62d.5). The case of πάσχω is not so clear cut, as pronunciation of it would have made the σκ- morph clear. There are also four more verbs found in Plato which have been linked to Greek -σκ-, or to its Indo-European ancestor, whose origins have been discussed in Chapter 3: άσκεω 'work' (of raw materials), ἀδόλεσχεω 'chatter', ultimately from λέσχη (both at § 1.2 n. 5), ἑρχομαι 'go' (§ 2.2) and ἥρχομαι 'dance' (§ 3.1.4). I also omit discussion of κικλήσκο 'call', since it is only found in quotation from Homer (Cra. 392a.5).

In addition, there are two cases of fossilised forms of old verbs in -σκω. One, frequently found, is φιλισκάνω 'become a debtor', presumably from an old verb φιλισκώ (only referred to by Suidas) recharacterised into one in -σκάνω (cf. Chapter 9 § 2.1). The other is the nominalised relic βασκάνα 'malign influence' (Phd. 95b.6); the origin of this form is obscure, however, and an etymological link with Hesychius' βασκείν λέγειν, κακολέγειν is generally denied; cf. Frisk 1960-72 s.v.; and Chantraine 1968-80 s.v. βασκανος.

Brandwood's index to the works of Plato (1976) was used to discover which forms of which verbs are to be found there; for some counting and checking purposes, the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae CD-ROM #D (1992) was also used.
drunk'); μμυνήσκω 'remind' (medio-passive μμυνήσκομαι 'remind oneself of, remember'); πυράσκομαι 'be sold'; στερίσκομαι 'be deprived'; τιτρώσκω 'wound'; and φώσκω (only found in participle and imperfect) 'say'. Eight verbs (here underlined) we have already seen in Homer. All are to some extent part of a paradigm, but in widely differing ways, and their forms will be investigated in the rest of this chapter.

1.2. Morphological classification: an overview

The verbs listed above show a variety of morphological features which can be used for classification of the different types of forms. The most obvious are reduplication and the use of -ιςκω rather than -σκω; even in these cases, however, there is a cross-over between the two types if, with Burnet, we read the form μμυνήσκομαι (cf. § 2.3 below). There is, therefore, room for rearrangement in any ordering of these forms; bearing in mind the synchronic nature of this examination, however, the following are adopted:

(1) The γιγνώσκω type: forms where a present in -σκω showing reduplication in -τ- is found beside non-present forms with the same stem; this set has already been seen in Homer. In Plato, we find γι- γνώ- σκω : γνω-; -δι- δρα- σκω : -δρα-, μι- μη- σκομαι : μνη-; πι- πρα- σκομαι : πρα-; and τι- τρω- σκω : τρω-.

(2) The εύρίσκω type: forms where a stem suffixed with -ιςκω alternates with non-present forms showing the same stem but ending in -η- or -ω-. These are, in -η-, εύρ- ειςκω : εύρη-; θη- ίςκω : θη-; κυ- ίςκομαι : κυ-; and στερ- ίςκομαι : στερη-.

In -ω- we find άλ- ίςκομαι : άλω-; and

---

7 Bośkow / Bóskomai (Chapter 3 § 3.1.2, 4 § 3.1.1); γηράσκω (3 § 7.2, 4 § 3.4.2); γιγνώσκω (3 § 4.1.1, 4 § 3.4.3); διδάσκω (3 § 4.2.1, 4 § 3.1.2); εύρίσκω (3 § 6.4, 4 § 4.1); θηνήσκω (3 § 3.2.2, 4 § 3.4.4); and μμυνήσκω / μμυνήσκομαι (3 § 4.1.3, 4 § 3.1.3). On the Homeric imperfect (Ε)φώσκον, see Chapter 5 § 6.2.
6t|1(&- ICTKCD : d|iptao- . (θνησκω, although showing suffix - ισκω and in some forms a non-present stem in - η-, only arguably fits here: one would expect non-present **θνη-, not θνη-.)

(3) Forms which do not fall into the above two classes but instead appear to show the same stem both before - σκω and before other suffixes. This class may be further subdivided into two. Firstly there is the ἀπεσκω type, where the stem is truly the same in all cases: such forms are ἀπε- σκω : ἀπε- ; - βιω- σκομαι : - βιω- ; and φα- σκω : φα-. Secondly, there is the γηράσκω type, where we appear to have a short vowel before - σκω and a long one in non-present forms. Historical and dialectal data need to be used to demonstrate the quantity of the vowel preceding - σκω, since scansion cannot help here. The only certain instance is γηρά- σκω : γηρά- ω : γηρά-, since we do not find **γηρήσκω in Ionic; the set γενειά- σκω : γενειά- ω : γενειά- looks so similar that we may suspect it belongs here, but with the final possible instance, μεθύ- σκω : μεθύ- ω : μεθυ-, we cannot be certain.

(4) Lastly, those presents in - σκω where the present-forming suffix has been reinterpreted as part of the stem: these are βόσκ- ομαι : βόσκ- ημα; and διδάσκ- ω : διδάσκ- αλος.

2. Reduplicated forms: the γιγνώσκω type

We have already seen in Homer γιγνώσκω 'know' and μιμνήσκω 'remind'; in Plato there are also - διδράσκω 'run', πιπράσκομαι 'be sold' and τιτρώσκω 'wound'. The verb διδάσκω 'teach' only belongs to this group historically, and will be discussed in § 5.2 below.
2.1. γιγνώσκο

Γιγνώσκο 'come to know, perceive, know' is very common in Plato. The stem γιγνωσκ- is found in the present active (203 times, of which one occurrence is in the Lysias speech), the imperfect active (three times) and the present medio-passive (22 times). The stem γνω(σ)- is found throughout other verbal forms: so, in the simple verb, we have future γνωσμαται (51 times), root aorist ἐγνω (116 times, of which two are in the Lysias speech), perfect active ἔγνωσκα (eleven times), future passive γνωσθήσομαι (Cra. 440b.4) and aorist passive ἔγνωσθην (seven times).

In addition, there are also eight compounds of γιγνώσκο in Plato, although only four are at all common and occur in several different tenses: ἀναγιγνώσκο 'read' (thirty times), διαγιγνώσκο 'distinguish, discern' (twenty-six times), καταγιγνώσκο 'observe; lay a charge against' (nine times) and συγγιγνώσκο 'pardon' (twenty times). The others are aorists ἐπέγνων 'recognised' (Euthd. 301e.4) and μετέγνων 'changed one's mind' (Phdr. 231a.4, in the Lysias speech); and presents παραγιγνώσκομαι 'be read as well' (Tht. 172e.3) and προγιγνώσκο 'know beforehand' (three times).

The simple stem γνω- is rare in nominal forms, γνωσ- being more common, further forms occur in γνωμ- 9 and γνωρ- 10. In addition, there is ἄγνωστο 'ignorance' beside ἀγνοεῖ 'not to perceive / recognise, be ignorant of'.

---

8Simple forms in γνω(σ)- are γνωστικός 'knowledge' (32 times), γνωστέων 'one must know' (twice), γνωστικός 'for knowing' (ten times) and γνωστός 'known' (fifteen times). Compound forms are ἄγνωσ 'unknown' (four times), ἄγνωστα 'ignorance; being unknown, obscurity' (three times), ἄγνωστος 'unknowable' (nine times), ἄναγιγνώσκε 'reading' (twice), διάγιγνωστική 'resolving, deciding' (three times), ἐγνωστός 'well-known' (Spb. 218e.2), συγγιγνώστα 'one must pardon, indulge' (Phdr. 236a.3) and proper noun Πολύγιγνωστος (twice in the Ion).

9Hence γνώμη 'thought, judgement' (seventeen times, of which one is a quotation), γνωμολογία 'sententious style' (Phdr. 267c.1), γνωμοκριτικός 'fit to judge of, skilled in' (R. V. 467c.10), ἄγνωμων 'ill-judging, senseless' (four times), ἄγνωστον 'want of acquaintance with' (Tht. 199d.2), ἐπιγνώμον 'judge' (found five times in Lg. VIII-IX), πολύγιγνωστόν 'knowing many things' (Thdr. 275a.7), συγγνώμη 'forbearance, lenient judgment' (31 times, of which one case occurs in Lysias' speech in the Phaedrus) and συγγιγνώστων 'indulgent' (four times in Lg. VI-XI).

10Cf. γνωρίζω 'make known' (ten times), compound ἀναγιγνώριζο 'recognise' (three times), γνωρίμος 'well-known' (fifteen times) and γνώριστις 'making known; getting to know, cognition' (four times), compound ἀναγιγνώριστις 'recognition' (Tht. 193c.4).
2.2. ἀπο- διδράσκω

-Διδράσκω\(^{11}\) is only found in the compound form ἀποδιδράσκω 'run away, escape or flee from' in Plato. The present stem διδράσκε- occurs twelve times in the present tense, and once in the imperfect. Other tenses show the stem δρά-: future ἀποδράσσομαι (R. V 457e.3), aorist ἀπέδραν (five times) and perfect ἀποδεδράκα (Th. 203d.10). As in the case of γιγνώσκω, therefore, a root of three elements – stop,\(^{12}\) resonant and long vowel – appears in all forms, augmented by reduplication in -τ- as well as -σκω in the present. Nominal derivatives, though not found in Plato, show the same basic stem: as we find γιγνώσκω : γνώσις, so there is also ἀποδιδράσκω : ἀπόδρασις ( Ionic ἀπόδρησις), where the latter means 'running away, escape; escape from, avoidance of' (cf. e.g. Herodotus 4.140, Demosthenes 21.166).

2.3. -μιμνήσκω

The verb -μιμνήσκω 'remind, put in mind' is usually found in Plato in the medio-passive; indeed, in uncompounded form it is not found in the active at all. In addition, there are five compounds, of which three are formed with ἄνα-. In the medio-passive μιμνήσκομαι 'remind oneself of, call to mind; make mention of', the simple verb is not found in the authentic works of Plato in the present,\(^{13}\) and the aorist ἐμμνησάμην is only found in a quotation from Tyrtaeus.\(^{14}\) The latter form is poetic – it only seems to occur at Herodotus 7.39.5 in all Classical

\(^{11}\)We know that the -α- was long in this form from Ionic - διδρήσκω: cf. e.g. Herodotus 9.59, and for further attestations Veitch 1887 s.v. (διδράσκω).

\(^{12}\)Obviously, however, we cannot be certain that by this time -γν- was pronounced with a velar nasal only.

\(^{13}\)The only use cited by Brandwood (1976) is at Ax. 368a.7.

\(^{14}\)Optative μησώμην at Lg. I 629a.7, II 660e.7.
Greek prose. Plato uses the future μνησθήσομαι three times, with ἐμνήσθην eighteen times. It is the perfect μέμνημαι ‘remember’, however, which is astonishingly common: it occurs 143 times (one instance of the imperative being in Lysias’ speech at Phdr. 234b.2). Of this total, 100 instances are in the indicative, of which 63 occurrences are first or second person singular. The perfect stem μεμνη- is also found in the future perfect μεμνήσομαι (four times, all first person plural indicative), and the pluperfect ἐμεμνήμην (five).

The compound form ἀναμμηνήσκω ‘remind’ shows a more even spread of forms throughout its tenses. In the active, there is a present (eleven times), with imperfect (once), with other tenses in μη-: future ἀναμνήσω (five times, all indicative) and aorist ἀνέμνησα (six). There is the same pattern in the medio-passive ‘remember, recall to mind’, except that the forms are much more frequent: present ἀναμμηνήσκομαι (36 times), future ἀναμμησθήσομαι (twice) and aorist ἀνεμνήσθην (41 times). Two further compounds in ἀνα- occur, both found only once: a present ἐπαναμμηνήσκω ‘remind’ (Lg. III 688a.3) and an aorist passive συναμμηνήσθην ‘recall together’ (Lg. X 897e.5).

Other compounds are: aorist ἐπεμμηνήσθην ‘make mention of’ (seven times) beside the perfect indicative form ἐπιμέμνητοι (La. 180e.6) and verbal noun ἐπιμνηστέον ‘one must mention’ (Ti. 90e.4); and ὑπομμηνήσκω ‘remind’, medio-passive ‘remember’, which shows presents active (five times) and medio-passive (twice), future ὑπομνήσω (five times), and aorist ὑπέμνησα (eighteen times).

There are occasional nominal derivatives in μνή-;15 but both simple and compound ones are more usually in μνη-;16 there is also a secondarily derived verb

15These are ἀνάμνηστις ‘reminiscence’ (18 times), ἀναμνηστός ‘that which one can recollect’ (Men. 876b.8) and ὑπόμνησις ‘reminding’ (three).
16These are μνήμη ‘memory, record’ (60 times), μνημεῖον ‘remembrance, record’ (eleven times, of which one is from the Lysias speech), μνημονικός ‘of / for remembrance / memory; having a good memory’ (six times), μνημοσύνη ‘remembrance, memory’ (three times) and μνήμον ‘mindful’ (10.
μημονεύω 'remember; mention' (31 times), which has its own compounds. Also related is μνεία 'remembrance, mention' (four times).

The formal patterns of this verb show that it belongs to the reduplicated class: a stem of three phonemes, ending in resonant and long vowel, showing reduplication in -ι- and suffix -σκω in the present, with non-present and nominal forms showing the bare stem. In the Oxford Classical Text this present is written as μμυνήσκομαι, but in fact there is no evidence for this form from the Classical era: see Chapter 3 § 3.2.5.

2.4. πιπρᾶσκομαι

Another verb which follows the same pattern is πιπρᾶσκομαι 'be sold'. The present is only found twice in Plato, both times in the participle (Phd. 69b.2, Sph. 224a.3); these occurrences were bracketed by Burnet but are now accepted by scholars. Other forms found show the unreduplicated stem πρα-: the only verbal one is the aorist ἐπράθην (three times, all in Laws VIII and XI), but there are also nominal forms with this stem. This verb therefore shown the same morphological patterns as those seen above, except that verbal forms are in the medio-passive only.

times); compounds are ὠμυημον 'unmindful, forgetful' (Ti. 88b.4), ὠμμηστία 'forgetfulness' (Mx. 239c.4) and ὑπόμνημα 'reminder' (four times).

17These are ὀπομμημονεύω 'relate from memory; remember' (sixteen times) and διαμμημονεύω 'remember distinctly' (four), with nominal μημονευτέον 'one must remember' (twice), ἐξιμημονευτεύς 'worthy of mention' (twice), δυσμημονευτεύς 'unmindful' (Ti. 74e.9) and εὐμημονευτεύς 'easy to remember' (twice); also related is ὠμμημονεύω 'be unmindful; forget' (five times).

18If we do read μμημήσκομαι, then this form suffers from similar problems of classification to θυήσκω, which does not fit well with 'other' forms in -ιςκω: cf. § 3.1.2 below.

19That the -α- was long is evidenced by attestation of the stem πιπρησκ- at Callimachus Iamb. 1.93.

20See further Chapter 8 § 3.1.3.2.

21These are πρᾶσμα 'for sale' (Lg. 848a.1), πρᾶσις 'sale' (14 times, of which half occur in Lg. VIII-XII), πράτεος 'to be sold, for sale' (Lg. VIII 849c.1) and πρατήρ 'seller' (Lg. XI 915d.1).
2.5. τιτρώσκω

Lastly in this section, we have τιτρώσκω 'wound'. The present stem is rare, only being found once in the indicative (Phlb. 13c.9).\textsuperscript{22} We also find the present participle once, at R. VIII 555e.5. Other tenses show τρω-. The aorist ἕτρωσα occurs six times as subjunctive τρώση in Lg. IX 876e-879a and six more as participle within Lg. IX 875d-878c. Remaining forms are all medio-passive: future τρώθησομαι (Cri. 51b.6), aorist ἔτρωθην five times (all participial and within Lg. IX 862c-879a)\textsuperscript{23} and perfect τέτρωμαι five times, of which four are participial. This verb, therefore, occurs almost never outside the participle. Nominal forms in τρω- are found, but are rare in Plato.\textsuperscript{24}

2.6. Summary: the γιγνώσκω type

In the Greek of Plato, therefore, reduplicated verbs in -σκω show a clearer pattern than in Homer, but there is still not complete regularity. The stem is composed of stop, resonant and long vowel, with reduplication in -τ- and suffix -σκω in the present; in non-present and nominal forms it is found without either. There are three areas where the data are not uniform, however. Firstly, there is the problem of μιμησκομαι, if there really was an added -τ- at this time. Secondly, root aorists ἐγνω and ἐδραυ (both dating from the Homeric period) occur for expected sigmatic forms ἐγνωσα - only found in Ionic Greek with the causative meaning 'I persuade' (cf. Chapter 3 § 4.1.4) - and **ἐδρασα. Lastly, the occurrences of non-etymological -σ- are not consistent: we find γνωσθησομαι

\textsuperscript{22}This instance has, however, been contested: see Chapter 8 § 3.1.2.2 n. 47.
\textsuperscript{23}Not including the instance at Ti. 76b.2, bracketed by Burnet.
\textsuperscript{24}We find only ἀπρωτος 'invulnerable' (Smp. 219e.2), but there is also τραυματ 'wound' (seventeen times, mostly in Lg. IX), Attic for τραυμα; cf. Chantraine 1968-80 s.v. τιτρώσκω, who lists further forms in τρω- found in Classical Greek.
έγνωσθην and μνησθήσομαι ἐμνήσθην, but without - στρωθήσομαι ἐπρώθην and ἐπράθην.

3. Formations in - ἵσκο: the εὑρίσκω type

Also familiar from Homer is the group of verbs which show not - σκω but - ἵσκο before the stem found in their other tenses. Here, however, they alternate with non-present (and sometimes nominal) stems in - η- or - ω-; Homer only showed the pair ἐπαυρίσκομαι : ἐπαυρήσομαι, rather using presents in - ἵσκο beside thematic aorists; also early is Homeric εὑρίσκω beside εὑρήσω (h.Merc. 302).25 Only εὑρίσκω 'find' is continued from Homer, beside four new verbs: with - η-, κυίσκομαι 'be pregnant' and στερίσκομαι 'be deprived'; and with - ω-,

3.1. With non-present forms in - η-

3.1.1. εὑρίσκω

Εὑρίσκω 'find' is the most frequently found verb of this set; as well as the simple form, there are four compounds occurring in Plato. The present active is found 23 times, and the imperfect five times. Two other tenses show εὑρ- η- : future active εὑρήσω (54 times) and perfects active ηὗρηκα (26 times) and medio-passive εὑρηματι (ten times). One shows εὑρε- : this is aorist passive ηὗρέθην (seven times). Lastly, there is a thematic aorist, in the active ηὗρον (114 times, of which 2 are quoted from Simonides26) and in the middle ηὗρόμην (three times).

More data are provided by the compounds. Of these, only ἀνευρίσκω and ἐξευρίσκω are common. The former, meaning 'find out, discover; invent', occurs

25 Cf. Chapter 3 § 6, especially 6.5.

26 These are Prt. 345c.11, 346d.5.
This compound has, according to Brandwood’s index (1976 s.v. ἀνευρίσκειν), a ‘passive’, which shows present, imperfect, future, aorist and perfect and, if Burnet’s reading at Phlb. 57b.6 is followed, pluperfect also: the future passive, which does not occur in the simple verb or any other compounds, is in - ἐ- : ἀνευρεθήσομαι (Ti. 63e.3). The other frequent case, ἐξευρίσκω ‘find out, discover’, occurring 47 times, shows the same pattern, with future active, perfects active and medio-passive in - η-, and frequent thematic aorist. The remaining two compounds are one instance of a future ἐνευρήσω ‘will discover in’,28 and one of a present ἐπευρίσκω ‘find out, discover’ (Plt. 307c.5), with aorist ἐφηήρουν (Phdr. 266a.5, 7). Nominal forms show both the - η- and - ἐ- variants, the latter certainly predominating.29

In summary, therefore, ἐπευρίσκω has a present in - ἴσκω, with future active and perfects in - η-; future and aorist passive are in - ἐ-, and the aorist active and middle are thematic. Nominal formations are almost always in - ἐ-, rarely in - η-. It is of interest that this verb, which shows formations in - ἐ- as well as - η- (and therefore does not fully fit the pattern of - ἴσκω : - η-), is not a Classical creation, but goes back to Homeric times.

3.1.2. ὑψήσκω

The present ὑψήσκω ‘die’ is almost never found without a preverb, except in the perfect: this tense is almost always in the simple form. There are seven compounds of this verb found in Plato, but except for ἀποθυψήσκω none is common.

---

27 Including, with Burnet, the instance of ἀνευρεῖν at Ti. 47b.6.
28 Taking Burnet’s reading of ἐνευρήσεις at R. VIII 554d.6.
29 In - η- we find only ἐμφη- κα ‘invention, discovery’ (five times, of which one, Ion 534e.1, is a quotation from Tynnichus), but in - ἐ- ἐμφετής ‘finding, discovery’ (five times), ἐμφετής ‘inventor, discoverer’ (twice, both La. 186-7), ἐμφρετικός ‘inventive, ingenious’ (four times) and also compound forms ἀνευρέτες ‘undiscovered’ (twice), ἀνευρέτεον ‘one must find out’ (Plt. 294d.1) and ἐξευρέτεον ‘id.’ (R. II 380.a8).
In the simple form, we only find the present twice, once each in the optative (Phd. 72a.2) and the imperative (Lg. XII 946e.3). The stem found in other tenses varies like that of no other verb in -σκω in Plato, although in simple form instances are rare: we find no future tense, and the aorist ἐθανυ
The origins of the alternations seen in the parts of ὅπησκω have already been discussed (Chapter 3 § 3.2.4), and the pair ὅπησκω : ἔθωλω appears incongruous beside the regularity of many other verbs found in this category. A pattern of present ὅπη- ἵσκω : non-present ὅπη- (as found in perfect τέθυνακα) might look not unacceptable beside e.g. ἔσυ- ἵσκω : ἔσυρ- / ἔσυρ-, except that the parallel is not quite right: beside ἔσυ- ἵσκω : ἔσυρ- we expect ὅπη- ἵσκω : **ἐθησ-**.

3.1.3. κυὶσκοματ

The present κυὶσκοματ 'conceive, become pregnant' is found only once in Plato, in participial form at Tht. 149b.6. Also occurring is a present κυεκ 'bear in the womb, be pregnant with', common in the Symposium – according to Brandwood (1976, s.v. κενείν), it occurs eleven times in Burnet's text, and there is also one case of an imperfect at Smp. 209c.3. Burnet has the present κύω, a rare variant of κυεκ, occurring once in Plato (Lg. VII 789e.1); it is apparently unnoticed by Brandwood (1976 s.v. κενείν), who has κουσκαν for Burnet's κύουσαν. On the other hand, Brandwood (1976: xxix) does list κοουντα as a variant for κουσκαν at Tht. 151b.8. There is also a present medio-passive κυηκοματ, which occurs once in participial form (Lg. VII 789a.10). The only non-present form has the stem κυη-: aorist ἐκυη- σκα (twice). Of all these fifteen certain cases, eight occur in the Symposium, four in the Theaetetus and three in Laws VII. Related nominal forms occur most often in κυη-但他们, but there is one instance of a nominal stem κυ- : ἔγ- κυ- μον 'pregnant' (five times: three in the Theaetetus, two in the Symposium).

δωσθοντέω 'struggle against death' (R. III 406b.8) and ἀπαθανατιζω 'aim at immortality' (Chrm. 156d.6).

Burnet does not read either instance of infinitive κενείν (Smp. 209a.3, Plt. 274a.7).

Hence κύημα 'embryo, foetus' (twice) and κύησις 'conception' (three times).
3.1.4. στερίσκομαι

The case of στερίσκομαι ‘be deprived’ is complicated. This present itself is found only once, in the infinitive, at R. III 413a.10. There are also, however, two further presents, στέρομαι ‘be deprived’ and στερέω ‘deprive’. The former occurs nineteen times; it is found beside the present στερέω, which only occurs once as a simple verb, in the imperative (Lg. XII 958e.6). Other tenses are formed from the stem στερι-: in the active, aorist ἐστέρησα (Lg. IX 873e.7), perfect ἐστέρησα (Lg. IX 868e.11); and in the medio-passive, future στερήσομαι (Phib. 66e.10), aorist ἐστερήθην (seventeen times), with perfect ἐστερήσα (five times).

Of the two compounds, συναποστερέω ‘help to steal’, is found only once (present indicative at Lg. XII 948c.6). The other, ἀποστερέω ‘rob’, shows the expected paradigm for a contracted verb in -έω in Classical Greek: contraction in the present tense and non-present stem in -η-. So we find present active ἀποστερέω (eleven times), medio-passive ὀποστερέομαι (Th. 201b.1 only), with future active ἀποστερήσω (Prm 134e.8), aorists active ἀπεστέρησα (four times) and passive ἀπεστερήθην (Smp. 219d.7); and perfects active ἀπεστέρησα (Phdr. 241b.3, Lg. IX 868d.4) and medio-passive ἀπεστερήμαι (R. I 329a.8). Nominal derivatives are in στερή-. 36

Here, then, we find a pattern of a present in -ίσκω beside non-present forms in -η-; the matter is complicated, however, not only by the presence of collateral contracted presents in -έω (simple and compound verb) and -ἐμοι (compound verb), but also by the fact that in the simple form the collateral medio-passive is in -ομι, rather than being contracted.

36Reading with Burnet ἀποστερήσει, not aorist optative ἀποστερήσειε.
3.2. With non-present forms in -ω-

3.2.1. άλίσκομαι / άνάλισκω

The simple verb άλίσκομαι 'be taken, be caught' is found in the present tense twelve times. Non-present forms show -ω-, in this case including a strong aorist. Thus we find future άλώσσομαι (Grg. 489a.1, Smp. 219e.3), aorist έάλων (seventeen times) and perfect έάλωκα (four times).

The active form with preverb, άνάλισκω 'use up, spend', is much more common; all compounds show άνακ-, but this is the only one that is at all frequently found. Here the present is found in the active άνάλισκω 24 times, as well as once in the imperfect (R. VIII 552b.6); and in the medio-passive άνάλισκομαι four times and once in the imperfect (Smp. 181e.1). Also found are future active άνάλώσω (three times), aorist active άνήλωσσα (four times), a medio-passive perfect άνήλωμαι once (indicative at Plt. 289c.9) and pluperfect άνηλόμην also once (Plt. 272e.1).

Two more compound verbs are also found. There is an aorist κοτανήλωσσα 'use up, spend, lavish' (Prt. 321c.1), with perfect κοτανήλωσσα (Ti. 36b.6) and aorist passive κοτανηλώθην (Phd. 72d.3), forms not found with any other combinations of preverbs in Plato. The other is one occurrence of the present participle of προσανάλισκω 'conserve besides' (Prt. 311d.4). Nominal derivatives occur from the simple stem άλω-37 and also in prefixed άναλω-38

Here again, the formations are not quite predictable. The simple form has intransitive present medio-passive in -ίσκω and non-present forms are in -ω-; yet the

37Cf. αίχμαλώτος 'taken by the spear, captive, prisoner' (Lg. XI 919a.6), άνάλωτος 'unassailable' (Thi. 179e.5), δωσάλωτος 'hard to catch or take; hard to comprehend' (three times) and είσκαλωτος 'easy to be taken' (Phdr. 240a.3).
38Hence άνάλωτος 'to be spent' (Lg. 847e.5), άνάλωσις 'expenditure' (Cri. 48c.3, Lg. VI 781c.4), άνάλωτης 'spender, waster' (R. VIII 552b.9, c.1), άνάλωτικός 'expensive' (three times, all in R. VIII), άνάλω- μα 'expense, cost' (ten times) and compound φιλονάλωτης 'fond of spending' (R. VIII 548b.5).
aorist has the appearance of a root formation like ἐγνως and the perfect is an
intransitive active. The forms in ἀνα-, however, show a regular -ισκω/-ω-
alternation; indeed we find a present ἀναλω built off the ω- stem, from Aeschylus
onwards (cf. Veitch 1887 s.v. ἀναλίσκω). In the case of the stem στερ-, we saw
that regularity of stems only existed in the compounds – there we found
ἀπο-στερεω: ἀπο-στερέομαι. Similarly, the predictable pattern here too exists
only in the compound forms.

3.2.2. ἀμβλίσκω

The verb ἀμβλίσκω ‘cause to miscarry’ is found twice, both times present
active, at Tht. 149d.3. The only other related form found in Plato shows a stem
ἀμβλω-, though augmented: it is an aorist with preverb, ἕξημβλωσα, once in the
indicative at Tht. 150c.4. Elsewhere, other verbal forms show the expected stem
ἀμβλω-: so Aristophanes has perfects ἕξημβλωσκα (Nu. 137) and ἕξημβλομαι
(Nu. 139). Nominal forms occur in ἀμβλω- too, although only found outside
Plato.40

3.3. Summary: the ἐφρίσκω type

The morphology of these verbs is not as clearly defined as that of the
reduplicated class. A relation to contracted presents in -εω is obvious in the cases of
κυσκομαι and στερίσκομαι, and all non-present forms (and most nominal ones)
related to these two verbs are in -η-. On the other hand, ἐφρίσκω has no such
collateral present, and it is not clear whether its non-present forms should be in -η-,

40Cf. ἀμβλωτις ‘abortion’ (Aristotle, Lysias, Theophrastus), ἀμβλωμα ‘abortion’ (Antipho
Sophista), ἕξημβλωστις ‘miscarriage’ (Hippocrates, Theophrastus) and ἀμβλωπης ‘abortive’
(Theophrastus), the latter apparently having undergone influence from ἀμβλωπος ‘dimmed, dark’
(cf. Chantraine 1968-80 s.v. ἀμβλίσκω).
-e- or neither; and the fact that ἰησκω's origins lie in a totally different system (that of set roots, Chapter 3 § 3.2.4) is entirely evident. The last two verbs examined, which show non-presents in -ω-, are more uniform; but note that the aorist ἐάλων is not formally compatible with a contracted verb paradigm of the type - ὁω / -ω-, not being a sigmatic formation. We have a rather 'patchy' conjugation here, but one showing regularities not found in Homer.

4. Same-stem formations

Formations where we find the same stem before -σκω as we do in non-present forms are of two types: those where the stem is identical, which are ἀρέσκω 'please', ἀναβτόσκομαι 'come back to life; bring back to life' and φάσκω 'say'; and those where there is or may be a vocalic alternation: γενείδσκω 'begin to get a beard', γεφύρṣκω 'grow old and μεθόσκω 'make drunk, intoxicate'.

4.1. Without vocalic alternation: the ἀρέσκω type

4.1.1. ἀρέσκω

The verb ἀρέσκω 'please' is only at all frequent in the present in Plato. We have this tense 42 times⁴¹ and the imperfect four times (all in Cri. 52), as well as an adverb derived from the present participle, ἀρεσκόντως 'agreeably' (R. VI 504b.6). Also with present stem is the one compound form, ἀπαρέσκω 'displease' (Tht. 202d.8). The only other tense found is the aorist ἱσσα (six times, half in Prt. 335-361). We are therefore dealing with a stem ἀρε-, showing either present suffix -σκω or aorist suffix -σα, depending on the tense. Occasional nominal forms occur outside Plato, generally in ἀρεσ-, with non-etymological -σ-,⁴² although later

---

⁴¹Reading ἀρκέσει with Burnet at R. VII 533e.7, not ἀρέσκετ.
⁴²Cf. e.g. ἀρεστός 'acceptable, pleasing' (found from Semonides onwards).
derivatives are found from the present stem, as ἀρεσκός ‘pleasing, obsequious’
(Aristotle, Theophrastus).\(^4\)

4.1.2. ἀναβιώσκομαι

The present - βιώσκομαι, only found with preverb ἀνα-, occurs with the
meaning ‘come back to life’ seven times in present forms and once in the imperfect;
in addition, there is one instance of the present participle with the causative meaning
‘bring back to life’ (Cri. 48c.5). Obviously semantically and morphologically related,
although listed separately by Brandwood (1976 s.v. ἀναβιώναι),\(^4\) are the strong
aorist ἄνεβιων ‘come back to life’ (three times) and a causative aorist middle
ἀνέβιωσάμην ‘bring back to life’ (Phd. 89b.10). Confusingly, LSJ’s division of
forms is different from Brandwood’s, with the former being listed under ἀναβιώνοι
and the latter under ἀναβιώσκομαι.

All other verbal forms related to those above also show a stem βιω- in Plato.
We would expect a contracted present βιόω; but this is not found in Plato, simple or
compound.\(^4\) With stem βιω- we find future βιώσομαι (sixteen times); both strong
aorist ἐβίων (fifteen times) and sigmatic one ἐβίωσα (Phd. 113d.3);\(^4\) and perfects
active βεβιωκα (ten times) and medio-passive βεβιωμαι (participle, at R. VI
498c.3 only).

Compound forms, other than those already seen in ἀνα-, are infrequent, but
show just the same pattern: future διαβιώσομαι ‘live through’ (Lg. VII 804b.2 ),

\(^4\)On nominal forms and later derivatives see further Chantraine 1968-80 s.v. ἀρεσκόω; for more on the
etymology see Ruijgh 1985: 145.
\(^4\)On this point see Chapter 8 § 2.2.1.
\(^4\)On this form see further Chapter 8 § 2.2.1 and n. 3.
\(^4\)Brandwood’s order of listing the forms of the two aorists is odd, apparently mixing them together.
There are fourteen forms which clearly belong to the strong aorist, and one which must be sigmatic: it
is βιώσαντες. Into the former case I also include the one instance of third person plural ἐβιώσαν (Phdr. 249b.1), thus making fifteen; of course, this form could also be taken as sigmatic, and is indeed
doubtless the starting-point for this new aorist stem here.
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with aorist διεβιων (eleven times); aorist κατεβιων ‘pass one’s life’ (three times); and future συμβιωσομαι ‘live with’ (Smp. 181d.5). There are related nominal forms in βιω-47 and also in βιο-. 48

In these verbs, therefore, we have a stem βιω-, which in non-present verbal forms occurs with future middle suffix - συμ-, sigmatic aorist - σα, perfect active - κα and perfect medio-passive - μα, as well as having root aorist forms; there are also nominal derivatives that are in βιω- (the verbally derived ones), but more usually βιο-. The only present from βιω- / βιο- to be found in Plato is ἄνα- βιώσκομαι, which therefore shows the same stem as other verbal forms, βιω-, with - σκ- and medio-passive endings.

The related present, its link with these forms now lost, is ζω ‘live’ (320 times), with imperfect εξων (eight times); 49 whence also another future form, ζησω (R. V 465d.2, IX 591c.7). Further instances of these tense stems occur in compounds also, and the forms act as presents to the non-present ones listed above: διαζω (R. VIII 561c.6, Lg. V 739d.7), διέζων (Chrm. 171d.7, Lg. III 679a.2); διαζησω (Lg. VII 792e.7); καταζω (Smp. 192b.3); and συζω (Plt. 302b.6). In addition, there is one instance of a present επίζω ‘survive’ (Lg. II 661c.5). The existence of ζω and its related forms shows that - βιωσκομαι was clearly secondarily formed on a non-present stem.

47Hence βιοτέου ‘one must live’ (five times, of which three are found in the Gorgias), compound διαβιωτέου ‘one must spend one’s life’ (Lg. VII 803e.1), and βιοτος ‘to be lived’ (nine times), negative διαβιωτος ‘not to be lived, intolerable’ (five times).

48Cf. especially βιος ‘life’ (438 times, of which four are in quotation), and also βιοτος ‘life’ (R. III 386c.6, but in quotation from Homer), whence βιοτεω ‘live’ (Phdr. 252d.3), and διαβιος ‘not to be survived’ (Lg. IX 873c.6); and compound adjectives βιοδότης ‘giver of livelihood’ (Lg. XI 921a.3), βιόδωρος ‘life-giving’ (R. II 381d.8, but in quotation from Aeschylus) and βραχύβιος ‘short-lived’ (R. VIII 546a.7).

49An occurrence at Chrm. 171d.7 is not read by Burnet.

50Reading the former instance with Burnet.
4.1.3. φάσκω

Lastly, there is φάσκω 'say, assert'. The stem φάσκ- is found only in the participle, but 71 times, and on one occasion in the imperfect (Lg. X 901a.4). Thus it seems to be used for the present participle and as imperfect to φημί, which in the present is found in the infinitive φάναι 203 times, in the unpredictable indicative (φημί, φής, φησί, φαμέν, φατέ, φασί) 935 times (of which seven are in quotation), in the subjunctive φῶ 179 times, in the optative φαίνω 179 times again, in the imperative (φάθω, φάτω) 16 times and in the participle not at all – except for two cases of the nominative plural φάνες which both occur in the dubious Alcibiades 2, noted for its unusual language (Alc. II 139c.3, 146b.2).51

The other tenses of φημί show both the stems φη- and φά-: the future φήσω is found 252 times; the root aorist ἐφην is only found in the indicative, but apparently 2323 times (of which 1967 are ἐφη); and the sigmatic aorist ἐφησά occurs thirteen times, of which one is participial (Th. 155d.4). Also found are certain medio-passive forms: φαττ' (Prt. 339c.4, in quotation from Simonides) and perfect imperative πεφάσθω (Ti. 72d.8).

The only frequent compound of φημί in Plato is σύμφημι 'assent, agree'. This follows the same pattern as the simple form, except that here no present participle is found at all: in the present the infinitive is found three times, the indicative eleven,52 the optative once (Lg. VIII 831b.2) and the imperative twice. Non-present forms are, as before, in φη-, with future συμφήσω (four times, all in the indicative); root aorist συνέφην (indicative only, 23 times, of which συνέφη accounts for 19 cases; of these, ten are from the Euthydemus); and sigmatic aorist συνέφησα four times (once each in infinitive, indicative, subjunctive and participle). The only other compounds say little more: a present ἀντίφημι 'contradict' occurs

51 Of this dialogue beside the others, Lesky says it is 'in complete linguistic discord with the rest' (1966: 511).
52 Reading σύμφησιν with Burnet at Smp. 178b.8, rather than ὁμολογεῖ.
once (indicative, at 'Grg. 501c.6), and a present ἀπόφημι 'speak out; deny' twice (both indicative), with aorist ἀπέφησα twice (once indicative and once optative).

There are no nominal forms in φη-, but many in φημ-,53 we also find (προ-)φητ-'.54 Further forms occur in φα-.55

This verb, therefore, is like no other so far seen. The stem in -σκω is only used for an extremely frequent participial and an extremely rare imperfect use. Before the suffix -σκω we find the stem φα-, which occurs both in certain verbal forms, and in certain nominal derivatives: the verbal noun in -τεου and the abstract noun in -σις.

4.2. With vocalic alternation: the γενειάσκω type

4.2.1. γενειάσκω

Γενειάσκω 'begin to get a beard' is found only once in Plato (Smp. 181d.3).

The only related verbal form is a present γενειάω 'grow a beard, get a beard' (Plt. 270e.3). The quantity of the vowel before -σκω cannot be determined, but it is to be noted that non-present forms show -α-: hence the -η- of γενειήσαντα 'having

53These are φήμη 'significant / prophetic saying; report; repute; speech, saying' (32 times), and several groups of compound forms: βλασφημέω 'speak profanely of sacred things; slander' (four times) and βλασφημία 'profane speech; defamation' (Lg. VII 800c.1, d.1); δύσφημος 'of ill omen' (Hp. Ma. 293a.5); ἐπιφήμιζω 'ascibe, assign; call, name' (three times); and most of all εὐφήμος 'fair-sounding, auspicious' (three times), proper noun Εὐφήμος (Phdr. 244a.2), εὐφήμικα 'religious silence; auspiciousness' (seven times) and εὐφήμεω 'use words of good omen' (present eleven times, future twice), which has compounds ἀνευφημέω 'cry aloud, shriek' (Phd. 60a.3) and ἐπευφημεῶ 'sing' (R. II 383b.4, but in quotation).

54Cf. προ- φητεύω 'prophesy' (Phdr. 244d.7), προφήτης 'prophet' (nine times) and προφήτεις 'prophetess' (Phdr. 244a.8).

55Cf. φατέω 'one must say' (11 times) and φάσις 'utterance; affirmation' (Ti. 49e.4, Sph. 263e.12), with compounds ἀπόφασις 'denial, negation' (four times) and πρόφασις 'alleged motive' (14 times, of which one case is in Lysias' speech in the Phaedrus). There is also προφασίζωρι 'plead in excuse' (three times, of which one case is in Lysias' speech in the Phaedrus).
become bearded, having grown a beard’ (Od. 18.176, 269). Related nominal forms in γενετ- are rare in Plato.56

4.2.2. γηράσκω

The present γηράσκω is found in Plato four times. Also listed under this verb in LSJ and Brandwood are a future γηράσω (R. III 393e.8), and an aorist εγήρασα (Lg. XII 958d.2). We are therefore dealing with a non-present stem γηρα-. There is also a related contracted compound verb, καταγηράω ‘grow old’ (Criti. 112c.5). This verb has future καταγηράσω (Lg. XII 949c.1) and aorist κατεγηράσα (twice). Related nominal forms in Plato show the stem γηρα(σ)- (most notably γήρας ‘old age’),57 with compound variant stem γηρο-.

The stem, therefore, is generally γηρα-. As we have already seen, however, Homer shows γηράσκω, not **γηρήσκω, which brings us to the conclusion that both presents show γηρα- instead. Although this is no proof that γενετάσκω also has  _, it seems intuitive – given their parallelism both of form and meaning – that this is the case.

4.2.3. μεθύσκω

The present μεθύσκω ‘make drunk’ is found once in the active in Plato (Lg. I 649d.7); the medio-passive present μεθύσκομαι ‘get drunk’ occurs once also (Smp. 176c.7). The stem μεθυ-, augmented by analogical - σ-, is also found in the aorist passive ἐμεθύσθην (six times), listed by LSJ and Brandwood as part of this verb.

---

56These are ἀγενετος ‘beardless, boyish’ (three times) and εὐγενετος ‘well-bearded’ (Euthphr. 2b.11).
57Γήρας occurs 45 times, of which one or two cases are quotations from another author; other forms are ἀγήρας ‘ageless, undecaying’ (five times), γηρατος ‘old’ (four times) and συγκαταγηράσις ‘growing old together’ (Lg. XI 930b.2).
58Cf. γηροτρόφος ‘taking care of in old age’ (three times, of which two are in quotation), whence γηροτροφεῖν ‘cherish in old age’ (twice).
With the same stem we also find μεθύω ‘be drunk, be intoxicated’ (nineteen times, of which 17 times are in the participle); and one compound form, causative sigmatic aorist καταμέθυσα ‘make drunk’, found in participial form once, at Grg. 471b.3. Related nominal forms are μέθυ ‘wine’, found only in quotation from Homer (R. III 390b.1), and μεθυστικός ‘drunken’ (R. IX 573c.9).

In the forms such as μεθύσκω and ἐμεθύσθην, it is impossible to tell the quantity of the final vowel of the stem. In the case of γενειάσκω and γνηράσκω, we saw that presents in -σκω beside presents in -άω probably appeared to show the alternation -άσκω : -άω, with non-present forms in -η-; it is therefore possible that at some stage the same vocalic alternations occur in these forms too, showing the pattern -όσκω : -υω : -υ-.  

4.3. Summary: same-stem formations

These forms evidently show a newly productive Classical Greek pattern, where a stem ending in a vowel may be followed by -σκω in the present, but is also used to create non-present forms. Because we cannot know whether to read μεθύσκω or μεθύσκω, the divide between these two types is blurred: is the distinction that stems only alternate between long and short vowels if in -α- (reading μεθύσκω), or that they alternate if a present in -σκω is found beside a contracted present (reading μεθύσκω : μεθύω : μεθύ-)? A further element is that all three members of γενειάσκω type show closely related nominal forms: γενειάς, γνηράς και μεθύσκω : μέθυν. There is no reason, however, to believe that these presents are denominative: we do not have a regular morphological pattern here (since γενειάς shows a dental stem, γνηράς an σ-stem), and related verbal forms are a more likely source, being found in Greek in all cases.

Of all the different classes here described, it seems that φάσκω fits in this set, although φη- is a more usual non-present stem than φα-. A further inconsistency is
to be found in the root aorist ἄνεβινον: for it seems from the data presented, in this class and the next, that regular conjugations in present -σκω and aorist -σα are being formed, and to this rule ἄνεβινον is an exception.

5. Misunderstood formations

Lastly, there are two presents found in Plato whose σκ-suffix has been reinterpreted as part of the unmarked stem: these are βόσκομαι ‘feed’ (intransitive) and διδάσκω ‘teach’.

5.1. βόσκομαι

The present medio-passive βόσκομαι ‘feed’ (intransitive) is only found once in Plato (indicative at R. IX 586a.8). There are no further verbal forms here, although the fairly common nominal derivative βόσκημα ‘thing fed, animal’ (nine times) implies that the suffix -σκω is no longer seen in these forms as a present formant; and indeed, we have already seen this to be the case in Homer, where the future βοσκήσω and iterative βοσκεσκουτο are found (Chapter 3 § 3.1.2). Related nominal forms occur in βο(τ)- and βω(τ)-.

5.2. διδάσκω

The verb διδάσκω ‘teach’, on the other hand, shows what was once present reduplication and the present formant -σκ- in all tense stems (cf. Chapter 3 § 4.2.1). The verb is found quite frequently in Plato, with five very rare compounds occurring as well as the simple form, and a variety of nominal derivatives. The basic verb occurs frequently in the present active (97 times, of which one instance of the participle is in a quotation from Theognis, at Men. 96a.1), and there are also the two

59 Hence βοτάνη ‘pasture’ (three times), βοτών ‘beast’ (Mx. 237d.4) and εὔβοτος ‘abounding in pasture’ (Crit. 11b.1).
60 Cf. συβώτης ‘swineherd’ (twice) and χηροβωτία ‘keeping / feeding of geese’ (Plt. 264c.6).
instances of the imperfect; Brandwood (s.v. διδάσκειν) also lists a present that he
classes as middle, found in the form διδάσκονται three times in Prt. 325b-c, and
one that is passive (four times, of which one occurrence is in reference to a line of
Solon’s at Lach. 189a.5). In combination with a following -σ-, the stem is διδαζειν.
Hence the future active is διδαζω (nineteen times), with middle διδαζομαι once in
the indicative (Rep. IV 421e.2), also being in quotation from Theognis at Men. 95d.6;
the aorist active is εδιδαζα (60 times), with middle εδιδαζαμην (three times). The
perfect active is the aspirated δεδιδαζα (two cases of the third person singular
δεδιδαχεν, both at Men. 85e), with medio-passive infinitive δεδιδαχαι once
(Phdr. 269c.2).

Of the five compounds, only one gives a further tense form not found in the
simple verb: ἄναδιδασκω ‘teach better’, which is found once in the aorist passive
ἀνεδιδαχθημεν (Hp. Ma. 301e.1). The others are εξεδιδαζα ‘taught thoroughly’
(Prt.328e.5), ἐπεκδιδαζω ‘will teach besides’ (Euphr. 7a.4, Prt. 328e.5),
προδιδασκω ‘teach beforehand’ (three times) and προσεδιδαζα ‘taught besides’
(Chrm. 173d.8).

The frequent nominal forms show some form of the stem διδασκαλις: there is
the extended διδασκαλος -61, the variant διδακτος - before -τος -62 and also διδαχη
‘teaching’ (14 times).

This verb was clearly once a reduplicated present in -τος-, belonging to the first
set of verbs examined in this chapter; but now the old present stem διδασκατος is no
longer seen as δι- δα- σκ- , but as a unit, and it is thus found in every form related to

61 Hence διδασκαλος ‘teacher’ (116 times), whence διδασκαλειον ‘teaching-place, school’ (four
times), διδασκαλεια ‘teaching, instruction’ (seven) and διδασκαλοικος ‘of / for teaching’
(seventeen); and compound nouns γεροντοδιδασκαλος ‘old man’s master’ (Euthd. 272c.5),
υποδιδασκαλος ‘under-teacher’ (Ion 536a.5) and χοροδιδασκαλος ‘chorus trainer’ (Lg. II 655a.8,
VII 812c.11).
62 Cf. διδασκτευον ‘one must teach’ (twice) and διδακτος ‘that can be taught / learnt’ (77 times, of
which 40 occur in the Meno, and 23 in the Protagoras).
it used in Plato – there are no forms in \( \delta \alpha - \), unlike in Homer (cf. Chapter 3 § 4.2.1). So \( \delta \delta \alpha \sigma \kappa - \) is treated like a verbal, not just present, stem, with exceptional consequences: although, as we have seen, \( \beta \sigma \kappa \mu \alpha \alpha i \) shows \( - \sigma \kappa - \) in an occasional nominal derivative, forms in \( \delta \delta \alpha \sigma \kappa - \) are widespread: the verbal noun in \( - \tau \omega \varsigma \) (with reduction of \( - \sigma \kappa - \) to \( - \kappa - \)), the perfect (with loss of \( - \sigma - \) and aspiration of \( - \kappa - \) to \( - \chi - \); cf. the examples of parallel formations at Chantraine 1991: 198-9) and the very frequently found nominal derivatives are unparalleled by any other form in \( - \sigma \kappa \omega \).

5.3. Summary: misunderstood formations

The two verbs examined in this section only have in common the fact that, in both cases, \( - \sigma \kappa - \) is viewed as part of the whole stem, and not as a present suffix. With \( \beta \sigma \kappa \mu \alpha \alpha i \) there are nominal forms both with and without \( - \sigma \kappa - \). With \( \delta \delta \alpha \sigma \kappa \omega \), there are only non-present forms with \( - \sigma \kappa - \) (or a reduction of it) and reduplication; it is also totally unlike the other reduplicated forms: one would expect a non-present stem \( \delta \alpha - \) beside present \( \delta \delta \alpha \sigma \kappa - \), but this is not found in Plato.

6. Conclusion: the morphology of verbs in \( - \sigma \kappa \omega \) in Plato

If we lay aside the formal differences between futures in \( - \sigma \omega \) and \( - \sigma \mu \alpha \alpha i \) (to an active verb), root and sigmatic aorists, and analogical intrusion of \( - \sigma - \) before \( - \eta \nu - \), \( - \eta \sigma \mu \alpha \alpha i - \), \( - \tau \sigma \zeta - \) and \( - \tau \varsigma \zeta - \), there are three fairly regular classes of verbs in \( - \sigma \kappa \omega \) in Plato. Reduplicated presents (the \( \gamma \gamma \nu \omega \sigma \kappa \omega \) type) in \( - \sigma \kappa \omega \) are formed on stems of the form \( CR\tilde{V} - \), with the exception of \( \theta \nu \eta \sigma \kappa \omega \). This latter verb fits with the other presents in \( - \iota \sigma \kappa \omega \) (as \( \epsilon \upsilon \rho i \sigma \kappa \omega \)), which have non-present stems most usually in \( - \eta - \), but also in \( - \omega - \) and in one case in \( - \epsilon - \). Stems that end in vowels but that are not of the form \( CR\tilde{V} - \) either show a short vowel before \( - \sigma \kappa \omega \) and a long vowel in non-present forms (\( \gamma \nu e i \alpha \sigma \kappa \omega \) type); or they have the same stem with \( - \sigma \kappa \omega \) as they do with other tense affixes (\( \chi \rho e \sigma \kappa \omega \) type). The exception is again an
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archaic form: φάσκω, which shows non-present φη- more often than φα-. Lastly, there are two presents that have been reinterpreted as having stems ending in -σκ-, not present suffix -σκ-, and which do not fit the above categories (βόσκομαι, διδάσκω).

Compared to Homer, we can see certain developments. Two classes—the reduplication and -ισκω—are extended, one of which shows only one Homeric form. Two more (the same-stem presents) arise, which show a tendency for great regularity of tense stems; in this case also, one Homeric form appears, which there was classed as miscellaneous (γηπάσκω, Chapter 3 § 7.2). There is an obvious consistency in the formation of new presents in Classical Greek that can be seen from the above data. In the first, reduplicated, group, all the verbs have a monosyllabic stem, as found in the other tenses; in the new formations, all roots have the form of stop followed by -ρ- and then a long vowel (ά or ω). Forms of the class in -ισκω also have monosyllabic roots, but non-present stems in -η- or, less often, -ω-, apparently in continuation of a pattern found once in Homer; with θυήσκω, the -η- is part of the root. The new types, those with vowel stems, always have, albeit only in the new forms, a stem before -σκω of two or more syllables. Thus the formation of a present in -σκω from a given stem seems to be morphologically predictable. The only exception to these rules is -βιώσκομαι: beside such a pair as non-present ἀλ-ω-: present ἀλ-ισκομαι, we would expect βι-ω-: *βι-ισκομαι. The reason that the latter is not found is presumably the need to avoid the sequence **βιω-; the latter was thus replaced with βιω-, as found in other verbal forms. The present ἀλισκομαι seems to be created on the analogy of -ισκω presents formed from non-presents in -η-; a reduplicated present in -υ- would of course be formally impossible for it.
Chapter 8
The Semantics of Verbs in -σκω in Plato

1. Introduction

Morphological analysis of verbs in -σκω found in Plato proved easier than that of those in Homer; similarly, semantic analysis is a more straightforward task in Classical Greek. A brief conspectus shows what at first appears to be a similar pattern. Again, there are causative actives beside inchoative medio-passives. Showing both voices we have μεθύσκω 'make drunk' / μεθύσκομαι 'get drunk', μιμησκω 'remind' / μιμησκομαι 'remind oneself of, remember'; an apparently similar pair is ἀνάλισκω 'use up, spend' / ἀλίσκομαι 'be taken'. Causative active are ἀμβλίσκω 'cause to miscarry' and apparently τυρφόσκω 'wound' ('make wounded'). κυμίσκομαι 'conceive, become pregnant' is an inchoative medio-passive; we have already seen that βόσκομαι 'feed, graze' (intransitive) is the inchoative of a causative βόσκω (Chapter 4 § 3.1.1), although the latter is not found in Plato. We might have inchoatives in πιπράσκομαι 'be sold' and στερίσκομαι 'be deprived', although these glosses (from LSJ) are ambiguous between inchoative and stative interpretation. On the other hand, ἀνα- βιώσκομαι 'come back to life; bring back to life' has both causative and inchoative meanings in the medio-passive present. There are also inchoative actives: γενειάσκω 'begin to get a beard', γνωσκω 'grow old' and θυμίσκω 'die'. This analysis leaves ἀφέσκω 'please', γιγνώσκω 'perceive, know', δίδασκω 'teach', ἀπο- διδράσκω 'run away from', εὑρίσκω 'find out' and suppletive φάσκω 'say'.
2. Minimal pairs

2.1. The data

Unlike in Homer, a study of minimal pairs in Plato is instructive. The most notable feature from a close examination of the data taken from Plato is that, in several cases, we are not just dealing with a present in -σκο, but also with an unmarked present from the same stem. These pairs are γενειάσκο / γενειάω; γηράσκο / κατα-γηράω; κυίσκομαι / κυέω; μεθύσκο / μεθύω; and στερίσκομαι / στερέω, στέρομαι. I shall also be looking at ἄνα-βιώσκομαι, which occurs beside ζῶ (found for expected βιόω), and φάσκω, which supplies some of the forms for φημί. It is necessary to examine these cases individually and in context, in order to determine whether any difference of meaning is apparent. Is Plato only interested in variatio, or is there a more regular pattern at work? The forms to be examined are listed in the table below, with citation forms and glosses from LSJ; both here and henceforth in this chapter, forms listed in tables but not found in Plato are given within parentheses.

---
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1 For criticism of Ruipérez’s (1954: 130-5) treatment of a different set of minimal pairs in Ancient Greek (γενειάσκο : γενειάω; γηράσκο : γηράω; ἡβάσκο : ἡβάω; and στερίσκο, στερίσκομαι : στερέω, στέρομαι), see Chapter 1 § 3.5. The only pair which he discusses and which does not occur in Plato is ἡβάσκο 'come of age': ἡβάω 'be in one’s prime’, which exhibits the same properties as γενειάσκο : γενειάω; see further Chapter 9 § 2.2. It will be seen that substantial evidence for the meaning of -σκ- as presented here comes from the pair μεθύσκο : μεθύω and their related aorist forms, which are not considered by Ruipérez.
Instances of the causative alternation are clear: -κυίσκω 'make pregnant': κυίσκομαι 'become pregnant'; μεθύσκω 'make drunk': μεθύσκομαι 'become drunk'; and presumably too στερίσκω 'make deprived': στερίσκομαι 'become deprived'. To this set apparently also belongs ἄνα-βιώσκομαι 'come back to life', although the causative meaning 'bring back to life' is also found in this medio-passive present. Secondly, we have the active inchoatives in -σκο, which are γενειάσκω 'begin to get a beard' and γηράσκω 'grow old'. In Plato, they have no causative variants and are found as active forms only. Generally, beside all these forms, we find an unmarked stative: thus ζῶ 'live', γενειάω 'have a beard', κυέω 'be pregnant (with)' and μεθύω 'be drunk'. There is also στερομαι, which we shall see has stative meaning, although LSJ's gloss 'be without, lack, lose' appears to indicate that it is inchoative also. There is one collateral to a causative form — στερέω 'deprive, bereave, rob', found in addition to the non-Platonic στερίσκω. Lastly, (-)γηράω 'grow old', despite the other unmarked forms, appears from this gloss not to have stative meaning, but rather seems to be inchoative.

2 I include ἄνα-βιώσκομαι not only because it appears beside cognate ζῶ, but also because its aorist ἄνεβιον is obviously to be compared with the the simple aorist ἐβιον.
The two groups will be dealt with as divided above: firstly the inchoative medio-passives in -σκομαι, and then the inchoative actives in -σκω.

2.2. Causative actives and medio-passive inchoatives: the μεθύσκω type

The verbs to be studied in this section are ἀναβιώσκομαι 'come back to life; bring back to life'; κυήσκομαι 'conceive, become pregnant'; μεθύσκω 'make drunk, intoxicate', with medio-passive μεθύσκομαι 'get drunk'; and στερίσκομαι 'be deprived'.

2.2.1. ἀναβιώσκομαι

The case of ἀνα- βιώσκομαι is the most complicated to be dealt with here. This medio-passive present has both the inchoative meaning 'come back to life' (eight times) and also the causative one 'bring back to life' (Cri, 48c.5). Although the collateral present βιώω is not found in Plato,3 this σκ-present is worth analysing here because there are cognate stative forms without -σκ- : a present, which takes the form ζω, and several non-present tense forms in βιω- . Thus, from the latter stem, we find the aorist ἐβιών 'lived' beside ἀν- εβιών 'came back to life', the inchoative aorist of ἀναβιώσκομαι. For example, in the following passage from the Symposium, Diotima is explaining that Love, being the child of Poverty (Πενία) and Resource (Πόρος), is of a mixed nature:

καὶ οὔτε ὡς ἀθάνατος πέφυκεν οὔτε ὡς θνητός, ἀλλὰ τοτε μὲν τῆς αὐτῆς ἡμέρας θάλλει τε καὶ ζή, ... τοτε δὲ ἀποθνῄσκει, πάλιν δὲ ἀναβιώσκεται διὰ τήν τοῦ πατρός φύσιν, ... (Smp. 203d-e)

3This present is evidently a back-formation from non-present parts in βιω- ; instances include those at Democritus 200, Euripides fr. 238 and Aristotle HA V 558a.20.
And he is by nature neither immortal nor mortal, but in the same day he at one
time flourishes and lives, ... but at another time he dies, and comes back to life
again thanks to his father’s nature...

It is in only one instance that the meaning of this verb is clearly causative; in
the passage concerned, Socrates is arguing both against Crito’s suggestion that he
escape, and in general against the opinion of the multitude:

Δς δε συ λέγεις τας σκέψεις, μη ως ἄληθως ταύτα, ὁ Κρίτων,
σκέμματα ή των ραδίως ἀποκτιννύντων καὶ ἃναβιωσκομένων γ’
ἀν, εἰ οὗτοι τ’ ἔσαν, οὐδενὶ ξύν νῦ, τούτων τῶν πόλλων. (Cri. 48c)

As to the considerations you suggest..., these are truly, Crito, the reflections of
those who readily put men to death and would bring them back to life, if they
could, without any sense – that is, of the multitude.

Although listed as a separate verb by Brandwood (s.v. ἄναβιωσκομαι) and LSJ
(s.v. ἄναβιωσκόμω), the aorist ἄνεβιων (three times) has the inchoative meaning of
‘came back to life’ that one would expect of the aorist of inchoative
ἀναβιωσκομαι. Two examples occur together in the passage below, where Er the
Pamphylian, killed in battle and yet brought home undecayed,

... μέλλων ἡλπτεσθαι δωδεκατάος ἐπὶ τῇ πυρᾷ κείμενος ἄνεβιον,
ἀναβιώς δ' ἔλεγεν ἄ ἐκεὶ ἰδοι. (R. X 614b)

... about to be cremated on the twelfth day, lying on the pyre came back to life,
and having come back to life he spoke of the things he had seen there.
Listed by Brandwood under the same heading of root aorist ἀναβιῶναί – but by LSJ under ἀναβιῶσκομαι – is a causative sigmatic middle aorist ἀνεβιωσόμην, found only in Plato in the following suggestion, made by Socrates to Phaedo:

τήμερον, ἔφη, κἀγώ τὰς ἐμὰς καὶ σὺ ταύτας, ἐκαντπερ γε ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος τελευτήσῃ καὶ μὴ δυνώμεθα αὐτὸν ἀναβιῶσασθαι.  
(Phd. 89b)

It is today, he said, that I [will cut off] mine [my hair] and you yours, if our argument dies and we cannot bring it back to life.

There are apparently no further instances to be found in Homeric or Classical Greek of a causative present - βιῶσκομαι; but we find two more cases of -ἐβιωσόμην. It occurs in the Odyssey, when Odysseus says to Nausicaa that he wishes to return home:

τῷ κέν τοι καὶ κεῖθι θεῷ ὡς εὐχετομῆν  
οἶει ἡματα πάντας σὺ γὰρ μ' ἐβιωσας, κούρη.  
(Od. 8.467-8)

Then I will there, too, pray to you as to a god all my days; for you, maiden, have given me life.

The use without preverb ἀνα- proves exceptional, however: for in the other instance, from the comic Crates (52 K.-A.), we find:

ἀνεβιωσόμην: ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀναβιῶναι ἐποίησα: Κράτης.  
ἀνεβιωσόμην: instead of “I made come back to life” – Crates.
No transitive ἔβιωσα ever seems to have occurred.

In summary, therefore, we have the unusual pattern of inchoative and causative present medio-passive ἀναβιωσκομα, with inchoative aorist active ἀνεβιών and also causative aorist middle ἀνεβιωσόμην.

These forms are to be compared with cognate stative forms which also occur in Plato. There are not infrequent non-present forms in βιω- to be found, meaning ‘live’: future βιώσομαι (sixteen times), root aorist κείνων (fifteen), sigmatic aorist κείωσα (Phd. 113d.3) and perfects active κεῖωσα (ten times) and medio-passive κείωμα (R. VI 498c.3). The present to these forms, actually cognate but with the old link now obscured, is ζώ (320 times); from it, a new occasional future ζήσω has been formed (R. V 465d.2, IX 591c.7). A good example of the use of ζώ beside a form in βιω-, with cognate accusative, is to be found in the following passage, where Nicias says of anyone who may come into close contact with Socrates:

... ἀνάγκη αὐτῶ... μὴ παύεσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦτον περιαγόμενον τῷ λόγῳ. πρὶν <ἀν> εὔμεσθῃ εἰς τὸ διδόναι περὶ αὐτοῦ λόγου, ὅτι οὐκ ἐπέτροπον νῦν τε ζή καὶ οὕτω τὸν παρεληλυθότα βιον βεβίωκεν... (La. 187e-188a)

He has to be led round and round by him in the argument, and not stop until he falls into giving an account of himself, both of the way he lives now and the life spent that he has lived [until now].

The perfect βεβίωμα is passive in meaning, being found in the phrase τῷ βιω τῷ βεβιωμένῳ ‘the life that was lived’ (R. VI 498c).

There are also other infrequent compounds of ζῷ, with non-present forms in βιω-, all stative in meaning: διαζῷ ‘live through’ (seventeen times), ἐπίζω.
'survive' (Lg. II 661c.5), κατα-ζω 'pass one's life' (four times) and συ-ζω 'live with' (twice).

The presentation of the data for the forms in άνα- made by both Brandwood and LSJ is surely unsatisfactory. On the one hand, we have an intransitive verb meaning 'come back to life' of the form present άναβιωσκομαι, aorist άνεβιων; on the other, a causative verb meaning 'bring back to life', which is present άναβιωσκομαι (again), aorist άνεβιωσάμην. It must be the case, therefore, that it was felt that the verb 'bring back to life' should be in the medio-passive. This is presumably because the act of bringing someone back to life is felt to affect the subject: άναβιωσκομαι is therefore a benefactive causative, as seen in Homer in e.g. τιτύσκομαι, тетуκέσθαι (Chapter 4 § 3.1.5). Its aorist is thus a benefactive in -σάμην (cf. Chapter 1 § 3.2 n. 38). Perhaps also in favour of the middle form in this case is the fact that an aorist δεπικαί ον would be expected to be intransitive, given that επικαί ον is a by-form of επικαί 'lived'. Only found once for certain in Plato (Phdr. 113d.3), this new άνα- aorist comes to replace the old form, with the sigmatic one being frequent by the time of Aristotle. Causative medio-passive aorist επικαί ον, therefore, gives rise to present άναβιωσκομαι 'bring back to life'.

Here, therefore, is a different pattern: not -σκω : -άνα : -σκομαι : - (θ)ην, but -σκομαι : -σάμην : -σκομαι : -ν, with our normally active forms being medio-passive as well. The meaning of the preverb άνα- here is presumably 'back, backwards', apparently with inchoativity due to the suffix -σκ-. If a present **άναζω existed, it would presumably have the stative meaning 'be alive again'.

---

5 The form is βιώσαντες; also found is επικαί ον (Phdr. 249b.1), which belongs to both the root and sigmatic aorists. Cf. Chapter 7 § 4.1.2 above.
6 It is first found in Homer, at Il. 8.429, 10.174, 15.511 and Od. 14.359. Rix (1998: 192) postulates a 'frentive' *g"ihν-ehh- / *g"ihν-ehh-.
7 Hence, for example, forms such as επικαί ον (HA V 545b.20) and βιώσας (Ath. 17.1). Indeed, we find πάλιν ανεβιωσαν 'he [the baby] comes back to life' at HA VII 587a.24.
8 LSJ s.v. άνα F 4; examples include άναχωρέω 'go back, withdraw'.
2.2.2. κυίσκομαι

The present κυίσκομαι 'conceive, become pregnant' is found only once in Plato, although this present is not infrequent elsewhere:9

οίσθα γάρ ποι ως οὐδεμία αὐτῶν ἐτι αὐτὴ κυίσκομενη τε καὶ τίκτουσα ἄλλας μαιεύεται, ἀλλ’ οἱ ἡδη ἀδύνατοι τίκτειν.

(Tht. 149b)

For you know, I suppose, that no-one of them [midwives], while still conceiving (becoming pregnant) and bearing herself, acts as a midwife for others, but those already incapable of bearing children do it.

Beside κυίσκομαι in Plato we find a present κυέω / κύω 'bear in the womb, be pregnant with' (LSJ s.vv.), both literally and metaphorically, whose present stem occurs twelve times in Burnet's text.10 An example of the indicative is as follows:

δεὶ δὲ... Θεαίτητον δὲν κυεῖ περὶ ἑπιστήμης πειράσθαι ἡμᾶς τῇ μαιευτικῇ τέχνῃ ἀπολύσαι. (Tht. 184a-b)

But we should... try to release Theaetetus from what he is pregnant with concerning knowledge, by means of the art of delivery.

A less literal but more idiomatic English way of translating δὲν κυεῖ here would be 'what he has conceived' – for what one is pregnant with is what one has conceived.

The present participle κυών occurs seven times in Plato; in contrast to that of

---

9For example, Herodotus uses it four times (2.93 [twice], 3.108 and 4.30) and Aristotle 37 (all instances being in the de Generatione Animalium and Historia Animalium).
10The two instances of κυεῖν (Plt. 274a.7, Smp. 209a.3) are not read by Burnet.
κύσκομαι, it has the stative meaning 'one who is pregnant':

ετι δ’ ἔγωγ’... φαίην ἀν δείν καὶ τὰς φερούσας ἐν γαστρὶ πασῶν
τῶν γυναικῶν μάλιστα θεραπεύειν ἐκεῖνον τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν, ὃπως
μῆτε ἡδοναῖς τισὶ πολλαῖς ἀμα καὶ μάργοις προσχρήσεται ἡ
κύουσα μήτε αὐν λύπαις, ... (Lg. VII 792e)

I would say besides that, out of all women, those who are pregnant should be
especially cared for for that year, in case the pregnant woman indulges in any
frequent mad pleasures or pains.

The aorist ἐκύησα occurs twice, and has the inchoative meaning ‘conceived,
became pregnant with’:

εἰσι γὰρ οὖν, ἐφη, δι’ ἐν ταῖς ψυχαῖς κυόσιν ετι μᾶλλον ἢ ἐν
τοῖς σώμασιν, ἆ ψυχῇ προσήκει καὶ κυήσαι καὶ τεκεῖν.11

(Smp. 209 a)

For there are those who are pregnant in their souls, he said, still more than in
their bodies, with the things that it is proper for the soul to conceive (become
pregnant with) and bear.

... κατακλίνεται τε παρ’ αὐτῷ καὶ ἐκύησε τὸν Ἐρωτα.

(Smp. 203 b-c)

... and she lay beside him and conceived (became pregnant) with Love.12

11As noted in n. 10 above, this is an emendation for κυεῖν.
12It has been suggested to me by Ms. Frisbee Sheffield (cf. Sheffield 1997) that, in the latter passage,
Plato is making a joke by giving Penia masculine attributes, inverting the roles in the standard image of
a man raping a woman, and so giving the passage the alternative meaning ‘... and she made him
pregnant with Love’ — that is, using ἐκύησα with causative sense. It is indeed possible that Plato is
playing on the morphological ambiguity of ἐκύησα — using an analogy such as στερισκομαι
‘become deprived’ : στερησα ‘made deprived’ :: κύσκομαι ‘became pregnant’ : X, where X =
On the analogy of inchoative present μεθύσκομαι : aorist ἐμεθύσθην and,
similarly, στερισκομαι : ἐστερήθην, we would expect the aorist of κυίσκομαι to be ἐκυήθην. Instead, however, we find the inchoative active aorist ἐκύησα. The reason for this state of affairs is presumably that ἐκύησα came about as the aorist of κυέω 'be pregnant', since aorists of stative present forms may have inchoative sense, indicating entrance into the state concerned.13 It is thus listed in lexica as the aorist of κυέω, as ἐφίλησα is of φιλέω (LSJ s.v.), but its connection to the similarly inchoative κυίσκομαι should not be ignored. The case with ἀναβιωσκομαι is similar, with aorists ἀνεβίων and ἀνεβιωσάμην being listed under different headings in different lexica (cf. Chapter 7 § 4.1.2 above). With στέρομαι, as we shall see below (§ 2.2.4), the aorist ἐστερήθην is found beside inchoative στερισκομαι and stative στέρομαι. These aorists have two presents; listing the non-present forms under either would be misleading.

The only other related verbal form is the present 'passive' κυέσαι 'get conceived', which occurs once14 in participial form. The Stranger is recommending that exercise begin at the earliest age possible:

οὐδαμῶς γε, ἀλλ` ἐτι καὶ πρότερον τοῖς ἐντός τῶν αὐτῶν 
μητέρων τρεφομένοις.

πῶς λέγεις, ὃ λῳστε; ἡ τοῖς κυομένοισι φράζεις;

(Lg. VII 789a)

14Another instance of this participle, found at Epinomis (973d.4), is of similar usage.
Not at all, but even earlier, [exercise will be prescribed] to those growing up inside their own mothers.

What do you mean, my good man? Are you talking about embryos?

Here the participle is passive ‘things that one is pregnant with’ and so ‘embryos’, thus making it similar to κύημα ‘embryo, foetus’ (Smp. 206d.7, R. V 461c.5).

Further tense stems are found outside Plato. The stative perfect κεκύηκα ‘be pregnant’ occurs apparently only twice – both times in the same passage – in Classical Greek:

τέθνηκε τις: μή δεινόν ἔστω τοῦτό σοι.
κεκύηκε τις, οὐ κεκύηκε τις, ἡτύχηκε τις,
βήττει τις, οἰμώζει τις. (Philemon fr. 107.3)
Someone or other’s dead; don’t let that be terrible for you. Someone’s pregnant, someone isn’t, someone’s unhappy, someone’s coughing, someone’s lamenting.

One might also expect a causative active - κύῑκω beside medio-passive κύῑκομαι; but unfortunately all Classical examples are dubious. In Aristotle, we find:

15Later, κύῑκω appears to mean both ‘become pregnant’ and ‘impregnate’: LSJ (s.v. κύῑκομαι) cite the former as occurring in Galen (4.513) and Philostratus (VA 1.22, Gp. 14.1.3) in the second-third centuries AD, and the latter in Himerius (Or. 1.7) in the fourth.
Ewes become pregnant within three or four copulations, and if rain ensues after the copulation, it makes them pregnant (??).

LSJ gloss this verb as causative ‘impregnate again’, presumably with the subject as ὀδωρ; in the Budé edition, Louis (1964-9: II.108-9) has the semantic opposite, ‘fait avorter’, and notes as many as three suggested emendations: ἀνακυίσκεται ‘they miscarry’, ἀμβλίσκει ‘it makes them miscarry’, and ἐκτιτρώσκει ‘they miscarry’. The subject, ὀδωρ, is translated by Louis as ‘la pluie’, although the sense might rather be ‘urine’, for the meaning of the passage is obscure. If we do read ἀνακυίσκει here, therefore, it is as a causative form; whether the sense is ‘make pregnant’ or ‘make miscarry’ is, however, contested. In Hippocrates, we do find the similarly causative νοῦσος ὀδρωποεῖδεις ἄποκυίσκει ‘it [excess nourishment in the body due to over-eating] brings about dropsical diseases’ (Vinct. III.76); but the form is not found in all manuscripts.

If there were a causative-inchoative pair of the form κυίσκω ‘make pregnant’ : κυίσκομαι ‘become pregnant’, then aorists to these forms should then be, respectively, causative ἐκύησα ‘made pregnant’ and ἐκυήθην ‘became pregnant’; but such data are, however, scanty. There is one example of a causative active aorist, in the form ἐκύσα, in the following passage from Aeschylus’ Danaiads, quoted by Athenaeus (12.600a):

ἐρᾷ μὲν ἄγνοις σύρανοι τρώσαι χθόνα,
ἐρως δὲ γαίαν λαμβάνει γάμου τυχεῖν·
ὅμβρος δ' ἀπ' εἰναίεσθος σύρανοι πεσόν
Holy heaven loves to violate the earth, and love seizes the land to join the union. The rain, having fallen from fair-flowing heaven, impregnates the earth; and she gives birth for mortals to food for sheep, and Demeter’s livelihood and the fruit of the trees...

The above text is taken from TrGF 3, where several suggested emendations for the causative sigmatic aorist ἐκύσε are listed, all of which involve the substitution of a different verb. In fact, it does not seem to be necessary to change the form; rather, as Chantraine (1968-80 s.v. κυέω) notes, the meaning can be accounted for by derivation from the archaic intransitive aorist middle participle κυσάμενος ‘having conceived’, which occurs first with preverb ὑπο- in the Iliad, as in:

οἱ δ᾽ ὑποκυσάμεναι ἔτεκον δυοκαίδεκα πώλους. (II. 20.225)

And they [Erichthonius’ foals], having become pregnant, gave birth to twelve foals.

It is also found in this use at II. 6.26 and Od. 11.254, but disappears after several other early appearances (Hesiod, the Homeric Hymns); significantly, the form is reinterpreted as causative in the third century BC – not unexpectedly, given the transitive sense of forms in -σάμην (§ 2.2.1 above). Hence Aeschylus’ use of a causative ἐκύσσα is most likely an archaism, not directly related to the forms found in Plato, and his supposed use elsewhere of another apparently causative aorist of a verb

---

16 Fr. Hymni Bacchum 4, Hymn. 32.15.
17 Οἱ οὐσον κύσσατο Κητώ ἀσισ, ‘As many as Ceto brought forth for Typhon’ (Euphorio 112).
in - σκω (aorist ἐγήρασσα at Supp. 894, discussed in § 2.3.2 below) is a coincidence.\footnote{Later, ἐκύνησα was apparently used to create a nonce-formation κύω ‘make pregnant’ (Anacreont. 25.16 W); see n. 12 above for the theory that ἐκύνησα could also be causative, however.}

The form ἐκύνησα in the meaning ‘became pregnant’, noted above as the expected aorist of the present κυίσκομαι ‘become pregnant’, is not found in Classical Greek. The form only seems to occur once, when Aristotle is discussing the complications of superfetation – i.e., being doubly pregnant:

\[
\text{τούτων δ' ὅσα μὲν μέγεθος ἔχει, καθάπερ ἄνθρωπος, εάν μὲν ἡ ἐτέρα ὀχεία τῆς ἐτέρας γένηται πάρεγγυς, ἐκτρέφει τὸ ἐπικυνηθέν. (Aristotle GA IV 773b)}
\]

Of these [animals], those that are large, such as man, if the second copulation takes place close to the first, do nourish the [foetus] that was conceived secondly.

This verbal form evidently means ‘become conceived’, and is therefore to be classed as aorist not of κυίσκομαι, but of the present κυέμαι ‘be conceived’, as found in Plato and discussed above.

In conclusion, then, we have in Plato an inchoative present κυίσκομαι ‘become pregnant, conceive’, another present κυέω ‘bear in the womb, be pregnant (with)’ and an aorist ἐκύνησα ‘became pregnant (with), conceived’. In addition there is a passive present of κυέω, κυέμαι ‘be conceived’. Elsewhere we find the perfect κεκύνηκα ‘have become pregnant, be pregnant’, the aorist passive - ἐκύνηθην ‘became conceived’ and an active present - κυίσκω of uncertain meaning. Once again, the form with - σκ- shows inchoative sense beside another present which does not, and the non-present forms are inchoative in meaning; here, however, as in the
case of ἀναβίωσκομαί, the aorist to our medio-passive present occurs in the active, not matching the voice of the present in -σκ-.

2.2.3. μεθύσκω

There are two cases of a present with stem μεθύσκ- in Plato: one in the active, and one in the medio-passive. LSJ (s.v.) define the former as ‘make drunk, intoxicate’, and the latter as its passive, which they say is the same as μεθύω ‘drink freely, get drunk’. Hence, in the active, the verb is causative in meaning, when it is used metaphorically in the following phrase:

... πλοῦτος, κάλλος, ἵσχύς, καὶ πάνθε οὕτα δι᾽ ἡδονῆς αὐτοῦ μεθύσκοντα παράφρονας ποιεῖ... (Lg. I 649d)

... wealth, beauty, strength and all the things which, intoxicating men (making men drunk) with pleasure, make them deranged.

The medio-passive occurs as follows:

ἐπειδὴ οὖν μοι δοκεῖ οἰδείς τῶν παρόντων προθύμως ἐχεῖν πρὸς τὸ πολὺν πίνειν οἶνον, ἵσως ἄν ἐγὼ περὶ τοῦ μεθύσκεσθαι οἶνον ἔστι τάληθη λέγων ἤπτον ἄν εἶναι ἀνήδης. (Smp. 176c)

Therefore, since no one present seems to be eager to drink much wine, perhaps if I speak about what getting drunk (becoming drunk) really is, telling the truth, I shall be less irritating.

Although I have glossed τοῦ μεθύσκεσθαι above as ‘getting drunk’, it is in fact ambiguous, even in context, between stative and inchoative readings. However, the following example from Herodotus testifies to the inchoativity of μεθύσκομαι.
Here, people living on the island of Araxes are doing what would be colloquially termed ‘getting stoned’:

... ὃσφαινομένους δὲ καταγιζομένου τοῦ καρποῦ τοῦ ἐπιβαλλομένου μεθύσκεσθαι τῇ ὀδη... πλεῦνος δὲ ἐπιβαλλομένου τοῦ καρποῦ μᾶλλον μεθύσκεσθαι... (1.202.2)

[Men say that] they, smelling the fruit that is thrown on as it [the fire] burns, get drunk (become drunk) from the smell, and as more fruit is thrown on they get more drunk (become more drunk)...”

We therefore again have an inchoative medio-passive form in -σκ- beside a causative active one.

The related present μεθύω occurs 19 times, of which all instances are participial, bar one of the infinitive and one of the indicative. It is glossed by LSJ as stative ‘be drunken with wine’, although under μεθύσκω it is equated with inchoative μεθύσκωμαι. In fact, they are correct in their stative gloss:

βούλεσθ ὄν, ἣν δ᾽ εὐγώ, ἐπειδὴ ὁσπερ μεθύομεν ὕπο τοῦ λόγου, συγχωρήσωμεν...; (Lys. 222ε)

So do you want us to agree now, I said, since we are, as it were, drunk from our argument...?

The participle of μεθύω therefore means ‘being drunk’, as e.g.:

ἀνδρες, χαίρετε· μεθύοντα ἄνδρα πάνυ σφόδρα δέξεσθε συμπότην...; (Smp. 212ε)
Greetings, gentlemen; will you receive a fellow-drinker, who is exceedingly drunk...?

As such it is found occasionally in contrast to νήφω ‘be sober’, as in the phrase μεθύοντας ἀ καὶ νήφοντας ‘when drunk or indeed when sober’ (R. III 395c-396a).

Also classed under this present by Brandwood (1976, s.v. μεθύσκοντας) and LSJ (s.v. μεθύσκω) is the aorist form εμεθυσθην (six times). The meaning is inchoative ‘became drunk’, as one would expect from the past of μεθύσκω:\n
πρὸς μὲν Σωκράτη, δὲ άνδρες, τὸ σοφισμά μοι σιδέννοπόσον γάρ ἀν κελεύῃ τις, τοσοῦτον ἐκπίων σιδέννο μᾶλλον μη ποτε μεθυσθην. (Smp. 214a)

As for Socrates, gentlemen, my plan is as nothing. For however much one orders him, having drunk it up he never gets any more drunk.

The participle of the aorist passive, since it means ‘one who has got drunk’, is used to mean ‘someone drunk, a drunken person’:\n
οὐ μόνον ἀρ’, ὡς ἐσικε, ὃ γέρων δις παῖς γίγνοιτ’ ἀν, ἀλλά καὶ ὃ μεθυσθείς. (Lg. I 646a)

Not only the old man, it seems, may be in his second childhood, but also the drunken one.

In addition Plato uses an aorist active, in one instance of the compound form κατ- εμέθυσα ‘make drunk’. It is used of Archelaus, who usurped the throne of Macedonia in 413 BC:
... ξενίσας καὶ καταμεθύσας αὐτόν τε καὶ τὸν ἱόν αὐτοῦ Ἀλέξανδρον, ... ἐμβαλὼν εἰς ἀμαξαν, νύκτωρ ἐξαγαγὼν ἀπέσφαξέν τε καὶ ἡφάνισεν ἀμφότερους. (Gr. 471b)

... having entertained and made both him [his master and uncle, Alcetas] and his son Alexander drunk, ... having thrown them into a wagon and taken them away by night, he murdered and made away with both of them.

This is therefore the aorist to causative present μεθύσκω; it is uncommon, only elsewhere occurring in Herodotus and also the Middle Comedy poet Alexis, where it is found in simple form.19

The adjective μεθυστικός also has an intransitive meaning in Plato: it means 'fond of drinking' (in LSJ 'given to wine, drunken') in the phrase μεθυστικός τε καὶ ἐρωτικός καὶ μελαγχολικός 'fond of drinking, amorous and melancholic' (R. IX 573c). The suffix - τικός is, therefore, here giving a sense of 'fond of doing X' to the intransitive base μεθυ- 'be/get drunk'; comparable is the pair ἀμφισβητέω 'disagree, dispute' (Prt. 337a.8 etc.) and ἀμφισβητικός 'fond of disputing, contentious' (Plit. 306a.9 etc.).

We therefore have a pattern in the present of stative μεθύω 'be drunk', inchoative μεθύσκομαι 'get drunk' and causative μεθύσκω 'make drunk'; non-present forms are only found in the aorist, with inchoative ἐμεθύσθην 'became drunk' occurring beside causative - ἐμέθυσα 'made drunk'. The suffix - σκ- shows in one form a causative active, in the other an inchoative middle, beside an unmarked stative present.

It is of interest here briefly to compare the similar morphology and semantics of the verb listed by LSJ as ὄνυω 'intoxicate', which, like the base in μεθυ-, shows several tense stems in Classical Greek. In the aorist active, we find the causative

---

19Herodotus 1.106, 2.121ε.4, 3.4; Alexis, fr. 214.2.
infinitive οἰνώσαι 'to make drunk' (Critias 6.28; cf. (-)ἐμέθυσα 'made drunk'); inchoative aorist 'passive' participle οἰνωθεῖς 'having got drunk' (in a repeated formula at Odyssey 16. 292, 19. 11; Sophocles fr. 929; cf. ἐμεθύσθην 'became drunk'); and perfect medio-passive participle φωμένος 'having got drunk, being drunk' (Herodotus 5.18, Aeschylus Supp. 409 and generally frequent in Attic-Ionic; cf. μεθύω, and the way that κεκύηκα is semantically identical with ΚΥΕΩ). That is to say, the patterns shown by the various parts of μεθύσκω in Plato are also clear in
the semantically similar οἰνώσα.

To summarise, therefore:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inchoative</th>
<th>Causative</th>
<th>Stative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>μεθύσκομαι</td>
<td>μεθύσκω 'make drunk'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'get drunk'</td>
<td>μεθύω 'be drunk'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'having became drunk'</td>
<td>φωμένος 'being drunk'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aorist</td>
<td>ἐμεθύσθην</td>
<td>(-)ἐμέθυσα 'made drunk'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'became drunk'</td>
<td>οἰνωθεῖς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'having become drunk'</td>
<td>'to make drunk'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.4. στερίσκομαι

The present στερίσκομαι is referred to as the passive of στερίσκω (itself not found in Plato) by LSJ (s.v. στερίσκω); the latter is there defined as a collateral present of στερέω 'deprive, bereave, rob'. The form in -σκ- is found only once in Plato, in the infinitive, in the following conversation between Socrates and Glaucon:

φαίνεται μοι δόξα ἐξίσινα ἐκ διανοίας ἢ ἐκουσίας ἢ ἀκουσίας, ἐκουσίας μὲν ἡ ψευδὴς τοῦ μεταμιμιθάνου τοῦ ἀκουσίας δὲ πάσᾳ ἡ ἀληθῆς.

τὸ μὲν τῆς ἐκουσίου, ἐφὶ, μαυθάνω, τὸ δὲ τῆς ἀκουσίου δέομαι μαθεῖν.
It seems to me that a notion leaves the mind either voluntarily or involuntarily — voluntarily when the false notion leaves a person who learns better, and involuntarily when every true notion leaves.

I understand about the voluntary notion, he said, but I need to learn about the involuntary one.

Do you not think, I said, that men lack (are without) good things unwillingly, but bad ones willingly? Is it not bad to be deceived about the truth, but good to possess the truth? Do you not think that to opine things that exist is to possess the truth?

You speak truly, he said; indeed they seem to me to lose (become deprived of) true opinion unwillingly.

In the above passage, I translate στέρεσθαι as stative 'be without' but στερίσκεσθαι as inchoative ‘become deprived of’. In the former case, this takes into account the parallel between στέρεσθαι and the following statives εψεύσθαι 'be deceived' and ἀληθεύειν 'possess the truth'; in the latter, it implies that Glaucon, in using στερίσκεσθαι, is referring back to the earlier ἔξιέναι ‘leave’ (said by Socrates), which indicates a change of state.

This example is a difficult one; more obvious is the following instance from outside Plato, where στερίσκομαι clearly shows inchoative sense:
And bulls, when castrated, relax from their high spirit and disobedience, but do not lose (become deprived of) their strength and performance.

In contrast are presents στερέω and στέροματι. The former, as we have already seen, is glossed as causative 'deprive' by LSJ; the latter they take as 'be without, lack, lose'. Of these three definitions for στέροματι, the first two are synonymous and stative, and the third is the associated inchoative notion: to lose something is to come to be without it. However, Plato's frequent use of this verb – it is found nineteen times – clearly shows that στέροματι has the stative sense 'lack, be without' only, and does not overlap in meaning with inchoative στερίσκομαι.

Hence the following instance, where Socrates is speaking of the shamelessness of talking about what 'to know' is when the meaning of 'knowledge' is not understood:

ει δὲ βούλει, καὶ νῦν ἐν τῷ παρόντι κεχρήμεθα αὖ τῷ ἀγνοεῖν τὲ καὶ “συνιέναι,” ὡς προσήκον αὐτοῖς χρήσθαι εἴπερ στερόμεθα ἐπιστήμης. (Th. 196e)

And if you please, we've just now again used 'be ignorant' and 'understand', as if it were proper for us to use them if we lack (are without) knowledge.

By assigning both inchoative and stative meanings to στέροματι, LSJ obscure the facts. Under the heading of στερέω, they state that the 'passive' of this verb, apart from compound form ἀπο- στερέωμαι, is usually found as στέροματι and στερίσκομαι in Classical authors. Formally, the inchoative appears to be the passive of the causative, so that in LSJ's terminology this statement is true of
στερίσκομαι; but it is not so with στέρομαι. This form is not involved in
alternations of voice: as a stative, it is only found in the active or the medio-passive,
but not both. It is no surprise that we find no active **στέρω, since there is no
meaning such a form derived from stative στέρομαι could have; a medio-passive
**μεθύσκομαι taken from μεθύω ‘be drunk’ would make equally little sense. The
question of why one stative should be in the active and another in the medio-passive is
therefore raised, which will be discussed below (§§ 2.6-2.7).

Leaving στέρομαι aside as the stative form which is the unmarked
counterpart to inchoative στερίσκομαι, we have as causative alternant the present
στερέω ‘make one be without, deprive’, whose present tense is apparently only
found once in simple form in Ancient Greek;²⁰ it is used in the quotation below, when
Plato states that no tombs are to be built on farmland:

... τοῖς δὲ ἄνθρώποις δὸς τροφὴν μὴ τὴν οὐσία ἡ γῆ πρὸς ταῦτα
πέφυκεν βούλεσθαι φέρειν, μήτε ζῶν μήτε τις ἀποθανὼν
στερεῖτω τὸν ζῶνθ’ ἡμῶν. (Lg. XII 958e).

But let no one living or dead deprive (cause to become without) a living man
among us of any [of the places] which earth, who is the mother for these
things, by her nature desires to carry food for men.

The pattern of causative : inchoative : stative, found in the previous section as
μεθύσκω : μεθύσκομαι : μεθύω, is here realised as στερέω : στερίσκομαι :
στέρομαι.

---
²⁰Unless στερεῖ at Aeschylus Pr. 862 is taken as present rather than, as is usual, future (cf. LSJ s.v.
στερέω).
Other tenses used by Plato are formed from the stem στερη-.21 There is no future active, but one case of the aorist ἐστέρησα, which also has causative meaning:

καὶ δὲ ἄνυχὸν τι ψυχῆς ἄνθρωπον στερήσῃ, ... δικαστὴν μὲν αὐτῷ καθιζέτω τῶν γείτόνων τὸν ἐγγύτατα ὁ προσήκων γένει, ...
(Lg. IX 873e)

And if a lifeless thing deprives (causes to become without) a man of life, let the relative set the nearest neighbour as judge on it.

Similarly, the perfect ἐστέρηκα, in its one instance, also has causative sense:

... ὃν ἀδελφοὺς τε ἀδελφῶν καὶ γονέας ἐστέρηκε παῖδων, τούτοις δὲ συνέστιος αὐτοῖς ἡμιδέποτε γιγνέσθω μηδὲ κοινωνὸς ιερῶν...
(Lg. IX 868e)

And let him never share house or worship with those whose brothers he has deprived brothers of or [whose] children [he has deprived] parents [of].

Three further tenses found in στερη- show medio-passive endings, all with inchoative meaning. Firstly, there is the future στερήσομαι, which occurs once:22

... εἴπον ὡς εἶ φανείη τι τούτοιν ἀμφοῖν βέλτιον, ὑπὲρ τῶν δευτερείων νῦ πρὸς ἡδονήν συνδιαμαχοίμην, ἡδονῆ δὲ καὶ δευτερείων στερήσοιτο. (Phlb. 66e)

---

21 For the occasional non-present forms in στερη- found outside Plato, see Veitch 1887 s.v. στερέω.
22 This form has inchoative 'passive' meaning although morphologically middle; it is frequently found in Classical Greek, the future 'passive' στερήσομαι becoming common only in post-Classical Greek: cf. Veitch 1887 s.v. στερέω.
I said that if anything appeared to be better than both of these, I would fight to the end together with mind against pleasure for second place, and pleasure would lose (become deprived of) even second place.

The other is the aorist ἐστερήθην, found seventeen times in all. This form is inchoative, meaning 'become deprived of, lose', as in:

\[ \text{μέντοι ἀγαθῶν καὶ ἐν τούτῳ τῷ πολέμῳ ἐστερήθημεν, ...} \]

(Mx. 245e)

But we lost (became deprived of) good men in this war ...

Lastly, there is the stative perfect ἐστέρημα (found five times), which denotes the state resulting from the change 'lose', and so the state itself. Plato says of plants:

\[ \text{... ένόμισεν δὲ καὶ κατερρίζομένου πέπηγεν διὰ τὸ τῆς ὑπ' ἑαυτοῦ κινήσεως ἐστερήσθαι. (Ti. 77c)} \]

But it remains stationary and rooted down through lacking (being without) [the power of] movement by itself.

This perfect is thus synonymous with the stative present στέρομα 'be without'.

The compounds show a more regular morphological pattern, with present forms in - ἐω and - ἐομα, non-present ones being again in στερη-. The only frequent compound, ἀποστερέω 'rob', has present active (eleven times), future ἀποστερήσω 'will rob' (Prm 134e.8), aorist ἀπεστερήσα 'robbed' (four times) and perfect ἀπεστερήσα 'have robbed' (Phdr. 241b.3, Lg. IX 868d.4). There are also instances of a medio-passive. We find one instance of an inchoative present ἀποστερέομαι, in the participle: ἀποστερομένοις χρήματα ἢ τι ἄλλο
βιαζομένοις ‘robbed of money or in some other way assaulted’ (Tht. 201b); one of the aorist ἀπεστερήθην ‘got robbed’ in the optative (Smp. 219d.7); and one of the perfect ἀπεστέρημαι ‘have been robbed’ in the participle (R. I 329a.8). The other compound from this stem found in Plato is συναποστερέω ‘help to steal’ (Lg. XII 948c.6).

Beside the causative-inchoative pair στερέω : στερίσκομαι we therefore find, in compound form, ἀποστερέω : ἀποστερέομαι. An example from outside Plato where the latter form is clearly inchoative is as follows:

ἡ τε πόλις οὐκ ὄφελεῖται ἐν τῷ τοιῷδε φοβῷ γάρ ἀποστερεῖται τῶν ξυμβούλων. (Thucydides 3.42.4)

And the state is not improved by this; for it is robbed (becomes deprived) of its counsellors through fear.

The alternations in the present tense found in Plato may therefore be summarised as causative στερέω, -στερέω, inchoative στερίσκομαι, -στερέομαι. Indeed, στερίσκομαι apparently never occurs in compound form; but there are at least three instances of a causative active present simple στερίσκω in Classical Greek, as in:23

χῶ μὲν νεάζων καὶ χρόνῳ μείων γεγώς τὸν πρόσθε γεννηθέντα Πολυνείκη θρόνων ἀποστερίσκει, κάξεληλακευν πάτρας. (Sophocles OC 374-6)

And he, full of youthful spirit and being lesser in years, deprives (causes to become without) Polyneices, born before him, of the throne; and he has driven him from the fatherland.

23 The other instances are at Thucydides 2.43.1 and Aristotle MM II 1199b.16-17.
This gives in all, in the present, causative στερέω, -στερέω, στερίσκω; inchoative στερίσκομαι, -στερέομαι. Other forms are stative στέρομαι and the non-present forms, which are causative or inchoative, in στερη-. The morphological pattern shown here is unusual, but clearly has no bearing on the semantics of these forms. Rather, it is merely morphological irregularity: στέρομαι is the oldest form, first being found in Hesiod (Op. 211); non-present inchoative medio-passive forms derived from this in στερ- with suffix -η-, such as the early ἐστέρηθην (found in many Classical authors, such as Pindar, Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, Herodotus, Demosthenes and Xenophon), resulted ultimately in active causative ones too, leading to the present opposition causative στερέω: stative στέρομαι, and thence also inchoative present - στερέομαι.

2.2.5. Summary: the μεθύσκω type

Forms examined so far may therefore be summarised as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Causative</th>
<th>Inchoative</th>
<th>Stative</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Aorist</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Aorist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>στερεόμαι</td>
<td>στερεάωσάμην</td>
<td>στερεόμαι</td>
<td>στερεάω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[- κυλίσκω]</td>
<td>(εκύλσα)</td>
<td>κυλίσκομαι</td>
<td>εκύλσα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μεθύσκω</td>
<td>-εμέθυσα</td>
<td>μεθύσκομαι</td>
<td>εμέθυσθην</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>στερέω (στερίσκω)</td>
<td>ἐστέρησα</td>
<td>στερίσκομαι, στερέομαι</td>
<td>ἐστερήθην</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At this point it seems possible to say that -σκ- marks inchoativity on medio-passive forms and causativity on active forms – except where the subject shows a special interest in the action, as it does in the case of ἀναβιώσκομαι. In the following section, however, we shall examine two cases which clearly contradict this rule.
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2.3. Active inchoatives: the γενειάσκω-type

Here we find only two forms to be studied: γενειάσκω and γηράσκω.

2.3.1. γενειάσκω

The present γενειάσκω, traditionally 'begin to get a beard' (LSJ s.v.) is only found once in Plato:

οὗ γὰρ ἐρώσι παιδων, ἀλλ' ἐπειδὰν ἤδη ἀρχωνταί νοῦν ἁρχεῖν,
τούτο δὲ πλησιάζει τῷ γενειάσκειν. (Smp. 181d)

For they [men attracted to other men] do not love boys, except when they are already beginning to have a mind for themselves; and this is near to [the time of] beginning to have a beard.

It is thus an inchoative present, denoting entry into the state of having a beard, and is to be contrasted with an unmarked form γενειάω, glossed in LSJ as both 'grow a beard, get a beard' (Odyssey, Hippocrates, Xenophon and Theocritus) and secondly 'have a beard' (Aristophanes, Plato, Aristotle and Dio Cassius). This form also only occurs once in Plato, in a passage concerning the reversal of natural processes:

καὶ τῶν μὲν πρεσβυτέρων οἱ λευκαὶ τρίχες ἐμελαίνοντο, τῶν δὲ
αὐ γενειώντων οἱ παρεια λεαινόμεναι πάλιν ἐπὶ τὴν
παρελθοῦσαν ὄραν ἔκαστον καθίστασαν, τῶν δὲ ἡβῶντων τὰ
σώματα λεαινόμενα καὶ σμικρότερα καθ' ἡμέραν καὶ νύκτα
ἔκαστην γιγνόμενα πάλιν ἐις τὴν τοῦ νεογενοῦς παιδὸς φύσιν
ἀπῆει, κατὰ τῇ τὴν ψυχῇ καὶ κατὰ τὸ σῶμα ἀφομοιούμενα.

(Plt. 270e)
And the white hair of the old grew black, and the cheeks of the bearded,
growing smooth again, brought each to a time that had passed, and the bodies
of the youthful, becoming smooth and smaller by each day and night, go back
to the nature of the new-born child, becoming like them in body and in soul.

The parallelism between τῶν οὖν ἐπεξεύγασαν with τῶν πρεσβυτέρων and τῶν
ηβώντων can leave us in little doubt that ἐπεξεύγασαν indicates an ongoing state: as
LSJ translate it with reference to this passage, it means 'to have a beard’, whereas
ἐπεξεύγασκον indicates entrance into the state of having a beard. As in the case of the
verbs in -σκομαί discussed above, we have the inchoative of an inchoative-stative
pair; but here, it shows active morphology, and no causative variant is found.

The present ἐπεξεύγασκον itself is only found once more (Xenophon Cyr.
4.6.5), and is apparently later replaced by ἐπεξεύγαζον, presumably under influence of
the common suffix -ατε; the latter present is also rare.24 In all these remaining
examples, ἐπεξεύγασκον / ἐπεξεύγαζον occurs in the participle with ἀρτέ, and means
'just beginning to get a beard’. On the other hand, the present ἐπεξεύγαζον – despite
LSJ’s apparently double definition – only ever occurs with the one, stative, sense, and
never with ἀρτέ.25 The verb itself is so rare that there are apparently only ever two
instances of it outside the present tense form: we find the inchoative aorist participle
form ἐπεξεύγαζαντα 'having become bearded, having grown a beard’ at Od. 18.176,
269; and a perfect one ἐγενεύγαζεν, presumably meaning ‘he has grown a beard’,
ascribed to Philemon (fr. 15).

24It is apparently only found at Theocritus 11.9, AP 12.12 and IG 3.1314.
25Aristophanes Ec. 145, Aristotle GA II 746b.24, Hippocrates Nat. Puer. 20, Theocritus 14.28,
Xenophon An. 2.6.29.
2.3.2. γηράσκω

The next verb, γηράσκω, shows an obvious affinity with γενειάσκω. Likewise active in morphology but apparently with subject affected by the action – LSJ (s.v.) gloss the present as ‘grow old’ – it too has a by-form in -άω. In this case, however, the latter is only found in Plato with preverb: it is κατα- γηράω, defined as ‘grow old’ by LSJ (s.v. καταγηράσκω, which is cited as meaning the same).

There are four instances of γηράσκω in Plato. Prior to the following instance, Plato has said that, in his ideal community, the rich should marry the poor, and the hasty should marry the well-balanced, in order to provide equilibrium:

περὶ δὲ προικὸς εἰρηται μὲν καὶ πρότερον, εἰρησθῶ δὲ πάλιν ὡς ἵσα ἀντὶ ἰσων ἐστιν τὸ μῆτε λαμβάνοντι μήτ’ ἐκδίδοντι διὰ χρημάτων ἀπορίαν γηράσκειν τοὺς πένητας· τὰ γὰρ ἄναγκαια ὑπάρχοντα ἐστὶ πᾶσι τῶν ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ πόλει, ...

(Lg. VI 774c)

And, concerning dowry, it has also been said before, and let it be said again, that it is equally likely that, among the poor, the one taking [the bride] or the one giving [her away] should die before old age [literally, should fail to become old] because of lack of money; for necessities are provided for all of those who live in this city.26

Reference is made here to an earlier discussion at Laws V 742c, where Plato says that no dowry will be given or received by either side in a marriage. He therefore means in the above passage that, whichever side of the family they are on (whether taking the bride or giving her away), the poor will not die because of poverty; for, without a

---

26 In this translation I take the negatives with γηράσκειν, and the understood object of λαμβάνοντι and ἐκδίδοντι as ‘bride’; see further England 1921: 1.611-12.
On dowry, there will be equality. γηράσκειν, therefore, refers to a change of state: ἐν ταῖς χρημάτων ἀπορίαις γηράσκειν means ‘[not] to become old through lack of money’.

A second case is as follows:

ὅταν δὲ ἢ μὲν ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ, γηράσκη δὲ, ἢ μέλαιν ἐκ λευκοῦ ἢ σκληροῦ ἐκ μαλακοῦ γίγνεται, ἢ τινα ἁλλήν ἁλλοίωσιν ἁλλοιώτατοι, ὥσπερ σύμ ἄξιον ἐκείνῳ εἰδος φάναι κινήσεως; (Th. 181c-d)

And whenever something stays in the same place, but grows old, or becomes black from being white or hard from soft, or changes in any other way, is it not right to say that it is another type of motion?

The two other instances are both participial, and refer to Solon fr. 18 West:

γηράσκῳ δ' ἀτεῖ πολλά διδασκόμενος ‘Always learning many things, I grow old.’ The passages from Plato are:

... ἀλλα καὶ τῷ Σόλωνι, ἐν μόνον προσλαβών, συγχωρῶν γηράσκων γὰρ πολλὰ διδάσκεσθαι ἐθέλω ὑπὸ χρηστῶν μόνον. (La. 189a)

But I agree with Solon, adding one thing alone: for as I grow old I wish to learn many things, from good men alone.

Σόλωνι γὰρ οὐ πειστέον ως γηράσκων τις πολλὰ δυνατὸς μοινθάνειν... (R. VII 536d)

For we must not believe Solon that as he grows old a man can learn many things...
In these cases also, \( \gamma \nu \rho \alpha \varsigma \kappa \omega \) has the inchoative meaning ‘become old’.

Listed too under this verb in LSJ and Brandwood are a future \( \gamma \nu \rho \alpha \varsigma \omega \)\textsuperscript{27} and an aorist \( \varepsilon \gamma \nu \rho \alpha \varsigma \alpha \), each found once. The future is in the infinitive:

\[
\text{πριν δὲ λυθήναι αὐτοῦ τὴν θυγατέρα, ἐν Ἀργείᾳ ἔφη γηράσειν μετὰ οὗ. (R. III 393e)}
\]

And before his daughter was released, he said, she would grow old in Argos with him.

The latter is a periphrasis of Agamemnon’s words at \( \text{Il. I. 29-31:} \)

\[
	ext{τὴν δ’ ἐγὼ οὐ λύσω. πρὶν μιν καὶ γῆρας ἔπεισιν ἡμετέρῳ ἐνὶ σίκῳ, ἐν Ἀργείᾳ, τηλόθι πάτρης, ἵστον ἐποικομένην καὶ ἐμὸν λέχος ἀντιδώσαν...}
\]

And I will not free her; and before then old age will come upon her in my house, in Argos, far from her homeland, as she walks back and forth at the loom and comes to my bed.

So \( \gamma \nu \rho \alpha \varsigma \epsilon i \nu \) ‘[she] will grow old’ is a paraphrase of \( \gamma \eta \rho \alpha \varsigma \epsilon \pi \epsilon \iota \sigma i \nu \) ‘old age will come upon [her]’ – both denote the inchoation of a new state, that of being old. The aorist also has inchoative meaning:

\[
... σὺν τοῖς νόμοις ἐν μοῖρα γηράσας τελευτῆ γίγνοιτ  ἀν κατὰ φύσιν. (Lg. XII 958d).
\]

\textsuperscript{27}The active future \( \gamma \nu \rho \alpha \varsigma \omega \) only occurs outside Plato at Simonides 85.9 Bergk; other authors show middle \( \gamma \nu \rho \alpha \varsigma \sigma \omega \) (simple at Critias 1.5, and compound at Aristophanes \( \text{Eq.} \) 1308, Euripides \( \text{fr.1058}, \) Thucydides 6.18).
To a man who has duly grown old, following the laws, the end will come naturally.

In contrast is the compound verb καταγηράω, which occurs once in the present. In the following passage concerning Athens of old, the δημιουργοί ‘craftsmen’ are said not to have made themselves luxurious homes,

... ἀλλὰ... κοσμίας ὕκοδομοῦντο σικήσεις, ἐν αἷς αὐτοὶ τε καὶ ἐγγόνων ἐγγονοὶ καταγηρώντες ἄλλοις ὁμοίοις τὰς αὐτὰς ἀεὶ παρεδίδοσαν... (Crit. 112c)

but... they built themselves modest houses, in which they and their children’s children grew old and always handed on the same to others like themselves.

Non-present forms have the expected inchoative meaning: we find future καταγηράσω at Lg. XII 949c.1 and aorist κατεγήρασα twice, in the following examples:

ἀφ', ὦ Θεαίτητε, νῦν οὖτω τῇδε τῇ ἡμέρᾳ εἰλήφαμεν δ' πάλαι καὶ πολλοὶ τῶν σοφῶν ζητοῦντες πρὶν εὑρεῖν καταγηράσαν; (Tht. 202d)

Have we today, Theaetetus, now in this way found out what even many wise men, though seeking it, did not find before they grew old?

... οἴχομαι φεύγων, ἵνα μὴ αὐτοῦ καθῆμενος παρὰ τούτῳ καταγηράσω. (Smp. 216a)

I flee away, in case I should become old sitting there beside him.
The relation *γενειάσκω* ‘begin to grow a beard’ : *γενετάω* ‘have a beard’ might lead one to expect a similar inchoative : stative relation between *γηράσκω* and -*γηράω*, giving ‘become old’ beside ‘be old’, but this is not the case: in the above examples, both are glossed by inchoative ‘grow old’. The problem here is that there are two concepts denoted by this phrase in English. Firstly, this verb may describe an action where the subject changes from the state of being young to being old, as *γηράσκω* clearly did in the example from *Theaetetus* 181d above (where *γηράσκη* ‘become old’ was conjoined with *γίγνηται* ‘becomes’ and *ἀλλοιώται* ‘changes’).

Secondly, the verb may denote the idea of constant change on the part of the subject: a young man may say, ‘I’m growing old’, and not mean that he is entering old age, but merely that he is older than he used to be – that is, ‘to age’. In the above passage, *καταγηρώντες* does not seem to denote a change of state from being young to being old, ‘becoming old’, but rather indicates the continuous state ‘spending one’s life, growing older’. Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1995: 97 with 295 n. 11) note this ambiguity in several English verbs which denote ‘internally caused’ changes of state, discussing in particular *bloom* and *blossom* (1995: 160-1): the difference comes out if one compares the phrases *the cactus bloomed in three days* (inchoative) with *the cactus bloomed for three days* (stative).

Isaeus uses *καταγηράσκω* and *καταγηράω* in a way which fits with this interpretation. Each is only found once in his surviving work; the former is inchoative ‘reach old age, become old’:

*ἐνθυμεῖσθαι τοίνυν χρή... πότερον δεί ἐάν ἀδελφὴν Φιλοκτήμονος, ἧ Χαίρεα συνώκησε, νῦν δὲ χρηεύει, ἐπὶ τούτοις γενέσθαι ἢ ἐκδούναι ὧτω βούλονται ἢ ἐάν καταγηράσκειν...* (6.51)
You must therefore decide... whether to allow Philoctemon’s sister, who was the wife of Chaereas, and is now his widow, to pass into the hands of our opponents and to marry her to anyone they choose, or to allow her to grow old (become old) [as a widow]...

The implication is, therefore, that she will not reach old age, an inchoative act, if forced to remarry. On the other hand, Isaeus’ use of καταγηράω is different. In the following passage, he is speaking on behalf of the adopted son of Menecles, whose estate is the subject of this speech:

οὐκόν έξ ἀνάγκης ἢν αὐτῷ ἀλλον τινα ποιήσασθαι μᾶλλον ἢ ἀπαιδα καταγηράν, ὥσπερ οὗτος ἀξιοὶ νυν αὐτόν. (2.22)

He therefore had to adopt someone else, or, failing that, grow old childless, as my opponent now thinks he ought to have done.

Menecles only ever came to adopt one son, and had none of his own; the meaning is therefore ‘continue to grow older childless’. The process is gradual: the longer Menecles is without a son, the older he will be if and when he adopts one. Isaeus is not interested in the point when Menecles reaches old age, but in the fact that Menecles needed to find a son and heir. So, unlike the former passage, we are not concerned with a point in time, but a continuous process. Comparable is the use of γηράω in Xenophon’s ἵσως δύναμιθ’ ἀν ακινδύνως εὐδαιμονισθεὶς γηράν ‘we might be able to grow old happy and away from danger’ (Cyr. 4.1.15).

The relationship between (κατα)γηράσκω and (κατα)γηράω is therefore ‘become old, grow old’ : ‘become older, grow old(er), age’, not ‘become old’ : ‘be old’, as might be expected from the data given above. On one occasion we do seem to find γηράω ‘be old’ in ‘Aristotle’, in the phrase ἐκνὶ μὴ μανιῶν ἢ γηρῶν ἢ
γυναικὶ πιθὸμενος ‘unless mad or old or influenced by a woman’ (Ath. 35.2); but
the text is almost certainly corrupt, with either μανιων ἢ γηρῶς or μανιων ἢ
γηρῶς <ἐνεκκα> the better reading.28

In Classical Greek, the quite commonly found29 perfect γεγήρακα ‘have
become old, be old’ is used in order to express the stative notion ‘be old’. Hence, in
the example below, the Chorus says to Oedipus:

θάρσει, παρέσται καὶ γὰρ εἰ γέρων ἐγὼ,
τὸ τῆςδε χώρας οὐ γεγήρακε σθένος. (Sophocles OC 726-7)

Be brave – you shall have it [safety]. For even if I am an old man, the strength
of this country has not grown old (is not old).

Two exceptional examples of parts of γηράσκω are found in early poets.
There is one instance of a medio-passive γηράσκωμαι in τρεῖς δ’ ἐλάφους ὁ
κόρυξ γηράσκεται in Hesiod (fr. 304 M.-W.) ‘and a raven grows old after three
stags [i.e., lives three times as long as a stag]’. This use of present tense γηράσκω in
the medio-passive is exceptional, and is apparently an unusual poetic formation.

Secondly, in a controversial passage in Aeschylus, there is a claimed instance
of a causative aorist ἐγήρασα ‘bring to old age’:

οὐτοι φοβοῦμαι δαίμονας τοὺς ἐνθάδε:
οὐ γὰρ μ’ έθρεψαν οὐδ ἐγήρασαν τροφή. (Aeschylus Supp. 893-4)

And I do not fear the gods of the place; they did not rear me, and they did not
bring me to old age with their nurture.

28Thus Rhodes (1993: 443-4), noting that μανικεω ‘be mad’ only elsewhere occurs in the much later
Josephus (BJ 1.150).
29Cf. Veitch 1887 s.v. γηράσκω.
Johansen and Whittle (1980: III.222-3) read ἐγήρασσαν ἵνα, giving ‘nor would I have reached old age on their nurture’. The two oldest manuscripts read μεθρέψαν τοῖς ἑρασσαν, corrected in a later version to μεθρέψαν τοῖς ἑγήρασσαν (as above). Their reasons for the further proposed change are, firstly, that in no other instance is a part of γεγένασκο or γεγέναω found as a causative; and, secondly, that the earlier reading of the line is tautological. With their interpretation, they argue, the remark is a sneer at the poor Greek diet, a subject brought up in the play elsewhere (v. 761; cf. vv. 952-3); furthermore, this meaning does not require the speaker to be an old man, which is also supported elsewhere: it is the Herald, who tries to drag off the Danaids shortly afterwards (v. 909).

To summarise, therefore, we may say that Plato shows inchoative γεγένασκο, non-present γεγένα-, with stative perfect γεγένασκαλα being found elsewhere; the one instance of a causative form, found in Aeschylus, is doubtful. The opposition with the unmarked present appears between inchoative ‘become old’ and not stative ‘be old’, but stative ‘age, grow old’, which denotes a constant unchanging process of ageing.

2.3.3. Summary: the γεγένασκο type

The forms of the inchoative actives examined in this section are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Causative</th>
<th>Inchoative</th>
<th>Stative</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Aorist</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Aorist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γεγενεϊσκον</td>
<td>(γεγενεϊσκα)</td>
<td>γεγενειαω</td>
<td>'have a beard'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γεγεναιασκο</td>
<td>(γεγεναιασκον)</td>
<td>γεγεναιασκα</td>
<td>'grow old'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the data discussed in § 2.2 these results may come as a surprise, as we now have two separate patterns: one of inchoative medio-passive, sometimes with a usually active causative, and one of inchoative active, with no causative form. A further verb must be discussed before a full inquiry is undertaken into why there should be such a difference.
2.4. φάσκω

The present form φάσκω is different from the other forms in -σκ- which show unmarked counterparts in Plato. Meaning ‘say, assert’ (LSJ s.v. φάσκω), it is exceptional in that, although found in the participle 71 times, its only other occurrence is one case of the imperfect. The many participial instances include:

τί οὖν ποτε λέγει φάσκων ἐμὲ σοφῶτατον εἶναι; (Ap. 21b)
What then does he mean when he says that I am the wisest?

τούτο γάρ μοι ὑνδάλλεται διανοομένη σοικ ἄλλο τι ἢ διαλέγεσθαι, αὐτή εαυτὴν ἔρωτοσα καὶ ἀποκρινομένη, καὶ φάσκουσα καὶ οὐ φάσκουσα. (Th. 189e-190a)
For [the soul] seems to me, when it thinks, to be merely conversing, asking itself questions and answering, affirming and denying.

The one case of the imperfect occurs in the following passage:

τρυφᾶν καὶ ἀμελῆς ἀργός τε, δὴ ποιητὴς κηφῆσι κοθούροισι μᾶλλον εἰκελον ἐφασκεν εἶναι, γίγνοιτ ἂν ὁ τοιοῦτος πᾶς ἦμιν; (Lg. X 901a)
Will every man who is extravagant, careless and idle be as far as we are concerned the one whom the poet [Hesiod, at Op. 303-4] said was very much like sting-less drones?

The participle φάσκων and imperfect ἐφασκοῦν are suppletive forms for the paradigm of φημῆ – that is to say, no present stem participial or imperfect forms are
found with the stem φη- / φα- without -σκ- in Plato.\textsuperscript{30} The present of φημί is of course extremely common: the present tense, for which no participle other than φάσκων exists in Plato, is found 1512 times in all; aorist ἔφην is even more common (2323 times), but the future φήσω and sigmatic aorist ἔφησσα have more respectable totals (252 and thirteen respectively). The only other instance of a participle of this verb in the whole of Plato, in both simple and compound forms, is from the infrequent sigmatic aorist ἔφησσα, also in reference to Hesiod (Theog. 7.80):

οὕ γάρ ἄλλη ἀρχὴ φιλοσοφίας ἡ αὕτη, καὶ ἔοικεν ὁ τήν Ἰριν Θαύμαντος ἐκγόνου φήσας οὐ κακῶς γενεάλογείν. (Thet. 155d)

For there is no other beginning for philosophy than this [i.e., θαύμα 'wonder'], and it seems that he who said Iris was the child of Thaumas worked the genealogy out well.

The stem φασκ- is used to form a participle and imperfect to φημί; it is a suppletive form, and the relationship between these two forms is quite different from that of all the other pairs so far examined. We are rather dealing with the extension of the sphere of φασκ- outside the imperfect, the only area where it was used in Homer.\textsuperscript{31}

\textbf{2.5. Summary: minimal pairs}

Leaving aside φάσκω / φημί, the minimal pairs discussed in Plato thus show tense forms as follows:

\textsuperscript{30}Except the two instances of φάς from the doubtful Alcibiades 2, on which see Chapter 7 § 4.1.3.
\textsuperscript{31}On (ἐ)φασκον in Homer see Chapter 5 § 6.2. The first attestation of a present φάσκω occurs at Isaeus 6.16; for further data on the extension of the stem φασκ-, see Veitch 1887 s.v. φάσκω; Fournier 1946: 23, 37; Chantraine 1968-80 s.v. φημί II; Wathelet 1973: 402; Kuıı 1973: 251; Jacquinod 1978: 53-7; and also the data at Threatte 1980-96: II.619.
All the presents in -σκ- here studied are of two types: inchoative medio-passive, sometimes with a usually active causative by-form, and inchoative active. The former are ἀναβιώσκομαι, κυίσκομαι, μεθύσκομαι and στερίσκομαι; the latter γενειάσκω and γηράσκω. Clearly, then, a form in -σκ- beside an unmarked present is marked for inchoativity. It is thus no coincidence that all six verbs except στερίσκομαι refer to physical processes: many verbs of change of state denote such concepts. As has been noted (Chapter 1 § 3.2), the pattern of causative active beside inchoative medio-passive is well-established for Greek. However, two areas remain unexplained in the data examined above. Firstly, there are inconsistencies of voice evident in the parts of the medio-passive presents κυίσκομαι and ἀναβιώσκομαι, which have active inchoative aorists, and in στερόμαι, a medio-passive stative found beside five active ones. Secondly, there are two inchoative actives found beside our four expected medio-passive ones. How are these phenomena to be explained?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Causative Present</th>
<th>Inchoative Present</th>
<th>Stative Present</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἀναβιώσκομαι</td>
<td>ἀναβιώσάμην</td>
<td>κυίσκομαι</td>
<td>ζω 'live'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(κυίσκω)</td>
<td>(κυίσα)</td>
<td>ουσκομαι</td>
<td>κυέω 'be pregnant'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μεθύσκω</td>
<td>- μεθύσα</td>
<td>μεθύσκομαι</td>
<td>μεθύω 'be drunk'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>στερέω (-στερίσκω)</td>
<td>στερήσα</td>
<td>στερόμαι,</td>
<td>στερόμαι, 'be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>στερήθην</td>
<td>στερήθην 'be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>στερεόμαι,</td>
<td>στερεόμαι 'be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>στερεότηθι</td>
<td>στερεότηθι 'be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>στερεοτήθη</td>
<td>στερεοτήθη 'be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>στερεοτήθητι</td>
<td>στερεοτήθητι 'be'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inchoative Present</th>
<th>Stative Present</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>γενειάσκω</td>
<td>γενειάσα</td>
<td>γενειάσα 'have a beard'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((γηράσα))</td>
<td>γηράσα</td>
<td>γηράσα 'grow old'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- γηράω,</td>
<td>γηράω 'be '</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(γεγηράκα)</td>
<td>γεγηράκα 'be'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inchoative Present</th>
<th>Stative Present</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ευγενείσκω</td>
<td>ευγενείάσα</td>
<td>ευγενείάσα 'have a beard'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ευγενείασα)</td>
<td>(ευγενείασα) 'be'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2.6. Intransitivity and the active / medio-passive distinction

As well as inchoatives in both -σκω and -σκοματ, voice also varies for our stative forms: all bar στέροματι show active endings. The problem of active intransitives has been discussed without solution. Klaiman (1991: 98-100) argued that, despite the obvious difficulties presented by pairs where apparently synonymous verbs occur in both voices (e.g. πηδάω and ἄλλοματι ‘leap’, κλύω and ἀκροάματι ‘hear’), morphologically active verbs indicate reflex actions, whereas medio-passive ones denote actions over which the subject has control. Thus, many verbs belonging to the former set indicate physical reflex actions, such as χέζω ‘defecate’ and ἐμέω ‘vomit’; in contrast, medio-passive verbs, where the subject has control of the action, include both physical (πέτοματι ‘fly’, δέρκοματι ‘see, look’) and mental actions (μέμφοματι ‘blame’, γάνυματι ‘rejoice’).

This observation has interesting repercussions for the data studied here. Our active statives, denoting ‘reflex actions’, are ζω ‘live’ (listed by Klaiman), κυέω ‘be pregnant’, μεθύω ‘be drunk’, γενειάω ‘have a beard’ and (-)γηράω ‘grow old’. The inchoatives of the first three are in the medio-passive, those of the last two in the active; and this may be a reflection of the interaction between inchoativity / stativity and affectedness. So, in the case of μεθύσκοματι ‘become drunk’ and μεθύω ‘be drunk’, we may say that the subject will tend to have a choice in the action of becoming drunk, but none when he/she gets there: the state itself cannot be controlled, and one must wait for the effects to pass. Klaiman’s theory that active verbs indicate reflex actions also, therefore, works for states. The same may also be said of the active inchoatives: γενειάσκω ‘become bearded’ and γενειάω ‘have a beard’ are reflex actions, which cannot be controlled.

One stative medio-passive has been discussed here: στέροματι ‘be without’. Whilst it is evident that this verb does not denote a reflex action in the same way as μεθύω and the other active statives and inchoatives listed above, one can hardly say...
that the subject exhibits control. There seems to be another factor at work here. If the
difference is not reflex beside controlled action, then what is it? A further question
also arises on attempting to apply Klaiman’s theory to inchoatives in -σκοµατι. We
may perhaps say that κυίσκοµατι ‘become pregnant’ and μεθώσκοµατι ‘become
drunk’ usually require control on the part of the subject – although, in fact, this need
not necessarily be the case. It is more disturbing to note that στερίσκοµατι ‘come to
be without, lose’ and ἀναβιώσκοµατι ‘come back to life’ do not seem to involve
control as a feature in any way. Our actives fit the theory, but our medio-passives fail
to work, and it appears that control is not the key after all.

2.7. -σκω, -σκοµατι and types of causation

Having begun with the active stative forms and apparently succeeded in
explaining them, it is now necessary to begin again from the other side, with the
medio-passive inchoatives, to complete this examination. On the one hand there are
the notions of coming back to life, getting drunk, pregnant and deprived, on the other
those of getting bearded and old. Morphologically, we see of course the difference of
medio-passive beside active forms. The result of this distinction is that one cannot
form a morphological causative off ἑνειάσκω and γηράσκω because they are
already active; the form would have to be the same (as is the case if Aeschylus really
did use a causative ἐγηρᾶσσα) or the formation would need to be done syntactically.
Pragmatically, there is a difference too. Barring accidents, getting old happens to
everyone, and getting bearded to many people; they happen naturally. Such physical
processes as these cannot be avoided, whereas the others are not so essential.
Klaiman calls these reflex actions; since they come naturally, we may note that they
are ‘internally caused’, and that the forms in -σκοµατι denote the opposite type:
actions which are ‘externally caused’. In this case, the presents in -σκω here studied
are formed according to the following pattern:
Externally caused action: inchoative - ΣΚΟΜΑΙ, causative - ΣΚΩ
Internally caused action: inchoative - ΣΚΩ

Modern theory divides intransitive verbs into unaccusative and unergative.\(^{32}\)
The difference is that those of the former type have a subject derived from an underlying object, and the latter a 'true' subject. So, in the former group, there occur such verbs as live, fall and die; in the latter, examples include play, laugh and speak. Palmer (1994: 76) equates these types with patientive and agentive verbs respectively, but there may be more to the division than this, as the recent investigation by Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1995) indicates. Many unaccusative verbs, they note, denote a change of state for the subject; and these largely exhibit the causative alternation, to which the authors devote a chapter (1995: 79-133). They point out that verbs denoting a change of state but not showing the causative alternation indicate actions which are internally caused (1995: 90 ff., 159-162); examples from English include blush and bloom:

(a) John blushed
(b) **I blushed John

(a) The flowers bloomed
(b) **We bloomed the flowers

The distinction between these two types of verbs of change of state is manifested in the morphology of the forms in Greek: externally caused verbs of change of state show medio-passive forms, and internally caused ones have active ones. Although this distinction has not been noted before, there is a hint of it both in Klaiman's theory

\(^{32}\)For introduction and bibliography, see Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1995: 2-4.
of reflex actions as just described; and in Rijksbaron’s remark (1994: 152 n. 7) that it is surprising that both agentive ἀπαλλλάττωμαί ‘depart, go away’ and passive ἀπαλλλάττωμαί ‘be removed’ have the same aorist, the morphologically passive ἀπηλλάχθην – denoting both ‘departed, went away’ and ‘was removed’ – when one in -σάμην was available: ‘possibly, even with agentive middle-passives, an external factor is essentially involved’. In fact, the distinction between these two presents is more blurred than Rijksbaron implies; this point is observed by Bakker, who states in relation to inchoative medio-passives: ‘the internal affectedness due to a physical process (e.g. “melt”) amounts to the same thing as the effect of an external cause’ (1994: 43; cf. also 1994: 31). When the action is or may be externally caused, therefore, the medio-passive is found. As we have seen, when an action is truly internally caused, then the forms will be active, not medio-passive.

In this way, the distinction between inchoatives in -σκω and -σκομαί appears not to be one of reflex versus controlled actions (with Klaiman) but rather, using Levin and Rappaport Hovav’s model, a matter of internal versus external causation. In these cases,33 the medio-passive involves affectedness of the subject, but only where the action denoted by the verb is or may be externally caused. Where the action is internally caused, the active voice is used.

2.8. Conclusion: minimal pairs

The data covered fall into three sections. On its own is φάσκω, which does not stand in opposition to the present φημί, but rather as a suppletive form of it. The remaining presents in -σκ- are of two types: inchoative active and inchoative medio-

33Since it appears that the Greek medio-passive denotes ‘affectedness’ of the subject (Chapter 1 § 3.2 n. 38), one may wonder to what extent one could extend outside the sphere of verbs in -σκω in Plato the conclusion that internally caused actions are denoted by active verbs. One may note that further research could prove fruitful in this regard, since at least some verbs of blooming and blushing in Plato show the expected active form: cf. ἄνθως ‘blossom, bloom’ (R. V 475a.2), θάλλω ‘thrive, flourish’ (e.g. Crat. 414a.8, Smp. 203e.2) and ἔρισκότω ‘blush’ (e.g. Lys. 204c.4, R. I 1350d.3).
passive, with optional (usually active) causative. The former are γενειάσκω and γηράσκω; the latter ἄνα-βιώσκομαι, κυίσκομαι, μεθύσκομαι and στερίσκομαι. Causative actives are paired with inchoative medio-passives; it is the same pattern that we have already seen with many verbs in Homer (Chapter 4 § 3.1), and indeed there are further examples of this - σκω : - σκομαι division elsewhere in Classical Greek (Chapter 9 § 2.2). In Plato, therefore, a form showing the suffix - σκ- beside an unmarked present from the same stem is marked for inchoativity. The obvious next step is to find out to what extent our definition for - σκ- in Plato so far holds for verbs where a stem provides only one present tense.

3. Remaining forms

Of nineteen verbs, we have now covered seven. The pattern established thus far is of inchoative actives (γηράσκω 'grow old'), for which there are no causatives, and of inchoative medio-passives (μεθύσκομαι 'get drunk'), which sometimes have (usually active) causatives (μεθύσκω 'make drunk'). Six of these seven forms are paired with unmarked forms with stative meaning. It will now be necessary to examine the twelve that remain, in order to see to what extent they also fit this analysis.

The largest group, as before and also as in Homer, is made up of causative actives beside medio-passive inchoatives. We find three verbs which show both parts: clearest of all are διδάσκω 'teach' (‘make learn’) / διδάσκομαι 'get taught' and μιμνήσκω 'remind' / μιμνήσκομαι 'remember'; also in this category is ἀνάλισκω 'spend' / ἀλισκομαι 'be taken', although the relationship between these two forms is rather different due to the addition of the preverb on the former. In other cases, we find only one of the two expected forms of the pair in the present: causatives ἀμβλισκω 'cause to miscarry' and τιτρώσκω 'wound' (‘make wounded’; cf. aorist ἐτρώθη 'became wounded'); medio-passives βόσκομαι 'feed'
('get fed') and πιπρᾶσκομαι 'be sold'. The only case of an inchoative active is θυήσκω 'die'.

This leaves four verbs which are neither causative nor inchoative: ἀρέσκω 'please', γνωσκω 'know', ἄπο- διδράσκω 'run away' and εὑρίσκω 'find'.

3.1. Causatives and inchoatives

3.1.1. Causative-inchoative pairs

3.1.1.1. ἀλίσκομαι / ἀνάλισκω

The simple medio-passive ἀλίσκομαι 'be taken, be caught, etc.' (LSJ) is found beside active compounds, which all show preverb ἄνα-: all are based on ἀνάλισκω 'use up, spend'. A connection between these two apparently quite different meanings is to be found in such extended uses as 'kill': parts of ἀλίσκομαι are found meaning 'get seized (by death), get killed' both with and without the dative θανάτω in Homer,34 and ἀνάλισκομαι has this meaning in Classical Greek.35 A Classical form *ἀλίσκω would be a causative 'make taken'36 beside inchoative ἀλίσκομαι 'get taken', just as ἀνάλισκω is causative 'use up, spend' beside inchoative ἀνάλισκομαι 'get used up, get spent'.

The simple present ἀλίσκομαι (twelve times) is for example used by Socrates in:

ἀλίσκεται δὲ δὴ ὁ αἰρεθεὶς τοῦδ' ἐποίη. (Phdr. 253c)

And [the fair one] who is captured [in love by the one who loves him] gets caught in the following way.

34E.g. respectively θανάτω ἀλώναι 'be seized by death' at II. 21.281 and ἀλῶναί 'be killed' at II. 12.172; cf. also Pindar P. 3.57.
35Cf. e.g. τοῦς ἀναλωθέντας at Aeschylus Ag. 570; cf. also Plato Plt. 272d, and for further examples see LSJ s.v. ἀνάλισκω.
36LSJ (s.v. ἀλίσκομαι) cite this form as first occurring in Aquila Ps. 21(22).14 and Zenobius (3.67), both second century AD.
Similarly inchoative is the future ἀλωσομω, only found twice in Plato:

καὶ διὸς μὴ ἀλώσῃ ἐνταῦθα σὺ αὖ ἁίσχυνόμενος. (Grg. 489a)

And mind that you too aren’t caught this time feeling ashamed here [as Gorgias and Polus were; cf. 482c-e, 487b].

Thus the aorist ἐάλων (seventeen times) means ‘became taken, got caught’, as in ἐπειδὴ ἡ Τροία ἠλω (Hp. Ma. 286a) ‘after Troy was taken’. On the other hand, the perfect ἐάλωκα (four times) has the stative meaning ‘be [in the state of being] taken’. Just as ἁλίσκομαι means ‘get convicted and condemned’ at Tht. 179b.6, 7, so we find its perfect showing a related but stative (present perfect) meaning in ἀλλά ἀπορία. μὲν ἐάλωκα (Ap. 38d) ‘but it is through a lack that I have been [and so now am in a state of being] convicted’.

The only frequently found compound, ἀνάλισκο, is defined by LSJ as ‘use up, spend’. According to Chantraine (1968-1980 s.v. ἁλίσκομαι), the fundamental meaning of this causative active is ‘détruire, consommer’; it is secondary to the medio-passive forms. As mentioned above, ἄναλισκω forms a causative-inchoative pair with its medio-passive ἀναλίσκομαι. An example of Plato’s use of the present active (24 times) is as follows, where the Stranger suggests that we might say of doctors:

... λωβῶνται... προστάττοντες ἀναλώματα φέρειν παρ’ ἑαυτοὺς οἷον φόρους, ὡς σμικρὰ μὲν εἰς τὸν κάμνοντα καὶ σιδέν ἁναλισκουσι... (Plt. 298a)

They maltreat us, ordering us to bring them payments of money, like tributes, of which they spend little or nothing on their patients.
There is one instance of the imperfect; here, the value to the state of a man who has sold all his possessions and so become poor is being discussed:

\[ \text{ἀρκα ὅτε πλούσιος ὤν ἀνήλισκεν ὁ τοιοῦτος, μάλλον τὶ τὸτ' ἦν ὅφελος τῇ πόλει εἰς καὶ νυνὴ ἐλέγομεν;} \ (R. VIII 552b)

When such a man was wealthy and spending, was he then more use to the state in the way we were just saying?

Similarly used are the future ἀναλώσω (three times), e.g. ἐὰν τε ἰερὰ χρήματα ἦν τῇ πόλει, ταῦτα ἀναλώσει ‘if there are sacred things in the city, he [the tyrant] will spend these’ (R. VIII 568d); and the aorist ἀνήλωσα (four times), as in ἐὰν τὸ ἀυτοῦ μέρος ἀναλώσῃ ‘if he spends his own share’ (R. IX 574a). Other Classical Greek authors such as Thucydides, Demosthenes and Xenophon use a perfect ἀνήλωκα, not found in Plato; cf.:

\[ \ldots \text{ἐγὼ μὲν ἤλθον οὐδὲν τὶ πολλὰ ἔχων ἰδιὰ χρήματα οἰκοθεν ὑπόσα δ' ἦν, τούτων πάνυ ὀλίγα λοιπὰ ἔχων ἀνήλωκα δὲ, ἐφ' εἰς τοὺς στρατιώτας.} \ (Xenophon Cyr. 2.4.9)

I came from home with not at all much money of my own; and of as much as I had, I have very little left; I have spent it, he said, on my soldiers.

The compound medio-passive present ἀναλίσκομαι is used in the present tense four times, as well as once in the imperfect (Smp. 181e.1). Since it is the inchoative alternant of a causative verb, it shows the expected meaning ‘become spent / used up’. Plato says that, as the result of the tyranny of love over a man,
\[
\text{ταχὺ ἀρα ἀναλίσκονται, ἕαν τινες ὤσι πρόσοδοι. (R. IX 573d)}
\]
whatever revenues there are, they quickly get used up.

There is also a medio-passive perfect ἀνήλωμαι. This form occurs once, when the Stranger says, after the seven arts which furnish implements have been divided up:

\[
\text{oí de ἄλλοι πάντες, ὡς συναιτιοι λεξθέντες... ἀνήλωνται...} \\
\text{(Plt. 289c)}
\]
All the others, said to be contingent causes, have been removed.

A pluperfect ἀνηλώμην also occurs, in τὸ γῆσυν ἑδή πᾶν ἀνήλωτο 'all the earth's race had by this time been used up' (Plt. 272e).

The two cases of the simple aorist passive ἀνηλωθῆν in Plato are only found in a doubtful work, both being at Epist. XIII 362a.6; an example from another prose author is:

\[
... εἰς δὲ τὴν τῆς πόλεως σωτηρίαν ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ ἀπαξ ἀνηλώθη. \\
\text{(Lysias 26.22)}
\]
And the whole of it got spent in the war on the preservation of the city.

The sense of the verb here is clearly 'became spent, got spent'; as usual, our inchoative present in - ὄμαι has its inchoative aorist in - θῆν. We do find this tense stem in the genuine works of Plato, but prefixed with κατα-: it is used in the phrase καταναλωθήναι εἰς τὸ τεθνάναι 'to get consumed into being dead' (Phd. 72d), and this is the only further tense stem which the compounds add to the data already seen.
Our oldest citations of this present in -σκω are for both medio-passive ἀλίσκομαι and active ἀνάλισκω (Pindar O. 8.42 and P. 9.25 respectively); the medio-passive ἀνάλισκομαι is a later formation, found in Classical Greek authors—in addition to Plato, it also occurs in Hippocrates, Isaeus, Lysias, Thucydides and Xenophon. A causative active ἀναλῶ occurs elsewhere in Classical Greek.37

In this instance of the causative alternation, the active is invariably in compound form, and the medio-passive usually simple, so that the relation that is clear in μεθύσκω beside μεθύσκομαι is here partially obscured. One could argue that here also we have inchoative -σκ-, as opposed to perfect forms without this suffix. Yet the such a pair does not form an obvious parallel to such present sets as γενειάσκω : γενειάω, and we rather seem to have a verb that shows one meaning throughout its paradigm. It therefore seems that ἀλίσκομαι and ἀνάλισκω use -σκ- as present formant in a similar way to the Homeric causative-inchoative verbs of Chapter 4 §3.

3.1.1.2. διδάσκω / διδάσκομαι

The verb διδάσκω ‘instruct, teach’ (LSJ s.v.) is found frequently in Plato. The basic verb is found in the present active 97 times. For example, Theodorus tells Theaetetus off by saying:

νεός ὁ, ὦ Θεαίτητε, τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους ἀδικεῖν διδάσκεις ὁμολογίας παραβαίνοντας; (Thi. 183d)

Do you, Theaetetus, although a young man, teach your elders to do wrong by breaking their agreements?

37This form is apparently first found in Aeschylus: for citations see Veitch 1887 s.v. ἀνάλισκω, LSJ s.v. ἀνάλισκω.
Further cases of the present stem in the active are to be found in the two instances of the imperfect: that at Symposium 207a.5 and the following case, when Plato has Protagoras say:

εἰ μὴ οἶον τ' ἢν πόλιν εἴναι εἰ μὴ πάντες αὐληταί ἤμεν, ὁποίος τις ἐδύνατο ἐκαστός, καὶ τούτο καὶ ἕδη καὶ δημοσία πᾶς πάντα καὶ ἐδίδασκε καὶ ἐπέπληττε τὸν μὴ καλῶς αὐλοῦντα, ...

(Prt. 327a)

[Suppose that] there could not be a state unless we were all flute-players, of such sort as each was able, and [that] everyone were teaching everyone else this [art] both in private and in public, and rebuked whoever did not play the flute well . .

An example of the future διδάξω (nineteen times) occurs when Socrates says of Nicias:

αὐτοῦ οὖν σαφέστερον πυθώμεθα τί ποτε νοεῖ· καὶ ἕαν τι φαίνῃ ταί λέγουν, συγχωρησόμεθα, εἰ δὲ μὴ, διδάξομεν. (La. 196c)

So let us ask him to explain more clearly what is in his mind; and if he seems to mean something, we will agree [with him]; but if not, we shall instruct [him].

The aorist ἐδίδαξα is found 60 times; here, Socrates says that he is not responsible for the actions of people to whom he spoke:

... ὡς μὴ ὑπεσχόμην μηδὲν μὴδὲν πῶποτε μάθημα μήτε ἐδίδαξα. (Ap. 33b)
... to none of whom I either made any promises or taught any lesson.

There is also a perfect δεδίδαχαν 'have taught', occurring twice in Plato, in the following passage:

 hely dediaxen tis tovton geowmetrein; ouc tos gar poinei peri
pashe geowmetrias tauta tauta, kai tov allon mabhmatow
apantov. estin ouv ostis tovton panta dediaxen; (Men. 85e)
Or has someone taught this [boy] geometry? For this boy will do the same
things with geometry and all other branches of knowledge. So, is there
someone who has taught him all these things?

The remaining forms of διδάσκω listed by Brandwood are divided into 'middle' and
'passive'. Both sets are small. The former comprises those medio-passive forms of
 διδάσκω used by Plato with the causative meaning 'get [someone] taught (for one's
own purposes)': present διδασκομαι, future διδαξομαι and aorist διδαξαμην.
The present with this meaning is found in the form διδασκονται three times in Prt.
325b-c, as when Protagoras says in his argument to show that virtue is teachable:

... oI agathoi andres ei ta men alla didaskontai touvs neis, touto
de mi, ... (Prt. 325b)
Good men, if they have their sons taught in all other things, do not [have them
taught] in this.

The one use of the morphologically middle future διδαξομαι seems to have the
active meaning 'will teach', but not, however, 'get taught', an occasional usage of the
middle of this verb according to LSJ (s.v. διδασκω I.1). In the passage concerned,
Socrates is arguing that a rich potter would become a bad one – and so would a poor one:

καὶ μὴν καὶ ὄργανα γε μὴ ἔχων παρέχεσθαι ὑπὸ πενίας ἢ τι ἄλλο τῶν εἰς τὴν τέχνην, τὰ τε ἔργα πονηρότερα ἐργάσεται καὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς ἡ ἄλλους οὖς ἄν διδάσκῃ χεῖρος δημιουργοὺς διδάξεται. (Rep. IV 421d-e)

And yet again, if he is unable out of poverty to provide himself with tools and anything else [that is required] for his art, he will produce work that is worse, and he will teach his sons or any others whom he teaches to be inferior workmen.

The morphologically middle aorist διδάξαμην (three times) shows the expected meaning in e.g. ἕν σὺκ ἄκηκοις ὅτι Θεμιστοκλῆς Κλεοφαντὸν τὸν ὅν ἀπέα μὲν διδάξατο ἀγαθῶν; 'Have you not heard how Themistocles had his son Cleon taught to be a good horseman?' (Men. 93d).

The forms described by Brandwood as passive are those which correspond to our inchoative set, and so have the meaning 'get taught, become taught'. In the works of Plato examined in this study we only find in the simple form present διδάσκομαι and perfect δεδιδαγμαται. There are four instances of this present, as when Socrates, in asking if virtue can be taught, first asks if knowledge can be:

ἡ τούτο γε παντὶ δῆλον, ὅτι οὐδὲν ἄλλο διδάσκεται ἀνθρώπος ἢ ἑπιστήμην; (Men. 87c)

38 Apparently erroneously listed under the passive heading is the instance of διδάξειτι 'you will win' from Theognis at Meno 95d.6.
Or is this plain to everyone – that man gets taught nothing other than knowledge?

There is one instance of the perfect medio-passive δεδιδαχματι, meaning ‘to have been taught [and now know]’. Socrates is talking of experts in rhetoric – Adrastus and Pericles – and envisages them telling him and Phaedrus that they are not angry with the inquirers’ ignorance of their subject, although they mistakenly

... ρητορικὴν ἡθησαν ηύρηκέναι, καὶ ταῦτα δὴ διδάσκοντες ἄλλους ἡγοῦνται σφισιν τελέως ρητορικὴν δεδιδάχθαι, ... (Phdr. 269c)

... thought that they had discovered rhetoric, and, in teaching others these [preliminaries], believe that rhetoric had been taught to them completely.

The aorist ἐδιδάξθην is not found in simple form in Plato, although it does occur in other authors.° In Plato, there is the compound form ἀνεδιδάξθημεν, the one instance of ἀναδιδάσκω ‘teach better’ found in Plato; here, Hippias has said that matters should not be divided up, but Socrates replies concerning the two of them together:

νῦν δὲ παρὰ σοῦ ἢδη ἀνεδιδάξθημεν ὅτι εἶ μὲν δύο ἀμφότεροι ἐσμεν, δύο καὶ ἑκάτερον ἡμῶν ἀνάγκη εἶναι, εἰ δὲ εἰς ἑκάτερος, ἕνα καὶ ἀμφότερος ἀνάγκη· (Hp. Ma. 301e)

But now we have got taught by you that if we are both two, it is necessary also that each of us is two, but if each is one, then both must also be one.

°Cf. e.g. Aeschylus Pr. 10, Aristophanes Nu. 637 and Herodotus 3.81.
The compounds do not give any further tense stems that are not found in the simple verb.

Since διδάσκω is such an ancient and commonly used verb, it is unsurprising that it has acquired an exceptional range of forms. As expected, a causative present in -σκω occurs beside inchoative in -σκομαί, which has its aorist in -την. There is also a benefactive middle, distinguished morphologically by sigmatic formations.

3.1.1.3. -μιμησκω / -μιμησκομαι

The last verb in Plato which shows both causative -σκω and inchoative -σκομai is -μιμησκω, which LSJ define as 'remind, put in mind'; beside it we find μιμησκομαι 'remind oneself of, call to mind; make mention of'. We thus find the same alternation as seen for this verb in Homer of causative 'make remember' beside inchoative 'come to remember'. A secondary meaning of the medio-passive in LSJ is 'make mention of', which, as already seen, presumably developed from the idea that remembering and thinking of something can lead to mentioning it. Usually found in Plato in the middle, this verb does not occur in the simple active in his works at all, although active forms are found in some of the five compounds.

In the medio-passive, the meaning is inchoative 'remember, come to remember'. The simple verb is not found in the present, and the one case of the aorist middle ἐμμησκομην is in quotation from Tyrtaeus. We find the future μησθήσομαι meaning 'will say, will mention' three times, as in the following criticism of Adeimantus:

40Cf. Chapter 4 § 3.1.3.
41Cf. Chapter 4 § 3.1.3.
42Cf. Chapter 7 § 2.3 and n. 14.
We have been waiting for a long time, expecting that you would mention something both about the procreation of children – how people beget them, and how they bring them up when they have been born.

More frequent is the morphologically passive aorist ἐμνήσθην 'came to remember, mentioned', occurring eighteen times, as in:

ἐγώ δὲ, ὁ Σώκρατες, πρὸς σὲ ἐπιεικῶς ἔχω φιλικῶς· κινδυνεύων οὖν πεπονθέναι νῦν ὅπερ ὁ Ζήθος πρὸς τὸν Ἀμφίονα ὁ Εὐριπίδου, οὔπερ ἐμνήσθην. (Grg. 485e)

And I, Socrates, feel fairly friendly towards you; and so I now feel what Zethus, whom I mentioned, did towards Amphion in Euripides.

The perfect medio-passive μέμνησαι 'have remembered, be in a state of remembering' is notably common: there are 143 instances, including that found in Lysias' speech in the Phaedrus (234b.2). In the following example, Socrates is speaking:

μέμνησαι γὰρ ποὺ ὅτι ἐν τῷ ἐμπροσθέν τό τε βού καὶ τὸ θεοφιλές οὖ ταῦτον ἡμῖν ἐφάνη, ἀλλ' ἐτέρα ἀλλήλων· ἢ οὐ μέμνησαι; (Euthphr. 15c)
For you remember, I suppose, that, earlier, holiness and what is dear to the gods did not seem the same to us, but different from each other; or do you not remember?

There are also four cases of a stative future perfect μεμνησόμαι 'will remember' ('will be in a state of remembering'); hence, after the Stranger has asked Clinias to continue to bear in mind certain things that were recently mentioned, the latter replies to him:

πάντως, ὦ ξένε, μεμνησόμεθα που <ὡν> τά νῦν διακελεύη.

(Lg. VI 783d)

We shall certainly (continue to) remember the things you now bid us, stranger.

Lastly for the simple verb, there are five instances of the pluperfect ἐμεμνημήνην; being the past of μέμνημαι, it therefore means 'remembered, was in a state of remembering':

... καὶ ὅσακις Ἀθήναξε ἀφικοίμην, ἐπανηρώτων τὸν Σωκράτη δ μὴ ἐμεμνημήνην, ... (Tht. 143a)

And whenever I came to Athens, I used to ask Socrates what I did not remember.

However, it is also found as medio-passive 'had mentioned'; hence Lysimachus says:

ἀλλ', ὦ παιδες, λέγετε μοι, δι' ἐστὶ Σωκράτης, περὶ οὗ ἐκάστοτε ἐμέμνησθε; (La. 181a)
Now tell me, boys, is this the Socrates you had mentioned so often?

There are five compounds of μμηνήσκω in Plato, of which ἀναμμηνήσκω ‘remind one of a thing, etc.’, medio-passive ἀναμμηνήσκομαι ‘remember, recall to mind’ (LSJ) is the most frequent; it has a much more even spread of forms throughout its tenses than the simple verb. In the present active, we find eleven instances, as in the following example, where Socrates says after the reiteration of certain facts:

ἀκριβέστατα, ἢν δ' ἔγω, ἀναμμηνήσκεις με. (R. VII 522b)
You remind me [about these things] most accurately, I said.

There is also one case of the imperfect. It occurs when Socrates compares himself to Odysseus and Agathon to Persephone, referring to the moment when the hero fears he will see the Gorgon’s head at Od. 11.632:

καὶ γὰρ με Γοργίου ὁ λόγος ἀνεμίμησκεν, ὡστε ἀτεχνῶς τὸ τοῦ Ὀμήρου ἐπεπάνθη’ (Smp. 198c)
For his [Agathon’s] speech reminded me of Gorgias, so that I simply suffered what was described by Homer.

The future ἀναμμήσω ‘will remind’, always indicative, also occurs (five times), as when Socrates says to Theaetetus:

ἡ μέ, καὶ εάν οὕριον ἀπαντήσω, ἀναμμήσει καὶ ποιήσει ὀρθὰ δοξάζειν περὶ σοῦ. (Th. 209c)
That [memory of you], even if I meet you again tomorrow, will remind me and make me have true opinion about you.
The aorist active is ἀνέμνησα ‘reminded’, found six times, used for example when Socrates says to Protarchus:

... καὶ ἀνέμνησας ὅτι καὶ τὸ σφόδρα τούτο, ὃ σὺ νῦν ἐφθέγξω, καὶ τὸ γε ἡρέμα τὴν αὐτὴν δύναμιν ἔχετον τῶ μᾶλλον τε καὶ ἥττον’ (Phlb. 24b-c)

And you reminded me that the word ‘emphatically’, which you have just said, and the word ‘gently’, have the same force as ‘more’ and ‘less’.

In the medio-passive ἀναμμηνήσκομαι ‘remember, recall to mind’, present and aorist forms are much more frequent than in the active. Here the present is found 36 times, meaning ‘get reminded of, (come to) remember’; in the following passage, Socrates is talking of the stirring speeches made at the funerals of those who died in battle:

οὕτως ἕναυλος ὁ λόγος τε καὶ ὁ φθόνος παρὰ τοῦ λέγοντος ἐνδυεται εἰς τὰ ὃτα, ὥστε μόνις τετάρτη ἡ πέμπτη ἡμέρα ἀναμμηνήσκομαι ἑμαυτοῦ καὶ αἰσθάνομαι οὐ γῆς εἰμί, ...

(Mx. 235c)

To such an extent does the ringing speech and voice of the speaker enter my ears, that scarcely on the fourth or fifth day do I remember myself and perceive where I am on earth.

The future ἀναμμηνεύσησομαι ‘will (come to) remember’ occurs only twice, both in the indicative. Socrates says to Simmias:
We agree, I suppose, that if anyone is to remember anything, he must know it at some previous time.

Lastly, there is the aorist άναμνήσθην ‘came to remember’, which occurs 41 times:

... Σιμμίαν τις ίδων πολλάκις Κέβητος άναμνήσθη, ... (Phd. 73d)
If one sees Simmias, one is often reminded of Cebes.

Of the four further compounds, the two in -οιμα- follow the patterns already seen. The verb ὑπομιμησκόω ‘put one in mind of, remind’, medio-passive ‘call to mind, remember’, usually occurs in its causative active. Lastly, there is the aorist ἐπεμνήσθην which means ‘make mention of’, a frequent usage of the aorist passive of this verb in Classical Greek (cf. LSJ s.v. ινικχιόνα II). It occurs seven times; the only other tense found from it is in the perfect indicative, in τά γὰρ μετιράκια τάδε... θαμα ἐπιμέμνηται Σωκράτους ‘these boys frequently mention Socrates’ (La. 180e).

Therefore, for μιμησκόω /μιμησκοια, as for ἀναλίσκω / ἀλισκοια and διδασκόω / διδάσκοια, the same meaning is found throughout the verb’s paradigm, with no opposition to a stative unmarked form.

43These are ἐπαναμιμησκόω ‘remind’ (Lg. III 688a.3) and aorist passive συναναμνήσθην ‘recall together’ (Lg. X 897e.5).
44For frequencies of the parts of this verb, see Chapter 7 § 2.3.
45There is also one instance of ἐπιμνηστέον ‘one must mention’ (Ti. 90e.4).
3.1.2. Causatives

3.1.2.1. ἀμβλίσκω

LSJ cite ἀμβλίσκω as being the same as ἀμβλῶ, 'make to miscarry; make abortive'. Plato, however, only uses the present in -σκω, which occurs twice: both times present active, in one passage. Socrates is talking about the role of midwives and what they can do; Duke et al. give the passage where ἀμβλίσκω is used as follows:

καὶ μὴν... ὁ ἑαυτῷ... καὶ θὰν τυέων ὑπὶ δόξη ἀμβλίσκειν, ἀμβλίσκουσιν; (Th. 149d)

The text here is difficult, but the manuscript reading νέον ὄν is not impossible. We may understand, with Campbell (1883: 28-9), that this phrase means 'at an early stage', with τὸ βρέφος ‘foetus’ understood; in this case the above line means, ‘And furthermore, the midwives – do they cause miscarriages if it seems right to cause a young [foetus] to be miscarried?’ Suggested emendations have included νόμιμον ‘lawful’ (Schanz) and ἀμετίνον ‘better’ (Madvig); whatever the case, we are certainly dealing with a causative active. Campbell compares Tht. 161a, where τὸ γε σών is used with κύημα understood. He is supported in his view by McDowell (1973: 110) and Diës (1955: 167).

Also found is an aorist with preverb, ἐξήμβλωσα:

πολλοὶ ἡδη... ἀπῆλθον πρωαίτερον τοῦ δέουντος, ἀπελθόντες δὲ τὰ τε λοιπά ἐξῆμβλωσαν διὰ πονηρῶν συνουσίαν καὶ τὰ ὑπ' ἐμοὶ μακευθέντα κακῶς τρέφοντες ἀπώλεσαν... (Th. 150e)
Many before now left me sooner than they should have, and having gone away miscarried the rest because of base company, and, raising badly the things that were delivered through me, they lost them.

Here Campbell (1883: 33) comments that τὰ... λοιπὰ means ‘what more they had in them’, and mentions in some confusion that εξαμβλίσκω is not causative here, as ἀμβλίσκω was in the passage above; he compares Aristophanes’ φροντίδ’ εξηβλωκας ἐξευρημένην ‘you have made the thought that I found miscarry’ (Nu. 137). What he misses is that the patient of the action denoted by ἀμβλίσκω is the child, not the parent, giving the literal meaning here ‘made the rest get miscarried’; and this supports the theory that the reading νέον ὅν in the passage just discussed was correct. That is to say, ἀμβλίσκω means ‘cause [a child] to get miscarried’; we would expect the medio-passive ἀμβλίσκομαι to mean inchoative ‘get miscarried’, with child as subject. Many passages where this verb is found in Classical Greek are ambiguous, but a clear indication that the child is the patient of the action for this verb can be found in Hippocrates’ ἐτὶ δὲ πρὸ τούτου ὡς ἐπιτοπουλῦ διαφθείρεται καὶ ἐξαμβλίσκεται ‘But still, before this, it [the foetus, τὸ ἐμβρυὸν] gets for the most part destroyed and gets aborted’ (Mul. 1.60).

This verb actually shows the usual pattern of -σκω : -σα : -σκομαι : -θην: for, apparently only once in all Classical Greek, we find an aorist passive ἡμβλάωθην:

ὅσα δ’ ἐλλειποντα γίνεται τῶν τοιούτων χορίων, οὖν ἀκρωτηρίου τινὸς ἢ τῶν ἄλλων μελῶν, τὴν αὐτὴν δὲ νομίζειν αἰτίαν ἡπερ καὶ εάν δλον τὸ γινόμενον ἀμβλώθη... (Aristotle GA IV 773a)
And whatever deficiencies occur of such parts, as of some extremity or other limbs, we must take it that it is the same cause as it is if the whole forming creature gets aborted.

Here is another clear case of the causative alternation, then: ἀμβλίσκω 'cause to get miscarried', with aorist in -σα and, outside Plato, perfect in -κα; also outside Plato are found the inchoative present ἀμβλίσκομαι 'get miscarried', with aorist in -θην and perfect in -ωμαι. As with ἀναλίσκω, we find a collateral present in -ώω with the same meaning outside Plato: ἀμβλῶ, ἀμβλόμαι.  

3.1.2.2. τιτρώσκω

Τιτρώσκω 'wound' is rare in Plato except in the aorist and in the perfect medio-passive. There are two instances of the present in the Oxford Classical Text. In the first, Socrates is talking about rulers who keep their offices, taking money from others; he refers to them as:

οί... χρηματισταῖ τε γεγυώντες, οὐδὲ δοκοῦντες τοῦτος ὑπὲρ, τῶν λοιπῶν τὸν ἀεί ἰπέικοντα ἐνείντες ἄργυρον τιτρώσκοντες, ...

(R. VIII 555e)

these money-makers, looking down, pretending not even to see them, but injecting their [poison] money into any of the remainder who do not resist, wounding them...

In the second case, Socrates and Protarchus are having a circular discussion, in which the former holds that pleasures are different from each other, and the latter that, in that

---

46 For citations see Veitch 1887 s.v. ἀμβλίσκω; LSI s.vv. ἀμβλίσκω, ἔξομβλῶ.
47 In the second instance, Jackson (1882: 262) argued for changing τιτρώσκει to τι τρώσει.
they are all pleasures, they are all alike; hence, after a few rounds of this, Socrates says:

... οὐδ’ ἄρα ἡδονὴν ἡδονῆς διάφορον, ἀλλὰ πάσας ὁμοίας εἶναι φήσομεν, καὶ τὰ παραδείγματα ἡμᾶς τὰ νυν ἐλεχθέντα οὐδὲν τιτρώσκει, ... (Philb. 13c)

And now we shall be asserting that one pleasure is not different from another pleasure, but they are all alike, and the examples cited just now do not affect us at all.

There is also an aorist active ἔτρωσα ‘wounded’: this occurs twelve times, all of which are within Laws IX 875d-879b; for example:

γονέας δ’ ἄν παῖς ὢ δούλος δεσπότην ὀσαύτως ἐκ προνοίας τρώση, θάνατον εἶναι τῇν ζημίαν· (Lg. IX 879b)

And similarly if a son deliberately wounds his parents or a slave his master, death shall be the penalty.

The other forms of this verb to be found in Plato are all medio-passive, with inchoative sense. No present is found, but the future τρωθήσομαι clearly means ‘will get wounded’ in its one occurrence:

... ἔκαντε εἰς πόλεμον ἀγνῂ τρωθησόμενον ἢ ἀποθανοῦμενον, ποιητέον ταῦτα, ... (Cri. 51b)

And if she [your country] leads you to war or to be wounded or slain, then these things must be done.
The conjunction with the future of another inchoative, ἀποθνῄσκω ‘die’, is noteworthy: ‘will become wounded’ is co-ordinated with ‘will become dead’. Hence the always participial aorist ἔτρωθην, which occurs five times within Lg. IX 862c-879a, means ‘became wounded’ in, for example:

δούλος δ' ἔαν τις ἐλεύθερον ὄργη τρώση, παραδότω τὸν δούλον ὁ κεκτημένος τῷ τρωθέντι χρησθαι δότι ἀν ἐθέλη. (Lg. IX 879a)

If a slave wounds a free man in anger, let his owner hand over the slave to the wounded man to be dealt with in whatever way he wishes.

Lastly, there is the perfect medio-passive τέτρωμαι, which indicates the state resulting from having been wounded, as in the phrase Ἐὐρυπύλω τέτρωμένορ ‘to the wounded Eurypylus’ (R. III 405e).

Although Plato only provides us with an active present for this verb, it is evident that a present medio-passive would mean ‘get wounded’, to judge from the future, aorist and perfect forms which he does use in this voice. Indeed, the use of an inchoative present medio-passive is also Classical. The earliest authors to use the present apart from Plato are Herodotus, Hippocrates and Xenophon. Herodotus’ only two instances of the present τιτρώσκω are in the medio-passive: these are at 6.5 and in the following passage:

μᾶλλον γάρ τι καὶ θειότερον ἔφαίνοντο τιτρώσκεσθαι οί ἐργαζόμενοι τοῦ οἰκότος (Herodotus 1.174)

The workers seemed to get hurt more, and less naturally, than was ordinary.

Hence, although not all the evidence is in Plato, we find the usual causative: inchoative pattern here: τιτρώσκω : ἔτρωσα :: τιτρῶσκομαι : ἔτρωθην.
3.1.3. Inchoative medio-passives

3.1.3.1. βόσκομαι

Βόσκομαι ‘feed, graze’ is cited as the passive of βόσκω ‘feed, nourish; tend’ in LSJ (s.v.). It is only found once in Plato, in a description by Socrates of the multitude:

οἱ ἀρὰ φρονήσεως καὶ ἀρετῆς ἀπειροι, εὐῳχίαις δὲ καὶ τοῖς τοιούτοις ἀεὶ συνόντες, ... οὐδὲ βεβαιοῦ τε καὶ καθαρὰς ἡδονῆς ἐγείσαντο, ἀλλὰ βοσκήματων δίκην κάτω ἀεὶ βλέποντες καὶ κεκυφότες εἰς γῆν καὶ εἰς τραπέζας βόσκονται χορταζόμενοι καὶ ὀχεύοντες, ... (R. IX 586a)

Then those inexperienced in wisdom and virtue, but always taking part in festivities and such things, ... have not tasted stable and pure pleasure, but like cattle, always looking down and bent forwards to the ground and to their tables, they feed, eating their fill and copulating.

With an inchoative formation in -σκομαι we have come to expect a causative one in -σκω. Although we do not find a causative βόσκω ‘make fed, feed’ in Plato, this causative active does go back to Homer (cf. Chapter 4 § 3.1.1). From the insubstantial data above one might think that this verb had all but died out by the Classical period; but, although Xenophon, for example, only uses nominal derivatives (having 20 instances of βόσκημα and two of γηροβοσκός ‘nurturing in old age’), Classical Greek does indeed show further cases of both causative and inchoative forms being used. Herodotus, for example, has one instance of βόσκομαι ‘graze’ (9.93) and two of βόσκω (1.44, 6.39). So, for example, when Croesus calls on Zeus of the Hearth (Ionic ἐπίστιος) after hearing of his son’s accidental death, it is
... διότι δὴ οἰκίσασι ὑποδεξάμενος τὸν ζείνον φωνέα τοῦ παιδὸς ἔλαυθανε βόσκων... (1.44)

because, having received the guest in his house, he had unwittingly nurtured (fed) the slayer of his son.

3.1.3.2. πιπράσκομαι

The present πιπράσκομαι is held by LSJ to be the passive of πιπράσκω, Ionic πιπρήσκω, defined as ‘export for sale’, Attic always ‘sell’ (s.v. πέρνημι). Plato only shows medio-passive forms of this verb. The present occurs twice in Plato, both times in the participle. In the earlier example, Socrates, who has been saying that one exchanges vices for virtues – fear makes one brave, self-indulgence makes one self-restrained – now remarks that he does not approve of this way of attaining virtue:

... ἀλλ’ ἦ ἐκεῖνο μόνον τὸ νόμισμα ὅρθων, ἀντὶ οὗ δεὶ πάντα ταῦτα καταλλάττεσθαι, φρόνησις καὶ τούτου μὲν πάντα καὶ μετὰ τούτου ὁπούμενα τὸ καὶ πιπρασκόμενα τῷ ὑπί τῇ καὶ ἀνδρεία καὶ σωφροσύνη καὶ δικαιοσύνη καὶ συλληβδὴν ἀληθὴς ἀρετὴν, μετὰ φρονήσεως, ... (Phd. 69b)

But [I suspect that] the only right coinage for which all these things [pleasures, pains and fear] must be exchanged is wisdom; and for and with this all [these] things, courage, wisdom and justice and, in short, true virtue, in fact get bought and sold.

In the second example, the Stranger is talking about the types of ἀγροραστική ‘commerce’:
Well, let us say that culture of all forms, having been bought constantly from one city into another city from there, and being brought to another and getting sold – painting, conjuring and the many other things that were brought in and are put on sale, both for the soul’s entertainment and for its serious need – would render the one bringing and putting them on sale rightly called a merchant, no less than one of the sale of food and drink.

These two occurrences of πιπράσκομαι were deemed not Plato’s own by Burnet, who edited them out of the passages accordingly; he had further linguistic and philosophical grounds for such action, but in fact both passages are now – it seems rightly – accepted as genuine by scholars. Nonetheless, it is true that the verb is rare: apart from these passages, the earliest instances are in Lysias (18.20) and Xenophon (An. 7.7.27); the active does not occur at this time, being first found at Callimachus fr. 191.2, 695 and perhaps Theophrastus fr. 98.

The only other tense of πιπράσκομαι found in Plato is the aorist ἐπράθην, which occurs three times in Laws VIII-XI. The meaning is inchoative ‘became sold’:

νόμος δ’ ἐκάστῳ μηνὸς τῇ νέᾳ ὁν δεῖ πραθήμαι τὸ μέρος τοῖς ξένοις ἔξαγειν τοὺς ἑπιτρόπους, ... (Lg. VIII 849b)

And let the law be for each man that on the first day of the month the guardians bring out the portion of the goods which must be sold to foreigners.

Although not found in Plato, there are quite frequent perfect forms in πεπρῶ- in other Classical authors: active πέπρῶκα (Demosthenes, Isaeus), medio-passive πέπρῶμα (Aeschylus, Andocides, Aristophanes, Herodotus, Lysias, Sophocles) and future perfect πεπρῶσομαι (Aristophanes, Xenophon). These forms show the expected stative meaning beside inchoative πιπράσκομαι: hence, for example, Philoctetes says πέπρωμαι καπόλωλ ‘(α) ‘I am betrayed and lost’ (Sophocles Ph. 978). It therefore seems clear that we have a further causative-inchoative-stative set.

According to Chantraine (1940), these forms were part of a suppletive conjugation along with πωλέω and ἀποδίδομαι. He glosses the former as ‘proposer pour de l’argent, chercher à vendre’, with ‘indéterminé’ meaning (1940: 17); the latter is used ‘avec un sens déterminé, la vente étant considérée comme réalisée’ (1940: 19). If this is indeed the case, then, despite his statement that πωλέω acted as present to ἐπράθην and πεπρῶμα (1940: 17), it must rather have been ἀποδίδομαι ‘buy’, aorist ἀπεδόμην that were used as the ‘active’ to medio-passive πιπράσκομαι, ἐπράθην. This suppletive conjugation explains the lack of need for active πιπράσκω, (*)ἐπράσσα in Classical Greek. The following example illustrates the use of πωλέω and ἐπράθην:

ἐπειδῆ γὰρ τῷ ὀρφανῷ τὰ χρήματα ἀποδίδοναι, ... τὸ χωρίον ἐπωλεῖ... καὶ οὕτως... διεκόλυνε τὸ χωρίον προσήναι. (Isaeus 2.28)

49 Other forms in πρᾶ- / πρη- are rare: Chantraine (1940: 15-16) cites future ‘passive’ πράθημα (Sopater Comicus 6, Septuagint Le. 25.23) and aorist active hapax ἐπρήσα (Schwyzer 714, Samos, 6th century BC). There was once a present πέρημα, aorist ἐπέρησα, both found in Homer. On these forms see in general Chantraine 1940: 11-17, and for use in the New Testament 1940: 20.
For when it was necessary to pay the money back to the orphan, he had the
land up for sale; and my opponent tried to prevent the land from getting sold.

For πωλέω beside ἀποδίδομαι, one may cite δὲ ἐν ἀροπᾷ πωλῶν καὶ
ἀποδίδομενος ‘the one who has [items] on sale and sells at the market’ (Xenophon
Smp. 8.21).

3.1.4. Inchoative actives

3.1.4.1. θνησκόω

LSJ define θνησκόω as ‘die’, although it is also used with an agent, meaning
‘be killed’. As in Homer (Chapter 4 § 3.4.4), it denotes a change of state for the
subject, who passes from being alive to being dead. It is rare in simple form outside
the perfect tense, so that we only find the simple present θνησκόω twice in Plato. On
the first occasion, Plato uses it in a description of how life occurs in cycles – the
living die, and then live again; and if this were not so, then surely everything would
die out:

εἰ γὰρ ἐκ μὲν τῶν ἄλλων τὰ ζῶντα γίγνοιτο, τὰ δὲ ζώντα
θνησκοι, τίς μηχανή μὴ οὐχὶ πάντα καταναλωθήναι εἰς τὸ
tεθνάναι; (Phd. 72d)

For if the living came to be from other things [than the dead], and the living
were to be dying, what way is there that all things do not get consumed into
being dead?

The other instance describes a death as a single penalty as opposed to a multiple one.

Of an official who claims he has not been judged justly, it is said:
εὰν δὲ ἀλῶ, εάν μὲν ἃ τῷ θανάτῳ τετιμημένον ὑπὸ τῶν εὐθύνων, ὥσπερ ἄνάγκη, ἀπλώς θυησκέτω, τῶν δ' ἄλλων τιμημάτων ὧν ἄν δυνατόν ἢ διπλῆν τείσαι, διπλασίαν τινῶν.

(Lg. XII 946e)

And if he is convicted, if the penalty of death has been imposed upon him by his examiners, let him be dying the once only, as is necessary; but let him pay double penalty of other penalties of which it is possible to pay double.

Use of simple present θυησκω is extremely rare in Classical Greek prose (cf. Veitch 1887 s.v. θυησκω). In the former example, the meaning is apparently durative 'be dying (out)'. In the latter, the phrase ἀπλώς θυησκέτω presumably means 'let him be dying once', as opposed to 'let him be dying more than once (in continuous succession)'.

Similarly rare for the simple verb are the future θανοῦμαι (never found in Plato without a preverb) and the aorist έθανον (only occurring in a quotation from Homer, at R. III 390b.5). On the other hand, the simple perfect is very frequent, being found 79 times, of which only one is in a quotation from Homer; and moreover this tense is only once found with a preverb in Plato, on which see below. The reason for the distribution is surely the perfect's stative meaning of 'be dead'. For example, we find:

καὶ ἡμεῖς τῷ ὑπὶ ἵσως τέθναμεν ἢδη γάρ του ἔγωγε καὶ ἡκοῦσα τῶν σοφῶν ὡς νῦν ἡμεῖς τέθναμεν καὶ τὸ μὲν σώμα ἐστιν ἡμῖν σῆμα, ... (Grg. 493a)

And perhaps we in fact are dead; for I even once heard one of our sages say that we are now dead, and our bodies are in our tombs.
The use in co-ordination with a present tense form, as above with τεθνομεν...
ἐστιν, and such phrases as κίνδυνον... τοῦ ζῆν ἢ τεθνάναι ‘danger of life or
death’ (Ap. 28b.7) make the stative meaning very apparent.

There is also one case of the future perfect form τεθνήζω. Socrates says,
supposing that he had a dagger on him:

καὶ γὰρ ἄρα ἐμοὶ δόξῃ τινὰ τοὺς τῶν ἄνθρωπων ὃν σὺ ὅρας
αὐτίκα μᾶλα δεῖν τεθνάναι, τεθνήζει οὗτος ὅν ἄν δόξη· (Grg.
469d)

For if it seemed good to me that one of these men you see here must be dead
right now, the man I thought it of would be dead.

In contrast, the remaining present, future and aorist forms are all frequently
found in combination with the preverb ἀπο- : the verb ἀποθνῄσκω ‘die; be put to
death, slain’, evidently an inchoative (‘become dead’), occurs 44 times in the present
tense, as in:

ἐπιόντος ἄρα θανάτου ἐπὶ τῶν ἄνθρωπων τὸ μὲν θυτὸν, ὡς
ἐσικεῖν, αὐτοῦ ἀποθνῄσκει, τὸ δ’ ἄθανατον σῶν καὶ ἁδιάφθορον
ὀίχεται ἀπιόν, ... (Phd. 106e)

Then when death comes to a man, the mortal part of him, it seems, dies, but
the immortal part [i.e., the soul] goes away intact and unharmed.

The inchoative nature of the verb is clearly evident from its co-ordination with a verb
of movement, ὀίχεται, and the way in which another such verb is used in a
paraphrase for it: hence ἐπιόντος θανάτου.
Plato uses the imperfect of ἄποθνησκω once, in a speech by Aristophanes. He is talking of the ἀνδρογύνοι ‘man-women, hermaphrodites’, who were each composed of both a man and a woman together; split apart by Zeus, they nonetheless find each other again –

... καὶ περιβάλλοντες τὰς χεῖρας καὶ συμπλεκόμενοι ἀλλήλοις, ἐπιθυμοῦντες συμφύναι, ἀπέθνησκον ὑπὸ λιμοῦ καὶ τὴς ἄλλης ἀργίας διὰ τὸ μηδὲν ἐθέλειν χωρίς ἀλλήλων ποιεῖν. (Smp. 191a)
and throwing their arms around each other and being locked together with each other, desiring to be together, they began to die from hunger and inactivity too, through not wishing to do anything apart from each other.

The future ἀποθανοῦμαι ‘will die’ occurs fifteen times, e.g. in:

ἐὰν δὲ ἀλώς ἢ τοῦτο πράττον, ἀποθανῆ. (Ap. 29d)
But if you are still caught doing this [investigating or practising philosophy], you will die [be put to death].

Lastly, there is the frequently found aorist ἀπέθανον ‘died’ (60 times):

καὶ ἵσως ἄν διὰ ταύτα ἀπέθανον, ἐὰν μὴ ἢ ἄρχῃ διὰ ταχέων κατελῦθη. (Ap. 32d)
And perhaps I would have died [been put to death] for it [not obeying the orders of the Thirty], if the government had not been quickly overthrown.

Of the six further compounds already listed (Chapter 7 § 3.1.2), the four in -ἀπο- show the same range of forms as ἀποθνησκω, and the one instance in
κατα - is in a quotation; but the use of the compound in ἐκ- is of some interest. This
is the participle of the perfect ἐκτέθνηκα, the one instance in Plato of the perfect
tέθνηκα showing a preverb. The present of this verb, ἐκθνήσκω, is defined by LSJ
as 'be in a death-like swoon'; in fact, it is the stative perfect that has this meaning in
our passage:

τὰς δὲ προθέσεις πρῶτον μὲν μὴ μακρότερον χρόνον ἔνδον
γίνεσθαι τοῦ δηλούντος τὸν τε ἐκτεθνεῶτα καὶ τὸν ὁντος
tέθνηκότα, ... (Lg. XII 959a)
And as for the laying-out of the corpse, first, let it occur within the house for
no longer time than is sufficient to show that the man is in a death-like state,
and really dead.

Hence, when we find the present of this compound outside Plato, it has inchoative
sense: so ἐκθνήσκουστ ‘[animals] fall into a swoon’ (Aristotle HA III 521a.11).

Present, future and aorist tenses of θνήσκω almost always show the preverb
ἀπο-, where there is a change of state: this prefix denotes such notions as
‘completing’ and ‘ceasing from’ (cf. LSJ s.v. ἀπό D). The perfect, on the other hand,
is always stative, including the one instance of it showing a preverb; and so we never
find τέθνηκα with ἀπο-. In this way it is similar to μιμήσκω, whose present,
future and aorist are usually found in compound form, but whose perfect forms are
always simple. This use of preverbs with the present, future and aorist tenses of these
verbs is to emphasise dynamic situations; the use of such preverbs with perfect tenses
is inappropriate, whence their omission.
3.2. Miscellaneous forms

Four verbs remain, which appear to show neither causative nor inchoative presents in -σκω: these are ἀφέσκω ‘please’, γιγνώσκω ‘know’, ἀπο-διδράσκω ‘run away’ and ἐφρίσκω ‘find’.

3.2.1. ἀφέσκω

Defined by LSJ as originally ‘make good; appease’ and, in the Classical era, ‘please, satisfy’, the present form ἀφέσκω is quite frequent in the present tense in Plato: it occurs 42 times, in both personal and impersonal use. Here, Clinias, with nine others, says that he has been given the task of founding a colony:

ἄμα δὲ καὶ νόμους τῶν τε αὐτόθι, εἰ τινὲς ἡμᾶς ἀφέσκουσιν,
tίθεσθαι κελεύει, καὶ εἰ τινὲς ἐτέρωθεν, ... (Lg. III 702c)

And at the same time [the city of Cnossus] bids us to make laws both from our own here, if any please us, and also from abroad...

An example of impersonal use occurs in the following passage, where Socrates shows that, if the beautiful is the cause of the good, then it cannot be it, and this brings about a contradiction:

ἀφέσκει σὺν ημῖν καὶ θέλοιμεν δὲν λέγειν ώς τὸ καλὸν οὐκ
ἀγαθὸν οὐδὲ τὸ ἀγαθὸν καλὸν; (Hp. Ma. 297c)

Therefore does it please us, and would we want to say, that the beautiful is not good and the good not beautiful?

There is also an imperfect, all four instances of which occur in Crito 52, as in,

ἡρεσκε τε σὺν ἰσως αὐτῶ τὰ λεγόμενα ‘and therefore, probably, the things
said pleased him’ (Cri. 52e.4). From the present participle comes the adverb ἀρεσκόντως ‘agreeably’, found in Plato only in the phrase εἴ δὲ ὑμῖν ἀρεσκόντως (R. VI 504b) ‘but if it pleased you’.

The only other tense of this verb found in Plato is the aorist ἥρεσσα (six times); hence e.g.:

ταύτα ἥρεσε τοῖς παροῦσι, καὶ πάντες ἐπήνεσαν, ... (Prt. 338b)

These things pleased those present, and they all applauded.

The only compound form is ἀπαρέσκω ‘displease’ which occurs once: ἐν µέντοι τί µε τὸν ῥηθέντων ἀπαρέσκει (Tht. 202d) ‘But one point in what has been said displeases me’. There are other tenses of this verb which occur outside Plato: also active is the future ἀρέσω (Demosthenes 39.33), ἀρέσσω (Apollonius Rhodius 3.901).

Of greater interest are the medio-passive forms. If ἀρέσκω is to follow the model of causative active beside inchoative medio-passive, it must either be an inchoative active or a causative one, with possible medio-passive inchoative. The meaning of the Homeric aorist ἀρέσσα, which has future middle ἀρέσσομαι, aorist ἀρέσ(σ)ασθαί, is according to LSJ ‘make good, make amends’, middle ‘appease, conciliate’, with the meaning ‘please, satisfy’ being a classical development. There is therefore some justification to view ἀρέσκω as, historically, a causative verb meaning ‘make pleased’, and we therefore expect medio-passive ἀρέσκομαι ‘become pleased’, aorist ἥρέσθην ‘became pleased’. We do not find these meanings, however. There is a transitive medio-passive ἀρέσκομαι, for example meaning ‘propitiate’ θεοὺς ἀρέσκεσθαι ‘to propitiate the gods’ (Xenophon Mem. 436

50 Cf. also Cunliffe 1924 s.v. ἀρέσκω, whose main meanings for the Homeric forms are ‘make atonement’ and middle ‘conciliate’.
4.3.16). This is therefore the ‘middle’ benefactive form. In what is traditionally
termed the passive, ἀφέσκομαι has the stative meaning ‘be pleased’ (cf. LSJ s.v.
ἀφέσκω III), and is apparently never inchoative **‘become pleased’; hence, for
example, καὶ τοῖς λόγοις τοῖς ἀπό σου ἀφέσκομαι ‘and I am pleased at the
things you have said’ (Thucydides 1.129). There is apparently only one possible case
of inchoative aorist ἥρεσθην in the Classical period, found in Sophocles when
Antigone says:

ὡς εμοὶ τῶν σῶν λόγων
ἀφεστὸν οὐδὲν, μηδ’ ἄφεσθείη ποτε’ (Sophocles Ant. 500)

As none of your words is pleasing me, nor would they ever become pleasing.

This reading has been questioned, but in fact is surely acceptable.51

It would seem that, in this case, ἀφέσκω is not causative or inchoative in
Plato, and the medio-passive present may be used with stative meaning.

3.2.2. γιγανώσκω

The verb whose present is γιγανώσκω means ‘come to know, perceive, know;
form a judgement, think; judge, determine, &c.’ according to LSJ.52 The present
active (203 times), unlike in Homer (Chapter 4 § 3.4.3) has stative meaning:

εἴπε δὴ μοι, ὦ παῖ, γιγανώσκεις τετράγωνον χαρίον ὅτι τοιοῦτον
ἔστιν; (Men. 82b)

Tell me, boy, do you know that a square figure is such [as this]?

---

52 LSJ’s statement that it only means ‘know’ in past tenses is corrected in the revised supplement s.v.
On one occasion, however, γιγνώσκω seems to mean ‘decide’:

εἶ δὲ βουλομένους ἵμιν ἐστὶν περὶ τῶν τοιοῦτων ἐρωτάσθαι τε καὶ
dιδόναι λόγον, αὐτοὺς δὴ χρὴ γιγνώσκειν, ὡς Νικία τε καὶ
Λάχης. (La. 187c)

But it is necessary for you, Nicias and Laches, to decide for yourselves
whether it suits you to be questioned and give explanations on such points.

The future γνώσομαι (51 times) is found, for example, when Protagoras says
to Socrates that courage is different from the other parts of virtue:

ὁδὲ δὲ γνώση ὃτι ἐγὼ ἀληθὴ λέγω: εἰρήσεις γὰρ πολλοὺς τῶν
ἀνθρώπων ἀδικωτάτους μὲν δυτας καὶ ἀνοσιωτάτους καὶ
ἀκολαστοτάτους καὶ ἀμαθεστάτους, ἀνδρειστάτους δὲ
dιαφερόντως. (Prt. 349d)

Thus you will perceive that I am speaking the truth: for you will find many
men very unjust, unholy, dissolute and ignorant, but pre-eminently
courageous.

The aorist ἔγνων (116 times) has the inchoative meaning ‘came to know,
perceived, recognised’, being the past tense of a stative. In the following passage,
Socrates is saying that, although he tried to show that he was less learned than the
poets, he failed, as they could not explain their own poems as well as others could:

ἔγνων οὖν αὖ καὶ περὶ τῶν ποιητῶν ἐν ἄλιγῳ τούτῳ, ὅτι οὐ σοφία
ποιεῖν ἄλλα φύσει τινὶ καὶ ἐνθουσιάζοντες...

(Ap. 22b-c)
Therefore, concerning the poets, I presently also perceived that they compose what they compose not through wisdom, but through some natural disposition and being inspired.

The perfect ἔγνωκα (eleven times) indicates the state of knowing that results from a past act of coming to know, as when a servant says to Socrates:

σὲ δὲ ἔγω καὶ ἄλλως ἔγνωκα ἐν τούτῳ τῷ χρόνῳ γενναίοτάτον καὶ πραότάτον καὶ ἄριστον ἀνδρὰ δυτὰ τῶν πώποτε δεύρο ἀφικομένων, ... (Phd. 116c)

And I have known you in every way in this time to be the noblest, gentlest and best man of those who have ever come here.

Therefore, it can also be synonymous with the stative present γιγνώσκω 'know':

tοσοῦτον σὺ ἐμοῦ σοφότερος εἶ τηλικοῦτον δυτος τηλικόστε ὅν, ὡστε σὺ μὲν ἔγνωκας ὅτι οἱ μὲν κακοὶ κακῶν τι ἔγγαζονται ἀεὶ τοὺς μάλιστα πλησίον ἕαυτῶν, οἱ δὲ ἀγαθοὶ ἀγαθῶν... (Ap. 25d)

And you at your age are so much wiser than I at my age that you have perceived that the bad always do something bad to those nearest them, and the good do some good.

There is also a medio-passive. The present γιγνώσκομαι (22 times) means stative 'be known', as in οὐδὲν <γὰρ> ἦττον γιγνώσκεται, τί τὸ λεγόμενον μὴ εἶναι 'for that which is said not to exist is known nonetheless' (Prm. 160d).

Equally, it can be inchoative 'come to be known, be recognised', as in:
Therefore is it likely and necessary that those who are pregnant and those who are not be recognised by midwives or by others?

Two other tenses occur in the medio-passive of this verb, both with passive morphology and inchoative meaning. These are future γνωσθησομαι 'will be known' (once) and aorist εγνωσθην 'came to be known, came to be determined' (seven times). The instance of the former occurs when Socrates is saying that, if knowledge is always changing, then there can be no knowledge due to the gap between the stages:

καὶ ἐκ τούτου τοῦ λόγου οὔτε τὸν γνωσόμενον οὔτε τὸ γνωσθησόμενον ἃν εἴη. (Cra. 440b)
And by this reasoning there would be neither anyone to know nor anything to be known.

An example of the aorist passive occurs when the Stranger says:

πάλαι γὰρ δὴ ποτε, ὡς ἔοικεν, ἐγνωσθη παρ' αὑτοῖς οὗτος ὁ λόγος... (Lg. II 656d)
For long ago, it seems, this rule came to be decided by them.

In sum, although γινωσκω appears beside a stative perfect εγνωκα, the form in -σκω nonetheless clearly shows stative meaning.
3.2.3. ἀπο- διδράσκω

The present - διδράσκω is only found in the compound form ἀπο- διδράσκω in Plato. The simple is apparently never found in Classical literature; other Classical authors show only forms prefixed with ἀπο-, except Aristophanes, who also has compounds in δια-, ἐκ- and συναπο-.

LSJ gloss ἀποδιδράσκω as ‘run away, escape or flee from, especially by stealth’; there is also a transitive use, ‘flee, shun’. There are twelve instances of the present tense in Plato, of which six are participial; there is also one of the imperfect.

An example of its use in the present tense is when Socrates says:

... εἰ μὴ δικαιότερον φιμην καὶ κάλλιου εἶναι πρὸ τοῦ φεύγειν τε καὶ ἀποδιδράσκειν ὑπέχειν τῇ πόλει δίκην ἦντιν’ ἂν τάττη.

(Phd. 99a)

[I would have gone to Megara long ago,] if I did not think it a more just and noble thing, instead of fleeing and running away, to endure from the city whatever penalty it may ordain.

The example of the imperfect occurs in the following passage. Socrates is giving Crito the laws’ view on himself, saying that he should not try to escape; concerning Crito’s friends in Thessaly, they say to Socrates:

... καὶ ἵσως ἄν ἡδέως σου ἁκοῦσιν, ὡς γελοίως ἐκ τοῦ δεσμωτηρίου ἀπεδιδράσκεις σκεύην τῇ τινα περιθέμενος...

(Cri. 53d)

And perhaps they will be pleased to hear how ludicrously you escaped from prison by putting on a disguise.
The future ἀποδρᾶσμαι appears only once in Plato, in the phrase ἐγὼ δ' ὑμῖν ἐκ γε τοῦ ἐτέρου ἀποδράσεσθαι 'but I thought I would escape from one of them' (R. V 457c). An example of the aorist ἀπρέδραν (five times) is e.g. οὐ γὰρ τοι παῖς με ὁ Σάτυρος ἀπέδρα 'for, you see, my boy Satyrus had run away' (Prt. 310c). A perfect ἀποδέδρακα only occurs in Plato once, although Aristophanes, Hippocrates and Xenophon also use it; it is found when Socrates says: ... καὶ οὔτως ἡμῖν ὁ καλὸς λόγος ἀποδεδρακώς σιχησεται 'and so our fine theory, having run away, will be gone' (Thet. 203d).

This verb is also used transitively by Plato. The certain example of transitive use is ὡσπερ παῖδες πατέρα τὸν νόμον ἀποδιδράσκοντες 'running away from the law like boys from their father' (R. VIII 548b); similar is the use of ἀποδράς at R. I 329c.4. Examples from outside Plato also occur; cf. ὅκως τε μὴ διαδρήσεται σφεας ὁ Δημοκτήτης 'and they were to take care that Democedes should not escape them' (Herodotus 3.135). In its earliest use, forms from this stem are intransitive;53 the later use with the accusative is an extension.

Classical Greek also shows a form δρασκάζω, apparently only found at Lysias 17.10 in quotation from a law of Solon’s: it is there equated with ἀποδιδράσκειν – Lysias says τὸ δρασκάζειν, ὃ νῦν ἀποδιδράσκειν δυνάμενον – so that LSJ’s definition of δρασκάζω as ‘attempt an escape’, also in Chantraine’s ‘tenter de s’échapper’ (1968-80 s.v. διδράσκω), seems unnecessary.

In this case, therefore, we have a verb which means ‘escape’; -κω is not inchoative here.

53The first occurrences are as aorist participle ἀποδράς, used with ἐκ νησίς at Od. 16.65 and with νησίς alone at Od. 17.516. On the meaning and etymology of the form see further Létoublon 1985: 189-90.
3.2.4. εὑρίσκω

Εὑρίσκω 'find' is often used by Plato in the active figuratively, meaning 'find out, discover; find that'; it thus has an important role in works of philosophical inquiry. Hence, in this voice the verb is commonly found. The present (23 times) is used, for example, when Socrates asks Hippias what the Spartans like to hear him talk about:

\[\text{άλλα τί μὴν ἔστιν ἡ ἡδέως σοι ἀκρούνται καὶ ἐπαινοῦσιν; αὐτὸς μοι εἶπέ, ἐπειδὴ ἐγὼ σοὶ εὑρίσκω. (Hp. Ma. 285d)}\]

But what is this thing about which they gladly listen to you and applaud? Tell me yourself, since I do not find it myself.

There are also five instances of the imperfect, as in ὡς ἐν τοῖς ἐμπροσθεν ηὑρισκομεν 'as we found in our former [argument]' (Grg. 513e).

The future active εὑρήσω (54 times) is for example used in the following passage. Here, it has been decided that temperance (σωφροσύνη) is the knowledge of what one does and does not know. But if temperance had full control of mankind, then would they be happy? Critias says:

\[\text{άλλα μέντοι, ἣ δὲ ὅς, οὐ ραδίως εὑρήσεις ἀλλὸ τὸ τέλος τοῦ εὗ πράττειν, κἂν τὸ ἐπιστημώνως ἀτιμάσῃς. (Chrm. 173d)}\]

But still, he said, you will not easily find any other fulfillment of welfare, if you reject the idea of knowledge.

The aorist ηὗρον is by far the most frequent form of this verb (114 times, including two quotations); for example, Socrates, talking of various people who have contributed to the art of rhetoric, says:
Do we not bring the excellent Parian, Evenus, into the midst of our discussion, who first invented insinuation and indirect praises...

Lastly in the active is the perfect ἡφηκα (26 times); this means literally ‘be in a state of having found’:

πρὸς γὰρ τὸ σέβεσθαι τὸν τὸ κάλλος ἔχοντα ἱατρὸν ἡφηκε μόνον τῶν μεγίστων πόνων. (Phdr. 252a-b)

For it [the soul], in addition to revering him who possesses beauty, finds him (has found him to be) the only healer of its greatest troubles.

Outside the active, forms of this verb are infrequent. As with διδάσκω, Brandwood divides the remaining non-active parts into ‘middle’ and ‘passive’. With the former, we find only the aorist ἡφόμην ‘found for oneself; invented’, which occurs three times. For example, Socrates says that madness comes from the gods and is therefore superior to sanity (σωφροσύνη), which is human; hence:

... ἡ μανία ἐγγενομένη καὶ προφητεύσασα, οἷς ἔδει ἀπαλλαγῆν ἡφητο, ... (Phdr. 244d-e)

... madness, having intervened and used its oracular power, found a way of release for those in need.

A second use at Phdr. 245a.1 is similar in meaning; in the only other case, the meaning is ‘invented’:

tὸν δὲ κάλλιστον Πάριον Ἐυηνὸν ἐς μέσον οὐκ ἄγομεν, ὡς ὑποδήλωσίν τε πρῶτος ἦφην καὶ παρεπαίνουσ... (Phdr. 267a)
επείτα... καὶ οἰκήσεις καὶ ἐσθήτας καὶ ὑποδέσεις καὶ στρωμάτας καὶ τάς ἐκ γῆς τροφὰς ηὐρέτο. (Prt. 322a)
And secondly, [by his skill] he [man] invented dwellings, clothes, sandals, beds and the foods of the earth.

Forms classed as passive are the aorist ηὐρέθην (seven times) and perfect ηὐρήματι (ten). An example of the former is:

δοκῶ μὲν γὰρ, τὸ πρῶτον ηὐρέθη νέων καὶ πλουσίων ἐμμισθος θηρευτῆς. (Sph. 231d)
First, I believe, [the sophist] was found to be a paid hunter after the young and wealthy.

In the following example of the medio-passive perfect ηὐρήματι, Glaucion is concluding an investigation into the place of wisdom in the city:

ἐμοὶ γοῦν δοκεῖ, ἐφη, ἀποχρώντως ηὐρήσθαι. (R. IV 429a)
It certainly seems to me, he said, that it [wisdom] has been discovered sufficiently.

The four compounds also provide some further tense stems. We find an example of the medio-passive present with preverb ἄν-:

καὶ ἐὰν τις τὰ ξενικὰ όνόματα ἀνασκοπῇ, σὺν ἥττον ἀνευρίσκεται ὁ ἐκαστὸν βούλεται. (Cra. 401c)
and if one were to examine foreign names, what each one means is (gets) easily found.
A future passive is found in ἀνευρεθήσεται 'it will be discovered' (Ti. 63e).

Although we could see in εὑρίσκω : -εὑρίσκομαι a causative-inchoative pair with, for instance, the meaning 'make found / plain / uncovered' : 'become found / plain / uncovered', this interpretation seems forced: there is no evidence that εὑρίσκω was felt to be a causative in Plato or in Homer (Chapter 4 § 4.1), the meaning 'invent' being too common.

3.3. Summary: remaining forms

It is clear that, in Plato as in Homer, there are many cases of causatives in -σκω beside inchoatives in -σκομαι. As also in Homer, we do not always find both members of a pair: though we have both -μιμνήσκω 'remind' and μιμνήσκομαι 'remember', ἀμβλίσκω 'make miscarry' shows no inchoative in Plato, and πιπράσκομαι has no causative. In most cases there is a stative perfect; where there is, it is generally a frequently found one, in Classical Greek if not in Plato.

Also as in Homer, however, there are four verbs which do not fall into this class. Whether they have stative perfects or not, these verbs are not causatives or inchoatives in Plato's work.

4. Conclusion: the semantics of verbs in -σκω in Plato

In Plato, therefore, there is a clear divide between two uses of -σκω. In most cases it is a present formant, with apparently no particular meaning (§ 3). That we find many cases of causatives in -σκω beside inchoatives in -σκομαι is, as has been seen (Chapter 1 § 3.2), a feature of Greek voice. Hence, beside μιμνήσκω : μιμνήσκομαι, ἐμνησα : ἐμνήσθην is also a causative-inchoative pair, without -σκ- being found in either form.
In five cases, however, our forms in -σκω / -σκομαι appear to be genuinely causative-inchoative, in opposition to an unmarked present (§2). Three show causative -σκω beside inchoative -σκομαι, as μεθύσκω ‘make drunk’: μεθύσκομαι ‘become drunk’ : μεθύω ‘be drunk’. In two, we have inchoatives in -σκω, as γενειάσκω ‘become bearded’. The difference between these two types of (causative-)inchoatives in -σκ- appears to be the type of action involved: becoming drunk is an ‘externally caused’ event, becoming bearded an ‘internally caused’ one. In this case, the meaning for -σκ- in Plato, when in opposition to a marked form, is by nature inchoative.
Chapter 9
Verbs in -σκω in Classical Greek: a Summary

1. Introduction

The previous two chapters have given respectively a morphological and semantic analysis of the verbs in -σκω found in Plato. Certain verbs were omitted because they did not seem to be felt to be verbs in -σκω in Plato’s time; others, on the other hand, have now been dealt with twice, since they were also used by Homer and were therefore studied in Chapters 3-4.¹ There is not room here to discuss other Classical forms in detail; this chapter therefore includes a summary of the twenty-two other verbs found in this period. Thereafter, the study of Classical Greek verbs in -σκω is concluded with a summary of what has been seen in these three chapters.

2. Other Classical verbs in -σκω: an overview²

2.1. Morphology

Most other verbs in -σκω found in Classical Greek fall into the same categories as those seen in Plato: classes of verbs with reduplication in -ν-, in -ισκω, and with the same stem throughout, apparently both with and without stem-final vowel alternation.

Four further presents in -σκω with reduplication in -ν- make up a small group of occasional forms. Most problematic is -ββόσκω ‘go; make go’ (h.Ap. 133, Hippocrates, Aristotle, IG 12(7).62.36 (fourth century, Amorgos) and Schweizer 126a (fifth century, Corinth)); cf. also Chapter 4 § 2.1.1). Others appear beside non-

¹Conversely, a handful of Homeric verbs in -σκω are hardly found in other works: notably rare are ἀλλήσκω ‘grow, increase’, ἀλόσκος ‘escape’, ἀπαφίσκω ‘trick’, ἀφαρίσκω ‘fit together’, βλάσκος ‘go, come’, δειδίσκεω ‘welcome, greet’, εἰσκω and ισκω ‘make like, etc.’ and ἠλάσκω ‘rove, flit about’.

²The data used in this summary are principally taken from Veitch 1887; Chantraine 1968-80; and LSJ.
present stems in the same way as those seen in Plato: hence βιβρώσκομαι ‘be eaten’ (Hippocrates Aff. 4, not in the active until Plutarch and Babrius) with non-present βρω- (most commonly in perfect forms in βεβρω-); ἐμ- πιπάσκομαι ‘acquire’ (found as (ε)νπιπάσκεσθο in Schwyzer 83 B3, fifth century, Argos) beside πα- (first in πέπαμαι, found from Solon, Aeschylus and Pindar onwards); and πιπίσκω ‘give to drink, make drink’ (Hippocrates), present to future πίσω and aorist ἐπίσα.

There are seven more presents in -ισκω with non-present forms in -η- and -ω-; non-present -εσ- also seems to be an option in two cases. This set is particularly notable in Hippocrates: here we find αλθίσκω ‘heal’ (Morb. 2.36), which has non-present forms in -η- (future απ- αλθ- η- σεσθον, Il. 8.405) and in Hippocrates -εσ- (aorist passive συν- αλθ- εσ- θημα, Art. 14) as well as a thematic aorist αλθετο (Il. 5.417)); κορίσκομαι ‘become saturated’ (Gland. 6, 14), ‘be irked’ (Art. 35), collateral to κορέννυμι, non-present κορε(σ)- / κορη-; οδίσκομαι ‘become swollen’ (Epid. 5.16), collateral to οδίεω : οδη-; and -πισκομαι ‘suppurate’ (quite frequent), collateral to -πνεω : πνη-. Other Classical forms are γαμίσκομαι ‘give oneself in marriage’ (Aristotle Pol. 1335a.20), collateral to γαμεομαι : γαμη-; and γεγωνίσκω ‘shout; proclaim’ (Aeschylus, Euripides, Thucydides), beside γεγωνέω : γεγωνη-. There is one form with non-present stem in -ω-: ἀμαυρίσκω ‘make dim’ (Democritus 177), found as collateral to ἀμαυρω- : ἀμαυρω-. Other Classical forms are γαμίσκομαι ‘give oneself in marriage’ (Aristotle Pol. 1335a.20), collateral to γαμεομαι : γαμη-; and γεγωνίσκω ‘shout; proclaim’ (Aeschylus, Euripides, Thucydides), beside γεγωνέω : γεγωνη-. There is one form with non-present stem in -ω-: ἀμαυρίσκω ‘make dim’ (Democritus 177), found as collateral to ἀμαυρω- : ἀμαυρω-.

Further examples of same-stem presents are also to be found. The only remaining verb which really appears to show a short / long vowel alternation before -σκω is apparently ἡβάσκω ‘come to puberty’ (Euripides, Hippocrates and Xenophon) beside ἡβάω ‘be in the prime of youth’: non-present ἡβη-. We might also suspect the same of ὀλάσκω ‘bark’; if indeed this form is to be read in its one

---

5There is also ὑνίσκομαι (non-present ὑνη-) ‘flow’, supposedly used by Archilochus but probably not to be attributed to him: cf. Schmidt 1904: 30; and Chantraine 1968-80: s.v. ὑδω A.
possible occurrence (Aeschylus *Supp.* 877), then it is a collateral to ἐλακτέω and ἐλάω, which would presumably have had non-present forms in ἐλατ-—although these are apparently not found (cf. Chantraine 1968-80 s.v. ἐλάω, LSJ s.v.). In the case of πυνόσκω ‘make prudent’ (Aeschylus, Simonides, Callimachus) beside πυνόσσω ‘id.’: non-present πυ-, (mostly in perfect πέπνυναι ‘be conscious’), we cannot be sure of the length of the -υ- before -σκ-; similarly, there is ἴμάκσκο, perhaps ‘flog’ or ‘imprison’ (cf. LSJ s.v. ἴμάκσκω; Chantraine 1968-80 s.v. ἴμάς) (*Schwyzer* 409.7, c. 580 BC, Elis) beside ἴμάσσω ‘flog’, aorist ἴμασσα (*Iliad, Odyssey*, etc.). Clearly with one stem throughout and no alternation are ἰόσκομαι, only found as ἰοσκομένως ‘with force’ (Hippocrates Cord. 1), which occurs beside ἰόμωμαι ‘strengthen’ : non-present ἰω-, the latter being especially common in the perfect middle ἐρρωμαι ‘be strong’, as participle ἐρρωμένος ‘powerful’; and lastly -φαύσκω / -φώσκω ‘begin to shine, dawn’ (Herodotus, Aristotle), which has no non-present verbal forms and whose relationship to Homeric and Classical πυφαύσκω is obscure.⁴

Beside all these formations, which largely show the same patterns that exist in Plato, there are three more small groups of forms. Firstly, there is the isolated ἵσκω, according to LSJ the iterative of ἵσκ ‘go’ (*Schwyzer* 180.3, archaic Crete).

The second group is comprised of the two parallel verbs λάσκω ‘shout’ (Aeschylus, Aristophanes, Euripides) beside aorist ἐλακούν and perfect λέληκα; and χάσκω ‘gape’ (Anacreon, Hipponax, Solon, Aristophanes, Xenophon) beside ἐχανοῦν and κέχνω. If these are derived from their thematic aorists, with preforms *λακ- σκω and *χαν- σκω, then we have the same pattern of present in - (ι)σκω beside thematic aorist which we saw for the four Homeric verbs in - ἵσκω (Ἀραβίσκω : ἰχαροῦν, ἀραφίσκω : ἰχαρόν, ἐπαυρίσκομαι : ἐπαὑρόν and

⁴See also Chapter 3 § 4.2.2.

⁵On the phonology of - κσκ- > - σκ- see Chapter 3 § 3.1.3 and n. 56; -υκ- may become -σκ- without lengthening of the preceding vowel: for examples cf. Lejeune 1972: 138-9, 314.
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εὐρίσκω : εὑρον), as well as for certain verbs with reduplication in -ι- beside
aorists with reduplication in -ε- (διδάσκω : δέδαιε, τιτύσκομαι : τετυκεῖν; cf.
also κικλήσκω : ἐκέκλετο) and perhaps even for one more verb in -σκω
(*παθσκω : ἐπαθον). Alternatively, χάσκω could be an ancient formation.6 In
addition, there is ὄφλισκω, attested by Suidas, which we should reconstruct for the
Classical period to account for ὄφλισκανο; it would be based on the aorist ὄφλον;
non-present forms also occur in ὀλφη-. Lastly, there is one more type of verb in -ισκω: we find Ionic forms on stems
in -η- beside collaterals in -ιω: κληίσκομαι 'be called' (Hippocrates Cord. 8; cf.
κλήζω, κληίζω 'call'); and χρηίσκομαι 'need' (Herodotus 3.117; cf. χρήζω
'want, have need of').

2.2. Semantics

It is impossible to give a full overview of the semantics of other verbs in
-σκω in Classical Greek without detailed examination of forms in context. What
follows is a brief attempt at categorisation, following groups already seen.

As in Plato, a large group of presents in -σκω in the rest of Classical Greek
seem to show the causative alternation. Although paucity of attestation of many
forms means that we only find one member of a pair, a collateral present often shows
a fuller picture; stative perfects also occur in opposition to inchoative presents in
-σκ-. Hence ἀλθίσκω 'heal', collateral to ἀλθαίνω 'heal' medio-passive ἀλθαίνομαι 'become whole and sound'; ὁμαυρίσκω 'make dim', collateral to ὁμαυρόν, 'make dim', medio-passive ὁμαυρόφοιμαι 'become dark or dim';
βιβρωσκομαι 'get eaten', beside perfect βέβρωμαι; γαμίσκομαι 'get given in
marriage', beside γαμίζω 'give in marriage'; κορίσκομαι 'become saturated',
collateral to κορέννυμαι, medio-passive of κορέννυμι 'satiate'; οὐδίσκομαι

'become swollen' beside actives ὄδεω, ὀδαίνω 'swell'; πιπυσκω 'make prudent', beside πιπυσσω 'id.' and stative perfect πέπνυμαι 'be wise'; ἐμ- πιπάσκομαι 'acquire', beside stative perfect πέπαιμαι 'possess'; -πυσκομαι 'suppurate', beside -πυέω 'suppurate'; and ὁσκομαι 'be strengthened', collateral to ὁνυνμαι, medio-passive of ὁνυνυμι 'strengthen', perfect ἔρρομαι.

As before, inchoative actives form a smaller set. Most notable is ἡβάσκω 'come to puberty', found beside the stative ἡβάω 'be in the prime of youth, etc.' in parallel to the pairs γηράσκω : γηράω and γενειάσκω : γενειάω, as already seen (Chapter 8 § 2.3). There is also -φαύςκω / -φόςκω, which in Classical Greek occurs in the forms διαφώςκω 'dawn' (Herodotus) and υποφαύςκω 'begin to shine' (Aristotle).

As with morphology, a few further small sets occur outside Plato which are not represented within his corpus. Some appear to form two semantically restricted classes. Firstly, as with Homer, there is a group of verbs of movement: two forms occur, both rare. There is the problematic βιβάσκω, apparently both 'go' and 'make go' (cf. Chapter 4 § 2.1.1); and also ισκω, perhaps an iterative of εἰμί 'go'.

There remains a group of forms which all involve the semantic field of speech and sound. The only verbs already seen which fit here are the suppletive φόςκω 'say' and, apparently in a figurative sense, πιφωςκω 'make manifest, declare'. Elsewhere in Classical Greek we find γεγονύςκω 'cry aloud; proclaim', λάςκω 'shout' and the dubious ὑλάςκω 'bark'.

A small group of five verbs is left over, which would deserve more extensive study of the sort which is not possible in this thesis. The present πιπίσκω 'give to drink, make drink' is a different type of causative from those just seen: it denotes causing another to perform a dynamic situation, not enter a state, and so is unsurprisingly not found beside an inchoative medio-passive or any stative perfect forms. Secondly, there is χάςκω 'gape', which out of context does not seem to be
an inchoative. The once attested 'μάσκω could be a causative if it means 'imprison',
but then how was it formed? Lastly, there are the two forms in -ισκω beside presents
in - ιω, κλησκομαί ‘be called’ and χρησκομαί ‘need’. The former may be
connected with κικλήσκω; but what of the latter?

3. Conclusions: Classical Greek - σκω

In Classical Greek, we find thirty-three verbs not found in Homer (eleven in
Plato, twenty-two elsewhere); including φάσκω, now found outside the imperfect,
this gives thirty-four in all.

Classical Greek shows quite clear-cut morphological distinctions for verbs in
- σκω. Pre-Classical formations do not necessarily fit easily into synchronic
categories, so that θυήσκω in particular was seen to be problematic. On the other
hand, in the Classical period, three major classes are all moderately productive:
formations with reduplication in - τ-, forms in - ισκω and lastly those with the same
stem throughout. The first type seems to be the way of forming verbs in - σκω from
monosyllabic stems: δρα- gives - διδράσκω, βρω- gives βιβρώσκομαι. Most
such stems are of the form CRV-, less commonly CV- (as εμ- πιπάσκομαι). A stem
whose non-present forms show - η- may form a present in - ισκω (οιδη- :
οιδίσκομαι), less frequently if they are in - ω- (άμβλω- : άμβλισκω); there are
also occasional verbs with stems in - ε- (ευρε- : ευρη- : ευρίσκω) and - εσ-
(κορε(σ)- : κορη- : κορίσκομαι). Lastly, vowel-final di- and trisyllabic stems
may form presents in - σκω simply by the addition of the latter suffix (άφε- :
άφέσκω); vowel alternation occurs at least for stems in - ά-, however, with a short
vowel being found before - σκω (ήβη- : ήβάσκω). In such cases a further present
in - άω is also found; this sub-type could be due to the model of γηρα- : γηράσκω.
The old pattern of derivation from a thematic aorist (as λάκ- ε/ο- : λάσκω) has
become unproductive; similarly rare is the apparently Ionic phenomenon of collaterals in -ισκω beside presents in -ιζω (χρηζω : χρηισκουμαι).

Semantically, the suffix -σκω has a role in Classical Greek which we did not see in Homer. Examination of data from Plato has illustrated that for five minimal pairs of present in -σκω beside an unmarked form, the suffix -σκ- has inchoative meaning: either a medio-passive in -σκομαι occurs with a possible causative alternant in -σκω, or there is an inchoative active in -σκω on its own. The distinction appears to involve the type of action concerned: ‘externally caused’ events are realised in the former way (μεθύσκω ‘make drunk’ : μεθύσκουμαι ‘become drunk’ : μεθύω ‘be drunk’), ‘internally caused’ ones in the latter (γενειάσκω ‘become bearded’ (never **‘make bearded’) : γενειάω ‘be bearded’). The rest of Classical Greek appears to furnish at least one more example: ἡβάσκω ‘come to puberty’ : ἡβάω ‘be in one’s prime’. Otherwise, -σκω appears to be used merely as a present formant, whether to create e.g. causative actives and medio-passive inchoatives (πινύσκω ‘make prudent’, πιπράσκουμαι ‘get sold’) or forms where there is no such opposition (ὁρέσκω ‘please’); in these cases, one meaning is found throughout each verb.

So far the analysis has been prevalently synchronic. It is now time to compare the results of this enquiry and reach some general conclusions on the type of development found in Greek verbs in -σκω.
Chapter 10
Conclusions

1. Introduction

In this final chapter, an attempt is made both to summarise previous conclusions and also to trace a line of development from early to Classical Greek. We must now ask: to what extent have the problems raised in Chapter 1 been solved, and what remains to be done?

2. The verbs in -σκω: semantic and morphological problems

From a Greek point of view, as we have seen, -σκω is a suffix used to form the present stem of certain verbs. In those verbs, other tenses such as aorists and perfects do not normally show -σκω, while presents and imperfects (which are built on the present stem) do. Very occasionally, -σκω is extended to tenses other than the present and the imperfect; but, in the vast majority of verbs, this does not occur. In itself this is not surprising: Greek inherited from Indo-European a verbal system in which the various 'tenses' had considerable independence. The extreme case is that of suppletive verbs (such as present ἐσθιω 'eat' beside aorist ἐφακιον), which use entirely different roots for different tenses. More frequent are those verbs which build all tenses on various forms of the same root or stem, but have a specific formant for the present, as in e.g. λαμβάνω : ἔλαβον; or in which the present is marked by reduplication, as in τίθημι : έθηκα. One should note that, in this type, the present stem is often morphologically 'marked' in contrast with the aorist. In Classical Greek, however, we observe the spread of a new 'regular' pattern, in which the aorist and the perfect stems are marked in contrast with a synchronically unmarked present: thus we have present τιμάω / τιμῶ but aorist ἐτίμησε, perfect τετίμηκα.¹

¹Obviously, even in this type of verb, the present may have once been marked by a special affix.
The verbs in -σκω belong to the same broad category as λαμβάνω (beside ἔλαβον), but their morphology is not straightforward. Most frequently, -σκω is simply added to the verbal stem, often in the zero grade, as in e.g. βάσκω or πάσκω; other verbs, however, add -σκω to a reduplicated form of the stem, as in γίνωσκω, and still others show an alternant -ίσκω, as in ἔψισκω. The questions we asked concerning the origin and status of the various forms were: are they inherited or are they Greek innovations? And what determines the choice of one or the other form?

The morphology of the verbs in -σκω seems problematic, but their semantics much more so. The various attempts at explaining what is characteristic of these verbs – or, in other terms, what meaning we should attribute to the formation – have reached different conclusions. Iterative, causative and inchoative meanings have all been cited, and it has also been necessary to acknowledge that sometimes the forms in -σκω do not differ in meaning from simple presents built on the same roots without the -σκω suffix. How are we to explain this apparent multiplicity of functions?

A third problem, which is both morphological and semantic, concerns the so-called iterative preterites. These verbal forms are found, essentially, in Homer and in Herodotus (as well as in literature influenced by these authors). They are inflected as (usually third person) imperfects but almost never show an augment, and are formed with a suffix -(e)σκον, which is added to the present or (more rarely) aorist stem, as in ἔχεσκον or δόσκον. We must treat these formations as separate from the presents in -σκω; yet it is impossible not to notice the morphological similarity, which should point to a common origin. These ‘iteratives’, however, raise semantic problems too. It has been suggested that they are indeed iterative in meaning, i.e. they indicate repeated events; but in some instances they have been claimed to be ‘intensive’. The real question is: what is their function and what is their link, if any, with the presents in -σκω? We may also wish to ask what status should be attributed
to them. Are they independent forms of present stems, or are they to be compared to modal forms? If the latter, could we say that καλέσκον is a 'mood' of καλέω?

3. Rationale of the thesis

I have deliberately avoided turning this thesis into a narrative account of the origins and development of the -σκ- forms in Greek. Both from a morphological and semantic point of view, the problems were too complicated and the data too messy to allow a simple account of the Greek situation; nor was there any certainty about the point of departure. While it is clear (as shown in Chapter 2) that Indo-European must have had a *-ske/o- present, since traces of it survived in so many Indo-European languages, not much in the way of semantic or even morphological clarification of the Greek data can come from our Indo-European reconstructions. The decision to concentrate on the detailed analysis of two corpora of data, the epic poems and Plato’s dialogues, was prompted by the desire to explore whether an inquiry limited to a specific corpus or period would lead to less contradictory results than those obtained until now. One might have hoped, for instance, that the multiplicity of meanings attributed to the formations in -σκ- would disappear if the data considered were only Plato’s, or if one concentrated on the earliest Greek evidence. The previous chapters have shown that that is not so. Some patterns have emerged, but they are not necessarily simple; nor are they entirely consistent. This does not imply that there is no development in Greek; rather, it merely means that the development is more complex than one might have guessed. In what follows, I shall try to summarise the results obtained, while introducing a more diachronic outlook than has been done so far.
4. Summary of results

4.1. The suffix *-ske/o- in Indo-European

In spite of the uncertainties concerning the function of Indo-European *-ske/o-*, it seems clear that it was a suffix used to form presents to roots which would normally yield root aorists. Such roots have here been referred to, as is traditional, as 'telic', and indeed this may well have been their meaning. It is thus likely that, at some stage of the Indo-European development, *-ske/o-* had some specific aspect-marking function. The question whether the meaning could be specified further so that it could be contrasted with that of other present-forming affixes was left unanswered, simply because the evidence did not seem adequate. Some more speculative suggestions will be made in § 4.5 below.

4.2. The earliest Greek evidence for *-ske/o- / -σκω

The first significant Greek evidence that we have, that of Homer, includes a mixture of archaisms and innovations. We find a few presents, such as βάςκω, which are built on the zero-grade of the root, have cognates in other languages and are likely to be inherited. We also have some new formations; above all, it seems likely that the reduplicated presents in -σκω (as γιγνωσκω, although ultimately inherited) are a Greek innovation. Their origin is not clear. It has been suggested that they may be due to the conflation of two different types of present, one with reduplication (*γ-γν-μι) and one in -σκω (*γν-σκo); alternatively, they may owe their reduplication to the model of other reduplicated forms of the verb. In favour of the first view, we may point out that, in set roots of the *CReH* type, the treatment of *CReH* and that of *CŘH* would merge in Greek, so that even if the reduplicated presents were built on *CReH- / *CŘH- and the verbs in *-ske/o-* on *CŘH-*, there would have been a morphological link between the two. On the other hand, the present κικλήσκω has a reduplicated aorist ἐκέκλετο, and indeed there are several
correspondences between reduplicated presents in -σκω and reduplicated aorists or
perfects (e.g. διδάσκω : δέδαξε and μιμησκομαί : μέμημαίι). We could then
envisage a sort of ‘morpheme replacement’ of the non-present ε-reduplication with the
present i-reduplication. In the discussion in Chapter 3 (§ 4.3), no choice was made
between the two alternative hypotheses, and we should not exclude the possibility that
the creation of these reduplicated presents is in fact due to a variety of causes
including those just mentioned. What we should note is that the creation of a new
type implies a certain level of productivity: i.e., at the time when the reduplicated
verbs in -σκω arose, the latter suffix was presumably productive.2

The second pre-Homeric innovation seems to lead to the creation of the type in
-ισκω, as in εὑρίσκω. This is very moderately attested in Homer (four verbs, each
only once), and it is likely that forms such as θυσκω with apparently added -ι- are
due to later respellings in the manuscripts. The origin of -ισκω is similarly far from
certain, and a number of alternative hypotheses have been mentioned. The suggestion
preferred here is that the -ι- developed as an anaptyctic vowel to avoid such forms as
εὑρισκω.

4.3. The Classical Greek developments: morphology

The exact origin of these new forms of the verbs in -σκω is unclear, but their
development is interesting. In Homer, reduplicated verbs could have both forms of
the μιμησκω type (from old set roots) and forms of the διδάσκω, τιτύσκομαί
type. In later Greek, some of the old verbs survive (γινώσκω, μιμησκω, 
διδάσκω); but there is also some expansion which is firmly morphology-led. The
new reduplicated verbs are all built to roots with long vowels, usually (in Plato,
always) from stems of the form CRV-; the model must have been provided by forms

2We leave aside here the difficult occasional forms with e-reduplication in the present: cf. Chapter 3
§ 5.
like γιννώσκω and μμανήσκω. Hence, we find in Plato the new forms ἀπο- διδράσκω, τιτρώσκω and πτιπράσκομαι. We see here the beginning of a paradigm which aims at regularity but does not quite attain it (see Chapter 7 § 2.6). The important fact, however, is that these verbs share morphological features which we have no reason to believe were linked to semantic characteristics: the morphology is sufficient to determine the type of present required.

In contrast with the reduplicated forms, the suffix - ἵσκω is expanded in an innovatory way. It was found to be useful for creating presents from consonant-final stems, and such stems often had non-present forms in - η-; in this way, paradigms arose where presents in - ἵσκω occurred beside such forms in - η-, as well as in - ω- and - ε(σ)-. The only example of this type in Homer is ἐπαυρ- ἵσκομαι: ἐπαυρ- ἦσομαι (each attested once); we also find Homeric ἐψρ- ἵσκω (once) beside ἐψρ- ἦσω (h.Merc. 302). In such cases in Classical Greek, presents in - ἐω or - όω often also existed, so that we find such sets as στερη- : στερ- ἐω : στερ- ἵσκω, and ἄμαυρω- : ἄμαυρ- ὀω : ἄμαυρ- ἵσκω. A consonantal stem is no longer a requirement for a form in - ἵσκω in the Classical era: we find κυ- ἵσκομαι from κυη-. As noted above, a further complication is that our manuscripts and, less commonly, inscriptions and papyri, give unexpected forms with added - ι-, most notably θυνήσκω for θυνήσκω; this was probably due to confusion of vowels of similar sounds at a post-Homeric period.

Homer also presents us with further forms, of uncertain origin (such as ἀλδησκω) and even almost entirely inexplicable (as δειδίσκομαι). Without earlier evidence, these instances remain indecipherable. When Classical Greek is viewed synchronically, forms which appear not to fit clear patterns can be understood as relics of earlier periods: θυνήσκω was found to be such in Plato, and forms from thematic aorists first attested early in the Classical period, such as χάσκω, also appear to have been formed on pre-Classical patterns.
To summarise: reduplicated forms in - σκω are fairly productive in Homer, formations in - ἵσκω less so; the reverse is true of Classical Greek. Yet there remains to be explained one more Classical morphological class, the ‘same-stem’ presents, where one verbal stem occurs throughout the paradigm and so before - σκω. The answer is surely that, just as in the Homeric period we find that εὔρ- σω gives rise to εὔρ- ἵσκω, so in Classical Greek, with the spread of the sigmatic aorist at the expense of the thematic one, aorist ἰρε- σα gives rise to ἰρε- σκω. No formations are found of this type from monosyllabic stems in the Classical period; this class is, it seems, in complementary distribution with the reduplicated type, where only monosyllabic stems occur.

We asked earlier what determined the distribution of the various types of verbs in - σκω. The answer is surely that, whatever the origin of the reduplicated and - ἵσκω types, their survival and/or spread was mainly determined by morphological reasons. In other words, we should not ask whether the various types have different meanings or functions; in the Classical period at least, the choice is fundamentally determined by the need to establish regular morphological patterns. The evidence is not very rich but, on the strength of the data that we have, it is also possible to conclude that the distinction between the different classes with reduplication, - ἵσκω and straight - σκω is phonological and morphological, but not semantic.

4.4. The semantics of - σκω
4.4.1. The general problems

We saw above that the semantic difficulties were extremely problematic. A close analysis of our two corpora reveals that it is not possible to accept one of the standard meanings proposed as basic for verbs in - σκω: causative, inchoative or iterative. It is undoubtedly true that verbs such as διδάσκω ‘teach, cause to learn’ or μνημήσκω ‘remind’ are causative, but such forms as βάσκω ‘come’, εὔρισκω
'find' and κικλήσκω 'call' are not. Verbs like ἀλησκω 'grow', γηράσκω 'become old' and θνήσκω 'die' can be called inchoative; but, again, not all verbs in -σκω show this meaning. Scholars cannot be blamed if they give up in despair when confronted with these inconsistencies.

However, some regular patterns can be identified, though so far not much has been made of them. First of all, it is clear that, frequently, one and the same verb appears with causative and inchoative meanings: μιμνήσκω 'remind': μιμνήσκομαι 'remember', διδάσκω 'teach, cause to learn': διδάσκομαι 'get taught, learn'. Secondly, it is well known that in a number of languages there is a close link between inchoatives and causatives: 'to cause X to become black' implies 'X changes state and becomes black'. In English there is a syntactic but not morphological contrast between the elements involved in this causative-inchoative alternation: hence I broke the vase is causative, but the vase broke is inchoative. In Greek, a similar alternation is represented by the examples quoted above: μιμνήσκω 'remind' beside μιμνήσκομαι 'remember', where one form indicates change of state, the other causing a change of state. In other words, we do not need to discuss whether these verbs are inchoatives or causatives, because they are predictably both.

However, the question arises whether it is the suffix -σκω which marks these verbs as inchoative or causative. This seems unlikely on two grounds: firstly, exactly the same alternation occurs with verbs which have no such suffix, though they too alternate between active and medio-passive; cf. e.g. the Homeric example of active διασκίδνημι 'make scattered, scatter' beside the medio-passive σκίδνομαι 'get scattered, scatter' (Chapter 4 § 5). In other words, the alternation of meaning is a feature of voice, not of the presence or absence of -σκ- . Secondly, in both Homer and Plato, causativity and inchoativity are typical of all forms in the paradigm and not only of the present stem, although this is the only stem marked by -σκω. Thus μιμνήσκω and μιμνησσα are both causative, γηράσκω and ἐγηρα / ἐγηράσσα both
Finally, not all verbs in -σκω are inchoative or causative. The conclusion must be that the basic meaning of -σκω is neither causative nor inchoative. If so, can these verbs in -σκω be iterative? In this case, the difficulty is that a number of such verbs show no sign of iterative meaning. The question also arises, although so far we have not dealt with it, of the so-called ‘iteratives’ in -(e)σκον. If these are to be kept apart from the presents in -σκω and their name is in any way deserved, we should not assume that the -σκω suffix of the present also marks iterativity. If it did, forms such as Homeric βοσκεσκονθ' with a double suffix -σκ- would be very strange indeed. We return to the basic question: what is the meaning of -σκω?

From a semantic point of view, there is some considerable difference between the data of Homer and those of Plato. A thorough and perhaps overdetailed analysis of Homer shows that, in Homer, the verbs in -σκω are not a consistent category; nor is it possible to attribute a unitary meaning to them. They have, however, one function in common: -σκω forms a present stem from roots which in other tenses do not have this additional suffix. If the word synchronic can be used for the epic language, we must conclude that, in Homer, -σκω synchronically indicates a present stem, and that it is not possible to provide a further definition which is not contradicted by a substantial part of the data. The crucial point that supports this view is that the same stem can yield presents with or without -σκω but which do not seem to differ in meaning, as with κικλησκω beside κολεω. We might then ask why there should be a suffix with no meaning; this, however, is a question which requires a historical account, and the explanation lies perhaps in the original distribution and function of -σκελο-. It was pointed out earlier that a preponderance of presents in -σκελο- belong with root or thematic aorists, i.e. with aorists which are likely to have originated from root aorists. In the view of the Indo-European verb followed here (cf. Hoffmann 1970, and further Chapter 2 § 4.3), the roots which yielded root aorists
needed to be aspectually redefined in order to yield present stems; and the formal expression of this redefinition was the addition of infixes or suffixes to the basic root. It is then possible to assume that in late Indo-European and Proto-Greek, i.e. before Homer, *-ske/o- fulfilled exactly this function. By Homer’s time the situation was changing; indeed, even before Homer, the meaning or function of *-ske/o-/-σκ- had undergone so much attrition that we find that the presents ἀλίσκω, βόσκω, μύσγω and διδάσκω behave as if -σκω were not an additional suffix but an integral part of the root, which is thus extended to other tenses and even to nominal derivatives.

4.4.2. From Homer to Plato

We do not expect to find exactly the same semantic patterns in Homer and Plato, but the analyses of Chapters 4 and 8 reveal similarities as well as differences, which were not entirely predictable before our inquiry began.

We may begin with the similarities. Firstly, in the Classical period, a number of verbs in -σκω attested in Homer are still in use; and, if we stated for these and other verbs that in Plato too -σκω is simply a present-forming suffix, we would not be too far from the truth. The difference, however, is that by Plato’s time the standard productive paradigm is one in which aorist and perfect are morphologically marked but the present is not; in other words, the system has changed, and the older verbs tend to become morphological oddities.

Secondly, Plato, as Homer, has clear causative-inchoative alternations tied to a contrast of active and medio-passive. Here too, as in Homer, the inchoative meaning is not only found in the present. Thus the present ἀλίσκωμαι is inchoative, but so are future ἀλώσομαι and aorist ἐἀλων. However, Plato also has examples of causative-inchoative pairs which do not belong in the Homeric pattern. The contrast μεθύσκω ‘make drunk’ : μεθύσκομαι ‘become drunk’ could be seen as an example of causative-inchoative alternation tied to voice; however, in Plato we must
also reckon with a present μεθ’ω ‘be drunk’. If we start from the pair μεθ’ωσκω / μεθ’ω then we must admit that, at this stage, and differently from Homer, we have reasons to treat the suffix -σκ- as a marker of inchoativity. Yet we can in no way regard this inchoative function of -σκω as inherited; rather, it is an innovation, and we may therefore be able to trace a model. This is probably provided by a verb like γηράσκω; the latter is attested as early as Homer with an inchoative meaning ‘become old’, which it shares, however, with the aorist εγηρα. Later on, a sigmatic aorist εγηράσσα replaces the earlier εγηρα and a new present (κοτο)γηραω is created; this, as shown in Chapter 8, indicates a continuous process or state of growing old. It seems certain that γηράσκω is the model for γενειάσκω ‘grow a beard’, which is contrasted with γενειάω ‘have a beard’, and that ἡβάσκω is also created from here. Eventually, μεθ’ωσκομαι / μεθ’ω come to fit within this pattern. Morphologically, the creation of γηραω regularises the paradigm, bringing it into line with the new model of such verbs as τιμαω, where non-present tense stems such as aorist and perfect are marked, but not presents. Semantically, therefore, the tendency is to emphasise the inchoative character of the forms in -σκω, to differentiate them from the simpler presents. At this stage, -σκω has become an inchoative suffix – but in some verbs only. Elsewhere, inchoativity remains entirely tied to voice.

In spite of changes and remodellings, Plato and Homer both show what looks like a morphosyntactical oddity; why do we have a verb like γηράσκω with a clear inchoative meaning but which is active? It is unlikely that this is a mere freak firstly because it survives from Homer to Plato, and secondly as it is even a model for new forms such as γενειάσκω, where the inchoative is also firmly in the active.

In these cases, we are not only dealing with an unexpected active instead of a medio-passive, but also with the absence of a causative to match the inchoative. The explanation this time is not morphological, but semantic. It can be argued that verbs
which refer to events that are 'internally caused' behave differently from verbs which refer to 'externally caused' events. The contrast between, for example, μέθοσκω / μεθοσκομαι on the one hand and γνασκω on the other is parallel to the English contrast between transitive and intransitive 'break' (he broke a vase vs. the vase broke) and English intransitive only 'blush' (he blushed but not **she blushed him).

From this point of view, Homer and Plato show the same features; and so the creation of an inchoative suffix -σκ- in Classical Greek does not alter the way in which voice contrasts are exploited.

4.5. The development of *-skelo- revisited

We can now attempt to trace a much broader picture of the Greek development of the verbs in -σκω. The starting point must be a late Indo-European or perhaps very early Proto-Greek stage at which *-skelo- / -σκ- formed present stems to roots which otherwise yielded root or thematic aorists. At that point, presumably, the addition of the suffix altered the aspectual character of the root. When we begin to have real Greek evidence, -σκω is still a present-forming suffix which is often, but not always, associated with root or thematic aorists. It is doubtful, however, that it still had its original aspectual characteristics since, on the one hand, we find verbs like βόσκω and διδάσκω in which -σκ- has become part of the stem and is found in nominal derivatives or non-present forms; and, on the other, the presents in -σκω come to be associated with sigmatic aorists as well. On the basis of the Early Greek evidence it seems impossible to attribute a specific meaning (iterative, inchoative, causative, and so on) to the presents in -σκω, firstly because no proposal fits all the data, and secondly as there are instances of simple presents (such as καλέω) and presents in -σκο (as κικλήσκω) which do not show any semantic contrast.

Moreover, it is possible to argue that the causative-inchoative meanings often linked to -σκω must in fact be associated with voice alternation; the causatives are generally
active, the inchoatives medio-passive. That -σκω is not merely a fossilised morpheme is shown by a few morphological innovations which are moderately productive: the reduplicated forms in -σκω (as γιγνώσκω) and the verbs in -ίσκω (as εὑρίσκω).

For the later stage, we might expect either the disappearance or the restructuring and expansion of -σκω, but the normal conservatism of Greek prevents either solution. In the Classical period, a number of older formations in -σκω are preserved, though they tend to be integrated in more regular paradigms. Thus presents in -ίσκω appear when other tenses have a stem in -η-. In fact, it seems that an attempt to regularise the morphology leads to the creation of a few new formations. At the same time we notice that, from a morphological point of view, verbs like βάσκω, γιγνώσκω and εὑρίσκω, all of which must have been created at a pre-Homeric stage, are now highly irregular. The new tendency is to mark aorists and perfects and to have synchronically unmarked presents, as in e.g. τιμάω / τιμῶ beside ἐτίμησα, τετίμηκα. However, the real innovation is a semantic one. In Plato we find minimal pairs of the type μεθύσκω 'make drunk', μεθύσκομαι 'become drunk': μεθύω 'be drunk', στερίσκομαι 'lose': στέρομαι 'be without' (cf. also στερίσκω 'deprive'), γενειάσκω 'begin to get a beard': γενειάω 'have a beard' and γηράσκω 'become old': γηράω 'grow old(er), age' (where the latter is not inchoative). This would not have happened in Homer; we must assume that, for a series of different reasons, models like Homeric γηράσκω led to the creation of a real -σκω inchoative – once again an innovation, not a survival.

If correct, this picture of Greek development answers some of the questions asked in our introduction. But is this a full and coherent account of the facts? It may be coherent but it is not full, since it leaves unexplained a crucial fact, the existence in Homer and Herodotus of the 'iterative' preterites. As we have seen, in Homer these form a category of their own, separated from the presents: but are we prepared to
believe that there is no original link between the presents in -σκω of the βάσκω type and the iteratives of the ἔχεσκον type? If such a link exists, the account just given is defective, because it does not make clear how from a mere present-forming suffix *-skel/o- becomes a marker of iterative preterites. In Chapter 5, it was argued that the semantic contrast between serial forms like κτείνεσκε ‘used to kill’, normally termed iterative, and the so-called intensive νοιεσκον ‘used to dwell’ is in fact lexically determined. The intensives belong to verbs which indicate a state, and it was suggested that the -(ε)σκον forms had a unitary meaning which was realised as serial (i.e. repeated) in dynamic situations and as continuous (i.e. non-serial) in stative ones. If so, we can also say that the iterative preterites are semantically distinguished by a feature ‘+ REPEATED’. But how old is this feature? Can it be a Greek innovation? The iteratives are clearly in decline, since they do not survive beyond Homer and Herodotus; it would be reasonable to assume that, partly at least, they continue an archaic category, although it seems certain that Homer has also innovated here. If we then wish to assume that the iterative preterites and the presents in -σκω have a common origin, we are left in an awkward situation: on the one hand we reconstruct a mere present-forming suffix with no specific iterative character, on the other we reconstruct a suffix characterised by the feature ‘+REPEATED’. Such a suffix could be usefully added to aoristic roots to form presents; on the other hand, if forms like the perhaps inherited ἐσκον are indeed old, it could also have been added to stative roots to give them ‘intensive’ value. At a later, but still pre-Homeric, stage, semantic attrition may well have deprived the suffix of its original value. Nonetheless, we wish to argue that these suffixes were originally the same.

The plausible (and of course highly speculative) solution is that we start with a suffix which did indeed mark repetition; the parallelism with Hittite would support this view. Such a suffix could usefully be added to aoristic roots to form presents, but at a pre-Homeric stage it may well have lost its original value and become a mere
marker of present tense. At the same time, we must assume that a subset of forms in
*-skel/o- / -σκω retained a value similar to the original one, and turned into a special
category of iterative preterites which were closer to verbal moods than to verbal
tenses. How this split occurred is far from clear, but it would be possible to claim that
this is a text-book example of change: on the one hand an old meaning or function is
retained in a marginal category (the iterative preterites); on the other, the new, more
productive category, that of the presents in -σκω, has lost its semantic substance. In
a similar way, English ‘will’ became an auxiliary but in specific contexts still retains
its original semantic value; hence ‘Do what you will’ and ‘Shall I help you?’ beside
‘Will I help you?’. The loss of semantic substance in a process of grammaticalisation
is a well known phenomenon; but we have also argued that, by the Classical period,
-σκω acquired real inchoative value – in a few verbs at least. If this suggestion is
correct, then we are confronted with a less frequent phenomenon, even if a not
entirely unexpected one.

4.6. Closing remarks

In spite of its length, this thesis has not covered the whole field. It would be
useful to study the evidence of authors other than Homer and Plato, and to extend the
analysis to a much later period; it would also be interesting to consider in much
greater depth the way in which voice contrasts express the causative-inchoative
alternation. However, even at the present stage, it seems clear that enough has been
done to put in doubt any attempt at semantic reconstruction of Indo-European which
is based on an inchoative or causative meaning of Greek -σκω, or on a purely
intensive value of the iterative preterites; on the other hand, a case can be made,
however speculative, for an iterative value of *-skel/o- in late Indo-European. We
argued above (§ 3) that in this instance Indo-European was not likely to clarify the
Greek data; this does not exclude that the reverse may be true.
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