



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

The development of the Proto-Indo-European syllabic liquids in Greek

Beek, L.C. van

Citation

Beek, L. C. van. (2013, December 17). *The development of the Proto-Indo-European syllabic liquids in Greek*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/22881>

Version: Corrected Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/22881>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/22881> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation

Author: Beek, Lucien van

Title: The development of the Proto-Indo-European syllabic liquids in Greek

Issue Date: 2013-12-17

10. The reflex of **l* in Ionic-Attic and in the other dialects

In this chapter, I will discuss the development of the lateral liquid in interconsonantal position, still keeping in mind the early vocalization to -αλ- in some environments (e.g. in front of a laryngeal, section 1.2). It is beyond doubt that the Proto-Ionic reflex of **l* was *a*-colored. Upon the traditional view, the regular outcome is -λα-; the aim of this chapter is to examine whether -αλ- can really be excluded. In general, there is much less evidence than for **r*, which makes it difficult to draw a definite conclusion. Many potential examples appear to be inconclusive for various reasons: the etymology is not compelling (section 10.1), the form may have levelled the slot of the full grade (section 10.2), or it does not contain the direct, regular reflex of **l* for another reason (section 10.3). There are only a few possible pieces of evidence (section 10.4). The evidence for a special vocalization of **l* in front of a nasal is treated in section 10.5.

10.1 Unknown, doubtful, or uncertain etymologies

Since the etymology of the following words is doubtful or unknown, they will be left out of consideration: ἄφλαστον ‘curved poop of a ship’ (*Il.*, Hdt.), γλάμων, γλαμυρός ‘blear-eyed’ (com.), θάλλω ‘to heat’ (*Od.*+), κάλπη ‘trot’ (Paus., Plu.), κλαδαρός ‘weak, handicapped’ (late), λάξ adv. ‘with the heel’ (Hom.+), λαπαρός ‘slack, hollow’ (Hp. Arist.), λαπάρη ‘flank of the body’ (*Il.*+), πλαδαρός ‘humid, damp, weak, flaccid’ (Hp., A. R.), πλαδάω ‘to be flaccid’ (Hp.+), φλαδεῖν them. aor. ‘to be rent’ (hapax, A. *Choe.* 28), φλάω ‘to bruise, crush’ (Pi.+). For a discussion of these words, I refer to the etymological dictionaries.

The following middle pf. formations are analogical creations on the basis of other stems with a full grade: ἐπὶ ... ἐτέταλτο (2x Hom.), mid. pf. of ἐπιτέλλω ‘to enjoin sth. on sbd., give a command to sbd.’, ἔσταλμαι (*Scut.*, A., Hdt.+), mid. pf. of στέλλω ‘to prepare, equip’. Note that τέλλω etymologically belongs to a root ending in a laryngeal, **telh₂-* ‘to carry’ (for ἐπιτέλλω, cf. G. *auftragen*).

For other words that have been reconstructed with **l*, there are important reasons to doubt the reconstruction. I will discuss these cases in alphabetical order.

A probable substrate word is As. αὔλακα ‘furrow’ (Hes., Pi.+), ἄλοκα (trag.), ὄλκα (Hom.).¹¹⁴⁹ The traditional etymology (see Frisk s.v. ἄλοξ, *LIV*² s.v. **h₂uelk-*) derives these words from the root underlying Lith. *vilkti*, 1s. *velkù* ‘to draw’, OCS 1s. *vlěkŭ* ‘to drag’, Av. *varak-* ‘to draw’, which was reconstructed by Schindler (1972) as **h₂uelk-* (with **h₂-*) on the evidence of the Greek substantive. Assuming that Hom. ὄλκα continues **ἄφολκα*, it has been derived, together with αὔλακα, from an ablauting paradigm PGr. As. **awolk-m*, Gs. **awlk-os*. But even if this is granted, it would remain unclear why ἄλοκα (if with “Aeolic” vocalization -λο-) has no trace of digamma, as in Hom. *ταλαυρῖνος*: to assume a reshaping of **ἄολκ-* to ἄλοκ- (see Frisk l.c.) is *ad hoc*. Moreover, there are other dialectal by-forms like Dor. *εὐλάκᾱ* and glosses such as *αὐλάχα*, ὄλοκες (Hsch.). It is not possible, therefore, to reduce the Greek forms to one proto-form. Beekes (*EDG* q.v.) concludes, probably rightly, that the word is Pre-Greek.

The sound word κλαγγή ‘piercing sound, cry’ (*Il.*+), root noun Ds. κλαγγί (Ibyc.), with a derived verb (pres. κλάζω < **klang-je/o-*, aor. κλάγξαι) may well be onomatopoeic, and it would be unwise to build any hypothesis on it. Lat. *clangere* ‘to cry’ (pres. only) and the Gm.

¹¹⁴⁹ The Ns. is not attested in Archaic and Classical Greek.

group of ON *hlakka* ‘id.’ have been compared, but if the group is onomatopoeic, it is better to depart from an original form with **a* than from a pre-form with **l̥*.¹¹⁵⁰ Within Greek, another old form of the verb is the intensive perfect κέκληγα (Hom.+), and the them. aor. κλαγεῖν (B., E.) may have been secondarily derived from it. Alternatively, this could point to a root **kleh₂g-* with a secondary (presentic?) origin of the nasal.

The substantive κλάδος (m.) ‘branch’ (Ion.-Att., also attested as a ntr. s-stem and in isolated forms as a root noun κλαδ-) has been compared with the Germanic group of ON and OE *holt* (n.) ‘wood; forest’, and reconstructed as PIE **k_ld-o-*. Although the formations are compatible and the meanings are highly similar, this etymology does not seem certain. The comparison with κράδη ‘branch’, κραδάω ‘to swing’ (Beekes, *EDG* s.v. κλάδος) deserves consideration. As Beekes remarks, “... it may be accidental that all [Germanic and Greek] forms can be derived from **kldo-*, since κλάδος can also be connected within Greek with κραδάω, which points to an interchange *p/λ* and therefore to substrate origin”. For this reason, it is better not to include κλάδος among the prime evidence.¹¹⁵¹

The adjective λάσιος means ‘hairy, shaggy (of animals, of the human chest); overgrown, wooded (of land)’ (Il.+), and occurs in the compound λασιάυχην ‘with hairy neck’ (h. Merc.).¹¹⁵² The first meaning is matched in Celtic (OIr. *folt* ‘hair’ < PCl. **wolto-*), the second in Germanic (G. *Wald*, OE *weald* < **wóltu-*).¹¹⁵³ If λάσιος were to be derived from a PIE **w_lt-o-*, we would only have a root etymology. Moreover, another word for ‘hair’ is **wolkō-*, attested in Skt. *válsa-* ‘sprout, twig’, Av. *varəsa-* ‘hair (on the head)’, Ru. *vólos* ‘hair’, etc.¹¹⁵⁴ One of the roots **wolt-* and **wolk-* may have influenced the other, and it does not seem wise to try and reconstruct the proto-form of λάσιος as **w_lt-io-*.

The substantive λάχνη ‘frizzy or curly hair’ (e.g. of a sheep’s fleece or the human chest), traditionally reconstructed as **w_lk-sn-ā-* (Pokorny s.v. **uel-* 4). Even if a root **uolk-* ‘hair’ is indeed attested in Balto-Slavic (e.g. Ru. *vólos* ‘hair’, *voloknó* ‘fibre’) and Indo-Iranian (e.g. Ved. *válsa-* ‘sprout, twig’), the lack of precise cognate formations is disturbing (see also on λάσιος).

Another feasible, inner-Greek connection exists with the adjective (fem. only) λάχεια ‘wooded, hairy’ (Hom.), as a first member in λαχύ-φλοιος ‘with a hairy rind’ (v.l. in Nic. *Al.* 269), and perhaps with ἀμφιλαχαίνω ‘to weed’ (*Od.*). The etymology of this second group has been extensively discussed by de Lamberterie (1975; 1990: 732-42). He plausibly compared λόχος ‘ambush’ < ‘bush, thicket’; moreover, he compared -νη in λάχνη with the suffix -vo- found in θάμνος ‘thicket’ and in πυκνός ‘densely grown’. Against the traditional reconstruction **w_lk-sn-ā-*, he argues that an initial digamma is excluded by the Homeric attestations (1990: 733). It is impossible to reconstruct a common PIE pre-form on the basis of the Greek evidence, which points to a root *λαχ-* / *λοχ-* (1990: 741-2). Thus, until more specific arguments are found, λάχνη cannot be counted among the evidence for **l̥*.

The adjective μαλθακός ‘soft, mild, weak’ is often compared with the Germanic adjective for ‘mild’, found e.g. in OHG. *milti*, Goth. *unmildjai*. A by-form μόλθακος is attested in Lesbian poetry (Alcaeus). It is supposed to be related to μάλθη (Hippon., Crat., S.), also μάλθᾱ (Ar. *fr.* 157), which is a technical term for a mixture of wax and pitch used for caulking ships, but which also more generally means ‘wax’ (S. *Ich.* 140), and could therefore

¹¹⁵⁰ For an extensive discussion of this group, cf. Tichy (1983: 41-48).

¹¹⁵¹ κλάδος may have been connected with the verb κλάω, aor. -κλάσαι ‘to break’ in Greek by folk etymology, as ‘that which is pruned’. But it cannot be etymologically related, because the verb is attested in Homer as -κλών, inf. -κλᾶν < PGr. **klāie/o-*.

¹¹⁵² Blanc (*DELG* Supp. q.v., following a suggestion of Bader) distinguishes λάσιος ‘hairy’ from λάσιος ‘willing’ in the formula λάσιον κῆρ, a formal term of address preceded by the genitive of a PN (Il. 2.851 and 16.554), which would originally mean ‘strong-willed heart’. However, his etymological reconstructions are untenable.

¹¹⁵³ For these, and possible Slavic cognates, see *GEW*, *DELG* and *EDG* s.v. λάσιος.

¹¹⁵⁴ In Slavic, the root is also found in depalatalized form before the suffix -no- (Ru. *voloknó* ‘fibre’, etc.).

be derived from *‘soft stuff’, cf. also Suda s.v. μάλθη. There is further the noun μάλθων (ascribed to Socrates in Stobaeus 4.15.16), denoting a “softy” as opposed to ἐργάτης in the sense of a hard-working man.

The meanings attested for μαλθακός are diverse. When it modifies object nouns, we find it referring to soft soil, cushions, skin, limbs, etc. But more often, the word is used metaphorically, either negatively (cowardly warriors, etc.) or positively (soothing words, mild sleep, etc.). It is possible that the ending of μαλθακός (which acc. to *LSJ* s.v. is a poetic word) was influenced by μαλακός (the prose word). It is unclear, however, which formation should be reconstructed for the adjective, and whether the comparison with Gmc. **mild-* is pertinent. Moreover, it is not obvious at all that the dialectal difference Ion. μαλθακός ~ Lesb. μολθακος goes back to a zero grade root: compare the dialectal distribution of καθαρός ~ κοθαρός (see section 9.4).

The adjective πλάγιος (Pi.+) ‘athwart, oblique, sideways’, substantivized as τὰ πλάγια ‘the flanks’, of the body but especially of an army (Hdt., Th.+), has no good IE etymology. It is perhaps to be connected with the root πλαγγ- ‘go astray’ in πλάζω, πλάγχθη; see below. Hom. ἔκπαγλος ‘terrible, outrageous’, if from **-plaglo-*, may belong here, too. The post-Hom. meaning ‘wondrous, amazing’ (Pi., trag.+), ἐκπαγλέομαι (Hdt.+) ‘be struck with amazement’, may be older and the Homeric use due to semantic bleaching.

The verb πλάζω, ἐπλάγχθη (root πλαγγ-) means ‘to turn sth. away from, thwart, make deviate’ in the active voice, and ‘to go astray, waver, wander’ in the middle. It is clearly the epic and poetic synonym of the prose form πλανάομαι. Frisk compares Lat. *plangō* (*plānxi*, *plānctus*) ‘to beat, strike; mourn’, assuming that the Greek meaning ‘to drive astray’ developed from ‘to beat off track’.¹¹⁵⁵ However, the Greek comparandum to Lat. *plangō* and Goth. *faiflokun* is clearly πλήσσω, πληῖξαι, πληγήναι, with same the duality of meanings, ‘to beat’ and ‘to beat the chest, mourn’. Frisk explains the root-internal nasal of πλάγχθη as deriving from the present stem, but there are no clear parallels for this process within Greek. Moreover, the nasal disappeared by regular sound change in the present πλάζω, so that the root was simply πλαγγ-. There is also a semantic gap between ‘to beat’ and ‘to go astray’. Therefore, this etymology has little to recommend itself. I suspect that the interchange between the roots *plang-* (ἐπλάγχθη), *plag-* (πλάγιος ‘athwart’), and *plak-* (Class. ἀμπλακεῖν, ἀμβλακεῖν ‘to err’) points to a substrate origin.¹¹⁵⁶

πλάξ, -κος (S., E.+) ‘flat surface (of the sea, the flank or flat top of a mountain, etc.)’ has been compared with a North Germanic word for ‘surface’, ON *flær* (f.pl.) ‘rocky plateau’ < PGm. **flahiz* (root noun), sg. *fló* < PGm. **flahō* (secondary *ā*-stem), and with a Baltic word for ‘flat’, Latv. *plakt* ‘to become flat, diminish, etc.’, Lith. *plàkti* ‘to beat’, *plākanas* ‘flat’. This comparison is possible only if we assume ablaut *o/Ø* in a PIE root noun **pl(o)k-* ‘surface’. This example must remain uncertain, however, since πλάξ is not attested in Homer and frequent in Greek toponyms: cf. the Πλάκα in downtown Athens, and the mountain name Πλάκος (Il.). Substrate origin cannot be excluded.

The verb πλάσσω ‘to shape, provide with a form, = Lat. *fungo*’ (Hes.+), with πλαστός ‘kneaded’, has no clear etymology. The root probably ended in -θ-, in view of the compounds in -πλάθος ‘-maker’ (Pl., Isoc.). Within Greek, a connection with πλάθανον ‘cake mould’ is possible, but not certain; this form could contain the instrument suffix -ανον.

¹¹⁵⁵ This comparison was recently accepted by de Vaan (*EDL* s.v.).

¹¹⁵⁶ See Beekes (*EDG* s.vv. ἀμπλακίσκω, πλάγιος, and πλάζω), who takes over my suggestion to reconstruct a Pre-Greek verbal root *(a)^mplaⁿk- on the basis of these comparisons. I have also included πλάνη ‘errand’ in the comparison, assuming a root-final nasal velar *-ŋ-, but this is much more hypothetical.

10.2 Cases of -λα- and -αλ- influenced by a full grade form

The outcome of a number of forms with **l* provides evidence for the color of the anaptyctic vowel, but not necessarily for its place, because the full grade slot may have been introduced in the vocalized zero grade. An adjectival root *ἀλπ-* is found in the following forms:

(1) ἔπαλπνος ‘cheerful, happy’ (*LSJ*), only in *Pi. Pyth.* 8.84, τοῖς οὔτε νόστος ὁμῶς ἔπαλπνος (...) κρίθη ‘for whom no homecoming as happy as yours was decided (...)’.

(2) the superlative ἄλπνιστος, only attested in the scholia to *Pi. Isthm.* 5.12, where the mss. have the corrupt (while unmetrical) form ⁺ἀνέλπιστος. The passage reads: “there are truly two things alone that foster the finest sweetness (ἄωτον ... τὸν ἄλπνιστον) of life in blossoming prosperity: (...)”. Wackernagel (1910) suggested to correct the form to ἄλπιστος. This form is indeed found in Aeschylus (*Pers.* 982), where it was traditionally interpreted as a proper name Ἄλπιστος, carried by a high-ranking Persian officer who is called “eye” of the King. In his edition of the *Persae*, West proposes to read παῖδ’ ἄλπιστον, with the appellative that is missing in the Pindaric passage. This seems attractive, because Pindar’s ἄωτον ... τὸν ⁺ἄλπνιστον is mirrored in the Aeschylean passage: Περσῶν τὸν ἄωτον, τὸν σὸν πιστὸν πάντ’ ὀφθαλμόν, μυρία μυρία πεμπαστάν, Βατανώχου παῖδ’ ἄλπιστον (...).¹¹⁵⁷ The form ἄλπνιστον must then probably be ascribed to an attempt by the scholiasts to relate the form ἄλπιστον to ἔπαλπνος.

(3) ἀρπαλέος ‘desirable’ (*Od.*), with dissimilation and with folk-etymological aspiration taken from ἀρπάζω ‘to rob, snatch away’. The meaning may have been influenced by that of ἀρπάζω already in Homer, where ἀρπαλέος occurs three times (*Od.* 6.250, 14.110 as in adv. in -έως, and *Od.* 8.164 as an adj.).¹¹⁵⁸ The older meaning ‘desirable’ is clear in the last-mentioned passage. Moreover, the gloss ἀλπαλέον· ἀγαπητόν ‘cherished, adorable’ (Hsch.) attests the undissimilated form.

As for the etymology of these adjectival forms, it is commonly accepted that they have a zero grade root corresponding to ἔλπομαι ‘to hope for, desire’.¹¹⁵⁹ The only possible cognate of ἔλπομαι is Lat. *volup* (adv.) ‘with pleasure’, which excellently fits the meaning of ἀρπαλέος.¹¹⁶⁰ This reconstruction implies that ἔπαλπνος is an Epic or Ionic word, because one would normally expect a reflex of the word-initial digamma in Pindar. Loss of digamma also has to be assumed for ἀρπαλέος in *Od.* 8.164. The added prefix ἐπ- is also attested in the compounded verb ἐπιέλπομαι ‘to hope for’ (*Hom.*), ἐπέλπομαι (*A.*), and in ἐπιέλπτος (*Archil.*).

It seems likely that the positive form with -vo- was created secondarily beside an adjective in -αλέος: cf. especially σμερδνός ‘terrible’ ~ σμερδαλέος ‘id.’ (note the quasi-

¹¹⁵⁷ Schmitt (1978) already remarked that Ἄλπιστος cannot be a genuine Iranian name, but this is not judged decisive by Garvie (ad loc.), since more “Iranian” names were made up by Aeschylus in this tragedy. Garvie discusses the relative merits of the competing hypotheses.

¹¹⁵⁸ The meaning given in the *Lfgre* is ‘erwünscht, angenehm’ (adj.), ‘freudig, gern’ (adv.). The etymological connection with ἔπαλπνος and ἄλπνιστος is accepted there, because it is favored by the attested inner-Greek semantic development of ἀρπαλέος. On the other hand, “... mit einer aus der antiken Etymologie gewonnenen Bedeutung *gierig* (Adv.) oder *zu erraffend, erraft, räuberisch* (Adj.) zu rechnen (...) ist an keiner Stelle nötig. Auch nachhomerisch tritt ἀρπαλέος zunächst noch in der etymologisch richtigen Bedeutung auf (...), daher ist wahrscheinlich, dass die anfänglich sich nur beim Adv. findende Bedeutung heftig (...) auf falscher Interpretation von besonders *Od.* 6.250 beruht, wo der Zusammenhang eine Umdeutung begünstigt.”

¹¹⁵⁹ DELG: “groupe archaïque altéré ensuite par l’étymologie populaire”. Beekes (*EDG* s.v. ἄλπνιστος) writes that “It is doubtful to interpret ἀλπ- as **φαλπ-*, a zero grade of **φελπ-* in ἔλπομαι, ἐλπῖς (for wouldn’t one expect **φλαπ-?*).” This objection to the traditional etymology can now be effectively answered by assuming that ἀλπ- replaces older **welp-*.

¹¹⁶⁰ It is possible that the original meaning of the root is preserved better in ἀρπαλέος than in ἔλπομαι; the meaning ‘to expect, hope’ may have arisen in the middle present, which frequently developed desiderative meaning in Greek (cf. futures of the type ἔδομαι). Lat. *volup* is reconstructed as **uelp-i-* (de Vaan 2008 s.v.), the same formation as Gr. ἐλπῖς.

opposite meaning of ἀρπαλέος), post-Hom. ἰσχνός ‘withered, thin, lean’ ~ Hom. hapax ἰσχαλέος ‘withered, dry’.¹¹⁶¹ We are left, then, with a well-paralleled scheme **walp-aléo-* : **walp-isto-*. The superlative replaces an earlier full grade form **wel-p-isto-* (see section 4.1.3) after the positive with **walp-*. Since the adjectives in -αλέος may replace older ablauting *u*-stem adjectives (section 4.2.2), the reflex **walp-* can be explained as follows: **wélp-u-*, **wlp-éw-* > **wélp-u-*, **wlap-éw-* >> **welprú-*, **walpréw-* >> **walprú-*, **walpréw-*. For this reason, ἀρπαλέος and ἄλπιστος cannot be used as evidence for a regular change **l̥ > -αλ-*.

An Eastern Ionic by-form of γλῶσσα ‘tongue’ is γλάσσα, attested in late literary Ionic in Herodas (a Hellenistic, 3rd c. mimographer who imitated the language of Hipponax). The authenticity of γλάσσα is guaranteed by its occurrence in inscriptions from Asia Minor, where it denotes the tongue as a part of a sacrificed animal. It seems, then, that γλάσσα was preserved beside γλῶσσα in Eastern Ionic because of its semantic specialization. It is possible that γλάσσα continues the original form of the motional feminine **dl̥k^h-ia*, which was derived from the weak stem of a root noun **dl̥ōg^h-*, **dl̥g^h-* reflected in γλῶχες ‘beard of corn’ (*Scut.*, cf. Hom. γλωχίς ‘barb of an arrow’). Subsequently, γλάσσα may have been reshaped, under the influence of γλῶχες or γλωχίς, to γλῶσσα, which was the only form to survive in Classical Attic.¹¹⁶² It cannot be excluded that the outcome -λα- in γλάσσα < **dl̥k^h-ia* was influenced by the vowel slot of cognate words like γλῶχες or γλωχίς. Therefore, Eastern Ionic γλάσσα is not a certain example for the regular development of **l̥ > -αλ-*.

There are two compounded forms with -πλακ-. Hom. δίπλαξ is attested as an adjective ‘double-layered’ in δίπλακι δημῶ [‘wrapped’] in a double layer of fat’ (*Il.* 23.243 and 253, in the funeral ceremony for Patroklos), and as a substantive in δίπλακα πορφυρέην ‘purple mantle’ (*Il.* 3.126, 22.441, *Od.* 19.241).¹¹⁶³ Furthermore, the hapax τρίπλακ- describes the “threefold” rim of the shield of Achilles (only in *Il.* 18.479-80 ἄντυγα βάλλε φαινήν τρίπλακα μαρμαρέην).¹¹⁶⁴

It is attractive to derive the second member -πλακ- from the root of πλέκω ‘to plait, twine’ (PIE **plek-*), and to compare the identical formation of Lat. *duplex* ‘twofold’ (de Vaan *EDL* s.v. *-plex*, Beekes *EDG* s.v. δίπλαξ). Semantically, the use of ‘-fold’ in Germanic offers a good parallel. It is possible that δίπλακι δημῶ preserves the original meaning ‘two-fold, wrapped twice’, and that in the substantivization δίπλακα πορφυρέην, -πλακ- originally qualified the kind of thread from which it was made (“twined twice” vel sim.).¹¹⁶⁵ It is noteworthy that the Latin form points to a full grade second member **-plek-*. This could mean either that Latin introduced the full grade from the verb (*plectō*, *-plicō*), or that -πλακ- replaces earlier -πλεκ- in Greek. In any case, the presence of the verb πλέκω forbids us to use δίπλακ- and τρίπλακ- as compelling evidence for -λα-, rather than -αλ-, as the regular outcome of **l̥* in Proto-Ionic.

The adjective πλατύς ‘broad; flat’ is quoted as a prime example for the development of **l̥* in almost every manual. Its forms of comparison are analogical (πλατύτερος and

¹¹⁶¹ Other adjectives in -νό- may also be secondary: hapax στιλπνός ‘glistening, gleaming’ (*Il.* 14.351, ~ στίλβω ‘gleam’), ἐρεμνός ‘dark, gloomy’ (~ ἔρεβος ‘underworld, darkness’), and in Pindar θαλπνότερος ‘warmer’ (θάλλω ‘to heat’). A very frequent form is τερπνός; since the root of τέρπομαι has no other positive, τερπνός probably underlies the rarer forms στιλπνός, ἔπαλπνος, θαλπνός.

¹¹⁶² In section 4.1, I have suggested that the motional feminine of *u*-stem adjectives may have been derived by adding the forms of the motional suffix directly to the ablauting *stem* forms of the masculine. It is possible, then, that a paradigm Ns. **dl̥ōk^h-ia*, Gs. **dl̥k^h-iās* yielded Ns. γλῶσσα, Gs. **γλασσῆς* (whence a new Ns. γλάσσα after semantic specialization).

¹¹⁶³ It is to be noted that the dictionary nominative forms δίπλαξ and τρίπλαξ are unattested.

¹¹⁶⁴ The precise meaning of the triple rim is disputed, cf. the commentary by Kirk et al. ad loc.

¹¹⁶⁵ I reject the thesis, defended in Frisk s.v. δίπλαξ, that this is a compound with second member -πλακ- ‘surface’. See there for further literature on this word.

-τατος).¹¹⁶⁶ The adjective is also attested in Lesbian poetry (πλάτυ Alc. fr. 74). Other forms attested in Greek are πλαταμών ‘flat stone or object’, πλάτος ‘breadth, width; plane surface’ (Cypr. fr. 1.2, Simon., Hdt.+), and adjectives in -πλατής (X., Th., Arist.).¹¹⁶⁷ The old form of the motional feminine is probably reflected in the toponym Πλάταια. But whether the outcome of vocalized **l* was -λα- or -αλ-, the original paradigm **pleth₂-u-*, **plth₂-eu-* would have been leveled out as *platu-*, **platew-* anyway. After this, the stem form **plat-* spread to all other derivatives. Therefore, πλατύς offers no clues about the regular outcome of **l*.

The collective formation σπλάγχνα ‘entrails, viscera’ (Hom.+) is clearly related to Av. *spərazan-* (m.) ‘spleen’, Ns. *spəraza*, and to Lith. *blužnis* ‘id.’, and within Greek to σπλήν ‘spleen’ (Il.+). The difficulty to reconstruct a PIE pre-form on the basis of these and other related terms for the spleen is well-known: “Da eine Rekonstruktion im einzelnen nicht möglich ist, müssen wir uns auch für σπλήν und das davon nicht zu trennende σπλάγχνα auf blosser Vermutungen beschränken” (Frisk, q.v.). Greek σπλήν has no trace of a root-final velar, which is mostly assumed to be due to tabooistic deformations.¹¹⁶⁸ The σπλάγχνα refer to a collection of innards, “especially heart, lungs, liver, kidneys, which in sacrifices were reserved to be eaten by the sacrificers at the beginning of their feast” (LSJ). In Frisk’s view, σπλάγχνα stands for earlier **σπλάχνα*, with a secondary internal nasal.¹¹⁶⁹ The collective would reflect a PIE “Transponat” **splǵ^h-n-h₂*, but is probably not old: the comparative evidence points to a specific denomination of the spleen, so to an original singular form. Therefore, σπλάγχνα was probably derived from the weak stem of the PIE paradigm, e.g. Gs. **splǵ^h-n-ós*, and is likely to contain a regular vocalization to -λα-.¹¹⁷⁰ There is no particular reason to assume that the vowel slot of σπλάγχνα was influenced by that of σπλήν.¹¹⁷¹ On the other hand, it would be unwise to base our conclusion on σπλάγχνα, because most of its cognates in other IE languages have undergone irregular deformations.

10.3 The pre-form did not necessarily contain **l*

10.3.1 βλάβομαι, βλάπτω

The paradigm of βλάπτω ‘to hinder, impede; bend off, mislead’ (Il.+, post-Hom. ‘to damage’) consists of a causative aor. βλάβῃ, a middle pf. ptc. βεβλαμμένος, and an intransitive aor.

¹¹⁶⁶ A comparative πλατίον ‘broader’ is attested in Epich. fr. 101 Kaibel, but the form is probably secondary for expected ⁺⁺πλάσσον << **πλέσσον*.

¹¹⁶⁷ As de Lamberterie (1990: 452-63) has argued, it is improbable that πλατύς ‘brackish’ is the same word in origin. The proponents of this identification believe that πλατύς ‘broad’, as an epithet of the Hellespont, was misunderstood to mean ‘salty’, given that Herodotus also calls the Hellespont ἄλμυρός ‘salty’. Cf. Frisk s.v. πλατύς 2. and Mayrhofer EWAia s.v. *paṭu-* (both embracing this view), DELG s.v. 2 πλατύς (doubting it). Against this, de Lamberterie remarks that πλατύς only means ‘brackish’, never ‘salty’. The suggestion found in older literature is a connection with Skt. *paṭu-* ‘sharp, biting, bitter’ (and many derived meanings) as PIE **plt-u-*; de Lamberterie suggests that this adjective belonged to a primary perfect with intransitive meaning ‘to split, cleave’ (with in Gmc. the 7th class strong verb **spaldan-* ‘to split’, Slav. **ras-platiti* ‘id.’, Skt. *paṭati* ‘crack, burst’, caus. *pāṭayati* ‘split’).

¹¹⁶⁸ Note, however, Puhvel’s proposal (1999: 74) to derive φρήν and σπλήν from **b^hreg^h-n-s* and **spleg^h-n-s*, respectively, by a regular development **-eg^hns > -ēn* with compensatory lengthening. It is unclear how Puhvel envisages this development phonetically, but it would have the advantage of providing φρήν with a natural etymology (cf. διάφραγμα) and of explaining why σπλήν coexists with σπλάγχνα in Greek. An obvious objection is that no structurally comparable PIE sound changes are known: one wonders what was wrong with a vocalization **b^hreg^h-n(-s)* or **spleg^h-n(-s)*.

¹¹⁶⁹ In this word, deformations took place in other branches too: compare Ved. *plīhán-* (AV+) ‘spleen’, which may have been influenced by *snīhán-* ‘snot’ (Mayrhofer, EWAia q.v.).

¹¹⁷⁰ The secondary zero grade in the Baltic forms (Lith. *blužnis* ‘spleen’, OPr. *blusne* ‘id.’), as well as Slavic material (OCS. *slězena* ‘id.’, Ru. *selezěnka*) and perhaps also Skt. *plīhán-* ‘id.’ (AV+), point to a full grade II. On the other hand, there is Celtic material pointing to a full grade I (Mlr. *selg*, MBret. *felch* ‘spleen’).

¹¹⁷¹ Cf. DELG (s.v. σπλήν): “il n’est pas sûr que les Grecs aient senti la parenté entre σπλήν et σπλάγχνα.”

ἐβλάβην ‘was impeded’ beside ἐβλάβην. The latter form was preferred by Homer for metrical reasons, but it is less frequent than ἐβλάβην in the classical language. Besides, a thematic middle present βλάβεται ‘to be hampered (of the voice), to give way (of the knees)’ is attested only in the *Iliad*,¹¹⁷² where it was preserved for metrical reasons. *LSJ* gives the basic meaning “*disable, hinder*”, but with some modifications like “*entangled, caught, stopped*”, and a separate metaphorical meaning “*II. distract, pervert, mislead, of the mind*”. The primary meaning was ‘to put off track, bend off, drive off course’.

The causative active paradigm βλάπτω, βλάψαι is clearly secondary to the older intransitive forms βλάβεται, ἐβλάβην. The compound ἀβλαβής ‘unharmful, unwavering, securely’ was derived directly from this intransitive verb, and must be old within Greek.¹¹⁷³ Other nominal derivatives follow productive patterns and may be relatively recent creations.¹¹⁷⁴ The question is, then, whether the root of βλάβεται and ἐβλάβην can be derived from a zero grade **mlk^w-*. Such a root is required by the etymological comparison with Ved. *marc-* (caus. *marcāyati*) ‘to slander, injure’, Avestan *mārəc-* ‘to destroy’ (vel sim.), which is accepted by both Frisk and *DELG* (s.v. βλάβη).¹¹⁷⁵ However, an obvious objection against this etymology is the root-final -β- in Ionic-Attic. For this reason, Knobloch proposed that the Indo-Iranian root should rather be compared to Hitt. *markije/a^{zi}* ‘to disapprove of’, an idea which has been accepted both by Puhvel (*HED*, q.v.) and Kloekhorst (*EDHIL*, q.v.).¹¹⁷⁶ This would leave βλάβομαι, βλάπτω without an etymology.¹¹⁷⁷

There are, however, several reasons to maintain the traditional comparison with Ved. *marc-* and Avestan *mārəc-*. First of all, there are clear semantic parallels between Greek and Indo-Iranian. The intransitive meaning ‘to turn off, lose the track, deviate’ is clearly old in Greek, but a second use of βλάπτω is found in Hesiod, where the causative verb means ‘to

¹¹⁷² Plus a Homeric imitation in *Anacreont.* 31.26.

¹¹⁷³ This formation also has a reflex in Cretan, see below. In traditional oaths, ἀβλαβής means ‘unwavering’, i.e. “abiding by the terms” (Th., Att. inscr.). The non-agentive semantics are also attested in the compound φρενοβλαβής ‘with perverted mind’ (Hdt., Eupolis, Hp.), i.e. “going astray in one’s thoughts”. For the phraseology, compare νόου βεβλαμμένος (Thgn. 223). Secondarily, ἀβλαβής (Sapph., Pi., trag., class. prose) also acquired the meanings ‘unharming’ (agentive) and ‘unharmful’ (passive), probably under influence of the causative semantics of βλάπτω. For the derivation of an s-stem compound from an intransitive verbal stem, see e.g. Meissner (2006: 186-97).

¹¹⁷⁴ As *DELG* (s.v. βλάβη) remarks, “Par son attestation plus ancienne comme par son sens concret, le thème verbal semble plus archaïque que les formes nominales”. Cf. for instance βλάβος n. ‘harm; curse’ (Hdt., backformed from ἀβλαβής) and βλάβη (A.) ‘id.’; ἀβλαβία (h. Merc., inscr.); βλαβερός ‘harmful’ (Hes.) may have been formed to ἀβλαβής on the model of κρατερός : ἀκρατής (Schwyzer 1939: 482; see chapters 4 and 5 on the adjectives in -ερό-).

¹¹⁷⁵ Beekes’ view (*EDG* s.v. βλάβη) that βλάπτω is of Pre-Greek origin cannot be substantiated. It could be envisaged to derive Lat. *mulcāre* ‘to damage, mutilate’ and *mulcēre* ‘to stroke’ from PIE **mlk^w-* (this was rejected by Walde-Hofmann and Frisk). If *mulcāre* is a denominative from **mulkā-* ‘damage’, the formal reconstruction could work if **k^w* was delabialized after **l* in a pre-Latin **mlk^wā-* (cf. *dulcis* ‘sweet’ < pre-Latin **dlkwī-* < **dlukwī-*). It is interesting that *mulcēre* has a special meaning ‘charm, beguile’ (e.g. with a song, *carmine mulcēre*, also *permulcēre mitibus verbis* ‘to manipulate someone with soft words’). This meaning is close to βλάπτω in the sense ‘to mislead’.

¹¹⁷⁶ Puhvel subsequently proposed to connect βλάπτω with Hitt. *gullak(k)uwan-* ‘impure’ (1996: 167), and speaks of “an important binary Hittite-Greek isogloss exhibiting Indo-European labiovelars and a sense of religion-tinged offensiveness (...)” (ibid.). According to Puhvel, the Hittite word “denotes hygienic or ritual or religious or moral failing” (*HED* s.v. *kullak(k)uwan*). Although βλαβ- does indeed occur in religious and moral senses from Homer onwards, this root etymology can hardly be correct, because the primary meaning of βλάπτω is ‘to hinder, put off track’, whence ‘to mislead’.

¹¹⁷⁷ Kloekhorst recently proposed to derive βλάπτω from a PIE root **mlek^w-*, for which the only other evidence would be Hitt. *malekk(u)^{zi}*, a “verb describing a negative consequence of illness” (*EDHIL*, q.v.). But this etymological connection remains “highly speculative” (as Kloekhorst admits), because we are dealing with a hapax. The passage where *malekkun* occurs reads in translation: “... because of the [ill]ness, I have become tired and *malekku-ed*; I cannot succeed (*taruḫmi*) any longer” (see Kloekhorst l.c.). An alternative proposal by Puhvel (*HED* s.v. *malikku-*) connects *malekkun* with *malīšku-* ‘weak’.

slander, pronounce a false oath' in at least three instances (*Op.* 193-4, *Op.* 258, *Op.* 282-3, and perhaps also in the only other instance in Hesiod, *Th.* 89). The only meaning of *marc-* in the *Rigveda* seems to be 'to lead astray', e.g. in combination with *dváyena* 'with double tongue'. Poetic phraseology pointing in the same direction is also found in Homer (*Il.* 9.505-512, about 'straight-footed' Ate overtaking men and making them err), and this meaning 'go astray' can be recognized in traditional oath formulae (e.g. *Th.* 5.18, 5.47, in Attic inscr. e.g. *IG* I³ 53.13-14). Since the concrete meaning of βλάπτω, 'to hinder, put off track', is clearly primary within Greek, it is quite possible that 'to slander, speak falsely' is a metaphorical use of 'to mislead' (sbd. with words) that existed already in PIE.¹¹⁷⁸

Secondly, the Old Avestan verbal paradigm has a remarkable parallel formation to Greek βλάβομαι: the athematic present *vī-mərəṇcaitē* (3p. mid. pres. ind.), *mərəṇgəduiē* (2p.), *mərəṇgəidiāi* (inf.), and the 3s. act. pres. opt. *mərəšiiāṭ*. The attestations of the Avestan verb allows us some freedom of translation (traditional is 'to destroy'), but there seems to be no difference in meaning between the active and the middle.¹¹⁷⁹ This suggests that the middle is older, and that it derives from a nasal infix formation **ml̥ṇk^w-to*. The oldest Greek present formation βλάβομαι may be the direct outcome of this same pre-form if we assume that it underwent thematicization.¹¹⁸⁰ If this is correct, -λα- in βλάβομαι may be the outcome of a vocalized nasal, rather than of **l̥*. If the aorist βλαβῆναι was formed secondarily beside βλάβεται within Greek, which seems likely, its -α- need not be the result of a vocalized **l̥* either.¹¹⁸¹

A third reason to retain the etymological comparison with Indo-Iranian is the Cretan evidence for a root *βλαπ-*, *βλοπ-*. The following forms are attested:

(1) inf. καταβλαπεθαι (*IC* IV 42.11), καταβλα[πεθ]αι (*IC* IV 82.3), both from Gortyn, early 5th c. BC. The middle inf. ending -θαι continues older -σθαι, and in older Cretan, word-internal -πτ- < **-p̥j-* was initially preserved, and later assimilated to -ττ-.¹¹⁸² Therefore, καταβλαπεθαι should be directly compared with Hom. βλάβεται. In the first inscription, a judge is said to καταβλαπεθαι "qui, pour une raison valable, ne peut exercer son métier. La loi dit expressément qu'il ne faut pas le «pénaliser»" (Bile 1988: 353). This would mean, in Bile's interpretation, that the judge should not be fined ("être lésé"). The prefixed causative verb καταβλάπτω is frequently found in inscriptions across Greece, in the meaning 'to inflict damage, do harm', but it is hardly attested in the Classical language.¹¹⁸³

¹¹⁷⁸ A further philological analysis of βλάπτω in Epic Greek, which I intend to provide elsewhere in the near future, shows that Homer and Hesiod agree with Vedic and Avestan in traditional phraseology.

¹¹⁷⁹ Since the object of *mərəc-* is often *ahu-* 'righteous life' or *aša-* 'order', a better translation may be e.g. 'to disturb, mess up'. This claim cannot be further elaborated here.

¹¹⁸⁰ It is in fact quite attractive to reconstruct a nasal present for βλάβομαι: since most thematic middle root presents have an *e*-grade root (*δέρκομαι*, *πείθομαι*, etc.), one would expect a present **βλέπομαι* or **μέλομαι*.

¹¹⁸¹ In this context, it is noteworthy that Homer structurally avoids *McL* scansion in the root *βλαβ-*. Whereas the regular Ionic-Attic form of the passive aorist is βλαβῆναι, Homer only uses the artificial form βλαφθῆναι, with the single exception of βλάβεν in front of a vowel (*Il.* 23.545). Moreover, the preservation of βλάβομαι is due to the metrical awkwardness of **βλάπτομαι* (a dactylic form with double initial consonant, which can only be placed in verse-initial position or after a syllable that is long by nature). Thus, if we depart from the assumption that the vocalization of **l̥* and **r̥* was simultaneous, it is remarkable that we find no traces of *McL* scansion at all. It follows either that βλαβ- does not contain the result of a vocalized **l̥*, or that the vocalization of **l̥* was prior to that of **r̥*.

¹¹⁸² Cf. pf. mid. *εγρατται* 'has been written', *επτα* > *εττα* 'seven'.

¹¹⁸³ In literary Greek, the only early attestation of καταβλάπτω is at *h. Merc.* 93, but there the meaning could be 'to hinder, harm' in a more general sense (see Richardson ad loc.). The only other two occurrences up to Plato are *Pl. Leg.* 864e and 877b. In this dialogue, the Athenian spokesman uses καταβλάπτω on both occasions, but since he is conversing with a Spartiate and a Cretan, he could be deliberately using a non-Attic juridical term here.

The relic thematic middle present attested in Cret. *καταβλαπεθαι* provides a serious indication that the root originally ended in a voiceless stop.¹¹⁸⁴ What does this form tell us about the vocalization of **l* in Cretan? We have seen in section 3.2 that **r* normally developed to -αρ- in Cretan, and to -ορ- after a labial consonant. But *καταβλαπεθαι* does not show *o*-vocalism, even if **l* was surrounded by two labial consonants. The development of an anaptyctic vowel after the liquid would also be in contrast with the development of **r* in Cretan. It follows either that **l* developed to Cretan -λα- prior to the conditioned development of **r*, or that *καταβλαπεθαι* does not contain the reflex of **l*.

The second alternative is made probable by the Cretan abstract *αβλοπια*, which is attested as *απλοπια* (SEG 27.631 = Bile No. 28, A 18 [Lytos]), Ds. *αβλοπια* (IC IV 81.12-13 [Gortyn], IC II v 2.10, and perhaps *ιοπια*, in an uncertain context, IC II v 4.2 [both from Axos]).¹¹⁸⁵ All attestations are from the 6th or 5th century, which ensures that we are dealing with an archaic legal term.¹¹⁸⁶ Chantraine (DELG s.v. βλάβη) translates *αβλοπια* as “conduite qui ne fait tort à personne”, and explains -λο- as a dialectal reflex of **l* with the suggestion that it may be pre-Doric.¹¹⁸⁷ How can the formation underlying *αβλοπια* be reconstructed? Chantraine (1933: 79) compared the near-synonym *ὠφελία* ‘service, behavior which benefits sbd. or sth.’, which is regularly opposed to *βλάβη* in Classical Greek. Since an older form *ὠφέλεια* (derived from *s*-stem adjectives in -ωφελής) is attested beside *ὠφελία*, he suggests that *αβλοπια* can be derived from the same pre-form as the classical *s*-stem compound *ἀβλαβής*. Such an *s*-stem compound is indeed attested in the gloss *ἀβλοπές· ἀβλαβές. Κρήτες* (Hsch.). In this way, we arrive at the following correspondences between Ionic-Attic and Cretan:

	middle pres.	s-stem adj.
Ionic-Attic:	βλάβεται	ἀβλαβής
Gortynian Cretan:	καταβλαπεθαι	ἀβλοπές (whence <i>αβλοπια</i>)

Since both *βλαπ-* and *βλοπ-* are attested in the dialect of Gortyn, at least one of them cannot have the regular Cretan outcome of **l*. In Chantraine’s view, *βλοπ-* is due to Achaeon substrate influence. But in view of the possibility that *καταβλαπεθαι* (like Homeric *βλάβεται*) contains the reflex of a vocalized nasal, this *ad hoc* assumption is unnecessary. It is a distinct possibility, then, that *ἀβλοπές* and *αβλοπια* contain the regular reflex -λο- of **l* in Cretan, and that -λα- < **l* is regular in Ionic-Attic *ἀβλαβής*.

Having said that, it must be taken into account that the vowel slot in *ἀβλοπές* may have been influenced by *καταβλαπεθαι*, and that Ionic *ἀβλαβής* may also have introduced the productive verbal root, which derived from a pre-form with **h* (cf. above on *βλάβομαι*, *βλαβῆναι*). The potential relevance of *βλαπ-* for the place of the epenthetic vowel also depends on the original full grade of the root. There is no trace of such an ablaut form in Greek, but the Indo-Iranian vowel slot was **mark-*, as seen in Ved. *marcáyati* (caus.), *marká-* ‘ruin’, and Av. *marəxšaitē* (3s. aor. subj.), *mimarəxšaitē* (desid.), *mahrka-* ‘death’. Although

¹¹⁸⁴ I have no unambiguous solution for the root-final voiced stop of Ionic *βλαβ-*, but a comparison with *γάλαγος* ‘milk’ (on which see below) could be interesting. This *s*-stem form is found in Homer beside *γαλακτ-* and *γαλακτο-*. It has been argued that *γάλαγος* may directly continue a zero grade root **glg-*, but this would not be a regular IE root structure. If the comparison with Hitt. *kalank-* ‘to soothe’ is pertinent, a reconstruction PGr. **glṇk^h* may be considered, with voicing of the stop between the heavy voiced initial cluster and a vowel.

¹¹⁸⁵ The form *απλοπια* from Lyttos may be due to the sound change **Dl- > Tl-*, which is also observed in *κλευκος* ‘new wine’ (in the same inscription) and in the Cretan gloss *κλάγος* ‘milk’ (Hsch.).

¹¹⁸⁶ Cf. the remark by Bile (1988: 123-4), “le registre juridique du mot le place parmi les archaïsmes”.

¹¹⁸⁷ Chantraine’s translation “conduite qui ne fait tort à personne” may have to be modified: if we compare the use of *ἀβλαβής* ‘unerring’ in Athenian oath formulae, it seems that *αβλοπια* originally referred to unerring social behavior, which was conform to the law.

Ved. *marká-* and Av. *mahrka-* could be productive replacements of the root noun Av. *mərəxš* (Ns.), Ved. *mṛc-*, the basic assumption must be that the PIE root was **melk^w*-.¹¹⁸⁸

For Ionic-Attic, no certain conclusions can be based on Hom. βλάβεται, because its pre-form may have contained an internal nasal, nor on ἀβλαβής or βλαβῆναι because it cannot be excluded that they were influenced by or derived from βλάβεται. The only significant conclusion to be drawn from the above analysis is that -λο- or -ολ- is probably the outcome of **l* in a labial environment in Cretan.

Finally, it is interesting that the verb βλάπτω is attested in Arcadian: aor. subj. ποσκατυβλαψη (*IG* V 2 6.37), aor. ptc. το κατυβλαφθεν (*ibid.* 41). The inscription contains regulations concerning construction sites, and the meaning of the verbal forms is simply ‘to damage’, like that of Classical βλάπτω. Although καταβλάπτω is not a normal Ionic-Attic form, a West Greek *Koine*-form cannot be excluded, because a number of clauses and collocations appear in similar inscriptions elsewhere.¹¹⁸⁹ If this is correct, the general non-Ionic-Attic verb καταβλάπτω may have been superficially Arcadianized by introducing the preverbs κατυ- and ποσ-. The Arcadian forms, then, do not inform us about the outcome of **l* in that dialect.

10.3.2 διπλάσιος

The adjective διπλάσιος ‘twofold, double the size, twice as much’ is not attested in Homer, but first in Solon (fr. 13.73), and it is common in Attic prose.¹¹⁹⁰ It may originally be a legal term: cf. διπλάσιος ζημία ‘double the fine’, also found in Arcadian (*IG* V² 6.35, also in Dubois 1988, Tegea 4.18) and in Elis (Minon 2007, I: 208), where it could be due to *Koine*-influence. The Ionic form διπλήσιος is attested in Herodotus and inscriptions, and may be analogical after a semantically close form like παραπλήσιος ‘about the same size, about equal’ (from the root **pelh₂-* of πέλας ‘near’).¹¹⁹¹

In Classical Greek, the meaning of διπλάσιος ‘double the size’ is different from that of διπλός, διπλός, contracted διπλοῦς (Hom., Pi., trag., etc.), which means ‘double, twofold’ in the sense of ‘consisting of two discrete entities’. διπλός clearly represents older **dui-pl-o-* as in Lat. *duplus* (< **du-pl-o-*), *simplus*, also in Goth. *tweifls* ‘doubt’, Lyc. *tbiplē* ‘twice(?)’, OIr. *díabul* ‘double’.¹¹⁹² The root may also be present in Gm. **-falpa-* ‘-fold’ (Goth. *-falps*, MoG. *-falt* < **-pol-to-*). For διπλάσιος, on the other hand, the etymological dictionaries (Boisacq, Frisk, *DELG* and Beekes) posit an earlier **δίπλατος*, enlarged by a suffix -ιος (like e.g. ἀμβρόσιος beside ἄμβροτος).¹¹⁹³ This **δίπλατος* would continue a compound **dui-pl-to-* from the same root **pel-* ‘fold’ as **dui-pl-o-*.

Upon closer scrutiny, however, it appears that διπλάσιος must have been created within the history of Greek, because there is also a verb διπλάζω ‘to be twice as big’ (S. *Aj.* 268 τό τοι διπλάζον μεῖζον κακόν). This denominative verb may have been derived from διπλός or its ntr. p. διπλά. For the subsequent derivation of διπλάσιος ‘double the size’, cf. Class. θαυμάσιος ‘amazing’ beside θαυμάζω ‘to be amazed’, Hom. ἀσπάσιος ‘quiet’ beside ἀσπάζομαι ‘to be quiet’. Thus, the derivational chain is διπλός, διπλά ‘double’ (Hom.+) →

¹¹⁸⁸ For an accentual difference between the Indic and Iranian forms, see Mayrhofer, *EWAia* s.v. *MARC*. Nothing can be based on the Hittite hapax *malekkun*, see above.

¹¹⁸⁹ Compare *IG* VII 3073.29-37 and 3074.9-11 (Lebadeia in Boeotia), which also contain regulations for construction.

¹¹⁹⁰ The word is unattested, however, in the tragedians.

¹¹⁹¹ Cf. also Hdn. 3.130.4. The special Ionic form is also attested in inscriptions, e.g. αὐτοὶ τὴν θωιὴν διπλησίην ὀφελόντων *IG* XII *Supp.* 347 II, 6 (Thasos).

¹¹⁹² According to Kretschmer (cited *apud* Frisk s.v. διπλός), διπλός was reanalyzed as διπλός after the word for ‘sea journey’, **plówo-* > πλόος > πλοῦς. This is not immediately convincing, but seems possible in view of the lack of alternatives.

¹¹⁹³ The form **δίπαλτος* is wrongly cited by Boisacq s.v. διπλός; it belongs to πάλλω ‘to swing’.

διπλάζω ‘to be twice as big’ (trag.) → διπλάσιος ‘double the size, twice as big’ (Thgn.+), whence later → διπλασιάζω ‘to double’ (Pl. *Leg.* 920a). We may conclude that the only old form in Greek is διπλός, and that διπλάσιος is not to be directly compared to E. *two-fold*. It provides no evidence for the development of **l̥*.

10.3.3 λαγάρος and λάγνος

The adjective λαγάρος ‘hollow, slack, thin, lean, etc.’ is attested in Ionic-Attic and epigraphically in Cos (*SEG* 28.697, lines 18 and 20, 4th c. BC). It is related within Greek to λαγών, plural λαγόνες ‘flanks of an animal’ < “weak spots” (with the location suffix -ών). The etymological dictionaries further compare λάγνος ‘lascivious’ (Arist.), λαγνεΐα ‘lasciviousness’ (X.+). Finally, the reconstruction of λαγῶός ‘hare’ (Hom.) as **slag-ows-ó-* ‘the one with slack ears’ (cf. Peters 1980: 59) is attractive.¹¹⁹⁴

For semantic as well as formal reasons, λαγάρος and λάγνος should first be compared with the Germanic group of ON *slakr*, OS *slac*, OE *slæk* ‘weak, floppy’ < PGm. **slak-n-*, but the question is in which way. Further forms that have been adduced as comparanda for λαγάρος and λάγνος are Lat. *laxus* ‘spacious, wide, loose’, Ved. *ślakṣhā-* ‘smooth, slippery, soft’ (AV+), MoP *lašn* ‘smooth’, and Tocharian A *slākkār* ‘sad’, B *slakkare* ‘darting’. There are three alternative ways to deal with this rather heterogeneous group.

First, we may be dealing with a group of European substrate words (cf. the suggestion in Beekes, *EDG* s.v. λαγαίω). To my mind, this is a promising option, in view of λαγγάζω ‘to slacken’ (Antiph., glosses) and other forms with λαγγ-, which may either have Pre-Greek prenasalization (Beekes, *EDG* s.v. λαγγάζω) or belong to a European substrate root **lang-* (cf. Lat. *languēō* ‘be slack, faint’). In the case of a root **(s)leh₂ǵ-* with internal laryngeal, the short vowel in Greek λαγ- could be explained from the zero grade of the **s*-less variant (Beekes 1988b: 26f., cf. Lubotsky 1981 for the derivation of Ved. *ślakṣha-* from **sleh₂ǵ-snó-*).

Finally, accepting Schrijver’s rule **RDC > RaDC*, de Vaan (*EDL* q.v.) explained Lat. *laxus* from a pre-form **slǵ-so-*. He explains (s.v. *languēō*) that he posits this pre-form in order to reconstruct *languēō* ‘to be sluggish’ as **slangw-* < **sl-n-ǵ-u-*, and remarks that the appurtenance of Tocharian B *slakkare*, which would point to **slh₂ǵ-*, cannot be ascertained. If this root reconstruction is correct, the entire Greek group could be derived from a zero grade root **slǵ-*.¹¹⁹⁵ Thus, neither a root PIE **slh₂ǵ-*, nor a European substrate word *slag-* can be definitely excluded for the group meaning ‘weak’, which comprises at least Germanic and Greek words.

10.4 Possible cases of **l̥* > -λα-

10.4.1 βλαδεῖς

An adjective **βλαδύς* is attested in the gloss βλαδεῖς· ἀδύνατοι. ἐξ ἀδυνάτων (Hsch.). Other glosses derived from this root are βλαδαρόν· ἐκλελυμένον, χαῖνον ‘flaccid, porous’, βλαδαρά· ἄωρα, μωρά, ὠμά ‘untimely, sluggish’, βλάδαν· νωθρῶς ‘slothful’, and βλαδόν· ἀδύνατον ‘powerless’ (all Hsch.). Since the root was **meld-* (see section 4.4.5), βλαδ- must be the regular outcome of a zero grade form.

¹¹⁹⁴ All these words are treated in the same entry in Frisk, *DELG*, and *EDG*. The appurtenance of Cretan λαγασαί ‘to release a prisoner’ (on which see section 10.6) to these words is usually taken for granted, but highly uncertain.

¹¹⁹⁵ Note, however, that Schrijver himself did not yet propose to explain *laxus* with his rule (1991: 136 and 165), because he followed Lubotsky’s proposal that the root contained a laryngeal. A fourth option would be to separate Lat. *laxus* ‘spacious, wide, loose’ from *languēō* and its Germanic cognates, and to compare its root with Ved. *sarj-* ‘to loosen, set free’.

It seems natural to suppose that βλαδεῖς reflects a PIE adjective **mld-ú-* ‘soft, weak’, and that this *u*-stem was replaced by a different suffix in the other glosses βλαδαρόν, βλάδαν, βλαδόν. However, a comparison with Arm. *melk* ‘weak, soft’, Lat. *mollis* ‘soft, gentle’, W. *blydd* ‘soft’ and Ved. *mṛdú-* ‘soft, delicate’ shows that we are dealing with an ablauting *u*-stem adjective **meld-u-*, **mld-eu-*. In section 4.4.5, I have argued that ἀμαλδύνω (with secondary ᾱ-) was built on an earlier full grade form of this adjective. The ablauting paradigm **meld-u-*, **mlad-ew-* was replaced by **meld-u-*, **mald-ew-*, and the factitive verb ἀμαλδύνω may have been derived after this replacement.

Since it is difficult to derive βλαδεῖς from the weak stem of the adjective in Ionic, I am inclined to consider two alternative solutions. On the one hand, the root allomorph βλαδ- may have originated in the adverb PGr. **mld-a*. Alternatively, the glosses may have been taken from a Doric dialect. Such an origin for βλαδεῖς could be confirmed if πλαδαρός ‘damp, weak, flaccid’, πλαδάω ‘to make flaccid’ are the genuine Ionic-Attic forms corresponding to the gloss βλαδαρός. But since their initial πλ- is hard to explain, I will not base any conclusions on them; for further details, see the discussion in section 4.4.5. For now, we may conclude that βλαδ- must be the regular outcome of **mld-*, but it is unclear in which formation this root allomorph originally came into being, and whether the glosses with βλαδ- are of Ionic-Attic provenance.

10.4.2 βλαστός

According to the etymological dictionaries, the thematic aor. βλαστεῖν ‘to sprout, bud’ (Pi.+), with the derived pres. βλαστάνω, has no etymology. In the meantime, de Lamberterie (1990: 358-61) proposed to derive it from the noun βλαστός ‘sprout, young shoot’ (Hdt.+), which he reconstructs as a substantivized adjective **mld-tó-* ‘tender, young’. As a parallel, he points at the fact that **meld-* ‘soft, weak’ also served as the basis for a word for soft or tender shoots in Slavic (**moldъ* ‘young, tender’ > OCS *mladъ*, Ru. *molodój*, etc.). The derivation of a thematic aorist βλαστεῖν from βλαστός yields some difficulties. De Lamberterie proposes to compare βλαστός with Hom. θαλλός ‘id.’, which can be derived from the present stem of θάλλω ‘to flourish’. On this basis, a verb **βλάστω*, impf. ἔβλαστον, aor. ἐβλάστησα would have been backformed, after which the imperfect was reinterpreted as a thematic aorist. The assumed switch of aspect is not without problems, but de Lamberterie’s idea to derive βλαστός from **mld-tó-* is certainly attractive. If the etymology is correct, it furnishes another example for a regular outcome -λα- < **l*.

10.4.3 γάλα, γλακτοφάγος, γλάγος

Beside the normal form γάλα, γάλακτος ‘milk’ (Il.+), there are a few by-forms with a different root shape: γλακτο-φάγος ‘living on milk’ (Il. 13.6), name of a Scythian people (Hes. fr. 151), γλάγος ‘milk’ (Il. 2.471 = 16.643, Pi. fr. 106.4), περιγλαγής ‘overflowing with milk’ (Il. 16.642).¹¹⁹⁶ There are also some glosses of unclear interpretation: κλάγος· γάλα. Κρήτες, γλακῶντες· μεστοὶ γάλακτος ‘full of milk’, and γλακκόν· γαλαθηνόν ‘sucking milk’ (all Hsch.).

If this word can be reconstructed for PIE at all, the main question is whether the Greek forms with γλα- derive from a pre-form with **l*. The main comparandum is Lat. *lac*, *lactis* ‘milk’, which could point to a reconstruction **glgt-* if Schrijver’s rule **CRDC-* > Lat. **CRaTC-* (1991: 479f.) is correct. Problematic, however, is the fact that the reconstructed root **glgt-* would contain two *mediae*, and that word-initial **gl-* would have to be retained in Latin. This has been mended either by positing a pre-form with **dl-*, or by assuming a

¹¹⁹⁶ After the end of the fifth century, γλάγος is again found in Hellenistic hexameter poetry (Nic., Mosch.), probably in imitation of Homer. Further, Callimachus has γάλακι (Hec. 1.4.4); Lycophron (4th c. tragedian) attests thematic (-)γλαγο- in compounds; and πολυγλαγής appears in the Hellenistic poet Aratus (Phaen. 1.1100).

dissimilation **glakt-* > Lat. *lact-* (cf. de Vaan, *EDL* q.v.). As Weitenberg has shown (1985, *apud* Kortlandt 2003: 65) a second comparable form is Class. Arm. *katc* ‘milk’, which may continue Ns. **glKt-s*. There is also a dialectal form *kat’n* ‘id.’, which he derives from the As. **glKt-m*. In both forms, the **l* regularly vocalizes to Arm. *-al-*. Again, this would point to a pre-form **glKt-*, and exclude a form with **dl-*.

Let us now consider the Greek situation. The variation between *γαλακτ-* and *γλακτ-* is somewhat problematic, but best explained as having originated in the monosyllabic nominative **glakt* > **gla* > *γάλα*. A parallel is *γυνή*, Boeot. *βάνα* ‘woman’, both < PGr. **g^wnā* (cf. Beekes, *EDG* s.v. *γάλα*). Then, the oblique stem *γαλακτ-* introduced the onset of the NAs. *γάλα*, and the compound *γλακτοφάγος* retains the older form.¹¹⁹⁷ The question remains whether *γλακτ-* can be the regular outcome of a PIE *t*-stem **glKt-*. A verbal root could be recognized in Hitt. *kalank-ⁱ* ‘to soothe, satiate, satisfy’, *galaktar* ‘a soothing drug’, perhaps opium (cf. Puhvel *HED*, q.v.). This connection is not discussed by Kloekhorst (*EDHIL* s.v. *kalank-ⁱ*), who follows Oettinger in comparing *kalank-ⁱ* with ON *kløkk* ‘weak, soft’, Lith. *glėžnas*, *gležnūs* ‘id.’, both < **glēg^h-n-* (note the non-acute root in Baltic). However, it is quite conceivable that milk, as the nourishment given to infants, was referred to as a soothing substance.¹¹⁹⁸

If this derivation is valid, *γάλα* and Arm. *katc* ‘could be compared with Hitt. *galaktar* and reconstructed as **glg^h-t-*. This would presuppose that we leave Lat. *lact-* unexplained, but that is perhaps not disastrous given the more general problems with this form (it would presuppose two *mediae* in the same root, and the absence of a reflex of **g-* is troublesome). It remains to explain *γάγος*, *περιγαγής*, and the glosses with *γλακ-*. Chantraine (*DELG* s.v. *γάλα*) speaks of assimilation from an earlier form *γλακ-*; Beekes (*EDG* s.v. *γάλα*) suggests that the forms with *γλαγ-* were created beside the Ns. at an intermediate stage **glak*. Neither solution is very appealing. If the *t*-stem is indeed old in *γάλα*, *γάγος* cannot be anything but a derivation from the unextended root. Is it possible, then, that *γάγος* was derived as **glṇk^(h)-os* from a verbal stem **glṇk^(h)-e/o-* ‘to soothe, satisfy’ in the prehistory of Greek? If the explanation of Hom. *βλάβομαι* given above is correct, it is perhaps conceivable that a **glṇk-e/o-* (with voiceless stop, which would explain *γλακ-* as well) developed to **glṇg-e/o-* in Proto-Ionic (or South Greek), and that the glosses with *γλακ-* derive from some other, North Greek dialect (cf. Cret. *-βλαπεθαι* beside Hom. *βλάβομαι*).¹¹⁹⁹ In other words, a root **glk-* may underlie all Greek forms. The assumption that the PIE root was **glk-*, however, would require that ON *kløkk* and Lith. *glėžnas*, *gležnūs* are left aside. Alternatively, we may assume that **glṇk^h-e/o-* and **glṇk-e/o-* would develop in an identical way, and discard the two glosses with *γλακ-*. In either case, explaining the entire Greek body of evidence brings along additional costs.

We have stretched the Greek evidence as far as possible, perhaps too far. The origin of *γάγος* and *περιγαγής* remains problematic, and the etymological connection with Hitt. *kalank-ⁱ* is not rock-solid. Perhaps it is best, then, not to draw any conclusions regarding the development of **l* on the basis of the word for ‘milk’.

¹¹⁹⁷ In Homer, the NAs. *γάλα* is attested 4x in verse-final *γάλα θῆσθαι* and *γάλα λευκόν*; the other case forms only in verse-final *λευκοῖο γάλακτος*, *γλυκεροῖο γάλακτος*. It is conceivable that the latter forms replace older *λευκοῖο* / *γλυκεροῖο* **γλάκτος*.

¹¹⁹⁸ Since drugs are often prepared with milk (e.g. in the Indo-Iranian tradition), another option could be that *γάλα* originally denoted milk mixed with drugs.

¹¹⁹⁹ Phonetically, we could be dealing with the voicing of a stop after a long voiced sequence. It may also be wondered whether there is any counterevidence to a development **glK-*, *m^lK^w-* > **glg-*, *m^lg^w-* (cf. *βλάβεται*) in Proto-Ionic.

10.4.4 γλαφυρός

The etymology of Hom. γλαφυρός ‘hollow’ (epithet of ships, caves, and the phorminx, in *Od.* 14.533 also of a hollow stone that provides shelter) has been evaluated in various ways. There are two basic proposals (see de Lamberterie 1990: 315ff.). First, γλαφυρός has been derived as an adjective in *-uló- from the root of γλάφω ‘to scoop out, dig a hole’. This verb is attested as a simplex only in ποσσὶν γλάφει ‘he digs [the earth] with his paws’, of a lion (*Scut.* 431), and with a preverb only in εὐνὰς δ’ ἐν ψαμάθοισι διαγλάψας ἄλιησιν ‘she [Eidothea] had scooped out lairs in the sand of the sea’ (*Od.* 4.438). De Lamberterie objects to this proposal that the only indication for a PIE verbal root is precisely Greek γλάφω, and that the alleged connections with Slavic (e.g. Bulg. *glob* ‘eye socket’) and Celtic words (MlIr. *gulba* gl. rostrum ‘beak’) are uncertain.

As a second proposal, Chantraine (*DELG* s.v. γλαφυρός) argues that γλάφω cannot be separated from γλύφω ‘to carve, sculpture’, a root which does have verbal cognates in other IE languages (Lat. *glūbere* ‘to peel, strip the bark’, OHG *klioban* ‘to cleave’). This combination is accepted by de Lamberterie, departing from a dissimilation *γλυφύ- > γλαφύ-, with a semantic specialization of the adjective from ‘stripped off’ to ‘hollow’. Subsequently, the verbal root would have been split into γλαφ- and γλυφ-.¹²⁰⁰ De Lamberterie further suggests that the reconstructed *u*-stem *γλυφύ- may be deverbal, and that another continuant of this *u*-stem is perhaps found in the Slavic adjective **glōbokъ* (Ru. *glubókij*) ‘deep’.

This scenario does not seem plausible to me. First, the assumed dissimilation *γλυφύ- > γλαφύ- remains without a convincing parallel in Greek.¹²⁰¹ Moreover, it is unclear how the split into γλύφω and γλάφω should be envisaged: for a new verb based on the adjective *γλαφύς, one would rather expect a factitive verb ⁺⁺γλαφύνω. Thirdly, the only proposed cognate is found in Slavic, where the three variants **glōb-*, **glyb-* and **glъb-* could also point to non-IE origin.¹²⁰² Finally, the semantic connection between ‘to peel off, scale’ and ‘to make hollow’ is conceivable, but not evident.¹²⁰³ It is true that the adjective γλαφυρός is applied not only to natural cavities (caves, holes), but also to artificial ones (musical instruments, ships). However, the verb γλάφω does not refer to holes that are made by carving, chiseling, or peeling: it means ‘to dig a hole with the hands or paws’ in both instances.

As an alternative etymology, I propose that γλαφυρός contains the root of δελφύς ‘womb’, δελφίς ‘dolphin’ (e.g. ‘the one with womb’), and ἀδελφεός ‘brother/sister, born of the same mother’ < **sm̥-gʷelbʰ-es-ó-* ‘from the same womb or nest’. In Indo-Iranian, the root **gʷelbʰ-* is found in Vedic *gárbha-* ‘womb, embryo’, Avestan *garāba* ‘womb’, *garābuš-* ‘newborn lamb’.¹²⁰⁴ The semantic development is straightforward: a meaning ‘hollow’ can be posited for the PIE root, and already in the proto-language, nominal formations with the

¹²⁰⁰ “... la relation, perçue en synchronie, entre l’adjectif et le verbe a entraîné la scission d’une seule et même racine *γλυφ- en deux racines, resp. γλυφ- et γλαφ-, la première ayant l’acception technique de “sculpter” dont la seconde est dépourvue, encore qu’on en trouve des traces dans certains emplois de γλαφυρός” (de Lamberterie 1990: 315).

¹²⁰¹ “Ce qui, assurément, ne va pas de soi”, as de Lamberterie (1990: 316) admits.

¹²⁰² Cf. the doubts expressed by Derksen, *EDSIL* s.v. **glōbōkъ*, about the possibility to reconstruct this word.

¹²⁰³ The oldest meaning in both Latin and Germanic is ‘to peel off, scale’, which is very close to that of γλύφω ‘to carve’, i.e. ‘to scale off chips of wood or stone’.

¹²⁰⁴ In spite of doubts concerning the chronology of the attestations (formulated e.g. in de Vaan 2008 s.v.), it seems to me that Lat. *vulva* (imperial inscr. *vulba*) ‘womb’ can hardly be separated from Ved. *gárbha-*. The meanings ‘bodily cavity’ and ‘cavity in the landscape’ are also found side by side in Gr. κολπός ‘bosom, lap, gulf of the sea’ (borrowed as Ital. *golfo*). This may have dissimilated from PGr. **kʷolpo-*, from a root **kʷelp-* also found in Germanic **hwelban-* ‘to vault, overarch’ (cf. Frisk, *EDG*). The root looks very much like the one under discussion, but at this point I can only speculate about their interrelation (some early borrowing, or substrate phenomenon in the proto-language?). Hitt. *huelpi-* (adj.) ‘new, fresh, newborn’, (n.) ‘newborn animal, whelp’ is also semantically close, but formally irreconcilable.

meaning ‘cavity’ developed a special meaning ‘womb’ (for the development, see e.g. Skt. *yóni-* ‘abode, place to stay’, also ‘lap, womb’).¹²⁰⁵

The formation of *γλαφυρός* < **g^wlb^hu-ló-* can be analyzed as an extension in **-ló-* based on the weak stem of a *u*-stem adjective **g^welb^h-u-*, **g^wlb^h-eu-* ‘hollow’ (for a discussion of the adjectives in **-uló-*, see de Lamberterie 1990: 708-714). There are clear parallels for this derivation of an adjective in *-υλός*, notably *δανυλός* ‘shaggy’ beside *δασύς* < PIE **déns-u-*, **d^hns-éu-* (see section 9.1.1) and the adverb *παχυλῶς* ‘roughly, coarsely’ beside *παχύς* ‘thick’, corresponding to Ved. *bahulá-* ‘thick, dense, wide’ and *bahú-* ‘many, frequent’ < PIE **d^hb^héng^h-u-*, **d^hb^hng^h-éu-* beside **d^hb^hng^h-u-ló-*.¹²⁰⁶

But are there any parallels for the delabialization of a labiovelar in front of *-λ-* within Greek? If we consider *βλέπω* (Att.), *βλέφαρα* (Hom.+), beside *γλέπω* (Alcm.), *γλέφαρον* (Alcm., Pi.), it is problematic that the forms with *γλ-* are limited to non-Ionic-Attic dialects. Moreover, *βλέπω* and *βλέφαρα* have no etymology, so that the variation may be due to a substrate phenomenon. It is therefore more promising to compare the numerous cases where a common Greek labiovelar dissimilated against a labial stop in the following syllable, for instance:

- *καπνός* ‘smoke’ < PGr. **k^wapno-* / **kwapno-* beside Lith *kvāpas* ‘id.’
- Hdt. *ἄρτοκόπος* ‘baker’ beside Myc. *a-to-po-qo* ‘id.’ (PIE **pek^w-* ‘to cook’, the Ionic form first with metathesis to **-k^wopo-*)
- Hom. *κόλπος* ‘bosom, lap, curvature, etc.’ < PGr. **k^wólpo-* (cf. PGm. fem. **h^walbō* in ON *hvalf*, OE *hwealf* ‘vault’).¹²⁰⁷

As can be gleaned from the evidence, this dissimilation is found in Ionic-Attic (not in Myc.) and must therefore be relatively late. The fact that *δελφύς* does show the palatalization of a labiovelar before *e* can be explained if the dissimilation **K^w...P > *K...P* took place after the palatalization of the labiovelar.¹²⁰⁸ It is possible, then, that the initial *γ-* of *γλαφυρός* and *γλάφω* arose in this way.

Since the full grade slot of the root for ‘hollow’ was **g^welb^h-*, this etymology furnishes new evidence for a regular development **l > -λα-* in Homeric Greek (and, presumably, in Proto-Ionic). It may also help us to clarify the background of the toponym *Δελφοί* (Boeot. *Βελφοί*). Given the etymological meaning ‘hollow’, this may be the plural of a substantivized adjective which referred to caves or places of shelter.¹²⁰⁹ The same meaning is found in *γλάφω* ‘cave’, and another toponym containing this root is *Γλάφυραι* (Il. 2.712).¹²¹⁰

¹²⁰⁵ See chapter 11 on the IE etymology of *yóni-*. In Classical Sanskrit, the meanings ‘inside, middle, interior’ and ‘adyton, interior of a sanctuary’ are well-attested for *gárbha-* (cf. Monier-Williams, q.v.).

¹²⁰⁶ The reconstruction of the root as **d^hb^héng^h-* (rather than **b^héng^h-*) is based on the Avestan verbal root *dabqz-* ‘to consolidate’.

¹²⁰⁷ See Schwyzler (1939: 298-9, 302) for an overview of these cases of dissimilation.

¹²⁰⁸ Hom. *γεφύραι* ‘dams, lines of battle’, post-Hom. *γέφυρα* ‘bridge’ beside Boeot. *βεφυρα*, Cret. *δεφυρα* < PGr. **g^wep^h-* seems to constitute a counterexample to this solution for *δελφύς*. But since the word cannot be properly reconstructed for PIE, it may also be argued (with Beekes, EDG) that the word was borrowed in different ways into the various Greek dialects. Note that both *γλαφυρός* and *γλάφω* are limited to Epic Greek, where the development may have been different from that of the vernacular. Finally, it is also possible that we are dealing with an incidental dissimilatory phenomenon.

¹²⁰⁹ It is possible to assume that **g^welb^h-ó-* contains the Caland suffix *-ó-* (cf. Nussbaum’s derivation of *ἀργός* ‘white’ from **h₂erg^h-ó-*).

¹²¹⁰ The precise origin of the hapax *γλάφω* (n.) ‘cave, shelter’ (Hes. *Op.* 533) is debated. De Lamberterie (1990: 313-14) analyzes it as a substantivized form of the *u*-stem adjective. However, in view of the evidence gathered in chapter 4, it seems unlikely that the adjective generalized the zero grade at an early date: since the original ablaut form **g^welb^h-u* would have a full grade, paradigmatic leveling would be expected to yield **+γάλφω*.

When using γλαφυρός as evidence for **l* > -λα-, we have to make one slight reservation concerning the origin of γλάφω ‘to scoop out, dig a hole’. This form is problematic: as we have seen, it would be the only trace of **g^welb^h*- as a verbal root. The precise origin of this Greek zero grade thematic root present (of the type Ved. *tudāti*) is unclear. An obvious comparandum for γλάφω within Greek is γράφω ‘to scratch, write’, which is also transitive and semantically close. If γράφω may reflect a formation with nasal infix (see section 9.2), the same could perhaps be assumed for γλάφω. I see no reason, however, to assume that the rare verb γλάφω influenced γλαφυρός, or that it was the derivational basis of the latter. In fact, ἀδελφεός presupposes the existence of a compounded s-stem adjective **sm-g^welb^h-es*-. This means that the existence of a parallel u-stem adjective **g^welb^h-u-*, **g^wlb^h-eu-*, from which γλαφυρός would have to be derived, is conform to expectation. More generally, Greek Caland formations derive from intransitive verbal stems, not from transitive verbs like γλάφω.

10.5 The development of **ln*

A couple of Ionic-Attic forms suggest that **l* developed to -αλ- in front of nasal plus vowel.¹²¹¹ An original sequence **ln* can be reconstructed in the following verbal forms:¹²¹²

- βάλλω ‘to throw’ < **g^wlne/o-* << **g^wl-n-(e)h₁-*
- θάλλω ‘to flourish’ < **d^hlne/o-* << **d^hl-n-(e)h₁-*
- πάλλω ‘to toss, sway, brandish’, perhaps < **plne/o-* << **pl-n-(e)h₁-*.

Ionic-Attic βούλομαι, West Greek δήλομαι ‘to wish, want’ and other dialectal variants must be reconstructed as PGr. **g^welne/o-*. Similarly, Hom. εἴλομαι ‘to throng together’ derives from **welne/o-*, and ὀφείλω ‘to owe’ from **op^helne/o-*. This proves that intervocalic -*ln*- developed to -λ- with compensatory lengthening of the preceding vowel (cf. Slings 1975). This can be reconciled with the geminate -λλ- in βάλλω, θάλλω, πάλλω if we assume that the vocalization **l* > -αλ- in *-*ln*- was posterior to the assimilation *-*ln*- > -*ll*- in original intervocalic position.

The question is whether the presents βάλλω, θάλλω, and πάλλω can be used to prove a regular vocalization *-*ln*- > *-*aln*- > -αλλ-. That βάλλω is indeed an original nasal present **g^wlne/o-* (PIE **g^wl-n-h₁-*) seems reasonably certain, but the present stem may theoretically have been influenced by the vowel slot of its aorist βαλεῖν. It is often suggested (see Frisk,

¹²¹¹ I leave aside the following forms: (1) σκαλμός ‘thole, pin by which the oar was fastened to the τρωπητήρ’ (trag.+). The connection with PGm. **skalma-* (attested in various concrete meanings), accepted by DELG and Frisk, seems uncertain; an inner-Greek derivation from σκάλλω ‘to hoe’ seems semantically difficult; (2) Ion.-Att. στήλη, Dor. στάλα, Lesb. στάλλα. The pre-form is not necessarily **stl^h-neh₂-*, as is often assumed: see section 1.2.4; (3) μαλλός ‘flock of wool’: the comparison with Armenian *mal* ‘ram’, proposed by Greppin (1981), is doubtful: cf. the discussion in Clackson (1994: 232); (4) φαλλός ‘penis’ could be related to OIr. *ball* ‘member’, *ball ferda* ‘penis’ < PCl. **balno-*, W. *balleg* ‘sack, purse’, Lat. *follicis* ‘bag, testicles’ < **b^hol-n-* or **b^hl-n-*. The pre-form **b^hlnó-* that would be presupposed by Gr. φαλλός could also underlie the Celtic word. Alternatively, φαλλός could be a substrate word (Beekes EDG s.v.), and the meaning of the word advises against basing any conclusions on it.

¹²¹² πύλναμαι ‘to approach’ preserved or rather restored -λν- due to a proportional analogy σκεδάσαι : σκίδναμαι = πελάσαι : X. It may have replaced an opaque form like *πάλλαμαι. I also leave aside πλανάω ‘to drive off track, mislead’, mid. ‘to err, go wrong; wander’, πλάνη ‘long journey, errand; error, falsehood’ (Ion.-Att.). Cognates within Ionic-Attic are πλάνος ‘vagabond; deceiver’ (trag.+), t-stem πλάνης, -ητος ‘vagabond; planet’, s-stem adjectives πολυπλανής (E.+), ‘wandering much’ (= πολύπλαγκτος) and ἀπλανής ‘unerring; fixed (of stars)’ (Pl.+). The verb is nearly absent from Homer (only πλανόωνται ‘they waver’, of horses at Il. 23.321), which may at least in part be due to the fact that πλάνης and the non-presentic stem forms of πλανάω would require McL scansion. According to the etymological dictionaries (cf. Frisk s.v.), the root has no convincing etymology. In view of the meaning, it would be obvious to compare πλαγχθῆναι and to assume a substrate word (see the remarks in Beekes EDG s.v. πλανόομαι).

Beekes *EDG*, q.v.) that a *yod*-present cannot be excluded, but this formation was not normally derived from a thematic aorist. On the other hand, a nasal present beside a thematic or root aorist is a well-known pattern, and probably inherited from PIE (within Greek, cf. δάκνω beside δακεῖν, Ion. τάμνω beside ταμεῖν). For θάλλω, the root reconstruction $*d^heh_1-$ proposed by Hackstein (2002: 220) clearly favors an inherited nasal present $*d^heh_1ne/o-$ < $*d^heh_1n-(e)h_1-$. The derivative θαλλός ‘sprout’ seems to be based on this present stem. It would be possible to argue, however, that the root shape of the frequent pf. ptc. τεθαλυῖα < $*d^heh_1us-ih_2$ influenced the vocalization of $*d^heh_1ne/o-$.

The case of πάλλω is much more complicated. The *LIV*² (s.v. $*pelh_1-$, following Harðarson 1993: 161) reconstructs an inherited nasal present $*pl_n-h_1-$. Frisk, however, reconstructs a *yod*-present $*pal-je/o-$ in view of the aorist πῆλαι < $*pal-s-$. In other words, Homeric Greek points towards a root PGr. $*pal-$, but the etymology requires a root ending in a laryngeal. The resolution of this issue depends on the question which formation was primary. The sigmatic aorist πῆλαι is clearly secondary (cf. *LIV*² l.c. and Beckwith 1996: 125), and the root aorist πάλτο is widely supposed to be a secondary and artificial creation (Leumann 1950: 60ff., accepted by Harðarson 1993: 196f.). The only remaining formation is the relic reduplicated aorist ἀμπεπαλὼν ‘swinging up (over the head)’, which is only attested in Homer and could be reconstructed as $*pe-plh_1-e/o-$. This seems to confirm the root reconstruction $*pelh_1-$.

Etymologically, πάλλω is connected by the *LIV*² ($*pelh_1-$) with Slov. *pláti* ‘to wave’, Ru. dial. *polót* ‘to winnow’. These meanings are indeed close to πάλλω ‘to toss, sway’, but it deserves attention that some older etymological dictionaries (Ernout-Meillet s.v. *pellō*, Frisk s.v. πάλλω) compare πάλλω primarily with Lat. *pellō* ‘to beat against, strike, push’. The Latin perfect *pepulī* could then be compared with the reduplicated aorist ἀμπεπαλὼν. This equation is also attractive from a semantic point of view: Frisk (l.c.) compares παλμός ‘pulse’ with Lat. *pulsus* ‘id.’. Although the formation of παλμός need not be inherited, a number of attestations of the intransitive middle present πάλλομαι suggest that this meaning is old: ‘to beat’, of the heart (πάλλεται ἥτορ *Il.* 22.452, παλλομένη κραδίην *Il.* 22.461), but also ‘to flounder’ (ἀναπάλλεται ἰχθύς, of a fish in *Il.* 23.692, also at *Hdt.* 1.141), ‘to quiver’ (of the knees of old men, *Ar. Ran.* 345), ‘to vibrate’ (of a string, *Pl. Phd.* 94c). Likewise, Lat. *pellō* may mean ‘to vibrate’ (transitive) when the action is applied to the strings of a musical instrument. It seems attractive, then, to derive πάλλω and Lat. *pellō* from an inherited nasal present $*pl_n-h_1-$ ‘to strike, vibrate’ (tr.) that was built to an intransitive verb with the meaning ‘to sway, vibrate’.

Most modern etymological dictionaries (e.g. *LIV*², de Vaan s.v. *pellō*) separate πάλλω from the root of Lat. *pellō* and Umbr. *am-pelust* ‘will have slain’, because they connect the Italic words with OIr. *ad-ella* ‘visits’ and fut. *-eblaid* ‘will drive’. The root is reconstructed as $*pelh_2-$ on the basis of a comparison between OIr. *ad-ella* and Gr. πῖλναμαι, aor. πελάσαι ‘to approach’; the semantic development is supposed to be **‘to bring near’* → *‘to thrust, drive near’* → *‘to strike’*. This scenario has been embraced by various scholars, but seems extremely unlikely to me. It seems much more pertinent to separate OIr. *ad-ella* from the future *-eblaid*, and to assume that we are dealing with two different nasal present formations: $*pl_n-h_1-$ ‘to strike, vibrate’ > Lat. *pellō*, Gr. πάλλω, and $*pl_n-h_2-$ ‘to approach’ > OIr. *ad-ella*, Gr. πῖλναμαι.

If this is correct, the question is whether -αλ- in the present πάλλω can be due to a restoration of -λα-. Given that πάλτο is generally supposed to be secondary, such a refashioning would have to be based on the relic form ἀμπεπαλὼν. It may be wondered, however, whether that is a very likely scenario. Therefore, πάλλω must be taken seriously as evidence for a regular development $*j_n > -αλλ-$ in Ionic-Attic.

10.5.1 καλλι-, περι-καλλής

It remains to discuss another lexical root with -αλλ-: that of περι-καλλής ‘very beautiful’, κάλλος ‘beauty’, possessive compounds like καλλι-γύναικα ‘with beautiful women’, and the forms of comparison καλλίων, κάλλιστος, which belong to καλός ‘beautiful’. The etymology of -καλλής and related forms is considered to be unclear. The only existing proposal is that by Wackernagel (1934: 191-197), who proposed to analyze Skt. *kalyāṇa-* ‘beautiful, lovely’ (fem. *kalyāṇī*) as an old compound *‘with beautiful elbows’, with a first member **kali-* to be compared with καλλι-, which in his view replaced an older *καλι-. Whether one accepts this analysis or not, it does not illuminate the remarkable allomorphy between καλός and καλλ- within Greek.

In my view, a much more direct reconstruction of -καλλής, καλλι- can be given. Since Caland adjectives (notably s-stem adjectives) were productively derived from intransitive verbs in Greek, -καλλής < **kľn-es-* and καλλι- < **kľn-i-* could be mechanically derived from a Proto-Greek thematic nasal present **kľne/o-*.¹²¹³ If we assume that ‘beautiful’ developed from ‘excelling, outstanding’, this reconstruct PGr. **kľne/o-* can be further analyzed as the equivalent of the nasal present attested in Lat. *-cellō* ‘to rise’ and Lith. *kĩlti* ‘to rise’, 1s. pres. *kylũ*.¹²¹⁴

The original meaning of περικαλλής (the only Homeric s-stem compound containing this root) would be ‘standing out (from the rest), excelling’.¹²¹⁵ The meaning ‘to excel, surpass’ is, of course, also found in Lat. *praecellō, excellō*. A further noteworthy detail is found in Lithuanian: this language not only has a u-stem adjective *kilũs* ‘protruding, sticking out’ (with the synchronic meaning of *kĩlti*), but also *kilnũs* ‘elevated, sublime’, which looks like a derivation from the older nasal present stem **kľn-* (before the liquid was vocalized and the nasal present changed into infixed **kinl-*). It is therefore both formally and semantically close to the Greek Caland forms.

This brings us to the formation of the positive, Att. *κάλός*, Hom. *κᾶλός*, Boeot. *καλφος* ‘beautiful’. On the basis of Greek alone, this **kalwó-* could theoretically continue a PGr. **kľwó-*, if one supposes a vocalization **ľ* > -αλ- in front of **w* (but see section 1.2.1). But if the etymology proposed here is correct, the root must be reconstructed as **kelh₁-* (final *-*h₁-* reconstructed on the basis of the thematicized present PGr. **kľne/o-*, cf. βάλλω, θάλλω, πᾶλλω). This implies that **kalwó-* must be a thematicization of PGr. **kalú-*, a phenomenon also encountered in Hom. στεινός ‘narrow’ beside στενυ-, ταναός ‘thin’ beside τανυ- (Ved. *tanú-*), or μανός ‘sparse, thin’ beside μανύ and Arm. *manr* (u-stem) ‘small, thin’. Note that a common pre-form PIE **klh₁-u-* ‘sticking out, rising up’ may be theoretically reconstructed for Lith. *kilũs* and PGr. **kalú-*.

The existence of **kalwó-* is important, because it offers at least the theoretical possibility that the vocalization **ľ* > -αλ- in περικαλλής was influenced by this form. As with πᾶλλω, the root καλλ- offers suggestive evidence for a regular vocalization **ľn* > -αλλ-, but the influence of cognate forms cannot be entirely excluded.

¹²¹³ This pre-form would have yielded Gr. *κάλλομαι. In the meaning ‘to stand out’, this verb was perhaps replaced by (δια)πρέπω. In Early Greek poetry, cf. also the inherited middle pf. κέκασμαι ‘to excel’.

¹²¹⁴ Lat. *-cellō* may have introduced its *e*-vowel from a prehistoric aorist, see de Vaan (EDL s.v. *-cellō* 1).

¹²¹⁵ In a number of cases, one may suspect that περικαλλής originally refers to a conspicuous or elevated object, Διὸς περικαλλεῖ φηγῷ (Il. 5.693), δόμον περικαλλέα, περικαλλέα δειρήν, and περικαλλέα βωμόν. Cf. in particular πᾶσαν γὰρ ὀηλικίην ἑκεαστο κάλλει “she excelled in beauty over all of her age-group” (Il. 13.431-2), and οἷος δ’ ἀστὴρ εἴσι μετ’ ἀστράσι νυκτὸς ἀμολγῷ ἔσπερος, ὃς κάλλιστος ἐν οὐρανῷ ἵσταται ἀστὴρ “as a star goes among the stars in the Milky Way, the Evening Star, which stands [out] in heaven as the most conspicuous (or: beautiful) star” (Il. 22.317-8, my translation).

10.5.2 ἄλης, Hom. ἀολλέες

The adjective Ion. ἄλης (Hdt., Hp.) means ‘thronged, amassed, in close formation, forming a unity’, plur. also ‘all together’.¹²¹⁶ This is a potentially important piece of evidence, because it is matched by the Homeric forms ἀολλέες (*plurale tantum*) ‘gathered together’ < zero grade **ha-wl̥n-es-*, and ἀελλής ‘thick, dense’ (Ns. msc., hapax at *Il.* 3.13) with a full grade root.¹²¹⁷ The zero grade formation is also found in West Greek: Elean ἀφλανεδός ‘all together’, and the gloss ἀλανέως· ὀλοσχερῶς. Ταραντῖνοι (‘entirely, completely’, Hsch.).¹²¹⁸ Since Taranto was a Spartan colony, this adverb can be reconstructed for Proto-West Greek.

Several uncertainties render the reconstruction of this adjective difficult. The dialectal origin of Hom. ἀολλέες is unclear. The hapax ἀελλής, with its geminate reflex of intervocalic **-ln-*, seems to have an Aeolic origin and to point to a pre-form **ha-welnes-*. The Ionic prose form ἄλης could theoretically continue a full grade (cf. ἀελλής) as well as a zero grade root (ἀολλέες, ἀφλανεδός). On the one hand, it could be reconstructed as **ha-wl̥n-* > **ha-waln-* > **hawall-* > **hāl(l)-*, where the geminate was automatically simplified after a long vowel. But since ἄλης may also be the regular contraction of a pre-form **hawēles-* < **ha-welnes-* with *e*-grade root, it does not necessarily presuppose an Ionic-Attic development **ln* > *-αλλ-*.

For present purposes, the main issue concerns the pre-form to be reconstructed for Proto-Greek. Since it is unlikely that West Greek and Homer independently introduced a zero grade without a clear motivation, we have to reconstruct **sm-wl̥n-es-*, with a zero grade root. It follows that the *e*-grade was introduced in the hapax ἀελλής, and possibly also in ἄλης. A possible basis for this introduction was the verbal root **wel-* ‘to throng’, which formed a nasal present **welne/o-* reflected in Hom. εἴλωμαι ‘to be thronged’. The full grade is present in most stems of the Homeric verbal paradigm: beside pres. εἴλωμαι, cf. mid. pf. ἔελμαι, and also pres. εἰλέω ‘to press together’, aor. ἔλσαι.¹²¹⁹

The derivational basis of the pre-form **sm-wl̥n-es-* has not been pointed out so far. A suffix **-nos-*, as assumed by Frisk, Chantraine, and Beekes, is difficult to motivate.¹²²⁰ Since *s*-stem adjectives could be directly derived from intransitive verbal stems, I would propose to reconstruct a present stem **wl̥n-e/o-* that was later replaced by the **welne-e/o-* > Hom. εἴλωμαι.¹²²¹ In the same way, one could assume that the precursors of βούλωμαι and ὀφείλω

¹²¹⁶ Cf. Ἀλῆς μὲν γὰρ γενομένη πᾶσα ἡ Ἑλλὰς χεῖρ μεγάλη συνάγεται ‘For when all of Hellas unites (...)’ (Hdt. 7.157). For the meaning of the plural, see e.g. ἄλεσι μὲν γὰρ σφί ἐστι Ἀτάραντες οὖνομα, ἐνὶ δὲ ἐκάστῳ αὐτῶν οὖνομα οὐδὲν κεῖται ‘For as a whole they are called Atarantes, but every single one of them does not have a name’ (Hdt. 4.184), and σίτοισι δὲ ὀλίγοισι χρέωνται, ἐπιφορήμασι δὲ πολλοῖσι καὶ οὐκ ἄλεσι ‘their side-dishes are numerous, and not served all together’ (Hdt. 1.133). Cf. also πάντες ἄλεες (Hdt.) corresponding to πάντες ἀολλέες (Hom.). Attic uses ἀθρόος (of uncertain etymology) in the same meaning.

¹²¹⁷ ὥς ἄρα τῶν ὑπὸ ποσσὶ κονίσαλος ὄρνυτ’ ἀελλῆς ἐρχομένων· μάλα δ’ ὄκα διέπρησσαν πεδίοιο (*Il.* 3.13-4). The Achaeans and Trojan armies approach each other; the Achaeans are compared to Notos (the South Wind) which blows a gust of mist over the mountains: “Likewise a thick cloud of dust arose from under their feet as they marched: and they crossed the plain very quickly”. The idea that ἀελλής is related to ἄελλα ‘gust of wind’ cannot be upheld, see Kirk’s commentary ad loc.

¹²¹⁸ The Elean form is an adverb in *-ως* based on the *s*-stem adjective. It modifies the directly preceding numeral <π>εντακατιδῶν, denoting the council of 500 “in its entirety”. Minon (2007: 36, 511-13) translates “au complet”. This excellently fits the semantics of Hom. ἀολλέες ‘gathered together’.

¹²¹⁹ There is also the intransitive aorist ἀλῆναι ‘to get close together, become thronged’, with a zero grade reflex in accordance with regular ablaut schemes. A perfect is perhaps attested as ἐόλει (a likely emendation in Pi. *Pyth.* 4.233) in the meaning ‘to push back’, cf. *DELG* s.v. εἰλέω 1.

¹²²⁰ The traditional analysis, as adopted by Beekes (*EDG*, q.v.) is as follows: “... both may go back to **ἄ-φαλνής* or **ἄ-φολνής*, with copulative *ἄ-*, *ἄ-* < **sm-* and **wa/oln-* < *QIE* **-ul-n-*. We may suppose a noun **φέλ-νός* ‘crowd, throng’, suffixed like ἔθνος, σμῆνος (Chantraine 1933: 420), which would belong to εἴλω. The expected full grade [for the *s*-stem compound] may be found in the hapax ἀελλής (*Il.* 3.13).” Upon this analysis, however, the zero grade of ἀολλέες remains unexplained, and the assumption of a suffix **-nes-* is problematic.

¹²²¹ Comparable derivations of an *s*-stem adjective from a middle present stem are, for instance, *-τρεφής* from *τρέφομαι* and *-δερκής* from *δέρκομαι*.

secondarily introduced a full grade. The process is well-known in Latin (*pellō*, *-cellō*, etc.). Thus, the original intransitive present **w_lneto* must have formed the basis of the s-stem **sm-w_ln-es-*.

A derivation of ἀελλής from the more recent present stem **weln-* (or later **well-*) reflected in εἶλομαι would make sense from a semantic point of view. Both ἀολλέες and ἀφλανεὸς have developed the meaning ‘gathered, all together’ (denoting a total or sum), while ἀελλής ‘thick’ qualifies a sandstorm (κονίσαιλος) in its only attestation. The latter form remains much closer in meaning to the verb εἰλέω, εἶλομαι. Moreover, the fact that ἀολλέες has a defective plural paradigm in Homer confirms its lexicalized and derivationally isolated status.¹²²² The lexical isolation of **sm-w_ln-es-* may go back to Proto-Greek, because the non-trivial semantic development is attested both in Homer and in West Greek, but especially because the introduction of *e*-vocalism into North-Greek **g^wélnomai* ‘to want’ and ὀφείλω ‘to owe’ must be very old (cf. Myc. *o-pe-ro-si*). Since the Ionic prose form ἀλής means both ‘united, all together’ and ‘thronged, in close formation’, it is hard to exclude that its root vocalism was influenced by εἰλέω, εἶλομαι.

Let us now consider the possible origins of Hom. ἀολλέες. At first sight, it seems logical to assume that ἀολλέες is Aeolic form, in view of the geminate reflex -λλ- < **-ln-* in combination with the *o*-vocalism. But since **-l_n-* yields -λλ- in the Ionic words discussed above, the only remaining argument for an Aeolic origin is the *o*-vocalism. There is no further evidence, however, to suggest that the outcome of **l* in the Aeolic dialects was -ολ-.¹²²³ It cannot be ruled out that **l* developed to Aeolic -ολ- in front of a nasal,¹²²⁴ but the conclusions reached in chapter 7 warn us that ἀολλέες may be an old Epic word.¹²²⁵ What might its dialectal origin be?

An Ionic origin does not seem likely. It is hard to exclude entirely that the preceding **w* could induce *o*-coloring in front of **-l_n-*.¹²²⁶ Still, this would require that **w_l-* developed differently from **w_r-*, as in ἄρσῃν. Moreover, the fact that Classical Ionic has ἀλής speaks against a vernacular origin. An inner-Epic vocalization of **-l_n-*, in the manner of chapters 6 and 7, does not seem likely either: ἀολλέες only occurs between |_T and |_B, so that its pre-form **haw_lnehes* would have required a metrical lengthening. However, I have found no convincing parallels for the metrical lengthening of a syllabic liquid. Note that **l* and **r* did not have a corresponding long phoneme.

Only one logical option remains: an Achaeian relic form. We do not know the regular outcome of **l* in Mycenaean, because there is no convincing evidence for **l* generally, let alone for the position in front of a nasal.¹²²⁷ But no matter whether **r* was preserved in

¹²²² Cf. section 4.3 on the defective plural paradigm of Hom. ταρφέες ‘numerous’.

¹²²³ Cf. e.g. Wathelet (1970: 170), who cites ἀολλής as the only example, and only with hesitation.

¹²²⁴ If the Aeolic outcome of **l* was -ολ-, parallel to **r* > -ρο-, one could theoretically assume that the vowel slot was analogically introduced from the verbal root **weln-*. But one wonders whether restoration of **w_lon-* to **w_oln-* was likely if the full grade verbal root was already **well-* when **l* vocalized. Clearly, the stage **-ln-* belonged to the past already in Mycenaean, given *o-pe-ro-si* /op^hellonsi/ < PGr. **op^heln-e/o-*. If the word is of Aeolic origin, then, it would follow either that the Aeolic vocalization **l* > -ολ- was prior to **-ln-* > **-ll-*, or that the Aeolic vocalization in front of a nasal was **l* > -ολ-.

¹²²⁵ The transitive verb ἀολλίζω ‘to gather together’ was derived from the s-stem ἀολλής by a productive process in Homer (cf. τεύχίζω beside τεύχος).

¹²²⁶ The only counterexample I know of is **walpu-*, presupposed by ἄλπιστος ‘loveliest’ etc. (see section 4.2.2).

¹²²⁷ A possible candidate could be Myc. *wo-ne-we*, if this form is to be interpreted as the Np. of a *u*-stem adjective **weln-u-*, **w_lln-ew-* ‘compact’. If this interpretation is correct, it would confirm the Achaeian origin of ἀολλέες in a spectacular way. But unfortunately, the context of the form does not allow us to reach certainty: see section 2.3.2.

Mycenaean or whether it had developed to *-or-*, it seems possible that the Mycenaean outcome of PGr. **sm-wln-es-* was Myc. **hawolnehes*.¹²²⁸

10.6 Dialectal evidence

There are two West Greek dialects for which some conclusions can be drawn: Cretan and the dialect of Elis. In Cretan, we have seen that the root *βλαπ-* ~ *βλοπ-* offers evidence for a conditioned development of **l̥* in a labial environment. However, given that *βλαπ-* probably contains a vocalized nasal, the vowel slot of *βλοπ-* may be due to leveling. The gloss *κλάγος· γάλα*. Κρήτες (Hsch.) contains a development *κλ-* < *γλ-* typical for certain parts of Crete.¹²²⁹ Another Cretan form, *κλευκος*, Gs. *κλευκιος* ‘new wine’ (Bile 1988, No. 28) beside Myc. *de-re-u-ko* /*dleukos*/, Cret. Gs. *γλευκιος* (Gortyn) and Att. *γλεῦκος* (Arist.) show that some regions of Crete underwent a devoicing *γλ-* > *κλ-*. The form *κλάγος* could seem to prove *l̥* > *λα* after a non-labial consonant for Cretan, but the reconstruction of the pre-form remains uncertain: as we have seen above, a vocalized nasal cannot be entirely excluded.

The verb *λαγαιω* ‘to release’ (of persons in custody) has an aor. *λαγασαι* (Gortyn, *IC* IV Nos. 14; 52B; 62.6; 78.4; also *Lex Gortyn* passim), and is also attested as a gloss *λαγάσσαι· ἀφεῖναι* (Hsch.). The origin of the *-α-* lies in the aorist, because the present (< **-as-je/o-*) was productively derived from it. Frisk (q.v.) suggests that *λαγάσσαι* is a remodelling of an older root aorist or thematic aorist *λαγ-* after *χαλάσσαι*, which has a similar meaning (*χαλάω* ‘to loosen, relax’, also ‘to release a prisoner’). Since the *-α-* in *λαγάσσαι* can hardly be part of the root, this solution seems reasonable. If this is correct, the etymological connection with Vedic *sarj-* ‘to let go, set free’ (*LIV*² s.v. **selǵ-*) is quite attractive. It would show that Cretan underwent a development **hl̥g-* > *λαγ-*, or perhaps rather word-initial **l̥g-* > *λαγ-*, because Cretan is a psilototic dialect. It must be stressed that this is based on a root etymology only, and that we are dealing with an *unus testis* for word-initial position.

As we have seen in the previous section, the West Greek cognates of Hom. *ἀολλέες* are Elean *αφλανεὸς* ‘all together’ and the gloss *ἀλανέως· ὀλοσχερῶς. Ταραντῖνοι* (‘entirely, completely’, Hsch.).¹²³⁰ They provide valuable evidence for the regular development of **l̥* in these dialects. The verb *αποφελεω* /*apowēleō*/ is attested in Elis (cf. Minon 2007: 511-13), with a reflex of the first compensatory lengthening. The full grade slot **weln-* ensures that *αφλανεὸς* has the uninterrupted development of **-wln-* in this dialect.

In this context, it is noteworthy that the reflex of **l̥* in Cretan was *-αρ-*, and that Cretan has *o*-vocalism after a preceding labial consonant, both in **l̥* > *ορ* (*πορτι, -μορτος, Αφορδιτα*) and **l̥* > *λο* or *ολ* (*αβλοπια*). This suggests that the development of **l̥* was later than Proto-West Greek (if it makes sense at all to reconstruct such an entity). Finally, *αφλανεὸς* proves that the development of an anaptyctic vowel in **-l̥n-* was a matter of the individual dialect groups, or even of the individual dialects. In other words, **-l̥n-* cannot be compared with the laryngeal developments discussed in section 1.2, where all Greek dialects behave in an identical way.¹²³¹

Among the reflexes of the root **plth₂-*, there is no evidence for a dialectal variant *πλοτ-*: the Cyprian form *po-lo-te-i* is unreliable (see section 3.5). The Lesbian evidence is as

¹²²⁸ The Homeric epithet *εἰλιποδ-*, attested in the formulae *βουσὶν ἐπ’ εἰλιπόδεσσι* and *εἰλίποδας βοῦς*, has remained without a convincing explanation to this date (cf. *DELG, EDG*). It may also contain the root of *ἀολλής*, if we suppose that it denoted cows ‘with thronged feet’. This is close to the core meaning of the verbal root, and a semantically satisfactory description of a herd of cattle. Note also Hom. *μάχεσθαι ἀολλέες* ‘to fight in close formation’ and *νηυσὶν ἀολλέσιν* (*Od.*), of ships gathered ashore. The first member may be derived either from **wel-i-* with metrical lengthening, or from **weln-i-* parallel to the form of the *s*-stem adjective with **weln-es-*.

¹²²⁹ It has been supposed that Cret. *κλάγος* is from **γλάκος* by metathesis of voice (see the older lit. in Frisk s.v.), but this is both unlikely and unnecessary.

¹²³⁰ Taranto was a colony of Sparta.

¹²³¹ The evidence from Elis for the outcome of **l̥* is minimal and internally contradictory: see section 3.3.3.

follows. In Mytilene we find the word for ‘shoulder-blade’ as ὠμοπλάτα[ν (*IG* XII 2 71.2), and also the abstract πλάτος ‘breadth’ (Hodot 1990, MYT 013, 10, 3rd c.). The adjective πλάτυς is attested in Lesbian poetry (Alc. fr. 74). An epicism or Ionicism cannot be easily excluded in any of these instances, and is especially likely in ὠμοπλάτα, given that the regular Aeolic outcome of ‘shoulder’ would be ομμο- < *Homso- (cf. ἐπομμάδιος, v.l. in Theoc. 29.29). Finally, note that σπλανχων (MYT 015.04, 3rd c.) could also be due to Ionic influence.

Beside πλάτυς, two other words with -λα- < *l are attested in literary Lesbian: ἀβλάβη[ν ‘unscathed’ (Sapph. 5.1) and γλαφύρα[‘hollow’ (Alc. 7.8), but both could be borrowings from Ionic. As a fixed epithet of ships and caverns in Homer, γλαφυρός ‘hollow’ is clearly a traditional Epic word. The adjective ἀβλάβη[ν is also poetic, and typical for Ionic-Attic. The Homeric word ἀολλέες ‘thronged, all together’ is attested as ἀόλλεες in Alcaeus, but again, an Epic origin cannot be excluded. Thus, it is theoretically possible that the Lesbian outcome of *l, unlike that of *r, had a-vocalism, but the material does not necessarily impose this conclusion.

Πλατηεύς ‘inhabitant of Plataea’ is the epichoric Boeotian term. It could be argued, however, that Plataea was originally founded by speakers of a different dialect. In this case we would probably be dealing with a South Greek form. It cannot be excluded, for instance, that Proto-Ionic was once spoken in the area.

In Arcadian, the term μπλατια (*IG* V 2 4.2) is perhaps related to πλατύς. Although the meaning is not clear, the following verb ιλασκεσθαι (with dative rection) may suggest that the Ds. μπλατιαι denotes a sacrificial offering (cf. Dubois 1988 ad loc.). Further, we find a PN Πλατιας (*IG* V 2 6.57 and 85, Dubois 1988: 45), but it is unwise to base any conclusions on it, because the bearer need not be an Arcadian.

Thus, it could be thought that -λα- was regular in Arcadian and Lesbian, notwithstanding the fact that these dialects have -ορ- < *r and -ρο- < *r, respectively. In view of the marginal evidence, however, it is better not to draw a conclusion.

10.7 Conclusions

What was the regular place of the anaptyctic vowel after the vocalization of *l in Ionic-Attic? Unless one wishes to base anything on the connection between μαλθακός and the Germanic word for ‘mild’, we may conclude that there is no evidence at all for the reflex -αλ-. On the other hand, there are several reasonable candidates for the development to -λα-. This would be remarkable in view of the evidence for *r > -αρ-, with a different vowel slot. One might hesitate to assume different developments for *l and *r: as far as we know, these sounds hardly ever undergo different developments in the Indo-European daughter languages. But the evidence deserves to be taken seriously.

To be sure, the evidence for a regular reflex -λα- is not overwhelming. The forms γλάσσα, δίπλαξ, σπλάγχνα stand beside γλῶσσα, πλέκω, and σπλήν. Furthermore, βλαδεῖς is not necessarily of Ionic-Attic origin, and the reconstruction of γάλα, γλακτοφάγος, γλάγος is beset with problems. A new piece of evidence is γλαφυρός ‘hollow’, which I derive from a pre-form *g^wlb^h-u-ló- ‘hollow’. Unless one is prepared to accept that the verb γλάφω derives from *g^wlñb^h-e/o- and that the vocalism of γλαφυρός may have been influenced by it, this adjective does seem to furnish reasonable evidence for a regular development *l > -λα-. It must also be taken into account that forms like σπλάγχνα are lexically isolated, and therefore most easily explained if *l > -λα- was indeed the regular outcome.

There is one environment where -αλ- may be regular in Ionic-Attic: in front of a nasal. The case would be analogous to the Celtic outcomes, where *l normally yields -li-, but -al- in front of a nasal. We have seen that the reflex of *ln contained a geminate -λλ-, as opposed to intervocalic ln which underwent the first compensatory lengthening. In favor of the outcome

-αλ- speak -καλλής, for which I have proposed a reconstruction PGr. **-k_ln-es-*, and πάλλω, of which the underlying formation is to be equated with that of Lat. *pellō*. The Ionic prose form ἀλής does not prove anything, because it may have introduced the full grade vowel or its slot. Its cognate Hom. ὁλλέες ‘gathered together’ could contain a trace of the Mycenaean vocalization.

In most other dialects, there is unfortunately no reliable epigraphic evidence for the reflex of **l̥*. The only serious indication is the difference between Elean ἀφλανεὸς and Cretan ἀβλοπια: this suggests that the vocalization of **l̥*, just like that of **r̥*, took place in the individual West Greek dialects.