

*lucida  
intervalla*

ČASOPIS ZA KLASIČNE NAUKE  
A JOURNAL OF CLASSICAL STUDIES

47 (2018) FILOZOFSKI FAKULTET  
BEOGRAD

*Lucida intervalla* – Časopis za klasične nauke / A Journal of Classical Studies  
Periodično izdanje Filozofskog fakulteta u Beogradu  
ISSN 1450-6645  
Izlazi jednom godišnje

*Uredništvo*

Stephanie West (Oxford), Aleksandar Loma (Beograd), Boris Pendelj, gl. i odg. urednik (Beograd), Vojin Nedeljković (Beograd), Daniel Marković (Cincinnati), Sandra Šćepanović (Beograd), Dragana Dimitrijević (Beograd), Il Akkad, sekretar uredništva (Beograd)

*Adresa*

Čika-Ljubina 18–20, 11000 Beograd, Srbija  
telefon +381112639628  
e-mail [lucida.intervalla@f.bg.ac.rs](mailto:lucida.intervalla@f.bg.ac.rs)  
[www.f.bg.ac.rs/lucidaintervalla](http://www.f.bg.ac.rs/lucidaintervalla)

*Žiro-račun*

840-1614666-19, s pozivom na broj 0302

Na osnovu mišljenja Ministarstva nauke (413-00-1080/2002-01)  
ova publikacija oslobođena je plaćanja opšteg poreza na promet,  
shodno čl. 11 st. 7 Zakona o porezu na promet.

Danilo Savić  
École Pratique des Hautes Études, Paris  
d.md.savic@gmail.com

## The Development of Indo-European *\*-ln-* in the Greek Inherited Lexicon<sup>1</sup>

*Abstract:* Two reflexes of the IE cluster *\*-ln-* are generally recognised in Greek: the assimilation of *\*-ln-* to *-λλ-*, and the vowel lengthening in front of *\*-l-*, prompted by the loss of *\*-n-*. A reassessment of the relevant Greek material is proposed.

*Key Words:* Greek, Proto-Indo-European, Etymology, Nasal Suffix.

### 0. Introduction

The IE cluster *\*-ln-*, containing two resonants, can manifest in three different forms, depending on its surroundings: *\*-ln-*, *\*-l̥n-*, or *\*-l̥ŋ-*. In this article, we shall deal with either *\*-ln-* or *\*-l̥n-*; the variation *\*-l-* provides no insight on the development of the cluster *\*-ln-*, since IE *\*-Vl̥ŋC-* > Gr. *-VλαC-*, as in *\*h<sub>1</sub>l̥ŋg<sup>wh</sup>-u-* > Gr. *ἐλαχύς*, Skt. *laghú-* / *raghú-*. All potential occurrences of the sequence *\*-Cl̥ŋV-* reflect as *-Cαλλ-* in Greek and are part of the verbal flexion, e.g. *θάλλω*, *σφάλλω*; the one exception, *πίλναμαι*, has probably preserved the cluster by means of analogy, as we explain below. On the other hand, *\*-VlnV-* seemingly reflects either as *-V̄lV-* (compensatory lengthening) or *-λλ-* (gemination). Sometimes the reflex of *\*-VlnV-* depends on the dialect: Ionic-Attic displays compensatory lengthening, e.g. in *βούλομαι*, while the Aeolic *βόλλομαι* has a geminate instead. However, there are some forms that do not necessarily belong to a dialect other than Attic-Ionic, but only show *\*-VlnV-* > *-λλ-* such as *ὄλλυμι*, or *ἐλλός* and *ὠλλόν*. The nature of *\*-l-* and *\*-n-* should also be taken into account. As our material shows, *\*-l-* is always part of the root, while *\*-n-* is either a nasal infix (in verbs such as *θάλλω*), or a suffix (e.g. in *ὠλλόν*, *ὄλλυμι*, but also probably in *βούλομαι* and *ὀφείλω*). Therefore, our analysis of the individual Greek forms considers the following criteria: dialectal attestations, the nature of *\*-n-* and its presence in IE cognates, as well as other possible sources of *-V̄lV-* or *-λλ-*.

<sup>1</sup>The content of this paper was originally presented in June 2017 as part of my BA thesis *Razvoj ie. \*ln u leksičkom nasleđu grčkog i latinskog jezika (The development of IE \*ln in the Greek and Latin inherited lexicon)* on the occasion of its defense at the Department of Classics, University of Belgrade.

## 1. IE *\*ln* in Greek verbal flexion

### 1.1 IE *\*-ln-* > Gr. *-λν-*

#### 1.1.1 *πίλναμαι*

Apart from middle *πίλναμαι*, active forms *πλνᾶ*<sup>2</sup> and, perhaps, *πλνᾶς*<sup>3</sup> are attested. They both imply a 1sg.pr.act. *πλνάω*. It is possible to assume *\*πίλνημι* < *\*πίλνᾶμι* as an active form of *πίλναμαι*. This is facilitated by the traces of contract active forms. On the basis of *κίρνημι* : *κίρνάω*, we can analogically suppose *\*πίλνᾶμι* : *πλνάω*.<sup>4</sup> Almost all verbs containing 1s.pr. *na* *-νημι/-νᾶμι* < *\*-ne-h<sub>2</sub>-mi* create a younger contract form in *-άω*, which may or may not retain the nasal infix (e.g. *πίτνημι* : *πετάω*).<sup>5</sup> Therefore, *πίλναμαι* is to be derived from IE *\*pelh<sub>2</sub>-*, ‘sich nähern’; v. LIV s.v. In favour of *\*-h<sub>2</sub>-*, apart from the analogy to *κίρνημι*, we adduce derivatives such as *πέλας* ‘near’ and *πελάζω* ‘to approach’. An obvious nasal present is also found in Yav. *pəṛəne* ‘to charge at someone, to attack’ of the same root.

In conclusion, there is sufficient evidence to postulate *\*πίλνᾶμι* < *\*p<sub>l</sub>-ne-h<sub>2</sub>-mi*, and *πίλναμαι* < *\*p<sub>l</sub>-n-h<sub>2</sub>-*. The *-i-* in *-ιλ-* instead of the expected *-αλ-* or *-λα-* is to be seen as the influence of verbs such as *πίτνημι* and *σκίδνημι*, in which it occurs regularly.<sup>6</sup> According to Lejeune, this analogy was in part prompted by the vocalism of the reduplication in present tense.<sup>7</sup> The nasal infix in *πίλναμαι* remains unhindered, under the influence of the verbs ending in *-νημι*.

*πίλναμαι* is thus the only example of a preserved *\*ln* in Greek.

### 1.2 IE *\*-Cl<sub>n</sub>V-* > Gr. *-CVλλV-*

This group is comprised of the verbs ‘ending in *-αλλω*’, along with *ὄλλυμι* and *τέλλω*. The central question to be unravelled is the origin of the geminate *-λλ-*. From an IE perspective, the geminate most often comes down to either *\*-ln-* or *\*-lj-*, i.e. a nasal present or an iota-present; v. LIV: 17, 19. The nasal present of these verbs in Greek is derived from the IE athematic present roots

<sup>2</sup> Hes. *Op.* 510.

<sup>3</sup> Hom. *Dem.* 115. The reading of the verse is problematical, v. STRUNK 1967: 34.

<sup>4</sup> STRUNK 1967: 34 claims that *πλνᾶ* can be read as *πίλνᾶ*, i.e. a non-augmented 3.sg.imp. Consequently, *-ᾶ* is expected in any case, and it belongs to *πλνάω*.

<sup>5</sup> Also, cf. Lesb. *κάλημι*, *φίλημι* with *καλέω*, *φιλέω*.

<sup>6</sup> LEJEUNE 1987: §212.

<sup>7</sup> LEJEUNE 1987: §212. and HARÐARSON 1993: 182<sup>119</sup>.

ending in  $*-h_{1/3}$ .<sup>8</sup> Necessary, but frequently insufficient evidence of any of the two solutions is almost always present in another IE language, or languages. As we consider  $\theta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega$  to be the most convincing example of an ‘ $-\alpha\lambda\lambda\omega$  verb’ continuing IE  $*-ln-$ , its case is presented at the beginning. The other ‘ $-\alpha\lambda\lambda\omega$  verbs’ are given in alphabetical order, while  $\delta\lambda\lambda\omega\mu$  and  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\omega$ , being somewhat different, are analysed at the end.

### 1.2.1 $\theta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega$

The only certain verb cognate of  $\theta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega$  ‘to bloom, flourish’ is Alb. *dal* ‘to sprout, come out’. Another cognate is to be found in the Arm. adjective *dalar* ‘green, fresh’. Possible Germanic and Celtic cognates exist; the forms in question are MW *deillyau* ‘to emanate’ and various Germanic words for ‘dill’.<sup>10</sup>

For  $\theta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega$  and *dal* LIV reconstructs the root  $*dhalh_1-$  ‘herausquellen, hervorsprießen’. Both verbs are traced back to a zero-grade present containing a nasal infix,  $*dh_1-n(e)-h_1-$ . Such a formation is permissible in both cases. While Greek offers no decisive evidence, Albanian might just present solid proof regarding the nasal infix.

We must remark, however, that a solution other than the nasal present appears to be possible.<sup>11</sup> If Alb. *dal* is to be derived from a nasal present, we must suppose that IE  $*ln >$  Alb. *l*. DEMIRAJ 1993: 260ff. argues for this development. According to him, there is a group of Albanian verbs whose present forms originate from the IE nasal present in the following manner: IE  $*rn >$  *rr*, as in *marr*,<sup>12</sup> while IE  $*ln >$  *l*, as in *dal*. OREL 2000: 91 differs significantly concerning *dal*. He claims that IE  $*ln >$  Alb. *ll* (although,  $*rn >$  *rr* remains). Nevertheless, the examples provided, especially the verbs,<sup>13</sup> can be reconciled with *dal*. OREL 2000: loc.cit. mentions two verbs, *kall* ‘to insert, thrust, incite, set on fire’ and *pjell* ‘to beget, produce, bear’. Regarding *kall*, a PAlb.  $*kalna$  is assumed, originating from IE  $*k^{w}ol-o-$ , a thematic present of the root  $*k^{w}el-$ . Indo-European  $*l$ , however, regularly gives Alb. *ll*, if in intervocalic position in Proto-Albanian.<sup>14</sup> Thus it seems that the PAlb. form might as well be  $*kala$ ; it would, further,

<sup>8</sup> RIX 1992: §226.

<sup>9</sup> EDG s.v.  $\theta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega$  expresses doubt concerning the comparison with *deillyau*, while the form isn’t even mentioned in LIV s.v.  $*d^{h}alh_1-$ . According to EDPC, however, *deillyau* < PCelt.  $*dal-n-$  < IE  $*d^{h}l-n-h_1-$  and can be compared with  $\theta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega$ .

<sup>10</sup> It seems that the Germanic forms are of no relevance for the present discussion, v. EDPG s.v.  $*deli$ .

<sup>11</sup> For a survey of suggested etymologies, v. AE and AED s.v. *dal*.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. LIV s.v.  $*merh_2-$  and AE s.v. *marr*. Also, cf. Alb. *luqerrë* < Lat. *lucerna*.

<sup>13</sup> The nouns adduced by OREL 2000: 91. are *bolle*, *gësthallë* and *hall*. None of them is etymologically transparent.

<sup>14</sup> AE 3.2.b: IE  $*seh_1l-$  > PAlb.  $*sālā$  > alb. *gjollë*.

regularly reflect as *kall*. The same reasoning can be applied to *pjell*, in spite of its obscure etymology.<sup>15</sup> In favour of this we adduce the Alb. verbs of similar formation: *shtjell*, *sjell*, *vjell*, all of which are derived from an IE thematic present.<sup>16</sup> In conclusion, Alb. *ll* is not to be traced back to IE *\*ln*. Furthermore, *dal* is not the only example of IE *\*ln* > Alb. *l*, the other one being *për-kul* < *\*k<sup>w</sup>l-n-h<sub>1</sub>-*.<sup>17</sup>

The different reflexes of IE *\*-l-* seen in *-kul* and *dal* should be addressed. The former probably presents a regular reflex, the latter simply does not contain one at all.<sup>18</sup> Therefore, the root *\*d<sup>h</sup>alh<sub>1</sub>-* proposed by LIV is not tenable. Having in mind the Aeolic and Doric perf. τέθαλα, along with IA perf. τέθηλα, we propose the root *\*d<sup>h</sup>eh<sub>2</sub>lh<sub>1</sub>-*.<sup>19</sup> The Alb. aor. *dola* fits in well, since IE *\*eh<sub>2</sub>* > Alb. *o*, as in *mótër* < *\*meh<sub>2</sub>-tr*. Therefore, we conclude that *dal* < *\*d<sup>h</sup>h<sub>2</sub>l-ne-h<sub>1</sub>-*.<sup>20</sup>

On the basis of noted similarities between *dal* and θάλλω, we may with great certainty assume that θάλλω also goes back to *d<sup>h</sup>h<sub>2</sub>l-ne-h<sub>1</sub>-*.<sup>21</sup>

This development of θάλλω supposes that its root was thematised, and that later on *\*-λv-* > *-λλ-* through assimilation. In other words, *\*d<sup>h</sup>h<sub>2</sub>l-ne-h<sub>1</sub>-mi* > *\*θάλvημι* ⇒ *\*θάλvω* > θάλλω. We suppose that the other ‘-αλλω verbs’ have undergone the same process, if a nasal present is to be reconstructed for them.

### 1.2.2 βάλλω

βάλλω has two interesting forms attested in the Arcadian dialect – part. pres. ἐσδέλλοντες and 3.sg.aor. ἔζελεν.<sup>22</sup> The variation β-/δ- indicates se an IE root beginning with *\*g<sup>w</sup>-*. LIV reconstructs *\*g<sup>w</sup>elh<sub>1</sub>-* ‘treffen, werfen’.<sup>23</sup> Old Irish 3.sg.pres. *at-baill* ‘stirbt’ is attributed to the same root. Both forms sup-

<sup>15</sup> Pace OREL 2000: 91, *pjell* cannot be simultaneously compared with Lat. *pellō* and with Gr. πάλλω, if a comparison can be maintained at all. Cf. LIV s.vv. *\*pelh<sub>1</sub>-*, *\*pelh<sub>2</sub>-*.

<sup>16</sup> AE s.v. *dal* and LIV s.vv. *\*stel-*, *\*k<sup>w</sup>elh<sub>1</sub>-*, *\*uel-* (2). Furthermore, cf. LIV s.v. *\*der-*, where Alb. *djerr* is derived from *\*der-e-*.

<sup>17</sup> LIV s.v. *\*k<sup>w</sup>elh<sub>1</sub>-*.

<sup>18</sup> AE 3.1.1.b: the reflex of IE *\*l* in PALb. is *\*li*, which may or may not be preserved. Cf. *pópel* < PALb. *\*pēl-p<sub>li</sub>*, *plis* < PALb. *\*pliti-*. Another reflex of IE *\*l* could be Alb. *ul*. In fact, *-kul* is the only solid example. It is of importance, however, to emphasise that in no case does IE *\*l* > Alb. *a*.

<sup>19</sup> I am uncertain whether MW *deillyau* can be derived from this root, if it is at all related to the discussed material. In any case, LIV s.v. *\*d<sup>h</sup>alh<sub>1</sub>-* remains open to a root *\*d<sup>h</sup>eh<sub>2</sub>lh<sub>1</sub>-*.

<sup>20</sup> IE *\*-CHC-* > *-CaC-* regularly in Albanian, as in *shtat* < *\*sthst-* (Cf. Lat. *status*).

<sup>21</sup> The *\*-h<sub>1</sub>* is certain. Cf. the deverbative adjective θαλερός < *\*d<sup>h</sup>h<sub>2</sub>lh<sub>1</sub>-ro-*. We also note that, in Greek, the following vocalisation is theoretically possible, although not probable: *\*d<sup>h</sup>h<sub>2</sub>l-ne-h<sub>1</sub>-*.

<sup>22</sup> ἐσδέλλοντες is found on IG V 2.6. ἔζελεν is attested by Hesychius, as the Arcadian form of ἔβαλεν. The grade of these forms must stem from an ancient radical aorist. ζ- next to β-/δ- is probably a particularity of Arcadian. Hesychius also notes δέρεθρον and ζέρεθρα, as Arc. for βάραθρα. Furthermore, Strab. 8.8.4 clearly states that ζέρεθρα is an Arc. word.

<sup>23</sup> *\*-h<sub>1</sub>* is reconstructed in view of the forms in βλη-, such as 1.sg.perf. βέβληκα. It is also convenient if we are to pursue the possibility of the nasal present. STRUNK 1967: 42ff. gives a survey of etymologies proposed for βάλλω.

posedly stem from a nasal present. While it looks as if this is not disputed for *at-baill*,<sup>24</sup> we cannot be certain about βάλλω. Even if we accept the attempt of STRUNK 1967: 44 to shrink the semantic distance,<sup>25</sup> this one OIr. form cannot present solid proof for Greek. Apart from that, the nasal present in βάλλω is sometimes reconstructed on the basis of Skt. *ud-gūrṇa-* ‘emporgehoben’. This has no solid basis: (1) *ud-gūrṇa-* is an adjective, where a nasal suffix is more probable, (2) Skt. root *ud-gur-* ‘emporwerfen’, which gave *ud-gūrṇa-*, contains no nasal suffix.<sup>26</sup>

The only, and somewhat obscure, indication of a nasal present is OIr. *at-baill*. Therefore, βάλλω might as well be an iota-present.

### 1.2.3 σφάλλω

σφάλλω ‘to bring down, ruin, mislead’ is compared with Skt. *skhálate* ‘to stumble, stagger’ and Arm. *sxalem* ‘id.’. The comparison with Lat. *fallō* ‘to deceive’ is less certain.

LIV s.v. \*(s)g<sup>wh</sup>eh<sub>2</sub>l- ‘straucheln, fehltreten’ reconstructs for the Skt. and Arm. forms a thematic present, while deriving σφάλλω from an iota present, and *fallō* from a nasal one. Before laying out the possibilities for Greek, we should briefly consider *fallō*, as it is the only cognate with a possible nasal infix. In terms of semantics, a leap from tripping to deceiving is easy to imagine. Even more so, since some rather subtle vestiges of such a development are found in Latin:

1) *Sed gradum firmare vix poterant, cum modo saxa lubrica vestigium fallerent, modo rapidior unda subduceret.*<sup>27</sup>

‘But, they could hardly stand fast, for at one moment the slippery rocks deceived their step, at another the strong current carried them away.’  
(Translation mine)

2) *Illa vero miserabilis erat facies, cum ii, quos instabilis gradus fefellerat, ex praecipiti devolverentur...*<sup>28</sup>

‘It was indeed a miserable sight, when they, who had been deceived by

<sup>24</sup> This is stated on the basis of EDPC s.v. \**bal-ni-* and THURNEYSSEN 1998: §215, §552. Our references do not seem to have any doubt regarding the nasal present of *at-baill*, although they provide no explanation for it.

<sup>25</sup> *at-baill* is interpreted as ‘es (das Leben) auswerfen’, in which case it was originally a euphemism for ‘sterben’.

<sup>26</sup> V. KEWA s.v. *guráte*.

<sup>27</sup> Curt. 4.9.18–19.

<sup>28</sup> Curt. 7.11.16.

the unsteady step, fell downhill...’ (Translation mine)

3) *Taetra ibi luctatio erat via lubrica non recipiente vestigium et in prono citius pedes fallente...*<sup>29</sup>

‘There was a terrible struggle, since the slippery path provided no foothold and swiftly deceived their steps down the slope...’ (Translation mine)

In all three cases, someone is deceived into falling due to the action carried out by *fallō*. Furthermore, the context of *fallō* is complemented by words such as *vestigium* ‘foot, step’, *gradus* ‘step, walk’ and *pes* ‘foot’. On the basis of these excerpts, although they are not to be taken as the most solid proof, it becomes easier to imagine the semantic leap from ‘trip, bring down’ to ‘deceive, mislead’.<sup>30</sup>

Be it as it may, if *fallō* is related to *σφάλλω*, *skhaláte* and *sxalem*, their common root would require a *s-mobile*, as reconstructed by LIV. The geminate in the present stem of *fallō* can, in theory, come from *\*-ld-*, *\*-ln-*, or *\*-ls-*. According to EDL s.v. *fallō*, perf. *fefellī* is derived from the present stem, while the pt.perf. *falsus*, contains *-ls-* by analogy to the pt.perf. *salsus* (*sallō* ‘to salt’). We can confidently discard *\*-ld-*, having in mind the small number of reliable attestations of *\*-ld-* and the fact that the cognates of *fallō* do not display a *\*-d-*.<sup>31</sup> The suffix of the desiderative, *\*-s-* seems even less viable. Thus, we also discard *\*-ls-* in *fallō*. Out of the remaining possibilities, LIV opts for a nasal present, while EDL is quite unclear.<sup>32</sup> However, if we are to imagine a *\*-ln-* in the root reconstructed by LIV, then it cannot possibly be an infix, since the root would be *\*s-g<sup>wh</sup>h<sub>2</sub>-n-l-*. Rather, we would need to posit *\*s-g<sup>wh</sup>h<sub>2</sub>(e)l-n-*, with a suffix.<sup>33</sup> In the case of the infix, it is unclear whether *\*-l-* or *\*-n-* would be vocalised, while the suffix would be an ad hoc solution. It is, however, possible to reconstruct a root which would contain the cluster *\*-ln-*, with a nasal infix:

<sup>29</sup> Liv. 21.36.7.

<sup>30</sup> A more thorough research of the semantics of *fallō* might provide further evidence. However, it cannot be conducted in the limits of the present work.

<sup>31</sup> However, cf. SIHLER 1995: §458.3 who argues for *\*-ld-* in this case. In a hypothetical *\*faldo*, *\*-d-* would be a root extension, as in Lat. *-fen-d-ō*, cf. Hitt. *k<sub>1</sub>en-<sup>zi</sup>*, Skt. *hán-ti*, Gr. *θείν-ω* (< *\*θεν-ι-ω*). Alternatively, *\*-d-* could be derived from IE 2.sg.ipv.act. *\*-d<sup>hi</sup>*. Such a development is attested in Latin, e.g. LIV s.v. *\*g<sup>wh</sup>en-* and EDL s.v. *-fendō*. Although both of these root extensions require an in-depth research in themselves, it can be said with confidence that *fallō* has little chance of continuing either of them.

<sup>32</sup> EDL s.v. *fallō* states that the transitive meaning of the verb in Latin is to be explained by a nasal present, and that the same goes for Gr. *σφάλλω*. Cf. SIHLER 1995: §454B. On the other hand, EDL s.v. *-cellō* 2 states that *fallō* must have contained a dental. SCHRIJVER 1991: 173, 180 also believes that *fallō* certainly contained *\*-ld-*.

<sup>33</sup> Exactly in this manner is the nasal present of *fallō* formulated by EDL.



\*s-g<sup>wh</sup>eh<sub>2</sub>lH-, or \*s-g<sup>wh</sup>h<sub>2</sub>l-n-H-. The root-final laryngeal is compatible, although not proven by, with the cognates in Sanskrit,<sup>34</sup> Armenian, and Latin. Further, such a root would allow us to see a typical IE nasal present reflected in Latin and Greek forms.

Greek σφάλλω, according to LIV, is derived from an iota present. Also, according to the root reconstructed therein, it is difficult to imagine a nasal present in σφάλλω. Like in Latin, we would have to reconstruct \*s-g<sup>wh</sup>h<sub>2</sub>-n-l-, which, depending on the vocalisation, could give σφάλλω (if \*-h<sub>2</sub>-; \*-nl- > -λλ-, kao συλλέγω), or, probably, \*σφάλω (if \*-ŋ-). For this reason it is more plausible in the case of Greek, as in Latin, to postulate a root-final laryngeal. However, unlike Latin, Greek requires a precise laryngeal. According to what was established in the section 1.2.1 for θάλλω, a root \*s-g<sup>wh</sup>eh<sub>2</sub>lh<sub>1</sub>- is to be posited. As for the precise preform of σφάλλω, we would need to reconstruct either \*s-g<sup>wh</sup>h<sub>2</sub>l-n-h<sub>1</sub>- or s-g<sup>wh</sup>h<sub>2</sub>l-n-h<sub>1</sub>-. It should be kept in mind that the form with \*-l- cannot reflect fallō.

It is therefore possible to trace back σφάλλω (and fallō) to an IE nasal present. However, this remains speculative for the following reasons: (1) root-final laryngeal in \*s-g<sup>wh</sup>eh<sub>2</sub>l- cannot be directly proven, (2) the same laryngeal does not exclude the possibility of σφάλλω originating from an iota present, since it regularly disappears in front of \*-i- by way of Pinault's Law, (3) no decisive support is found in Lat. fallō, the only other cognate with a possible nasal present.

#### 1.2.4 σκάλλω

The verb σκάλλω 'stir up, hoe' presents a somewhat problematic etymology. LIV s.v. \*(s)kel- (2), leaves it isolated, although not decisively. An iota present \*(s)k<sub>1</sub>l<sub>1</sub>-e/o- is posited for σκάλλω. Elsewhere<sup>35</sup> a possible connection with Lith. *skeliù*, *skél̃ti* / *skiliù*, *skilti* 'to split, strike fire',<sup>36</sup> *skylù*, *skilti* 'to split off, separate oneself' and with Hitt. *iškalla-i* 'to slit, split, tear' is proposed. The Lithuanian and Hittite forms are grouped under \*skelH- 'aufschlitzen, spalten'.<sup>37</sup> It is worth noting that *skiliù* and *skeliù* (the -e- of *skeliù* stemming from the aorist) both derive from an iota present, while *skylù* derives from a nasal

<sup>34</sup> It is, however, unclear what the reflex of \*-h<sub>3</sub> would be in that situation. Would it reflect as -ā- according to Brugmann's law? Whatever the answer, a root ending in \*-h<sub>3</sub> could not engender σφάλλω.

<sup>35</sup> EDG s.v. σκάλλω and EDH s.v. *iškalla-i*.

<sup>36</sup> LIV s.v. \*skelH- and LEW s.v. *skilti* 2. 'Feuer schlagen', i.e. the act of making fire.

<sup>37</sup> The appurtenance of Arm. *c'elum*, which is questionable according to LIV s.v. \*skelH-, is of no importance for our discussion.

present. The root *\*skelH-* can be extended to include σκάλλω, on both phonological and semantic grounds.

LIV partly announces the semantic correspondence, since it attributes the meaning ‘spalten’ to both roots, *\*(s)kel-* and *\*skelH-*. Furthermore, LIV explains that σκάλλω specialised its meaning, from ‘aufschlitzen’ (i.e. to make an incision, cut open) to ‘den Boden spalten, hacken’ (i.e. to hoe, hack the ground). According to dictionaries,<sup>38</sup> it is in this meaning that σκάλλω is attested for the first time. The aforementioned difference in root-vocalism in Lith. *skiliù* and *skeliù*, as well as their meaning ‘to strike fire’, sparks a comparison with Greek; more precisely, with σκάλλω and σκέλλω ‘to dry up, wither’.<sup>39</sup> The comparison is based on the assumption that σκέλλω, similarly to σκάλλω, specialised its meaning from ‘scorch’ to ‘dry up’, whereby the Greek ‘scorch’ is comparable to the Lithuanian ‘strike fire’. This is all the more attractive when the root-vocalisms of Greek and Lithuanian are taken into account: a zero-grade in σκάλλω corresponds to the zero-grade in *skiliù*, while the *e*-grade in σκέλλω corresponds to the one in *skeliù*. Furthermore, Homer’s use of σκέλλω speaks in favour of this:

τῶ δ' ἐπὶ κυάνεον νέφος ἤγαγε Φοῖβος Απόλλων  
 οὐρανόθεν πεδίον δέ, κάλυψε δὲ χῶρον ἄπαντα  
 ὄσσον ἐπεῖχε νέκυς, μὴ πρὶν μένος ἠελίοιο  
 σκίλει' ἀμφὶ περὶ χροῶ ἴνεσιν ἠδὲ μέλεσσιν.<sup>40</sup>

„And above him (Hector) Apollo brought down from the skies a dark cloud to the field, and covered the ground where the dead man lay, before the sun scorched the skin on his sinews and limbs.“ (Translation mine)

It seems correct to attribute the meaning ‘to scorch’ to σκέλλω; scorching can be derived without greater difficulties from the basic meaning of the root *\*skelH-* ‘aufschlitzen’, if we have in mind the effect of fire on materials such as wood or, in this case, skin. In view of this interpretation of σκέλλω, cognates are more easily found in Lithuanian. Having in mind that the laryngeal of *\*skelH-* would not necessarily change the reflection in Greek, it is probable that both σκάλλω and σκέλλω belong to that root. In order to posit a nasal present for σκάλλω we need the root *\*skelh<sub>7</sub>-*. (A good parallel concern-

<sup>38</sup> EDG and LSJ s.v. σκάλλω. Attested by Hdt. 2.14.

<sup>39</sup> LIV s.v. *\*skelh<sub>7</sub>-* adduces σέλλομαι, deriving it from a nasal present.

<sup>40</sup> Hom. *Il.* 23.188–191. The verses 190–191 are quoted by Plut. *Quaes. Conv.* 3.10, in the discussion titled ‘Why flesh rots sooner under moonlight, than under sunlight?’ (Διὰ τί τὰ κρέα σήπεται μᾶλλον ὑπὸ τὴν σελήνην ἢ τὸν ἥλιον;). The context of the relevant passages there seems to indicate the meaning ‘to dry up’.

ing the nasal present is found in Lith. *skylù*.) However, Hitt. *iškalla*<sup>-i</sup> does not seem to allow such a reconstruction, for it requires *\*-h<sub>2/3</sub>*, according to EDH.<sup>41</sup> LIV, on the other hand, with its reconstruction *\*skelH-*, might not completely discard the possibility of *\*-h<sub>1</sub>*.

Should the question of the Hittite form remain open, two solutions present themselves: (1) *σκάλλω* is originally a nasal present, which is hardly imaginable without *\*-h<sub>1</sub>*, (2) *σκάλλω* is an iota present,<sup>42</sup> whose laryngeal is deleted by Pinault's Law. The same dilemma applies to *-λλ-* in *σκέλλω*; it is not necessarily of the same origin as the geminate in *σκάλλω*, especially if the Lithuanian cognates are taken into account.

### 1.2.5 πάλλω

In theory, *πάλλω* 'to swing, rock' may represent an iota present. However, the Indo-European background of the verb can be disputed on grounds of its lack of IE cognates. In spite of the possible connection with Sln. *pláti*, *pól-jem* 'wogen, wallen machen',<sup>43</sup> a PGr. etymology cannot be excluded.<sup>44</sup> Nevertheless, if the connection with *pláti* is to be accepted, then the common root should be *\*pelh<sub>1</sub>-*,<sup>45</sup> and *πάλλω* < *\*pl<sub>o</sub>-ne-h<sub>1</sub>-*. All of this is highly speculative. The root *\*pleh<sub>1</sub>-* 'to fill' most probably isn't a *Schwebeablaut* of *\*pelh<sub>1</sub>-*, since their semantics have no apparent connection.

### 1.2.6 ὄλλυμι

ὄλλυμι can be compared to Lat. *ab-oleō* and *dē-leō* 'to destroy'. A somewhat uncertain comparison is found in Hitt. *hallanna*<sup>-i</sup> 'to trample down, flatten', which indicates a root *\*hall-*.<sup>46</sup> From the perspective of Greek, a reconstruction

<sup>41</sup> EDH 2.3.2.2d and s.v. *iškalla*<sup>-i</sup>. Some verbs of the *tarn(a)* class, such as *iškalla*<sup>-i</sup>, require a root excluding *\*-h<sub>1</sub>*. On grounds of the development of 3.sg.praes. of those verbs, where IE *\*CoCH-e-i* > PHitt. *\*CoCai*, *\*-h<sub>1</sub>* is to be excluded. In other words, EDH considers the development IE *\*CoCH<sub>1</sub>-e-i* > PHitt. *\*CoCai* impossible, which is why it reconstructs *skelh<sub>2/3</sub>-* for *iškalla*<sup>-i</sup>, *skilū*, *skylū* and *σκάλλω*. We are not in the position to contradict this proposal. However, it should be observed that the Hitt. geminate *-ll-* might continue *\*-lh<sub>1</sub>-*, since IE *\*VRHV* > Hitt. *VRRV*, according to ärrī < *\*h<sub>1</sub>orh<sub>1</sub>ei*. V. EDH 1.4.5j.

<sup>42</sup> A comparison with *σκούλλω* 'to lacerate, tear up' speaks in favour of a nasal present. This is possible if we accept the arguments adduced by VINE 1999: 565ff. He believes that *σκούλλω* < *\*skol(H)-je/o-*, with a regular development of IE *\*-ol̥-* > Gr. *-υλλ-*, according to Cowgill's law. (Cf. IE *\*b<sup>h</sup>ol̥jom* > Gr. *φύλλον*, Lat. *folium*).

<sup>43</sup> LIV s.v. *\*pelh<sub>1</sub>-*.

<sup>44</sup> EDG s.v. *πάλλω*.

<sup>45</sup> This root could consequently encompass the other Slavic cognates, Polish and Upper Sorabian *plóc*, v. SES s.v. *pláti*.

<sup>46</sup> EDH s.v. *hallanna*<sup>-i</sup>. If this comparison stands, then the original meaning should probably be 'to trample down'. The attestations of the Hittite verb are rare, and its meaning is simultaneously

\* $h_3elh_3-$  is preferable,<sup>47</sup> since it covers both Latin and Hittite, while allowing a nasal present. The Greek form is then derived from \* $h_3elh_3-$ , in the following manner: \* $h_3ol-n-h_3-mi$  > \* $\delta\lambda\nu\upsilon\mu\iota$  >  $\delta\lambda\lambda\upsilon\mu\iota$ .<sup>48</sup> The aor.  $\delta\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\alpha\iota$ , and derivatives such as  $\delta\lambda\epsilon\theta\rho\varsigma$ , indicate a root ending in \* $-h_1$  rather than \* $-h_3$ .<sup>49</sup> On the other hand, the derivatives can be explained by a dissimilatory process  $o-o > o-e$ , or as continuation of the aorist stem. In turn,  $\delta\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\alpha\iota$ , could show a metathesis  $o-e > e-o$ , as seen in  $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\acute{o}\rho\epsilon\sigma\alpha$  and  $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\acute{o}\rho\epsilon\sigma\alpha$ .<sup>50</sup>

### 1.2.7 τέλλω

Apart from the aforementioned Arc.  $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\delta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ ,  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\omega$  ‘to make rise, spring, produce’ could be an example of an aorist-stemming  $e$ -grade nasal present. EDG s.v.  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\omega$  considers it an iota present, on grounds of comparison with  $\sigma\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\omega$ . This may seem more probable at first, since  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\omega$  originates from the root \* $telh_2-$ , which, lacking \* $-h_1$ , should not normally follow the development of the verbs ending in  $-\alpha\lambda\lambda\omega$ . A nasal present is evident in  $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\mu\nu\omega < *k\acute{e}mh_2-$ ,<sup>51</sup> and in  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\mu\nu\omega < *temh_1-$  which displays an  $e$ -grade of the aorist. Moreover, the root \* $telh_2-$  is found in OIr. *tlenaid* and Lat. *tollō*; in view of Old Irish, the Latin form latter certainly continues \* $t_l-n-h_2-$ .<sup>52</sup> All of this points to a nasal present in  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\omega$ .

### 1.3 IE \*-VlnV- > Gr. -V̄λV-/-VλλV-

The reflections of IE \* $-ln-$ , if at all present in these verbs, are different depending on the dialect. Although the precise outcome for each dialect is difficult to establish, some constants can be observed: in IA the \* $-n-$  is lost, trig-  
deduced from the context in which it is found and the comparison with  $\delta\lambda\lambda\upsilon\mu\iota$  and *ab-oleō*. In Hittite,  $-ll-$  < IE \* $-lH-$ , v. footnote 41. LIV s.v. \* $h_3elh_1-$ , EDH 1.4.7.2b, and EDH s.v. *hallanna*<sup>i</sup> also assume that Hitt.  $-ll-$  < IE \* $-ln-$ .

<sup>47</sup> \* $h_1-$  is excluded because of Hittite. Greek can continue \* $h_{1/3}$ .

<sup>48</sup> According to Cowgill’s law  $-v\upsilon\mu\iota < *nh_3mi$ . The long vowel in  $-l\upsilon-$  may be analogical, e.g. from  $\delta\omicron\nu\upsilon\mu\iota$ . Alternatively the present may stem from a zero-grade, \* $h_3l-ne-h_3-mi$ . This would provide an explanation for  $-l\upsilon-$ , but  $\delta\lambda-$  instead of then expected \* $\acute{\alpha}\lambda-$  is problematic. Cf. LIV s.v. \* $sterh_3-$  and HARĐARSON 1993: 222 for  $\sigma\tau\acute{o}\rho\nu\upsilon\mu\iota < *st_l-ne-h_3-$ , where  $-o\omicron-$  of the aorist is also reflected in the present stem, instead of \* $-a\omicron-$ .

<sup>49</sup> \* $-h_1$  would require an explanation as to why  $\delta\lambda\lambda\upsilon\mu\iota$  did not follow the development of  $\theta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega$ .

<sup>50</sup> LIV s.v. \* $k\acute{e}rh_3-$ , \* $sterh_3-$ .

<sup>51</sup> LIV s.v. \* $k\acute{e}mh_2-$ .

<sup>52</sup> According to WATKINS 1965: 184, already in Proto-Italic a zero-grade nasal infix IE \* $-n-H-$  > Plt. \* $-n\acute{a}-$  is generalised, expanding from plural into singular. At the same time, a thematisation takes place in 1.sg.praes. and 3.pl.praes. The Celtic languages go through an identical generalisation (but without thematisation, cf. OIr. *sernaim*, *tlenaim* < \* $ster-n-h_3-mi$ , \* $t_l-n-h_3-mi$ ), which is why WATKINS 1965, loc.cit. suggests an Italo-Celtic \* $n\acute{a}$ -conjugation, accepted by SCHRIJVER 1991: 406. The Latin nasal presents stemming from this process are generally comparable to nasal presents in other IE languages, e.g. *sternō* < \* $ster-n-h_3-$ , cf. OIr. *sernaid*, Gr.  $\sigma\tau\acute{o}\rho\nu\upsilon\mu\iota$ , Skt. *stṛṇāti*). As shown by *sternō* and e.g. *cernō*, *spernō*, *temnō*, they continue the  $e$ -grade of the aorist.

gering compensatory lengthening in front of \*-l-. The \*-n- is also lost in Doric, where it prompts regular vowel lengthening in front of \*-l-. Aeolic shows \*-ln- > -λλ-. The reflection of \*-ln- in Arcadian is uncertain. IE cognates being rare, the nature of \*-n- in \*-ln- is unclear.

### 1.3.1 βούλομαι

Before entering the discussion about βούλομαι, we provide a table of its dialectal forms, along with variations of βουλή.<sup>53</sup>

Dialect	Verb	Noun
Ionic-Attic	βούλομαι	βουλή
Arcadian	βόλομαι <sup>1</sup>	βωλά <sup>2</sup>
Lesbian	βόλλομαι	βόλλα
Doric	βώλομαι, δήλομαι <sup>3</sup>	βωλά
Thessalian	βέλλομαι	βουλά <sup>4</sup>
Boeotian	βείλομη	
Locran, Delphian	δείλομαι	

<sup>1</sup> Attested in Hom. Il. 9.319, Hom. Od. 1.234, and Hom. Od. 16.387. Those verses are considered to be a younger part of the Homeric corpus by Chantraine 1948: 311.

<sup>2</sup> Possibly a Doric loanword in Arcadian.

<sup>3</sup> More precisely, EDG qualifies βώλομαι as Cretan, and δήλομαι as Heracleian.

<sup>4</sup> Not mentioned by EDG, but epigraphically attested. The noun might represent a 'thessalised' form of βουλή. Slings 1975: 11f. treats it as an originally Thessalian form, mainly because of the Larissa inscription (IG IX 2.517), where -βουλ- is found in Thessalian names and patronyms, along with names and patronyms belonging to other dialects (e.g. Αὐτόβουλος next to Ἀρχιππας Καλλιφούντειος). The language of the inscription also contains a visible amount of Thessalian characteristics (such as 3.sg.praes.conj. βέλλειτε), next to the letter of king Philip V of Macedon written in κοινή. In spite of all of this, cf. THESS. στάλλα.

<Fig. 1 – dialectal forms of βούλομαι>

No IE cognates are known, but an IE root *\*g<sup>w</sup>el-* is usually reconstructed.<sup>54</sup> There are two key questions related to βούλομαι. Firstly, the question of vowel lengthening. If the possible sources of the lengthening, \*-s- and \*-n-, are taken into account along with the proposed root *\*g<sup>w</sup>el-*, it becomes obvious that we are dealing with a suffix. Besides, it is unclear whether the noun βουλή is derived from the verb, or vice versa. There is no apparent solution that would

<sup>53</sup> Dialectal forms according to EDG s.v. βούλομαι. DELG s.v. βούλομαι adduces two Pamphylian forms whose appurtenance is unclear. We do not discuss them in this work.

<sup>54</sup> EDG s.v. βούλομαι. A different root is given by LIV *\*g<sup>w</sup>elh<sub>3</sub>-*, but the root with \*-h<sub>3</sub> and a nasal infix does not explain the *o*-grade.

cover all variations of βούλομαι and βουλή.

The suffix \*-s- implies that βούλομαι originates from IE \*g<sup>w</sup>ol-s-, be it desiderative or aorist subjunctive. The former of the two is not a satisfactory solution, since it cannot account for the prevalent *o*-grade. Furthermore, the desiderative is usually reflected as future, which is not the case here. And finally, it seems as superfluous, as it is natural, to imagine a desiderative form of a verb that already means 'to wish'. As far as aorist is concerned, the *o*-grade remains problematic.<sup>55</sup> Although there are reasons to doubt \*-s-,<sup>56</sup> it is a priori an easier assumption, since it does have an apparent morphological motivation (unlike \*-n-). Since both suffixes are, in their own way, speculative, we shall not engage in a discussion of their probability. Rather, we would like to present a somewhat plausible hypothesis motivating \*-n- in βούλομαι.

The suffix \*-n- can be found in the noun βουλή. Contrary to the verb, where the \*-n- does not seem particularly motivated, in βουλή it can be as easily described as in ποινή < \*k<sup>w</sup>oi-nēh<sub>2</sub>; that is, as part of -νη < \*-neh<sub>2</sub>, a well known productive suffix. Furthermore, the noun evidently goes back to an *o*-grade \*g<sup>w</sup>ol-, as proven by IA βουλή and Dor. βωλά. This solution indicates that βούλομαι is a denominative verb, which is acceptable in general, but seemingly not for Arc. βόλομαι, since this form does not show any trace of a nasal suffix. This can be attributed either to Arcadian orthography, or to the archaicity of the Arcadian verb. We are reluctant to accept that the orthography of βόλομαι hides the true quantity of -o- in the first syllable. In view of the attested Arcadian forms of ὀφείλω (v. section 1.3.3), and the presence of βόλομαι in the Homeric epic, pace CHANTRAINE loc.cit., we believe that βόλομαι is unsuffixed, thus being older than the other dialectal forms.

The instances of βόλομαι in Homer show that -o- in βολ- is indeed short. Next to Arc. (?) βωλά, whose first-syllable vowel length indicates a suffix, it can be claimed that βόλομαι had no suffix,<sup>57</sup> unlike the other dialectal variations. A potential form of indicative perfect of βόλομαι is used by Homer:

<sup>55</sup> *o*-grade is usually ascribed to the influence of the 1.sg.perf. προβέβουλα (Hom. *Il.* 1.113). Some sigmatic aorists with an *o*-grade do exist. SLINGS 1975: 4<sup>13</sup>, however, notes that, as a rule, they originate from a bisyllabic root ending in \*-h<sub>3</sub>. The same is found in HARÐARSON 1993: 75<sup>60</sup>. The aorist *o*-grade in these verbs presupposes a metathesis of \*-e- and \*-o-, e.g. IE \*k<sup>w</sup>erh<sub>3</sub>- > PGr. \*kero- > \*kore- > Gr. ἐκόρεσα. The same is found in LIV s.v. \*k<sup>w</sup>erh<sub>3</sub>-. Therefore, they are not to be compared with \*g<sup>w</sup>el-.

<sup>56</sup> Also against \*-s- v. SLINGS 1975: 3ff.

<sup>57</sup> Even if βωλά is understood as a dorism, it is highly probable that the suffix would not have disappeared without trace in βόλομαι. As already indicated, cf. Arc. ὠφηλον. For this to be proven incorrect, different reflections in Arcadian should be posited for \*-oln- and \*-eln-, which is not likely. A more complicated alternative would be positing an entirely different suffix for ὀφείλω, but see section 1.3.3.

καὶ γὰρ ῥά Κλυταμνήστρης προβέβουλα  
κουριδίδης ἀλόχου (...) <sup>58</sup>

'For I prefer her [Chryseis] to Clytemnestra, my lawful wife (...) (Translation mine)

CHANTRAINE 1948: 426 states that προβέβουλα was formed on the basis of βούλομαι, which is not necessarily correct. There are no significant obstacles to interpreting προβέβουλα as an indicative perfect. The aorist, however, would require us to overcome certain morphological difficulties.<sup>59</sup> Since προβέβουλα is a quadrisyllabic word, it is easy to ascribe -ου- to metrical lengthening.<sup>60</sup> Therefore, if this indeed is a perfect indicative, its simplex would probably be \*βέβουλα. In favor of an *o*-grade perfect stem we can observe a certain kind of conservatism in προβέβουλα, which has -ου- < -ο-, instead of -υ- which should otherwise be expected, according to Cowgill's Law. However, VINE 1999: 557 narrows down the general formulation of this law (*o* > *υ* between a labial consonant and a resonant) to the instances in which *o* > *υ* only if -ο- is between a labiovelar consonant and a nasal. If this is correct, then προβέβουλα indeed contains an *o*-grade perfect stem. Accordingly, -ολ- of βόλομαι may have appeared under the influence of the perfect stem. On the other hand, since the *e*-grade aorist is seen in some dialects, it indicates, along with the *o*-grade perfect, a zero-grade present.<sup>61</sup> βόλομαι can continue an original zero-grade present under two tendentious conditions: (1) IE \**l* > Arc. ολ<sup>62</sup> and (2) IE \**l* remains vocalised in \**g<sup>w</sup>l*-V.<sup>63</sup> Alternatively, βόλομαι might have simply received its root vocalism under the influence of the *o*-grade perfect. Whichever the solution may be, the Arcadian form plausibly remains the older than the other forms, and a predecessor of the noun βουλή:<sup>64</sup> (1) βόλομαι is the only form with no suffix, (2) as a potential zero-grade it the only form that certainly avoids the effect of Cowgill's Law, if we keep in mind the conclusion of VINE 1999: *loc.cit.*, which, if applied to βουλή and βούλομαι

<sup>58</sup> Hom. *Il.* 1.113–114.

<sup>59</sup> In theory, it can be assumed that -βέβουλα < \**g<sup>w</sup>e-g<sup>w</sup>ol-ni*, or < \**g<sup>w</sup>e-g<sup>w</sup>l-ni*, but the athematic ending would be unexpected. It is also unclear whether \*-*l*- or \*-*m*- would be vocalised.

<sup>60</sup> It is hard to imagine this form without metrical lengthening. Cf. \*σοφότερος > σοφώτερος.

<sup>61</sup> Cf. γίγνομαι, γέγονα, ἐγενόμην and τίκτω, ἔτεκον, τέτοκα. However, it is to be noted that these verbs, unlike βούλομαι, have reduplicated presents. γίγνομαι also has a causative aorist ἐγενάμην. One should in theory be posited for βούλομαι as well, but it is unclear if the semantics of the verb allow this.

<sup>62</sup> This is fairly certain, since IE \**l* > Arc. ολ, τετόρταυ (= τετάρτης) < \**k<sup>w</sup>etm<sup>w</sup>*-.

<sup>63</sup> This is hardly the case, but let us note two precedents: acc.pl. τέσσαρας < \**k<sup>w</sup>etm<sup>w</sup>ns* and Boeot. βανά (= γυνή) < \**g<sup>w</sup>neh<sub>2</sub>* (the accent in Greek indicates an IE zero-grade root; -α- in the first syllable can only be explained by \*-*h*-).

<sup>64</sup> Pace SLINGS 1975: 8f. The argument that βουλή, if deverbial, could not have acquired its technical meaning 'council, counsel' at an early stage in all the dialects is not convincing; βουλή is already used by Homer as both 'will, wish' and 'council, counsel' (cf. Hom. *Il.* 1.5. and *Il.* 2.53).

would most probably disrupt the *o*-grade. It should, therefore, be assumed that βουλή and βούλομαι retained somehow their root-vocalism.<sup>65</sup>

It is therefore possible that the same root gave the PGr. verb \**g<sup>w</sup>olomai* and the noun \**g<sup>w</sup>olnā*, while the verb \**g<sup>w</sup>olnomai* was derived from the noun. Additionally, both \**g<sup>w</sup>olnā* and \**g<sup>w</sup>olnomai* preserve their root vocalism in analogy to \**g<sup>w</sup>olomai*. The *e*-grade forms can fit into this frame: (1) the aorist *e*-grade was generalised in all tenses, (2) furthermore, they might have also preserved the formant \**-s-*, if a sigmatic aorist is to be reconstructed at all. This proposition, however, also requires a high degree of speculation.

### 1.3.2 εἰλέω and εἰλύω

Greek has two different verbs εἰλέω: εἰλέω 1 ‘to press together, draw together, fence in’ and εἰλέω 2 ‘to roll, turn, wind, revolve’ (cf. Lat. *volvō*). Synonymous with the latter is εἰλύω ‘to wrap around, envelop, cover’. εἰλέω is found in different forms. The Attic dialect shows ἴλλω and εἴλλω.<sup>66</sup> The Doric of Elis has φηλέω, while the Doric of Delphi has εἴλομαι. Hesychius notes ἀπέλλειν, as an Aeolic word for ἀποκλείειν ‘to shut out’. LIV groups all of these under two different roots \**mel-*. The comparison with Skt. *vyhōti*, which is posited for εἰλέω 1 by LIV, and for εἰλύω by DELG and EDG, has been convincingly refuted by LUBOTSKY 2000: 317, who proved that *vyhōti* continues the IE root \**H<sub>1</sub>mer-*. An IE \**-ln-* is therefore very improbable in all of these verbs.

### 1.3.3 ὀφείλω

As is the case of βούλομαι, ὀφείλω has no IE cognates. A root \**h<sub>3</sub>b<sup>h</sup>el-* is therefore reconstructed purely on the basis of Greek forms. The dialectal forms are Aeol. ὀφέλλω and Dor. ὀφήλω.<sup>67</sup> Apart from ὀφείλω ‘to owe’, one also finds ὀφέλλω ‘to increase’.<sup>68</sup> Since the Aeolic dialect formally makes no distinction between these two verbs, it is unnecessary to reconstruct an iota-present for ὀφέλλω ‘to increase’.<sup>69</sup>

<sup>65</sup> We are not certain whether the claim of VINE 1999: 568, that *-oll-* not originating form \**-ol̥-* is not affected by Cowgill’s Law, refers also to Lesb. βόλλομαι, βολλά, nor whether it has any implications regarding the forms with vowel lengthening. As an example *-oll-* < \**-oln-* we only find ὄλλυμι, which is not convincing enough. Namely, ὄλλυμι already has *-νυμι* < \**-nh<sub>3</sub>mi*, so it is difficult to imagine that \**h<sub>3</sub>oln-* would give \**υλλ-* at the same time.

<sup>66</sup> Perhaps ἴλλω < \**ῥί-ῥλ-ω*. EDG s.v. εἰλέω 1 sees εἴλλω as a result of confusion between ἴλλω and εἰλέω.

<sup>67</sup> V. footnote 62 for the possible Arc. forms showing *-ελλ-* and *-ηλ-*. The Arcadian inscription IPArk 5 (Tegean, found in Delphi) attests ὀφηλον and ὀφειλίμασι.

<sup>68</sup> ὀφέλλω ‘to sweep, broom’ shall not be taken into account here.

<sup>69</sup> SLINGS 1975: 10.



There are not direct indications for a nasal present. It can only be posited if all other possible developments are excluded. EDG s.v. ὀφείλω and SLINGS 1975: 6 offer the following analogies, ἔτεμον : τέμνω and ἔδακον : δάκνω, and ὄφελον : ὀφείλω, in order to reconstruct a nasal present. Their proposition is not strong enough. On the other hand, the only other possibility, \*-ls-, is even more speculative. The verb ὀφείλω simply gives no basis for a \*-s-<sup>70</sup> in the present stem. If the lack of better solutions leads one to propose a nasal present in ὀφείλω, a question arises concerning its nature. There is no noun like βουλή, which could serve as basis for a nasal suffix. A \*-neu-/nu- present is out of question. A speculation seems worthwhile: perhaps ὀφείλω originally continued a zero-grade with a nasal infix, while the present obtained the e-grade from the aorist. This is however problematic in three ways: (1) against the root  $*h_3b^helh_1-$ , which is necessary in our speculation, one can adduce the noun ὀφειλέτης, (2) the only cases of a verb with a nasal infix and an e-grade in present would be τέλλω and Arc. hapax ἐσδέλλοντες,<sup>71</sup> (3) if the root was indeed  $*h_3b^helh_1-$ , there is no obvious reason why the development  $*h_3b^h_1neh_1mi > *ὀφάλημι \Rightarrow *ὀφάλλω$  did not take place.

There is reason to consider an IE \*-ln- in the context of ὀφείλω, but no solid proof in its favour. If there indeed was a \*-n-, cannot be an infix. A further inquiry regarding the Arcadian forms is also necessary.

## 2. IE \*-ln- in Greek nominal flexion

### 2.1 IE \*-VlnV- > Gr. -VλλV-

#### 2.1.1 ἐλλός

In view of ἔλαφος <  $*h_1el-n_2b^ho-s$  'deer'<sup>72</sup>, ἐλλός 'deer calf' gmost certainly continues  $*ἐλνός < *h_1el-no-s$ . EDG s.v. ἐλλός sees 'an Aeolic development', probably based on \*-ln- > -λλ-. The word is rare. Homer attests it only once,<sup>73</sup> and there is no explicit proof of an Aeolic origin. As is the case of ἔλαφος, ἐλλός too can have a root-final laryngeal on the basis of Lith. élnis. The reconstruction is in that case  $*h_1elh_{1/2}-no-$ .

#### 2.1.2 θαλλός

θαλλός 'green twig, sprout' is probably derived from θάλλω. A different

<sup>70</sup> The sigmatic aorist ὀφλήσαι is of a later date and is derived from the fut.act. ὀφλήσω.

<sup>71</sup> V. footnote 38.

<sup>72</sup> V. EDG s.v. ἔλαφος.

<sup>73</sup> Hom. *Od.* 19.228.

development is difficult to imagine, since θαλλός cannot continue a root-final laryngeal. This noun, therefore, is not an independent reflex of IE \*-ln-.

### 2.1.3 κελλάς

A gloss of Hesychius meaning μονόφθαλμος ‘one-eyed’. The comparison with Skt. *kāṇāḥ* and OIr. *coll* ‘one-eyed’, which would continue the *o*-grade of the same root, cannot provide for an IE \*-ln-. In Skt. -n- < \*-ln- seems impossible,<sup>74</sup> while the OIr. -ll- does not necessarily continue IE \*-ln-.

### 2.1.4 κιλλός

According to EDG, κιλλός ‘grey’ is attested four times, and relatively late. There is also a derivative κίλλος ‘ass’, which according to Hesychius also means ‘cricket’. A possible connection with κελαινός ‘black, dark’, or with Lat. *columba* ‘pigeon’, are purely hypothetical. The Latin form, if related, would not solve the origin of the Gr. geminate, while κελαινός itself has no clear etymology. Consequently, κιλλός remains obscure.

### 2.1.5 κυλλός

κυλλός ‘deformed, crippled’ is probably connected to the gloss κελλόν (Hesychius) meaning ‘twisted’. A connection with Skt. *kunih* ‘lame’ probably does not exist.<sup>75</sup> VINE 1999: 566 reconstructs *\*k<sup>w</sup>ol(H)-io-*, where the laryngeal is deleted by Pinault’s Law, while *\*-ol̥-* > -υλλ- in accordance with Cowgill’s Law. In theory, it is possible to derive the Gr. -λλ- from IE \*-ln-, if we accept that in *\*k<sup>w</sup>ol(H)-no-* the laryngeal can be deleted by the Saussure’s Effect. Additionally, VINE 1999: 568 would in this case have to be proven wrong; that is, PGr. *\*-oln-* would in fact be affected by Cowgill’s Law and give Gr. -υλλ-.<sup>76</sup>

### 2.1.6 ώλλον

Hesychius’ gloss ώλλον is defined as ‘τήν του βραχίονος καμπήν’ (‘the place where the hand bends’) which allows a comparison with ώλένη ‘elbow’. ώλένη is compared with IE words for elbow, all of which continue an old *n*-stem:<sup>77</sup> Lat. *ulna*, OHG *ell*, OIr. *uilen*. Greek also has the form ώλήν,

<sup>74</sup> KEWA s.v. *kāṇāḥ*. Skt. reflects IE \*-ln- as -rñ-, cf. *vrñóti*, *varñah*.

<sup>75</sup> KEWA s.v. *kunih* supposes a non-IE origin. If κυλλός and κελλάς are indeed related to Skt. *kunih* and *kāṇāḥ* they would show two examples of Skt. *n* < IE \*-ln-, if such a development is even possible.

<sup>76</sup> V. footnote 65.

<sup>77</sup> The nasal stem seems to be an innovation of certain languages. The Baltic and Slavic cognates (e.g. Lith. *úolektis*, OCS *lakъto*) show an older formation, v. LUBOTSKY 1990: 131f.

-ένος (Suda), which is probably younger (perhaps analogical to ἀυχίην, -ένος ‘neck’). In view of the adduced IE cognates, ὠλλόν < \*ὠλνον < \*h<sub>3</sub>eHl-no- can be reconstructed.

## 2.2 IE \*-VlnV- > Gr. -V̄λV-/ -VλλV-

In this group we find two kinds of words – those that, like βουλή, show a lengthened vowel in front of -λ- in alternance with -λλ- and those that have only one of the two outcomes of IE \*VlnV. For βουλή v. section 1.3.1.

### 2.2.1 ἀλής

ἀλής ‘thronged, crowded’ (initial ā-) also has two variations: Aeol. ἀολλής and the hapax ἀελλής.<sup>78</sup> All of these belong to the root \*uel- (cf. εἰλέω). On those grounds ἀολλής and ἀελλής should confirm preforms with a digamma – \*ἀφολλής, \*ἀφελλής. The aspiration of ἀλής is not certain, but changes nothing regarding our inquiry. To encompass ἀλής and ἀολλής, we can reconstruct \*sm-μl̥-n-, although ἀολλής might also continue an o-grade. ἀελλής certainly requires an e-grade. DELG considers that ἀλής could be derived from an unattested noun \*φέλ-νος ‘crowd’ (cf. ἔθνος, συμῆνος), which would then explain the \*-n- in \*sm-μl̥-n-. In view of the vowel lengthening in the IA form, \*-j- is impossible, while \*-s- has no obvious motivation. Even so, the suggested etymology remains speculative. One should also have in mind the lack of IE cognates.

### 2.2.2 ἐξουλή

ἐξουλή is an Attic legal term meaning ‘ejectment, dispossession’, with no apparent etymology. An earlier \*ἐκφολ-νᾱ has been suggested,<sup>79</sup> which further leads to the root \*uel-, or, more precisely, to its o-grade. This makes sense semantically. One of the meanings of the verb εἰλέω, a derivative of the root \*uel-, is indeed ‘to fence in’. It therefore seems reasonable, as supposed by DELG, that ἐξουλή is a verbal noun of an unattested \*ἐκ-φελνέω ‘eject’. In this regard, note the resemblance with βουλή. An existence of an IE \*-ln-, however, is not directly proven. On the other hand, there is no apparent alternative.

### 2.2.3 μείλιχος

The adjective μείλιχος ‘soft, mild, friendly’ is attested already in Homer

<sup>78</sup> Hom. Il. 3.13: κονίσαλος ἀελλής ‘thick cloud’.

<sup>79</sup> V. DELG and EDG s.v. ἐξουλή.

and Hesiod. The Doric material points to μηλ-, and the Aeolic to μελλ-. This can lead us to reconstruct \*μελ-v-, but, much like in the case of ὀφείλω, confusion is produced by Arcadian derivatives Μελιχίωι<sup>80</sup> and Μελίχων.<sup>81</sup> The inscription of the former is lost.<sup>82</sup> On the other hand, Μελίχων resembles ὀφειλήμασι. Equally problematic are comparisons with other IE forms, such as Lat. *mel* ‘honey’ and Lith. *malónė* ‘mercy’. An \*-ln- in this case is therefore improvable.

### 2.2.4 οὐλή

οὐλή is attested in the *Odyssey*, but not in the *Iliad*. It means ‘scarred wound, scar’ and is connected to the root \*uelh<sub>3</sub>-, cf. Lat. *vulnus* ‘wound’, OIr. *fuil* ‘blood’. This root also gave Lat. *vellō* ‘to pull out’, Hitt. *ualh<sup>-zi</sup>* ‘to hit’ and Gr. ἀλίσκομαι, aor. ἔαλων ‘to be caught’. None of these reveal the formation of οὐλή. A possible reconstruction is \*uolh<sub>3</sub>-neh<sub>2</sub>- > οὐλή (cf. ἔξουλή, βουλή), if one accepts the deletion of \*-h<sub>3</sub>- in the position \*-oRHC-, according to the Saussure’s Effect. However, since the latter phenomenon is not widely accepted, we are inclined to offer an alternative. VAN BEEK 2011: 163 concludes that the forms showing the deletion of the laryngeal in \*-oRHC- share three traits: (1) a nasal suffix, (2) the \*-R- in the formula is always a liquid, (3) the suffix is always -CV-. οὐλή fits in perfectly. An IE \*-ln- in this case is quite probably.

In spite of this, one alternative cannot be completely discarded, although it strikes us as somewhat more difficult: the suffix \*-ueh<sub>2</sub>. If \*uolh<sub>3</sub>-ueh<sub>2</sub> is the correct etymology, then the compensatory lengthening is Ionic, but certainly not Attic (cf. Att. κόρη, Ion. κούρη < PGr. \*korwā); additionally, we would need to accept that the Ionic form expanded into the Attic dialect.

### 2.2.5 οὔλος

The adjective οὔλος ‘crinkly, woolly’ is attested in Homer. The connection with λῆνος ‘wool’ from the root \*uelh<sub>1</sub>- is semantically attractive, but it is possible to group οὔλος with εἰλέω 2 ‘to roll, turn’ from the root \*uel-. In the first case, οὔλος < \*uolh<sub>1</sub>-no-,<sup>83</sup> while \*-h<sub>1</sub>- is regularly deleted, as in οὐλή.<sup>84</sup> In the

<sup>80</sup> IG V, 2 90.

<sup>81</sup> IG V, 2 38.

<sup>82</sup> SLINGS 1975:14.

<sup>83</sup> \*h<sub>2</sub>- is sometimes reconstructed in the initial position, but we have excluded it here, since it only serves to explain Hitt. *hulana*-. According to EDH s.v. *hulana*-, it may be of Hurrian origin. It is also phonologically problematic, since IE \*-lh<sub>1</sub>- > Hitt. -ll-, while here \*h<sub>2</sub>ulh<sub>1</sub>- would need to give *hula*-.)

<sup>84</sup> Cf. VAN BEEK 2011: 138 does not comment upon the loss of \*-h<sub>1</sub>-, probably since he does not consider that οὔλος and λῆνος are necessarily related. VINE 1999: 563 is in favour of the nasal suffix and the Saussure’s Effect in οὔλος and οὐλή.

other case, οὔλος < \**uol-no-*.

οὔλος is not a reliable example of an IE \*-*ln-* in Greek, since both cases present an alternative formation: \**uol-uo-*. If \*-*u-* caused the compensatory lengthening, then, as οὐλή, οὔλος is to be considered as an exclusively Ionic form.

### 2.2.6 στήλη

Apart from IA στήλη, we know of Dor. στάλα and Thess. στάλλα. On the basis of these forms one might reconstruct a preform \**steh<sub>2</sub>l-*. Alternatively, a connection with στέλλω ‘to put in order’ and the IE root \**stel-* is possible. For IA, the latter option would require a development \**stl<sub>2</sub>-neh<sub>2</sub>* > \**stal-nā* > \**stālā* > στήλη, and the former \**steh<sub>2</sub>l-neh<sub>2</sub>* > \**stāl-nā* > \**stālā* > στήλη. The preform \**stl<sub>2</sub>-neh<sub>2</sub>* has the advantage of encompassing all three attested variations of the noun. It also has a convenient cognate in the form of the OHG noun *stollo* ‘scaffold’.

## 3. Conclusion

Not counting πύλναμαι, the Greek material can be sorted in two groups: (i) forms showing gemination, and (ii) forms showing vowel lengthening in front of the IE \*-*l-*. The group (ii) is particularly problematic, lacking reliable IE etymologies that could confirm \*-*ln-*. Apart from Arc. ἐδέλλοντες, the group (i) has no dialectal forms, while the verbs of this group always have a nasal infix in the present stem. In the nominal flexion, the nasal is always part of a suffix. In the group (ii) most of the forms have different dialectal reflections of \*-*ln-*, while the \*-*n-*, if it exists, is always a suffix. In order to explain these differences, the most reliable forms of each group should be singled out.

The most reliable nouns of group (i) are ἐλλός and ὠλλόν, on grounds of their comparative material. As for the verbs, θάλλω and ὄλλυμι are the reliable sources of IE \*-*ln-* in this group. We regard as partially reliable all the other verbs of group (i). All of them, with the exception of πάλλω, have at least one IE cognate for which a nasal present can reasonably be posited.

It is difficult to determine whether group (ii) contains any plausible reflections of \*-*ln-*, apart from στήλη. The following forms we consider to be partially reliable: ἀλής, βουλή, and ἐξουλή, since in their cases all other sources of vowel lengthening can be excluded.<sup>85</sup> To this we add, in spite of the confusion caused by Arcadian forms, the verb βούλομαι, since its nasal suffix could

<sup>85</sup> οὐλή and οὔλος are excluded here, since they might continue the suffix \*-*uo-*.

have originated from βουλή, and ὀφείλω, since all possibilities other than the nasal suffix seem rather difficult. A nasal suffix is thus posited for practically all of these examples. Its existence is indicated by the geminate -λλ- present in dialectal forms of the etymologies of group (ii), which, according to the evidence of group (i), can indeed continue an IE \*-ln-.

It is worth noting that the gemination exists in both groups. However, the one in θάλλω and ὄλλυμι could not have taken place at the same time as Aeol. βόλλομαι and ὀφέλλω, in view of the IA forms βούλομαι and ὀφείλω. While θάλλω, with significant hesitation, can be attributed to the Aeolic dialect,<sup>86</sup> the rest of the -αλλω verbs cannot. In the same way ὄλλυμι could, in theory, be of Aeolic origin. But, in this case one would deal with Aeolic loanwords in Ionic-Attic, which is all the more improbable in view of an alternative solution. Group (ii) probably reflects an older state, since the gemination \*-ln- > -λλ- exists alongside vowel lengthening across the Greek dialects, while in group (i) the gemination is the only known development. Furthermore, θάλλω and other (potential) nasal -αλλω preserved the \*n longer than those in group (ii), by means of analogy to κάμνω or δάκνω.<sup>87</sup> For τέλλω cf. τέμνω. A similar analogy to the -νυμι verbs, would have preserved the \*n in ὄλλυμι. On the other hand, such an analogy did not affect βούλομαι and ὀφείλω. Their nasal present is not of the same origin, nor formation, as the one of θάλλω and ὄλλυμι. Rather, one should see in them thematic verbs with a nasal suffix. In βούλομαι such a suffix is derived from the noun, while in ὀφείλω it has no clear source. As such, these verbs did not belong to any larger group of morphologically similar verbs. Consequently, no analogy could have preserved their nasal suffixes.

It is tempting to apply the same interpretation to the nouns of group (i), but this would also open a new question. What is the difference between ἐλλός and ὠλλόν on one side, and βουλή and ἐξουλή on the other? It is possible, in principle, that ἐλλός and ὠλλόν have kept their nasal suffixes longer than βουλή and ἐξουλή. However, both -vo- and -νη- are quite productive in Greek. There is no apparent reason as to why the analogy would affect only one of the two. But the following facts are worth pointing out: (1) if they reflect \*-ln-, all of the forms of the nominal flexion in group (i), apart from κελλάς, show the suffix \*-no-, (2) in group (ii) all of the nominal flexion, except οὔλος and μείλιχος, shows the suffix \*-neh<sub>2</sub>-, (3) the sequence \*-Vl-neh<sub>2</sub>- is never reflected exclusively as -Vλλᾱ-/Vλλη-. Therefore, according to

<sup>86</sup> If the root had a vocalised \*-h<sub>2</sub>- instead of a vocalised \*-l-, then, strictly speaking, n Aeolic origin cannot be discarded completely. The same is possible for a nasal present in σφάλλω.

<sup>87</sup> A similar development is seen in ἔννυμι, cf. the older εἴνυμι < \*mes-nu-mi.

the available material, it is possible to claim that IE  $*-Vl-neh_2-$  > IA  $-\bar{V}\lambda\eta-$ , Dor.  $-\bar{V}\lambda\bar{\alpha}-$ , Aeol.  $-V\lambda\lambda\alpha-$  regularly.

If it continues an IE  $*-ln-$ , the form οὔλος contradicts the supposed development of  $*-Vl-neh_2-$ . Also, no explanation is provided for μείλιχος and κελλάς. On the other hand, οὔλος can be understood as a Ion. form with the suffix  $*-μo-$ . κελλάς most probably has no IE etymology. A lack of IE etymology is also possible for μείλιχος, whose nasal, if it existed, must have been part of a suffix, the nature of which remains obscure. It also must be admitted that there seems to be no particular phonetical motivation for the mentioned reflections of  $*-Vl-neh_2-$  in Greek.

### Abbreviations:

\* – reconstructed form

> – ‘yields’

< – ‘comes from’

⇒ – ‘yields by derivation’

C – consonant

H – laryngeal

R – resonant

V – vowel

Aeol. – Aeolic

Alb. – Albanian

Arc. – Arcadian

Arm. – Armenian

Att. – Attic

Boeot. – Boeotian

Dor. – Doric

Gr. – Greek

Hitt. – Hittite  
IA – Ionic-Attic  
IE – Indo-European  
Ion. – Ionic  
Lat. – Latin  
Lesb. – Lesbian  
Lith. – Lithuanian  
MW – Middle Welsh  
OCS – Old Church Slavonic  
OHG – Old High German  
OIr. – Old Irish  
PAlb. – Proto-Albanian  
PCelt. – Proto-Celtic  
PGr. – Proto-Greek  
PHitt. – Proto-Hittite  
Skt. – Sanskrit  
Sln. – Slovenian  
Thess. - Thessalian  
YAv. – Young Avestan



## Sources

- Curt. = Curtius Rufus, *Historiae Alexandri Magni*. WWW : <https://goo.gl/nn-hiQG>. (Accessed 15.05.2017.) (On [www.perseus.tufts.edu](http://www.perseus.tufts.edu) from Curtius Rufus, Quintus. *Historiarum Alexandri Magni Macedonis libri qui supersunt*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1908. Ed. Edmund HEDICKE.)
- Hdt. = Herodotus, *Historiae*. WWW: <https://goo.gl/RLvYn7>. (Accessed 13.05.2017.) (On [www.perseus.tufts.edu](http://www.perseus.tufts.edu) from Herodotus, with an English translation by A. D. Godley. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1920.)
- Hes. *Op.* = Hesiodus, *Opera et dies*. WWW: <https://goo.gl/B4KkqU>. (Accessed 04.05.2017.) (On [www.perseus.tufts.edu](http://www.perseus.tufts.edu) from Hesiod. *The Homeric Hymns and Homerica with an English Translation by Hugh G. Evelyn-White. Works and Days*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1914.)
- Hes. *Th.* = Hesiodus, *Theogonia*. WWW: <https://goo.gl/dZ4ap6> (Accessed 04.05.2017.) (On [www.perseus.tufts.edu](http://www.perseus.tufts.edu) from Hesiod. *The Homeric Hymns and Homerica with an English Translation by Hugh G. Evelyn-White. Theogony*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1914.)
- Hom. *Dem.* = Homerus, *Hymnus Cereris*. WWW: <https://goo.gl/Vra3oO>. (Pristupljeno 04.05.2017.) (On [www.perseus.tufts.edu](http://www.perseus.tufts.edu) from Anonymous. *The Homeric Hymns and Homerica with an English Translation by Hugh G. Evelyn-White. Homeric Hymns*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1914.)
- Hom. *Il.* = Homerus, *Ilias*. WWW: <https://goo.gl/MlJelq>. (Accessed 13.05.2017.) (On [www.perseus.tufts.edu](http://www.perseus.tufts.edu) from Homer. *Homeri Opera in five volumes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1920.)
- Hom. *Od.* = Homerus, *Odyssea*. WWW: <https://goo.gl/YzMdB8>. (Accessed 17.05.2017.) (On [www.perseus.tufts.edu](http://www.perseus.tufts.edu) from Homer. *The Odyssey with an English Translation by A.T. Murray, PH.D. in two volumes*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1919.)
- Liv. = Livius, *Ab urbe condita*. WWW: <https://goo.gl/OEJoAG>. (Pristupljeno 15.05.2017.) (On [www.perseus.tufts.edu](http://www.perseus.tufts.edu) from Livy. *Ab urbe condita*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1929. Edd. Robert Seymour CONWAY. Charles Flamstead WALTERS.)
- Plut. *Quaes. Conv.* = Plutarchus, *Quaestiones Convivales*. WWW: <https://goo.gl/>

[HcDByy](#). (Accessed 17.05.2017.) (On [www.perseus.tufts.edu](http://www.perseus.tufts.edu) from Plutarch. *Moralia*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1892. Ed. Gregorius N. BERNARDAKIS.)

Strab. = Strabo, *Geographica*. WWW: <https://goo.gl/7ccYSB>. (Accessed 17.05.2017.) (On [www.perseus.tufts.edu](http://www.perseus.tufts.edu) from Strabo. *Geographica*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1877. Ed. A. MEINEKE.)

Text of Greek inscriptions in this article are quoted in accordance with: <http://inscriptions.packhum.org> (Accessed 25.05.2017.)

## References

- AE = DEMIRAJ, Bardhyl. *Albanische Etymologien*. Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi, 1997.
- AED = OREL, Vladimir. *Albanian Etymological Dictionary*. Leiden/Boston/Köln: Brill, 1998.
- VAN BEEK, Lucien. The “Saussure Effect” in Greek: a revision of the evidence. *The Journal of Indo-European Studies* 39 (2011), 129–175.
- BUCK, Carl Darling. *The Greek Dialects*. Chicago/London: Chicago University Press, 1973.
- CHANTRAINE, Pierre. *Grammaire homérique I*. Paris: Klincksieck, 1948.
- CHANTRAINE, Pierre. *Grammaire homérique II*. Paris: Klincksieck, 1953.
- CHANTRAINE, Pierre. *Morphologie historique du grec*. Paris: Klincksieck, 1984.
- COWGILL, Warren. *Evidence in Greek*. Winter, Werner (ed.). *Evidence for Laryngeals*. London/The Hague/Paris: Mouton & Co., 1965, 142–180.
- DELG = CHANTRAINE, Pierre. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*. Paris: Klincksieck, 1968.
- DEMIRAJ, Shaban. *Historische Grammatik der albanischen Sprache*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1993.
- EDG = BEEKES, Robert S.P. *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2010.
- EDH = KLOEKHORST, Alwin. *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2008.
- EDL = DE VAAN, Michiel. *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the other Italic Languages*. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2008.
- EDPC = MATASOVIĆ, Ranko. *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Celtic*, Leiden/Bos-

- ton, Brill 2009.
- EDPG = KROONEN, Guus. *Etymological dictionary of Proto-Germanic*, Leiden/Boston, Brill, 2013.
- HARÐARSON, Jón Axel. *Studien zum urindogermanischen Wurzelarist*. Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge für Sprachwissenschaft, 1993.
- KEWA = MAYRHOFER, Manfred. *Kurzgefaßtes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1956.
- KLINGENSCHMITT, Gert. *Das altermenische Verbum*, Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 1982.
- LEJEUNE, Michel: *Phonétique historique du mycénien et du grec ancien*. Paris: Klincksieck, 1987.
- LEW = FRAENKEL, Ernst. *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1962.
- LIV = RIX, Helmut. KÜMMEL, Martin *et al.* (edd.). *Lexicon der indogermanischen Verben*. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 2001<sup>2</sup>.
- LSJ = LIDDELL, Henry George. SCOTT, Robert. *A Greek-English Lexicon, revised and augmented throughout by Sir Henry Stuart Jones, with the assistance of. Roderick McKenzie*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940.
- LUBOTSKY, Alexander. La loi de Brugmann et \*H<sub>3</sub>e-. (*Sine ed.*) *La reconstruction des laryngales*. Liège-Paris: Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège, fascicule CCLIII, 1990, 129–136.
- LUBOTSKY, Alexander. The Vedic root vr̥- 'to cover' and its present. Forssman and Plath (edd.). *Indoarisch, Iranisch und die Indogermanistik. Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 2. bis 5. Oktober in Erlangen*. Wiesbaden: 2000, 315–325.
- MARTIROSYAN, Hrach L. *Etymological Dictionary of the Armenian Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2009.
- OREL, Vladimir. *A Concise Historical Grammar of the Albanian Language*. Leiden/Boston/Köln: Brill, 2000.
- RIX, Helmut. *Historische Grammatik der Griechischen*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1992.
- SCHRIJVER, Peter. *The Reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Latin*. Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi, 1991.

SCHWYZER, Eduard. *Griechische Grammatik*. München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1939.

SIHLER, Andrew L. *New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.

SLINGS, S. R. The Etymology of βούλομαι and ὀφείλω. *Mnemosyne* 28 (1975): 1–16.

SES = SNOJ, Marko. *Slovenski etimološki slovar*. Ljubljana: Inštitut za slovenski jezik Frana Ramovša ZRC SAZU, 2015. WWW: [www.fran.si](http://www.fran.si) (Accessed 13.05.2017.).

STRUNK, Klaus. *Nasalpräsentien und Aoriste*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1967.

THURNEISEN, Rudolf. *A Grammar of Old Irish*. Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, 1998.

VINE, Brent. On "Cowgill's Law" in Greek. Eichner *et al.* (edd.). *Compositiones Indogermanicae in memoriam Jochem Schindler*. Prague: 1999, 555–600.

WITHNEY, William Dwight. *The Roots, Verb-forms and the Primary Derivatives of the Sanskrit Language*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 2006.

Danilo Savić  
École Pratique des Hautes Études, Paris  
d.md.savic@gmail.com

### **Развој индоевропског \**ln* у лексичком наслеђу грчког језика**

*Апстракт:* Два се одраза ие. групе \**ln* углавном препознају у грчком језику: асимилација \**ln*- у -*λλ*-, односно дужење вокала испред \**l*-, узроковано губитком \**n*-. Предлаже се поновни преглед релевантног грчког материјала.

*Кључне речи:* грчки, прото-индоевропски, етимологија, назални суфикс.

## Sadržaje sveske 47 (2018)

DANILO SAVIĆ	
The Development of Indo-European *-In- in the Greek Inherited Lexicon	13
ЈЕЛЕНА ТОДОРОВИЋ ВАСИЋ	
Есхилови драмски принципи у трагедији <i>Оковани Прометеј</i>	39
ИФИГЕНИЈА РАДУЛОВИЋ — ГОРДАН МАРИЧИЋ	
<i>Против Ератостена</i> или како је једно политичко убиство прошло некажњено	55
РОДОЉУБ КУБАТ	
Историјски извештаји о настанку Септуагинте	75
МИЛОСАВ ВЕШОВИЋ	
Изводи из историје истраживања језика <i>Новог Завета</i>	93
ВИТАС — ГОЛУБОВИЋ — МИЛИЋ РАДИШЕВИЋ — ЦВЈЕТИЧАНИН	
<i>Astronomica</i> : Прво певање <i>Звездословља</i> Марка Манилија	133
DRAGANA GRBIĆ	
Some Considerations about the Peregrine Communities in Upper Moesia	221
MARIJA ILIĆ	
Ein Blick auf die Götterepitheta der Orphischen Hymnen in Bezug auf die dichterische Tradition: Kontinuität, Einmaligkeit und Erneuerung	235
MARCELA ANDOKOVÁ	
<i>The law of freedom is the law of love</i> . Some remarks on Christian liberty in Augustine's thinking.	249
TAMARA LOVATO BENEYTO	
The Punic motif in Claudian's <i>De Bello Gildonico</i> . A case of <i>memoria</i> and <i>exemplum</i> in Late Antique Latin literature	263
ДУШАН ПОПОВИЋ	
Средњовизантијске поетске монодије с посебним освртом на две Евгенијанове песме у спомен на Продрома	277
[prikazi, saopštenja]	
Collegium Carolivicanum Сремски Карловци, 18–25. август 2018.	289