A new look at the Greek desiderative

Daniel Kölligan

Universität zu Köln, Institut für Linguistik

d.koelligan@uni-koeln.de

Abstract

This paper argues that the Greek desiderative formation in *-σειε/ο-* may be explained as continuing a form in **-s-εμ-ιε/ο-*, derived from the weak stem in **-εμ-* of *u*-stem adjectives built to non-reduplicated *s*-presents/desideratives of the type Ved. *d(h)akṣu-* ‘burning’ which is marginally preserved in Mycenaean *e-wi-su^o* and probably Alphabetic Greek φαῦλος and αἴσυλα.

Keywords

Greek – desiderative – morphology – derivation

1 Desideratives in *-σειε/ο-*

1.1 Attestations

Ancient Greek has a present stem formation in *-σειε/ο-* with “desiderative” meaning, i.e. expressing the intention of the subject to bring about a state of affairs. The first and only instance in Homer is the participle ὀψείοντες ‘wishing to see’ in *Il.* 14.37:

τῷ ῥ' οἳ γ' ὀψείοντες ἀϋτῆς καὶ πολέμοιο / ἔγχει ἐρειδόμενοι κίον ἄθροοι

The kings therefore were faring all in one body, leaning each on his spear,
to look upon the war and the combat.

In Classical Greek both participles and indicative forms are attested, e.g. *E. Med.* 93 δρασείουσαν, *s. Ph.* 1245 δρασείεις, also an imperfect in Sophron (5th c. BC, Sicily) *frg.* 81.1 [Kaibel] ἐγὼν δέ τυ καὶ πάλαι ὥψεον ‘I wanted/have been want-

ing to see for long'.¹ In postclassical times the formation seems to have lost its productivity: later authors restrict the use of -σειε/ο-forms to the participle and largely to the same lexemes or semantic fields attested in classical times, as may be seen from the following table.²

	Classical	Post-classical
'get rid of' ἀπαλλάττω	Thuc. 1.95.7, 3.84.1 ἀπαλλαξείοντες, 8.89.2 ἀπαλλαξείειν	Aristides 284.10 [Jebb] ἀπαλλαξείων, Procopius <i>Historia arcana</i> 4.40.4, Theodoretus 326.5 ἀπαλλαξείοντα, Macarius Macres <i>Orationes</i> 2.9.9 ἀπαλλαξείοντας etc.
'step, go' βαίνω	Thuc. 8.56.3 ξυμβασιέοντα (codd.) ξυμβησιέοντα (Pier-son)	Dio Cassius 40.32.2 διαβησιέων, Luc. <i>Charon</i> 9.7 ἐλασιέοντι 'wishing to campaign against', Agath. 111.26 πελασιέοντες (τῇ πολιορκίᾳ)
'laugh', 'cry' γελάω, κλαίω	Pl. <i>Phd.</i> 64b1 γελασιέοντα	Euseb. <i>PE</i> 2.3.18 γελασιέουσιν etc., antonym κλαυσιέοντες 'wishing to cry' in Synesius <i>de regno</i> 14.28
'give', 'buy' δίδωμι, ἀγοράζω, ὠνέω	Thuc. 4.28.2 παραδωσιέοντα	Procopius <i>de bellis</i> 7.34.21 ἀποδωσιέοντες, schol. Ar. <i>Ran.</i> 1068 ἀγορασιέων 'wishing to buy', Dio Cassius 47.14 ὠνησιέοντα 'id.'
'do' δράω, ἐργάζω	s. <i>Aj.</i> 326 δρασιέων, <i>Aj.</i> 585, <i>Ph.</i> 1245 δρασιέεις, E. <i>Med.</i> 93 δρασιέουσιν, <i>Ph.</i> 1208 δρασιέετον, Ar. v. 168 δρασιέει, <i>Pax</i> 62 δρασιέεις, s. <i>Tr.</i> 1232 ἐργασιέων, <i>Ph.</i> 1001 ἐργασιέεις	Pachym. 63.19, 568.6 [Failler/Laurent] δρασιέόντων
'shit', 'eat' χέζω, βιβρώσκω	Ar. <i>Eq.</i> 998, <i>Nub.</i> 295 χεσιέω, <i>Eq.</i> 888 χεσιέῃ	Call. <i>Aetia</i> frg. 24.17 [Pfeiffer] βρωσιέοντες 'wishing to eat'
'battle', 'be a tyrant' πολεμέω, τυραννέω	Thuc. 1.33.4 πολεμησιέοντα	πολεμησιέοντ- App. 3×, D.C. 2×, Theodoretus 1×, Syrianus 1×, Agath. 1×, Procop. 4× etc. τυραννησιέε/ο- Sol. ap. D.L.1.65 -οντα, Philostr. <i>VA</i> 5.33 -οντι, 8.7 -οντα
'listen, hear' ἀκούω	s. <i>frg.</i> 991 [Radt] ἀκουσιέων	Georgius Pachymeres (13th/14th c.) Συγγρ. 25.7 τοῖς ἀκουσιέουσι

1 Cf. Hsch. ὤψεον· †ὥπτεισαν† εἶχον. 'περιεβ'ῆλεποντο, ἰδεῖν ἐβούλοντο. See the appendix for a list of forms.

2 Cf. Wackernagel (1887: 142 f.).

It seems likely that this restriction is an Atticist phenomenon, as later authors imitated only those morphological forms (i.e. participles) and only those lexemes or semantically related verbs (as near-synonyms, antonyms etc.) that were attested in their canonized predecessors with some frequency. This does not preclude that a later author might have become creative and used a form not known from earlier literature—unless, of course, this impression is due to our limited data³—, but the overall correspondence between classical and postclassical usage may be interpreted as showing that the desiderative had ceased to be productive by the 3rd c. BC and was perpetuated only as a literary marker in the forms known from the classical authors.⁴

1.2 *Earlier explanations*

1.2.1 Wackernagel

The origin of the Greek desiderative formation in *-σειε/ο-* has remained unclear, despite various attempts at a derivation. Wackernagel (1887) bases his reconstruction on the fact that the desiderative, as seen in 1.1, frequently occurs as a participle. The unexpected genitive objects ἀϋτῆς καὶ πολέμοιο in the single desiderative attested in Homer, ὀψείοντες ‘wishing to see’, might neatly be explained if, as Wackernagel proposes, there was an original syntagm *ῥψει ἰόντες ‘going to the sight’ with a dative of ῥψις triggering an adnominal genitive. Several problems are connected with this hypothesis, however: a) as already pointed out by Ehrlich (1912: 97), there is no evidence for a syntagm *ῥψει εἶμι anywhere else, hence it is assumed *ad hoc*. b) the desiderative is not restricted to the participle in Classical Greek and its later perseveration in participles only is likely to be an effect of literary language use. Hence, there is no compelling reason to base an etymological explanation on the participle.⁵ c) While

3 E.g. cases without a clear model in classical literature such as γαμησειε/ο- ‘wish to marry’ (Alciphron 1.16.2.6 -ω, Vitae Aesopi [Ferrari] 30.12 -ουσα) and κατηγορησειε/ο- ‘wish to accuse’ (Agath. 4.2 -οντες), which may be due to chance in transmission.

4 Probably already in the 5th c. the derivational rule for this rare formation had become ambiguous as shown by πολεμνησειε/ο- on the one hand and transmitted ξυμβασειε/ο- (beside the conjecture ξυμβησειε/ο-) on the other hand in Thucydides: the former is to be related to the stem of the future πολεμνησε/ο-, while for the latter only a relation to the abstract noun (σύμ-)βασις seems viable as opposed to the future stem βησε/ο-. Euripidean φευξείω (HF 628 οὐ γὰρ πτερωτὸς οὐδὲ φευξείω φίλους) is ambiguous; note the fut. φεύξομαι (Hom.+) and the abstract φεύξις in s. (Ant. 362 [lyr.]) beside φύξις (Hom. only Il. 10[!].311, 447; Nic.). Beside παραδωσειοντα in Thucydides, Hesychius has δοσειν· δοτικῶς ἔχειν with the root vowel of the noun δόσις (contrast the future δώσω). As in the case of ξυμβασειε/ο-, it may remain open whether one should correct παραδοσειοντα, as Wackernagel (1887: 143) proposes.

5 Cf. section 5 for a possible reason why participles are frequent in this formation.

a genitive object is indeed rare with verbs of seeing,⁶ the desiderative meaning of ὀψείοντες may be responsible for the genitive, marking partial or non-affectedness of the object as in the case of ὀρέγομαι ‘stretch towards, reach out, take hold’ with accusative of body-part vs. genitive of person and other verbs meaning ‘aim at, try to reach’ such as ἐπιμαίομαι ‘strive after’, ἵεμαι ‘desire’, ἔλδομαι ‘desire’, ἔραμαι ‘love, desire’, ἐπείγω ‘press for, be eager’ etc., as pointed out by Chantraine (2013: 71 = 1953: 50f.),⁷ who lists ὀψείοντες among these forms.

1.2.2 Ehrlich, Schwyzler et al.

The weaknesses of Wackernagel’s explanation have led to other proposals that have not met with universal approval either:⁸

a) Ehrlich (1912: 97) compares Ved. *iṣ* ‘search’, Av. *aēšma-* ‘wrath’, Gk. οἶμα ‘rush’ and explains the first element as going back to abstract nouns in -τι-, i.e. ὀψείοντ- < *ὀπτι- + -ειοντ- from *-εισοντ-, i.e. something like ‘rushing to the sight of’. The connection with *iṣ* is difficult on formal grounds, since the PIE root was probably **h₂eṛs-* (LIV² 260, cf. Arm. *ayc* ‘visit, inspection’) and one would expect Gk. *-αισοντ-. Gk. οἶμα and Av. *aēšma-* probably belong to PIE **h₁eṛsh₂-* ‘invigorate, urge’⁹ (> Gk. *-εισαντ/οντ-) or a root **h₃eṛs-* (> Gk. *-οισοντ-).¹⁰ As in the case of Wackernagel’s explanation, there is no further evidence in Greek for such a grammaticalization of periphrastic constructions.

b) Schwyzler (1939: 789) takes -σεῖω to be an “expressive” form *-*seḱō* of *-*seḱō*, which in turn he interprets as an enlargement of the *-*se/o*-future. Probably the future in *-*sē/o-* (Skt. -*sya-*, Lith. 1sg -*siu*) is an enlargement of the simple *-*s-*future parallel to its simple thematic variant *-*se/o-*,¹¹ whereas a form *-*seje/o-* seems to be unparalleled. Another problem with this explanation is the gratuitous assumption of gemination.

c) Frequently, researchers try to connect the desiderative with both the future in -*σε/o-* and the “Doric” future in -*σεε/o-*:¹² according to Lindeman (1965),

6 LSJ quote X. *Mem.* 1.1.11 οὐδεις Σωκράτους οὐδὲν ἀσεβὲς ... οὔτε πράττοντος εἶδεν οὔτε λέγοντος ἤκουσεν and remark “where the constr. is suggested by the use of ἤκουσεν” and Arat. 429 νότον δ’ ἐπὶ σήματι τούτῳ [430] δεῖδιθι μέχρι βορῆος ἀπαστράψαντος ἰδεῖναι “But at this sign fear the South Wind, until thou see’st the North Wind come with lightning,” where μέχρι + gen. may have influenced the construction.

7 “Les verbes exprimant l’idée de ‘viser à, chercher à atteindre’ sont proches de τυγχάνω et s’associent volontiers au génitif.”

8 Cf. also Lindemann (1965: 48).

9 Cf. LIV² 234.

10 Cf. Beekes (2010: 1057).

11 Cf. e.g. Jasanoff (2003: 133).

12 For the Doric future, cf. recently Willi (2017: 441), who assumes that forms in -*σε/o-* may

the Greek desiderative and the “Doric” future continue a formation in **-sje/o-* comparable with the Vedic future forms in *-sya-* and the Lith. 1SG fut. of the type *busiù* ‘I will be’. For Lindeman, Greek inherited desideratives going back to **-sje/o-* and to **-h₁sje/o-* after resonants beside futures in **-se/o-* of the type *λείψω*. The variants **-sje/o-* and (**h₁sje/o-* >) **-esje/o-* were contaminated to **-sesje/o-* > **-sejje/o-*, which yielded both the desiderative *-σειε/o-* and the “Doric” future *-σέω* by simplification of the geminate as in Hom. *τελείω*, *τελέω*, Att. *τελῶ*, from *τέλος*.¹³ The arbitrary hypothesis of a contamination of two formations assumed *ad hoc* to be continued in Greek makes this explanation rather unlikely. This is also true of Hollifield (1981), who assumes *-σειε/o-* to stem from **-se-* + **-sje/o-*. A similar explanation has recently been proposed by Willi (2017: 458 fn. 106), who also takes the Greek desideratives to go back to forms in **-sje/o-*: after obstruent-final roots, desideratives in **-sje/o-* would have become indistinguishable from futures in **-se/o-*, e.g. **dejk-sje/o-* > **δεϊξε/o-* like **dejk-se/o-* > **δεϊξε/o-*, which led to a remarking by analogy to roots with final resonant, e.g. **men-esje/o-* > **μενεϊε/o-* > **δεϊξεϊε/o-*. The Greek data are not favourable for this approach, as the only possible instance of a desiderative of a root ending in a resonant is Homeric *κειε/o-* ‘wish to lie’ (16×), which, whatever its origin, does not lend itself as a model for analogy as synchronically it consists of the root *κει-* and the ablauting thematic vowel.¹⁴

As pointed out by Wackernagel (1887: 144), an intermediate consonant /ɥ/, /s/ or /j/ may have been lost in the desiderative in *-σειε/o-*.¹⁵ The following discussion will try to show that this form continues a denominal verb formation with /ɥ/.

2 *-ειε/o-* < **-euje/o-*?

The phonological possibility of a derivation from a hypothetical preform **-euje/o-* > *-ειε/o-* is shown by parallel cases such as Att. *καίω* ‘burn’ from **kauje/o-*, aor. *ἔκαυσα*,¹⁶ and Elean, the Greek dialect famous for preserving the orig-

have developed by extension of the *μενέω*-type to roots ending in consonants other than resonants: **CeRh₁se/o-* > **CeRe^he/o-* → **CeC-e^he/o-*, Dor. *δεϊξέω*, Hom. *έσσεῖται* etc.

13 Cf. Lejeune (1987: 132f.).

14 The form may go back to a regular future **ke_j-h₁se/o-* with the suffix **-h₁se/o-* in resonant-final roots (i.e. the type *μένω*, fut. *μενέω* > *μενῶ*), developing via **ke_j-ese/o-* to **ke^hehe/o-* > **kē(h)e/o-*, spelt *κειε/o-*.

15 “Es kann nach attischen lautgesetzen auf εϕι (βασιλειος), auf εϕj (βραδεία), εσι (τέλειος) und natürlich auch auf εji zurückgeführt werden.”

16 Cf. Schwyzler (1939: 728).

inal alternation between presents in -είω beside aorists in -ευσ(α)- derived from nouns in -εύς,¹⁷ in forms such as λατρειόμενον, σταθμείοι, κατιαραίων, φυγαδείην, φυγαδείοι vs. aor. φυγαδεύαντι, and πολιτειόμενοιρ. In the first case, the noun λατρεύς ‘servant’ is attested only from the 2nd c. onward (Lyc.), the only older form being λάτρις (Thgn. 302+). This shows the productivity of the formation in -είω : -ευσ(α)-, which has become independent of the existence of a corresponding noun in -εύς. Likewise, there is no *πολιτεύς from which to derive πολιτειόμενοιρ, only πολίτης, and φυγάς, but no **φυγαδεύς, etc.

3 Nouns in -εύς¹⁸

Since the formal relation between nouns in -εύς and presents in -είω is well established, it is tempting to pursue the hypothesis that the desideratives in -σειε/ο- are denominals based on nouns in *-s-eus. As the following discussion will show, however, both the derivation of desideratives from nouns in -εύς and the assumption of a connection of the subgroup in -σεύς with a verbal stem are problematic. The latter type is already attested in Mycenaean, and in the first edition of *Documents Ventris & Chadwick* (1953: 94) interpreted it as based on the future stem, a view they changed in the second edition where they speak more cautiously of “verbal stems with a -s-suffix”.¹⁹

Myc. form	Interpretation/ Alph.-Gk. correspondence	Verb/stem
<i>A-re-ke-se-u</i>	Ἀλεξεύς (Argos 303 BC) ²⁰	ἀλέξω ‘ward off’ (cf. Ved. <i>rákṣati</i>)
<i>A-we-ke-se-u</i>	*Ἀφεξεύς	ἀέξω, ἀυξάνω ‘grow’ (cf. Ved. <i>ukṣant-</i>)
<i>De-ke-se-u</i>	Δεξεύς (Argos 4th/3rd c. BC)	δέξομαι ‘get’

17 Cf. Minon (2007: 396 f.). Another instance may be attested in Dodona (Dor., ca. 400 BC) *μαστειέϊ* from *μαστεύω* ‘search’ (Ἐ ἄλλαν *μαστειέϊ* ‘Should he *look for* a different wife?’), cf. Lhôte (2006: no. 29).

18 For discussion of the origin of nouns in -eu-, which is not treated here, cf. recently Meissner (2017).

19 Ventris & Chadwick (1973: 100), cf. also Ventris & Chadwick (1956: 100), Kerschensteiner (1955: 69 with fn. 56): “offenbar von s-Futur/Aoriststämmen gebildet”.

20 CEG II 816, 9.

(cont.)

Myc. form	Interpretation/ Alph.-Gk. correspondence	Verb/stem
<i>E-ne-ke-se-u</i>	*Ένεξεύς	– (ένεγκειν) ²¹
<i>Ka-ri-se-u</i>	*Χαρισεύς	χαριούμαι, χαρίζομαι, χαρίσομαι 'grant'
<i>O-na-se-u</i>	*Όνασεύς	δνήσω 'profit, help'
<i>Pa-ra-ke-se-u</i>	Πραξεύς	πράξω 'do'
<i>Qo-wa-ke-se-u</i>	*Γωφαξεύς	ἄξω 'lead'

As a further argument for this derivation, one could point out that both in Mycenaean and Alphabetic Greek nouns in *-eus* may be derived from verbal stems, although this is apparently much less often the case than the productive denominal pattern of the type χαλκός 'copper', χαλκεύς 'smith', χαλκεύω 'forge', cf. e.g. in Alphabetic Greek forms such as²²

- στιγεύς 'tattooer' (Hdt. 7.35) : στίζω 'to tattoo'.²³
- πνίγεύς 'damper, extinguisher, cover of a stove' (Ar. Nu. 96+) : πνίγηναι 'to choke'.²⁴
- ψύγεύς 'cooler (for wine)' (=ψυκτήρ, Alex. 64 [4th c. BC], Euphro 3 [3rd c. BC]) : ψύγηναι 'to cool'.²⁵
- σκαλεύς 'hoer' (x. Oec. 17.12,15) : σκάλλω 'to stir up, hoe'.²⁶
- πλύνεύς 'clothes-cleaner' (=πλύντης, IG 2.1327, Poll.7.38) : πλύνω 'to wash'.
- ἄλειφεύς 'anointer' (imp., Priene) : ἄλειφω 'to anoint'.

In Mycenaean a similar pattern is found in²⁷

- *pe-re-ke-u* /plekeus/ 'weaver' : πλέκω 'to weave'.

21 On the probably original meaning 'receive' preserved in the personal name, cf. García Ramón (2017), see fn. 33.

22 Cf. Perpillou (1973: 354).

23 Hdt. 7.35 ἤδη δὲ ἤκουσα ὥς καὶ στιγέας ἅμα τούτοις ἀπέπεμψε στίζοντας τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον. "I have even heard that he sent *branders* with them to *brand* the Hellespont"; perhaps an *ad hoc* formation beside the verb στίζω.

24 This is the only form with ι, cf. against this πνίγμα and πνίγος, so probably it is derived from the aorist stem πνίγηναι.

25 Parallel to the case of πνίγεύς, the short vowel (υ) is attested only in the aorist ψύγηναι (Ar. Nu. 151).

26 No other nominal forms are attested.

27 Leukart (1994: 246) takes all these forms to be personal names from terms for professionals (miller, weaver, etc.) and nicknames ('Επειγεύς).

- *pe-ke-u* /pekeus/ : πέχω ‘to comb’ or /sperk^heus/ : σπέρχομαι ‘to strive’.
- *pe-qe-u* /pek^weus/ ‘cook, chef’ : πέττω/πέσσω ‘to cook’.²⁸
- *e-pe-ke-u* /Epeigeus/ ‘one who urges on, impels’ : ἐπείγω ‘to urge on, impel’, Alph.-Gk. Ἐπειγέυς.²⁹

By analogy one might assume that if deverbal nouns in *-eu-* are possible, built either to aorist stems (as in πνιγέυς) or to present stems (as in πλυνέυς), nouns in *-s-eu-* might go back to sigmatic aorist stems or desiderative/future stems in *-s-*, which served as the basis for denominal verbs:

aorist/future/desiderative *-s-* → noun in *-s-eu-* → denominal present in *-s-eu-īe/o-* > *-σειε/ο-*³⁰

In contrast to the denominal presents based on nouns in *-eu-*, the type in *-s-eu-* does not seem to have been productive in post-Mycenaean times. This might account for the fact that there was no analogical restitution of *-eu-* in the forms in *-σειε/ο-*, because the corresponding nouns in *-σευ-* no longer existed (or never had), whereas in the case of the presents in **-eu-īe/o-* the nouns in *-εϋ-* are usually present (with the exceptions noted above), e.g. βασιλεύς / *βασιλείω → βασιλεύω. Further analogical pressure was exerted by the other tense/aspect forms aor. βασιλευσ(α)- and fut. βασιλευσε/ο-, while there is no evidence for secondary sigmatic forms built to **-s-eu-* nouns.

But even if we assume that some of the names in *-s-eus* are based on sigmatic verbal stems and that it was possible to derive appellatives in *-eus* from verbal stems in general (such as πνιγέυς), the lack of unambiguous appellatives in *-s-eus* makes a direct derivation of these simplicia unlikely, i.e. there is no evidence for a *nomen agentis* of the type *ὀψεύς ‘one who wants to see’ derived from the stem of ὀψομαι. The exception is personal names in *-s-eus*, and these

28 Cf. Szemerényi (1957: 164).

29 In Homer a Myrmidon, son of Agacles, slain by Hector, *Il.* 16.571.

30 Similarly, Leukart (1994: 227 fn. 251) assumes that personal names with ἄλξ- as first member, such as *A-ko-so-ta* /*Alksoitās*/ ‘der das (schlimme) Geschick abwehrt’, *A-ka-sa-no* /*alk-sānor*/ ‘der die (feindlichen) Männer abwehrt’, continue the desiderative **alk-s-*. Beside *A-we-ke-se-u* we find the simple verbal root in *Au-ke-wa* /*Augew(w)ās*/ (probably a short form of a compound such as **[Augewastus]*); note also [...] *-ke-se-ra-wo* (ΚΝ As 1516), behind which a name /*Aukselāwos*/ may hide. This type was later contaminated with τερψίμβροτος-type compounds, e.g. ἀλεξιῖκακος instead of expected **alekse-kako-*. *De-ke-se-u* may similarly go back to the desiderative/future stem **deks-* of δέχομαι or simply be an analogical formation following the model of **alekse-* and **aukse-*, where the desiderative/future stem is inherited (cf. Ved. *rakṣati*, *ukṣant-*). In both cases, it is likely to be a short form of a compound, e.g. [*de*]-*ke-se-ra-wo* /*Dekselāwos*/, cf. Δεξιῖλαος, if we read ΚΝ As 1516 this way.

are likely to be the result of a shortening of corresponding longer forms, mostly compounds, even though such compounds may not be attested in early times for all such personal names, cf.³¹

- *a-re-ke-se-u* : Ἀλεξίκακος (Athens, 188/7 AD), Ἀλεξίμβροτος (3×)³²
- *a-we-ke-se-u* : Αὐξίβιος (Delos, 218 BC), frequent Αὐξησίβιος, Αὐξιτύχη (3rd c. AD), cf. also adj. ἀεξίγυιος ‘strengthening the limbs’ (Pi. N. 4.73), ἀεξίφυλλος ‘nourishing leaves’ (A. Ag. 697)
- *de-ke-se-u* : Δεξιμάχος (10×), Δεξιχαρίς (2×), δεξιμήλος ‘receiving sheep, rich in sacrifices’ (E. Andr. 129 [lyr.], 1138, Ph. 632)
- *ka-ri-se-u* : Χαρίσανδρος (34×)
- *o-na-se-u* : Ὀνασίτιμος (6×), overall names with Ὀνασι^o 380×
- *pa-ra-ke-se-u* : Πραξιδαμος (14×)³³

4 Comparative data

4.1 Vedic

If an inner-Greek explanation of the desiderative in -σειε/o- is not forthcoming, a comparative perspective may be helpful. In Vedic, the productive desidera-

31 An unshortened form is *qo-wa-ke-se-u* /*G^wōwakseus*/, probably an inversion of **aksi-g^wom-*, cf. the thematic form in -αξος such as Χάραξος (Mytilene, 7–6th c. BC), Εὐαξος (Megara, 242–238) and see García Ramón (2017: 60 f.). The same process may underlie agent nouns in -eus not based on verbal stems, such as ἀλιεύς ‘fisherman; sailor’ as a short form of compounds such as H. ἀλιαῆς, ἀλίπλοος, ἀλιστέφανος [*h. Ap.*], ἀλίτροχος [Ibyc.], or σπογγο-θήρας (m.) ‘diver for sponges’ (Plu. 2.950b, 981e) → σπογγ-εύς (Arist. HA620b34, Pr. 960b21.etc.), cf. Perpillou (1973: 245 ff.).

32 Numbers of attestations are taken from the *LGPn* website (<http://www.lgpn.ox.ac.uk/>).

33 The dossier of names in -seus has increased since 1952, but the basic situation still holds, cf. the recent treatment of the data by García Ramón (2017): *ka-e-se-u* /*Ka^hēseus*/ (PY Qa 1299, MY Ge 605.4B), dat. *ka-e-se-we* (MY Ge 7024B) is most probably a short form of *ka-e-sa-me-no* (PY An 656.19, TH Ug 5), gen. -o-jo (Vn 1191.2) related to Lat. *cēnsēre*, -eō ‘to tax, assess’, Ved. *śāns-* ‘to praise’; for *qe-te-se-u* /*K^{wh}ēiseus*/ (KN As [1] 609.3) cf. H. φθεισῆνωρ, φθισίμβροτος ‘making men perish’. *E-ne-ke-se-u* /*Enekeus*/ is likely to continue the presuppletive meaning of PIE **h₁nek-* ‘get, acquire’, cf. *ἐνεχα* < **h₁nekēn* ‘for the acquisition of, in order to get’, Toch. B /enk-/ ‘take, seize’, cf. similar names like Κτήσαρχος, Κτησάρετος, etc. The aorist ἐνεγκέιν, which continues **h₁nek-*, may have had causative meaning ‘make someone get/acquire something’; in suppletion with φέρω this meaning developed into ‘bring’, cf. Kölligan (2007: 336). *E^o* may derive from **enekti-* or (less likely) from a future stem **enek-s-*, cf. ambiguous Ἀξι^o (Ἀξανδρος, Ἀξίλεως, Ἀξίπολις etc.) beside fut. ἄξω. The process has remained productive in post-Mycenaean Greek, cf. Ἀκεσεύς (-ις, -ίας, -[ι]ων, Ἀκεσώ) beside Ἀκεσίδαμος, Ἀκεσίμβροτος, Ἀκεσίστρατος, Ἀκεσίλαος, or Μνασεύς (-ις, -έας, -[ι]ων, Μνασώ) beside Μνησίστρατος etc. (609 names with Μνησι^o in *LGPn*).

tive is a reduplicated form with a suffix *-s-a-*,³⁴ e.g. *cit* ‘realize, note’ : *ci-kit-sa^{ti}* ‘tries to see’, *pā* ‘drink’ : *pī-pā-sa^{ti}* / *pī-pī-ša^{ti}* ‘is thirsty, wishes to drink’ and *dabh-* ‘damage’ : *di-p-sa^{ti}* ‘wishes to damage’ < **di-db^h-sa-*, cf. OAv. inf. *diβžaidiūai* [Y. 45.4] ‘deceive’.³⁵ In the latter case, the proto-form **di-db^h-se/o-* underwent loss of the intermediate /d/ followed by assimilation of **b^(h)*s to Ved. *-ps-* and Av. *-βž-* respectively. The desiderative stem serves as a basis for *u*-stem adjectives, i.e. *dabh-* : *dipsú-* ‘wishing to damage’, *cit* : *cikitsú-* ‘cautious, wise’ (AV), *yaj-* ‘sacrifice’ : *īyaksú-*, *ji* ‘win, conquer’ : *jigīśú-* etc.³⁶

Beside this, an unreduplicated desiderative may be supposed to have existed in an early layer of Indo-Iranian, of which only a few remnants seem to be attested in Vedic such as RV 1.100.8 *apsanta* ‘they try/want to reach’, which may be an independent *-sa*-subjunctive built to the root *ap* ‘reach’ or a desiderative without reduplication,³⁷ and the presents *nákṣa-* from PIE **h₂nek-* ‘reach’, which may continue **h₂nek-s(e/o)-*,³⁸ *ukṣāti* ‘to sprinkle’, from PIE **ueg^u-* ‘make wet’;³⁹ and *caṣṭe* ‘sees’, to which corresponds YAv. *cašte* ‘teaches’ (PIE **k^uek-s-*).⁴⁰ Other *membra disiecta* of this formation may be Hittite *kweršun* ‘I cut’ (KBo 10.2 ii 48 [OH/NS]) beside the reduplicated form *kuguršant-* ‘mutilated’⁴¹ and a set of roots ending in /s/ that seem to have been lexicalized already in

34 Cf. also Heenen (2006).

35 Or rather ‘wish to deceive’, implying that, according to the Mazdaist triad of thought, word and deed, the faithful should not even think of deceiving the supreme being (cf. in the Roman Catholic Confiteor *cogitatione, verbo et opere*).

36 Cf. Wackernagel & Debrunner (1964: 11.2.468 f.).

37 *tām apsanta śavasa utsavēṣu* / *náro nāram āvase tām dhánāya*. Kümmel (2000: 123): “Ihn [Indra] *wollen* sie *erreichen* bei den Unternehmungen der Kraft, die Männer den Mann zur Hilfe, ihn für den Gewinn.” Differently, but with a question mark, Jamison/Brereton: “Him they *inspired* [?] in the upsurgings of his vast power—the men inspired [?] the man to help, inspired [?] him to the stakes.”, supposing that *apsanta* belongs to *bhas* ‘blow, inspire’ as in compounds with *-psu-* and Gk. ψυχή (cf. online commentary <http://rigvedacommentary.alc.ucla.edu/>).

38 E.g. RV 1.95.10 *śukraír ūrmíbhīr abhí nakṣati kṣám* (Agni) “with blazing waves he *reaches* the ground” (Jamison/Brereton), “mit lichten Wogen *sucht* er die Erde *auf*” (Geldner) from *‘is eager to reach’.

39 Cf. LIV² 662.

40 Cf. LIV² 383–385. The loss of desiderative meaning is paralleled by the case of Ved. *ikṣa-* ‘see’ < ‘wish to see, imagine’ (PIE **h₃i-h₃k^u-se/o-*), cf. also Heenen (2006: 56–57).

41 Cf. LIV² 391. Oettinger (2002: 119) assumes that *kweršun* continues a sigmatic aorist, but the continuation of both a root aorist (Hitt. *kwerta*) and a sigmatic aorist would be unusual. Puhvel (1984: IV[1997]: 217) takes it to be a “suffixed variant of the root *kuer-*”, but the function of the suffix remains open. Kloekhorst (2008: 487) assumes an *ad hoc* formation “without any historicity”, but it remains unclear what the model for such a formation would have been.

the protolanguage, losing the putative desiderative meaning, such as Gk. ἀέξω and ἀλέξω (v. *supra*), which are simple presents meaning ‘grow’ and ‘defend’ respectively. Instances of this type may be PIE **b^hleh₁(s)-* ‘blow’ (Goth. *ble-san*, OHG *blāsan* [v. *infra* on Gk. φαῦλος] beside OHG *blāen* ‘id.’, Lat. *flēre*, *fleō* ‘to cry’, Latv. *blēju*, *blēt* ‘to bleat’),⁴² **kleu(s)-* ‘hear’ (Ved. *śroṣan* ‘they obey’, OCS *slyšati*, *slyšō*, OHG [*h*] *losēn*), **h₂eug-* ‘grow’ : **h₂ueks-* (Lat. *augēre*, Goth. *aukan*; Gk. ἀέξω, ἀϋξάνω, Ved. *úksant-*), **h₂elk-* ‘defend, ward off’ : **h₂leks-* (Gk. ἀλαλκεῖν, Lat. *ulciscor*; Gk. ἀλέξω, Ved. *rákṣati*), **k^uei(s)-* ‘realize, notice’ (Ved. *cáyati*, Gk. τίω ‘honour’; OAv. *cōišť* [aor.], *cinasti* ‘assign’),⁴³ and **ten(s)-* ‘stretch’ (Gk. τείνω; Goth. *ṑpinsan* ‘draw’, Lith. *tęsiù*, *tęsti* ‘stretch’, Ved. *taṁsaya-* ‘pull’). Beside such lexicalized forms, the Baltic and Italic *s*-futures (Lith. 3sg *duōs* ‘will give’, Osc. 3sg *fust* ‘will be’) may speak in favour of the assumption of an original athematic *s*-present, probably with desiderative meaning, from which the thematic futures in **-se/o-* and **-sje/o-* and the reduplicated Indo-Iranian desiderative and Old Irish future (3sg *gigis*, *-gig* ‘will pray’) are derived.⁴⁴

As discussed by Nussbaum (2014: 222 f.), *u*-stem adjectives based on unreduplicated desideratives may be *dah* ‘burn’ → *d(h)ákṣu-* ‘eager to burn’ [Jamison/Brereton]; *brennlustig* [Geldner]’ (RV 10.115.4)⁴⁵ and *cákṣuṣ-* ‘eye’, if this is derived from a desiderative adjective **cakṣu-* ‘wishing to see’. Cf. similar *-s*-derivatives based on *u*-stem adjectives such as *tápuṣ-* ‘heat’ from *tápu-* ‘hot’ and *áyus-* ‘life, vitality’ from *āyú-* ‘lively’, and from the *-su*-adjective *d(h)ákṣu-* the *s*-stem *d(h)akṣuṣ-* in RV 1.141.7 *dakṣúṣaḥ* ‘burning [gen. sg.]’.⁴⁶

4.2 Myc. e-wi-su-^o

This unreduplicated formation in *-su-* has been suspected in Greek as well in the Myc. form *e-wi-su-zo-ko*, read as */ewisu-^o/* since the first edition of *Documents in Mycenaean Greek* in 1956.⁴⁷

- *e-wi-su-zo-ko* (KN Se 965, 1007) (epithet of a chariot)
- *e-wi-su-^{*}79-ko* (PY Va 404, 482) (related to pieces of ivory)

Since intervocalic */s/* may denote a geminate */ss/* going back to a consonant cluster, one possible interpretation is */ewi(s)su-/* from **/ewidsu-/*, a form which

42 Cf. LIV² 87.

43 Cf. recently Weiss (2017), who reconstructs **k^ueh₁-je/o-* and **k^ueh₁ih₁s-*.

44 Cf. Jasanoff (2003: 133) for a discussion of possible further types.

45 The form is usually interpreted as based on an *-s*-aorist, but such a derivational pattern cannot be supported by further evidence.

46 Cf. Wackernagel & Debrunner (1964: 1.126, III.291).

47 Cf. Ventris & Chadwick (1956: 394), Ventris & Chadwick (1973: 547) and especially Ruijgh (1987) and de Lamberterie (1990: 11.945–949).

would be the predecessor of thematized Alph.-Gk. *ἐφισφᾶ in Homer, e.g. *Il.* 1.468 δαιτὸς ἐΐσης, *Il.* 13.405 ἀσπίδι πάντοσ' ἐΐση, beside the form without initial ἐ- found in Att. ἴσος 'same, identical' < *φισφος (Arc. Cret. Boeot. φισφός, Hesych. γισγόν· ἴσον)⁴⁸ and probably attested in Myc. *wi-so-wo-pa-na* /*wiswo*-°/ (PY Sh 740), an epithet of armour. The parallel presence and absence of initial /e-/ in Mycenaean /*ewisu*-/ and /*wiswo*-/ on the one hand and Alphabetic Greek *ἐφισφο- and *φισφο- on the other makes a connection of these forms likely, whatever the origin of /e-/.⁴⁹ Myc. /(*e*)*wisu*-/ and its putative continuants in Alphabetic Greek may derive from an adjective **uid-s-u*- built to PIE **meid*- 'look, see', cf. the -s-form from the same root in Lat. *visere* 'go to see, look closely'. The process of thematization can be compared with that found in στενός 'narrow' < **stenuo*- for earlier **stenu*-, cf. the name of a plane in Messenia Στενύκληρος (Hdt. 9.64).⁵⁰ As argued by Ruijgh (1987: 536 f.), the thematic forms may be backformed from the neuter plural as in δάκρυ : δάκρυα → δάκρυον 'tear', i.e. *στενφά (like *δόρφα after the oblique cases *δορφός etc.) → *στενφός.⁵¹ Alternatively, one may consider a derivation with "possessive" *-ό- of the type βιός 'bow' < *'having a bowstring' (Ved. *jyá*), which would, however, require the additional assumption of a substantivized adjective as intermediary, i.e. **stenu*- 'narrow' → **sténu*- 'something narrow, strait; narrowness' → **stenu*-ό- 'having narrowness = narrow'. The adjective **uidsu*- was probably polysemous, meaning 'wishing/trying to see' and 'wishing/trying to look like x', which corresponds to the *activity* and *phenomenon* readings in Viberg's classification of the semantics of verbs of perception.⁵² As in NE *look*, these meanings may be colexified, cf. (activity) *Look at that!* beside (phenomenon) *He looks sad*, Gk. Att. ἰδέ/Hom. ἴδε (*Il.* 17.179) 'Look!' and εἰδόμενος 'looking like x' (*Il.* 5.462 εἰδόμενος Ἀκάμαντι 'looking like Akamas'). A neuter plural **uidsu*a referring to non-agents would probably have meant 'things looking like x', or, if

48 On the accent cf. Ruijgh (1987: 534): the barytone accent may be due to analogy with the pronominal adjectives τόσος, ὅσος, πόσος.

49 Ruijgh (1987: 538) proposes a root **h₁meis*- for *ἐφισφύ-, *ἐφισφός- beside **meid*- in *φεισάμενος 'having made oneself similar to x'. *φισφός- then arose by the proportional analogy *ἐφισφός- : *φεισάμενος :: x : *φεισάμενος, x = *φισφός-. There is no further evidence for such a root. Since one would expect **h₁uisu*- to be reflected as */*ewi*^h*u*-/ in Mycenaean, Ruijgh (1985: 542) assumes a root aorist 3sg. **éwisto* as the basis for the analogical restitution of /s/.

50 Probably also in the adj. στενυ-γρός 'narrow' [Semon. 14 στενυγρήι ... ἐν ἀτραπῶι], although the second element is unexplained, cf. de Lamberterie (1990: 1.261), García Ramón (2014: 28 fn. 61).

51 Cf. τὰ στενά 'the narrows, straits' (Hdt. 7.223 etc.), also in Hesychius τέμπη· τὰ σύνδε(ν)δρα χωρία. τινὲς δὲ τὰ στενά τῶν ὁρῶν, cf. García Ramón (2014).

52 Cf. Viberg (2001).

one follows the possessive derivation, the adjective **μῑdsμó-* may have come to mean ‘having the look of *x*’ from **μῑdsu-* ‘wishing/attempting to look like *x*’.

4.3 Gk. φαῦλος

Another instance of a *-su*-adjective could be Gk. φαῦλος ‘slight, mean, bad’, which may have been dissimilated from *φαλαῦλος; cf. the parallel adjective φλαῦρος (Pi. *P.* 1.87) which may either show a different dissimilation or contain the suffix *-ro-*.⁵³ Gk. φαῦλος may be connected with the root PIE **b^hleh₁-* ‘to blow, howl’ (Lat. *flēre*, *flēō* ‘to cry’, OHG *blāen* ‘to blow’, etc., *v. supra*), which may be analyzed as a stative present in **-eh₁-* built to a root **b^hel-*.⁵⁴ whose antecorsonantal zero-grade form **b^hl-* would be reflected in Greek as *φαλ-. A possible context for **b^hlC-* could be a formation in /s/ parallel to that found in **b^hleh₁-s-* (Goth. *blēsan*, OHG *blāsan* etc.), i.e. **b^hel-s-*, to which an adjective **b^hl-s-ú-* was built that resulted in Greek *φαλαθύ- > φαλαῦς → φ(λ)αυ-λο- / φλαυ-ρο-. The semantic development would have been from ‘blowing; like a breath, hint’ to ‘windy, mean, worthless, bad’, cf. ἀνεμώλιος ‘windy, vain, powerless’ from ἄνεμος ‘wind’. The same complex suffix -υλο- is found in other adjectives with a pejorative meaning, cf. στωμύλος ‘talkative’ (Ar. *Ach.* 429, Pl. *Erx.* 397d, Theoc. 5.79)⁵⁵ and αἰμύλος (Hes.+), αἰμύλιος (H.) ‘flattering’.⁵⁶

53 Cf. Chantraine (2009: 1140). The form φαῦρος attested in Hesychius (φαῦρος κοῦφος) may show loss of /l/, if from *φαλαῦρος, or of /r/, if from *φραῦρος by assimilation.

54 Possible parallel cases are discussed by Lipp (2009: 1.78f.), among them **kel-* ‘to be warm’: Ved. *śṛtá-* ‘cooked, ready’, Lith. *šiltas*, Welsh *clyd* ‘warm’ < **k₁l-tó-* → **k₁l-eh₁-* / **k₁l-h₁-* ‘get warm’: Ved. *śráyant-* ‘get cooked, ready’, Lith. *šilti* ‘become warm’, Lat. *calēre*, -*eō* < **k₁l_h1-eh₁-je/o-*, OHG *lāo* (NHG *lau*) ‘lukewarm’ < **k₁leh₁mo-*, Ved. *śarād-* ‘autumn’ < **k₁ol_h1-éd-*.

55 Cf. Vine (2019).

56 In LIV² 74 Germanic and Baltic forms are taken as evidence for a different root **b^helH-* ‘to drone, resound’ (“tönen, dröhnen”), cf. OE *bellan* ‘to shout’, OHG *bellan* ‘to bark’ etc., Lith. *bilti* [-*sta*/*býla*, -*o*] ‘to (start to) speak’, cf. also the probably inner-Baltic formations *balsas* ‘voice’, *balsùs* ‘loud’ (cf. ALEW 88, 113–115) and Ved. *bhāṣā* ‘speech’ which could either go back to **b^holHseh₂* or derive from **b^heh₂-s-* ‘speak’ with secondary -s- (cf. EWAia 11.261f.). These forms might belong to **b^hel-/b^hl-(e)h₁-*, partly showing a secondary full grade **b^hel_h1-* taken from the simple root **b^hel-* (cf. Ved. *śarad-* < **k₁ol_h1-éd-* from **k₁leh₁-* / **k₁l_h1-*). As in the cases quoted above like **k₁leus-* beside **k₁leu-*, **b^hel_h1s-* could be a lexicalized s-present/desiderative stem. If the root was **b^hel_h2-*, a *-su*-adjective **b^hl_h2sú-* would result in Gk. *φαλαθύ- > φαλαῦ- > φαλαῦ- > nom. sg. m. *φαλαυς (with shortening by Osthoff’s Law) → φαλαυλός ‘chatty, mean’, cf. Lith. *byliniñkas* ‘chatterer’ from *bilti* → *bylinėti* ‘to quarrel, litigate’.

4.4 *Gk. αἷσυλος*

Finally, the adjective αἷσυλος* may belong to this small group as well. It means roughly ‘unseemly, evil’ (*LSJ*), ‘verderblich, frevelhaft, ungebührlich, schlecht’ (*Lfgre*), cf. in Hesychius αἷσυλα ῥέξεις· ἀπρεπή πράττεις (Φ 214) and αἷσυλα· κακά, ἄδικα, ἀμαρτήματα (Ε 403). The only attested form—apart from grammarians using the quotation form nom. sg. αἷσυλος/-ον—is the ntr. pl. αἷσυλα as a substantive ‘evil things’ used as the object of a verb meaning ‘say’ or ‘do’ (H. 6×),⁵⁷ cf. *Il.* 5.403 αἷσυλα ῥέζων, 20.202, 20.433 αἷσυλα μυθήσασθαι, 21.214 αἷσυλα ῥέξεις, *Od.* 2.232, 5.10 αἷσυλα ῥέζοι (in *Od.* 2.231 f. opposed to αἷσιμα εἰδώς ‘(not) heeding righteousness’). It may go back to a form **aíd-su-* > **αἰσύ-* (+*-λο-*) built to αἰδομαι ‘be ashamed, feel awe’ (cf. αἰδώς, αἰδέομαι), meaning ‘wishing/trying to put someone to shame’ (Germ. *beschämen*). The neuter plural form expressing words and deeds that ‘put someone to shame’ may have applied both to the speaker feeling shame for someone else’s immoral behaviour and to the addressee who ought to be ashamed. From this use, the more general meaning ‘causing the feeling of shame, shameful, to be reproached, evil’ may have developed (cf. Germ. *beschämende Worte/Taten*).⁵⁸ In *Il.* 20.201 f. ἐπεὶ σάφα οἶδα καὶ αὐτὸς / ἡμὲν κερτομίας ἡδ’ αἷσυλα μυθήσασθαι ‘I know well myself how to utter both taunts and αἷσυλα’, Düntzer has conjectured αἷσιμα ‘proper words’ against all mss., as ἡμὲν ... ἡδέ may imply a contrast, but, as Edwards (1991: 315) points out, “there may be contrast enough between a mocking taunt [...] and a malicious false statement”. Furthermore, the parallel in l. 246 ἔστι γὰρ ἀμφοτέροισιν ὀνειδέα μυθήσασθαι ‘*Revilings* are there for both of us to utter’, including the rebuked comparison with children’s talk in l. 200 νηπύτιον ὥς and l. 244 νηπύτιοι ὥς, can be taken to summarize both κερτομίας and αἷσυλα, the more so, if, as proposed here, αἷσυλα is related to αἰδομαι and hence close in meaning to ὀνειδος. A moral overtone is also noticeable in *Il.* 5.403 (describing Heracles) in the combination with οὐκ ὄθομαι ‘care not, have no scruples’, σχέτλιος ὀβριμοεργός (v.l. Ar. αἰσυλοεργός) ὃς οὐκ ὄθετ’ αἷσυλα ῥέζων ‘Harsh man, worker of violence, who did not hesitate (‘who had no scruples’) to do evil deeds.”⁵⁹

57 Cf. also in *h.Merc.* 164 αἷσυλα οἶδε.

58 On the root **h₂eíd-* cf. Kölligan (2016). A derivation from the *s*-stem **aídos-* (cf. αἰδώς), **aíd-s-u-*, would be without parallels.

59 The verse has been taken to be a later interpolation, cf. e.g. Leaf (1960: 222), but also Kirk (1990: 103), who interprets the relative clause as a typically Homeric etymological appendage, if the reading αἰσυλοεργός is correct (in which case ὀεργός would be picked up by ῥέζων).

It is unclear whether the *hapax legomenon* ἀήσυλα in *Il.* 5.876⁶⁰ belongs to αἴσυλος. It has been supposed to be an itacistic spelling of *ἀΐσυλα, e.g., by Fraenkel (1955: 308), who connects both forms as *ἀΐσυλα with *ΐσφος (ἴσος),⁶¹ but in this case a number of *ad hoc* changes have to be made to the relevant verses (as discussed by Fraenkel) for which there is no independent evidence. Therefore it seems best to separate the two forms and accept that ἀήσυλα remains unexplained for the time being.⁶²

To sum up: the combined data of Greek and Vedic *-su*-adjectives and remnants of unreduplicated desiderative stems in various languages may allow the assumption that both Indo-Iranian and Greek inherited an unreduplicated desiderative in *-s-* to which adjectives in *-u-* could be built:⁶³

Root	Desiderative stem	<i>u</i> -adjective
Skt. <i>dah</i>	<i>dakṣ-</i>	<i>dakṣu-</i>
<i>cak</i>	<i>cakṣ-</i>	* <i>cakṣu-</i> , <i>cakṣuṣ-</i> ‘eye’
Gk. <i>ΐδ-</i>	* <i>ΐδσ-</i> (lat. <i>vīsō</i>)	Myc. <i>e-wi-su-</i> / <i>e-wis(s)u-</i>
<i>φλα-</i>	* <i>φλασ-</i>	* <i>φλα</i> ^(h) <i>υ-</i> → <i>φ(λ)αῦλος</i>
<i>αἰδ-</i>	* <i>αἰδσ-</i>	* <i>αἰδσυ-</i> → <i>αἴσυλος</i>

60 Σὺ γὰρ τέκες ἄφρονα κοῦρήν / οὐλομένην, ἥ τ' αἰὲν ἀήσυλα ἔργα μέμνηεν ‘You are father to that mad and accursed maid, whose mind is always set on *deeds of lawlessness*’.

61 Cf. also Leaf (1960: 253), Panagl (1987: 512).

62 For earlier proposals cf. Bechtel (1914: 15) (*ἀήσυλος ~ Ved. *yātú-* ‘sorcery’), Chantraine (1933: 250: αἴσα, cf. also Panagl 1987 and the explanation of Apion [*infra*]), Frisk (1960–1972: 1.27: remodelling of αἴσυλος, but the model is unclear), Panagl (1987: 514 f.), Chantraine (2009: 26, 38), Beekes (2010: 27 f., 44: Pre-Greek; still, the gloss in Hesychius (αἰήσυλον)· ἄνομον (A) [οὐ] κακοποιόν may be a blend of αἰσυ- and ἀησυ-). Other possibilities, likewise undemonstrable: a) similar to ἀνεμος ‘wind’ : ἀνεμώλια ‘windy, empty’, folk etymology with ἀη-σι ‘blows’, i.e. αἴσυλα → ἀήσυλα as ‘idle words/deeds’ (cf. Chantraine 2009: 26 s.v. ἀήσυλος), b) derivation from *ῥῆθος ‘manner, custom’ as ‘deeds/words not according to custom, to good behaviour’. In αἴσυλος, the accent on the root instead of the suffix (*αἰσύλος), which one might expect based on στωμύλος, αἰμύλος, etc., may be due to various factors (either exclusive or adding up): analogy to the antonym αἴσιμα (cf. *Od.* 2.231 f., see Panagl 1987: 519), secondary root accent due to substantivization or reinterpretation as containing the negative particle ἄ-, cf. Apion (*fragmenta de glossis Homericis*) 15.8 ἔστιν οὖν αἴσυλα ... ἀαἰσυλα, ἐστερημένα τῆς αἴσης, τουτέστι τοῦ καθήκοντος.

63 Another obvious candidate would be ὀξύς ‘sharp’, but its derivational history is unclear. Narten (1986) revives a proposal of Delbrück to connect it with Ved. *akṣṇóti* ‘to sting’ and proposes a root **h₃ek_s*—which lacks further support—or a connection with **h₂ek-* ‘sharp’, but in that case the *o*-grade in ὀξύς would be unexplained (transferred from the

5 Greek derivation

If this type of **-su-* adjective existed in Greek, the question arises what a denominal verb stem derived from a *u*-stem adjective should look like. In the case of ablauting stems, denominal verbs usually take the weak stem as their basis, cf. βλίττω ‘cut out the comb of bees, take honey’ from μέλιτ- ‘honey’, i.e. **mlit-je/o-*, and *n*-stems like

Strong stem	Weak stem	Denominal verb
φρήν ‘midriff, mind’, φρέν(-ες) ποιμήν ‘shepherd’, ποιμέν(-ες)	dat. pl. φρασί (Pi.) < <i>*-n-si</i> dat. pl. <i>*-asi</i>	εὐφραίνω ‘to gladden’ < <i>*-n-je/o-</i> ποιμαίνω ‘to herd’

In originally proterokinetic *u*-stem adjectives, the weak stem had the full grade of the suffix, i.e. **-eμ-*, cf. Gk. nom. sg. m. ἡδύς, gen. -έ(φ)ος ‘sweet’. The same ablaut grade is found in the feminine: **ἡδέφια* > *ἡδέϊα*. In contrast to this, Indo-Iranian derives the feminine from the strong stem: m./n. *svādú-* : f. *svādvī* < **-u-ih₂*, OAv. *vohu-* ‘good’ : f. *vaṇ^hhī*. Greek seems to have innovated here, reinterpreting the feminine stem as derived from the weak stem of the m./n., whereas in the other languages it derives from the strong stem with *-u*.⁶⁴ This innovation is known from other stem classes as well, e.g. *n*-stems such as f. τέρεινα ‘soft, delicate’ after m. τέρην, τερεν(-ος) instead of **τέραινα* < **-n-ih₂*. In adjectives in **-uent-*, the vowel has been transferred from the m./n. to the f., cf. χαρίεσσα ‘graceful, beautiful’ instead of **χαρίασσα* < **-unt₂ia* (~ Ved. *-vatī*) after m./n. *χαριεντ-*.⁶⁵ This seems to invite the conclusion that if a) the weak stem of the m./n. is the basis of denominal verbs and if b) this stem in the case of *u*-stems has a full grade (as in the f. forms), the expected derivation based on an adjective in **-s-u-* is a present in **-s-eμ-je/o-* > *-σειε/o-*.

CoC-έιε/o-present **h₂ok-eie/o-* [MWelsh *hogi*, OHG *eggen*, LIV² 261] or Gk. ὄκρις ‘rugged’ [cf. Narten 1986: 214 fn. 68]?). Cf. also Beekes (2010: 1089).

64 Cf. Chantraine (1961: 104): “Dans les thèmes en **-u-* le vocalisme *e* de la voyelle présuffixale est général dès le grec commun: γλυκεία repose sur **γλυκεφ-γα*; cette extension du vocalisme *e* semble propre au grec.” Ruijgh (1987: 537) assumes analogy to the nom. pl. m. **γλυκ-έφ-ες*. According to Schindler (1972: 152) **-ih₂*-stems had *e*-grade in the last morpheme of the strong cases before the suffix already in the protolanguage, cf. the type **déiμ-ih₂* : **diμ-íéh₂-s* with the fem. of *u*-stem adjectives **-éμ-ih₂*; cf. also Schaffner (2001: 513). If so, the Indo-Iranian type in **-u-ih₂* would be an innovation by intraparadigmatic analogy.

65 A transfer of the whole ending **-φεντ-* would have given **-(φ)είσα*, cf. Rix (1992: 165).

A counterargument would seem to be verbs in -ύω, but these are not based on *u*-adjectives, but on substantives in *-*u*- or *-*u*-*h*₂ of the type Ved. *tanú* ‘body’ f., instr. *tanúā* < *-*uh*₂(-), and neither of them shows ablaut of the suffix in Greek,⁶⁶ e.g.

- ἀρτύω ‘to arrange, prepare’ : Hesch. ἀρτύς· σύνταξις, Ved. *ṛtú-* m. ‘right time’
- κορθύεται ‘to rise to a head, tower up’ (*Il.* 9.7) : κόρθυς f. ‘heap’
- πληθύω ‘to be/become full’ : Ion. πληθύς f. ‘crowd, people’
- οἷζύω ‘to lament’ : οἷζύς f. ‘lamentation’

The derivational chain for the desiderative in -σειε/ο- would then look like this:

- PIE desiderative *-*se/o-* → adj. *-*s-u-* → denom. verb *-*s-em-je/o-* > -σειε/ο-.

The lack of comparable denominal verbs to simple *u*-stem adjectives such as *βαρύω ‘be heavy’ on the one hand, and the presumed productivity of denominals to desiderative *u*-stem adjectives on the other, may be due to their different semantics: while simple *u*-stem adjectives mostly describe “basic property concepts” and hence stative concepts such as ‘hot, cold, heavy, light’ that tend to be expressed nominally in Indo-European languages, e.g. βαρύ ἐστὶ ‘it is heavy’, not **βαρύει ‘it heavies’, desiderative adjectives in *-*su-* would more frequently than not describe an agent’s transient desire and effort to bring about a state of affairs relevant at the moment of speaking, e.g. ‘wanting/trying to see’, ‘wanting/trying to fight’ etc., which tends to be expressed verbally. The preponderance of participles in the -σειε/ο- formation may in turn be due to the semantic equivalence between the basic *-*su*-adjectives and the participles of the denominal verbs, both meaning ‘wanting/trying to *x*’, which may have triggered the replacement of the former by the latter, leaving only isolated remnants in the lexicon as discussed in section 4.⁶⁷

Appendix: desideratives in Attic authors

Ar. *Eq.* 888. οὐκ, ἀλλ’ ὅπερ πίνων ἀνὴρ πέπονθ’ ὅταν χεσεῖη, / τοῖσιν τρόποις τοῖς σοῖσιν ὥσπερ βλαυτίοις χρώμαι. “No, it’s your own tricks that I am borrowing, just as a drunken guest, when *he has to take a crap*, seizes some other man’s shoes.”

Ar. *Eq.* 998 οἴμ’ ὥς χεσεῖω· κοῦχ ἅπαντας ἐκφέρω. “Ugh! The weight of them is *squeezing the crap right out of me*, and still I’m not bringing them all!”

Ar. *Nu.* 295 κεῖ θέμις ἐστίν, νυνὶ γ’ ἤδη, κεῖ μὴ θέμις ἐστί, χεσεῖω. “And right now, if it’s sanctioned, and even if it isn’t, *I need to shit!*”

⁶⁶ Cf. Schwyzler (1939: 727).

⁶⁷ Thanks to one of the anonymous reviewers for pointing out this possibility.

- Ar. V. 168. ἄνθρωπος οὗτος μέγα τι δρᾷσει κακόν. “The man’s *set to commit* some awful crime!”
- Ar. Pax 62 ὦ Ζεῦ, τί δρᾷσεις ποθ’ ἡμῶν τὸν λεών; “Zeus! What on *earth* are you *trying to do* to our people?”
- E. Med. 92 ἤδη γὰρ εἶδον ὄμμα νιν ταυρουμένην / τοῖσδ’, ὥς τι δρᾷσειουσιν. “For I have seen her turn a savage glance at them, as if she *meant to do* something to them.”
- E. HF 628 οὐ γὰρ πτερωτὸς οὐδὲ φευξείω φίλους “For I cannot fly away, nor *have I any wish to flee* from those I love.”
- E. Ph. 1208 τί τάπιδ’ ἐμῶν παῖδ’ ἐμὴ δρᾷσειετον; “What are my two sons *planning to do* after this?”
- Pl. Phd. 64a–b Καὶ ὁ Σιμμίας γελάσας, Νῆ τὸν Δία, ἔφη, ὦ Σώκρατες, (b) οὐ πάνυ γέ με νυνδὴ γελασέοντα ἐποίησας γελάσαι. “And Simmias laughed and said, ‘By Zeus, Socrates, I don’t *feel much like laughing* just now, but you made me laugh.’”
- S. Aj. 326 καὶ δῆλός ἐστιν ὥς τι δρᾷσει κακόν. “And plainly he *plans to do* something terrible”
- S. Aj. 585 ὦ δέσποτ’ Αἴας, τί ποτε δρᾷσεις φρενί; “Ajax, my lord, what can you *have in mind*?”
- S. Tr. 1232 ὥς ἐργασέων οὐδὲν ὦν λέγω θροεῖς. “Your words *show no willingness* to do as I say.”
- S. Ph. 1001. τί δ’ ἐργασείεις; “What do you *plan to do*?”
- S. Ph. 1245 Σὺ δ’ οὔτε φωνεῖς οὔτε δρᾷσεις σοφά. “Neither your words nor your *intentions* are clever!”
- S. fr. 991 Radt ἀκουσέων
- Th. 1.33.3 οὐκ αἰσθάνεται τοὺς Λακεδαιμονίους φόβῳ τῷ ὑμετέρῳ πολεμῆσειντας. “[He] fails to perceive that the Lacedaemonians, through fear of you, *are eager for war*.”
- 1.95.7 οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι [...] ἀπαλλαξέοντες δὲ καὶ τοῦ Μηδικοῦ πολέμου “The Lacedaemonians [...] *wanted to be rid* of the Persian war.”
- 3.84.1 Ἐν δ’ οὖν τῇ Κερκύρᾳ τὰ πολλὰ αὐτῶν προετολμήθη, καὶ ὅπως ἂν ὕβρει μὲν ἀρχόμενοι τὸ πλεόν ἢ σωφροσύνη ὑπὸ τῶν τὴν τιμωρίαν παρασχόντων οἱ ἀνταμυνόμενοι δράσειαν, πενίας δὲ τῆς εἰωθυίας ἀπαλλαξέοντές τινες. “It was in Corcyra, then, that most of these atrocities were first committed—all the acts of retaliation which men who are governed with highhanded insolence rather than with moderation are likely to commit upon their rulers when these at last afford them opportunity for revenge; or such as men resolve upon contrary to justice when they *seek release* from their accustomed poverty.”
- 4.28.2 ὁ δὲ τὸ μὲν πρῶτον οἰόμενος αὐτὸν λόγῳ μόνον ἀφιέναι ἑτοῖμος ἦν, γνοὺς δὲ

τῷ ὄντι παραδωσείοντα ἀνεχώρει καὶ οὐκ ἔφη αὐτὸς ἀλλ' ἐκείνον στρατηγεῖν. “As for Cleon, he was at first ready to go, thinking it was only in pretence that Nicias offered to relinquish the command; but when he realized that Nicias really *desired to yield* the command to him, he tried to back out, saying that not he but Nicias was general.”

8.56.3 ὁ δὲ Ἀλκιβιάδης, ἐπειδὴ ἑώρα ἐκείνον καὶ ὥς οὐ ξυμβησείοντα, δοκεῖν τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις ἐβούλετο μὴ ἀδύνατος εἶναι πείσαι. “But Alcibiades, as soon as he saw that even on his own terms he did not *want to reach an agreement*, wished it to appear to the Athenians, not that he was unable to persuade him.”

8.89.2 ἀπαλλάξειεν conj. for ἀπαλλάξιν (Abresch) οὗτοι ἀπαλλάξειεν τοῦ ἄγαν ἐς ὀλίγους ἐλθεῖν “(They did not indeed openly profess that) they *wanted to avoid* reducing the government to an extreme oligarchy.”

Acknowledgments

I thank E. Hill (Cologne) and the anonymous reviewers for their helpful remarks. Unless stated otherwise, translations of Greek authors are taken from the Loeb series (Harvard University Press).

Bibliography

- ALEW = Hock, W. et al. (2015). *Altltauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. 2 vols. Hamburg: Baar.
- Balles, I. (2006). *Die altindische Cvi-Konstruktion: Form—Funktion—Ursprung*. Bremen: Hempten.
- Bechtel, F. (1914). *Lexilogus zu Homer*. Halle a.d.S.: Niemeyer.
- Beekes, R.S.P. (2010). *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill.
- Chantraine, P. (1933). *La formation des noms en grec ancien*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Chantraine, P. (1961). *Morphologie historique du Grec*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Chantraine, P. (2013). *Grammaire homérique*. Tome 1: *Phonétique et morphologie*. Nouvelle édition revue et corrigée par Michael Casevitz. Paris: Klincksieck.
- de Lamberterie, C. (1990). *Les adjectifs grecs en -ys: sémantique et comparaison*. Louvain-La-Neuve: Peeters.
- Edwards, M. (1991). *The Iliad. Books 17-20: A Commentary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ehrlich, H. (1912). *Untersuchungen über die Natur der griechischen Betonung*. Berlin: Weidmann.

- EWAia = Mayrhofer, M. (1992–2001). *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*. 3 vols. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Fraenkel, E. (1955). Zur griechischen Wortforschung. *Glotta* 34 (3/4), 301–309.
- García Ramón, J.L. (2014). The place-name Τέμπη, τέμπεα: ... τὰ στενὰ τῶν ὁρῶν (Hsch.), IE *temp- 'stretch'. In *Munus amicitiae. Norbert Oettinger a collegis et amicis dicatum*, ed. by H. Craig Melchert. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Beech Stave Press, 19–31.
- García Ramón, J.L. (2017). La suffixation des anthroponymes: du mycénien aux dialectes du premier millénaire. In *La suffixation des anthroponymes grecs antiques (SAGA). Actes du colloque international de Lyon, 17–19 septembre 2015, Université Jean-Moulin-Lyon 3*, ed. by Alcorac Alonso Déniz. Genève: Droz, 33–65.
- Heenen, F. (2006). *Le désidératif en védique*. Amsterdam: Brill.
- Hollifield, P.H. (1981). Homeric κείω and the Greek desideratives of the type δρασεῖει. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 86, 161–189.
- Jasanoff, J. (2003). *Hittite and the Indo-European Verb*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kerschensteiner, J. (1955). Bemerkungen zur kretischen Linearschrift B. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 6, 56–70.
- Kirk, G.S. (1990). *The Iliad. Books 5–8: A Commentary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kloekhorst, A. (2008). *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden: Brill.
- Kölligan, D. (2007). *Suppletion und Defektivität im griechischen Verbum*. Bremen: Hempen.
- Kölligan, D. (2016). PIE *h₂eǵd- and its descendants. In *Proceedings of the 27th Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference: Los Angeles, October 23rd and 24th, 2015*, edited by David M. Goldstein, Stephanie W. Jamison, and Brent Vine. Bremen: Hempen Verlag, 61–78.
- Kroonen, G. (2013). *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Germanic*. Leiden: Brill.
- Leaf, W. (1960). *The Iliad. Edited, with Apparatus Criticus, Prolegomena, Notes and Appendices*. Vol. 1, Books I–XII. 2. ed., [Reprint]. Amsterdam: Hakkert.
- Lejeune, M. (1987). *Phonétique historique du mycénien et du grec ancien*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Leukart, A. (1994). *Die frühgriechischen Nomina auf -tās und -ās*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Lfgre = Snell, B. et al. (1979–2010). *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- LGPn = Fraser, P.M., and E. Matthews. (1987–). *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lhôte, É. (2006). *Les lamelles oraculaires de Dodone*. Genève: Droz.
- Lindeman, F.O. (1965). Notes sur quelques formes verbales en grec ancien. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique* 60 (1), 46–52.

- LIV² = Rix, H. (2001). *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben: die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstammbildungen*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- LSJ = Liddell, H.G., R. Scott, and H.S. Jones. (1996). *A Greek English Lexicon. With a Revised Supplement 1996*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Meissner, T. (2017). Archaeology and the archaeology of the Greek language: on the origin of the Greek nouns in -εύς. In *The Archaeology of Greece and Rome: Studies In Honour of Anthony Snodgrass*, ed. by John Bintliff & Keith Rutter. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 22–30.
- Minon, S. (2007). *Les inscriptions éléennes dialectales*. Vol. 11: *Grammaire et vocabulaire institutionnel*. Genève: Droz.
- Narten, J. (1986). Griechisch δέξυς und das vedische Verb *aks*. In *o-o-pe-ro-si: Festschrift für Ernst Risch zum 75. Geburtstag*, edited by Annemarie Etter. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 204–214. Reprinted in Albino, M. & Fritz, M. (eds.), *Kleine Schriften*. Band 1. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 305–315.
- Nussbaum, A. (2014). Greek τέκμαρ ‘sign’ and τέκμων ‘sign’: why both?. In *Das Nomen im Indogermanischen. Morphologie, Substantiv versus Adjektiv, Kollektivum. Akten der Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 14. bis 16. September 2011 in Erlangen*, edited by Norbert Oettinger & Thomas Steer. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 215–260.
- Oettinger, N. (2002). *Die Stammbildung des hethitischen Verbums*. Dresden: Verlag der TU Dresden.
- Panagl, O. (1987). Nochmals zu homer. αἴσυλος—αἴσιμος. In *Studies in Mycenaean and Classical Greek Presented to John Chadwick*, edited by John T. Killen, José L. Melena & Jean-Pierre Olivier. Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca, 511–519.
- Perpillou, J.-L. (1973). *Les substantifs grecs en -εύς*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Puhvel, J. (1984–). *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Rix, H. (1992). *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen*. Darmstadt: Wiss. Buchges.
- Ruijgh, C. (1987). À propos de *φιςφο-* (*wi-so-wo-*), *έφισυ-* (*e-wi-su-*) et hom. *έ(φ)εισάμενος*. In *Studies in Mycenaean and Classical Greek Presented to John Chadwick*, edited by John T. Killen, José L. Melena & Jean-Pierre Olivier. Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca, 533–544.
- Schaffner, S. (2001). *Das Vernersche Gesetz und der innerparadigmatische grammatische Wechsel des Urgermanischen im Nominalbereich*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck.
- Schindler, J. (1972). Review of Raimo Anttila, *Proto-Indo-European Schwebelaute*. *Kratylos*, 15, 146–152.
- Schwyzler, E. (1939). *Griechische Grammatik*. Bd. 1: *Allgemeiner Teil, Lautlehre, Wortbildung, Flexion*. München: Beck.
- Szemerényi, O. (1957). The Greek nouns in -εύς. In *MNHMHE XAPIN. Gedenkschrift Paul Kretschmer*, vol. 2. Wien: Wiener Sprachgesellschaft, 159–181.

- Ventris, M. & J. Chadwick. (1953). Evidence for Greek dialect in the Mycenaean archives. *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 73, 84–103.
- Ventris, M. & J. Chadwick. (1956). *Documents in Mycenaean Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ventris, M. & J. Chadwick. (1973). *Documents in Mycenaean Greek*. 2. ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Viberg, A. (2001). Verbs of perception. In *Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft*. Vol. 20: *Language Typology and Language Universals*, ed. by Armin Burkhardt, Hugo Steger & Herbert E. Wiegand. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1294–1309.
- Vine, B. (2019). Greek στωμύλος ‘chatty’, *Indo-European Linguistics* 7.
- Wackernagel, J. (1887). Miscellen zur griechischen Grammatik, *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der indogermanischen Sprachen* 28 (1/2), 109–145.
- Wackernagel, J. & A. Debrunner. (1964). *Altindische Grammatik*. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Weiss, M. (2017). Gk. τίω ‘I honor’ and τιμή ‘honor’. In *Miscellanea indogermanica. Festschrift für José Luis García Ramón*, ed. by Ivo Hajnal, Daniel Kölligan & Katharina Zipser. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck, 869–880.
- Willi, A. (2017). *Origins of the Greek Verb*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.