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CHAPTER 5

5 ‘Synonymous’ Active and Middle Verbs

5.0 Introduction

One of the problems that might puzzle students of the Greek middle voice is the co-
existence of active and middle verbs that are (near-)synonyms. Well-known examples are:

*Of different verbal stems:*
- ἥθέλω - βούλομαι
- χαίρω - ἡδομαί
- εἴμι - ἔρχομαι\(^{351}\)
- ἰκάνω, ἰκό - ἰκνέομαι
- ἀκολουθέω - ἑπομαι\(^{352}\)
- πηδάω - ἀλλομαί
- σκοπέω - σκέπτομαι
- θαυμάζω - θεάομαι

*Of the same verbal stem:*
- ὁμάω (intr.) - ὄμαομαι
- πειράω - πειράομαι
- πολίτευω - πολιτεύομαι

The first, unavoidable point that must be made is that absolute synonymy is a very rare
phenomenon - if it exists at all (see e.g. Lyons 1996: 67-8, Cruse 2000: 156). In
languages, it runs against the principle of economy to have two different expressions for
only one meaning. The force of economy shows a strong tendency to maintain (or to
achieve) a division of semantic (or pragmatic) labour between two ‘synonymous’ expres-
sions, at least to some extent. This tendency is sometimes referred to as *synonymophobia.*

The question now is how to deal with the ‘synonymous’ active - middle pairs
above. The most obvious explanation for the existence of these pairs would be to state
simply that the active verb does not involve subject-affectedness, while the middle verb
does. This explanation is a priori possible, but not very likely. If the difference between
the active and the middle member of these pairs would be a question of absence vs.
presence of subject-affectedness, it would have been hard to conceive of them as (near-)
synonyms. In other words, the semantic distinction between the ‘synonymous’ pairs is
probably more subtle than that. Take, for instance, the pair βούλομαι and ἥθέλω (to which

---

\(^{351}\) Léroublon (1985: 71) observes a difference in inherent aspect between ἰέναι and ἔρχεσθαι, especially
in the non-indicative moods. The former is unmarked as to inherent aspect, while the latter often has a
durative or iterative value. How this distinction relates to their different voices I cannot explain.

\(^{352}\) Notice that ἀκολουθέω ‘follow’ is a denominative verb (from ἀκόλουθος ‘follower, attendant’), cf.
also σκοπέω from σκοπός ‘watcher’. The active voice of these verbs may reflect their original stative
meaning, which may be rendered by ‘be a follower’ and ‘be a watcher’ respectively.
I will return later). One cannot simply state: ἐθέλω is active - therefore it lacks subject-affectedness, since it is clear that ἐθέλω, like βούλομαι, implies an element of mental involvement on the part of the subject. The conclusion is that we have to consider other types of explanations for our 'synonymous' pairs.

The question I would like to tackle in this section is whether or not the active and middle endings of these pairs contribute to the over-all verb meaning. In principle, one can think of three possible scenarios that could apply to each of these 'synonymous' pairs:

(i) Neither verb of the pair involves subject-affectedness, i.e. the middle ending of the middle member is lexicalized and meaningless, possibly a relic of an older meaning of the verb.

In the section on the status of the media tantum (1.3.1), I have argued against this type of explanation. One of the central objectives of the present study is to aim for a unified account of all types of middle verbs: oppositional middles as well as media tantum. As a matter of principle, in my view, the burden of proof lies on those who would claim that these two types of middles should be treated separately. In the section on media tantum, I have also shown that most media tantum belong to a restricted number of semantic classes, and that in all these classes subject-affectedness is an element of their meaning. Now if we look at the verbs enumerated above, we can observe that they are either verbs of motion, or verbs of mental processes.353 Both semantic verb-classes involve subject-affectedness. The subject undergoes a change of location, or a change of mental state, respectively. Although one cannot rule out the possibility that, as a result of a radical semantic change, the original middle meaning of a particular middle verb has disappeared without a trace, one should consider such an explanation only as a last resort. In many cases it is possible to discern a subtle semantic distinction between active and middle 'synonyms', involving a difference in degree of subject-affectedness. This bring us to scenario (ii):

(ii) Both 'synonymous' verbs inherently involve subject-affectedness. However, the aspect of subject-affectedness is emphasized by means of the middle inflection.

To illustrate this scenario, consider the pairs puppy vs. puppy dog, and oak vs. oak tree (from Langacker 1987: 294-7). The lexical items puppy and puppy dog do not differ in truth-conditional content. The two expressions are semantically very similar since the meaning component 'dog' is already inherent in the lexical item puppy. In the expression puppy dog, the meaning of dog is included in the lexical meaning of puppy. The same holds for oak vs. oak tree. Nevertheless, although the 'objective', truth-conditional content of the two expressions may be identical, there is a conceptual difference. By using an analytic expression like puppy dog or oak tree the semantic facets dog and tree are

353 Πολυτέομαι is the odd one out here. I will return to this interesting verb below.
highlighted, i.e. the status of the designated entities as members of the category dog and tree.  

A similar relation may hold for 'synonymous' pairs of active and middle verbs: both expressions imply subject-affectedness since this is an inherent feature of the lexical semantics. However, the semantic facet of subject-affectedness is highlighted by the middle ending. Consequently, there is a subtle difference between the active verb - of which subject-affectedness is an implicit facet of the lexical meaning - and the middle verb - in which subject-affectedness is made more salient by means of the middle ending. An example of this type of subtle contrast is the active-middle pair ἴδειν - ἴδοσθαι, of which the middle variant conveys the notion that a lasting mental impression is left on the subject (see section 2.1.8). In other words, the middle inflection emphasizes the subject-affectedness inherent in the lexical meaning. As I will argue below, the pair βούλομαι - ἐθέλω can also be accounted for by means of this scenario. While both verbs involve a degree of mental affectedness in their lexical meaning, this element is emphasized in the case of βούλομαι by means of the middle ending of the verb.

Finally, we come to scenario (iii):

(iii) Both verbs of the pair involve subject-affectedness. The affectedness of the subject of the active verbs is inherent in the lexical meaning of the verb. There is no demonstrable semantic difference between the active and the middle verb.

This is a scenario I deem very plausible since it is in harmony with the claim that the active voice is the unmarked member of the opposition, neutral with respect to subject-affectedness. It is possible that, historically, there had been a semantic distinction (as in scenario (ii)) which had disappeared in the course of time. In other words, for this type of active-middle pairs, semantic factors do not determine the distribution of the active and the middle verb. We have a strong indication that semantic factors are irrelevant if we can point to other factors that adequately explain the distribution of the 'synonymous' active and middle verb. Other important factors might be diachronical factors, genre-

---

354 In the verbal domain, examples would be: English rise up (the adverb emphasizes the upward movement already inherent in the lexical item rise), and the auxiliary do as in You DID see it! and Did you see it? The auxiliary can be analyzed as designating a maximally schematic state of affairs (cf. Langacker 1991: 205). Therefore, using the auxiliary do emphasizes the abstract element of the actual occurrence of the state of affairs - which is also inherent in the lexical semantics of every verbal predicate.

355 Within the Greek verbal system, a comparable phenomenon is found in the perfects that are formed from inherently stative verbs, the so-called intensive perfects (see e.g. Rijksbaron 1994: 36, Ruijgh 1996: 670). E.g., the perfect form συνήπαγε 'maintain complete silence' (from stative σιωπάω 'be silent') emphasizes the stative aspect that is already inherent in the lexical meaning of the verb. Maldonado (1999) describes a comparable phenomenon in relation to Spanish se. E.g., (i) La maestra captó la voluntad de los alumnos ('The teacher captured the student's good will') vs. Es un maestro que se capta la voluntad de los alumnos ('He is a teacher that captures [for himself] the student's good will'). The lexical semantics of capturar 'capture' inherently implies that the event is beneficial to the subject. The clitic se is used to highlight the benefit implied by the verb (see Maldonado 1999: 167-8).

356 It can never be excluded that a speaker of Ancient Greek still felt a subtle semantic nuance (consciously or not) which cannot be detected anymore for lack of native speakers.
factors, and stylistic factors. There is a number of phenomena that might be explained in a this way.

The first case of active-middle pairs without detectable semantic distinction concerns the following verbs (see also Kühner-Gerth, I: 102; Chantraine 1927; Schwyzer-Debrunner, II: 232-3):

\[\text{άκούω (prose/poetry) - άκούομαι (poetry) 'hear'}\]
\[\text{αύδάω (poetry) - αύδάομαι (poetry) 'speak'}\]
\[\text{βρέμω (poetry) - βρέομαι (poetry) 'roar'}\]
\[\text{διακρώ (prose/poetry) - διακρόομαι (poetry) 'cry'}\]
\[\text{διόκω (prose/poetry) - διώκομαι (poetry) 'pursue'}\]
\[\text{διαφέρω (poetry) - διαφέρομαι (prose/poetry) 'give, present'}\]
\[\text{ημετέρω (esp. poetry) - ημετέρομαι (poetry/lon. prose) 'desire'}\]
\[\text{κλαιώ (prose/poetry) - κλαίομαι (poetry) 'lament'}\]
\[\text{λάμπω (prose/poetry) - λάμπομαι (poetry) 'shine'}\]
\[\text{μέλπω (poetry) - μέλπομαι (poetry) 'celebrate with song and dance'}\]
\[\text{νήχω (poetry) - νήχομαι (poetry) 'swim'}\]
\[\text{οίω (poetry) - οίομαι/οίομαι (prose/poetry) 'think'}\]
\[\text{πέλλω (poetry) - πέλλομαι (poetry) 'become, be'}\]
\[\text{σπέρχω (prose/poetry) - σπέρχομαι (poetry) 'haste'}\]
\[\text{σπευδώ (prose/poetry) - σπευδομαι (prose/poetry) 'speed'}\]
\[\text{ψημαι (prose/poetry) - έψαθο (esp. poetry) 'say'}\]

Of these verbs, either one of the variants is restricted to poetry (mostly the middle variant, e.g. άκούω - άκούομαι), or both variants occur only in poetry (e.g. αύδάω - αύδάομαι). In sum, oppositions between the active and the middle variant of these verbs is only found in poetry. An example may be illustrative:

(1)  

a. οὗτος ἐγώ γε

\[\text{νηχήμενος τόθε λαίτιμε διέτιταν (η 276)}\]

But by swimming I made my way through this great gulf of the sea here (...).

b. \[\text{όλλα' ἀναγχασθήμενος νήχων πάλιν (η 280)}\]

(... but I retreated, and swam back (...).

Within a short passage the poet uses the verb twice; once in the middle voice, once in the active. There are no indications of a semantic difference.

With Schwyzer-Debrunner (II: 232), I assume that the coexistence of the active and the middle verbs in poetry is a matter of metrical convenience, and that the variants are used indistinctly. However, this assumption does not imply that, in these verbs, the

Neuberger-Donath (1980) argues, against Schwyzer, that there is a semantic distinction between πέλλω and πέλλομαί. This distinction, according to Neuberger-Donath, is in harmony with the general definition of the middle: πέλλω expresses a static event and is 'extroverted' (related to εἰμι), whereas πέλλομαί is dynamic and 'introverted' (related to γίγνομαι).

Boeder (1961-2) cites the middle διάφέρομαι involves a degree of generosity on the part of the subject; as to οίω - οίομαι, the middle conveys a (more subjective) suspicion, whereas the active expresses "die Feststellung einer Meinung, fast eine Behauptung" (p. 130); ημετέρομαι, against ημετέρω, expresses the desire as a reaction to a stimulus (p. 131). Cf. further διώκω/-ομαι (p. 135-6); πέλλω/-ομαι (p. 163-8).

155
use of voice is completely arbitrary from a semantic point of view. On closer inspection of the list above, it can be observed that the verbs almost all belong to a restricted number of semantic classes: verbs of motion, verbs of perception, (emotional) speech act verbs, and verbs of mental (emotional) processes. In other words, all verbs inherently involve subject-affectedness. This inherent subject-affectedness motivates the presence of the (semantically redundant, cf. Schwyzer-Debrunner’s “Doppelcharakterisierung”) middle inflection. The active inflection can be used in these verbs since it is, as I have argued, unspecified as to the feature of subject-affectedness.

The second case concerns verbs that have different voices in different aspect stems, e.g.:

Middle present - active aorist
άλλισκομαι - ἐάλλων 'be caught'
δέρκομαι - ἔδρακον 'look'
δύναμι - ἔδων 'enter, plunge into'
ἵσταμαι - ἱστην 'stand still, stand up'
πέρδομαι - ἔπαρσον 'break wind'
πτάρνυμαι - ἐπαρταν 'sneeze'
τρέφομαι - ἔτραφον (Hom.) 'grow up'
φύσκομαι - ἐφύν 'grow; become'

Active present - passive aorist
χαίρω - ἔχάρην 'enjoy'

The explanation of this remarkable active - middle pattern probably lies in the pre-history of Greek. It is clear that the middle forms have a middle meaning. They all expres

359 Άδμασμα/-ομαι can be semantically compared to φαίνομαι 'become visible', both denoting a spontaneous internal affection.

360 Other possible examples are: δίμαι - δίαν (X 251); ἑρεικόμενος (N 441) - ἥρικε (P 595); ἑρείπομαι - ἢρικον; ἑρεύγομαι - ἢρυγον; λάξομαι [Hom.] - ἱλαξάμοι; μυκάμαι (κ 413) - ἠμυκόν; κίνναμαι - ἐκον [Hom.]. Note, further, that most of these verbs have an active perfectum, e.g. ἐάλλωκα, δέδοκα, δέδυκα, ἱστηκα, πέποροδο, τέτροφα, and πέφυκα.

361 Though Gonda (1979: 90) notes that in Sanskrit the active voice predominates in the root aorist, there is no clear evidence that this pattern was inherited from PIE - unless one counts as evidence the Sanskrit middle pardate 'breaks wind' (corresponding with πέρδεται) and the uncertain Late Avestan active aorist form pārdōdn (V. 3.32) 'they broke wind' (corresponding with ἔπαρσον). In the remaining cases the present middle appears to be a Greek innovation. Thus, ἵσταμαι and πτάρνυμαι correspond respectively with the active presents Skt. tisṛthati 'stand', Lat. sistō 'stand', and Lat. sternō 'sneeze'. As to δέρκομαι and φύσκομαι, these verbs probably did not have a present form in PIE, given that in Sanskrit only the aorist formations seem to be old: dārśam 'I see' (cf. (έ-)δρακον) and dhūt 'has become' (cf. ἤφω). As an explanation of the occurrence of an active aorist (and perfect) vs. a middle present, I tentatively suggest the following process: (1) In opposition to the intransitive active aorists (e.g. ἱστην, ἐπαρταν), sigmatic aorists with causative meaning were created (e.g. ἱστησα, ἔθρεψα); (2) This led to the creation of corresponding causative active present formations (ἵστημι, τρέφω), or, alternatively, the already existing active formation acquired a causative meaning (e.g. ἱστημι *'stand still' > 'make stand' (3) Then, intransitive middle presents (ἵσταμαι, τρέφομαι) were formed. This analogical process is not implausible, since an almost identical analogical process led to the formation of the sigmatic aorist εἶσα 'I made sit down' (in opposition to the intransitive middle aorist εὔζων 'I sat down'), which, in turn, brought about that active present ἵζω acquired a causative meaning 'make sit down', in addition to its original intransitive meaning 'sit down' (cf. Lat. sīdō 'sit
mental or physical affectedness. The active aorists (or active present, in the case of χαίρω), however, do not seem to express a lower degree of affectedness. The subject-affectedness, therefore, must be an inherent property of the lexical meaning of the verb root. The unmarked active voice can be used since the subject-affectedness is already present in the context (in this case the verb root). This phenomenon may be compared to the use of the active ἀποθνῄσκω (ὁπό) ‘be killed by’ as the suppletive passive of κτείνω ‘kill’ (see section 1.1.4). The subject-affectedness is an inherent property of the lexical meaning of ἀποθνῄσκω.

In the two cases I have discussed above, there was no indication that any semantic distinction existed between active and middle verbs. This phenomenon was explained by means of the neutral value of the active voice, and the inherent lexical middle semantics of the verbs concerned. In the first case mentioned above (type ἀκοῦω - ἀκοόμαι), the distribution between active and middle form was explained by genre-factors (the need of metrical alternatives in poetry). The second case of active-middle pairs (ἀλίσκομαι - ἔλλων) was explained by the pre-history of the Greek language.

down'). Now, as a result of the analogical process, we find oppositions such as ἵσταμαι/τρέφομαι vs. ἔστην/ἐτραφον. These pairs may have constituted a precedent for the formation of other verbs, e.g., ἐτραφον : τρέφομαι = ἔδρακον : => δέρκομαι (also influenced by σκέπτομαι?). The active χαίρω is probably old, witness Skt. ḫarayati. The form ἔχαρην was probably created when the η-aorist formation did not yet strictly belong to the verbal conjugational system, and could also be derived from verb roots with active presents, cf. also ρέω ‘stream’, aor. ἔρρυην.

362 We cannot exclude (nor prove) that a speaker of Ancient Greek experienced a subtle semantic nuance between the middle voice of δέρκομαι and the active voice of ἔδρακον. However, then the question arises as to why the present stem would involve a affectedness, whereas the aorist stem would not.
5.1 Some Active and Middle ‘Synonyms’

In the previous section three possible scenarios that might hold for active - middle 'synonymous' pairs were discussed. In this section, a number of case-studies will be presented. Of five of the active - middle pairs, I will try to analyze the factors that explain their distribution. These may be semantic factors, but also diachronical or stylistic factors. Three of the pairs concerned are built on the same lexical stem: ὀρμᾶω - ὀρμάομαι (5.1.1), πειρᾶω - πειράομαι (5.1.2), πολιτεύω - πολιτεύομαι (5.1.3). The two remaining pairs are from different stems: ἄλλομαι - πηδᾶω (5.1.4) and βούλομαι - ἐθέλω (5.1.5). After a discussion of these pairs I will devote some attention to the domain of the verbs of motion (section 5.2). It will be argued that it is possible to discern a tendency behind the distribution of active and middle verbs of motion.

5.1.1 ὀρμᾶω vs. ὀρμάομαι

The first near-synonymous pair to be discussed, consisting of an active intransitive and a middle intransitive verb, is ὀρμᾶω 'rush, set off (intr.)' and ὀρμάομαι 'set off'. In Homer, the two verbs seem to be used without a clear distinction in meaning. Compare the two following examples:

(2) αὐτὸς δ' ὡς τ' ἵππας ὁκύπτερος ὄρτο πέτεσθαι, ὡς ρά τ' ἀταίντοις πήρῃς περιμήκεος ἄρθεις ὀρμησθεὶς πεδίοιο διώκειν ὄρνεον ἀλλο (N 64)
And he himself, just as a hawk, swift of flight, rises to fly, and poising himself aloft above a high sheer rock, darts over the plain to chase some other bird.

(3) λαυπηρὰ δὲ γούνατ' ἐνώμα
φευγέμεναι τοι δ' αἰγα διώκειν ὀρμήθησαν (K 359)
(... and he [Diomedes] pried his limbs swiftly in flight, and they speedily set out in pursuit.

'Ὀρμήση is the sigmatic aorist of ὀρμᾶω; ὀρμήθησαν is the aorist of ὀρμάομαι. In both examples, the subjects set off in pursuit (διώκειν). The two forms appear to be used

363 Other examples are βουλεύω - βουλεύομαι and πρεσβεύω - πρεσβεύομαι. The distribution of the active and middle forms of these verbs is not entirely clear. The active πρεσβεύω is used in two ways (i) ‘be eldest, be first, be ambassador’ (stative), and (ii) ‘place as eldest/first, pay special honour to’ (transitive causative). The active voice can be explained by the stative and causative meanings, respectively. The middle is mostly used in the meaning ‘send ambassadors’. Here, the middle voice can be explained as an indirect reflexive since a leader usually sends ambassadors for his own benefit. However, the problem is that πρεσβεύομαι is also used in the meaning ‘serve as an ambassador’. Here, the middle voice may be interpreted as a passive ‘be sent as an ambassador’, which implies that one serves as an ambassador. For βουλεύω/-ομαι see section 2.1.9.

364 Corresponding to the middle intransitive ὀρμάομαι, there is a causative transitive active ὀρμᾶω ‘urge, dispatch’. Judged on the basis of its frequency, the active transitive verb is clearly of secondary importance. E.g., in Herodotus the active transitive occurs only twice, whereas the intransitive middle occurs 67 times.
without semantic distinction. In the next pair of examples, the subjects rush up to an enemy:

(4) ἔστασαν, ὀπότε πύργος Ἀχαιῶν ἄλλος ἐπελθὼν
Τρώων ὀρμήσατε καὶ ἀρξείαν πολέμιο (Δ 335)
(...), and they waited until some other detachment of the Achaeans should advance to set on the Trojans, and begin the battle.

(5) Πηνέλεω δὲ μάλιστα δαξύρονι θυμόν ὅρινεν:
ὁρμήθη δ’ Ἀκάμαντος (Ξ 488)
[Acamas] (....) and beyond all did he stir the heart of battle-minded Peneleos. He rushed on Acamas.

It appears that, in Homer, both the intransitive active ὀρμάω (occurs 5x365) and the intransitive middle ὀρμάομαι (occurs 55x, including aorists in -Θη-) designate setting off at a high speed. The distribution between intransitive ὀρμάω and ὀρμάομαι is not easily explained by metrical factors. Note, for instance, that in example (2) above the passive aorist ὀρμήθη would also have been possible. Furthermore, metrically equivalent forms such as -ὁρμήσας/-ὁρμῆθης and -ὁρμήσασα/-ὁρμηθεῖσα occur.

In Classical Greek, however, it appears that there is a division of labour between the two verbs. Intransitive active ὀρμάω emphasizes the speed or force of the motion (i.e. motion of high intensity), whereas ὀρμάομαι focuses on the transition into motion, i.e. 'set oneself in motion, depart', being neutral as to the speed/force of the motion. This semantic distinction seems also to have been discerned by Powell (1938). He renders intransitive ὀρμάω with 'set off, rush', and "passive" (= middle intransitive) ὀρμάομαι with 'set off'. In Herodotus, intransitive ὀρμάω is only used in contexts of battle, either for an army rushing up to the enemy (adequately translated as 'storm, assail'), or for an army taking to flight. In both cases, the element of speed and/or force is obviously of the utmost importance. In some cases, however, intransitive ὀρμάω has the special meaning of 'march against'. Although here the element of speed is backgrounded, the idea of force is still prominent.

The 7 occurrences of intransitive ὀρμάω in Herodotus may illustrate the point made:

(6) καὶ τοὺς Φοίνικας διακελεύσαμένους ὀρμήσατο ἐπ’ αὐτάς (Hdt. 1.1.4)
(...) the Phoenicians heartened each other to the deed, and rushed to them.

The Phoenicians made for the Greek women, who escaped or were carried off.

(7) [The Greeks] προϊδόντες δὲ οὕτω τὰς νέας τῶν βαρβάρων ἐς φυγήν ὀρμήσαν (Hdt. 7.179)
These, when they sighted the foreigner's ships, took to flight.

(8) [Demaratus to the Persians] Ἦκουσας μὲν καὶ πρότερόν μεν, οὕτε ὀρμῶμεν ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα (....) (Hdt. 7.209.2)
I have told you already (....) when we were marching off to Hellas.

365 The places are A 335, N 64, Φ 265, Χ 194, μ 221. It is worthy of mention that the optative ὀρμήσατε occurs three times. In addition, the transitive active ὀρμάω occurs 4 times in Homer.
(9) ἐκ μὲν δὴ τῆς ἀντίτης προσπλέειν οὐ κἂν σφι ἔδοκε τῶνδε εἶνεκα, μὴ κἂς ἵδοντες οἱ "Ελληνες προσπλέοντες ἐς φυγὴν ὄρμησιαν (...) (Hdt. 8.6.2)
Now they were not yet minded to make an onfall front to front, for fear lest the Greeks should see them coming and take to flight (...).

(10) [Pausanias to the Athenians about the Persian cavalry]
εἰ μὲν νῦν ἐς ὑμέας ὄρμησε ἀρχὴν ἡ ἱππας (...) (Hdt. 9.60.2)
If the cavalry would have rushed up to you first (...).

Twice, the verb is construed with an infinitive. In both cases, we are dealing with armies marching (cf. ἐξελαύνειν and στρατεύεσθαι).

(11) [Cyrus] πρὶν δὲ ἐξελαύνειν ὄρμησαι τὸν στράτον, πέμψας κήρυκας ἐς τοὺς Ἰονας ἐπειράτῳ σφέας ἀπὸ Κροίσου ἀπιστάναι (Hdt. 1.76.3)
But before marching off in order to lead out the army, he sent heralds to the Ionians to try to draw them away from Croesus.

(12) ἐστὶ δὲ ἄλλος λόγος (...) ὡς Ζέρξης ἐπημισε κήρυκα ἐς "Ἀργος πρότερον ἡ περ ὄρμησαι στρατεύεσθαι ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα (Hdt. 7.150.1)
(....) but there is another story told in Hellas: That before Xerxes set out to march against Hellas, he sent a herald to Argos (...).

In 4 of the instances cited above, the speed of the movement is essential, either in attack ((6) and (10)) or in flight ((7) and (9)). In the remaining 3 instances ((8), (10), and (12)) the verb means 'march, advance (against'). In these cases, speed may not be important. Instead, the element of (military) force is relevant.

That speed is often essential to the semantics of ὄρμαω may also be illustrated by two examples from Thucydides, where ὄρμαω is modified by the adverbs μᾶλλον and μᾶλλον, thereby showing its gradable character. This would be impossible if the verb would merely mean 'set off, start'.

(13) [Brasidas] χειμών δὲ ἦν καὶ ύπένειφεν · ἦ καὶ μᾶλλον ὄρμησε (...) (Th. 4.103.2)
The weather was bad and somewhat snowy, and for this reason he made the more haste (...).

(14) [of ships] αἱ μὲν μᾶλλον ὄρμήσασαι τρεῖς διαφθείρονται (Th. 8.34)
The three that had pursued most hotly were wretched.

Let us now turn to intransitive ὄρμωμαι. As I claimed above, its meaning is neutral as to speed and/or force. Instead, it focusses on the onset of the motion. To support this claim - without going through all 67 instances in Herodotus - I would like to point out that it is highly significant that ὄρμωμαι, 59 times out of 67, is accompanied by an adverbial phrase with ἐκ or ἀπό, expressing the starting point of the motion (cf. Powell

366 The infinitive may be interpreted as an optional final infinitive, or as a complement depending on a semantic element of volition present in the verb ὄρμαω, cf. Homeric ἰέμαι 'rush', but with inf. 'wish, be eager to'.

367 Possibly, the military meaning 'march, advance', which is neutral as to speed, has developed from the meaning 'storm, assail' which implies both speed and force.
1938). Furthermore, it is not surprising that the concrete spatial meaning 'set off, start' has been extended to the metaphorical meaning 'begin to', which is construed with an infinitival complement. To illustrate how different ὄρμαομαι is from ὄρμαω, the first three instances of ὄρμαομαι occurring in Herodotus may suffice:

(15) [Arion; passage in acc. plus inf.] ὄρμαθαι μὲν νῦν ἐκ Τάραντος, (...) μισθόσαθαι πλοῖον ἀνδρῶν Κορινθίων (Hdt. 1.24.2)
He set off from Tarentum and (...) he hired a ship of men of Corinth.

Arion leaves to return to Corinth. Since he is in no particular rush ὄρμαω would not have been appropriate.

(16) [Croesus to Adrastus] (...) φύλακα παιδὸς σε τοῦ ἐμοῦ χρηίζω γενέσθαι ἐς ἄγριν ὄρμωμένου (...) (Hdt. 1.41.2)
(...) I ask you to watch over my son as he goes out to the chase (...).

Croesus’ son goes out hunting. No rush nor force involved.

(17) [Croesus sends out the Lydians to consult the oracles] ἐντειλάμενος δὲ τοῖς Λυδίοις τάδε (...) ἁπ’ ἦς ἄν ἡμέρης ὄρμιθέωσι ἐκ Σαρδίων, ἀπὸ τούτης ἡμερολογέοντας τὸν λοιπὸν χρόνον ἐκατοστή ἡμέρη χρύοσθαι τοῖς χρηστηρίουσι (Hdt. 1.47.1)
And (...) he gave the Lydians this charge: they were to keep count of the time from the day of their leaving Sardis, and on the hundredth day inquire of the oracles (...).

The messengers leave Sardis. There is clearly no speed involved since they are ordered to question the oracles only on the hundredth day after departure.

To conclude the discussion on the 'synonymous' pair ὄρμαω - ὄρμαομαι, consider the following example from Xenophon that illustrates the semantic contrast nicely:

(18) [Cyaxares leaves to make a charge on the people carrying off the spoil]
Οὕτω δὴ ὁ Κυαξάρης λαβὼν τῶν ἔρρωμένων ὑπ’ χαὶ ἀνδρῶν προσελθεῖτε, καὶ ὁ Κύρος ὡς εἶδεν ὀρμωμένος, ἔξορμα, καὶ αὐτὸς πρῶτος ἤγειτο ταχέως, καὶ ὁ Κυαξάρης μέντοι ἐφείπτετο (Xen.Cyr. 1.4.20)
So when Cyaxares had taken some of the most powerful horses and men he advanced. And when Cyrus saw them leaving, he rushed off and soon took the lead, while Cyaxares followed after (...)

Cyrus sees Cyaxares and his men leaving (ὁρμάομαι), and speeds away (ὁρμάω) in order to outstrip them.

To summarize, ὄρμαω can be adequately rendered by 'rush (up to)' or 'march (against)'; ὄρμαομαι can be rendered by 'start off, leave'.

368 It is noteworthy that the semantic distinction between ὄρμαω and ὄρμαομαι appears to be a reflection of the semantics of the noun ὄρμη from which both verbs are derived. In LSJ, we find the following meanings of ὄρμη: (I) rapid motion forwards, onrush, onset, assault; (II) impulse to do a thing, effort; (III) setting oneself in motion, start. ὄρμη (I) corresponds with the ὄρμαω 'rush; march against'; ὄρμη (III) corresponds to the middle ὄρμαομαι 'start off'; ὄρμη (II) is of a more metaphorical nature, and corresponds - though I have not elaborated on this point - largely to the middle ὄρμαομαι. Incidentally, there seems to be an interesting distinction between ἀπαλλάττομαι and ὄρμαομαι. Though they both denote the departure
these semantic differences between the two verbs relate to their respective voice markings. My explanation runs as follows: the inherent lexical semantics of both active ὁρμάω and middle ὁρμάομαι implies the affectedness of the subject, since in both cases the subject undergoes the effect of the action, viz. a change of location. However, in the case of ὁρμάομαι the subject-affectedness is conceptualized as stronger: the verb focuses on the moment in which the subject undergoes a change from a stationary position into motion. Thus, ὁρμάομαι is a punctual verb. This change is cognitively more salient than that expressed by ὁρμάω, that focuses on the ongoing (and essentially unchanging) motion at high speed (atelic/durative Aktionsart). In sum, the middle inflection of ὁρμάομαι highlights the relatively salient change undergone by the subject. As a consequence, scenario (ii) above is applicable: both verbs involve a degree of subject-affectedness, but in the case of middle ὁρμάομαι, the affectedness of the subject is emphasized.

5.1.2 πειράω vs. πειράομαι

I will continue now with a discussion of the pair πειράω - πειράομαι. In Homer, the active occurs 10 times, against 66 instances of the middle (including ἐπειρήσαμην and ἐπειρήσατο). It is possible to distinguish a number of different meanings of Homeric πειράω - πειράομαι. As we shall see, the active and middle verbs are, to some extent, distributed differently with respect to the variant meanings.

The active verb πειράω exhibits three meanings in Homer ('A' as in 'A1' stands for 'Active'):

A1. make an attempt on by words (+ gen. [human]) [2x]

(19) μὴ μεν πειράτω ἐν εἰδότος, οὐδὲ με πείσετ (I 345)
[pειράσθω metrically equivalent]
Let him not tempt me who know it well; he will not persuade me.

Cf. also: I 181.

from some starting point, the difference lies in the nature of the starting point and the goal of the movement. That is, ἀπαλλάττομαι seems to designate going away from a place where something has happened or something is done by the person who leaves (e.g. leave after battle), whereas ὁρμάομαι implies that the subject leaves with the intention of achieving a specific goal elsewhere (e.g leave to go to battle). This may explain why ὁρμάομαι has developed the metaphorical, psychological sense of ‘be eager to, be minded to’ (often in the perfect stem), which focusses on the intention of the subject while backgrounding the element of spatial motion.
A2. try by force (+ inf./+ ὦς/+ ὀποίας-clause\textsuperscript{369}) [6x]

(20) [Telemachus to suitors]

πειρήσω ὦς κ’ ὑμιμι κακάς ἐπὶ κήρας ἵλω (β 316)

(...) I will try to send upon you fates of evil death (...).

Cf. also: Δ 66=71, Θ 8 [πειράτω; πειράσθω metr. equiv.], T 30, δ 545 [πείρα; πειράω metrically equivalent].

A3. make an attempt on by force\textsuperscript{370} (+ gen. [animal]) [2x]

(21) κέλεται δὲ ἐ θυμός ἀγήνωρ

μήλων πειρήσοντα καὶ ἐς πυκνὸν δόμον ἐλθεῖν (Μ 301= ζ 134)

And his proud spirit tells him to go even into the well-built fold to make an attempt on the flocks.

Now the middle variant πειράματι shows five meaning variants:

M1. try (mostly by force) (+ inf./+ ὦς-clause/ellips) [8x]

This meaning is similar to (A2).

(22) [Trojans at the gates of the Greek camp]

tοι δὲ κατ’ αὐτὰς

ιστάμενοι πειράντο βίη ῥήξαντες ἐσελθεῖν (Μ 341)

And before them stood the foe, and tried to break them by force and enter in.

Also: Α 5\textsuperscript{371}, E 279 [abs.], Ζ 435 [abs.], N 457 [abs.], Φ 459 [πειρᾷ; πειράς metr. equiv.], X 381 [abs.], δ 417 [sc. ἀλύζατι]

M2. make an attempt on by words (+ gen. [human]) [1x]

This meaning is similar to (A1).

\textsuperscript{369} It is hard to tell whether the ὦς/ὅπως-clause is a complement or an optional satellite. The fact that πειράω does not occur with ἵνα nor ἄφθα (introducing optional final clauses) may be an indication that the ὀποίας-clause is complementary.

\textsuperscript{370} Probably, this meaning comes closest to what must have been the original meaning of πειράω. The noun πειρά (＜*per-yh,>) is built on the root *per- ‘penetrate’. Hence, the original meaning of the noun must have been something like ‘penetration (through some barrier) by force’. Yet, the extended meaning ‘test, experience’ may also be quite old, witness Latin experior ‘test, experience’.

\textsuperscript{371} Δ 5: αὐτίκα ἐπειράτο Κρόνιδης ἐρεμήζεμεν Ἡρην/ κερτομίοις ἐπέεσσι (‘And immediately the son of Cronos attempted to provoke Hera with mocking words’). Although no physical force is involved, πειράματι here still appears to have an aggressive and hostile nuance.
(23) \( \text{πειρα\' \ εμείο, γεραίε, νεωτέρου, \ ο\' \ δέ \ με \ πείσεις} (\Omega 433) \)
You make trial of me, old sir, a younger man than you; but you will not persuade me.

M3. test, try (mostly by force) (+ gen. [human]/ellips) [24x]

(24) [Zeus challenges the gods to a tug-of-war]
\( \text{γνώσετι' \ έπειθ' \ ο\' \ δ\' \ ειμι \ θε\' \ ον \ κάρτιςτος \ απάντων.} \\
\( \text{ει \ \delta' \ \α\' \ \πειρήσασθε, \ θε\' \ οι, \ \ινα \ \ει\' \ \δετε \ \πάντες} (\Theta 18) \\
[\text{sc. \ μεν?}] \)
Then you will recognize how far the mightiest am I of all gods. But come on, just try it, you gods, so that you all may know.

That the action has the character of a test (the subject desires to know whether the genitival object is capable of something, cf. English try me), is shown by the many cases in which the implicit question underlaying the test is made explicit. In the example above, Zeus trusts that the trial of strength will reveal his superiority to the gods (\( \text{γνώσετι' \ έπειθ' ...} \) and \( \text{ινα \ \ει\' \ \δετε ...}\)). Other examples are:

(25) [Achilles challenges Agamemnon to take away his gifts]
\( \text{ει \ \δ' \ \α\' \ \μην \ \πειρήσαι, \ \ινα \ \γνώσαι \ \και \ \ο\' \ \δε' \}
\( \text{α\' \ \ψά \ \τοι \ \α\' \ \μα \ \κελα\' \ \ον \ \ε\' \ \ο\' \ \δουρί} (\Delta 302) \\
\text{Come on, just try it, so these men here also may know: at once your dark blood will spurt around my spear.} \)

Here the expected ‘test-result’ (\( \text{ινα \ \γνώσαι \ \και \ \ο\' \ \δε'} \) is made explicit in the next line (\( \text{α\' \ \ψά} \ \... \ \\text{περί \ \δουρί).} \)

(26) \( \text{ο\' \ \φρ\' \ \ε\' \ \και \ \Τρόων \ \πειρήσο\' \ \α\' \ \\text{ε\' \ \ην\' \ \ι\' \ \α\' \ \ι\' \ \αι\' \ \ι\' \ \ε\' \ \ο\' \ \δουρί} (\text{T 70}) \)
(...) so that I may go out against the Trojans and make trial of them yet again, whether they are minded to spend the night by the ships.

The question to be answered is \( \text{α\' \ \κ' \ \\text{ε\' \ \θέ\' \ \λω\'} \ \ε\' \ \\text{ην\' \ \ι\' \ \α\' \ \ι\' \ \\text{ε\' \ \ι\' \ \ε\' \ \ο\' \ \δουρί.}} \)

(27) \( \text{πάντη \ \δ' \ \\text{α\' \ \μ\' \ \φά\' \ \\text{\alpha\' \ \πε\' \ \ρι\' \ \το \ \\text{προ\' \ \δι\' \ \ο\' \ \ν}} (\text{N 806}) \\
\text{And everywhere he made trial of the battalions, moving forward step by step, to see if they would perhaps give way before him.} \)

In this example, the added indirect question (\( \text{ε\' \ \ + \ \ oblique \ optative) \) shows that this meaning is related to that of (M5) question.\(^{373}\) Other examples with explicit ‘test-result’ are K 444, \( \Phi \ 225, \ Psi \ 804, \Pi \ 305, \omega \ 216. \)

\(^{372}\) It is also possible to interpret the \( \text{ε\' \ \- clause, not as an indirect question 'in order to see whether ...',} \)
\( \text{but as a conditional clause: 'I will test the Trojans, if they will wish, etc.'}. \)

\(^{373}\) In many cases, \( \text{ε\' \ - clauses combined with πειράσο\' \ are ambiguous. They can be interpreted both as a} \)
\( \text{final clause ('in the hope that')} \) and as an indirect question (see Wakker 1994: 370-1).
In many cases the test-character of the action is not explicitly expressed. However, in these cases, too, we can assume that middle πειράωμαι conveys (albeit implicitly) this semantic nuance. E.g.:

(28) καὶ ἐκτελέσειν ἄθλους
πολλοὺς, τοὺς Φαείκες ἐκείρησαν' ὁδυσῆος (θ 22-3)
[toûs; internal accusative]
(…) and that he might accomplish the many feats in which the Phaeacians made trial of Odysseus.

Cf. also: B 73 [sc. υἱῶν 'Ἀχαϊῶν], B 193 [sc. υἱῶν 'Ἀχαϊῶν], E 129 [sc. σένω], E 220 [sc. Diomedes], Λ 386 [sc. μεν], Π 590 [abs.], Y 349, Y 352 [= T 70], Φ 580, Ψ 553, θ 120 [sc. one another], θ 126, θ 205 [sc. μεν], θ 213 [sc. everyone], θ 377 [abs.].

M4. try, test, investigate (+ inanimate gen.) [23x]

(29) ὅφρα μεθ’ ὑμίν
χειρῶν καὶ σθένεος πειρήσομαι, ἡ μοι ἐτ’ ἐστὶν
ις, οἷς πάρος ἔσκεν ἐνὶ γναμπτοῖσι μέλεσιν,
ἡ ἰδὴ μοι ὄλεσεν ἁλὴ τ’ ἀκομιστή τε (φ 282)
(…) that in your midst I may prove my hands and strength, whether I have still vigour such as was formerly in my supple limbs, or whether by now my wandering and lack of food have destroyed it.

The disjunctive indirect question expresses the question that is to be answered by the test.
The genitival indirect complement can express the particular quality of the subject that is tested (as in φ 282 above: χειρῶν καὶ σθένεος), or it can express the test-object by means of which one tries one’s powers, e.g. τοῦ τόξου in:

(30) καὶ δέ κεν αὐτὸς ἔγώ τοῦ τόξου πειρήσαμην·
εἰ δέ κεν ἐντανύσω διοἰστεύσω τε σιδήρου (φ 113)
And I too myself might make trial of that bow. If I shall string it and shoot an arrow through the iron (…).

Again, the question that is to be answered by the test is expressed explicitly (εἰ δέ κεν ἐντανύσω).

Cf. also: Ο 359, Σ 601[374], Τ 384, Ψ 432, Ψ 707=753=831, ζ 126 [πειρήσομαι ἢδὲ ἱδομαι; sc. the unknown people], θ 100, θ 145, θ 149 [sc. ἄθλουν], θ 184, σ 369, φ 135, φ 159 [cf. ζ 159], φ 180=268, φ 184 [sc. ἐντανύσατι?], φ 394, φ 410.

[374] Αἰ Σ 601 πειράωμαι seems to be construed with an accusative object: ὡς ὦτε τις τροχῶν ἔρμενον ἐν παλάμησιν/ ἔξομενος κεραμέως πειρήσεται, αἱ κε θέσιν. It is, however, preferrable to interpret the accusative as a thematic object in a proleptic construction or as an anacoluthon in which ἐν παλάμησιν ἔχων is to be understood.
M5. test by questioning (+ gen./ellips) [8x]

(31) ἐλθών τὸν δ' ἄνδρᾶν πειρήσωμαί, οἳ τινὲς εἶσιν (τ 174)
I will go and make trial of these men, to learn who they are (...).

Also: Ω 390, δ 119 [sc. Telemachus] = ω 238 [sc. Laertes], ν 336, τ 215, ψ 181, ω 240 [sc. Laertes].

M6. experience (+ gen.) [2x]

(32) τοῖοι δ' ἄλλοι κοίλης ἐντοσθε φαρέτρης
κειότο, τῶν τάξ' ἐμέλλον Ἀχαῖοι πειρήσθεθαι (φ 418)
But the others [arrows] were stored within the hollow quiver, those of which the Achaeans were soon to get experience.

Also: γ 23 [abs.; perfect: ‘be experienced’; frequent in Classical Greek].

The different meanings of πειράματα and πειράματα are summarized in the table below. We may observe that some meanings occur exclusively with one particular form, and that there is an overlap in the meaning try (by means of force).

Table 1: Different meanings of πειράματα and πειράματα in Homer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>πειράματα [10x]</th>
<th>πειράματα [66x]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A3. make an attempt on by force (+ gen. [animal])</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2/M1. try (mostly by force) (+ inf/+ ὑπ'/+ ὀποιος)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1/M2. make an attempt on by words (+ gen. [human])</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3. test (mostly by force) (+ gen. [human])</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4. try, test, investigate (+ gen. [inanimate])</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5. test by questioning</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M6. experience</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now what can we learn from the table? First, the meanings test (+ gen), test by questioning, experience are exclusively expressed by the middle verb. The active form, on the other hand, occurs exclusively in the meaning: make an attempt on by force (be it only in two identical lines).375 Subsequently, the question arises as to the rationale behind this

375 The question may arise whether it is justified to distinguish the meanings πειράματα + gen. [animal] ‘make an attempt on X by force’ from πειράματα + gen. [human] ‘test X’ (mostly by means of force). Do they not rather, although they differ in voice, express the same meaning? My answer would be negative. It is significant that in the sole instance of the active form construed with a genitive complement, this complement is non-human: μῆλον (M 301 = ζ 134), whereas in the 23 instances of the middle verb with a genitive
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distribution. I would like to suggest that there is indeed one: the meanings that are exclusively expressed by the middle form each involve an element of cognition, i.e., the subject acquires information as a result of the event, either by testing or by questioning the object. Or the subject may acquire information about the object in a non-volitional way. Conversely, the active voice seems to be neutral as to the aspect of cognition.

As was noted above, both the active and the middle voice occur in the meaning try (by means of force) to X (+ inf/+ ύς/+ ὄπως/ellipsis). It is possible, though hard to prove, that the middle voice conveys the semantic nuance that the subject acquires knowledge as a result of the attempt, which then can be considered as a trial of strength. In this case, the meaning of πειράσομαι (+ inf./+ ύς/+ ὄπως/ellipsis) can contain the same element of cognition as the meanings (M3) and (M4) test (by means of force) somebody/something. Thus, in example (22), τοι δὲ κατ’ αὐτὸς/ ἵσταμεν οἱ πειρώντο βιή ρῆξαντες ἐσελθεῖν (M 341), the middle may express that the Greeks, as a result of the attack, know whether or not they are strong enough to break in. Furthermore, the availability of two variant forms, active and middle, to express the frequently occurring meaning 'try to' is obviously convenient for metrical purposes.

I will not go into the opposition between πειράω and πειράσομαι in Classical Greek in much detail, since the middle πειράσομαι has almost been completely generalized at the cost of the active verb (e.g. Herodotus: 3x πειράω vs. 88x πειράσομαι). Instead, I will briefly discuss Thucydides, the only classical author in which the opposition is still alive. In Thucydides, too, it appears that the element of cognition is relevant to the distribution of πειράω and πειράσομαι. Thucydides consistently uses the middle form to express the meaning 'experience', where the element of cognition is apparent.376 On the other hand, he uses the active verb to express the cognition-neutral meanings: (i) 'seduce'377; (ii) 'try something'378; (iii) 'make an attempt on something by force'379. Further, he uses the active πειράω with an infinitive-complement, always with the special nuance 'try to V by means of force'.380 Conversely, the middle πειράσομαι plus infinitive 'try to V' is neutral as to the element of force, for example, (…) τοῖς δὲ φιλίαν καὶ ξυμμαχίαν πειρώμεθα ποιεῖσθαι (Th. 6.34.1) ('(...) and to endeavour to make friendship with others').381

δαμάσσεται, ἢ κεν ἐγὼ τὸν ["Εκτορι to be construed with ἀντιβήν"] ('And to make trial, man to man with Hector, whether he will slay me or I him').

376 E.g., Th. 2.44.2, 2.85.2, 4.108.6, 4.114.4, 5.111.1.
377 Only Th. 6.54.3; in fact a passive aorist to πειράω.
378 With internal accusative: πάσαν ἱδέαν (2.19), πολλά (6.38.2).
379 With genitival object: Th. 4.25.10, 6.63.2, 7.37.3, 4.100.1, 2.77.2.
380 E.g., πειράσομαις καταλαβεῖν τὴν πόλιν (Th. 2.5.5) ('having tried to seize the city'). Cf. also 2.72.2, 4.128.1, 4.9.2, 4.102.1, 7.32.
381 The other instances of πειράσομαι + inf. (37) : 1.25.1, 1.71.7, 1.81.3, 1.143.1, 1.144.4, 2.33, 2.35.3, 2.65.1, 3.38.2, 3.39.1, 3.54.1, 3.63.1, 4.15.2, 4.41.3, 4.49.4, 4.60.2, 4.61.2, 4.66.4, 4.92.4, 4.92.7, 4.117.1, 4.126, 5.35.5, 5.69.1(bis), 5.112.2, 6.18.6, 6.34.1, 6.38.4, 6.40.6, 6.48, 6.87.3, 6.88.7, 6.89, 8.3.5, 8.63.3, 8.76.6. The fact that the middle πειράσομαι + inf. is neutral with respect to the element of (military) force does not exclude the verb being used in a context in which force is involved. These cases resemble the use of the active form, e.g., ἀφικόμενοι δὲ μηχανᾶς τε τῇ Ποτιδαίᾳ προσέφερον καὶ παντὶ τρόπῳ ἐπειρώντο
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Clearly, in the case of πειράω/πειράματι, the semantic element of cognition is somewhat diluted. It may, however, still be present, since in attempting to do something, the person who makes the attempt will always be curious as to the outcome.

To conclude our discussion of πειράω/πειράματι, the semantic distinction we have found between active πειράω and middle πειράματι - the semantic element of cognition - can conveniently be connected with the general meaning of the active and middle voices. Middle πειράματι expresses that the subject-referent is affected in that he undergoes a mental change. In this manner, the verb is semantically related to cognition-verbs like πυθάνομαι ‘hear/learn that; ask’ and αισθάνομαι ‘perceive’. Conversely, the active πειράω is neutral with respect to subject-affectedness.382

5.1.3 πολιτεύω vs. πολιτεύματι

According to Kühner-Gerth, the active πολιτεύω means ‘bin πολίτης’, whereas the middle means ‘verwalte den Staat’, and the passive ‘lebe unter einer Verfassung, in e. Staate’ (I2: 525). In the aorist stem, the three forms are, indeed, neatly distinguished: ἐπολίτευσα, ἐπολίτευσάμην, ἐπολιτεύθην383. However, the semantic distinction between active πολιτεύω (aor. ἐπολίτευσα) and middle πολιτεύματι (aor. ἐπολιτεύσάμην) is not as cut-and-dry as Kühner-Gerth’s remark suggests. In fact, the opposition appears to have a very marginal existence. Only Xenophon uses both the active (6 times) and the middle form with middle meaning (about 10 times). Apart from Thucydides, no other classical authors use the active verb. Thucydides, on the other hand, only uses active πολιτεύω ‘be/act as a citizen’ (17 times), and never the middle form. Only the passive aorist (with passive meaning) occurs once. This situation is summarized in the following table:

---

382 The semantic distinction between πειράω and πειράματι seems to be a reflection of the semantics of the noun πείρα from which both verbs are derived. In LSJ we find the following meanings: (I 1) trial, attempt and experience; (I 2) experiment; (II) attempt on or against one and (abs.) attempt, enterprise. It appears that πείρα (I) corresponds roughly with the middle verb, while πείρα (II) corresponds with the active verb. Note further that the semantic distinction between πειράω and πειράματι resembles the distinction between ἔλειν and ἔδεσθαι as demonstrated by Bechert (1964): middle ἔδεσθαι expresses that a lasting mental impression is made on the subject.

383 Passive πολιτεύματι may be compared to βασιλεύματι ‘be ruled by a king’ (to βασιλεύω + gen. ‘be king of’) and ἀρχόμαι ‘be ruled’ (to ἀρχο + gen. ‘rule’). Cf. also δημοκρατεύματι (aor. ἐδημοκρατήθην) ‘be governed democratically’.
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Table 2: The occurrence of πολιτεύω and πολιτεύομαι

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ACTIVE πολιτεύω (ἐπολιτέυσα)</th>
<th>MIDDLE πολιτεύομαι (ἐπολιτεύσαμην)</th>
<th>PASSIVE πολιτεύομαι (ἐπολιτεύθην)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Xenophon</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thucydides</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As was noted above, the semantic distinction between active πολιτεύω 'bin πολίτης' (stative) and middle πολιτεύομαι 'verwalte den Staat' (activity) is not as clear as Kühner-Gerth take it to be. Thucydides uses the active form with the meaning 'be a citizen' (stative), but also in a more active sense 'function as a citizen, act politically'. E.g. stative 'be a citizen':

(33) (...) ο Βρασίδας τοίς μὲν μετὰ τῶν Ἀθηναίων Τορωναίοις καταπεφευγόσι κήρυγμα ἐποιήσας τὸν βούλομενον ἐπὶ τὰ ἐκατούτῳ ἐσχεθόντα ἀδεώς πολιτεύειν (...)(Th. 4.1.141)

(...). Brasidas made proclamation to the Toroneans who had taken refuge with the Athenians, that whoever wished might return to his property and be a citizen without fear; (...)

*Activity* 'act politically', e.g.:

(34) οι δὲ ταύτα τε πάντα ἐς τούναντιόν ἐπραξαν καὶ άλλα ἔξω τοῦ πολέμου δοκοῦντα εἶναι κατὰ τὰς ίδιας φιλοτιμίας καὶ ίδια κέρδη κακῶς ἐς τε σφᾶς αὐτοὺς καὶ τοὺς συμμάχους ἐπολιτεύεσαν (...)(Th. 2.65.7)

But they acted not only contrary to his advice in all these things, but also in matters that apparently had no connection with the war they were led by private ambition and private greed to adopt policies which proved injurious both to themselves and their allies (...).

These people are not just in a state of being citizens. The active ἐπολιτεύεσαν must refer to an active political behaviour (cf. also ἐπραξαν before), namely a behaviour that aims at the benefit of their allies and of themselves. In a comparable expression, Lysias uses the middle verb:

(35) [subject: those that beat the phalluses off the Hermes-statues]

(...). καὶ εἰς ἄπασαν τὴν πόλιν ἰμαρτήκασιν, ἀδίκας καὶ παρανόμως καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἄλλους πολιτεύομενοι καὶ πρὸς σφᾶς αὐτοὺς διακείμενοι (...)(Lys. 14.42)

(...). and they committed offences against the whole city, showing injustice and illegality alike in their public treatment of their fellow-men and in their behaviour to each other (...).

It appears that Thucydides uses the active voice both in the stative meaning 'be a citizen' and in the activity-meaning 'act politically'. This observation is, of course, in keeping with the fact that Thucydides does not use the middle verb (save with a passive meaning).
In Xenophon, who as we have seen is the only author using both πολιτεύω and πολιτεύομαι (with middle meaning), it is unclear what factor determines the choice of either of the verbs. This obscure situation may well be caused by the circumstance that, in the real world, being a citizen usually implies that one governs the state (esp. in Athens) and/or lives under a certain constitution, and vice versa. In this fashion the contrast between the neutral active on the one hand, and the middle/passive on the other, may easily become blurred. Illustrative examples of this confusion are the following:

(36) ἔδοξε τῷ δήμῳ τριάκοντα ἄνδρας ἔλεσθαι, οἵ τοὺς πατρίους νόμους συγγραφούσι, καθ’ οὗς πολιτεύομαι (Xen. HG 2.3.2)
It was voted by the people to choose thirty men to frame the ancient laws into a constitution under which to conduct the government.

(37) αἰρεθέντες δὲ ἐφ’ ὅτε συγγράψαι νόμους, καθ’ οὕστινας πολιτεύομαι (Xen. HG 2.3.11)
(...); although chosen for the purpose of framing a constitution under which to conduct the government (...).

(38) ἔπαιτα δὲ νόμους θείναι, καθ’ οὗς πολιτεύομαι (Xen. HG 5.3.25)
Secondly, they should draw up a constitution under which to conduct government.

The active and the two middles refer to the same state of affairs in reality. I fail to notice any semantic nuance.\(^{384}\) In the following example, Xenophon uses the active verb in a comparable context as Thucydides above (34):

(39) [Alcibiades] (...) ἐπιθουλευθεὶς δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν ἔλαττον ἐκείνου δυναμένων μοχθηρότερα τε λεγόντων καὶ πρὸς τὸ σύντων ἵδιον κέρδος πολιτεύομασω, ἐκείνου ἄει τὸ κοινὸν σύζυγον (...). (Xen. HG 1.4.13)
(...) but rather because he was plotted against by those who had less power than he and spoke less well and ordered their political doings with a view of their own private gain, whereas he was always advancing the common weal (...).

As in Thucydides' examples above, the active πολιτεύω appears to refer to political activity, rather than to a state.

To all appearances, Xenophon does not use the active and middle with any semantic distinction. The question now remains how we must account for the occurrence of both the active and the middle verb. Tentatively, I would suggest that there is a stylistic difference: πολιτεύομαι is the normal form, in Attic as well as elsewhere, whereas πολιτεύω is restricted to Thucydides. In other words, my guess is that in using the active verb, Xenophon - consciously or not - commits a Thucydideanism. It is, in any case, significant that 5 of the 6 instances of active πολιτεύω (also once in the Anabasis) occur in the Hellenica, which is Xenophon's sequel to Thucydides' Histories. The consequence of the absence of a semantic distinction between πολιτεύω and πολιτεύομαι (with non-

---

384 It can, however, not be excluded that the latter two examples must be interpreted as passives: 'according to which they would be governed'.
passive meaning) is that scenario (iii) above applies: both verbs imply subject-affectedness, and the active inflection is neutral with respect to subject-affectedness.

An interesting additional question might be how πολλείνομαι is to be classified as to middle usage type. Πολλείνομαι is often mentioned as the prime example of a *dynamic middle*. Schwyzner-Debrunner (II: 232) describes the dynamic middle thus:

(40) "Die gefühlsmäßige Beteiligung des Subjektes am Verbalinhalt, die das Medium gegenüber dem Aktiv zunächst ausdrückt, wirkt sich teilweise durch Steigerung des Verbalinhaltes aus: intensives (oder dynamisches) Medium."

In other words, the dynamic middle heightens the intensity of the lexical verbal content. The problem with such a definition is that it is rather unspecific (not to say vague), and ad hoc. Gildersleeve, in his review-article on Stahl’s syntax, rightly puts it as follows:

(41) "And now we have come to what I would fain call the drip-pan middle, the πανδέκτης-middle, the middle that is put at the bottom to catch the drippings of the other uses as the ablative is put to catch the drippings of the other cases. It is called the intensive middle, the dynamic middle" (Gildersleeve 1908: 277)

Indeed, Gildersleeve’s sarcasm is justified if we consider Stahl’s inventory. His enumeration of ‘dynamic’ middles constitutes quite a mixed bag. Consider, for example, παρέχεσθαι, στρατεύεσθαι, λαβέσθαι, πολιτεύεσθαι, ἔκεσθαι, ἰδέσθαι, and πειράσθαι (Stahl 1907: 57-62). How should this group of verbs be dealt with then? They should not, in my view, be lumped together. For each of these verbs, the middle voice can be explained differently. I shall confine myself to the examples I mentioned above. (i) Παρέχεσθαι can be taken as an indirect reflexive. The subject maintains control over the things he contributes, and so the subject can still benefit from it. The active form παρέχω lacks this implication. (ii) Στρατεύεσθαι can be considered a body motion middle since it is very often combined with an expression of the goal (e.g. ἔπι or ἐκ). With (iii) λαμβάνομαι, Stahl probably refers to the special use of the verb with a genitive complement ‘hold on to s.th.’. In chapter 2, I have explained this middle as a special type of body motion middle (see section 2.1.4). (iv) The middle inflection of ἔκεσθαι ‘follow’ can best be explained by the fact that the verb denotes a change of location (cf. the body motion middle). In addition, the middle form may express a passive element, considering that following implies that one responds to a more actively involved, initiating participant that leads the way. (iv) The use of ἰδέσθαι has been investigated thoroughly by Bechert (1964). He concludes that the middle form expresses that the perceived object leaves a strong impression on the subject (see also section 2.1.8). In other words, the middle endings of ἰδέσθαι have a fairly specific function, that is, to express that the subject is mentally affected. (vi) Above, the middle voice of πειράσθαι was explained as expressing a notion of cognition. We may conclude that in the above cases it is not necessary to invoke a special dynamic or intensive meaning of the middle form.385

To return to πολλείνομαι, the verb that is often cited as the best example of the dynamic middle, it has been concluded above that the middle πολλείνομαι appears to have

385 Also Wackernagel (1926-8: 127) and Margulíes (1930: 117-8) doubt the existence of a distinct dynamic middle type.
the same meaning as the active πολιτεύω. This means that the middle form cannot have a dynamic or intensive meaning - assumed that it existed - in opposition to the active form. One question, however, is still to be dealt with: how can πολιτεύομαι then be classified as a middle? What is the precise character of the affectedness of the subject? I would suggest that πολιτεύομαι should be classed as an indirect reflexive middle. When a (Greek) citizen acts politically, he benefits - or at least intends to benefit - from his actions.

5.1.4 ἀλλομαί and πηδᾶω

Unlike the verbs discussed above, ἀλλομαί and πηδᾶω are not built on the same lexical stem. Again, we may pose the question whether or not a semantic distinction is can be discerned. It will be argued here that in the case of ἀλλομαί and πηδᾶω the answer is negative. The difference between the two verbs is mainly one of register, at least as far as Attic prose is concerned. This point may be illustrated by the distribution of the two verbs (including their compounds) over different authors and different genres:

Table 3: Frequencies of ἀλλομαί and πηδᾶω

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ἀλλομαί</th>
<th>πηδᾶω</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homer</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aeschylus</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophocles</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euripides</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herodotus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thucydides</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aristophanes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plato</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xenophon</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demosthenes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be observed that, in Homer, ἀλλομαί is far more frequent than πηδᾶω. We may conclude that ἀλλομαί is the older word for 'jump' (probably already PIE, cf. Lat. salio 'jump'; from the same yod-present *sh2l-ye-o-), while πηδᾶω has become more frequent in Attic.

The two verbs exhibit the same usages. Compare the following examples from Herodotus, where cats and frogs jump into a fire and a pool, respectively:

(42) οἱ δὲ κατέλημνεν διαδόνοντες καὶ ὑπερβρύσκοντες τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἐσάλλονται ἐξ τοῦ πῦρ (Hdt. 2.66.3)
But the cats slip through or leap over the men and spring into the fire.

386 Other (quasi-)synonymous verbs such as θράσιο, ὀρφυο, and σκιτᾶω are not taken into consideration here, since these verbs are clearly belong to the poetic vocabulary.

387 The formation πηδᾶω seems to be connected to the word *ped-s 'foot'.
(43) (...) ἥ βέτραχοι γενόμενοι ἐς τὰς λίμνας ἐσπηδῆσητε (...) (Hdt. 4.132.3)
(...) or become frogs and jump into lakes (...)

Two comparable examples from Homer:

(44) χειρός ἀπὸ στιβαρῆς ἄλλην πηδήσαι ἄκοντα (Ξ 455)
(...) from the stout hand the spear has not leapt in vain (...).

(45) νευρὴ δὲ μέγ’ ἱερεῖ, ἀλτὸ δ’ οὐστὸς
ὀξυβελῆς, κοθ’ ὀμίλον ἐπιπτέσθαι μενεαίνων (Δ 125)
(...) and the string sang aloud, and the sharp arrow leapt, eager to wing its way through the throng.

In both instances, an inanimate object (spear and arrow, resp.) ‘jumps’ away.

The following two examples from Euripides refer to the same event.

(46) [Prologue: Electra tells how Orestes is terrorized by the Eumenids]
ποτὲ δὲ δεμνίων ἄπο
πηδᾶ δρομαῖος, πᾶλος ὅς ὑπὸ ζυγοῦ (Ε. Ὁr. 45)
(...) while at other times he leaps from the bedding and runs about like an unyoked colt.

The present stem πηδᾶ here expresses iterativity.

(47) [Orestes, in a frenzy:]
ποῖ ποὶ ποθ’ ἱλιμεθθὰ δεμνίων ἄπο; (Ε. Ὁr. 278)
Where ever have I leapt to from my bed?

The aorist stem designates a single event.

Next, consider the following passage from Xenophon.

(48) [a raw horse] (...) ἀλλ’ ἦν μόνον ῃδη ὀπιοθέν τινα ἐπελθόντα, ἀλεῖται. ἐπειδὰν
δὲ οὔτω διακηθῶν ἥτοιθή (...) (Xen. Ἐq. 8.4-5)
(...) for if he merely sees a man approaching behind him, he will leap. As soon as he has grown accustomed to leap in the way (...).

There does not appear to be a semantic motivation for first using ἀλλομαι and consequently πηδᾶω. The alternation between the two verbs is probably due to a striving for variatio. Another example is

(49) πηδημα κοῦφον ἐκ νεῶς ἄφηλατο (A. Pers. 305)
He jumped a light leap from the ship.

Here, the action noun πηδημα is used as an internal object to ἄφηλατο. From these examples, it can be concluded that ἀλλομαι and πηδᾶω are semantically identical. The question then remains as to what factors determine the use of the two verbs. Let us first examine the distribution in poetry. As was noted above, Homer strongly prefers ἀλλομαι, which may indicate the antiquity of the verb, as compared to πηδᾶω. In classical poetry

---

388 A similar case can be found in Xen. Ἐq. 3.7 and Ἐq. Mag. 8.3.
the situation is different. The tragedians prefer πηδάω, which probably reflects the contemporary Attic usage. In tragedy, ἀλλομαί appears to be used under specific conditions, as can be seen in table 4, which depicts the occurrences of the two verbs (and their compounds) in Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, and Aristophanes (fragments excluded):

Table 4: Occurrences of ἀλλομαί and πηδάω in Attic drama:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PRESENT</th>
<th>AORIST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἀλλομαί</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πηδάω</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We can observe that the Attic dramatists exhibit a fairly clear tendency to use ἀλλομαί in the aorist stem, and πηδάω in the present stem. This tendency is not discernible in prose: in Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, Plato, and Demosthenes ἀλλομαί occurs 28 times, of which 21x present, and only 3x aorist. The distribution of πηδάω and ἡλάμην/ἥλόμην in drama is, one may conclude, not determined semantically. A possible alternative explanation is that metrical factors are relevant. Assuming that πηδάω is used as the unmarked default-option in drama as it is in Attic prose, the poet will encounter difficulties when trying to fit the aorist forms of πηδάω in the iambic metre, e.g. ἐπηδήσας, ἐπηδήσας, ἐπηδήσε, etc. In such cases, he will have to take recourse to the synonymous aorist forms of ἀλλομαί. This mechanism would explain why ἀλλομαί is virtually confined to the aorist stem.

Now let us turn to the use of the verbs in prose. In prose, the choice of ἀλλομαί appears to be a matter of register. Ἀλλομαί, as I will argue, belongs to an elevated, more poetic, register, whereas πηδάω is neutral from a stylistic point of view. This is especially supported by the use of ἀλλομαί in Plato. Ἀλλομαί appears six times in the works of Plato. In all six cases, we are dealing with a stylistically marked context. The clearest example, in this respect, is Ion 535b which clearly refers to the Odyssey (χ 2).

389 Ἀλλομαί has two aorist forms: thematic ἡλόμην and pseudo-sigmatmatic ἡλόμην. At A. Pers. 516 (see comm. Groenboom), Eu. 372, and Soph. ὈΤ 1311 (see comm. Jebb), there is some doubt between imperfects ἡλοέα and thematic aorists ἡλοέα. The thematic aorist, however, is semantically and textually preferable in every case.

390 The future occurs once. Excluded from these numbers are three cases in Xenophon, where the mss. vary between present and thematic aorist: HG 4.4.11, 4.5.7, An. 4.2.17.

391 Indeed, these forms do not occur in drama, unless with elision (e.g. ἄνεκδησ').

392 It should be noted that, from a semantic point of view, one would expect a preponderance of aorist forms, given the punctual aspect of the lexical meaning. In Homer, indeed, the aorist occurs 56 times, the present only twice. Furthermore, the formation also points to a punctual (or at least telic) Aktionsart, since the root aorist formation ἄνεκδησα is morphologically unmarked, as opposed to yod-present ἀλλομαί (< *ς(h)μη-γο-). The two exceptional cases of ἀλλομαί in drama used in the present stem (both cases with iterative meaning) are found at Ar. ὄνο. 145 (Socrates asks Chaerephon about a flea: ὁπόσους ἀλλοιοτο τοὺς συνής πόδας ὑπό μεγάς 'how many of its own feet a flea could jump'), and at Lys. 83 (the Spartan girl Lampito asserts: γυμνόδομοι γάρ καὶ ποτί πυγάν ἀλλομαί 'At any rate I do gymnastics and jump heel-to-buttocks'). Aristophanes may have used the more elevated ἀλλομαί here to a comical effect.
(50) (...) ἦ τὸν Ὄδυσσεα ὅταν ἐπὶ τὸν οὐδὸν ἐφαλλόμενον ἀδης (...) (Pl. Ion 535b)
(...) either when you sing of Odysseus - when he sprang to the threshold (...

Compare Homer:

(51) Ἀλτά δ’ ἐπὶ μέγαν οὐδόν ἔχων βιόν ἦδε φαρέτρην (χ 2)
He sprang to the broad threshold with the bow and the quiver (...

Plato uses the verb ἄλλομαι in order to remain close to the original wording of Homer. Notice that he also employs the Homeric form οὐδόν, instead of Attic ὁδὸν.

Likewise, the case of Lg. 653ε τὰ μὲν ἄλλομενα καὶ σκιρτάντα - about the inclination of young beings to move around and cry out - has a poetic ring to it. This may be inferred from its occurrence in the hendiatys, and from the fact that σκιρτάω is a verb that is typically used in poetry.393

Next, consider Phdr. 255c:

(52) καὶ οἶον πνεῦμα ἦ τις ἔχω ἀπὸ λείων τε καὶ στερεῶν ἄλλομένη πάλιν ὦθεν ὄρμηθι φέρεται, οὗτο τὸ τοῦ κάλλους ρεῦμα πάλιν εἰς τὸν καλὸν διὰ τῶν ὁμίμων ἰόν, (…) (Pl. Phdr. 255c)
And just as the wind or an echo rebounds from smooth, hard surfaces and returns whence it came, so the stream of beauty passes back into the beautiful one through the eyes, (…).

The use of ἄλλομαι is in accordance with the exalted style of this simile (cf. also the use of the poetical word ὄμμα).

In the next case in Plato, Cra. 413b, ὅπερ τὰ ἔσχαμμένα ἄλλοσθαι (‘to jump over the trenches’), we are dealing with a proverbial expression originating from the language of athletics, which conveys the idea "going too far". It is a common phenomenon that proverbial expressions exhibit a somewhat conservative wording. Hence, the occurrence of ἄλλοσθαι here, instead of πηδάν, is not surprising.

The last two cases of ἄλλομαι in Plato are related somehow, if however in an unclear manner. Both cases concern a combination of the verbs θείν καὶ ἄλλοσθαι:

(53) Θείν δὲ καὶ ἄλλοσθαι καὶ τὰ τοῦ σώματος ἀπαντα ἔργα, οὗ τὰ μὲν ὄξεις καὶ ταχύ γιγνόμενα τὰ τοῦ καλοῦ ἐστίν, (…) (Pl. Chrm. 159c)
And with running and jumping and all the movements of the body, aren’t the ones that are performed briskly and quickly the admirable ones?

(54) [etymology of the word θάλλειν]
οὖν ὅπερ σοῦ μεμιήση τὸ ὀνόματι, συναρμόσας ἀπὸ τοῦ θείν καὶ ἄλλοσθαι τὸ ὄνομα (Pl. Cra. 414b)
Something of that sort the namegiver has reproduced in the name, which he compounded of θείν (run) ἄλλοσθαι (jump).

393 At Lg. 672c, likewise referring to young beings, Plato writes ἀτάκτως αὐτή πηδῶ. Again, the difference between ἄλλομαι and πηδῶ appears to be stylistic (cf. also the absence of the hendiatys in 672c), not semantic. In the same manner, our example from Herodotus (2.66.3) can be explained by stylistic factors. This may also be inferred from the appearance of (ὑπὲρ)θρόφσκα in the same sentence, a verb that almost exclusively occurs in poetry.
As regards their content, there is no relation between the two passages. In the context of the *Charmides*, Socrates is dealing with the question of whether certain activities like playing the lyre and wrestling are more admirable when performed quickly or quietly. Likewise, he asks whether running and jumping are considered more admirable when they are performed quickly. There is no reason to assume that ἀλλομαί is preferred to πηδάω due to the elevated tone of the passage. In fact, the subject-matter is quite colloquial: boxing, wrestling, etc. How then can the use of ἀλλομαί be explained? Although I did not encounter additional instances in the TLG, the reappearance of the identical combination θείν καὶ ἀλλεσθαι in the *Cratylos* suggests that we are dealing with a fixed expression that conveys the general idea of vehement movement. As in the example of *Cra.* 413b, in fixed expressions the occurrence of less colloquial words such as ἀλλομαί is not surprising.

To conclude our discussion of ἀλλομαί in Plato, it appears that the verb is used in marked contexts, either involving a higher, more poetic register (*Ion* 535b, *Lg.* 653e, *Phdr.* 255c), or involving fixed expressions (*Cra.* 413b, 414b, *Chrm.* 159c).

There is also some evidence that Xenophon used ἀλλομαί as a more elevated alternative for πηδάω.

Table 5: Occurrences of ἀλλομαί and πηδάω in the works of Xenophon:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ἀλλομαί (19)</th>
<th>πηδάω (50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hellenica</td>
<td>6 (40.0 %)</td>
<td>9 (60.0 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anabasis</td>
<td>4 (36.4 %)</td>
<td>7 (63.6 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyropaedia</td>
<td>4 (25.0 %)</td>
<td>12 (75.0 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Equitandi Ratione</td>
<td>3 (20.0 %)</td>
<td>12 (80.0 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Equitum Magistro</td>
<td>1 (25.0 %)</td>
<td>3 (75.0 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorabilia</td>
<td>1 (50.0 %)</td>
<td>1 (50.0 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynegeticus</td>
<td>0 (0.0 %)</td>
<td>6 (100 %)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be seen that, of Xenophon’s works, the *Hellenica* and the *Anabasis* have the highest ratios of ἀλλομαί as compared to πηδάω (40.0 % and 36.4 %). This may be due to the military subject-matter of these works. Especially in contexts of battles, Xenophon seems to be inclined to use ἀλλομαί: soldiers jumping on and off walls, horses, chariots, etc. The fact that Homer, too, mostly uses ἀλλομαί in this type of context may have influenced Xenophon’s usage of the verb. Through the use of ἀλλομαί, Xenophon’s descriptions of military events may have evoked an association with Homer’s battle scenes. By comparison, in the more technical works the occurrence of ἀλλομαί is less frequent (cf. *de Equitandi Ratione*, *de Equitum Magistro*, *Cynegeticus*).

To conclude, in this section I have argued that there is no semantic distinction between ἀλλομαί and πηδάω (cf. scenario (iii)). Both verbs are verbs of body motion, both verbs imply subject-affectedness. Distributional differences must be explained by stylistic or, in the case of Attic drama, by metrical factors. In section 5.2 below, the general class of motion verbs will be dealt with in relation to their voice marking.
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5.1.5 βούλομαι vs. ἔθέλω

One of the first issues that will pop up in any Greek linguist’s mind when thinking about the Greek middle voice is probably the contrast between middle βούλομαι and active ἔθέλω. Why do these verbs have different voice-markings, even though semantically they are closely related? There have been a number of studies describing the semantic differences between the verbs, e.g. Fox (1917), Rödiger (1917), Wifstrand (1942), Madden (1975). However, none of these studies deals with the difference in voice. The aim of this section, therefore, is to analyze the relation between the semantics of the two verbs and their respective voices.

In Homer, the meanings of the two verbs are clearly distinct (see LfgE\textsuperscript{394}). Βούλομαι, according to LfgE, means: "(...) eine spontane, intuit. Regung, die dem den Vorzug gibt, was sich als vorzüglicher anbietet (...) oder als das geringere Übel erscheint". The verb is often modified by πολύ or occurs with the comparative particle ἃ. In other words, βούλομαι can be rendered by ‘prefer’. As for ἔθέλω, LfgE observes that its meaning can be characterized as a spectrum between two extremes: "(1) Verlangen haben, etw. zu tun oder geschehen zu lassen (Impuls kommt in erster Linie vom Subj.) u. (2) bereit, willig sein, etw. zu tun oder geschehen zu lassen (Verhalten ist vor allem Reaktion auf von außen kommenden Impuls)". Thus, ἔθέλω can be rendered by (1) ‘wish, want’ or (2) ‘be willing’. Further, the meaning of βούλομαι ‘prefer’\textsuperscript{395} is more specific - since it implies the existence of an alternative choice - than that of ἔθέλω which has a more general, neutral sense ‘wish, want’. This semantic difference correlates with their frequencies in Homer: βούλομαι 38 occurrences, against ἔθέλω 292.

In Classical Greek, the boundary between βούλομαι and ἔθέλω has gradually become fuzzier in comparison to the situation in Homer. This development is mainly due to a broadening of the meaning of βούλομαι: the verb extended from the specific meaning ‘prefer’ to a more neutral meaning ‘wish, want’.\textsuperscript{396} As a consequence, ἔθέλω lost semantic ‘ground’ in favour of βούλομαι. This development is reflected in the frequencies of the verbs.

\textsuperscript{394} Under βούλομαι we find: "Den Bereich von ἔθελειν (s.d.) berührt β. nur an den untyp. Stt. A 67, δ 353, (…)."

\textsuperscript{395} Cf. Neuberger-Donath (1975), who renders Homeric βούλομαι by Latin malle.

\textsuperscript{396} Thus, βούλομαι did not lose its meaning ‘prefer’ in the Classical language. In many instances of βούλομαι an alternative choice is still implied. However, the verb met with competition from the (post-Homeric) middle verb προαιροῦμαι ‘prefer’.
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Table 6: Frequencies of 
\( \text{βούλομαι} \) and \( \text{ἐθέλῳ} \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>( \text{βούλομαι} )</th>
<th>( \text{ἐθέλῳ} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homer</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aeschylus</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophocles</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euripides</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herodotus</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aristophanes</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thucydides</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xenophon</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plato</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demosthenes</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The preponderance of \( \text{ἐθέλῳ} \) in the Attic tragedians must be taken as a feature of the poetic vocabulary. In the Attic prose-authors, \( \text{ἐθέλῳ} \) is almost entirely reduced to the meaning 'be willing' ('bereit sein, geneigt sein', cf. Rödiger 1917: 14, Wifstrand 1942: 17). In Herodotus and in poetry, \( \text{ἐθέλῳ} \) has partly preserved its broader use 'wish, intend', cf. Wifstrand (1942: 29) 'wünschen, beabsichtigen'. An example which neatly illustrates the semantic contrast between the two verbs is the following:

\[(55)\]  
\[\text{εἰ δὲ βούλει, σοὶ ἐγώ, ὡς τοῦτο οὕτως ἔχει, ἐθέλῳ λόγον λέξει (Pl. Grg. 522e)}\]  
If you like, I'm willing to give you an account showing that this is so.

In this example, \( \text{βούλει} \) represents the mental state of wishing that exists autonomously in the subject-referent. \( \text{ἐθέλῳ} \) denotes that the subject only acts in compliance with the will of the other person. This example also shows another important feature of the semantics of the two verbs. In this example, the subject-referent of \( \text{βούλει} \) is not in control to bring about the state of affairs that is wished for. \( \text{ἐθέλῳ} \), however, does imply that the subject is in control and also has the intention of carrying out the event designated by the infinitive.

A strong indication of \( \text{ἐθέλῳ} \)'s more restricted use in Classical Greek prose as compared to Homer is the fact that it has almost lost the possibility to be construed with an accusative plus infinitive, a construction which is fairly common in Homer. This means that \( \text{ἐθέλῳ} \) requires that the subject of the main clause is coreferential with the...

---

397 The data is drawn from the \( LfE [\text{Homer}], \text{Powell (1938)} [\text{Herodotus}], \text{Rödiger (1917)} [\text{others}] \).

398 It is a remarkable fact that in post-Classical Greek (\( \text{i)θέλῳ} \) regained the ground it had lost to \( \text{βούλομαι} \). In the New Testament θέλω is the general word for 'wish, want', cf. Modern Greek θέλω. Wifstrand (1942: 31-2) explains this fact by assuming that \( \text{ἐθέλῳ} \) preserved its original, more extensive, use in \textit{vernacular} Attic (as it had in Ionic), i.e., the temporary success of \( \text{βούλομαι} \) may have been restricted to the literary Attic language.

399 E.g., in Herodotus 2 times out of 188 occurrences (1.1 %), whereas \( \text{βούλομαι} \) occurs 16 times out of 256 with acc. c. inf. (6.3 %).
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(unexpressed) subject of the infinitive. In other words, ἔθέλω implies that the subject-referent performs the event himself. In the exceptional cases of ἔθέλω + acc. c. inf., although the subject of the main clause and the infinitival subject are not coreferential, the subject of the main clause may still be involved in the event expressed by the infinitive. E.g.:

(56) [Alexandros hears the story of the rape of Medea] δευτέρη δὲ λέγουσι γενεθεῖ μετά ταύτα Ἀλέξανδρον τὸν Πρίμου ἀκτικότα ταύτα ἔθελοσαί οἱ ἐκ τῆς Ἑλλάδος δὶ ἀρπαγῆς γενέσθαι γυναῖκα, (...) (Hdt. 1.3.1)

Then (so they say) in the second generation after this Alexandros son of Priam, having heard this tale, intended to win himself a wife out of Hellas by ravishment.

Though the subject of the subordinate clause is γυναῖκα, and therefore different from the subject in the superordinate clause (Ἀλέξανδρον), the state of affairs described in the subordinate clause clearly implies an action and a degree of control on the part of Alexandros. And, indeed, immediately after this, Herodotus describes Alexandros’ rape of Helen (1.3.2). In other words, ἔθελοσαί does not merely express - as βούλομαι would - Alexandros’ wish tout sec, but it implies the intention of the subject to realize the event denoted by the infinitive. Furthermore, the subject-referent of the main clause is involved through its role of beneficiary/recipient in the subordinate clause (οί).

400 The feature of control exercised by the matrix subject may also be relevant to the tendency of ἔθέλω to occur with divine subject-referents, e.g. Dem. 2.20: (...), ὃν οἱ τε θεοὶ θέλωσι καὶ ὑμεῖς βούλησθε. For a similar case of contrast, cf. Pl. Alc. 1 135d. Expressions like ἐὰν θεὸς (ἔθελη) (θεοὶ (ἔθελοσι) are frequently occurring formulas. Note that the alliteration may also have contributed to the success of these formulas.

401 Note that ἔθελοσαί οἱ (...) γενεθεῖ γυναῖκα is practically equivalent to ἔθελοσαί σχεῖν γυναῖκα with a coreferential subject.

402 The other instance of an acc. c. inf. from Herodotus is: (...) γίνεσαι μοι ἄναγκασσαταν ἐντέλλεσθαι τὰ θέλω μοι γενέσθαι τελευτῶν τῶν θιῶν (Hdt. 3.65.6) ('(...) necessity constrains me to charge you with what I want to be done for me as I now am dying'). While dying, Cambyses beseeches the Persian nobles never to let the empire devolve to the Medes. One may wonder whether θέλω implies control on the part of Cambyses, since he is dying. But, perhaps he - as Great King of the Persians - presents the situation as if he were still in control. Further, Cambyses is involved as a beneficiary (οι) in the embedded event. Besides the two instances I have discussed hitherto (Hdt. 1.3.1 [ex. (56)], 3.65.6), I am only aware of two additional instances of ἔθέλω + acc. c. inf. in Classical Greek (see also Wifstrand 1942: 24): Pl. Lg. 628c (a peculiar case where ἔθέλω appears to mean 'prefer', i.e. as an equivalent of βούλομαι), and Xen. Cyr. 3.1.43 (where the matrix subject has control). Another instance of ἔθέλω construed with an acc. plus inf. is cited by Fox (1917: 636): (...) ἐπεὶ αὐτῶν γε καὶ πόδας καὶ χείρας ἔθελοσαν ἀποτέμνεσθαι οἱ ἄνθρωποι, ἐὰν αὐτοῖς δοκη ἡ ἁρπῇ πονηρᾶ εἶναι (Pl. Lg. 205e) ('For men are prepared to have their own feet and hands cut off if they feel these belongings to be harmful'). Fox takes καὶ πόδας καὶ χεῖρας as accusative subject. However, as C.J. Ruijgh pointed out to me, it is better to take οἱ ἄνθρωποι as the subject of the infinitive ἀποτέμνεσθαι, which should be taken as a permissive passive ('let themselves be cut off as to feet and hands'). The accusative καὶ πόδας καὶ χεῖρας, then, is to be interpreted as an accusative of the affected body part.
The syntactico-semantic property of subject-coreferentiality approximates ἔθελω to the class of auxiliaries (e.g. δύναμι, μέλλω). It is well known that equi-subject constructions are the main diachronic source of grammaticalized auxiliaries such as tense-aspect-modality markers (see e.g. Givón 2001b: 79-80). It is therefore no surprise that the verb eventually developed into the future particle θα in Modern Greek, e.g. θα γράφω ‘I will be writing’. This indeclinable clitic particle finds its origin in the syntagm θέλω ήνα ‘I want that’, after a typical process of grammaticalization, viz. coalescence and attrition. In this manner, we can follow the development from ἔθελω as a verb of full semantic content in Homer to a content verb with auxiliary-like properties in Classical Greek, and eventually into a future marking clitic particle in Modern Greek. This diachronic pathway full verb > auxiliary > clitic is one that is typically found in language-change (see e.g. Hopper & Traugott 1993: 108).

My last remark on the semantics of βούλωμαι and ἔθελω concerns their use with inanimate subjects. The use of ἔθελω with an inanimate subject is more frequent than that of βούλωμαι, and there are considerable semantic differences between the two. In cases in which βούλωμαι has an inanimate subject, the subject typically refers to entities like μύθος, τέρας, and the infinitives are verbs like σημαίνειν, λέγειν. Though βούλωμαι here has an inanimate subject, the verb still implies a mental involvement of some kind, namely that of the human that wanted to convey something by means of the word or sign. Words can be identified metonymically with the human mind that produced them.

Now the use of ἔθελω with an inanimate subject is strikingly different. Unlike βούλωμαι, ἔθελω with inanimate subject does not involve the (implicit) presence of a mental entity. Rather than to human intentionality, ἔθελω seems to refer to the momentum that is inherent in the normal course of events.

(57) [Harpagus is deliberating whether he should kill Astyages' infant son]

εἰ δ’ ἔθελησε τοῦτον τελευτήσαντος ἐς τὴν θυγατέρα ταύτην ἄναβηναι ἢ τυραννίς (…) (Hdt. 1.109.4)

If after his death the sovereignty should pass to this daughter of his (…).

The construction ἔθελησε ταύτην ἄναβηναι is practically equivalent to a future ἄναβησηται. ἔθελω here contributes the idea of the force that is inherent in the natural course of events which brings about the transition of the tyranny. Here, as often, ἔθελω implies that,

403 That βούλωμαι, ἔθελω, μέλλω, and δύναμι are semantically closely related is also shown by the spread of the remarkable augment ή-. This augment was a product of reanalysis of the pair θέλω (from ἔθελω by aphaeresis) and the augmented form ήθελον. This novel augment ή- then spread through a process of analogy, e.g. θέλω : ήθελον = μέλλω : Χ (= ἠμέλλον). In the same fashion, ήδονάμην and ήβουλόμην were created (see Debrunner 1954).

404 ’ἔθελω’s development can be compared to that of English will, which originally meant ‘want’ (cf. be willing, and Dutch willen ‘want’), and now functions as a temporal auxiliary.

405 In cases where the infinitive is absent, such verbs can be understood. Then, βούλωμαι is usually translated by ‘mean’, e.g. Pl. Th. 156c: τί ήμιν βούλεται οὗτος ὁ μύθος; (…) Βούλεται γὰρ δὴ λέγειν ὥς (…) (‘Now what does this tale mean? (…) For what it means to say is that (…)’). To complicate matters, Herodotus appears to use ἔθελω in this type of context consistently (e.g. 2.13.3). However, Herodotus’ use of ἔθελω seems to be generally more extensive than that of the Attic authors. This is also shown by the frequency-figures above.
unless it is blocked by an unforeseen force, the course of events will lead to the occurrence of the event expressed by the infinitive. Consider further:

(58) οἰκότα μέν νυν βουλευομένοισι ἀνθρώποισι ὡς τὸ ἐπίταν ἔθελει γίνεσθαι εὖ
(Hdt. 8.60.γ).

Success tends to come most often to men that make reasonable designs.

In such contexts, ἔθελο can be rendered by 'be wont'. Here, once again, ἔθελο⁴⁰⁶ refers to the force that resides in the natural course of events.

Our main question now still remains, namely: what is the relation between the semantics of ἔθελο and βούλομαι and their respective voices? My claim is that there is indeed such a relation. In general, βούλομαι implies a higher degree of mental involvement than ἔθελο. The former verb implies a positive choice, by which the subject actively and autonomously prefers one alternative to another. The latter verb typically denotes an intention that emerges under the influence of the will of another person. In making up one’s mind (βούλομαι), a person is psychologically involved to a greater extent than in complying to someone’s request (ἔθελο). Also the special use of ἔθελο 'be wont', and its eventual development into a temporal auxiliary shows that the mental aspect of its lexical meaning may be somewhat backgrounded. Summarizing, the pair βούλομαι and ἔθελο can be regarded as a case of scenario (ii) above. Although in the lexical semantics of both verbs an element of mental affectedness is present, this inherent element is emphasized by means of the middle voice ending in the case of βούλομαι. As for ἔθελο, the active ending, being neutral as to subject-affectedness, does not contribute to the lexical meaning of the verb.

5.2 Active and Middle Body Motion Verbs

In this chapter, I have already discussed two active-middle pairs of body motion verbs, ὄρμαω - ὄρμαομαι and πηδάω - ἄλλομαι. For these two pairs, I have tried to pin down the factors that determine the distribution of the active and the middle member of the pair. In this section, the general class of body motion verbs will be addresses. What makes this class of verbs interesting for our purpose is the fact that it is relatively numerous, and that it consists of both active and middle verbs. These include activa tantum (e.g. βαίνω), media tantum (e.g. ἱκνέομαι), and oppositional middles (e.g. κινέομαι - κινέω). To all appearances, there is no pattern that explains why one verb is active and the other middle. However, in this section I will argue that a number of general tendencies can be discerned within this class of verbs. To this purpose, consider the following synoptical table of body motion verbs:⁴⁰⁷

---

⁴⁰⁶ Interestingly, the verb φιλάω seems to have undergone a similar semantic shift from a verb designating an affection ‘love’ to an auxiliary meaning ‘to be wont’. The change can be explained as follows: ‘she (always) wants/loves to speak the truth’ pragmatically implies ‘she is wont to speak the truth’.

⁴⁰⁷ An exhaustive inventory and discussion of the semantics of the media tantum of motion in Homer can be found in Boeder (1961-2: 33-63). For a study of the verbs of motion in Homer, I refer to Kurz (1966). Recall that the term translational motion refers to motion along one dimension in space; non-translational motion refers to motion that is neither translational, nor involves a change in body posture.
Table 7: Verbs of body motion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7: Verbs of body motion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Translational Motion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activae Tantum</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other activae</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Media Tantum</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other middles</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oppositional Middles</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activae Tantum</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other activae</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Media Tantum</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other middles</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oppositional Middles</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Translation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first tendency that can be observed in the table concerns the verbs of manner of motion: the majority of these verbs are actives, e.g. βαδίζω 'walk, διδώϑαι 'run'. There

---

408 According to Létoublon (1985: 166-77), the original meaning of στέξχω was 'marcher droit, en ligne', which bleached to 'go'. A similar semantic bleaching can be observed in βαίνω 'make a step' > 'go'; ἔρπω 'creep' > 'go' (in some dialects); νέομαι 'return' > 'go'; χορέω 'yield' > 'go'.

409 In section 5.0 it was argued that there was no discernable semantic distinction between νήχο and νήχομαι.

410 Ὄρμαδω designates motion at high speed (see 5.1.1). With some hesitation, I would regard it therefore as a manner of motion verb. Ὀρμόμοιμαι, on the other hand, is neutral with respect to the manner of motion.

411 Βαίνω originally meant 'make a step', and thus belonged to the class of manner of motion verbs. Βαδίζω can be considered the successor to βαίνω in Attic.

412 For the semantic distinction between present εἰμι ('centrifuge') and aorist ἡλθον ('centripète'), see Létoublon (1985: 27ff.).

413 In Homer, the middle variant ἰκάνομαι (probably formed after ἱκνέομαι) also occurs.
are a few exceptions (e.g. ἀλλοματαί). From this preponderance of actives, one may assume that this class of verbs involves a low degree of subject-affectedness. I would argue that this is indeed the case: verbs denoting manner of motion inherently involve a lower degree of subject-affectedness than the other verbs of body motion. Since these verbs focus on the manner in which the change of location takes place, the element of change (of location) undergone by the subject is backgrounded. Therefore, most manner of motion verbs are atelic (durative) as to their inherent lexical meaning.\footnote{414} They denote an event that is viewed as unchanging through time, without an inherent endpoint.\footnote{415} For example, the subject of an atelic event like τρέχω may be viewed as less affected than the subject of a verb like ἰκνέοματα, which denotes an event that focuses on the endpoint, and hence on the change of location which the subject undergoes.\footnote{416}

The second tendency that can be observed in the table involves the verbs denoting non-translational motion (mostly verbs denoting change in body posture, e.g. κονθόματα). Verbs designating non-translational motion tend to be oppositional middles. A priori, one can assume that these verbs involve a higher degree of subject-affectedness. This may be explained by the salience of the element of change (mostly change in body posture), that is inherent in the meaning of these verbs. This salient conception of change implies an increased subject-affectedness. It must be noted, furthermore, that the middle voice inflection, of course, has the additional advantage that it enables an opposition with an active causative verb (e.g. ἰσταματαί - ἰστημι). This factor alone, however, is not sufficient means to explain why the non-translational motion verbs show a tendency to be middles.

The two tendencies discussed above can be considered as manifestations of a semantic scale within the class of motion verbs.

(59) \textit{Motion verbs: Scale of Subject-affectedness}:

\begin{tabular}{ll}
LOW Subject-affectedness & HIGH Subject-affectedness \\
\hline
Manner of Motion & Neutral Translational Motion & Non-Translational Motion \\
\end{tabular}

\footnote{414} Clear exceptions are verbs of 'jumping': ἀλλοματαί, θρόματα, and πηδάω (see section 5.1.4).

\footnote{415} There is some evidence from other languages that telicity in the domain of body motion is connected to middle marking. For example, French s’en voler 'fly away' focuses on the fact that the flying entity departs from its initial stationary position, whereas voler refers to the fact of flying without specific reference to a change of state, nor to the beginning or endpoint (Kemmer 1993: 157). klaiman (1991: 58) makes a similar observation in relation to Fula, a Niger-Congo language with a middle voice system. Atelic verbs of physical motion are active tantum, e.g. war- 'come', yah- 'walk', dill- 'go', dogg- 'run', whereas telic verbs are media tantum, e.g. yott- 'arrive', ma’y- 'climb, mount'.

\footnote{416} The telic Aktionsart of ἰκνέοματα is also reflected in its morphology: the unmarked formation is found in the aorist stem (ἰκ-οματαί), whereas the present stem is marked (ἰκ-νέ-οματαί). Notice further that there are no contrastive middle verbs denoting manner of motion. This may explained thus: the active causative verbs would express that a person makes another person move in a certain manner (cf. active causative ἱστημι means \textit{to make} (mostly \textit{command}) somebody \textit{stand still/up}). However, in practice when a person X makes (commands) a person Y to move, the manner of this motion is generally irrelevant. Therefore, the concept of \textit{make somebody move in a certain manner} is not often lexicalized (e.g. **ἀλλοματαί 'make jump'). Rather, this meaning is expressed by a lexical causative verb (e.g. by means of ποταμαί).
At the left extreme of the scale, verbs tend to be active; at the right extreme, verbs tend to be middles. The manner-neutral translational verbs located in between do not exhibit a preference for either of the voices.

Although in this section we are not dealing with a *pair* of verbs, but with a whole class of semantically related verbs, it is interesting to see whether one of the scenarios applies to the distribution of the active and middle voice within the class of verbs of motion. It appears that scenario (ii) accounts for the distributional pattern best. That is to say, all verbs of motion - actives and middles alike - inherently involve a degree of subject-affectedness: in all cases, the subject changes location or body posture. However, the function of the middle voice marking is to *emphasize* the element of subject-affectedness. In sum, although both active τρέχω and middle καθίζομαι involve, to a certain degree, subject-affectedness, the middle ending of the latter makes the element of subject-affectedness more salient as compared to τρέχω.

5.3 Conclusion

In a number of semantic studies on (near-)synonymous active and middle pairs, we have seen that very often one can discern a semantic distinction between active and middle near-synonymous verbs, namely in the cases of ὅρμος - ὅρμομα, πειράω - πειράμα, βοῦλομαι - ἐθέλω. In these cases, the lexical semantics of the active and middle verb alike involve, to some extent, an element of subject-affectedness. The middle ending makes this inherent element conceptually more salient, whereas the active ending - being neutral as to subject-affectedness - does not contribute to the meaning of the verb (scenario (ii)). In two other cases, πολιτεύω - πολιτεύμα and ἓλλομαι - πηδάω, I argued that there is no discernable semantic distinction. In these cases, too, the lexical meaning of both the active and the middle verb involves an inherent element of subject-affectedness. The middle voice redundantly codes this inherent subject-affectedness (scenario (iii)).