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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:
- ἐθέλω - βούλομαι
- χαίρω - ἱδομαι
- εἰμι - ἔχομαι\(^{351}\)
- ἵκανον, ἵκο - ἱκνέομαι
- ἀκολουθέω - ἑπομαι\(^{352}\)
- πηδάω - ἄλλομαι
- σκοπέω - σκέπτομαι
- θαυμάζω - θεόμαι

Of the same verbal stem:
- ὁμάω (intr.) - ὄμασμαι
- πειράω - πειράμαι
- πολιτεύω - πολιτεύμαι

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’ expressions, 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 ἐθέλω (to which

---

\(^{351}\) Létoubion (1985: 71) observes a difference in inherent aspect between ἵναι and ἔχεσθαι, 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 ἀκολούθος ‘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: ἔχελω is active - therefore it lacks subject-affectedness, since it is clear that ἔχελω, 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 Πολιτεύομαι 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*.\textsuperscript{354}

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.\textsuperscript{355} An example of this type of subtle contrast is the active-middle pair ἰδεῖν - ἴδεσθαι, 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.\textsuperscript{356} 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-

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{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 συντάξα ‘maintain complete silence’ (from stative συντάξω ‘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 *capturarcapturar* ‘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).

\textsuperscript{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; Chantaine 1927; Schwyzer-Debrunner, II: 232-3):

\(\text{ἀκούω (prose/poetry)} - \text{ἀκούομαι (poetry)}\) 'hear'
\(\text{αύδάω (poetry)} - \text{αύδάομαι (poetry)}\) 'speak'
\(\text{βρέμω (poetry)} - \text{βρέμομαι (poetry)}\) 'roar'
\(\text{δικρύω (prose/poetry)} - \text{δικρύομαι (poetry)}\) 'cry'
\(\text{διάκα (prose/poetry)} - \text{διάκομαι (poetry)}\) 'pursue'
\(\text{διαρέω (poetry)} - \text{διαρέομαι (prose/poetry)}\) 'give, present'
\(\text{ιμειρω (esp. poetry)} - \text{ιμείρομαι (poetry/lon. prose)}\) 'desire'
\(\text{κλαίω (prose/poetry)} - \text{κλαίομαι (poetry)}\) 'lament'
\(\text{λάμπω (prose/poetry)} - \text{λάμπομαι (poetry)}\) 'shine'
\(\text{μέλπω (poetry)} - \text{μέλπομαι (poetry)}\) 'celebrate with song and dance'
\(\text{νήχω (poetry)} - \text{νήχομαι (poetry)}\) 'swim'
\(\text{νίω (poetry)} - \text{νίομαι/νίομαι (prose/poetry)}\) 'think'
\(\text{πέλαω (poetry)} - \text{πέλλομαι (poetry)}\) 'become, be'
\(\text{σπέρχω (prose/poetry)} - \text{σπέρχομαι (poetry)}\) 'haste'
\(\text{σπευδώ (prose/poetry)} - \text{σπεύδομαι (poetry)}\) 'speed'
\(\text{φημί (prose/poetry)} - \text{ἐφαστο (esp. poetry)}\) 'say'

Of these verbs, either one of the variants is restricted to poetry (mostly the middle variant, e.g. \(\text{ἀκούω - ἀκούομαι}\)), or both variants occur only in poetry (e.g. \(\text{αύδάω - αύδάομαι}\)). 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. \(\text{αύτάρ ἐγώ γε νηχόμενος τόδε λαίτμας διέτμαγον (η 276)}\)
But by swimming I made my way through this great gulf of the sea here (...).

b. \(\text{ἄλλα: ἀναχασσάμενος νήχον πάλιν (η 280)}\)
(... 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.\(^{358}\) However, this assumption does not imply that, in these verbs, the

\(^{357}\) Neuberger-Donath (1980) argues, against Schwyzer, that there is a semantic distinction between \(\text{πέλαω}\) and \(\text{πέλλομαι}\). This distinction, according to Neuberger-Donath, is in harmony with the general definition of the middle: \(\text{πέλαω}\) expresses a static event and is 'extroverted' (related to \(\text{εἰμί}\)), whereas \(\text{πέλλομαι}\) is dynamic and 'introverted' (related to \(\text{γίνομαι}\).

\(^{358}\) A different position is often taken by Boeder (1961-2). Wit regard to many of the active-middle pairs at issue, he claims that there is a semantic distinction. According to Boeder (p. 78), the middle \(\text{διαρέομαι}\) involves a degree of generosity on the part of the subject; as to \(\text{ὁιοι - ὁιομαι}\), the middle conveys a (more subjective) suspicion, whereas the active expresses "die Feststellung einer Meinung, fast eine Behauptung" (p. 130); \(\text{ιμείρομαι}\), against \(\text{ιμείρω}\), expresses the desire as a reaction to a stimulus (p. 131). Cf. further \(\text{διόκω-μαι}\) (p. 135-6); \(\text{πέλαω-μαι}\) (p. 163-8).
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**

άλίσκομαι - ἔλαλον 'be caught'
δέρκομαι - ἔδρακον 'look'
δύναμαι - ἔδυν 'enter, plunge into'
ίστομαι - ἵστην 'stand still, stand up'
πέρδομαι - ἐπάρθον 'break wind'
πτάρνομαι - ἐπιταρφ 'sneeze'
τρέφομαι - ἐπιφαν 'grow up'
φύσομαι - ἐφύν 'grow; become'

**Active present - passive aorist**
χαίρω - ἐχάρην '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 Αέμπαμ-ομαι can be semantically compared to φαίνομαι 'become visible', both denoting a spontaneous internal affection.

360 Other possible examples are: δίεμα - διό (X 251); ἐρεικόμενος (N 441) - ἣνίκε (P 595); ἐρέπομαι - ἡρίκον; ἐρέθυμαι - ἡρυγον; λάξυμαei [Hom.] - ἔλκαμον; μύκαμαι (χ 413) - ἤμυκον; κίνυμαι - έκπον [Hom.]. Note, further, that most of these verbs have an active perfectum, e.g. ἐάλωκα, δέδορκα, δέδυκα, ἔστηκα, πέρδορδα, 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 párdatē 'breaks wind' (corresponding with πέρδεται) and the uncertain Late Avestan active aorist form pārdētōn (V. 3.32) 'they broke wind' (corresponding with ἐπάρθον). In the remaining cases the present middle appears to be a Greek innovation. Thus, ἵστομαι and πτάρνομαι correspond respectively with the active presents Skt. tīṣhati 'stand', Lat. sistō 'stand', and Lat. sternēt 'sneeze'. As to δέρκομαι and φύσομαι, 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. ἐ-δρακον) and ābhit 'has become' (cf. ἔφυ). 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. ἔστηκα, ἔφυ), sigmatic aorists with causative meaning were created (e.g. ἔστηκα, ἔφυ); (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. ἰστήμι *'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 (e.g. 'I sat down') in opposition to the intransitive middle aorist εἰξόμην 'I sat down'), which, in turn, brought about that active present ἐξῄμι acquired a causative meaning 'make sit down', in addition to its original intransitive meaning 'sit down' (cf. Lat. sīdo 'sit
mental or physical affectedness. The active aorists (or active present, in the case of \(\chi\alpha\tau\rho\omega\)), 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 \(\alpha\pi\omicron\theta\nu\omicron\sigma\kappa\omega\ (\omicron\pi\omicron\) ‘be killed by’ as the suppletive passive of \(\kappa\tau\epsilon\iota\nu\omega\ ‘kill’ (see section 1.1.4). The subject-affectedness is an inherent property of the lexical meaning of \(\alpha\pi\omicron\theta\nu\omicron\sigma\kappa\omega\).

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 \(\acute{\alpha}k\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\ - \acute{\alpha}k\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\)), 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 (\(\acute{\alpha}l\acute{i}\acute{s}k\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\ - \acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omega\omicron\)) was explained by the pre-history of the Greek language.

---

362 We cannot exclude (nor prove) that a speaker of Ancient Greek experienced a subtle semantic nuance between the middle voice of \(\delta\epsilon\rho\kappa\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\) and the active voice of \(\epsilon\delta\rho\kappa\omicron\omicron\omicron\). 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: ὁρμάω - ὁρμάομαι (5.1.1), πειράω - πειράομαι (5.1.2), πολιτεύω - πολιτεύομαι (5.1.3).\(^{363}\) The two remaining pairs are from different stems: ἀλλομαί - πηδάω (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 ὁρμάω vs. ὁρμάομαι

The first near-synonymous pair to be discussed, consisting of an active intransitive and a middle intransitive verb, is ὁρμάω 'rush, set off (intr.)' and ὁρμάομαι 'set off'.\(^{364}\) 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' ἔχει ὀκύπτερος ὅρτο πέτεσθαι, ὡς ἴτ' ἀτ' αἰγὴν πέτρης περιμήκεος ἀρθείς ὁρμήσῃ πεδίου διώκειν ὅρνεοι ἄλλο (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) λαιψηρὰ δὲ γούνατ' ἐνώμα, θευγέμεναι τοῖ δ' ἀйμα διώκειν ὁρμήσθησαι (K 359)
(....) and he [Diomedes] pled his limbs swiftly in flight, and they speedily set out in pursuit.

'ὁρμήσῃ is the sigmatic aorist of ὁρμάω; ὁρμήσθςαν is the aorist of ὁρμάομαι. 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 ὁρμάομαι, there is a causative transitive active ὁρμάω '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, ὑπότε πύργος Ἀχαιῶν ἄλλος ἐπελθὼν
Τρώων ὀρμήσει καὶ ἀρξεῖαι πολέμιοι (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 μάλλον δαξίφρονι θυμὸν ὀρινεν·
ὸρμηθῇ δʼ 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 ὄρμαω (occurs 5x365) and the intransitive middle ὄρμάωμαι (occurs 55x, including aorists in -Θη-) designate setting off at a high speed. The distribution between intransitive ὄρμαω and ὄρμάωμαι 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/ ὀρμήθης and -ὁρμήσασαι/ -ὁρμήθησα occur.

In Classical Greek, however, it appears that there is a division of labour between the two verbs. Intransitive active ὄρμαω emphasizes the speed or force of the motion (i.e. motion of high intensity), whereas ὄρμαωμαι focusses 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 ὄρμαω with 'set off, rush', and "passive" (= middle intransitive) ὄρμάωμαι with 'set off'. In Herodotus, intransitive ὄρμαω 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 ὄρμαω 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 ὄρμαω in Herodotus may illustrate the point made:

(6) καὶ τοὺς Φοίνικας διακελευσαμένους ὀρμήσατι ἐκ' 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] προϊόντες δὲ οὗτοι 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] Ἡκουσας μὲν καὶ πρότερον μεν, ἔστε ὄρμῳμεν ἐπὶ τὴν 'Ελλάδα (…) (Hdt. 7.209.2)
I have told you already (…) when we were marching off to Hellas.

---

365 The places are Δ 335, N 64, Φ 265, Χ 194, μ 221. It is worthy of mention that the optative ὀρμήσει occurs three times. In addition, the transitive active ὄρμαω occurs 4 times in Homer.
(9) ἐκ μὲν δὴ τῆς ἀντίπς προσπλέειν οὐ κὼ σφι ἐδόκεε τὼνδε εἴνεκα, μή κως ἱδόντες οἱ "Ελληνες προσπλέοντες εἰς φυγὴν ὁρμήσειαν (...) (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 ὑμᾶς ὁρμήσε όρχην 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 καὶ στρατεύεσθαι).

(11) [Cyrus] πρὶν δὲ ἐξελαύνειν ὁρμήσαι τὸν στράτον, πέμψας κήρυκας ἐς τοὺς Ἰωνας ἐπειράτω σφεας ἀπὸ Κροῖσου 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) ἔστι δὲ ἄλλος λόγος (...) ἡς Ξέρξης ἐπέμψε κήρυκα ἐς "Ἀργος πρῶτερον ἡ περ ὁρμήσαι 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 ὁρμάω may also be illustrated by two examples from Thucydides, where ὁρμάω 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] χείμων δὲ ἢν κοι ὑπένειευν· ἢ κοι μᾶλλον ὁρμήσε (... (Th. 4.103.2)
The weather was bad and somewhat snowy, and for this reason he made the more haste (....).

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

Let us now turn to intransitive ὁρμάω. As I claimed above, its meaning is neutral as to speed and/or force. Instead, it focuses 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 ὁρμάω, 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 ὁρμάω, cf. Homeric ἤμαι '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 ὁρμάομαι is from ὁρμάω, the first three instances of ὁρμάομαι occurring in Herodotus may suffice:

(15) [Arion; passage in acc. plus inf.] ὁρμᾶσθαι μὲν νυν ἐκ Τάραμνος, (...) μισθώσασθαι πλοίον 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 ὁρμάω would not have been appropriate.

(16) [Croesus to Adrastus] (...) φύλακα παιδός σε τοῦ ἐμοῦ χρηίζω γενέσθαι ἐς άγρην ὁρμωμένου (...) (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 Λυδοῖς τάδε (…) ἀν’ ἣς ἄν ἡμέρης ὁρμήσθαι ἐκ Σαρδίων, ἀπὸ ταύτης ἡμερολογεύοντας τὸν λοιπὸν χρόνον ἐκατοστῇ ἡμέρῃ χρόσθαι 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 ὁρμάω - ὁρμάομαι, 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 ἐρρώμενον ὑπ' αὐτὸ καὶ ἀνδρῶν προσελαύνει, καὶ ὁ Κύρος ὡς εἶδεν ὁρμωμένος, ἐξορμεῖ, καὶ αὐτὸς πρῶτος ἡγεῖτο ταχεῖος, καὶ ὁ Κυαξάρης μέντοι ἐφεύγετο (…) (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, ὁρμάω can be adequately rendered by ‘rush (up to)’ or ‘march (against)’; ὁρμάομαι can be rendered by ‘start off, leave’.368 The question remains how

---

368 It is noteworthy that the semantic distinction between ὁρμάω and ὁρμάομαι appears to be a reflection of the semantics of the noun ὁρμή from which both verbs are derived. In LSJ, we find the following meanings of ὁρμή: (I) rapid motion forwards, onrush, onset, assault; (II) impulse to do a thing, effort; (III) setting onself in motion, start. Ὅρμη (I) corresponds with the ὁρμάω ‘rush; march against’; Ὅρμη (III) corresponds to the middle ὁρμάομαι ‘start off’; Ὅρμη (II) is of a more metaphorical nature, and corresponds - though I have not elaborated on this point - largely to the middle ὁρμάομαι. Incidentally, there seems to be an interesting distinction between ὁμαλλάττομαι and ὁρμάομαι. 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 ὄρμαω and middle ὀρμάωμαι 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 ὀρμάωμαι the subject-affectedness is conceptualized as stronger: the verb focusses on the moment in time at which the subject undergoes a change from a stationary position into motion. Thus, ὀρμάωμαι is a punctual verb. This change is cognitively more salient than that expressed by ὄρμαω, that focusses on the ongoing (and essentially unchanging) motion at high speed (atelic/durative Aktionsart). In sum, the middle inflection of ὀρμάωμαι 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 ὀρμάωμαι, 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 ἐπιειρημόμην and ἐπιειρήμην). 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 εὖ εἰδότος, οὐδὲ με πείσει (I 345)
[πειράομαι 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, ἀκαλλάττομαι 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 ὀρμάωμαι 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 ὀρμάωμαι 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./+ ὥς/+ ὂκως-clause\(^{369}\)) [6x]

(20) [Telemachus to suitors]
    πειρήσω ὥς κ’ ὡμμι κακάς ἐπὶ κήρας ἴῆλω (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; πειρῶ metrically equivalent].

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

(21) κέλεται δὲ ἐ θυμός ἀγήνωρ
    μῆλων πειρήσοντα καὶ ἐς πυκνόν δόμον ἐλθεῖν (M 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 πειράομαι shows five meaning variants:

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

This meaning is similar to (A2).

(22) [Trojans at the gates of the Greek camp]
    τοι δὲ κατ’ αὐτὰς
    ἰστάμενοι πειρᾶντο βίή βῆζοντες ἐσελθεῖν (M 341)
    And before they stood the foe, and tried to break them by force and enter in.

Also: Δ 5\(^{371}\), Ε 279 [abs.], Ζ 435 [abs.], Ν 457 [abs.], Φ 459 [πειρᾶ; πειρᾶς metr. equiv.], Χ 381 [abs.], δ 417 [sc. ἀλύξαι]

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

This meaning is similar to (A1).

\(^{369}\) It is hard to tell whether the ὥς/ὁκως-clause is a complement or an optional satellite. The fact that πειρᾶω does not occur with ἵνα nor ὄφα (introducing optional final clauses) may be an indication that the ὀκως-clause is complementary.

\(^{370}\) Probably, this meaning comes closest to what must have been the original meaning of πειρᾶω. The noun πειρᾶ (< *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’.

\(^{371}\) Δ 5: αὐτίκα ἐπειράτω Κρονίδης ἐρεθίζεμεν Ἡρην/ κερκομίοις ἐπέεσσι (‘And immediately the son of Cronos attempted to provoke Hera with mocking words’). Although no physical force is involved, πειράομαι here still appears to have an aggressive and hostile nuance.
(23) ἑαὶ, γεραίε, νεωτέροι, οὕτε με πείσεις (Ω 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]

γνώσετ' ἐπειθ' δόσον εἰμὶ θεῶν κάρτιστος ἀπάντων.
εἰ δ' ἀγε πειρήσασθε, θεοί, ἴνα εἴδετε πάντες (Θ 18)
[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 underlying the test is made explicit. In the example above, Zeus trusts that the trial of strength will reveal his superiority to the gods (γνώσετ' ἐπειθ' ... and ἴνα εἴδετε ...). Other examples are:

(25) [Achilles challenges Agamemnon to take away his gifts]

εἰ δ' ἀγε μὴν πείρησαι, ἴνα γνώσι καὶ οἴδε·
αἰσχρὰ τοι αἴμα κελαίνων ἐρωθήσει περὶ δουρί (Α 302)
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’ (ἴνα γνώσι καὶ οἴδε:) is made explicit in the next line (αἰσχρὰ ... περὶ δουρί).

(26) ὅφρ' ἑτὶ καὶ Τρώων πειρήσομαι ἄντιον ἔλθων,
αὐτὴ κ' ἐθέλωσ' ἐπὶ νησὶν ιαὐειν (Τ 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 αὐτὴ κ' ἐθέλωσ' ἐπὶ νησὶν ιαὐειν.372

(27) πάντη δ' ἀμφὶ φάλαγγας ἑπειράτο προσδιζών,
εἰ πάς οἱ εἰςεισαγὸν (Ν 806)
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 (εἰ + oblique optative) shows that this meaning is related to that of (M5) question.373 Other examples with explicit ‘test-result’ are K 444, Φ 225, Ψ 804, π 305, ω 216.

372 It is also possible to interpret the ei-clause, not as an indirect question ‘in order to see whether ...’, but as a conditional clause: ‘I will test the Trojans, if they will wish, etc.’.

373 In many cases, ei-clauses combined with πειράζομαι are ambiguous. They can be interpreted both as a 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 πειράματι conveys (albeit implicitly) this semantic nuance. E.g.:

(28) καὶ ἐκτελέσειεν ἀέθλους
πολλοὺς, τοὺς Φοίτηκες ἐκειρήσαντ' Ὀδυσσῆος (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 'Αχαιῶν], Β 193 [sc. υἱῶν 'Αχαιῶν], Ε 129 [sc. σεύ], Ε 220 [sc. Diomedes], Λ 386 [sc. μευ], Π 590 [abs.], Υ 349, Υ 352 [= T 70], Φ 580, Ψ 553, θ 120 [sc. one another], θ 126, θ 205 [sc. μευ], θ 213 [sc. everyone], θ 377 [abs.].

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

(29) ὁφρα μεθ' ύμιν
χειρῶν καὶ σθένεος πειρήσομαι, ἦ μοι ἐτ' ἐστιν
ίς, οἷς πάρος ἔσκεν ἐνὶ γναμπτοίσα μέλεσσιν,
ἲ ἤδη μοι ἀλεσσεν ἄλη τ' ἀκομείτη 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 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 δὲ κεν αὐτὸς ἐγὼ τοῦ τόξου πειρησάμην·
ei δὲ 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 (ei δὲ κεν ἐντανύσω).

Cf. also: Ο 359, Σ 601374, Τ 384, Ψ 432, Ψ 707=753=831, ζ 126 [πειρήσομαι ἦδὲ ἱδομαι; sc. the unknown people], θ 100, θ 145, θ 149 [sc. ἀέθλων], θ 184, σ 369, φ 135, φ 159 [cf. ζ 159], φ 180=268, φ 184 [sc. ἐντανύσαι?], φ 394, φ 410.

---

374 Ατ Σ 601 πειράματι seems to be construed with an accusative object: ὡς ὶτε τις τροχῶν ἐρρενεν ἐν παλάμησιν/ ἐξόμενος κεραμεῖς πειρήσεται, αἱ κε θείσιν. It is, however, preferable 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) ἐλθὼν τῶν δ’ ἀνδρῶν πειρήσωμαι, οἳ τινὲς εἰσίν (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) τοῖς δ’ ἄλλοις κοίλης ἔντοσθε φαρέτρης
keίτο, τῶν τάχ’ ἔμελλον Ἀχαιοί πειρήσεσθαι (φ 418)
But the others [arrows] were stored within the hollow quiver, those of which the Achaean were soon to get experience.

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

The different meanings of πειράω and πειράσματι 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 πειράω and πειράσματι in Homer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>πειράω [10x]</th>
<th>πειράσματι [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/ + ὁ/δος)</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 πειράω + gen. [animal] 'make an attempt on X by force' from πειράσματι + 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: μήλων (M 301 = ζ 134), whereas in the 23 instances of the middle verb with a genitive
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/+ ὦς/+ 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 πειράζομαι (+ inf./+ ὦς/+ 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’ αὐτάς/ ιστάμενοι πειρώντο βίη ῥήξαντες ἐσελθείν (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 πειράζομαι in Classical Greek in much detail, since the middle πειράζομαι has almost been completely generalized at the cost of the active verb (e.g. Herodotus: 3x πειράω vs. 88x πειράζομαι). 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 πειράζομαι. Thucydides consistently uses the middle form to express the meaning 'experience', where the element of cognition is apparent. On the other hand, he uses the active verb to express the cognition-neutral meanings: (i) 'seduce'; (ii) 'try something'; (iii) 'make an attempt on something by force'. Further, he uses the active πειράω with an infinitive-complement, always with the special nuance 'try to V by means of force'. Conversely, the middle πειράζομαι plus infinitive 'try to V' is neutral as to the element of force, for example, (...) τοὺς δὲ φιλίαν καὶ ξυμμαχίαν πειρώμεθα ποιεῖσθαι (Th. 6.34.1) ('(...) and to endeavour to make friendship with others').

δαμάστεται, ἢ κεν ἐγὼ τῶν ["Ektor! 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 ίδεαν (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., πειράζομεντος 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 πειράζομαι + 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 πειράζομαι + 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., ἄφικομενοι δὲ μηχανᾶς τε τῇ Ποτειδαίᾳ προσέφερον καὶ παντὶ τρόπῳ ἐπειρώντο
Clearly, in the case of ἀντιποιματιγ + inf. in the neutral meaning 'try to V', 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 ἀντιποιματιγ/ἀντιποιματιγ, the semantic distinction we have found between active ἀντιποιματιγ and middle ἀντιποιματιγ - the semantic element of cognition - can conveniently be connected with the general meaning of the active and middle voices. Middle ἀντιποιματιγ 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 πνυθάνομαι 'hear/learn that; ask' and αἰσθάνομαι 'perceive'. Conversely, the active ἀντιποιματιγ 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: ἐπολιτεύσα, ἐπολιτευσάμην, ἐπολιτεύθην383. However, the semantic distinction between active πολιτεύω (aor. ἐπολιτεύσα) and middle πολιτεύματι (aor. ἐπολιτευσάμην) 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:

| ἔλειν (Th. 2.58.1) ('And on their arrival they brought siege-engines to bear upon Potidaea, and tried in every way to take it'). |

382 The semantic distinction between ἀντιποιματιγ and ἀντιποιματιγ 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 ἀντιποιματιγ and ἀντιποιματιγ resembles the distinction between ἔιδειν and ἔιδεῖθαι as demonstrated by Bechert (1964): middle ἔιδεῖθαι 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 ἔρχομαι 'be ruled' (to ἔρχομαι + gen. 'rule'). Cf. also δημοκρατεύματι (aor. δημοκρατήθην) 'be governed democratically'.
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Table 2: The occurrence of πολιτεύω and πολιτεύομαι

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ACTIVE πολιτεύω (ἐπολιτεύεσα)</th>
<th>MIDDLE πολιτεύομαι (ἐπολιτευσάμην)</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 τοις μὲν μετὰ τῶν Ἀθηναίων Τορωναίως καταπεφευγόσι κήρυγμα ἐποιήσατο τὸν βουλόμενον ἐπὶ τὰ ἑαυτοῦ ἑσθελόντα ἀδεώς πολιτεύειν (...) (Th. 4.114.1)

(...) Brasidas made proclamation to the Toronaean 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) οintégrα τε πάντα ἐς τοῦναντίον ἔπραξαν καὶ ἄλλα ἔξω τοῦ πολέμου δοκοῦντα εἶναι κατὰ τὰς ἰδίας φιλοτιμίας καὶ ἱδία κέρδη κακῶς ἐς τε σφάς αὐτοῦς 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 ἔπραξαν 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 ἄξοναν τὴν πόλιν ἠμαρτήκασιν, ἀδίκως καὶ παρανόμως καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἄλλους πολιτεύομενοι καὶ πρὸς σφάς αὐτοῦς διακείμενοι (...), καὶ τοίχους ἔπραξαν (...). (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 ἐλέσθαι, οἳ τοὺς πατρίους νόμους συγγράψουσι, καθ’ οὕς 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) σιρεθέντες δὲ ἔφ’ ὅτε συγγράψαι νόμους, καθ’ οὕς σιρηνας πολιτεύομαι (Xen. HG 2.3.11)
(…); although chosen for the purpose of framing a constitution under which to conduct the government (…).

(38) ἔπειτα δὲ νόμους θείναι, καθ’ οὕς 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.\footnote{In the following example, Xenophon uses the active verb in a comparable context as Thucydides above (34):}

(39) [Alcibiades] (...) ἐπιβουλευθεῖς δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν ἐλαττον ἐκείνου δυναμένων μοχθηρότερα τε λεγόντων καὶ πρὸς τὸ αὐτῶν ἵδιον κέρδος πολιτευόντων, ἐκείνου ἄει τὸ κοινὸν σύζωντος (...) (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 wheal (…).

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-
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 πολιτεύομαι is to be classified as to middle usage type. Πολιτεύομαι 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 πανδεκτημίκος-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. ἐπι or ἐπι). 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 ιδέσθαι 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 ιδέσθαι 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 πολιτεύομαι, the verb that is often cited as the best example of the dynamic middle, it has been concluded above that the middle πολιτεύομαι appears to have

---

385 Also Wackernagel (1926-8: 127) and Margulies (1930: 117-8) doubt the existence of a distinct dynamic middle type.
the same meaning as the active ποιμενόω. 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 ποιμενόμαι then be classified as
a middle? What is the precise character of the affectedness of the subject? I would suggest
that ποιμενόμαι 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 ἄλλομαι and πηδάω

Unlike the verbs discussed above, ἄλλομαι and πηδάω 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 ἄλλομαι and πηδάω 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 ἄλλομαι and πηδάω

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ἄλλομαι</th>
<th>πηδάω</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, ἄλλομαι is far more frequent than πηδάω. We may
conclude that ἄλλομαι is the older word for ‘jump’ (probably already PIE, cf. Lat. salio
‘jump’; from the same yod-present *sh₁-ye/o-), while πηδάω 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 εἰέλουροι διαδόνοντες καὶ ὑπερθρόσκοντες τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἐσάλλονται
εξ τὸ 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 θρόσκω, ὑσπόω, and σκύτεω are not taken into
consideration here, since these verbs are clearly belong to the poetic vocabulary.

387 The formation πηδάω seems to be connected to the word *pēd-s ‘foot’.
Two comparable examples from Homer:

(44) χειρὸς ἀπὸ στιβαρῆς ἄλλων πηδήσαι ἄκοντα (Ξ 455)

(45) νευρὴ δὲ μέγ’ ἱαχέν, ἀλτὸ δ’ ὁϊστὸς ὀξυβελῆς, κοθ’ ὀμιλὸν ἐπιπτέσθαι μενεαινῶν (Δ 125)

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]

(47) [Orestes, in a frenzy:]

The present stem πηδά here expresses iterativity.

The aorist stem designates a single event.

Next, consider the following passage from Xenophon.

(48) [a raw horse] (...) ἀλλὰ ἂν μόνον ἵνα ὁπίσθεν τινα ἐπελθόντα, ἔλειται. ἐπειδὰν δὲ οὗτο διαπηθών ἐθισθῇ (...) (Xen. Eq. 8.4-5)

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

(49) πῆδημα κούφον ἐκ νεῶς ἀφῆλατο (A. Pers. 305)

He jumped a light leap from the ship.

Here, the action noun πῆδημα is used as an internal object to ἀφῆλατο. From these examples, it can be concluded that ἀλλομαι and πηδάω 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 πηδάω. In classical poetry
the situation is different. The tragedians prefer πηδάω, which probably reflects the contemporary Attic usage. In tragedy, ἄλλομαι 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 ἄλλομαι and πηδάω in Attic drama:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PRESENT</th>
<th>AORIST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἄλλομαι</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 ἄλλομαι in the aorist stem \(^{389}\), and πηδάω in the present stem. This tendency is not discernible in prose: in Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, Plato, and Demosthenes ἄλλομαι occurs 28 times, of which 21x present, and only 3x aorist. \(^{390}\) The distribution of πηδάω and ἡλάμην/ἀλόμην 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. ἐπήδησα, ἐπήδησας, ἐπήδησε, etc. \(^{391}\) In such cases, he will have to take recourse to the synonymous aorist forms of ἄλλομαι. This mechanism would explain why ἄλλομαι is virtually confined to the aorist stem. \(^{392}\)

Now let us turn to the use of the verbs in prose. In prose, the choice of ἄλλομαι appears to be a matter of register. "Ἀλλομαι, 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 ἄλλομαι in Plato. "Ἀλλομαι 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).

---

\(^{389}\) ἄλλομαι has two aorist forms: thematic ἡλαμήν and pseudo-sigmatic ἡλόμην. At A. Pers. 516 (see comm. Groeneboom), Eu. 372, and Soph. OT 1311 (see comm. Jebb), there is some doubt between imperfects ἡλάλοε- and thematic aorists ἡλόε-. 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. ἄνεπηδησε̊ς’).

\(^{392}\) 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 ἄλατο is morphologically unmarked, as opposed to yod-present ἄλλομαι (< *s(h)l-γο-). The two exceptional cases of ἄλλομαι in drama used in the present stem (both cases with iterative meaning) are found at Ar. Nu. 145 (Socrates asks Chaerephon about a flea: ὁπόσους ἄλλοιτο τοὺς ὀφθῆς πόθα ς 'how many of its own feet a flea could jump'), and at Lys. 83 (the Spartan girl Lampito asserts: γυμνόδομοι γὰρ καὶ ποτὶ πνεύμα ἄλλομαι ('At any rate I do gymnastics and jump heel-to-buttocks'). Aristophanes may have used the more elevated ἄλλομαι here to a comical effect.
Compare Homer:

(51) ἀλλατό δ' ἐπὶ μέγαν οὐδὸν ἔχων βιόν ἤδε φαρέτρην (χ 2)
He sprang to the broad threshold with the bow and the quiver (...).

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

Likewise, the case of Lg. 653ε τὰ μὲν ἄλλομενα καὶ σκιρτῶντα - 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 πνεύμα ἢ τις ἥχω ἀπὸ λείων τε καὶ στερεῶν ἄλλομένη πάλιν οἶθεν ὀρμηθῇ φέρεται, οὕτω τὸ τοῦ κάλλους θέμα πάλιν εἰς τὸν καλὸν διὰ τῶν ὀμμάτων ἰον, (...) (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 ἀλλοματι is in accordance with the exalted style of this simile (cf. also the use of the poetic word ὄμμα).

In the next case in Plato, Cra. 413b, ὅπερ τὰ ἔσχαμμενα 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 ἀλλοματι 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, οὐ τὰ μὲν ὀξέως καὶ ταχὺ γιγνόμενα τὰ τοῦ καλοῦ ἐστιν, (...) (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]
οἴνιπερ σὺν μεμιμητῷ τῷ ὀνόματι, συναιρμόσας 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 ἀπάκτως αὐ τῆς. Again, the difference between ἀλλοματι and πηδάω 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 ὑπερθροφίκῳ 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 ἄλλομαι 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 ἄλλομαι be explained? Although I did not encounter additional instances in the TLG, the reappearance of the identical combination θείν καὶ ἄλλεσθαι in the *Cratylus* 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 ἄλλομαι is not surprising.

To conclude our discussion of ἄλλομαι 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 ἄλλομαι as a more elevated alternative for πηδάω.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ἄλλομαι (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 ἄλλομαι 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 ἄλλομαι: soldiers jumping on and off walls, horses, chariots, etc. The fact that Homer, too, mostly uses ἄλλομαι in this type of context may have influenced Xenophon's usage of the verb. Through the use of ἄλλομαι, 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 ἄλλομαι 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 ἄλλομαι 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.
5.1.5 Βούλομαι vs. έθέλω

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 έθέλω. 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 LfgE394). Βούλομαι, according to LfgE, means: "(...) eine spontane, intuit. Regung, die dem den Vorzug gibt, was sich als vorzüglich anbietet (...) oder als das geringere Übel erscheint". The verb is often modified by πολύ or occurs with the comparative particle ἤ. In other words, Βούλομαι can be rendered by 'prefer'. As for έθέλω, 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.) und (2) bereit, willig sein, etw. zu tun oder geschehen zu lassen (Verhalten ist vor allem Reaktion auf von außen kommenden Impuls)". Thus, έθέλω can be rendered by (1) ‘wish, want’ or (2) ‘be willing’. Further, the meaning of Βούλομαι ‘prefer’395 is more specific - since it implies the existence of an alternative choice - than that of έθέλω which has a more general, neutral sense ‘wish, want’. This semantic difference correlates with their frequencies in Homer: Βούλομαι 38 occurrences, against έθέλω 292.

In Classical Greek, the boundary between Βούλομαι and έθέλω 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’.396 As a consequence, έθέλω lost semantic ‘ground’ in favour of Βούλομαι. This development is reflected in the frequencies of the verbs.

394 Under Βούλομαι we find: "Den Bereich von έθέλειν (s.d.) berührt β. nur an den untyp. Stt. A 67, δ 353, (...)".


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 προαιρούμαι ‘prefer’. 177
Table 6: Frequencies of βούλομαι and ἐθέλω

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>βούλομαι</th>
<th>ἐθέλω</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 ἐθέλω in the Attic tragedians must be taken as a feature of the poetic vocabulary. In the Attic prose-authors, ἐθέλω 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, ἐθέλω 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) εἰ δὲ βούλεται, σοὶ ἐγὼ, ὡς τοῦτο οὕτως ἔχει, ἐθέλω λόγον λέξει (Pl. Grg. 522e)

If you like, I’m willing to give you an account showing that this is so.

In this example, βούλεται represents the mental state of wishing that exists autonomously in the subject-referent. Ἐθέλω 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 βούλεται is not in control to bring about the state of affairs that is wished for. Ἐθέλω, 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 ἐθέλω’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 ἐθέλω requires that the subject of the main clause is coreferential with the

---

397 The data is drawn from the LfgE [Homer], Powell (1938) [Herodotus], Rödiger (1917) [others].

398 It is a remarkable fact that in post-Classical Greek (ἐ)θέλω regained the ground it had lost to 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 ἐθέλω preserved its original, more extensive, use in vernacular Attic (as it had in Ionic), i.e., the temporary success of βούλομαι may have been restricted to the literary Attic language.

399 E.g., in Herodotus 2 times out of 188 occurrences (1.1 %), whereas βούλομαι occurs 16 times out of 256 with acc. c. inf. (6.3 %).
(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 γενεθεί μετὰ ταῦτα Ἀλέξανδρον τὸν Πρίμον ἀκριβώς ταῦτα ἔθελοσι οἱ ἐκ τῆς Ἑλλάδος δι’ ἀρπαγής 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, ἔθελοσι does not merely express - as βοῦλομαι 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 (οἱ).
The syntactico-semantic property of subject-coreferentiality approximates ἐθέλω to the class of auxiliaries (e.g. δύναμαι, 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 ἵνα 'I want that', after a typical process of grammaticalization, viz. coalescence and attrition. In this manner, we can follow the development from ἐθέλω 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 βούλομαι and ἐθέλω concerns their use with inanimate subjects. The use of ἐθέλω with an inanimate subject is more frequent than that of βούλομαι, and there are considerable semantic differences between the two. In cases in which βούλομαι has an inanimate subject, the subject typically refers to entities like μούθος, τέρος, and the infinitives are verbs like σημαίνειν, λέγειν.405 Though βούλομαι 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 ἐθέλω with an inanimate subject is strikingly different. Unlike βούλομαι, ἐθέλω with inanimate subject does not involve the (implicit) presence of a mental entity. Rather than to human intentionality, ἐθέλω 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᾽ ἔθελησει τοῦτον τελευτήσαντος ἐς τὴν θυγατέρα ταύτην ἀναβηγάναι ἢ τυραννίς (...)
(Hdt. I.109.4)

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

The construction ἔθελησει ἀναβηγάναι is practically equivalent to a future ἀναβήσεσται. Ἐθέλω 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, ἐθέλω implies that,

403 That βούλομαι, ἐθέλω, μέλλω, and δύναμαι are semantically closely related is also shown by the spread of the remarkable augment ἴ. This augment was a product of reanalysis of the pair θέλω (from ἐθέλω by aphaeresis) and the augmented form θελόν. This novel augment ἴ then spread through a process of analogy, e.g. θελόν : θελέον = μέλλον : Χ (= ἱμέλλον). In the same fashion, ὑδνάψιν and ἡβουλύμην were created (see Debrunner 1954).

404 'Ἐθέλω'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, βούλομαι is usually translated by 'mean', e.g. Pl. Th. 156c: τί ἴμαν βούλεται σύντοσος ὁ μύθος; (...) Βούλεται γὰρ ἐν λέγειν ὡς (...) ('Now what does this tale mean? (...) For what it means to say is that (...)'). To complicate matters, Herodotus appears to use ἐθέλω in this type of context consistently (e.g. 2.13.3). However, Herodotus' use of ἐθέλω 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:

\[(58)\] \(\text{οἰκότα μὲν νυν βουλευομένοισι ἄνθρώποισι ὡς τὸ ἐπίταν ἔθελει γίνεσθαι εἵν (Hdt. 8.60.γ).}\]

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

In such contexts, ἔθελω can be rendered by ‘be wont’. Here, once again, ἔθελω\(^{406}\) 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 ἔθελω 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 ἔθελω. 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 (ἔθελω). Also the special use of ἔθελω ‘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 ἔθελω 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 ἔθελω, 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, ὀρμάω - ὀρμάομαι 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. ικνέομαι), 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>Translational Motion</th>
<th>Manner of Motion</th>
<th>Manner-neutral Motion</th>
<th>Non-Translation and Change in Body Posture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Active Tantum</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βαδίζω 'walk, proceed'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διδάξω 'run'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἔρομαι 'creep'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δόμα 'run'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διδάσκω (poetry) 'jump'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πατάω 'walk'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πηδάω 'jump'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πλέω 'sail, float'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>στέφχω 'march straightforward'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τρέχω 'run'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Other active         |                  |                       |                                          |
| νήχο (poetry) 'swim' |                  |                       |                                          |

| **Media Tantum**     |                  |                       |                                          |
| ἀλλομαί 'jump'       |                  |                       |                                          |
| κέπομαι 'fly'        |                  |                       |                                          |

| Other middle         |                  |                       |                                          |
| νήχομαι (poetry) 'swim' |               |                       |                                          |

| **Active Tantum**    |                  |                       |                                          |
| βαίνω 'go'          |                  |                       |                                          |
| βιέμαι (Hom.) 'come' |                  |                       |                                          |
| ειμί 'go' (or, ἠλθον 'I came') |       |                       |                                          |
| ἱκέω (Hom.) 'come, have come' |   |                       |                                          |
| ἱκέω (Hom.)         |                  |                       |                                          |
| νοτόπω 'return'     |                  |                       |                                          |
| χαρέω 'yield, go'   |                  |                       |                                          |

| **Media Tantum**     |                  |                       |                                          |
| ἔρχομαι 'go, come'  |                  |                       |                                          |
| ἱκέωμαι 'reach'     |                  |                       |                                          |
| νίκουμαι 'return (home), go' | |                       |                                          |
| οὔχομαι 'depart, be away' |     |                       |                                          |
| χάζομαι 'draw back'  |                  |                       |                                          |

| **Oppositional Middles** |                |                       |                                          |
| ἀπαλλακτεύουμαι 'depart' |              |                       |                                          |
| δοῦμαι 'enter, plunge into' |        |                       |                                          |
| ἵκουμαι 'stand still, stand up' |     |                       |                                          |
| κινοῦμαι 'move (intr.)'  |                  |                       |                                          |
| κομίζομαι 'travel'       |                  |                       |                                          |
| ὅρμουμαι 'start off (intr.)' |      |                       |                                          |
| ὄρνημαι (Hom.) 'arise'   |                  |                       |                                          |
| πορεύομαι 'go, walk'     |                  |                       |                                          |
| στελλομαι 'set out, journey' |       |                       |                                          |

| **Oppositional Middles** |                |                       |                                          |
| ἐρεύνομαι (Hom.) 'lean on' |            |                       |                                          |
| ἀλλομαί (Hom.) 'set down'  |                  |                       |                                          |
| κλίνουμαι 'lean, lie down' |                |                       |                                          |
| ὅργυγομαι 'stretch oneself out' |      |                       |                                          |
| στρέφομαι 'turn around (intr.)' |   |                       |                                          |
| τανύσομαι 'stretch oneself out' |        |                       |                                          |
| τείνομαι 'stretch oneself out'     |            |                       |                                          |
| τρέχομαι 'turn around (intr.)'    |                  |                       |                                          |

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, διδάσκω 'run'. There

---

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

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

410 Ὄρμαξ designates motion at high speed (see 5.1.1). With some hesitation, I would regard it therefore as a manner of motion verb. Ὄρμαξ, 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 ἠλθον ('centripète'), see Létoublon (1985: 27ff.).

413 In Homer, the middle variant ἰκάνομαι (probably formed after ἰκνέωμαι) also occurs.
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are a few exceptions (e.g. ἀλλομοι). 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.\textsuperscript{414} They denote an event that is viewed as unchanging through time, without an inherent endpoint.\textsuperscript{415} For example, the subject of an atelic event like τρέχω may be viewed as less affected than the subject of a verb like ἰκνέωμαι, which denotes an event that focusses on the endpoint, and hence on the change of location which the subject undergoes.\textsuperscript{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. κοσθιζομαι). 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. ἱστημαι - ἱστημι). 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:}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOW Subject-affectedness</th>
<th>HIGH Subject-affectedness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manner of Motion</td>
<td>Neutral Translational Motion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{414} Clear exceptions are verbs of ‘jumping’: ἀλλομαι, θρίψκω, and πηδάω (see section 5.1.4).

\textsuperscript{415} There is some evidence from other languages that telicity in the domain of body motion is connected to middle marking. For example, French \textit{s'en voler} ‘fly away’ focuses on the fact that the flying entity departs from its initial stationary position, whereas \textit{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'y- ‘climb, mount’.

\textsuperscript{416} The telic Aktionsart of ἰκνέωμαι is also reflected in its morphology: the unmarked formation is found in the aorist stem (ἰκ-ὀμαι), whereas the present stem is marked (ἰκ-νε-ομαι). 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 ἱστημαι means to make (mostly command) somebody 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 make somebody move in a certain manner is not often lexicalized (e.g. **ἀλλοι ‘make jump’). Rather, this meaning is expressed by a lexical causative verb (e.g. by means of ποτω).
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 ορμάω - ορμάωμαι, πειράω - πειράομαι, βούλομαι - έθέλω. 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 - πολιτεύομαι and άλλομαι - πιθάω, 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)).