UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM

UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

The Middle Voice in Ancient Greek. A study in Polysemy

Allan, R.J.

Publication date
2002

Link to publication

Citation for published version (APA):
Allan, R. J. (2002). *The Middle Voice in Ancient Greek. A study in Polysemy*. [Thesis, fully internal, Universiteit van Amsterdam].

General rights
It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations
If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, P.O. Box 19185, 1000 GD Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

UvA-DARE is a service provided by the library of the University of Amsterdam (https://dare.uva.nl)

Download date:18 Nov 2026

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 - ἥδομαι
εἶμι - ἔρχομαι[351]
ἱκάνω, ἵκω - ἱκνέομαι
ἀκολουθέω - ἕπομαι[352]
πηδάω - ἅλλομαι
σκοπέω - σκέπτομαι
θαυμάζω - θεάομαι

Of the same verbal stem:
ὁρμάω (intr.) - ὁρμάομαι
πειράω - πειράομαι
πολιτεύω - πολιτεύομαι

The first, unavoidable point that must be made is that absolute synonymy is a very rare phenomenon - if it exists at all (see e.g. Lyons 1996: 67-8, Cruse 2000: 156). In languages, it runs against the principle of economy to have two different expressions for only one meaning. The force of economy shows a strong tendency to maintain (or to achieve) a division of semantic (or pragmatic) labour between two 'synonymous' 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] Létoublon (1985: 71) observes a difference in inherent aspect between ἰέναι and ἔρχεσθαι, especially in the non-indicative moods. The former is unmarked as to inherent aspect, while the latter often has a durative or iterative value. How this distinction relates to their different voices I cannot exlain.

[352] Notice that ἀκολουθέω 'follow' is a denominative verb (from ἀκόλουθος 'follower, attendant'), cf. also σκοπέω from σκοπός 'watcher'. The active voice of these verbs may reflect their original stative meaning, which may be rendered by 'be a follower' and 'be a watcher' respectively.

I will return later). One cannot simply state: ἐθέλω *is active - therefore it lacks subject-affectedness*, since it is clear that ἐθέλω, like βούλομαι, implies an element of mental involvement on the part of the subject. The conclusion is that we have to consider other types of explanations for our 'synonymous' pairs.

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

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

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

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

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

[353] 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*.[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.[355] An example of this type of subtle contrast is the active-middle pair ἰδεῖν - ἰδέσθαι, 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.[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-

---

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

[355] Within the Greek verbal system, a comparable phenomenon is found in the perfects that are formed from inherently stative verbs, the so-called *intensive perfects* (see e.g. Rijksbaron 1994²: 36, Ruijgh 1996: 670). E.g., the perfect form σεσιώπηκα 'maintain complete silence' (from stative σιωπάω 'be silent') emphasizes the stative aspect that is already inherent in the lexical meaning of the verb. Maldonado (1999) describes a comparable phenomenon in relation to Spanish *se*. E.g., (i) *La maestra captó la voluntad de los alumnos* ('The teacher captured the student's good will') vs. *Es un maestro que se capta la voluntad de los alumnos* ('He is a teacher that captures [for himself] the student's good will'). The lexical semantics of *capturar* 'capture' inherently implies that the event is beneficial to the subject. The clitic *se* is used to *highlight* the benefit implied by the verb (see Maldonado 1999: 167-8).

[356] It can never be excluded that a speaker of Ancient Greek still felt a subtle semantic nuance (consciously or not) which cannot be detected anymore for lack of native speakers.

factors, and stylistic factors. There is a number of phenomena that might be explained in a this way.

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

ἀκούω (prose/poetry) - ἀκούομαι (poetry) 'hear'
αὐδάω (poetry) - αὐδάομαι (poetry) 'speak'
βρέμω (poetry) - βρέμομαι (poetry) 'roar'
δακρύω (prose/poetry) - δακρύομαι (poetry) 'cry'
διώκω (prose/poetry) - διώκομαι (poetry) 'pursue'
δωρέω (poetry) - δωρέομαι (prose/poetry) 'give, present'
ἰμείρω (esp. poetry) - ἰμείρομαι (poetry/Ion. prose) 'desire'
κλαίω (prose/poetry) - κλαίομαι (poetry) 'lament'
λάμπω (prose/poetry) - λάμπομαι (poetry) 'shine'
μέλπω (poetry) - μέλπομαι (poetry) 'celebrate with song and dance'
νήχω (poetry) - νήχομαι (poetry) 'swim'
ὀΐω (poetry) - ὀΐομαι/οἴομαι (prose/poetry) 'think'
πέλω (poetry) - πέλομαι (poetry) 'become, be'[357]
σπέρχω (prose/poetry) - σπέρχομαι (poetry) 'haste'
σπεύδω (prose/poetry) - σπεύδομαι (poetry) 'speed'
φημί (prose/poetry) - ἔφατο (esp. poetry) 'say'

Of these verbs, either one of the variants is restricted to poetry (mostly the middle variant, e.g. ἀκούω - ἀκούομαι), or both variants occur only in poetry (e.g. αὐδάω - αὐδάομαι). 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. αὐτὰρ ἐγώ γε
νηχόμενος τόδε λαῖτμα διέτμαγον (η 276)
But by swimming I made my way through this great gulf of the sea here (...).
b. ἀλλ' ἀναχασσάμενος **νῆχον** 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 πέλω and πέλομαι. This distinction, according to Neuberger-Donath, is in harmony with the general definition of the middle: πέλω expresses a *static* event and is 'extroverted' (related to εἰμί), whereas πέλομαι is *dynamic* and 'introverted' (related to γίγνομαι).

[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 δωρέομαι involves a degree of generosity on the part of the subject; as to ὀΐω - ὀΐομαι, the middle conveys a (more subjective) suspicion, whereas the active expresses "die Feststellung einer Meinung, fast eine Behauptung" (p. 130); ἰμείρομαι, against ἰμείρω, expresses the desire *as a reaction to a stimulus* (p. 131). Cf. further διώκω/-ομαι (p. 135-6); πέλω/-ομαι (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.[359] 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
ἁλίσκομαι - ἑάλων 'be caught'
δέρκομαι - ἔδρακον 'look'
δύομαι - ἔδυν 'enter, plunge into'
ἵσταμαι - ἔστην 'stand still, stand up'
πέρδομαι - ἔπαρδον 'break wind'
πτάρνυμαι - ἔπταρον 'sneeze'
τρέφομαι - ἔτραφον (Hom.) 'grow up'
φύομαι - ἔφυν 'grow; become'[360]

Active present - passive aorist
χαίρω - ἐχάρην 'enjoy'

The explanation of this remarkable active - middle pattern probably lies in the pre-history of Greek.[361] It is clear that the middle forms have a middle meaning. They all expres

---

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

[360] Other possible examples are: δίεμαι - δίον (X 251); ἐρεικόμενος (N 441) - ἤρικε (P 595); ἐρείπομαι - ἤριπον; ἐρεύγομαι - ἤρυγον; λάζομαι [Hom.] - ἔλλαβον; μυκάομαι (κ 413) - ἔμυκον; κίνυμαι - ἔκιον [Hom.]. Note, further, that most of these verbs have an active perfectum, e.g. ἑάλωκα, δέδορκα, δέδυκα, ἕστηκα, πέπορδα, 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 inhereted from PIE - unless one counts as evidence the Sanskrit middle *pardate* 'breaks wind' (corresponding with πέρδεται) and the uncertain Late Avestan active aorist form *pərədən* (V. 3.32) 'they broke wind' (corresponding with ἔπαρδον). In the remaining cases the present middle appears to be a Greek innovation. Thus, ἵσταμαι and πτάρνυμαι correspond respectively with the active presents Skt. *tíṣṭhati* 'stand', Lat. *sistō* 'stand', and Lat. *sternuō* 'sneeze'. As to δέρκομαι and φύομαι, these verbs probably did not have a present form in PIE, given that in Sanskrit only the aorist formations seem to be old: *dárśam* 'I see' (cf. (ἔ-)δρακον) and *ábhūt* '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. ἔστην, ἔτραφον), sigmatic aorists with causative meaning were created (e.g. ἔστησα, ἔθρεψα); (2) This led to the creation of corresponding causative active *present* formations (ἵστημι, τρέφω), or, alternatively, the already existing active formation acquired a causative meaning (e.g. ἵστημι *'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 εἷσα 'I made sit down' (in opposition to the intransitive middle aorist ἐζόμην 'I sat down'), which, in turn, brought about that active present ἵζω acquired a causative meaning 'make sit down', in addition to its original intransitive meaning 'sit down' (cf. Lat. *-sīdo* 'sit

mental or physical affectedness. The active aorists (or active present, in the case of χαίρω), however, do not seem to express a lower degree of affectedness.[362] 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 ἀποθνήσκω (ὑπό) 'be killed by' as the suppletive passive of κτείνω 'kill' (see section 1.1.4). The subject-affectedness is an inherent property of the lexical meaning of ἀποθνήσκω.

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 ἀκούω - ἀκούομαι), 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 (ἁλίσκομαι - ἑάλων) was explained by the pre-history of the Greek language.

---

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

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

5.1 Some Active and Middle 'Synonyms'

In the previous section three possible scenarios that might hold for active - middle 'synonymous' pairs were discussed. In this section, a number of case-studies will be presented. Of five of the active - middle pairs, I will try to analyze the factors that explain their distribution. These may be semantic factors, but also diachronical or stylistic factors. Three of the pairs concerned are built on the same lexical stem: ὁρμάω - ὁρμάομαι (5.1.1), πειράω - πειράομαι (5.1.2), πολιτεύω - πολιτεύομαι (5.1.3).[363] The two remaining pairs are from different stems: ἄλλομαι - 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' ὥς τ' ἴρηξ ὠκύπτερος ὦρτο πέτεσθαι,
ὅς ῥά τ' ἀπ' αἰγίλιπος πέτρης περιμήκεος ἀρθεὶς
ὁρμήσῃ πεδίοιο διώκειν ὄρνεον 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
φευγέμεναι· τοὶ δ' αἶψα διώκειν **ὡρμήθησαν** (K 359)
(...) and he [Diomedes] plied his limbs swiftly in flight, and they speedily set out in pursuit.

Ὁρμῆσῃ is the sigmatic aorist of ὁρμάω; ὡρμήθησαν 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 oldest/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, ὁππότε πύργος Ἀχαιῶν ἄλλος ἐπελθὼν
Τρώων **ὁρμήσειε** καὶ ἄρξειαν πολέμοιο (Δ 335)
(...) and they waited until some other detachment of the Achaeans should advance to set on the Trojans, and begin the battle.

(5) Πηνέλεῳ δὲ μάλιστα δαΐφρονι θυμὸν ὄρινεν·
ὡρμήθη δ' Ἀκάμαντος (Ξ 488)
[Acamas] (...) and beyond all did he stir the heart of battle-minded Peneleos. He rushed on Acamas.

It appears that, in Homer, both the intransitive active ὁρμάω (occurs 5x[365]) and the intransitive middle ὁρμάομαι (occurs 55x, including aorists in -θη-) designate *setting off at a high speed*. The distribution between intransitive ὁρμάω and ὁρμάομαι is not easily explained by metrical factors. Note, for instance, that in example (2) above the passive aorist ὁρμηθῇ would also have been possible. Furthermore, metrically equivalent forms such as -ὁρμήσας/ ὁρμηθείς and -ὁρμήσασα/ -ὁρμηθεῖσα occur.

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

(6) καὶ τοὺς Φοίνικας διακελευσαμένους **ὁρμῆσαι** ἐπ' αὐτάς (Hdt. 1.1.4)
(...) the Phoenicians heartened each other to the deed, and rushed to them.

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

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

(8) [Demaratus to the Persians] Ἤκουσας μὲν καὶ πρότερόν μευ, εὖτε **ὁρμῶμεν** ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα (...) (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, X 194, μ 221. It is worthy of mention that the optative ὁρμήσειε occurs three times. In addition, the *transitive* active ὁρμάω occurs 4 times in Homer.

(9) ἐκ μὲν δὴ τῆς ἀντίης προσπλέειν οὔ κώ σφι ἐδόκεε τῶνδε εἵνεκα, μή κως ἰδόντες οἱ Ἕλληνες προσπλέοντες ἐς 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 μέν νυν ἐς ὑμέας **ὥρμησε** ἀρχὴν ἡ ἵππος (...) (Hdt. 9.60.2)
If the cavalry would have rushed up to you first (...).

Twice, the verb is construed with an infinitive.[366] In both cases, we are dealing with armies marching (cf. ἐξελαύνειν and στρατεύεσθαι).

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

(12) ἔστι δὲ ἄλλος λόγος (...) ὡς Ξέρξης ἔπεμψε κήρυκα ἐς Ἄργος πρότερον ἢ περ **ὁρμῆσαι** 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.[367]

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 μάλιστα, thereby showing its gradable character. This would be impossible if the verb would merely mean 'set off, start'.

(13) [Brasidas] χειμὼν δὲ ἦν καὶ ὑπένειφεν· ᾗ καὶ μᾶλλον **ὥρμησε** (...) (Th. 4.103.2)
The weather was bad and somewhat snowy, and for this reason he made the more haste (...).

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

Let us now turn to intransitive ὁρμάομαι. As I claimed above, its meaning is neutral as to speed and/or force. Instead, it focusses on the *onset* of the motion. To support this claim - without going through all 67 instances in Herodotus - I would like to point out that it is highly significant that ὁρμάομαι, 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 ἵεμαι '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** μέν νυν ἐκ Τάραντος, (...), μισθώσασθαι πλοῖον ἀνδρῶν Κορινθίων (Hdt. 1.24.2)
He set off from Tarentum and (...) he hired a ship of men of Corinth.

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

(16) [Croesus to Adrastus] (...) φύλακα παιδός σε τοῦ ἐμοῦ χρηίζω γενέσθαι ἐς ἄγρην **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 τοῖσι Λυδοῖσι τάδε (...) ἀπ' ἧς ἂν ἡμέρης **ὁρμηθέωσι** ἐκ Σαρδίων, ἀπὸ ταύτης ἡμερολογέοντας τὸν λοιπὸν χρόνον ἑκατοστῇ ἡμέρῃ χρᾶσθαι τοῖσι χρηστηρίοισι (...) (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 ἐρρωμένων ἵππων τε καὶ ἀνδρῶν προσελαύνει. καὶ ὁ Κῦρος ὡς εἶδεν **ὁρμωμένους**, **ἐξορμᾷ**, καὶ αὐτὸς πρῶτος ἡγεῖτο ταχέως, καὶ ὁ Κυαξάρης μέντοι ἐφείπετο (...) (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*. 'Ορμή (I) corresponds with the ὁρμάω 'rush; march against'; ὁρμή (III) corresponds to the middle ὁρμάομαι 'start off'; ὁρμή (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 ἀπαλλάττομαι 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 ὁρμάω and middle ὁρμάομαι implies the affectedness of the subject, since in both cases the subject undergoes the effect of the action, viz. a change of location. However, in the case of ὁρμάομαι the subject-affectedness is conceptualized as stronger: the verb focusses on the moment in time at which the subject undergoes a change from a stationary position into motion. Thus, ὁρμάομαι is a punctual verb. This change is cognitively more salient than that expressed by ὁρμάω, that focusses on the ongoing (and essentially unchanging) motion at high speed (atelic/durative Aktionsart). In sum, the middle inflection of ὁρμάομαι highlights the relatively salient change undergone by the subject. As a consequence, scenario (ii) above is applicable: both verbs involve a degree of subject-affectedness, but in the case of middle ὁρμάομαι, the affectedness of the subject is emphasized.

5.1.2 πειράω vs. πειράομαι

I will continue now with a discussion of the pair πειράω - πειράομαι. In Homer, the active occurs 10 times, against 66 instances of the middle (including ἐπειρησάμην and ἐπειρήθην). 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) μή μευ **πειράτω** εὖ εἰδότος. οὐδέ με πείσει (I 345)
[πειράσθω metrically equivalent]
Let him not tempt me who know it well; he will not persuade me.

Cf. also: I 181.

---

from some starting point, the difference lies in the nature of the starting point and the goal of the movement. That is, ἀπαλλάττομαι seems to designate going away from a place where something has happened or something is done by the person who leaves (e.g. leave after battle), whereas ὁρμάομαι implies that the subject leaves with the intention of achieving a specific goal elsewhere (e.g leave to go to battle). This may explain why ὁρμάομαι has developed the metaphorical, psychological sense of 'be eager to, be minded to' (often in the perfect stem), which focusses on the intention of the subject while backgrounding the element of spatial motion.

A2. **try by force** (+ inf./+ ὡς/+ ὅπως-clause[369]) [6x]

(20) [Telemachus to suitors]
πειρήσω ὥς κ' ὔμμι κακὰς ἐπὶ κῆρας ἰήλω (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 δέ ἑ θυμὸς ἀγήνωρ
μήλων **πειρήσοντα** καὶ ἐς πυκινὸν 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./+ ὡς-clause/ellips) [8x]

This meaning is similar to (A2).

(22) [Trojans at the gates of the Greek camp]
τοὶ δὲ κατ' αὐτὰς
ἱστάμενοι **πειρῶντο** βίῃ ῥήξαντες ἐσελθεῖν (M 341)
And before them stood the foe, and tried to break them by force and enter in.

Also: Δ 5[371], E 279 [abs.], Z 435 [abs.], N 457 [abs.], Φ 459 [πειρᾷ; πειρᾷς metr. equiv.], X 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 ὡς/ὅπως-clause is a complement or an optional satellite. The fact that πειράω does not occur with ἵνα nor ὄφρα (introducing optional final clauses) may be an indication that the ὅπως-clause is complementary.

[370] Probably, this meaning comes closest to what must have been the original meaning of πειράω. The noun πεῖρα (< **per-yh₂*) 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: αὐτίκ' ἐπειρᾶτο Κρονίδης ἐρεθιζέμεν Ἥρην/ κερτομίοις 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) **πειρᾷ** ἐμεῖο, γεραιέ, νεωτέρου, οὐδέ 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' ἔπειθ' ὅσον εἰμὶ θεῶν κάρτιστος ἁπάντων.
εἰ δ' ἄγε **πειρήσασθε**, θεοί, ἵνα εἴδετε πάντες (Θ 18)
[sc. μευ?]
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' ἔπειθ' ... and ἵνα εἴδετε ...). Other examples are:

(25) [Achilles challenges Agamemnon to take away his gifts]
εἰ δ' ἄγε μὴν **πείρησαι**, ἵνα γνώωσι καὶ οἵδε·
αἶψά τοι αἷμα κελαινὸν ἐρωήσει περὶ δουρί (A 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' (ἵνα γνώωσι καὶ οἵδε·) is made explicit in the next line (αἶψα ... περὶ δουρί).

(26) ὄφρ' ἔτι καὶ Τρώων **πειρήσομαι** ἀντίον ἐλθών,
αἴ κ' ἐθέλωσ' ἐπὶ νηυσὶν ἰαύειν (T 70)
(...) so that I may go out against the Tojans and make trial of them yet again, whether they are minded to spend the night by the ships.

The question to be answered is αἴ κ' ἐθέλωσ' ἐπὶ νηυσὶν ἰαύειν.[372]

(27) πάντῃ δ' ἀμφὶ φάλαγγας **ἐπειρᾶτο** προποδίζων,
εἴ πώς οἱ εἴξειαν (N 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 εἰ-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, εἰ-clauses combined with πειράομαι 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 πειράομαι conveys (albeit implicitly) this semantic nuance. E.g.:

(28) καὶ ἐκτελέσειεν ἀέθλους
πολλούς, τοὺς Φαίηκες **ἐπειρήσαντ'** Ὀδυσῆος (θ 22-3)
[τοὺς: internal accusative]
(...) and that he might accomplish the many feats in which the Phaeacians made trial of Odysseus.

Cf. also: B 73 [sc. υἱῶν Ἀχαιῶν], B 193 [sc. υἱῶν Ἀχαιῶν], E 129 [sc. σευ], E 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.) [23x]

(29) ὄφρα μεθ' ὑμῖν
χειρῶν καὶ σθένεος **πειρήσομαι**, ἤ μοι ἔτ' ἔστιν
ἷς, οἵη πάρος ἔσκεν ἐνὶ γναμπτοῖσι μέλεσσιν,
ἦ ἤδη μοι ὄλεσσεν ἄλη τ' ἀκομιστίη 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 δέ κεν αὐτὸς ἐγὼ τοῦ τόξου **πειρησαίμην**·
εἰ δέ κεν ἐντανύσω διοϊστεύσω τε σιδήρου (φ 113)
And I too myself might make trial of that bow. If I shall string it and shoot an arrow through the iron (...).

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

Cf. also: O 359, Σ 601[374], T 384, Ψ 432, Ψ 707=753=831, ζ 126 [πειρήσομαι ἠδὲ ἴδωμαι; 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] At Σ 601 πειράομαι seems to be construed with an accusative object: ὡς ὅτε τις τροχὸν ἄρμενον ἐν παλάμῃσιν/ ἐζόμενος κεραμεὺς πειρήσεται, αἴ κε θέῃσιν. It is, however, preferrable to interpret the accusative as a thematic object in a proleptic construction or as an anacoluthon in which ἐν παλάμῃσιν ἔχων is to be understood.

M5. test by questioning (+ gen./ellips) [8x]

(31) ἐλθὼν τῶνδ' ἀνδρῶν **πειρήσομαι**, οἵ τινές εἰσιν (ι 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) τοὶ δ' ἄλλοι κοίλης ἔντοσθε φαρέτρης
κείατο, τῶν τάχ' ἔμελλον Ἀχαιοὶ **πειρήσεσθαι** (φ 418)
But the others [arrows] were stored within the hollow quiver, those of which the Achaeans were soon to get experience.

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

The different meanings of πειράω and πειράομαι 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* πειράομαι *in Homer*

	πειράω [10x]	πειράομαι [66x]
A3. **make an attempt on by force** (+ gen. [animal])	2	---
A2/M1. **try (mostly by force)** (+ inf/+ ὡς/+ ὅπως)	6	8
A1/M2. **make an attempt on by words** (+ gen. [human])	2	1
M3. **test** (mostly by force) (+ gen. [human])	---	24
M4. **try, test, investigate** (+ gen. [inanimate])	---	23
M5. **test by questioning**	---	8
M6. **experience**	---	2

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 πειράομαι + 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./+ ὡς/+ ὅπως/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 πειράομαι (+ inf./+ ὡς/+ ὅπως/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), τοὶ δὲ κατ' αὐτὰς/ ἱστάμενοι πειρῶντο βίῃ ῥήξαντες ἐσελθεῖν (M 341), the middle may express that the Greeks, as a result of the attack, know whether or not they are strong enough to break in. Furthermore, the availability of two variant forms, active and middle, to express the frequently occurring meaning 'try to' is obviously convenient for metrical purposes.

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

δαμάσσεται, ἦ κεν ἐγὼ τόν ["Εκτορι to be construed with ἀντιβίην] ('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: πᾶσαν ἰδέαν (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., πειράσαντες 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 πειράομαι + 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 πειράομαι + inf. is neutral with respect to the element of (military) force does not exclude the verb being used in a context in which force is involved. These cases resemble the use of the active form, e.g., ἀφικόμενοι δὲ μηχανάς τε τῇ Ποτειδαίᾳ προσέφερον καὶ παντὶ τρόπῳ ἐπειρῶντο

Clearly, in the case of πειράομαι + 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 πειράω/πειράομαι, the semantic distinction we have found between active πειράω and middle πειράομαι - the semantic element of *cognition* - can conveniently be connected with the general meaning of the active and middle voices. Middle πειράομαι 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 πυνθάνομαι 'hear/learn that; ask' and αἰσθάνομαι 'perceive'. Conversely, the active πειράω is neutral with respect to subject-affectedness.[382]

5.1.3 πολιτεύω vs. πολιτεύομαι

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' (I^2: 525). In the aorist stem, the three forms are, indeed, neatly distinguished: ἐπολίτευσα, ἐπολιτευσάμην, ἐπολιτεύθην[383]. However, the semantic distinction between active πολιτεύω (aor. ἐπολίτευσα) and middle πολιτεύομαι (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:

ἑλεῖν (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 πειράω and πειράομαι seems to be a reflection of the semantics of the noun πεῖρα 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 πεῖρα (I) corresponds roughly with the middle verb, while πεῖρα (II) corresponds with the active verb. Note further that the semantic distinction between πειράω and πειράομαι resembles the distinction between ἰδεῖν and ἰδέσθαι as demonstrated by Bechert (1964): middle ἰδέσθαι expresses that a lasting mental impression is made on the subject.

[383] Passive πολιτεύομαι may be compared to βασιλεύομαι 'be ruled by a king' (to βασιλεύω + gen. 'be king of') and ἄρχομαι 'be ruled' (to ἄρχω + gen. 'rule'). Cf. also δημοκρατέομαι (aor. ἐδημοκρατήθην) 'be governed democratically'.

Table 2: *The occurrence of* πολιτεύω *and* πολιτεύομαι

	ACTIVE πολιτεύω (ἐπολίτευσα)	MIDDLE πολιτεύομαι (ἐπολιτευσάμην)	PASSIVE πολιτεύομαι (ἐπολιτεύθην)
Xenophon	+	+	+
Thucydides	+	-	+
Others	-	+	+

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) (...) ὁ Βρασίδας τοῖς μὲν μετὰ τῶν Ἀθηναίων Τορωναίοις καταπεφευγόσι κήρυγμα ἐποιήσατο τὸν βούλομενον ἐπὶ τὰ ἑαυτοῦ ἐσελθόντα ἀδεῶς **πολιτεύειν** (...) (Th. 4.114.1)
(...) Brasidas made proclamation to the Toronaeans 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) οἱ δὲ ταῦτά τε πάντα ἐς τοὐναντίον ἔπραξαν καὶ ἄλλα ἔξω τοῦ πολέμου δοκοῦντα εἶναι κατὰ τὰς ἰδίας φιλοτιμίας καὶ ἴδια κέρδη κακῶς ἔς τε σφᾶς αὐτοὺς καὶ τοὺς συμμάχους **ἐπολίτευσαν** (...) (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 ἐπολίτευσαν 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 ἅπασαν τὴν πόλιν ἡμαρτήκασιν, ἀδίκως καὶ παρανόμως καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἄλλους **πολιτευόμενοι** καὶ πρὸς σφᾶς αὐτοὺς διακείμενοι (...) (Lys. 14.42)
(...) and they committed offences against the wole 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 ἑλέσθαι, οἳ τοὺς πατρίους νόμους συγγράψουσι, καθ' οὓς **πολιτεύσουσι** (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) αἱρεθέντες δὲ ἐφ' ᾧτε συγγράψαι νόμους, καθ' οὕστινας **πολιτεύσοιντο** (Xen. *HG* 2.3.11)
(...); although chosen for the purpose of framing a constitution under which to conduct the government (...).

(38) ἔπειτα δὲ νόμους θεῖναι, καθ' οὓς **πολιτεύσοιντο** (Xen. *HG* 5.3.25)
Secondly, they should draw up a constitution under which to conduct government.

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

(39) [Alcibiades] (...) ἐπιβουλευθεὶς δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν ἔλαττον ἐκείνου δυναμένων μοχθηρότερά τε λεγόντων καὶ πρὸς τὸ αὑτῶν ἴδιον κέρδος **πολιτευόντων**, ἐκείνου ἀεὶ τὸ κοινὸν αὔξοντος (...) (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-

[384] It can, however, not be excluded that the latter two examples must be interpreted as passives: 'according to which they would be governed'.

passive meaning) is that scenario (iii) above applies: both verbs imply subject-affectedness, and the active inflection is neutral wit 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*. Schwyzer-Debrunner (II: 232) describes the dynamic middle thus:

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

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

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

Indeed, Gildersleeve's sarcasm is justified if we consider Stahl's inventory. His enumeration of 'dynamic' middles constitutes quite a mixed bag. Consider, for example, παρέχεσθαι, στρατεύεσθαι, λαβέσθαι, πολιτεύεσθαι, ἕπεσθαι, ἰδέσθαι, and πειρᾶσθαι (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 a 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 ἐς). 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 ἕπομαι 'follow' can best be explained by the fact that the verb denotes a change of location (cf. the body motion middle). In addition, the middle form may express a passive element, considering that following implies that one responds to a more actively involved, initiating participant that leads the way. (iv) The use of ἰδέσθαι has been investigated thoroughly by Bechert (1964). He concludes that the middle form expresses that the perceived object leaves a strong impression on the subject (see also section 2.1.8). In other words, the middle endings of ἰδέσθαι have a fairly specific function, that is, to express that the subject is mentally affected. (vi) Above, the middle voice of πειρᾶσθαι 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 Marguliés (1930: 117-8) doubt the existence of a distinct dynamic middle type.

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

5.1.4 ἅλλομαι and πηδάω

Unlike the verbs discussed above, ἅλλομαι and πηδάω are not built on the same lexical stem.[386] 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 ἅλλομαι 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* ἅλλομαι *and* πηδάω

	ἅλλομαι	πηδάω
Homer	**58**	4
Aeschylus	**3**	1
Sophocles	4	**5**
Euripides	3	**20**
Herodotus	1	**6**
Thucydides	**1**	0
Aristophanes	8	**19**
Plato	6	**22**
Xenophon	19	**52**
Demosthenes	1	**14**

It can be observed that, in Homer, ἅλλομαι is far more frequent than πηδάω. We may conclude that ἅλλομαι is the older word for 'jump' (probably already PIE, cf. Lat. *salio* 'jump'; from the same yod-present *$*sh_2l$-ye/o-*), while πηδάω has become more frequent in Attic.[387]

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 αἰέλουροι διαδύνοντες καὶ ὑπερθρῴσκοντες τοὺς ἀνθρώπους **ἐσάλλονται** ἐς 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 θρῴσκω, ὀρούω, and σκιρτάω 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'.

(43) (...) ἢ βάτραχοι γενόμενοι ἐς τὰς λίμνας **ἐσπηδήσητε** (...) (Hdt. 4.132.3)
(...) or become frogs and jump into lakes (...)

Two comparable examples from Homer:

(44) χειρὸς ἄπο στιβαρῆς ἅλιον **πηδῆσαι** ἄκοντα (Ξ 455)
(...) from the stout hand the spear has not leapt in vain (...).

(45) νευρὴ δὲ μέγ' ἴαχεν, **ἅλτο** δ' ὀϊστὸς
ὀξυβελής, καθ' ὅμιλον ἐπιπτέσθαι μενεαίνων (Δ 125)
(...) and the string sang aloud, and the sharp arrow leapt, eager to wing its way through the throng.

In both instances, an inanimate object (spear and arrow, resp.) 'jumps' away.
The following two examples from Euripides refer to the same event.

(46) [Prologue: Electra tells how Orestes is terrorized by the Eumenids]
ποτὲ δὲ δεμνίων ἄπο
πηδᾷ δρομαῖος, πῶλος ὡς ὑπὸ ζυγοῦ (E. *Or.* 45)
(...) while at other times he leaps from the bedding and runs about like an unyoked colt.

The present stem πηδᾷ here expresses iterativity.

(47) [Orestes, in a frenzy:]
ποῖ ποῖ ποθ' **ἡλάμεσθα** δεμνίων ἄπο; (E. *Or.* 278)
Where ever have I leapt to from my bed?

The aorist stem designates a single event.
Next, consider the following passage from Xenophon.

(48) [a raw horse] (...) ἀλλ' ἢν μόνον ἴδῃ ὄπισθέν τινα ἐπελθόντα, **ἁλεῖται**. ἐπειδὰν δὲ οὕτω **διαπηδᾶν** ἐθισθῇ (...) (Xen. *Eq.* 8.4-5)
(...) for if he merely sees a man approaching behind him, he will leap. As soon as he has grown accustomed to leap in the way (...).

There does not appear to be a semantic motivation for first using ἅλλομαι and consequently πηδάω. The alternation between the two verbs is probably due to a striving for *variatio*.[388] Another example is

(49) **πήδημα** κοῦφον ἐκ νεὼς **ἀφήλατο** (A. *Pers.* 305)
He jumped a light leap from the ship.

Here, the action noun πήδημα is used as an internal object to ἀφήλατο. From these examples, it can be concluded that ἅλλομαι 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 ἅλλομαι, which may indicate the antiquity of the verb, as compared to πηδάω. In classical poetry

[388] A similar case can be found in Xen. *Eq.* 3.7 and *Eq. Mag.* 8.3.

the situation is different. The tragedians prefer πηδάω, which probably reflects the contemporary Attic usage. In tragedy, ἅλλομαι 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* ἅλλομαι *and* πηδάω *in Attic drama:*

	PRESENT	AORIST
ἅλλομαι	2	**16**
πηδάω	**34**	15

We can observe that the Attic dramatists exhibit a fairly clear tendency to use ἅλλομαι in the aorist stem[389], and πηδάω in the present stem. This tendency is not descernible in prose: in Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, Plato, and Demosthenes ἅλλομαι occurs 28 times, of which 21x present, and only 3x aorist.[390] The distribution of πηδάω and ἡλάμην/ἡλόμην 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 ἅλλομαι. This mechanism would explain why ἅλλομαι 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 ἅλλομαι appears to be a matter of register. Ἅλλομαι, 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 ἅλλομαι in Plato. Ἅλλομαι 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] Ἅλλομαι has two aorist forms: thematic ἡλόμην and pseudo-sigmatic ἡλάμην. At A. *Pers.* 516 (see comm. Groeneboom), *Eu.* 372, and Soph. *OT* 1311 (see comm. Jebb), there is some doubt between imperfects ἡλλο/ε- and thematic aorists ἡλο/ε-. 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. ἀνεπήδησ').

[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 ἅλτο is morphologically unmarked, as opposed to yod-present ἅλλομαι (< **s(h₂)l-yo-*). The two exceptional cases of ἅλλομαι 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 ἅλλοιτο τοὺς αὑτῆς πόδας 'how many of its own feet a flea could jump'), and at *Lys.* 83 (the Spartan girl Lampito asserts: γυμνάδδομαι γὰρ καὶ ποτὶ πυγὰν ἅλλομαι ('At any rate I do gymnastics and jump heel-to-buttocks'). Aristophanes may have used the more elevated ἅλλομαι here to a comical effect.

(50) (...) ἢ τὸν Ὀδυσσέα ὅταν ἐπὶ τὸν οὐδὸν **ἐφαλλόμενον** ᾄδῃς (...) (Pl. *Ion* 535b)
(...) either when you sing of Odysseus - when he sprang to the threshold (...)

Compare Homer:

(51) ἆλτο δ' ἐπὶ μέγαν οὐδὸν ἔχων βιὸν ἠδὲ φαρέτρην (χ 2)
He sprang to the broad threshold with the bow and the quiver (...).

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

Likewise, the case of *Lg.* 653e τὰ μὲν ἀλλόμενα 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 hendiadys, and from the fact that σκιρτάω is a verb that is typically used in poetry.[393]

Next, consider *Phdr.* 255c:

(52) καὶ οἷον πνεῦμα ἤ τις ἠχὼ ἀπὸ λείων τε καὶ στερεῶν **ἀλλομένη** πάλιν ὅθεν ὡρμήθη φέρεται, οὕτω τὸ τοῦ κάλλους ῥεῦμα πάλιν εἰς τὸν καλὸν διὰ τῶν ὀμμάτων ἰόν, (...) (Pl. *Phdr.* 255c)
And just as the wind or an echo rebounds from smooth, hard surfaces and returns whence it came, so the stream of beauty passes back into the beautiful one through the eyes, (...).

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

In the next case in Plato, *Cra.* 413b, ὑπὲρ τὰ ἐσκαμμένα ἄλλεσθαι ('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 ἄλλεσθαι here, instead of πηδᾶν, is not surprising.

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

(53) Θεῖν δὲ καὶ **ἄλλεσθαι** καὶ τὰ τοῦ σώματος ἅπαντα 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]
οἱόνπερ οὖν μεμίμηται τῷ ὀνόματι, συναρμόσας ἀπὸ τοῦ θεῖν καὶ **ἄλλεσθαι** τὸ ὄνομα (Pl. *Cra.* 414b)
Something of that sort the namegiver has reproduced in the name, which he compounded of θεῖν (run) ἄλλεσθαι (jump).

---

[393] At *Lg.* 672c, likewise referring to young beings, Plato writes ἀτάκτως αὖ πηδᾷ. Again, the difference between ἄλλομαι and πηδάω appears to be stylistic (cf. also the absence of the hendiadys 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 appearence of (ὑπερ)θρῴσκω 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 θεῖν 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:*

	ἄλλομαι (19)	πηδάω (50)
Hellenica	6 (40.0 %)	9 (60.0 %)
Anabasis	4 (36.4 %)	7 (63.6 %)
Cyropaedia	4 (25.0 %)	12 (75.0 %)
de Equitandi Ratione	3 (20.0 %)	12 (80.0 %)
de Equitum Magistro	1 (25.0 %)	3 (75.0 %)
Memorabilia	1 (50.0 %)	1 (50.0 %)
Cynegeticus	0 (0.0 %)	6 (100 %)

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. ἐθέλω

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 ἐθέλω. Why do these verbs have different voice-markings, even though semantically they are closely related? There have been a number of studies describing the semantic differences between the verbs, e.g. Fox (1917), Rödiger (1917), Wifstrand (1942), Madden (1975). However, none of these studies deals with the difference in voice. The aim of this section, therefore, is to analyze the relation between the semantics of the two verbs and their respective voices.

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

In Classical Greek, the boundary between βούλομαι and ἐθέλω 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, ἐθέλω 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 ἐθέλειν (s.d.) berührt β. nur an den untyp. Stt. A 67, δ 353, (...)".

[395] Cf. Neuberger-Donath (1975), who renders Homeric βούλομαι by Latin *malle*.

[396] Thus, βούλομαι did not lose its meaning 'prefer' in the Classical language. In many instances of βούλομαι an alternative choice is still implied. However, the verb met with competition from the (post-Homeric) middle verb προαιροῦμαι 'prefer'.

Table 6: *Frequencies of* βούλομαι *and* ἐθέλω[397]

	βούλομαι	ἐθέλω
Homer	38	**292**
Aeschylus	3	**68**
Sophocles	38	**102**
Euripides	170	**288**
Herodotus	**256**	188
Aristophanes	**193**	93
Thucydides	**369**	70
Xenophon	**788**	292
Plato	**976**	527
Demosthenes	**757**	269

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'.[398] An example which neatly illustrates the semantic contrast between the two verbs is the following:

(55) εἰ δὲ **βούλει**, σοὶ ἐγώ, ὡς τοῦτο οὕτως ἔχει, **ἐθέλω** λόγον λέξαι (Pl. *Grg.* 522e)
If you like, I'm willing to give you an account showing that this is so.

In this example, βούλει represents the mental state of wishing that exists autonomously in the subject-referent. 'Εθέλω 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 βούλει is not in control to bring about the state of affairs that is wished for. 'Εθέλω, 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.[399] 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, ἐθέλω implies that the subject-referent performs the event himself. In the exceptional cases of ἐθέλω + 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] δευτέρῃ δὲ λέγουσι γενεῇ μετὰ ταῦτα Ἀλέξανδρον τὸν Πριάμου ἀκηκοότα ταῦτα **ἐθελῆσαί** οἱ ἐκ τῆς Ἑλλάδος δι' ἁρπαγῆς 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.[400] And, indeed, immediately after this, Herodotus describes Alexandros' rape of Helen (1.3.2). In other words, ἐθελῆσαι does not merely express - as βούλομαι would - Alexandros' wish *tout sec*, but it implies the intention of the subject to realize the event denoted by the infinitive.[401] Furthermore, the subject-referent of the main clause is involved through its role of beneficiary/recipient in the subordinate clause (οἱ).[402]

---

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

[401] Note that ἐθελῆσαί οἱ (...) γενέσθαι γυναῖκα is practically equivalent to ἐθελῆσαι σχεῖν γυναῖκα with a coreferential subject.

[402] The other instance of an acc. c. inf. from Herodotus is: (...) γίνεταί μοι ἀναγκαιότατον ἐντέλλεσθαι τὰ θέλω μοι γενέσθαι τελευτῶν τὸν βίον (Hdt. 3.65.6) ('(...) necessity constrains me to charge you with what I want to be done for me as I now am dying'). While dying, Cambyses beseeches the Persian nobles never to let the empire devolve to the Medes. One may wonder whether θέλω implies control on the part of Cambyses, since he is dying. But, perhaps he - as Great King of the Persians - *presents* the situation as if he were still in control. Further, Cambyses is involved as a beneficiary (μοι) in the embedded event. Besides the two instances I have discussed hitherto (Hdt. 1.3.1 [ex. (56)], 3.65.6), I am only aware of two additional instances of ἐθέλω + acc. c. inf. in Classical Greek (see also Wifstrand 1942: 24): Pl. *Lg.* 628c (a peculiar case where ἐθέλω appears to mean 'prefer', i.e. as an equivalent of βούλομαι), and Xen. *Cyr.* 3.1.43 (where the matrix subject has control). Another instance of ἐθέλω construed with an acc. plus inf. is cited by Fox (1917: 636): (...) ἐπεὶ αὐτῶν γε καὶ πόδας καὶ χεῖρας ἐθέλουσιν ἀποτέμνεσθαι οἱ ἄνθρωποι, ἐὰν αὐτοῖς δοκῇ τὰ ἑαυτῶν πονηρὰ εἶναι (Pl. *Smp.* 205e) ('For men are prepared to have their own feet and hands cut off if they feel these belongings to be harmful'). Fox takes καὶ πόδας καὶ χεῖρας as accusative subject. However, as C.J. Ruijgh pointed out to me, it is better to take οἱ ἄνθρωποι as the subject of the infinitive ἀποτέμνεσθαι, which should be taken as a permissive passive ('to let themselves be cut off as to feet and hands'). The accusative καὶ πόδας καὶ χεῖρας, then, is to be interpreted as an accusative of the affected body part.

The syntactico-semantic property of subject-coreferentiality approximates ἐθέλω to the class of auxiliaries (e.g. δύναμαι, μέλλω[403]). 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).[404]

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 μῦθος, τέρας, 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' **ἐθελήσει** τούτου τελευτήσαντος ἐς τὴν θυγατέρα ταύτην ἀναβῆναι ἡ τυραννίς (...) (Hdt. 1.109.4)
If after his death the sovereignty should pass to this daughter of his (...).

The construction ἐθελήσει ἀναβῆναι is practically equivalent to a future ἀναβήσεται. 'Εθέλω 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 ἡ-. This augment was a product of reanalysis of the pair θέλω (from ἐθέλω by aphaeresis) and the augmented form ἤθελον. This novel augment ἡ- then spread through a process of analogy, e.g. θέλω : ἤθελον = μέλλω : X (= ἤμελλον). In the same fashion, ἠδυνάμην and ἠβουλόμην were created (see Debrunner 1954).

[404] 'Εθέλω'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. *Tht.* 156c: τί ἡμῖν βούλεται οὗτος ὁ μῦθος; (...) Βούλεται γὰρ δὴ 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) οἰκότα μέν νυν βουλευομένοισι ἀνθρώποισι ὡς τὸ ἐπίπαν ἐθέλει γίνεσθαι εὖ (Hdt. 8.60.γ).
Success tends to come most often to men that make reasonable designs.

In such contexts, ἐθέλω can be rendered by 'be wont'. Here, once again, ἐθέλω[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 ἐθέλω 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 ἐθέλω. 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 (ἐθέλω). Also the special use of ἐθέλω '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 ἐθέλω 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 ἐθέλω, 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, ὁρμάω - ὁρμάομαι and πηδάω - ἄλλομαι. For these two pairs, I have tried to pin down the factors that determine the distribution of the active and the middle member of the pair. In this section, the general class of body motion verbs will be addresses. What makes this class of verbs interesting for our purpose is the fact that it is relatively numerous, and that it consists of both active and middle verbs. These include *activa tantum* (e.g. βαίνω), *media tantum* (e.g. ἱκνέομαι), and *oppositional middles* (e.g. κινέομαι - κινέω). To all appearances, there is no pattern that explains why one verb is active and the other middle. However, in this section I will argue that a number of general tendencies can be discerned within this class of verbs. To this purpose, consider the following synoptical table of body motion verbs:[407]

---

[406] Interestingly, the verb φιλέω 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*

Translational Motion		**Non-Translational Motion and Change in Body Posture**
Manner of Motion	**Manner-neutral Motion**	
Activa Tantum βαδίζω 'walk, proceed' διδράσκω 'run' ἕρπω 'creep' θέω 'run' θρῴσκω (poetry) 'jump' νέω 'swim' πατέω 'walk' πηδάω 'jump' πλέω 'sail, float' στείχω 'march straightforward'[408] τρέχω 'run' **Other actives** νήχω (poetry) 'swim'[409] ὁρμάω 'rush (intr.)'[410]	**Activa Tantum** βαίνω 'go'[411] βλώσκω (Hom.) 'come' εἶμι 'go' (aor. ἦλθον 'I came')[412] ἥκω/ἵκω 'come, have come' ἱκάνω (Hom.)[413] νοστέω 'return' χωρέω 'yield, go'	**Activa Tantum** κύπτω 'bend forward, stoop' **Other actives** ἵζω (Hom./Ion.) 'sit down (intr.)'
Media Tantum ἄλλομαι 'jump' πέτομαι 'fly' **Other middles** νήχομαι (poetry) 'swim'	**Media Tantum** ἔρχομαι 'go, come' ἱκνέομαι 'reach' νέομαι 'return (home), go' οἴχομαι 'depart, be away' χάζομαι 'draw back' **Oppositional Middles** ἀπαλλάττομαι 'depart' δύομαι 'enter, plunge into' ἵσταμαι 'stand still, stand up' κινέομαι 'move (intr.)' κομίζομαι 'travel' ὁρμάομαι 'start off (intr.)' ὄρνυμαι (Hom.) 'arise' πορεύομαι 'go, walk' στέλλομαι 'set out, journey	**Oppositional Middles** ἐρείδομαι (Hom.) 'lean on' (καθ)ίζομαι 'sit down' ἵσταμαι 'stand still, stand up' κλίνομαι 'lean, lie down' ὀρέγνυμαι 'stretch oneself out' στρέφομαι 'turn around (intr.)' τανύομαι 'stretch oneself out' τείνομαι 'stretch oneself out' τρέπομαι '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, διδράσκω 'run'. There

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

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

[410] 'Ορμάω designates motion *at high speed* (see 5.1.1). With some hesitation, I would regard it therefore as a *manner* of motion verb. 'Ορμάομαι, 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 εἶμι ('centrifuge') and aorist ἦλθον ('centripète'), see Létoublon (1985: 27ff.).

[413] In Homer, the middle variant ἱκάνομαι (probably formed after ἱκνέομαι) also occurs.

are a few exceptions (e.g. ἄλλομαι). 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.[414] They denote an event that is viewed as unchanging through time, without an inherent endpoint.[415] For example, the subject of an atelic event like τρέχω may be viewed as less affected than the subject of a verb like ἱκνέομαι, which denotes an event that focusses on the endpoint, and hence on the change of location which the subject undergoes.[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. καθίζομαι). 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. ἵσταμαι - ἵστημι). 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) *Motion verbs: Scale of Subject-affectedness*:

LOW Subject-affectedness **HIGH Subject-affectedness**

<----------->

Manner of Motion < Neutral Translational Motion < Non-Translational Motion

---

[414] Clear exceptions are verbs of 'jumping': ἄλλομαι, θρώσκω, and πηδάω (see section 5.1.4).

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

[416] The telic Aktionsart of ἱκνέομαι is also reflected in its morphology: the unmarked formation is found in the aorist stem (ἱκ-όμην), whereas the present stem is marked (ἱκ-νέ-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 ἵστημι 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. **ἄλλω 'make jump'). Rather, this meaning is expressed by a lexical causative verb (e.g. by means of ποιέω).

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 ὁρμάω - ὁρμάομαι, πειράω - πειράομαι, βούλομαι - ἐθέλω. In these cases, the lexical semantics of the active and middle verb alike involve, to some extent, an element of subject-affectedness. The middle ending makes this inherent element conceptually more salient, whereas the active ending - being neutral as to subject-affectedness - does not contribute to the meaning of the verb (scenario (ii)). In two other cases, πολιτεύω - πολιτεύομαι and ἄλλομαι - πηδάω, I argued that there is no discernable semantic distinction. In these cases, too, the lexical meaning of both the active and the middle verb involves an inherent element of subject-affectedness. The middle voice redundantly codes this inherent subject-affectedness (scenario (iii)).