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Abstract

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

1.1 Attestations

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

τῶ ρ’ οί γ’ ὄψειοντες ἀυτῆς καὶ πολέμου / ἔγχει ἐρειδόμενοι κίον ὄθροι

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

In Classical Greek both participles and indicative forms are attested, e.g. Ε. Med. 93 δρασείουσαι, s. Ph. 1245 δρασείες, also an imperfect in Sophron (5th c. BC, Sicily) frg. 81.1 [Kaibel] ἐγὼν δὲ τύ καὶ πάλαι ὄψεον ‘I wanted/have been want-
In postclassical times the formation seems to have lost its productivity: later authors restrict the use of -σείε/-o-forms to the participle and largely to the same lexemes or semantic fields attested in classical times, as may be seen from the following table.  

---

1. Cf. Hsch. ὤψεον· ἔχειν· ἑξούσιον· ἐμφάνισιν· ἐξεδρασέων. “perieβ’λέποντο, ἰδεῖν ἐβούλοντο. See the appendix for a list of forms.

2. Cf. Wackernagel (1887: 142 f.).
It seems likely that this restriction is an Atticist phenomenon, as later authors imitated only those morphological forms (i.e. participles) and only those lexemes or semantically related verbs (as near-synonyms, antonyms etc.) that were attested in their canonized predecessors with some frequency. This does not preclude that a later author might have become creative and used a form not known from earlier literature—unless, of course, this impression is due to our limited data\(^3\)—, but the overall correspondence between classical and postclassical usage may be interpreted as showing that the desiderative had ceased to be productive by the 3rd c. BC and was perpetuated only as a literary marker in the forms known from the classical authors.\(^4\)

1.2 Earlier explanations

1.2.1 Wackernagel

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

\(^3\) E.g. cases without a clear model in classical literature such as \(γαμήσειε/\text{o}\) ‘wish to marry’ (Alciphron 1.6.2.6 -ω, Vitae Aesopi [Ferrari] 30.12 -οσα) and \(κατηγορήσειε/\text{o}\) ‘wish to accuse’ (Agath. 4.2 -οντες), which may be due to chance in transmission.

\(^4\) Probably already in the 5th c. the derivational rule for this rare formation had became ambiguous as shown by \(πολέμησειε/\text{o}\) on the one hand and transmitted \(\xiμβασειε/\text{o}\) (beside the conjecture \(\xiμβησειε/\text{o}\)) on the other hand in Thucydides: the former is to be related to the stem of the future \(\piολεμησε\)/\(\text{ο}\), while for the latter only a relation to the abstract noun (\(\sigmaύμ\)-)\(\text{ βάςες}\) seems viable as opposed to the future stem \(\text{βησε}/\text{o}\). Euripidean \(\phiεύξει\) (\(\text{HF}\) 628 οὐ γάρ \(\piεροτά\) σοῦ \(\phiεύξει\) \(\phiιλου\)) is ambiguous; note the fut. \(\phiεύξομαι\) (Hom.) and the abstract \(\phiεύξι\) in s. (\(\text{Ant.}\) 362 [Ilyr.]) beside \(\phiύξ\) (Hom. only \(\text{Il.}\) 10[1].31, 447; Nic.). Beside \(\piαραδοισει\) in Thucydides, Hesychius has \(\deltaοσίεν\) \(\δοτικώς\) \(\εχειν\) with the root vowel of the noun \(\deltaόσι\) (contrast the future \(\δώσω\)). As in the case of \(\xiμβασειε/\text{o}\), it may remain open whether one should correct \(\piαραδοισει\), as Wackernagel (1887: 143) proposes.

\(^5\) Cf. section 5 for a possible reason why participles are frequent in this formation.
a genitive object is indeed rare with verbs of seeing,\(^6\) the desiderative meaning of ὀψεῖοντες may be responsible for the genitive, marking partial or non-affectedness of the object as in the case of ὀρέγομαι 'stretch towards, reach out, take hold' with accusative of body-part vs. genitive of person and other verbs meaning 'aim at, try to reach' such as ἔπιμαίομαι 'strive after', ἔβαμαι 'desire', ἔλθο-μαι 'desire', ἔραμαι 'love, desire', ἔπειγω 'press for, be eager' etc., as pointed out by Chantraine (2013: 71 = 1953: 59 f.),\(^7\) who lists ὀψεῖοντες among these forms.

\(1.2.2\) Ehrlich, Schwyzer et al.

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

a) Ehrlich (1912: 97) compares Ved. Ḣ ‘search’, Av. aēšma- ‘wrath’, Gk. ὀμα ‘rush’ and explains the first element as going back to abstract nouns in -τι, i.e. ὀψεῖοντ- < *οτιτι + -ιοντ from *-ισοντ-, i.e. something like ‘rushing to the sight of’. The connection with Ḣ is difficult on formal grounds, since the PIE root was probably *h₂ei̯s (LIV\(^2\) 260, cf. Arm. ayc ‘visit, inspection’) and one would expect Gk. *-ισοντ-. Gk. ὀμα and Av. aēšma- probably belong to PIE *h₂eis₂- ‘invigorate, urge’ (Gk. *-ισοντ/οντ-) or a root *h₂ei̯s- (> Gk. *-ισοντ/οντ-).\(^9\) As in the case of Wackernagel’s explanation, there is no further evidence in Greek for such a grammaticalization of periphrastic constructions.

b) Schwyzer (1939: 789) takes -σίω to be an “expressive” form *-σειjo of *-σεjo, which in turn he interprets as an enlargement of the *-σε/o-future. Probably the future in *-σεjo/o- (Skt. -ṣa-, Lith. 1sg -siu) is an enlargement of the simple *-s-future parallel to its simple thematic variant *-σε/o,\(^10\) whereas a form *-σεjo/o- seems to be unparalleled. Another problem with this explanation is the gratuitous assumption of gemination.

c) Frequently, researchers try to connect the desiderative with both the future in -σε/o- and the “Doric” future in -σεε/o-\(^12\) according to Lindeman (1965),
the Greek desiderative and the “Doric” future continue a formation in *-sje/o-
comparable with the Vedic future forms in -syá- and the Lith. 1sG fut. of the
type busiù ‘I will be’. For Lindeman, Greek inherited desideratives going back
to *-sje/o- and to *-há/sje/o- after resonants beside futures in *-se/o- of the
type λείψω. The variants *-sje/o- and (*-há/sje/o- >) *-esje/o- were contaminated
to *-sesje/o- > *-seγe/o-, which yielded both the desiderative -σειε/ο- and the
“Doric” future -σέω by simplification of the geminate as in Hom. τελείω, τελέω,
Att. τελώ, from τέλος.13 The arbitrary hypothesis of a contamination of two
formations assumed ad hoc to be continued in Greek makes this explanation
rather unlikely. This is also true of Hollifield (1981), who assumes -σειε/ο- to stem
from *-se- + *-sje/o-. A similar explanation has recently been proposed by Willi
(2017: 458 fn. 106), who also takes the Greek desideratives to go back to forms in
*-sje/o-: after obstruent-final roots, desideratives in *-sje/o- would have become
indistinguishable from futures in *-se/o-, e.g. *dejkd-sje/o- > *deγe/ε/o- like *dejkd-
se/o- > deγε/ε/o-, which led to a remarking by analogy to roots with final resonant,
e.g. *men-esje/o- > *μενειε/ο- → deγειε/ε/o-. The Greek data are not favourable for
this approach, as the only possible instance of a desiderative of a root ending
in a resonant is Homeric κειε/ο- ‘wish to lie’ (16×), which, whatever its origin,
does not lend itself as a model for analogy as synchronically it consists of the
root κει- and the ablauting thematic vowel.14

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

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

13 Cf. Lejeune (1987: 132 f.).
14 The form may go back to a regular future *κεί̯-há/se/o- with the suffix *-há/se/o- in resonant-
final roots (i.e. the type μένω, fut. μενέω > μενώ), developing via *κεί̯-esε/o- to *κεδε/o- >
*κεδο/ε/o-, spelt κεδειε/ο-.15
15 “Es kann nach attischen lautgesetzen auf εἰ (βασιλειος), auf εἴ (βραδεία), εί (τέλειος) und
natürlich auch auf εἴ zurückgeführt werden.”
16 Cf. Schwyzer (1939: 728).
inal alternation between presents in -είω beside aorists in -ευσ(α) derived from nouns in -εύς,\footnote{Cf. Minon (2007: 396 f.). Another instance may be attested in Dodona (Dor., ca. 400 BC) μαστεύω from μαστέω ‘search’ (‘Ε ἄλλαν μαστεῖα ‘Should he look for a different wife?’), cf. Lhôte (2006: no. 29).} in forms such as λατρεύμενον, σταθμείον, καταραίων, φυγαδεύναι, φυγαδεύσατε, and πολιτειομέναι. In the first case, the noun λατρεύς ‘servant’ is attested only from the 2nd c. onward (Lyc.), the only older form being λάτρις (Thgn. 302+). This shows the productivity of the formation in -είω : -ευσ(α), which has become independent of the existence of a corresponding noun in -εύς. Likewise, there is no *πολιτεύς from which to derive πολιτειομέναι, only πολίτης, and φυγάς, but no **φυγαδεύς, etc.

3 Nouns in -εύς\footnote{Fordiscussion of the origin of nounsin -ευ-, which is not treated here, cf. recently Meissner (2017).}

Since the formal relation between nouns in -εύς and presents in -είω is well established, it is tempting to pursue the hypothesis that the desideratives in -σεύς/- are denominals based on nouns in *-s-eus. As the following discussion will show, however, both the derivation of desideratives from nouns in -εύς and the assumption of a connection of the subgroup in -σεύς with a verbal stem are problematic. The latter type is already attested in Mycenaean, and in the first edition of \textit{Documents} Ventris & Chadwick (1953: 94) interpreted it as based on the future stem, a view they changed in the second edition where they speak more cautiously of “verbal stems with a -s-suffix”.\footnote{Ventris & Chadwick (1973: 100), cf. also Ventris & Chadwick (1956: 100), Kerschensteiner (1955: 69 with fn. 56): “offenbar von s-Futur/Aoriststämmen gebildet”.}

| Myc. form       | Interpretation/ Verb/stem |
|-----------------|---------------------------|
| A-re-ke-se-u     | Ἀλεξέυς (Argos 303 BC)\footnote{CEG II 816, 9.} ἀλέξω ‘ward off’ (cf. Ved. rákṣati) |
| A-we-ke-se-u     | *Ἀφεξέυς ἀφέξω, αὐξάνω ‘grow’ (cf. Ved. ukṣant-) |
| De-ke-se-u       | Δεξέυς (Argos 4th/3rd c. BC) δέξομαι ‘get’ |
As a further argument for this derivation, one could point out that both in Mycenaean and Alphabetic Greek nouns in -eus may be derived from verbal stems, although this is apparently much less often the case than the productive denominal pattern of the type χαλκός ‘copper’, χαλκεύς ‘smith’, χαλκεύω ‘forge’, cf. e.g. in Alphabetic Greek forms such as:

1. στιγεύς ‘tattooer’ (Hdt. 7.35): στίζω ‘to tattoo’.
2. πνῐγεύς ‘damper, extinguisher, cover of a stove’ (Ar. Nu. 96+): πνῑγῆαι ‘to choke’.
3. ψῠγεύς ‘cooler (for wine)’ (=ψυκτήρ, Alex. 64 [4th c. BC], Euphro 3 [3rd c. BC]): ψῡγῆαι ‘to cool’.
4. σκαλεύς ‘hoer’ (X. Oec. 17.12, 15): σκάλλω ‘to stir up, hoe’.
5. πλῑνεύς ‘clothes-cleaner’ (=πλύντης, IG 2.1327, Poll. 7.38): πλύνω ‘to wash’.
6. ἀλειφεύς ‘anointer’ (imp., Priene): ἀλείφω ‘to anoint’.

In Mycenaean a similar pattern is found in:

1. pe-re-ke-u /plekeus/ ‘weaver’: πλέκω ‘to weave’.

---

21 On the probably original meaning ‘receive’ preserved in the personal name, cf. García Ramón (2017), see fn. 33.
22 Cf. Perpillou (1973: 354).
23 Hdt. 7.35 ἤδη δὲ ἤκουσα ὡς καὶ στιγέας ἅμα τούτοις ἀπέπεμψε στίξοντας τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον. “I have even heard that he sent branders with them to brand the Hellespont”; perhaps an ad hoc formation beside the verb στίζω.
24 This is the only form with ἕ, cf. against this πνῑγα and πνῑγας, so probably it is derived from the aorist stem πνῑγαναι.
25 Parallel to the case of πνῑγεύς, the short vowel (ῦ) is attested only in the aorist ψῡγῆαι (Ar. Nu. 151).
26 No other nominal forms are attested.
27 Leukart (1994: 246) takes all these forms to be personal names from terms for professionals (miller, weaver, etc.) and nicknames (Ἐπειγεύς).
– pe-ke-u /pekeus/ : πέκω ‘to comb’ or /sperkteus/ : σπέρχωμαι ‘to strive’.
– pe-ke-u /pekweus/ ‘cook, chef’ : πέττω/πέσσω ‘to cook’.
– e-pe-ke-u /Epigeus/ ‘one who urges on, impels’ : ἐπείγω ‘to urge on, impel’, Alph.-Gk. Ἐπειγεύς.

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

aorist/future/desiderative -s- → noun in -s-eu- → nominal present in -s-eu-je/o- → -s-ei/o-

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

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

28 Cf. Szemerényi (1957: 164).
29 In Homer a Myrmidon, son of Agacles, slain by Hector, II. 16.571.
30 Similarly, Leukart (1994: 227 fn. 251) assumes that personal names with ἀλξ- as first member, such as A-ko-so-ta / Alksoitais/ ‘der das (schlimme) Geschick abwehrt’, A-ka-sa-no / alkso-nor/ ‘der die (feindlichen) Männer abwehrt’, continue the desiderative *alk-s-. Beside A-we-ke-se-u we find the simple verbal root in Au-ke-wa / Augew(w)as/ (probably a short form of a compound such as */Augewastus/); note also [..]-ke-se-ra-wo (KN As 1516), behind which a name /Aukselawos/ may hide. This type was later contaminated with τερψίμβρο-τος-type compounds, e.g. ἀλξίκακος instead of expected *alekse-kako. De-ke-se-u may similarly go back to the desiderative/future stem *deks- of ἔδεκαμαι or simply be an analogical formation following the model of *alekse- and *aakse-, where the desiderative/future stem is inherited (cf. Ved. raksati, uksant-). In both cases, it is likely to be a short form of a compound, e.g. [de]-ke-se-ra-wo / Dekselawos/, cf. Δεξιλάος, if we read KN As 1516 this way.
are likely to be the result of a shortening of corresponding longer forms, mostly compounds, even though such compounds may not be attested in early times for all such personal names, cf.31

- a-re-ke-se-u : Ἀλεξίκακος (Athens, 188/7 AD), Ἀλεξίμπροτος (3x)32
- a-we-ke-se-u : Ἀὐξίζης (Delos, 218 BC), frequent Ἀὐξησίτης, Ἀὐξιτύχη (3rd c. AD), cf. also adj. ἀεξίγυιος ‘strengthening the limbs’ (Pi. N. 4.73), ἀεξιφύλλος ‘nourishing leaves’ (Α. Αγ. 697)
- de-ke-se-u : Δεξίμαχος (10x), Δεξίχαρις (2x), δεξίμηλος ‘receivingsheep, rich in sacrifices’ (Ε. Άνδρ. 129[lyr.], 1138, Φh. 632)
- ka-ri-se-u : Χαρίσανδρος (34x)
- o-na-se-u : Ὀνασίτιμος (6x), overall names with Ὀνασι°360x
- pa-ra-ke-se-u : Πραξίδαμος (14x)33

4 Comparative data

4.1 Vedic

If an inner-Greek explanation of the desiderative in -σειε/-ο- is not forthcoming, a comparative perspective may be helpful. In Vedic, the productive desiderative -σειε/-ο- may be taken as an inversion of *aksi-g*wou-, cf. the thematic form in -άς such as Χάραξος (Mytilene, 7–6th c. BC), Εὐάξος (Megara, 242–238) and see García Ramón (2017: 60 f.). The same process may underlie agent nouns in -ευς not based on verbal stems, such as ἀλιεύς ‘fisherman; sailor’ as a short form of compounds such as Μνησικακός, Μνησικάκος, Μνησικάκος [H. Ap.], Μνησικάκος [Ibyc.], or σπογγοφύτας (m.) ‘diver for sponges’ (Plu.2.950b, 981e) → σπογγοεύς (Arist.HA620b34, Pr.962b21.etc.), cf. Perpillou (1973: 245 ff.).

31 An unshortened form is qo-wa-ke-se-u /G*owakseus/, probably an inversion of *aksi-g*wou-, cf. the thematic form in -άς such as Χάραξος (Mytilene, 7–6th c. BC), Εὐάξος (Megara, 242–238) and see García Ramón (2017: 60 f.).

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

33 The dossier of names in -seus has increased since 1952, but the basic situation still holds, cf. the recent treatment of the data by García Ramón (2017): ka-e-se-u /Ka*ēseus/ (Ψ Qa 1299, ΜΥ Ge 605.4b), dat. ka-e-se-we (ΜΥ Ge 73248), gen. -eou; k-ou; /K*ēseus/ (Ψ Qa 1191.2) related to Lat. cēnsēre, -ēō ‘to tax, assess’, Ved. saṁs- ‘to praise’; for ge-se-se-u /Kwht*ēseus/ (Ψ Qa [1] 609.3) cf. Φθισήνωρ, φθισίμβροτος ‘making men perish’. E-ne-ke-se-u /Enekseus/ is likely to continue the presuppositive meaning of PIE *h₁nek- ‘get, acquire’, cf. ἕνεκα < *h₁nekʰi ‘for the acquisition of, in order to get’, Toch. b *enke- ‘take, seize’, cf. similar names like Κησίραχος, Κησίρακτος, etc. The aorist ἐνεκεῖν, which continues *h₁nek-, may have had causative meaning ‘make someone get/acquire something’; in suppletion with φέρω this meaning developed into ‘bring’, cf. Kölligan (2007: 336). ἐφ’ may derive from *enekti- or (less likely) from a future stem *enek-, cf. ambiguous Αξίος (Ἀξιόνδρος, Ἀξίλεως, Ἀξίσαλος etc.) beside fut. ἄξιος. The process has remained productive in post-Mycenaean Greek, cf. Ἀκεσός (-ις, -ιας, -ιων, Ἀκεσώ) beside Ἀκεσίδαμος, Ἀκεσίμβροτος, Ἀκεσιστάτος, Ἀκεσίδαμος, or Μνασέως (-ις, -ιας, -ιων, Μνασώ) beside Μνησιστάτος etc. (609 names with Μνησι° in LGPN).
tive is a reduplicated form with a suffix -s-a-,\textsuperscript{34} e.g. cit ‘realize, note’ : ci-\textit{kit-sa}\textsuperscript{a} ‘tries to see’, pā ‘drink’ : \textit{pī-pā-sa}\textsuperscript{a}/\textit{pi-pi-śa}\textsuperscript{a} ‘is thirsty, wishes to drink’ and dabh-‘damage’ : di-\textit{p-sa}\textsuperscript{a} ‘wishes to damage’ < *\textit{di-db}\textsuperscript{h}-sa\textsuperscript{a}, cf. OAv. inf. \textit{diśzaidiāā}\textsuperscript{a} [Y. 45.4] ‘deceive’.\textsuperscript{35} In the latter case, the proto-form *\textit{di-db}\textsuperscript{h}-se/o- underwent loss of the intermediate /d/ followed by assimilation of *\textit{b}(h)s to Ved. -\textit{ps}- and Av. -\textit{b}ž- respectively. The desiderative stem serves as a basis for u-stem adjectives, i.e. dabh- : dipsū- ‘wishing to damage’, cit : cikitsū- ‘cautious, wise’ (AV), yaj- ‘sacrifice’ : ĭyakṣū-, ji ‘win, conquer’ : jīgīṣū- etc.\textsuperscript{36}

Beside this, an unreduplicated desiderative may be supposed to have existed in an early layer of Indo-Iranian, of which only a few remnants seem to be attested in Vedic such as RV 1.100.8 apsanta ‘they try/want to reach’, which may be an independent -\textit{sa}-subjunctive built to the root ap ‘reach’ or a desiderative without reduplication,\textsuperscript{37} and the presents nākṣa- from PIE *\textit{h}_2\textsuperscript{a}nek- ‘reach’, which may continue *\textit{h}_2\textsuperscript{a}nek-s(e/o)-,\textsuperscript{38} ukṣāti ‘to sprinkle’, from PIE *\textit{yeg}\textsuperscript{v}- ‘make wet’,\textsuperscript{39} and casṭe ‘sees’, to which corresponds YAv. casste ‘teaches’ (PIE *\textit{k}e\textsuperscript{e}k-s-).\textsuperscript{40} Other membra disiecta of this formation may be Hittite kweršun ‘I cut’ (KBo 10.2 ii 48 [OH/NS]) beside the reduplicated form kugursant ‘mutilated’\textsuperscript{41} and a set of roots ending in /s/ that seem to have been lexicalized already in...

\textsuperscript{34} Cf. also Heenen (2006).
\textsuperscript{35} Or rather ‘wish to deceive’, implying that, according to the Mazdaist triad of thought, word and deed, the faithful should not even think of deceiving the supreme being (cf. in the Roman Catholic Confiteor cogitatione, verbo et opere).
\textsuperscript{36} Cf. Wackernagel & Debrunner (1964: 11.2468f.).
\textsuperscript{37} tām apsanta sāvāsa utsaṃvṛṣu | nāro nāram āvase tāṃ dhānāya. Kümmel (2000: 123): “Ihn [Indra] wollen sie erreichen bei den Unternehmungen der Kraft, die Männer den Mann zur Hilfe, ihn für den Gewinn.” Differently, but with a question mark, Jamison/Brereton: “Him they [?] inspired in the upsurgings of his vast power—the men inspired [?] the man to help, inspired [?] him to the stakes,” supposing that apsanta belongs to bhas ‘blow, inspire’ as in compounds with -\textit{psu}- and Gk. ψυχή (cf. online commentary http://rigvedacommentary.alc.ucla.edu/).
\textsuperscript{38} E.g. RV 1.95.10 śukrair ērēbhīr abhī naṅkṣati kṣām (Agni) *with blazing waves he reaches the ground” (Jamison/Brereton), “mit lichten Wogen sucht er die Erde auf” (Geldner) from *‘is eager to reach’.
\textsuperscript{39} Cf. LIV\textsuperscript{2} 662.
\textsuperscript{40} Cf. LIV\textsuperscript{2} 383–385. The loss of desiderative meaning is paralleled by the case of Ved. īkṣa-‘see’ < ‘wish to see, imagine’ (PIE *\textit{h}_3\textsuperscript{i}k-\textit{h}_3k-se/o-), cf. also Heenen (2006: 56–57).
\textsuperscript{41} Cf. LIV\textsuperscript{2} 391. Oettinger (2002: 119) assumes that kweršun continues a sigmatic aorist, but the continuation of both a root aorist (Hitt. kwerta) and a sigmatic aorist would be unusual. Puhvel (1984: IV[1997]: 217) takes it to be a “suffixed variant of the root kuer-”, but the function of the suffix remains open. Kloekhorst (2008: 487) assumes an \textit{ad hoc} formation “without any historicity”, but it remains unclear what the model for such a formation would have been.
the protolanguage, losing the putative desiderative meaning, such as Gk. ἀέξω and ἀλέξω (v. supra), which are simple presents meaning ‘grow’ and ‘defend’ respectively. Instances of this type may be PIE *bʰle₂h₁(s)- ‘blow’ (Goth. blēsan, OHG blāsan [v. infra on Gk. φαῦλος] beside OHG blāen ‘id.’, Lat. fleo, fleō ‘to cry’, Latv. blēju, blēt ‘to bleat’), 42 *k₁le₂h₁(s)- ‘hear’ (Ved. śroṣan ‘they obey’, OCS slyšati, slyšǫ, OHG [h]losēn), *h₁₂e₂ugas- ‘grow’ : *h₁₂e₂uxa₁s- ‘realize, notice’ (Ved. cā́yati, Gk. τίω ‘honour’; OAv. cōišt [aor.], cinasti ‘assign’), 43 and *ten(s)- ‘stretch’ (Gk. τείνω; Goth. þinsan ‘draw’, Lith. tęsiù, tę̃sti ‘stretch’, Ved. tamsaya- ‘pull’). Besides such lexicalized forms, the Baltic and Italic s-futures (Lith. 3sg duòs ‘will give’, Osc. 3sg fust ‘will be’) may speak in favour of the assumption of an original athematic s-present, probably with desiderative meaning, from which the thematic futures in *-se/o- and *-sje/o- and the reduplicated Indo-Iranian desiderative and Old Irish future (3sg gigis, gig ‘will pray’) are derived.44

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

4.2 Myc. e-wi-su-°

This unreduced formation in -su- has been suspected in Greek as well in the Myc. form e-wi-su-zo-ko, read as /ewisu°/ since the first edition of Documents in Mycenaean Greek in 1956:47

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

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

---

42 Cf. LIV2 87.
43 Cf. recently Weiss (2017), who reconstructs *kʰe₁h₁je/o- and *kʰeh₁h₁s-.
44 Cf. Jasanoff (2003: 133) for a discussion of possible further types.
45 The form is usually interpreted as based on an -s-aorist, but such a derivational pattern cannot be supported by further evidence.
46 Cf. Wackernagel & Debrunner (1964: 1.126, 111.291).
47 Cf. Ventris & Chadwick (1956: 394), Ventris & Chadwick (1973: 547) and especially Ruijgh (1987) and de Lamberterie (1990: 11.945–949).
would be the predecessor of thematized Alph.-Gk. *ἔψισφά in Homer, e.g. *ἴδχως, II. 13.405 ἄσπιδι πάντως ἔδη, beside the form without initial ἐ- found in Att. ἵδως ‘same, identical’ < *ἵσφως (Arc. Cret. Boeot. ῥιψῆς, Hesych. γισγόν ἵδων) and probably attested in Myc. wi-so-wa-pa-ṇa /wiswo-/ (PY Sh 740), an epithet of armour. The parallel presence and absence of initial /e/- in Mycenaean /ewisu-/ and /wiswo-/ on the one hand and Alphabetic Greek *ἔψισφο- and *ψισφό- on the other makes a connection of these forms likely, whatever the origin of /e/-.

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

49 Ruijgh (1987: 538) proposes a root *ʰyéis- for *εψισύ-, *ἔψισφό- beside * FileWriter-in *ϝεισάμενος ‘having made oneself similar to x’. *Ψίσφό- then arose by the proportional analogy *ἔψισφό- : *ϝεισάμενος :: x : *ϝισφό, x= *ψισφό. There is no further evidence for such a root. Since one would expect *ʰψισμα- to be reflected as *ewolfue- in Mycenaean, Ruijgh (1985: 542) assumes a root aorist 3sg. *ἔψιστο as the basis for the analogical restitution of /s/.

50 Probably also in the adj. στενο-γρός ‘narrow’ [Semon. 14 στενογρόφι ... ἐν ἄτραπωϊ], although the second element is unexplained, cf. de Lamberterie (1993: 1.261), García Ramón (2014: 28 fn. 61).

51 Cf. τὰ στενά ‘the narrows, straits’ (Hdt. 7.223 etc.), also in Hesychius τέμπη· τὰ σύνδε (ν) ὅρα τινὲς δὲ τὰ στενά τῶν ὀρῶν, cf. García Ramón (2014).

52 Cf. Viberg (2001).
one follows the possessive derivation, the adjective *yidsu Phó- may have come to mean ‘having the look of x’ from *yidsu- ‘wishing/atempting to look like x’.

4.3 \textit{Gk. φαῦλος}

Another instance of a -su-adjective could be Gk. φαῦλος ‘slight, mean, bad’, which may have been dissimilated from *φλαῦφος; cf. the parallel adjective φλαῦφος (Pi. P. 1.87) which may either show a different dissimilation or contain the suffix -ro.\footnote{53} Gk. φαῦλος may be connected with the root PIE *bhléh₁- ‘to blow, howl’ (Lat. flère, fleô ‘to cry’, OHG blählen ‘to blow’, etc., v. supra), which may be analyzed as a stative present in *-eh₁- built to a root *bhél\footnote{54} whose antecsonantal zero-grade form *bh₁- would be reflected in Greek as *φλα-. A possible context for *bh₁C- could be a formation in /s/ parallel to that found in *bh₁eh₁-s- (Goth. blēsan, OHG blásan etc.), i.e. *bh₁el-s-, to which an adjective *bh₁el-s-ú- was built that resulted in Greek *φλαζή- > *φλαάζ- > φ(λ)αυ-λο- / φλαυ-ρο-. The semantic development would have been from ‘blowing; like a breath, hint’ to ‘windy, mean, worthless, bad’, cf. ἄνεμωλίς ‘windy, vain, powerless’ from ἄνεμος ‘wind’. The same complex suffix -ύλο- is found in other adjectives with a pejorative meaning, cf. στωμύλος ‘talkative’ (Ar. Ach. 429, Pl. Erx. 397d, Theoc. 5.79)\footnote{55} and αἱμύλος (Hes.), αἱμύλιος (II.) ‘flattering.’\footnote{56}

\footnote{53} Cf. Chantraine (2009: 1140). The form φαῦρος attested in Hesychius (φαῦρος· καύρος) may show loss of /l/, if from *φλαῦφος, or of /r/, if from *φφαῦφος by assimilation. Possible parallel cases are discussed by Lipp (2009: 178 f.), among them *kel- ‘to be warm’ : Ved. śrát ‘cooked, ready’, Lith. šiltas, Welsh eyd ‘warm’ < *kl-tó → *kl-eh₁- / *kl₁-eh₁- ‘get warm’; Ved. śráyant ‘get cooked, ready’, Lith. šilti ‘become warm’, Lat. calère, -ēō < *kl₁-h₁-eh₁-je/o, OHG lāon (NHG lau) ‘ lukewarm’ < *kleh₁u̯o-, Ved. śarád- ‘autumn’ < *kol₁h₁-éd-. Cf. Vine (2019).

\footnote{55} In \textit{Liv}² 74 Germanic and Baltic forms are taken as evidence for a different root *bh₁elH- ‘to drone, resound’ ("tönen, dröhnen"), cf. OE bellan ‘to shout’, OHG bellan ‘to bark’ etc., Lith. bilti [-sta/býla, -o] ‘to (start to) speak’, cf. also the probably inner-Baltic formations balsas ‘voice’, balsús ‘loud’ (cf. AEW 88, 113–115) and Ved. bhāṣā ‘speech’ which could either go back to *bh₁olHse₁h₂ or derive from *bh₁eh₂-s- ‘speak’ with secondary -s- (cf. EWAia 11.261f.). These forms might belong to *bh₁el/-bh₁l(e)₁h₁-, partly showing a secondary full grade *bh₁elh₁- taken from the simple root *bh₁el- (cf. Ved. śarád- < *kol₁h₁-éd- from *kleh₁-). As in the cases quoted above like *klys- beside *kly-, *bh₁elh₂-s- could be a lexicalized s-present/desiderative stem. If the root was *bh₁elh₁-, a -su-adjective *bh₁elh₂-su- would result in Gk. *φλάζή- > *φλάζ- > *φλαύ- > nom. sg. m. *φλαύς (with shortening by Osthoff’s Law) → *φλαυλός ‘chatty, mean’, cf. Lith. hylünkës ‘chatterer’ from bilti > bylinëti ‘to quarrel, litigate’.
Finally, the adjective αἴσυλος* may belong to this small group as well. It means roughly ‘unseemly, evil’ (LSJ), ‘verderblich, frevelhaft, ungebührlich, schlecht’ (LfgrE), cf. in Hesychius αἴσυλα ῥέζεις· ἀπρεπῆ πράττεις (Φ 214) and αἴσυλα· κακά, ἀδικα, ἀμαρτήματα (κ 403). The only attested form—apart from grammarians using the quotation form nom. sg. αἴσυλος/*-ον—is the ntr. pl. αἴσυλα as a substantive ‘evil things’ used as the object of a verb meaning ‘say’ or ‘do’ (H. 6×), cf. II. 5.403 αἴσυλα ῥέζειν, 20.202, 20.433 αἴσυλα μυθήσασθαι, 21.214 αἴσυλα ῥέζεις, Od. 2.232, 5.10 αἴσυλα ῥέζοι (in Od. 2.231f. opposed to αἰσίμα εἰδῶς ‘(not) heeding righteousness’). It may go back to a form *aíd-su- > *aísu- (+-λο-) built to αἴδομαι ‘be ashamed, feel awe’ (cf. αἰδώς, αἰδέομαι), meaning ‘wishing/trying to put someone to shame’ (Germ. beschämen). The neuter plural form expressing words and deeds that ‘put someone to shame’ may have applied both to the speaker feeling shame for someone else’s immoral behaviour and to the addressee who ought to be ashamed. From this use, the more general meaning ‘causing the feeling of shame, shameful, to be reproached, evil’ may have developed (cf. Germ. beschämende Worte/Taten). In II. 20.211f. ἐπεὶ σάφα οἶδα καὶ αὐτὸς / ἠμὲν κερτομίας ἠδ*) αἴσυλα μυθήσασθαι “I know well myself how to utter both taunts and αἴσυλα”, Düntzer has conjectured αἴσμα ‘proper words’ against all mss., as ἠμὲν ... ἰδέ may imply a contrast, but, as Edwards (1991: 315) points out, “there may be contrast enough between a mocking taunt [...] and a malicious false statement”. Furthermore, the parallel in l. 246 ἦστι γὰρ ἀμφιέρτοις ὅνειδεα μυθήσασθαι “Revilings are there for both of us to utter”, including the rebuked comparison with children’s talk in l. 200 νηπτύτιον ὅς and l. 244 νηπτύτιοι ὃς, can be taken to summarize both κερτομίας and αἴσυλα, the more so, if, as proposed here, αἴσυλα is related to αἴδομαι and hence close in meaning to ὅνειδος. A moral overtone is also noticeable in II. 5.403 (describing Heracles) in the combination with οὐκ ὄθομαι ‘care not, have no scruples’, σχέτλιος ὀβριμοεργὸς (v.l. Ar. αἰσυλοεργὸς) ὃς οὐκ ὄθετ* αἴσυλα ῥέζων “Harsh man, worker of violence, who did not hesitate (‘who had no scruples’) to do evil deeds.”

57 Cf. also in h.Merc. 164 αἴσυλα οἶδε.
58 On the root *hɔ eid- cf. Kölligan (2016). A derivation from the s-stem *aídos- (cf. αἰδός), *aíd-s-u-, would be without parallels.
59 The verse has been taken to be a later interpolation, cf. e.g. Leaf (1960: 222), but also Kirk (1990: 103), who interprets the relative clause as a typically Homeric etymological appendage, if the reading αἴσυλοεργός is correct (in which case *εργάς would be picked up by ῥέζων).
It is unclear whether the hapax legomenon ἀήσυλα in Il. 5.876 belongs to αἴσυλος. It has been supposed to be an itacistic spelling of *ἀίσυλα, e.g., by Fraenkel (1955:308), who connects both forms as *ἀήσυλα with *ἔσις (ἴσος), but in this case a number of ad hoc changes have to be made to the relevant verses (as discussed by Fraenkel) for which there is no independent evidence. Therefore it seems best to separate the two forms and accept that ἀήσυλα remains unexplained for the time being.

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

| Root | Desiderative stem | u-adjective |
|------|------------------|-------------|
| Skt. dah | daks- | daksu- |
| cak | caks- | *cakṣu-, cakṣus- ‘eye’ |
| Gk. φίθ- | φίθσ- (lat. viṣo) | Myc. e-wis-su-/e-wis(s)u-/ |
| φλα- | φλασ- | *φλα(θ)υ- → φ(λ)αύλος |
| αἰθ- | αἴδσ- | *αϊδσυ- → αἴσυλος |

Σὺ γὰρ τέκες ἄφρονα κούρην / οὐλομένην, ἥ τ’ αἰέν ἀήσυλα ἔργα μέμηλεν “You are father to that mad and accursed maid, whose mind is always set on deeds of lawlessness”.

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

For earlier proposals cf. Bechtel (1914:15) (*ἀήσυλος – Ved. yātū- ‘sorcery’), Chantraine (1933:250: αίσα, cf. also Panagl 1987 and the explanation of Apion [infra]), Frisk (1960–1972: 1:27: remodelling of αίσυλος, but the model is unclear), Panagl (1987: 514f.), Chantraine (2009: 26, 38), Beekes (2013: 27f., 44: Pre-Greek; still, the gloss in Hesychius (αἰήσυλον)· ἄνομον (Α) [οὐ] κακοποιόν may be a blend of αἰςυ- and ἄνσυ-). Other possibilities, likewise undemonstrable: a) similar to ἰήσος ‘wind’: ἰαεμώλια ‘windy, empty’, folk etymology with ἰή- si ‘blows’, i.e. ἰαςυλα → ἀήσυλα as ‘idle words/deeds’ (cf. Chantraine 2009: 26 s.v. ἀήσυλος), secondary root accent due to substantivization or reinterpretation as containing the negative particle ἄ-, cf. Apion (fragmenta de glossis Homericis) 15.8 ἐστιν οὖν ἀησυλα ... ἀειςυλα, ἐστερημένα τῆς αἰσής, τούτετι τού καθήκοντός.

Another obvious candidate would be δξος ‘sharp’, but its derivational history is unclear. Narten (1986) revives a proposal of Delbrück to connect it with Ved. aksnoit ‘to sting’ and proposes a root *h2eḱs—which lacks further support—or a connection with *h2eḱ- ‘sharp’, but in that case the o-grade in δξος would be unexplained (transferred from the
Greek derivation

If this type of *-*su--adjective existed in Greek, the question arises what a
denominational verb stem derived from a u-stem adjective should look like. In the
case of ablauting stems, denominational verbs usually take the weak stem as their
basis, cf. βλίττω ‘cut out the comb of bees, take honey’ from μέλιτ- ‘honey’, i.e.
*mli-t-je/o-*, and n-stems like

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

In originally proterokinetic u-stem adjectives, the weak stem had the full grade
of the suffix, i.e. *-ευ-*, cf. Gk. nom. sg. m. ἡδύς, gen. -έ(σ)ος ‘sweet’. The same
ablaut grade is found in the feminine: *ἡδέφια > ἡδεία*. In contrast to this, Indo-
Iranian derives the feminine from the strong stem: m./n. svāḍí < *-u-ih₂, OAv. vohu ‘good’: f. vaŋ’hī. Greek seems to have innovated here, reinterpre-
ting the feminine stem as derived from the weak stem of the m./n., whereas
in the other languages it derives from the strong stem with -u-. This innova-
tion is known from other stem classes as well, e.g. n-stems such as f. τέρεινα
‘soft, delicate’ after m. τέρην, τερεν(-ος) instead of *τέραινα < *-n-ih₂. In adjectives
in *-*μεν-, the vowel has been transferred from the m./n. to the f., cf.
χαρίεσσα ‘graceful, beautiful’ instead of *χαρίασσα < *-ητία (~ Ved. -vati) after
m./n. χαρίεντ-. This seems to invite the conclusion that if a) the weak stem of the m./n. is
the basis of denominational verbs and if b) this stem in the case of u-
stems has a full grade (as in the f. forms), the expected derivation based on an
adjective in *-*s-u- is a present in *-*s-ευ-je/o- > *-σειε/o-.

---

64 Cf. Chantraine (1961: 104): “Dans les thèmes en *-*u- le vocalisme e de la voyelle présuf-
fixale est général dès le grec commun: γλυκεία repose sur *-γλυκε-γά; cette extension du
vocalisme e semble propre au grec.” Ruijgh (1987: 537) assumes analogy to the nom. pl. m.
*γλύκ-ε-ς. According to Schindler (1972: 152) *-ih₂-stems had e-grade in the last mor-
pheme of the strong cases before the suffix already in the protolanguage, cf. the type
*dḗi-ih₂: *dī́-i̯e̯h̥-s with the fem. of u-stem adjectives *-ευ-ih₂; cf. also Schaffner (2001:
513). If so, the Indo-Iranian type in *-*u-ih₂ would be an innovation by intraparadigmatic
analogy.

65 A transfer of the whole ending *-*ϝεντ- would have given *-ηισα, cf. Rix (1992: 165).
A counterargument would seem to be verbs in -ὐω, but these are not based on u-adjectives, but on substantives in *-u- or *-u- hendrix, of the type Ved. tanū ‘body’ etc., instr. tanūata < *-uh₂(-), and neither of them shows ablaut of the suffix in Greek. e.g.

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

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

- PIE desiderative *-se/σ- → adj. *-s- → denom. verb *-s-eu/σ- > -σειε/σ-.

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

Appendix: desideratives in Attic authors

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

Ar. Eq. 998 οἷ’ ὡς χεσείω· κοῦχ ἀπαντας ἐκφέρω. “Ugh! The weight of them is squeezing the crap right out of me, and still I’m not bringing them all!”

Ar. Nu. 295 κεῖ δέμις ἐστίν, νυνι γ’ ἥδη, κεῖ μὴ δέμις ἐστί, χεσείω. “And right now, if it’s sanctioned, and even if it isn’t, I need to shit!”

66 Cf. Schwyzer (1939: 727).
67 Thanks to one of the anonymous reviewers for pointing out this possibility.
Ar. v. 168. ἀνθρώπος οὗτος μέγα τι δρασείει κακόν. “The man’s set to commit some awful crime!”

Ar. Pax 62 Ὠ Zeus, τι δρασείεις ποθ’ ἡμῶν τὸν λεών; “Zeus! What on earth are you trying to do to our people?”

e. Med. 92 ἢδε γάρ ἐδοξάσατο ἰχνον ταυρομένην / τοίσδ’, ᾃς τι δρασείουσαν. “For I have seen her turn a savage glance at them, as if she meant to do something to them.”

e. HF 628 οὐ γὰρ πτερωτὸς οὐδὲ φευξείω φίλους “For I cannot fly away, nor have I any wish to flee from those I love.”

e. Ph. 1208 τί τάπαι τούτων παίδ’ ἐμώ δρασείτον; “What are my two sons planning to do after this?”

Pl. Phd. 64a–b Καὶ ὁ Σιμμίας γελάσας, ἔφη, ὦ Σώκρατες, (b)  ἐποίησας γελάσαι. “And Simmias laughed and said, ‘By Zeus, Socrates, I don’t feel much like laughing just now, but you made me laugh.’”

s. Aj. 326 καὶ δὴ λός ἐστιν ὡς τι δρασείων κακόν. “And plainly he plans to do something terrible”

s. Aj. 585 ὥς ἐστιν ἂν φίλους δρασείας φιλούς “Ajax, my lord, what can you have in mind?”

s. Tr. 1232 ὡς ἐργασείων οὐδὲν ὧν λέγω θροεῖς. “Your words show no willingness to do as I say.”

s. Ph. 1001. τί δ’ ἐργασείες; “What do you plan to do?”

s. Ph. 1245 Σὺ δ’ οὔτε φωνεῖς οὔτε δρασείες σοφά. “Neither your words nor your intentions are clever!”

s. fr. 991 ζοκουσείων Θ. 1.33.3 οὐκ αἰσθάνεται τοὺς Λακεδαιμονίους φόβῳ τῷ ὑμετέρῳ πολεμησείοντας. “He fails to perceive that the Lacedaemonians, through fear of you, are eager for war.”

1.95.7 οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι [...] ἀπαλλαξείοντες δὲ καὶ τοῦ Μηδικοῦ πολέμου “The Lacedaemonians [...] wanted to be rid of the Persian war.”

3.84.1 ἴν δ’ οὐν τῇ Κερκύρᾳ τὰ πολλὰ αὐτῶν προετολμήθη, καὶ ὅπου’ ἢ ὑβρίς ἢ ἀρχόμενοι τὸ πλέον ἢ σωφιστήρα ὑπὸ τῶν τὴν τιμωρίαν ὑπάρχοντων ἤν ἄνταλλοις ὑποταθήκην δράσειαν, πενικὰς δὲ τῆς εἰκοσίας ἀπαλλαξείοντες τινες. “It was in Corcyra, then, that most of these atrocities were first committed—all the acts of retaliation which men who are governed with highhanded insolence rather than with moderation are likely to commit upon their rulers when these at last afford them opportunity for revenge; or such as men resolve upon contrary to justice when they seek release from their accustomed poverty.”

4.28.2 ὅ δὲ τὸ μὲν πρῶτον οἰόμενος αὐτῶν λόγος μόνον ἀφιέναι ἔτοιμος ἢν, γνοὺς δὲ
τῷ ὄντι παραδωσεῖντα ἄνεχώρει καὶ σὺν ἔφη αὐτὸς ἄλλ᾽ ἐκεῖνον στρατηγεῖν. “As for Cleon, he was at first ready to go, thinking it was only in pretence that Nicias offered to relinquish the command; but when he realized that Nicias really desired to yield the command to him, he tried to back out, saying that not he but Nicias was general.”

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

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