Chapter 10

The Reflexes of *ᵱ

Introduction

This chapter discusses the developments affecting the lateral liquid when it served as a syllabic nucleus. There can be no doubt that the Proto-Ionic reflex of *ᵱ was α-colored. The mainstream view is that -λα- is the regular outcome; the main aim of this chapter is to examine whether *ᵱ > -αλ- can be excluded, still keeping in mind that there was an early vocalization to -αλ- in some environments (e.g. before laryngeal plus vowel, cf. section 1.2.1).

The fact that there is much less evidence for *ᵱ than for *ᵱ makes it difficult to draw clear-cut conclusions. As we will see, many potential examples are inconclusive for various reasons: the etymology is not compelling (section 10.1), the full grade vowel slot may have been levelled (section 10.2), or *ᵱ is not reflected directly for another reason (section 10.3). A number of strong pieces of evidence for *ᵱ > -λα- are discussed in section 10.4, and the possibility of a special development *ᵱ > -αλ- before nasals is examined in section 10.5. Finally, the scanty evidence from other dialects is treated in section 10.6.

10.1 Unknown, Doubtful, or Uncertain Etymologies

Since the etymology of the following words is doubtful or unknown, they will be left out of consideration:

- ἄφλαστον 'curved poop of a ship' (Il., Hdt.);
- γλάμων and γλαμυρός 'blear-eyed' (com.);
- θάλπω 'to heat' (Od.+);
- κάλπη 'trot' (Paus., Plu.);
- κλαδαρός 'weak; handicapped' (late);
- λάξ adv. 'with the heel' (Hom.+);
- λαπαρός 'slack, hollow' (Hp. Arist.) and λαπάρη 'flank of the body' (Il.+);
- πλαδαρός 'humid, damp; flaccid' (Hp., A.R.), πλαδάω 'to be flaccid' (Hp.+);
- φλάω 'to bruise, crush' (Pi.+).

For discussion of these words, I refer to the standard etymological dictionaries.

Various middle perfect forms are analogical creations on the basis of present or aorist stems with a full grade root, e.g. ἔπι ... ἔτέταλτο (Hom.) to ἐπιτέλλω 'to
enjoin, give a command’ and ἔσταλμαι (Scut.+ to στέλλω ‘to prepare, equip’. An analogical origin of ἐτέταλτο follows from the fact that τέλλω etymologically belongs to a root ending in a laryngeal, *telh₂- ‘lift’.

In other cases, discussed in alphabetical order in the following subsections, there are serious reasons to doubt a reconstruction with *Ӏ that has been proposed by previous scholars.

10.1.1 αὖλαξ and ἄλοξ
These words are attested in the acc. sg. as αὔλακα ‘furrow’ (Hes., Pi.+), ἄλοκα (trag.), ὦλκα (Hom.).¹ The traditional etymology (gew s.v. ἄλοξ, liv² s.v. *h₂u̯elk-) derives these words from the same root as Lith. vil̃kti (1sg. velki) ‘to draw’, OCS 1sg. vlěkó ‘to drag’, Av. varək- ‘to draw’, which was reconstructed by Schindler (1972) as *h₂u̯elk- (with *h₂- based on the Greek noun). Assuming that Hom. ὦλκα continues *ἄϝολκα, this form has been derived, together with αὔλακα, from a Proto-Greek ablauting paradigm containing the forms acc. sg. *αυ̯olk-m̥, gen. sg. *αυ̯l-κ-os. This is theoretically possible, but it would remain unclear why ἄλοκα, attested in the tragedians with an alleged Aeolic vocalization to -λο-, has no trace of digamma (cf. the preserved trace in Hom. ταλαύρινος < *tala-u̯rīnos). To assume that ἄλοκ‑ is a reshaping of *ἄολκ‑ (gew, l.c.) is unmotivated. Moreover, various dialectal by-forms are attested: Dor. εὐλάκᾱ and the glosses αὐλακός and ὄλοκες in Hsch. Since it is not possible to reduce these to one proto-form, the word is most probably a borrowing: Beekes (edg q.v.) views it as Pre-Greek in view of the interchanges x/χ and word-initial α/ο‑ attested in the Hesychius glosses.²

10.1.2 γάλα
Beside γάλα, γάλακτος (Il.+ a few by-forms with a different root shape are found: γάλακτοφάγος ‘who live on dairy’ (Il. 13.6), name of a Scythian people (Hes. fr. 151), γάλαγος n. ‘milk’ (Il. 2.471 = 16.643, Pi. fr. 106.4), περιγλαγής ‘overflowing with milk’ (Il. 16.642).³ There are also some glosses of unclear interpretation: γλάγος· γάλα. Κρῆτες ; γλακῶντες· μεστοὶ γάλακτος ‘full of milk’, and γλακκόν·

¹ The nom. sg. is not attested in archaic and classical Greek.
² Schrijver (2019: 369) tentatively proposes to identify the source from which αВиде and relatives were borrowed as Minōan (Lin. A) au-re ‘pig’. For the semantic connection between ‘pig’ and ‘plow’ he draws attention to OIr. soc ‘pig’s snout; plowshare’ as well as French soc ‘plow’, which was borrowed from this Celtic word for ‘pig’, PClt. *sukko‑, *sukkā‑.
³ After the classical period, γάλαγος is again found in Hellenistic hexameter poetry (Nic., Mosch.), probably in imitation of Homer. Callimachus has γάλακτος (Hec. 1.4.4); Lykophron (4th c. tragedian) attests thematic (-)γάλαγο‑ in compounds; and πολυγλαγής appears in Aratus (Phaen. 1.1100).
γαλακθηνόν ‘sucking milk’ (all Hsch.). The variation between γαλακτ‑ and γλακτ‑ can be explained as originating in the monosyllabic nominative *glakt > *gla > γάλα.4 The question is, then, whether the Greek forms with γλα‑ must be derived from a pre-form with *l.5

Unfortunately, it is quite uncertain how the ‘milk’-word is to be reconstructed for PIE, and if it can be reconstructed at all. The most obvious comparandum is Lat. lac, lactis ‘milk’, which could be the outcome of a pre-form *glgt‑ if we assume the validity of Schrijver’s rule *CRDC‑ > pre-Lat. *CRA DC.5 A second possible cognate is Class. Arm. kalc ‘milk’, which might reflect a nom. *glKt-s.6 Taken together, these words for ‘milk’ could point to a pre-form *glKt‑ (Armenian excludes a form with *dl‑). Finally, it has been suggested that this *glgt‑ was derived from the verbal root of Hitt. kalank‑i ‘to soothe, appease’ (cf. also galaktar ‘a soothing substance’).7 Indeed, it is conceivable that milk, as the nourishment given to infants, was referred to as a soothing substance.8 Problematic, however, are the structure of the reconstructed root *gl‑ with two mediae, and the fact that word-initial *gl‑ should have been retained in Latin. The first problem could be addressed by reconstructing the root as *gleǵh‑, but in this case the Latin vocalism and the root shape of Greek γλάγος, περιγλάγης would remain unexplained. The second problem could be resolved by reconstructing a different anlaut (*dl‑ or *ml‑), or by assuming a dissimilation *glkt‑ > Lat. lact‑.9 In view of these problems, it is best not to base any conclusions regarding the development of *l on the word for ‘milk’.

10.1.3 κλαγγή
The noun κλαγγή ‘piercing sound, cry’ (Il.+) is also attested as a root noun (dat. sg.) κλαγγί (Ibyc.), and has given rise to a derived verb κλάζω < *klang-i̯e/o‑, aor. κλάγξαι. Latin clangō ‘to cry’ (pres. only) has been compared, but if the word is onomatopoeic, it would be unwise to use it as evidence, because in that case the

---

4 A parallel is γυνή, Boeot. βανά ‘woman’, both from PGr. *gmnā (cf. Beekes, EdG s.v. γάλα).
5 Schrijver (1991: 479–480).
6 Weitenberg (1985), also apud Kortlandt (2003: 65). Weitenberg derives the dialectal form kat’n from the acc. sg. *glKt‑m.
7 Puhvel, Hed s.v. kala(n)k‑, gala(n)k‑. This connection is not discussed by Kloekhorst (EdHil s.v. kalank‑1), who follows Oettinger in comparing kalank‑i with ON klôkkr ‘weak, soft’, Lith. gležnas, gležnis ‘id.’, and reconstructs the root as *gleǵh‑ because of the non-acute root in Baltic.
8 Since drugs are often prepared with milk, another idea could be that γάλα originally denoted milk mixed with drugs.
9 For the latter assumption, see Meiser (1998: 114) and EdL s.v. lac.
original form may have contained *a rather than *l. Another possibly related form within Greek is the intensive perfect κέκληγα (Hom.+), with the aor. χλα-γεῖν (B., E.). Nothing in this lemma decisively points to a pre-form with *l.

10.1.4 λάσιος
The adjective λάσιος (Il.+.) means ‘hairy, shaggy’ (of animals, of the human chest); ‘overgrown, wooded’ (of land), cf. λασιαύχην ‘with hairy neck’ (h. Herm.). For the first meaning, the etymological dictionaries compare OIr. folt ‘hair’ < PClt. *yoltot-; for the second, a Germanic word for ‘uncultivated field; wood’ (G. Wald, OE weald < *yoltu-). In view of these, λάσιος has been derived from an inherited noun PIE *u̯lto- with a suffix -ιος. There are, however, several issues with this reconstruction: we are dealing with a root etymology, and the zero grade is only attested in Greek. Moreover, the Balto-Slavic word for ‘panicle’ (e.g. Lith. váltis f.), whose acute root points to *u̯oltu- and thereby excludes a comparison with λάσιος, is probably related to the Germanic word. It would therefore be unwise to draw conclusions concerning *l from λάσιος.

10.1.5 λαγαρός and λαγωός
The adjective λαγαρός ‘hollow, sunken; thin, lean’ (Ion.-Att.; epigraphically at Cos) is clearly related within Greek to λαγών, attested mostly in the plural λαγό-νες ‘the flanks of an animal’ ("sunken spots"). Furthermore, it is attractive to reconstruct λαγωός ‘hare’ (Hom.) as PGr. *slag-ou̯s-ó‑ or *sl ̥ g-ou̯s-ó‑ “slack-eared [animal]” (cf. Peters 1980: 59). Outside of Greek, these forms are to be compared primarily with the Germanic group of ON slakr, OE slæk ‘weak, floppy’ < PGmc. *slaka- < PIE *slógo-.15

10 For an extensive discussion of this word group, cf. Tichy (1983: 41–48). The Germanic group of ON hlakka ‘to cry; rejoice’ is probably related to *hlahi(j)an- ‘to laugh’ (cf. EDPG s.v. *hlakkōn-) and has nothing to do with χλαγγή, unless in the sense that both are onomatopoeic.
11 One could assume that χέλληγα derives from a root *kleh₂g- and is unrelated to χλαγγή.
12 Bader (see DELG, Supp. q.v.) distinguishes λάσιος ‘hairy’ from λάσιος ‘willing’ in the formula λάσιον κῆρ, a formal term of address preceded by the genitive of a pn (II. 2.851 and 16.554), which would originally mean ‘strong-willed heart’. Bader’s reconstruction is questionable, however, because she has to assume an irregular laryngeal metathesis.
13 For these, and possible Slavic cognates, see GEW, DELG and EDPG s.v. λάσιος.
14 The reconstruction of this material is further complicated by the existence of another word for ‘hair’: *yolkō-, attested in Skt. vāsā- ‘sprout, twig’, Av. vāraṣa- ‘hair (on the head)’, Ru. vólos ‘hair’, etc. The roots *yolkH- and *yolk- may have influenced each other.
15 See EDPG s.v. *slaka-, where it is proposed that OIr. lace ‘slack’ (which is clearly related to the Germanic adjective) could reflect *slg-no-.
The further reconstruction of these words is muddled by the multitude of potential cognate forms. First of all, within Greek etymological dictionaries compare λαγαρός with λάγνος ‘lustful, horny’ (Arist.+ ) and its derivations λαγνεύω ‘to have intercourse’, λαγνεία ‘intercourse’. However, the semantic connection is weak; in my view, λάγνος is better derived from the root PIE *selǵ- ‘to let go’ (Ved. sarj ‘release, set free’, Av. harəz) together with Cretan λαγαιω, aor. λαγασαι ‘to release’ and λαγάσσαι ἀφεῖναι ‘to let go’ (Hsch. λ. 39). This root has a different full grade compared to the Germanic words reflecting *slaka- (and hence also λαγαρός), suggesting that the latter belong to a different root *sleg- ‘weak, slack’.

The reconstruction of λαγαρός is complicated further by the existence of words in other languages with more or less similar forms, but diverging semantics:

- Lat. laxus ‘spacious, wide, loose’ with laxō, -āre ‘to extend; relax; release’ (reflecting pre-Italic *slg-s-o- by Schrijver’s rule *RDC > RaDC),
- Lat. langueō ‘to be faint, be languid’;
- Ved. ślakṣṇá ‘smooth, slippery, soft’ (AV+), MoP laṣn ‘smooth’;
- Toch. A slakkār ‘sad’, B slakkare ‘darting’.

Although the Tocharian forms have a similar appearance to Greek λαγαρός, they are probably unrelated for semantic reasons. In my view, the appurtenance of the Indo-Iranian words for ‘smooth’ is uncertain in view of the considerable semantic difference. On the other hand, I would propose to derive at least Lat. laxus from *selǵ- ‘to let go’, because the derived verb laxō, -āre means ‘to relax; release’ (cf. Cret. λαγασαι and Ved. sarj). Lat. langueō, however, is semantically close not to laxus, but to the Greek verbs λαγγάζω ‘to give way, yield’ and λαγγάζω ‘to loiter, waste time’, ascribed to Aeschylus, Aristophanes and Antiphanes in the lexicographical tradition. In λαγγάζω one might even see evidence for a

16 See GEW, DELG, and EDG, all s.v. λαγαία.

17 See also Van Beek (2018: 59–60 with n. 72 and 73), where I have also suggested that ἄσελγής ‘brutal’ reflects PGr. *ad-selges-, containing a trace of the PIE preverb *h2ed and of an e-grade verbal stem based on PIE *selǵ-.

18 EDL s.v. laxus. Schrijver himself did not explain laxus with his rule (1991: 136 and 165), as he followed Lubotsky’s proposal that the root contained a laryngeal.

19 Connected by Mayrhofer (EWAla q.v.) with most of the words listed above: λαγαρός, λαγαία, Lat. laxus, ON slakr.

20 Cf. DTB s.v. slakkare and EDL s.v. langueō.

21 Cf. λαγγάζειν: ἐνδιατρῖψαι, στραγγεύσει ‘to waste time, loiter’ (Hsch. λ. 1192), λαγγάζω στραγγεύσει ‘loiter’ (Phot. λ. 370 = A. fr. 112); λαγγάζειν: τὸ διαδιδράσκειν τὸ ἔργον ‘to shirk’ (Phryn., = Ar. fr. 81; according to Phrynichus, in the passage in question the subject of λαγγάζειν are horses pretending to have lame legs); λαγγάζειν ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐνδιάδοσιν ‘gives way, yields’. Ἀντιφάνης Ἀντερώσῃ (= Antiph. fr. 37, in Antiatticist lexica).
different root with an internal nasal (perhaps to be connected with Lat. *longus ‘long’, Goth. *laggs ‘id.’). It is therefore attractive to reconstruct Lat. *laxus as *sl̥g-s-o- and to disconnect it from *languēō etymologically.

It is possible to argue that λαγαρός ‘hollow, lean’ and λαγωός ‘hare’ must be compared primarily with PGmc. *slaka- ‘weak, floppy’, reflecting a zero grade *sl̥g-, and that forms with an internal nasal (λαγγάζω, Lat. *languēō) are to be derived from a different root. On the other hand, from a semantic perspective this would be arbitrary. Thus, no firm conclusions can be based on λαγαρός, λαγόνες and λαγωός, as too many problems are involved in the reconstruction of the root. On the other hand, λάγνος ‘horny’ (and derivatives) and Cretan λαγαίω, λαγασαι ‘to release’ derive from PIE *selǵ- and are strong pieces of evidence. On these forms, see further sections 10.4.5 and 10.6.1.

10.1.6 λάχνη

The noun λάχνη ‘frizzy or curly hair’ (e.g. of a sheep’s fleece or the human chest) is traditionally reconstructed as PGr. *u̯l̥k-snā-. A root *u̯olk- ‘hair’ is indeed attested in Balto-Slavic and Indo-Iranian (e.g. Ru. vólos ‘hair’. Ved. válśam- ‘sprout, twig’), but the lack of precise cognate formations is disturbing (cf. above on λάσιος), and assuming a suffix -snā- is an emergency measure. In fact, λάχνη can be plausibly connected within Greek with the adjective λάχεια (f.) ‘wooded’ (Hom.), λαχύ-φλοιος ‘with a hairy rind’ (v.l. in Nic. Al. 269), and perhaps ἀμφιλαχαίνω ‘to weed’ (Od.). The etymology of this second group has been extensively discussed by Lamberterie (1975: 732–742), who plausibly compares λόχος ‘ambush’ < *'bush, thicket’, and relates -νη in λάχνη to the suffix -νο- in θάμνος ‘thicket’, πυκνός ‘compact, close, thick’. Against the reconstruction λάχνη < *u̯l̥k-snā-, he argues that an initial digamma is excluded by the Homeric attestations (1990: 733), and concludes that the Greek evidence points to a root λαχ- / λαχ- of unknown origin (1990: 741–742); it is therefore impossible to reconstruct a common PIE pre-form.

22 Beekes (EdG s.v. λαγγάζω and λαγαίω) views the internal nasal of λαγν- beside the root λαγ- in λαγαρός as well as λαγαίω as a substrate phenomenon.

23 A recent treatment of the semantics and etymology of Lat. *laxus is Höfler 2017, as I discovered when finalizing the manuscript of this book. Höfler and I converge in criticizing the assumed etymological relation between laxus (laxāre) and languēō, but in my view he is mistaken in rejecting the reconstruction *sl̥g-s-o- and the connection with PIE *selǵ- ‘to let go’. Höfler’s own reconstruction *slk-s-o- to a hypothetical PIE root *selk- is subject to two problems: the evidence for such a root is very marginal, and *slk-s-o- does not actually yield *lakso-. Höfler resorts to positing a pre-form *sl̥k-s-o- with shwa secundum, but he gives no clear morphological motivation for this.

24 Cf. IEW s.v. *uel- 4.
10.1.7 μαλθακός
The adjective μαλθακός 'soft, mild, weak' (class.), Aeol. μόλθακος (Alc.), is supposed to be related within Greek to μάλθη (Hippon., Crat., S.), μάλθα (Ar. fr. 157). The last-mentioned word is a technical term for a mixture of wax and pitch used for caulking ships, but it may also denote wax (S. Ichn. 140). From a semantic point of view, this comparison could work if we start from a basic meaning *'soft stuff', but from a morphological perspective it is less evident. There is a derivative μάλθων (ascribed to Socrates by Stobaeus 4.15.16) which perhaps means *'softie', as opposed to ἔργατης in the sense of a hard-working man; this may indeed imply that -ακος was later added as a suffix. However, an adjectival suffix -ακος is not productive, and although influence of μαλακός 'soft' on μαλθακός is conceivable, this would be an additional assumption.

The meanings attested for μαλθακός are diverse. It qualifies nouns referring to physical objects like soft soil, cushions, the skin, limbs, etc. More often, however, the word is used metaphorically—either negatively (e.g. cowardly warriors) or positively (e.g. soothing words, mild sleep). In view of this, the often cited connection with the Germanic adjective for 'mild', e.g. OHG milti ‘merciful’, Goth. *unmilds, is semantically quite attractive.25 However, in view of the problems just discussed, this root etymology is not more than a fairly remote possibility.26 Finally, it is not certain that the dialectal difference between Ion.-Att. μαλθακός and Aeol. μόλθακος must be ascribed to a syllabic liquid: compare the dialectal distribution of καθαρός and κοθαρός ‘pure’ (section 9.7.2).

10.1.8 πλάγιος and πλάζω
The adjective πλάγιος (Pl.+) 'athwart, oblique, sideways' occurs in substantivized form as τὰ πλάγια 'the flanks/sides', of the body but especially of an army (Hdt., Th.+). It has no established Indo-European etymology, and accordingly there is no unambiguous evidence that πλάζω- developed from *pl̥g-. There are two possible cognates within Greek: the root πλαγγ- in πλάζω 'to go astray', and on the other hand Hom. ἔκπλαγος 'terrible, outrageous' (if this was dissimilated from *-plag-lo-).

25 For this comparison and other uncertain suggestions, see nil 485 f. The further connection of this alleged PIE *meldh- with Ved. mārdhati 'to neglect, abandon' is semantically not evident (cf. the remarks in EWAlia s.v. mardh); morphologically, mārdhati could be viewed as an intransitive present in *-dhe/o- of the type πλήθω to the root *mer- 'disappear' (cf. also the extensions Ved. marṣ ‘forget’ and marḍ ‘be merciful’).

26 Kroonen (edpg s.v. *melda-) now reconstructs the Germanic adjective as PIE *melh₂-tó-, comparing Skt. mélata- ‘soft’ and OIr. méláith ‘id.’. In my view, the Schwebeablaut speaks against this etymology; moreover, I would reconstruct the PIE root for ‘crush’ as *melh₁- (see chapter 4), although this does not per se affect the connection.
The verb πλάζω ‘to turn sth. away from, thwart, make deviate’ (act.), ‘to go astray, waver’ (mid.-pass.) is the epic and poetic counterpart of the prose form πλανάομαι. Frisk (GEW s.v.) compared this to Lat. plangō (plānxi, plāncrus) ‘to beat, strike; mourn’, assuming that the Greek meaning ‘to drive astray’ developed from ‘to beat off track’.27 However, the Greek comparandum to Lat. plangō is not πλάζω but πλήσσω, which has the same duality of meanings, ‘to beat’ and ‘to beat the chest, mourn’ (cf. Goth. faiflokun 3pl. ‘beat the chest’). Frisk explains the root-internal nasal of the aorist ἐπλάγχθη as imported from the present stem, but this assumption is gratuitous, as a root πλαγγ‑ underlies all stems of this verb (including πλάζω < *plang-i̯e/o‑, where the nasal disappeared by regular sound change). One could assume that an infixed present stem *plh2‑n‑ developed first to *plāng‑, and then to the attested plang‑ by Osthoff’s Law. However, in view of the semantic gap between ‘to beat’ and ‘to deviate’, this etymology remains uncertain.

A better comparandum for some of the Greek words is a North-Germanic verb meaning ‘to swerve’: ON flakka ‘to rove about’, Far. flakka ‘to roam’, which is derived by Kroonen from an o-grade iterative PGmc. *plog-neh2‑ (EDPG s.v. *flakkōn‑). It is difficult to include πλάζω in this comparison in view of its root-internal nasal, but πλάγιος ‘athwart’ could constitute a more serious comparandum for the Germanic words.

There is, however, a second possibility: the interchanges between the various roots meaning ‘to go astray’ et sim. can be taken as reflexes of a substrate origin.28 The attested root shapes are:
- *plang‑ > πλάζω, ἐπλάγχθη ‘to drive off course’;
- *plag‑ > πλάγιος ‘athwart’, ἔκπαγλος ‘outrageous’
- *a-m(b)lak‑ > Att. ἄμπλακεῖν, ἀμβλακεῖν ‘to err’ (trag.);
- *mlāk‑ > βλάξ, gen. βλᾰκός ‘stolid, stupid’.

As there is no way to derive all these forms from an Indo-European root, and in view of the absence of clear cognates, it is a distinct possibility that they were all borrowed. Therefore, I will not use πλάγιος and πλάζω in this discussion.

10.1.9 πλάσσω

The verb πλάσσω ‘to knead; mold, shape, form’ (Hes.+) has no ascertained etymological comparanda (cf. GEW, DELG s.v.), and Beekes (EDG) even considers

27 This judgement is taken over by de Vaan (EDL s.v.).
28 See Beekes (EDG s.vv. ἀμπλακίσκω, πλάγιος, and πλάζω), who adopted my suggestion to reconstruct a Pre-Greek verbal root *(a)nplak‑ on the basis of these comparisons. I also included πλάνη ‘errand’ in the comparison, assuming a root-final nasal velar *(η-) in the substrate language, but that is much more hypothetical.
a Pre-Greek origin. That the root ended in -θ- is shown by the compound χορο-
πλάθος ‘modeler of figurines’ (Pl., Isoc.) and πλάθανον ‘cake mold’ (Theoc.). Componds such as καταπλάθοσις ‘to smear, plaster over’ (Hdt., Ar.+ ) illustrate that the connection with malleable materials such as dough and plaster is old.

The non-ablauting root πλαθ- in combination with a yod-present suggests that the verb is denominative. I would like to propose an etymological connection with the PIE root *bhleudh- ‘to mingle; become turbid’ which is reflected in Germanic (Goth. blandan ‘to mix, mingle’, ON blanda ‘to blend, mix’, cf. EDPG s.v. *blandan-) as well as in Balto-Slavic (cf. notably Lith. blėsti (isg. blendžiu) ‘to sleep, stir flour into soup, talk nonsense, become cloudy’ < *bhleudh-je/o-). The Germanic strong verb is suggestive of an Indo-European origin.

If we start from an original meaning ‘to mix flour (dust, sand) through a liquid; make turbid’ (as in the meaning ‘stir flour into soup’ of Lith. blėsti), we may suppose that an early form of Greek had reflexes of nominal derivatives such as *bhleudpθ- (cf. πλαστός) or *bhleudpθ-έθ2 (cf. the form πλαθά ‘modelled figure’ mentioned as Doric in Plutarch) denoting a dough or wall-plaster. Starting from such a form it would be possible to create a denominative verb *bhleudpθ-
je/o- denoting the process of working dough or plaster, i.e. ‘to knead; smear’.

A problem for this reconstruction is the fact that Grassmann’s Law has applied in πλάσσω, πλαστός , πλάσμα and all other derivatives (instead of expected xφλάσσω, xφλαστός, xφλάσμα, etc.). By itself, a deaspirated word-initial stop spreading through all derivatives containing the root would not be shocking: cf. πιστός, πίστις, πισυνός with the root of πείθομαι ‘to give ear to, obey’, and paradigmatic forms like ἐπείσα and πέπεισμαι. However, in that case there was a clear basis of forms where Grassmann’s Law did operate: the verbal stems πείθω, πείθομαι, ἐπιθόμην, as well as the old perfect πέποιθα.

This issue could be resolved by assuming that the denominative verb was derived from a nominal form such as *πλαθή (cf. Dor. πλαθά mentioned above) after Grassmann’s Law had applied there. A comparable case seems to be πεί-
σμα n. ‘rope’: its root no doubt reflects PIE *bhleudh- ‘to bind’, but the verb is absent from Greek. In fact, this form suggests another possibility: Grassmann’s Law may not have operated in forms where -θμ- was preserved relatively long, such as *πεφλαθμένος > *πεπλαθμένος (later > (>) πεπλασμένος) or *φλάθμα > *πλάθμα (later > (>) πλάσμα). If one is prepared to accept this possibility, it is attractive to connect πλάσσω with the root *bhleudh- in the way just described.

10.1.10 σκαλμός and σκάλμη
σκαλμός m. ‘thole, i.e. the pin by which the oar was fastened to the τρωπητήρ’ (h. Hom., A.+), σκάλμη ‘a type of knife or dagger’ (S. fr. 620, Hsch.). A possi-
ble connection with PGmc. *skalma-,*skalmō- as attested in various concrete meanings (e.g. ON skölms ‘tip of a fork’, OHG scalm ‘canoe’) is mentioned by DELG and GEW (both s.v. σκαλμός). Ffrs suggests that the Greek words have an identical origin with these Germanic words (i.e. PIE *skol-mo-, *skol-meh2-), but that their vocalism was secondarily influenced by that of the verb σκάλλω ‘to hoe, stir up’ in a more original meaning such as ‘to split off’ (“hat sich nach σκάλλω gerichtet, u. zw. in einem ursprünglicheren Sinn von ‘spalten’ o. ä.”). Chantraine (DELG s.v. σκαλμός) is slightly more vague, but agrees that the vocalism may have been influenced by σκάλλω. Beekes (EDG s.v. σκάλλω) apparently views σκαλμός and σκάλμη as inner-Greek derivatives of σκάλλω and does not mention the possibility of comparing the Germanic words.

In any case, since the PIE root *skelH- ‘split, slit’ is now reconstructed with a laryngeal on account of Lith. skalėti ‘to split; strike fire’, Hitt. iškalla- to split, split’ (cf. Kloekhorst, EDHIL s.v. iškalla-1, who argues that the laryngeal was *h2 or *h3), the root of σκαλμός and σκάλλω cannot reflect a pre-form with *l (pace LIV2 s.v. *skel-, where σκαλμός is cited as the main reason to posit a laryngeal-less root). Beekes (EDG s.v. σκάλλω) envisages whether σκάλλω may reflect an inherited *sklΗ-i̯e/o‑ (with loss of laryngeal by the so-called ‘Pinault Effect’) or a nasal present *skl-neH‑ (cf. βάλλω, on which see section 10.5.1). In my view, it is more likely that σκάλλω is a denominative, cf. forms like σκαλις ‘pickaxe’ (Att. inscr., 4th c. BCE) and the related denominative σκαλεύω ‘to stir; poke (the fire)’ (Ar.+), forms in which σκαλ‑ could well reflect a prevocalic zero grade *sklΗ-. Thus, σκάλλω may reflect a denominative PGr. *skal-je/o-.

Finally, note that σκαλμός has also been compared to PGmc. *helman‑ > OE helma ‘rudder’ (E. helm), ON hjalm-vǫlr ‘id.’, which is semantically very close. However, this connection is uncertain, as the Germanic words lack the initial s- and could instead be connected with the word for ‘stalk, reed’, *klh2-m- (Kroonen 2011: 162–163, EDPG s.v. *helman-).

10.1.11 σπλάγχνα

σπλάγχνα (n. pl.) ‘entrails, viscera’ (Hom.+)) refers to a collection of innards, “especially heart, lungs, liver, kidneys, which in sacrifices were reserved to be eaten by the sacrificers at the beginning of their feast” (LSJ). This word is clearly related to YAv. sparazan- m. ‘spleen’, nom. sg. sparaza, Lith. blūnis ‘id., and within Greek to σπλήν ‘spleen’ (II.+). The difficulty to reconstruct a PIE pre-form on the basis of these and other related terms for the spleen is well-known:29 the

---

29 “Da eine Rekonstruktion im einzelnen nicht möglich ist, müssen wir uns auch für σπλήν und das davon nicht zu trennende σπλάγχνα auf blosse Vermutungen beschränken” (Ffrs, GEW s.v. σπλήν).
lack of a root-final velar in Greek σπλήν is mostly assumed to be due to taboo deformations.30

In Frisk’s view, σπλάγχνα stands for earlier *σπλάχνα, with a secondary internal nasal.31 This collective would reflect a PIE Transponat *splǵhᵢⁿ⁻h₂, but is probably not old: the comparative evidence points to a specific denomination of the spleen, so to an original singular form. Therefore, σπλάγχνα probably contains the weak stem of the PIE paradigm, e.g. gen. sg. *splǵhᵢⁿ⁻ós, and is likely to contain a regular vocalization to -λα.32 I see no particular reason to assume that the vowel slot of σπλάγχνα was influenced by that of σπλήν.33 On the other hand, it would be unwise to base any conclusions on σπλάγχνα, because most of its cognates in other IE languages have undergone irregular deformations.

10.1.12 φαλλός

φαλλός m. ‘penis’ is attested in the classical language from Hdt. and Ar. onwards. There are possible cognate forms in two other branches: in Celtic we find OIr. ball ‘member’, ball ferda gl. membrum virile < PClt. *balno-, and possibly also W. balleg ‘sack, purse’. Latin has follis ‘bag; testicles’, which may derive from *bʰo niño- or *bʰinio-. It is possible to posit a pre-form PIE *bʰinó-, which would account for Gr. φαλλός as well as the Celtic words.34 While it is true that the word lies in a sphere of taboo, there is no principled reason to doubt the validity of this comparison. However, Greek also has another synonymous word, φάλης -ητος (also φαλής -ῆτος) m. ‘penis’. Since there is no obvious way to derive this variant from a pre-form in *bʰi-, it is doubtful whether φαλλός must reflect *bʰinó-.35

30 However, note the proposal of Puhvel (1999: 74) to derive φρήν and σπλήν from *bhreǵh-n-s and *spleǵh-n-s, respectively, by a regular development PIE *-eǵhs > -ēn with compensatory lengthening. It is unclear how Puhvel envisages this development phonoetically, but it would have the advantage of providing φρήν with a natural etymology (cf. διάφραγμα) and of explaining why σπλήν coexists with σπλάγχνα in Greek. An obvious objection is that no structurally comparable PIE sound changes are known: one wonders what was wrong with a vocalization *bhreǵh-n̥(-s) or *spleǵh-n̥(-s).

31 In this word, deformations took place in other branches too: compare Ved. plihán- (AV+) ‘spleen’, which may have been influenced by snihán- ‘snout’ (Mayrhofer, EWAia q.v.).

32 The secondary zero grade in the Baltic forms (Lith. blužnis ‘spleen’, OPrr. blusne ‘id.’, as well as Slavic material (OCS. slezena ‘id.’, Ru. selezěnka) and perhaps also Skt. plihán- ‘id.’ (AV+), point to a full grade 1. On the other hand, there is Celtic material pointing to a full grade 1 (Mlr. selig, MBret. felch ‘spleen’).

33 Cf. delg (s.v. σπλήν): “il n’est pas sûr que les Grecs aient senti la parenté entre σπλήν et σπλάγχνα.”

34 Cf. edpc s.v. *ballo-.

35 In the opinion of Beekes (EDG s.v.), φαλλός could be a substrate word.
10.2 Cases of -\( \lambda \alpha \)- and -\( \omega \lambda \)- Influenced by a Full Grade Form

The outcome of a number of forms with \( ^*l \) provides evidence for the color of the anaptyctic vowel, but not necessarily for its place, because the full grade slot may have been introduced in the vocalized zero grade.

10.2.1 \( \epsilon \pi \alpha \lambda \pi νος \), \( \alpha ρπαλέος \) and \( \alpha λπνιστος \)

A root shape \( \alpha λπ- \) is found in the following forms:

- \( \epsilon \pi \alpha λπνος \), only in Pi. *Pyth. 8.84* (modifying νόστος), glossed as ‘cheerful, happy’ by *LSJ* but possibly rather meaning ‘hoped for’; the adjective seems derived from the verb \( \epsilon πέλπομαι \) ‘to hope’.

- \( \alpha λπνιστος \), a superlative attested in the scholia to Pi. *Isthm. 5.12*, where the mss. have the corrupt (while unmetrical) form \( \alpha νελπιστος \). The passage reads: “there are truly two things alone that foster the finest sweetness (\( \alpha ωτον \ldots \) τὸν \( \alpha λπνιστον \)) of life in blossoming prosperity: (...)”. Wackernagel (1910) suggested to correct the form to \( \alpha λπιστος \). This form is indeed found in Aeschylus (*Pers. 982*), where it was traditionally interpreted as a proper name ‘\( \alpha λπιστος \) carried by a high-ranking Persian officer who is called ‘eye’ of the King. In his edition of the *Persae*, West proposes to read an appellative \( \alpha λπιστον \). This is attractive, because Pindar’s phrase \( \alpha ωτον \ldots \) τὸν \( \alpha λπιστον \) is directly mirrored in the Aeschylean passage: Περσάν τὸν \( \alpha ωτον \), τὸν σὸν πιστὸν πάντ’ \( \alpha ρβαλμόν \), μυρία μυρία πεμπαστάν, Βατανώχου παίδ’ \( \alpha λπιστον \) (...). In my view, the -\( \nu \)- in Pindar’s \( \alpha λπιστον \) could be caused by an attempt (by scholiasts or grammarians?) to explicitly connect \( \alpha λπιστον \) to \( \epsilon \pi \alpha λπνος \).

- \( χραλαλέος \) ‘with pleasure’ (*Od.*), probably with dissimilation \( \lambda \ldots \lambda > \rho \ldots \lambda \) and folk-etymological aspiration taken from \( χραπάζω \) ‘to rob; snatch away’. Indeed, the meaning of \( χραλαλέος \) may have been influenced by that of \( χραπάζω \) already in Homer, where \( χραλαλέος \) occurs three times. The non-dissimilated form is attested in the gloss \( χραλαλέον \) ‘\( χραπαπτόν \) ‘cherished’ (Hsch.).

36 For a discussion of the competing hypotheses and their relative merits, see Garvie ad loc. Schmitt (1978) remarks that ‘\( \alpha λπιστος \) cannot be a genuine Iranian name, but this is not judged decisive by Garvie because Aeschylus made up several other Iranian-sounding names in the *Persae*.

37 The meaning given in the *LfgrE* is ‘erwünscht, angenehm’ (adj.), ‘freudig, gern’ (adv.). The etymological connection with \( \epsilon παλπνος \) and \( \alpha λπιστος \) is accepted there, because it is favored by the attested inner-Greek semantic development of \( \alpha ρπαλέος \). On the other hand, ‘... mit einer aus der antiken Etymologie gewonnenen Bedeutung *gierig* (Adv.) oder *zu erraffend, erraft, räuberisch* (Adj.) zu rechnen (...) ist an keiner Stelle nötig. Auch nach-homerisch tritt \( \alpha ρπαλέος \) zunächst noch in der etymologisch richtigen Bedeutung auf (...),
As for the etymology of these adjectival forms, it is commonly accepted that their root reflects the zero grade of ἔλπομαι ‘to surmise, reckon; expect, hope’. Possibly, Pindar’s ἐπαλπνός was derived directly from the verb (ἐπέλπο-μαι ‘to hope’, cf. Hom. ἐπιέλπομαι ‘to aspire to’) when the root was still capable of undergoing ablaut; for deverbal -νός cf. τερπνός ‘agreeable’ (τέρπομαι ‘enjoy’). It must also be taken into account that adjectives in -αλέος and -νός occur more often as a pair: cf. σμερδνός ‘terrible’ beside σμερδαλέος ‘id.’ (quasi-opposite in meaning to ἁρπαλέος), and post-Hom. ἰσχνός ‘withered, thin, lean’ beside Hom. ἰσχαλέος ‘withered, dry’ (hapax).

For these reasons, it is likely that a simplex *ἀλπνός < *u̯alp-nó‑ once existed. Under its influence, an original superlative *u̯elp‑isto‑ may have been reshaped as *u̯alpisto‑ (cf. section 4.1.2). As a deverbal adjective, *u̯alp‑nó‑ may owe its vocalism (instead of expected *u̯lap‑ < *u̯l‑) to the influence of verbal forms with *u̯elp‑, or to the comparative and superlative. For this reason, ἁρπαλέος and ἄλπιστος cannot be used as cogent evidence for a regular *l̥ > ‑αλ‑.

10.2.2 γλάσσα
An Eastern Ionic by-form of γλῶσσα ‘tongue’ is γλάσσα, attested in late literary Ionic in Herodas (a Hellenistic, 3rd c. BCE mimographer who imitated the language of Hipponax). The authenticity of γλάσσα is guaranteed by its occurrence in inscriptions from Asia Minor, where it denotes the tongue as a part of a sacrificed animal. Possibly, γλάσσα was preserved beside γλῶσσα in Eastern Ionic because of its semantic specialization. It may continue the original form of the motional feminine *dλkh‑i̯a, which was derived from the weak stem of a root noun *dλgh‑, *dλg‑ reflected in γλῶχες ‘beard of corn’ (Scut., cf. Hom. γλωχίς ‘barb of an arrow’). Subsequently, γλάσσα may have been reshaped, under the influence of γλῶχες or γλωχίς, to γλῶσσα, which was the only form to survive in Classical Greek. It cannot be excluded that the outcome -α‑ in γλάσσα <

daher ist wahrscheinlich, dass die anfänglich sich nur beim Adv. findende Bedeutung heftig (…) auf falscher Interpretation von besonders Od. 6.250 beruht, wo der Zusammenhang eine Umdeutung begünstigt." (LfgrE s.v. ἁρπαλέος).

38 delg comments on the adjectives: "groupe archaïque altéré ensuite par l’étymologie populaire". The older root meaning of ἔλπομαι is ‘to think, surmise, reckon’, cf. Lachnit (1965). This casts some doubts on the connection with Lat. volup (adv.) ‘with pleasure’, which can be derived from *u̯elp‑i‑ (de Vaan 2008 s.v.) and would thereby reflect the same formation as Gr. ἐλπίς.

39 This also answers the objection made by Beekes (edg s.v. ἀλπιστος): ‘It is doubtful to interpret ἄλπ‑ as *fαλ‑, a zero grade of *fελ‑ in ἔλπομαι, ἐλπίς (for wouldn’t one expect *fελ‑‑?)."
*dlkh-*ja was influenced by the vowel slot of cognate words like γλώξις or γλώχις. Therefore, Eastern Ionic γλάσσα is not a certain example for the regular development of */l/ in Ionic-Attic.

10.2.3 πλατύς

The adjective πλατύς ‘broad; flat’ is quoted as a prime example for the development of */l/ in almost every manual. Its forms of comparison are secondary (πλατύτερος and -τατος). Other forms attested in Greek with this root are πλαταμών m. ‘flat stone or object’, πλάτος n. ‘breadth, width; plane surface’ (Cypr. fr. 1.2, Simon., Hdt.+), and adjectives in -πλατής (X., Th., Arist.). The old form of the adjectival feminine is probably reflected in the toponym Πλάταια. It is possible that -λα- directly reflects */l/, but it cannot be excluded that the vocalization was influenced by a now-lost full grade reflex *pleth2- > PGr. *plet(a)- (cf. Ved. práthas-n., práthate) that was originally present in the forms of comparison, or by the older form *pletos of the neuter abstract. After this, the stem form πλατ‑ would have spread from the adjective to all other derivatives. Therefore, πλατύς and related ‘Caland system’ forms do not offer absolutely compelling evidence for the regular reflex of */l/.

10.3 The Pre-form Did Not Necessarily Contain */l/

10.3.1 βλάβομαι, βλάπτω

As I have argued extensively elsewhere (Van Beek 2017b), the root of βλάπτω ‘to hinder; harm’ must be reconstructed as */mlkw‑ in view of the etymological comparison with Ved. marcáyati ‘to slander, injure’ (caus.) and OAv. mərəc ‘to destroy’ (vel sim.). This connection is accepted by both gew and delg (s.v. βλάβη) and is supported by phraseological material. I will now summarize the arguments; for the details the reader is referred to Van Beek 2017b.

40 The comparative πλατίν (Epich. fr. 100 K-A) is probably secondary for expected *πλάςσων.
41 It is uncertain whether this is an authentic Lesbian form or a borrowing from Ionic; see section 10.6 on the dialectal evidence.
42 Since the object of Av. mərəc is often ahu‑ ‘righteous life’ or aš́a‑ ‘order’, better translations than ‘to destroy’ might be available, e.g. ‘to disturb’.
43 The comparison of the Indo-Iranian root with Hitt. markii̯e/a‑zi ‘to disapprove of’, as accepted by Hed and Edhil (q.v.), therefore has little to recommend it. Beekes’ view (Edg s.v. βλάβη) that βλάπτω is of Pre-Greek origin cannot be substantiated either. See Van Beek 2017b: 55–56 for criticism of these and other views.
There are two old formations in the verbal paradigm: the thematic root present βλάβεται ‘to be distracted (of a speaker); to give way (of the knees)’, attested only in the *Iliad*, and the intransitive aor. ἐβλάβην ‘was impeded’ (beside younger ἐβλάφθην)44 attested from Homer onwards.45 Compared to these intransitive forms, the causative active paradigm βλάπτω, βλάψαι is clearly secondary. As for the nominal forms, there are two archaic-looking formations. First, the compound ἀβλαβής ‘unharmed; unwavering, securely’ is old within Greek (it is also attested in Cretan: see below) and could be compared with the root compound in *‑mlk* (replacing Old Avestan *a.mərəxš* ‘which does not harm’, *ahu.mərəxš* ‘harming life’).46 Secondly, βλάβη ‘harm; curse’ (A.+)) may reflect an old root noun with later addition of *‑ā* in Proto-Greek.47 Other nominal derivatives follow productive patterns and may be relatively recent creations.48

The oldest meanings of βλάπτω are ‘to hinder, impede’ and ‘to mislead’ (*II.+); the meaning ‘to damage’ first appears after Homer. A second remarkable use of βλάπτω is found in Hesiod: the verb means ‘to slander, pronounce a false oath’, i.e. it refers to deceiving someone else with crooked words.49 The meaning ‘to speak falsely or deceptively’ arose metaphorically from ‘to put off track, mislead’ (with words). It is probably of PIE age in view of the corresponding phrase marcáyati dváyena ‘leads astray with double tongue’ attested in the *Rigveda*. Similar phraseology must underlie the use of the adverb ἀβλαβέως ‘sincerely, without deceiving’ in traditional oath formulae in Thucydides and Attic inscriptions (e.g. *IG* i3 53.13–14).

A well-known problem with this etymology is the root-final ‑β‑ in Ionic-Attic. Interestingly, forms with root-final ‑π‑ (in harmony with the root reconstruction *‑melkw*) are found in Cretan (for the attestations, see Bile 1988):

– inf. καταβλαπεθαι, rendered as “être lesé” (Gortyn, early 5th c. BCE; mid.-pass. inf. ‑θαι is regular from ‑εθαι).

44 ἐβλάφθην is preferred in Epic Greek for metrical reasons, and is less frequent than ἐβλάβην in the classical language. Therefore, ἐβλάβην must be older.
45 Plus a Homeric imitation in *Anacreont*. 31.26.
46 For the derivation of an s-stem compound from an intransitive verbal stem in Greek (replacing an original root compound), see Meissner (2006: 186–197).
47 A root noun is attested in Vedic (RV 8.07.9, ins. sg. *mr̥cā́* and YAv. (*maraxš* ‘ruin’). Cf. ἀλκή ‘fighting spirit’, φυγή ‘flight’ beside Homeric ἀλκί, φύγαδε, as well as δίκη ‘verdict; way of conduct’ (a quasi-antonym of ἀβλάβη) corresponding to Vedic *dis‑* ‘direction’.
48 As *delg* (s.v. βλάβη) remarks, “Par son attestation plus ancienne comme par son sens concret, le thème verbal semble plus archaïque que les formes nominales”. The forms βλάβος (n.) ‘harm; curse’ (Hdt.+) and βλαβερός ‘harmful’ (Hes.+) are either deverbal or backformations to ἀβλαβής (cf. Schwyzzer 1939: 482).
49 The instances are Hes. *Op*. 193–194, *Op*. 258, *Op*. 282–283, and perhaps also *Th*. 89.
abstract αβλοπια (Gortyn, Axos); απλοπια (Lyttos), rendered as “conduite qui ne fait tort à personne” (DELG s.v. βλάβη)\textsuperscript{50}

– ἀβλοπές· ἀβλαβές. Κρῆτες (Hsch.).

For αβλοπια, Chantraine (1933: 79) compared the near-synonym ὠφελία ‘service; behavior which benefits’. Since an older form ὠφέλεια (derived from the s-stem forms ὄφελος, ‑ωφελής) is attested beside ὠφελία, he suggested that αβλοπια can be derived from the s-stem attested in ἀβλαβής and the gloss ἀβλοπές· ἀβλαβές. Κρῆτες (Hsch.). Since all attestations of αβλοπια are from the 6th or 5th c. BCE and from various different regions of Crete, it is probably a traditional legal term. The form απλοπια at Lyttos may be due to the sound change *DL‑ > TL‑ also observed in κλευκος ‘new wine’ (in the same inscription as απλοπια) and in the Cretan gloss κλάγος ‘milk’ (Hsch.).

In view of this Cretan evidence, it must be asked whether βλαβ‑ in Ionic-Attic can be secondary. It would be ad hoc to assume a distance assimilation βλαπ‑ > βλαβ‑ for Ionic-Attic.\textsuperscript{51} An analogical explanation of the -β‑ is out of reach, as most verbs in -άπτω have a stem ending in -φ‑ (cf. ἁφή, βαφή, τάφος, etc.). While some remodeling took place in derived verbs with occlusive-final roots (for example, πλήσσω ‘to strike’ replacing the reflex of *plāgi̯e/o‑, cf. Barber 2013: 262–269), it is usually the yod-present stem that adapts its consonantism. Moreover, a labiovelar would have lost its labial feature before yod early on (cf. νίζω ‘to wash’), so βλάπτω must have been reshaped by analogy at some point anyway. Therefore, βλάβεται and βλάβη probably preserve an old reflex of the root-final stop.

A second issue is the difference in root vocalism between καταβλαπεθαι and αβλοπια. Chantraine explains ‑λο‑ as a pre-Doric dialectal reflex of *l, but this seems ad hoc (both root shapes are attested in Gortyn). The stem-formation of καταβλαπεθαι must be identical to that of Hom. βλάβεται since word-internal -πτ‑ (< *‑pi̯‑) was originally preserved in Cretan (it was later assimilated to -ττ‑).\textsuperscript{52} There are, then, two issues: the difference between βλοπ‑ and βλαπ‑ in Gortynian Cretan, and the divergence in the root-final stop between Cretan and Ionic-Attic.

Both issues can be resolved in the same way. In Van Beek 2017b, I proposed to compare Hom. βλάβεται to the athematic nasal infix present *ml‑n‑k‑ reflected

\textsuperscript{50} This translation may have to be modified: if we compare the use of ἀβλαβής ‘sincerely, unerring’ in Athenian oath formulae, αβλοπια may have originally referred to behavior that was conform to the law (or legal procedure).

\textsuperscript{51} Schwyzer claims (1939: 257) that the phenomenon of distance assimilation belongs to the “ungepflegte Umgangssprache” and therefore rarely appears in literary testimonies, but this is unfalsifiable.

\textsuperscript{52} Cf. pf. mid. εγρατται ‘has been written’, επτα > εττα ‘seven’.
The reflexes of *l̥461 in Greek

| Proto-Greek | Ionic-Attic | Cretan |
|-------------|-------------|--------|
| *mlń̥kʷ-e/o- | βλάβεται | *βλαβεσθαι >> βλαπεθαι |
| *mlń̥kʷ- >> *mlń̥kʷ-ā- | βλάπη >> βλάβη |
| *n-mlń̥kʷ- >> *n-mlń̥kʷ-es- | *ἀβλαπῆς >> ἀβλαβῆς | ἀβλοπές |

by Old Avestan forms like 3pl. mid. vī-mərəṇcāitē.53 The idea is that in PGre. *mlń̥kʷ-e/o-, the root-final stop was voiced after an accented syllabic nasal (> *mlń̥gʷe/o-), which was later vocalized (> *mlń̥gʷe/o- > βλάβε/ο-). This sound change *-ń̥T‑ > *-ń̥D‑ is an extension of the rule *-ń̥T‑ > *-ń̥D‑ proposed by Olsen (1989).54 The thematic nasal infix present *mlń̥kʷ-e/o- underlying βλάβε‑ται could be compared to λάμπω ‘to shine’ < *lh₂-n-p-e/o- (for the root *leh₂p-, cf. Lith. lópē ‘torch’).55

This voicing rule may help us explain the divergences between Ionic-Attic and Cretan in the following way. If Greek inherited both *mlń̥kʷ-e/o- (> βλα‑βεται) and a root noun *mlń̥kʷ- (cf. βλάβη), we may assume that Ionic-Attic preserves the regular outcome of the primary nasal present in Homeric βλα‑βεται, while the outcome of the root noun *mlń̥kʷ-ā was aligned with the verbal stem, yielding βλάβη for expected *βλάπη. The aorist βλαβῆναι may have secondarily taken over the root of the present stem. In Cretan, on the other hand, the root-final consonant of the verb καταβλαπεθαι may have been influenced by the primary noun or other forms without the original nasal infix (cf. αβλο‑πία, ἀβλοπές); these latter forms may show the regular zero grade reflex. These developments are shown in Table 26.

53 Cf. also OAv. marəŋəduiiē (2pl. mid. pres. ind.), marəŋədiidiiāi (pres. inf.), and marəš́iiāt (3sg. act. pres. opt.).
54 Cf. Cretan δεκά‑ ‘decad’ and ἐξωβάδια‑: ἐνώτια. Λάκωνες ‘earrings’ (Hsch.), adduced by Olsen (1989), which probably continues *eks-ou̯sń̥t-ia. In view of these forms, the rule must be dated to Proto-Greek.
55 A nasal present would also account for the zero grade root vocalism of βλάβομαι: usually, thematic middle root presents have an e-grade root (δέρκομαι, πείθομαι, etc.). It is assumed here that the nasal, not the liquid, was vocalized in the Greek pre-form. In Indo-Iranian, it was the liquid that vocalized in nasal infix presents to *CRC-roots: cf. Ved. kṛntāti ‘cuts’, YAv. karəntaiti, or Ved. ptc. rṇḥant‑ ‘succeeding’ (root ardh). However, this consonantal realization of the nasal could be ascribed to the occurrence of ablauting athematic forms like Skt. rṇādh‑. This means that the vocalization *mlń̥kʷ‑e/o‑ presupposed by the Greek form could be regular. Nasalized verbal stems like πλαγχ‑, λαγγ‑, κλαγγ‑ are non-probative in this respect because they have no ascertained IE etymology.
This scenario may account for the existence of two root allomorphs \( \beta \lambda \sigma \rho - \) and \( \beta \lambda \alpha \pi - \) in Gortyn without resorting to unmotivated borrowing from a pre-Doric (Achaean) substrate (as is done by, e.g., Chnatraine in _DELG_ s.v. \( \beta \lambda \acute{b} \beta \)). For we may now assume that \( \beta \lambda \alpha \pi - \) has the reflex of *\( \eta \), while \( \beta \lambda \sigma \rho - \) directly reflects *\( mlkw - \), with \(-\lambda o-\) as the regular outcome of *\( \iota \) between two labial consonants. Such a reflex of *\( \iota \) in Cretan would be paralleled by the reflex \(-\sigma f-\) in this dialect after labial consonants (section 3.1.2). Moreover, the reflex \(-\lambda o-\) with an anaptyctic vowel after the liquid would be at variance with the development of *\( f \) in Cretan.\(^{56}\) Seen in this light, it is indeed likely that \( \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \beta \lambda \alpha \pi \theta \varepsilon \tau \alpha i \) does not contain the reflex of *\( mlkw - \) but that of *\( mlnkw - \), and that the vowel slot of the vocalized zero grade \( \beta \lambda \sigma \rho - < *mlkw - \) was influenced by that of \( \beta \lambda \alpha \pi - \).

In sum, for Ionic-Attic no definite conclusions can be based on Hom. \( \beta \lambda \alpha \beta \varepsilon \tau \alpha i \) (because its \(-\alpha-\) may reflect a syllabic nasal), nor on \( \acute{a} \beta \lambda \alpha \beta \varepsilon \acute{h} \acute{h} - , \beta \lambda \acute{b} \eta i \) or \( \beta \lambda \alpha \beta \varepsilon \eta n i \) (because they may have been influenced by \( \beta \lambda \acute{b} \beta \varepsilon \tau \alpha i \)). The only significant conclusion to be drawn is that \(-\lambda o-\) or \(-\sigma l-\) (in \( \acute{a} \beta \lambda \omega \pi \varepsilon \acute{e} s \) and \( \acute{a} \beta \lambda \omega \pi \pi \varepsilon \acute{a} \), possibly with analogical vowel slot) was probably the Cretan outcome of *\( \iota \) in a labial environment.

10.3.2 \( \delta i p l \acute{a} s i o s \)

The adjective \( \delta i p l \acute{a} s i o s \) ‘twofold, double the size, twice as much’ is first attested in Solon (fr. 13.73 W), and it is common in Attic prose.\(^{57}\) It may originally be a legal term: cf. \( \delta i p l \acute{a} s i o s \) \( \zeta \gamma \mu \alpha i a \) ‘double the fine’, also found in Arcadian (IG v,2 6.35, also in Dubois 1988, Tegea 4.18) and in Elis, where it could be due to Koine influence (Minon 2007, 1: 208). The Ionic form \( \delta i p l \acute{h} \acute{s} i o s \) is attested in Herodotus and inscriptions; its \(-\eta-\) may be analogical after a semantically close form like \( \pi \alpha r a \pi \lambda \acute{h} \acute{s} i o s \) ‘about the same size, about equal’ (from the root *\( pelh_2 - \) of \( \pi \acute{e} l \alpha \acute{s} \) ‘near’).\(^{58}\)

In Classical Greek, the meaning of \( \delta i p l \acute{a} s i o s \) ‘double the size’ is different from that of \( \delta i p l \acute{o}s , \delta i p l \acute{o}s \), contracted \( \delta i p l \omega \upsilon s \) (Hom., Pi., trag., etc.), which means ‘double, twofold’ in the sense of ‘consisting of two discrete entities’. \( \delta i p l \dot{o}s \) clearly represents older *\( du-i-pl-o- \) as in Lat. _duplus_ (< *\( du-pl-o- \)), _simplus_, also in Goth. _twefls_ ‘doubt’, Lyc. _thiplê_ ‘twice(?)’, OIr. _diabul_ ‘double’.\(^{59}\) The

---

56 To assume an o-grade root in the pre-form of \( \acute{a} \beta \lambda \omega \pi \varepsilon \acute{e} s \) would be unmotivated.
57 The word is unattested, however, in the tragedians.
58 Cf. Hdn. 3.130.4. The special Ionic form is also attested in inscriptions, e.g. αὐτοὶ τὴν δωμὴν διπλήσιν ἀφελόντων IG xi Supp. 347 11, 6 (Thasos).
59 According to Kretschmer (cf. Frisk _GEW_ s.v. _diplós_), _diplás_ was reshaped as _diplós_ under influence of the word for ‘sea journey’, *\( \rho \lambda \acute{o} \mu o - > \pi \lambda \dot{o} \varepsilon - \pi \lambda o \upsilon s \). This is not immediately convincing, but seems possible in view of the lack of alternatives.
root is also present in PGmc. *-falþa- ‘fold’ (Goth. *-falþs MiG. *-falt < *-*pol-to-). For διπλάσιος, on the other hand, the etymological dictionaries (Boisacq 1916, *gew, delg and edg*) posit an earlier *δίπλατος, enlarged by a suffix -ιος (like e.g. ἀμβρόσιος beside ἄμβροτος).60 This *δίπλατος would continue a compound *dui-pl-o- from the same root *pel- ‘fold’ as *dui-pl-o-.

Upon closer scrutiny, however, it appears that διπλάσιος may have been created within the history of Greek, because there is also a verb διπλάζω ‘to be twice as big’ (S.Aj. 268 τό τοι διπλάζον μείζον κακόν). This denominative verb may have been derived from διπλός or its n.pl. διπλά. For the subsequent derivation of διπλάσιος from διπλάζω, cf. διπλάζων διπλασία (Hom.) διπλάζω (trag.) διπλάσιος ‘double the size, twice as big’ (Thgn.), whence later διπλασιάζω ‘to double’ (Pl. Leg. 920a). If the only old form in Greek is διπλός, then διπλάσιος must not be compared directly with E. (two)-fold.

10.4 Promising Evidence for *l > -λα-

10.4.1 βλαδεῖς and βλαδαρός

A root βλαδ- reflecting *meld- is attested in the following glosses, all from Hsch.: – βλαδεῖς· ἀδύνατοι. ἐξ ἀδυνάτων ‘weak’;
– βλαδαρόν· ἐκλελυμένον, χαῦνον ‘flaccid, porous’;
– βλαδόν· ἀδύνατον ‘weak’.

In addition, the same root might be contained in the following glosses from Hsch., even if connecting them is less obvious from a semantic perspective:
– βλαδαρά· ἀυρά, μωρά. ὁμά ‘untimely; dull, stupid; raw’;
– βλαδόν· νωθρός ‘slothful’.

Since the PIE full grade was *meld- (see section 4.4), βλαδ- must be the regular outcome of zero grade *meld-. The form βλαδεῖς (from an unattested sg. βλαδύς) seems the most archaic, as it would directly reflect the PIE adjective *meld-ú- (Ved. myrdi- ‘soft, delicate’, Lat. mollis ‘soft, gentle’).

In addition to these forms, ἀμαλδύνω (with secondarily added ἀ-) is likely to be based on another reflex of the u-stem adjective, with an alternative vocalization. The problems with the two coexisting vocalizations βλαδύς and * (ἀ)μαλδύς have been discussed in section 4.4. Since πλαδαρός ‘damp, weak, flaccid’ (cf. πλαδάω ‘to make flaccid’) looks like the Ionic-Attic vernacular form corresponding to βλαδαρός, I suggested there that πλαδαρός may have arisen from βλαδαρός

60 The form διπλάτος is wrongly cited by Boisacq 1916 s.v. διπλός; it belongs to πάλω ‘to toss’.
by contamination with a semantically close word, such as πλάσσω ‘to knead’. If one were to assume that βλαδαρός and βλαδύς stem from a non-Ionic-Attic dialect, *(ἀ)μαλδύς would continue the u-stem adjective, with levelling of the full grade slot; but even in this case, Attic πλαδαρός would indirectly continue the outcome of *mlÐ-.

10.4.2 βλαστός
According to the etymological dictionaries, the thematic aor. βλαστεῖν ‘to sprout, bud’ (Pi.+), with the derived pres. βλαστάνω, has no etymology. In the meantime, Lamberterie (1990: 358–361) proposed to derive it from the noun βλαστός ‘sprout, young shoot’ (Hdt.+), which he reconstructs as a substantivized adjective *ml̥d‑tó‑ ‘tender, young’. As a parallel, he points out that PIE *meld‑ ‘soft, weak’ also served as the basis for a word for soft or tender shoots in Slavic (*moldź ‘young, tender’ > OCS mlads, Ru. molodój, etc.). The derivation of a thematic aorist βλαστεῖν from βλαστός yields some difficulties. Lamberterie proposes to compare βλαστός with Hom. θαλλός ‘id.’, which seems to be derived from the present stem of θάλλω ‘to flourish’. On this basis, a verb *βλάστω, impf. ἐβλάστον, aor. ἐβλάστησα would have been back-formed, after which the imperfect ἐβλάστησα was reinterpreted as a thematic aorist. The assumed switch of aspect is not without problems, but the idea to derive βλαστός from *ml̥d‑tó‑ is intuitively attractive. If the etymology is correct, it furnishes another example for a regular outcome ‑λα‑ < *l̥.

10.4.3 γλαφυρός
The etymology of Hom. γλαφυρός ‘hollow’ (epithet of ships, caves, and the phorminx, in Od. 14.533 also of a hollow stone that provides shelter) has been evaluated in various ways.61 There are two basic proposals. First, γλαφυρός has been derived as an adjective in *‑uló‑ from the root of γλάφω ‘to scoop out, dig a hole’. This verb is attested as a simplex only in ποσσὶν γλάφει “he digs [the earth] with his paws”, of a lion (Scut. 431), and with a preverb only in the line εὐνάς δ’ ἐν ψαμάθοις διαγλάψασ’ ἁλίῃσιν “having scooped out lairs in the sand of the beach” (Od. 4.438, the subject is Eidothea). Lamberterie objects to this proposal that the only indication for a PIE verbal root is precisely Greek γλάφω, and that the alleged connections with Slavic (e.g. Bulg. glob ‘eye socket’) and Celtic words (Mlr. gulba gl. rostrum ‘beak’) are uncertain.

A second proposal is made by Chantraine (DELG s.v. γλαφυρός). He argues that γλάφω can hardly be separated from γλύφω ‘to carve, sculpture’, a root

61 See Lamberterie (1990: 315 ff.) for an extensive treatment.
which does have verbal cognates in other IE languages (Lat. *glūbere* ‘to peel, strip the bark’, OHG *kliohan* ‘to cleave’). This combination is accepted by Lamberterie, who assumes a dissimilation *γλυφ‑ > γλαφ‑ and a semantic development from ‘stripped off’ to ‘hollow’ in the adjective. Subsequently, the verbal root, too, would have split into γλαφ‑ and γλυφ‑. Lamberterie further suggests that the reconstructed u-stem *γλυφ‑ could be deverbal, and that another reflex of this u-stem is perhaps found in the Slavic adjective *globokъ (Ru. *glubókij*) ‘deep’.

The second scenario does not seem plausible to me. First, the assumed dissimilation *γλυφ‑ > γλαφ‑ is not self-evident (as Lamberterie 1990: 316 himself admits); I have not found a convincing parallel in Greek. Moreover, it is unclear how the split into γλύφω and γλάφω should be envisaged: for a factitive verb based on the new adjective *γλαφρός, one expects *γλαφύνω. Thirdly, the only proposed cognate is found in Slavic, where the three root variants *glob‑, *glyb‑ and *glokb‑ could point to non-IE origin. Finally, the semantic connection between ‘to peel off, scale’ and ‘to make hollow’ is conceivable, but not evident. The oldest meaning in both Latin and Germanic is ‘to peel off, scale’, which is very close to that of γλύφω ‘to carve’, i.e. ‘to scale off chips of wood or stone’. In defense of Chantraine, it is true that the adjective γλαφρός is applied not only to natural cavities (caves, holes), but also to man-made hollow objects (musical instruments, ships). However, the verb γλάφω does not refer to holes that are made by carving, chiseling, or peeling: it means ‘to dig a hole with the hands or paws’ in both its attestations.

In view of these problems, I wish to propose an alternative etymology: γλαφρός contains the root of δελφός ‘womb’, δελφίς ‘dolphin’ (i.e. ‘[aquatic animal] with womb’), and ἀδελφεός ‘brother/sister, born of the same mother’ < *sme‑gwelbh‑es‑ó‑ “from the same womb”. In Indo-Iranian, the root *gewelb‑ is reflected in Ved. *garbh‑ m. ‘womb, embryo’, YAv. *garv‑ m. ‘womb’, *garvb‑ ‘newborn lamb’. The verb γλάφω would be the only trace of *gewelb‑ as a ver-

---

62 “… la relation, perçue en synchronie, entre l’adjectif et le verbe a entraîné la scission d’une seule et même racine *γλυφ‑ en deux racines, resp. γλυφ‑ et γλαφ‑, la première ayant l’acception technique de “sculpter” dont la seconde est dépourvue, encore qu’on en trouve des traces dans certains emplois de γλαφρός” (Lamberterie 1990: 315).
63 Cf. the doubts expressed by Derksen, *edsl s.v. *globoks, about the possibility to reconstruct this word.
64 In spite of doubts concerning the chronology of the attestations (cf. *edl s.v. vulva*), it seems to me that Lat. *vulva* (imperial inscr. vulba) ‘womb’ can hardly be separated from Ved. *gárha-. The meanings ‘bodily cavity’ and ‘cavity in the landscape’ are also found side by side in Gr. *kólpos ‘bosom, lap; gulf of the sea’. This may have dissimilated from PGr. *kwelph‑, from a root *kwelp‑ also found in Germanic *hwelfan‑ ‘to vault, revolve’ and
bal root, but even if the precise origin of the zero grade thematic root presents (of the type Ved. *tudāti*) is unclear, I see no reason to doubt its etymological connection with the nouns mentioned.

As for the phonological developments, there is a number of clear cases where a Common Greek labiovelar onset dissimilates against a labial stop in the following coda or onset: compare καπνός 'smoke' < PGr. *kʰapno-IPA| *kyapno-(Lith. kvapas 'id.'), ἄρτοκόπος 'baker' (Hdt.) beside Myc. a-to-po-qa 'id.' (PIE *pekʷ- 'to cook, ripen'; the Ionic form has undergone metathesis to *-kʰopo-), and Hom. κόλπος 'bosom, lap; gulf' < PGr. *kʰólpo- (cf. PGmc. *hwalfa- n. in ON hvalf, OE hwalf 'vault'). This dissimilation took place relatively late, as it is not yet found in Mycenaean. Moreover, δελφύς and relatives illustrate that the palatalization of labiovelars before e precedes the dissimilation. It is possible that the dissimilation took place irregularly, but it seems to be applied in a remarkably consistent fashion.

The semantic development is relatively straightforward: a meaning 'hollow; cavity' can be posited for the PIE root. Already in the proto-language, nominal formations developed a special meaning 'womb'. It deserves attention, however, that γλαφυρός would be the only adjective derived from this root, which mainly furnishes substantival derivatives. This brings us to the hapax γλάφυ (n.) 'cave, shelter' (Hes. Op. 533). Lamberterie (1990: 313–314), building on Leumann (1953: 223 n. 2), analyzes this as a substantivized form of an adjective *gʷlʰbh-ú-, and claims that γλαφυρός is an extension in *-ló- of this adjective.
However, it cannot be excluded either that γλάφυ is an original noun, with a suffix to be compared with δελφύς. In this case, γλαφυρός can be analyzed as a de-substantival derivation in *‑ró‑.70

In either case, since the full grade slot of the root for ‘hollow’ was */gwelhʷ/, this etymology furnishes new and compelling evidence for a regular development */l̥/<‑λα‑ in one of the dialects reflected in Homeric Greek. This etymology also helps to clarify the background of the toponym Δελφοί (Boeot. Βελφοί). Given a root meaning ‘hollow’, this name may be a substantivized adjective which referred to caves or places of shelter, just as in γλάφυ ‘cave’; also note the toponym Γλάφυραι (Il. 2.712).

10.4.4 χλάδος
The thematic noun ὁ / τὸ χλάδος ‘branch’ (Ibyc., A., B. † ), later also attested as a monosyllabic stem χλαδ‑ (E., Ar.), has been compared with Germanic and Slavic words: ON and OE holt (n.) ‘wood; forest’ < *kldo‑, and OCS klada, Ru. kolóda ‘wooden log’ < *kóldeh₂‑. The comparison is semantically attractive and phonologically perfect, and I therefore follow the etymological dictionaries in reconstructing a PIE noun *kldo‑.71 Still, the limited distribution of this word and the lack of a good root etymology are reasons for some doubt.72

10.4.5 λάγνος
The adjective λάγνος ‘lascivious, horny’ (Arist.) and its derivatives λαγνεύω, λαγνεία are best derived from the root *selǵ‑ that is also attested in Ved. sarj ‘to release, let go’ and in the Cretan verb λαγαιω (aor. λαγασαι) ‘to release’ (on which see section 10.6.1). As argued above, a further possible cognate is Lat. laxus ‘spacious, wide, loose’ if this reflects *slg‑‑s‑‑o‑ with Schrijver’s rule *RDC > RaDC. Furthermore, as I have argued in Van Beek 2018: 59–60, ἀσελγής ‘wanton’ may also be related to λάγνος, reflecting PGr. *ad‑selg‑es‑. The Greek evi-

---

70 Probert (2006: 284–285) remarks that while some adjectives in ‑υρός derive from *‑u‑lo‑, in other cases *‑u‑ro‑ is old.
71 Cf. EDPG s.v. *hulta‑, GEW s.v. χλάδος.
72 Greek speakers may have connected χλάδος with the verb χλάω, aor. χλάσαι ‘to break (also of branches and stalks)’ by folk etymology, but a direct etymological connection (as assumed in DELG s.v. χλάδος) is hard to substantiate because it is difficult to see how the present χλάω could be secondary. Beekes’ comparison with χράθη ‘branch’, χράδω ‘to swing’ (EDG s.v. χλάδος), assuming an interchange ρ/λ which he explains from a substrate origin, clearly goes too far.
dence suggests the existence of a Proto-Greek verb, with an e-grade thematic present *selg-e/o- (whence ἀσελγής) beside a zero grade thematic aorist *slg-e/o- (whence Cret. λαγασσαί).

The derivation from PIE *selg- implies that λάγνος is unrelated to Germanic *slaka- ‘slack’ (compared by Frisk, GEW s.v. λαγασσαί) because the latter has a different vowel slot. Therefore, λάγνος is a relatively strong piece of evidence for the development of *l.

10.4.6 πλάξ and δίπλαξ, τρίπλαξ

πλάξ, gen. πλακός (S., E.+) denotes a ‘flat surface’, e.g. that of the sea, or the flank or flat summit of a mountain. This noun is traditionally compared to Germanic words meaning ‘layer, surface’, especially ON flær (f. pl.) ‘strip of land’ < PGmc. *flahiz and ON flá (f. sg.) ‘id.’ < PGmc. *flahó. According to Frisk (GEW s.v. πλάξ), this comparison points to an inherited root noun PIE *plak-, with inherited *a. However, we must note that according to Kroonen (EDPG s.v. *flahó-), the root noun inflection in the plural form flær is secondary, and the ā-stem form reflected in the singular flá is older. Kroonen therefore compares the Germanic words to Latv. plaka ‘lowland, plain’, and reconstructs them as quasi PIE *plok-eh2 (EDPG s.v. *flaka-).73

Does this mean that the comparison of the Germanic words with the Greek root noun πλάξ, as a mere root etymology, becomes less plausible? On the contrary, for it appears that a verbal root *plek- can be reconstructed. In Germanic we find various reflexes of a strong verb *flahan-, e.g. OE flēan ‘to strip, flay’, ON flá ‘id.’. This throws an unexpected light on the semantic development to ‘plain; flat surface’. Features of the landscape are often named by analogy with the body of animals (e.g. ridge, headland, neck, mouth of a river). The identification made in the case of πλάξ is that between hair and vegetation: a plain without trees was described using the image of a skinned animal, stripped of its hairy skin. The same image was at work in the Germanic nouns quoted above.74

There are two Greek forms with a 2nd compound member -πλακ- ‘layer’. Hom. δίπλαξ (adj.) ‘two-layered’ is attested in δίπλακι δημῷ ‘(wrapped) in a double layer of fat’ (Il. 23.243 and 253), and it occurs in substantivized form in δίπλακα πορφυρέην ‘purple mantle’ (Il. 3.126, 22.441, Od. 19.241). The hapax

---

73 Cf. also Icel. flár, Nw. flá ‘flat, wide’ < PGmc. *flaha- < PIE *plók-o- (EDPG, s.v. *flaka-).
74 In addition, there is also a Baltic verbal root with reflexes in Lith. plakti ‘to beat’, Latv. plakt ‘to become flat’; compare also the derivative Lith. (dial.) plakanas ‘flat’, Latv. plakans ‘id.’. As for the meaning of Lith. plakti ‘to beat’, Derksen (EDBIL s.v. plakti) remarks that this root and ‘plaHk- ‘to beat’ (in Slavic plakati ‘to cry, lament’) may have influenced each other.
τριπλαξ describes the ‘three-layered’ rim (ἐντυξ) of Achilles’ shield (II. 18.479–480). What is the etymology of this second member -πλακε? It has been derived from the root of πλέκω ‘to plait, twine’ (PIE *plek-). Given the identical formation of Lat. duplex ‘twofold’ and the existence of the verb plicāre ‘to fold, wind’ in that language, this seems plausible at first sight. In addition, the use of ‘-fold’ in the Germanic languages seems to offer a good parallel; the phrase δίπλακι δημῷ would preserve a trace of the original meaning ‘two-fold, wrapped twice’.

In reality, διπλαξ and τριπλαξ must be compounds with πλαξ ‘surface’; their second member is unrelated to πλέκω ‘to twine’. The main argument is that πλαξ, like other nouns derived from the verbal root *plek- ‘to strip, flay’ (compare ON fló ‘layer’ < PGmc. *flōhō, edpg q.v.), must also have had the meaning ‘layer’. It is telling that all Homeric uses of διπλαξ and τριπλαξ concern layers that may have been obtained in the process of flaying and dissecting an animal: hides (in a shield) and layers of fat.

Thus, πλαξ can be plausibly reconstructed as a root noun PIE *pl(o)k‑ ‘surface, layer’ belonging with a verbal root meaning ‘strip, flay’. There is no reason to assume that an ablauting full grade form *plok‑ was preserved in the paradigm sufficiently long to influence the vocalization of *pl̥k‑, and the verb has left no traces in Greek. Hence, πλαξ < *plk‑ is an important piece of evidence.

10.4.7 πλάτη

Although πλατύς and related ‘Caland’-system forms do not offer compelling evidence for the regular reflex of *l, this may be different for the cognate form πλάτη ‘shoulder-blade; blade of an oar’, which often occurs as a determinative compound ὠμοπλάτη when denoting the body-part. It is often maintained that πλάτη may refer to any flat surface, but meanings other than the two just cited (‘sheet of papyrus’, ‘winnowing fan’) are rare and late. This means that πλάτη has very concrete referents. Moreover, it is remarkable that Hitt. paltana- c. ‘shoulder(blade)’; OIr. leithe ‘id.’ and OCS pleše ‘shoulder’ derive from the same root. The Celtic and Slavic forms both appear to continue a pre-form *pleth2‑jo-. One might therefore be inclined to view πλάτη as directly reflecting PIE *plth2‑eh2‑. According to Chantraine (DELG s.v. 1 πλατύς), πλάτη was created beside the neuter abstract πλάτος, on the model of βλάβη beside βλάβος; but this does not seem likely to me because the antiquity of βλάβος is not guaran-

---

75 Cf. de Vaan, EDL s.v. -plex (following Ernout-Meillet, DELL) and Beekes, EDG s.v. διπλαξ.
76 Thus also Frisk, GEW s.v. διπλαξ and W-H, s.v. duplex, but without the argumentation given here.
ted, and also since the last-mentioned forms retained a connection with the verb βλάπτω. Thus, although the formation underlying πλάτη is not necessarily of PIE origin, it is an old derivative that is relatively isolated within Greek, and therefore a reasonably strong candidate to display the regular reflex of *l.}

**10.5 The Development of *ln**

A couple of Ionic-Attic forms suggest that *l developed to -αλ- conditioned by a following nasal plus vowel. Indeed, a special development before nasals would not be unexpected, given that the same happened to the syllabic liquids in the prehistory of Celtic (cf. section 9.4). In order to see whether such a development is conceivable for Greek, let us first discuss several present stems for which an original sequence *ln can be reconstructed.

**10.5.1 The Presents βάλλω and θάλλω**

Consider the three following reconstructions:

- βάλλω ‘to throw’ < *gwlnhe/o- << *gwlnh1-
- θάλλω ‘to flourish’ < *dhlnhe/o- << *dhlnh1-
- πάλλω ‘to toss, sway, brandish’ < *plnhe/o- << *plnh1-

That βάλλω continues an original nasal present *gwlnhe/o- (PIE *gwlnh1-) is widely accepted and seems reasonably certain. Since the root of θάλλω is best reconstructed as *dhlnh1-, with Hackstein (2002: 220), an inher-

---

* I leave aside the following forms: (1) Ion.-Att. στήλη, Dor. στάλα, Lesb. στάλλα. The pre-form is not necessarily “stl-neh2”, as is often assumed: see section 1.2.5; (2) μαλλός ‘flock of wool’: the comparison with Arm. mal ‘ram’, proposed by Greppin (1981), is doubtful: cf. the discussion in Clackson (1994: 232); (3) κυλλός ‘crooked, club-footed’, which Meier-Brügger (1990) derived from *kwl¬w¬, with the root *k¬el- ‘turn’: see section 1.3.2 for criticism of this etymology; (4) φαλλός ‘penis’, on which see section 10.1.12; (5) πλανάω ‘to drive off track; lead astray’ (Hom.+), πλάνη ‘long journey; error’ (Ion.-Att.) and other related forms, because they have no convincing IE etymology according to the standard etymological dictionaries.

---

77 In πίλναμαι ‘to approach’, -λν- was restored due to a proportional analogy with its antonym σκεδάσαι: σκίδναμαι ‘to disperse’ (cf. aor. πελάσαι). It may have replaced a morphologically opaque form like *πάλλαμαι.

78 Cf. LIV s.v. *gwelh1- with further refs. It has been claimed (GEW and EDG, both s.v. βάλλω) that a yod-present cannot be excluded. However, yod-presents were not normally derived from thematic aorists, whereas nasal presents regularly occur beside thematic or root aorists (cf. e.g. Ion. τάμνω < *tm-n-eh1- beside ταμεῖν < *tmh1-e/o-). This pattern is probably inherited from PIE.

---

80 Pace LIV s.v. *dhelh1-.
ited nasal present *dhlne/o- << *dhl-n-(e)h₁- is also the most likely option. The reconstruction of πάλλω as *pl₁-n-(e)h₁- is less certain, but remains a viable possibility, cf. the next section.

There is good evidence showing that intervocalic *-ln- developed to -λ- with compensatory lengthening of the preceding vowel. As argued by Slings (1975), West Greek and Aeolic forms of the verb ‘to wish, want’ (Dor. δήλομαι, Boeot. βειλομη, Thess. βέλλομαι) are best reconstructed as a nasal present PGr. *gwelne/o-. In my view, Ion.-Att. βούλομαι is best analyzed as a contamination of this *gwelne/o- and the old verb βόλομαι (attested in e.g. Homer, Euboean and Arcadian). The noun βουλή < *gwolnā is best analyzed as a regular deverbal abstract of the type τομή to the outcome of PGr. *gwelne/o-.81 Slings also draws attention to ὀφείλω ‘to owe’, which demands a similar pre-form *ophelne/o- beside the thematic aorists ὤφελον, ὦφλον. To these examples, I would also add the case of Hom. εἴλομαι ‘to throng together’, which is best derived from *yelne/o- (see below).

If this is true, and if βάλλω and θάλλω indeed continue nasal presents, how can their geminate ‑λλ‑ be accounted for? I propose that it reflects *‑l‑ and that the development of *‑l‑ to ‑αλ‑ took place after the first stages of the 1st compensatory lengthening had affected original post-vocalic *‑ln‑.82 However, even if this analysis of βάλλω and θάλλω is correct, the question whether these presents can be used to prove a *regular* vocalization *‑l‑ > *‑al‑ > ‑αλ‑- (rather than > ‑λαν‑) remains open. In βάλλω the vocalization may have been influenced by the aorist βαλεῖν, and similarly, it would be possible to argue that the outcome of *dhlne/o- was influenced by the root allomorph θαλ‑ in the frequent pf. ptc. τεθαλύσα < *dhe-dhl₁-us-ih₂, and in derivatives like θαλέθω, θαλύς, θαλε‑ρός.

10.5.2 πάλλω

The case of πάλλω is more complex. Considering the verb and its derivatives, we have evidence for a non-ablauting root PGr. *pal-. The question is from which Indo-European pre-form this root was generalized. The root is mostly reconstructed as *pelh₁- on account of the denominative verb πελεμίζω ‘to shake, cause to quiver’ (probably derived from a lost noun *πέλεμος n.). The LIV² (s.v. *pelh₁-, following Hardørson 1993: 161) reconstructs an inherited nasal present

---

81 Sling's proposal (op. cit.) that Ion.-Att. βούλομαι was directly derived from βουλή is not very attractive.
82 In the development of original intervocalic *‑ln‑, there may have been an intermediate stage *‑ll‑, after which the geminate was simplified with cl in most dialects. For a different scenario, see Sling (1975: 4–5).
that is directly reflected in πάλλω. Frisk (GEW s.v. πάλλω), however, derives πάλλω from a yod-present *pal-ie/o- in view of the sigmatic aorist πῆλαι < *pal-s-, which normally does not pair with a nasal present stem. Thus, the reconstruction of the present stem depends on which verbal formation is considered to be primary. The sigmatic aorist πῆλαι must be secondary in any case (cf. LIV² l.c. and Beckwith 1996: 125); the root aorist πάλτο, ἔπαλτο is also widely supposed to be an artificial creation (Leumann 1950: 60 ff., followed by Hardarson 1993: 196–197). The only potentially old aorist formation is the reduplicated participle ἀμπεπαλών ‘swinging up (over the head)’ < *pe-plh₁-e/o-, which is exclusively Homeric.

Etymologically, πάλλω has been connected with Slav. pláti ‘to wave’, Ru. dial. polót’ ‘to winnow’: see LIV² (s.v. *pelh₁-) and Beckwith (1996: 123–129). On the other hand, several etymological dictionaries (DELL s.v. pellō; GEW s.v. πάλλω) compare πάλλω primarily with Lat. pellō ‘to beat against, strike; push’; in this case the Latin perfect pepuli can be compared directly with the reduplicated aorist ἀμπεπαλών. Indeed, pace LIV², the comparison with Latin is attractive also from a semantic point of view: Frisk (l.c.) compares παλμός ‘pulse’ with Lat. pulsus ‘id.’. Although neither of these formations can be inherited, the meaning ‘to beat’ (of the heart) may well be old: compare πᾶλλεται ἵττορ (Il. 22.452), παλλομένη κραδίην (Il. 22.461). Another meaning shared by πάλλω and Lat. pellō is ‘to vibrate’ (of the strings of an instrument), cf. Pl. Phd. 94c.83 For this reason, the reconstruction of a nasal present *pl₁-n-h₁‑ ‘to shake, quiver, vibrate’ (tr.) underlying both πάλλω and Lat. pellō deserves full consideration.

Most modern etymological dictionaries, however, separate πάλλω from the root of Lat. pellō and U. am-pelust ‘will have slain’ because they prefer to connect the Italic words with OIr. ad·ella ‘visits’ and fut. -eblaid ‘will drive’. The root of OIr. ad·ella is reconstructed as *pelh₂- on the basis of a comparison with πίλναμαι, aor. πελάσαι ‘to approach’; the fut. -eblaid ‘will drive’ is also included in the comparison, with a supposed semantic development *‘to bring near’ > ‘to thrust, drive near’ > ‘to strike’.85 This scenario has been embraced by various scholars, but in my view the assumed semantic development is questionable; in addition, as just argued, it is implausible to separate πάλλω from Lat. pellō.86

---

83 Cf. also the meanings ‘flounder’ (ἀναπάλλεται ιχθύς, of a fish in Il. 23.692, also at Hdt. 1.141) and ‘quiver’ (of the knees of old men, Ar. Ran. 345).
84 E.g. LIV² s.v. *pelh₁-, EDL s.v. pellō.
85 Strunk (1985: 235).
86 The connection of Lat. pellō with Gr. πάλλω is now also defended by Willi (2018: 73) as “semantically more straightforward” than a connection with *pelh₂- ‘approach’.
The only reason to disconnect these verbs is the assumption that the Irish future -eblaid is derived from the same root as ad-ella. However, in view of the difference in meaning (‘drive’ versus ‘visit’), it is possible to separate ad-ella etymologically from -eblaid, and to regroup the words as follows: *pəlh₁- ‘to strike, vibrate’ is reflected in Lat. pellō, pepuli, Gr. πάλλω, ἀμπεπαλών, and OIr. -eblaid, while *pəlh₂- ‘to draw close’ is continued in OIr. ad-ella ‘visit’ and Gr. πέλναμαι, πελάσαι, πλήτω ‘to draw near’.

Nevertheless, it remains uncertain whether πάλλω continues an old nasal present. Given that the middle root aorist πάλτω and the sigmatic aorist ἕπηλα must both be secondary if the root was indeed PIE *pəlh₁-, it is certainly possible to assume that the entire verbal system was rebuilt on the basis of an inherited present stem πάλλω < *p[-n]-h₁-. In that case, the development would be comparable to that found in βάλλω and θάλλω. However, it cannot be excluded either that πάλλω reflects a yod-present beside the aorist ἕπηλα, and that both formations are denominative, for instance to πάλος m., which is retained only with the meaning ‘lot (shaken from a helmet)’ but may originally have been a verbal noun denoting the act of tossing.

10.5.3 κάλλος, καλλι- and Related Forms

The sequence -αλλ- also appears in the lexical root of κάλλος, περικαλλής, the first compound member καλλι-, and the forms of comparison καλλίων, κάλλιστος. All these forms belong to the positive καλός ‘beautiful’. The etymology of these forms is mostly considered unclear. The only existing proposal is a comparison with Ved. kalyāṇa- ‘beautiful, lovely’ (f. kalyāṇī), assuming an IE adjectival root *kal- that would appear as *kal-i- in compounds. It is problematic for this comparison that Greek καλλι- has a geminate, moreover, the a-vocalism of the reconstructed root is disturbing.

87 See GEW (though judging the comparison with Skt. kalyāṇa- to be “brauchbar”) and DELIG (“étymologie ignorée”).
88 The first proposal to link Skt. kalyāṇa- to Greek καλλι- was made by E. Leumann (1893). Wackernagel (1934: 191–197) subsequently analyzed the Sanskrit word as an old compound containing the word for ‘elbow’ as a second member. This etymology was never fully embraced by the handbooks, but Pinault (2003) again pleads for it, arguing that the second member of Skt. kalyāṇa- (or rather its feminine kalyāṇī-) is a non-IE word for ‘haunch’ borrowed independently by both Indo-Aryan and Tocharian. See Pinault’s article for an overview of previous research on kalyāṇa-.
89 In the view of Wackernagel (1934), καλλι- replaced an older *καλι-. Since Pinault (2003) does not deal with this issue, he apparently accepts Wackernagel’s view.
90 For the problems involved in reconstructing a PIE phoneme *a, see Lubotsky 1989. I will not further deal with this issue here.
The root shape καλ- can be accounted for if we start from a pre-form containing *ln.\textsuperscript{91} Since adjectives with ‘Caland’ morphology could be productively derived from primary verbs in Greek, the forms κάλλος, -καλλής and καλλίων, κάλλιστος can be mechanically derived from a verb *κάλλω, reflecting a thematized nasal present PGr. *klne/o-.\textsuperscript{92} Noting that ‘beautiful’ may easily develop from ‘excelling, outstanding’, this reconstructed form PGr. *klne/o- may directly correspond to the nasal present attested in Lat. -cellō ‘to stand out’ (cf. also Lith. kilti ‘to rise’, isg. pres. kylū).\textsuperscript{93} Thus, the original meaning of Homeric περικάλλις would be ‘standing out, excelling’. That a semantic development to ‘excel, surpass’ could easily take place in derivatives from this root is illustrated not only by Lat. praecellō and excellō, but also by Lith. kilnūs ‘upright; excellent, splendid’, related to kilti ‘to rise’.

This brings us to the formation of the positive, Att. κᾰλός, Hom. κάλ+'/'+καλός, Boeot. καλφος. A root *kal- (with old *a) is excluded because Ionic-Attic -καλ- cannot be obtained from this. Now, *kalu̯ó- could theoretically reflect PGr. *klu̯ó-, if one supposes a vocalization *l > -αλ- before *u.\textsuperscript{94} However, if the etymology proposed here is correct, the root is to be reconstructed as *kelh₁-.\textsuperscript{95} This would imply that *kalu̯ó- did not derive directly from *klu̯ó-, but is a thematicization of PGr. *kali≤- < PIE *klh₁-u-.\textsuperscript{96} Lith. kilūs and PGr. *kali≤- may theoretically derive from a common pre-form PIE *klh₁-u- ‘sticking out, rising up’, but the Lithuanian form is more likely to be an independent, productive creation of that language.

\textsuperscript{91} I further elaborated this idea, which was presented already in Van Beek 2013, in a paper presented during the workshop Caland in Sicht (Österreichische Linguistiktagung, Graz, 20 November 2016). A published version of this paper is in preparation.

\textsuperscript{92} In the meaning ‘to stand out’, the normal Homeric Greek verb was (δια)πρέπω; note also the inherited middle perfect κέκασμαι ‘to excel’. For ‘Caland’ systems secondarily derived from an already constituted stem, see also Nussbaum (1976: 98).

\textsuperscript{93} Lat. -cellō is assumed to have introduced its e-vowel from a prehistoric aorist: see \textsc{edl} s.v. -cellō 1.

\textsuperscript{94} See Willi (2017), who derives PGr. *kalu̯ó- / *klu̯ó- from the root PIE *kleu- ‘hear’. Note, however, that there is no evidence directly supporting such a rule for the vocalization of *lu: see section 1.2.2.

\textsuperscript{95} I assume root-final *-h₁- because of the present PGr. *klne/o-, on a par with other thematized nasal presents like βάλλω, τάμνω, θάλλω that derive from roots in *-h₁-; Vine (2006) and Seržant (2008) reconstruct this root as *kelh₁-, but this claim is based on reconstructions and etymologies that I consider to be questionable.

\textsuperscript{96} Thematicization of u-stem adjectives, whatever its cause, occurs more often in Greek: cf. Hom. στενός ‘narrow’ beside στενο- in compounds, ταυνός ‘thin’ and Myc. ta-na-wa beside ταν- in compounds (cf. Ved. tanu-), and μανός ‘sparse, thin’ beside μανό and Arm. manr (u-stem) ‘small, thin’.
Returning to the vocalization of *l̥, the root καλλ- can be plausibly derived from *kł̥n-e/o- and thus offers suggestive evidence for a regular development of *ln to -αλλ-. However, it cannot be entirely excluded that the outcome -αλ- in καλλος, καλλίων and related forms arose under influence of the basic adjective *kalum-.

10.5.4 _Ion. ἁλής, Hom. ἀολλέες_

The Ionic adjective ἁλής (with ᾱ) (Hdt., Hp.) means ‘thronged, amassed, in close formation, forming a unity’, pl. also ‘all together’.97 This is a potentially important piece of evidence for *ln, because it is cognate to Hom. ἀσκλλέες (plurale tantum) ‘in a throng, all together’ < zero grade *ha- вполн-es-, and probably also ἀσκλλής ‘thick, dense’ (hapax at Il. 3.13) with a full grade root.98 The zero grade formation is also reflected in West Greek: Elean αϝλανεο̄ς ‘all together’, and the gloss ἀλανέως· ὁλοσχερῶς. Ταραντῖνοι ‘entirely, completely’ (Hsch.).99 Since Tarentum was a Spartan colony, the adverb can be reconstructed also for Proto-West Greek.

There are several uncertainties in the reconstruction of this adjective. The dialectal origin of Hom. ἀσκλλέες is unclear. The hapax ἀσκλλής must reflect *ha-uhn̥elnes- and seems to be of Aeolic origin in view of its geminate reflex of intervocalic *-ln-. The Ionic prose form ἁλής could continue a full grade (like Homeric ἁελλής) or a zero grade root (like ἀσκλλέες, ἀσκλλεος). In the latter case, the development could be reconstructed as *ha- vpn- > *haυaln- > *haυall- > *hαll-, with loss of digamma followed by simplification of the geminate after a long vowel.100 However, since ἁλής may also be the regular contraction product of a pre-form *haυε̆les- < *ha-uhn̥elnes- with a (secondarily introduced) e-grade root, it cannot serve as evidence for the Ionic-Attic development of *ln.

For present purposes, the main question is: which pre-form to reconstruct for Proto-Greek? We must reconstruct *sm- vpn-es- with a zero grade root,

---

97 Attic uses ἁθρόος (of uncertain etymology) with the same meaning.
98 The context is as follows. The Achaeans and Trojan armies approach each other; the Achaeans are compared to Notos (the South Wind) which blows a gust of mist over the mountains: ὡς ἄρα τῶν ὑπὸ ποσσὶ κονίσαλος ὄρνυτ’ ἀελλής ἐρχομένων· μάλα δ’ ὦκα διέπρησον πεδίοιο (Il. 3.13–14), “Likewise a thick cloud of dust arose from under their feet as they marched; and they crossed the plain very quickly’. The idea that ἀελλής is related to ἄελλα ‘gust of wind’ is difficult to maintain; see Kirk (Comm. Il., ad loc.).
99 The Elean form is an adverb in -ως based on the s-stem adjective. It modifies the directly preceding numeral (π)εντακατιο̄ν, denoting the council of 500 in its entirety (Minon 2007: 36, 511–513 translates ‘au complet’). This excellently fits the semantics of Hom. ἀσκλλέες ‘gathered together, in a group’.
100 Ex hypothesi, the cluster -ln- (with consonantal realization of the liquid) would have emerged too late from *-ln- to join the first compensatory lengthening.
because there would be no motivation for introducing a zero grade indepen-
dently in the West Greek and Homeric forms. It follows that the e-grade was
introduced secondarily in Homeric ἄελλης ‘dense’ (and possibly also in Ionic
ἁλῆς: see above). The basis for its introduction must have been the verb ‘to
throng’, which formed a nasal present *μελνε/o- reflected in Hom. εἰλομαι ‘to be
thronged’ < *μελνε/o-.\(^{101}\) Indeed, this same full grade is found in the Homeric
causative present εἰλέω ‘to press together’ and most other stems of its paradigm
(aor. ἐλσαι, mid.-pass. pf. έελμαι).\(^{102}\) A zero grade reflex *μαl- is preserved only
in the inagentive aorist ἄληναι.

What was the derivational basis of *sm-ųl-nes?- A suffix *-nes-, as assumed
by the etymological dictionaries (GEW, DELG, EDG), is difficult to motivate in
this compound. Since s-stem adjectives could be directly derived from verbal
stems in Greek, I propose that the present stem *μελνε/o- (reflected in Hom.
εἰλομαι) originally had the shape *ųl-ne/o-.\(^{103}\) In a similar way, the precursors of
βούλομαι ‘to want’ (West Greek δείλομαι, etc.) and ὀφείλω ‘to owe’ must have
secondarily introduced their full grade (see above). Moreover, this substitu-
ion is paralleled in Latin nasal presents such as pellō ‘to thrust’, excellō ‘to
excel’. In sum, a Proto-Greek present stem *ųl-ne/o- (or perhaps rather com-
pounded *sm-ųlne/o/o-) is the most likely derivational basis for an adjective *sm-
ųl-nes-.\(^{104}\)

Let us now consider the possible origins of Hom. ἄολλες. At first sight, it
seems logical to view this form as Aeolic, in view of the geminate reflex -λλ- <
*-ln- in combination with the o-colored reflex. However, since *-ln- (as opposed
to *-Vln-) may have yielded -ολ- also in the Ionic words discussed above, the
geminate by itself does not tell us much. As for the o-vocalism, one might expect
*ļ > -λο- in Aeolic on the basis of *t > -ρο-, but in reality there is no further evi-
dence to support or exclude the idea that *ļ yielded -ολ- (rather than -λο-) in

---

101 In Van Beek 2018: 43–44, I have proposed that *sm-ųl-nes- was derived from a compounded
verb *sm-ųlne/o- ‘to flock together’, with *sm- ‘together’ functioning as a preverb compara-
table to Vedic sām.

102 A primary active perfect is perhaps attested as ἔδλει (a likely emendation in Pi. Pyth. 4.233)
in the meaning ‘to push back’, cf. DELG s.v. εἰλέω 1.

103 Comparable derivations of an s-stem adjective from a middle present stem are, for
instance, -τρεφής from τρέφομαι and -δερκής from δέρκομαι. Cf. Meissner 2006: 192–193;
most recently, Blanc (2018) has given an extensive overview of such deverbal forma-
tions.

104 Interestingly, the forms attested in West Greek are adverbial and have a petrified lexical
meaning ‘completely’ (denoting a total or sum); this may have helped the preservation of
their zero grade root (as opposed to the verb ‘to throng’, which had a full grade in West
Greek, too: cf. Elean αποϝελεω).
Aeolic dialects, whether generally or only in the position before *n. Therefore, Wathelet (1970: 170) is rightly hesitant when he cites ἀολλής as a possible example for the outcome of *l in Aeolic.

Another option to be taken into serious consideration is an ‘Achaean’ origin of ἀολλέες. We do not know the regular outcome of *l in Mycenaean: there is no convincing evidence for *l generally, let alone in the position before nasals. Nevertheless, it is possible to assume that the Mycenaean outcome of PGr. *smēlēs was hau̯o̯lnēs or hau̯ollēs.

To sum up, the Proto-Greek form *ha-ulan-es- was directly reflected as *hau̯olane(h)- in at least part of West Greek, given El. αϝλανεο̄ς ‘all together’ and the gloss ἀλανέως· ὁλοσχερῶς. Ταραντῖνοι in Hesychius. These forms will play an important role in section 10.6. On the other hand, the value of ἁλής and ἀολλέες as evidence for the regular outcome of *-ln- is, unfortunately, limited.

10.5.5 Conclusions on *ln in Ionic-Attic

The verbs βάλλω and θάλλω (and perhaps πάλλω) continue old nasal presents. A possible scenario is that these presents directly reflect pre-forms of the type PGr. *Cl̥-n-e/o-. This development is supported by κάλλος, καλλίων, κάλλιστος, which I propose to derive from an inherited nasal present *kl̥-n-eh >> *kl̥ne/o- > *κάλλω ‘to excel’. However, analogical influence on the vowel slot of these forms cannot be entirely excluded.

10.6 Dialectal Evidence

There is only little evidence for the vocalization of *l in the other dialects, but nevertheless, important conclusions can be drawn for two West Greek dialects: Cretan and the dialect of Elis.

10.6.1 Cretan

As we have seen above, the root βλαπ‑ ~ βλοπ‑ might offer evidence for a conditioned o-colored development of *l in a labial environment in Cretan. The vowel slot of βλοπ‑ may be due to leveling if βλαπ‑ contains the outcome of a syllabic nasal.

---

105 If the Aeolic outcome of *l was -λ-, one could theoretically assume that the vowel slot in ἀολλέες was analogically introduced from the verbal root *uλh-.

106 In Van Beek 2013: 47 n. 131, I suggested that Myc. wo-ne-we (PY Cn 40.2 and 643.1) could be the nom. pl. of a u-stem adjective *uλn-u- meaning ‘compact’, related to ἀολλέες. I have now changed my mind: see section 2.3.1.  

107 Note that in the Mycenaean outcome of original intervocalic *-ln-, the nasal has been lost or assimilated: cf. o-pe-ro-te /opbēlontes/ vel sim.
The gloss κλάγος· γάλα. Κρήτες (Hsch.) displays a development κλ‑ < γλ‑ typical for certain parts of Crete.\(^{108}\) The form κλάγος suggests a development *\(l\) > *\(\lambda\) in Cretan after a non-labial consonant, but the reconstruction of the pre-form remains uncertain (see above): a vocalized nasal cannot be excluded.

The verb λαγαιω ‘to release’ (of persons in custody) has an aor. λαγασαι that is well-attested in Gortyn, and is also found as a gloss λαγάσσαι· ἀφεῖναι ‘to let go’ (Hsch.). The vowel -α- in the second syllable of this telic lexeme probably originated in the aorist, from which the present stem was derived. Frisk (\(GEW\) q.v.) suggests that λαγάσ(σ)αι is a reshaping of an older root or thematic aorist after χαλάσαι (χαλάω ‘to loosen; relax; release a prisoner’), which has a similar meaning. This is reasonable since -α- can easily be part of the root in χαλάσαι but not in λαγάσαι. The etymological connection with Ved. \(s\)arj ‘to let go, set free’ (cf. \(LIIV\) s.v. *\(selg\)-) is obviously attractive; it shows that Gortynian Cretan underwent a development *\(hl\)g‑ > *\(hlag\)- > λαγ‑, or perhaps rather *\(hlg\)- > *\(lg\)- > λαγ‑, depending on the relative chronology.

If λαγαιω and αβλοπια are reliable evidence for the Cretan reflex of *\(l\), they would mirror the dual reflex of *\(r\) in this dialect, which yielded -\(ar\)- normally, but -\(er\)- after labial consonants (-\(morto\), \(porti\), and probably Αφορδιτα: see section 3.1). It must be noted, however, that the vowel slot of αβλοπια might be analogical. The evidence is so scanty that adding one form to the dossier may completely change the picture.

10.6.2 \textit{Elean α\(\varphi\)λανεο\(\varphi\)ς and Tarentine ἀλανέως}

As we have seen in section 10.5.4, the West Greek cognates of Hom. ἀ\(\varphi\)λλέες are Elean α\(\varphi\)λανεο\(\varphi\)ς ‘all together’ and the gloss ἀλανέως· ὁλοσχερῶς. Ταραντῖνοι ‘entirely, completely’ (Hsch.).\(^{109}\) They provide valuable evidence for the regular development of *\(l\) in these dialects. The related verb αποφελεω /apowēleō/ is also attested in Elis (cf. Minon 2007: 511–513), with a reflex of the first compensatory lengthening. The full grade *\(\mu\)eln- presupposed by αποφελεω ensures that α\(\varphi\)λανεο\(\varphi\)ς displays the regular development of *\(\mu\)ln- in this dialect.\(^{110}\)

In this context, the post-labial reflex *\(l\) > λο (possibly for \(\lambda\)) in Cretan α\(\beta\)λο-πια gains new significance. It strongly suggests that the development of *\(l\) was

\(^{108}\) It has been supposed that Cret. κλάγος is from *γλάκος by metathesis of voice (see the older lit. in Frisk s.v.), but this is both unlikely and unnecessary. Another Cretan form, κλευκος (gen. κλευκιος) ‘new wine’ (Bile 1988, No. 28) beside Myc. de-re-u-ko /dleukos/, Cret. gen. γλευκιος (Gortyn) and Att. γλεῦκος (Arist.), shows that some regions of Crete underwent a devoicing γλ‑ > κλ‑.

\(^{109}\) Tarentum was a colony of Sparta.

\(^{110}\) The evidence from Elis for the outcome of *\(r\) is minimal and internally contradictory: see section 3.2.3.
later than Proto-West Greek (assuming that it makes sense to reconstruct such an entity), because in αφλανεός we find an a-colored reflex even after digamma. In addition, Elean αφλανεός proves that the development of an anaptyctic vowel in *-l̥n- was also a matter of the individual dialect groups, or even of the individual dialects: there was no early pan-Greek anaptyxis before the liquid in the sequence *-l̥n-.

10.6.3 Other Dialects
The Lesbian evidence is as follows. In Mytilene we find the word for 'shoulder-blade' as ὠμοπλάτα[ν (IG xii,2 71.2), and also the abstract πλάτος 'breadth' (Hodot 1990, MYT 015.10, 3rd c.). The adjective πλατύς is attested in Lesbian poetry as πλάτυ (Alc. fr. 74). Borrowing from Ionic cannot be easily excluded for any of these instances, and is especially likely in ὠμοπλάτα, given that the expected Aeolic outcome of 'shoulder' would be ὀμμο‑ < *Homso‑ (cf. ἐπομμα‑διος, v.l. in Theoc. 29.29). Finally, σπλανχνων (Hodot 1990, MYT 015.04, 3rd c.) could also be an Ionic borrowing.

In literary Lesbian, two other words with -λα‑ < *l̥ are attested: ἀβλάβη[ν 'unscathed' (Sapph. 5.1) and γλαφύρα[ 'hollow' (Alc. 7.8), but both could be borrowings from Ionic or from epic poetry (γλαφυρὸς 'hollow' is a traditional epithet of ships and caverns in Homer, and the adjective ἀβλαβής belongs to a high register). The adjective μόλθακος occurs as the Aeolic counterpart of class. molthaks. However, as argued above, the etymological connection with OHG milti ‘merciful’ and other Germanic words is uncertain; as a consequence, it remains uncertain whether the difference in vocalism must be ascribed to the vocalizations of a syllabic liquid or to some other cause (cf. καθαρός beside κοθαρός 'pure', section 9.7.2). Finally, the Homeric word ἄσολλεες 'thronged, all together' is attested as ἄόλλεες in Alcaeus, but again an epic origin cannot be excluded. In sum, the evidence for *l̥ in Lesbian is inconclusive.

As for Boeotian, Πλατηεύς is the epichoric term meaning 'inhabitant of Plataea'. We are dealing, however, with a toponym and it cannot be excluded that Plataea was originally founded by speakers of a different dialect.

In Arcadian, the term ἐπλατια (IG v,2 4.2) is perhaps related to πλατύς. Although the meaning is not clear, the following verb ἀλασκεσθαι (with dative rection) may suggest that the dat. sg. ἐπλατια denotes a sacrificial offering (cf. Dubois 1988 ad loc.). Further, we find a PN Πλατιας (IG v,2 6.57 and 85, Dubois 1988: 45), but it would be unwise to base a conclusion on it because the bearer need not have been an Arcadian. The verb βλάπτω is attested also in Arcadian: aor. subj. ποσκατυβλαψη (IG v,2 6.37), aor. ptc. το κατυβλαφθεν (ibid. 41). The inscription contains regulations concerning construction sites, and the meaning of the verbal forms is simply 'to damage', like that of Classical βλάπτω. While
the compound καταβλάπτω is not normal in Ionic-Attic, a West Greek Koine form cannot be excluded because a number of clauses and collocations appear in similar inscriptions elsewhere.\textsuperscript{111} That is, the West Greek verb καταβλάπτω may have been Arcadianized by introducing the preverb κατυ‑ (and ποσ‑). Thus, none of the Arcadian forms discussed here informs us about the regular outcome of *\textit{I}\textit{f} in that dialect.

The Cyprian form \textit{po-lo-te-i} (ICS\textsuperscript{2} 318 vii, 2) cannot be relied upon. It was interpreted by R. Meister, in his editio princeps of this text, as the dat. sg. of a neuter πλάτος\textsuperscript{e} which he supposed to be the dialectal equivalent of Ionic-Attic πλάτος ‘plane surface’. For the Cyprian form, he posited the meaning ‘tablet, writing surface’. With \textit{i te-ka-to-i po-lo-te-i}, the ostracon on which the text has been written would then refer to itself as the ‘tenth page’ of an archive. However, Masson’s edition and especially his 1966 article make it clear that no definite value can be attached to Meister’s interpretation.\textsuperscript{112} Instead of Meister’s \textit{po-lo-te-i}, Masson prefers to read \textit{pe-lo-te-i}. Moreover, the interpretation ‘tablet’ and the comparison with Attic πλάτος, which is not attested in that meaning, are mere guesses. Therefore, the form can be left out of further consideration.\textsuperscript{113}

10.7 Conclusions on *\textit{I}\textit{f}

The regular slot of the anaptyctic vowel before occlusives in Ionic-Attic was probably -\textit{λα}-. Leaving aside the uncertain connection between μαλθακός and the Germanic word for ‘mild’, reliable evidence for a reflex -\textit{αλ}‐ is completely absent. On the other hand, there are several good candidates for the development to -\textit{λα}‑: βλαδεῖς < *\textit{ml}‑d‑ and other entries in βλα‑ from Hesychius meaning ‘weak, porous, flaccid’, πλάτη ‘shoulder-blade’, possibly also βλαστός ‘sprout’ (if from *\textit{ml}‑d‑t‑o‑) and κλάδος ‘branch’ (if < *\textit{k}‑d‑o‑ with G. Holz). As new

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{111} Compare IG vii 3073.29–37 and 3074.9–11 (Lebadeia in Boeotia), which also contain regulations for construction.
  \item \textsuperscript{112} “On a gardé ici sans modification la translittération de Meister (...) la lecture de nombreux signes et la présence de beaucoup de diviseurs apparaissent très incertaines, ainsi même que le sens de la lecture” (Masson, ICS\textsuperscript{1} ad loc., pp. 317–318). The text was left unchanged in the 1983 second edition of ICS. In his article, Masson comments: “L’interprétation des deux derniers mots est fort incertaine. Meister voulut reconnaître (\textit{v}) δεκάτῳ πλότει “sur la dixième tablette”, avec (...) une forme “πλάτος correspondant à l’ionien-attique πλάτος “largeur, surface”, qui aurait ici le sens matériel non attesté de “Tonplatte, Tonscherbe”; toute l’argumentation concernant ce dernier terme est peu plausible; d’autant plus que nous ne croyons guère au \textit{po} initial.” (1966: 263–264).
  \item \textsuperscript{113} It is not even mentioned by DELG \textit{of} GEW s.v. πλατός.
pieces of evidence, I have adduced γλαφυρός ‘hollow’, from a pre-form *\(g\)ymph-\(u\)-\(lo\) ‘hollow’, and πλάξ ‘plane surface, plain’ (including δίπλαξ and τρίπλαξ, which preserve an older meaning ‘layer’).

This conclusion that *\(l\) > -\(\lambda\)- is remarkable given the evidence for *\(r\) > -\(\alpha\)-, with a different vowel slot. One could object that, as far as we know, the developments of PIE *\(l\) and *\(r\) were identical in all other Indo-European daughter languages. However, the evidence that we have must be taken seriously. In addition, if the treatment of *\(l\) and *\(r\) was indeed different, this may suggest that their developments took place at different chronological stages, i.e. that *\(l\) was vocalized earlier, at least in Ionic-Attic.

We have seen that the reflex of *\(ln\) in Ionic-Attic resulted in a geminate -\(\lambda\)- that did not take part in the 1st compensatory lengthening, as opposed to older instances of intervocalic *\(ln\) which did undergo the 1st compensatory lengthening. The evidence in favor of *\(ln\) > -\(\alpha\)- consists of the verbs βάλλω and θάλλω (which reflect pre-forms of the type PGr. *\(C\)-\(n\)-\(e/o\)-, from inherited athematic nasal presents), as well as κάλλος, καλλίων, κάλλιστος, for which I have proposed a new etymological derivation from a lost verb *\(kl\)-\(e/o\)- > *κάλλομαι ‘to stand out’. It is not excluded that -\(\alpha\)- in these forms was the regular development of *\(l\) before n. This would be analogous to the conditioned reflexes of *\(l\) and *\(r\) in Celtic, which developed to al and ar before n, but to li and ri before stops and m.

On the other hand, it cannot be excluded either that *\(ln\) > *\(\omega\)ln is analogical, and that we happen to have no good examples of *\(ln\) > *\(lan\) in Ionic-Attic. We do know that the last-mentioned reflex was regular in (part of) West Greek, witness Elean αϝλανεο\(\omega\)ς ‘all together’. Further evidence for the dialectal reflexes of *\(l\) is extremely scanty. A potentially important form is Cret. αβλοπια ‘condition of having done no harm’, which could display an o-colored reflex of *\(l\). If this interpretation is correct, it suggests that the vocalization of *\(l\), like that of *\(r\), took place in the individual West Greek dialects.