

The Greek 3rd pl. endings

The Vedic 3rd pl. active ending is *-ur* instead of *-an* in the following instances:

- (1) root presents with fixed stress, e.g. inj. *taksur* of *táksati* 'they fashion';
- (2) reduplicated imperfects, e.g. *ádadhur* of *dádhati* 'they put';
- (3) sigmatic aorist *-sur* ;
- (4) root aorists of roots in a laryngeal, e.g. *ádhur* 'they put';
- (5) optative *-yur*.

Besides, the ending *-ur* is found in the perfect. Elsewhere¹⁾ I have argued that *-ur* replaced earlier **-at* from syllabic **-nt* in those athematic forms where the stress was either on the root or on a preceding syllable. It follows that inj. *dhúr* adopted the vocalism of ind. *ádhur*, whereas the converse substitution took place in ind. *ávrán* 'they covered', inj. *vrán*. This view is supported by the apophonic difference between 3rd pl. indicative and injunctive forms in the middle root aorist: *ákrata* 'they made', *árata* 'they went' versus *kran-ta*, *ranta*²⁾. It also provides an explanation for the remarkable 3rd pl. middle subjunctive ending *-anta*, which must originally have been the inj. ending corresponding to ind. *-ata* from syllabic **-nto*. This ending was evidently reinterpreted as a subjunctive because it differed from the other inj. endings by the presence of an initial vowel.

What is the expected distribution of full and zero grade 3rd pl. endings in Greek? In the thematic flexion we expect *-ov*, *-ovti* (*-ousal*), *-ovto*, *-ovtoi* (*-ovtal*). Outside the themat-

tic flexion, the sigmatic aorist, and the original stative, I find no evidence for an original paradigm with fixed stress in Greek. I therefore expect zero grade 3rd pl. endings in the sigmatic aorist, reduplicated and augmented forms, the optative, and the original stative, and *e*-grade endings in unreduplicated athematic presents and augmentless root aorist forms. I claim that the actual distribution is closer to this expectation than is usually assumed. In the following, page numbers will refer to the discussion of the 3rd pl. forms by E. RISCH³).

The ending *-εντι (-ενσι)* is attested in Myc. *e-e-si /ehensi/* 'they are', contracted in Ionic *εἰσί* and West Greek *εντί* (324), also in Myc. *ki-ti-je-si /kdiyensi/* 'they cultivate', Vedic *sánti*, *kṣiyánti*. RISCH puts the middle verbs *κεῖ-* 'lie', *ἴσ-* 'sit', and *ἴσ-* 'wear' in the same category, which is inappropriate because these represent original statives with a root-stressed 3rd pl. form, e.g. *κέαται*, *εἴατο*, which are in perfect agreement with the corresponding Vedic forms. The original zero grade ending *-ατι (-ασι)* from syllabic **-nti* is well preserved in the perfect, e.g. Hom. *πεφύκασι* 'they have grown'. Elsewhere we find *-αν* and *-αντι (-ᾶσι)* for the zero grade active endings.

Turning now to the reduplicated presents and the root aorists, we find the zero grade 3rd pl. endings in Attic *τιθέασι*, *διδόασι*, Arcadian *συνέθειαν*, Cyprian *ka-te-ti-ja-ne /katethiyan/*, Boeotian and Locrian *ἀνέθειαν*, also Arc. imp. *ὕθειάντω* beside *καθέντω*, Elean opt. *ἐπιθειᾶν*, *γνοῖαν* (325). These forms have not received an adequate explanation. RISCH's comment deserves full quotation (327):

Die Tatsache, daß der Typus *ἔθειαν*, *ἔδοαν* sowohl im Arkadischen als auch im Kyprischen gilt, spricht m.E. eindeutig dafür, daß er wenigstens bei dieser Dialekt-

gruppe alt ist. Auch das Böotische ist ein Dialekt, der neben verschiedenen Neuerungen doch manches Alte bewahrt hat, so z.B. die Endung $-φι$ in $ἐπιπατρόφιον$, pronominale Formen mit $-νί$ in $προτηνί$ 'früher', Patronymika auf $-ιος$. Also darf $ἔθειαν$ auch im äolischen Bereich eventuell als alt betrachtet werden. Dafür spricht auch das Zeugnis des homerischen Gebrauchs. Bekanntlich haben wir hier bei den langvokalischen Aoristen sowohl $ἔσταν$ als auch $ἔστησαν$, sowohl $ἔφανε$ als auch $ἔφάνησαν$ usw., wobei die längere Form typisch ionisch-attisch ist und die kürzere vermutlich dem Äolischen zugewiesen werden kann. Ebenso $ἔφαν$ und $ἔφασαν$ und bei $-νῦμι$ $ἔξεύγυυον$ und $ἔξεύγυυσαν$. Um so überraschender ist, daß nur $ἔθεισαν$, $ἔδοσαν$ $ἔδίδοσαν$, nie $ἔθειν$, $ἔδον$ $ἔδιδον$ vorkommen. Der Schluß liegt nahe, daß auch das vorhomerische Äolisch sie nicht kannte, sondern vermutlich $ἔθειαν$, $ἔδοαν$ (oder $*ἔδοεν$?) hatte, die dann ohne weiteres durch metrisch gleichwertiges $ἔθεισαν$, $ἔδοσαν$ ersetzt werden konnten.

In view of this, the West Greek forms $τίθεντι$, $ἔτιθεν$, $ἔθειν$, $δίδοντι$, $ἔδιδον$, $ἔδον$ can hardly be ancient. They are easily explained as the result of a secondary development, while their replacement by forms in $-αντι$ ($-ασι$) and $-αν$ in the other dialects can hardly be motivated.

RISCH thinks that the Attic forms $τιθέασι$, $διδόασι$, $ἰάσι$, $ἰστιάσι$ are recent⁴) because we find Myc. $di-do-si$ /*didonsi*/, $-i-je-si$ /*hiyensi*/, and Hom. $τιθειῖσι$, $λεῖσι$, $διδουῖσι$, $ἰστιάσι$, where he attributes the accent to the influence of $ἔστιάσι$, $τεθναῖσι$ from $-άασι$ (329). The problem is that the perfect provides a small and none too obvious basis for such an analogical development. Moreover, the ending $-αντι$ ($-ασι$) from syllabic $*-nti$ must have been introduced into the perfect from the

reduplicated present. It seems much more plausible that the zero grade ending was never eliminated from the reduplicated present in Attic and was replaced by the regular athematic ending $-\epsilon\nu\tau\iota$ ($-\epsilon\iota\sigma\iota$) in Ionic. Thus, we may surmise that $\tau\iota\theta\epsilon\tau\iota\sigma\iota$, $\delta\iota\delta\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota$ represent earlier $*\tau\iota\theta\acute{\epsilon}\epsilon\nu\sigma\iota$, $*\delta\iota\delta\acute{\omicron}\epsilon\nu\sigma\iota$ ⁵). Since neither the replacement of $-\alpha\nu\sigma\iota$ by $-\epsilon\nu\sigma\iota$, nor the converse replacement can easily be motivated, we may conjecture that the two endings were alternative solutions for the elimination of an irregular ending. In this way I arrive at the tentative reconstruction of the 3rd pl. forms $*\tau\iota\theta\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota$, $*\delta\iota\delta\acute{\omicron}\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota$ for Attic-Ionic.

The situation in Aeolic and Arcado-Cyprian is different. Though the evidence of these dialects points to the aorist forms $\acute{\epsilon}\theta\epsilon\alpha\nu$, $\acute{\epsilon}\delta\omicron\alpha\nu$, it appears that the present forms were replaced by $\tau\acute{\iota}\theta\epsilon\nu\tau\iota$, $\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\nu\tau\iota$, as they were in West Greek (where the substitution may have taken place independently at a more recent stage). First, Myc. *di-do-si* and *-i-je-si* seem to reflect */didonsi/* and */hiyensi/*. Second, RISCH has called attention to Arc. present $\rho\acute{\omicron}\lambda\epsilon\nu\sigma\iota$ beside imperfect $\rho\alpha\rho\epsilon\kappa\acute{\alpha}\lambda\epsilon\alpha\nu$ (329). This can hardly be a recent distribution. Third, there is evidence for $*\tau\acute{\iota}\theta\epsilon\iota\sigma\iota$ beside $\tau\iota\theta\epsilon\tau\iota\sigma\iota$ in the Hom. imperfect (329):

Es ist vielleicht auch nicht zufällig, daß bei Homer zwar keine Aoriste vom Typus $\acute{\epsilon}\theta\epsilon\nu$, wohl aber einige Imperfekta dieser Art, nämlich $\lambda\epsilon\nu$ M 33, $\xi\acute{\omicron}\nu\lambda\epsilon\nu$ A 273, $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\theta\iota\lambda\epsilon\nu$ ϕ 377 (stets vor der Hephthemimeres-Zäsur), dazu als Lesung Aristarchs $\rho\rho\acute{\omicron}\tau\iota\theta\epsilon\nu$ α 112 (cod. $\rho\rho\acute{\omicron}\tau\iota\theta\epsilon\nu\tau\omicron$) neben sonstigen $\tau\acute{\iota}\theta\epsilon\sigma\alpha\nu$, $\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\sigma\alpha\nu$, $\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\alpha\nu$ bezeugt sind.

These must be Aeolic forms. Fourth, the remarkable spread of the secondary ending $-\epsilon\nu$ in Thessalian requires an explanation. The raising of a to e before and after i in Thess. $-\epsilon\iota$, $\delta\iota\acute{\epsilon}$ for $-\alpha\iota$, $\delta\iota\acute{\alpha}$ does not suffice to explain the rise of the end-

ing -αεν for -αν, e.g. *ὄνεθείκαεν* beside *ὄνεθείκαν*. The spread of -εν suggests the earlier replacement of **ἐτίθειαν* by *ἔτιθεν*, which presupposes the replacement of **τιθέατι* by *τίθεντι*, as in West Greek. Putting the evidence together, I tentatively reconstruct the following distribution:

3rd pl.	present	imperfect	aorist
West Greek	τίθεντι	ἔτιθεν	ἔθεν
Aeolic	τίθεντι	ἔτιθεν	ἔθειαν
Arcado-Cyprian	τίθενσι	ἐτίθειαν	ἔθειαν
Attic-Ionic	τιθέασι	ἐτίθειαν	ἔθειαν

This scheme does not necessarily reflect a single chronological layer. In particular, the Aeolic state of affairs may be a younger development of the one posited for Arcado-Cyprian. The West Greek simplification may have taken place at any stage; the Elean optative forms in -αν, e.g. *ἐπιθεῖαν*, suggest that it was a recent development. In any case, the Attic-Ionic distribution is evidently archaic, and the cleavage between this dialect and Arcado-Cyprian must be ancient.

We now come to the discrepancy between *ἔβαν* and *ἔσταν* on the one hand, and *ἔθειαν* and *ἔδοαν* on the other. There can be little doubt that the disyllabic forms are secondary. If they replace earlier *ἔθεν* and *ἔδον*, it is hard to see a motivation for the introduction of the new ending. Such a motivation is even more difficult to find in the case of **τιθέασι* and **διδόασι* if these replace earlier *τίθεντι* and *δίδοντι*. I therefore think that we have to start from **ἔθειαν*, **ἔδαν*, **τίθατι*, **δίδατι*, where the introduction of the root vowel is a natural development. It follows that after a consonant the laryngeals were lost without a trace before a syllabic nasal, which was regularly vocalized to *a*, in spite of the fact that word-initial laryngeals were vocalized before a tautosyllabic nasal.

This brings us to a reconsideration of the *nt*-participle. Since BEEKES' discussion of Latin *iens*⁶⁾ we have to start from nom. **dheH₁nts*, acc. **dhH₁entm*, gen. **dhH₁ntos*, which now yields Gr. θείς, θέντα. *θατός. The oblique stem may be reflected in Arc. άπυδόας, Elean άνταποδιδώσσα from **-δι-δόασσα* (325). The original participle of ετλην is preserved in τάλᾶς 'wretched', which represents **telH₂nts*, **tlH₂(e)nt-*, while the 3rd pl. form ετλαν evidently replaces **εταλαν*. Similarly, I think that εγνον replaces **εγαναν* from **-gnH₃nt* and cannot be used as evidence for a root aorist with fixed stress. After a consonant, the nom.sg. ending **-as* from zero grade **-nts* was replaced by **-ōn(t)*, e.g. ἐκών 'willing', evidently because polysyllabic consonant stems usually had an asigmatic nominative in Greek. Thus, the ending of ἐών, ἰών, βαλών (not -είς) corroborates the reconstruction **H₁esnts*, **H₁ieints*, **g^welH₁nts*, as opposed to δούς, γνούς from **deH₃nts*, **gneH₃nts*, cf. also δρόκων beside δραμείς reflecting **derknts*, **drkentm*.

As I pointed out above, the Vedic evidence leads us to expect *e*-grade 3rd pl. endings in augmentless and unreduplicated forms, as opposed to zero grade endings in the forms which have just been discussed. This is actually what we find in the imperative θέντων, δόντων; the *-a-* of Arc. ύνθεάντω beside καθέντω must have been taken from the indicative. The *e*-grade ending is also found in the optative θεῖεν, as opposed to -σειαν in the sigmatic aorist⁷⁾. There seem to be traces of the original distribution in the middle voice as well, cf. Hom. ξύμβληντο for **-βάλεντο*, πλῆντο for **πάλεντο* and **πάλαντο*, but βεβλήαται and βεβλήατο for **βεβάλατο* from **-g^wlH₁nto*. The 3rd sg. form ἐπρίατο 'bought' for **επρωτο* must be based on augmentless πρίαντο from **k^wriH₂ento*, similarly δίενται 'they hasten' from **diH₁ento*, also επιον 'they drank' for **επῖν* on

the basis of **pH₃ient*, and κέονται 'they lie'. The *e*-grade endings were largely replaced by the thematic *o*-grade endings outside the optative, where the model for this substitution was lacking. Thus, we find -ο- for *e*-grade 3rd pl. endings in τανύουσι, ζεύγυυον, ὤμυυον, ὄρυυον, καταέλνυον, τανύοντο beside the usual zero grade in δεικνύασι, ζεύγυυασαν, δαίνυνται, ῥήγνυντο. The accent of δαμνάσι, ῥηγνύσι may reflect earlier *-νάεσαι, *-νύεσαι, as in the case of τιθεῖσι.

It appears that Greek preserved the original PIE. alternations more faithfully than is generally assumed.

Footnotes:

- 1) Fs. Hoenigswald (1987), 219ff.; cf. also my contribution to the 8th Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft (Leiden, 1987).
- 2) Cf. A. MEILLET, MSL 21 (1920), 203, 205.
- 3) Fs. Neumann (1982), 321-334.
- 4) Similarly P. CHANTRAINE, Grammaire homérique I (1973), 471, and H. RIX, Historische Grammatik des Griechischen (1976), 252.
- 5) Note that West Greek τίθεντι may actually represent *τι-θέεντι.
- 6) The origins of the Indo-European nominal inflection (1985), 67-71.
- 7) Cf. my paper for the 8th Fachtagung der Idg. Gesellschaft.