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THESSEIAN εἶναι AND THE PARTICIPLE OF THE VERB ‘TO BE’

par Anna Morpurgo Davies

1. The third century B.C. inscription from Metropolis in Hestiaeotis (S. W. Thessaly), for which see the excellent edition by B. Helly, offers such a wealth of information about the local dialect and the Thessalian dialect in general that it is only now, a few years after its publication, that we begin to realise its importance. To honour Michel Lejeune, to whom we owe so much of what we know about the phonology and the morphology of Greek dialects, I should like to tackle here one of the problems created by the new evidence.

Helly reads the first sentence of the inscription as follows:

Συμβολάκα Βασαίδων τῆς εἶναι τῶν πεταροῦν γενεσὶν καὶ τὰς ταξιας κοινωνίας

οι τοι πάντες χρόνον καὶ αὐτόν καὶ τὰς γενεσίς ταῖς ἐκ τῶν γυναικῶν γυναικεύονται.

And translates it: « Convention pour ceux des Basaidai qui appartenaient aux quatre familles qui partageaient aussi la magistrature suprême, pour toujours, pour eux et pour la descendance qui en sera issue. » The form εἴναι, dat. pl. of the participle of the verb ‘to be’, is new and the εἴναι stem appears here for the first time in Greek: it obviously requires explanation. Elsewhere we have Ionic (et al.) ἰῶν, ἰῶνος (< "es-ont"), Attic ἰὸν, ἰονος (possibly from "s-ont" with analogical loss of h), and, more rarely in some

1. *BCH* 94 (1970), 161 ff. Cf. also the preliminary edition by D. Theokhras, *Arch. Delt.* 19 (1964), 289 and pl. 309, and the comments by J. and L. Robert, *Klio* 54 (1971), 372. The dialect of the inscription has a number of unique peculiarities (-ον, -οντος>, -ον, -ον, etc.), but the main features are very similar to those of East Thessalian (semantic conjunction of contracted verbs, -ον davvus, etc.) in what follows we shall mostly deal with East Thessalian.

2. It is not sufficiently realized that the divergence between Attic and Ionic causes difficulties, all the more so since Mycenaean agrees with Ionic and nowadays it is often
Doric dialects, forms built on an 

**ειμ** - **τομ** (Nom. pl. 

**ειμ** - **τος** etc.).

For the corresponding Nom. sg. 

**ειμ** - **το** quoted by the

Grammarians, we have no direct evidence.

The morphological variation among the attested forms of ‘being’

is due on the one hand to ablaut in the verbal root (it looks as if we have an alternation between a full grade 

**ειμ** - **ς**- and a zero grade 

**ειμ** - **ς**-) and on the other hand to vocable alternations in the suffix 

**-οι-** vocalism in 

**ειμ** - **ιον** and 

**ειμ** - **ιος**, but apparent 

**-ειμ** - **ς** vocalism in 

**ειμ** - **ις**; a zero grade 

**-οι-** -> 

**-αι-** is occasionally attested in the fem.: e.g. 

Arcadian 

**ειμ** - **ικα** (<

**ειμ** - **ικα-**).

The earliest Greek evidence, Mycenaean, argues for a full grade 

of the verbal root and an 

**-οι-** vocalism in the masc. participle 

(α-πε-ο, α-πε-ο-λε, i.e. 

**αιπειν**,

**αιπεινεις** and for a full 

grade of the root and a zero grade of the suffix in the feminine 

(α-πε-ο-σα, i.e. 

**απεισαι**)

This may suggest, but does not prove, 

that the other dialect forms attested in Greek arose as replacements 

for forms similar to those of Mycenaean. Yet any statement on 

the position of Common Greek must be based at least as much 

on comparative evidence as on the actual Greek data.

Unfortunately the forms of the other IE languages are not 

entirely unambiguous. Yet they seem to point to an original 

masculine of the type 

**ειμ** - **ς**-**οι-**/ 

**ειμ** - **ς**-**ας**- where the suffix, whenever it 

appears in the full grade, has an 

**-οι-** vocalism. Any other 

conclusion would go against the agreement of two remarkably 

archaic forms: the Latin 

**sons** (in-sons, etc.) and the Germanic 

**sonar,** 

**Ωε** 

**σον** 

**Οθ** 

**σον** 

**σον**, all from 

**-ον**), which 

acquired a specialized meaning and consequently escaped the 

morphological levelling of most participial forms. Other forms like 

Latin 

**prae-sons** can be due to the generalization of the zero grade 

stem 

**-οι-** -> 

**-οι** - **ς**-**οι-**. Greek 

**ειμ** - **ς** cannot be based on a

argued that Attic and Ionic are offshoots of the same dialect group to which Mycenaean 

belonged. The old suggestion (cf. e.g. V. Henry, 

**Problemes de grammaire comparée du 

græca et du latin**, Paris 1888, 326) that 

**ειμ** - **ς** is from 

**ειμ** - **ς** and 

**ειμ** - **ς** (rather than 

**ειμ** - **ς**) is analogical has much to be said for it (cf. also Szemerényi, 


**Einleitung zur Laogaia**, The Hague, 1965, 167 ff.) has argued that the change 

**ειμ** - **ς** -> **ειμ** - **ς** is purely phonological; if so, it would also 

explain the smooth breathing.

3. For the basis data cf. e.g. Schwyzer, 

**Or.Gr.**, 1 678. The earliest example of the 

**ειμ** - **ς** participle is literacy: cf. Alcman fr. 118 Pago (ματρονα) and see also 

**Frage**, 989 Pago. For the nom. cf. e.g. Hesiod, 

**Theogonia** 1 11 239 Lex. (<

**θοσσ** 2.260.10).

4. Among the forms 

**ειμ** - **ς** could derive from 

**ειμ** - **ς**; if so 
vokalism would be difficult to explain, but 


5. Cf. M. Lejeune, 

**PAP** 15 (1900), 15 ff.; 

**Mémoires de Philologie Myceniennes**, II, 

**Pompe** 1971, 356 f.

6. Cf. in general 

Szemerényi, 

**Einführung**, 299 ff. and J. Kuryłowicz, 


For some, etc. see G. Watkins in 

**Studies in honor of G. S. Lane**, Chapel Hill 

1967, 186 ff. I ignore here the problem of the initial laryngeal.

zero grade of the suffix and remains isolated; we may feel inclined 

to accept Kuryłowicz’s suggestion (loc. cit.) that it is a new 

formation and its explanation must be internal to Greek. 

We shall come back to this point later; for the moment we may 

simply state that we reconstruct for Proto-Greek an inherited 

**ειμ** - **ς**-**οι-** which alternated with 

**ειμ** - **ς**-**ει-**. As far as we know, 

there is no reason to attribute 

**ειμ** - **ς**-**οι-** to Proto-Greek.

2. We can now return to Thessalian and to the hapax 

**ειμ** - **ς**. 

In this dialect the evidence for the participle of ‘to be’ is limited. 

If we exclude the texts written in koine (where 

**ειμ** - **ς** and the 

fem. 

**ειμ** - **ς** are standard) the following forms are attested:

Masc.: a) 

**ειμ** - **ς** IG 2 506.6 (Larisa, early 2nd C. B.C.); 

**παραγγελα** ibid. 517.15 (Larisa, late 3rd C. B.C.).

b) 

**ειμ** - **ς** Metropolis loc. cit. (3rd C. B.C.).

Feminine: a) 

**ειμ** - **ς** Th. Atenides, I Pelagis Larisa, II, Athens 

1949, 48 ff., 1 9; Larisa, early 2nd C. B.C.); 

**ειμ** - **ς** IG 2 1056.5 (Mopsium, late 3rd C. B.C.).

b) [**ειμ** - **ς** IG 2 512.22 (Larisa, early 2nd C. B.C.); 

**ειμ** - **ς** ibid. 515.3.7 (Larisa, 2nd C. B.C.); 

**ειμ** - **ς** restoration by Bequignon, 

**BCH** 59 (1935), 58; ]

**ειμ** - **ς** Bequignon, loc. cit., 55 ff., line 32 

(Larisa, 2nd C. B.C.).

The bulk of the evidence comes from Larisa; for the late third 

century and the early second century (we have no earlier data) it 

points to a masc. 

**ειμ** - **ς** in contrast to the isolated 

**ειμ** - **ς** and to two different feminines, 

**ειμ** - **ς** and 

**ειμ** - **ς** which cannot be 

arranged in a definite chronological order. In other words, we 

must consider the problem caused by 

**ειμ** - **ς** but we must also 

ask what can explain the presence of two different feminines in 

the same period and in the same formula. The comparative 

evidence and some early Greek survivals (Mycenaean, Arcadian, 

Cretan, etc.) show that the expected fem. was (cf. 

**ειμ** - **ς**; if so, both 

**ειμ** - **ς** and 

**ειμ** - **ς** must be innovations. The origin of 

**ειμ** - **ς** is clear; as 

we shall see (cf. 4.2) it was rebuilt on 

**ειμ** - **ς** on the model of 

**ειμ** - **ς**. What about 

**ειμ** - **ς**? The obvious 

conclusion would be that this too was rebuilt on the masc. but 

in fact we have no direct evidence for 

**ειμ** - **ς** and, while 

**ειμ** - **ς** is an inherited 

form, 

**ειμ** - **ς** where it occurs, may be an innovation.

7. That 

**ειμ** - **ς** is due to an innovation is already suggested by G. Curtius (and probably by others before him); cf. 

**Das Verbum der griech. Sprache**, vol. 11, Leipzig 1876, 117.
3. The basic problems now concern ἐπικοινωνεῖν and ἔνα. It may be convenient to start from ἐπικοινωνεῖν. Holly (loc. cit., 176) derives it from ἐπικοινωνεῖν, a by-form of ἐπικοινωνεῖν, but this presupposes that the form is ancient enough to belong to a period in which inter-vocales → still survived and qualitative ablaut was still productive in the inflection. The suggestion is not impossible, but, based as it is on third-century evidence and on no comparative data, seems implausible. It would be more satisfactory to treat ἐπικοινωνεῖν as an innovation, provided we could account for its origin.

The striking feature of ἐπικοινωνεῖν is, of course, the presence of a long /e/ vowel before the -nt- cluster (in Thess. εν = [e]). Examples of this type of sequence exist in Greek but are rare since all original clusters of the VRC type were altered to VHC because of Osthoff's law. Holly's derivation (ἐπικοινωνεῖν < *ἐπικοινωνεῖν) may be phonologically acceptable since most long vowels arising from contraction were not affected by Osthoff's law, but, as we have seen, does not meet other objections. On the other hand any different explanation of ἐπικοινωνεῖν will also have to account for the 'irregular' long vowel.

This induces us to turn to an identical phonological irregularity, also attested in the Metropolis inscription published by Holly (I. 3/4), viz. the long /e/ vowel of the form κοινωνεῖν. Holly takes this form as a present participle of the verb corresponding to Attic κοινωνεῖ (in the gen. pl.).

If so, we have again a pres. participle with an unexpected long vowel before the -nt- cluster. Holly quotes as parallels the Lesbian forms of the type διώργωνε (Sappho I, 11 Lobel-Page, according to some MSS.) and κοινωνεῖται (IG XII 2 15.18 = Schweizer DGE 622) but does not pursue the matter. In fact an explanation is easily available. In Lesbian, just as in Thessalian, the so-called contracted verbs are treated as athematic in most of their forms. The endings are added directly to the stem which regularly ends in a long vowel, unless this is followed by an -ν- cluster. Hence in the equivalent of the Attic -εω verbs (φρειά, etc.) the middle participle regularly ends in -οικεῖν, while the active participle (nom. pl.) ends in -ενές. In Thessalian the situation is the same, if we allow for the different vocalic systems: cf. e.g. the middle participles διώργωνε (Phalanna IG 1 X 2 1229.34.39.46), ἀφροεικά (Larisa, cf. Holly, Mnemosyne 24 [1970], 250 ff., line 13), κοινωνεῖν (ibid., lines 21, 26), and contrast them with the active participles ἀφροεικόνος (Larisa, IG 1 X 2 506.20, etc.), ἀφροεικός (< *ενεῖς, ibid., 461 b. 23), κοινωνεῖον (ibid., 513.3.25), etc. Both in Lesbos and, as we now know, in Thessaly, the long vowel of the stem was extended at some stage to environments where previously it was shortened, viz. before -ν-. The details of the spread of the innovation are difficult to determine but it seems likely that the active participle had as its immediate model the middle participle.

How does this help us with ἐπικοινωνεῖν? Obviously there is no middle participle of ἐπικοινωνεῖν which may have served as a model for the change from a supposed *ένει- to ἐπικοινωνεῖν. Two other suggestion might seem possible: the long vowel of ἐπικοινωνεῖν may be due to analogy with the nom. sg. ἐπικοινωνεῖ for which, as we have seen, we have only indirect evidence from the grammarians. Alternatively the long vowel might have been generalized from other forms of the paradigm of ἐπικοινωνεῖν. Yet both hypotheses must be abandoned simply because they could not work in a Thessalian context. The nom. sg. ἐπικοινωνεῖ of the grammarians, presumably goes back to *ἐπικοινωνεῖ (if not to *ἐπικοινωνεῖ), but in Thess. this form would yield *ἐπικοινωνεῖ and not *ἐπικοινωνεῖ (cf. ἐπικοινωνεῖται < *ἐπικοινωνεῖ). Similarly those forms of ἐπικοινωνεῖ which in Attic have a long [e] vowel (ei), in Thessalian tend to have a geminate consonant (cf. the infinitive ἐπικοινωνεῖ, etc.). In Attic the third pers. pl. ἐπικοινωνεῖ has already been explained as from *ἐπικοινωνεῖται or from *ἐπικοινωνεῖται (cf. Myc. ἐ-ε-ε, i.e. *ἐπικοινωνεῖται). If the latter explanation were correct and Thessalian too derived its third pers. pl. from *ἐπικοινωνεῖ we could expect a form ἐπικοινωνεῖ with a long vowel. Yet a recently published inscription from Larisa (Helly, Mnemosyne 24 [1970], 250 ff., line 22) has shown that the Thess. form is ὑπελθεῖ (presumably from *ἐπικοινωνεῖ) with a short first vowel (cf. note 15).

We may wonder at this stage whether a different methodological slant may provide the desired explanation. Hook (op. cit., 1, 150 ff.) argues that in Lesbos forms like κατακόμβων, etc. are due to the optional loss of the vowel shortening rule before nasal + consonant. This implies that the underlying form is something like /kata+olikɔ+nt+dɔ/ in the early period /e/ was compulsorily shortened before -nt- but later on the rule was relaxed. Can we say the same for ἐπικοινωνεῖν? Unfortunately not, because we cannot aduce any synchronic (or diachronic) justification for positing an underlying /ent/ or even /ent/ in Thessalian. If at
any stage /eint/ became the underlying form this must have been
due to some sort of restructuring and we are thus brought back
to the same problem from which we started, even if we now couch
it in different terms: what determined the restructuring?

4. Before we conclude one further path remains. If *eintos*
is an innovation, it is likely to be an analogical innovation.
We know that a number of analogical processes lead to a simplifica-
tion or redistribution of allomorphs. This would have been the
case, for instance, if we had been able to explain the long vowel
of *eintos* as due to analogy with the nom. sing., etc. However
we must also reckon with other types of analogy and in particular
with those which lead to the creation of new morphs. In these
cases analogical change is often based on a purely formal parallelism
between different grammatical elements. It all works as if there
were morphological rules of derivation which link various elements
of one paradigm and these rules could be extended from one
paradigm to another through analogy. The so-called Paul's propor-
tion (a: b = c: x) can often be restated in terms of allomor-
phic redistribution but sometimes calls for a reinterpretation in
terms of linking rules of the type described above. Thus—to
give an example—Wackernagel explained the creation of a new
-sous morph of dative plural in Attic Greek (*θέσεος, *θάρσεοι, etc.)
with a proportion of the type λόγος (nom. pl.): λόγοι (dat. pl.)
= θέους (nom. pl.) x (dat. pl.), where x = *θάρσεοι. We could
describe the same analogical process more explicitly, but still
informally, as follows: The thematic inflection forms the dat. pl.
through a simple rewrite rule: Dat. pl. → Nom. pl. (masc./fem.)
+/-s.11 The scope of this rule was extended to embrace the
nouns of the athematic inflection.12

In other words there is scope for looking at analogical change
on the basis of a model of morphological description which is
dynamic and static and which is not very different from the
Word and Paradigm model adopted by the ancient grammarians.13

Let us now look at the creation of *eintos* from this angle.
We must begin by considering the various formal links which
obtain between the participle and other verbal forms.

4.1. In a number of Greek dialects there is an obvious parallelism
between, on the one hand, the third pers. pl. of some verbs and
their present participle, and, on the other hand, the termination
of some verbal participles and the participle of the verb 'to be'.
We may start with the third pers. plural.

In Ionic-Attic the ancient grammarians14 already note the
formal identity between the third pers. pl. present and the dat. pl.
of the present participle: cf. λόγου (3rd pl.) vs. λόγοι (dat. pl.)
τιμῶν (3rd pl.) vs. τιμῶν (dat. pl.), φίλου (3rd pl.) vs. φίλοι
(dat. pl.), δηλοῦ (3rd pl.) vs. δηλοῦ (dat. pl.). In Attic the
-μο verbs do not show the same pattern (the third pers. pl. διδάξατι,
τίθεμι, ἔμαθε are contrasted with the dat. plurals διδάσατε, τίθησι,
ἐμαθεί) but in Ionic the third pers. pl. are (or can be) διδοῦτε,
τίθετες, etc. In most Doric dialects we also find a link—though a different one—
between third pers. plural and participle. In proportional terms we
have (λόγοι: λόγους =) διδοῦτε: διδότες = τίθετες: τίθετες. Doric is in fact representative of a stage which must have existed in
the whole of Greek before successive phonetic and analogical changes
(e.g. -λον > -λοι) altered it. Yet the verbal 'to be', if our assumptions
about the earliest form of the participle are correct, remains
outside this pattern; the reconstructed third plural (*e)henl does
not show the same vocalism as the reconstructed participle
*e)hontes. Given the data quoted above, however, it now
becomes clear why some Doric dialects have (or, we may say,
acquire) a participle ἔντες. In traditional terms it is easy to set
up a proportion of the type (λόγοι: λόγους =) διδοῦτε: διδότες
= ἔταντε: ἔταντες = τίθετες: τίθετες = ἔντες: x, where x = ἔντες.15

Presumably this is why Kuryłowicz speaks in terms of a Doric ἔντες
as sekundár der 3. P. Pl. ἄν nachgebildet ... wie die Partizipia
Präs. τίθετες, τίθετο, διδότες' (op. cit., 269).

Could the same analogical proportion have operated in Thessal-
ian? The answer is positive but a few remarks are in order.
Textbooks state that in Larisa, Atrax and Crannon the third pers.
pl. endings -ντι, -ντα, -ντο shifted to -νθι, -νθα, -νθο under the
influence of ἄνθι which in its turn owes its form to metathesis
of aspiration (*ένθι < *henl < *sentl)16. The first example of the

11. I have discussed this example in detail in Studies in Greek, Italic and Indo-
European Linguistics offered to L. R. Palmer, Innsbruck 1976, 181 ff. My point is
that some links between different elements of a paradigm rest merely on a formal
connection and not on a semantic basis. In other words there's no reason to suppose
that there is a particular semantic link between nom. and dat. pl. in this example or
between the third pers. plur. and the participle in the example discussed in 4.1.

12. I have considered these problems in more general terms in my Colloquium lecture
'Analogy and Greek' presented to the Summer Meeting of the Linguistic Society of
America in Tampa, Florida, on 26 July 1975.

13. Cf. e.g. Geoor, in Theodos. Alex. 334 (Hilgared).

14. We know nothing about Thessalian accent and little about Doric accent.
In this proportion the accents are those of Attic and it will be clear that the forms in
brackets are not entirely parallel to the others. And might just seem to match
τίθετες, etc., but the position is different in the case of the (very frequent) compounds
like πράξεις, etc.: τίθεν: τίθετες = πράξεις: πράξεις.

15. See e.g. Thurnb-Schoner, Gr. Diale. II 68. The basic evidence now available
does not differ from that quoted in the textbooks. According to Cowgill (loc. cit.)
even ἄνθι goes back to *sentl < *sentl.
phenomenon goes back to ca. 475 B.C. but Phalanna produces a counter-example. On the whole it seems likely that the various Thessalian areas differed and that while some of them replaced ἴν if of the personal endings with -ίνθ-, others did not; the position of Metropolis, where ἑύρηκα is attested, remains uncertain because of lack of evidence. Yet it seems clear that, whenever it occurred, the innovation was consistent, so that even in the innovating areas we can establish, mutatis mutandis, a proportion similar to that posited for Doric: (ἵνοικα : λόγοις =) διδόμενοι : διδόμενοι = ἐνθέφι : χ, where χ = ἐνθέσις. In other words in all areas of Thessaly we might expect to have a form ἑυρίσκει because the conditions for its creation are there; if it is not attested, this may be due to chance and its existence should not be excluded (though, so far, it is not proved). The objection that the clear evidence for ἑυρίσκει makes it unlikely that ἑυρίσκει existed may be countered with the observation that in the feminine we have evidence for both ἑύρηκα and ἑύρα.

4.3. We now turn to the second instance of formal parallelism referred to above. In Attic the participle of the verb ‘to be’, ὄν, ἐντὸς, fem. ὑπὸ has the same phonological make up as the termination of the thematic verbs; in proportional terms: λογίν : ὄν = λόγοις : ἐντὸς = λόγους : ὑπὸς, etc. In Ionic ὄν, ἐντὸς, ὑπὸ show the same inflection and terminations as λογίν, etc. but a real overlap occurs only between the participle and the termination of e.g. φίλος, φίλον, φίλον, φίλον. The position is different for those Doric dialects where ἑυρίσκει replaced ἑυρίσκει; here the link is rather with athematic verbs like τίθημι (τίθει : εἴπει = τίθέντος : ἑυρίσκει : ἑντὸς, etc.). Where does Thessalian stand? As mentioned before, in Thessalian we have evidence for the masc. ὄν, ἐντὸς as well as for ἑυρίσκει (admittedly in different areas) and for the fem. ὑπὸ and ἑύρα (in the same area and period). As we have seen ὄν is likely to be inherited but ὑπὸ must be an innovation which seems based on the proportion: λογίν : ὄν = λόγοις : χ, where χ = ἑυρίσκει. ἑυρίσκει must be a concurrent innovation but if so we come back to the problem of its origin. A solution is only possible in terms of a proportion of the type τίθεντος, φίλον, κοινοῦντος : ἑυρίσκει : τίθήματος, φίλον, κοινοῦντος : χ, where χ = ἑυρίσκει.

In other words the creation of ἑυρίσκει can be explained if we can show that in Thessalian too, as in some Doric dialects, there existed a formal link between the participle of the verb ‘to be’ and the

athematic verbs of the τίθημι, φίλον, etc., type. Yet this link can only be posited if at the same time we attribute to Thessalian an unattested ἑντὸς alongside the inherited ἑντὸς. We have shown above that the necessary conditions for the creation of ἑντὸς were present in the dialect; we now see the need to postulate this form in order to explain ἑυρίσκει; in spite of the argumentum ex silentio against it, the case for its existence is now strong.

One last point on ἑντὸς and ἑυρίσκει: why were they felt to be inadequate and replaced? The answer can be only tentative and partial but we may point out that while in Ionic ὄν, ἐντὸς, ὑπὸ was supported by e.g. φίλος, φίλον, φίλον, as suggested above, this was not true in most Thessalian areas where φίλον, etc. had shifted to the athematic inflection16.

5. We started from ἑυρίσκει and to ἑυρίσκει we now return. We saw above that at some time Lesbian and Thessalian independently extended the long vowel of the stem of verbs like φίλον, etc. to the active participle (Lesb. κοινοῦντον, Thess. κοινοῦντον). ἑυρίσκει seems to belong with these participles, but we found that in Thessalian the paradigm of ‘to be’ did not include any other form with a long vowel and consequently it seemed impossible to speak of an extension of the long vowel to the participle. However, we also argued that at some stage Thessalian created a new ἑντὸς participle on the basis of the analogical proportion φίλον (or φίλον) : φίλον = ἑντὸς (or ἑντὸς) : χ, where χ = ἑντὸς. After the creation of ἑντὸς a clear link was established between the athematic participles of the type φίλον, τίθέντος, etc. and the participle of the verb ‘to be’ and we argued that it is this link that we owe the creation of ἑυρίσκει. However, as soon as φίλον, τίθέντος, etc., were replaced by φίλον, τίθεντος, etc. the situation must have changed. On the one hand the original proportion now led to the creation of ἑντὸς rather than ἑντός (φίλον : φίλον = ἑντός : χ), on the other hand ἑντός was no longer supported by τίθεντος, φίλον, etc., while the link between these participles in their heightened form and the participle of ‘to be’ also led to a new ἑντός formation. That being so, the appearance of ἑυρίσκει on the scene was almost inevitable.

17. Note, however, that there is a difference in concotimation: διόν vs. φίλον. In some forms (e.g. in the gen. pl. ἐντός, φίλον) the difference is neutralised.

18. Hock, op. cit., 243, has argued that in Thessalian the athematic inflection of contracted verbs is a relatively late innovation and that it postdates the Atax inscription quoted in note 16. The point is not relevant here because even if the φίλον conflagration were an innovation it would be likely to precede the formation of ἑντός and ἑυρίσκει, but it is worth pointing out (cf. also Gillis 43 (1966): 242, note 1) that ἑυρίσκει could be a subjunctive, in which case it would give no support to Hock's thesis.
6. We can now summarize. We argued that Thessalian inherited a part. ιόν with a fem. *فزσσα. The latter form was soon replaced by ζόνα on the analogy of λός, λόνα. Yet, alongside ζόντες another participle *έντες was also created because of the preexisting link between the third pers. pl. and the participle: (λόντες: λόντες = ) ποθεντι: ποθέντες = φάσαντι: φάσάντες = έντες: έντες, where χ = έντε. At this stage the participle of 'to be' was attracted to the orbit of the athetic participles of the τόθεντες, φάσάντες type and as a result acquired a new ένα feminine for which we have direct evidence. The next change was the extension of the long vowel of the stem of φάσμα, etc. to the participle; hence the attested καινοζάσσα of the Metropolis inscription. But in its turn the newly created ζάσσες participle influenced the participle of 'to be' and in lieu of the expected *έντες we find in the Metropolis inscription the form έντασσα which we set out to explain. Our conclusion is that έντασσα does not derive from *es-ent- and cannot be treated as an archaism; it must rather be considered as the final product of a long series of analogical change.