



ÉTRENNES  
DE  
SEPTANTAINE

*Travaux de linguistique et de grammaire comparée*

*offerts à*

**MICHEL LEJEUNE**

par un groupe de ses élèves

1978

ÉDITIONS KLINCKSIECK  
PARIS

ÉTRENNES  
DE  
SEPTANTAINE

*Travaux de linguistique et de grammaire comparée*

*offerts à*

**MICHEL LEJEUNE**

par un groupe de ses élèves

1978

ÉDITIONS KLINCKSIECK  
PARIS

THESSALIAN εἴντεσσι 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<sup>1</sup>, 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 :

Συνθείνα Βασαίδου τεῖς εἴντεσσι τοῦν πε-  
ταροῦν γενίουν καὶ τὰς ταγᾶς κοινανείν-  
ουν τὲν πάντα χρόνεν καὶ αὐτεῖς καὶ τᾶι γε-  
νῶι τᾶι ἐς τούτου γινομέναι .

and translates it : « Convention pour ceux des Basaidai qui appartiennent aux quatre familles qui partagent aussi la magistrature suprême, pour toujours, pour eux et pour la descendance qui en sera issue ». The form εἴντεσσι, dat. pl. of the participle of the verb 'to be', is new and the εἴντ- stem appears here for the first time in Greek : it obviously requires explanation. Elsewhere we have Ionic (etc.) ἐών, ἐόντος (< \**es-ont-*), Attic ὄν, ὄντος (possibly from \**s-ont-* with analogical loss of *h-*)<sup>2</sup>, and, more rarely in some

1. *BCH* 94 (1970), 161 ff. Cf. also the preliminary edition by D. Theokharis, *Arch. Dell.* 19 (1964), *Khron.* p. 265 and pl. 307, and the comments by J. and L. Robert, *REG* 84 (1971), 372. The dialect of the inscription has a number of unique peculiarities (-*os*, -*on* > -*es*, -*en*, etc.), but the main features are very similar to those of East Thessalian (athematic conjugation of contracted verbs, -*εσσι* datives, 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  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\text{-}$  stem (Nom. pl.  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ , etc.). For the corresponding Nom. sg.  $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\varsigma$ , quoted by the Grammarians, we have no direct evidence<sup>3</sup>.

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  $*es\text{-}$  and a zero grade  $*s\text{-}$ )<sup>4</sup> and on the other hand to vocalic alternations in the suffix ( $-o\text{-}$  vocalism in  $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\omicron}\nu$ ,  $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$  and  $\acute{\omicron}\nu$ ,  $\acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$ , but apparent  $-e\text{-}$  vocalism in  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ ; a zero grade  $*\text{-}\acute{\eta}t\text{-}$   $\rightarrow$   $\text{-}at\text{-}$  is occasionally attested in the fem.: cf. e.g. Arcadian  $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\varsigma$   $<$   $*es\text{-}\acute{\eta}t\text{-}\acute{\iota}a\text{-}$ ).

The earliest Greek evidence, Mycenaean, argues for a full grade of the verbal root and an  $-o\text{-}$  vocalism of the suffix in the masc. participle ( $a\text{-}pe\text{-}o$ ,  $a\text{-}pe\text{-}o\text{-}te$ , i.e.  $ape\acute{\omicron}n$ ,  $apeontes$ ) and for a full grade of the root and a zero grade of the suffix in the feminine ( $a\text{-}pe\text{-}a\text{-}sa$ , i.e.  $apeassa$ )<sup>5</sup>. 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  $*s\text{-}ont\text{-}/*s\text{-}\acute{\eta}t\text{-}$  where the suffix, whenever it appears in the full grade, has an  $-o\text{-}$  vocalism. Any other conclusion would go against the agreement of two remarkably archaic forms: the Latin *sons* (*in-sons*, etc.) and the Germanic  $*san\acute{h}az$  ( $>$ ON *sannr*, OE *sōd*, OHG *sand*, all from  $*sont\text{-}o\text{-}$ ), which acquired a specialized meaning and consequently escaped the morphological levelling of most participial forms. Other forms like Latin *prae-sens* can be due to the generalization of the zero grade stem ( $*s\text{-}\acute{\eta}t\text{-}$   $\rightarrow$  Lat. *sent-*)<sup>6</sup>. Greek  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$  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, *Précis de grammaire comparée du grec et du latin*, Paris 1888, 306) that  $\acute{\omicron}\nu$  is from  $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\omicron}\nu$  and  $\acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$  (rather than  $*\acute{\omicron}\acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$ ) is analogical has much to be said for it (cf. also Szemerényi, *Einführung*, 292). On the other hand W. Cowgill (in W. Winter ed., *Evidence for Laryngeals*, The Hague, 1965, 167 ff.) has argued that the change  $\acute{\epsilon}o\text{-}$   $\rightarrow$   $\acute{\omicron}\text{-}$  is purely phonological; if so, this would also explain the smooth breathing.

3. For the basic data cf. e.g. Schwyzler, *Gr.Gr.*, I 678. The earliest example of the  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$  participle is literary: cf. Aleman fr. 118 Page ( $\pi\alpha\rho\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\omicron\nu$ ) and see also *Fragm. Adesp.* 980 Page. For the nom. cf.  $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\varsigma$  Herod. 7 II 833 Lenz (=Choer. 2.859.10, *Anecd. Ox.* Cramer IV 356.24) and the *Etymologica* (cf. e.g. the *Et. Magn.* passim). See also Ahrens, *de graec. ling. dial.*, II, 324.

4. Obviously  $*es\text{-}$  could derive from  $*\acute{e}s\text{-}$ ; if so  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\acute{\iota}$  would be difficult to explain, but cf. Cowgill, *loc. cit.*

5. Cf. M. Lejeune, *PdP* 15 (1960), 15 ff. = *Mémoires de Philologie Mycénienne*, II, Rome 1971, 236 ff.

6. Cf. in general Szemerényi, *Einführung*, 292 f. and J. Kuryłowicz, *Idg. Grammatik*, II, 268 ff. For *sons*, etc. see C. 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  $*(e)sont\text{-}$  which alternated with  $*(e)s\acute{\eta}nt\text{-}$ . As far as we know, there is no reason to attribute  $*(e)sent\text{-}$  to Proto-Greek.

2. We can now return to Thessalian and to the hapax  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$ . In this dialect the evidence for the participle of 'to be' is limited. If we exclude the texts written in koine (where  $\acute{\omicron}\nu$ ,  $\acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$  and the fem.  $\acute{\omicron}\sigma\alpha$  are standard) the following forms are attested:

*Masculine:* a)  $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$  IG IX 2 506.6 (Larisa, early 2nd C. B.C.);  $\pi\alpha\rho\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$ , *ibid.* 517.15 (Larisa, late 3rd C. B.C.);

b)  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$  Metropolis *loc. cit.* (3rd C. B.C.).

*Feminine:* a)  $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\omicron}\nu\sigma\alpha\varsigma$ , Th. Axenides, *I Pelasgis Larisa*, II, Athens 1949, 48 ff., l. 9; Larisa, early 2nd C. B.C.);  $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\omicron}\nu\sigma\alpha\varsigma$  IG IX 2 1056.5 (Mopsium, late 3rd C. B.C.).

b)  $[\acute{\epsilon}]\nu\sigma\alpha\varsigma$  IG IX 2 512.22 (Larisa, early 2nd C. B.C.);  $[\acute{\epsilon}]\nu\sigma\alpha\varsigma$  *ibid.* 515, 3.7 (Larisa, 2nd C. B.C.; restoration by Béquignon, *BCH* 59 [1935], 58);  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\sigma\alpha\varsigma$ , Béquignon, *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.  $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\omicron}\nu$ ,  $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$  in contrast to the isolated  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$  and to two different feminines,  $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\omicron}\nu\sigma\alpha$  and  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\sigma\alpha$ , which cannot be arranged in a definite chronological order. In other words, we must consider the problem caused by  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$  but we must also ask what can explain the presence of two different feminines in the same period and in the same formulae. The comparative evidence and some early Greek survivals (Mycenaean, Arcadian, Cretan, etc.) show that the expected fem. was  $(\acute{\epsilon})\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\alpha$ : if so, both  $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\omicron}\nu\sigma\alpha$  and  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\sigma\alpha$  must be innovations. The origin of  $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\omicron}\nu\sigma\alpha$  is clear; as we shall see (cf. 4.2.) it was rebuilt on  $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\omicron}\nu$  on the model of  $\lambda\acute{\omicron}\omega\nu$ ,  $\lambda\acute{\omicron}\acute{\omicron}\nu\sigma\alpha$ , etc. What about  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\sigma\alpha$ ? The obvious conclusion would be that this too was rebuilt on the masc. but in fact we have no direct evidence for  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ , and, while  $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\omicron}\nu$  is an inherited form,  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ , where it occurs, may be an innovation<sup>7</sup>.

7. That  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\text{-}$  is due to an innovation is already suggested by G. Curtius (and probably by others before him); cf. *Das Verbum der griech. Sprache*, vol. II, Leipzig 1876, 117.

3. The basic problems now concern είντεσσι and ένσα. It may be convenient to start from είντεσσι. Helly (*loc. cit.*, 175) derives it from \**es-ent-*, a by-form of \**es-ont-*, but this presupposes that the form is ancient enough to belong to a period in which intervocalic -s- 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 είντεσσι as an innovation, provided we could account for its origin.

The striking feature of είντεσσι is, of course, the presence of a long /ē/ vowel before the -nt- cluster (in Thess. ει = [ē]). Examples of this type of sequence exist in Greek but are rare since all original clusters of the VRC type were altered to V̄RC because of Osthoff's law. Helly's derivation (είντεσσι < \**es-entlessi*) 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 είντεσσι 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 Helly (l. 3/4), viz. the long /ē/ vowel of the form κοινανείντου. Helly takes this form as a present participle of the verb corresponding to Attic κοινωνέω (in the gen. pl.)<sup>8</sup>. If so, we have again a pres. participle with an unexpected long vowel before the -nt- cluster. Helly quotes as parallels the Lesbian forms of the type δίννηντες (Sappho 1, 11 Lobel-Page, according to some Mss.) and κατοικήντων (IG XII 2 15.18 = Schwyzler DGE 622) but does not pursue the matter<sup>9</sup>. 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 -nC- cluster. Hence in the equivalent of the Attic -εω verbs (φιλέω, etc.) the middle participle regularly ends in -ημενος, while the active participle (nom. pl.) ends in -εντες. In Thessalian<sup>10</sup> the situation is the same, if we allow for

8. An alternative explanation could see in it an imperative third pers. pl. from the same verb, provided we were willing to put a strong interpunction after γενίον and to explain away the datives αὐτεῖς and γενεῖσι instead of the expected nominatives. Yet Helly's explanation has probably more chances to be correct. In any case, even if κοινανείντου were an imperative, it would still have an irregular long vowel before -nt- and the same explanation would be necessary.

9. For a full account of the Lesbian evidence see H. Hock, *The so-called Aeolic inflection of the Greek contract verbs*, Diss. Yale 1972, I, 154 ff. who argues that the early literary forms (δίννηντες and ὄρχηνη, *Inc. Lesb.* 16.2 Lobel-Page) may be due to manuscript corruption.

10. Or at least in part of it (Thessalotis is excluded); for π[ρο]καλέονθαι in Atrax see below notes 16 and 18.

the different vocalic systems: cf. e.g. the middle participles διεσαφειμένα (Phalanna IG IX 2 1229.34.39.46), ἀφαγγρεμέναν (Larisa, cf. Helly, *Mnemosyne* 24 [1970], 250 ff., line 13), καλειμένου (*ibid.*, lines 21, 26), and contrast them with the active participles ἀγορανομέτος (Larisa, IG IX 2 506.20, etc.), εὐεργετές (< \**-ents*, *ibid.*, 461 b. 23), γυμνασιαρχέντος (*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 -nC-. 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 είντεσσι? Obviously there is no middle participle of εἰμί which may have served as a model for the change from a supposed \*έντ- to είντ-. Two other suggestion might seem possible: the long vowel of είντεσσι may be due to analogy with the nom. sg. εἶς for wich, 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 εἰμί. Yet both hypotheses must be abandoned simply because they could not work in a Thessalian context. The nom. εἶς quoted by the Grammarians, presumably goes back to \**ents* (if not to \**s-ents*), but in Thess. this form would yield \*έξ and not εἶς (cf. εὐεργετές < \**-ents*). Similarly those forms of εἰμί which in Attic have a long [ē] vowel (εἰ), in Thessalian tend to have a geminate consonant (cf. the infinitive ξίμεν < \**esmen*, etc.). In Attic the third pers. pl. εἶσι has been alternatively explained as from \**s-enti* or from \**es-enti* (cf. Myc. *e-e-si*, i.e. *e(h)ensi*). If the latter explanation were correct and Thessalian too derived its third pers. pl. from \**es-enti* we could expect a form \*είνοι with a long vowel. Yet a recently published inscription from Larisa (Helly, *Mnemosyne* 24 [1970], 250 ff., lines 22.40) has shown that the Thess. form is ένθι (presumably from \**s-enti*) with a short first vowel (cf. note 15).

We may wonder at this stage whether a different methodological slant may provide the desired explanation. Hock (*op. cit.*, I, 155 ff.) argues that in Lesbos forms like κατοικήντων, 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+oikē+nt+ōn/. In the early period /ē/ was compulsorily shortened before -nt- but later on the rule was relaxed. Can we say the same for είντεσσι? Unfortunately not, because we cannot adduce any synchronic (or diachronic) justification for positing an underlying /ēnt/ or even /eent/ in Thessalian. If at

any stage /ēnt/ 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 concede defeat one further path remains. If είντεσσι is an innovation, it is likely to be an analogical innovation. We know that a number of analogical processes lead to a simplification or redistribution of allomorphs. This would have been the case, for instance, if we had been able to explain the long vowel of είντεσσι as due to analogy with the nom. sing. εἷς. 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 proportion (a: b = c: x) can often be restated in terms of allomorphic 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 -εσσι morph of dative plural in Aeolic Greek (πόδεσσι, θήρεσσι, etc.) with a proportion of the type λύκοι (nom. pl.): λύκοισι (dat. pl.) = θῆρες (nom. pl.) x (dat. pl.), where x = θήρεσσι. 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.) +/si/'. The scope of this rule was extended to embrace the nouns of the athematic inflection.»<sup>11</sup>

In other words there is scope for looking at analogical change on the basis of a model of morphological description which is dynamic and not static and which is not very different from the Word and Paradigm model adopted by the ancient grammarians<sup>12</sup>.

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

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 is 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 Collitz lecture on 'Analogy and Greek' presented to the Summer Meeting of the Ling. Society of America in Tampa, Florida, on 25 July 1975.

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 grammarians<sup>13</sup> already note the formal identity between the third pers. pl. present and the dat. pl. of the present participle: cf. λύουσι (3rd pl.) vs. λύουσι (dat. pl.), τιμῶσι (3rd pl.) vs. τιμῶσι (dat. pl.), φιλοῦσι (3rd pl.) vs. φιλοῦσι (dat. pl.), δηλοῦσι (3rd pl.) vs. δηλοῦσι (dat. pl.). In Attic the -μι verbs do not show the same pattern (the third pers. pl. διδάσκει, τιθέασι, ἰᾶσι are contrasted with the dat. plurals διδοῦσι, τιθεῖσι, ἰεῖσι), but in Ionic the third pers. pl. are (or can be) διδοῦσι, τιθεῖσι, 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 (λύοντι: λύνοντες =) δίδοντι: διδόντες = τίθεντι: τιθέντες. 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. -ti > -si) altered it. Yet the verb 'to be', if our assumptions about the earliest form of the participle are correct, remains outside this pattern; the reconstructed third plural \*(e)senti does not show the same vocalism as the reconstructed participle \*(e)sontes. 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 (λύοντι: λύνοντες =) δίδοντι: διδόντες = ἴσταντι: ἰστάντες = τίθεντι: τιθέντες = ἐντί: x, where x = ἔντες.<sup>14</sup> Presumably this is why Kuryłowicz speaks in terms of a Doric ἔντες «sekundär der 3. P. Pl. ἐντί nachgebildet ... wie die Partizipia Präs. τιθεντ-, ἴσταντ-, δίδοντ-» (*op. cit.*, 269).

Could the same analogical proportion have operated in Thessalian? 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, -νται, -ντο shifted to -νθι, -νθαι, -νθο under the influence of ἐνθι which in its turn owes its form to metathesis of aspiration (ἐνθι < \*henti < \*senti)<sup>15</sup>. The first example of the

13. Cf. e.g. Choer. in Theodos. Alex. 334 (Hilgard).

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. ἐντί too might seem not to match τίθεντι, etc., but the position is different in the case of the (very frequent) compounds like πάρεμι, etc.: τίθεντι: τιθέντες = πάρεντι: παρέντες.

15. See e.g. Thumb-Scherer, *Gr. Dial.* II 68. The basic evidence now available does not differ from that quoted in the textbooks. According to Cowgill (*loc. cit.*) even ἐνθι goes back to \*esenti < \*a<sub>1</sub>senti.

phenomenon goes back to ca. 475 B.C.<sup>16</sup> 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 *-nt-* of the personal endings with *-nth-*, others did not; the position of Metropolis, where *εἴντεσσι* 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: (λύονθι : λύοντες =) δίδονθι : διδόντες = ἐνθί : x, where x = ἔντες. In other words in all areas of Thessaly we might expect to have a form ἔντες 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 ἐόντες makes it unlikely that ἔντες existed may be countered with the observation that in the feminine we have evidence for both ἐόνσα and ἔνσα.

4.2. We now turn to the second instance of formal parallelism referred to above. In Attic the participle of the verb 'to be', ὦν, ὄντος, fem. οὔσα has the same phonological make up as the termination of the thematic verbs; in proportional terms: λύων : ὦν = λύοντος : ὄντος = λύουσα : οὔσα, etc. In Ionic ἐών, ἐόντος, ἐούσα show the same inflection and terminations as λύων, etc. but a real overlap occurs only between the participle and the termination of e.g. φιλέων, φιλέοντος, φιλέουσα<sup>17</sup>. The position is different for those Doric dialects where ἔντες replaced ἐόντες; here the link is rather with athematic verbs like τίθημι (τιθείς : εἶς = τιθέντος : ἔντος = τιθέντες : ἔντες, etc.). Where does Thessalian stand? As mentioned before, in Thessalian we have evidence for the masc. ἐών, ἐόντες as well as for εἴντεσσι (admittedly in different areas) and for the fem. ἐόνσα and ἔνσα (in the same area and period). As we have seen ἐών is likely to be inherited but ἐόνσα must be an innovation which seems based on the proportion: λύων : ἐών = λύουσα : x, where x = ἐόνσα. ἔνσα 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 τιθέντες, φιλέντες, κοινανέντες : ἔντες = τιθένσαι, φιλένσαι, κοινανένσαι : x, where x = ἔνσαι. In other words the creation of ἔνσα 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

16. π]ροκαλέουθαι from Atrax; cf. Giannopoulos, AE 1934-5, 140 ff.; L. H. Jeffery, *Local Scripts of Archaic Greece*, 99 no. 6.

17. Note, however, that there is a difference in accentuation: ἐών vs. φιλέων. In some forms (e.g. in the gen. pl. ἐόντων, φιλέοντων) the difference is neutralized.

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

One last point on ἐόντες and ἐόνσα: 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 ἐών, ἐόντος, ἐούσα was supported by e.g. φιλέων, φιλέοντος, φιλέουσα, as suggested above, this was not true in most Thessalian areas where φιλέω, etc. had shifted to the athematic inflection<sup>18</sup>.

5. We started from εἴντεσσι and to εἴντεσσι we now return. We saw above that at some time Lesbian and Thessalian independently extended the long vowel of the stem of verbs like φιλειμι, etc. to the active participle (Lesb. κατοικιήντων, Thess. κοινανείντων). εἴντεσσι 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 ἔντες participle on the basis of the analogical proportion φίλεντι (or φίλενθι) : φιλέντες = \*ἐντί (or ἐνθί) : x, where x = ἔντες. After the creation of ἔντες a clear link was established between the athematic participles of the type φιλέντες, τιθέντες, etc. and the participle of the verb 'to be' and we argued that it is to this link that we owe the creation of ἔνσα. However, as soon as φιλέντες, τιθέντες, etc., were replaced by φιλεῖντες, τιθεῖντες, etc. the situation must have changed. On the one hand the original proportion now led to the creation of εἴντ- rather than ἐντ- (φίλεντι : φιλεῖντες = \*ἐντί : x), on the other hand ἔντες was no longer supported by τιθέντες, φιλέντες, etc., while the link between these participles in their new lengthened form and the participle of 'to be' also led to a new εἴντ- formation. That being so, the appearance of εἴντεσσι on the scene was almost inevitable.

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 Atrax inscription quoted in note 16. The point is not relevant here because even if the φιλειμι conjugation were an innovation it would still be likely to precede the formation of \*ἐντες and εἴντεσσι, but it is worth pointing out (cf. also *Glotta* 43 (1965) 242, note 1) that π]ροκαλέουθαι 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.  $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\omega}\nu$  with a fem. \* $\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\sigma\sigma\alpha$ . The latter form was soon replaced by  $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\omicron}\nu\sigma\alpha$  on the analogy of  $\lambda\acute{\omicron}\omega\nu$ ,  $\lambda\acute{\omicron}\omicron\nu\sigma\alpha$ . Yet, alongside  $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$  another participle \* $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$  was also created because of the preexisting link between the third pers. pl. and the participle: ( $\lambda\acute{\omicron}\omicron\nu\tau\iota$  :  $\lambda\acute{\omicron}\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$  =)  $\tau\iota\theta\epsilon\nu\tau\iota$  :  $\tau\iota\theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$  =  $\phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\epsilon\nu\tau\iota$  :  $\phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$  =  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\iota$  : x, where x =  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ . At this stage the participle of 'to be' was attracted to the orbit of the athematic participles of the  $\tau\iota\theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ ,  $\phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$  type and as a result acquired a new  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\sigma\alpha$  feminine for which we have direct evidence. The next change was the extension of the long vowel of the stem of  $\phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\epsilon\iota\mu\iota$ , etc. to the participle; hence the attested  $\kappa\omicron\iota\nu\alpha\nu\acute{\epsilon}\iota\nu\tau\omicron\nu$  of the Metropolis inscription. But in its turn the newly created  $-\epsilon\iota\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$  participle influenced the participle of 'to be' and in lieu of the expected \* $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$  we find in the Metropolis inscription the form  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$  which we set out to explain. Our conclusion is that  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$  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.