

KENNETH SHIELDS, Jr.
 Millersville State College
 Millersville, Pennsylvania 7551

UDC 807.5—555

ON THE ORIGIN OF THE GREEK NOMINATIVE—ACCUSATIVE DUAL SUFFIX *-e*

In the nominative-accusative dual of consonant-, *i*-, and *u*-stems, Greek shows the ending *-e* (e.g. *mētére* 'two mothers'). Lithuanian also appears to attest this same dual desinence. As Endzelīns (1971: 165) observes: „In Lithuanian the nominative and the accusative of masculine words are now formed on the model of the (*i*)*jo*-stems, e.g. *ākmeniu* '(two) stones', *šuniù* '(two) dogs'. The nominative and accusative of feminine words follow the *i*-stems, e.g. *dūkteri* '(two) daughters' (= OCS *dōšteri*). In Daukša's writings one still finds (from *žmuõ* 'man') the nominative dual *žmūne* '(two) men' (cf. Gk. *kúne* '(two) dogs') In the old texts and in some dialects . . . there are masculine nominative duals of past active participles with . . . the ending *-e*, e.g. *đuguse* 'having grown'. „It has been suggested that this termination, elsewhere replaced by *-au* in Sanskrit, is preserved in the dual dvandva *māta-ra-pítarau* 'parents' which the grammarians quote as a northern form“ (Burrow 1973: 240). Lewis and Petersen (1961: 174) maintain that **-e* is likewise attested in such Old Irish dual forms as *rig* (< **rēg-e*) 'two kings' and *athir* (< **pāter-e*). On the basis of such evidence, Buck (1933: 187) suggests that Gk. *-e* „possibly represents the IE ending of masc. and fem. cons. stems“ in the nominative-accusative dual function, as do Gray (1932: 197), Misra (1968: 58), Adrados (1975: 442), and Szeemerényi (1980: 146). I, too, believe the desinence to have been an Indo-European suffix; however, I feel that when it is viewed in the light of some recent proposals about Indo-European phonology and morphology, a reanalysis of the original shape of the suffix within still earlier stages of Indo-European becomes possible.

Before proceeding to a discussion of these new proposals, I must point out how the dual number developed in Indo-European. In the first place, the dual and the plural originally constituted a single morphological category. As Schmalstieg (1974: 192) says: „Evidence for the assumption that dual and plural were not clearly distinguished at an early period of Indo-European comes from the fact that the **ā*-stem ending **-ai* functions as a plural marker in Greek and Latin (cf. Gk. *khōr-ai* 'lands', Lat. *port-ae* 'doors'), whereas in Sanskrit and Balto-Slavic the same ending marks the dual (cf. Skt. *bāl-e* '(two) maidens', OCS *roč-ě*, Lith. *rank-i* [< **ai*] '(two) hands'). Likewise the **o*-stem

ending **-oi* furnishes nominative plurals for masculine nouns in Balto-Slavic (cf. OCS *grad-i* 'cities', Lith. *výr-ai* 'men' [$< *oi$]), but duals for neuters in Slavic and Sanskrit (cf. OCS *měst-ě* '(two) places', Skt. *phal-e* '(two) fruits')¹. Similarly, the suffix **-i* is attested as a marker of the nominative-accusative dual and plural in neuter *i*-stems: Skt. *akṣi'*, Avest. *aši*, OCS *oči*, Lith. *aki* 'two eyes'; Skt. *tri'*, OCS *tri*, OIr. *tri*, Lat. *tri(-giniā)* 'three'.

In the second place, Indo-European originally had no non-singular inflectional category at all. Hirt (1934: 23) thus argues: „Eine besondere flektierte Form für den Plural war demnach ursprünglich nicht notwendig“. He feels that a number of dialectal phenomena support this conclusion. For example, „Die neutralen *i*-Stämme gebrauchen als Plural im Aind. den Singular. *apratī, asthūrī, jāmī, bhūrī, śāmi, surabhī, māhi* (AV).“ The structural identity of various neuter singular and non-singular forms in other stem-classes in Vedic Sanskrit (*ūdhar* 'udder(s)', *vāsu* 'possession(s)'), Homeric Greek (*hēmar* 'day(s)'), and perhaps Hittite (*wetar* 'water(s)') also demonstrates that number distinctions emerged only in late Indo-European and the early dialects. Lehmann (1974: 201—202) further writes: „The system of verb endings clearly points to an earlier period in which there was no verbal inflection for number For the dual and plural endings are obviously defective. We cannot reconstruct endings in these two numbers which are as well supported as are the those of the singular, except for the third plural The number system is defective in substantival as well as in verbal inflection. The personal pronouns never did introduce expressions for plurality, as suppletive paradigms indicate, e.g., Hitt. *uk* 'I, *uēš* 'we', etc., in contrast with demonstratives, e.g., *kāš, kē*, 'this, these', and nouns, e.g., *antuššaš, antušeš* 'man, men'. . . . Number accordingly was not consistently applied in late PIE and the early dialects in accordance with natural reference. Subsequently application became more regular, and number congruence was carried out for both substantives and verbs“.

Now Schmalstieg (1973, 1974, 1977: 124—129) has proposed „that within Indo-European in pre-vocalic position a short vowel plus nasal retained its original shape, whereas in pre-consonantal position the nasal was lost with compensatory lengthening of the preceding vowel in word-final position this phonological alternation was manifested in the creation of sandhi doublets“ (1974: 187)¹. These sandhi doublets were then frequently morphologized (i.e. specialized in certain functions); or, instead, one or the other was generalized in certain dialect groups. In support of his claim, he argues, for example, that „the Indo-European 1st sg. secondary ending **-om* and the primary ending **-ō* (derived from **-om* in pre-consonantal sandhi) were originally merely sandhi variants, see Szemerényi, . . . [1980. .K. S.], 308.

¹ Schmalstieg's theory of Indo-European monophthongizations has been criticized by Pajares (1976), but Schmalstieg has successfully refuted these objections in Schmalstieg 1978.

In general the phonologically newer form in $*-\bar{o}$ takes over the primary function of the present tense, whereas the older form, the ending $*-om$, is found in the non-present formations. Thus, for example, we find the 1st sg. pres. Gk. *phērō*, Skt. *bhār-ā-mi* vs. the 1st sg. imperfect Gk. *épheron*, Skt. *ābhar-am*" (1974: 187). Likewise, „The Skt. nom. sg. *ṽṽtra-hā* (< $*gh^wen$) shows a stem alternate with final $-n$ in the other cases, e.g. acc. sg. *ṽṽta-haṅ-am*, instr. sg. *ṽṽtra-ghn-ā*, dat. sg. *ṽṽtra-ghn-e*, abl.-gen. sg. *ṽṽtra-ghn-ah*, loc. sg. *ṽṽtra-haṅi*, $-ghni$, voc. sg. *ṽṽtra-han*. The nominative singular shows the pre-consonantal sandhi, i.e. $-\bar{a} < *-\bar{e} < **-eN$, whereas the vocative singular shows the pre-vocalic sandhi, i.e. $-an < *-eN < **-eN$ " (1974: 187). Schmalstieg (1973: 108) notes that at times one „finds . . . a contamination of the pre-vocalic and the pre-consonantal forms" ($*-VN + *-V > *-VN$), as in the case of the genitive plural suffix $*-\bar{o}n$ (Gk. $-\bar{o}n$, Skt. $-\bar{ā}m$), the pure prevocalic form of which probably appears in Lat. $-um$ and OCS $-\bar{o}$ (< $*-on$) (1977: 130).

In addition to proposing the Indo-European monophthongization of preconsonantal $*-VN$, „at least for word-final position" (1973: 101), Schmalstieg (1977: 129—141) has suggested that besides the non-singular elements $*-i$ (attested, e.g., in nominative plural \bar{a} -stem nouns like Gk. *khōra-i* 'lands' and Lat. *rōsa-e* 'roses', as well as in Hittite nominative-accusative neuter plural nouns like *kurur-i* 'hostilities' and *huppar-i* 'large jars') and $*-s$ (attested, e.g., in nominative plural o -stem nouns like Skt. *devās* 'gods' and Go. *dagōs* 'days', as well as in accusative plurals like Lat. *lupōs* and Lith. *vilkūs* 'wolves'), Indo-European possessed a non-singular suffix $*-N$ ($=m$ or n). This suffix appears in Tocharian plurals ending in $-\bar{n}$: AB *riñ* 'cities', AB *kāntwāñ* 'tongues', A *pyāpyāñ*, B *pyapyaiñ* 'flowers', cf. Schmalstieg 1977: 131². Moreover, in Tocharian A nominative-oblique dual („Paral," cf. Krause and Thomas 1960: 76—77) nouns end in $-ṃ$, while Tocharian B shows $-ne$ as a marker of this nominal function. It has been suggested that the nasal in certain Sanskrit o -, i -, and u -stem nominative-accusative neuter plural forms, such as *bhūvanāni* (which alternates with *bhūvanā* in Vedic but which is generalized in later Sanskrit) 'worlds', *śúcīni* (which similarly alternates with *śúcī*) 'bright ones', and *vāsūni* (which similarly alternates with *vāsu*) 'possessions', has been introduced from the n - and nt -stems. However, I maintain that the termination $-Vni$ is a result of the passage of $*-VN$ to $*-V$, with the analogical reintroduction of the non-singular marker $*-N$, motivated by the simple contamination of sandhi variants. The non-singular suffix $*-i$ was added here at a later date (Shields 1977: 61). Non-singular formations like the following result from the generalization of the preconsonantal sandhi variant of $*-VN$: nom-acc. du. masc.-fem. Skt. *ṽṽ'kā*, Gk. *lúkō* 'two wolves'; Gk. *khōrā* 'two lands', *nūmphā* 'two nymphs' ($-\bar{a} < *-\bar{a} < *-\bar{a}N$, cf. Shields 1977: 62); Skt. *āvī* 'two sheep', Lith. *naktī* 'two

² In Shields 1977: 60, I propose that the palatalization of $-\bar{n}$ here results from the influence of a following $*-i$, another marker of the non-singular.

nights'; Skt. *sū'nū*, Lith. *sū'nu* 'two sons'; nom.-acc. pl. neut. Skt. *yugā*, OCS *iga* 'yokes'; Skt. *tri*, OCS *tri* 'three'; Skt. *mādhū* 'honeys'. (See Schmalstieg 1973: 147—154 and Shields 1977: 30—66 for more details.)

As I have already noted, the contamination of the sandhi variants **-VN* and **-V* within Indo-European and the early dialects produced suffixes like the genitive plural marker **-ōN*, a form with the length of the preconsonantal variant and the nasal of the prevocalic one. It is quite possible that a similar contamination of the two variants would have produced a suffix in **-V*, i.e. a form which shows the short vowel of the prevocalic variant and the loss of the nasal evidenced in the preconsonantal one (**-VN + *-V > *-V*). In other words, the prevocalic variant exerted analogical pressure on the preconsonantal variant, with the latter adopting the vocalism of the former. If this hypothesis is accepted, then many attested cases of alternation of word-final nasals are easily explained. In this regard, Meillet (1964: 173) says: „En fin de mot, on observe souvent une alternance entre des formes terminées par une voyelle simple et des formes terminées par voyelle suivie de nasale. Le cas le plus net de cette alternance est le *-n* éphelcystique de l'ionien-attique dans des cas tels que: *éphere*, *épheren*; *ésti*, *éstin*; *posi*, *posin*; hom. *biēphī*, *hiēphin*; etc. La comparaison présente souvent le cas de formes terminées les unes par une voyelle, les autres par voyelle suivie de nasale, sans aucune différence de sens. Ainsi . . . à la 1^{re} personne de pluriel active, l'indo-iranien a *-ma*, et le grec *-men*“³.

Now the masculine-feminine *i-*, *u-*, and consonant-stems of Indo-European show a suffix **-es* in the nominative plural (< non-singular), i.e. the e-grade of the connecting vowel plus the non-singular marker **-s*: e.g. Skt. *agnāyas* 'fires', Gk. *ōpheis* 'snakes', Go. *ansteis* 'favors'; Skt. *sūnāvas*, OCS *synove* 'sons', Gk. *pēkhees* 'fore-arms'; Skt. *mātāras*, Gk. *mētēres* 'mothers', OIcel. *fōtr* (< **fotiz*) 'feet'. I would like to suggest that a parallel Indo-European non-singular suffix in **-eN* also existed in the masculine-feminine consonant-stems (from where it was extended in Greek to the *i-* and *u-* stems as well as to all genders) and that its reflexes are attested in the nominative-accusative dual (< non-singular) of various dialects.

The preconsonantal form of this desinence is seen in the Vedic Sanskrit masculine-feminine consonant-stem ending *-ā* (< **-ē*), e.g. *pitār-ā* 'two fathers', *mātār-ā* 'two mothers', cf. Meillet 1964: 297, and perhaps in Old Irish forms like *athir* 'two fathers' since „le vieil-irlandais *athir* s'explique par un ancien **pāterē/-ē*“ (Meillet 1964: 197)⁴. The pre-

³ In the case of the Greek forms with the so-called *n*-movable, one sees a tendency towards free variation of the alternates (Buck 1933: 160). Of course, Greek has analogically extended the alternation of **-VN ~ *-V* „from certain forms in which the *n* was inherited“ (Buck 1933: 160). I should also point out that some of the cases of alternation mentioned by Meillet (1964: 173) can be explained as resulting from the generalization of the contaminated variant **-VN* in some dialects and of the preconsonantal variant **-V* in others, e.g., „au datif-instrumental duel l'iranien a *-byā*, et le sanskrit *-bhyām*; à la 2^e—3^e personne sg. active secondaire du duel, le sanskrit a *-tām* et le grec *-tān*, tandis que le slave a *-ta*“.

vocalic variant **-eN* is preserved in certain Tocharian nominative-oblique dual (paral) forms in A-*äm* and B-*ane*, including consonant -stems like A *aśäm*, B *eśane* 'two eyes' and A *klośäm*, B *kiautsane* 'two ears', cf. Van Windekens 1979: 242—242. It is interesting to note that Van Windekens (1979: 243) relates the *-e* of Tocharian B-*ane* to the Greek dual suffix *-e*: „Or B-*e* ne s'explique qu'à partir d'i.e. **-o(-)*: toute autre interprétation est phonétiquement impossible. À mon avis B-*e* n'est pas autre qu'i.e. **-o* qui constitue la forme apophonique (degré *o*) d'i.e. **-e*, désinence du nom.-voc.-acc. du duel qui s'observe en grec (cf. *patère*), . . . et en tokharien même où les caractéristiques B-*ñc* et B-*š* du nominatif-accusatif du duel proprement dit peuvent remonter à **-nte* et à **-se*“. On the basis of this reconstruction, I would maintain that the Tocharian B suffix *-ane* is a contamination of the prevocalic sandhi variant **-eN* and the *o*-grade of the contaminated variant **-e* (< **-eN* + **-ē*). Of course, this variant **-e* is clearly attested not only in Greek (*-e*) but also in Lithuanian (*-e*); and it can perhaps be seen in Sanskrit (*-a*) and Old Irish (*-ø*) as well.

Thus, when the data are viewed in the manner which I have suggested, the Greek nominative-accusative dual desinence *-e* and the few cognates traditionally ascribed to it no longer remain isolated forms but represent reflexes of a well-integrated element of the Indo-European inflectional system which came to have a widespread dialectal distribution.

Received 12 March 1982.

REFERENCES

- Adrados, Francisco. 1975. *Lingüística indoeuropea*. Madrid: Gredos.
 Buck, Carl. 1933. *Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
 Burrow, T. 1973. *The Sanskrit Language*. Rev. ed. London: Faber and Faber.
 Endzelins, J. 1971. *Comparative Phonology and Morphology of the Baltic Languages*. Trans. by W. Schmalstieg and B. Jegers. The Hague: Mouton.
 Gray, Louis. 1932. „On Indo-European Noun-Declension, Especially of *-O-* and *-A-* Stems.“ *Language* 8. 183—199.
 Hirt, Hermann. 1934. *Indogermanische Grammatik*. Vol. 6. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
 Krause, Wolfgang and Werner Thomas. 1960. *Tocharisches Elementarbuch*. Vol. 1. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
 Lehmann, Winfred. 1974. *Proto-Indo-European Syntax*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
 Lewis, Henry and Holger Pedersen. 1961. *A Concise Comparative Celtic Grammar*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.
 Meillet, A. 1964. *Introduction à l'étude comparative des langues indo-européennes*. Alabama: University of Alabama Press.
 Misra, Satya. 1968. *A Comparative Grammar of Sanskrit, Greek and Hittite*. Calcutta: The World Press Private, Ltd.

⁴ Burrow (1973: 240) and Misra (1968: 58) both derive Skt. *-ā* here from an analogical extension of the *o*-stem nominative-accusative dual suffix **-ō*, while Meillet (1964: 297) maintains that it represents IE **-ə*.

- Pajares, Alberto Barnabé. 1976. „A Critical Review of Some Interpretations of the IE Long Diphthongs (I)“. *Archivum Linguisticum* 7. 161—190
- Schmalstieg, William. 1973. „New Thoughts on Indo-European Phonology“. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 87. 99—157.
- Schmalstieg, William. 1974. „Some Morphological Implications of the Indo-European Passage of *-oN to *-ō“. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 88. 187—198.
- Schmalstieg, William. 1977. „Speculations on the Development of the Indo-European Nominal Inflection“. *Folia Linguistica* 10. 109—149.
- Schmalstieg, William. 1978. „More on Indo-European Monophthongizations: A Reply to Dr. Alberto Barnabé-Pajares.“ *Archivum Linguisticum* 9. 135—162.
- Shields, Kenneth. 1977. „Some New Observations Concerning the Origin of the Indo-European Feminine Gender.“ *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 91. 56—71.
- Szemerényi, Oswald. 1980. *Einführung in die vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft* Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Van Windekens, A. J. 1979. *Le tokharien confronté avec les autres langues indo-européennes*. Vol. 2.1. Louvain: Centre International de Dialectologie Générale.

J. T. HOOKER
University College
London

UDC 807.5—73

Ἀυτόκωλος

Part of Semonides' description of the 'monkey-woman' (7.73—76 West) runs as follows:

τοιαύτη γυνή
εἶσιν δι' ἄστεος πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις γέλως
ἐπ' αὐχένα βραχεῖα κινεῖται μόγις
ἄπυρος, αὐτόκωλος.

The meaning of αὐτόκωλος is not self-evident. West himself proposes the tentative translation 'she has no buttocks, it's just leg', πυγὴν οὐκ ἔχει ἀλλ' αὐτὰ κῶλα: *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus* (1974) 178. That is certainly possible. But it seems equally possible that Semonides here refers not to the *appearance* of the woman, grotesque though it is, but to her *gait* or *manner of movement*. It is her going (εἶσιν) through the town that arouses laughter; 'and she moves with difficulty (κινεῖται μόγις). Hence we may see in the compound αὐτόκωλος a conflation of αὐτόματος and κῶλον: the woman's movements are so awkward (so unco-ordinated, as we say) that her legs appear to move of their own accord.

Received 18.IV 1981.