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. mëtére 'two mothers'). Lithuanian also appears to attest this same dual desinence. As Endzelïns (1971: 165) observes: „In Lithuanian the nominative and the accusative of masculine words are now formed on the model of the (i)ò-stems, e.g. dëkmeniu '(two) stones', šuniū '(two) dogs'. The nominative and accusative of feminine words follow the i-stems, e.g. dìkteri '(two) daughters' (= OCS došteri). In Daukša’s writings one still finds (from žmuo 'man') the nominative dual žmûne '(two) men' (cf. Gk. kûne '(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. áuguse 'having grown'. „It has been suggested that this termination, elsewhere replaced by -au in Sanskrit, is preserved in the dual dvandva mātara-pitarau '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 (< *rëg-e) 'two kings' and athir (< *pater-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 Szemerényi (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. khôr-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 rçc-ê, Lith. rank-î [< -ai] '(two) hands'). Likewise the *o-stem
ending *-oi furnishes nominative plurals for masculine nouns in Balto-Slavic (cf. OCS grad-i 'cities', Lith. vyr-ai 'men' [<- *-oi]), but duals for neuters in Slavic and Sanskrit (cf. OCS měst-ě 'two places', Skt. phal-e 'two fruits')

Similarly, the suffix *-l is attested as a marker of the nominative-accusative dual and plural in neuter i-stems: Skt. aksī', Avest. aši, OCS oči, Lith. aki 'two eyes'; Skt. tri', OCS trī, OIr. trī, Lat. trī(-gintē) '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 be­brauchen als Plural im Aind. den Singular. aprati, asthūri, īṃti, bhū'ri, šāmi, surabhī, māhi (AV.).“

The structural identity of various neuter singular and non-singular forms in other stem-classes in Vedic Sanskrit (ūdhār '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 en.lin’s 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 ū, uēš ‘we’, etc., in contrast with demonstratives, e.g., kāš, kē, ‘this, these’, and nouns, e.g., antuhsaš, antušes ‘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 ist sg. secondary ending *-om and the primary ending *-o (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 *-ö 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. phérô, Skt. bhrâ-â-âmi vs. the 1st sg. imperfect Gk. éphe- on, Skt. bhâr-âmita (1974: 187). Likewise, „The Skt. nom. sg. vr̥tra-hâ (<*ghwen) shows a stem alternate with final -n in the other cases, e.g. acc. sg. vr̥tra-ha-n-â, dat. sg. vr̥tra-ghn-e, abl.-gen. sg. vr̥tra-ghn-hâ, loc. sg. vr̥tra-ha-ni, -hni, voc. sg. vr̥tra-ha-ni. The nominative singular shows the pre-consonantal sandhi, i.e. -â < *-ë < **-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 *-ö̅n (Gk. -ön, Skt. -ām), the pure prevocalic form of which probably appears in Lat. -um and OCS -a (<*-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 á-stem nouns like Gk. khôra-i ‘lands’ and Lat. rôsa-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. devds ‘gods’ and Go. dagôs ‘days’, as well as in accusative plurals like Lat. lupôs and Lith. vilkûs ‘wolves’), Indo-European possessed a non-singular suffix *-N (=m or n). This suffix appears in Tocharian plurals ending in -n: AB rin ‘cities’, AB kântwân ‘tongues’, A pyâpyâ, B pyâpyân ‘flowers’, cf. Schmalstieg 1977: 131. Moreover, in Tocharian A nominative-oblique dual („Paral,“ cf. Krause and Thomas 1960: 76—77) nouns end in -n, 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 bhûvanâni (which alternates with bhûvanâ in Vedic but which is generalized in later Sanskrit) ‘worlds’, śucîni (which similarly alternates with śucî) ‘bright ones’, and vâsûni (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. vṛkā, Gk. lúkō ‘two wolves’; Gk. khôrâ ‘two lands’, númphâ ‘two nymphs’ (-ā < *-ā < -*aN, cf. Shields 1977: 62); Skt. âvî ‘two sheep’, Lith. naktî ‘two

In Shields 1977: 60, I propose that the palatalization of -ē 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. mádhū '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 *-dN, 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 éphelecyistique de l'ionien-attique dans des cas tels que: éphe.re, épheren; ésti, éstin; posî, posîn; hom. bîephî, hîephîn; 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 1re personne de pluriel active, l'indo-iranien a -ma, et le grec -men“.

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. agnâyas 'fires', Gk. ópheis 'snakes', Go. ansteis 'favors'; Skt. sünàvas, OCS synove 'sons', Gk. pêkhees 'fore-arms'; Skt. mâtâras, Gk. métières 'mothers', OIce. fôtr (<*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. pitārā 'two fathers', mātārā '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 *htērē/-ē“ (Meillet 1964: 197)\(^8\). The pre-

\(^8\) 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 -bhāyām; à la 2e—3e 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 (parai) forms in A-aäm and B-ane, including consonant-stems like A ašām, B ešane ‘two eyes’ and A klośām, 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(-): t.ute 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), . . . ct en tokharien même où les caractéristiques B -uc et B -s du nominatif-accusatif du duel proprement dit peuvent remonter à *-nte et à *-seu.

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 + *-ë). 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 (-o) 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 dialectical distribution.
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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 *-ē.
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Αὐτόκωλος

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

τοιαύτη γυνή
ἐξαίν δὲι ἀστεος πάσιν ἀνθρώποις γέλως*
ἐπ’ αὐχένα βραχεία κινεῖται μόγις·
ἀπυγος, αὐτόκωλος.

The meaning of αὐτόκωλος is not self-evident. West himself proposes the tentative translation ‘she has no buttocks, it’s just leg’, τυγήν οὐκ ἔχετ 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 (ἐξαίν) 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.
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