

Two Notes on Greek Epigraphical Perfects

By DONALD A. RINGE Jr., Philadelphia

1. *The Third Person Plural of the East Aiolic Mediopassive Perfect*

The 3pl. of the mediopassive perfect appears in East Aiolic¹⁾ only in inscriptions of the second century B. C.; there are three forms, one of which is attested twice, as well as one probable example. The following are the occurring forms with their contexts:²⁾

διαδεδίκασται IG XII Suppl. 139. 20 (Miletos, decrees of Methymna and Eresos; after 188 B. C., and perhaps not after 167 B. C.):

ἐπεῖδη διαδεδίκασται αἱ δίκαι αἱ κατὰ τὰν ἐπισυνθήκαν | κτλ.

διαδεδίκασται IG XII Suppl. 139. 59:

ἐπεῖδη διαδεδίκασται αἱ δίκαι αἱ πρὸς | Μαθυμναίοις κτλ.

ἀναγέγραπται IG XII Suppl. 139. 94:

ὅ]ποι καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι πρόξενοι καὶ εὐέργεται τᾶς πόλιος ἀναγέγραπται·

ἐψ]αφίσμενοί ἐστι IG XII Suppl. 3. 17 (Mytilene, shortly after 196 B. C.):

ἐπεῖδη Θέσσαλοι ἐν τε τῷ [πρό]σθε χρόν]ωι διετελείων οἰκηῖως καὶ εὐνόως [ἔχον]τες πρὸς] τὰν πόλιν καὶ νῦν ἄξια πράσσοντες [τῷ ἔθνεος | αὐτῶν ἐψ]αφίσμενοί ἐστι εἰς τε τὰν θυσίαν τῷ Ἄσ- κ[λαπίω θε]αρία]ν πέμπην κτλ.

ἐψαφίσμενοί ἐ(σ)τι IG XII Suppl. 138. 10-1 (Magnesia on the Maiandros, decree of Mytilene; ca. 199 B. C.):

— — — ψάφισμα] ἀπέδωκ[αν ἐν ᾧ ἐμφα]||νίζοισι ὅ[τ(τ)ι, γνόν]τες χρῆσαι εἰς αὐτοῖσ[ι τὸν θεόν]|| τὸν ἐν Δέλφοισι ..|...|...|... ἐψαφίσμενοί | ἐ(σ)τι συντελείην ..|...|...|... θυσίαν κτλ.

(The stone reads ἐντι, apparently an error of the Magnesian stonemason.)

¹⁾ I use the term “East Aiolic” rather than “Lesbian Aiolic” because the Greek of the mainland opposite Lesbos was so similar to that of the island that the two are best treated as a single dialect. — An earlier draft of the first of these notes was presented at the 1984 Annual Meeting of the American Philological Association (Toronto, December 1984); an earlier draft of the second was presented at the 1986 Annual Meeting of the Classical Association of the Middle West and South (Tampa, April 1986). The data for both are taken from my Ph. D. dissertation, *The Perfect Tenses in Greek Inscriptions* (Yale 1984); the discussion has been so extensively revised as to bear little resemblance to the relevant sections of that work.

²⁾ In addition to the usual epigraphical conventions, I use the following

Note that the non-periphrastic examples are identical with the corresponding 3sg. forms; in the periphrastic examples the finite verb is identical with 3sg. *ἔστι*, though the participles are unambiguously plural. Unfortunately no 3pl. mediopassive pluperfect of this dialect is attested.

Scholars have not paid much attention to these surprising forms. Blümel (1982: 183–4) refers to *διαδεδίκασται* in passing; Schwyzer (1939: 677 with fn.3) and Thumb and Scherer (1959: 101) note the more general use of *ἔστι* as a 3pl. in East Aiolic, but they do not mention the perfects in question. I would like to propose an explanation for these East Aiolic perfects.

Any discussion of the 3pl. perfects must start from the fact that in the Hellenistic period the 3pl. present of 'be' in East Aiolic was *ἔστι*, identical with the 3sg. form. 3pl. *ἔστι* is attested from the end of the fourth century B.C., more than a century before the earliest of our perfects; its context makes its use as a 3pl. absolutely clear:

καὶ ἐπαγγελλὰ[μέ|ν]ων πρὸς Ἀλέξανδρον ὅτι ἔτοιμοί ἐστι δίκ[αν|ύ]ποσκέ(θ)ην περὶ τῶν ἐγκαλημένων ἐν τῷ δά[μω·
(IG XII-2. 526. a. 38–40).

Davies (1964: 141–4) gives a plausible explanation for this use of *ἔστι*, which can be summarized briefly as follows. The East Aiolic 3sg. imperfect of 'be' was *ἦς*; the original 3pl., though not actually attested, must have been **ἦεν* or **ἦν*. Inconsistent adoption of the Attic koine forms, 3sg. *ἦν* and 3pl. *ἦσαν*, would have led to a situation in which *ἦν* was one of the competing forms of the 3sg. and also one of the competing forms of the 3pl. Such a circumstance might easily have led to a similar confusion in the present, with the result that 3sg. *ἔστι* began to be used also as a 3pl. form. Sicilian Doric 3sg. *ἐντί* is the opposite result of a precisely similar process (Davies, loc. cit.; Wackernagel 1921: 121–2).

Given the existence of a 3pl. *ἔστι*, we might try to account for the anomalous 3pl. perfects as follows. In many (perhaps all) dialects periphrastic and non-periphrastic forms of the mediopassive perfect and pluperfect coexisted for centuries; East Aiolic was no exception. After the adoption of *ἔστι* as the 3pl. present of 'be', the periphrastic and non-periphrastic 3sg. and 3pl. of the mediopassive perfect of

device: ... indicates material present in the inscription but not quoted here (three points per line, two or one for parts of lines).

such a verb as *δικάσδην* 'judge' must have been approximately the following:

	non-periphrastic	periphrastic
3sg.	<i>δεδίκαται</i>	<i>δεδικάσμενός ἐστι</i>
3pl.	<i>(δεδικάδαται?)</i>	<i>δεδικάσμενοί ἐστι</i>

In the periphrastic forms the finite verb would have been identical in the 3sg. and 3pl.; conceivably this could have led to the use of 3sg. *δεδίκαται* as a 3pl.

However, further consideration renders this scenario unconvincing. For one thing, the participles of the periphrastic 3 sg. and 3 pl. are *not* identical; consequently the analogical proportion that must be invoked is flawed. More importantly, the periphrastic 3pl. *δεδικάσμενοί ἐστι* is quite unambiguous in spite of its apparently 3sg. finite verb, since after all the participle is plural; given the existence of such an unambiguous 3pl. form it is hard to see why anyone would be led to use the *non*-periphrastic 3sg. as a 3pl., thus creating a new ambiguity in the system, no matter how great the pressure to replace the original non-periphrastic 3pl. might have been. Of course neither of these objections is fatal, but an explanation open to neither objection might be preferable.

There is another factor that can have played a part in the development of these 3 pl. perfects. The original shape of the 3pl. ending in this category was *-νται* after vowels, *-αται* (< **-ηται*) after consonants; we have numerous examples of both endings from various dialects. But in some dialects *-αται* has spread from stems ending in consonants to those ending in vowels, partially or wholly displacing *-νται*; note the following examples:

Homeric *βεβλήαται* Λ 657, λ 194;

East Ionic *κεκλέαται* Herodotos 2.164.1;

West Ionic *εἰρήται* < **εἰρήαται*, IG VII 235. a. 17 (Oropos, fourth century B. C.);

Boiotian *μεμισθῶαθη* DGE 485.6 (III c. B. C.; *-αθη* is the normal Boiotian equivalent of *-αται*).

We do not know whether a similar development occurred in East Aiolic; there is no direct evidence one way or the other. But since *-αται* did spread to vowel stems in East Ionic, and since that dialect exerted considerable influence on East Aiolic (Thumb and Scherer 1959:85 with bibliography), the suggestion that *-αται* spread at the expense of *-νται* in East Aiolic is plausible. For stems in nonhigh vowels the initial result must have been approximately as follows:

**νενικάνται* → **νενικάαται* > **νενικάται*
 **κέκληνται* → **κεκλήαται* > **κεκλήται*
 **μεμίσθωνται* → **μεμισθώαται* > **μεμισθῶται*

At this stage the new 3pl. forms were still distinct from 3sg. *νενικάται*, *κέκληται*, *μεμίσθῶται*, etc. But East Aiolic had recessive accent. If the recessive accent rule was productive,³⁾ it would have caused the new, contracted 3pl. forms to merge with the old 3sgs.:

**νενικάται* > **νενικάται* = 3sg. *νενικάται*
 **κεκλήται* > **κέκληται* = 3sg. *κέκληται*
 **μεμισθῶται* > **μεμίσθῶται* = 3sg. *μεμίσθῶται*

Once the distinction between 3sg. and 3pl. had been lost in the majority of vowel stems, the rule “3pl. = 3sg.” could have become productive in the mediopassive perfect; hence forms like 3pl. *διδίκασαι*.

If the east Aiolic recessive accent rule was *not* productive, a development similar to that outlined above would be more difficult, but still not impossible. It is at least thinkable that an analogical proportion

κέκληται : **κεκλήται* :: *δεδίκασαι* : x

would be solved as

x = **δεδικάσαι*;

our epigraphical forms could, of course, have been accented in this fashion.

Either of these developments would have been all the easier if the periphrastic 3pl. mediopassive perfects already contained a 3pl. *ἔστι* identical with the corresponding 3sg.; the situation in the present of ‘be’ will then have been a contributing factor in the creation of our peculiar 3pl. mediopassive perfect forms.⁴⁾

³⁾ The evidence consists of forms such as *ā*-stem genitive plurals marked as barytones in papyri; the difficulty is that we cannot completely trust the expertise of whoever marked the accents in those papyri. See Thumb and Scherer 1959:86–7 with bibliography, and especially Hamm 1957:42–4; Blümel 1982 does not discuss this problem.

⁴⁾ However, it is not possible to establish that the use of *ἔστι* as a 3pl. actually preceded the creation of our 3pl. mediopassive perfect forms, nor is it necessary for the argument of this note. — It seems likely that such forms as 3pl. *χεχέμανται* (Pindar, *Pyth.* 9.32) are the result of a similar series of processes (replacement of *-αται* by *-ανται*, followed by haplology?); on the other hand, forms like 3sg. *βεβλήαται* (*H. Apol.* 20) are probably errors of some sort. I am grateful to Olav Hackstein for pointing these forms out to me. (Collection: Allen et al. (edd.) 1936:204.)

2. *Γεγράβεται, γεγράβανται, κεκλεβώς*

In Doric dialect inscriptions occur three forms of the perfect tense that exhibit β's in place of expected π's or φ's:

γεγράβεται SEG 4.30.1 (Kamarina, archaic):

[*χοί*]δε γεγράβεται | ἐπὶ δυσπραγί[αι] | κερδῶν ἐλάσ[ιο|ς?] ἐξ
λότῳ περ κῶ || Πύθῶν Διοκλ[.ι.ε.α.] τιτα' | (list of names follows)

γεγράβανται DGE 90.12 (Argos, 1st half of III c. B. C.):

πολίταν ἦμεν αὐτὸν | καὶ ἐκγόνονος καὶ θεαροδόκον τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ
Νεμέαι καὶ τᾶς | Ἦρας τ[ᾶ]ς Ἀργείας, τὸν δὲ στραταγόνος, οἷς
 γράφει Δαμέας, ἀ[ν]|γράψαι ἐνς τὰνς στάλανς τὰνς ἐν τῶι ἱερῶι
 τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος | τοῦ Λυκείου, ἶ καὶ τοὶ ἄλλοι πολῖται γεγράβαν-
 ται, κτλ.

κεκλεβώς IG V-1.1390.75 (Doric koine, Andania, 92/1 B. C.):

Ἀδικημάτων. ἂν δέ τις ἐν ταῖς ἀμέραις, ἐν αἷς αἶ τε θυσίαι καὶ τὰ
 μυστήρια γίνονται, ἀλῶι εἴτε κεκλεβὼς εἴτε ἄλλο τι ἀδίκημα
 πεποιηκώς, ἀγέσθω ἐπὶ τοὺς ἱερούς.

Concerning the second and third of these forms, and some superficially similar examples, Schwyzer (1939:772) remarks:

Neubildungen sind sicher auch *κεκλεβὼς* (Andania; 92 v. Chr.),
βεβλαβότος (Argos Bechtel, Dial. 2, 496), *γεγράβανται* (Argos,
 vor 251 v. Chr.; Del.³⁹⁰, 12), *ῶριγα* (Messenien? neben *-ικα*
 Dem. Aristot.); es sind wohl alles falsche ‚Dialektisierungen‘ helle-
 nistischer Perfekta auf *-φα* bzw. *-χα*.

Apparently archaic Kamarinan *γεγράβεται* was not known to Schwyzer; and of course it is precisely that form that cannot possibly represent the artificial Doricization of an Attic koine stem, and which should therefore lead us to reject Schwyzer's explanation for this whole class of perfects.

Moreover, the forms of the perfect listed by Schwyzer in the passage cited (and by Vollgraff 1916:71) do not all demand the same explanation. Doric koine *βεβλαβότος* (IG IV².65.14; Epidaurus, I c. B. C.), *περιῶριγα* (IG V-2.443.50; Megalopolis, late II/early I c. B. C.), and *ἦσαν περιωριγότες* (ibid. line 10) and Hesykhios' *λέλεγα· εἴρηκα* (Vollgraff, loc. cit.; dialect and date unknown) all exhibit stem-final consonants that one would expect to find on etymological grounds, no matter how odd they look from a classical Attic point of view; the same is true of Doric koine *μεταλλαγόντων* (IG

V-1.1433.37; Messene, late I c. B. C.).⁵⁾ Such examples really need no explanation at all, since they need not be Attic koine perfects that have been deliberately altered. But the three forms listed in the title of this note and quoted in context above do require some elucidation, since their stem-final consonants are unexpected from any viewpoint.

The general lines along which an explanation of the β 's of *γεγράβανται*, *γεγράβανται*, and *κεκλεβώς* must be sought were noted by Carl Buck (1925:141):

The β [of *γεγράβανται*] ... is put in its proper connection by Vollgraff ... and in Brugmann-Thumb (*Gr. Gram.*, p. 375). That is, it is a new example of that analogical interchange between π , β , φ , in roots ending in a labial, on account of common forms in ψ and $\pi\tau$, which is seen in Mess. *κεκλεβώς* (*κλέπτω*, *κλοπή*) and Cret. *ἀβλοπία* = *ἀβλαβία*, and which has reached larger proportions in Modern Greek (*κόβω*, *κρύβω*, *κλέβω*, etc.), where the influence of verbs in *-αυω*, *-εω* is an added factor.

This is unobjectionable as far as it goes; however, it is possible to reconstruct the course of events that gave rise to these Doric stems in *-β-* in much greater detail.⁶⁾

It is no accident that two of the forms in question are mediopassive 3pls. Of all forms of the mediopassive perfect and pluperfect in common use,⁷⁾ only the 3pls. maintained distinctions of voicing and aspiration in stem-final labial and velar stops, because only the 3pl. endings began with vowels; thus *κέκοπται* \approx *βέβλαπται* \approx *γέγραπται* and *κεκόφθαι* \approx *βεβλάφθαι* \approx *γεγράφθαι*, but **κεκόπαται* : **βεβλάβανται* : *γεγράφανται*. In such a paradigm the spread of one of the stem-final labial or velar stops from verb to verb at the expense of the others must have been very easy; in Attic and Ionic φ and χ did

⁵⁾ In fact, *βεβλαβότος* and *λέλεγα* are so transparent that they could have been created by analogy at almost any time (probably on the basis of the corresponding mediopassive stems; see below). *περιωριγ-* is the most surprising stem, but the abstraction of a verb base in *-ιγ-* from the pattern present *-ίζω* : aorist *-ιζα* is at least a reasonable possibility.

⁶⁾ Buck's attempt, in the passage immediately following that quoted (pp. 141-2), to establish a stem *γεγραβᾶ-* (on the grounds that an ending *-ανται* is not likely to have been linguistically real) is much less happy; note that this idea has been abandoned in Buck 1955:113.

⁷⁾ Non-periphrastic subjunctives and optatives of mediopassive perfect stems ending in consonants are not attested; if they ever existed they must have been rare.

spread in just that fashion (Osthoff 1884:284–8). It is therefore more than likely that *γεγράβεται* and *γεγράβανται* owe their *β*'s to the influence of some mediopassive perfect stem ending in *β*. Given the paucity of our early Doric data, we cannot say what that stem was; a likely candidate is *λελαβ-* (*λελαμβ-*?), a mediopassive perfect of *λαμβάνω* which is well attested in Ionic and in third-century Doric.⁸⁾

The mediopassive perfect is also the ultimate source of the *β* of active *κεκλεβώς*, to judge from the ablaut grade of its root. To roots ending in *ε* plus a stop we expect to find o-grade active perfect stems; that is what we do find in classical Attic even among innovative perfects – not only in *κέκλοφα*, for example, which is of a normal shape and appears already in the fifth century B. C., but even in such fourth-century monsters as *συνείλοχα*. The e-grade root of *κεκλεβώς* is historically intelligible only if the stem was analogically introduced into the active from the mediopassive (cf. Wackernagel 1904:15–6 with bibliography), in which an e-grade root was normal (cf. Attic *κέκλεμμαι*); the *-β-* of *κεκλεβώς* can therefore be explained in precisely the same fashion as the *-β-* of the other forms. The process by which *κεκλεβώς* must have arisen can be diagrammed as follows:

*κεκλέπαται → *κεκλέβαται → active *κέκλεβα, ptc. κεκλεβώς.

Note that this development is exactly parallel to the Attic and Ionic spread of *φ* and *χ* from the 3pl. mediopassive perfect and pluperfect to the active, the process by which the aspirated perfect is generally held to have arisen (J. Schmidt 1884).⁹⁾ So striking a parallel strongly supports the traditional view concerning the origin of the aspirated perfect; it largely invalidates the arguments against that view which I advanced in a previous article (Ringe 1984) and is entirely compatible with the objections of Slings (1986:12–3), most of which are well taken.¹⁰⁾ Though the existence of *εἴληφα* may

⁸⁾ Herodotos: *διαλελαμμένος* 3.117.2, 4.68.2; *ἀπολελαμμένοι* 9.51.4. Hiprokrates: *ἀπολέλαπται*, *Περὶ φύσιος παιδίου* 20.4; *ἀναλελά(μ)φθαι*, *Κατ' ἰητρείον* 11; etc. Arkhimedes: *λέλαπται*, *Περὶ ἐλίγων* 21; (*ἀπο*)*λελάφθω* and (*ἀπο*)*λελαμμένος* frequenter; etc. Doric inscriptions: *καταλέλαμμαι* DGE 173.41 (Doric koine, Tauric Khersonesos, III c. B. C.).

⁹⁾ This implication was pointed out to me by the late Warren Cowgill not long before his death.

¹⁰⁾ However, note the following. (1) It must have been relatively difficult for a native speaker of Greek to “recover” the underlying *-δ-* of verb bases with presents in *-ζω*, since in almost all forms the original *-δ-* was dropped, or

have contributed to the success of the aspirated perfect as a productive formation in Attic (Schwyzer 1939:772), it is most likely that the primary source of that stem type is to be found in 3pl. mediopassive forms in *-φαται* and *-χαται*.

References

- Allen, T. W., W. R. Halliday, and E. E. Sikes (edd.). 1936: *The Homeric hymns*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Blümel, Wolfgang. 1982: *Die aiolischen Dialekte*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. (= *KZ*, Ergänzungsheft 30.)
- Buck, Carl Darling. 1925: Epigraphical notes. *CP* 20.133–44.
- . 1955: *The Greek dialects*. Chicago: U. of Chicago Press.
- Davies, Anna Morpurgo. 1964: 'Doric' features in the language of Hesiod. *Glotta* 42.138–65.
- Hamm, Eva-Maria. 1967: *Grammatik zu Sappho und Alkaios. Abhandlungen der deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Klasse für Sprachen, Literatur und Kunst, Jahrgang 1951, Nr. 2*.
- Osthoff, Hermann. 1884: *Zur Geschichte des Perfects im Indogermanischen*. Straßburg: Trübner.
- Ringe, Donald A., Jr. 1984: *Εἰληφα* and the aspirated perfect. *Glotta* 62.125–41.
- Schmidt, Johannes. 1884: Die Entstehung der griechischen aspirierten Perfecta. *KZ* 27.309–14.
- Schwyzer, Eduard. 1939: *Griechische Grammatik. Band I*. Munich: Beck.
- Slings, S. R. 1986: *ΕΙΛΗΦΑ*. *Glotta* 64.9–14.
- Thumb, Albert, and Anton Scherer. 1959: *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte. Band II*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Vollgraff, Wilhelm. 1916: *Novae inscriptiones Argivae. Mnemosyne, Nova Series* 44.46–71.
- Wackernagel, Jacob. 1904: Studien zum griechischen Perfectum. *Programm zur akademischen Preisverteilung der Universität Göttingen*, pp.3–24. (= Wackernagel, *Kleine Schriften* [n.d.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht], pp. 1000–21)
- . 1921: Zu altir. *fitir*. *IF* 39.220–3.

replaced by *-σ-*, or incorporated into the morphophonemically ambiguous *-ζ-*. This obviously has something to do with dialect differences involving the sigmatic stems (*-ισα* vs. *-ιζα*, etc.) and with the creation of active perfects in *-ικα*, *-ακα*; it should also have some bearing on the lack of aspirated perfects made to such verbs. It seems unreasonable to maintain that this consideration "is not to the point" (Slings 1986: 12), in spite of the obvious error in my careless remark about the relative chronology of the terms (Ringe 1984: 129). (2) On Meillet's idea that the epigraphical spellings *-φσα*, *-χσα*, etc. reveal an actual phonetic aspiration of the stop (which could then be extended to the active perfect) see Ringe 1984: 130, fn. 10.