The active imperfect of the verbs of the ‘2nd conjugation’ in the Peloponnesian varieties of Modern Greek*

Nikolaos Pantelidis

Demokritus University of Thrace

The present paper treats the different types of formation and the inflectional patterns of the active imperfect of the verbs that in traditional grammar are known as verbs of the ‘2nd conjugation’ in the Peloponnesian varieties of Modern Greek (except Tsakonian and Maniot), mainly from a diachronic point of view. A reconstruction of the processes that led to the current situation is attempted and directions for further possible changes are suggested. The diachrony of the morphology of the imperfect of the ‘2nd conjugation’ in the Peloponnesian varieties involves developments such as morphologization of a phonological process and the evolution of number-oriented allomorphy at the level of aspectual markers, while at the same time offering interesting insights into the mechanisms and scope of morphological changes and the morphological structure of the Modern Greek verb. These developments can also offer important evidence for the process of dialectal differentiation of Medieval/‘Early Modern’ Greek.

Keywords: Modern Greek dialects, Peloponnesian varieties, imperfect, morphologization, leveling, violation of the trisyllabic window, loss of morpheme boundary, doubling of morphemes

Introduction

The aims of this paper are several: to present the different types of formation and inflectional patterns, in the Peloponnesian varieties of Modern Greek (except Tsakonian and Maniot), of the active imperfect of the verbs which in traditional Greek grammar are known as verbs of the ‘2nd conjugation’, working from a diachronic point of view; to reconstruct the processes that led

to the current situation; to relate them synchronically and diachronically with the respective paradigms and formations of other Modern Greek varieties; and to identify tendencies that suggest further possible changes. It also aims at presenting their geographical distribution on the peninsula and, as far as possible, changes in this distribution over the course of time. Before proceeding to the main part of this paper, a remark must be made concerning the sources of dialectal evidence. The state of recording of a number of the Modern Greek varieties forces us to use a variety of sources of material in order to get as complete and clear a picture as possible of the synchrony as well as of the diachrony of the varieties: actual (tape) recordings made by linguists, collections of folkloric material as far as they are written down in the local varieties (e.g. narrations of villagers on matters of the local culture), as well as other sources such as appendices of books on the history and the culture of various regions, old grammars such as e.g. Mullach's or Thumb's, publications such as Koukoulés's (1908) and Politis's (1904), folkloric songs, publications of the Greek journal *Laographia*, local publications (newspapers/periodicals), etc.¹ Many of the above sources, every one with its own particularities, must of course — as written sources — be handled with the appropriate caution, yet they are particularly valuable as sources of varieties such as Peloponnesian that have died out or are close to dying out. Peloponnesian in particular has from the nineteenth century on been regarded as having been the basis of the Modern Greek standard language and thus as being virtually identical to Dhimitiki. This theory led to relative indifference towards Peloponnesian and, with a few exceptions and apart from the act of collecting the material per se, to an almost total lack of scientific research on it. However, a more careful look at this variety would probably cast doubt on the validity of the theory which connects Peloponnesian intimately with the process of the formation of the Modern Greek Standard (for more on this see Pantelidis 2001).

1. The present of the verbs of the '2nd conjugation'

1.1 The types of '2nd conjugation' verbs

In the Peloponnesian varieties of Modern Greek the two original types of the Verbs of Class II (the ancient 'contracted' verbs) were kept distinct, especially in some parts of the Peloponnese and in the speech of older generations of speakers. As examples may serve the verbs *pernó* (→ *perná-o*) "pass" and *foró* "wear, put on", seen in Table 1:

Table 1.

Type A		Type B	
Singular	Plural	Singular	Plural
<i>pern-ó</i> → <i>perná-o</i>	<i>pernúme</i> → <i>perná-me</i>	<i>for-ó</i>	<i>forúme</i>
<i>perná-s, perná-is</i>	<i>pernáte</i>	<i>forís</i>	<i>foríte, forúte</i>
<i>perná</i> → <i>perná-i</i>	<i>pernún(e)</i> → <i>perná-ne</i>	<i>forí</i>	<i>forún(e)</i>

1.2 The present of Type A

The extension of the forms of the singular in the present of Type A to *-á-o*, (*-á-is*), *-á-i* and the abandonment of the alternation /a/ ~ /u/ in the plural in favour of /a/ created a new more uniform paradigm, built on the stem *perná-*, which does not display allomorphy, with the endings *-o*, *-(i)s*, *-i*, *-me*, *-te*, *-ne*. The whole development most probably started in the 3SG, in accordance with the tendency observed by Watkins (also known as Watkins’s Law) for the forms of the 3SG to be reinterpreted as being morphologically unmarked for person-number and thus serving as the pivot/basis and the starting point for the restructuring of whole paradigms (Watkins 1962:90–96; cf. also Householder & Nagy 1972:43, Arlotto 1972:156, Bybee 1985:55–56). 3SG present forms in *-á-i* are attested as early as the sixteenth century (§2.3):

3SG *perná-* → reinterpretation as *perná-Ø* → *perná-i* → *perná-o*, *perná-is*, *perná-me*, *perná-ne*

Figure 1.

As noted above a process of leveling led to the creation of the new 1PL and 3PL forms *perná-me* and *perná-ne*, which almost completely replaced the older *pernúme* and *pernún(e)*. This leveling process conforms to the definition of leveling as “the complete or partial elimination [within a paradigm] of morphophonemic alternations that do not seem to signal important differences in meaning or function” (Hock & Joseph 1996:155; cf. also Hock 1986:183). The peculiar distribution of stem allomorphs (if /u/ in *pernú-* is to be regarded as part of the stem at that time) in the older paradigm is for the most part the product of ancient phonological changes (vowel contractions) and conflation processes with Type B (forms with /u/; cf. Horrocks 1997:242f.). It does not synchronically reflect major systematic semantic-functional differences (e.g. person, number) but rather combinations of person + number:

pern- ‘1SG’ ~ *perna*- ‘2SG, 3SG, 2PL’ ~ *pern*(-)*u*- ‘1PL, 3PL’

Figure 2.

Person + number was sufficiently marked by the morphemes *-me*, *-te*, etc., a fact that contributed to the elimination of the original morphophonemic alternation. In the speech of older speakers, ‘contracted’ older forms of the present paradigm of Type A are still in quite limited use (e.g. 1SG *pernó*, 3SG *perná*, 1PL *pernúme*, 3PL *pernún(e)*). They are also used in the Modern Greek Koine (MGK) in more formal speech.

1SG of Type A: In Peloponnesian the 1SG in the present of the verbs of Type A and, more generally, of (synchronically) vocalic verbs shows an ending *-u* or absence of ending: *perná-u/perná-Ø*, *tró-u/tró-Ø* ‘I eat’, *lé-u/lé-Ø* ‘I say, I tell’, etc. The realization of the ending as *-u* could be attributed to an attempt at maximizing the articulatory distance between adjacent vowels. The absence of an ending in forms like *perná-Ø* etc. may be a sandhi phenomenon, yet the whole matter remains to be examined.

2SG of Type A: 2SG forms like e.g. *piná-is* ‘you are hungry’ (compare also *klé-is* ‘you cry’) are securely attested in twentieth-century collections from numerous parts of the Peloponnese (villages in the regions of Kynouría and Gortynía — i.e. parts of Arkadia, parts of Messenia and Lakonia) and are explicitly mentioned as being in use in the Peloponnese by Mullach (1856:277) and Thumb (1910:162). Neither give any details about the exact geographic extension and the systematicity of the use of such forms in their times.

1.3 The present of Type B

1.3.1 ‘Primary’ Type-B-verbs

Type B is still represented by a relatively large number of verbs, most of which in the spoken MGK have already passed to Type A. This process can also be observed in the Peloponnesian varieties. There is, of course, a great deal of fluctuation among the Modern Greek dialects as to what verbs of Class II belong now or belonged originally to which of the two types, a fact that was already pointed out by Hatzidakis (1892:129–130). The same fluctuation can also be observed in the Peloponnese. The verbs of Class II that show inflectional forms of Type B in Peloponnesian varieties are the following: *boró* ‘can, be able’, *kaló* ‘invite’, *zó* (or *žó*) ‘live’, *aryó* (*arjó*) ‘be late, delayed’, *karteró* ‘await, expect’, *filó* ‘kiss’, *varó* ‘beat, hit’, *laló* ‘sing (of singing birds), crow (of roosters)’, *perpató* ‘walk’, *foró* ‘wear, put on’, *ponó* ‘ache, hurt’, *krató*

“hold”, *piloló* “run”, *pató* “tread, stand on, set one’s foot on”, *volí* (impersonal) “it is convenient”, and others, varying depending on the region. *Zó*, *boró*, and *kaló* seem to be those that are the most resistant to the process of transformation to verbs of Type A. Interestingly, the same holds true also for the MGK. *Boró* especially is one of the most frequently used verbal lexemes (it shows high token frequency, on which notion see Bybee 1985:ch.5), a fact that contributes to its preserving its older inflectional pattern.² At the other end of the scale, *pató* has in the spoken Peloponnesian varieties probably completely passed to the more productive Type A (*patá-o*, *patá-me*, *páta-γ-a* — 1SG, 1PL, 1SG imperfect — etc.). Older forms following the inflectional pattern of Type B, though, can still be found in demotic songs (2SG *patís* vs. today’s *patás*, etc.). Mullach (1856:274 n.3) records the same verb as still showing the inflectional pattern of Type B then: “The Peloponnesians say *epátja epátjes epátje* in the singular ...”.

A leveling process such as that which took place in the plural of the present of Type A did not take place in Type B. Forms such as **foríme*, **foríne*, for example, are not securely attested. This fact would favour morphological analyses such as those of Babiniotis (1972) and Ralli (1987), according to which the alternating vowels /i/ and /u/ in the present paradigm of Type B are not part of the verbal base (the ‘stem’), as is the case with the vowel /a/ in Type A, but rather are part of the ending (“thematic vowel (/i/, /u/) + person+number markers -s, -me etc.”). Yet there is also a phonological aspect to this problem. As seen above, the starting point of the whole development in Type A was the extension of the 3SG form to *-á-i*. In the form of the 3SG of Type B *forí*, ‘extension’ would ultimately have led to a phonetically identical surface form: **forí-i* > **forí*. This (surface) form could hardly have been the starting point of the restructuring of the present paradigm of Type B. It is also not clear what surface 1SG forms such an extension would have produced (compare Type A): *foró* → ? **forí-o* > ? **forj-ó*.

2PL: The termination is *-íte* in the largest part of the Peloponnese, transformed from *-íte* as part of a leveling process within the paradigm of the plural. The process conforms to the definition of leveling as “the elimination of unimportant morphophonemic alternation” (Hock 1986: 183, 2003:442), since person is sufficiently marked by *-me*, *-te*, *-n(e)*:

forúme
foríte → *forúte*
forúne

Figure 3.

This innovation was not restricted to Type-B-presents but affected every verbal category showing the 1PL and 3PL endings *-ume/-úme* and *-une/-úne* respectively:

- (1) *éx-ute* “have” (active present indicative, ‘barytone’ verb)
ksér-ute “know” (active present indicative, ‘barytone’ verb)
(na, θa) perás-ute “pass” (active aorist subjunctive)
δók-ute “give” (active aorist subjunctive; indicative *é-δoka* “I gave”)
pa(n)dreft-úte “get married” (mediopassive aorist subjunctive)
pj-úte “drink” (active aorist subjunctive)
ip-úte “say, tell” (active aorist subjunctive)
ið-úte “see” (active aorist subjunctive)
katev-úte “come down” (active aorist subjunctive, indicative *katévika* “I came down”)

The innovation did not affect the imperative, the inflectional paradigm of which does not show forms of the 1PL and 3PL:

- (2) *éxete* “have!”
varíte “hit!”
katevíte “come down!”

Neither did it affect the verbs of Type A (**pernúte*). This fact can serve as an indication for the relative chronology of the appearance and spread of *-ute/-úte*: The transformation of *-íte* to *-úte* may have occurred after the above-described leveling of the alternation /a/ ~ /u/ within (the plural of) the present of Type A.

1.3.2 ‘Secondary’ or ‘pseudo-Type-B-verbs’

These were created mainly through phonological processes.

1.3.2.1 *Verbs of the type kljó “close”*. A group of verbs which in Peloponnesian Modern Greek (PMG) seem to follow the inflectional pattern of Type B is the following ‘monosyllabics’ (in the present singular): *ljó* “untie, loose”, *ksjó* “scratch, scrape”, *kljó* “close”, *ftjó* “spit”, *sjó* “shake”.³ These verbs, however, are of a completely different origin. They go back to ancient ‘vocalic’ verbs with stem-final vowels that all finally merged with /i/: *lýō > lío*, *ksýō > kšío*, *kleíō > klío*, *ptyō > ftío*, *seíō > sío*. Through a ‘synizesis’ which took place in medieval times, the sequence /ío/ developed to *jó* yielding the current forms *ljó*, etc. PMG did not in general participate in one of the most important innovations of the MGK, the transformation of these presents (among several others) to presents with stem final (or suffixal) *-n-* (compare standard Modern Greek *lí-n-o*, *ksí-n-*

o, *klí-n-o*, *ftí-n-o* (*sío* did not survive in unbroken continuity down to spoken MGK but was introduced into the standard language through archaizing forms of the written language). Thus these verbs, unlike their more numerous partners that were listed above, go back to ordinary ancient ‘barytone’ verbs (verbs of Class I like Ancient Greek *p^hér-ō* “carry, bear”) and show no signs of passing to Type A at all in any part of the peninsula (apart, of course, from their substitution under the influence of the MGK by presents with stem-final *-n-*, e.g. *klí-n-o*), for example **ftá-o* “spit” (as opposed to *krató*, *kratís* → *kratá-o*, *kratá-s*, etc.). An example, *klj-ó* “close”, is given in Table 2:

Table 2.

Singular	Plural
<i>kljó</i>	<i>kljúme</i>
<i>kljís⁴</i>	<i>kljíte/kljúte</i>
<i>klji</i>	<i>kljún(e)</i>

A number of other ‘monosyllabic’ verbs, which did not originally belong to this group, were also drawn to this inflectional pattern in parts of the Peloponnese, with the perfective past (formed with the *-s*-suffix attached to an allomorph of the verbal base ending in /i/) forming the pivot for this ‘four-part’ (proportional) analogical change:

Aorist	Present
<i>é-klis-a</i> :	<i>klj-ó</i>
<i>é-skis-a</i>	<i>X = skj-ó</i>
(3) <i>skjó</i>	“tear apart” (vs. standard <i>skízo</i> , also Peloponnesian <i>skíno</i>)
<i>xtjó</i>	“build” (vs. standard <i>xtízo</i> < ancient <i>ktízō</i> , common Peloponnesian <i>xtíno/xténo</i>)
<i>zvjó</i>	“erase, delete, wipe out” (vs. standard <i>zvíno</i> , common Peloponnesian <i>zvéno</i>)
<i>γδjó</i>	“undress” (attestations from the region of Kynouria — Arkadia — and Elis, standard <i>γδίno</i> , common Peloponnesian <i>γδέno</i> ; <i>γδjó</i> may of course directly continue ancient <i>ekdýō</i> “undress”)
<i>xrjó</i>	“smear, daub” (ancient <i>k^hríō</i> , later and modern <i>xrízo</i> , also Peloponnesian <i>xríno/xréno</i> ; <i>xrjó</i> may of course directly continue ancient <i>k^hríō</i>), etc.
Imperfects: <i>é-skiy-a</i> , <i>é-xtiy-a</i> , <i>é-zviy-a</i> , <i>é-xriy-a</i> , etc.	

Figure 4.

In the mediopassive, the verbs of the *kljó*-type are superficially inflected as ordinary Type-B-verbs. The forms of the paradigm (except of the 1sg) can be attributed to the action of synizesis on the original forms:

Table 3.

<i>kljéme</i> (compare <i>filjéme</i> , <i>filó</i> “kiss”)
<i>kljése</i> < <i>klí-ese</i>
<i>kljéte</i> < <i>klí-ete</i>
<i>kljómate</i> < * <i>kli-ómesta</i>
<i>kljéste</i> < * <i>klí-este</i> , <i>kljó(sa)ste</i>
<i>kljó(n)de</i> < <i>klí-o(n)de</i>

Also: *ljéme*, *ksjéme*, *ftjéme*, *sjéme*, *skjéme*, *xtjéme*, *γðjéme*, etc.

1.3.2.2 Other ‘secondary’ or ‘pseudo-Type-B-verbs’. Another group of ‘secondary’ or ‘pseudo-Type-B-verbs’ consists of originally ‘barytone’ verbs with stem-final /γ/ like *aníyo* “open” and a few others. Through loss of intervocalic /γ/ and synizesis, the above verbs were transformed in parts of the Peloponnese to verbs whose surface paradigms are identical with the respective paradigms of the verbs of Type B proper. The paradigm of the imperfect retained its original structure (aorists in *-ksa*, e.g. *ániksa* “I opened”):

aníyo > **aníó* > *anjó*

Figure 5.

Table 4.

Present	Imperfect
<i>anjó</i>	<i>ániya</i>
<i>anjís</i>	<i>ánijes</i>
<i>anjí</i>	<i>ánije</i>
<i>anjúme</i>	<i>aníyame</i>
<i>anjíte</i>	<i>aníyate</i>
<i>anjúne</i>	<i>aníyane</i>

2. The imperfect

2.1 Current formation and the development of the Class II imperfect with -γ-

Currently the formation most widely used throughout the peninsula for the imperfect is the following:

Table 5.

Type A		Type B	
Singular	Plural	Singular	Plural
<i>(e-)pérna-γ-a</i>	<i>(e-)perná-γ-ame</i>	<i>(e-)fóri-γ-a</i>	<i>(e-)forí-γ-ame</i>
<i>(e-)pérna-(j-)es</i>	<i>(e-)perná-γ-ate</i>	<i>(e-)fóri-(j-)es</i>	<i>(e-)forí-γ-ate</i>
<i>(e-)pérna-(j-)e</i>	<i>(e-)perna-γ-an(e)</i>	<i>(e-)fóri-(j-)e</i>	<i>(e-)forí-γ-ane</i>

A remark must be made concerning the ending of the 2PL. The older 2PL ending *-ete* (*e-perná-j-ete*, *e-forí-j-ete*) is attested in twentieth-century collections for the varieties of West Korinthia (ILNE 705 b, year 1957) and of the adjacent region of Kalávryta (southeastern part of Achaia, ILNE 133 and 312, years 1917–1918) but may well have been even more widely used in the Peloponnese in older times. It is interesting to note that Mullach (1856:274) and Thumb (1910:161–169) record (almost) exclusively *-ete* as the 2PL ending in the imperfect of the verbs of the ‘2nd conjugation’ for Modern Greek then (cf. also Triantafyllidis 1936:241; for an account of the retention of 2PL *-ete* see Joseph 1980:181).

The forms of the imperfect can be morphologically derived synchronically from the forms of the semantically more basic present by means of the past endings *-a*, *-es*, *-e*, *-ame*, *-ate* (*-ete*), *-an(e)*. This in a way reflects the diachronic development of the morphology of the imperfect of the ‘2nd conjugation’, on which more below.

2.2 Original formation of the imperfect of the ‘2nd conjugation’

As regards the imperfect, i.e. the imperfective past, taking into account the data from different periods of the history and from different varieties of the Greek language, we have to start at some point in time (Medieval or ‘Early Modern’ Greek) with the following paradigms:

Table 6.

Type A		Type B	
Singular	Plural	Singular	Plural
<i>e-pérnun</i>	<i>e-pernúme(n)</i>	<i>e-fórun</i>	<i>e-forúme(n)</i>
<i>e-pérnas</i>	<i>e-pernáte</i>	<i>e-fóris</i>	<i>e-foríte</i>
<i>e-pérna</i>	<i>e-pérnun</i>	<i>e-fóri</i>	<i>e-fórun</i>

The forms attested in the Peloponnesian varieties point to an original paradigm of the type presented above (cf. also Horrocks 1997:243). The original Peloponnesian imperfect paradigm strongly resembles the respective paradigms of insular varieties such as those of Kálymnos and Ikária (Triantafyllidis 1936:241, Thumb 1910:166), which are among the most archaic ones within the frame of the Modern Greek varieties.

The older 1sg of both Types A and B in *-un* was probably preserved long enough to be attested in demotic songs which perhaps do not go beyond the second half of the eighteenth century: 1sg *epérnun pátun* (present *pató*) (both attested in Peloponnesian demotic songs, exact provenance unknown, as found in *Laoghrafia* 1 (1909):188–189; date of the first edition of the songs: 1888). Forms in *-un* survived in Dodecanesian varieties, e.g. *e-jélun* ‘I laughed’, *e-míljun* ‘I spoke’, *e-θórjun* ‘I looked/stared at’, with [j] from the 2–3sg *e-míljes*, *e-mílje* (Tsopanakis 1948:23, 1949:57). Such forms also survived in Maniot (*e-mílu* ‘I spoke’, *e-kálu* ‘I invited’, with loss of final /n/ (Kassis 1982:66–67)). The form of the 1sg resisted restructuring for longer due to its high frequency (more on this in §2.5).

2–3sg: The ‘contracted’ older forms *epérnas*, *efóris* and *epérna*, *efóri* are rare even in the older demotic songs and their preservation could be attributed to the meter.

1–3PL: It is not clear if right after the original stage in Type A (Figure 10) the same leveling process as in the 1 and 3PL forms of the present also began in the respective forms of the imperfect, leading to new imperfect forms such as **e-pernáme(n)*, **e-pérnan*, alternating with the older *e-pernúme(n)*, *e-pérnun*. Such a development is probable.

Imperfect paradigms formed with the suffix *-ús-*, common in numerous Modern Greek varieties and the Modern Greek written standard, are not attested for any of the (non-Tsakonian and non-Maniot) Peloponnesian varieties with certainty. The occasional presence — especially in demotic songs, old notarian documents, or even twentieth-century recordings — of forms with

-ús- could be attributed to external influence and/or koineizing tendencies, whether at the level of the spoken or of the written language. Yet the possibility of the former existence of at least some genuine forms of the paradigm formed with the *ús*-suffix in spoken Peloponnesian cannot be completely excluded. The 3PL form in *-ús-an*, in particular, which has been the starting point of the process of extension of the suffix to the other forms of the paradigm of the imperfect, may have been in use as the only form in the paradigm of the imperfect showing this type of formation even in the Peloponnese, as is the case in other parts of the Greek-speaking world, e.g. Cyprus Chíos and Kárpáthos (Thumb 1910: 166, Triantafyllidis 1936: 241), Calabria (Karanastasis 1997: 87, 89), and Mani (Kassis 1982 (vol. A): 67). A similar situation is evidenced by numerous vulgar texts from the sixteenth to seventeenth centuries, though it is not certain whether 1–2PL forms showed the *ús*-suffix or not, since they do not appear in the text.

2.3 The development of the Imperfect of Type A.

The origin of the γ -formation in Type A (which covers a considerable part of continental Greece: Peloponnese, Lokris, Etolia, Euboea, Epirus, Thessaly, etc.; Papadopoulos 1927: 99–100) has already been extensively analysed by a number of linguists. As part of a strong tendency for, as Babiniotis labeled it, “unification of past structures (i.e. categories)”, the endings of the past paradigm of the verbs of Class I (the so-called ‘barytones’ in traditional grammar) with the characteristic of the past categories, the alternating vowels /a/ and /e/ (together with *shifted stress*) were added to the stem allomorph with stem-final /a/ (*perna-*). In other words, the semantically derived character of the imperfect, as opposed to the more basic present, through this development came to be reflected in the morphological structure of the former more clearly (present *perna-/pernu-* : imperfect *perna-a-/pernu-a-*). The relatively frequent homonymy between present and imperfect that resulted in the plural forms due to the instability of the so-called ‘syllabic’ augment (*e-*) may also have played a decisive role in this development (Horrocks 1997: 244). The same observations can be made regarding the imperfect of Type B:

Table 7.

<u>Present</u>	<u>Imperfect</u>
<i>pernúme(n)</i> : (<i>e</i>) <i>pernúme(n)</i>	
<i>pernáte</i> : (<i>e</i>) <i>pernáte</i>	
<hr/>	
‘Barytones’ (Class I), stem <i>trex-</i> ‘run’, stem-final /x/	Class II (Type A), stem <i>perna-</i> ‘pass’, stem-final /a/
<hr/>	
<i>é-trex-a</i>	(<i>e</i> -) <i>pérna-a</i>
<i>é-trex-es</i>	(<i>e</i> -) <i>pérna-es</i>
<i>é-trex-e</i>	(<i>e</i> -) <i>pérna-e</i>
(<i>e</i> -) <i>tréx-ame</i>	(<i>e</i> -) <i>perná-ame</i>
(<i>e</i> -) <i>tréx-ate</i> , (<i>e</i> -) <i>tréx-ete</i>	(<i>e</i> -) <i>perná-ate</i> , (<i>e</i> -) <i>perná-ete</i>
<i>é-trex-an</i> /(<i>e</i> -) <i>tréx-an</i> (<i>e</i>)	(<i>e</i> -) <i>pérna-an</i> /(<i>e</i> -) <i>perná-ane</i>
<hr/>	

The whole development was accompanied by epenthesis of /γ/ between the stem-final vowel and the initial vowels of the terminations. This consonantal phoneme is widely used in Modern Greek varieties as a means of resolving the hiatus. The details may of course vary from variety to variety and are still not very clear. There are cases in Modern Greek varieties (also in Peloponnesian ones and even in MGK) where the /γ/ seems to have indeed been epenthesized intervocalically at morpheme boundaries, e.g. *efkéle-γ-o* (standard *efxéle-o*) ‘Holy Unction’, 1PL *perná-γ-ame* ‘we passed, we were passing’, *filá-γ-ome* (instead of *filá-ome* ‘I watch over myself’). But there are also examples where /γ/ is epenthesized in ‘morphologically indifferent’ positions, e.g. *a-j-éras* ‘air, wind’ (standard *aéras*).⁵ On the other hand, in at least some parts of the peninsula there has been a strong tendency in the opposite direction: deletion of intervocalic /γ/, especially in the position before front vowels, where it surfaces as [j], whether at a morpheme boundary or not. The exact nature of the conditioning of the /γ/-epenthesis (purely phonological or morpho-phonological) is not clear. The available evidence seems to point more to (at least originally) phonological conditioning (cf. also Ralli 1987:298ff., Joseph 1998:351f., 367). Suffice it to mention here that, as regards the paradigm of the imperfect of the verbs of Class II, the evidence in the vast majority of instances shows frequent presence of the /γ/ before endings with initial /a/, that is, the endings of the 1sg and of the plural. In the 2sg and 3sg (endings *-es*, *-e* respectively), the /γ/, which in this case would surface as [j], is often omitted in the collections.⁶ This has two possible explanations: (a) The /γ/ was inserted in the beginning only in environments where it would not undergo any *phonetic* change (/γ/ > [j]), following a possible general distributional pattern of PMG

according to which the phoneme /ɣ/ could not appear in the position after a vowel and before front vowels. Later, under the pressure from the rest of the paradigm, the /ɣ/ was also inserted in the position before front vowels, where it came to be realized as [j]. This is the situation in today’s MGK. (b) The /ɣ/ was inserted in all forms of the paradigm of the imperfect from the beginning and was realized as [j] before vowels (in this case /e/). In this position, however, it was highly unstable and subject to occasional deletion, a fact which would explain the frequent omission of [j] in collections of material.

Regardless of the actual course of development, today the /ɣ/ is stable in the position between vowels, at least in the paradigm of the active imperfect of the verbs of Class II and in contemporary spoken MGK, where this imperfect formation has already established itself, more in the south of Greece than in the north.⁷ This segment is regarded by some linguists (e.g. Babinotis 1972, Ralli 1987) as being already an aspect marker marking the [–perfective] since it fills the same slot as the [+perfective] marker *-s-*. This would constitute a case of morphologization of a phonological process that seems to be ‘partial’ (see Anderson 1987:331–333) since the new morpheme can still appear only between vowels, the first of which is stem-final and characteristic of the stems of a subclass of verbs (Type A of Class II), and the second of which is a vowel that, in certain theoretical frames, could be viewed as a tense marker ([+past]). We probably have here a situation such as that described by Anderson (1987:332–333): “... there is good reason to believe that a phonological environment for a given change [in our case /ɣ/-epenthesis] may persist even after some instances of the rule’s application have been reanalyzed as morphologically determined”. This seems to be the case with the intervocalically inserted /ɣ/ of Modern Greek, which has developed to a general aspectual marker in vocalic verbs (i.e. verbs with stem-final vowels); compare *ákú-o* “I hear/listen”: *áku-ɣ-a* “I heard, I was listening”, *klé-o* (“cry”): *é-kle-ɣ-a*, *fté-o* (“be guilty, be at fault”): *é-fte-ɣ-a*. In *lé-o* (“say”): *é-le-ɣ-a* and *tró-o* (“eat”): *é-tro-ɣ-a* the /ɣ/ is ‘original’ (ancient *leg-ō* > *léyo* > *léo*, *trōg-ō* > *tróy-o* > *tró-o*) but can be said to be reanalysed as an aspectual marker just as in the original vocalic verbs. The same observations regarding intervocalic /ɣ/ can also be made for Type B.

The absence of stem allomorphy within the (current) paradigm of the imperfect of Type A (see Table 5) would suggest that the new imperfect formation appeared *after* the creation of present forms like *perná-o*, *perná-i*, *perná-me*, *perná-ne*, which replaced the older *pernó*, *perná*, *pernúme*, *pernúne*. In other words, it was created after the generalization of the vowel /a/ throughout the present paradigm on the new stem *perna-*, which does not display

allomorphy. Apart from chronological considerations though (the forms with stem-final /a/ have not yet completely ‘ousted’ the older ones with /u/ in the present), the examination of more dialectal material revealed traces of the imperfect paradigm possibly going through the same stage of the /a/ ~ /u/ alternation as did the present paradigm. Sporadic forms like 1PL *arxinú-γ-ame* (*arxiná-o* “begin”), 3PL *jirnú-γ-ane* (*jirná-o* “turn”), etc., attested from various places in the Peloponnese (but also in parts of Central Greece, e.g. Lokris), could serve as strong indications in favour of this hypothesis. Besides, as we saw in §2.2, it is quite possible that 1–3PL forms like **e-pernúme(n)*, **e-pérnan* (alternating with the older *e-pernúme(n)*, *e-pérnun*) also emerged. If, as we saw above, we suppose that the principle that governed the developments in the imperfect could alternatively be formulated as “overt derivation of the imperfect from the present by means of the past endings usual in barytone verbs”, it follows that in this development both stem allomorphs of the present could originally have participated, yielding alternating forms like *pernú-γ-ame* ~ *perná-γ-ame* and *pernú-γ-ane* ~ *perná-γ-ane* in those forms of the paradigm, of course, where such an alternation indeed evolved (1PL and 3PL). This means that the abandonment of the /a/ ~ /u/ alternation probably ran in parallel both in the present *and* the imperfect (although it seems to have proceeded somewhat faster in the imperfect). The developments described above presuppose, of course, the interpretation from the speakers’ side of *both* the sequences *perna-* and *pernu-* as allomorphs of the verbal stem, whatever their possible original internal structure. This (re)analysis was probably brought about or strongly favoured by the extension of the 3SG to *-á-i*. The vowels /a/ and /u/ would thus have to be regarded as stem-final vowels, i.e. as parts of the stem and not of the termination, by the time of the emergence of the new imperfect formation:

Stage 1

Present	Imperfect
<i>pernúme</i> ~ <i>pernáme</i>	<i>e-pernúme(n)</i> ~ (?) <i>e-pernáme(n)</i>
<i>pernúne</i> ~ <i>pernáne</i>	<i>e-pérnun</i> ~ (?) <i>e-pérnan</i>

Stage 2

Present	Imperfect
<i>pernúme</i> ~ <i>pernáme</i>	<i>e-pernú-(γ-)ame</i> ~ <i>e-perná-(γ-)ame</i>
<i>pernúne</i> ~ <i>pernáne</i>	<i>e-pernú-(γ-)ane</i> ~ <i>e-perná-(γ-)ane</i>

Stage 3

Present	Imperfect
<i>pernáme</i>	<i>e-perná-(γ-)ame</i>
<i>pernáne</i>	<i>e-perná-(γ-)ane</i>

Figure 6.

The stem allomorph, which through leveling was ultimately extended to the whole paradigm both in the present and the imperfect, was that of the 3sg, again in accordance with Watkins's Law:

pern(-)á → reinterpretation as *perná-Ø* → *perná-i* → *perná-o*, *perná-is*,
perná-me, *perná-ne*
e-pern(-)a → reinterpretation as *e-pérna-Ø* → *e-pérna-e* → *e-pérna-es*,
e-perná-ame etc.

Figure 7.

As for the chronology of the developments, the oldest Peloponnesian attestations that I am aware of are found in a sixteenth-century document from Achaia (year 1582 or 1572, edition in Veis 1956): *xalá-i* "destroys" (3sg present) and *e-pérna-γ-an* "passed" (3pl imperfect). Forms in *-úyame*, *-úyane* have not yet been found in older vulgar texts or (notarian) documents. If these really are relic forms, as supposed above, and not sporadic formations of colloquial speech or sporadic blends with the standard forms with the *us*-suffix, it could be the case that they were avoided as highly dialectal and stigmatized. Such plural forms do in fact appear in the Modern Greek variety of Apulia (Puglia) in Southern Italy in verbs of Type A: *agapúamo*, *agapúato*, *agapúane* (if not from **-úsamo* etc.) "loved".

2.4 The development of the imperfect of Type B

2.4.1 The development of the imperfect of 'primary Type-B-verbs'

The process may have produced analogously structured surface forms at an early stage:

Table 8.

Singular	Plural
<i>e-fórun</i>	<i>e-forú-γ-ame</i>
<i>e-fóri-es/-j-es</i> (→ <i>e-fóri-j-es</i>)	<i>e-fori-γ-ate/e-fori-j-ete</i>
<i>e-fóri-e/-j-e</i> (→ <i>e-fóri-j-e</i>)	<i>e-forú-γ-ane</i>

The starting point of the whole development was the form of the 3SG that was extended to *e-fóri-e*. This process also conforms to Watkins’s Law. From there the new formation spread to the 2SG, yielding *e-fóri-es*:

Figure 8.

The extension of the original 2–3SG forms *e-fóris*, *e-fóri* to *e-fóri-es*, *e-fóri-e* must have taken place in Peloponnesian between the fourteenth century (the date of the “Chronicle of Morea”, where the process is not yet evidenced — judging from the linguistic use in what is the probably oldest version of the Codex of Copenhagen) and the beginning of the sixteenth century (1519: date of the poem “Ανδραγαθήματα Μερκουρίου Μπούα” by the Peloponnesian poet Tzánes from the Messenian town of Koróni).⁸ In any case it must have taken place well before the extension of the plural forms as there are still varieties in the respective paradigms of which only the 2–3SG forms are extended but not the plural forms. This is the case, for instance, in the variety of southern Máni (see the Maniot paradigms in Kassis 1982 (vol. A):66–67):

Table 9.

<i>kaló</i> ‘invite’:	<i>e-kálu</i> (< <i>e-kálun</i> , loss of final /n/)
	<i>e-káli-es</i>
	<i>e-káli-e</i>
	<i>e-kalú-ma</i> (< <i>e-kalú-man</i> , loss of final /n/) ⁹
	<i>e-kalí-ta</i>
	<i>e-kalúna</i> (< <i>e-kalun-an</i>)/ <i>e-kalú-sa</i> (< <i>e-kalú-san</i> , loss of final /n/)

There is also evidence for the extension of the 2–3SG forms of Type B having taken place earlier than the extension of the respective forms of the verbs of Type A. In a religious text (an exegesis) written by the Peloponnesian clergyman Máximos in 1606 in a mixed language with numerous of its vulgar elements conforming to the features observable in twentieth-century sources of Peloponnesian, 3SG forms of

verbs following both types of the 2nd conjugation appear.¹⁰ The forms of Type B appear extended to *-i-e*, whereas the forms of Type A appear still unextended (*-a*). The same observation can be made also with respect to numerous other vulgar texts from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries:

- (4) *e-kráti-e* “held” *e-filoníka-Ø* “argued”
vs. *e-katíyóra-Ø* “accused, blamed”
e-bóri-e “was able” *e-zíta-Ø* “asked for”

The same also still holds true for (southern) Maniot where we have e.g. 2–3sg imperfect *e-mila-s*, *e-mila-Ø* “spoke” (Type A, not extended) versus *e-káli-es*, *e-káli-e* “invited” (Type B, extended).

The 2–3sg forms *e-fóri-es*, *e-fóri-e* and *e-fójr-es*, *e-fójr-e* are used beside the ‘fuller’ ones, *(e-)fóri-j-es*, *(e-)fóri-j-e*. As for the first ones one cannot of course be certain whether in every case they should be regarded as direct survivals of the original *e-fóri-es*, *e-fóri-e* (with occasional synzesis yielding *e-fójr-es*, *e-fójr-e*):

e-fóri-es > *e-fórj-es* (synizesis)

e-fóri-e > *e-fórj-e* (synizesis)

Figure 9.

or as products of the following process(es):¹¹

e-fóri-e > *e-fóri-j-e* (/y/-epenthesis) > *e-fór-j-e* (/i/-deletion)

or *e-fóri-e* > *e-fóri-j-e* (/ɣ/-epenthesis) > *e-fóri-e* (loss of intervocalic [j])

Figure 10.

The former existence of 1-3PL forms in *-úyame*, *-úyane*, much like the respective ones seen above for Type A, is confirmed by relatively numerous attestations from various places of the peninsula:

- (5) *karterúyame* (*karteró* “await, expect”; Achaia)
borúyame (*boró* “can, be able”; region of Kynouría in Arkadia)
forúyame (*foró* “wear, put on”; recorded in Elis)
zúyame (*zo* “live”; Lakonia)

Such plural forms are also attested for verbs of Type B from other varieties:

- (6) Lokris (Central Greece, Papadopoulos 1927:99):
filó > *f'ló* “kiss”: PL *f'lú-γ-ami*, *f'lú-γ-ati*, *f'lú-γ-an(i)*
 Apulia (Puglia, Southern Italy; Karanastasis 1997:89):
prató “walk”: *e-pratú-amo*, *e-pratú-ato*, *e-pratú-ane*, if not from
**epratúsamo* etc.

The original /i/ ~ /u/ alternation was then leveled in Peloponnesian in favour of the vowel /i/, resulting in the current plural forms e.g. 1PL *kratí-γ-ame* (*krat-ó* “hold”), 3PL *borí-γ-ane* (*bor-ó* “can, be able”), etc. The forms *karterúyame* etc. should then be regarded as relic forms. As happened with the verbs of Type A, the stem allomorph that served as the pivot for leveling was that of the 3SG (*krati-*) in accordance with Watkins’s Law. The fact that the stem allomorph /fori-/ was established in the plural as [fori-] and not [forj-] (yielding e.g. 1PL **fórj-ame*) is in my opinion a strong indication that, in the 2PL and 3PL, variants without synizesis (e.g. *e-fóri-e*) were originally the main variants in use beside the ones with synizesis (*e-fórj-e*).¹² It is also noteworthy that despite 2PL present *forúte* (see above) in the greatest part of the peninsula, the stem allomorph in /i/ was extended to the whole plural of the imperfect. This stresses the important position of the 3SG in the verbal paradigm but may also be an indication that the process that led to plural forms built on the stem allomorph in /i/ are earlier than the appearance and spread of *-úte*.

Table 10.

Singular	Plural
(e-)fóri-γ-a	(e-)fóri-γ-ame
(e-)fóri-j-es	(e-)fóri-γ-ate
(e-)fóri-j-e	(e-)fóri-γ-ane

The same formation is also evidenced from Etolia and Lokris (probably also parts of Boeotia), as well as Euboea in Central Greece.¹³

The development of the imperfect formation of Type B poses a problem with regard to the morphological analysis proposed above for this type of verb. There it was argued that in the paradigm of the present the alternating vowels /i/ and /u/ are probably not part of the stem but should rather be considered as parts of the ending, more specifically as ‘thematic’ vowels (Babiniotis 1972, Ralli 1987). This seems to be supported by the absence of any leveling tendencies in the present that would give forms like **foríme*, **foríne* (cf. also §1.3.1). Yet the development of the imperfect would force us, just as in the case of Type A, to analyse the present (and of course the original imperfect) paradigm as containing, at the stage where the development leading to the current paradigms started, a stem *fori-/foru-* displaying allomorphy (/i/ and /u/ being stem-final) and the endings:

Table 11.

Singular	Plural
<i>for-ó</i>	<i>forú-me</i>
<i>forí-s</i>	<i>forí-te</i>
<i>forí-</i>	<i>forú-n(e)</i>

This would mean that the speakers would have regarded the alternating sequences *fori-*, *foru-* in the present as allomorphs of the verbal base from which they derived the imperfect forms, adding the endings *-a*, *-es*, *-e*, etc. characteristic of the past tenses (perfective past of Classes I and II, imperfective past of Class I). These endings always appear to the right of the stem. To regard the alternating vowels /i/ and /u/ as ‘thematic’ vowels — which always appear to the immediate left of the [person+number]-markers — and not as parts of the verbal base would lead to the rather odd hypothesis that the speakers inserted between the ‘thematic vowels’ and the endings the alternating vowels /a/ and /e/, that is, another set of ‘thematic vowels’ or ‘tense markers’ (depending on the theoretical framework one is willing to follow for the morphological analysis of the Modern Greek verb). Unfortunately, as seen above, there are no signs of leveling in the present of Type B, comparable to that of Type A. So either: (a) we hold on to the analysis of the sequences *fori-*, *foru-* as realizations of the stem, accepting the preservation of an inherited alternation in the present (*fori-* ~ *foru-*) but leveling in the imperfect (*fori-* ~ *foru-* → *fori-*), or (b) we accept a different morphological analysis for the present and the imperfect:

- (7) a. present with stem alternation *fori-* ~ *foru-* (where /i/ /u/ stem-final) :
imperfect *fori-* (/i/ stem-final, no stem alternation)
- b. present with stem alternation *for-i-* ~ *for-u-* (where /i/ /u/ “thematic vowels”) : imperfect *fori-* (/i/ stem-final, no stem alternation)

Solution (7b) has the disadvantage of considerable asymmetry in the system of the verbs of Class II. If (7a) is adopted, we could just assume that the leveling process has not started yet in the present. In the meantime, a new, stronger, and more general tendency leads the verbs of Type B to Type A, a process probably also strongly connected to the rapid spread of the MGK’s linguistic norms even in the speech of older generations of speakers.

2.4.2 The development of the imperfect of ‘secondary Type-B-verbs’
(type *klj*ó “I close”)

The surface outcomes of the developments that took place in the paradigm of the imperfect of these verbs resemble those of the ‘ordinary’ Type-B-verbs (example: *klj*ó “I close”):

Table 12.

Singular	Plural
<i>é-kli-γ-a</i>	<i>(e-)klí-γ-ame</i>
<i>é-kli-(j-)es</i>	<i>(e-)klí-γ-ate</i>
<i>é-kli-(j-)e</i>	<i>(e-)kli-γ-an(e)</i>

The development has not been as complicated as in the imperfect of the other Type-B-verbs. What happened here was the replacement of the older endings of the imperfect (just as in the case of the verbs of Class I — ‘barytones’ — to which they originally belonged) and /γ/-insertion intervocally:

- 1SG *é-kli-on* → **é-kli-a* > *é-kli-γ-a*
- 1PL *e-klí-omen* → **e-klí-ame(n)* > *e-klí-γ-ame*
- 3PL *é-kli-on* → **é-kli-an* > *é-kli-γ-an*

Figure 11.

The sequence *kli-* ~ *klj-* is constant in the paradigm of the present (see above) and the imperfect and can be regarded as the stem. The vowel *-u-* in the present paradigm could be regarded as part of the ending:

- (8) 1PL *klj-úme*
3PL *klj-úne* < * *klí-un* (**klí-usi*)

All the above explain the fact that in almost the whole of the Peloponnese, except for the variety of the former ‘Municipality of Inoús (Oinoús)’ (cf. §2.5.1), I have not found forms like 1PL *kljúyame* or 3PL *kljúyane*, comparable to *forúyane*. Thus, despite synizesis and the developments in the imperfect that rendered the surface forms of the verbs of the *klj*ó-type similar to the respective ones of the verbs of Type B proper, this similarity has not been sufficient to render them to full members of Type B of Class II, at least in the active. Sporadically occurring present forms such as *klí-j-i* (3SG) *klí-γ-ume* (1PL) could serve as indications that the speakers perhaps still analyse forms of the imperfect like *é-kli-γ-a* in the same way as e.g. *é-trex-a* (*tréx-o* “run”). Even the /γ/ seems to be analysed in cases like these as forming part of the stem and not having any

morphemic status. Furthermore, the total absence of any signs of these verbs passing to Type A (e.g. **ftá-o*), as happened in varieties of Central Greece (Hatzidakis 1905:273), is in my opinion also a strong indication of the special position of these verbs at least in PMG.

2.4.3 Imperfects of Type B: 1SG *fór-γ-a*, 1PL *fór-γ-ame*, etc.

From a number of villages in Messenia, Arkadia, northern Elis, Achaia, and the region of West Korinthia 1SG/1–2–3PL forms of the imperfect of Type B such as the following are attested:

- (9) 1SG *fór-γ-a*
 1PL *fór-γ-ame*
 2PL *fór-γ-ate*¹⁴
 3PL *fór-γ-ane*

The age of these forms is unknown. The earliest attestation of such a form that I am aware of originates from Messenia: *vár-γ-ane* “they hit” (instead of *varí-γ-ane*, present *var-ó*). The form appears in a text (a real narration) published by Politis (1904 [Part I]:297). The text might of course be several years older than its publication in Politis’s book. The ‘fuller’ forms *fóri-γ-an/fóri-γ-ane* are in many cases also attested in the variety of the same village beside *fór-γ-ame/fór-γ-ane*. Before attempting an explanation of these forms, some remarks must be made regarding the vowel system and the accentuation of the Peloponnesian varieties:

a. Unstressed vowels, especially /i/ and /u/, can drop in some parts of the Peloponnese, not as systematically as in the northern Greek dialects, but nevertheless relatively frequently and in some cases with permanent results. Among the most favourable environments for this deletion is the position between /r/ and another consonant or a word boundary. The /i/-deletion seems to be phonological: compare *kor’tsáki* (*koritsáki* “little girl”), *per’sótero* (*perisótero* “more”), etc. The result of /i/-deletion is in some cases so permanent that it can lead to reanalysis of the structure of the word. Compare here the verbs *perisév-o* “to be left over, to be superfluous, to be more than is necessary” and *surupón-i* (impersonal “it gets/is getting dark”), which through /i/- and /u/-deletion appear as *per’sév-o* and *sur’pón-i*. The creation of surface past forms *pérsev-a*, *pérsep-sa* and *súrpon-e*, *súrpos-e* (imperfective and perfective past respectively), instead of expected *perísev-a*, *períseps-a* and *surúpone*, *surúpose*, points to a reanalysis of the lexemes as lacking the /i/ and /u/ in the underlying representation.

Through /i/-deletion, the forms of the 1SG (*e-)**fóri-γ-a* and 3PL (*e-)**fóri-γ-an* became (*e-)**fór-γ-a*, (*e-)**fór-γ-an*, the latter forms being actually attested. The

forms of the 2sg and 3sg *(e-)fórj-es*, *(e-)fórj-e* could either be the results of /i/-deletion from *(e-)fóri-j-es*, *(e-)fóri-j-e* or represent the older forms without /γ/ (from *(e-)fóri-es*, *(e-)fóri-e*, with synizesis /i/ > [j]). This development created a new stem alternation *fór- ~ fori-* within the paradigm of the imperfect:

Table 13.

Singular	Plural
<i>(e-)fór-γ-a</i>	<i>(e-)fóri-γ-ame</i>
<i>(e-)fór(-)j-es</i>	<i>(e-)fóri-γ-ate</i>
<i>(e-)fór(-)j-e</i>	<i>(e-)fór-γ-an(e)</i> (< <i>e-fóri-γ-an</i> , beside <i>e-fóri-γ-ane</i>)

b. In numerous parts of the Peloponnese there is a tendency towards fixing the stress in verbal paradigms, as is common in various other Modern Greek varieties. This development often results in violation of the trisyllabic window. Thus in cases of enlargement of endings with final /n/ by the vowel /e/ the stress remains in its original position:

- (10) *jen-ódustane* “they became” (← *jen-ódustan*, not **jenodústane*)
i-mastune “we were” (← *ímastun*, not **ímástune*)

The violation of the trisyllabic window is ‘remedied’ (though not systematically) in different ways.¹⁵ In many cases secondary stress on the penultima evolves (attestations from Lakonia, Arkadia, Messenia, Argolis, Arkadia):

- (11) *ejírisáne* “they returned” (vs. *(e-)jírisan* or *(e-)jirisane*, singular *(e-)jírisa*)
éfernáme “we brought” (vs. *(e)férname*, present *férno* “I bring”)
i-dusáne “they were” and *e-kit-ódusáne* “they lay” (vs. *ídušan ekitódusan*)

In cases where we have no secondary stress, the vowels /i/, /u/, and /e/ drop, reducing the number of (unaccented) syllables. For example in parts of the region of Kalávryta (Achaia) the /i/ of the mediopassive-indicative-aorist-suffix allomorph *-θik-* drops as a result of fixing stress on the verbal base in the plural.¹⁶

- (12) *e-s’kó-θ’k-ame* “we stood up, we rose” (instead of *(e-)siko-θik-ame*, singular *(e-)sikó-θik-a*)¹⁷

The plural forms *fór-γ-ame*, *fór-γ-ate*, *fór-γ-ane* could have evolved much the same way: Placement of stress on the first syllable (analogically to the singular) and /i/-deletion for avoidance of violation of the trisyllabic window.¹⁸ The fact that no secondary stress evolved supporting the primary stress on the pro-antepenultima in the plural may have to do with stress restrictions in the respective varieties,

which is probable considering the fact that no forms such as **káli-γ-áme* — present *kaló* — or **kráti-γ-áne* — present *krató* — are recorded. The above-described development was probably strongly favoured by the fact that the vowel /i/ could also drop in the 1SG *fóri-γ-a* > *fór'-γ-a*. In the 1SG of the imperfect paradigms of verbs of Type B which do not contain the liquid /r/ in their base, the vowel /i/ did not drop (at least no such cases are known to me), e.g. **krát'-γ-a* (< *kráti-γ-a*) **kál'-γ-a* (< *káli-γ-a*), from which also **krát'-γ-ame* **kál'-γ-ane*.

The change could also, of course, have been instigated as a whole by the /i/-deletion in the 1SG and the absence of /i/ in the 2–3SG in the first place: In the 1SG /i/-deletion resulted in *(e-)fór'-γ-a*. The forms of the 2SG and 3SG *(e-)fórj-es*, *(e-)fórj-e* either derive from *(e-)fóri-j-es*, *(e-)fóri-j-e* with /i/-deletion, or they actually represent the older forms *(e-)fóri-es* > *(e-)fórj-es* and *(e-)fóri-e* > *(e-)fórj-e* (synizesis).¹⁹ In the latter case they could have been reanalysed as *(e-)fór-j-es*, *(e-)fór-j-e*, with [j] being reinterpreted as an allophone of the /γ/ and thus as a variant of the aspectual marker -γ-, and not as part of the stem:

1SG	/e-fóri-γ-a/ > [e-fór-γ-a]
2SG	/e-fóri-es/ > [e-fórj-es] (synizesis) → reanalysis as [e-fór-j-es] (/e-fór-γ-es/), compare 1SG
3SG	/e-fóri-e/ > [e-fórj-e] (synizesis) → reanalysis as [e-fór-j-e] (/e-fór-γ-e/), compare 1SG

Figure 12.

The step that speakers undertook in this case after the deletion of /i/ in the 1SG (and probably also 2–3SG) was towards ‘simplifying’ the imperfect paradigm of the verbs of Type B of Class II, the stems of which contain the liquid /r/, through leveling: They extended the new /i/-less allomorph to the forms of the paradigm that were not subject to /i/-deletion, thus eliminating the allomorphy *fór-* ~ *fóri-*:

fóri-γ-a > *fór'-γ-a*
fórj-es
fórj-e
fóri-γ-ame
fóri-γ-ate
fóri-γ-ane/fóri-γ-an > *fór'-γ-an*

possible reanalysis of [j] as an allophone of /ɣ/

fór-ɣ-a
fór-j-es
fór-j-e
fór-ɣ-ame
fór-ɣ-ate
fór-ɣ-ane

Figure 13.

Whatever the actual course of development was, the change in any case is also a further step in the process of morphologization of the /ɣ/, since this segment can now appear in a position other than its original intervocalic position.

Joseph in a 1992 paper presented various cases which can serve as evidence for the observed tendency (cf. also Kiparsky 1974:265) of speakers to operate in language change (and especially analogical change) within a rather limited range of linguistic data, thus ‘simplifying’ grammar only within a small scale while at the same time complicating it on a larger scale. In our case, /i/-deletion disturbed the surface regularity of the imperfect paradigm of the verbs of Type B, the stem of which contains the /r/, introducing an allomorphy *fór-* ~ *forí-*. Instead of restoring the deleted /i/, which probably was still present in the underlying representation of all forms of the imperfect since it surfaced in the 1–2(–3)_{PL} (*e-*)*forí-ɣ-ame* etc. and in the imperfect of other Type-B-verbs (e.g. *kráti-ɣ-a*, *kratí-ɣ-ame*), the speakers extended the newly created (surface) allomorph *fór-* to the plural, leveling the (surface) alternation *fór-* ~ *forí-*. Thus the speakers simplified ‘locally’, in a very restricted area of the system, on the basis of surface realizations of forms. At the same time they disturbed the symmetry of the imperfect paradigm of the verbs of Type B as a whole and, on a larger scale, of the verbs of Class II.²⁰

2.4.4 Imperfects of the *fóreɣa*-type

Evidence from numerous villages across the peninsula shows a more or less strong tendency towards leveling of the stem alternation between the past tenses in those verbs of Type B which show a stem allomorph with stem-final /e/ in the forms of the [+perfective]. In the material from these places we have imperfect forms like the following:

- (13) 2SG *bóre-j-es*
 3SG *váre-e, kale-j-e* etc.
 1PL *foré-γ-ame*
 3PL *bóre-γ-an, fóre-γ-an* etc.

instead of *bórijes, vári(j)e, foríyame, bóriyan, fóriyan*, which in most cases are also attested beside the forms with stem-final /e/. Compare the respective forms of the perfective past (aorist): *bóre-s-es, váre-s-e, foré-s-ame, bóre-s-an, fóre-s-an*. The stem allomorph with stem-final /e/ is originally restricted to the forms of the aorist (perfective past). An analogous process is evidenced (though more scarcely) from various places in the Peloponnese also for the verbs of Type A (attestations from Arkadia, Messenia, Lakonia, etc.):

- (14) 3SG *apá(n)di-j-e* (instead of *apá(n)daje, apa(n)dá-o* “meet”)
 1PL *metrí-γ-ame* (instead of *metráyame, metrá-o* “measure, count”)
 3PL *ke(n)dí-γ-ane* (instead of *ke(n)dáyane, ke(n)dá-o* “embroider”)
 3PL *yle(n)dí-γ-ane* (instead of *yle(n)dáyane, yle(n)dá-o* “celebrate, amuse oneself”)

Compare the respective forms of the perfective past: *metrí-s-ame, kendí-s-ane, ylendí-s-ane, apándi-s-e*.²¹

What we have here is a process through which the stem alternation between the imperfect and the aorist (perfective past) is leveled in favour of the aorist. It is well known from the history of Greek that the perfective (which in the semantically unmarked indicative is intimately connected to the past) holds an important position in the overall verbal system, as shown by the constant remodelings of the present stem ([−perfective]) in which the aorist stem ([+perfective]) serves as the pivot for these four-part analogical processes. These remodelings seem to occur around the axis of aspect since they affect both the present *and* the imperfect (i.e. [−perfective]), both of which remain clearly differentiated morphologically at the level of the stem allomorphs from the forms of the [+perfective] (aorist indicative-subjunctive-imperative). The processes presented above from PMG varieties are of a different kind though. They represent instances of leveling of stem alternation between two past categories across ‘aspectual borders’ (the fact that the allomorph of the aorist appears also in the subjunctive and imperative, which do not have any past time reference, is irrelevant here). Leveling occurs, however, within the limits of the tense category [+past], and, within these limits, with the perfective part of the opposition serving as the pivot. The stem alternation is retained as such, but its basis changes:

	Imperfective	Perfective
Present	<i>fori-(foru-), metra-</i>	—
Past	<i>fori-, metra-</i>	<i>fore-, metri-</i>

↓

	Imperfective	Perfective
Present	<i>fori-(foru-), metra-</i>	—
Past	<i>fore-, metri-</i>	<i>fore-, metri-</i>

Figure 14.

The speakers take steps towards redistributing the stem allomorphs according to the category of tense ([+past]), disrupting the morphological unity (at least as regards the stem form) of the imperfective aspect (present and imperfect) and increasing the morphological uniformity of the past (imperfect-aorist).

The fact that the perfective past (= aorist) serves as the pivot for these leveling processes, extending its stem allomorph to the imperfective past (= imperfect), could serve as an indication of the unmarked character of the perfective as opposed to the imperfective. This may be true from a semantic and contextual point of view (Comrie 1976:§6), yet other criteria such as the specific morphological patterns in Greek do not always conform to this. For example, there are indeed numerous cases where the perfective is built on a stem allomorph without a suffix as opposed to the imperfective:

- (15) *fér-n-o, é-fer-n-a* “I bring”, “I brought” (imperfective) : *é-fer-Ø-a* “I brought” (perfective)

but in most cases the perfective is either more marked than or as marked as the imperfective:

- (16) *δέ(-)n-o, é-δε(-)n-a* “tie, bind” (imperfective) : *é-δε(-)s-a* “I tied” (perfective)
πλέκ-o, é-plek-a “knit” (imperfective) : *é-plek-s-a* (perfective)

2.5 The *n*-formation

Let us now turn to the formation of the imperfective past in the varieties of a number of villages, all of which are situated around Mt. Parion in the northern part of southeastern Peloponnese, in an area close to Tsakonian. In these villages we have an imperfect formation with a suffix *-n-*, with no sign of stem allomorphy within the paradigm of the imperfect:

Table 14.

Singular	Plural
<i>fórun-a</i>	<i>forún-ame</i>
<i>fórun-es</i>	<i>forún-ate</i>
<i>fórun-e</i>	<i>fórun-an/forún-ane</i>

Koukoulés records this formation (1908:197) for the villages of the former ‘Municipality of “Inoús” (Oinoús)’ except Vamvakoú.²² It is also attested for villages, which did not all belong to ‘Inoús’ then or even to Lakonia: Ághii Anárghyri (former Zoúpena, region of Lakedhémon-Lakonia), Aghriáni (Αγριάνοι, region of Lakedhémon-Lakonia), and Pighádhi (to the east of ‘Inoús’, region of Kynouría-Arkadia).²³ Koukoulés is not very clear in his passage as to whether this formation was used only with the verbs of Type B or *both* Type A and B or as to exactly which of the villages that made up the municipality show it. I am inclined to interpret Koukoulés as recording the *n*-formation only for the verbs of Type B. Yet the first sentence of p. 197 is again confusing. On p. 156 he published a demotic song, in the second verse of which is found the imperfect form *e-rovólunan* (3PL) “they came down, they rushed (downhill)”. The verb is generally recorded as a verb of Type A (*rovolá-o*). Furthermore, it is not very clear if this formation coexisted with the *γ*-formation in free alternation (e.g. *fórunes* beside *fóri-j-es* or *fóra-j-es*) in the variety of ‘Inoús’. As for the villages of Pighádhi, Ághii Anárghyri, and Aghriáni, the available evidence shows: (a) use of the *n*-formation beside the *γ*-formation in free alternation, as was the case in the variety of ‘Eghina (Aigina, cf. Thumb 1891:115, 126), (b) use of the *n*-formation with verbs of both types (see below), but also (c) abandonment of the original morphological distinction between the two types (the latter also in Vamvakoú, cf. Koukoulés 1908:197):

- (17) Pighádhi: 1SG *bórun-a*, 3PL *bórun-an* (*bor-ó*); originally a verb of Type B²⁴
 1PL *travún-ame* (*travá-o* “pull”), a verb of Type A²⁵
 Ághii Anárghyri: 3SG *filun-e* (*fil-ó* “kiss”), originally a verb of Type B²⁶

1SG *pétun-a*, 3PL *petún-ane*²⁷ (*petá-o* “throw”); a verb of Type A
 Aghriáni: 3SG *lákun-e* (*laká-o* “run”), a verb of Type A
 3SG *pídhun-e* (*pidhá-o* “jump”), a verb of Type A²⁸

This type of imperfect formation may have been originally in use in a wider area of the Peloponnese (at least in some forms of the paradigm, e.g. 1SG and 3PL) beside the γ -formation, the latter having gradually ousted the former. There are traces of earlier use of this formation from the region of northwest Kynouría (Arkadia), to the north of ‘Inoús’, in a 3SG imperfect form *i-bórune* “was able” found in the memoirs of Theodore Kolokotrónis, who originated from (north-east) Arkadia, and in imperfect forms like 1SG *bórune* or 3SG *a(n)díxune* “echoed, resounded” (present *a(n)dixó*), found in the story ‘*Ελα να πάμε στο γιάλό*’ (“Let’s go to the seashore”) by the writer Spílios Pasayánnis (1874–1909). Spílios, as well as his older brother Kóstas (1872–1933) with whom he lived the first years of his life in various Lakonian towns outside ‘Inoús’, wrote stories with a strongly Peloponnesian linguistic ‘touch’. Stories such as those mentioned above are full of Peloponnesian forms and lexical items.

The *n*-formation was also used outside the Peloponnese proper: Eastern Crete, the islands of Éghina (Aigina, Thumb 1891:115, 126), Kýthnos, and Corfu (Koukoulés 1936:160), and in the Greek varieties of Corigliano and Martano in Apulia (Puglia) in Southern Italy.²⁹ The superficially similar imperfects of the type *e-púl(i)na* “I sold”, *e-pór(i)na* “I could, was able”, etc., which are used in the Greek varieties of Cappadocia, Pontos, and the Ukraine, had the form of the 3SG as the starting point: *e-púli* → *e-púli-n* → *e-púlin-e* (see Oikonomidis 1933, Babiniotis 1972:212f.).

The creation of the new morpheme *-n* is based on the forms of the 1SG *e-pérnun* and *e-fórun* (see also Babiniotis 1972:211–213).³⁰ Forms like these had become morphologically opaque due to loss of the morpheme boundary. The *-n* was perhaps no longer regarded as the ending but as part of the stem. The opacity was probably brought about by the strong influence the other past categories exerted on the imperfect of the ‘2nd conjugation’, with the ending *-a* carrying the function “1SG.PAST” in the greater part of the verbal system: the imperfect of the ‘1st conjugation’, active aorist, mediopassive aorist. The high frequency of the 1SG contributed to the relatively long retention of such synchronically irregular forms (§2.1). Bybee (1985:57) speaks of the ability of frequently used forms of paradigms to resist restructuring for longer (they show a high degree of ‘autonomy’). The ‘unanalysable’ 1SG form was restructured, with the termination *-a* being added to the whole giving *e-fórun-a*. This change

constitutes an instance of 'doubling of morphemes' in the sense of Koch (1996:246), that is, "the addition of a productive affix onto the periphery of a word to make the analysis of the word more transparent", which "typically occurs when the existing marker is obscure" (compare e.g. the English plural *childer* → *children*, or the Vulgar Latin infinitive *esse* 'to be' → *esse-re*; Koch 1996:246).

In the rest of the paradigm the older forms were probably retained and later extended. As is evidenced by the paradigms of other varieties, the 2–3SG forms were extended first, the plural forms possibly later. Thus in the first stage a mixed paradigm resulted. A similar situation (in the singular) is evidenced by a vulgar text from the sixteenth century of unknown geographic provenance (possibly Crete, Kehagioglou 2001:213). In this text a 1SG form in *-una* appears beside 2–3SG forms in *-ies*, *-ie*:

Table 15.

Type A	Type B
<i>-un-a</i>	
<i>-as</i> → <i>-a-es</i>	<i>-is</i> → <i>-i-es</i>
<i>-a</i> → <i>-a-e</i>	<i>-i</i> → <i>-i-e</i>
<i>-úme/(?)-áme</i> → <i>-ú-(γ-)ame/-á-(γ-)ame</i>	<i>-úme</i> → <i>-ú-(γ-)ame</i>
<i>-áte</i> → <i>-á-(γ-)ate</i>	<i>-íte</i> → <i>-í-(γ-)ate</i>
<i>-un(-an)</i>	

Maniot remained closer to the original paradigm distinguishing the 3PL from the 1SG only by means of the extended ending *-un* → *-un-an* > *-un-a* (loss of final /n/) or of the ending *-ús-an* > *-ús-a* (loss of final /n/). As for the rest of the paradigm, only the 2–3SG of Type B were extended to *-i-es*, *-i-e* (§2.4.1).

From the 1SG the new formation spread to the rest of the paradigm, resulting in e.g. 3SG (*e-*)*fórun-e*, 1PL (*e-*)*forún-ame*, etc. (see the paradigm in Table 14). The same change took place in the equally opaque and homonymous 3PL form *e-fórun*, which could have been extended to *e-fórun-an/e-forún-ane* at about the same time, thus forming *together* with the new 1SG form *e-fórun-a* the starting point for extending the new formation from the 1SG and 3PL forms, so frequently used in speech, to the rest of the paradigm. It is possible that (the) Peloponnesian varieties developed (at the same time?) two separate full imperfect paradigms, one with *n-* and one with the *γ-*suffix (Figure 15), the latter having gradually ousted the former completely, as happened, according to Thumb, in the variety of the island of 'Eghina (Aigina, 1891:115, 126). The

n-formation would thus have survived until the beginning of the twentieth century only in relic areas such as ‘Inoús’ and adjacent regions. Or, it is possible that some of the Peloponnesian varieties just remained for at least some time with a mixed paradigm similar to that of Table 15.

1SG	<i>e-fórun</i> → <i>e-fórun-a</i> beside <i>e-fóri-γ-a</i>
3PL	<i>e-fórun</i> → <i>e-fórun-an</i> beside <i>e-fóri-γ-an</i>
	↓
2SG	<i>e-fóri-es/e-fórun-es</i>
3SG	<i>e-fóri-e/e-fórun-e</i>
1PL	<i>e-forú/ti-γ-ame/e-forún-ame</i>
2PL	<i>e-forí-γ-ate/e-forún-ate</i>

Figure 15.

2.5.1 *The imperfect in the variety of Aráchova (now Karyés)*

For Aráchova (now Karyés) in ‘Inoús’, Koukoulés records a morphophonemic alternation /n/ ~ /γ/ within the paradigm of the imperfect. The distribution followed, according to Koukoulés (1908: 197), the number distinction: /n/ in the singular, /γ/ in the plural (Koukoulés’s example: *varó* ‘hit’):

Table 16.

Singular	Plural
<i>váruna</i>	<i>varúyame</i>
<i>várunes</i>	<i>varúyate</i>
<i>várune</i>	<i>varuyan/varúyane</i>

The /n/ and /γ/ can be regarded as having morphemic status ([–perfective]), just like the /γ/ in the imperfects of the *pérnaya*- and *fóriya*-type.³¹

Koukoulés himself (1908: 197) regards forms like *borúyame* as blends: *borúname* × *boráyame*. Yet instances of blends in inflectional morphology (the vast majority of reported cases of blending concern word-formation), and especially such that would have such large-scale consequences as the transformation of a whole inflectional category, are rarely reported, if even existent at all. Processes like these are known for their sporadic and unsystematic character.³² The case of Old English *bēom/bīom*, Old High German *bim* ‘I am’ (root of *be* × *eom/im* ‘I am’, Lehmann 1992: 223–224) is a rather isolated case. Joseph (1998: 358f.) mentions the Ancient Greek 1.DUAL.MEDIOPASSIVE ending *-methon*, which according to him can be explained as a blend of 1PL *-metha* and

2.DUAL *-sthon*. Apart from the fact that this ending could as well be explained as a case of a four-part analogical process (PLURAL *-metha* / *-sthe*: DUAL *x* / *-sthon* → *x* = *-methon*), it appears extremely rarely and does not seem to have ever become a stable part of non-poetic diction, though it indeed filled a gap in the paradigm of the mediopassive. Turning back to Koukoulés’s assumption, we see that it does not explain what inhibited the same process from taking place also in the singular yielding **bóruya*, **bórujes*, **bóruje*.

What we have here is a case of number-oriented allomorphy at the level of aspectual markers. This allomorphy probably came about as follows: As happened also in the varieties of the other villages of ‘Inoús’, in the form e.g. *e-fórun* a loss of morpheme boundary took place. In the rest of the paradigm, which was morphologically more transparent than the form of the 1SG, the endings *-es*, *-e*, *-ame*, *-ate* (*-ete*), *-an(e)* were added to the sequences *perna-* ~ *pernu-* (for Type A) and *fori-* ~ *foru-* (for Type B), which were analysed by the speakers as the stems. This process yielded *pérna-es*, *pernú-γ-ame* (with /γ/-epenthesis, later *perná-γ-ame*; see §2.3), etc. and *fóri-es*, *forú-γ-ame* (with /γ/-epenthesis, later *forí-γ-ame*; see §2.4.1), etc. Thus the paradigm of the imperfect must have resembled at some point in time in the variety of Aráchova the paradigm shown in Table 17 (see also Table 15). At this stage this paradigm probably strongly resembled structurally the respective paradigm of the Greek variety of a part of Apulia (Puglia) in Southern Italy (Karanastasis 1997:89): *prató* ‘walk’, imperfect: Singular *e-práton-a* (επράτων-α ← -ων), *e-práti*, *e-práti*; plural *e-pratú-amo*, *e-pratú-ato*, *e-pratú-ane* (if not from **e-pratús-amo* etc.).

Table 17.

Singular	Plural
(<i>e-</i>) <i>fórun-a</i>	(<i>e-</i>) <i>forú-γ-ame</i>
(<i>e-</i>) <i>fóri-es</i>	(<i>e-</i>) <i>fóri-γ-ate</i> → (<i>e-</i>) <i>forú-γ-ate</i>
(<i>e-</i>) <i>fóri-e</i>	(<i>e-</i>) <i>forú-γ-ane</i>

The new alternation /*n/* ~ /*γ/* between the 1SG and the 1PL did not have any phonological basis so it was reanalysed as being connected to the morpho-syntactic feature of number. The /*n/* was connected with the singular and the /*γ/*, which probably appeared originally only in the plural (before /*a/*, see §2.3), with the plural (for a more detailed account of analogous developments see also Koch 1996:ch.4, Mayerthaler 1980). From the 1SG the *-n-* spread to the rest of the singular, yielding (*e-*)*fórun-es*, (*e-*)*fórun-e* as opposed to the plural forms (*e-*)*forú-γ-ate*, (*e-*)*forú-γ-ane*. It is of course not the case that /*n/* and /*γ/* are the

primary markers of number. Number is primarily marked by the morphemes *-a*, *-es*, *-e*, *-ame*, etc. Thus /n/ and /ɣ/, though undoubtedly aspectual markers ([–perfective]), could also be regarded as subsidiary markers or co-signals of number (Koch 1996: 228–229) in the imperfect paradigm, a fact that is evident from the distributional pattern that the whole development resulted in. An analogous case is offered by the variety of the island of Corfu and probably also Kefallonia. The imperfect paradigm of e.g. *ayápó* ‘love’ (verb of Type A) is structured as shown in Table 18 (Hytiris 1987: 234):

Table 18.

Singular	Plural
<i>ayápun-a</i>	<i>ayapús-ame</i>
<i>ayápun-es</i>	<i>ayapús-ete</i>
<i>ayápun-e</i>	<i>ayapús-ane</i>

The current structure of the Corfiot paradigm probably resulted from a similar development. From an original 1SG *ayápun* → *ayápun-a* the *-n*-formation spread to the rest of the singular yielding *ayápun-es*, *ayápun-e* instead of original *ayápa-(e)s*, *ayápa-(e)*. From the 3PL *ayapús-ane*, the *-us*-formation spread to the rest of the plural probably before the spread of the *-(u)n*-formation in the singular, as could be evidenced by the following Rhodian paradigms (Tsopanakis 1948: 23):

Table 19.

Type A	Type B
<i>e-jélun</i> ‘I laughed, was laughing’	<i>e-míljun</i> ‘I spoke, was speaking’
<i>e-jélas</i>	<i>e-míljes</i>
<i>e-jéla(n)</i>	<i>e-mílje</i>
<i>e-jel-ús-amen</i>	<i>e-mil-ús-amen</i>
<i>e-jel-ús-ete</i>	<i>e-mil-ús-ete</i>
<i>e-jel-ús-a(si)n</i>	<i>e-mil-ús-a(si)n</i>

The tendency of the allomorphs of markers of other morphosyntactic categories to be distributed on the basis of number leading to what Babinotis called ‘intranumerical symmetry’ (1972: 185) is not unusual in the Modern Greek verbal system, although the details may of course differ considerably. Compare for instance the mediopassive present paradigm of the verbs of Class II or the present paradigm of the deponential verbs of the type *kimá-me* ‘sleep’ (also

θimáme “remember”, *lipáme* “feel sorry”, *fováme* “fear, be afraid”):

Table 20.

<i>ayapjé-me</i> “I am loved”	<i>kimá-me</i> “sleep”
<i>ayapjé-se</i>	<i>kimá-se</i>
<i>ayapjé-te</i>	<i>kimá-te</i>
<i>ayapjó-maste</i>	<i>kimó-maste</i>
<i>ayapjó-saste</i> (for older <i>ayapjé-ste</i>)	<i>kimó-saste</i> (for older <i>kimá-ste</i>)
<i>ayapjó-(n)de</i> (beside <i>ayapjú-(n)de</i>)	<i>kimó-(n)de</i> (beside <i>kimú-(n)de</i>)

-jé- ~ -jó- and *-á- ~ -ó-* are certainly not the primary markers of number, yet it is interesting that the alternants have strongly tended to be fixed around the axis of number in the course of development of Greek, at least in its more standard forms.

The reason the /n/ ~ /ɣ/ alternation also did not occur in the varieties of the other villages of ‘Inoús’ may lie in the fact that there the emergence of the form (*e-*)*fórun-a* (plus 3PL *e-fórun-an/e-forún-ane*) and the spread of this formation to the rest of the paradigm of the imperfect perhaps took place *before* the emergence of the *ɣ*-formation, e.g. 3SG (*e-*)*pérna-e*, 1PL (*e-*)*forú-ɣ-ame*, etc., that is, at the stage where forms like *e-pérna-*, *e-forú-me(n)*, etc. were still in use. Yet this need not be the case. Another important factor may have been the form of the 3PL. The original 3PL form *e-fórun* was in the biggest part of ‘Inoús’ transformed to *e-fórun-an* in an attempt at marking it (more) clearly as a 3PL form, and especially at distinguishing it more clearly from the homonymous 1SG form. The need to distinguish clearly the 3PL from the 1SG as a motive for transformation of verbal forms has a parallel in the creation in Hellenistic Greek of 3PL forms like *elambánosan* (Class I), *parekalúsan* (Class II), replacing older *elámbanon*, *parekálun* which were homonymous to the 1SG *elámbanon*, *parekálun*. The new 3PL forms did not survive in Class I, while in Class II they were the starting point of the emergence of the *ús*-imperfect. As mentioned above, the frequent new 1SG and 3PL forms *e-fórun-a* and *e-fórun-an* constituted a good basis for establishing and extending the *n*-formation to the rest of the paradigm. In the variety of Karyés the distinction between the 1PL and the 3PL in the imperfect on the one hand, and between the 3PL imperfect and 3PL present on the other was instead accomplished by the creation (as in all forms of the paradigm except the 1SG) — already before the spread of the *n*-formation — of a new formation *e-forú-ane* > *e-forú-ɣ-ane*.

2.5.2 The imperfect of the ‘secondary’ Type-B-verbs

The *n*-formation is used also for the verbs of the *kljó*-type (cf. §§1.3.2 and 2.4.2). Koukoulés (1908: 197) mentions the following forms:

(18) From Vrísthena and the other villages (except Vamvakoú):

- 1PL (*e*-)*kljúname* (present *kljó*)
 (*e*-)*ksjúname* (present *ksjó*)
 e-ftjúname (present *ftjó*)
 xtjúname (present *xtjó*)
 3PL *e-ljúname* (present *ljó*)

From Vrísthena he also mentions the 1PL form (*e*-)*klúname* (present *kljó*) which according to him points to 1SG *é-kluna* and which he does not go into further detail about. The latter imperfect might point to a present *kló*.

This formation cannot be traced back to *original* 1SG imperfect forms like **é-kljun*, **é-ksjun* and the like. The presence of the (*u*)*n*-formation in the imperfect verbs of the *kljó*-type is as a whole probably based on the surface similarity of their (present) paradigms with the respective ones of the verbs of Type B proper. The imperfect formation of Type B proper was then probably directly ‘copied’ to the *kljó*-type in a four-part analogical process: *kljúme* : *klíyame* → *kljúme* : *kljúname*, analogically to *forúme* : *forúname*. The possibility of the creation first of 1SG imperfect forms like **é-kljun*, **é-ksjun* only (directly ‘copied’ from e.g. *e-fórun*) and of a subsequent development similar to that which gave rise to the *n*-formation in Type B proper (§2.5) cannot of course be completely excluded:

Stage 1

-
- **é-kli-a*/**é-klj-a* → **é-kljun* → **é-kljun-a*
 **é-kli-es*/(?) **é-klj-es*
 **é-kli-e*/(?) **é-klj-e*
 **e-kli-ame*(*n*)
 **e-kli-ete/ate*
 **é-kli-an*/(?) **é-klj-an*
-

Stage 2

é-kljuna
é-kljunes
é-kljune
e-kljúname
e-kljúinate
é-kljunan/e-kljúnane

Figure 16.

Such forms are indeed attested in other varieties; compare Rhodian 1SG *é-ftjun* (Tsopanakis 1948:29).

- (19) From Karyés (former Aráchova):
 1PL (*e-*)*kljúyame* (*kljó*)
 (*e-*)*ksjúyame* (*ksjó*)
 (*e-*)*ftjúyame* (*ftjó*)

In §2.4.1 it was argued that in the varieties of the greatest part of the peninsula the *-u-* is part of the termination and not of the stem. Yet the above forms could point to an analysis from the speakers' side of the respective forms of the present as *kljú-me*, *ksjú-me*, *ftjú-me*, with /u/ having 'moved' from the termination to the stem (an instance of the shift of a morpheme boundary): *klj-úme* : *kli-γ-ame* → *kljú-me* : *kljú-γ-ame* (for more details see below). This reanalysis of the morphological structure of this type of verb could of course have been the result of, rather than the motive for, the creation of plural forms like the above. Such plural forms could have been created by direct 'copying' of the *surface* forms of the verbs of Type B proper: *kljúme* : *klíyame* → *kljúme* : *kljúyame* analogically to *forúme* : *forúyame*, thus resulting in a new morphological structure *kljú-me* : *kljú-γ-ame*.

Conclusion

The development of the imperfect formations and inflectional paradigms of the verbs of the '2nd conjugation' in PMG involves changes that conform to crosslinguistically well-observed tendencies of (morphological) change in general, and more specifically to changes that have taken place also in other Modern Greek varieties. Parts of PMG show interesting developments, such as

the Inoúntian (of Aráchova) number-oriented allomorphy *-n- ~ -γ-* or plural forms like *kljúyame*. PMG is traditionally regarded as a ‘southern’ Greek variety. As regards the imperfect of the ‘2nd conjugation’, it shows remarkable similarities with the Megarian-Athenian-Euboean group, and a more distant relationship to Corfiot and Maniot (though closely related with the latter two in other respects), Cretan and the south Aegean insular varieties. Of particular interest are the similarities in this respect with ‘northern’ varieties (e.g. Lokris, Boeotia, etc.) and with Modern Greek varieties of Southern Italy (especially Apulia). The exact nature of these similarities and the impacts on our understanding of the process of dialectal differentiation of Medieval/‘Early Modern’ Greek is, of course, a subject for a more thorough and extensive study of a different kind.

Notes

* An earlier version of this paper appears in the *Proceedings of the 1st International Conference of Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory, Patras (Greece), 12–14 October 2000* ed. by A. Ralli, B. Joseph & M. Janse, pp. 207–221 (Patras: University of Patras, July 2001).

1. For instance, many of the collections of the archive of the Academy of Athens’s Historical Lexicon of the Modern Greek Language (abbreviated as *ILNE*, from Greek *Istorikón Lexikón tis Néas Ellinikís* ‘Historical Lexicon of Modern Greek’). Collections of folkloric material include: (a) The archive of the Academy of Athens’s Research Center of Greek Folklore (abbreviated as *KEEL* from Greek *Kéntron Erévnis tis Ellinikís Laoghrafías* ‘Research Center of Greek Folklore’), (b) the archive of the Library of Folklore of the Faculty of Philosophy of the University of Athens (abbreviated as *SL* from Greek *Spoudhastirion Laoghrafías* ‘Library of Folklore’). The numbering of the collections given in the present paper follows the numbering of the respective archives.

2. Yet forms of this verb following Type A (especially in the imperfect: *bóraya*) can frequently be found across the peninsula, especially in Lakonia. See also Hock (1986:ch.10). Present forms following Type A (e.g. *borás*, *borá-i*, *borá-me*, etc.) are more scarcely attested. As for those Type-B verbs that contain /l/ or /n/ in their stem, as far as they are preserved as such (and are not transformed to Type-A verbs) in the different Peloponnesian varieties, they usually show *lj* and *nj* in those forms of the active present paradigm in which /l/ and /n/ are followed by back vowels: *kaljó*, *laljó*, *filjó*, *pilaljó*, *ponjó*; 1 and 3PL *filjúme*, *filjúte*, *kaljúme*, *laljúne*, gerund *kaljó(n)da*, *laljó(n)da*, *filjó(n)da* etc. Compare also the imperfect forms *e-filjun-a* in a folkloric song from Voúrvoura (a region of Kynouría-Arkadia, *Laoghrafía* 5:570) and *filjúyane* (3PL) from Sellasía (former Vrouliás) in Lakonia (SL 3104:116). In the present paper they are referred to in their ‘global’ Greek form *kaló* etc. An attempt at explaining this phenomenon is not undertaken in the present paper since this is beyond the scope of it.

3. In Modern Greek the sequence *lj* is always (synchronically) realized as a single segment [ʎ]. Yet for the sake of clarity of argumentation in the present paper and in order to avoid a

theoretical discussion on the status of the palatalized consonants in Modern Greek — a discussion that does not affect the essence of this paper — the transcription *lj* is used. The sequence *sj* is generally realized in Peloponnesian as [s] or [ʃ]: [kso] or [kʃo], [so] or [ʃo].

4. It is not clear whether, when, and where the [λ] loses palatality in the position before /i/ yielding *klís*, *klí*, *klíte*. There is evidence of /l/ surfacing as [λ] in the position before /i/ in (numerous parts of) the Peloponnese (e.g. [λikos] for /likos/ “wolf”, standard [likos]). This, if doubled by hypothetical reasons of morphological transparency, could have contributed to the retention of palatality also in cases like *kljís*, *kljí*, *kljíte*, which have of course different underlying representations from cases like /likos/. As for the cluster *tj*, it loses the [j] before /i/. Compare the forms *ftís*, *ftí*, *ftíte* instead of *ftjís*, *ftjí*, *ftjíte* (*ftjó* “spit”). These forms have led in some parts of the Peloponnese to the formation of a new present *ftó*. The same also happened with the verb *zvjó* (*zvjis*, *zvjí*, *zvjíte* > *zvís*, *zví*, *zvíte*, hence also present *zvó*).

5. The /ɣ/ surfaces as [j] in the position before front vowels in Modern Greek. For the sake of clarity of argumentation the transcription *j* is used throughout the present paper whenever /ɣ/ appears before front vowels. For the same reasons this transcription is also used for the non-syllabic allophone of /i/.

6. /ɣ/-less forms are also well attested, albeit rarely (e.g. *e-fíla-a* “I watched over”, *kratá-ame* “we held”), a situation which of course does not necessarily correspond to their original frequency.

7. Imperfects of the *fóriya*-type are unknown in the MGK. In verbs of Type B the imperfect formation with the suffix *-ús-* is used instead: *borúsa* “I could, I was able”.

8. In this work such forms do appear: *e-θóri-e* (*θoró* “look at, stare at”), *bóri-e* (*boró* “can, be able”), *kráti-e* (*krató* “hold”), *é-zi-e* (*zó* “live”). Edition of the poem: Georgios Zoras, ed., *Βυζαντινή ποίησης. Βασική Βιβλιοθήκη*, vol. 1, 236–241. Athens: Ioannis Zacharopoulos editions.

9. The 1PL ending *-ma* (from earlier *-man* — compare 3PL *-(s)a* with loss of final /n/) is also attested in the “Chronicle of Morea” (e.g. *e-zitú-man* “we asked for”, *e-djávi-man* “we went”, Maniot *eʹdjáima*, *e-stráfi-man* “we turned to”) but is — interestingly enough — not attested for the Peloponnese proper.

10. Edition of the text: Nikolopoulou, Angeliki P. 1995. “Μαξιμου του Πελοποννησίου εξήγηση του ‘Κατά Ιουδαίων’ έργου του Μελετίου Πηγά”. *Παρνασσός* 57.308–346.

11. For the sake of clarity of argumentation the transcription *j* is used here throughout in cases where this phone could be regarded as an allophone of /i/.

12. This is the explanation of Hatzidakis (1892: 130, 1905: 48); his suggestion of /i/-epenthesis in the extended 3SG form as the starting point for the development does not seem very likely (*e-fórje* > *e-fórije*) as this might rather have led to a plural **e-forijame* etc.

13. See Papadopoulos 1927, p. 99: *fili-γ-a* > *fil’-γ-a*, *fil’-j-is*, *fil’-j-i*, *fil’-γ-ami*, *fil’-γ-ati*, *fil’-γ-an*.

14. I have not yet actually found the form of the 2PL anywhere in the sources. Yet, the existence of forms such as 1PL *fór-γ-ame*, 3PL *fór-γ-ane* assures the likelihood of this form of the 2PL in appropriate contexts.

15. Stress often remains on the pro-antepenultima without the support of secondary stress. Compare e.g. *i-xriaz-ómastune* “we needed” (recorded in Messenia) or *ley-ósastune* “was your name” (recorded in Lakonia).
16. From ILNE 133 (year 1917) we get the information that double stress was not possible in the variety of (part of) this region: “... an accentuation like *káθomáste* [“we sit”, singular *káθume*] does not occur in Kalávryta at all” (p.69).
17. From Lousí (former Soudhená, ILNE 419:866).
18. An interesting parallel is offered by the form *fór’same* “we wore, put on” (1PL perfective past, instead of *forésame*, singular *fóresa*, -es, -e, present *foró*) recorded in Messenia (ILNE 1412:7). The form might of course be a hapax legomenon, yet it certainly is characteristic of the tendencies of change in (some of the) Peloponnesian varieties.
19. See Newton 1972: 54–55.
20. The paradigms of the other verbs of Type B do not show such forms (e.g. **kál-γ-ame* — present *kal-ó* — or **krát-γ-ane* — present *krat-ó* — are not attested).
21. In some of the instances, however, such forms could serve as evidence for the verb belonging originally to Type B, the imperfect of which shows forms similar to the ones listed here.
22. Vrésthena, Varvítsa, Vas(s)arás, Véria, Megháli Vrísi, Karyés (former Aráchova), Polýdhroso (or Tzintzina), and Vamvakoú.
23. Koukoulés 1936: 160, review *Malevós* (6th year, p.452).
24. SL 2959:65, 20.
25. SL 2959:65.
26. SL 2950:77.
27. SL 2950:27, 85.
28. Both forms occur in the review *Malevós* (6th year, p.452).
29. *prató* “walk”: *e-prátōnn-a* (-ωv-α ← -ωv), *e-prátōnn-e*, *e-prátōnn-e*, *e-prátōnn-amo*, *e-prátōnn-ato*, *e-prátōnn-ane* (Karanastasis 1997: 89).
30. For the sake of uniformity of representation of morphemes the segmentation -n- is preferred over -un- so as to avoid a segmentation -uy- in forms like *forúyame*. Such a segmentation would mean the introduction of an unnecessary allomorphy -iy- ~ -ay- ~ -uy- in the aspectual marker as a consequence.
31. But see also Babiniotis (1972:212), where he proposes a different analysis for this formation: *e-kín-un-a* “I moved (transitive), I set off” with a suffix -un-.
32. On blending see among others also Hock (1986:189–192, 197–198), Hock & Joseph (1996:165–168).

References

- Anderson, Stephen R. 1987. "Morphological Change". *Linguistics: The Cambridge Surveyed*. by F. J. Newmeyer, vol. I, 324–362. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Arlotto, Anthony. 1972. *Introduction to Historical Linguistics*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin. [Reprinted Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1981.]
- Babiniotis, Georgios. 1972. *Το ρήμα της Ελληνικής*. University of Athens.
- Bybee, Joan. 1985. *Morphology*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1976. *Aspect*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hatzidakis, Georgios. 1892. *Einführung in die neugriechische Grammatik*. Athens.
- Hatzidakis, Georgios. 1905. *Μεσαιωνικά και Νέα Ελληνικά* A. Athens: Sakellariou.
- Hock, Hans Henrich. 1986. *Principles of Historical Linguistics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hock, Hans Henrich. 2003. "Analogical change". *The Handbook of Historical Linguistics* ed. by Brian D. Joseph & Richard D. Janda, 441–460. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hock, Hans Henrich & Brian D. Joseph. 1996. *Language History, Language Change and Language Relationship*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Horrocks, Geoffrey. 1997. *Greek: A History of the Language and its Speakers*. London & New York: Longman.
- Householder, F. W. & G. Nagy. 1972. *Greek, a Survey of Recent Work*. The Hague & Paris: Mouton.
- Hytiris, Gerasimos. 1987. *Κερκυραϊκό Γλωσσάρι, ακατάγραφες και δίσημες λέξεις (επίμετρο: Γραμματικά στοιχεία του γλωσσικού ιδιώματος της Κέρκυρας)*. Corfu.
- Joseph, Brian D. 1980. "Watkins' Law and the Modern Greek Preterite". *Die Sprache* 26.179–184.
- Joseph, Brian D. 1992. "Diachronic Explanation: Putting Speakers back into the Picture". *Explanation in Historical Linguistics* ed. by Garry W. Davis & Gregory K. Iverson, 123–144. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Joseph, Brian D. 1998. "Diachronic Morphology". *The Handbook of Morphology* ed. by Andrew Spencer & Arnold M. Zwicky, 351–373. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Karanastasis, Anastasios. 1997. *Γραμματική των ελληνικών ιδιωμάτων της Κάτω Ιταλίας*. Athens: Academy of Athens.
- Kassis, Kyriakos. 1982. *Το γλωσσικό ιδίωμα της Μάνης*, vol. A. Athens.
- Kehagioglou, Giorgos. 2001. *Πεζογραφική Ανθολογία: Αφηγηματικός γραπτός νεοελληνικός λόγος*, vol.1, 213–215. Thessaloniki: Aristotle University of Thessaloniki / "Manolis Triantafyllidis" Foundation.
- Kiparsky, Paul. 1974. "Remarks on Analogical Change". *Historical Linguistics II: Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Edinburgh, 2–7 September 1973* ed. by J. M. Anderson & C. Jones, 257–275. Amsterdam & Oxford: North Holland.
- Koch, Harold. 1996. "Reconstruction in Morphology". *The Comparative Method Reviewed: Regularity and Irregularity in Language Change* ed. by Mark Durie & Malcolm Ross, 218–263. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Koukoulés, Phaidon I. 1908. *Οινουντιακά*. Hania: Michael Saliveros.
- Koukoulés, Phaidon I. 1936. "Μορφολογικά και γραμματολογικά ζητήματα". *Glotta* 25.159–166.

- Lehmann, Winfred P. 1992. *Historical Linguistics: An introduction*. 3rd edn. London & New York: Routledge.
- Mayerthaler, Willi. 1980. "Aspekte der Analogietheorie". *Kommunikations-theoretische Grundlagen des Sprachwandels* ed. by H. Lüdtke, 80–130. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Mullach, F. W. A. 1856. *Grammatik der griechischen Vulgärsprache*. Berlin: Ferd. Dümmlers Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Oikonomidis, Dhimos. 1933. "Γραμματικά εκ της ποντικής διαλέκτου". *Αθηνά* 45.286–294.
- Newton, Brian. 1972. *The Generative Interpretation of Dialect*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pantelidis, Nikolaos. 2001. "Πελοποννησιακός ιδιωματικός λόγος και Κοινή Νεοελληνική". *Μελέτες για την Ελληνική Γλώσσα: Πρακτικά της 21ης ετήσιας συνάντησης του Τομέα Γλωσσολογίας της Φιλοσοφικής Σχολής του Αριστοτέλειου Πανεπιστημίου Θεσσαλονίκης, Thessaloniki, 12–14 May 2000* ed. by Aghathoklis Haralambopoulos & Maria Karali, 550–561. Thessaloniki.
- Papadopoulos, Anthimos. 1927. *Γραμματική των βορείων ιδιωμάτων της Νέας Ελληνικής Γλώσσας*. Athens: P. D. Sakellariou.
- Politis, Nikolaos. 1904. *Μελέται περί του βίου και της γλώσσας του ελληνικού λαού-Παραδόσεις, Μέρος Α΄*. Athens: Sakellariou.
- Ralli, Angeliki. 1987. *Éléments de morphologie du grec moderne: La structure du verbe*. Université de Montréal.
- Thumb, Albert. 1891. "Μελέτη περί της σημερινής εν Αιγίνη λαλουμένης διαλέκτου". *Αθηνά* 3.95–128.
- Thumb, Albert. 1910. *Handbuch der neugriechischen Volkssprache*. 2nd edn. Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner.
- Triantafyllidis, Manolis. 1936. "Η ελληνική αύξηση και το ξεχώρισμα των ομόφωνων ρηματικών τύπων". *Glotta* 25.238–248.
- Tsopanakis, Agapitos. 1948. *Κοινή-Ροδιακά ιδιώματα*. Rhodes.
- Tsopanakis, Agapitos. 1949. *Το ιδίωμα της Χάλκης Δωδεκανήσου*. Rhodes.
- Veis, Nikos A. 1956. "Χαρτιά του Κλαβαζού". *Πελοποννησιακά* 1.441–453.
- Watkins, Calvert. 1962. *Indo-European Origins of the Celtic Verb, I. The Sigmatic Aorist*. Dublin: The Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.

Abstract

Αντικείμενο της παρούσας μελέτης είναι οι τρόποι σχηματισμού και το κλιτικό παράδειγμα του ενεργητικού παρατατικού των ρημάτων της λεγόμενης στην παραδοσιακή γραμματική «2ης Συζυγίας» στα πελοποννησιακά ιδιώματα της Νέας Ελληνικής (εκτός της Τσακωνικής και των Μανιάτικων) από τη σκοπιά κυρίως της διαχρονικής γλωσσολογίας. Επιχειρείται η ανασύνθεση των μεταβολών, οι οποίες οδήγησαν στη σημερινή κατάσταση, και παρουσιάζονται

οι τάσεις περαιτέρω μεταβολής. Η διαχρονική εξέλιξη της μορφολογίας του παρατατικού των ρημάτων της «2ης Συζυγίας» σε πελοποννησιακά ιδιώματα περιλαμβάνει μεταβολές όπως μορφολογικοποίηση φωνολογικών διαδικασιών και εμφάνιση αλλομορφίας με βάση την κατηγορία του αριθμού στο επίπεδο των μορφημάτων δηλωτικών ρηματικής όψης. Επιπλέον, η παρακολούθηση της εξέλιξης μπορεί να συμβάλει στην καλύτερη κατανόηση των μηχανισμών και του εύρους των μορφολογικών μεταβολών καθώς και στην καλύτερη κατανόηση της μορφολογικής δομής του νεοελληνικού ρήματος. Μπορεί επίσης να συμβάλει ουσιαστικά στην ανασύνθεση της διαδικασίας διαλεκτικής διαφοροποίησης της Μεσαιωνικής/«Πρώιμης Νέας Ελληνικής».