

Nikolaos Pantelidis
 Department of Greek Philology
 Demokritus University of Thrace
 e-mail: gpantel@math.ntua.gr

THE ACTIVE IMPERFECT OF THE VERBS OF THE “2ND CONJUGATION” IN THE PELOPONNESIAN VARIETIES OF MODERN GREEK

Abstract

The present paper deals with the different types of formation and the inflectional patterns of the active imperfect of the verbs which in traditional grammar are known as verbs of the “2nd conjugation” in the Peloponnesian varieties of Modern Greek (except Tsakonian and Maniot) mainly from the point of view of diachronic linguistics. An attempt is made to reconstruct the processes which led to the current situation and tendencies of further change are presented. 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 aspect markers level while on the other side it might offer interesting insights into the mechanisms and scope of morphological changes and the morphological structure of the modern Greek verb.

- 1.1. 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 the older generations of speakers. As examples may serve here the verbs *pernó* (→ *perná-o*) ‘pass’ and *foró* ‘wear, put on’¹:

¹ The dialectal material is drawn mainly from collections of the archive of the Academy of Athens’ Historical Lexicon of the Modern Greek Language (abbreviated as *ILNE*, from greek *Istorikón Lexikón tis Néas Ellinikís* ‘Historical Lexicon of Modern Greek’) and collections of the archive of the Library of Folklore of the Faculty of Philosophy of the University of Athens (abbreviated as *SL* from greek *Spoudhastírion Laoghraftias* ‘Library of Folklore’). The latter (as well as a considerable part of the former) contain narrations of villagers (mostly elderly and illiterate people), on matters of the local culture.

A careful selection of the most suitable and carefully written collections (as to the degree of recording accuracy of the local variety they show) from both archives was undertaken. The collections of *ILNE* were carried out in different periods of the 20th century whereas those collections of the *SL*, where material was drawn from, date back in the late 1960s to the early 1980s. The numbering of the collections given in the present paper follows the numbering of both archives.

The material was further drawn from peloponnesian demotic songs published in the Greek review *Laoghrafía* (‘Folklore’), from Koukoulés (1908) and other sources.

<u>Type A</u>		<u>Type B</u>	
<u>SINGULAR</u>	<u>PLURAL</u>	<u>SINGULAR</u>	<u>PLURAL</u>
<i>pern-ó</i> → <i>perná-o</i>	<i>pernúme</i> → <i>perná-me</i>	<i>for-ó</i>	<i>forúme</i>
<i>pernás</i>	<i>pernáte</i>	<i>forís</i>	<i>foríte</i>
<i>perná</i> → <i>perná-i</i>	<i>pernún(e)</i> → <i>perná-ne</i>	<i>forí</i>	<i>forún(e)</i>

Especially Type B is still represented by a relatively large number of verbs which in the spoken Modern Greek Koine (hereafter: MGK) have already passed to Type A. This process can also be observed in the peloponnesian varieties, where it seems to have spread much further in the south of Lakonia and in parts of the Argolis compared with other parts of the Peloponnese such as the west and southwest. There is of course a great deal of fluctuation among the modern Greek dialects as to what verbs of Class II belong or belonged originally to which of the two types, a fact which was already pointed out by Hatzidakis (1892:129-130). The same fluctuation can also be observed in the Peloponnese. The verbs of Class II which show inflectional forms of Type B in PMG are the following: *boró* ‘can, be able’, *kaló* ‘invite’, *zó* (or *zó*) ‘live’, *aryó* ‘be late, delayed’, *karteró* ‘await, expect’, *filó* ‘kiss’, *varó* ‘beat, hit’, *laló* ‘sing (of singing birds), crow (of roosters)’, *perpató* ‘walk’, *foró* ‘wear’, *ponó* ‘ache, hurt’, *krató* ‘hold’, *pilaló* ‘run’, *pató* ‘tread, stand on, set one’s foot on’ and others, different ones depending on the region. *zó*, *boró* and *kaló* seem to be the most resistant ones to the process of “take-over” by Type A. Interestingly the same holds true also for the MGK. Especially *boró* is one of the most frequently used verbal lexemes, a fact which contributes to its preserving its older inflectional pattern². At the other end of the scale, *pató* has in the spoken peloponnesian varieties probably completely passed long ago to the more productive Type A (*patá-o*, *patá-me*, *páta-γ-a* –1.SG, 1.PL, 1.SG. imperfect- etc.). Older forms following the inflectional pattern of Type B though can still be found in demotic songs (*patís* –2.SG- vs. today’s *patá-s* etc.). Moreover, in the speech of some of the older speakers, “contracted” older forms of the present paradigm of Type A are still in limited use (e.g. 1.SG. *pernó*, 3.SG. *perná*, 1.PL. *pernúme*, 3.PL. *pernún(e)*). They are also used in the MGK in more formal speech.

1.2. Another group of verbs which in the Peloponnesian varieties seem to follow the inflectional pattern of Type B are the following “monosyllabics” (in the SG present): *ljó*³ ‘untie, loose’, *ksjó* ‘scratch, scrape’, *kljó* ‘close’, *ftjó* ‘spit’, *sjó*⁴ ‘shake’. These verbs are of a totally different origin though. They go back to ancient “vocalic” verbs with stem final vowels that all finally merged with /i/: *lý:o* > *lío*, *ksýo* > *ksío*, *kleío* > *kli:o* > *klío*, *ptýo* > *ftío*, *seío* > *si:o* > *sío*. Through ‘synizesis’ which took place in medieval times, the

²The notion of ‘token frequency’. See also Bybee (1985:Ch.5). Yet forms of this verb following Type A (e.g. *bóraγa* –imperfect-) can also be found across the peninsula, especially in Lakonia. See also Hock (1986:Ch.10).

³In Modern Greek the sequence *lj* is always (synchronically) realized as a single segment [*λ*]. 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 which doesn’t affect the essence of this paper- the transcription *lj* is used.

⁴The sequence *sj* is sometimes realized as [*s*] or [*ʃ*]: [*kso*] or [*kʃo*], [*so*] or [*ʃo*].

sequence /iɔ/ developed to *jó* yielding the current forms *ljó* etc. Peloponnesian Modern Greek (hereafter: PMG) did not participate in one of the most important innovations of the MGK, the transformation of these presents (among several others) to presents with stem final *-n-* (compare standard modern Greek *li-n-o ksi-n-o kli-n-o ftí-n-o* (*sío* didn't 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 which were listed above, go back to ordinary ancient "barytone" verbs (verbs of Class I like *phér-o*: 'carry, bear') and don't show any signs of passing to Type A at all at no part of the peninsula (apart, of course, from their substitution under the influence of the MGK by presents with stem-final *-n-*, e.g. *kli-n-o*), for example **ftá-o* 'spit' (as opposed to *krató kratís* → *kratá-o kratá-s* etc.). Example: *klj-ó* 'close':

<u>SINGULAR</u>	<u>PLURAL</u>
<i>Kljó</i>	<i>Kljúme</i>
<i>Kljís</i>	<i>Kljíte</i> ⁵
<i>Klji</i>	<i>Kljún(e)</i>

1.3. 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 (late 'Koine', Medieval or "Early Modern Greek"⁶) with the following paradigms:

<u>Type A</u>		<u>Type B</u>	
<u>SINGULAR</u>	<u>PLURAL</u>	<u>SINGULAR</u>	<u>PLURAL</u>
<i>e-pénnun</i>	<i>e-pernúme</i>	<i>e-fórun</i>	<i>e-forúme</i>
<i>e-pénnas</i>	<i>e-pernáte</i>	<i>e-fóris</i>	<i>e-foríte</i>
<i>e-pérna</i>	<i>e-pénnun</i>	<i>e-fóri</i>	<i>e-fórun</i>

Here also the "contracted" older forms of the 2.SG. *epénnas efóris* and 3.SG. *epérna efóri* can still occur even though very sporadically. Even in the older demotic songs these forms are rather rare and their preservation could be attributed to the metre. The older 1.SG. 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: 1.SG *epénnun pátnun* (present *pató*) (both attested in Peloponnesian demotic songs⁷). The extension of the forms of the 1. and 3.SG. present of Type A to *-á-o* and *-á-i* respectively and the abandonment of the alternation /a/~lu/ in favour of /a/ created a new more uniform paradigm built on the stem *perna-* which -within the present at least- does not display allomorphy, with the endings *-o -s -i -me -te -ne*. Yet, a comparable development did not

⁵ It is not clear whether, when and where the [κ] loses palatality in the position before /i/ yielding *klís kli klíte*. There is evidence of /l/ surfacing as [κ] in the position before /i/ in (parts) of the Peloponnese (e.g. [ˈχikos] for /likos/ 'wolf', standard [ˈlikos]). This doubled by hypothetical reasons of morphological transparency could have contributed to retaining palatality also in cases like *kljís klji kljíte* which have of course different underlying representations from cases like /likos/. As for *tj* it loses the [j] before /i/. Compare the forms *ftís fti ftíte* instead of *ftjís ftji ftjíte* of the verb *ftjó* 'spit'.

⁶ These are of course notions which are difficult to delimit with certainty.

⁷ *Laoghrafía* 1 (1909:188-189 late of the first edition of the songs:1888).

take place in the present paradigm of Type B. Forms like **foríme* **foríne* for example, are not attested⁸. This fact would favour morphological analyses like e.g. Babiniotis' (1972) and Ralli's (1987) according to which the alternating vowels /i/ and /u/ in the present paradigm of Type B are not parts of the verbal base (the "stem"), as is the case with the vowel /a/ in Type A, but parts of the terminations, that is 'thematic vowel (/i/, /u/) + ending' (-s, -me etc.).

1.4. Let us now take a closer look at the formation of the imperfect. Currently the most widely used formation throughout the peninsula is the following:

<u>Type A</u>			<u>Type B</u>	
<u>SINGULAR</u>	<u>PLURAL</u>		<u>SINGULAR</u>	<u>PLURAL</u>
(e-)pérna-γ-a	(e-)perná-γ-ame		(e-)fóri-γ-a	(e-)fori-γ-ame
(e-)pérna-(j-)es	(e-)perná-γ-ate		(e-)fóri-(j-)es	(e-)fori-γ-ate
(e-)pérna-(j-)e	(e-)perna-γ-an(e)		(e-)fóri-(j-)e	(e-)fori-γ-ane

The origin of this formation, at least in Type A, has already been extensively analyzed by a number of linguists. As part of a strong tendency for, as Babiniotis labeled it, "unification of past structures (i.e. categories)", the terminations of the past paradigm of the verbs of Class I (the so-called "barytones" in traditional grammar) with the characteristic of the past categories alternating vowels /a/ and /e/ (together with *shifted stress*), were added to the stem allomorph with stem-final /a/ (*perna-*) replacing the older terminations. This process yielded forms like *pérna-e-s* *perná-a-me* etc. The whole development was accompanied by the insertion of the voiced velar fricative /ɣ/ 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 /ɣ/ seems to have been inserted intervocally at morpheme boundaries, e.g. *petréle-γ-o* (standard *petréle-o*) 'petroleum', 1.PL. *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 the /ɣ/ is inserted in "morphologically indifferent" positions, e.g. *a-j-éras*⁹ 'air, wind' (standard *aéras*). On the other hand there has been at least in some parts of the peninsula a strong tendency in the opposite direction: deletion of intervocalic /ɣ/, especially in the position before front vowels, where it surfaces as [j], whether at a morpheme boundary or not. The evidence seems contradictory and inconclusive. The exact nature of the conditioning of the /ɣ/-insertion (purely phonological or morphophonological) is not clear although the evidence seems to point more to (at least originally) phonological conditioning¹⁰. Further and more detailed research is needed though in order to clear the picture. Suffice it to mention here that, as regards the paradigm

⁸ I have up to now found just one form which, if correctly recorded, would be the only indication of such a process: the 1.PL-form *kalíme* (instead of *kalúme*, *kaló* 'invite') from the village of Lákka (former Ghrópa) in Achaia (SL 2341:12).

⁹The /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.

¹⁰See also Ralli (1987:298ff), Joseph (1998:351f. and p.367).

of the imperfect of the verbs of Class II, the evidence in the vast majority of instances shows presence of the /ɣ/ before terminations with initial /a/, that is the terminations of the 1.SG and of the plural. In the 2. and 3.SG (terminations *-es -e* respectively) the /ɣ/, which in this case would surface as [j], is often omitted in the collections. This has two possible explanations: (a) The /ɣ/ was in the beginning inserted only in environments where it would not undergo any *phonetic* change (/ɣ/ > [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 from the beginning inserted in all forms of the paradigm of the imperfect and was realized as [j] before front vowels (in this case /e/), a position where it was highly unstable though and subject to occasional deletion 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 north¹¹. This segment is regarded by some linguists¹² as being already an aspect marker marking the [-perfective]. This would constitute a case of morphologization of a phonological process which seems to be "partial"¹³ since the new morpheme can still appear only between vowels¹⁴, 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 which, in certain theoretical frames, could be viewed as tense marker ([+past]).

1.5. The absence of stem allomorphy within the paradigm of the imperfect of Type A would suggest that the new imperfect formation appeared *after* the creation of present forms like *perná-o perná-i perná-me perná-ne* instead of *pernó perná pernúme pernúne* - in other words, 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/), 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.

¹¹ 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'.

¹² Babinotis (1972), Ralli (1987).

¹³ See Anderson (1987:331-333).

¹⁴ We probably have here a situation 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/-insertion] 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 intervocally inserted /ɣ/ of Modern Greek, which seems to have developed to a general aspect marker in vocalic verbs (i.e. verbs with stem final vowels), compare *akú-o* 'I hear/listen': *áku-ɣ-a* 'I heard, I was listening', *lé-o* ('say'): *é-le-ɣ-a*, *t'ó-o* ('eat'): *é-tro-ɣ-a*.

Forms like 1.PL. *arxinú-γ-ame* (*arxiná-o* 'begin')¹⁵, 3.PL. *jirnú-γ-ane* (*jirná-o* 'turn')¹⁶ etc. attested from various places in the Peloponnese can serve as strong indications in favour of this hypothesis. This means further that the abandonment of the /a/~u/ alternation ran probably in parallel both in the present *and* the imperfect (although it seems to have proceeded somewhat faster in the imperfect) and that the interpretation from the speakers' side of *both* the sequences *perna-* and *pernu-*, whatever their possible original internal structure, as allomorphs of the verbal stem is highly probable. The vowels /a/ and /u/ would have thus 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.

2.1. Let us now turn to the imperfect of Type B. Here the process may in the beginning have produced analogously structured surface forms:

<u>SINGULAR</u>	<u>PLURAL</u>
<i>e-fórun</i> ¹⁷	<i>e-forú-γ-ame</i>
<i>e-fóri-es/-j-es</i> (→ <i>e-fóri-j-es</i>)	<i>e-forí-γ-ate</i>
<i>e-fóri-e/-j-e</i> (→ <i>e-fóri-j-e</i>)	<i>e-forú-γ-ane</i>

The forms *e-fóri-es* *e-fóri-e* and *e-fórj-es* *e-fórj-e* of the 2. and 3.SG. 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 can be regarded as direct survivals of the original *e-fóri-es* *e-fóri-e* (with occasional synizesis yielding *e-fórj-es* *e-fórj-e*¹⁸) or as products of the following process: *e-fóri-e* > *e-fóri-j-e* (/γ/-insertion, see above) > *e-fór-j-e* (with deletion of /i/ common in PMG) or *e-fóri-e* (with deletion of [j]).

The former existence of forms like the above in the 1.PL and 3.PL, much alike the respective ones we saw above for Type A, is confirmed by relatively numerous attestations from various places of the peninsula. Compare for instance 1.PL *karterúyame* (*karteró*) from Páos (former Skóupi) in Achaia¹⁹, 1.PL *borúyame* (*boró*) from the region of Kynouría (Arkadia)²⁰, 3.PL *forúyane* (*foró*) from Lechená in Elis²¹, 3.PL *zúyane* (*zo*) from Xirokámbi in Lakonia²² etc.. The original /i/~u/ alternation was then abandoned in favour of the vowel /i/ resulting in the current forms e.g. 1.PL. *kratí-γ-ame* (*krat-ó* 'hold') 3.PL. *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 which served as the pivot for levelling was that of the 2.-3.SG. and 2.PL. (*krati-*):

¹⁵ From Piána in Arkadia (SL 2382:23).

¹⁶ From Ellinítsa (former Memi) in Arkadia (SL 1303:22).

¹⁷ This form may have been preserved longer, see above.

¹⁸ For the sake of clarity of argumentation the transcription *j* is used in the present paper in cases where this phone could be regarded as an allophone of /i/.

¹⁹ ILNE 133:56.

²⁰ ILNE 635:7.

²¹ ILNE 900:261.

²² ILNE 1038:68.

<u>SINGULAR</u>	<u>PLURAL</u>
(e-)fóri-γ-a	(e-)fori-γ-ame
(e-)fóri-j-es	(e-)fori-γ-ate
(e-)fóri-j-e	(e-)fori-γ-ane

Yet the development of the imperfect formation of Type B poses a problem with regard to the morphological analysis proposed above for this type of verbs. There it was argued that in the paradigm of the present the alternating vowels /i/ and /u/ are probably not a part of the stem but should rather be considered as parts of the termination, more specifically as «thematic» vowels²³. This seems to be supported by the absence of any levelling tendencies which would give forms like *forime *forine. Yet the development of the imperfect would force us, just like 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 started which led to the current paradigms, a stem *fori-/foru-* displaying allomorphy (/i/ and /u/ being stem-final) and the endings:

<u>SINGULAR</u>	<u>PLURAL</u>
for-ó	forú-me
forí-s	forí-te
forí-	forú-n(e)

This would mean that the speakers would have regarded the alternating sequences *fori-foru-* as allomorphs of the verbal base to which they added the terminations *-a -es -e* etc. characteristic of the past tenses (perfective past of Classes I and II, imperfective past of Class I). These terminations appear always 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 endings- and not as parts of the verbal base, would lead to the 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 frame one is willing to follow for the morphological analysis of the modern Greek verb). Unfortunately, as we saw above, there are no signs of levelling 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 levelling in the imperfect (*fori- ~ foru- > fori-*), or (b) we accept a different morphological analysis for the present and the imperfect (present *for-i- for-u-* where /i/ /u/ «thematic vowels»/parts of the termination : imperfect *fori-* where /i/ stem-final). Solution (b) has the disadvantage of considerable asymmetry in the system of the verbs of Class II. In case (a) we could assume that the leveling simply hasn't started yet. In the meantime a new, stronger and more general tendency leads the verbs of Type B to Type A.

2.2. As for the imperfect of the «monosyllabic» verbs *kljó* etc. the surface outcomes of the developments which took place in the paradigm of the imperfect of those verbs resemble the ones of the other Type-B-verbs (example: *kljó* ‘I close’):

²³See Babiniotis (1972), Ralli (1987).

<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-)klí-γ-an(e)</i>

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

1.SG	<i>é-kli-on</i> > <i>é-kli-a</i> > <i>é-kli-γ-a</i>
1.PL	<i>e-klí-omen</i> > <i>e-klí-ame(n)</i> > <i>e-klí-γ-ame</i>
3.PL	<i>é-kli-on</i> > <i>é-kli-an</i> > <i>é-kli-γ-an</i>

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 is part of the termination:

1.PL	<i>klj-úme</i>
3.PL	<i>klj-úne</i>

All the above explain the fact that in almost the whole of the Peloponnese I have not found forms like 1.PL *kljúyame* or 3.PL *kljúyane*, comparable to *forúyane*²⁴. Thus, despite synzesis and the developments in the imperfect, which rendered the surface forms of the paradigm of the present and the imperfect similar to the respective ones of the verbs of Type B proper, the surface similarity of the verbs *kljó* etc. to the verbs of Type B proper has not been sufficient to render them full members of Type B of Class II at least in the active²⁵. Occasional present forms like *klí-j-i* (3.SG) and *klí-γ-ume* (1.PL)²⁶ and 3.PL *δjalí-γ-une*²⁷ (instead of *δja-lj-úne*, 1.SG present: *δja-ljó* ‘disperse, scatter, dissolve’) can 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.

²⁴ Such forms, which would show shift of morpheme boundaries, are attested only for the variety of the former “municipality of Inoús (Oinoús)” in northeastern Lakonia (see below). Koukoulés (1908:197) mentions the 1.PL-forms *kljúname* from the village of Vresthena, and *kljúyame e-ksjúyame* (*ksjó* ‘scratch, scrape’) and *e-fjúyame* (*fjó* ‘spit’), which point to an analysis from the speakers’ side of the respective forms of the present as *kljú-me ksjú-me* and *fjú-me*, with /u/ having “moved” from the termination to the stem.

²⁵ The total absence of any signs of these verbs passing to Type A (e.g. **ftá-o*), as happened in varieties of Central Greece according to Hatzidakis (1905:273), is in my opinion also a strong indication of the special position of these verbs.

²⁶ Both from Paleá Epídhavros in the Argolis (SL 2987:90). *klíyume* is also attested from Ellinikó (former Moulátsi) in the region of Gortynia (Arkadia) (SL 2966:12).

²⁷ From Vromóvrysi in Messenia (SL 3514:275).

2.3. From a number of villages and the region of West Korinthia²⁸ (see map) forms of the imperfect of Type B like 1.SG *fór-γ-a* 1.PL *fór-γ-ame* 2.PL *fór-γ-ate*²⁹ 3.PL *fór-γ-ane* are attested. The age of these forms is unknown. The earliest attestation of such a form that I am aware of originates from the village of Ichalia in Messenia: *vár-γ-ane* ‘they hit’ (instead of *vari-γ-ane*, present *var-ó*). The form appears in a text (a real narration) published by Politis (1904)³⁰. The “fuller” forms *fóri-γ-an/fori-γ-ane* are in many cases also attested beside *fór-γ-ame fór-γ-ane*. Before attempting to explain these forms, a remark must be made, which has to do with the vowel system of the Peloponnesian varieties. Unstressed vowels, especially /i/ and /u/ drop in some parts of the Peloponnese, not as systematically as in the northern Greek dialects, nevertheless very frequently and in some cases with permanent results. The most favourable environment for this is the position between /r/ and another consonant or the word boundary³¹. Through /i/-deletion the forms of the 1.SG (*e-)**fóri-γ-a* and 3.PL (*e-)**fóri-γ-an* became (*e-)**fór-γ-a* (*e-)**fór-γ-an*, forms which are actually attested. The forms of the 2. and 3.SG *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:

<u>SINGULAR</u>	<u>PLURAL</u>
(<i>e-)</i> <i>fór-γ-a</i>	(<i>e-)</i> <i>fóri-γ-ame</i>
(<i>e-)</i> <i>fór-j-es</i>	(<i>e-)</i> <i>fóri-γ-ate</i>
(<i>e-)</i> <i>fór-j-e</i>	(<i>e-)</i> <i>fór-γ-an</i> (< <i>e-fóri-γ-an</i> , beside <i>e-fori-γ-ane</i>)

The forms *fór-γ-ame fór-γ-ate fór-γ-ane* show levelling of the stem alternation which was caused by the deletion of /i/ in the position between /r/ and /γ/. As for the forms of the 2. and 3.SG, if they represent the older forms (*e-)**fóri-es* > (*e-)**fórj-es* (*e-)**fóri-e* > (*e-)**fórj-e*, they could have been reanalysed (probably already before the emergence of *fór-γ-ame fór-γ-ate fór-γ-ane*) as (*e-)**fór-j-es* (*e-)**fór-j-e* with [j] being reinterpreted as an allophone of the /γ/ this phoneme being realised as [γ] in the rest of the paradigm. What we have here is an interesting case of a sound change disturbing the symmetry of the imperfect paradigm of the verbs of Type B the stems of which contain the /r/³² and, on a larger scale, of the verbs of

²⁸ ILNE 705:156, 200.

²⁹ I haven't yet actually found the form of the 2.PL anywhere in the sources. Yet, the existence of forms like 1.PL. *fór-γ-ame* 3.PL *fór-γ-ane* assures the possible appearance of the form of the 2.PL in appropriate contexts.

³⁰ Part I:297. The text might of course be several years older than its publication in Politis' book.

³¹ The result of /i/-deletion in positions like this is so permanent that it can lead to reanalysis of the structure of the word. Compare e.g. the verb *perisév-o* ‘to be left over, to be superfluous, to be more than is necessary’ which through /i/-deletion appears as *persév-o*. The creation of an imperfect *pérsev-a* -which is actually attested in some places of the peninsula- (instead of *perísev-a*) seems to point to a reanalysis of the word as lacking the /i/ in the underlying representation.

³² The paradigms of the other verbs of Type B don't show such forms (**kál-γ-ame* -present *kal-ó-* or **krát-γ-ane* -present *krat-ó-* for example are not attested).

Type B and of Class II. The step which the speakers undertook after the deletion of /i/ was not towards restoring the deleted /i/ which was preserved in the forms 1. and 2.PL and in the imperfect paradigm of the rest of the verbs of Type B. On the contrary the speakers moved towards “simplifying” the imperfect paradigm of the verbs of Type B of Class II, the stems of which contain the liquid /r/, extending the new stressed /i/-less allomorph to the forms of the paradigm which were not subject to /i/-deletion. This means that they simplified “locally”, in a very restricted area of the system on the basis of surface realizations of forms³³. In the same time they complicated matters in the larger system of the verbs of Type B or, more general, Class II. This development is also a step further in the process of morphologization of the /ɣ/ since this segment can now appear in a position other than its original intervocalic position.

2.4. Evidence from a number of villages (see map) shows a more or less strong tendency towards levelling 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 2.SG *bóre-j-es*³⁴ 3.SG *váre-e*³⁵ 1.PL *foré-ɣ-ame*³⁶ 3.PL *bóre-ɣ-an*³⁷ *fóre-ɣ-an*³⁸ (instead of *bórijes*, *vári(j)e*, *foriyame*, *bóriyan*, *fóriyan*) which in most cases are also attested beside the ones 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 perfective aspect. The interesting point in this development is that the stem allomorph of the perfective past served as the pivot for the change, a fact which stresses the importance of the perfective aspect in the modern Greek verbal system³⁹. The same process is evidenced from various places in the Peloponnese also for the verbs of Type A: 1.PL *metrí-ɣ-ame* (instead of *metráyame*, *metrá-o* ‘measure, count’) and 3.PL *kendí-ɣ-ane* (instead of *kendáyane*, *kendá-o* ‘embroider’)⁴⁰, 3.PL *ɣlendí-ɣ-ane* (instead of *ɣlendáyane*, *ɣlendá-o* ‘celebrate, amuse oneself’)⁴¹, 3.SG *apándi-j-e* (instead of *apándaje*, *apandá-o* ‘meet’)⁴² etc. Compare the respective forms of the perfective past: *metrí-s-ame*, *kendí-s-*

³³ See also Kiparsky (1982:230), Joseph (1992).

³⁴ From Ághios Nikólaos (region of Kalávryta-Achaia) (SL 1652:7).

³⁵ From Vlachokerasiá (Arkadia) (ILNE 843:217, 218).

³⁶ From Ághios Flóros (Messenia) (SL 3334:23).

³⁷ From Vlachokerasiá (Arkadia) (ILNE 843:213).

³⁸ From Mavriki (Arkadia) (SL 1657:22, 23, 24, 25).

³⁹ The importance and the central position of the “aorist” (perfective) in the verbal system of Modern Greek has already been stressed and extensively laid out by Seiler (1952). Evidence from the diachronic evolution of Greek (constant remodelings of the “present” - i.e. imperfective- stems with the ones of the perfective as starting points) and in our case from processes observed in PMG, offers important evidence for the position of the perfective in Modern Greek.

⁴⁰ From Nerómylos (Messenia) (SL 1795:32,62).

⁴¹ From Longanikos (Lakonia) (SL 3517:374).

⁴² From Orchomenós (Arkadia) (SL 2364:79).

ane, ylendī-s-ane, apándī-s-ε. The interesting point about processes like this is that the speakers, through this redistribution of the stem allomorphs they undertake, seem to be moving away from the morphological unity (at least as regards the stem form) of the imperfective aspect and towards an increase of morphological uniformity of the past. The stem allomorphs seem to be redistributed according to the category of tense.

3.1. Let us now turn to the formation of the imperfective past in the varieties of a number of villages, which are all situated around Mt.Parnon (see map). In these villages we have an imperfect formation with a suffix *-n-* with no sign of stem allomorphy within the paradigm of the imperfect:

<u>SINGULAR</u>	<u>PLURAL</u>
<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 who records this formation (1908:197) for the villages of the “municipality of ‘Inoús’ (Oinoús)”⁴⁴ except Vamvakoú, is not very clear in this passage as to whether this formation was used only with the verbs of Type B or *both* Type A and B and in exactly which of the villages which made up the municipality⁴⁵. Furthermore it is not very clear if this formation coexisted with the γ -formation in free alternation (e.g. *fórunes* beside *fóra-j-es* or *fóri-j-es*) in the variety of ‘Inoús’. As for the village of Vamvakoú, as can be inferred from what he writes, in its variety the distinction between Type A and Type B had perhaps been abandoned in favour of Type A and only the γ -formation was in use⁴⁶. As for the villages of Pighádhī (region of Kynouría-Arkadia) and Ághīi Anárghyri (former Zoúpena, region of Lakonia) there is evidence for the use of the *n*-formation beside the γ -formation in free alternation, use of the *n*-formation with verbs of both types⁴⁷ (see below) but also abandonment of the original morphological distinction between the two types:

⁴³ In some of the instances however such forms could be evidence for the verb belonging originally to Type B, the imperfect of which shows forms similar to the ones listed here.

⁴⁴ Vrésthena, Vamvakoú, Varvítsa, Vassarás, Véria, Megháli Vrýsi, Karyés (former Aráchova).

⁴⁵ I am inclined to interpret Koukoulés as recording the *n*-formation only for the verbs of Type B. Yet the first sentence of page 197 is again confusing. On p.156 he published a demotic song, in the second verse of which the imperfect form *e-rovólunan* (3.PL) ‘they rushed downhill’. The verb is generally recorded as a verb of Type A (*rovólá-o*).

⁴⁶ P.197: «βάρουνα βάρουνες βάρουνε (εν Βαμβ. εβάρουνα εξ ενεσ. βάράω)» instead of original *varó varís vari* which seems to have been preserved in the other villages (p.196). At the bottom of the same page he also mentions the form *forá-γ-ame* from Vamvakoú (instead of *forí-γ-ame* or perhaps *forúname*).

⁴⁷ Note also the interesting imperfect forms 3.SG *áku-n-e* 3.PL *áku-n-an* from Ághīi Anárghyri (SL 2950:25) which show use of the *n*-formation also with the vocalic verb *akú-o* ‘hear, listen’, a verb with stem-final /u/ but no stem alternation (present *akú-o akú-i akú-te*, imperfect *áku-γ-a*, aorist *áku-s-a*).

Pighádhhi: 1.SG *bórun-a* 3.SG *bórun-an* (*bor-ó*)⁴⁸, originally verb of Type B
 1.PL *travún-ame* (*travá-o* ‘pull’)⁴⁹, verb of Type A
 Ághii Anárghyri: 3.SG *filun-e* (*fil-ó* ‘kiss’)⁵⁰, originally verb of Type B
 1.SG *pétun-a* 3.PL *petún-ane*⁵¹ (*petá-o* ‘throw’), verb of Type A

As for the village of Voúrvoura (region of Kynouría-Arkadia) in the respective collections from the archive of the Academy of Athens’ Historical Lexicon of the Modern Greek Language (ILNE 346 dated around 1920, ILNE 635 dated from 1942) this formation has not been recorded for the region of northwestern Kynouría (north of ‘Inoús’ the latter belonging to Lakonia)⁵². But in a demotic song from Voúrvoura published in the review *Laoghrafia* (1911:570) an imperfect form *e-filjun-a* (instead of *e-fili-γ-a*, present *filjó* ‘kiss’) appears. But demotic songs often “travel”, so one could imagine this song having spread to Voúrvoura from the adjacent area of ‘Inoús’.

3.2. For Aráchova (now Karyés) 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:

	<u>SINGULAR</u>	<u>PLURAL</u>
<i>varó</i> ‘hit’:	<i>váruna</i>	<i>varúyame</i>
	<i>várunes</i>	<i>varúyate</i>
	<i>várune</i>	<i>várúyan / varúyane</i> ⁵³

The /n/ and /γ/ can be regarded as having morphemic status ([+perfective]), just like the /γ/ in the imperfects of the *pérnaya-* and *fóriya-*type⁵⁴. The creation of the new morpheme *-n-* is based on the forms of the 1.SG⁵⁵ *e-pérnun* and *e-fórun*. Forms like these had become morphologically opaque⁵⁶. The majority of the Peloponnesian varieties simply replaced these forms by totally new and more transparent ones built on the stems with stem-final /a/ (Type A) and /i/ (Type B) by means of the termination *-a* (*e-pérna-(γ-)a*, *e-fóri-(γ-)a*), just as they did in the other forms of the paradigm. In the varieties which we are dealing with in this section, except in the variety of Aráchova, the speakers added to the whole “unanalysable” form, in which the morpheme boundaries were lost, the termination *-a* and

⁴⁸ SL 2959:65, 20.

⁴⁹ SL 2959:65.

⁵⁰ SL 2950:77.

⁵¹ SL 2950:27, 85.

⁵² Koukoulés himself records (1908:73) that the variety of Inoús bears very little resemblance to the variety of the adjacent region of Kynouría without going into details about this statement.

⁵³ Koukoulés (1908:197) regards forms like *borúyame* as blends: *borúname* × *boráyame*. Apart from theoretical difficulties, one could ask why the same process did not take place in the singular giving **bóruya* **bórujes* **bóruje*. See also Hock (1986:189-192, 197-198).

⁵⁴ But see also Babiniotis (1972, p.212), where he proposes a different analysis for this formation: *e-kín-un-a* ‘I moved (transitive), I set off’ with a suffix *-un-*.

⁵⁵ See also Babiniotis (1972:211-213).

⁵⁶ Or: ‘opacity’ see Hock (1986:271-274), Mayerthaler (1980).

then extended the new formation to the rest of the paradigm resulting in e.g. 3.SG (*e-*)*pérnun-e* 1.PL (*e-*)*forún-ame* etc. The fact that the *-γ*-formation appears beside the *-n*-formation (alternating freely with the latter) in the collections from Ághii Anárghyri and Pighádhi has two possible explanations: Either both formations coexisted in free alternation from the beginning in the paradigm of the imperfect and none of them has yet ousted the other, or the forms with the suffix *-γ* have found their way into the varieties of both villages rather recently under the influence of the varieties of adjacent areas or the spoken MGK or even internal change. Judging from what follows with regard to the variety of Arahova the latter explanation is more probable.

As regards the variety of Aráchova (now Karyés) we have an interesting case of number-oriented allomorphy at the level of aspect 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. The *-n* was no longer regarded as the ending but as part of the stem. This reanalysis was perhaps brought about by the strong influence other past categories exerted on those of Class II with the termination *-a* carrying the function '1.SG.PAST' in the biggest part of the verbal system. The now "endingless" form was as a whole added the termination *-a* becoming *e-fórun-a*⁵⁷. In the rest of the paradigm which was morphologically more transparent than the form of the 1.SG displaying the "ordinary" endings *-s*, *-*, *-me*, *-te*, *-n*, the terminations *-es* *-e* *-ame* *-ate* *-an(e)* were added to the sequences *perna-* ~ *pernu-* (for Type A) and *fori-* ~ *foru-* (for Type B) -which were regarded as the stems- yielding *pérna-es* *pernú-γ-ame* (with /γ/-insertion, later *perná-γ-ame*, see §1.4.) etc. and *fóri-es* *forú-γ-ame* (with /γ/-insertion, later *fóri-γ-ame*, see above) etc. Thus the paradigm of the imperfect must at some point in time have resembled in the variety of Aráhova the following:

<u>SINGULAR</u>	<u>PLURAL</u>
(<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/~lγ/ between the 1.SG and the 1.PL did not have any phonological basis so it was reanalysed as being connected to a morphosyntactic feature: number. The alternation /n/~lγ/ was correlated with number distinction⁵⁸: the /n/ with the singular and the /lγ/, which probably appeared originally only in the plural (before /a/, see §1.4.), with the plural⁵⁹. From the 1.SG 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*. The reason why this alternation did not occur also in the varieties of the other villages of 'Inoús' (Oinoús) lies in the fact that there the emergence of the form (*e-*)*fórun-a* and the spread of this formation to the rest of the paradigm of the imperfect took place perhaps *before* the emergence of the imperfect formation e.g. 3.SG (*e-*)*pérna-e* 1.PL (*e-*)*forú-γ-ame* etc, that is at the stage where forms like *e-pérna-* *e-forú-me* were still in use. This is furthermore the reason why I think that occasionally appearing forms in *-a-es* *-á-γ-ame* etc. in collections of material

⁵⁷ A case of "doubling of morphemes" in the sense of Koch (1996:246).

⁵⁸ See also Lass (1990:83-87).

⁵⁹ See also Koch (1996, Ch.4) and Mayerthaler (1980).

from Ághii Anárgyri and Pighádhí are recent and perhaps due to influence from other varieties or even due to internal change in the varieties of these villages themselves.

References

- Anderson S., 1987: "Morphological Change", *Linguistics: The Cambridge Survey Vol.I* (ed. by F.J.Newmeyer): 324-362.
- Babinotis G., 1972: *To ríma tis Ellinikís*. University of Athens.
- Bybee J., 1985: *Morphology*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Hatzidakis G., 1892: *Einführung in die neugriechische Grammatik*.
 ———, 1905: *Mesaioniká kai Néa Elleniká A*. Athens: Sakellariou.
- Hock H.H., 1986: *Principles of Historical Linguistics*. Berlin et al.: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Joseph B., 1992: "Diachronic Explanation: Putting Speakers back into the Picture", *Explanation in Historical Linguistics* (ed. by G.Davis & G.Iverson): 123-144.
- , 1998: "Diachronic Morphology", *The Handbook of Morphology* (ed. by A.Spencer & A.Zwicky): 351-373.
- Kiparsky P., 1982: "Analogical Change as a Problem for Linguistic Theory", *Explanation in Phonology* (ed. by G.J.de Haan & W.Zonneveld): 217-236.
- Koch H., 1996: "Reconstruction in Morphology", *The Comparative Method Reviewed* (ed. by M.Durie & M.Ross): 218-263.
- Lass R., 1990: "How to do things with junk: exaptation in language evolution", *Journal of Linguistics* 26 (1990):79-102.
- Koukoulés Ph., 1908: *Oinountiaká*. Hania: Michael Saliveros.
- Mayerthaler W.: "Aspekte der Analogietheorie", *Kommunikationstheoretische Grundlagen des Sprachwandels* (ed. by H.Lüdtke): 80-130.
- Politis N., 1904: *Μελέται περί του βίου και της γλώσσης του ελληνικού λαού-Παραδόσεις, Μέρος Α'* ("Studies in the Life and the Language of the Greek People-Traditions, Part I"). Athens: Sakellariou.
- Ralli A., 1987: *Éléments de morphologie du grec moderne: La structure du verbe*. Université de Montréal.
- Seiler H., 1952: *L' aspect et le temps dans le verbe néo-grec*. Paris: Les belles lettres.

