

“Split deponency” in Proto-Indo-European

Laura Grestenberger
Lgresten@fas.harvard.edu

Oct. 25, 2013
25th Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference

1 Introduction

The term ‘deponents’ is traditionally applied to verbs that take non-active (middle or passive) morphology, but are semantically and syntactically active (Lat. *dē-pōnere* ‘lay aside’ (sc. the verb’s passive meaning), *verbum dēpōnens*¹) in languages which morphologically distinguish (at least) between a synthetic active and non-active voice.

The goals of this talk:

- Clarify methodological and terminological problems in discussing deponents in PIE
- Give an account of what “canonical” use of the middle voice meant in (late) PIE
- Show that PIE had instances of “non-canonical” use of the middle voice, i.e., true deponents
- Argue that non-canonical use was restricted to certain tense-aspect stems

1.1 Canonical uses of the middle voice

As recognized widely in the literature (e.g. Klaiman 1991, Kemmer 1993, 1994, Embick 1998, Kaufmann 2007, Alexiadou and Doron 2012, etc.), middle (or “non-active”) voice tends to have the same set of functions cross-linguistically in languages that have an active–non-active voice opposition.

- (1) a. Anticausatives/inchoatives: Verbs designating spontaneous, non-externally caused changes of state verbs (i.e., Engl. intransitive *break*, *open*, *grow*, *bloom*, Skt. *várdhate* ‘grows’ (itr.) — *várdhati* ‘grows’ (tr.), *váhate* ‘drives, moves’ — *váhati* ‘drive sbdy./sth.’, etc.)
- b. Naturally reflexive verbs (Engl. *wash*, *comb*, Gk. *λούομαι* ‘wash myself’ — *λούω* ‘wash sth.’, etc.); naturally reciprocal verbs (Engl. *meet*, *kiss*), indirect reflexives (self-benefactives, e.g. Skt. *yájate* ‘sacrifices for him-/herself’ — *yájati* ‘sacrifices’, etc.)

¹Apparently “eine der naivsten und dilettantischsten Bezeichnungen in der grammatischen Terminologie der Alten.” (Brugmann 1895, 111). For a thorough (and more balanced) discussion of the history of the term see Flobert 1975.

- c. Dispositional/generic middles (Engl. *This book sells well*)
- d. Medio-passives (Engl. *get-passive*)

NB these functions are typically those of “oppositional” middles, in which the meaning of the middle is (somehow) opposed to the meaning of the active.

Moreover, Kemmer (1993) and Zombolou and Alexiadou (2012) add the following non-oppositional functions of the middle voice that can be considered canonical:

- (2) a. Denominative and deadjectival verbs (e.g., Engl. *hammer, flatten, redden*, etc.)
- b. Verbs of cognition and perception, “psych verbs”, “experiencer verbs” (e.g., *know, think, hear, remember, smell, fear, ..*)
- c. Verbs of translational motion (*run, climb, approach,...*)
- d. Statives (*have, be, sit ...*)

Beside the canonical/oppositional functions of the middle, the typological & theoretical literature usually recognizes transitive deponents as instances of non-canonical use of middle morphology (e.g., Embick 1998, Zombolou and Alexiadou 2012).

- (3) Generalization: Synthetic active–non-active voice systems have transitive deponents

These non-canonical uses of middle morphology are sometimes referred to as “feature mismatch”², that is, they display a mismatch between morphology and expected syntactic function. I will use this terminology in the following to distinguish canonical from non-canonical uses of middle morphology.

1.2 Summary: Canonical vs. non-canonical middles

If being a deponent means “laying aside” the canonical function associated with middle (or, in general, non-active) morphology, then the term should only be used for verbs with non-canonical syntax and meaning.

Table 1: Uses of the middle

Canonical		Non-canonical
Oppositional middles	<i>Media tantum</i>	Deponents
Anti-causative/inchoative	Anti-causative/inchoative	Active, transitive, agentive
Reflexive/reciprocal/self-benefactive	Reflexive/reciprocal/self-benefactive	
Dispositional	Dispositional	
Medio-passive	(Medio-passive)	
	Denominal/deadjectival	
	Psych verbs, verbs of emotion and cognition	
	Verbs of (translational) motion	
	States	

²Cp. the papers in Baerman et al. (2007).

- (4) Definition of deponency (general)
 “In an active—non-active voice system, all finite forms of a deponent verb are morphologically non-active, but syntactically active and do not instantiate any of the canonical uses of non-active voice.”

Criteria for active syntax:

- Accusative direct objects
- External argument = agent
- Passivization possible
- Agent noun formation possible
- Agent-oriented adverbs possible

Feature mismatch verb: A verb that fulfils the definition of deponency in (4).

2 Deponency in IE

Deponents (as defined above) in the IE daughter branches tend to only make a primary imperfective (present) stem (line b. in the following table), while verbs alternating between active and middle usually make both an imperfective and a perfective (aorist) stem (a.), where either can be primary. While a few deponents also have a derived middle aorist (c.), there are no deponents that *only* have an aorist stem (d.) or where the aorist stem is primary. This holds for at least Indo-Iranian, Ancient Greek, and (with some caveats) Latin.

Table 2: Deponents and aspect

	pres.act.	pres.mid.	aor.act.	aor.mid.
a. Alternating	✓	✓	✓	✓
b. Deponent 1	✗	✓	✗	✗
c. Deponent 2	✗	✓	✗	✓
d. Not attested: Deponent 3	✗	✗	✗	✓

2.1 Case study 1: Vedic

Corpus: Rigveda.

Table 3. Vedic deponents

Root	Present	Perfect	Aorist	PIE root
$\bar{i}ks$ ‘see’	3du.ipf. $\bar{a}ik\bar{s}et\bar{a}m$			* h_3ek^u
$\bar{i}j$ ‘impel’	$\bar{i}jate$			* $h_2e\hat{g}$
$\bar{i}d$ ‘praise’	$\bar{i}tte$	$\bar{i}le$		* $h_2e\hat{i}sd$
$\bar{i}s$ ‘rule, own’	$\bar{i}se, \bar{i}ste$			* $He\hat{i}k$
gu ‘praise’	(int.) $j\acute{o}guve$			* $geu\hat{h}_2$
$gras$ ‘devour’	3du.ipv. $gr\acute{a}set\bar{a}m$	$jagras\bar{a}n\acute{a}$ -		* $gre(n)s$
$tr\bar{a}$ ‘protect’	$tr\acute{a}yante$	$tatre$	[sub. $tr\bar{a}sate$, etc. (10x)] ³	
$d\bar{a}$ ‘split up, distribute’	$d\acute{a}yate$		aor.opt. $di\bar{s}i\bar{y}a$ (1x) ⁴	(* deh_2-i-)
pat ‘rule’	$p\acute{a}tyate$			(* $poti-e-$)
$b\bar{a}dh$ ‘attack’	$b\acute{a}dhate$	$bab\bar{a}dh\acute{e}$	$b\bar{a}dhi\bar{s}ta$ (1x)	
$rabh$ ‘seize’	$rabhante$	$r\bar{a}rabhe^5, rebhir\acute{e}$	$\acute{a}rabdha^6$ (1x)	* $lemb^h$
$v\bar{r}$ ‘choose’	$v\bar{r}\bar{n}t\acute{e}$	$vavr\bar{s}e$	$avri$ (1x), $v\bar{r}ta$ (1x), $varanta$ (1x) ⁷	* $uelh_1$
$\acute{s}am$ ‘work, perform’	$\acute{s}am\bar{a}yate$	$\acute{s}as\bar{a}m\acute{e}$	$\acute{a}sami\bar{s}ta^8$ (2x)	* $\hat{k}emh_2$

³Narten 1964, 131f. argues that the Rigvedic forms are not evidence for a productive *s*-aor. paradigm; the ipvs. $tr\bar{a}sva$ and $tr\bar{a}dhvam$ are analyzed as belonging to a middle root present by Whitney (1885) and Macdonell (1910).

⁴Root aor.opt. $ad\bar{i}mah\acute{i}$ in VS, TS, KS, MS, see Narten 1964, 138ff.

⁵1x perf.act. in RV 8.45.20.

⁶The root later makes an *s*-aorist, and this is how Whitney (1885) and Macdonell (1910) interpret this form, cp.Narten (1964, 218).

⁷Aor.subj.act. (3x), aor.opt.mid. (2x).

⁸Modelled on $\acute{a}jani\bar{s}ta$ and apparently passive in RV 5.2.7, Narten (1964, 254), Geldner (1951).

2.1.1 Media Tantum

NB I only summarize *transitive* media tantum here, since these could potentially be mistaken for deponents (and some are, in fact, borderline cases). Unambiguous cases like *sáye* ‘lies’ are therefore not included here.

This also means that transitivity alone is not a reliable diagnostic for deponent status.

Table 4. Vedic transitive media tantum (canonical)

Root	Present	Perfect	Aorist	PIE root
<i>uh</i> ‘notice, consider’	<i>óhate</i>		<i>aúhiṣta</i> (1x)	*h ₁ ueg ^{uh}
<i>gāh</i> ‘reach, dive in’	<i>gáhate</i>			*g ^(u) eǵ ^h
<i>cyu</i> ‘move’ (itr./tr.)	<i>cyavante</i> ⁹	<i>cucyuvé</i>	<i>cyoṣtāh</i> (1x)	*k ^u ie _u
<i>nas</i> ‘return’	<i>násate</i>		Opt. <i>nasīmahi</i> (1x)	*nes
<i>man</i> ‘think, consider’	<i>mányate</i>	2du. <i>mamnáthe</i>	<i>ámata</i> , <i>mananta</i> (2x, subj. 22x?), <i>amamṣata</i> (17x)	*men
<i>mud</i> ‘enjoy’	<i>módate</i>	[1x act. <i>mumóda</i>]	opt. <i>mudīmahi</i> (1x)	*meud
<i>mṛṣ</i> ‘forget’	<i>mṛṣyate</i>	<i>mamárṣa</i>	<i>mṛṣthāh</i> (1x), <i>mṛṣanta</i> (1x), <i>marṣiṣthāh</i> (1x)	*mers
<i>spṛdh</i> ‘fight’	<i>spárdhante</i>	<i>paspṛdhré</i>	<i>aspṛdhran</i> (2x)	*sperd ^h

2.1.2 Summary

Vedic deponents tend to be restricted to imperfective formations; aorists (in particular old aorists) are more likely to be found with media tantum.

⁹Act. *cyávam* (1x) in RV 1.165.10.

2.2 Case study 2: Greek

Corpus: Homer, *Iliad* & *Odyssey*.

Table 5. Greek deponents

Present	Aorist	Meaning	PIE root
αἶνυμαι		‘take’	* h_2ai
ἀρνέομαι	ἀρνήσασθαι	‘refuse’	* h_2res
ἄρνυμαι	ἀρόμην; ἤρατο	‘win, carry off’	* h_2er
βούλομαι, βόλομαι		‘wish, will’	* g^uelh_3
δέχομαι, [3pl. δέχεται]	ἔδεξάμην; δέκτο	‘accept, receive’	* dek
δίζημαι		‘seek’	* ieh_2
δύναμαι	δυνήσατο; ἐδυνάσθη	‘be able to (do)’	* $deuh_2$
(ε)ἔλδομαι		‘desire, wish for’	* h_1uel
ἐρέπτομαι		‘feed on’	* $(h_1)rep$
ἐρεύγομαι	ἤρυγεν	‘belch out’	* $(h_1)reug$
ἔρῳμαι, ἐρύομαι, ῥύομαι	ἐρύσατο, εἰρύσατο, ἐρύσσατο	‘protect, shield’	* uer
εὔχομαι, [εὔκτο]	εὔξάμην	‘pray’	* h_1ueg^{uh}
καίνυμαι		‘excel, surpass’	[* $k/kend$]
κέλομαι		‘exhort, command’	* kel
λάζομαι		‘take’	* $sleh_2g^u$
μαίομαι	ἐπ-εμάσσατο	‘seek’	* mes
μήδομαι, μέδομαι	μήσατο	‘plan, devise’	* med
μνάομαι		‘be mindful of; court’	* $mneh_2$
ᾄνομαι	ᾄνοσάμην; ᾄνατο	‘scorn’	* h_2neh_3
ὄσσομαι		‘see’	* h_3ek^u
πονέομαι	πονήσατο	‘work at, attend to’	* $(s)penh_1$

2.3 Preliminary conclusion

- Vedic deponents are based on an imperfective stem and avoid aorists, Vedic *media tantum* can be based either on a perfective or an imperfective stem.
- Greek deponents and *media tantum* both form productive aorists (*s*-aorists, *θη*-aorists). However, only *media tantum* can be based on an old root aorist (not productive), e.g., ἄλτο, ᾤρτο ...

3 PIE deponent vs. media tantum paradigms

3.1 Proto-Indo-European deponents

Based on the evidence from Greek and Vedic, we can already reconstruct a number of “mis-match verbs” (deponents) that in all likelihood go back to PIE, provided we exclude cases of “canonical” use of the middle voice.

1. $*h_2e\tilde{i}s\tilde{d}$ ‘praise, revere’: Ved. $\acute{i}tte$ ‘implores, beseeches’, perf. $\bar{i}lé < *h_2i-h_2is\tilde{d}-a\tilde{i}$; Hom. $\acute{\alpha}\tilde{\iota}\delta\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ ‘be reverent of, fear’ ($\acute{\alpha}\tilde{\iota}\delta\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$)
2. $*deh_2-i-$ ‘distribute’ ($*i$ -present, Jasanoff 2003, 104f, with metathesis of $*dah_2\tilde{i}- > *da\tilde{i}h_2-$), Ved. $d\acute{a}yate$ ‘distributes’ (also $ava-dy\acute{a}ti$ (YV) ‘takes away’); Gk. $\delta\acute{\alpha}\iota\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ ‘distribute’.
3. $*h_3ek^u$ ‘behold, catch sight of’: Ved. $\bar{i}\tilde{s} < desiderative *h_3i-h_3^u-se/o-$, Ved. $\acute{i}k\tilde{s}ate$; Gk. $\acute{\omicron}\sigma\sigma\omicron\mu\alpha\iota < *h_3k^u-\tilde{i}e/o-$, fut. $\acute{\omicron}\psi\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$.
4. $*He\tilde{i}k\hat{}$ ‘appropriate, seize’: Toch. B $ai\tilde{s}t\ddot{a}r$ ‘recognizes’; Ved. $\acute{i}se$ ‘owns, has power over’ ($< perf. *Hi-Hi\hat{k}- \leftarrow *He-Hi\hat{k}-$), OAv. $is\bar{e}$).
5. $*h_1ueg^{uh}$ ‘speak solemnly’: Ved. $\acute{o}hate$, OAv. $aog\acute{a}d\bar{a}$, Gk. $\epsilon\tilde{\upsilon}\chi\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ (older athematic $\epsilon\tilde{\upsilon}\chi\alpha\tau\omicron < *h_1e-h_1ug^{uh}-$ (LIV², 253, Villanueva Svensson (2012, 335))¹⁰.
6. $*peh_2-s$ ‘protect’¹¹: s -present or desiderative $*peh_2-s-$: Hitt. $pa\tilde{h}\tilde{s}$ ¹²; Toch. A class II pres. $p\bar{a}\tilde{s}t\ddot{a}r/p\bar{a}\tilde{s}t\ddot{a}r$, 3pl. $p\bar{a}\tilde{s}ant\ddot{a}r$ (Jasanoff 2012, Malzahn 2010a, 699).
7. $*h_2neh_3$ ‘scorn’: Gk. $\acute{\omicron}\nu\omicron\mu\alpha\iota, \acute{\omega}\nu\omicron\sigma\acute{\alpha}\mu\eta\gamma$; Hitt. $\tilde{h}annari$.
8. $*med$ ‘measure, discern’: Gk. $\mu\acute{\eta}\delta\omicron\mu\alpha\iota, \mu\acute{\epsilon}\delta\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ ‘devise’, $\mu\acute{\eta}\sigma\alpha\tau\omicron$, OAv. aor.subj. $masat\bar{a}$; OIr. $midithir$ ‘judge’; Lat. $medeor$ ‘help’.
9. $*pot\tilde{i}e/o-$ ‘be master over, own’: inherited denominative deponent ($*p\acute{o}ti-$ ‘lord, master’): Ved. $p\acute{a}tyate$, Lat. $potior$.
10. $*ues$ ‘wear clothes’: Ved. $v\acute{a}ste$, aor.3pl. $avasran$. Both in Indo-Iranian and Greek, this verb is transitive (direct object = thing being worn, cp. Eichner 1968):

(5) RV 4.2.19: $\acute{r}t\acute{a}m\ avasrann\ u\tilde{s}\acute{a}so\ vibh\acute{a}t\tilde{i}\tilde{h}$
“The radiant dawns clothed themselves in truth”¹³

¹⁰But a full grade athematic $*h_1eug^{uh}-tor$ would also give the Greek and Indo-Iranian forms.

¹¹The root $*peh_2$ is not exclusively deponent, Indo-Iranian has an active root present Ved. $p\acute{a}ti$, OAv. $p\acute{a}t$ and a subjunctive $p\bar{a}\tilde{s}ati$, cp. also the “ si -imperative” Hitt. $pa\tilde{h}\tilde{s}i < *peh_2-si < haplogized *peh_2-se-si$, Jasanoff (2012), etc.

¹²Classified by LIV², 460 as active mi -verb, but active forms are practically non-existent until the Neo-Hittite period. Kloekhorst (2008, 612) points out that $pa\tilde{h}\tilde{s}-$ takes on the active $hi-$ rather than the mi -inflection when it is finally transformed into an active verb (the form $pa\tilde{h}\tilde{h}a\tilde{s}mi$ cited by LIV² is actually attested only once, whereas $pa\tilde{h}\tilde{h}a\tilde{s}hi$ is much more frequent).

¹³Insler (1968).

The Greek cognate of *váste*, εἶμαι, synchronically functions as the perfect of the renewed present ἔννομι. It also takes accusative objects, and its participle has active syntax:

- (6) Hom., Od. 15.331:
 χλαίνας εὖ εἰμέννοι ἦδ' ἔχιτωνας
 “wearing clothes and tunics”

The same is true of Hittite *wēšta* ‘wears’, which can be intransitive and transitive with an accusative object (Kloekhorst 2008, 1004ff.), and active and transitive with the reflexivizing particle *-za* and an accusative object. The latter construction must be an innovation of Hittite.

11. **ues* ‘graze, eat’: Hitt. *wešiyattari* ‘grazes’ (tr./itr.) (Kloekhorst (2008, 1007f.): denominative to *weši-* c. ‘pasture’?); Lat. *vēscor* ‘nourishes oneself (with), eats’ (+ abl., acc.)

... and maybe:

12. Ir. **trā* ‘protect’: Ved. *tráyate*, OAv. *θrāzdūm* (= Ved. *trádhvam*), etc.
 13. **gres/grens* ‘devour’: Ved. *grásate* (perf. mid. opt. *jagrasīta*) = Greek γράω ‘eat, gnaw’¹⁴?
 14. **uer* ‘protect; fend off, stop’: Gk. ἔρῳμαι, ἐρούομαι, perf. εἴρῳμαι; Ved. *várate* (aor.subj.), *vāráyate*.

These have a very different profile from canonical middles: They are based on present/imperfective stems rather than aorist/perfective stems and lack old aorist formations altogether.

3.2 Proto-Indo-European Media tantum

3.2.1 Presents

See Villanueva Svensson (2012)¹⁵, e.g.,

- **keǵ* ‘lie’: Ved. *sáye*, *sére*, Gk. κεῖται, Hitt. *kitta(ri)*, CLuw. *zīyar(i)*, etc.
- **h₁es*¹⁶ ‘sit’: Ved. *áste*, YAv. 3pl. *āṅhāire*, Gk. ἵσται, Hitt. *eša(ri)* < **h₁e-h₁s-(t)or* or < **h₁ēs-(t)or*.
- **sek^u* ‘join, accompany, follow’: Ved. *sácate*, OAv. *hacaitē*, Gk. ἔπομαι, Lat. *sequor*, OIr. *sechithir*. Aorist formations: Ved. *sacāná-*, opt. *sacīmahi*,¹⁷ Gk. ἐσπόμην.¹⁸
sek^u takes accusative objects in the individual languages, e.g.:

¹⁴The Cypriot Greek act.ipv. γράσθι ‘devour!’ is apparently late, Masson (1983, 280).

¹⁵NB most of his examples of *duhé*-presents are grouped in the next section because they are ultimately derived from a primary aorist, cp. Jasanoff (2003, 169ff.)

¹⁶LIV², 232: **h₁eh₁s* ‘sit (down), occupy sth.’, but see Villanueva Svensson (2012, 335, fn. 7).

¹⁷Could be an inner-Vedic formation, Narten 1964, 262.

¹⁸Active forms of this root include Ved. 3sg. *síṣakti*, 3pl. *sáscati*, YAv. *-hišhaxti*, the Avestan active pres.subj. *hēcā* in Y.46.1. (which LIV², 525 classifies as an aorist subjunctive). Note that the active forms have the same range of functions as the middle ones, so these were not oppositional actives.

- (7) Vedic, RV 4.7.11c:
vā́tasya med́iṃ sácate (...)
 “He follows the roar of the wind”
- (8) OIr., MI. 19b11:
ní sechethar immurgu ord oc suidiu
 “They do not, however, follow the order in this”

In Vedic, the instrumental is more common, the predicate then means ‘join with, go together with’, e.g.:

- (9) RV 1.145.2:
śyá krátvā sacate ápradr̥pitaḥ
 “The one who isn’t careless follows his insight”

Cp. Greek, where ἔπομαι is usually constructed with dative objects (although accusative is occasionally found, too).

- (10) Hom., Od., 9.159:
νῆες μὲν μοι ἔποντο δυῶδεκα
 “Twelve ships followed me”

- **h₁erǵ^h* ‘go up, climb’: Hitt. *arkatta* ‘mounts sexually’; Gk. ὀρχέομαι ‘dances’¹⁹.
- **mag^h* ‘be able to, enable, achieve’: Ved. *á mahe*²⁰ < **mag^h-oi*; Gk. μάχομαι ‘fight’ (+ dat.); OCS *mogo*; Goth. *mag*, ‘be able to’.

3.2.2 Aorists

Quite a large group of inherited media tantum are based on a **h₂e*-conjugation paradigm in a “stative-intransitive system” (Jasanoff 2003, cp. also Meiser 2009):

¹⁹Maybe also ἔρχομαι ‘come, go’, if this is not a **skē/o*-present to **h₁er* ‘reach sth., stand’ (LIV², 238; 239), but note that the other attested **skē/o*-presents to this root are active (Ved. *ῥecháti* ‘reaches’, Hitt. *āraskizzi* ‘reaches’, OP *-ársatiy* ‘comes’). If ἔρχομαι does go back to **h₁erǵ^h*, it provides another parallel of transitive use with Hittite, since it is used with accusatives designating the path/goal of the action, e.g. in Il. 1.322: ἔρχεσθον κλισίην ... Ἴαχίλῃος “go to the hut of Achilles”, etc. Hitt. *ark-* is almost exclusively transitive (Friedrich and Kammenhuber 1975-84, I, 301), the formally active *ārki* attested in a Neo-Hittite text (KBo 10.45 iv 30) is probably not old (a variant of the same text has *arga*)

²⁰Act. optative *mahema* attested twice in the RV.

Table 6. Media tantum/“stative-intransitive systems”:

root	aorist	present	perfect	stat.-itr. pres.
* <i>b^heud^h</i> 'wake up'	Ved. <i>ábodhi</i> , <i>ábudhran</i> , <i>budhánta</i> “woke up”, Gk. <i>ἐπυθόμην</i> ‘I learned’	Ved. <i>budhya-</i> ‘wake up’, YAv. (-) <i>būiḍiia-</i> ‘wake up’, Gk. <i>πέυθομαι</i> ‘learn, perceive’	Gk. <i>πέπυσμα</i> ‘have learned, know’, Ved. <i>bubudhānā-</i> ‘woken up’	OCS <i>bъditъ</i>
* <i>g_{eu}s</i> 'try, taste'	Ved. <i>jūṣāṇá-</i> , <i>ajūṣata</i> , <i>jūṣanta</i> , <i>ajūṣran</i> ‘like, try’	Gk. <i>γεύομαι</i> ‘taste’ ²¹	Ved. <i>jūjóṣa</i> ‘has tried, likes’, Goth. <i>kaus</i> ‘tested’	
* <i>leg^h</i> 'lie down'	Hitt. <i>lāki</i> (tr.), Gk. <i>ἔλεχτο</i> , OCS <i>-leže</i>	Gk. <i>λέχεται</i> (Hsch.), [TB pres. II <i>lyasām</i> ‘lies’], OIr. <i>laigid</i> , Goth. <i>ligan</i> (< * <i>ie/o-</i>)	Gk. <i>λελοχῶα</i> , Goth. <i>lag</i>	Hitt. <i>lagāri</i> , ²² OCS <i>-ležitъ</i>
* <i>leuk</i> 'shine'	Hitt. <i>lukta</i> ‘dawns’, Ved. <i>rucāná</i> - ²³ , TA <i>lyokāt</i> ²⁴	Ved. <i>rócate</i> , YAv. ptc. <i>raociṅt-</i> , TB subj. II <i>lyústār</i> (< * <i>leuk-e-</i>)	Ved. <i>ruróca</i>	TB <i>lyuketār</i> ‘shines’
* <i>men</i> 'think'	Ved. <i>ámata</i> , OAv. <i>maṅtā</i> , Gk. [ἐμάνην] ²⁵	Ved. <i>mámyate</i> ; <i>manuté</i> , OAv. <i>mainiēntē</i> , Gk. <i>μαίνομαι</i> , OIr. <i>do-moinethar</i>	Gk. <i>μέμονα</i> , Lat. <i>meminī</i> , Ved. plupf. <i>ámaman</i> , YAv. <i>mamne</i> , Goth. <i>gaman</i> ‘remembers’ ²⁶	OCS <i>mъnitъ</i> , Lith. <i>mini</i> , Goth. <i>munaiþ</i>
* <i>mers</i> 'forget'	Ved. RV 3.33.8 <i>má mṛṣthās</i> ‘do not forget!’, 3pl. <i>mṛṣanta</i> ; Toch. B <i>mārsam</i> ²⁷	Ved. <i>mṛṣyate</i>	Ved. <i>pra-mamárṣa</i>	Toch. B <i>mārsetār</i> ²⁸
* <i>ped</i> 'fall'	Ved. <i>apadran</i> , OCS <i>padq</i> ‘they fell’	Ved. <i>pádyate</i> , YAv. subj. <i>paidiāite</i>	Ved. <i>papāda</i> , OE <i>ge-fæt</i>	

Other cases that probably belong here:

- **d^heug^h* ‘be/make useful’ (?): Ved. *duhé* ‘gives milk’, 3pl. *duh-ré*; Gk. *ἔτυχον* ‘happen to be at, chanced upon’.
- **iet* ‘take up position’: Ved. *yātāná*-²⁹, TB subj. V *yātaṅ*; pres. Ved. *yátate*, Lat. *nītor*³⁰; perf. Ved. *yetire* ‘are standing firmly’, OAv. *yōiṭhāmā*; root stative-itr. pres. TB *yototār*, TA *yatatār*.³¹

²¹Meiser (2009, 324)

²²Jasanoff (2003, 166; 170)

²³No finite aor. forms in Vedic.

²⁴“Presigmatic” aorist with *o/ø*-ablaut (**louk-to*, root initial palatalization irregular), Jasanoff (2003, 180).

²⁵Gk. *η*-aorists = replacements of middle root aorists, Jasanoff (2002/2003, 163).

²⁶But not Hitt. *mēmai* ‘speaks’, which is from **me-moH-i-* (‘stammer’), Jasanoff (2003, 118).

²⁷< **h₂e*-conjugation aorist **mórs-e*.

²⁸< **mṛs-o-tor* ← **mṛṣ-ór*.

²⁹No other aorist forms attested.

³⁰< **ni-je-te-*, LIV², 314.

³¹Malzahn (2010a, 787).

- **nes* ‘return’: Ved. aor.opt. *sám nasīmahi* ‘may we reunite’, Gk. pctp. ἄσμενος; pres. Ved. *násate*, Gk. νέομαι, Goth. *ga-nisan*; Ved. *nímisate*, Gk. νίσσομαι(?); perf. Goth. *ga-nas*³².
- **sperdh* ‘run away’: Hitt. *išparzasta* ‘escaped’, Ved. *ásprdhran*; pres. Ved. *spárdhate*

Summary: *Media tantum* can go back to either primary presents or aorists, in the latter case they are often based on an old **h₂e*-conjugation aorist/“stative-intransitive system”.

4 Conclusion

Separating *media tantum* from deponents via the definition of the canonical function of the middle voice, in connection with syntactic criteria, allows us to distinguish between different types of middle paradigms.

Table 7. Media tantum & deponents

	<i>media tantum</i>	<i>deponents</i>
canonical	✓	✗
transitive	✗?	✓
have old aorists	✓	✗
Examples	<i>*k_ēi̯, *h₁er, *men</i>	<i>*deh₂-i̯-, *Hei̯K, *h₂eisd, ...</i>

- In reconstructing the distribution of the PIE active (**-mi, *-si, *-ti*) vs. (proto-)middle set of endings (**h₂e, *-th₂e, *-e*), we should distinguish between canonical and non-canonical uses of the latter.
- In order to do this, we first need to establish how the Indo-European languages synchronically treat *media tantum* and deponent verbs and what their averbos look like in these languages.
- Both deponents and *media tantum* can be reconstructed for PIE and had different averbos in PIE: *Media tantum* could be based on an aorist stem, while deponents (“mismatch” cases) clearly prefer the imperfective aspect (both at the synchronic and the diachronic level).

References

- Alexiadou, Artemis, and Edit Doron. 2012. The syntactic construction of two non-active voices: Passive and middle. *Journal of Linguistics* 48:1–34.
- Baerman, Matthew, Greville G. Corbett, Dunstan Brown, and Andrew Hippisley, ed. 2007. *Deponency and morphological mismatches*. Proceedings of the British Academy 145. Oxford University Press.

³²Toch. A *nas-*, B *nes-* not from a perfect (*pace* LIV², 454), but from Narten-present, Jasanoff (2003, 74).

- Brugmann, Karl. 1895. Die mit dem Suffix *-to-* gebildeten Partizipia im Verbalsystem des Lateinischen und des Oskisch-Umbrischen. *IF* 5:89–152.
- Eichner, Heiner. 1968. Hethitisch *uešš-/uaššīia-* ‘(Gewänder) tragen; anziehen; bekleiden’. *MSS* 27:6–43.
- Embick, David. 1998. Voice systems and the syntax/morphology interface. In *Papers from the Penn/MIT Roundtable on Argument Structure and Aspect, May 1997 (MITWPL)*, ed. H. Harley.
- Flobert, Pierre. 1975. *Les verbes déponents latins des origines à Charlemagne*. Paris: Belles Lettres.
- Friedrich, Johannes, and Annelies Kammenhuber. 1975–84. *Hethitisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.
- Geldner, Karl F. 1951. *Der Rig-Veda aus dem Sanskrit ins Deutsche übersetzt*, volume I–III. Cambridge, Mass. [Harvard Oriental Series 33–35].
- Inslar, Stanley. 1968. The origin of the Sanskrit passive aorist. *IF* 73:312–46.
- Jasanoff, Jay. 2002/2003. “Stative” **-ē-* revisited. *Die Sprache* 43:127–170.
- Jasanoff, Jay. 2003. *Hittite and the Indo-European verb*. Oxford University Press.
- Jasanoff, Jay. 2012. Did Hittite have *si*-imperatives? In *The sound of Indo-European II*, ed. R. Sukač and O. Šefčík. München: Lincom.
- Kaufmann, Ingrid. 2007. Middle voice. *Lingua* 117:1677–1714.
- Kemmer, Suzanne. 1993. *The middle voice*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kemmer, Suzanne. 1994. Middle voice, transitivity, and the elaboration of events. In *Voice: form and function*, ed. Barbara Fox and Paul J. Hopper. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Klaiman, M. H. 1991. *Grammatical voice*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kloekhorst, Alwin. 2008. *Etymological dictionary of the Hittite inherited lexicon*. Leiden: Brill.
- LIV² = Rix, Helmut. 2001. *Lexikon der Indogermanischen Verben*. Bearbeitet von Martin Kümmel, Thomas Zehnder, Reiner Lipp und Brigitte Schirmer. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2 edition.
- Macdonell, Arthur A. 1910. *A Vedic Grammar*. Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner.
- Malzahn, Melanie. 2010a. *The Tocharian Verbal System*. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter.
- Masson, Olivier. 1983. *Les inscriptions cyprïotes syllabiques*. Paris: École française d’Athènes.
- Meiser, Gerd. 2009. Zur Typologie des urindogermanischen Mediums. In *Protolanguage and prehistory. Akten der XII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, vom 11. bis 15. Oktober 2004 in Krakau*, ed. R. Lühr and S. Ziegler, 318–334. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Narten, Johanna. 1964. *Die sigmatischen Aoriste im Veda*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Villanueva Svensson, Miguel. 2012. The ablaut of the middle root athematic presents in Indo-European. In *The Indo-European verb. Proceedings of the conference of the Society for Indo-European Studies, Los Angeles, 13–15 September 2010*, 333–42. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Whitney, William Dwight. 1885. *The roots, verb-forms, and primary derivatives of the Sanskrit language*. Leipzig and London.
- Zombolou, Katerina, and Artemis Alexiadou. 2012. The canonical function of the deponent verbs in Modern Greek. Paper submitted to the proceedings of the 15th IMM.