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## PREFACE

In writing this Grammar I have followed as far as possible the plan adopted in the other Grammars of the Series, my object being to furnish students with a concise account of the phonology, word-formation, and inflexions of the language. As the book is not intended for specialists ${ }^{1}$ some more or less important details have been intentionally omitted. This is especially the case in regard to those dialects which have been preserved in such scanty fragments as to render it impossible for us to give a full account of their phonology. It must not, however, be assumed that these dialects have been entirely omitted; on the contrary, I have made considerable use of them in the phonology and elsewhere, wherever they have helped to throw light upon the development and history of the other dialects, such as Attic, Ionic, Doric, Aeolic.

Much of the time and labour spent on this Grammar has been taken up with selecting examples from the vast amount of material which I had collected to illustrate the sound-laws of the various dialects. This selection was necessary if I was to keep steadily in view the class of students for whom the Series of Grammars was originally planned, otherwise it would have been far easier to produce a Comparative Greek Grammar at least three times the size of the present one. In spite of this great compression of the material, I venture to think that I have included within a modest compass all that the ordinary

[^0]student will require to know about the subject, and I believe that the student who thoroughly masters the book will not only have gained a comprehensive knowledge of Comparative Greek Grammar in particular, but will also have acquired the elements of the Comparative Grammar of the Sanskrit, Latin, and Germanic languages. Examples have been more copiously used from these than from the other branches of the Indo-Germanic family of languages, because it can be safely inferred that the students who study this Grammar will already possess a practical knowledge of one or more of them.

This Grammar makes no pretence whatever of being an original and exhaustive treatise on the subject. In a book of this kind there is practically no scope for a display of either of these features, but I have contrived to bring within a comparatively small space a great deal of matter which will be new to students, and especially to those who are unable to study the subject in works written in foreign languages. All that I have attempted to do is to furnish our countrymen with a systematic and scientific treatment of Comparative Greek Grammar based upon the philological books and articles of the best workers of the present day in the wide field of Comparative Philology. Specialists in the subject will accordingly find little that is new in the book.

In Greek as in all the other Indo-Germanic languages there are still innumerable points which have never been satisfactorily explained, and not a few points about which there is a great divergence of opinion even among the best philologists. In all such cases I have carefully considered the various explanations which have been proposed, and have given those with which I agreed without, as a rule,
stating my authority, but where I was unable to agree with any of the proposed explanations I have generally preferred to state that the phenomenon in question has never been satisfactorily explained or that the explanation is unknown, rather than burden the book with attempted explanations with which I did not agree. I have generally omitted to give the authorities for various statements made throughout the Grammar, except in special cases where I thought it desirable to refer the student for further information to the sources which deal more fully with the case in point.

I gratefully acknowledge the help I have derived from the learned books and articles by the splendid band of German Philologists who have done so much to throw light upon the history and philology of the various IndoGermanic languages. On pp. xiv-xvii will be found a select list of the books and articles which I have found most useful in the writing of this book, but a mere place in a list would not adequately express my indebtedness to the works of Brugmann, Hirt, Gustav Meyer, Osthoff, Johannes Schmidt, and Wackernagel. In conclusion I wish to express my sincere thanks to the Controller of the University Press for his great kindness in complying with my wishes in regard to special type ; to Mr. A. Davidson, for his valuable collaboration in the making of the index verborum ; and lastly to the press-reader, Mr. W. F. R. Shilleto, for his invaluable help with the reading of the proofs.

JOSEPH WRIGHT.
Oxford,
January, 1912.
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## ABBREVIATIONS

| abl. | $=$ Ablative |
| :--- | :--- |
| Aeol. | $=$ Aeolic |
| Arcad. | $=$ Arcadian |
| Arm. | $=$ Armenian |
| Att. | $=$ Attic |
| Balt. | $=$ Baltic |
| Boeot. | $=$ Boeotian |
| Cret. | $=$ Cretan |
| Cypr. | $=$ Cyprian |
| dial. | $=$ dialect(s |
| Dor. | $=$ Doric |
| El. | $=$ Elean |
| ep. | $=$ epic |
| Germ. | $=$ German |
| Goth. | $=$ Gothic |
| Gr. | $=$ Greek |
| Heracl. | $=$ Heraclean |
| Herod. | $=$ Herodotus |
| Hesych. | $=$ Hesychius |
| Hom. | = Homer(ic |
| Indg. | Indo-Germanic |
| instr. | = instrumental |
| Ion. | $=$ Ionic |
| Lac. | = Laconian |

Lat. = Latin
Lesb. = Lesbian
Lith. = Lithuanian
loc. = locative
Locr. = Locrian
ME. = Middle English
NE. = New English
NHG. = New High German
M.Ir. = Middle Irish

OE. = Old English
OHG. = Old High German
O.Icel. = Old Icelandic
O.Ir. = Old Irish
O.Lat. = Old Latin

OS. = Old Saxon
Osc. = Oscan
O.Slav. = Old Slavonic

Pamph. = Pamphylian
prim. = primitive
Skr. = Sanskrit
Thess. = Thessalian
Umbr. = Umbrian
Ved. = Vedic

The asterisk * prefixed to a word denotes a theoretical form, as $\eta^{\jmath} a$ from ${ }^{*}{ }^{\eta} \sigma a=$ Indg. ${ }^{*}$ ésm; $\sigma \pi a i \rho \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \sigma \pi a \rho j \omega=$ Indg. *sprjó.

## TRANSCRIPTION

In the following remarks on transcription we shall only deal with such points as are likely to present a difficulty to the student who is unfamiliar with the transcription used throughout this Grammar.

Long vowels are generally indicated by - as $\overline{\mathbf{a}}, \overline{\mathbf{i}}, \overline{\mathrm{u}}$; nasal vowels by ${ }_{c}$, as ą, 9 ; close vowels by . or ${ }^{\bullet}$, as ẹ or é ; vocalic liquids and nasals by ${ }_{\circ}$, as $1, \mathrm{~m}, \mathrm{n}, \mathrm{r}$; $\ddot{0}=$ the ö in German Götter, and $\ddot{u}$ the $\ddot{u}$ in Mütter.

Sanskrit :- $\tilde{n}=$ the palatal, and $\eta$ the guttural ng-sound. $\mathbf{j}=$ the $\mathbf{j}$ in NE. $\mathbf{j u s t}$. The dot . is placed under a dental, $\mathbf{n}$ and s , to indicate the cerebral pronunciation of these consonants, as $\mathbf{t}$, ḍ, ṇ, ṣ. The combination explosive $+\mathbf{h}$ is pronounced as a voiceless or voiced aspirate according as the first element is voiceless or voiced, as th, ph , dh , bh . $\mathbf{c}=$ the $\mathbf{c h}$ in NE. church. ss is the palatal and ṣ the cerebral sh-sound. Final -h from older -s or -ṣ $=\mathbf{h}$ in NE. hand.

Primitive Germanic:-In the writing of primitive Germanic forms the signs $p=$ the th in NE. thin ; đ, $\partial$ the th in NE. then ; $\mathrm{t}=\mathrm{a}$ bilabial spirant which may be pronounced like the $v$ in NE. vine; $z=a$ voiced spirant, often heard in the pronunciation of German sagen ; $x=$ German ch and the ch in Scotch loch.

Gothic:-aí = the e in NE. get; ái=nearly the $\mathbf{i}$ in NE. five; $a \mathfrak{u}=$ the $o$ in NE. lot ; áu = nearly the ou in NE. house; ei $=\overline{\mathrm{l}}$ like the ie in German sie and nearly like the ee in NE. feed. $\quad p=$ the th in NE. thin ; medially after vowels $\mathbf{b}, \mathrm{d}=$ the $\mathbf{v}$ in NE. living and the th in then; medially between vowels $\mathrm{g}=$ prim. Germanic $\mathbf{3}$, before another guttural it was pronounced like the $\mathbf{n}$, ng in NE.
think, sing ; $\mathbf{j}=\mathrm{NE}$. y in you; initially before and medially between vowels $\mathbf{h}=$ the $\mathbf{h}$ in NE. hand, but in other positions it was like the $\mathbf{c h}$ in Scotch loch; $\mathbf{l u}=$ the $\mathbf{w h}$ in the Scotch pronunciation of when ; $q=$ the $q u$ in NE. queen.

Lithuanian :-e = the e in NE. get; $\dot{\mathbf{e}}=$ long close $\bar{e}$ like the first e in German leben ; $\mathbf{0}=$ long close $\overline{0}$ like the $\mathbf{o}$ in German Bote ; ë $=$ the diphthong ie or ia $; \stackrel{\circ}{\mathbf{u}}=$ the diphthong uo or ua; $\mathbf{y}=\mathbf{i}$ like the ie in German sie and nearly like the ee in NE. feed. $\mathbf{j}=$ the y in NE. you; $\dot{z}=$ the $s$ in NE. measure and the $j$ in French jour ; $\mathrm{c}=$ the ts in NE. cats; $\mathbf{c z}=$ the ch in NE. church; $s z=$ the $s h$ in NE. ship.

Old Slavonic :-ě = a long close ẹ like the first e in German leben, but in some positions it was probably a diphthong ia or ea; $\breve{1}=$ a very close e nearly like the é in French été ; $\breve{u}=$ a very close $\mathbf{o}$ or ö ; y was probably an unrounded $\mathbf{u}$-sound. $\mathbf{j}=$ the $\mathbf{y}$ in NE. you; $\mathbf{c}=$ the ts in NE. cats ; č = the ch in NE. church; ch $=$ the ch in Scotch loch.

## INTRODUCTION

§ 1. Greek forms one branch of the Indo-Germanic family of languages. This great family of languages is usually divided into eight branches :-
I. Aryan, consisting of: (1) The Indian group, including Vedic (the language of the Vedas), classical Sanskrit, and the Prākrit dialects. The oldest portions of the Vedas date at least as far back as 1500 в. с., and some scholars fix their date at a much earlier period, see Winternitz, Geschichte der indischen Litteratur, pp. 246-58. (2) The Iranian group, including (a) West Iranian (Old Persian, the language of the Persian cuneiform inscriptions, dating from about $520-350$ B. c.) ; (b) East Iranian (Avesta-sometimes called Zend-Avesta, Zend, and Old Bactrian-the language of the Avesta, the sacred books of the Zoroastrians).
II. Armenian, the oldest monuments of which belong to the fifth century A. D.
III. Greek, with its numerous dialects (§ 2).
IV. Albanian, the language of ancient Illyria. The oldest monuments belong to the seventeenth century.
V. Italic, consisting of Latin and the Umbrian-Samnitic dialects. From the popular form of Latin are descended the Romance languages: Portuguese, Spanish, Catalanian, Provençal, French, Italian, Raetoromanic, Roumanian or Wallachian.
VI. Keltic, consisting of : (I) Gaulish (known to us by Keltic names and words quoted by Latin and Greek authors, and inscriptions on coins) ; (2) Britannic, including Cymric or Welsh, Cornish, and Bas Breton or Armorican (the
oldest records of Cymric and Bas Breton date back to the eighth or ninth century) ; (3) Gaelic, including Irish-Gaelic, Scotch-Gaelic, and Manx. The oldest monuments are the Old Gaelic ogam inscriptions which probably date as far back as about 500 A . D.
VII. Germanic, consisting of:-
(I) Gothic. Almost the only source of our knowledge of the Gothic language is the fragments of the biblical translation made in the fourth century by Ulfilas, the Bishop of the West Goths.
(2) Scandinavian or North Germanic, which is subdivided into two groups: (a) East Scandinavian, including Swedish, Gutnish, and Danish ; (b) West Scandinavian, including Norwegian, and Icelandic.

The oldest records of this branch are the runic inscriptions, some of which date as far back as the third or fourth century.
(3) West Germanic, which is composed of:-
(a) High German, the oldest monuments of which belong to about the middle of the eighth century.
(b) Low Franconian, called Old Low Franconian or Old Dutch until about 1200 .
(c) Low German, with records dating back to the ninth century. Up to about 1200 it is generally called Old Saxon.
(d) Frisian, the oldest records of which belong to the fourteenth century.
(e) English, the oldest records of which belong to about the end of the seventh century.
VIII. Baltic-Slavonic, consisting of: (I) The Baltic division, embracing (a) Old Prussian, which became extinct in the seventeenth century, (b) Lithuanian, (c) Lettic (the oldest records of Lithuanian and Lettic belong to the sixteenth century) ; (2) the Slavonic division, embracing: (a) the South-Eastern group, including Russian (Great

Russian, White Russian, and Little Russian), Bulgarian, and Illyrian (Servian, Croatian, Slovenian); (b) the Western group, including Czech (Bohemian), Sorabian (Wendish), Polish and Polabian. The oldest records (Old Bulgarian, also called Old Church Slavonic) belong to the second half of the ninth century A.D.
§ 2. The oldest Greek records exhibit clearly defined dialectal peculiarities which have been treated in some detail in the phonology and accidence of this book. For a detailed account of the Greek dialects and of the literature on the subject see Thumb, Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte (1909).

It is to Greek inscriptions that we must look for the purest forms of the various dialects. The literary language, especially that of the poets, is in many respects artificially constructed. Towards the end of the fifth century в. c. was gradually formed on the basis of the Attic dialect a literary language common to all Greeks, which almost entirely excluded the use of the other dialects from the later prose literature of antiquity. In this grammar Attic is taken as the standard and is treated in greater detail than the other dialects. It was formerly the custom to divide the Greek dialects into three groups :-Ionic-Attic, Doric, and Aeolic. This threefold division was both unsatisfactory and unscientific, because Aeolic was made to embrace all Greek dialects which were not either IonicAttic or Doric, whereas strictly speaking Aeolic proper only embraces the North-East group of dialects. The only really scientific classification of the dialects must be based on the lexicographical and grammatical peculiarities as exhibited on the oldest inscriptions. In this manner Greek can be conveniently divided into the following dialects or groups of dialects :-
I. Ionic-Attic : ( I ) Ionic including the dialects of $(a)$ The central portion of the West Coast of Asia Minor together
with the islands of Chios and Samos; (b) The Cyclades: Naxos, Ceos, Delos, Paros, Thasos, Siphnos, Andros, Ios, Myconos ; (c) Euboea. (2) The dialect of Attica.
II. The Doric group including the dialects of (I) Laconia together with the dialects of Tarentum and Heraclea; (2) Messenia ; (3) Argolis and Aegina; (4) Corinth together with Corcyra ; (5) Megara together with Byzantium and Selinus; (6) The Peloponnesian colonies of Sicily ; (7) Crete; (8) Melos and Thera together with Cyrene; (9) Rhodes together with Gela and Acragas; (io) The other Doric islands in the Aegean: Anaphe, Astypalaea, Telos, Nisyros, Cnidos, Calymna, Cos, \&c.
III. The dialect of Achaia and its colonies.
IV. The dialect of Elis.
V. The North-West group including the dialects of (i) Epirus, Acarnania, Aetolia, Phthiotis and of the Aenianes; (2) Locris and Phocis including Delphi.
VI. The Arcadian-Cyprian group including the dialects of (1) Arcadia ; (2) Cyprus.
VII. The North-East or Aeolic group including the dialects of ( I ) Lesbos and the coast of Asia Minor adjoining ; (2) Thessaly except Phthiotis ; (3) Boeotia.
VIII. The dialect of Pamphylia.

## PHONOLOGY

## CHAPTER I

## PRONUNCIATION

§ 3. The account of Greek pronunciation given below is only approximately accurate. It is impossible to ascertain with perfect certainty the exact pronunciation of any language in its oldest period. The Greek letters had not always the same sound-value in all the dialects, and at different periods the same letter was often used to express different sounds. Many examples of this kind will be found in the phonology. For a detailed account of Greek pronunciation see Blass, Über die Aussprache des Griechischen, third edition (1888); and for the history of the alphabet see Kirchhoff, Studien zur Geschichte des griechischen Alphabets, fourth edition (1887), and Giles, Manual of Comparative Philology, second edition (1901), pp. 517-22, where other literature on the subject will also be found.

## A. The Vowels.

§4. $\alpha, \iota, v$ were used to express both short and long vowels. When long they are expressed in this grammar by $\bar{\alpha}, \bar{i}, \bar{v} . \quad \epsilon$, o were short, the corresponding long of which were expressed by $\eta, \omega$.
§ 5. $\alpha$ had approximately the same sound as in German Mann, Gast, and northern English dial. lad, as á $\gamma \rho o ́ s$,


$\bar{\alpha}$ had the same sound as the a in English father, as $\tau \bar{\imath} \mu \hat{\alpha} \tau \epsilon, \mu \bar{\epsilon} \lambda \bar{\alpha} s, \chi^{\omega} \rho \bar{\alpha}$, Dor. $\dot{\alpha} \delta \tilde{\alpha}^{\prime} s, \mu \bar{\alpha} \tau \eta \rho, \tau \bar{\imath} \mu \bar{\alpha}$.
§ 6. $\epsilon$ was a close vowel in Attic and Ionic like the é in French été, as $\epsilon \delta \delta \omega, \phi \epsilon ́ \rho \omega$, oî $\delta \epsilon$. That $\epsilon$ was close in these dialects is shown by the contraction of $\epsilon \epsilon$ to $\epsilon \iota$ (§12) in words like $\phi \iota \lambda \epsilon i \tau \tau \in$ from $\phi \iota \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon$. In Aeolic and some Doric dialects the $\epsilon$ was open, hence the contraction of $\epsilon \epsilon$ to $\eta$ in words like $\phi i \hat{\lambda} \eta, \hat{\eta} X o \nu=$ Att. $\phi i ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota, \epsilon i \bar{\chi} \circ \nu$; and it must also have been open in Elean and Locrian where $\epsilon$ partly became $\alpha$ (§ 44, note 2 ).
$\eta$ was an open vowel like the ai in English air and the è in French père, as $Z \hat{\eta} \nu, \tau i \theta \eta \mu l$, $\epsilon^{\prime \prime} \eta s$; Att. Ion. $\mu \eta \tau_{\tau} \eta \rho$, $\xi \notin \eta \nu \alpha, \sigma \epsilon \lambda \eta \eta \eta$ beside Dor. $\mu \dot{\alpha} \tau \eta \rho$, ${ }^{\epsilon} \phi \bar{\alpha} \nu \alpha, \sigma \epsilon \lambda \bar{\alpha} \nu \bar{\alpha}$. The $\eta$ from older $\bar{\alpha}$ was originally more open than the $\eta=$ Indg. $\overline{\mathbf{e}}$, the former was written $\mathbf{H}$ and the latter $\mathbf{E}$ on old Ionic inscriptions, but the two sounds fell together in Attic in the fifth century в. с., see $\S \S \mathbf{5 0}, \mathbf{5 1}$.
§7. It cannot be determined whether $\iota$ was an open vowel like the $\mathbf{i}$ in English bit or a close vowel like the $\mathbf{i}$ in French fini, as ${ }^{\prime} \mu \epsilon \nu$, $\pi o ́ \lambda \iota s, \tau \rho \iota \sigma i ́$.
$i$ was probably close like the ie in German Vieh ( $=\mathrm{fi}$ ), and nearly like the ee in English see, as $\frac{\dot{\imath}}{\mu} \dot{\alpha} \varsigma, \pi i \hat{\imath} \ell l$, $\pi \hat{\imath} \omega \nu$, $\kappa \lambda \grave{\iota} \nu \omega$.
§ 8. o was a close vowel which is common in some English dialects in such words as coal (köl), foal (fól), and in the final syllable of such words as fellow (felo), window (windò). It corresponded in quality but not in quantity to
 $o$ was close in Attic and Ionic is shown by the contraction of oo to ov (§17) in words like $\delta \eta \lambda o \hat{v} \mu \in \nu$ from $\delta \eta \lambda o ́ o \mu \in \nu$.
$\omega$ was an open vowel like the au in English aught, as $\delta i \delta \omega \omega \mu$, $\delta \omega \tau \omega \rho, \phi \notin \rho \omega$.
§ 9. In Attic, Ionic and probably also in some other dialects $v(=\ddot{u})$ had the same sound as the $\mathbf{u}$ in French $\mathbf{t u}$, as $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \rho v \theta \rho o ́ s, \xi^{\xi} v \gamma^{o} \nu, \mu \epsilon^{\prime} \theta v$. The original $\mathbf{u}$-sound ( $=$ the $\mathbf{u}$ in

English full) remained in Laconian, Boeotian, Lesbian, Thessalian, Arcadian, Cyprian and Pamphylian, but was generally written ov (see § 47, note I).
$\bar{v}=\overline{\mathrm{u}}$ in those dialects which changed short $\mathbf{u}$ to $\ddot{\mathrm{u}}$, as 'Є申ӣтov, $\theta \bar{v} \mu o ́ s, \mu \hat{v} s$.
§ 10. The short diphthongs $\alpha \iota, \epsilon \iota, o \iota ; \alpha v, \epsilon v, o v ; v \iota=\alpha$, $\epsilon, o+\iota ; \alpha, \epsilon, o+v ; v+\iota$, but the original $\mathbf{u}$ quality was preserved in the second element of the $\mathbf{u}$-diphthongs.
§ 11 . $\alpha \iota$ was nearly like the $\mathbf{i}$ in English five, as $\alpha^{\prime} \theta \omega$, фє́िєє $\alpha \iota ; \beta \alpha i ́ \nu \omega, \tau \epsilon ́ \kappa \tau \alpha \iota \nu \alpha$.
§ 12. $\epsilon l(=$ Indg. ei, § 58) had nearly the same sound as the ai in English stain until about the beginning of the fifth century b. c., it then became long close $\overline{\mathbf{e}}$ in Attic, Ionic and the milder Doric dialects, although the $\epsilon \iota$ was retained in writing, as $\epsilon i \sigma \iota, \lambda \epsilon i ́ \pi \omega, \pi \epsilon i \theta \omega$; ктєiv $\omega, \phi \theta \epsilon i ́ \rho \omega$. The $\epsilon \iota$ was then used to express the long close $\overline{\mathbf{e}}$ which arose from contraction and from compensation lengthening,
 Cret. ${ }^{\prime} \ell \nu S, \tau \iota \theta \epsilon i \bar{s}, \chi \alpha \rho i \epsilon \iota s$ from ${ }^{*} \tau \iota \theta \epsilon \nu \tau s,{ }^{*} \chi \alpha \rho \iota F \epsilon \nu \tau s$; this $\epsilon \iota$ was written $\epsilon$ on the oldest Attic inscriptions, whereas prim. Greek $\epsilon \iota$ was always written $\epsilon \iota$.
§ 13. oc had the same sound as the oy in English boy, as oî̊ $\alpha, \phi \in ́ \rho о \iota \mu \in \nu, \lambda$ úкoı.
§ 14. $v \iota=u ̈ i i$ (see $v$ above) was a special Greek development and arose partly from the loss of an intervening consonant and partly from contraction, as iovio, viós from ${ }^{*} F i \delta v \sigma j \alpha,{ }^{*} \sigma v i j o s$, loc. sing. Hom. $\pi \lambda \eta \theta v i \hat{\text { in }}$
§ 15. $\alpha v$ had the same sound as the au in German Haus, and was nearly like the ou in standard English house, as $\alpha v ̌ \xi \alpha ́ \nu \omega, \tau \alpha \hat{v} \rho o s$.
§ 16. $\epsilon v$ had approximately the same sound as is often heard in the southern English dialect pronunciation of house (eus), mouse (meus), as $\gamma \epsilon \dot{v} \omega$, $\pi \epsilon \dot{v} \theta o \mu \alpha \iota, Z \in \hat{v}$.
§ 17. ov (= Indg. ou, § 62) $=o+v$ (see $o$ above) until the fifth century в. c., it then became long close $\overline{\mathbf{u}}$ through the
intermediate stage of long close $\overline{\mathbf{o}}$, although the ov was retained in writing. The ov was then used to express the long close $\overline{\bar{o}}$ later $\overline{\mathbf{u}}$ which arose from contraction and compensation lengthening, as $\nu o \hat{v} s, \lambda u ́ \kappa o v, \delta \eta \lambda o v ̂ \mu \in \nu$, from $\nu o ́ o s$,

 $o$ on the oldest Attic inscriptions, whereas prim. Greek ov was always written ov.
§ 18. The original long diphthongs $\bar{a} \mathbf{i}, \bar{e} \mathbf{i}, \bar{o} \mathbf{i}$; $\overline{\mathrm{a}} \mathbf{u}$, ēu, $\overline{\mathrm{o}} \mathbf{u}$ became short before consonants already in prim. Greek, as in $\delta \rho \alpha i ̂ \mu \in \nu, \gamma \rho \alpha \phi \epsilon i ̂ \mu \epsilon \nu, \lambda u ́ k o \iota s ; \nu \alpha \hat{v} s, Z \in u ́ s, \beta o v ̂ s$, from * ${ }^{*} \rho \bar{\iota} \iota \mu \in \nu$, $\& c$. (§ 63). The second element of the long final diphthongs $-\bar{\alpha} \iota,-\eta \iota,-\omega l$ ceased to be pronounced in the second century в.c., and in $\eta \iota$ probably much earlier. The modern mode of writing these diphthongs as $\underset{\sim}{\alpha}, \eta, \underset{c}{\omega}(\theta \in \hat{q}$, $\left.\chi{ }^{\omega} \rho \rho \underset{\iota}{\alpha}, \tau \bar{\imath} \mu \hat{\eta}, \lambda \tilde{v} \kappa \varphi\right)$ only dates back to manuscripts of the twelfth century.

## B. The Consonants.

§ 19. The voiceless explosives $\pi, \tau, \kappa$, the voiced explosives $\beta, \delta$, the nasals $\mu, \nu$ and the liquid $\lambda$ had approximately the same sound-values as in English. The remaining consonants require special attention.
§ 20. In the oldest period of the language $\gamma$ was in all positions a voiced explosive like the $\mathbf{g}$ in English go or
 an early period it became a voiced spirant in the popular dialect medially between vowels. The guttural nasal $\eta$ (=the $\mathbf{n}$ in English think and the $\mathbf{n g}$ in sing) was expressed by $\nu$ on the oldest inscriptions, but after the combinations $\gamma \nu, \gamma \mu$ had become $\mathfrak{\eta n}, \eta \mathrm{m}$ in such words as $\gamma i \gamma \nu o \mu \alpha \iota$,
 $\dot{\alpha}^{\alpha} \gamma \kappa \omega \dot{\nu}, \ddot{\alpha}^{\gamma} \gamma \chi^{\omega}, \sigma \phi \dot{i} \gamma \xi$.
§ 21. In the earliest historic period of the language $\delta$ was a compound consonant like the zd in English blaz(e)d
and arose from older dz by metathesis ( $(\mathbf{1 2 9}, 8$ ), as $\delta u \gamma o ́ v$,


 beside $\delta$ וó $\delta \delta o \tau o s, \theta$ 白órסotos. § probably became z in Attic some time during the fourth century b.c. Some scholars assume that $\delta$ was pronounced like the $s(=\check{z})$ in English measure, pleasure already in the earliest period of the language.
§ 22. $\rho$ had a strong trill formed by trilling the point of the tongue against the gums. It was voiceless initially (written $\rho$, see $\S 215$ ), and medially after $\phi, \theta, \chi$ and probably after all other voiceless consonants. In other positions it was voiced like the Scotch $\mathbf{r}$ in hard, bearing, bear, as

§ 23. $\sigma$ was voiced ( $=\mathrm{z}$ ) before voiced explosives, as
 other positions, as $\sigma \tau \alpha \tau o ́ s, \theta \dot{\alpha} \rho \sigma o s, \lambda u ́ k o s$. It is doubtful how the Ionic $-\sigma \sigma$ - and Attic, Boeotian, Thessalian and Cretan $-\tau \tau$ - were pronounced in such words as Ion. $\pi i ́ \sigma \sigma \alpha$, $\theta \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \omega \nu, \pi \rho \dot{\eta} \sigma \sigma \omega \nu$ beside Attic, \&c. $\pi i \tau \tau \tau, \theta \frac{\alpha}{\alpha} \tau \tau \omega \nu, \pi \rho \dot{\alpha} \tau \tau \omega \nu$ (cp. § 129, 7). Some scholars assume that the $-\sigma \sigma$-, $-\tau \tau$ - was like the th in English thin or a kind of lisped s, whilst others think that the sound was the same as the sh in English she.
§ 24. $\phi, \theta, X$ were aspirated voiceless explosives like the $\mathrm{p}, \mathrm{t}, \mathrm{k}$ in German paar, teil, kein and in the AngloIrish pronunciation of pair, tell, kill, as $\phi$ '́ $\rho \omega, \nu$, $\notin \phi o s$, ò $\phi \rho \hat{v}_{s}$; $\theta \in \rho \mu o ́ s, \pi \epsilon i \theta \omega$, $\tau i \theta \eta \mu \iota$, oî $\sigma \theta \alpha$; $\chi \in \iota \mu \omega \nu, \lambda \in i ́ \chi \omega$, ${ }_{\alpha} \gamma \chi \chi^{\omega}$. $\theta$ became a spirant ( $=$ th in English thin) at an early period in some dialects. $\quad \phi$ and $\chi$ also became spirants later, but $\phi, \theta, \chi$ must have been aspirated voiceless explosives at the time de-aspiration took place, cp. $\pi \epsilon \in \phi \epsilon v \gamma \alpha, \tau \rho \in ́ \phi \omega$, $\kappa^{\prime} \chi \cup \kappa \alpha$ : $\phi \in \cup ́ \gamma \omega, \theta \rho \epsilon ́ \psi \omega, \chi \epsilon \epsilon \omega(\S 115)$; and also when $\pi, \tau, \kappa$ became aspirated before a following rough breathing, cp. $\dot{\alpha} \phi^{\prime} \hat{\omega} \nu, \dot{\alpha}^{\nu} \nu \theta^{\prime}$ ov̂, oủX $\begin{gathered} \\ \\ \pi\end{gathered} \omega s$.
§ 25. $\xi, \psi$ probably represented the combinations $k s, \pi s$

§ 26. The spiritus asper ' corresponded to the English $h$ in house, and was originally represented by $H$. It disappeared in the prehistoric period in Lesbian, Elean, the dialect of Gortyn, and the Ionic of Asia Minor. H then came to be used in Ionic to represent the $\overline{\mathbf{e}}$ from older $\overline{\mathrm{a}}$ (§ 51). At a later period the H was halved $\vdash$, $t$, and the former was used for the spiritus asper and the latter for the lenis. From these fragments came the later signs ' and '.
§ 27. On $F$ and 9 see § 120 and § 47, note 2.

## Accent.

§ 28. By accent in its widest sense is meant the gradation of a word or word-group according to the degree of stress or of pitch with which its various syllables are uttered. Although strictly speaking there are as many different degrees of accent in a word or word-group as there are syllables, yet for ordinary purposes it is only necessary to distinguish three degrees, the principal accent, the secondary accent, and the weak accent or as it is generally termed the absence of accent. The secondary accent is as a rule separated from the principal accent by at least one intervening syllable.

All the Indo-Germanic languages have partly pitch (musical) and partly stress (expiratory) accent, but one or other of the two systems of accentuation always predominates in each language, thus in Greek and Vedic the accent was predominantly pitch, whereas in the oldest periods of the Italic dialects, and the Keltic and Germanic languages, the accent was predominantly stress. The effect of this difference in the system of accentuation is clearly seen by the preservation of the vowels in unaccented syllables in the former languages and by the weakening or loss of them in the latter. In the early period of the
parent Indg. language, the stress accent must have been more predominant than the pitch accent, because it is only upon this assumption that we are able to account for the origin of the various phenomena of quantitative ablaut ( $\S 886-90$ ). It is now a generally accepted theory that at a later period of the parent language the system of accentuation became predominantly pitch with which was probably connected the origin of qualitative ablaut ( $\S 83$ ). This pitch accent was preserved in Greek and Vedic, but became predominantly stress again in the primitive period of nearly all the other languages. It had also become predominantly stress in Greek by about the beginning of the Christian era, see Kretschmer, Kuhn's Zeitschrift, xxx, pp. 59i-6oo.
§ 29. The quality of the prim. Indg. syllable-accent was of two kinds, the 'broken' or acute and the 'slurred' or circumflex. The former was a rising and the latter a rising-falling accent. Long vowels with the acute accent were bimoric and those with the circumflex trimoric. All original long vowels including the first element of long diphthongs had the acute accent. The circumflex accent was unoriginal and arose in prim. Indo-Germanic in the following manner :-(a) From the contraction of vowels, as -ã̃s from -ā-es in the nom. pl. of ā-stems, oõs from -o.es in the nom. pl. of 0 -stems, $\cdot 0.0$ from $\cdot 0 \cdot a \mathrm{ai}$ in the dat. sing. of $\mathbf{o}$-stems, $\mathrm{cp} . \theta \in \hat{\omega}$, see $\S 79$. The circumflex also arose by vowel contraction within Greek itself, as $\tau \rho \epsilon i{ }^{i}$ from ${ }^{*} \tau \rho$ '́jes,
 (b) When a short vowel disappeared after a long vowel, as in gen. sing. $\theta \epsilon \hat{\alpha} \mathrm{s}$ from an original form *dhwesāso (cp. § $92(a)$ ), cp. also $\nu \alpha \hat{v} s$ from an original form *náwos beside $Z$ tús from *djéwos. (c) When a medial long diphthong lost its second element, as in acc. sing. $\beta \hat{\omega} \nu$, Vedic gấm (= metrically gaam), Z $\hat{\eta} \nu$, Vedic dyấm (= metrically dyaam), from *gõ̃m, *djềm, older *góum, *djếum. The
same change from the acute to the circumflex accent also took place in prim. Indo-Germanic when a nasal or liquid disappeared after a long vowel, as Lith. akmŭ̃ ( $=.0$ õ̃), stone beside $\dot{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \mu \omega{ }^{\nu}$; Goth. tuggō ( $=.0 \overline{0}$ ), tongue beside hana ( $=\cdot \overline{\mathrm{o}} \mathrm{n}$ or $\cdot \overline{\mathrm{e}} \mathrm{n}$ ), cock; Lith. motẽ̃ ( $=\cdot \cdot \mathrm{e}$ ), wife beside $\pi \alpha \tau \dot{\eta} \rho$. This distinction in the quality of the accent was preserved in final syllables containing a long vowel in Greek, Vedic, Lithuanian, and in the oldest periods of the Germanic languages. The old inherited difference in the quality of the syllable-accent was also preserved in Greek in final syllables which had not the principal accent, cp. loc. sing. oíkoı, $\phi \in \rho о \mu \epsilon ́ v o \iota$ beside 'I $\sigma \theta \mu o \imath ̂$ and nom. pl. oîkoı, $\phi \in \rho o ́-$
 shall turn. The circumflexed trimoric and the acuted dimoric short diphthongs of final syllables had each lost a mora in prim. Greek before the trisyllabic law came into operation (§ 30 ).
§ 30. The word-accent in the parent Indg. language was free or movable, that is its position was not determined either by the number or the length of the syllables which a word contained. This freedom in the position of the principal accent of a word was better preserved in Vedic than in any of the other Indg. languages. The free accent was still preserved in prim. Germanic at the time when Verner's Law operated, whereby the voiceless spirants became voiced when the vowel immediately preceding them did not bear the principal accent of the word ( $\S 100$, note 4). At a later period of the prim. Germanic language, the principal accent became confined to the first syllable of the word. And in like manner the principal accent of the word became confined to the first syllable in prim. Italic and Keltic, for the further history of the principal accent in these branches see Brugmann, Grundriss, Éc., vol. i, second ed., pp. 971-8o.

The word-accent became restricted in its freedom in
prim. Greek by the development of the so-called trisyllabic law whereby the principal accent could not be further than the third syllable from the end of the word nor further than the second syllable when the last syllable was originally long, as $\dot{\alpha} \pi o ́ \tau \iota \sigma \iota s$ from *ä ${ }^{\prime} о \tau \iota \sigma \iota s:$ Skr. ápa.citiḥ, $\phi є \rho o ́-$

 Skr. jánasām, $\mathfrak{\eta} \delta i t \omega \nu$ : Skr. svádíyān, $\dot{\eta} \delta i t \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \sigma F \bar{\alpha} \delta \bar{i}-$ $j o \sigma \alpha, \mathrm{cp}$. Skr. svádīyąsam. Words of the type $\pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \omega s$ from older $\pi o ́ \lambda \eta o s$ by quantitative metathesis ( $\$ 72$ ) are not exceptions to the above law, which was older than the change of $\eta o$ to $\epsilon \omega$. At the time when this new system of accentuation came into existence the original trimoric long vowels and short diphthongs and the original bimoric short diphthongs .oi, -ai, -ei had each lost a mora (§ 29), cp. $\gamma \epsilon \nu \epsilon \in \omega \nu$ from Indg. *génesõ̀m, loc. sing. $\phi \in \rho \circ \mu$ évoc beside nom. pl. фєро́ $\mu \in \nu о \iota$; $\phi \epsilon ́ \rho \epsilon \sigma \theta \alpha \iota, ~ \phi є ́ \rho о \mu \alpha \iota . ~$

The new system of accentuation was also extended to polysyllabic enclitic words in which more than the two or respectively three last morae were unaccented, as $\pi \dot{\sigma} \tau \epsilon \rho o s$, $\pi о \tau \epsilon ́ \rho о \iota o$ from ${ }^{*}$ ! $\pi о \tau \epsilon \rho о \varsigma,{ }^{*} \leq \pi о \tau \epsilon \rho о \iota o, \eta ँ \mu \omega \nu$, $\eta \mu \bar{\nu} \nu$ from
 $\pi \omega \mu \epsilon \nu,{ }^{* \iota} \delta \in \delta о \rho \kappa \alpha$ (§ 38).

Note.-In the Lesbian dialect the accent was in all cases thrown as far back as the trisyllabic law would permit, as

 Doric dialect see § 38, note.
§ 31. In words ending in a trochee with a long vowel or a diphthong in the penultimate, the highest pitch went from the second mora of the syllable to the first, as $\hat{\eta} \mu \alpha$ from ${ }^{*} \eta \mu \alpha, \nu \hat{\eta} \epsilon \epsilon$ from ${ }^{*} \nu \dot{\alpha} f \epsilon \varsigma$, hence also $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \hat{\omega} \tau \epsilon \varsigma$ from є́ $\sigma \tau \alpha o ́ \tau \epsilon \varsigma$.
§ 32. Dactylic oxytona or oxytona ending in a dactyl
became paroxytona, as $\alpha \gamma \kappa v ́ \lambda o s, ~ a i o ́ \lambda o s, ~ \beta o \eta \delta \rho o ́ \mu о s, ~ \gamma о \mu-~$
 $\tau \in \lambda \epsilon \sigma$ фо́pos, beside aizoßoбкós, $\pi \alpha \chi^{v \lambda o ́ s, ~ \& c . ~ T h i s ~ l a w ~}$ has numerous exceptions owing to analogical formations, as $\delta \eta \mu \circ$ ßó $\rho o s$, ai $\quad \chi \rho 0 \lambda o ́ \gamma o s$ after the analogy of forms like

 $\gamma \mu \epsilon ́ \nu o s, \pi \epsilon \phi v \gamma \mu \notin \nu \sigma s$.
§ 33. But apart from the above changes and analogical formations like $\chi \rho \bar{v} \sigma o \hat{v}$ for * $\chi \rho \tilde{v} \sigma o u s$ after the analogy of $\chi \rho \bar{v} \sigma o \hat{v},-\hat{\varphi}$, and conversely $\epsilon \dot{u} \nu o v,-\omega$ for ${ }^{*} \epsilon \dot{v} \nu 0 \hat{v},-\hat{\omega}$ after

 *éfoos after * $\mu$ ós, $\sigma$ ós, Fós, the original Indg. accent generally remained in Greek when it did not come in conflict with the trisyllabic law, cp. $\gamma^{\prime} \nu 0$ s, $\gamma \in{ }^{\prime} \nu \epsilon o s: S k r$. jánaḥ, jánasaḥ, $\mu \hat{\epsilon} \theta v$ : Skr. mádhu, $\theta \dot{v} \gamma \alpha \tau \epsilon \rho$ : Skr. dúhitar, $\phi \rho \bar{\alpha} \tau o \rho \epsilon s: ~ S k r$. bhrătaraḥ, ov̂ $\theta \alpha \rho$ : Skr. údhar, ס $\omega$ т $\omega \rho$ : Skr. dấtā, $\pi \alpha \tau \eta{ }^{\prime} \rho$, $\pi \alpha \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \alpha, \pi \alpha \tau \rho \alpha ́ \sigma \iota:$ Skr. pitắ, pitáram, pitf̣́ṣu, Dor. $\pi \omega ́ s$, $\pi o \delta o ́ s, \pi o \sigma i ́: ~ S k r . ~ p a ̆ ́ t, ~ p a đ a ́ h ̣, ~ p a t s u ́, ~ \gamma \in \nu \epsilon \tau \eta ́ \rho: ~ S k r . ~ j a n i t a ́ ́, ~$ $\kappa \lambda u \tau o ́ s: S k r$. šrutáh, $\epsilon \in v \theta$ pós : Skr. rudiráḥ, $\beta \alpha \rho u ́ s: ~ S k r$. gurúḥ, ف̉kús: Skr. āsúúḥ, é $\pi \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha}:$ Skr. saptá, \&c.
§ 34. As we have already seen (§ 28) there are strictly speaking as many grades of accent in a word as there are syllables. In Greek the principal accent of a word was indicated by the acute or circumflex and all other syllables were regarded as unaccented. And as papyri show an attempt was sometimes made to indicate such syllables by the grave accent, as in $\theta$ éóvò̀̀ò̀s. But in ordinary Greek the grave accent became restricted to final syllables and merely denoted the absence of accent as contrasted with the acute, as $\dot{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho i ̀ ~ \tau o v ́ \tau \varphi, \pi \epsilon \rho i ̀ ~ \tau o v ́ \tau o v ~ b e s i d e ~ \tau o v ́ \tau o v ~ \pi \epsilon ́ ~ \rho \iota . ~$
§ 35. In sentence-accent we have to do with the accentual relations between the various members of a sentence or word-group. No word of whatever part of speech was
originally always accented in every position in the sentence. Any word could under certain conditions lose its independent accent and thus become enclitic. Certain particles were always enclitic already in the parent Indg. language, as ${ }^{*} \mathbf{q e}=\tau \epsilon$, Skr. ca, Lat. que, ${ }^{*}$ ge in ${ }^{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \epsilon-\gamma \epsilon=$ Goth. mi•k, OE. me-c, *de in oîkóv- $\delta \epsilon, \& c$. The original distinction between the accented and unaccented forms of the pronouns was still preserved in the oldest periods of the separate Indg. languages and in many of these languages it has been preserved down to the present day ( $\$ \S 397 \mathrm{ff}$.).
§ 36. The vocative was originally partly accented and partly enclitic or unaccented. It was accented at the beginning of a sentence and unaccented in other positions. The accented form became for the most part generalized in prim. Greek and thus came to have the same accentuation as the nominative. Vocatives like $\alpha 00 \epsilon \lambda \phi \epsilon$, $\theta \dot{v} \gamma \alpha \tau \epsilon \rho$, $\pi o ́ \nu \eta \rho \epsilon$, $\mu^{\prime} \chi \forall \eta \rho \epsilon$, ' $A \gamma \alpha \alpha^{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \mu \nu 0 \nu$ probably represent the original forms ${ }^{*}-\alpha \dot{\alpha} \delta \in \lambda \phi \epsilon,{ }^{*}\lfloor\theta \nu \gamma \alpha \tau \epsilon \rho$, \&c., ср. $\boldsymbol{\pi} o ́ \tau \epsilon \rho о$, from ${ }^{*}-\pi o \tau \epsilon \rho o s(\S 30$ ), and that forms like $Z \epsilon \hat{v}=Z \bar{\epsilon} \dot{v}, \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \epsilon \rho$, $\ddot{\alpha} \nu \in \rho$ for ${ }^{*} \leq Z \in \nu,{ }^{*}-\pi \alpha \tau \epsilon \rho,{ }^{*} \_\dot{\alpha} \nu \epsilon \rho$ were accented after the analogy of the trisyllabic forms which were subject to the trisyllabic law. In Vedic the accent was always thrown back on to the first syllable when the sentence began with the vocative, as ágnē, dévi, vádhu, pítar, beside nom. agníḥ, fire, đēví, goddess, vadhứḥ, woman, pitá, acc. pitáram, father.
§ 37. When one word defined another more closely in compounds the first element was generally accented and the second became enclitic, as $\dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \alpha^{\prime}-\beta \alpha \sigma \iota s,{ }^{\prime \prime} \varphi-v \pi \nu o s, \pi \alpha \rho \alpha ́-$ $\pi \alpha \nu, \pi \rho o ́-\delta o \sigma \iota \varsigma, \quad \dot{v} \pi \epsilon ́ \rho-\mu o \rho o \nu$, cp. Lat. đénuo $=$ dē novō;
 $\pi о \lambda \iota \varsigma, \pi \alpha ́ \mu-\pi \alpha \nu$, cp. Lat. decém-virī; $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \nu-\delta \epsilon \kappa \alpha, \delta \omega-\delta \epsilon \kappa \alpha=$
 ботоs, ' $E \lambda \lambda \eta$ そ́ $\sigma-\pi o \nu \tau o s$.
§ 38. In prim. Indo-Germanic the finite forms of the
verb were partly accented and partly enclitic. But when the one and when the other form was used, it is impossible to determine for all cases because the original system of verbal accentuation has not been preserved in the historic period of any of the languages. It was best preserved in Vedic in which the finite forms of the verb were always accented in subordinate sentences and at the beginning of principal sentences, but unaccented in all other positions, cp . yádi pragácchati, if he goes forward, āpnốti imạ́ $10 \overline{\mathrm{k}}$ ám, he obtains this world, beside prá gacchati, he goes forward, ní padyatē, he lies down, á-bharam $=\frac{\epsilon}{\epsilon}-\phi \epsilon \rho \circ \nu$, but the fixed rule that the finite forms were always accented in subordinate sentences, independently of their position in the sentence, was doubtless a special development within Vedic itself. The original rule in the parent Indg. language probably was that the finite forms were accented when they began the sentence, but unaccented when they came after the subject. But after negatives and other adverbs including the augment, they were partly accented and partly unaccented. The type oú $\phi \eta \mu l, \dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{o}-\lambda \alpha \beta \epsilon, \pi \rho o ́ \sigma-$ $\lambda \alpha \beta \epsilon,{ }_{\epsilon}^{\prime \prime}-\lambda \alpha \beta o \nu$ was probably the rule at the beginning of the sentence, and also after unaccented words, as $\pi \alpha \rho-\epsilon$ к $\kappa$ סos, $\sigma v \mu-\pi \rho o ́-\epsilon s, \pi \alpha \rho-\epsilon-\sigma \chi{ }^{\prime} \nu, \pi \rho \circ \sigma-\epsilon \hat{\imath} \chi o \nu$.

The original rule that the finite forms were accented when they began the sentence was preserved in Greek in a few aorist imperatives like $\epsilon \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\pi} \epsilon$, ${ }^{\prime} \lambda \theta^{\prime} \epsilon, \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \rho \rho^{\prime}, \lambda \alpha \beta \epsilon$ (§ 540)
 tive forms became generalized for all positions in the sentence, cp. also aor. mid. imperatives like $\lambda \alpha \beta o \hat{v}, \lambda \iota \pi o \hat{v}, \& c$. In other respects it became the rule in prim. Greek to throw back the accent of the finite forms as far as was permitted by the trisyllabic law, as ' $\epsilon \phi \epsilon \rho \circ \nu, \phi$ ф́ $\rho o v \sigma \iota, \phi \epsilon \rho o ́-$

 imáḥ, vidmá, da.d-máḥ, dađárša; $\lambda i ́ \pi o \nu, \lambda i ́ \pi o \mu \in \nu$ for
older ${ }^{*} \lambda \iota \pi o ́ \nu,{ }^{*} \lambda \iota \pi o ́ \mu \in \nu$, \&c. The original unaccented or enclitic forms then came to be accented after the analogy of the original accented forms. The original accented and unaccented forms were preserved side by side in $\epsilon \hat{i},{ }_{\epsilon} \epsilon^{\prime} \sigma \tau \iota$, $\phi \eta_{\eta}$ beside $\epsilon i \mu i, \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau i, \phi \eta \mu i, \phi \eta \sigma i, \& c$.

Note.-Doric had a processive accent both in verbs and nouns as compared with Attic, as $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \dot{a} \beta o v, ~ \grave{e} \lambda \hat{v} \sigma a v, ~ \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau a ́ \sigma a v, ~$


§ 39. Oxytona preserved their accent in pausa, but otherwise became proclitic, as $\dot{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho i ̀ \tau o u ́ \tau \varphi$. The only exception is the interrogative pronoun $\tau i$ is which always preserved its accent.
§40. The accented word in combinations consisting of an accented word and an enclitic preserved its original accentuation when the combination was in accordance with the trisyllabic law, as фídos $\tau \iota s, \pi o \lambda \lambda \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \iota s \quad \gamma \epsilon$, ка入ós $\tau \iota s$,
 $\kappa \alpha \lambda o ́ s ~ \epsilon ́ \sigma \tau \iota, \pi о \tau \alpha \mu o i ́ ~ \tau \iota \nu \epsilon s, ~ a u ̀ \tau o ́ s ~ \phi \eta \sigma \iota \nu$.
If the enclitic became accented by the trisyllabic law, the first word was accented in the same manner as it would be if followed by another originally accented word, as aủ $\partial \grave{s}$ $\pi o ́ \tau \epsilon \rho о \nu, \pi \alpha \tau \eta ̀ \rho ~ \eta ้ \mu \epsilon \omega \nu$, \&c. Forms like $\eta^{\prime} \kappa o v \sigma \alpha ́ \alpha \iota \nu \omega \nu$,
 were due to the analogy of $\eta_{\kappa} \kappa о \sigma \sigma \alpha$ $\tau \iota \nu 0 s, \& c$. ; and conversely $\ddot{\alpha} \lambda \gamma \epsilon \alpha \hat{\eta} \mu \nu \nu$ for ${ }^{*} \dot{\alpha} \lambda \gamma \epsilon \alpha \dot{\alpha} \dot{\eta} \mu \nu \nu$ after the analogy of ${ }_{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \epsilon \alpha{ }_{\eta}^{\eta} \mu \bar{\tau} \nu$.

In other cases where we should expect the original accentuation to be regulated by the trisyllabic law, we find nothing but deviations from the law. These deviations were due to the tendency in the language to preserve the position and individuality of the accent of the first word, and partly also to prevent two acutes following each other in successive syllables. The trisyllabic law only held good for
these combinations in so far as not more than two syllables were allowed to be unaccented after the principal accent :-

The first word, whether proparoxytone or properispomenon, got the acute accent on the final syllable in addition
 $\tau \iota \nu \alpha, \pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau o ́ s \quad \phi \eta \sigma \iota, \sigma \hat{\omega} \mu \alpha ́ \tau \epsilon, \sigma \hat{\omega} \mu \alpha ́ \pi ~ \pi o v, \sigma \hat{\omega} \mu \alpha ́ ~ \tau \iota \nu o s$. This acute was the same which unaccented words had before enclitics, as $\pi \epsilon \rho i ́ \tau \epsilon, \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \tau \iota \nu \epsilon \varsigma, \epsilon^{\prime \prime} \pi o v, \& \mathrm{c}$.

Paroxytona remained unchanged before monosyllabic enclitics containing a long vowel, as $\ddot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega s, \pi \omega s, \pi o \lambda \lambda \alpha ́ \kappa \iota s$ $\pi \omega s$.

Dissyllabic enclitics got a principal accent after paroxytona, as $\phi i ́ \lambda o s ~ \epsilon ̇ \sigma \tau i ́, ~ \tau \epsilon ́ \chi \nu \eta s ~ \tau \iota \nu o ́ s, ~ a ̈ \lambda \lambda \omega \nu ~ \tau \iota \nu \hat{\omega} \nu$. This was the same accent which enclitics had at the beginning of a sentence, as $\tau \iota \nu \omega \bar{\omega} \nu \mu^{\prime} \nu$. See Brugmann, Griechische Grammatik, pp. 157-9.

## CHAPTER II

## THE PRIMITIVE INDO-GERMANIC VOWELSOUNDS

§ 41. The parent Indo-Germanic language had the following vowel-system :-

| Short vowels | a, e, i, o, u, ә |
| :---: | :---: |
| Long | $\overline{\mathbf{a}}, \overline{\mathrm{e}}, \overline{\mathrm{i}}, \overline{\mathrm{o}}, \overline{\mathrm{u}}$ |
| Short diphthongs | ai, ei, oi, au, eu, ou |
| Long |  |
| Short vocalic | 1, m, n, r |

Note.-r. The short vowels $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{u}, \boldsymbol{\partial}$, the long vowels $\overline{\mathbf{i}}, \overline{\mathbf{u}}$, and vocalic $\frac{1}{6}$, m, n, re occurred originally only in syllables which did not bear the principal accent of the word.

The short vowels $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{u}$, and vocalic $1_{0}, \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{r}$ arose from the loss of e in the strong forms ei, eu, el, em, en, er, which was caused by the principal accent having been shifted to some other syllable in the word.
$ə$, the quality of which cannot be precisely defined, arose from the weakening of an original $\overline{\mathbf{a}}, \overline{\mathrm{e}}$, or $\overline{\mathbf{o}}$, caused by the loss of accent. It is generally pronounced like the final vowel in German Gabe, gift.
$\overline{\mathbf{i}}$ and $\overline{\mathbf{u}}$ were contractions of weak diphthongs which arose from the strong forms eiə, $\bar{a} i, \bar{e} i, \bar{o} i$; euə, $\bar{a} u$, $\bar{e} u$, $\bar{o} u$ through the loss of accent. The e in eio, euə had disappeared before the contraction took place. Although the əi, $\boldsymbol{\mathrm { u }}$, which arose from the weakening of long diphthongs, generally became contracted to $\overline{\mathrm{i}}, \overline{\mathrm{u}}$, there are phonological reasons for assuming that they occasionally became ai, au under certain unknown conditions and thus fell together with original ai, au, but the uncontracted forms were so rare in the parent Indg. language that no further account will be taken of them in this Grammar.

The diphthongs were falling diphthongs, that is the accent was on the first element (see § 98, note 4). Strictly speaking the combination a, e, or o+ nasal or liquid is also a diphthong, because the history and development of such combinations are precisely parallel with those of the diphthongs ai, ei, oi and au, eu, ou. See Ch. IV.
2. Upon theoretical grounds it is generally assumed that the parent Indg. language contained long vocalic $\overline{1}, \overline{\mathrm{~m}}, \overline{\mathrm{n}}, \overline{\mathrm{r}}$, see § 68.
§ 42. In the following table is given the normal development of the prim. Indo-Germanic short and long vowels, short diphthongs, and short vocalic nasals and liquids in the more important languages, viz. Greek, Sanskrit, Latin, Old Irish, Gothic, Old English, Lithuanian and Old Slavonic :-


Note. -From the above table are omitted numerous details for which the grammars of the separate languages should be consulted.

## CHAPTER III

## THE GREEK DEVELOPMENT OF THE INDO. GERMANIC VOWEL-SYSTEM

## A. The Short Vowels.

## a

§ 43. Indg. a remained in Greek as also in the oldest periods of the other languages except Old Slavonic where it became o, as á $\gamma \rho o ́ s$, Skr. ajraḥ, Lat. ager, Goth. akrs, field; ä $\gamma \omega$, Skr. ájāmi, Lat. ago, O.Ir. agim, $I$ drive, lead, O.Icel. aka, to drive; ${ }^{\gamma} \gamma \chi^{\omega}$, Lat. ango, cp. Goth. aggwus, narrow ; ä $\lambda \lambda$ 右, Lat. alius, Goth. aljis, other; $\alpha_{\alpha} \lambda s$, Lat. gen. salis, O.Ir. salann, Goth. salt, O.Slav. solĭ, salt ; $\ddot{\alpha} \mu \phi \omega$, Lat. ambo; $\ddot{\alpha} \nu \epsilon \mu 0 s$, wind, Lat. animus, mind, O.Ir. anim, soul, Skr. ániti, he breathes, Goth. us-anan, to breathe out, expire ; $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau i$, Skr. ánti, opposite, before, Lat. ante, before, Goth. and, along, on, Lith. añt, on ; ä $\xi \omega \nu$, Skr. ákṣah, Lat. axis, OHG. ahsa, Lith. aszis, axle ; đ̈nó, Skr. ápa, Lat. ab, Goth. af, from, away from; д́ pów, Lat. aro, Goth. arja, Lith. ariù, 1 plough, cp. O.Ir. arathar, plough; ס́́ккрv, Lat. dacruma, lacruma, Goth. tagr, tear; ка́т $\quad$ os, wild boar, Lat. caper, O.Icel. hafr, he-goat ; oi $\delta \alpha=$ Skr. véda.

## e

§ 44. Indg. e (=Skr. a, Lat. e, (o, i), O.Ir. e, (i), Goth. i , (aí), OE. e, (i), Lith. O.Slav. e) generally remained in Greek, as $\gamma^{\epsilon} \nu$ 生, Skr. jánaḥ, Lat. genus, race, generation ; $\gamma^{\prime}$ éves, Skr. hánuh, jawbone, Lat. gena, Goth. kinnus, cheek; $\delta^{\prime} \kappa \alpha$, Skr. dáša, Lat. decem, Goth. taíhun, ten ; Є̇ $\gamma \omega$, Skr. ahám, Lat. ego, Goth. ik, 1 ; ধ́̇os, Skr. sádaḥ, seat, Lat. sedēre, OE. sittan, to sit ; ${ }^{\prime \prime} \delta \omega$, Skr. ádmi, Lat. edo, OE. ete, I eat ; ধ̈vos, Skr. sánaḥ, Lat. senex, O.Ir. sen, Goth.
sineigs, Lith. sẽnas, old; $\notin \pi \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota$, Skr. sácatē, Lat. sequitur, he follows, Lith. sekù, I follow ; є́ $\pi \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha}$, Skr. saptá, Lat. septem, O.Ir. secht, Goth. sibun, Lith. septyni, seven; $\epsilon_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \pi \pi \omega$, Skr. sárpāmi, Lat. serpo, I creep; '̇ $\sigma \tau i ́$, Skr. ásti, Lat. est, Goth. ist, Lith. ẽsti, is ; $\kappa \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \pi \omega$, Lat. clepo, Goth. hlifa, I steal ; $\mu$ '́ $\sigma \sigma o s, ~ \mu \epsilon ́ \sigma o s ~ f r o m ~ * ~ \mu ́ ́ \theta j o s, ~ S k r . ~ m a ́ d h y a h, ~, ~$ Lat. medius, Goth. midjis, middle ; $\pi \epsilon \in \nu \tau \epsilon$, Skr. páñca, Goth. fimf, Lith. penkì, five; $\pi \epsilon \rho i$, Skr. pári, around, about, Lat. per-, O.Ir. er-, Goth. faír-, Lith. per-, through; $\tau \epsilon$, Skr. ca, Lat. que, and; $\phi^{\prime} \rho \omega$, Skr. bhárāmi, Lat. fero, O.Ir. berim, OE. bere, O.Slav. berą, I bear; Cret. $\tau \rho \epsilon \in \epsilon \varsigma$, Att. $\tau \rho \in i ̂ s$, Skr. tráyah, from *tréjes, three; $\nu \in(f)$ ) ${ }^{\prime}$, Skr. návaḥ, Lat. novos, -us, Goth. niujis, new; $\rho \in(f) \epsilon \iota$, Skr. srávati, it flows ; ${ }_{\alpha} \gamma \epsilon$, Lat. age ; $\delta \in ́ \delta о \rho к \alpha=$ Skr. dadárš̆a; $\notin \notin \epsilon \rho о \nu=$ Skr. ábharam, $\lambda$ úк $=$ Skr. vfrka, Lat. lupe; $\gamma^{\prime} \nu \in \neq$ Skr. jánasah, Lat. generis ; $\pi \alpha \tau \epsilon \in \rho \in=$ Skr. pitáraḥ; $\phi \in ́ \rho \epsilon \tau \epsilon=$ Skr. bháratha, Goth. baírip, O.Slav. berete.

Note.-I. It is difficult to account for the $\iota$ beside $\epsilon$ in ${ }_{\iota} \boldsymbol{\iota} \sigma ө \iota$ :


 $\chi \epsilon i ́ \lambda \iota \iota$ from ${ }^{*} \chi^{\epsilon} \sigma \lambda \iota \circ \iota=$ Lesb. $\chi^{\epsilon} \lambda \lambda \iota o \iota$; iँ $\pi \pi о$ : Lat. equos. In some of the above examples the $\iota: \epsilon$ may be due to vowelassimilation, cp . §§ 73-4.
2. є became $a$ before $\rho$ in the dialects of Elis and Locris, as

3. $\epsilon$ became $\imath$ before guttural vowels in Boeot. Cypr. Pamph. Thessal. and some of the Doric dialects (Arg. Cret. Heracl. and Lac.), as $\theta \iota o ́ s=\theta \epsilon o ́ s ;$ Boeot. F'́т $\tau \alpha=$ є̈ $\tau \epsilon \alpha$; Cret. ${ }^{\imath} \omega \nu \tau \iota=$ Att. $\epsilon \omega \omega \tau$.

$$
\mathbf{i}
$$

§ 45. Indg. i remained in Greek and generally also in the oldest periods of the other languages, in Latin it became e finally (mare beside pl. maria) and before $\mathbf{r}$ from older $\mathbf{s}$
（gen．cineris beside nom．cinis），as $\delta \iota-$ from ${ }^{*} \delta \mathrm{~F}^{\prime}$ ，Skr．dvi．，
 OE．witon，we know，cp．Lat．vidēre ；${ }^{\imath} \mu \epsilon \nu=$ Skr．imáh， cp．Lat．itum ；Dor．acc．${ }^{2} \nu, h i m$ ，Lat．Goth．is，Lith．jis，he ； $\mu \nu \nu v ́ \theta \omega$ ，Skr．minó́mi，Lat．minuo，I lessen，Goth．mins， less；$\pi i \sigma \sigma \alpha$ ，$\pi i \tau \tau \alpha$ from ${ }^{*} \pi \iota k j \alpha$ ，Lat．pix，Lith．pikis，pitch； $\tau$ ís，Lat．quis，who ？；loc．pl．$\tau \rho \iota \sigma i ́$, Skr．triṣ̆ú，Lat．tribus， O．Ir．trib，Goth．prim，Lith．trisè，tribus ；グס८бтos，Skr． svádiṣ̣thaḥ，Goth．sutists，sweetest ；ï $\sigma \tau \bar{\alpha} \mu \iota$ ，ï $\sigma \tau \eta \mu \iota=$ Skr． tíṣthāmi，cp．Lat．sisto ；єípí，Skr．ásmi，Lith．esmì，am ； ＇́ $\sigma \tau i ́$, Skr．ásti，Lith．êsti，is；Dor．ф́єpovtı＝Skr．bháranti ； тódıs，$\pi o ́ \lambda \iota \nu, ~ c p . ~ S k r . ~ a ́ v i h, ~ a c c . ~ a ́ v i m, ~ s h e e p, ~ L a t . ~ t u r r i s, ~$ turrim；loc．sing．$\mu \eta \tau \rho i ́=$ Skr．mātári，Lat．mātre，O．Slav． materi．

## 0

§ 46．Indg．o（Skr．a，also $\overline{\mathbf{a}}$ in open syllables，Lat．O．Ir． o，（u），Goth．Lith．a，O．Slav．o）remained in Greek，as үó $\mu \phi$ os，nail，bolt，Skr．jámbhah，tooth，OE．camb，comb； ס́́ঠоркє $=$ Skr．dadárš́a ；סó $\mu о$ ，Lat．domus ；őıs，Skr． ávih，Lat．ovis，Lith．avìs，sheep，cp．Goth．awistr，sheep－
 ahtáu，eight ；ős，Skr．yáḥ，who ；dual ö $\sigma \sigma \epsilon$ ，cp．Lat．oculus， Lith．akìs，O．Slav．oko，eye ；то́ркоs，Lat．porcus，O．Ir． orc，OHG．farah，pig，boar ；$\pi$ ó $\iota \iota$ ，Lith．pàts，husband， Skr．pátih，master，cp．Lat．potis ；$\pi o ́ \tau \epsilon \rho o s$, Skr．kataráh， Goth．luapar，Lith．katràs，which of two？；$\pi \rho o ́$, Skr．prá， before，Lat．pro－，O．Ir．ro－，Goth．fra－，Lith．pra－，O．Slav． pro－；$\tau$ ó，Skr．tád，Goth．bat－a，O．Slav．to，the，this ；入úkos ＝Skr．vŕkaḥ，Lat．lupus，wolf；$\gamma$ ヒ́vos，Skr．jánaḥ，Lat． genus，race，generation ；suróv，Skr．yugám，Lat．jugum， yoke，Dor．фє́ $\rho \circ \mu \epsilon$ ，Skr．bhárāmaḥ，Goth．baíram，we bear ； Dor．фє́ $о \nu \tau \iota$, Skr．bháranti，Lat．ferunt，Goth．baírand， they bear ；＂$\epsilon \phi \epsilon \rho \circ \nu=$ Skr．ábharam．

## $u$

§ 47. Indg. u remained in the oldest Greek and generally also in the oldest periods of the other languages, but already at an early period it became $\mathfrak{u}$ in Attic and Ionic and probably also in many of the other dialects, as $\epsilon \rho v \theta \rho o ́ s, S k r$. rudhiráḥ, Lat. ruber, red; ̧uyóv, Skr. yugám, Lat. jugum, Goth. juk, yoke ; $\theta v \gamma \alpha ́ \tau \eta \rho$, Skr. duhitár-, Goth. daúhtar, Lith. duktẽ̀, daughter; к $\lambda v \tau$ ós, Skr. š́rutáh, Lat. in-clutus, renowned; gen. кvขós $=$ Skr. š́únaḥ, Lith. szuñs, cp. OE. hund, hound; vvós, Skr. snuș̃á, Lat. nurus, daughter-inlaw; $\beta \alpha \rho v ́ s$, Skr. gurúh, Goth. kaúrus, heavy; ঠáк $\rho v$, Lat. dacruma, lacruma; $\mathfrak{\eta} \delta$ ús $=$ Skr. svādúḥ ; $\mu \epsilon ́ \theta v$, wine, Skr. mádhu, Lith. medùs, honey, OE . medu, mead.

Note.-r. The original u-sound seems to have been regularly preserved in the Laconian, Boeotian, Lesbian, Thessalian, Arcadian, Cyprian and Pamphylian dialects. In these dialects it is mostly represented by ov (sometimes also by o) after the introduction of the Ionic alphabet at about the end of the fifth century b. c. In Boeotian u became ju (ıov) after dental explosives and $\lambda, \nu, \sigma$.
2. We have no means of determining the approximate date at which $\mathbf{u}$ became $\mathfrak{u}$ ( $=$ the $\mathbf{u}$ in French tu) in Attic and Ionic. But it is certain that Ionic $v$ was no longer pronounced like the $\mathbf{u}$ in English put at the end of the fifth century b. c., otherwise the Boeotians, \&c., would not have taken ov to represent their $\mathbf{u}$-sound, when they adopted the Ionic alphabet. Original u must have become a front vowel (ii) in Attic at the period of the oldest inscriptions, because before $Y$ the guttural tenuis is always represented by $\mathbf{K}$ and never by 9 , see Meisterhans, Grammatik der att. Inschriften, pp. 3, 22. On the other hand the Attic and Ionic change of $\mathbf{u}$ to $\mathfrak{i i}$ must be older than the $\overline{\mathbf{u}}$ (written $o v$ ) which arose from older oo, $\boldsymbol{\epsilon o}(\S 80$ ), otherwise this $\overline{\mathbf{u}}$ would have fallen together with original Indg. $\overline{\mathbf{u}}$

 OE. mūs.
§48. Indg. initial $\mathbf{u}$ appears as $\dot{v}$. It is difficult to account for this change unless we may assume that $\mathbf{u}$ became $\dot{v}$ through the intermediate stages $\mathfrak{u}, \mathrm{íu}, \mathrm{ju}$ (cp. § 127), cp. the development of Old French $\mathfrak{u}$ in words like NE. use (júz, northern dial. íuz), ME. üsen from O.Fr. user:- v̈ $\delta \rho o s$, v̈ $\delta \rho \bar{\alpha}$, water serpent, Skr. udráḥ, water animal, Lith. údra, otter ; v̂ $\pi \epsilon \rho$, Skr. upári, Lat. s-uper, Goth. ufar, over, above ; シ̈ $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho o s$, Skr. úttaraḥ, latter, later.

## $ə$

§ 49. $\partial$, which arose from the weakening of original $\overline{\mathrm{a}}, \overline{\mathrm{e}}, \overline{\mathrm{o}}(\S 87)$, became a in all the Indg. languages, except the Aryan branch where it became $\mathbf{i}$, as $\pi \alpha \tau \eta \rho$, Lat. pater, O.Ir. athir, Goth. fadar, Skr. pitár-, father ; $\sigma \tau \alpha \tau o ́ s$, Lat. status, Skr. sthitáh, standing, Goth. staps, place; $\theta v \gamma \dot{\alpha}-$ $\tau \eta \rho$, Skr. duhitár-, daughter; $\pi \alpha \nu-\delta \alpha \mu \alpha ́ \tau \omega \rho, \mathrm{cp}$. Skr. da-
 ániti, he breathes; $\gamma \in \nu \in ́ \tau \omega \rho=$ Skr. janitár•; к $\rho \in ́ \alpha a s$, Skr. kravíh, flesh, raw meat ; nom. acc. neut. pl. $\phi$ '́ $\rho 0 \nu \tau \alpha=$ Skr. bháranti.

Note.-In forms like $\theta \epsilon \tau o ́ s$, Skr. hitáh, $\tau i \theta \epsilon \mu \epsilon \nu$ for ${ }^{*} \tau i \theta a \mu \epsilon \nu$ : $\tau i \theta \eta \mu \nu$; $\delta o \tau o ́ s$, Lat. datus, $\delta i \delta o \mu \epsilon \nu$ for ${ }^{*} \delta i \delta \alpha \mu \epsilon \nu$ : $\delta i \delta \delta \omega \mu$ the $\epsilon, o$ was due to qualitative assimilation to the $\eta, \omega$, but this does not account for the $\epsilon$ in the second syllable of dissyllabic heavy bases like $\gamma \epsilon \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \dot{\epsilon} \tau \omega \rho$ : Skr. janitár.

## B. The Long Vowels.

## $\overline{\mathbf{a}}$

§ 50. Indg. $\overline{\mathrm{a}}$ (= Skr. Lat. O.Ir. $\bar{a}$, Germanic Lith. $\overline{\mathbf{o}}$, O.Slav. a) remained in all the Greek dialects except Ionic and Attic, as Dor. à $\delta u ́ s$, Skr. svādúḥ, Lat. suāvis, OS. swōti, sweet; Dor. $\mu \bar{\alpha} \tau \eta \rho$, Skr. mātár., Lat. māter, O.Ir. māthir, OE. mōdor, O.Slav. mati, mother, Lith. motẽ, wife ; Dor. фā $\begin{gathered}\text { ós, } \\ \text { a kind of oak, Lat. fāgus, } \mathrm{OE} \text {. bōc-trēow, beech; }\end{gathered}$

Dor. $\phi \rho \bar{a} \tau \eta \rho$, member of a clan, Skr. bhrấtar., Lat. frāter, O.Ir. brāthir, OE. brō̄or, brother, Lith. broterẽ̃lis, little brother; Dor. ${ }^{\epsilon} \beta \bar{\alpha} \nu$, Skr. ágām, I went ; Dor. ${ }^{\ell} \epsilon \sigma \tau \bar{\alpha} \nu$, Skr. ásthām, I stood, Lat. stāre, to stand, cp. OE. stōd, $I$ stood; nom. acc. sing. Dor. $\tau \bar{\iota} \mu \dot{\alpha}, \tau \bar{\iota} \mu \bar{\alpha} \nu$, cp. Skr. ášvā, ášvām, mare; ending of the third pers. dual active Dor. $\cdot \tau \bar{\alpha} \nu=$ Skr. $-\operatorname{tā} \mathrm{m}$.
§ 51. Indg. $\overline{\mathrm{a}}$ became $\eta$ (=long open $\overline{\mathrm{e}}$ ) in prim. Attic and Ionic. In the oldest historic period this $\eta$ was more open than the $\eta=$ Indg. $\overline{\mathrm{e}}(\S 52)$, the former being written H and the latter E in the oldest Ionic inscriptions. $\eta$ from older $\bar{\alpha}$ remained in Ionic, but became $\bar{\alpha}$ again in Attic after $\rho, \epsilon, l$, as Dor. $\dot{\alpha} \delta \dot{v} s$, í $\sigma \tau \bar{\alpha} \mu l, \mu \dot{\alpha} \tau \eta \rho, \phi \bar{\alpha} \mu i ́,{ }^{\prime} \beta \beta \bar{\alpha} \nu, \tau \bar{\tau} \mu \dot{\alpha}$ $=$ Attic, Ionic $\grave{\eta} \delta \dot{v} s, ~ i ̈ \sigma \tau \eta \mu l$, \&c. Attic $\pi \rho \frac{\dot{\alpha}}{} \tau \tau \omega, \chi \chi^{\omega} \rho \bar{\alpha}$, $\gamma \epsilon \nu \epsilon \bar{\alpha}, \nu \in \bar{\alpha} \nu i \bar{\alpha} s, \beta i \bar{\alpha}, \kappa \alpha \rho \delta i \bar{\alpha}=$ Ionic $\pi \rho \eta{ }^{\prime} \sigma \sigma \omega, \chi$ Х $\omega \rho \eta, \gamma \in \nu \in \dot{\eta}$, $\nu \in \eta \nu i ́ \eta s, \beta i \eta$, крабí $\eta$. But $\eta$ did not become $\bar{\alpha}$ after $\rho$ in Attic when an intervening $F$ had disappeared, as Att. кóp $\eta$, Ion. кои́ $\eta$, Arcad. ко́ $\rho\lceil\bar{\alpha}$; Att. $\delta \epsilon ́ \rho \eta$, Ion. $\delta \epsilon \iota \rho \eta$, Lesb. $\delta \epsilon ́ \rho \rho \bar{\alpha}$, from ${ }^{*} \delta \epsilon ́ \rho \digamma \bar{\alpha}$.

## $\overline{\text { ē }}$

§ 52. Indg. $\overline{\mathrm{e}}$ (= Skr. $\overline{\mathrm{a}}$, Lat. Goth. $\overline{\mathrm{e}}$, O.Ir. ī, Lith. è, OE. $\overline{\boldsymbol{x}}, \mathrm{O}$.Slav. ě) generally remained in Greek, as ${ }_{\alpha} \eta \mu \iota$ from * ${ }^{\alpha}-F \eta-\mu l$, Skr. vāmi, I blow, Lith. véjas, wind; Hom. $\grave{\eta} \alpha$, Skr. ás am, I was; ̀̀ $\mu$ í, Skr. sāmí, Lat. sēmi•, half; acc. $Z \hat{\eta} \nu=$ Skr. dyấm, sky ; $\mu \eta{ }_{\eta} \nu$, Lat. mēnsis, O.Ir. mī, month, Skr. más-, Goth. mēna, Lith. ménů, moon; $\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \omega$, I am full, Skr. prātáh, Lat. im.plētus, full, filled; $\tau i \theta \eta \mu \iota=$ Skr. dádhāmi, cp. Lith. déti, to put, place ; єìs, Skr. syắh, O.Lat. siēs, thou mayest be.

Note.-I. In the oldest Attic and Ionic $\eta=$ Indg. $\overline{\mathrm{e}}$ was closer than $\eta$ from Indg. $\bar{a}$ ( $\S 51$ ), the former being written $\mathbf{E}$ and the latter $\mathbf{H}$ in the oldest Ionic inscriptions, as $\mathrm{ME}=$ Dor. $\mu \dot{\eta}$, but $\triangle H M O \Sigma=$ Dor. $\delta a ̂ \mu o s$. The two sounds fell together in Attic in the fifth century в. с.
2. Indg. $\bar{e}$ became a very open sound $(\bar{x})$ in the dialect of Elis, which was often written $\bar{\alpha}$, as $\mu \bar{\alpha}, \pi a \tau \alpha \hat{a} \rho=\mu \eta$, $\pi a \tau \eta$ 向 . In Boeotian, Thessalian and Pamphylian it became long close $\overline{\mathrm{e}}$ which was written $\boldsymbol{\epsilon \epsilon}(\S \S 12,58)$ after the introduction of the Ionic alphabet in the fifth century b. c., as Boeot. Thess.

i
§ 53. Indg. i remained in Greek and generally also in the oldest periods of the other languages, as $\bar{\tau} \mu \bar{\alpha} s$, leathern strap, Skr. simann-, parting of the hair on the top of the head, OE, sima, rope, cord ; ì $\tau \bar{\alpha}$, willow, Lat. vītis, vine, Lith. výti, O.Slav. viti, to wind, plait; îós from *Fīoos, Lat. virus, O.Ir. fî, poison; $\bar{\iota}_{S}^{\prime}=$ Lat. vīs; $\pi i \theta_{l}$, drink thou, Skr. pittáh, having drunk, O.Slav. piti, to drink; $\pi \hat{\imath}($ (F)os, $\pi i ̀(F) \omega \nu$, Skr. pívan•, fat, plump; коракìvos, cp. Skr. navínaḥ, new, Lat. haedīnus, Goth. gáiteins, belonging to a goat.

## $\overline{0}$

§ 54. Indg. $\bar{o}$ (= Skr. O.Ir. $\overline{\mathrm{a}}$, Lat. and Germanic $\overline{\mathrm{o}}$, Lith. ů, O.Slav. a) remained in Greek, as acc. sing. Dor. $\beta \hat{\omega} \nu=$ Skr. gá́m ; $\gamma \nu \omega \tau o ́ s$, Skr. jñātáḥ, Lat. (g)nōtus, O.Ir. gnāth, known ; $\delta i \delta \omega \mu \iota=$ Skr. dádāmi; $\delta \hat{\omega} \rho o \nu$, Skr. dấnam, Lat. dōnum, O.Ir. dān, gift, Lith. dùti, O.Slav. dati, to give ; $\delta v ́ \omega$, Vedic duvá, dvá, O.Ir. dā, two ; $\pi \epsilon ́ \pi \omega \kappa \alpha$, Lat. pōtāvi, I have drunk, Skr. pá́ti, he drinks; $\pi \lambda \omega \tau$ ós, swimming, Goth. flōdus, OE. flōd, flood, tide, cp. Lat. plōrāre, to weep aloud; Dor. $\pi$ 白 (Att. Ion. $\pi$ oús, the ov of which has never been satisfactorily explained), Skr. pát, OE. fōt,
 Skr. dātá, giver ; nom. acc. dual of o-stems $\lambda$ úk $\omega=$ Vedic vr̂kā ; $\tau \epsilon \in \kappa \tau \omega \nu$, Skr. tākṣ̄ā, carpenter ; $\phi \in \notin \rho=$ Skr. bhárā$\mathrm{mi} ; \phi \in \rho \in ́ \tau \omega=$ Skr. bháratād, cp. O.Lat. estōd.

Note.- $\bar{o}$ became $\overline{\mathfrak{u}}$ (written ov) in the Thessalian dialect, as


## $\overline{\mathbf{u}}$

§ 55. Indg. ū remained in the oldest Greek and generally also in the oldest periods of the other languages, but already at an early period it became $\overline{\mathrm{u}}$ in those dialects which changed $\mathbf{u}$ to $\ddot{\text { ü }}$ (§ 47), as $\begin{gathered} \\ \epsilon\end{gathered} \bar{v} \tau o \nu$, Skr. ábhūtam, ye two were, cp. Lith. búti, to be ; $\theta \bar{v} \mu$ ós, courage, passion, Skr. dhūmáh., Lat. fūmus, Lith. dūmai (pl.), smoke; $\sigma \kappa v ̂ \tau o s$, Lat. scūtum, shield ; $\mu \hat{v} s$, Skr. múṣ̣̆, Lat. OE. mūs, mouse; $\nu \hat{v}$, Skr. OE. nū, now ; ỏф $\rho \hat{s}$, Skr. brúụ, OE. brū, eyebrow ; $\pi \dot{v} \theta \omega$, I make to rot, Skr. pû́yati, he stinks, Lith. púti, to rot, OE. fūl, foul, rotten; ̂̂̀s, Lat. sūs, OE. sū, sow, pig, Skr. sū-karáh, boar.

## C. The Short Diphthongs.

## ai

§ 56. Indg. ai (= Skr. è, Lat. O.Ir. ae (older ai), Goth. ái, OE. à, Lith. ai, (ë), O.Slav. ě) generally remained in Greek, as $\alpha i \theta \omega, I$ burn, Skr. édhaḥ, firewood, Lat. aedēs, sanctuary, originally fire-place, hearth, O.Ir. aed, fire, OE. ād, funeral, pile ; ai $\omega \nu$, Lat. aevum, Goth. áiws, life-time, eternity; $\lambda \alpha$ ıós, Lat. laevus, left; $\sigma \kappa \alpha$ lós, Lat. scaevus, left ; fem. nom. pl. $\tau \alpha i=$ Skr. té, Lat. is-tae ; $\phi \in ́ \rho \in \tau \alpha \iota$, $\phi^{\prime} \rho о \nu \tau \alpha \iota=$ Skr. bháratē, bhárantē.

Note.-In Boeotian ac became $\alpha \epsilon$ in the fifth century b. с., which a century later became $\eta$, and then still later long close $\eta$ (written $\epsilon$ ).
§ 57. The combination - $\alpha \iota$ F- became $-\bar{\alpha}$ - before $\epsilon$ - and $\iota$ vowels in Attic and Ionic, as $\delta \bar{\alpha} \eta \rho^{\rho}$ from * $\delta \alpha \iota F \eta \rho$, Skr. dēvár., Lat. lēvir, Lith. dëverìs, brother-in-law ; $\bar{\alpha} \in i ́, ~ C y p r . ~$ $\alpha i \neq \epsilon i$, beside $\alpha i \omega \nu$; $\kappa \frac{1}{\alpha} \epsilon \iota, \kappa \lambda \frac{\alpha}{\alpha} \epsilon \iota$ from ${ }^{*} \kappa \alpha i ́ f \epsilon \iota,{ }^{*} \kappa \lambda \alpha i \neq \epsilon \iota$, beside $\kappa \alpha i ́ \omega, \kappa \lambda \alpha i ́ \omega$; Ion. $\dot{\alpha} i \sigma \sigma \omega$, Att. $\ddot{\alpha}_{\alpha} \tau \tau \omega$ from *aifıkj $\omega$. Forms like $\kappa \dot{\alpha} \omega, \kappa \lambda \hat{\alpha} \omega$ were new formations due to levelling out the $\bar{\alpha}$ in forms like $\kappa \bar{\alpha} \epsilon \ell, k \lambda \hat{\alpha} \in \iota$. In Att. ai $\epsilon_{i}^{\prime}$ the $\alpha \iota$ was due to the influence of $\alpha i \omega \nu$. See $\S \S \mathbf{7 5}, 125$.
ei
§ 58. Indg. ei (= Skr. ē, O.Lat. ei, later i, O.Ir. $\overline{\mathrm{e}}$, (ia), OE. ī, Goth. ī (written ei), Lith. ei, (ë), O.Slav. i) remained in Greek until about the beginning of the fifth century в. с., when it became long close $\overline{\mathbf{e}}$ in Attic, Ionic and the milder Doric dialects, although $\epsilon \iota$ was retained in writing. This accounts for the writing of $\epsilon \iota$ for older $\epsilon \epsilon$ in such forms as Att. $\tau \rho \in i ̂ s$ from ${ }^{*} \tau \rho \epsilon ́ j \epsilon s=$ Skr. tráyạ̣. The old diphthongal pronunciation was still preserved at the time when vowel contraction took place in such forms as Att. $\alpha \underset{\ell}{\alpha} \delta \omega=$ $\dot{\alpha} \epsilon i ́ \delta \omega, \nu \bar{\iota} \kappa \underset{\imath}{s} s=\nu \bar{l} \kappa \alpha ́ \epsilon \iota s$, as compared with $\phi \bar{\alpha} \nu o ́ s=\phi \alpha \epsilon \iota \nu o ́ s$ from * $\phi \alpha F \epsilon \sigma \nu o ́ s, \nu \bar{\imath} \kappa \hat{\alpha} \nu=\nu \bar{\imath} \kappa \alpha ́ \epsilon \iota \nu$ from ${ }^{*} \nu \bar{\iota} \kappa \alpha ́ \epsilon \epsilon \nu$. Examples are :- $\delta \epsilon i ́ \kappa \nu \bar{v} \mu \iota, I$ show, Lat. dico, I say, Goth. ga-teihan, to tell, announce ; єîбı, Skr. éti, Lith. eĩti, eĩt, he goes, Lat. is, thou goest ; $\lambda \epsilon i \pi m \omega$, Lith. lëkù, I leave, Goth. leîvan, to lend; $\pi \epsilon i \theta \omega$, Lat. fido, cp. OE. bidan, to remain; $\sigma \tau \epsilon i ́ \chi \omega$, $\mathrm{cp} . \mathrm{OE}$. stigan, to rise.

Note. - In Boeotian ei had become $\overline{\mathbf{i}}$ already in the fifth


## oi

§ 59. Indg. oi (= Skr. ē, O.Lat. oi, oe, later $\bar{u}$, O.Ir. oi, (oe), Goth. ái, OE. ā, Lith. ai, (ë), O.Slav. ě) remained in Greek, as oîठ $\alpha$, Skr. véda, Goth. wáit, OE. wāt, I know; oiv $\eta$, oiv $\ddagger$, the one on dice, Lat. oinos, ūnus, O.Ir. oen, Goth. áins, OE. ān, one; masc. nom. pl. roí, Skr. tế, Goth. pái, OE. pā, Lith. tễ, the, these; $\lambda \epsilon$ 向oı $\pi \epsilon$, Skr. riréca, has left, Goth. láiv, OE. lāh, he lent; loc. pl. $\lambda$ úкоь-бı $=$ Skr. vṛ́kē-ṣ̌u.

Note.- In Boeotian oı became of in the fifth century b. c., which two centuries later became $\overline{\mathfrak{u}}$ and then still later $\bar{i}$ (written $\epsilon \iota$ ).

## au

§ 60. Indg. au (=Skr. $\overline{\mathbf{o}}$, Lat. Lith. au, O.Ir. $\overline{\mathbf{o}},(\mathrm{ua})$, Goth. áu, OE. ēa, O.Slav. u) remained in Greek, as $\alpha u \neq \xi \omega$, $\alpha v ̌ \xi \alpha \nu \omega$, Lat. augeo, Goth. áuka, Lith. áugu, I grow, increase, cp. Skr. ốjas-, strength; av̉os from * $\sigma \alpha v \sigma o s, \mathrm{OE}$. sēar, Lith. saũsas, dry, withered; кav入ós, Lat. caulis, stalk; $\tau \alpha \hat{v} \rho o s$, Lat. taurus, bull; $\alpha \hat{v}, \alpha \hat{v}-\tau \epsilon$, again, Lat. au-t, au-tem.

## eu

§ 61. Indg. eu (= Skr. ō, O.Lat. ou, later $\bar{u}$, O.Ir. $\overline{\mathbf{o}}$, (ua), Goth. iu, OE. ēo, Lith. au, O.Slav. u) remained in Greek, as $\epsilon \cup ̛ \omega$, Skr. óșāmi, Lat. ūro, I burn ; $\gamma \epsilon \dot{v} \omega, I$ give a taste of, Skr. jóşati, he tastes, Goth. kiusan, OE. cēosan, to choose; $\pi \epsilon$ ย́Өouaı, I inquire, Skr. bódhati, he is awake, learns, Goth. ana-biudan, to order, command, OE. bēodan, to offer ; $\zeta \epsilon \hat{v} \gamma \mu \alpha=$ Lat. jūmentum, $\nu \in \hat{v} \mu \alpha=$ Lat. nūmen, voc. $Z \epsilon \hat{v} \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \epsilon \rho=$ Lat. Jūpiter.

## 01

§ 62. Indg. ou (= Skr. $\overline{\mathbf{o}}$, O.Lat. ou, later $\overline{\mathbf{u}}$, O.Ir. $\overline{\mathbf{o}}$, (ua), Goth. áu, OE. ēa, Lith. au, O.Slav. u) remained in the oldest period of the language, but in Attic and Ionic it became $\overline{\mathbf{u}}$ through the intermediate stage of long close $\overline{\mathbf{o}}$ in the fifth century b.c., although the ov was retained in writing. This accounts for the writing of ov for older oo in such forms as gen. $i \pi \pi \pi o v$ from older ${ }^{*} i \pi \pi \pi o o(§ 325)$ and in $\ddot{i} \pi \pi \pi o v s$ from older $i \pi \pi \pi o \nu s$ ( $(69)$. From our knowledge of the other Indg. languages the diphthong ou must have been fairly common in the parent language, but in Greek there are only a few words which contain it, as d́коv́w, Goth. háusja, I hear. It occurred originally especially in the perfect active singular of verbs which have $-\epsilon v$ - in the present stem-forms and in nouns related to such verbs, as
 $\sigma \pi \epsilon \cup \dot{\delta} \delta \omega$; but in verbs like $\kappa \in \dot{v} \theta \omega, \tau \epsilon \cup ́ \chi \omega, \phi \epsilon \dot{v} \gamma \omega$ the perfect
 formed direct from the present, see § 518.

## D. The Long Diphthongs.

§ 63. The parent language had the same number of long as of short diphthongs, but the history of the former in the separate languages differs materially from that of the latter. The second element of long diphthongs often disappeared medially before consonants (especially m), and also finally, as acc. sing. Hom. and Dor. $\beta \hat{\omega} \nu=$ Skr. găm beside nom. gāúḥ; ỏкт白, Lat. octō, Skr. aṣ̂tāú beside aṣ̂tá, Goth. ahtáu, Indg. *oktốu. The exact conditions under which the second element remained or disappeared have never been ascertained. When the second element was preserved in the European languages, the first element was regularly shortened before a following consonant, as $Z$ eús from *Z $\eta$ ús $=$ Skr. dyāúh, , $k$ y $;$ 入úkoıs, Lat. lupīs, Lith. vilkaĩs, beside Skr. vfŕkāih. When the second element of a long diphthong disappeared or when the first element was simply shortened, the resultant long vowel or short diphthong had the same further development in the different languages as the original simple long vowels or short diphthongs.
$\bar{a} i: ~ O p t . ~ \delta \rho \alpha i ̂ \mu \epsilon \nu$ from ${ }^{*} \delta \rho \bar{\alpha} \iota \mu \epsilon \nu$, beside indic. ${ }^{\ell} \delta \rho \bar{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \nu$; $\Theta_{\eta} \beta \alpha l-\gamma \epsilon \nu \eta \eta_{s}, \mu \epsilon \sigma \alpha l-\pi o ́ \lambda \iota o s$; dat. sing. $\chi^{\omega} \rho \rho \alpha, \theta \in \hat{\alpha}$, cp. Skr. sếnāyāi, to an army, Lat. mensae, Osc. deívaí, divae, Goth. gibái, to a gift, Lith. rañkai, to a hand.
ēi: Opt. $\gamma \rho \alpha \phi \epsilon i \hat{\mu} \epsilon \nu$ from ${ }^{*} \gamma \rho \alpha \phi \eta \iota \mu \epsilon \nu$, beside indic. $\bar{\epsilon} \gamma \rho \alpha ́ \phi \eta \nu$; aor. ${ }^{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \iota \psi \alpha$ from ${ }^{*} \epsilon \lambda \eta \iota \psi \alpha=$ Skr. árāikș̌am, Indg. *élēiqsm (cp. § 507); $\theta \eta-\lambda \hat{\eta}, \theta \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta \alpha \iota, c p$. Lat. fé-mina, fē-lāre, root dhēì, suckle.
ōi : $\lambda$ úкoıs, Lat. lupīs, Lith. vilkaĩs, beside Skr. vợkāiḥ;
opt. $\gamma \nu o i ̂ \mu \epsilon \nu$ from ${ }^{*} \gamma \nu \omega \iota \mu \in \nu$, beside indic. ${ }^{\ell} \gamma \nu \omega \mu \in \nu$; dat. sing. $\lambda \kappa ́ \kappa \varphi$, Lat. lupō, Lith. viĩkui, beside Skr. vf̊kāya (with the enclitic particle $\cdot a$ ), cp. Skr. dat. sing. tásmāi, him.
āu: $\nu \alpha \hat{v}$ s beside Skr. nāụ̄́, ship; loc. pl. $\nu \alpha v \sigma i ́, ~ S k r . ~$ nāuṣ̆ú.
 áyāukṣ̌am, Indg. *éjēuqsm (cp. § 507); acc. $Z \hat{\eta} \nu=$ Skr. dyấm.
$\bar{o} u: \beta o v e_{s}$ from ${ }^{*} \beta \omega u ́ s=$ Skr. gāúḥ ; acc. Dor. $\beta \hat{\omega} \nu=$ Skr. gấm; dual of o-stems $\lambda$ úk $\omega=$ Skr. vốkāu beside vŕkā; $\pi \lambda \omega \tau$ ós, cp. OE. flōd, flood, tide, beside Lith. pláuju, I rinse.

## E. The Vocalic Nasals and Liquids.

§ 64. The vocalic nasals and liquids, generally written $\mathrm{m}, \mathrm{n}, 1, \mathrm{r}$ in order to distinguish them from the corresponding consonants $\mathbf{m}, \mathrm{n}, 1, \mathrm{r}$, occurred originally in unaccented syllables only. They arose in the parent Indg. language through the loss of a preceding (rarely following) vowel. This loss was caused by the shifting of the principal accent from the syllable originally containing the vowel to some other syllable in the word. Then consonantal $\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{r}$ became vocalic just in the same manner as consonantal $\mathbf{i}$ and $\mathfrak{u}$ in the combinations ei and eu became vocalic after

 $\delta \epsilon \rho к о \mu \alpha \iota$. But already in the parent language or at least in the prehistoric period of all the Indg. languages, the vocalic nasals and liquids came analogically to have the principal accent in certain words, as é $\pi \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha}$, Skr. saptá, Lat. septem, from *septmí, older *séptm, seven; $\lambda$ úkos, Skr. vŕkah, Lat. lupus, Goth. wulfs, Lith. vil̃kas, from *wíqos, older *wlóqós.

## r. Short Vocalic Nasals.

§ 65. In Greek and Sanskrit m, n had a twofold development according to their position in the word :-
I. Finally and before consonants except semivowels they became $\mathbf{a}$ in these two languages, and in Lat. em, en, Germanic um, un, Lith. im̃ (im), iñ (in), O.Slav. ę, (ĭm, inn), as $\delta_{\text {fék }} \alpha$, Skr. dáša, Lat. decem, Goth. taíhun, from *dékm, beside Lith. dẽsimt., O.Slav. desęt., from *dékmt. ten; €̇-kađóv, Skr. š́atám, Lat. centum, Goth. hund, from *kmtóm, hundred; $\beta$ á $\iota \iota$ s, Skr. gátih, gait, step, Goth. gaqumps, assembly, from *gmtis; $\ddot{\alpha}-\pi \alpha \xi$, Skr. sa-kfit, once, Lat. sim•plex older *semplex, from *sm: ${ }_{\epsilon} \ell \nu$ from *sem, one ; acc. sing. of consonantal stems as $\pi o ́ \delta \alpha, \phi$ '́ $\rho o \nu \tau \alpha$, Lat. pedem, ferentem; Hom. $\grave{\eta} \alpha$ from *ésm, $I$ was.

тarós, Skr. tatáḥ, Lat. tentus, from *tnóós, stretched; סaбús, Lat. densus; фarós, Skr. hatáh, killed: фóvos; ${ }_{\alpha}$ - $\gamma \nu \omega \tau 0 s$, Skr. á-jñ̄ātah, Goth. un-kunps, unknown, from *ñ: : *ne, not ; ồ $\mu \mu$, Skr. nấma, Lat. nōmen, name; acc. pl. of consonantal stems, as $\pi o ́ \delta a s$, Skr. pá́daḥ, Lat. pedēs from *pedens, Goth. fötuns, feet; loc. pl. of $\mathbf{n}$-stems, as $\phi \rho \alpha \sigma_{i}^{\prime}: \phi \rho \in ́ \nu \in s$, in this case the regular development was almost entirely obliterated in Greek by new formations formed after the analogy of the other cases, as $\pi о \iota \mu \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \iota$ for ${ }^{*} \pi о \iota \mu \alpha ́ \sigma \iota, \kappa v \sigma i ́$ for ${ }^{*} \kappa v \alpha \sigma i=$ Skr. š́vásu (§ 345) ; $\mu \in \mu \alpha ́ \tau \omega{ }^{\prime}=$ Lat. mementō ; Hom. ท̈ $\alpha \tau \alpha \iota$, Skr. ásatē, from *ésñtai, they sit ; $\pi \epsilon ́ \phi a \tau \alpha \iota$ : фóvos, and similarly $\gamma^{\epsilon} \gamma \alpha \mu \epsilon \nu, \mu_{\epsilon} \mu \alpha \mu \epsilon \nu$,

2. Before vowels and semivowels m, n became am, an in Greek and Sanskrit, but in Lat. Germanic and Lith. they had the same development as in I. Some scholars maintain that the original vowel did not entirely disappear in these positions, but that it merely became reduced in quality. Instead of $m, n_{0}$ they accordingly write em, en and assume that the e became a in Greek and Sanskrit
and the consonants $\mathrm{m}, \mathrm{n}$ remained. Other scholars write the sounds in question as mm, nn before vowels and m, n before semivowels. The correct interpretation of the development is probably that the off-glide of the nasal remained consonantal, and that this eventually became a full nasal consonant, cp. the consonantal off-glide in NE. seldm iz, seldom is, ritn it, written it.
$\dot{\alpha} \mu \rho^{-}$(in $\dot{\alpha} \mu \dot{\sigma} \theta \epsilon \nu$ ), Skr. sama., Goth. pl. sumái, from *smo-, some one, any one ; $\tau \alpha \mu \epsilon i \nu: \tau \in ́ \mu \nu \omega$.
$\tau \alpha \nu v ́-($ in $\tau \alpha \nu v ́-\delta \rho o \mu o s, \tau \alpha \nu v ́-\pi o v s)$, Skr. tanúh, Lat. tenuis, OHG. dunni, from *tnu-, stretched, thin; Boeot. $\beta \alpha \nu \bar{\alpha}$, Vedic ganá́., O.Icel. kona, from *gnā̄. : Goth. qinō, woman; ä $\nu v \delta \rho o s$, Skr. anudráḥ, waterless ; $\tau \alpha ́ \nu v \tau \alpha \iota=$ Skr. tanutế; $\kappa \tau \alpha \nu \epsilon i ̂ \nu: \kappa \tau \epsilon i \nu \omega \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \kappa \tau \epsilon \nu j \omega$.

Hom. ik $\alpha \bar{\alpha} \nu \omega$ from *iк $\alpha \nu F \omega$; $\mu \bar{\alpha} \nu o ́ s, \mu \alpha \nu o ́ s$, from ${ }^{*} \mu \alpha \nu$ fós.
$-\alpha \mu j$ - and $-\alpha \nu j$ - became - $\alpha \iota \nu$ - (§ 75), as $\beta \alpha i \nu \omega$ from * $\beta \alpha \nu j \omega$, older ${ }^{*} \beta \alpha \mu j \omega$, Lat. venio from ${ }^{*}$ gwenjō, older ${ }^{*}$ gwemjō, Indg. *gmjó, cp. Skr. opt. gamyắt, he may go. каiva from *к $\alpha \nu j \omega$; and similarly ктаiv $\omega, \mu \alpha i \nu о \mu \alpha \iota, \pi о \iota \mu \alpha i \nu \omega$, ò $\nu о \mu \alpha i \nu \omega$, $\pi \epsilon \pi \alpha i ́ \nu \omega, \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \mu \alpha i \nu \omega$.

## 2. Short Vocalic Liquids.

§ 66. Many points connected with the development of the Indg.vocalic liquids in the various languages have neverbeen definitely settled. The vowel which was developed before or respectively after liquids in the prehistoric period of the European languages seems to have been unstable in quality, when it was preceded or followed by a labial or guttural. In Greek, Latin, Keltic and the Baltic-Slavonic languages the vowel sometimes appears in this position as $\mathbf{u}$, as in Gr . $\lambda$ úkos, Lat. lupus, O.Slav. vlŭkŭ, beside Skr. vfrkah, Indg. *wiqos, wolf; $\phi$ úd $\lambda o \nu$ from * $\phi \nu \lambda j o \nu$, beside Lat. folium; $\alpha{ }^{\alpha} \gamma v \rho \iota s: \dot{\alpha} \gamma \epsilon i \rho \omega$. For further examples, see Brugmann's Grundriss, \&c., vol. i, second ed., pp. 453-5. It will also be noticed from the normal development of the vocalic
liquids given below that the vowel sometimes appears before and sometimes after the liquid. The reason for this twofold development is unknown. In Greek $\lambda \alpha, \rho \alpha$ beside $\alpha \lambda, \alpha \rho$ only occur before consonants. In all other positions we have $\alpha \lambda, \alpha \rho$. Various attempts have been made by scholars to account for the difference in the position of the vowel, but they all leave a large residuum of unexplained forms.
§ 67. In several languages $1, \mathrm{r}$ had a twofold development according to their position in the word :-
I. Before consonants. In this position they became in Gr. $\alpha \lambda, \lambda \alpha$; $\alpha \rho, \rho \alpha$, Skr. r, Lat. ol, ul; or, ur, prim. Germanic ul, ur (rarely lu, ru) = Goth. ul, aúr, but ol, or in the other Germanic languages, Keltic li, ri, prim. BalticSlavonic i1, ir, as $\pi \lambda \alpha \tau u ́ s$, Skr. prthúh, broad, OE. folde, Skr. prorthiví, earth; - $\pi i \pi \lambda \alpha \mu \in \nu$, Skr. piprómáh, we fill;
 $\kappa \lambda \epsilon ́ \pi \tau \omega$. $\sigma \kappa \alpha ́ \lambda \lambda \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \sigma \kappa \alpha \lambda j \omega$, I stir up, Lith. skiliù, I strike fire, Indg. *sqljó ; and similarly $\beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega, \pi \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega, \& c$.
$\kappa \alpha \rho \delta i \bar{\alpha}$, Ion. кpadín, Lat. cor (gen. cordis), O.Ir. cride,
 $\theta a \rho \sigma$ ús, $\theta \rho \alpha \sigma$ ús : Aeol. $\theta^{\prime} \rho \sigma \sigma$ os, cp. Skr. dhrṣṇ̣óti, he dares, Goth. ga-daúrsan, to dare ; крávos, $\kappa \rho \alpha{ }^{2} \nu 0 \nu$, Lat. cornus, cornum, cornel-tree; $\tau$ '́ $\tau \alpha \rho \tau о \varsigma$, Hom. $\tau \in ́ \tau \rho a \tau o s ~ f r o m ~ * ~ \tau \epsilon ́ \tau ~ F \rho \alpha-~$

 pitfṣ̆u, OE. fæderum, to fathers; $\delta \alpha \rho \tau o ́ s, ~ \delta \rho a \tau o ́ s, ~ \delta \epsilon \delta \alpha \rho-$
 $\kappa \alpha ́ \rho \sigma \iota \varsigma, \tau \alpha \rho \sigma o ́ s, \tau \rho \alpha \pi \epsilon i ̂ \nu, \tau \rho \alpha \phi \epsilon i ̀ v: \pi \epsilon ́ \rho \theta \omega, \sigma \pi \epsilon i ́ \rho \omega, \pi \epsilon i \rho \omega$,
 became - $\alpha \iota \rho-(\S 75)$, as $\sigma \pi \alpha i \rho \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \sigma \pi \alpha \rho j \omega$, I struggle convulsively, Lith. spiriù, I push with the foot; and similarly ${ }^{\epsilon} \chi \theta \alpha i \rho \rho \omega, \pi \tau \alpha i \rho \omega, \sigma к \alpha i \rho \omega, \chi^{\alpha i} \rho \omega, \theta \alpha \iota \rho o ́ s ~ f r o m ~ * \theta F a \rho j o s$, Indg. *dhwrjos.
2. Before vowels $1, \mathrm{r}(\mathrm{cp} . \S 65,2)$ became in Gr. $\alpha \lambda, \alpha \rho$,

Skr. ul (= Indg. 1), ur, ir (= Indg. 1, ro), Lat. al, ar, Keltic al, ar, Germanic and Baltic-Slavonic as in I, as $\tau a ́ \lambda \bar{\alpha} s, ~ e n d u r i n g$, Skr. tulấ, balance, scale, O.Ir. talla, he takes away, Goth. pulan, OE. polian, to suffer, endure; $\pi \alpha \lambda \hat{v} \nu \omega, I$ strew, Lat. palea, chaff; $\kappa \alpha \lambda \iota \alpha$, , Skr. kuláyam, hut, nest ; $\beta \alpha \lambda \epsilon i v$, '̇ $\sigma \tau \alpha ́ \lambda \eta \nu: \beta$ ' $\lambda o s, \sigma \tau \epsilon \in \lambda \lambda \omega$.
$\beta a \rho u ́ s$, Skr. gurúh, Goth. kaúrus, Indg. *grás, heavy; $\pi \alpha ́ p o s$, Skr. puráḥ, Goth. faúra, OE. fore, before ; ка́ $\bar{\alpha} \bar{\alpha}$, Skr. šíras-, head; ' $\delta \delta \alpha ́ \rho \eta \nu, \pi \tau \alpha \rho \mu o ́ s: ~ \delta ́ \epsilon \rho \rho \omega, \pi \tau o ́ \rho o s$.
Examples of final r in Greek are : $\hat{\eta} \pi \alpha \rho$, Skr. yakft, Lat. jecur, liver ; $\hat{\eta}^{\hat{\eta}} \mu \alpha \rho: \eta{ }_{\eta} \mu \epsilon \in \bar{\alpha}$; ${ }^{\prime} \in \rho \rho$ from Indg. *wésr.

## 3. Long Vocalic Nasals and Liquids.

§ 68. Whilst all scholars agree that the parent Indg. language possessed short vocalic nasals and liquids, there is considerable difference of opinion as to whether long vocalic nasals and liquids existed in the parent language. Just as $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{u}, \mathrm{m}, \mathrm{n}, \frac{1}{0}, \mathrm{r}$ arose from the weakening and eventual loss of e in the diphthongs ei, eu, em, en, el, er, and as $\bar{i}, \overline{\mathrm{u}}$ arose from the weakening and eventual loss of e in the combinations ejo, ewə, it can be assumed upon theoretical grounds that $\overline{\mathrm{m}}, \overline{\mathrm{n}}, \overline{\mathrm{I}}, \overline{\mathrm{F}}$ arose in the parent language from the weakening and eventual loss of $\mathbf{e}$ in the combinations emə, enə, elə, era, where $\partial$ represents the weakening of $\overline{\mathbf{a}}, \overline{\mathrm{e}}$, or $\overline{\mathbf{o}}(\S 87)$. But whereas $\overline{\mathrm{i}}$ and $\overline{\mathbf{u}}$ regularly appear in the oldest stages of all the Indg. languages, no language has preserved a long vocalic nasal or liquid in historic times. Notwithstanding the above parallels the subject still requires further investigation before it can be established with any degree of certainty that these sounds existed in the parent language. Most of the forms which are supposed to represent a long vocalic nasal or liquid in Greek, Latin and Keltic admit of an entirely different explanation, viz. as being dissyllabic heavy bases with loss of vowel in the first syllable and preservation of an original long vowel in
the second syllable (§ 90), as *gnātós from the base *genā-, whence Lat. (g)nātus, born : genitor, but this would not account for Skr. jātáh, born, begotten, which presupposes an original form *gñ̄tós; *dhwnātós, whence Dor. $\theta \nu \bar{\alpha} \tau o ́ s$, Att. Ion. $\theta \nu \eta \tau o ́ s$, beside ${ }^{\text {Ád }} \nu \alpha \tau o s$ from *dhwñətós ; *grōtêr from the base *gerō-, whence Gr. $\beta \rho \omega \tau \bar{\eta} \rho$, beside $\beta \alpha \alpha^{\rho} \alpha \theta \rho \rho o \nu$ from *grodhrom. But this explanation of the Greek and Latin forms would not account for the equivalents in Sanskrit, Germanic and the Baltic-Slavonic languages. From what has been said above it will be seen that the whole subject is at present beset with unsolved difficulties. Brugmann, Kurze vergleichende Grammatik, pp. 121-38, regards the following as the normal development of the long vocalic nasals and liquids in the various languages. For the treatment of the whole subject from an entirely different standpoint, the student should consult Hirt, Der indogermanische Ablaut.

| Indg. | Gr. (Dor.) | Skr. | Lat. | Keltic | Germanic | Lith. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| mi | $\mu \bar{\alpha}$ | $\overline{\mathrm{a}}$, a m | m $\overline{\mathrm{a}}$ | mā | um | ím |
| กั | $\nu \bar{\alpha}$ | $\overline{\mathrm{a}}$, ān | nā | nā | un | ín |
| İ | $\lambda \omega$ | $\mathrm{ir}, \mathrm{u} \mathrm{r}$ | lā | lā | ul, ( 1 u ) | íl |
| $\overline{\mathrm{r}}$ | $\rho \omega$ | $\mathrm{ir}, \mathrm{u} \mathrm{r}$ | rā | rā | ur, (ru) | ír |

Note. $-\overline{\mathrm{m}}, \overline{\mathrm{n}}$ regularly became $\overline{\bar{o}} \mathrm{~m}$, ān before a following y in Sanskrit.

Examples are : $\nu \in \dot{c}-\delta \mu \bar{\alpha} \tau o s,-\delta \mu \eta \tau o s, n e w-b u i l t$, Lat. māteriēs, from ${ }^{*} \mathrm{dma} \cdot: ~ \delta \delta \epsilon \mu \omega ; \delta \mu \eta \tau \eta \dot{\rho}$, $\delta \mu \eta \tau o ́ s$, from ${ }^{*} \delta \mu \bar{\alpha}$, Skr. dấmyati, he tames : Lat. domitor, domitus.
$\kappa \nu \eta \dot{\eta} \mu \eta$, older ${ }^{*} \kappa \nu \frac{\alpha}{\alpha} \mu \bar{\alpha}$, shin-bone, leg, O.Ir. pl. cnāmai, bones; $\nu \hat{\eta} \sigma \sigma \alpha$ from older ${ }^{*} \nu \hat{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \alpha$, duck, Skr. ātí, $a$ kind of aquatic bird : Lat. gen. anatis, Lith. ántis, duck; Skr.
jātáh, Lat. (g)nătus, born, Goth. aírpa-kunds, born of the earth: Lat. genitor.
$\beta \lambda \omega \theta$ oós, tall, Skr. mūrdhán•, height, head ; Skr. úrṇā, Lat. lāna, OE. wulle, Lith. vílna, from *wīnā, wool: Gr. oủ̉os from *Fo入los, thick, fleecy; Skr. pūrṇáh, filled, O.Ir. lān, Lith. pílnas, full.
$\beta \rho \omega \tau \eta \rho$, devourer, Skr. girrnáḥ, swallowed up, Lith. gírtas, drunken; $\sigma \tau \rho \omega \tau$ ós, Lat. strātus, Skr. stīrṇáḥ, spread, strewed; Dor. Ion. $\tau \epsilon \tau \rho \omega$-kov $\tau \alpha$, Lat. quadrā-gintā; $\pi \rho \hat{\tau} \tau$ s from ${ }^{*} \pi \rho \omega F \alpha \tau o s$, Skr. pūrvyáh, first.

The Lengthening of Short Vowels.
§ 69. Short vowels were often lengthened through the loss of a following consonant. This process is sometimes called compensation lengthening. In Att. and Ion. e became long close $\overline{\mathbf{e}}$ (written $\epsilon \iota$, see § 58), and o became $\overline{\mathbf{u}}$ (written ov, see § 62) through the intermediate stage of long close $\overline{\mathbf{o}}$. In Dor. they became $\eta$ and $\omega$. The following are the principal cases in which short vowels were lengthened:-
I. In final or medial syllables in Attic and Ionic through the loss of a nasal before a following s whether original or developed from some other source, the long vowel having passed through the intermediate stage of a long nasalized vowel, as $\epsilon i$ is from *sems, Cret. ${ }^{\prime \prime} \nu \mathrm{s}$. Masc. nom. sing.
 Cret. -avs ; $\lambda$ úkovs, Cret. -ovs, Goth. wulfans; Heraclean $\tau \rho i_{s}^{\prime}$ (Att. Ion. $\tau \rho \in i{ }^{\text {is }}$ was the nom. used for the acc.), Cret. $\tau \rho i \nu s$, Goth. prins. Masc. nom. sing. $\gamma i \gamma \bar{\alpha} s, \tau \iota \theta \in i ́ s, \chi \alpha \rho i \epsilon i s$ (cp. Skr. pad-vánt-, having feet), סiסoús, from *'íyavts, ${ }^{*} \tau \iota \theta \epsilon \in \nu \tau s, \quad{ }^{*} \chi \alpha \rho i f \in \nu \tau s,{ }^{*} \delta \iota \delta o \partial \nu \tau s . \quad \pi \hat{\alpha} \sigma \alpha$ from ${ }^{*} \pi \alpha \nu \tau j \alpha$; $\mu o \hat{v} \sigma$, Dor. $\mu \hat{\omega} \sigma \alpha$, from * $\mu о \nu \tau j \alpha$; $\phi \epsilon ́ \rho o v \sigma \iota=$ Dor. $\phi$ '́ $\rho o \nu \tau \iota$, Skr. bháranti, Goth. baírand; fem. participle фépovoa, from * $\phi^{\prime} \rho о \nu \tau j \alpha$, see $\S \mathbf{1 2 9}, 6$. The same lengthening also occurs through the loss of a nasal in the combination Ion. $-\bar{\alpha} \sigma \sigma$, Att. $-\bar{\alpha} \tau \tau$-, from older $-\alpha \gamma \chi j$ (§ 156), as Ion. $\hat{\alpha} \sigma \sigma o v$
from ${ }^{*} \dot{\alpha} \nu \sigma \sigma \sigma \nu$, older ${ }^{*} \dot{\alpha} \gamma \chi \chi j \nu \nu$, cp. ${ }^{\alpha} \gamma \chi \chi$; Ion. ${ }^{\epsilon} \lambda \hat{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \omega \nu$, Att. ${ }^{\epsilon} \lambda \hat{\alpha} \dot{\alpha} \tau \tau \omega \nu$, from ${ }^{*} \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \alpha \gamma \chi j \omega \nu$; Ion. $\theta \frac{\alpha}{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \omega \nu$, Att. $\theta^{\prime} \frac{\alpha}{\alpha} \tau \tau \omega \nu$, from * $\theta a \gamma \chi j \omega \nu$.
2. s in the combination ms , ns + vowel became voiced and then became assimilated to the preceding nasal. The long (double) nasal remained in Lesbian, but in the other dialects it was shortened or simplified and the preceding vowel was lengthened by transferring the long quantity of the consonant to the vowel, as gen. Att. Ion. X $\eta$ vós, Dor. $\chi^{\bar{\alpha} \nu o ́ s, ~ c p . ~ S k r . ~ h a ̨ s a ́ ., ~ L a t . ~ a n s e r ~ f o r ~ o l d e r ~ * h a n s e r, ~ G e r m . ~}$ gans, goose ; aorist Att. Ion. ${ }^{\epsilon} \phi \eta \nu \alpha$, Dor. ${ }^{\prime} \epsilon \phi \bar{\alpha} \nu \alpha$, from ${ }^{*} \epsilon \phi \alpha \nu \sigma \alpha$; Att. Ion. ${ }^{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \epsilon \nu \alpha$, Dor. ${ }^{\epsilon} \mu \eta \nu \alpha$, Lesb. ${ }^{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \nu \nu \alpha$, from ${ }^{*} \epsilon \mu \epsilon \nu \sigma \alpha$; Att. Ion. ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \nu \epsilon \epsilon \mu \alpha$, Dor. ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\prime} \nu \eta \mu \alpha$, Lesb. ${ }^{\prime \prime} \nu \in \mu \mu \alpha$,
 бо $\mu \alpha$.
3. $\nu j, \rho j$ became $\nu \nu, \rho \rho$ which remained in Lesbian, but became simplified in Att. Ion. with lengthening of the preceding $\epsilon, \iota, v$, cp. 2, as Att. Ion. $k \tau \epsilon i ́ v \omega, \phi \theta \epsilon i \rho \omega$, Lesb. $\kappa \tau \epsilon ́ \nu \nu \omega, \phi \theta \epsilon \epsilon \rho \rho \omega$, from ${ }^{*} \kappa \tau \epsilon ́ \nu j \omega,{ }^{*} \phi \theta \epsilon ́ \epsilon j \omega ; \pi \epsilon i \bar{\rho} \alpha$ from ${ }^{*} \pi \epsilon \rho j \alpha$; Att. Ion. $\kappa \lambda \frac{i}{l} \nu \omega, ~ o i k \pi i ́ \rho \omega, ~ I ~ p i t y, ~ L e s b . ~ к \lambda i ́ \nu \nu \omega, ~ o i k \tau i \rho \rho \omega, ~$
 § 129, 4.
4. $\mathbf{s}$ in the combination $\mathbf{s}+$ liquid or nasal became voiced and then became assimilated to the following liquid or nasal. The long (double) consonant remained in Lesbian, but was simplified in the other dialects with lengthening of the preceding vowel, cp. 2, as Ion. $\tau \rho \emptyset \rho \rho \omega \nu$ from ${ }^{*} \tau \rho \check{\alpha} \sigma \rho \omega \nu$; Att. Ion. $\chi$ eílııol, Lesb. रé $\overline{\lambda \lambda \iota o l, ~ c p . ~ S k r . ~ s a-h a ́ s r a m, ~ t h o u s a n d ; ~}$ Att. Ion. $\sigma \epsilon \lambda \dot{\eta} \nu \eta$, Dor. $\sigma \epsilon \lambda \frac{\alpha}{\alpha} \nu \bar{\alpha}$, Lesb. $\sigma \epsilon \lambda \alpha_{\alpha} \nu \nu \bar{\alpha}$, from * $\sigma \epsilon-$ $\lambda \alpha ́ \sigma \nu \bar{\alpha}$; Att. Ion. $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \bar{i} s$, Dor. $\dot{\bar{\alpha}} \mu$ '́s, Lesb. ${ }^{\alpha} \mu \mu \epsilon \varsigma$, from
 ${ }^{\prime} \epsilon \mu \mu i=$ Skr. ásmi, Indg. *esmi ; Att. $\phi \bar{\alpha} \nu o ́ s$, Ion. $\phi \alpha \epsilon \iota \nu o ́ s$,
 * $\sigma \iota \sigma \lambda \alpha$ Fos.
5. Intervocalic $\sigma F$ disappeared with lengthening of the
preceding vowel, as Dor. $\nu \bar{\alpha} o ́ s$, Ion. $\nu \eta o ́ s$, Att. $\nu \epsilon \epsilon \omega_{s}(\S 72)$, from ${ }^{*} \nu \alpha \sigma$ Fós ; Hom. $\tau \in \lambda \eta^{\prime} \epsilon \iota, \tau \epsilon ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota o s$, from ${ }^{*} \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \sigma F \epsilon \nu \tau s$, * $\tau \in \lambda \epsilon \sigma$ Fos ; tóós from *ífoos.
6. $-\lambda \nu$ - became $-\lambda \lambda$ - by assimilation, which remained in Lesbian and Thessalian, but in the other dialects the long (double) consonant was simplified with lengthening of the preceding vowel, cp. 2, as Att. Ion. $\sigma \tau \eta \dot{\lambda} \lambda$, Dor. $\sigma \tau \dot{\alpha} \lambda \bar{\alpha}$, Lesb. $\sigma \tau \alpha ́ \lambda \lambda \bar{\alpha}$, from ${ }^{*} \sigma \tau \alpha \lambda \nu \bar{\alpha}$; Hom. $\epsilon^{\prime} \lambda \bar{\lambda}{ }^{\prime} \mu \alpha \iota$ from ${ }^{*} F \in \lambda \nu 0$ $\mu \alpha \iota$; ó $\phi \epsilon i ́ \lambda \omega$ from ${ }^{*} F o \phi \in \lambda \nu \omega$; $\beta o v \lambda \eta$ й, Lesb. $\beta o ́ \lambda \lambda \lambda \bar{\alpha}$, from * $\beta \circ \lambda \nu \bar{\alpha} ; \beta o v ́ \lambda о \mu \alpha \iota$ from * $\beta o \lambda \nu о \mu \alpha \iota$. See § 148.
7. Short vowels were lengthened in Ionic, but not in Attic, with the loss of $F$ in the combinations $\nu F, \lambda F, \rho F$, as Ion. $\phi \theta \dot{\alpha} \nu \omega$, Att. $\phi \theta \dot{\alpha} \nu \omega$, from ${ }^{*} \phi \theta \dot{\alpha} \nu F \omega$; Ion. $\kappa \bar{\alpha} \lambda$ ós, Att.
 and similarly Ion. $\epsilon^{\prime \prime \nu} \alpha \tau \sigma o s, \sigma \tau \epsilon \nu \nu o ́ s, \xi \in i \in \nu o s, ~ \tau_{i}^{i} \nu \omega, \phi \theta i ̂ \nu \omega$,
 $\phi$ ív $^{2}$, dopós, ôpos, yóvata. See § 124, 6.

## The Shortening of Long Vowels.

§ 70. Long vowels were shortened in prim. Greek before a following nasal, liquid, or semivowel + consonant, as third pers. plural ${ }_{\epsilon} \beta \beta \alpha \nu$ from ${ }^{*} \epsilon \beta \bar{\alpha} \nu \tau,{ }^{\ell} \tau \lambda \alpha \nu$ from ${ }^{* \prime} \epsilon \tau \lambda \bar{\alpha} \nu \tau$, ${ }^{\epsilon} \mu \iota \gamma \epsilon \nu$ from *' $\mu i \gamma \eta \nu \tau$, ${ }^{\epsilon} \gamma \nu \nu \nu$ from ${ }^{* \prime} \epsilon \gamma \nu \omega \nu \tau$, ${ }^{\epsilon} \phi \nu \nu$ from ${ }^{* ’ \notin \phi \bar{v} \nu \tau, ~}$ beside first pers. sing. ${ }^{\epsilon} \beta \eta \eta \nu$, Dor. ${ }^{\epsilon} \beta \bar{\alpha} \nu,{ }_{\epsilon}{ }^{\prime} \tau \lambda \eta \nu$, Dor. ${ }^{\epsilon} \tau \lambda \bar{\alpha} \nu$, ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \mu i \gamma \eta \nu$, ${ }^{\epsilon} \gamma \nu \omega \nu$, ${ }^{\epsilon} \phi \bar{v} \nu$; forms like Hom. $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \nu \tau 0$, ä $^{\prime} \eta \nu \tau \alpha \iota$, ${ }^{\epsilon} \mu-$ $\pi \lambda \eta \nu \tau o$ for ${ }^{*} \pi \lambda \alpha \nu \tau o,{ }^{*} \dot{\alpha} \in \nu \tau \alpha \iota,{ }^{*}-\pi \lambda \epsilon \nu \tau o$ were new formations with the long vowel levelled out from the other persons; acc. pl. $\chi{ }^{\omega} \rho \bar{\alpha} s$ from $-\alpha \nu s(\S 69$ ), older $-\bar{\alpha} \nu s ; \mu \epsilon i ́ s$, month, from ${ }^{*} \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu s$, older ${ }^{*} \mu \eta \eta^{\prime} \nu s$, cp. Lesb. gen. $\mu \hat{\eta} \nu \nu o s$ from * $\mu \eta \eta^{\prime} \nu \sigma o s ; \pi \tau \in \rho \nu \alpha$ from * $\pi \tau \eta \rho \sigma \nu \alpha$, cp. Skr. párṣ̣̆nị̣, heel;
 vấti, he blows), ${ }^{*} \gamma \nu \bar{\omega} \nu \tau$-. For examples of the shortening of long vowels before a semivowel + consonant, see § 63.
§ 71. Long vowels were shortened before long vowels especially in Attic and Ionic and partly also in Doric.

There was also a tendency to shorten them before short vowels in Ionic and Doric, but the exact conditions under which the shortening took place are difficult to determine, see Brugmann, Griech. Grammatik, pp. 56-7. Examples
 aurōra; $\theta^{\epsilon} \bar{\alpha}$, Dor. $\theta^{\prime} \bar{\alpha} \bar{\alpha}$; Att. $\nu \epsilon \bar{\omega} \nu$, Hom. $\nu \eta \hat{\omega} \nu$, Skr. nāvám; Att. $\beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \omega \nu$, Hom. $\beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \eta^{\prime} \omega \nu$ from $-\eta F \omega \nu$. Ion. Dor. $\beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon$ óos beside Hom. $\beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \hat{\eta} o s$.
§ 72. The combinations $\eta o, \eta \breve{\alpha}$ became $\epsilon \omega, \epsilon \bar{\alpha}$ in prim. Attic and Ionic, but in later Ionic the law was greatly obscured by various new formations due to analogy and by dialectal differences within Ionic itself, as gen. Att.
 Cyprian - $\hat{\eta}$ Fos ; $\pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \omega s$, Hom. $\pi o ́ \lambda \eta o s ; ~ n o m . ~ \lambda \epsilon \omega ́ s, ~ \nu \epsilon \omega ́ s, ~$ Hom. $\lambda \bar{\alpha} o ́ s, ~ D o r . ~ \nu \bar{\alpha} o ́ s ; ~ a c c . ~ \beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon ́ \bar{\alpha}$, Hom. $\beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \hat{\eta} \alpha$.


## Assimilation of Vowels.

§ 73. The vowel in an originally unaccented syllable was often assimilated either partially or entirely in quality to the vowel of the following syllable. The examples occur mostly on inscriptions in the various dialects, and show how valuable inscriptional forms are for philological purposes as compared with the forms in ordinary literature.
$\alpha$ to $\epsilon$ before a following $\epsilon$, as Att. ${ }^{\epsilon} \rho \epsilon \tau \dot{\eta}$ beside $\dot{\alpha} \rho \epsilon \tau \bar{\eta}$;
 $\pi \epsilon \delta \delta \alpha$, cp. Att. $\tau \rho \alpha \dot{\alpha} \epsilon \oint \alpha$.
$\alpha$ to $\epsilon$ before a following $o$ and $\omega$. This assimilation of $\alpha$ to $\epsilon$ probably took place in prim. Greek, but owing to levelling the $\alpha$ was mostly restored again, cp. $\dot{\eta} \beta \hat{\epsilon} \omega$ beside $\dot{\eta} \beta \dot{\alpha} \omega$ with $\alpha$ from $\dot{\eta} \beta \alpha \dot{\alpha} \epsilon \iota s, \& c$., and conversely $\dot{\eta} \beta \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \iota, \dot{\eta} \beta \bar{\epsilon} \epsilon \iota$

 similarly on inscriptions of the Cretan, Elean and NorthWestern dialects.
$\alpha$ to o before a following $o$ and $\omega$, as $\delta o \chi \mu o ́ s$ from
 Att. ó $\rho \rho \omega \delta \delta \epsilon i \nu$ beside Ion. $\dot{\alpha} \rho \rho \omega \delta \in \epsilon \hat{\imath}$; $\sigma o \rho \omega \nu$ ís beside $\sigma \alpha \rho \omega$ $\nu i ́ \delta \epsilon s$; $\sigma о \neq o ́ s$ beside $\sigma \alpha ́ \phi \alpha$; Arcad. є́котóv from éкатóv.
$\epsilon$ to $\alpha$ before a following $\alpha$, as late Att. $\lambda \alpha \kappa \alpha ́ \nu \eta=\lambda \epsilon \kappa \alpha ́ \alpha \nu \eta$; Att. $\sum^{\prime} \alpha ́ \rho a \pi \iota s$ beside $\sum^{\prime} \epsilon ́ \rho \alpha \pi \iota s ; ~ C o r i n t h . ~ F \alpha \kappa \alpha ́ \beta \bar{\alpha}$, Att.
 Arcad. $М \alpha \lambda \alpha \gamma \kappa o ́ \mu \bar{\alpha} s$ beside $M \epsilon \lambda \alpha \gamma \kappa o ́ \mu \bar{\alpha} s$; $\psi \alpha \kappa \alpha ́ s ~ b e s i d e ~$ $\psi \in \kappa \alpha ́ s$.
$\epsilon$ to $o$ before a following $o$ and $\omega$, as $\dot{o} \beta o \lambda o ́ s$, ó $\rho o \beta o s=$


$\epsilon$ to o before a following $v$, as $\gamma^{\prime} \rho \gamma v \rho \alpha$ from * $\gamma^{\epsilon} \rho \gamma v \rho \alpha$; кро́ $\mu \nu o \nu$ beside крє́ $\mu v o \nu$ (Hesych.) ; ó óquvıa, cp. ó $\rho \in ́ \gamma \omega$;

$o$ to $\alpha$ before a following $\alpha$, as $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \tau \alpha \kappa o ́ s, \dot{\alpha} \sigma \tau \alpha \phi i s=\dot{o} \sigma \tau \alpha-$ kós, ò oz $\alpha \phi i ́ s$.
$\iota$ to $v$ before a following $v$, as Att. inscription $\eta^{\eta} \mu \nu \sigma v s=$ $\eta ̋ \mu \iota \sigma v s ; K \nu \nu \delta \nu \epsilon u ́ s$ beside Kıvסvєús.
$v$ to $\iota$ before a following $\iota$, as $\beta \iota \beta \lambda i ́ o \nu$ from $\beta v \beta \lambda i ́ o \nu$.
For a detailed treatment of vowel assimilation in Greek see J. Schmidt, Kuhn's Zeitschrift, vol. xxxii, pp. 321-94.
§ 74. The change of $\alpha$ to $\epsilon$ after $\iota$ and $v$ is also due to

 ia ó́s, $\pi$ úa入os, \&c.

## Epenthesis.

§ 75. In the combinations $\alpha, o+\nu j, ~ p j, ~ F j$ the $\mathbf{j}$ palatalized the preceding consonant and then disappeared. The palatal element in the consonant then combined with the preceding vowel to form a diphthong, as $\beta \alpha i \nu \omega$ from * $\beta \alpha v j \omega$ older ${ }^{*} \beta a \mu j \omega$, Indg. *gmjoó, cp. Lat. venio, Goth. qima, I come; фаive from *фаvjן; fem. $\tau \epsilon ́ \kappa \tau \alpha \iota \nu \alpha$ from *тєктаvja, and similarly $\mu^{\prime} \lambda \alpha \iota \nu \alpha, \tau \alpha ́ \lambda \alpha \iota \nu \alpha, \lambda^{\prime} \alpha \iota \nu \alpha$; Att. äyкoıva from

* $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \kappa о \nu j a$. $\quad \sigma \pi \alpha i ́ \rho \omega$ from *$\sigma \pi \alpha \rho j \omega$, Indg. *sprjố ; $\theta \alpha \iota \rho o ́ s$ from *OFapjos, Indg. *dhwrjos, hinge of a door; $\mu \mathrm{o} \rho \mathrm{\rho} a$ from ${ }^{*} \mu \circ \rho j \alpha$, cp. $\mu$ ó $\rho o s, \delta \alpha i ́ \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \delta \alpha \iota \digamma \omega$ older ${ }^{*} \delta \alpha F j \omega$, and similarly $\kappa \alpha i ́ \omega, \kappa \lambda \alpha i ́ \omega . \quad$ See § 129, 3.
§ 78. The combinations $\alpha \sigma j, o \sigma j, \epsilon \sigma j, v \sigma j$ became $\alpha l, o l$, $\epsilon \iota, v \iota$ (through the intermediate stage $\alpha h j, \& c$.), and then the second element of the diphthong partly disappeared in Attic and Ionic before a following o, as Hom. $\lambda_{\iota} \lambda \alpha i o \mu \alpha \iota$ from ${ }^{*} \lambda \iota \lambda \alpha \sigma j o \mu \alpha \iota ; ~ \nu \alpha i ́ \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \nu \alpha \sigma j \omega$, cp. aor. $\nu \alpha ́ \sigma-\sigma \alpha \iota$; Hom. roîo, Skr. tásya; Hom. ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \mu \in \hat{i} 0$, from ${ }^{*} \epsilon \mu \epsilon \sigma j o$; opt. $\epsilon i \not \eta \nu$ from ${ }^{*} \epsilon \sigma j \eta \nu$, Skr. sýam ; Hom. $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon i ́ \omega, \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \omega$, Att. $\tau \epsilon \lambda \hat{\omega}$, from ${ }^{*} \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \sigma j \omega$; $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \epsilon \iota \alpha$ from ${ }^{*} \dot{\alpha} \lambda \bar{\alpha} \theta \epsilon \sigma j \alpha$, cp. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \eta_{\eta} s$, -'є́s ; pf. part. fem. Hom. ívîa from ${ }^{*} F i \delta v \sigma j \alpha=$ Skr. vidúṣī̀. See § 129, 9.


## Prothesis.

§ 77. It used to be assumed that prothesis took place in Greek before an initial liquid, nasal or $F+$ vowel, but most scholars are now generally agreed that a prothetic vowel was only developed in the initial combination Indg. $\mathbf{r}+$ vowel, as ${ }_{\epsilon} \rho \in \beta$ ßos, Skr. rájaḥ, Goth. riqis, darkness; ' $\epsilon \rho v \theta \rho o ́ s$, Skr. rudhiráḥ, Lat. ruber, OE. rēad, red; ó $\rho \in ́ \gamma \omega$ beside Lat. rego. Even in these examples it is not improbable that the initial vowel represents a phase of ablaut which has not been preserved in these and similar words in the other Indg. languages. Forms like $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \epsilon i ́ \phi \omega$ beside $\lambda i \pi m o s$; $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \grave{\imath} \nu \omega$ beside Lat. lino ; $\dot{\alpha} \mu \tilde{\mu} \lambda \gamma \omega$ beside Lat. mulgeo ; $\dot{\alpha} \nu \eta \eta^{\prime} \rho$ beside Skr. nár., man; ô $\nu \boldsymbol{\sigma} \mu \alpha$ beside Lat. nōmen; ${ }_{\alpha}(F) \eta \sigma \iota$ beside Skr. váti, he blows; Hom. ${ }^{\epsilon}(F) \in ́ \epsilon \rho \sigma \eta$ beside ${ }^{\epsilon} \varphi \rho \sigma \eta$; which were formerly regarded as containing a prothetic vowel, represent a different grade of ablaut.

## Anaptyxis.

§ 78. By anaptyxis is meant the development of a vowel between a liquid or nasal + a preceding or following consonant. Vowels of this kind are found in the old and
modern periods of most of the Indg. languages. No sure examples occur in classical Greek, but they are not altogether uncommon on inscriptions, \&c., as Attic (Vase)
 ponax) for $\beta \rho \alpha \gamma^{\prime} \chi o s$, qópovos (quoted by Hesychius for
 Lat. pōcolum, pōculum beside pōclum, French canif beside English knife, mod. northern dial. stərək, stə̄k beside Old English styric, styrc, calf; filəm, marəbl beside standard English film, marble.

## Vowel-contraction.

§ 79. In treating of vowel-contraction it is necessary to distinguish three periods: (I) contractions which took place already in the Indg. parent language, (2) those which took place in primitive Greek, and were accordingly common to all the Greek dialects, and (3) those which took place in the individual dialects.

To treat in detail the question of vowel-contraction in the first period would be beyond the plan and scope of this grammar, because the resultant long vowels or diphthongs were not merely common to Greek, but to all the Indg. languages. It will therefore be sufficient to give here only a few examples of such contractions:-
$\mathbf{e}+\mathbf{e}>$ ẽ̃, as $\hat{\eta} \alpha$, Skr. ásam, from *ésm, older ${ }^{*} \mathbf{e}$ (augment) + esm, I was.
$0+\mathbf{a}>\tilde{0}$ in the dat. sing. of o-stems, as $\theta \epsilon \hat{\varphi}$ from *dhweso $+\mathrm{ai}, \mathrm{cp}$. the original ending preserved in infinitives like ${ }^{i} \delta \delta \mu \in \nu \alpha \iota$, Skr. vidmánē, to know; Att. סov̂val, Cypr. $\delta_{0} \neq \nu \alpha$, , Skr. dāvánē, to give.
$0+\mathrm{e}>\mathrm{o}$ on in the nom. pl. of o-stems, as Skr. vfrikāh, Goth. wulfōs, from *wlqqõ̃s, older *wlqqo + es, wolves, cp. $\pi \alpha \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \in s$.
$\overline{\mathbf{a}}+\mathrm{e}>\overline{\mathrm{a}}$ in the nom. pl. of $\overline{\mathrm{a}}$-stems, as Skr. vfŕkāḥ, she-wolves, from ${ }^{*}$ wlq $q \bar{a}+$ es.
$\overline{\mathbf{a}}+\mathbf{a}>\overline{\mathbf{a}}$ in the dat. sing. of $\overline{\mathbf{a}}$-stems, as $\theta \in \hat{\alpha}, \mathrm{cp}$. Goth. gibai, for a gift, Indg. $-\bar{a}+\mathbf{a i}$.

Most of the contractions were due to the loss of intervocalic $\mathbf{s}$ (through the intermediate stage $\mathbf{h}$ ) and $\mathbf{j}$ in primitive Greek. After the loss of these consonants the combinations $\check{\overline{\mathrm{a}}}, \check{\mathrm{e}}, \check{\mathrm{o}}+\overline{\mathrm{I}}$ or $\check{\breve{\mathrm{u}}}$ were contracted in certain cases in the prehistoric period of all the dialects. The loss of intervocalic $F$ took place at a much later period and accordingly belongs to the history of the separate dialects (§ 122). But the great majority of vowel-contractions took place after primitive Greek became differentiated into the various separate dialects. Vowels were contracted in Attic more extensively than in any of the other dialects, although even in this dialect there were certain combinations which did not undergo contraction in all cases:-
(i) The combinations $\epsilon 0, \epsilon \omega, \epsilon \alpha$, where an intervocalic $\mathbf{s}$ or $\mathbf{j}$ had disappeared, remained in dissyllables, but underwent contraction in words of more than two syllables, as $\theta$ єós from ${ }^{*} \theta$ $\epsilon \epsilon \sigma o s$, but $\Theta o u ́ \phi i \lambda o s, ~ \Theta o u ́ \phi \rho \alpha \sigma \tau o s ; ~ \xi ' \epsilon \omega ~ f r o m ~$ ${ }^{*} \xi \in \epsilon \sigma$, but $\hat{\xi} \circ \hat{v} \mu \in \nu, \hat{\xi} \circ \hat{v} \sigma \iota$; ${ }^{\epsilon} \alpha \rho$ from ${ }^{*} F^{\epsilon} \sigma \alpha \rho$, but gen. $\hat{\eta} \rho o s$
 but $\delta o \hat{v} \mu \in \nu$, $\delta o \hat{v} \sigma \iota$. But when the same combinations arose after the loss of $F$ they remained uncontracted in older Attic even in words of more than two syllables, as $\nu^{\prime}(f)$ ) os,
 $\hat{\alpha} s$, from $* \frac{1}{\alpha} F o s, u n t i l ; \quad \beta \alpha \sigma i \lambda \epsilon \omega \omega s$, Hom. - $\hat{\eta} o s$, Cypr. $-\hat{\eta} f o s ;$
 manner the combinations $\alpha \eta, \epsilon o v, o \alpha$ remained uncontracted after the loss of $F$, as $\dot{\alpha}(F) \eta \delta \dot{\omega} \nu, \chi^{o}(F) \alpha \nu o s, X^{0}(F) \dot{\alpha} \nu \eta$, gen. $\Pi \epsilon \rho \iota \kappa \lambda \epsilon ́ \sigma v s$, from ${ }^{*}-\kappa \lambda \bar{\epsilon} f \in \sigma o s$.
(2) The combinations $\epsilon \alpha, \epsilon \omega$ were contracted when preceded by $\iota$, but remained in other cases, as acc. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \iota \hat{\alpha}, \dot{\alpha} \lambda \iota \hat{\alpha} s$, beside $\beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon \bar{\alpha},-\epsilon \in \bar{\alpha} \bar{s}$; gen. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \iota \omega \bar{\omega}, \dot{\alpha} \lambda \iota \omega \bar{\omega}$, beside $\beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \omega s$, $-\epsilon \in \omega \nu$.
§ 80. Below is given a classification of the contractions arranged according to the nature of the first vowel.
$\alpha+\alpha>\bar{\alpha}$ in all the dialects, as Hom. Ion. ${ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \tau \eta$ from * $\dot{\alpha} f{ }^{\alpha} \tau \bar{\alpha} \bar{\alpha}$;

$\alpha+\epsilon>\bar{\alpha}$ in Att. Ion., but $\eta$ in Dor., as $\bar{\alpha} \kappa \omega \nu$ from $\dot{\alpha} \epsilon ́ \kappa \omega \nu$; $\dot{\alpha} \rho \hat{\omega}$ from $\dot{\alpha} \epsilon \rho \hat{\omega}$; Att. Ion. $\tau \bar{\iota} \mu \hat{\alpha} \tau \epsilon$, Dor. $\tau \bar{\iota} \mu \hat{\eta} \tau \epsilon$ from $\tau \bar{\iota} \mu \alpha \in \tau \epsilon$; Dor. ő $\rho \eta$ from ő ${ }^{\circ} \rho \alpha \epsilon$.


$a+o>\omega$ in Att. Ion., but $\bar{\alpha}$ in Dor. Aeol. and Elean, as
 from $\tau \bar{\imath} \mu \dot{\alpha} o \mu \epsilon \nu$; Dor. (Theocritus) $\bar{\epsilon} \pi \hat{\alpha} \hat{\alpha} \xi \bar{\alpha}$ from - $\alpha 0$; Boeot. $\phi \bar{v} \sigma \hat{\alpha} \nu \tau \epsilon s$ from - $\alpha 0 \nu \tau \epsilon$.
$\alpha+v>\alpha v$, as $\delta \alpha v \lambda$ ós from * $\delta \alpha \sigma v \lambda o s$, Indg. *dnsulos.
$\alpha+\bar{\alpha}>\bar{\alpha}$ in all the dialects, as $\beta \epsilon \beta \hat{\alpha} \sigma \iota$, i$\sigma \tau \hat{\alpha} \sigma \iota$, from $-\alpha \bar{\alpha} \sigma \iota$.
$\alpha+\eta>\bar{\alpha}$ in Att. Ion., but $\eta$ in Dor. Locr., as subj. $\tau \bar{\imath} \mu \hat{\alpha} \tau \epsilon$, Dor. $\tau \bar{\iota} \mu \hat{\eta} \tau \epsilon$, from $\tau \bar{\iota} \mu \alpha ́ \eta \tau \epsilon$; Ion. $\alpha \dot{\alpha} \delta \dot{\eta} s$ from $\dot{\alpha} \eta \delta \delta^{\eta} s$.
$\alpha+\eta>\bar{\alpha}$, as subj. $\tau \bar{\imath} \mu \hat{a}$ from $\tau \bar{\iota} \mu \alpha{ }_{\eta} \eta$.
$\alpha+\omega>\omega$, as $\tau \bar{\imath} \mu \hat{\omega}$ from $\tau \bar{\iota} \mu \dot{\alpha} \omega$.
$\alpha+\epsilon \iota(=\overline{\mathbf{e}})>\bar{\alpha}$ in Att., as $\phi \bar{\alpha} \nu o ́ s$, Ion. $\phi \alpha \epsilon \iota \nu o ́ s$, from * $\phi \alpha$ $F \in \sigma \nu O S$; $\bar{\alpha} \bar{\alpha} \bar{\alpha} s$ from $\dot{\alpha} \in i ́ \rho \bar{\alpha} s$.
$\alpha+\epsilon \iota(=$ prim. Gr. $\epsilon \iota)>\bar{\alpha}$ in Att. Ion., but $\eta$ in Dor., as $\ddot{\alpha} \delta \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \dot{\alpha}(F) \epsilon i ́ \delta \omega$; indic. $\tau \bar{\imath} \mu \hat{q}$ from $\tau \bar{\tau} \mu \dot{\alpha} \epsilon \iota$; Dor. $\delta \rho \hat{\eta}$ from ópá $\epsilon$.
$\alpha+o \iota>\varphi$, as $\dot{\omega} \delta \dot{\eta}$ from $\dot{\alpha}(F) o \iota \delta \dot{\eta} ; \tau \bar{\imath} \mu \hat{\varphi}, \tau \bar{\imath} \mu \hat{\varphi} \mu \epsilon \nu$, from $\tau \bar{\iota} \mu \alpha ́ o \iota, \tau \bar{\tau} \mu \alpha \dot{o} o \iota \mu \epsilon \nu$.

$\epsilon+\alpha>\eta$, as gen. $\hat{\eta} \rho o s$ from ${ }^{*} F^{\prime} \epsilon \sigma \alpha \rho o s ; \gamma^{\prime} \nu \eta$ from ${ }^{*} \gamma^{\prime} \nu \in \sigma \alpha$.
$\epsilon+\epsilon>\epsilon \iota$ ( $=$ long close $\bar{e}$ ) in Att. Ion. and mild Dor., but $\eta$ in Aeolic and severe Dor., as $\phi i \lambda \epsilon \iota$, severe Dor. $\phi i \lambda \eta$, from $\phi i \lambda \epsilon \epsilon ; ~ \epsilon i \hat{i} \chi o \nu$, Lesb. severe Dor. $\hat{\eta} X o \nu$, from

$\epsilon+\iota>\epsilon \iota$, as $\epsilon \hat{i}$ from ${ }^{*} \epsilon \sigma \iota=$ Skr. ási ; $\pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota$ from $\pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \epsilon i ;$ $\gamma^{\prime} \nu \epsilon \iota$ from ${ }^{*} \gamma^{\prime} \nu \in \sigma \iota$.
$\epsilon+o>o v(=\overline{\mathbf{o}}$, later $\overline{\mathbf{u}}$ ) in Att., $\omega$ in Dor., and $\epsilon v$ in Ion. and Boeot., as Att. $\gamma^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\nu}^{\prime}$ ous from ${ }^{*} \gamma^{\prime} \nu \in \sigma \sigma$; $\delta o \hat{v} \mu \in \nu$ from



$\epsilon+\bar{\alpha}>\epsilon \eta>\eta$ in Ion. (§ 51), as $\beta o \rho \eta \hat{s}, \nu \hat{\eta}=\beta o \rho \epsilon \bar{\alpha}_{s}, \nu \epsilon \in \bar{\alpha}$.
$\epsilon+\alpha>\epsilon \eta>\eta$ in Ion., as dat. $\gamma \epsilon \nu \hat{\eta}=$ Att. $\gamma \in \nu \in \hat{\alpha}$.
$\epsilon+\eta>\eta$ in all the dialects, as $\phi \iota \lambda \hat{\eta} \tau \epsilon$ from $\phi \iota \lambda \epsilon \emptyset \tau \epsilon$; $\Pi \epsilon р \iota \kappa \lambda \hat{\eta} s$ from - $\dagger$ $\eta$ s.
$\epsilon+\eta>\eta$, as $\phi \iota \lambda \hat{\eta}$ from $\phi i \lambda \epsilon$ $\eta$.
$\epsilon+\omega>\omega$ in Att., as $\phi \iota \lambda \hat{\omega}, \dot{\alpha} \lambda \iota \omega \hat{s}$, beside Ion. $\phi \iota \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \omega$, $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \iota \epsilon ́ \omega s$.
$\epsilon+\alpha \iota>\eta$, as indic. mid. $\phi$ '́ $\rho \eta$ from $\phi$ $\epsilon \rho \epsilon(\sigma) \alpha \iota=$ Skr. bhárasē. $\epsilon+\epsilon \iota(=\overline{\mathbf{e}}, \S 58)>\epsilon \iota(=$ long close $\overline{\mathrm{e}})$, as $\kappa \lambda \epsilon \iota \nu$ ós from ${ }^{*} \kappa \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \iota \nu o ́ s$, older ${ }^{*} \kappa \lambda \epsilon F \epsilon \sigma \nu o s$.
$\epsilon+\epsilon \iota(=$ prim. Gr. $\epsilon \iota)>\epsilon \iota$, as $\phi \iota \lambda \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ from $\phi \iota \lambda \epsilon \in \epsilon$.
$\epsilon+o \iota>o l$ in Att., as $\phi i \lambda o i ̂, \phi i \lambda o i ̂ \mu \in \nu$, from $\phi i \lambda \epsilon ́ o l, \phi l-$ $\lambda$ є́ог $\mu \in \nu$.
$\epsilon+o v>o v$, as $\phi \iota \lambda o \hat{v}, \phi \iota \lambda o \hat{v} \sigma \iota$, from $\phi \iota \lambda \epsilon{ }^{\prime} o v, \phi i \lambda \epsilon \in o v \sigma \iota$.
$\imath+\iota>\bar{\imath}$, as $\Delta \hat{\imath}$ from $\Delta \iota f i$, Att. $\Delta i \hat{i}$ had its $\iota$ from the genitive.
$o+\alpha>\omega$, as $\alpha i \delta \hat{\omega}$ from $\alpha i \delta o ́ \alpha$, Indg. *aidosm ; $\hat{\omega} \tau \alpha$ from ${ }_{o} \alpha \tau \alpha ; \Delta \eta \mu \hat{\omega} \nu \alpha \xi$ from $\Delta \eta \mu o ́-+\alpha \nu \alpha \xi$.
$o+\epsilon>o v$ in Att. Ion. mild Dor., but $\omega$ in severe Dor., as $\mu \iota \sigma \theta o v ̂ \tau \epsilon$, severe Dor. $-\hat{\omega} \tau \epsilon$, from -ó $\epsilon \tau \epsilon$; $\lambda o u \tau \rho o ́ \nu$ from $\lambda o \epsilon \tau \rho o ́ v ;$ Att. $\epsilon^{\prime} \lambda \frac{\alpha}{\alpha} \tau \tau o v s$, Ion. $\epsilon^{\prime} \lambda \frac{\alpha}{\alpha} \sigma \sigma o v s$, Dor. $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \lambda \frac{\alpha}{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \omega s$, from oofs, Indg. *-oses.
$o+\imath>o \iota$, as кoî̀os from *kofi入os; oîs from *ófls = Lat. ovis, Skr. áviḥ.
$o+o>o v$ in Att. Ion. and mild Dor., but $\omega$ in Aeol. and severe Dor., as $\nu 0$ ôs from $\nu$ vóos; $\lambda$ úcov, Boeot. Lesb. severe Dor. $\lambda u ́ \kappa \omega$; $\mu \iota \sigma \theta o v ̂ \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma$, severe Dor. - $ิ \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma$, from -óo $\nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma$. $o+\eta>\omega$, as $\delta \eta \lambda \omega \bar{\omega} \epsilon$ from $\delta \eta \lambda o ́ \eta \tau \epsilon$; Ion. $\beta \omega \theta \theta^{\prime} \omega=\beta o \eta \theta^{\prime} \omega$. $o+\eta>o l$, as subj. $\delta \eta \lambda o i ̂ s, \delta \eta \lambda o i ̂$, from $\circ$ ó $\eta$.
$o+\omega>\omega$ in all the dialects, as $\delta \eta \lambda \hat{\omega}$ from $\delta \eta \lambda o ́ \omega, \delta \eta \lambda \hat{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu$ from $\delta \eta \lambda o \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$.
$o+\varphi>\omega$ in all the dialects, as $\dot{\alpha} \pi \lambda \hat{\varphi}$ from $\dot{\alpha} \pi \lambda o ́ \varphi$.
$o+\epsilon \iota(=$ long close $\overline{\mathrm{e}})>o v$, as $\delta \eta \lambda o \hat{\nu} \nu$ from $\delta \eta \lambda o ́ \epsilon \iota \nu$, oivov̂s from oivóets.
$o+\epsilon \iota(=$ prim. Gr. $\epsilon \iota)>o \iota$, as $\delta \eta \lambda o \hat{\imath}$ from $\delta \eta \lambda o ́ \epsilon \iota$; oily $\omega$ beside Lesb. inf. ó $\neq \epsilon$ 'í $\eta \nu$.
$o+o \iota>o l$, as $\delta \eta \lambda o i ̂ s$, , $\eta \lambda o i ̂ \epsilon$, from $\delta \eta \lambda o ́ o \iota s, ~ \delta \eta \lambda o ́ o \iota \tau \epsilon$; $\epsilon \hat{\nu} \nu o \iota$ from єüvool.
$o+o v>o v$, as $\nu o \hat{v}$ from vóov, $\delta \eta \lambda o \hat{v} \sigma \iota$ from $\delta \eta \lambda o ́ o v \sigma \iota ; \sigma o \hat{\nu} \mu \alpha \iota$ from $\sigma o o v ̂ \mu \alpha \iota$, older * $\sigma o$ Fóo $\mu \alpha \iota$.
$v+v>\bar{v}$, as Att. (inscription) $\tilde{v}_{s}^{\prime \prime}=\dot{v} u ́ s$.
$\bar{\alpha}+\alpha>\bar{\alpha}$, Att. $\lambda \hat{\alpha} s$ beside Hom. $\lambda \hat{\alpha} \alpha s$; Dor. $\gamma \hat{\alpha}$ from ${ }^{*} \gamma \hat{\alpha} \alpha$.
$\bar{\alpha}+\epsilon>\bar{\alpha}$ in Dor. and Aeol., as Dor. $\tilde{\alpha}^{\prime} \lambda \iota o s$, Lesb. $\tilde{\alpha}^{\alpha} \lambda \iota o s$
from $\frac{\dot{\alpha}}{}{ }^{\prime} \hat{\lambda} \iota o s$; Dor. $\phi \omega \nu \hat{\alpha} \nu \tau \alpha$ from $\phi \omega \nu \nu^{\prime} \in \nu \tau \alpha$.


$\bar{\alpha}+o>\eta 0, \epsilon \omega(\S 72)$ in Att. Ion., but $\bar{\alpha}$ in Dor. and Aeol., as Hom. $\hat{\eta} o s$, Att. $\epsilon \omega \omega s$, Dor. Boeot. $\hat{\alpha} s$, from $\hat{\alpha} o s$, until; gen. 'A $\tau \rho \epsilon$ í $\delta \epsilon \omega$, Dor. $-\bar{\alpha}$; Dor. Lesb. $\epsilon \dot{v} \epsilon \rho \gamma \epsilon \in \tau \bar{\alpha}$ from $-\bar{\alpha} 0$. See § 323.
$\bar{\alpha}+\bar{\alpha}>\bar{\alpha}$ in all the dialects, as ${ }^{\prime} A \theta \eta \nu \hat{\alpha}$ from ${ }^{\prime} \bar{\alpha} \bar{\alpha}$; gen. Dor. $\gamma \hat{\alpha}_{s}$ from - $\bar{\alpha} \bar{\alpha} \varsigma, ~ c p . ~ § ~ 323 . ~$
$\bar{\alpha}+\underset{\alpha}{\alpha} \underset{\alpha}{\alpha}$, as dat. Dor. $\gamma \hat{\alpha}$ from ${ }^{*} \gamma \bar{\alpha} \dot{\alpha}$.
$\bar{\alpha}+\omega>\bar{\alpha}$ in Dor. and Aeol., gen. pl. $\tau \hat{\alpha} \nu$, Att. $\tau \bar{\omega} \nu$, from $\tau \frac{\alpha}{\alpha} \omega \nu$, older ${ }^{*} \tau \dot{\alpha} \sigma \omega \nu=$ Skr. tásām.
$\eta+\epsilon>\eta$ in all the dialects, as $\beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \hat{\eta} s$ from $-\hat{\eta} F \epsilon s$; Ion. acc. $\tau \bar{\tau} \mu \eta \hat{\eta} \nu \tau \alpha$ from $\tau \bar{\mu} \mu \eta{ }_{\eta} \epsilon \nu \tau \alpha$.
$\eta+\eta>\eta$ in all the dialects, as Att. subj. § $\eta \tau \epsilon, \phi \alpha \nu \eta \tau \epsilon$, from

$\eta+\eta>\eta$ in all the dialects, as Att. subj. $\zeta \hat{\eta}$ from * $\S \eta \eta$.
$\eta+\epsilon \iota$ ( $=$ long close $\overline{\mathrm{e}})>\eta$ in Att. Ion. and mild Dor., as Ion. nom. $\tau \bar{\tau} \mu \hat{\eta}_{s}$ from $\tau \bar{\tau} \mu \eta \epsilon \epsilon \zeta$.
$\eta+\epsilon \iota(=$ prim. Gr. $\epsilon \iota)>\eta$ in all the dialects, as Att. $\zeta \hat{\eta}$ from * $\oint \dot{\eta} \epsilon \iota ; \eta \eta \delta \eta$ from ${ }^{*} \dot{\eta} F \epsilon \epsilon \delta \eta$.
$\omega+\alpha>\omega$ in Att. Lesb., but $\bar{\alpha}$ in Dor. and Boeot., as Att.
 $\eta ँ \rho \omega$ from $\eta \eta \rho \omega \alpha ; ~ \hat{\omega} \nu \alpha \xi=\hat{\omega} \alpha \not \partial \nu \alpha \xi$.
$\omega+\epsilon>\omega$, as $\bar{\eta} \rho \omega s$ from $\eta \eta \rho \omega \epsilon s$; Att. $\dot{\rho} \bar{\imath} \gamma \hat{\omega} \tau \epsilon$ from $-\omega \in \tau \epsilon$.
$\omega+\iota>\varphi$, as $\eta^{\eta} \rho \varphi$ from $\eta \eta \rho \omega \iota$.
$\omega+\sigma>\omega$ in all the dialects, as $\sigma \hat{\omega} s$ from $\sigma \hat{\omega} o s$; $\rho \dot{\imath} \gamma \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \epsilon s$ from - $\omega 0 \nu \tau \epsilon \mathrm{~s}$.
$\omega+\eta>\omega$, as subj. $\rho^{\rho} \bar{\gamma} \bar{\omega} \tau \epsilon$ from - $\omega \eta \tau \epsilon$.
$\omega+\eta>\omega$, as subj. $\dot{\rho}_{i} \gamma \bar{\omega}$ from $\omega \eta$.
$\omega+\omega>\omega$ in all the dialects, as $\dot{\rho} \bar{\imath} \hat{\omega} \hat{\omega}$ from $\dot{\rho} \bar{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \omega$; subj.
$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \hat{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu$ from $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \omega \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$.
$\omega+\epsilon \iota(=$ prim. Gr. $\epsilon \iota)>\omega$, as $\hat{\rho}^{\imath} \gamma \bar{\varphi}$ from $\rho^{\rho} \bar{\imath} \gamma \omega \epsilon \iota$.
$\omega+o l>\omega$, as $\rho \dot{\rho} \gamma \omega \hat{\omega} \in \nu$ from *- $\omega 0 \iota \in \nu$.
$\omega+o v>\omega$, as $\dot{\rho} \tau \gamma \hat{\omega} \sigma \alpha$ from - $\omega o v \sigma \alpha$.

## CHAPTER IV

## ABLAUT

§ 81. Up to this point we have treated the Indg. vowels and their equivalents in the more important languages without any reference to the manner in which these vowels stand to each other in any one language. It now remains to illustrate and formulate the manner in which they stand to each other, or in other words to discuss the phenomenon of what is called ablaut or vowel gradation. And for this purpose we shall confine our examples almost entirely to Greek, partly because it is the language which concerns us most intimately in this book and partly because, having preserved the Indg. vowels more faithfully than any other language, it is best fitted to illustrate the various phenomena of ablaut.
§ 82. By ablaut or vowel gradation is meant such quantitative, qualitative and accentual differences in the vocalic elements of groups of etymologically and morphologically related words as were caused by sound-laws which operated in the prim. Indg. language before it
became differentiated into the separate languages. Such are e.g. the differences in the root-syllables of $\lambda \in i(\pi \omega$ :
 фópos: $\phi \dot{\omega} \rho: \phi \alpha \rho \in ́ \tau \rho \bar{\alpha}: \delta i ́-\phi \rho o s$, Lat. pedem : $\pi o ́ \delta \alpha$ : Lat.
 $\rho \omega \gamma \alpha: \dot{\rho} \alpha \gamma \hat{\eta} \nu \alpha \iota$. $\delta i-\delta \omega-\mu \iota$ : Lat. datus: Skr. da-d-máḥ, we give. Dor. $\phi \bar{\alpha} \mu i ́: \phi \omega \nu \eta$ : $: \phi \alpha \mu^{\prime} \nu$. Examples in other than root-syllables are $\lambda$ úк $\epsilon$ : $\lambda$ úкov : Goth. wulfōs, wolves, $\phi \epsilon ́ \rho \epsilon \tau \epsilon:$ Dor. ф'́ $\rho о \nu \tau \iota, \pi о \iota \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \alpha$ : $\delta \alpha i ́ \mu о \nu \alpha$ : $\pi о \iota \mu \eta \eta_{\nu}: \delta \alpha i ́ \mu \omega \nu$ : $\pi о i ́ \mu \nu \eta, \pi \alpha \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \epsilon s: \epsilon \dot{v}-\pi \alpha ́ \tau o \rho \epsilon s: \pi \alpha \tau \eta ́ \rho: \epsilon \dot{v}-\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega \rho: \pi \alpha \tau \rho o ́ s$,
 $\delta \omega \tau \omega \rho$.
§ 83. According as the vowels which stand in ablaut relation to each other differ in quality or in quantity only, or both in quality and quantity, we have what is called qualitative, quantitative or qualitative-quantitative ablaut.

Qualitative ablaut only occurs in syllables which have the strong grade of ablaut and is for the most part confined to the interchange of $\mathrm{e}: \mathbf{o}$ and of $\overline{\mathrm{e}}: \overline{\mathrm{o}}$ in the e -series of

 $\phi \omega \nu \eta$. It is most difficult to account for this phase of ablaut. The interchange between $\mathbf{e}$ and $\boldsymbol{o}$ and between $\overline{\mathbf{e}}$ and $\overline{\mathrm{o}}$ seems to have been so regulated that er originally stood in the chief-accented syllable and $\check{0}$ in the next
 $\pi \alpha \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \epsilon \varsigma, \pi \alpha \tau \eta{ }^{\prime} \rho: \epsilon \dot{v}-\pi \alpha ́ \tau o \rho \in \varsigma, \epsilon \dot{v}-\pi \alpha ́ \tau \omega \rho$.

Quantitative and qualitative-quantitative ablaut mostly arose through the loss or weakening of vowels in unaccented syllables, as $i /-\mu \epsilon \nu: \epsilon i-\mu l=$ Skr. i.máh : éemi,
 $\pi \epsilon ́ \tau o \mu \alpha \iota, \pi \alpha \tau \rho^{\prime} s: \pi \alpha \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \alpha, \mu i ́ \mu \nu \omega: \mu \in ́ \nu \omega$. Lat. datus : $\delta i$ -
 The stress accent must have been more predominant than the pitch accent at the time quantitative ablaut came into
existence, because it is only upon this assumption that we are able to account for the weakening and eventual loss of vowels in unaccented syllables. See § 28.
§ 84. Scholars are now generally agreed that the factors which brought about the phenomenon called ablaut were of various kinds. Although the prime factor was doubtless the system of accentuation which prevailed at different periods in the parent Indg. language, there were also several other factors more or less connected with accent, such as vowel-contraction, lengthening of vowels by compensation for the loss of a vowel in the next syllable, rhythmical lengthening (see Wackernagel, Das Dehnungsgesetz der griech. Composita), numerous analogical formations, the mixing up of the various ablaut-series through the influence of analogy, \&c. And as all these vowelchanges and probably many others connected with ablaut took place long before the separate languages came into existence, it is practically impossible to determine their chronological order or to be certain about the precise nature of some of the vowel-changes. In the following account of ablaut certain more or less problematical details have been omitted as being beyond the scope of this book. The student who wishes to pursue the subject in greater detail should consult Brugmann's Grundriss, vol. i, second ed., pp. 482-505, and Kurze vergleichende Grammatik, pp. 138-50 ; Hirt's Der indogermanische Ablaut and the excellent epitome in his Handbuch der griech. Laut- und Formenlehre, pp. 84-ro5.
§ 85. From the examples given above (§§82-3) it will be seen that ablaut is not confined to what is generally called root-syllables but that it also occurs equally in other syllables. For practical purposes it is convenient to divide words into root-bases and suffix-bases, as in $\phi \in \rho \in \in \tau \rho \sigma-\nu$ : Skr. bharí-tra-m, arm, $\pi \alpha-\tau \epsilon \in \rho-\alpha: \epsilon \dot{v}-\pi \alpha^{\prime}-\tau \rho \rho-\alpha: \pi \alpha-\tau \dot{\eta} \rho:$ $\epsilon \dot{v}-\pi \dot{\alpha} \alpha-\tau \omega \rho: \pi \alpha-\tau \rho-o ́ s$, Dor. $\phi \in ́ \rho o-\mu \epsilon s:$ Lat. feri-mus (older
-mos), OHG. bera-mēs. In the following paragraphs we shall call root-bases simply bases or ablaut-bases, and suffix-bases simply suffixes. Bases or ablaut-bases are mostly monosyllabic or dissyllabic. The monosyllabic bases are called heavy or light according as they contain a long or a short vowel, as *dhē-, *dō-, *bhā- in $\tau i-\theta \eta-\mu l$, $\delta i-\delta \omega-\mu l$, Dor. $\phi \bar{\alpha}-\mu i ́$; *es-, *ei- in ${ }^{\prime} \epsilon \sigma-\tau \iota$, $\epsilon \hat{i}-\mu l$. The dissyllabic bases are called heavy when the first syllable contains a short vowel and the second syllable a long vowel, and light when both syllables contain a short vowel, as *pelē-, fill, *genō-, know, *petā-, fly, see § 458 ; *leiqe-, leave, in $\lambda \epsilon i \pi \epsilon-\tau \epsilon: \lambda \iota \pi \epsilon \hat{\nu} \nu$. The bases underwent numerous vowel-changes owing to the operation of various sound-laws which took place in the prim. Indg. period. The more important of these changes were :-

## i. The Wearening or Loss of Vowels.

§ 86. Vowels were weakened or disappeared in syllables which did not have the chief accent of the word. Such syllables are said to have the weak grade of ablaut. The weak grade is subdivided into weak grade I ( $\mathrm{wg} . \mathrm{I}$ ) and weak grade 2 (wg. 2) according as the syllable in which it occurs originally had the secondary accent or was unaccented. In the former case short vowels merely became reduced in quality (generally written e, o, a) and long vowels became reduced in quality and quantity (generally written $\partial, \S 49$ ), whereas in the latter case both short and long vowels disappeared through the intermediate stage of reduced vowels. At a later period in the parent Indg. language the reduced short vowels e, o, a regained their full quality again and thus fell together with the original strong grade vowels e, $\mathbf{o}, \mathbf{a}$. When the vowel e entirely disappeared in diphthongs (ei, eu, em, en, el, er) the second element of the diphthong became vocalic or re-
mained consonantal according as it was followed by a consonant or a vowel in the next syllable.
§ 87. Long vowels were reduced to $\boldsymbol{2}$ ( $=$ Aryan $\mathbf{i}$ but $\mathbf{a}$ in the other languges) or disappeared in the heavy ablautseries (§ 49), as $\theta \in \tau$ ós for $* \theta \alpha$ тós ( $\S 49$, note), Skr. hitáh, Indg. *dhatós : $\tau i ́-\theta \eta-\mu l$, $\lambda \alpha \gamma \alpha \rho_{o ́ s ~: ~}^{\lambda \eta} \gamma \omega$, $\dot{\rho} \alpha \gamma \hat{\eta} \nu \alpha \iota: \rho \dot{\eta} \eta-$ $\gamma \nu \bar{v} \mu l$; $\delta o \tau o ́ s$ for ${ }^{*} \delta \alpha \tau o ́ s(§ 49$, note), Lat. datus, Skr. ádita $=\epsilon \neq-\delta o \tau o: \delta i(-\delta \omega-\mu$, Lat. dōnum ; $\sigma \tau \alpha \tau o ́ s$, Skr. sthitáh, Lat. status, Indg. *stətós : Dor. í $\sigma \tau \bar{\alpha}-\mu l$, Lat. stāre, $\phi a \mu \epsilon ́ \nu$ : Dor. $\phi \bar{\alpha} \mu i$, Skr. bhávi-tum, Indg. *bhéwo-tum, to be : base *bhewā.. Skr. pl. da-dh $\mathrm{máh}$ : sing. dá-dhā-mi, $\tau i \cdot \theta \eta-\mu \ell$, pl. da•d-máḥ : sing. đá-dā-mi, $\delta i-\delta \omega \omega-\mu l$, dēvá-ttaḥ, given by the gods, with -ttah from older *.d-tos beside Lat. datus, $\phi \dot{v} \sigma \iota s$ beside $\bar{\epsilon}-\phi \bar{u}$ from *é-bhwət : base *bhewā-.
§ 88. The first element of the long diphthongs $\bar{e} \mathbf{i}, \bar{o} \mathbf{i}, \bar{a} \mathbf{i}$, $\overline{\mathbf{e} u}, \bar{o} \mathbf{u}, \overline{\mathrm{a}} \mathbf{u}$ was reduced to $\partial$. The əi, əu then became contracted to $\overline{\mathrm{i}}, \overline{\mathrm{u}}$ before a following consonant already in the prim. Indg. period. But as the second element of long diphthongs often disappeared in the parent language (§ 63) we thus have the ablaut relation $\overline{\mathrm{i}}: \overline{\mathrm{e}}, \overline{\mathrm{o}}, \overline{\mathrm{a}}$ and $\overline{\mathrm{u}}: \overline{\mathrm{e}}, \overline{\mathrm{o}}, \overline{\mathrm{a}}$ in the earliest historic period of all the languages, as Skr. dhītạh, pp., sucked, Lat. filius : $\begin{array}{r}\text { ク́ } \sigma \alpha \tau o, ~ h e ~ s u c k e d, ~ L a t . ~\end{array}$ fēlāre, $\sigma \kappa \grave{\imath} \pi \omega \nu: \sigma \kappa \hat{\eta} \pi \tau \rho o \nu, \pi \hat{\imath} \theta_{l}: \pi \hat{\omega} \mu \alpha$ beside Skr. pāyáyati, he gives to drink: inf. pátum, to drink; Skr. múlam, root : $\mu \hat{\omega} \lambda v$, Skr. údhar, udder : ồ $\theta \alpha \rho$ from * $\omega \hat{v} \hat{\theta} \theta \rho$ (§ 70), $\mu \hat{v} \mu \alpha \rho: \mu \hat{\omega} \mu \alpha \rho$, Skr. mūráḥ, dull, stupid : $\mu \hat{\omega} \rho o s$, Lat. mōrus. When $\overline{\mathrm{i}}$ and $\overline{\mathrm{u}}$ became unaccented they were

 $\pi \lambda \tilde{\sigma} \iota \iota: \pi \lambda \omega \tau o ́ s$.
§ 89. In the light ablaut-series the short vowels e, o, a were reduced to voiceless (?) e, o, a or disappeared through the intermediate stage of $e, o$, a. At a later period in the parent Indg. language the reduced vowels regained their full quality again and thus fell together with the original
strong grade vowels $\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{o}$, a, as $\pi \epsilon \pi \tau o ́ s$, Indg. *peqtós, gen. sing. Lat. pedis, Skr. padáh, Indg. ${ }^{*}$ pedés ; ó $\pi \tau$ 白 $o \nu$ from *oq. : ö $\psi о \mu \alpha \iota ; ~-\alpha \kappa \tau o ́ s, ~ I n d g . ~ * a k t o ́ s ~: ~ a ̈ \gamma \omega . ~ I n ~$ Greek there are no sure examples of the loss of $\mathbf{o}$, $\mathbf{a}$ in the light ablaut-series. It should also be noted that the above 0 is not the same as the o which stands in ablaut relation to e, as in фópos: ф'́ $\rho \omega$. Examples of the loss of e are
 pl. s-máḥ : ás-mi, I am = Indg. *s-més : *és-mi, é $\pi i ́-\beta \delta \alpha \iota:$ Lat. pedem, i $\ddagger \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \sigma l-\sigma \delta-\omega$ : édos from ${ }^{*} \sigma \epsilon \in \delta o s$, ${ }^{\prime} / \sigma \chi \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \sigma i-\sigma \chi \chi^{\omega}$ : ${ }^{\epsilon} \chi \chi$ from * $\sigma \epsilon \in \chi \omega$.

When the vowel e entirely disappeared in the diphthongs ei, eu, em, en, el, er the second element of the diphthong became vocalic or remained consonantal according as it was followed by a consonant or a vowel in the next syllable, as





 Skr. y-ánti, they go : i-máh, we go = Indg. *j-énti : *i-més ; Hom. $\pi \in i ́ \rho \alpha \tau \alpha$ from ${ }^{*} \pi \epsilon \rho F-\alpha \tau \alpha: \pi \rho v-\mu \nu o ́ s ; ~ \gamma i ́-\gamma \nu o \mu \alpha \iota: ~ \epsilon ่-$
 $\pi \alpha \tau \rho o ́ s: \pi \alpha \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \alpha$.
§ 90. The combinations emə, enə, elə, erə had in heavy bases (§97) a threefold development in prim. Greek. They became (I) $\dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha, \alpha, \alpha \alpha, \alpha ́ \lambda \alpha, \alpha, \alpha \alpha$ when the first element had the secondary accent, (2) $\mu \bar{\alpha}, \nu \bar{\alpha}, \lambda \bar{\alpha}, \rho \bar{\alpha}$ (see § 68) when the last element had the secondary accent and the first element disappeared, and (3) $\mu \alpha, \nu \alpha, \lambda \alpha, \rho \alpha$ when neither the first nor the last element had the secondary accent;
 Lat. lātus; $\theta$ ávatos : $\theta \nu \eta \tau o ́ s$, Dor. $\theta \nu \bar{\alpha} \tau o ́ s ; ~ к \alpha ́ \rho \eta \nu o \nu ~ f r o m ~$ *ка $\alpha \sigma \sigma \nu \nu$ : кра̄то́s from ${ }^{*} \kappa \rho \bar{\alpha} \sigma \alpha \tau о s ; ~ к \alpha ́ \mu \alpha \tau о s: ~ к \mu \eta \tau o ́ s, ~$

 $\theta \nu \alpha \mu \epsilon \nu: \theta \alpha ́ \nu \alpha \tau o s ; \tau \epsilon \in-\tau \lambda \alpha \theta_{l}: \tau \in \lambda \alpha \mu \omega \bar{\omega}, \kappa \alpha-\chi \lambda \alpha ́ \xi \omega: \kappa \epsilon \in-\chi \lambda \bar{\alpha} \delta \alpha$;
 bhávitum, to be, base *bhewā-.

## 2. The Lengthening of Vowels.

§ 91. Several kinds of vowel lengthening took place in the prim. Indg. period, as lengthening by compensation for the loss of a syllable, contraction of vowels and rhythmical lengthening. See Streitberg, Indogermanische Forschungen, iii, pp. 305-416.
§ 92. With quantitative ablaut is connected the prim. Indg. lengthening of vowels by compensation for the loss of a syllable. The vowels thus lengthened have what is called the lengthened grade of ablaut (lg.). The vowels in nearly all the examples which have this lengthening belong to the e-series of ablaut. And the lengthened vowels $\overline{\mathbf{e}}, \overline{\mathbf{o}}$ are respectively called $\lg$. I and $\lg .2$.
(a) A short accented vowel in an originally open syllable became lengthened if the following syllable entirely disappeared. This occurs especially in the nom. singular of nouns, as Lat. pēs, Dor. $\pi \omega$ 白 from prim. Indg. *pêts, *pôts, *pédes or -os, *pódes or -os, beside acc. pedem, $\pi o ́ \delta \alpha$, Indg. ${ }^{*}$ pédm, ${ }^{*}$ pódm; $\pi \alpha \tau \eta{ }^{2} \rho$ from prim. Indg. ${ }^{*}$ pətére beside $\pi \alpha \tau$ ́́ $\rho \alpha$, Indg. *pətérm; and similarly ${ }^{\prime} \dot{\eta} \rho:$ Lat. ferus, $\kappa \hat{\eta} \rho$ : base *kéred-, ср. кар $\delta i \bar{\alpha}, \pi о \iota \mu \dot{\eta} \nu: \pi о \iota \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \alpha$, $\phi \rho \dot{\eta} \nu: \phi \rho_{\epsilon} \nu \alpha, \beta \lambda \omega \psi$ : $\beta \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \pi \omega, \delta \alpha i ́ \mu \omega \nu$ : $\delta \alpha i ́ \mu о \nu \alpha$, Hom.


Note.-Also when a short vowel disappeared after a long vowel, as in gen. $\theta \epsilon \hat{\epsilon}$ s from an original form *dhwesāso : nom. $\theta \epsilon \overline{a ́}$.
(b) The e was also lengthened in prim. Indg. in the active singular of the s-aorist, as *léksm from older
${ }^{*}$ legesm, cp. Lat. lēxī : pres. legit; Lat. vēxī, Skr. á-vākș̣am : pres. vehit, váhati. The s-aorist in Greek was a new formation with the vowel from the present, as ${ }_{\epsilon} \epsilon-\lambda \epsilon \xi \alpha,{ }^{\epsilon}-\lambda \epsilon \iota \psi \alpha$, but Skr. á-rāikṣam, see § 507.
§ 93. Contraction of the augment with a following vowel, as in $\grave{\eta} \alpha(\S 79)$, Skr. ásam, Indg. *ésm from older *é-esm ; $\hat{\eta} \alpha$ for * $\hat{\eta} \alpha$, Skr. ắyam, Indg. *éjm from older *é-ejm; $\hat{\eta} \gamma o \nu$, Dor. $\hat{\alpha} \gamma o \nu$, Skr. ájam : pres. ${ }_{\alpha} \neq \gamma \omega$, ájāmi.

The contraction of case-endings with the stem, as añ from $\cdot \overline{\mathrm{a}} \cdot \mathrm{es}$ in the nom. plural of $\overline{\mathbf{a}}$-stems; -ỡi from -o.ai in the dat. singular of o-stems; .õs from -o.es in the nom. plural of o-stems, see §79.
§ 94. Rhythmical lengthening in the first elements of compounds and before suffixes so as to avoid a long succession of short vowels, as $\pi \rho \omega-\pi \epsilon ́ \rho v \sigma \iota, ~ i \epsilon \rho \omega \sigma v ́ v \eta$ : íє $\rho o ́ s$,


## Ablaut-Series.

§ 95. The vowels vary within certain series of related vowels called ablaut-series. The parent Indg. language had six such series, three light and three heavy, viz.
sg. I. sg. 2. lg. I. lg. 2. wg. r. wg. 2.

| I. e-series | é | - | é | $\overline{0}$ | e | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| II. o-series | ó | o | ó | ¢ | - | - |
| III. a-series | á | - | á | $\overline{\text { ¢ }}$ | a | - |
| IV. ē-series | é | $\overline{\text { o }}$ |  |  | ә | - |
| V. ō-series | ó | - |  |  | ә | - |
| VI. $\overline{\mathrm{a}}$-series | á | $\bar{\circ}$ |  |  | ə | - |

Strong grade I is taken as the normal grade in all the series. The three light series have three grades, strong grade, lengthened grade, and weak grade, whereas the three heavy series have only the two grades, strong and weak. The origin of the difference between the strong and the weak grade and between the strong and the
lengthened grade have already been explained in the preceding paragraphs. And some indication of the probable origin of the difference between strong grade I and strong grade 2 has been given in § 83, but much still remains obscure about the origin of these qualitative differences.
The first ablaut-series is by far the most important. It is found in many monosyllables and always in the first syllable of dissyllabic heavy bases and in the second syllable of dissyllabic light bases and nearly always in the first syllable of dissyllabic light bases. And one or other grade of this series occurs in nearly all suffixes. The second and third series are exceedingly rare. Apart from a few monosyllabic heavy bases the fourth, fifth, and sixth series only occur in the second syllable of dissyllabic heavy bases, and even here the number of examples is not very great. The $\overline{\mathrm{e}}$ in the fourth series often came to be regarded as a formative element in prim. Greek and was then extended by analogy to bases to which it did not originally belong, see $\S 458,506$.
§ 96. Many examples of the various grades of ablaut have been given in the preceding paragraphs. In this and the following paragraph are given examples of the various ablaut-series, and of their application to dissyllabic light and heavy bases.


Phonology


## III. The a-series.


IV. The è-series.

| sg. ${ }_{\text {c }}$ I. | sg. 2. | wg. I. | wg. 2. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\overline{0}$ | ə |  |
| $\tau i \nexists \eta \mu \iota$ | $\theta \omega \mu$ ós | $\theta \varepsilon \tau$ ós for ${ }^{*} \theta a \tau$ ós |  |
| Skr. dá-dhā-mi |  | hitáh | da.dh-máh |
| $\rho^{\rho} \eta \chi^{\prime} \nu \bar{v} \mu \iota$ | ${ }^{\prime} \rho$ ¢- $\rho \omega \gamma^{\prime}$ |  |  |
| $\lambda \eta \dot{\gamma} \gamma \omega$ |  | 入ayapós |  |
| $\hat{\eta} \mu \alpha$ | $\dot{\alpha} \phi-\epsilon-\omega-\kappa \alpha$ | étós for * $\dot{\text { ácós }}$ |  |

V. The $\overline{0}$-series.
sg. I.
ó
sío $\omega \mu$
Lat. dōnum, $\delta \hat{\omega} \rho o \nu$
sg. 2.
$\overline{0}$
wg. I.
-
wg. 2.
סotós for *¿acós Skr. da-d-máh Lat. datus, $\delta \dot{\alpha} \nu o s$

## VI. The $\bar{a}$-series.

sg. I.
á
sg. 2.
$\overline{\mathbf{o}}$
$\phi \omega \nu \eta$
$\pi \tau \omega \times$ ós

Dor. $\phi \bar{\alpha} \mu i$
Dor. í $\sigma \tau \bar{\alpha} \mu \iota$
Dor. ${ }^{\ell}-\pi \tau \bar{\alpha} \xi \alpha$
Dor. $\tau \dot{\alpha} K \omega$
wg. I .
ə
wg. 2.
$\phi \alpha \mu \epsilon ́ \nu$
$̈ \sigma \tau \alpha \mu \epsilon \nu, \sigma \tau \alpha \tau o ́ s$
$-\pi \tau \alpha \kappa \omega ́ \nu$
$\tau \alpha \kappa \in \rho o ́ s$

Dissyllabic Bases.
§ 97. In the parent Indg. language either the first or the second syllable of dissyllabic bases always contained the weak grade of ablaut. Both syllables could have the weak, but not the strong grade. From this it follows that forms
of the type $\phi \bar{\epsilon} \rho \epsilon$, $\phi \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon-\tau \epsilon$, Dor. $\phi \epsilon \in \rho o-\mu \epsilon s$, and $\gamma^{\prime}-\gamma \nu 0-\mu a \iota$ cannot be original. The prim. Indg. forms corresponding to the former were *bhér, *bhr.t(h)é, *bhr-més = prim. Gr . ${ }^{*} \phi^{\prime} \rho,{ }^{*} \phi \rho \alpha \tau \epsilon \in,{ }^{*} \phi \rho \alpha \mu \epsilon$ 's, and to the latter *gi.gnə-mai = prim. Gr. ${ }^{*} \gamma^{\prime}-\gamma \nu \alpha-\mu \alpha \iota$. $\phi^{\prime} \rho \epsilon, \phi^{\prime} \rho \epsilon-\tau \epsilon, \phi^{\epsilon} \rho \sigma-\mu \epsilon s, \gamma i \cdot \gamma \nu 0-\mu \alpha \iota$ and similar forms contained the thematic vowels, e, o. See §§ 450, 456. And in like manner forms of the type $\gamma^{\prime}$ 'vos
 new formations which came into existence long after the factors which caused the phenomenon of ablaut had ceased to operate. Such new formations took place partly in the parent Indg. language itself and partly in the prehistoric period of the separate languages.

In the following examples of dissyllabic bases the grade of ablaut before the + refers to the first syllable of the base and the one after the + to the second syllable.
(a) Dissyllabic light bases:-sg. $\mathrm{I}+\mathrm{wg} .2$ Lith. lëk-mi, I leave, sg. $2+$ wg. $2 \lambda \epsilon \in \cdot \lambda o \iota \pi \cdot \alpha$, lg. $\mathrm{I}+\mathrm{wg} .2$ Skr. á-rāikṣ̆am (§507), wg. $2+$ sg. I $\epsilon-\lambda \iota \pi \epsilon-\mathrm{s}$, wg. $2+\mathrm{sg} .2{ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon}-\lambda \iota \pi o-\nu$ :
 lg. $2+$ wg. $2 \phi \omega \rho(\S 92(a))$, wg. $2+$ sg. 2 ס $i \cdot-\phi \rho o \cdot s:$ base *bhere. sg. $1+$ wg. 2 Lat. genu, sg. $2+$ wg. 2 yóvv, wg. $2+$ sg. I Goth. kniu, lg. $2+$ wg. $2 \gamma \omega \nu-i \bar{\alpha}$, wg. $2+$ wg. 2 Skr. abhi.jñú, down to the knee, $\gamma \nu v$ 自 : base *geneu-.
 wg. $2+$ wg. 2 F it $^{i}$ Kat $\iota=$ Indg. *.dkmti : base *dekemt. sg. I + wg. $2 \alpha \ddot{v} \xi \omega$, Lat. augēre, wg. $2+$ sg. I Lat. vegeo, wg. $2+$ lg. 2 OE. wōcor, progeny, usury, wg. $2+$ sg. 2 Goth. wahsjan, to grow, wg. $2+$ wg. 2 Skr. ugrạh, mighty: base *aweg., increase. wg. $2+$ sg. I ${ }^{\prime} \not \alpha \rho$ from *wesr, wg. $2+\mathrm{lg}$. I Lat. vēr from *wēsr., lg. $1+$ wg. 2 缯s from *āusōs, wg. $2+$ wg. 2 Skr. uṣ̌ás-, dawn : base *awes-, shine, flash up.
(b) Dissyllabic heavy bases. The long vowel ( $\overline{\mathbf{e}}, \overline{\mathbf{o}}, \overline{\mathbf{a}}$ ) in the second syllable of these bases was weakened to a
when the accent was on the first syllable (§ 458). When the accent was on the second syllable the long vowel was preserved and the short vowel of the first syllable disappeared, as *témə., *génə., *pétə- beside *tmê., *gnō-, *ptá.. It is therefore impossible to determine to which of the long vowels the $\partial$ goes back unless forms have been preserved in which the second syllable of the base originally had the accent. The same difficulty also exists with the prim. Indg. combinations emə, enə, ela, erə, which became in prim. Greek $\mu \bar{\alpha}, \nu \bar{\alpha}, \lambda \bar{\alpha}, \rho \bar{\alpha}$ when the last element of the combination had the secondary accent (§ 90). They thus fell together with the base forms of the type *ptā- with long ā. Examples are-sg. $\mathrm{I}+\mathrm{wg}$. $\mathrm{I} \tau \hat{\epsilon} \mu \alpha-\chi$ os, wg. $2+\mathrm{sg}$. I $\tau \epsilon \in-\tau \mu \eta-\kappa \alpha$ : base *temē-, cut. .sg. i + wg. i Skr. vémanfrom *vayiman-, loom, sg. $2+$ wg. 2 (F)oîoos, wg. $2+$ sg. I Lat. viēre, wg. $2+\mathrm{wg}$. i $\grave{\iota} \tau \in \bar{\alpha} \bar{\alpha}$, Lat. vitis, wg. $2+\mathrm{wg}$. 2 ítus : base *wejē-, plait, wind. sg. I + wg. i Skr. jáni-tōḥ, to beget, $\gamma^{\prime} \nu \epsilon-\sigma \iota$ s for ${ }^{*} \gamma^{\prime} \nu \alpha-\sigma \iota s$, wg. $2+$ sg. I $\gamma \nu \omega \tau o ́ s,{ }^{\prime} \epsilon-\gamma \nu \omega \nu$, Lat. (g)nōtus, OE. cnāwan (*gné.), to know, wg. 2+wg. I Skr. já-jñih, germinating : base *genō., *genē-, gignere. sg. I + wg. I $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \tau \alpha-\mu \alpha \iota$, sg. $2+\mathrm{wg}$. I $\pi о \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha}-\rho \mu \alpha \iota, \lg .2+\mathrm{wg}$. I $\pi \omega \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha}-$ o $\mu \alpha \iota$, wg. $2+$ sg. I $\pi \tau \hat{\eta}-\nu \alpha \iota$ : base *petā-, spread out, fly. sg. $1+$ wg. I Skr. bhávi-tum from *bhéwi.tum, to $b e$, wg. $2+$ sg. I Lat. -bam from *-bhwām, wg. $2+$ wg. I ${ }^{\epsilon}-\phi \bar{u}$ from *é-bhwət, wg. $2+$ wg. $2 \phi \dot{v}-\sigma \iota \varsigma$ : base *bhewā-, be. sg. I+wg. I $\kappa \in ́ \rho \rho \alpha-\sigma \alpha \iota$, wg. $2+$ sg. I $\kappa \frac{\epsilon}{-}-\kappa \rho \bar{\alpha}-\mu \alpha \iota:$ base *kerā-, mix. sg. I +wg. I $\tau \in \lambda \alpha-\mu \omega \nu$, wg. I +wg. I $\mathfrak{\epsilon}-\tau \alpha ́ \lambda \alpha-$ $\sigma \sigma \alpha$ (Hesych.), wg. $2+$ sg. I $\tau \lambda \eta \tau o ́ s, ~ D o r . ~ \tau \lambda \alpha ́ \alpha ̃ o s, ~ L a t . ~$ lātus : base *telā-, bear, endure.

## CHAPTER V

## THE PRIMITIVE INDO-GERMANIC CONSONANTS

§ 98. The Indo-Germanic parent language had the following system of consonants:-

| ) tenues | p | t | k | q, $\mathbf{q}^{\text {w }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | b | d | g | $g, g^{w}$ |
| Tenues aspiratae | ph | th | kh | qh, $q^{\text {wh }}$ |
| $4{ }_{4}$ mediae aspiratae | bh | dh | gh | $\mathrm{gh}, \mathrm{g}^{\mathrm{w}}$ |
| $\text { Spirants }\left\{\begin{array}{l} \text { voiceless } \\ \text { voiced } \end{array}\right.$ |  | z | ? ${ }^{\text {d }}$ |  |
| Nasals | m | n | กั | $\eta$ |
| Liquids |  | 1, r |  |  |
| Semivowels | $\mathbf{w}(\underline{\text { u }}$ ) |  | j (i) |  |

Note.-1. Explosives are consonants which are formed with complete closure of the mouth passage, and may be pronounced with or without voice, i. e. with or without the vocal cords being set in action; in the former case they are said to be voiced (e. g. the mediae), and in the latter voiceless (e.g. the tenues). The aspirates are pronounced like the simple tenues and mediae followed by an $\mathbf{h}$, like the Anglo-Irish pronunciation of $t$ in tell.

The palatal explosives are formed by the front or middle of the tongue and the roof of the mouth (hard palate), like $\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{k}$ (c) in English get, good, kid, could; whereas the velars are formed by the root of the tongue and the soft palate (velum). The latter do not occur in English, but are common in Hebrew, and are often heard in the Swiss pronunciation of German. In the parent Indo-Germanic language there were two kinds of velars, viz. pure velars and velars with lip rounding. The latter are here indicated by w. The palatal and velar nasals
only occurred before their corresponding explosives, ñk, ñg ; ŋq, ŋg, \&c.
2. Spirants are consonants formed by the mouth passage being narrowed at one spot in such a manner that the outgoing breath gives rise to a frictional sound at the narrowed part.
$z$ only occurred before voiced explosives, e. g. ${ }^{*}$ nizdos $=$ Lat. nïdus, English nest ; *ozdos = Gr. öלos, Goth. asts, bough.
3. The nasals and liquids had the functions both of vowels and consonants (§ 64).
4. The essential difference between the so-called semivowels and full vowels is that the latter always bear the accent of the syllable in which they occur, e. g. in English ców; stáin the first element of the diphthong is a vowel, the second a consonant; but in words like French rwá (written roi), bjér (written bière), the first element of the diphthong is a consonant, the second a vowel. In consequence of this twofold function, a diphthong may be defined as the combination of a sonantal with a consonantal vowel. And it is called a falling or rising diphthong according as the stress is upon the first or second element.
5. From the above system of consonants have been excluded certain rare sounds which only existed in the parent language in combination with other sounds, viz. sh and $\mathbf{z h}, \mathbf{p}$ and đ, ph and đh.
sh and $\mathbf{z h}$ only occurred in combination with tenues and mediae and arose from the older combinations, tenues aspiratae and mediae aspiratae $+\mathbf{s}$, as tsh, psh, dzh, bzh from older ths, phs, dhs, bhs.
p and đ only occurred after palatals and velars which were originally unaspirated, as $\mathrm{kp}, \mathrm{qp}, \mathrm{g} đ$, gđ.
ph and th only occurred after palatals and velars which were originally aspirated, as $\mathbf{k p h}$, qph, gđh, gđth from older khp, qhp, ghđ, ghđ. In the present state of our knowledge it is impossible to determine how these four spirants were pronounced in the parent language. In Greek they became $\mathbf{t}$-sounds, and in Sanskrit, Latin, Germanic and the BalticSlavonic languages they became s-sounds. See §§ 225-8.
6. The tenues aspiratae and the mediae aspiratae only occurred before vowels, semivowels, liquids and nasals. When they came to stand before explosives or spirants, they became deaspirated, as pth, bdh, tsh, dzh from older pht, bht, ths, dhs, see § 109.
7. It is doubtful whether the parent language had a spirant $j$, see § 227.
§ 99. The following tables contain the normal equivalents of the Indg. explosives in Greek, Latin, Old Irish, prim. Germanic, Gothic, Sanskrit and the Baltic-Slavonic languages. For examples see the paragraphs dealing with labial, dental, palatal and velar explosives.
§ 100.
I. The Tenues.

| Indg. | Gr. | Lat. | O.Ir. | P. Germanic. | Goth. | Skr. | Lith. | O.Slav. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| p | $\pi$ | p | - | f, b, b | f, $\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{b}$ | p | p | p |
| t | $\tau$ | t | t , th | p, đ, d | p, đ, d | t | t | t |
| k | $k$ | c | c | x, 3 | h, $3, \mathrm{~g}$ | ś | sz | s |
| q | $\kappa$ | c | c | X, 3 | h, 3, g | k, c | k | k, č |
| $\mathrm{q}^{\mathbf{w}}$ | $\pi, \tau, \kappa$ | qu, c | c | xw,gw | h, $3, \mathrm{w}$ | k, c | k | k, č |

Note.- i. On the development of the Indg. pure and labialized velars in Greek, Sanskrit, Lithuanian and Old Slavonic see §§ 195-210.
2. In Lat. $\mathbf{p}$ and $\mathbf{c}$ disappeared medially before $\mathbf{s}+$ consonant and initially before $\mathbf{s} ; \mathbf{p n}, \mathbf{t n}, \mathrm{tsn}>\mathrm{nn} ; \mathrm{tt}, \mathrm{ts}>\mathbf{s s}$; $\mathrm{tsl}>\mathrm{ll} ; \mathrm{tl}>\mathbf{1}$ initially and cl medially; $\mathrm{cn}>\mathrm{gn}$; and $\mathrm{ncn}>\mathrm{n}$ with lengthening of a preceding vowel; qu>c before $\mathbf{u}$ and consonants.
3. In O.Ir. p disappeared initially and medially between vowels ; sp>s, f initially and sc medially; pt, ps, rp>cht, ss,
$\mathbf{r r} ; \mathrm{tt}$, ts , st>ss; $\mathbf{t}$ and c disappeared before nasals and liquids ; cs, ct, rct, nc>ss, cht, rt, gg.
4. The Indg. tenues $\mathrm{p}, \mathrm{t}, \mathrm{k}, \mathrm{q}, \mathrm{q}^{\mathrm{w}}$ became in prim. Germanic the voiceless spirants $\mathrm{f}, \mathrm{p}, \mathrm{x}, \mathrm{xw}=$ Goth. $\mathrm{f}, \mathrm{p}, \mathrm{h}, \mathrm{h}$. These voiceless spirants as also Indg. s became by Verner's Law the voiced spirants $\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{4}, \mathbf{3}, \mathbf{3} \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{z}$ (see § 103, note 2 ) medially and finally when the vowel next preceding them did not, according to the original Indg. system of accentuation, bear the principal accent of the word. The Indg. tenues remained unshifted in the combination $\mathbf{s}+$ tenuis, and $\mathbf{t}$ also remained unshifted in the Indg. combinations pt, kt, qt. In some words the Indg. velars, when preceded or followed by a w or another labial in the same word, appear in the Germanic languages as labials by assimilation, as Goth. fimf, five, wulfs, wolf = Indg. *peyqwe, *wilq ${ }^{\text {wos. }}$
§101. 2. The Mediae.

| Indg. | Gr. | Lat. | O.Ir. | P. Ger manic. | Goth. | Skr. | Lith. | O.Slav. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| b | $\beta$ | b | b | p | p | b | b | b |
| d | $\delta$ | d | d | t | t | d | d | d |
| g | $\gamma$ | g | g | k | k | j | $\dot{\mathbf{z}}$ | $z$ |
| $g$ | $\gamma$ | g | g | k | k | g, j | g | g , ž |
| $\mathrm{g}^{\text {w }}$ | $\beta, \delta, \gamma$ | v, gu, g | b, g | kw | q | g, j | g | g , ž |

Note.-I. On the development of the Indg. pure and labialized velars in Gr. Lat. Skr. Lith. and O.Slav. see §§ 195-210.
2. In Lat. $\mathrm{bn}, \mathrm{dn}, \mathrm{dm}, \mathrm{dl}>\mathrm{mn}, \mathrm{nn}, \mathrm{mm}, 11$ (but 1 initially), $\mathrm{ld}>\mathrm{ll}$; initial dj, dw, gn $>\mathrm{j}, \mathrm{b}, \mathrm{n}$.
3. In O.Ir. d, $\mathbf{g}$ disappeared before $\mathbf{1}, \mathrm{n}, \mathrm{r} ; \mathrm{bn}>\mathrm{mn}$; mb , $\mathrm{dm}>\mathrm{mm} ; \mathrm{db}, \mathrm{gb}>\mathrm{bb} ; \mathrm{dg}>\mathrm{gg} ; \mathrm{gd}>\mathrm{dd}$.
4. The Indg. mediae $\mathbf{b}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{g}, \mathrm{g}, \mathrm{g}^{\mathrm{w}}$ became in prim. Germanic the tenues $\mathrm{p}, \mathbf{t}, \mathrm{k}, \mathrm{kw}$.

## § 102. 3. The Tenues Aspiratae.

The tenues aspiratae were rare sounds in the Indg. parent language. Sanskrit and Greek were the only languages which preserved them in historic times. In prim. Keltic, Germanic and the Baltic-Slavonic languages they fell together with the original tenues.

| Indg. | Gr. | Lat. | O.Ir. | P. Germanic. | Goth. | Skr. | Lith. | O.Slav. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ph | $\phi$ | f, b | - | f, b, b | f, b, b | ph | p | p |
| th | $\theta$ | f, b, d | t, th | b, d, d | f, đ, d | th | t | t |
| kh | X | $\mathrm{h}, \mathrm{f}, \mathrm{g}$ | c | X, 3 | h, $3, \mathrm{~g}$ | ? ch | Sz | S |
| qh | X | h, (f), g | c | X, 3 | h, 3, g | kh, ch | k | k, č |
| $\mathrm{q}^{\text {wh }}$ | $\phi, \theta, \chi$ | f, v,gu | c | xw, 3 w | lv, $3, \mathrm{w}$ | kh, ch | k | k, č |

Examples of the tenues aspiratae in Greek and Sanskrit are :-
ph: $\sigma \phi \alpha \rho \alpha \gamma_{\epsilon} о \mu \alpha, I$ crack, crackle, Skr. sphứrjati, he cracks ; $\sigma \phi \dot{\eta} \nu$, Skr. sphyáḥ, wedge ; $\sigma \phi \bar{\epsilon} \lambda a s$, Skr. phálakam, footstool.
th : oî $\sigma \theta \alpha$, Skr. vêttha, thou knowest ; $\pi \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \theta \alpha \nu o \nu$, a platter or mould to bake in, Skr. prothúh, broad ; $\mu$ ó $\theta$ os, battle-din, Skr. mánthati, he shakes, twists. Indg. sth became $\sigma \tau$, as í $\sigma \tau \eta \mu$ l, Skr. tíṣṭhāmi, I stand; $\sigma \tau \hat{\lambda} \lambda o s$, pillar, Skr. sthūráhe, strong ; superlative suffix -ıбтos $=$ Skr. -iṣ̆thaḥ.
kh : $\sigma \times i{ }^{i}{ }^{\circ} \omega$, Lat. scindo, $I$ split, Skr. chinátti from *skhinátti, he splits, OE. scādan, to divide ; $\sigma \chi \alpha ́ \omega, I$ slit, Skr. chyáti, he slits.
qh: $\kappa \alpha \chi \alpha ́ \xi \omega$, I laugh, Skr. kakhati, he laughs ; кó $\chi \chi$ os, Lat. congius, Skr. šaŋkháḥ, muscle.
$\mathbf{q}^{\mathrm{w}} \mathrm{h}: \phi \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \eta, \mathrm{OE} . \mathrm{hwæl}$, whale ; $\sigma \phi \alpha ́ \lambda \lambda о \mu \alpha \iota, I$ stumble, Skr. skhalatē, he stumbles.
§ 103. 4. The Mediae Aspiratae.

| Indg. | Gr. | Lat. | O.Ir. | P. Germanic. | Goth. | Skr. | Lith. | O.Slav. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| bh | $\phi$ | f, b | b | b, b | b, b | bh | b | b |
| dh | $\theta$ | f, b, d | d | đ, d | đ, d | dh | d | d |
| gh | X | h, f, g | g | 3, 8 | 3, g | h | $\dot{\mathbf{z}}$ | z |
| gh | $\chi$ | h, (f), g | g | 3, 9 | 3, g | $\underline{\mathrm{gh}, \mathrm{h}}$ | g | g , ̌̌ |
| $g^{w h}$ | $\phi, \theta, \chi$ | f, v, gu | g | 3w, ${ }^{\text {, w }}$ | 3, w | gh, h | g | g , ž |

Note.-I. In prim. Greek and Italic (Lat. Oscan, Umbrian, \&c.) the mediae aspiratae became voiceless and thus fell together with the original tenues aspiratae.
2. The mediae aspiratae became in prim. Germanic the voiced spirants, $\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{đ}, \mathbf{3}, \mathbf{3}^{\mathbf{w}}$, and thus fell together with the voiced spirants which arose from the Indg. tenues by Verner's Law (§ 100, note 4). These sounds underwent the following changes during the prim. Germanic period :- $\mathbf{t}$, đ initially, and $\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{đ}, \mathbf{3}$ medially after their corresponding nasals, became the voiced explosives, b, d, g. b, đ, $\mathbf{z}$ remained in other positions, and their further development belongs to the history of the separate Germanic languages. In Goth. $\mathbf{b}$, $\mathbb{\text { a (written }} \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{d}$ ) remained medially after vowels, but became explosives (b,d) after consonants. They became $f, b$ finally after vowels and before final -s. 3 remained medially between vowels, and medially after vowels before voiced consonants, but became $\mathbf{x}$ (written g) finally after vowels and before final -s. It became g initially, and also medially after consonants.

1. Prim. Germanic $\mathbf{3}^{\mathbf{w}}$ became $\mathbf{3}$ before $\mathbf{u}$, in other cases it became w.
§ 104. From what has been said in $\$ \S 100-3$ it will be seen that several of the Indg. explosives fell together in the various languages. In Keltic, Germanic and the Baltic-Slavonic languages the tenues aspiratae fell together with the original tenues. Sanskrit is the only language which preserved the original mediae aspiratae. In Greek and Latin they fell together with the original tenues aspiratae. In Keltic and the Baltic-Slavonic languages they fell together with the original mediae. In Greek, Latin, Keltic and the Germanic languages the pure velars fell together with the original palatals, but were kept apart in Sanskrit and the Baltic-Slavonic languages. In Sanskrit and the Baltic-Slavonic languages the labialized velars fell together with the pure velars, but were kept apart in Greek, Latin, Germanic and partly also in the Keltic languages.

## Indg. Sound-Changes.

§ 105. The consonants underwent various sound-changes during the prim. Indg. period, i. e. before the parent language became differentiated into the separate Indo-Germanic languages. The most important of these sound-changes are given in the following paragraphs.
§ 106. Mediae became tenues before voiceless consonants, as \}єukтós, Skr. yuktáḥ, Lat. jūnctus, Lith. júnktas, Indg. *juqtós, yoked, beside §uyóv, Skr. yugám, Lat. jugum, Indg. *jugóm, yoke ; oî $\sigma \theta \alpha$, Skr. vêttha, thou knowest, beside oî $\alpha$, véda, I know; loc. pl. $\pi \circ \sigma \sigma i, \pi o \sigma i ́$, Skr. patsú, beside nom. pl. $\pi o ́ \delta \epsilon \varsigma$, pádaḥ ; Lat. nūptum, nūpsī : nūbere; rectum, rēxī : regere; Goth. giban, to give, beside fra-gifts, a giving, espousal; OE. bringan, to bring, beside brōhte, I brought; and similarly in Gr. $\alpha v \mathfrak{\xi} \boldsymbol{\omega} \omega$,
 unwashed, Skr. niktáh, washed, ví $\psi \omega$ : ví§o from *nigjō ;

§ 107. Voiceless consonants became voiced before voiced explosives and $\mathbf{z}$, as ${ }^{\prime \prime} \beta \delta \delta o \mu o s: \dot{\epsilon} \pi \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha}$; $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i ́-\beta \delta \alpha \iota$ (nom. pl.), the day after the feast, where - $\beta \delta$ - is the weak form of *ped-, foot, cp. Skr. upa-bdá-, stamping, trampling ; Skr. nīdáh, Lat. nidus, OE. nest, from *ni-zdos, nest, where ni-=down, and $\cdot \mathrm{zd} \cdot$ is the weak form of *sed $\cdot$, sit ; $\beta \delta \delta^{\prime} \epsilon \omega$ from * $\beta z \delta \epsilon \omega$ where $\beta z \delta$ is the weak form of *pezd- which occurs in Lat. pēdo; and similarly $\kappa u ́ \beta \delta \eta \nu, \pi \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \delta \eta \nu, \kappa \lambda \epsilon \in \beta \delta \eta \nu: \kappa u ́ \pi \tau \omega$, $\pi \lambda \epsilon ́ \kappa \omega, \kappa \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \pi \tau \omega ; \gamma \rho \alpha ́ \beta \delta \eta \nu, \beta \rho \epsilon ́ \gamma \delta \eta \nu: \gamma^{\epsilon} \gamma \rho \alpha \pi \tau \alpha \iota, \beta \epsilon \in \beta \rho \epsilon \kappa \tau \alpha \iota$; Hom. $\dot{v} \beta \beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega$ : $\dot{v} \pi \sigma-\beta \alpha \bar{\alpha} \lambda \omega$.
§ 108. When two aspiratae came together the first one
 dhi, older *bhebhidh.dhi : $\pi \epsilon \in \pi o \iota \theta \alpha$. This combination of consonants was rare in the parent language.
§ 109. When an aspirata came to stand before s or before one or more unaspirated explosives, the aspiration became transferred to the last consonant. When the aspirata was voiced the whole group became voiced, as airxos from *aighskos, Goth. áiwiski from *aizwisk-, shame, disgrace; ${ }^{\prime} \epsilon \sigma \chi \alpha \tau 0 s$ from *eghskatos : ${ }^{\epsilon} \xi \xi ; \lambda \epsilon \in \sigma \chi \eta$ from ${ }^{*} \operatorname{legzghā,~}$ older *leghskā : $\lambda$ '́ $\chi o s$; $\pi \alpha ́ \sigma \chi \omega$ from ${ }^{*}$ patskhō, older *pnthskō, Indg. *qnothskō : $\pi \alpha \theta \in i v ;$; $\xi \in \nu 0 s$ from *gzhen-, older *ghsen., Goth. gasts, guest, stranger, Lat. hostis ; $\psi \omega \omega$ from *bzhō-, older *bhsō- : Skr. bá-bhasti, he chews, devours. Cp. § 225.

The sound-law whereby bht, ght became bdh, gdh $=$ prim. Greek $\pi \theta, \kappa \theta$ was obliterated by new formations made after the analogy of forms which regularly had $\tau$, as in $\beta \lambda \epsilon \pi \tau o ́ s: \beta \lambda \epsilon ́ \pi \omega ; \tau \epsilon ́ \tau \rho \iota \pi \tau \alpha \iota$, $\ddot{\alpha}-\tau \rho \iota \pi \tau 0 s: \tau \rho \grave{\imath} \beta \omega ; \pi \epsilon \in-$
 combinations like psh, bzh, from older phs, bhs, regularly became ps in prim. Greek ( $\S 225$ ), the above sound-laws may, so far as historic Greek is concerned, be formulated as follows : $\phi, \chi$ appear as $\pi, \kappa$ before a following $\tau$ or $\sigma$, as $\gamma \epsilon \prime \gamma \rho \alpha \pi \tau \alpha l, \gamma \rho \alpha ́ \psi \omega: \gamma \rho \alpha ́ \phi \omega ; \dot{\alpha} \lambda \epsilon i \not \psi \omega: \dot{\alpha} \lambda \epsilon i ́ \phi \omega$; $\dot{\rho} о \pi \tau o ́ s:$
 $\sigma \tau \epsilon i \xi(\omega: \sigma \tau \epsilon i \chi \chi$.

Every Indg. dental +s became ts (§110) in prim. Greek, for the further development of which see $\S 166$.
§ 110 . When two dental explosives came together a spirantal glide was developed between them, which is generally written ${ }^{s, z}$, as $t^{s t}$, $t^{s t}$, $d^{2} d, d^{2} d_{h}$. These combinations became in prim. Greek $\sigma \tau$ ( $=$ Skr. tt, Lat. Germanic ss), $\sigma \theta, z \delta, \sigma \theta$. Every original dental +t appears in Greek as $\sigma \tau$. Examples are :- $\ddot{\alpha}-\iota \sigma \tau o s$, unseen, unknown, Skr. vittáh, known, OE. ge-wiss, sure, certain, Lat. vīsus from *vissus; ${ }^{\prime} \sigma \tau \epsilon$ : oì $\alpha \alpha$; $\dot{\imath} \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho o s$, Skr. úttaraḥ, latter; pp. Skr. sattáḥ, sitten, OE. sess, seat, Lat. ob-sessor : *sed-, sit; $\dot{\alpha} \nu v \sigma \tau o ́ s, ~ \ddot{\alpha}-\pi \alpha \sigma \tau o s: ~ \dot{\alpha} \nu u ́ \tau \omega$,

 knowest : oî $\alpha$, vếda, I know. $\pi \epsilon ́ \pi \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \tau \alpha \iota: \pi \epsilon i ̂ \theta \omega$. ウ̀ $\rho \epsilon i-$
 mēdaḥ, fat.
§ 111. Tenues often alternated with mediae especially before or after nasals, as $\sigma \kappa \alpha \pi \alpha ́ \nu \eta$ : Lat. scabo; Skr.
 Lat. pango, тоєкí入os : Lat. pingo, $\delta i ́ k \eta$, Lat. dīco : $\delta \in \notin \epsilon \epsilon \iota-$ $\gamma \mu \alpha \iota$, єíkoб८: Lat. vīgintì.

The alternation between mediae aspiratae and mediae was also not uncommon, as $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \tau \epsilon \mu \phi \eta_{s}: \sigma \tau \epsilon ́ \mu \beta \omega$, $\dot{\alpha} \phi \rho_{0}$ : ${ }^{\circ} \mu \beta$ роs; $\pi \lambda i \nu \theta$ os : English flint, $\pi v \theta \mu \eta{ }^{\prime} \nu: \pi \dot{v} \nu \delta \alpha \xi$; Skr. ahám : '̇ $\gamma \dot{\omega}$, Lat. ego, Goth. ik; Skr. hánuh, jawbone: $\gamma^{\prime}$ 'ves, Goth. kinnus, cheek; Skr. mahấn : $\mu^{\prime} \gamma \alpha \mathrm{s}$, Goth. mikils; and similarly between tenues and tenues aspiratae, as $\pi \lambda \alpha \tau u ́ s: ~ S k r . ~ p r o t h u ́ h ̣, ~ b r o a d, ~ \pi \lambda \alpha ́ \theta \alpha \nu o \nu, b o a r d ; ~ \pi \alpha ́ \tau o s: ~$ Skr. pánthāh, path. The reasons for these alternations are unknown. For further examples see Brugmann, Grundriss, \&.c., vol. i, second ed., pp. 629-35.
§112. $\mathrm{s}+$ consonant often alternated with the simple
consonant, as $\sigma \tau^{\prime} \neq 0 s: \tau \epsilon ́ \gamma o s$, Lat. tego; $\sigma \tau \in ́ \nu \omega$, I groan: Lat. tonāre ; $\sigma \kappa \alpha i \rho \omega \omega$ : кó $\rho \bar{\alpha} \xi ;$; $\sigma \mu^{i} \lambda \eta$ : Goth. máitan, to cut, here.

## CHAPTER VI

## THE GREEK DEVELOPMENT OF THE INDG. CONSONANT-SYSTEM

§ 113. Before entering upon the history of the individual consonants, it will be well to treat here several points concerning the Greek consonants in general.
§114. The Indg. mediae aspiratae became tenues aspiratae in prim. Greek as also in prim. Italic, and thus fell together with and underwent all further changes in common with the Indg. tenues aspiratae ( $\S \mathbf{1 0 3}$, note I). For examples see §§ 162, 177, 193, 201, 209.
§ 115. Aspirates became de-aspirated in prim. Greek as also in prim. Sanskrit when the next syllable or the next but one began with an aspirate :-
$\pi \alpha \chi u ́ s$, thick, large, stout, Skr. bahúh, abundant ; $\pi \epsilon i \theta \omega$, Lat. fīdo, Indg. *bhéidhō ; $\pi \in u ́ \theta \in \tau \alpha l$, he asks, inquires, Skr. bódhati, he learns, is awake; $\pi v \theta \mu \eta \nu^{\prime}$, Skr. budhnáh, bottom, depth ; $\dot{\alpha} \mu \pi \epsilon \chi \chi \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \dot{\alpha} \mu \phi-\epsilon \in \chi \omega$.
$\tau \alpha ́ \chi \iota \sigma \tau 0 s: \theta \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \sigma \nu,{ }^{\alpha} \dot{\alpha} \tau \tau \omega \nu$; $\tau i \theta \eta \mu \iota$ from *dhidhēmi, Skr.
 т $\iota \not \subset o ́ s: ~ \theta \rho i ́ \xi$.
 from ${ }^{*} \chi \epsilon \phi \alpha \lambda \frac{\alpha}{\alpha} ; \lambda \iota \kappa \rho \iota \phi i s$ : $\lambda \epsilon ́ \chi \rho \iota o s$.
And similarly with the spiritus asper, as ${ }_{\alpha} \mu \alpha \theta$ os : Engl. sand; av̉os from *av̉hos older *havhos, Lith. saũsos, dry,
 $\sigma \chi \epsilon i \nu$. See § 213, r.
 were new formations due to the influence of forms like $\pi \epsilon^{\prime} \theta_{0} \mu a \iota$, $\pi \epsilon i \theta \omega, \chi^{\epsilon} \omega$, фаiv $\omega$.
§ 116. A tenuis, whether original or from an older media (§ 106), was written tenuis aspirata before a following $\theta$. This was not a sound-change but merely a kind of graphic assimilation, as $\epsilon \in \kappa \lambda \epsilon ́ \phi \theta \eta \nu$, ${ }_{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \epsilon \mu \phi \theta \eta \nu$, 'ُ $\rho \rho i ́ \phi \theta \eta \nu$, '́ $\tau \rho \epsilon ́ \phi \theta \eta \nu$,
 $\dot{\epsilon} \tau \rho i ́ \phi \theta \eta \nu$, $\epsilon^{\lambda} \lambda \epsilon ́ \chi \theta \eta \nu,{ }_{\epsilon} \mu i ́ \chi \theta \eta \nu: \tau \rho i ́ \beta \omega, \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \omega, \mu i \gamma \nu \bar{v} \mu \iota$.

## Assimilation of Consonants.

§ 117. $\pi, \beta, \phi+\mu>\mu \mu$, as $\beta \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \mu \mu \alpha: \beta \lambda \epsilon ́ \pi \omega ; \lambda \epsilon ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota \mu \mu \alpha \iota:$ $\lambda \epsilon i ́ \pi \omega$; ${ }^{\circ} \mu \mu \alpha$ from ${ }^{*}$ ó $\pi \mu \alpha$ : Lat. oculus, Lith. akis, eye; $\tau \epsilon \in \tau \rho \iota \mu \mu \alpha \iota: \tau \rho \grave{\iota} \beta \omega$; $\gamma \rho \alpha ́ \mu \mu \alpha, \gamma \epsilon ́ \gamma \rho \alpha \mu \mu \alpha \iota: \gamma \rho \alpha ́ \phi \omega ; \psi \alpha ́ \mu \mu о s:$廿афарós.
$\beta \nu>\mu \nu$, as $\dot{\alpha} \mu \nu o ́ s$ from * $\alpha \beta \nu o ́ s:$ Lat. agnus; $\dot{\epsilon} \rho \in \mu \nu o ́ s:$ ${ }^{\prime \prime} \rho \in \beta$ os ; $\sigma \epsilon \mu \nu$ ós : $\sigma \epsilon \in \beta o \mu \alpha \iota$.
$\delta, \tau+\pi>\pi \pi$, as Hom. ő $\pi \pi \omega$, from *ő $\delta-\pi \omega s$; ка́ $\pi \pi \epsilon \sigma \epsilon$ from ${ }^{*} k \alpha \tau-\pi \epsilon \sigma \epsilon$.
$\delta \lambda>\lambda \lambda$, as Lac. $\in \lambda \lambda \lambda \frac{\dot{\alpha}}{}$, Lat. sella, from *sedlā: OE. set1, seat; $\pi \epsilon ́ \lambda \lambda \bar{v} \tau \rho o \nu$ from ${ }^{*} \pi \epsilon \in \delta-\lambda \bar{v} \tau \rho \circ \nu$.
$\gamma \nu>y \nu$, as $\gamma^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \nu$ о $\mu \alpha \iota=\gamma^{\prime} \not \equiv \nu о \mu \alpha \iota$. See § 189.
$\lambda \nu>\lambda \lambda$, as ${ }^{\circ} \lambda \lambda \bar{v} \mu \iota$ from ${ }^{*}{ }^{\circ} \lambda \nu \bar{v} \mu \iota$; Lesb. $\beta o ́ \lambda \lambda o \mu \alpha \iota$ from * $\beta$ ó $\lambda \nu$ о $\mu \alpha \iota$.

Before explosives $\nu$ became the corresponding homorganic nasal, as $\pi \alpha \lambda i ́ \mu \pi \alpha \iota s, \sigma v \mu \beta \alpha ́ \lambda \lambda \omega, \pi \alpha \lambda \iota \gamma \gamma \in \nu \in \sigma i \alpha$.
$\nu \lambda>\lambda \lambda$, as $\pi \alpha \lambda$ í $\lambda \lambda$ oyos, $\sigma u ́ \lambda \lambda o \gamma o s$.
$\nu \mu>\mu \mu$, as $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \omega, \sigma \dot{v} \mu \mu \alpha$ Хоs.
$\nu \rho>\rho \rho$, as $\sigma v \rho \rho \alpha ́ \pi \tau \omega, \sigma v \rho \rho$ é $\omega$.
Antevocalic $\mu \sigma>\mu \mu$ in Lesb. and Thess., which became simplified to $\mu$ in the other dialects with lengthening of the preceding vowel, as Lesb. ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \nu \in \mu \mu \alpha$, Att. Ion. $\epsilon^{\prime} \nu \in \iota \mu \alpha$, Dor. ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\prime} \nu \eta \mu \alpha$ : $\nu \epsilon ́ \mu \omega$. See § 216.

Antevocalic $\nu \sigma>\nu \nu$ in Lesb. and Thess., which became simplified to $\nu$ in the other dialects with lengthening of the preceding vowel, as Lesb. $\mu \hat{\eta} \nu \nu o s$, Thess. $\mu \epsilon \iota \nu \nu o ́ s, ~ D o r . ~$ Att. Ion. $\mu \eta \nu$ ós : Lat. mēnsis. See § 216.

Medial $\sigma \lambda>\lambda \lambda$, which remained in Lesb., after short
vowels, but became simplified to $\lambda$ in the other dialects, as Lesb. ${ }^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \alpha o s$, Att. Ï̀ $\lambda \alpha o s$, from * $\sigma \iota \sigma \lambda \alpha F o s . ~ S e e ~ § ~ 215 . ~$

Medial $\sigma \mu>\mu \mu$ in Lesb. and Thess., which became simplified to $\mu$ in the other dialects with lengthening of the preceding vowel, as Lesb. Thess. ${ }^{\epsilon} \mu \mu i$, , Dor. $\dot{\eta} \mu i$, Att. Ion. єi $\mu i$ : Skr, ásmi, I am. See § 214.

Medial $\sigma \nu>\nu \nu$ in Lesb. and Thess., which became simplified to $\nu$ in the other dialects, as Lesb. $\phi a \in \nu v o{ }^{\prime} s$, Ion.


On the prim. Gr. assimilation of the combination $\tau \sigma$, see § 166.
$\tau \sigma \nu>\nu \nu$, as $\beta \lambda \epsilon ́ \nu \nu 0$ from * $\beta \lambda \epsilon \tau \sigma \nu 0$, see § 223.

## The Semivowels.

§ 118. $\mathbf{w}$ and $\mathbf{j}$, generally called $\mathbf{u}$ - and $\mathbf{i}$-consonant, are the consonants corresponding to the vowels $\mathfrak{u}$ and $\mathbf{i}$ with which they often interchange in different forms of the same word, as Indg. *swépnos, Skr. svápnaḥ, beside *supnós,
 beside $\notin \phi v y o v$; Indg. *djēés, Skr. dyāúụ, sky, Gr. Zєús beside loc. Skr. diví, Gr. $\Delta$ lfí; Indg. *jénti, Skr. yánti, they go, beside *imés, Skr. imáḥ, Dor. ${ }^{\prime} \mu \epsilon \mathrm{s}$, we go ; $\lambda \in i ́ t \omega$ beside $\epsilon^{\prime} \lambda \iota \pi \sigma \nu$. In many philological works $\mathfrak{u}$ - and $\mathbf{i}$-consonant are written $\underset{\sim}{u}$ and $\underset{i}{i}$ in order to indicate their close relationship to the vowels $\mathfrak{u}$ and $\mathbf{i}$. In this grammar they are written $\mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{i}$ when they form the second element of a tautosyllabic diphthong, as $\phi \in \cup ́ \gamma \omega, \lambda \in i \pi \omega$, oí $\kappa \epsilon \iota, Z \in \hat{v}$, in all other positions they are written $\mathbf{w}$ or respectively $F$ and j. It should be noted that $\mathbf{u}$-consonant remained in the oldest period of the language not only as the second element of diphthongs but also in other positions; whereas i-consonant only remained as the second element of tautosyllabic diphthongs, in all other positions it either disappeared or became some other sound.

Beside i-consonant it is generally supposed that the Indg.
parent language had a spirant $\mathbf{j}$ initially which is represented in Greek by $\delta$, but which fell together with i-consonant in all the other Indg. languages, cp. suyóv, Skr. yugám, Lat. jugum, Goth. juk, yoke, beside $\dot{v} \mu \in i ̂ ̧$, Skr. yūyám, Goth. jus, Lith. jũs, ye. It is probable however that this distinction is not original, but is due to a soundchange which took place in prim. Greek under conditions that have not yet been discovered. See § 227.
§ 119. In the Indg. parent language postconsonantal w, $\mathbf{j}$ alternated with uw, ij. The former regularly occurred after short and the latter after long syllables. This original distinction was best preserved in Sanskrit. In the other languages it became greatly obscured owing partly to special sound laws which took place in the separate languages, and partly to numerous analogical formations whereby forms with short syllables were remodelled on the analogy of those with long syllables and vice versa. Regular forms were: Ion. oủ̉ os, Att. ö̀os, from *ö̀ $\overline{\text { Fos }}=$ Skr. sárvaḥ, whole, all; and similarly סovpós, סopós; $\mu \mathrm{ov} \nu 0$ s,
 cp. OE. nom. pl. brūwa, eyebrows; i¿đv́os from *iXAúfos;
 $\beta o ́ \tau \rho v s ; \dot{\alpha} \gamma \nu \dot{v} \bar{\alpha} \sigma \iota$ from * $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \nu v ́ f \bar{\alpha} \sigma \iota, \mathrm{cp}$. Skr. aš้nuvánti, they attain. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda$ los from * $\dot{\alpha} \lambda j o s$, Lat. alius, Goth. aljis, other; $\mu^{\prime} \sigma \sigma \sigma o s, \mu^{\prime} \epsilon \sigma o s$, from Indg. *médhjos = Skr. mádhyah, Lat. medius, Goth. midjis, middle ; $\pi \epsilon$ §ós from ${ }^{*} \pi \epsilon \delta j$ ós $=$
 from *ảypijos = Skr. ajríyaḥ ; $\nu \dot{\eta}(F) c o s=$ Skr. nāvíyaḥ ; $\pi \alpha ́ \tau \rho \iota o s$, Skr. pítriyaḥ, Lat. patrius, Indg. *patrijos, paternal; äk $\rho \iota o s$ from * $\alpha 火 \kappa \rho \iota j o s: \not \partial \alpha \kappa \rho \iota s ;$ gen. $\tau \rho \iota \omega ิ \nu=$ Goth. prijē.

## w

§ 120. Indg. w, which probably had the same soundvalue as NE. w in win, remained in the oldest period ot all the Greek dialects. It was the sixth letter of the
alphabet and was called digamma by later grammarians. In Att. Ion. it disappeared so early that hardly any trace of it is left, but in the other dialects the sound remained until far into historic times, as is shown by inscriptions in the various dialects. It also began to disappear in these dialects about the end of the fifth century в. с. In all the dialects it began to disappear earlier medially than initially, and initially earlier before $o, \omega, o v$ than before other vowels. Upon metrical grounds it can be shown that $F$ must have been a living sound at the flourishing period of the Greek epic. It was also still in existence initially among the Boeotians at the time they adopted the Ionic alphabet at the end of the fifth century в. с.
§ 121. Initial w disappeared in Att. Ion., but remained in the oldest period of the other dialects. It also remained in Latin and the old Germanic languages, but became the spirant v (= NE. v) in Sanskrit and the Baltic-Slavonic languages, and $\mathbf{f}$ in O.Irish, as oî $\delta \alpha$, Hom. Foî $\delta a$, Skr. véda, OE. wāt, I know, Lat. vidēre; єïkool, Dor. Fєíkaтı, Boeot. fíkatı, Skr. vịisatí., Lat. vīgintī, O.Ir. fiche, twenty; oîkos, Cypr. Foîkos, Skr. vēšáh, house, Lat. vīcus, Goth. weihs, village; ơXos: Pamph. F́́X ${ }^{\omega}$, Skr. váhāmi, Lat.
 Fápyov, OE. weorc, work; and similarly ${ }^{\epsilon} \alpha \rho \rho$, Lat. vēr;
 Lat. virus; îs, ${ }_{\iota}^{c}$, Lat. vis ; ${ }_{i} \tau \epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \bar{c}$, Lat. vitis; oivos, Lat. vīnum. $\lambda \alpha ́ \sigma l o s ~ f r o m ~ * F \lambda \alpha ́ \tau l o s ~ ; ~ \lambda u ́ k o s, ~ S k r . ~ v f ̂ ́ k a h ̣, ~ O E . ~$ wulf, Lith. viilkas, Indg. *wloqos, wolf. Att. $\rho \dot{\eta} \tau \rho \bar{\alpha}$, Elean F $\rho^{\alpha} \tau \rho \bar{\alpha}$, saying, maxim, Skr. vratám, command ; $\hat{\rho} i \bar{\zeta}\langle, \mathrm{OE}$. wyrt, root ; Att. $\hat{\rho} \hat{\eta} \xi \iota s=$ Lesb. $F \rho \hat{\eta} \xi \in \iota s$. Initial $F$ before consonants was sometimes written $\beta$ in Lesbian and Boeotian. But as Lesbian inscriptions of the fourth century b. c. have only $\rho$ it follows that the $\beta \rho$ in earlier Lesbian was merely graphical.

Note.-In a few instances we have the spiritus asper where
we should regularly expect the lenis, as Att. ${ }^{\ell} v v \bar{v} \mu \mathrm{l}$ from

 vašah, will, pleasure. A satisfactory explanation for the spiritus asper in these words has not yet been found. It is highly probable that it has nothing to do with the $F$, but is due to the unsettled state of the spiritus asper in Attic of the fourth century в. с. Cp. its misuse in words like $\dot{\alpha} \pi \tau \omega$, Lat.

§ 122. Intervocalic $F$ disappeared in Att. Ion., but is frequently met with in some of the other dialects, as Att. Ion. $\nu$ éos, Skr. návah, Lat. novus, new ; ć $\nu-\nu$ 白 $\alpha$, Skr. náva, Lat. novem, nine; oís, Skr. ávih, Lat. ovis, Lith. avis, sheep, Goth. awistr, sheepfold ; $\pi t \omega \nu$, fat, Skr. pívan., swelling ; $\dot{\eta}-i \theta \in o s$ ${ }^{*} \dot{\eta}$ - $-\downarrow \theta \in F o s, b a c h e l o r$, Skr. vidhávā, O.Ir. fedb, OE. widewe, widow, cp. Lat. vidua; gen. $\Delta$ (F)ós, Lat. Jovis, cp. Skr. diváh, of the sky; gen. Att. $\beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \omega s, H o m . \beta \alpha \sigma i \lambda \hat{\eta} o s$, Cypr. $\beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \hat{\eta}$ Fos; $\kappa \lambda \epsilon$ éos, dial. of Phocis $\kappa \lambda \epsilon$ Fos, Skr. s̆rávaḥ, renown; $\phi \alpha \epsilon \iota \nu o ́ s$ from * $\phi \alpha F \epsilon \sigma \nu o s ; ~ X \alpha \rho i \epsilon i s$ from


 srávaḥ, Lith. sravà, stream; and similarly $\theta o o ́ s, \pi$ 入óos, Xóos. It also disappeared between a diphthong and a following vowel, as $\lambda$ aıós, Lat. laevus; oîos, Cypr. oîfos; on forms like $\delta \bar{\alpha} \dot{\eta} \rho$ from ${ }^{*} \delta \alpha \iota F \eta \rho$, $\dot{\alpha} \in i ́$, Cypr. and dial. of Phocis aiffí, see § 57.
§ 123. Medial $F$ before $\rho$ and $\lambda$ regularly combined with a preceding vowel to form a diphthong, as Aeol. $\dot{\alpha} \pi o v^{\rho} \rho \bar{\alpha} s$
 $\kappa \alpha \lambda \alpha \hat{v} \rho \circ \psi$ : $\rho o ́ \pi \pi \alpha \lambda o \nu$ older ${ }^{*}$ F $o ́ \pi \pi \alpha \lambda o \nu ; \tau \alpha \lambda \alpha v ́ \rho \bar{\nu} \nu o s=\tau \alpha \lambda \alpha ́-$ fpìvos, cp. Lesb. fpivos, skin, hide. Forms like Att. $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \rho \rho \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \eta$,
 had their $\rho \rho$ from the initial position before $\rho \rho$ became simplified to $\rho$, see § 138 .
§ 124. Indg. postconsonantal $\mathbf{w}$. In this combination it is necessary to take into consideration the nature of the preceding consonant.
I. $F$ disappeared after $\pi, \phi, \theta, \kappa=$ Indg. p, bh, dh (gh), and pure velar $\mathbf{q}(\S 195)$, as $\nu \dot{\eta} \pi i o s$ from ${ }^{*} \nu \eta-\pi F$ los, infans. $\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho \phi i ́ \alpha \lambda o s, \phi i \tau v$, from * $\dot{u} \pi \epsilon \rho-\phi F \iota \alpha \lambda o s,{ }^{*} \phi F i \tau v$, root *bheu-, $b e$. $\theta \nu \eta \tau o ́ s, \theta \alpha ́ \nu \alpha \tau o s ~ f r o m ~ * ~ \theta F \nu a ̄ \tau o ́ s, ~ * ~ \theta F a ́ v a \tau o s, ~ c p . ~ S k r . ~$ dhvāntáh, covered, dark; ỏpOós, Skr. ūrdhváḥ, straight; $\theta a \iota \rho o ́ s, ~ \theta o \lambda o ́ s, ~ \theta \epsilon o ́ s, ~ \mu \epsilon ́ \theta \eta ~ f r o m ~ * ~ * ~ F a p j o s, ~ * ~ Ө ~ F o \lambda o ́ s, ~ * ~ \theta F \epsilon \sigma o s, ~$ ${ }^{*} \mu \notin \theta \neq \eta ; \theta \dot{\eta} \rho$, Lesb. ф $\eta \rho$, Lith. żvéris, wild animal, Lat. ferus. к $\alpha \pi \nu$ ós, Lat. vapor, Lith. kvãpas, smoke, vapour.
2. kw became $\pi \pi$ which was simplified later to $\pi$ initially, as ím $\pi \pi$ os, Skr. ásvaḥ, Lat. equus, horse, Goth. aílua-tundi, thornbush, lit. horse tooth; Boeot. $\tau \grave{\alpha} \pi \pi \frac{1}{\alpha} \mu \alpha \tau \alpha$ beside Dor. $\pi \hat{\alpha} \mu \alpha, \pi \frac{\alpha}{\alpha} \sigma \alpha \sigma \theta \alpha l$, from ${ }^{*} \mathrm{kwā} \cdot$, cp. Skr. švātráh, flourishing, prosperous.
3. Initial tw - became $\sigma \sigma$ - which was simplified later to $\sigma$-, as $\sigma$ '́, Skr. tvā, tvấm, thee; $\sigma$ ós, Skr. tváḥ, thy; $\sigma$ ókos beside $\phi \in \rho \epsilon-\sigma \sigma \alpha \kappa \eta$ ŋ, cp. Skr. tvác-, hide, skin, cover; $\sigma \epsilon i \omega$ beside Hom. ${ }^{\epsilon} \pi t-\sigma \sigma \epsilon i \omega \nu$, cp. Skr. tviṣ̆., to be excited; oopós, coffin, Lith. tveriù, I hold, contain. Medial -twbecame $\cdot \tau \tau$ - in Att. and Boeot., and $\cdot \sigma \sigma$. in the other dialects, as Att. $\tau$ '́ $\tau \tau \alpha \rho \epsilon \varsigma$, Boeot. $\pi \in ́ \tau \tau \alpha \rho \epsilon \varsigma$, Hom. $\tau \in ́ \sigma \sigma \alpha \rho \epsilon s$, Skr. catvấrah, Goth. fidwōr, four.
4. F disappeared after $\delta$, as $\delta i ́ s$, Skr. dvíh, O.Lat. duis, later bis, twice ; $\delta \omega \cdot \delta \epsilon \kappa \alpha$, Skr. dvá-dắsa, twelve, cp. Goth. twái, two ; in Homer sometimes with metrical lengthening of a preceding short vowel or with doubling of the $\delta$, as
 Hom. $\theta \epsilon o v \delta \dot{\eta} s$ from $* \theta \epsilon o \delta F \eta \eta$, , $\epsilon \delta \delta \epsilon \iota \sigma \epsilon \nu$, root $*$ dwei., to fear.
5. Initial sw- became the spiritus asper in Att. Ion., as éкv Dor. à $\delta u ́ s$, Skr. svādúh, Lat. suāvis from *swādwis, OE. swēte, sweet; ôs, Skr. sváḥ, his ; Hom. ô ö $\pi \omega$ s from * $\sigma$ Foo$\pi \omega \mathrm{s}$; and similarly ${ }^{\prime \prime}, o \hat{i}, \mathrm{Hom}$. ö $\tau \tau \iota$, from ${ }^{*} \sigma F \epsilon,{ }^{*} \sigma F o \iota,{ }^{*} \sigma F o \delta-\tau \iota$.

Intervocalic -sw- disappeared with lengthening of the preceding vowel, as Dor. $\nu \bar{\alpha} o ́ s$, Ion. $\nu \eta o ́ s$, Att. $\nu \epsilon \omega ́ s$ (§ 72), from
 arrow.
6. The combinations $\nu F, \rho F, \lambda F$ remained unchanged in some dialects until after the beginning of historic times. In Ionic and some of the Doric dialects the $F$ disappeared with lengthening of a preceding vowel, and in Attic and the other dialects without such lengthening, as Ion. $\tau^{\frac{1}{L} \nu} \omega$, Att. $\tau^{i} \nu \omega \omega$ from * $\tau \iota \nu F \omega, \mathrm{cp}$. Skr. cinvati, cinốti, he arranges,
 Att. $\kappa \iota \gamma \chi \alpha ́ \nu \omega, \phi \theta^{\alpha} \nu \omega, \phi \theta^{\prime} \nu \omega$; Ion. єi้vatos, $\kappa \epsilon \iota \nu o ́ s, \mu o \hat{\nu} \nu$ os,
 Att. ö̉ $\lambda o s$, Skr. sárvah,, all ; Ion. $\kappa \bar{\alpha} \lambda o ́ s$, Att. $\kappa \alpha \lambda o ́ s$, Dor. $\kappa \alpha \lambda$ Fós. Ion. кои́ $\eta$, Cret. $\kappa \omega ́ \rho \bar{\alpha}$, Att. кó $\eta \eta$, Arcad. кó $\rho \bar{\alpha}$; Ion.

§ 125. Medial $F$ disappeared before $\mathbf{j}$, as $\delta i \cos$ from * $\delta \iota f j o s$, Skr. divyáh, divine, celestial; $\tau \in \sigma \sigma \alpha \rho \alpha \beta$ ßoıos from *- $\beta$ ofjos $=$ Skr. gávyaḥ, consisting of or relating to cattle ; $\delta \alpha i \omega$, $\kappa \lambda \alpha i \omega$, from $* \delta \alpha F j \omega,{ }^{*} \kappa \lambda \alpha \neq j \omega$. See § 129, 5.
§ 126. F disappeared between consonants, as Hom. $\tau \epsilon \in \tau \rho \alpha-$ $\tau 0 s$ from ${ }^{*} \tau \epsilon ́ \tau$ f $\rho \alpha \tau o s$, Lith. ketvir̃tas, fourth; Ion. $\tau \in \tau \rho \omega$ $\kappa o \nu \tau \alpha$ from ${ }^{*} \tau \epsilon \tau\left\lceil\rho \omega-\right.$; fem. $\pi о \lambda \lambda \dot{\eta}$ trom ${ }^{*} \pi o \lambda F j \bar{\alpha}, \mathrm{cp}$. Skr. fem. pūrví, many, gen. pūrvyáạ.
§ 127. Initial j became in Greek the spiritus asper through the intermediate stage of voiceless $\mathbf{j}$. It remained in all the other Indg. languages with the exception of Old Irish where it disappeared, as $\hat{\eta} \pi \alpha \rho$, Skr. yákrt, Lat. jecur, Lith. pl. jeknos, liver; ơs, Skr. yáh, who, Goth. ja-bái, if; $\dot{v}-\mu \epsilon i \bar{s}$, Skr. yūyám, Goth. jus, Lith. jũs, $y e$; ä $\delta_{o \mu \alpha \iota}$ from *jayjoual, I honour, Skr. yájati, he honours.
§ 128. Intervocalic $\mathbf{j}$ disappeared in Greek, Latin and the Keltic languages, but remained in Sanskrit and the

Baltic－Slavonic languages and also in Gothic between vowels which remained as such in the historic period of the language，as $\tau \rho \epsilon \bar{i} s$ ，Cret．$\tau \rho \epsilon \in \epsilon s$, Skr．tráyah，Lat．trēs， O．Ir．trĭ，Goth．neut．prija，O．Slav．trije，Indg．＊tréjes， three；$\delta^{\prime} \epsilon \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \delta^{\prime} j \omega$ ；$\delta^{\prime} \epsilon o s$ from ${ }^{*} \delta F \epsilon j o s$ ；gen．$\kappa l o ́ s$ from ${ }^{*}$ K $\iota$ jós（ $\S 330$ ）；in adjectives denoting the material of which a thing is made，as $\lambda i \theta \epsilon o s$ from ${ }^{*} \lambda i \theta \epsilon j o s$ ；and similarly
 in iterative，causative and denominative verbs，as $\pi о \tau$＇́ $о \mu \alpha$ ， Skr．patáyāmi，I hover ；ó $\chi$＇́ $\omega$ ，Skr．vāháyāmi，I let drive， Goth．wagja，I move，shake ；and similarly $\tau \rho \circ \mu \epsilon \epsilon \omega, \tau \rho \circ \pi \epsilon ́ \omega$ ， $\phi о \rho^{\prime} \omega, \phi \circ \beta^{\prime} \epsilon$, ，cp．verbs like Lat．doceo，moneo，noceo， torreo ；$\tau \bar{\iota} \mu \alpha ́ \omega, \phi \iota \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \omega$ ，from ${ }^{*} \tau \bar{\imath} \mu \bar{\alpha} j \omega,{ }^{*} \phi \iota \lambda \epsilon ́ j \omega$ ；and similarly $\dot{\omega} \nu \dot{\epsilon} о \mu \alpha \iota, \beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon \dot{\jmath} \omega$ ，$\nu о \mu \epsilon \dot{\sigma} \omega$（see however § 489），корí $\omega$ ， $\mu \alpha \sigma \tau i \omega, \alpha \dot{\alpha} \chi \lambda v ́ \omega, \gamma \eta \rho v ́ \omega, \mu \in \theta \dot{v} \omega$ ，cp．verbs like Skr．dēvayáti， he honours the gods，from dēváh，god；Lat．planto，albeo， fīnio，statuo，from＊plantājō，＊albejō，＊fīnijō，＊statujō．
§ 129．Indg．postconsonantal $\mathbf{j}$ ．In this combination it is necessary to take into consideration the nature of the preceding consonant．

1．$\pi j$ became $\pi \tau$ ，as $\pi \tau \dot{v} \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \pi j v j \omega$ ，Lith．spiáuju， I spit out ；and similarly $\theta \dot{\alpha} \pi \tau \omega, \kappa \lambda \epsilon \in \pi \tau \omega, \pi \tau \dot{v} \sigma \sigma \omega, \chi^{\alpha \lambda} \bar{\epsilon} \pi \tau \omega$ ．

2．$\lambda j$ became $\lambda \lambda$ ，as $\alpha \not \lambda \lambda$ dos，Lat．alius，Goth．aljis，other； фúl入ov，Lat．folium ；ка́入入os，beauty，Skr．kalyaḥ，healthy；

 $\tau \in ́ \lambda \lambda \omega$ ．

Note．－r．In the Cyprian dial．the $\mathbf{j}$ merely palatalized the $\lambda$ ，and the $\lambda$ thus palatalized was expressed by $\iota \lambda$ ，as ai $\lambda \omega \nu$ ， ${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{A} \pi \epsilon^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \lambda \omega \nu=\ddot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega \nu$ ，${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{A} \pi \bar{\epsilon} \lambda \lambda \omega \nu$ ，cp．the similar process in O．Ir． aile from＊aljos，＊aljā，other．

3．The combinations $\alpha, o+\nu j, \rho j, F j$ became $\alpha \iota \nu, \alpha \iota \rho, \alpha \iota$ ， $o \iota v$ ，olp，as $\delta \rho \alpha i \nu \omega$ from＊$\delta \rho \alpha \nu j \omega$ ，Indg．＊drnjô ；and similarly краív $\omega, \mu \alpha i \nu о \mu \alpha \iota, \mu \in \lambda \alpha i \nu \nu \omega$ ，òvо $\mu \alpha i \nu \omega$ ，тоь $\mu \alpha i \nu \omega$ ，
$\xi \alpha i \nu \omega$; $\sigma \pi \alpha i \rho \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \sigma \pi \alpha \rho j \omega$, Indg. *sprjó ; and similarly

 further examples see § 75.
4. $\nu j$, $\rho j$, preceded by $\epsilon, \iota, v$, became $\nu \nu, \rho \rho$, which remained in Lesbian, but became simplified in Att. Ion. with lengthening of the vowel, as Att. Ion. $\kappa \tau \epsilon i \nu \omega, \phi \theta \in i \rho \omega$,
 $\kappa \tau \epsilon ́ \nu \nu \omega, \phi \theta \epsilon ́ \rho \rho \omega, \kappa \lambda i ́ \nu \nu \omega$, оiктíp $\omega$, ò òофи́ $\rho \rho \omega$; and similarly $\tau \epsilon i ̀ \nu \omega$, $\epsilon^{\gamma} \gamma \epsilon i ́ \rho \omega, \kappa \epsilon i ́ \rho \omega, \mu \in i ́ \rho o \mu \alpha \iota, \pi \epsilon i ́ \rho \omega, \tau \epsilon i ́ \rho \omega, \kappa \rho i t \nu \omega, \pi \lambda \tilde{v} \nu \omega$, $\kappa \bar{v} \rho \omega, \mu \hat{v} \rho \rho \mu \alpha \iota$. See § 69, 3 .
5. $F$ disappeared in the intervocalic combination $F j$ and then the $\mathbf{j}$ combined with the preceding vowel to form a diphthong, except in the case of $\iota$ which simply became lengthened, as $\delta \alpha i \omega$, $\epsilon \dot{\jmath} \rho \epsilon i \alpha, \tau \epsilon \sigma \sigma \alpha \rho \alpha ́ \beta o \iota o s$, from * ${ }^{*} \delta \alpha j \dot{j} \omega$, *єúpéfja, *- $\beta$ ofjos, but dios from סıfjos. See 3 and 4 above.
6. Indg. $\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{th}, \mathrm{dh}+\mathrm{j}$ became $\tau \sigma$ in prim. Greek. $\tau \sigma$ then became $\sigma$ initially and medially after long vowels, diphthongs, and consonants, but medially between vowels it became $\tau \tau$ in Boeotian and Cretan (Cret. also $\zeta$ ), $\sigma$ in Attic and Ionic, and $\sigma \sigma, \sigma$ in the other dialects, as $\sigma \circ \beta \epsilon \epsilon$, I scare away, Skr. tyājayati, he expels; $\sigma \hat{\eta} \mu \alpha$, Dor. $\sigma \hat{\alpha} \mu \alpha$, from * $\theta j \hat{\alpha} \mu \alpha$, sign, token, Skr. đhyấman-, thought; aî $\alpha$, $\pi \hat{\alpha} \sigma \alpha, \delta o \xi \xi \alpha$, from *aitja, ${ }^{*} \pi \alpha \nu \tau j \alpha$, ${ }^{*} \delta_{0} \tau j \alpha$; nom. acc. neut. pl. Att. $\alpha^{\alpha} \tau \tau \alpha$, Ion. $\ddot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \alpha$, from ${ }^{*} \ddot{\alpha}-\tau j \alpha ; \tau \epsilon \tau \rho \alpha \xi \not{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$ from ${ }^{*} \tau \epsilon \tau \rho \alpha-$
 Hom. $\mu \notin \sigma \sigma o s$, Att. Ion. $\mu \epsilon ́ \sigma o s$, Skr. mádhyaḥ, Lat. medius, Goth. midjis, middle; Hom. $\nu \in \mu \in \sigma \sigma \alpha ́ \omega$, Att. $\nu \epsilon \mu \in \sigma \alpha ́ \omega$, from ${ }^{*} \nu \in \mu \in \tau j \alpha \omega$; and similarly $\pi o ́ \sigma \sigma o s, \pi \rho o ́ \sigma \sigma \omega$, тó $\sigma \sigma o s$, Att. Ion. то́бos, $\pi$ ро́ $\sigma \omega$, тóбоs; Boeot. о́то́ттоs, Cret. ómóттos, Att. ото́боя.

Note.-2. The presents of verbs in $-j \omega$, the comparatives in $-j \omega \nu$ and feminines in $-j a$, formed from dental stems, were in all the dialects remodelled on the analogy of those formed




 фoivuraa : фoivık.
7. Indg. $\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k h}, \mathbf{q h}, \mathbf{g h}, \mathbf{g h}+\mathbf{j}$ became $\tau \tau$ in Att. Boeot. Thessal. Cret. (Cret. also $\theta \theta$ ), but $\sigma \sigma$ in the other dialects, as Att. $\pi i \tau \tau \alpha$, Ion. $\pi i \sigma \sigma \alpha$, from ${ }^{*} \pi \iota k j \alpha$, Lat. pix, Lith. pikis, pitch; Att. $\pi \epsilon \in \tau \tau \omega$, Ion. $\pi \epsilon \in \sigma \sigma \omega$, I cook, ripen, Skr. pácyatē, it ripens; Att. $\theta \dot{\alpha} \tau \tau \omega \nu$, Ion. $\theta \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \sigma \omega \nu$, cp. $\tau \alpha \chi$ ús; and similarly Att. $\pi \rho \frac{1}{\alpha} \tau \tau \omega, \pi \lambda \eta \eta^{\prime} \tau \tau \omega$, $\bar{\epsilon} \lambda \frac{\alpha}{\alpha} \tau \tau \omega \nu$, $\tau \alpha \rho \alpha ́ \tau \tau \omega, \quad \gamma \lambda \hat{\omega} \tau \tau \alpha=$ Ion. $\pi \rho \dot{\eta} \sigma \sigma \omega, \quad \pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma \sigma \omega, \quad \grave{\epsilon} \lambda \hat{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \sigma \omega \nu$, $\tau \alpha \rho \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \omega, \gamma \lambda \omega \bar{\omega} \sigma \alpha$.
$\tau \tau, \sigma \sigma$ were simplified to $\tau, \sigma$ initially, as Hom. $\sigma \epsilon \hat{v} \epsilon$ beside ${ }^{\epsilon}-\sigma \sigma \epsilon v \epsilon$, cp. Skr. cyávatē, he moves himself; Att. $\tau \dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \rho o \nu$, Ion. $\sigma \dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \rho o \nu$, from ${ }^{*} k j \bar{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \rho o \nu$; Att. $\tau \epsilon \hat{v} \tau \lambda o \nu$, Ion. $\sigma \epsilon \hat{\tau} \tau \lambda \nu \nu$.
8. Indg. dj and $\mathrm{g}, \mathrm{g}+\mathrm{j}$ became in prim. Greek dz and then later $\mathbf{z d}$ by metathesis. Initial dz became $\delta$ in Boeot. Cret. and Laconian, but $\zeta(=\mathbf{z d})$ in the other dialects. Medially after consonants it became $\delta$ in all the dialects. Medially after vowels it became $\delta \delta$ in Boeot. and Cretan, but $\zeta$ (sometimes written $\sigma \delta$ ) in the other dialects, as Att. Ion. Z cús, Boeot. Cret. and Laconian $\Delta$ cús, Indg. *djēus, cp. Skr. dyāúh, sky; Boeot. Cret. $\delta \omega \epsilon \epsilon=$ Att. Ion. $\xi^{\xi} \omega \eta$. ${ }^{\epsilon} \rho \delta \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \epsilon \rho \gamma j \omega$. $\pi \epsilon$ §óós from ${ }^{*} \pi \epsilon \delta j{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\circ}$, Skr. pádyah, on foot;
 from ${ }^{*} \dot{\rho} \epsilon \gamma j \omega$; $\sigma \phi \alpha ́ \xi \omega$, Boeot. $\sigma \phi \alpha ́ \delta \delta \omega$, from ${ }^{*} \sigma \phi \dot{\alpha} \gamma j \omega$; and

9. Initial $\sigma j$ became the spiritus asper through the intermediate stage of voiceless $\mathbf{j}$, as $\dot{v} \mu \dot{\eta} \nu$, thin skin, $\dot{v} \mu \nu 0 s$, hymn, song, Skr. syû́man-, string, cord, syūtáh, sewn.

The medial combinations $\alpha \sigma j, o \sigma j, \epsilon \sigma j, v \sigma j$ became $\alpha \iota, o l$, $\epsilon \iota, v \iota$, but $\iota \sigma j$ became $i$, as $\nu \alpha i ́ \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \nu \alpha \sigma j \omega$, cp. $\nu \alpha ́ \sigma \sigma \alpha \iota$;
$\lambda \iota \lambda \alpha i ́ \rho \mu \alpha \iota$ from ${ }^{*} \lambda \iota \lambda \alpha \sigma j o \mu \alpha \iota$; Hom. $\tau 0 i ̂$ from ${ }^{*}$ тoбjo $=$ Skr. tásya; Hom. $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \epsilon^{\prime} \omega$, $\tau \in \lambda \epsilon$ é $\omega$, Att. $\tau \in \lambda \hat{\omega}$, from ${ }^{*} \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \sigma j \omega$, $\epsilon i \not \eta \nu$ from *’̇ $\sigma j \eta \nu$, Skr. syấm, I may be; Hom. iSvîa from
 $\sigma j \omega$. For further examples see § 76.
§ 130. $\mathbf{j}$ disappeared after a consonant + nasal, as $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \lambda \alpha \underset{\sim}{\nu} \omega$
 $F \in \sigma \nu j \omega$; and similarly $\mu \bar{\epsilon} \rho \iota \mu \nu \alpha$, $\tau o ́ \lambda \mu \alpha$.

## The Liquids.

§ 131. The Indg. parent language had two liquids : 1 and r. Apart from cases of dissimilation, which are common in most languages, the two sounds were regularly kept apart in Armenian and the European languages, but in Iranian and partly also in the Indian group of dialects they fell together in r. According to Whitney, Sanskrit Grammar, § 53 , 'r and 1 are very widely interchangeable in Sanskrit, both in roots and in suffixes, and even in prefixes : there are few roots containing 1 which do not show also forms with $\mathbf{r}$; words written with the one letter are found in other texts, or in other parts of the same text, written with the other. In the later periods of the language they are more separated, and the $\mathbf{1}$ becomes decidedly more frequent, though always much rarer than the r.' From this it may be inferred that where 1 and $\mathbf{r}$ exist side by side in the same word, it is due to a mixture of dialects, as in léhmi beside rêhmi, $I$ lick.

## 1

§ 132. Indg. 1 generally remained in Greek as also in the other European languages, as $\alpha^{\prime} \lambda \lambda$ dos, Lat. alius, O.Ir. aile, Goth. aljis, other ; ${ }_{\alpha} \lambda s$, Lat. sā1, O.Ir. salann, OE. sealt, salt ; $\dot{\alpha} \mu \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \gamma \omega$, Lat. mulgeo, OE. meolce, I milk; $\kappa \lambda \epsilon ́ \pi \tau \omega$, Lat. clepo, Goth. hlifa, I steal; к $\lambda \nu \tau$ ós, Skr. šrutáh, Lat. in.clutus, renowned, cp. O.Ir. cloth, renown, OE. hlēopor, sound, melody; $\lambda \epsilon i \pi \omega \omega$, Lat. linquo, Lith.
lëkù, I leave, Skr. riṇákti, he leaves, Goth. leihra, I lend; pf. $\lambda \in ́ \lambda o \iota \pi \alpha=$ Skr. riréca ; $\lambda \epsilon i ́ \chi \omega$, Skr. rếhmi, lếhmi, Lat. lingo, OE. liccie, I lick; $\lambda$ é $X o s$, Lat. lectus, O.Ir. lige, bed, couch, OE. licgan, to lie down; $\nu \epsilon \notin \in ́ \lambda \eta$, Lat. nebula, OHG. nebul, cloud, mist ; Ion. oû̀os, Att. ö̀os, Skr. sárvah, whole, all.
§ 133. In some of the Doric dialects $\lambda$ became $\nu$ before $\tau$ and $\theta$, as $\beta \dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \iota \sigma \tau o s, \phi i \nu \tau \alpha \tau \alpha l, \dot{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \nu \theta \omega \nu, \hat{\eta}^{\nu} \nu \epsilon \epsilon=\beta \in \hat{\epsilon} \lambda \tau \iota \sigma \tau o s$, фí入татац, $\epsilon^{\lambda} \lambda \theta \dot{\omega} \nu, \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon \varsigma$.
§ 134. In the Cretan dialect anteconsonantal $\lambda$ became u-consonant and then combined with the preceding vowel to
 $\epsilon \dot{v} \theta \epsilon i \nu \nu, \dot{\alpha} \delta \epsilon v \phi \iota \alpha i ́ l=H o m . ~ \theta \epsilon ́ \lambda \gamma \omega$, $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \theta \epsilon i v, \alpha \dot{\alpha} \delta \epsilon \lambda \phi \epsilon \alpha i ́$, sisters. Cp. Mod. northern dialects aud, oud, old; kaud, koud, cold.
§ 135. Occasionally $\lambda$ became $\rho$ and vice versa by dissimilation. This phenomenon is common in all the Indg. languages and especially in Greek and Latin, as $\dot{\alpha} \rho \gamma \alpha \lambda$ éos from * $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \gamma \alpha \lambda \epsilon$ 'os; $\kappa \in \phi \alpha \lambda \alpha \rho \gamma i \bar{\alpha}$ beside $\kappa \epsilon \phi \alpha \lambda \alpha \lambda \gamma^{i} \bar{\alpha}$; Lat. Aleria beside 'A $\lambda \alpha \lambda i ́ \alpha$; Lat. caeruleus : caelum. $\quad \theta \eta \lambda \eta \tau \eta \rho$ beside $\theta \eta \rho \eta \tau \uparrow \rho \rho ; \mu о \rho \mu о \lambda \tau ́ \tau \tau о \mu \alpha \iota: \mu о ́ \rho \mu о \rho o s ;$ Lat. culter from *certros; pelegrīnus from peregrinus; frāglo beside frāgro.

## r

§ 136. Indg. r generally remained in Greek, as $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \rho v \theta \rho o ́ s$, Skr. rudhiráh, Lat. ruber, O.Ir. ruad, OE. rēad, Lith. raũdas, red; ${ }^{\epsilon} \rho \in \beta$ os, Skr. rájas•, Goth. riqis, darkness; $\epsilon_{\epsilon} \rho \pi \omega$, Skr. sárpāmi, Lat. serpo, I creep; $\phi \in \notin \omega$, Skr. bhárāmi, Lat. fero, O.Ir. berim, Goth. baíra, O.Slav. berą, I bear; $\tau \rho \in i ̂$ ís, Skr. tráyaḥ, Lat. trēs, O.Ir. trī, Goth. preis, O.Slav. trije, three; $\dot{\alpha} \rho o ́ \omega$, Lat. aro, Goth. arja, Lith. ariù, I plough, O.Ir. arathar, plough; á $\gamma$ pós, Lat. ager, Goth. akrs, field, Skr. ájraḥ, a plain ; пópкоs, Lat. porcus, OE. fearh, pig; $\pi \alpha \tau \eta ́ \rho$, Skr. pitár., Lat. pater, O.Ir. athir, OE. fæder, father. See § 77.
§ 137. Indg. sr became voiceless $\rho \rho$ which was later simplified to $\dot{\rho}$ initially, as $\tilde{\rho}^{\prime} \epsilon \omega$, Skr. srávāmi, Lith. sraviù, I flow, beside $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha-\rho \rho^{\prime} \omega$; $\rho_{o} \phi^{\prime} \omega$, Lat. sorbeo, Lith. srebiù, I gulp down. See § 215.
§ 138. Indg. wr became $\dot{\rho}$ initially (through the intermediate stage of $\rho \rho$ ) in the course of the individual dialects, as Att. $\dot{\rho} \dot{\eta} \tau \rho \bar{\alpha}$, Elean $F \rho \frac{\alpha}{\alpha} \tau \rho \bar{\alpha}$, sayng, maxim, Skr. vratám, command, saying. See § 121.

## The Nasals.

§ 139. The Indg. parent language had four kinds of nasals-labial m , dental n , palatal n , and velar $\mathfrak{\eta}$, corresponding to the four classes of explosives $\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{t}, \mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q}$. Of these the palatal and velar nasals only occurred before their corresponding explosives and underwent in the different languages all changes in the place of articulation in common with these explosives, as Indg. ${ }^{*}$ pé ${ }^{\prime} q \mathrm{e}=\pi \epsilon ́ v \tau \epsilon$, Lesb. $\pi \epsilon ́ \mu \pi \epsilon$, Skr. páñca, Goth. fimf, Lith. penkì, five ; Indg. *pénqtos $=\pi \epsilon ́ \mu \pi \tau o s$, Lat. quīntus, Goth. fimfta., Lith. peñktas, fifth; Indg. ${ }^{*}$ añghō $=\ddot{\alpha}^{\prime} \gamma \chi^{\omega}$, Lat. ango, cp. Goth. aggwus, OE. enge, narrow. The dental and labial nasals occurred also in other positions. All the nasals had in Greek a weak articulation before explosives and $\sigma$ which accounts for their frequent omission on inscriptions and for nasals of all kinds being expressed by $\nu$ in archaic Greek orthography.

## m

§ 140. Indg. m generally remained initially and medially in Greek, as Att. Ion. $\mu \dot{\eta} \tau \eta \rho$, Dor. $\mu \dot{\alpha} \tau \eta \rho$, Skr. mātár., Lat. māter, O.Ir. māthir, OE. mōdor, O.Slav. mati, mother ; $\mu$ é $\lambda$, Lat. mel, O.Ir. mil, Goth. milip, honey; $\mu \hat{v}$, Skr. múṣ̆., Lat. OE. mūs, mouse ; yó $\mu \phi$ os, bolt, nail, Skr. jámbhah, tooth, OE. camb, comb; єi $\mu$ í, Skr. ásmi,

Lat. sum, Lith. esmì, I am; ${ }^{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \in \omega$, Skr. vámāmi, Lat. vomo, I vomit; $\dot{\eta} \mu \mathrm{c}$-, Skr. sāmí, Lat. sēmi., OE. sam-, half; $\phi \in ́ \rho o \mu \epsilon \nu$, Skr. bhárāmaḥ, Lat. ferimus, Goth. baíram, we bear.
§ 141. Final m became n , as éккатóv, Skr. š́atám, Lat. centum, hundred; suyóv, Skr. yugám, Lat. jugum, yoke; ${ }^{\prime} \phi \in \rho \circ \nu=$ Skr. ábharam, cp. Lat. eram ; gen. pl. $\lambda u{ }^{\prime} \kappa \omega \nu$ $=$ Skr. vfrkkān̄ām; acc. sing. of vocalic stems, as $\lambda$ úko $=$ =Skr. vốkam, Lat. lupum ; $\tau o ́ v=$ Skr. tám, Lat. is.tum ; Skr. ášvām $=$ Lat. equam, $\mathrm{cp} . \chi^{\omega} \rho \bar{\alpha} \nu ; \tau \eta{ }^{\prime} \nu=$ Skr. tấm, Lat. is-tam ; $\beta$ á $\sigma \iota=$ Skr. gátim, cp. Lat. partim, sitim;
 Lat. hiem., winter, from ${ }^{*}{ }_{\epsilon} \mu,{ }^{*} \chi \theta \dot{\omega} \mu$, ${ }^{*} \chi \iota \omega \mu$, with $\nu$ levelled out into the oblique cases : €́vós, $\chi$ Øoovós, $\chi$ ıóvos, \&c.
§ 142. mj became nj, as $\beta \alpha i \nu \omega$ from * $\beta \alpha \nu j \omega$, older ${ }^{*} \beta \alpha \mu j \omega$, Indg. *gmjó, Lat. venio, cp. Goth. qiman, to come ; кoıvós from *кovjos, older *коцјоs, cp. Lat. cum, com-, and quoniam from *quom.jam.
§ 143. mt became nt, as $\alpha_{\alpha} \nu \tau \lambda o \nu, \mathrm{cp} . \dot{\alpha} \mu \dot{\alpha} \omega, I$ gather in ; $\beta \rho о \nu \tau \eta ́$, ср. $\beta \rho \epsilon ́ \mu \omega$, I roar ; $\gamma^{\epsilon} \nu \tau$, he grasped, cp. M.Ir. gemel, fetter.
§ 144. ms became ns and then the nasal disappeared in all the dialects in the combination ns + consonant without lengthening of the preceding vowel (see § 153), as $\delta \epsilon \sigma \pi o ́ \tau \eta$ s from ${ }^{*} \delta \epsilon \mu \mathrm{~s}$, gen. of ${ }^{*} \delta \epsilon \mu$-, house. When the ns was not followed by another consonant the nasal disappeared in most of the dialects with lengthening of the preceding vowel, as Att. Ion. $\epsilon i \bar{i}$, Dor. $\hat{\eta} s$, but Cret. ${ }^{\epsilon} \nu s$, from ${ }^{*} \epsilon \mu$ s, cp. Lat. semel, semper.
§ 145. $\mathrm{ml}, \mathrm{mr}$ became $\mathrm{mbl}, \mathrm{mbr}$ which were simplified to bl , br initially, as $\beta \lambda \omega \sigma \kappa \kappa \omega, \mu \epsilon \epsilon \mu \beta \lambda \omega \kappa \alpha,{ }^{\epsilon} \mu 0 \lambda o \nu$; $\beta \lambda \alpha \delta \alpha \rho o ́ s$, flaccid, Skr. mr̊đúḥ, soft ; $\beta \lambda \alpha \hat{\alpha} \xi, \beta \lambda \eta \chi$ คós, beside $\mu \alpha \lambda \alpha \kappa o ́ s ;$ $\beta \lambda \omega \theta$ pós, shooting up, high growing, Skr. mūrdhă, head; $\beta \lambda i ́ \tau \tau \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \mu \lambda \iota \tau \tau \omega$, ср. $\mu$ é $\lambda \iota$. $\beta \rho о \tau o ́ s=$ Skr. mrtáḥ, mortal, beside $\ddot{\alpha}^{\mu} \mu \beta \rho o \tau o s=$ Skr. amŕtaḥ ; $\mu \in \sigma \eta \mu \beta$ pía , mid .
day, beside $\grave{\eta} \mu \epsilon ́ \rho \bar{\rho}$. Cp. words like NE. humble, number, Fr. humble, nombre, beside Lat. acc. humilem, numerum.
§ 146. Prim. Greek $-\mu \nu$, the weak grade of $\cdot \mu \epsilon \nu$-, was simplified to $-\nu$ - after long vowels, as inf. $\gamma \nu \omega \bar{\omega} \alpha \iota$ from ${ }^{*} \gamma \nu \omega \mu \nu \alpha \iota$ beside $\gamma \nu \omega \mu \epsilon \nu \alpha \iota$; and similarly $\alpha \mathfrak{\eta} \nu \alpha \iota, \delta \alpha \eta \hat{\eta} \alpha \iota$, $\sigma \tau \hat{\eta} \nu \alpha \iota, \& c ., c p$. § 546.

## n

§ 147. n generally remained in Greek, as עéos, Skr. návaḥ, Lat. novus, Goth. niujis, Lith. naũjas, new ; vé申os, cloud, Skr. nábhas., Lat. nebula, OHG. nebul, fog, mist; $\nu u ́ \xi$, Skr. náktih, Lat. nox, Goth. nahts, Lith. naktis, night; ôvo $\mu$, Skr. ná́ma, Lat. nōmen, OE. nama, name ; ${ }^{\epsilon \prime} \nu \eta$, the day before the new moon, Skr. sánah, Lat. senex, O.Ir. sen, Goth. sineigs, Lith. sẽnas, old; $\gamma^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$ os, Skr. jánas-, Lat. genus, Goth. kuni, race, generation ; $\gamma \nu \omega \tau$ ós, Skr. jñātáḥ, known; Dor. ф́́povtı, Skr. bháranti, Lat. ferunt, Goth. baírand, they bear ; v̈rvos, Skr. svápnaḥ, sleep; voc. kúov, Skr. šván, $\operatorname{dog}^{2}$, hound.
§ 148. Indg. In became 11 in prim. Greek, Latin, Keltic and Germanic. In Greek it is necessary to distinguish three categories all of which belong to the prehistoric period of the language.
I. The Indg. 1 ln which became 11 in prim. Greek. This 11 remained in Lesb. and Thessalian, but in the other dialects it became simplified to 1 with lengthening of the preceding vowel, as Lesb. $\dot{\alpha} \pi-\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \lambda \omega$, Dor. F $\bar{\eta} \lambda \omega$, Hom. $\epsilon^{i} \lambda \omega$, from ${ }^{*} F^{\epsilon} \lambda \nu \omega$; Lesb. $\beta o ́ \lambda \lambda \lambda o \mu \alpha \iota, ~ T h e s s . ~ \beta \epsilon ́ ̀ \lambda \lambda o \mu \alpha \iota, ~ D o r . ~$ סŋ́ $\lambda о \mu \alpha \iota$, Att. ßoúло $\alpha \iota \iota$ from ${ }^{*} \beta o ́ \lambda \nu о \mu \alpha \iota:$ Lesb. ßó $\lambda \lambda \bar{\alpha}$, Att. $\beta$ ov $\lambda \dot{\eta}$; Hom. oủ̀os from * Fo入vos, fleecy; Lesb. Thess. $\sigma \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \bar{\alpha}$, Dor. $\sigma \tau \bar{\alpha} \lambda \bar{\alpha}$, Att. Ion. $\sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \lambda \eta$, from ${ }^{*} \sigma \tau \alpha ́ \lambda \lambda \bar{\alpha}$. See § 69, 6.
2. When $\lambda \nu$ came together at a later period it became $\lambda \lambda$ and remained as such in all the dialects, as $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha \xi$, girl, $\Pi \alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha$ s, Pallas, epith. of Athena, to stem ${ }^{*} \pi \alpha \lambda \in \nu$, cp. OE. fola, foal, gen. folan for *fulen ; é $\lambda \lambda$ ós, to stem
${ }^{*} \in \lambda \in \nu$, cp. O.Slav. jelen•, Lith. élnis, young deer; ö $\lambda \lambda \bar{\nu} \mu \iota$ from *ờ $\nu \bar{v} \mu$, beside ${ }^{\circ} \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \alpha \iota$.
3. When $\lambda \nu$ came together at a still later period, it remained, as $\pi i \lambda \lambda \nu \mu \alpha \iota, \pi i \lambda \nu \eta \mu \mu, \pi \iota \lambda \nu$ ós.
§ 149. When $\nu \lambda$ came together in composition it became
 خoyos.
§ 150. $\nu \mu$ became assimilated to $\mu \mu$, as ${ }^{\epsilon} \mu \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \omega, \sigma \dot{v} \mu \mu \epsilon \tau \rho o s$,
 $\mu \epsilon \mu \omega ́ \rho \alpha \mu \mu \alpha \iota: \mu \omega \rho \alpha i ́ \nu \omega$.
§ 151. Before explosives $\nu$ became the corresponding homorganic nasal, as $\sigma v \mu \beta \alpha \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega, \sigma v \mu \pi \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \omega, \sigma v \mu \phi \epsilon \dot{\gamma} \gamma \omega$, $\pi \alpha \lambda i ́ \mu \pi \alpha \iota s, \pi \alpha \lambda \iota \gamma \gamma \in \nu \in \sigma^{\prime} \alpha, \pi \alpha \lambda \iota \gamma \kappa \alpha \pi \eta \lambda \epsilon v^{\prime} \omega$.
§ 152. nr became ndr which was simplified to dr initially, as $\alpha \nu \delta \rho o ́ s ~ f r o m ~ * \alpha ̉ \nu \rho o ́ s ~: ~ \alpha ̀ \nu \eta ́ \rho ; ~ \sigma ı \nu \delta \rho o ́ s ~: ~ \sigma ı \nu \alpha \rho o ́ s, ~ h u r t, ~$ damaged; Hesychius $\delta \rho \omega \psi^{*}{ }^{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi$ os. Cp. words like NE. gander, thunder, beside OE. ganra, punor.
§ 153. n disappeared in prim. Greek before s or $\mathrm{z}+$ consonant without lengthening of the preceding vowel. This sound-change took place both when $\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{z}$ were original or arose from some other source, as $\kappa \in \sigma \tau o ́ s$ from * $\kappa \in \nu \sigma \tau o ́ s$ : $\kappa \in \nu \tau \epsilon ́ \omega$; $\tau \rho \iota \bar{\alpha} \kappa о \sigma \tau o ́ s$ from * $\tau \rho \iota \bar{\alpha} \kappa о \nu \sigma \tau o ́ s ; ~ i m p e r a t i v e ~ m i d . ~$


 ros from ${ }^{*} \sigma v \nu$-z $\delta u \gamma o s$, see § 155 . Here belong also the various dialect forms of the acc. pl. of o- and à-stems. In prim. Greek the regular endings were: -os, $-\alpha s$ when the next word began with a consonant and oovs, $-\alpha \nu$ in pausa and when the next word began with a vowel, as $\tau o ̀ s ~ \lambda u ́ к о \nu s, ~$ but $\tau o ̀ \nu s \in \in \in \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \theta \in \rho o \nu s$. This original distinction was fairly well preserved in the dialect of Crete. The other dialects generalized the oovs, $-\alpha \nu s$, the $\nu$ of which then disappeared with lengthening of the preceding vowel, whence Att. Ion. $-o u s,-\bar{\alpha} s$, Dor. - $\omega s,-\bar{\alpha} s$, Lesb. -ols, $-\alpha \iota \varsigma$. See $\S 69$, I.

Note.-When $n$ came to stand in the above combination at a later period it disappeared with lengthening of the preceding vowel in Att. Ion. and in most of the other dialects, as Att. ${ }_{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\prime} \sigma \pi \epsilon \iota \sigma \tau \alpha \iota$ from ${ }^{*} \epsilon \sigma \pi \epsilon \nu \sigma \tau \alpha \iota$ with $\nu$ re-introduced from the pres. $\sigma \pi \epsilon \in \nu \delta \omega$, the regular form would have been * $\epsilon \sigma \pi \epsilon \sigma \tau \alpha \iota$; Ion. $\pi \epsilon \hat{\imath} \sigma \mu \alpha$ from ${ }^{*} \pi \epsilon \in \sigma \mu \alpha$ which was a new formation for ${ }^{*} \pi \epsilon \in \nu \mu a$.
§ 154. $\nu$ remained in Arcad. Arg. Cret. and Thessalian before final $-s$ and the medial $-\sigma$ - which arose from the assimilation of consonants, but in the other dialects-except Lesbian-the $\nu$ disappeared with lengthening of a preceding short vowel. In Lesb. the $\nu \sigma$ became $\iota \sigma$, the $\iota$ of which combined with a preceding short vowel to form a diphthong, as Att. Ion. $\epsilon i \hat{i} s$, Dor. $\hat{\eta}_{s}$, Cret. ${ }^{\epsilon} \nu \bar{\nu}$, Lesb. $\epsilon i \hat{i}$, one (§ 144); Att. Ion. $\mu^{\prime} \lambda \bar{\alpha} s, \tau \alpha ́ \lambda \bar{\alpha} s$, from ${ }^{*} \mu \epsilon \in \lambda \alpha \nu s,{ }^{*} \tau \alpha ́ \lambda \alpha \nu s ; \gamma i \gamma \bar{\alpha} s$, $\tau \iota \theta \epsilon i ́ s, \delta \iota \delta o v ́ s$, from ${ }^{*} \gamma \iota \gamma \alpha \nu \tau s,{ }^{*} \tau \iota \theta \epsilon \nu \tau s,{ }^{*} \delta \iota \delta o \nu \tau s ; \pi \hat{\alpha} \sigma \alpha$ from ${ }^{*} \pi \alpha \nu \tau j \alpha$ beside Lesb. $\pi \alpha \hat{\imath} \sigma \alpha$; $\delta \iota \delta o \hat{v} \sigma \alpha, \tau \iota \theta \epsilon i \sigma \alpha$ from ${ }^{*} \delta \iota$ -
 prim. Gr. ä $\gamma \sigma \nu \tau \iota, \alpha^{\alpha} \gamma \omega \nu \tau \iota$, beside Lesb. $\ddot{\alpha}^{\prime} \gamma \circ \iota \sigma \iota, \alpha^{\alpha} \gamma \omega \sigma \iota$.

$$
\tilde{n}, \eta
$$

§ 155. The oldest mode of representing these nasals in Greek was by $\nu$ which is common on inscriptions. They came to be represented by $\gamma$ after the combinations $\mathrm{gn}, \mathrm{gm}$ had become assimilated to $\eta \mathbf{n}, \eta \mathrm{m}$ (§ 189), as in Att.
 pointed out that these nasals only occurred in the parent language before their corresponding explosives and underwent in the different languages all changes in the place of articulation in common with these explosives (§ 139). $\tilde{\mathbf{n}}$ : $\eta ้ \nu \in \gamma \kappa \alpha, I$ bore, Skr. ānąš́a, he obtained, cp. Lat. nanciscor ; $a^{\alpha} \gamma \chi \omega$, Lat. ango, cp. Goth. aggwus, narrow. ŋ: $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \kappa \omega \nu$, O.Lat. ancus, cp. Skr. aŋkáh, hook, OE. angel, fish-hook; $\pi \epsilon ́ \nu \tau \epsilon$, Lesb. $\pi \epsilon ́ \mu \pi \epsilon$, Skr. páñca, Lat. quīnque, O. Welsh pimp, Goth. fimf, Lith. penkì, five ; $\lambda \iota \mu \pi \alpha ́ \nu \omega$, Lat. linquo, cp . Skr. riñcánti, they leave.
§ 156. The nasal disappeared with lengthening of the preceding vowel before Ion. $\sigma \sigma$, Att. $\tau \tau$ from prim. Greek $\chi{ }^{j}=$ Indg. ghj $(\S 129,7)$, as Ion. $\hat{\alpha} \sigma \sigma o \nu$ from ${ }^{*} \dot{\alpha} \gamma \chi j o \nu$, cp. ${ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \gamma \chi \iota$; Ion. $\grave{\epsilon} \lambda \frac{\alpha}{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \omega \nu$, Att. ${ }^{\epsilon} \lambda \hat{\alpha} \tau \tau \tau \nu$, from ${ }^{*} \hat{\epsilon} \lambda \alpha \gamma \chi j \omega \nu$; Ion. $\theta \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \omega \nu$, Att. $\theta \dot{\alpha} \tau \tau \omega \nu$, from * $\theta a \gamma \chi j \omega \nu$.

It also disappeared, but without lengthening of the preceding vowel, before $\zeta$ from prim. Gr. $\gamma j$, as $\kappa \lambda \alpha \oint \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \kappa \lambda \alpha \gamma \gamma j \omega$ : Lat. clango; $\pi \lambda \alpha \dot{\xi} \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \pi \lambda \alpha \gamma \gamma j \omega$ : Lat. plango; $\sigma \alpha \lambda \pi i ́ \jmath \omega$ : gen. $\sigma \alpha ́ \lambda \pi \iota \gamma \gamma o s$.

## The Labials.

## p

§ 157. Indg. p (= Skr. Lat. Lith. O.Slav. p, Germanic f, b. In O.Ir. it disappeared initially and medially between vowels) remained in Greek initially and generally also medially, as $\pi \alpha \tau \eta ́ \rho$, Skr. pitár., Lat. pater, O.Ir. athir, OE. fæder, father; $\pi$ oús, Skr. pắt (gen. padáhẹ), Lat. pēs, OE. fōt, foot; $\pi \rho^{\prime}$ ó, Skr. prá, Lat. pro-, O.Slav. pro-, before ; modús, Skr. purúh, O.Ir. il, Goth. filu, much, many; $\pi \lambda \epsilon ́ \kappa \omega$, Lat. plecto ; ধ̇ $\pi \tau \tau \dot{\alpha}$, Skr. saptá, Lat. septem, Goth. sibun, seven; ${ }^{\epsilon} \rho \pi \pi$, Skr. sárpāmi, Lat. serpo, I creep; $\dot{v} \pi \epsilon ́ \rho$, Lat. s-uper, OE. ofer, over, Skr. upári, above ; v̋ $\pi \nu o s$, Skr. svápnaḥ, Lat. somnus from *swepnos, O.Ir. sūan, sleep, OE. swefan, to sleep ; ка́ $\pi \rho o s$, Lat. caper.
§ 158. $\pi \mu$ became $\mu \mu$, as $\beta \lambda \epsilon ́ \mu \mu \alpha: \beta \lambda \epsilon ́ \pi \omega$ (see § 117). $\pi$ became $\beta$ before $\delta$, as $\kappa \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \beta \delta \eta \nu$, by stealth : $\kappa \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \pi \tau \omega$; $\epsilon^{\prime} \beta \delta о \mu$ os: $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} ; \dot{\epsilon} \pi i-\beta \delta \alpha \iota$ (nom. pl.), the day after the feast, where - $\beta \delta$ is the weak form of *ped-, foot, cp. Skr. upa-bdá-, stamping, trampling. See § 107.
b
§ 159. Indg. b (= Skr. Lat. O.Ir. Lith. O.Slav. b, Germanic p) remained in Greek initially and generally also medially, as $\beta \dot{\kappa} \kappa \tau \eta s$, blustering, Skr. buk-kāraḥ, the roaring
of a lion, Lat. būcina, trumpet, O.Slav. bučati, to roar, bellow; $\beta$ áp $\beta$ apos, foreign, Skr. barbaraḥ, stammering; $\beta \alpha \lambda \lambda i \xi \omega, I$ dance, Skr. bal-baliti, he whirls; $\lambda \epsilon i \not \beta \omega$, Lat. lībo ; ő $\mu \beta$ pos, Lat. imber, cp. Skr. ámbu, water. It should be noted that b was a rare sound in the parent Indg. language.
§ 160. On the change of $\beta$ to $\pi$ before voiceless sounds, as in $\tau \rho i t \psi \omega, \tau \epsilon \tau \rho \iota \pi \tau \alpha \iota: \tau \rho^{i} \beta \omega$, see § 106. $\beta \mu$ became $\mu \mu$, as $\tau \epsilon ́ \tau \rho \iota \mu \mu \alpha \iota: \tau \rho t \hat{i} \beta \omega$, see § 117.

## ph

§ 161. ph was one of the rarest sounds in the parent language. It was preserved in Sanskrit and Greek, but in prim. Latin it fell together with original bh, and in prim. Keltic, Germanic and the Baltic-Slavonic languages with original p. $\sigma \phi \alpha \rho \alpha \gamma^{\prime} о \mu \alpha \iota, ~ I ~ c r a c k, ~ c r a c k l e, ~ S k r . ~ s p h u ̛ ́ r j a t i, ~$ he cracks; $\sigma \phi \dot{\eta} \nu$, Skr. sphyáḥ, wedge; $\sigma \phi^{\prime} \lambda \alpha$ s, Skr. phálakam, footstool, see § 102.

## bh

§ 162. Indg. bh (= Skr. bh, Lat. $\mathbf{f}$ initially and $\mathbf{b}$ medially, Germanic b, $\mathbf{b}$, Keltic and Baltic-Slavonic b) became voiceless $\phi$ in Greek, as $\phi \epsilon ́ \rho \omega$, Skr. bhárāmi, Lat. fero, O.Ir. berim, OE. bere, O.Slav. berą, $I$ bear; $\phi \rho \bar{\alpha} \tau \eta \rho$, member of a $\phi \rho \frac{1}{\bar{\alpha}} \tau \rho \bar{\alpha}$, Skr. bhrắtar., Lat. frāter, O.Ir. brāthir, OE. brōpor, brother ; ó $\phi \rho \hat{s}$, Skr. bhrûh, OE. brū, Lith. bruvis, eyebrow; véфos, cloud, Skr. nábhas-, Lat. nebula, OHG. nebul, mist; ó $\mu \phi \alpha \lambda o ́ s$, Lat. umbilīcus; үó $\mu \phi$ os, nail, Skr. jámbhah, tooth, OE. camb, comb.
§ 163. $\phi \mu$ became $\mu \mu$, as $\gamma^{\prime} \gamma \rho \alpha \mu \mu \alpha \iota: \gamma \rho \alpha ́ \phi \omega$, see § 117.
On the change of $\phi$ to $\pi$ before voiceless sounds, as in $\gamma \rho a ́ \psi \omega$, $\gamma^{\prime} \gamma \rho \alpha \pi \tau \alpha \iota: \gamma \rho \alpha ́ \phi \omega$, see § 109. On the de-aspiration of $\phi$, as in $\pi \epsilon ́ \phi \epsilon v \gamma \alpha: \phi \epsilon \cup \gamma \omega$, see § 115.

## The Dentals.

## t

§ 164. Indg. $\mathbf{t}(=$ Skr. Lat. Lith. O.Slav. $\mathbf{t}$, O.Ir. $\mathbf{t}, \mathrm{th}$, Germanic $\mathbf{p}$, đ, but $\mathbf{t}$ in the Indg. combinations pt, kt, qt, st) generally remained in Greek initially and medially, as $\tau \epsilon i ́ \nu \omega$, Lat. tendo, OE. penne, I stretch, Skr. tanṓti, he stretches ; Lat. tenuis, O.Ir. tana, Lith. tenvas, OE. pynne, thin ; тaтós, Skr. tatáh, Lat. tentus, stretched; $\tau$, Skr. tád, Lat. is-tud, OE. bæt, the, that; $\tau \rho \in i$ is, Skr. tráyah, Lat. trēs, O.Ir. trī, OE. brī, O.Slav. trije, three; $\tau \rho \in ́ \mu \omega$, Lat. tremo; $\pi \alpha \tau \eta \dot{\eta} \rho$, Skr. pitár-, Lat. pater, O.Ir. athir, OE. fæder, father ; $\phi \in ́ \rho \epsilon \tau \epsilon$, Skr. bháratha, Lat. (imper.) ferte, Goth. baírip, O.Slav. berete, ye bear; Є̈ $\neq \frac{\text { L }}{}$ Lat. vetus ; $\kappa \lambda \nu \tau o ́ s$, Skr. šrutáh, Lat. in-clutus, renowned, O.Ir. cloth, renown ; '̈́ $\sigma \tau \iota$, Skr. ásti, Lat. est, Goth. ist, Lith. ẽsti, he is ; клє́ $\pi \tau \eta s$, Goth. hliftus, thief; óктడ́, Skr. așțāú, așṭá, Lat. octō, O.Ir. ocht, OE. eahta, eight.
§ 165. $\tau \pi$ became $\pi \pi$, as Hom. $\kappa \alpha ́ \pi \pi \epsilon \sigma o \nu$ from $\kappa \alpha \tau \epsilon ́ \pi \epsilon \sigma \circ \nu$ : $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \pi i \pi \tau \omega$.
§ 166. Prim. Greek $\tau \sigma$ (§ 109) became a double spirant the precise pronunciation of which is uncertain. Most scholars assume that it was pb ( $=$ th in Engl. thin) or a kind of lisped ss. Before and after consonants, and finally it became $\sigma$ through the intermediate stage $\sigma \sigma$ in all the dialects, as Hom. ívos, Att. ívos, Cret. Fí Foos from * Fıт Fos, older *widswos; Att. $\beta \alpha ́ \lambda \lambda o v \sigma \iota, ~ C r e t . ~ \beta \alpha ́ \lambda \lambda o v \sigma \iota, ~ f r o m ~$ * $\beta \alpha ́ \lambda \lambda о \nu \tau \sigma \iota: \beta \alpha ́ \lambda \lambda \omega \nu$; $\nu o ́ \sigma o s$ from * $\nu o ́ \tau \sigma F o s ; \pi \alpha ́ \sigma \chi \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \pi \alpha ́ \tau \sigma \chi{ }^{\omega}$ : $\pi \alpha \theta \epsilon i \nu \nu$; Att. $\not{\epsilon} \epsilon \pi \epsilon \epsilon \iota \sigma \alpha$, Cret. $\neq \epsilon \sigma \pi \epsilon \nu \sigma \alpha$, from
 $\nu v ́ \xi, \nu \epsilon o ́ t \eta s, \pi o v ́ s$, кópvs, $\gamma i \not \gamma \bar{\alpha} s, \delta i \delta o v ́ s, ~ \tau \iota \theta \in i ́ s$, beside stem $\nu$ и́кт-, $\nu є$ є́т $\eta \tau$-, $\pi о \delta$-, ко́ $\rho v \theta-$, , रí $\alpha \nu \tau$-, $\delta \iota \delta o ́ \nu \tau$-, $\tau \iota \theta \in ́ \nu \tau$-.

Medially after long vowels and diphthongs it became $\sigma$ in all the dialects, as dat. pl. $\phi \omega \sigma \iota$ from ${ }^{*} \phi \omega \tau \sigma \iota ; \sigma \pi \epsilon \hat{v} \sigma \omega$ from


Medially between short vowels it became $\tau \tau$ in Boeot. Cret. (Cret. also $\S$ ), $\sigma$ in Att. Ion., and $\sigma \sigma, \sigma$ in the other dialects, as aor. Hom. $\delta \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \alpha \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$, Att. $\delta \alpha \dot{\sigma} \alpha \sigma \sigma \theta \iota \iota$, Cret. סáт $\tau \alpha \theta \theta \alpha \iota, \delta \alpha ́\} \alpha \theta \alpha \iota: \delta \alpha \tau є ́ \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$; loc. pl. Hom. $\pi о \sigma \sigma i$, Att. $\pi o \sigma i ́$, Skr. patsú, beside nom. $\pi o ́ \delta \epsilon \varsigma$, Skr. pádaḥ.
§ 167. Indg. tj became ts in prim. Greek and then had the same further development as the ts in § 166, as Hom. Att. Boeot. $\pi \hat{\alpha} \sigma \alpha$, Lesb. $\pi \alpha \hat{i} \sigma \alpha$, Thess. Cret. $\pi \alpha ́ \nu \sigma \alpha$, from ${ }^{*} \pi \alpha \nu \tau j \alpha$; $\delta o \xi \xi \alpha$ from ${ }^{* \delta o ́ k \tau j \alpha ; ~} \alpha i \sigma \alpha$ from *aitja; Hom.
 § 129, 6.
§ 168. Initial tw- became $\sigma \sigma$ - which was simplified later to $\sigma$-, as $\sigma$ '́, Skr. tvā, tvấm, thee. Medial -twbecame $-\tau \tau$ - in Att. and Boeot., and $-\sigma \sigma$ - in the other dialects, as Att. $\tau \epsilon \in \tau \tau \alpha \rho \epsilon \varsigma$, Boeot. $\pi \epsilon \in \tau \tau \alpha \rho \epsilon \varsigma$, Hom. $\tau \in \notin \sigma \alpha \rho \epsilon \varsigma$, Skr. catvárah, four. For further examples see § 124, 3.
§ 169. $\tau \iota$ remained initially and also in the combination $\sigma \tau \iota$, as $\tau i \sigma \iota s$, 光 $\sigma \tau \iota$, $\pi i \sigma \tau \iota s, \sigma \tau \iota \phi$ pós. Medially it partly became $\sigma \iota$ and partly remained. The reason for this twofold treatment has never been satisfactorily explained. P. Kretschmer-Kuhn's Zeitschrift, vol. xxx, pp. 565-91after investigating the subject in great detail, arrives at the following result: $\tau \iota$ remained medially when the $\iota$ was accented, and also finally when the accent was on the penultima, but it became $\sigma \iota$ when the $\iota$ was unaccented. On the other hand Brugmann-Grundriss, vol. i, p. 662assumes that the $\iota$ became consonantal before vowels, as in $\pi \lambda$ ov́ $\sigma$ los from * $\pi \lambda$ дoútjos; gen. Ion. $\beta$ á $\sigma l o s$ from * $\beta$ átjos and then the $\sigma$ was levelled out into the nom. and acc. sing. $\beta \dot{\alpha} \sigma \iota s, \beta \dot{\alpha} \sigma \iota \nu$. A careful examination of the material collected by Kretschmer shows that both explanations leave a large residuum of unexplained forms, even when due allowance is made for a considerable number of analogical formations. The ti-stems and likewise the adjectives in ${ }^{*}-\tau \iota o s$ have $\sigma \iota$, as $\beta \dot{\alpha} \sigma \iota s, \pi o ́ \sigma \iota s$, dó $\sigma \iota s, \phi \dot{v} \sigma \iota s ; \pi \lambda o v ́ \sigma l o s$,
$\dot{\epsilon} \nu l a v ́ \sigma l o s, \dot{\alpha} \mu \beta$ pó $\sigma \iota o s$. The pres. third pers. sing. of $\mu l-$ verbs and the third pers. pl. of $\omega$-verbs have $-\sigma \iota$ in Att. Ion., but $-\tau \iota$ in Dor. and Boeotian, as Att. סíסw $\iota \iota, \tau i \theta \eta \sigma \iota ~ \phi \epsilon ́ p o v \sigma \iota$ beside Dor. $\delta i \delta \delta \omega \tau \iota, \tau i \theta \eta \tau \iota, \phi \in ́ \rho o \nu \tau \iota$.
§170. $\tau$ became $\sigma$ before a following $\tau$, as $\ddot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \sigma \tau o s:$
 úttarah, latter. See § 110.

## d

§ 171. Indg. d (= Skr. Lat. O.Ir. Lith. O.Slav. d, Germanic t) generally remained initially and medially in Greek, as $\delta$ fék $\alpha$, Skr. dáśa, Lat. decem, O.Ir. deich, Goth. taíhun, OE. tīen, Lith dẽzimt-, ten ; $\delta i \delta \delta \omega \mu$, Skr. dádāmi, Lat. dō, I give, O.Slav. dati, to give ; סó $\mu$ os, Skr. dámaḥ, Lat. domus, O.Slav. domŭ, house ; dú $\omega$, Skr. dvāú, dvā́, Lat. duo, O.Ir. đāu, đō, Lith. đù, OE. twā, two ; $\notin \delta \omega$, Skr. ádmi, Lat. edo, OE. ete, I eat ; ধ̌®os, Skr. sádas-, seat, Lat. sedēre, OE. sittan, to sit ; $\kappa \alpha \rho \delta i \bar{\alpha}, ~ \kappa \rho \alpha \delta i ́ \eta$, Lat. gen. cordis, O.Ir. cride, Lith. szirdis, OE. heorte, heart; oî $\varepsilon$, Skr. véda, OE. wāt, he knows, Lat. vidēre, to see; acc. $\pi$ ó $\delta \alpha$, Skr. pắdam, Lat. pedem, OE. fōt, foot.
$\S 172$. $\delta \lambda$ became $\lambda \lambda$, as $\pi \epsilon ́ \lambda \lambda \bar{v} \tau \rho o \nu$ from ${ }^{*} \pi \epsilon \in \delta-\lambda \bar{v} \tau \rho o \nu$, bandage worn by runners on the ankle; Lac. $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \lambda \hat{\alpha}=$ Lat. sella, from *sedlā, OE. setl, seat.
$\delta \pi$ became $\pi \pi$, as Hom. ö $\pi \pi \omega$ s from $* \delta \delta \delta-\pi \omega$ s older * $\sigma$ Fód- $\pi \omega \mathrm{s}$, quomodo.
§ 173. Indg. dj became $\zeta$, as $Z$ ev́s, cp. Skr. dyāúḥ, sky; $\pi \epsilon$ §ós, Skr. padyáh, on foot. See § 129, 8.
$\S$ 174. $\delta$ became $\sigma$ before a following voiceless dental, as oî $\sigma \theta$ : oî $\alpha$; ${ }^{\epsilon} \psi \in v \sigma \tau \alpha \iota: \psi \in \tilde{\delta} \delta o \mu \alpha \iota$. See § 110 .

## th

§ 175. th was a rare sound in the parent language. It was preserved in Sanskrit and Greek, but in prim. Latin it fell together with original dh , and in prim. Keltic,

Germanic and the Baltic-Slavonic languages with original t. oí $\sigma \alpha$, Skr. vêttha, thou knowest ; $\pi \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \theta \alpha \nu o \nu$, a platter or mould to bake in, Skr. prthúh, broad; $\mu$ ó $\theta o s$, battle-din, Skr. mánthati, he twists, shakes, see § 102.
§ 176. Indg. sth became $\sigma \tau$, as i' $\sigma \tau \eta \mu \iota$, Skr. tíṣṭhāmi, $i$ stand ; $\sigma \tau$ v̂̀os, pillar, Skr. stūráh, strong; superlative suffix $-\iota \sigma \tau 0 s=$ Skr. -ištḥaḥ, see § 102.

## dh

§ 177. Indg. dh (= Skr. dh, Lat. f initially, b medially before and after $\mathbf{r}$, before $\mathbf{1}$ and after $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{w})$, in other cases d, Keltic and Baltic-Slavonic languages d, Germanic d, đ) became voiceless $\theta$ in Greek, as $\theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \alpha \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$, to suck, Skr. dháyanti, O.Ir. denait, they suck, Lat. fēlāre, Goth. daddjan, to suckle; $\theta \bar{v} \mu^{\prime}$ ós, courage, passion, Skr. dhūmáh, Lat. fūmus, Lith. pl. đúmai, smoke; $\theta \dot{v} \rho \bar{\alpha}$, OE. duru, pl. Lat. fores, Lith. dùrys, door ; тíQ $\eta \mu$ l, Skr. dádhāmi, $I$ put, place, OE. dǣđ, deed, Lith. dêti, O.Slav. děti, to lay, cp. Lat. facio, fēcī ; $\mu$ é $\theta v$, wine, Skr. mádhu, O.Ir. mid, OE. medu, meodu, Lith. medùs, mead, honey; '́pvepós, Skr. rudhiráḥ, Lat. ruber, OE. rēad, red; â $\theta \omega, I$ burn, Skr. édhas-, fire-wood, Lat. aedēs, sanctuary, originally, fireplace, hearth, OE. ād, funeral pile; oû̀ap, Skr. údhar, Lat. ūber, OE. ūder, udder; $\pi \epsilon_{i} \hat{\theta} \theta$, Lat. fīdo ; imperative $\kappa \lambda \hat{v} \theta_{\iota}=$ Skr. š́rudhí, hear thou.
§ 178. Indg. dhj became $\sigma \sigma, \sigma$, as $\mu \epsilon ́ \sigma \sigma o s, ~ \mu \epsilon ́ \sigma o s$, Skr. mádhyaḥ, middle, see § 129, 6.
§ 179. Indg. dh appears as $\sigma$ before voiceless dentals, as $\pi \epsilon ́ \pi \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \tau \alpha \iota, \dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \theta \eta \nu: \pi \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \theta \omega$, see § 110 .
§ 180. On the de-aspiration of $\theta$, as in $\tau i \theta \eta \mu l$, see § 115.

## The Palatals and the Velar Gutturals.

§ 181. In treating the history of these consonants in the various languages it is convenient to divide the Indg. family of languages into two great groups according to the
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different development which these sounds underwent in the two groups. The palatal explosives $\mathbf{k}, \mathrm{kh}, \mathrm{g}$ and gh usually appear in Greek, Italic (Latin, Oscan, Umbrian), Keltic and the Germanic languages as explosives or as sounds which are directly developed from explosives, whereas in the Aryan, Armenian, Albanian and BalticSlavonic languages they usually appear as spirants. The former group is generally called the centum- and the latter the satəm-group of languages, where Latin centum and Zend satom represent the original Indg. word *kmtóm, hundred. This twofold development of the palatals is probably due to dialectal differences which already existed in the Indg. parent language. In addition to the palatals the parent language also had two kinds of velars, viz. pure velars and labialized velars or velars with lip-rounding. The pure velars fell together with the palatals in the centumlanguages, but were kept apart in the satəm-languages. On the other hand the pure velars fell together with the labialized velars in the satəm-languages, but were kept apart in the centum-languages.

The following table contains the normal development of the palatals and velar gutturals in the various languages. The labialized velars are here indicated by w. In other parts of this grammar the ${ }^{w}$ is almost always omitted as being unnecessary, because the Greek words themselves generally indicate whether they originally contained a pure velar or a labialized velar.


## i. The Palatals.

## k

§ 182. Indg. $\mathbf{k}(=$ Lat. O.Ir. $\mathbf{c}$, Germanic $\mathbf{h} ; \mathbf{g}, \mathbf{3}$, Skr. š́, Lith. sz, O.Slav. s) remained in Greek initially and generally also medially, as €́к $\alpha \tau^{\prime} \nu$, Lat. centum, O.Ir. cēt, OE. hund, Skr. š̌atám, Lith. sziñtas, hundred; к $\alpha \rho \delta i ́ \bar{\alpha}$, $\kappa \rho \alpha \delta i ́ \eta$, Lat. cor, O.Ir. cride, OE. heorte, Lith. szirdis, heart ; клє́ $\pi \tau \omega$, Lat. clepo, Goth. hlifa, I steal; к $\boldsymbol{\lambda} v \tau$ ós, Lat. in-clutus, Skr. šrrutáh, renowned, O.Ir. cloth, renown; $\kappa v ́ \omega \nu$, Lat. canis, O. Ir. cū, OE. hund, Skr. š̀vắ, gen. š́únah, Lith. szŭ̃, gen. szuñs, dog, hound; סє́кк, Lat. decem, Goth. taîhun, Skr. dáš̌a, Lith. dẽszimt-, ten; $\delta \in \notin о \rho к \epsilon$, Skr. dadárš้a, he has seen; oîkos, foîkos, Skr. vēšáḥ, house, Lat. vīcus, village ; óктஸ́, Lat. octō, OE. eahta, Skr. aștāū, aṣṭắ, Lith. asztůni, eight; Ф́кús, Skr. āšúụ, quick, Lat. ōcior.
§183. kw became $\pi \pi$, as $i \pi \pi \pi$, Lat. equus, OE. eoh, Skr. áš́vaḥ, horse. See § 124, 2.
§ 184. Medial kj became $\tau \tau$ in Att. and $\sigma \sigma$ in Ion., as $\eta ँ \tau \tau \omega \nu, \eta ้ \sigma \sigma \omega \nu: \eta \geqslant \kappa \iota \sigma \tau o s ; \pi \alpha ́ \tau \tau \alpha \lambda o s, \pi \alpha ́ \sigma \sigma \alpha \lambda o s: ~ r o o t * p a \bar{k}$. $\tau \tau$ and $\sigma \sigma$ were simplified to $\tau$, and $\sigma$ initially, as Att. $\tau \eta ́ \mu \epsilon \rho o \nu$, Ion. $\sigma \dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \rho \circ \nu$ from *$\kappa j \bar{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \rho o \nu$. See § 129, 7.
§ 185. ks became $\chi$ before a liquid or nasal, as $\mu v \chi \lambda$ ós from * $\mu v \kappa \sigma \lambda o s$, stallion-ass : Lat. mūlus; $\lambda \epsilon ́ \chi \rho \iota o s: \lambda o$ sós, Lat. luxus; $\dot{\alpha} \rho \alpha ́ \chi \nu \eta$ from * $\alpha \rho \alpha \kappa \sigma \nu \bar{\alpha}$, Lat. arānea; $\lambda \alpha ́ \chi \nu \eta$ from $\lambda \alpha ́ \kappa \sigma \nu \bar{\alpha} ; ~ \lambda u ́ \chi \nu o s$ from ${ }^{*} \lambda \nu \kappa \sigma \nu o s:$ Lat. lūna from ${ }^{*}$ louksnā; $\pi \alpha ́ \chi \nu \eta$ from ${ }^{*} \pi \alpha \kappa \sigma \nu \bar{\alpha} ; \pi \lambda о \chi \mu o ́ s: \pi \lambda o ́ к \alpha \mu о s$. See § 218.
§ 186. $\mathbf{k}$ disappeared before sk, as סíбкоs from ${ }^{*} \delta \iota \kappa \sigma \kappa o s:$
 $\lambda \alpha \kappa \epsilon i \nu$; $\delta \iota \delta \alpha ́ \sigma \kappa \omega$ from* $\delta \iota \delta \alpha \kappa \sigma \kappa \omega$.
§ 187. к became $\gamma$ before voiced sounds, as $\pi \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \delta \eta \nu$ : $\pi \lambda \epsilon ́ \kappa \omega$. See § 107.

## g

§ 188. Indg. $\mathbf{g}(=$ Lat. O.Ir. g, Germanic k, Skr. j, Lith. $\dot{\mathbf{z}}$, O.Slav. z) remained in Greek initially and generally also medially, as $\gamma^{\prime} \nu \nu$, Lat. genus, Goth. kuni, Skr. jánas-, race, generation, O.Ir. gein, birth; $\gamma \in \dot{o} o \mu \alpha \iota$, Lat. gusto, I taste, OE. cēosan, to choose, Skr. juṣ̌átē, he tastes ; ${ }^{\prime} \nu \nu v$, Lat. genu, OE. cnēo, Skr. jánu, knee ; $\gamma \nu \omega \tau o ́ s$, Lat. (g)nōtus, O.Ir. gnāth, Skr. jñātáh, known, OE. cnāwan, O.Slav. znati, to know ; ároós, Lat. ager, Goth. akrs, Skr. ájraḥ, field, acre ; ä $\gamma \omega$, Lat. ago, O.Ir. agim, Skr. ájāmi, I drive; є́ $\gamma \omega$, Lat. ego, OE. ic, $I$; ' $\epsilon \rho \gamma o \nu, \mathrm{OE}$. weorc, work ; $\alpha \mu \epsilon ́ \lambda \gamma \omega$, Lat. mulgeo, M.Ir. bligim, OE. meolce, Lith. mélżu, I milk, Skr. mrjáti, he wipes, rubs.
§ 189. Medial $\gamma \nu, \gamma \mu$ became $\eta \nu, \eta \mu$, as in $\gamma \iota \gamma \nu \omega \sigma \kappa \omega$, ү' $\gamma \nu о \mu \alpha \iota, \sigma \tau v \gamma \nu o ́ s$, á $\gamma \mu o ́ s$. This explains why the guttural nasal came to be expressed by $\gamma$ in Greek (§ 155). At a later period $\eta \nu$ was simplified to $\nu$, as $\gamma \iota \nu \omega \sigma \kappa \omega$, $\gamma i \nu о \mu \alpha \iota$. The $\nu$ occurs on inscriptions in Ion. already in the fifth and in Att. about the end of the fourth century в.с.
§ 190. gj became $\xi$, as $\ddot{\alpha}\} o \mu \alpha \iota$ from ${ }^{*} \alpha \ddot{\alpha} \gamma j о \mu \alpha \iota, I$ stand in awe of, Skr. yájate, he honours ; $\dot{\alpha} \rho \pi \alpha ́ \oint \omega$ from * $\dot{\alpha} \rho \pi \alpha \gamma j \omega$. See § 129, 8.
§ 191. $\gamma$ became $\kappa$ before voiceless consonants, as $\lambda \epsilon ́ \xi \in \omega$, $\lambda \epsilon ́ \lambda \epsilon \kappa \tau \alpha \iota: \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \omega$. See § 106.

## kh

§ 192. kh was one of the rarest sounds in the parent Indg. language. It was generally preserved in Greek, but in prim. Latin it fell together with original gh, and in the prim. Keltic, Germanic and Baltic-Slavonic languages with original $\mathbf{k}$. It is doubtful what simple $\mathbf{k h}$ would have become in Sanskrit, because it only occurs in the original combination skh which became ch initially and cch medially. $-\sigma \chi i\} \omega$, Lat. scindo, $I$ split, Skr. chinátti from
＊skhinátti，he splits，OE．scādan，to divide ；$\sigma \chi^{\alpha} \omega, I$ slit， Skr．chyáti，he slits，see § 102.

## gh

§ 193．Indg．gh（＝Lat．h medially between vowels and also initially before vowels except $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{f}$ initially before $\mathfrak{u}$ ， g before and after consonants，O．Ir．g，Germanic g，3， Skr．h，Lith．$\dot{\mathbf{z}}$, O．Slav．z）became voiceless $\chi$ in Greek，as $\chi \iota \omega \nu$, Skr．himáḥ，snow ；$\chi \in \iota \mu \dot{\omega} \nu$ ，Lat．hiems，O．Ir．gaim， Lith．żëmà，O．Slav．zima，winter，Skr．hếman，in winter； $X^{\alpha \mu \alpha i ́, ~ o n ~ t h e ~ g r o u n d, ~ L a t . ~ h u m u s, ~ L i t h . ~ \dot{e ̃ m e ́, ~ O . S l a v . ~}}$ zemlja，earth，ground；$\chi^{\epsilon}(f) \omega$ ，Lat．fundo，OE．gēote， I pour，Skr．hutáh，poured，sacrificed；$\chi$ ŋ́v，Lat．（h）anser， OE．gōs，Skr．hąsáhạ，goose ；$\lambda \in \epsilon^{\prime} \chi \omega$ ，Lat．lingo，O．Ir． ligim，Skr．réhmi，lêhmi，Lith．lëżiù，O．Slav．lizą，I lick； Pamph．$F^{\prime} \notin \omega$ ，Lat．veho，OE．wege，Skr．váhāmi，Lith． veżù，O．Slav．vezą，I bear，carry，move ；ä $\gamma \chi \omega$ ，Lat．ango， I press tight，Skr．áhas－，need，distress，OE．enge，narrow； $\pi \eta \hat{\eta}$ vs，fore－arm，Skr．bāhúḥ，arm．
§ 194．ghj became $\tau \tau$ in Att．and $\sigma \sigma$ in Ion．，as Att． $\theta \dot{\alpha} \tau \tau \omega \nu$ ，Ion．$\theta \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \omega \nu: \tau \alpha \chi \nu{ }^{\prime} s, \tau \alpha ́ \chi \iota \sigma \tau o s$. See § 129， 7.

## 2．The Pure Velars．

## q

§ 195．Indg．q（＝Lat．O．Ir．c，Germanic h；g，3，Skr． $\mathbf{k}$ but $\mathbf{c}$ before $\mathbf{i}$ ，and $\mathbf{a}=$ Indg． $\mathbf{e}$ ，Lith． $\mathbf{k}$, O．Slav． $\mathbf{k}$ but č before palatal vowels）became $\kappa$ in Greek initially and generally also medially，as каркívos，Lat．cancer，Skr． karkaṭah，crab ；ко́入лй，Skr．kalikā，flower－bud ；картós， fruit，Lat．carpo，I pluck，pick，OE．hærfest，autumn，Skr． krpānaḥ，sword，Lith．kerpù，I shear；к $\alpha \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \omega$ ，Lat．calo， I call，call out，Lith．kalbà，speech；к $\alpha \lambda$ ós，Skr．kalyấṇaḥ， beautiful；kє入aıvós，Skr．kālaḥ，black，cp．Lat．cālīgo； $\kappa^{\epsilon} \lambda \lambda \lambda \omega, I$ drive，Skr．kāláyati，kaláyati，he drives，Lat． celer，quick；ko入⿴⿱亠䒑ós，Lat．collis，hill，Lith．kálnas，
mountain ; крє́as, flesh, OE. hrā(w), corpse, carrion, Skr. kravíṣ-, raw meat, Lat. cruor, O.Ir. crū, Lith. kraũjas, blood, gore ; á $\gamma \kappa \omega \nu$, ä $\gamma \kappa o s$, O.Lat. ancus, Skr. áŋkas-, bend, hollow, Lith. anka, loop, knot; \}єvктós, Lat. jūnctus, Skr. yuktáḥ, Lith. júnktas, yoked; $\mu \in i \rho \alpha \xi \xi$, Skr. maryakáh, boy, young man.
§ 196. qj became $\tau \tau$ in Att. and $\sigma \sigma$ in Ion., as Att. $\pi \lambda \eta ́ \tau \tau \omega$, Ion. $\pi \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \sigma \omega$, root *plāq.. See § 129, 7.

## 9

§ 197. Indg. $\mathbf{g}(=$ Lat. O.Ir. g, Germanic k, Skr. g but $\mathbf{j}$ before $\mathbf{i}$, and $\mathbf{a}=$ Indg. e, Lith. g, O.Slav. $\mathbf{g}$ but ž before palatal vowels) became $\gamma$ in Greek initially and generally also medially, as $\gamma^{\prime} \rho \alpha \nu o s$, Lat. grūs, OE. cran, Lith. gérvè, crane ; äyos, guilt, Skr. ágas-, offence, crime, sin; $\dot{\alpha} \gamma o \rho \dot{\alpha}, ~ a s s e m b l y, \dot{\alpha} \gamma \epsilon i ́ p \omega, I$ assemble, Lat. grex, herd, flock, O.Ir. graig, herd of horses, Skr. grắmaḥ, crowd; ̧uyóv, Lat. jugum, Goth. juk, Skr. yugám, O.Slav. igo, yoke ; $\sigma \tau \in ́ \gamma o s, \tau \epsilon ́ \gamma o s$, OE. bæc, Lith. stógas, roof, O.Ir. teg, house : $\sigma \tau$ '́ $\gamma \omega$, Lat. tego, I cover, Skr. sthágati, sthagayati, he hides, conceals.
§ 198. gj became $\zeta$, as $\sigma \tau i \xi \omega$ from * $\sigma \tau i \gamma j \omega$ : $\sigma \tau i \gamma \mu \alpha, \mathrm{cp}$. Skr. tigmáh, pointed, sharp, Lat. in-stigo. See § 129, 8.
§ 199. $\gamma$ became $\kappa$ before voiceless consonants, as $\sigma \tau \epsilon \in \xi \omega$ : $\sigma \tau \epsilon ́ \gamma \omega$; $\alpha u ̛ \xi \omega, \alpha u ́ \xi \alpha ́ \nu \omega$ : Lat. augeo, Goth. áuka, Lith. áugu, I grow, increase, add. See § 106.

## qh

§ 200. qh was of rare occurrence in the parent language. It became $\chi$ in Greek, kh but ch before $\mathbf{i}$ and $\mathbf{a}=$ Indg. $\mathbf{e}$ in Sanskrit ; in prim. Lat. it fell together with original gh, $\mathbf{g h}$, in prim. Keltic and Germanic with original $\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q}$, in Lith. and O.Slav. with original q. $\kappa \alpha \chi \alpha ́ \xi \omega$, I laugh, Skr. kakhati, he laughs; кó $\gamma \chi$ os, Lat. congius (a small liquid measure), Skr. šaŋkkháḥ, muscle, see § 102.

## gh

§ 201. Indg. gh (= Skr. gh but $\mathbf{h}$ before $\mathbf{i}$, and $\mathbf{a}=$ Indg. e, Lat. $h$ initially before and medially between vowels, g before and after consonants, O.Ir. g, Germanic g, 3, Lith. g, O.Slav. $\mathbf{g}$ but $\check{z}$ before palatal vowels) became voiceless $\chi$ in Greek, as $\chi^{\alpha \lambda \kappa o ́ s, ~ b r a s s, ~ L i t h . ~ g e l e z ̇ ı s, ~ i r o n ; ~} \chi^{\alpha \nu \delta} \delta \alpha \nu \omega$, I lay hold of, Lat. pre-hendo, I seize, Goth. bi-gita, I find, O.Slav. gadają, I guess, divine; סo入ıxós, Lat. longus, OE. lang, Skr. dïrgháḥ, long ; $\lambda$ '́ $\chi o s$, O.Ir. lige, bed, Goth. ligan, O.Slav. ležati, to lie down ; ó $\mu i ́ x \lambda \eta$, Lith. miglà, fog, mist, Skr. mēgháḥ, cloud; $\sigma \tau \epsilon i ́ \chi \omega$, O.Ir. tīagu, I go, OE. stīge, I rise, O.Slav. stigną, I come.

## 3. The Labialized Velars.

## $q^{\text {w }}$

§ 202. Indg. $q^{\boldsymbol{w}}$ (= Lat. qu before vowels except $\mathfrak{u}$, but c before $\mathbf{u}$ and consonants, O.Ir. c, Germanic hw, h; 3w, 3, w; f, $\mathbf{t}(\S 181)$, Skr. $\mathbf{k}$ but $\mathbf{c}$ before $\mathbf{i}$, and $\mathbf{a}=$ Indg. e, Lith. k, O.Slav. $\mathbf{k}$ but č before palatal vowels) had a threefold development in Greek. It became $\pi$ before all sounds except $\iota, \epsilon, v$ and $j ; \tau$ before $\iota$ and $\epsilon ; \kappa$ before and after $v$, as $\pi \delta^{\prime}-\theta \epsilon \nu$, whence, Lat. quis, O.Ir. cīa, OE. hwā, Skr. káḥ, Lith. kàs, who? ; пótєpos, OE. hwæper, Skr. kataráh, which of two? ; $\pi$ pía $\begin{gathered}\text { Oal, to buy, Skr. kriṇắmi, }\end{gathered}$ I buy; поьшウ́ : тívss,penalty,Skr.cáyatē,he avenges, punishes; $\pi \alpha ́ \lambda \alpha \iota, ~ l o n g ~ a g o, ~ f o r m e r l y, ~ S k r . ~ c a r a m a ́ h, ~ t h e ~ l a s t ; ~ \lambda \epsilon i ́ m \omega, ~$ Lat. linquo, O.Ir. lēcim, Lith. lëkù, I leave, Skr. riṇákti, he leaves, Goth. leibvan, to lend; ${ }^{\prime \prime} \pi{ }^{\prime} \mu \alpha \iota$, Lat. sequor, Lith. sekù, I follow, Skr. sácatē, he follows; $\hat{\eta} \pi \alpha \rho$, Lat. jecur, Skr. yákrt, Lith. pl. jeknos, liver ; $\pi \epsilon \pi \tau$ ós, Lat. coctus, Skr. paktáh, cooked.
$\tau i \prime$, $\tau i$, Lat. quis, quid, Oscan pis, pid, Skr. indef. pronoun cid ; Hom. $\tau \in \in$, Goth. lvis, O.Slav. česo, whose? $\tau^{\prime} \tau \tau \alpha \rho \epsilon \varsigma, \tau \epsilon \in \sigma \sigma \alpha \rho \epsilon \varsigma$, Lat. quattuor, O.Ir. cethir, Goth.
fidwōr, Skr. catvắraḥ, Lith. keturì, four ; $\tau \epsilon$, Lat. .que,
 quīnque, O.Ir. cōic, Goth. fimf, Skr. páñca, Lith. penkì, five.
$\lambda u ́ k o s$, Goth. wulfs, Skr. vffkah, wolf; vv́g, vvктós, Lat. nox, noctis, Goth. nahts, Skr. nákti-, Lith. naktis, night; кúкдоs, OE. hwēol, Skr. cakráh, wheel; $\theta \alpha \lambda v \kappa \rho o ́ s ~: ~ \theta \alpha ́ \lambda \pi o s . ~$

Note.-r. Forms derived from the pronominal stem $\mathbf{q}^{\text {w }} \mathbf{o}$ have $\kappa$ instead of $\pi$, especially in the Ionic dialect of Herodotus
 the regular forms with $\pi$ are found on Ion. inscriptions; in Thess. kis also occurs beside tis. It is difficult to account for the $\kappa$-forms unless we may suppose that they first arose in combination with the negative particle, as in ov̋к $\omega \mathrm{s}$, ovँкıs, where the original velar would regularly become $\kappa$ because of the preceding $v$. In like manner may also be explained $\pi$ oддáкıs a new formation for older * $\pi$ o $\lambda \hat{v} \kappa$ кs.
2. In the Aeolic dialects $\pi$ occurs beside $\tau$ before palatal vowels, as Lesb. $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \sigma v p \epsilon \varsigma$, Hom. $\pi i ́ \sigma v \rho \epsilon \varsigma$, Boeot. $\pi \epsilon \in \tau \tau a \rho \epsilon \varsigma$, beside Att. $\tau \epsilon \in \tau \tau a \rho \epsilon s$; Lesb. Thess. $\pi \epsilon ́ \mu \pi \epsilon$ beside $\pi \epsilon \in \tau \epsilon$; Thess. $\pi \epsilon \hat{\sigma} \alpha a \iota$ beside Att. тeíoal.
3. Forms like $\lambda \epsilon$ 'ím $\epsilon s$, $\lambda \epsilon i ́ m \epsilon \epsilon$, $\lambda \epsilon$ ín $\epsilon \tau \epsilon$ were due to levelling out the regular $\pi$-forms $\lambda \epsilon i ́ \pi \omega$, $\lambda \epsilon i ́ \pi \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu$, $\lambda \epsilon i ́ \pi o v \sigma t$; and similarly

§ 203. $q^{w j}$ became $\tau \tau, \sigma \sigma$, as Att. $\pi \epsilon ́ \tau \tau \omega$, Ion. $\pi \epsilon ́ \sigma \sigma \omega$ : $\pi \epsilon ́ \psi \omega, \pi \epsilon \pi \tau o ́ s$, Lat. coquo, O.Slav. peką, 1 cook, bake, Skr. pácati, he cooks. See § 129, 7.
§ 204. $\pi \mu$ became $\mu \mu$, as $\lambda \epsilon ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota \mu \mu \alpha \iota: \lambda \epsilon$ ín $\omega$; oै $\mu \mu \alpha$ from *ö $\pi \mu \alpha$, cp. Lat. oculus, Lith. akis, eye. See § 117.

## $g^{W}$

§ 205. Indg. $\mathrm{g}^{\mathrm{w}}$ (= Lat. v but gu after $\mathbf{n}$, and g when the labialized element had been lost, O.Ir. b but $\mathbf{g}$ before old $\mathbf{j}$, Germanic $\mathbf{k w}, \mathbf{k}$, Skr. $\mathbf{g}$ but $\mathbf{j}$ before $\mathbf{i}$, and $\mathbf{a}=$ Indg. e, Lith. g, O.Slav. g but ž before palatal vowels) had
a threefold development in Greek. It became $\beta$ before all sounds except $\epsilon, v$ and $j ; \delta$ before $\epsilon ; \gamma$ before and after $v$, as $\beta a i v a, I$ go, Lat. venio, Goth. qima, I come, Skr. gámati, he goes, ja.gáma, he has gone; $\beta \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \alpha \nu 0$, Lat. glans, Lith. gilè, acorn ; $\beta \alpha \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega$, I throw, Skr. gálati, he trickles down; Boeot. $\beta \alpha \nu \bar{\alpha}$, O.Ir. ben, Goth. qinō, OE. cwene, O.Slav. žena, woman, Skr. gnắ, wife of a god ; $\beta \alpha \rho u ́ s$, Lat. gravis, Goth. kaúrus, Skr. gurúh, heavy ; $\beta$ ov̂s, Skr. gáuh, $o x$, O.Ir. bō, OE. cū, cow, Lat. bōs for *vōs is an UmbrianSamnitic loanword; Att. $\beta$ oú $\lambda \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota$ : Dor. $\delta \dot{\eta} \lambda \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota$; ${ }^{\prime \prime} \rho \epsilon \beta$ os, Goth. riqis, Skr. rájas-, darkness ; $\epsilon_{\epsilon} \beta \eta \nu,{ }_{\epsilon} \beta \bar{\alpha} \nu, I$ went, Skr. agāt, he went; $\tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \beta$ oos, fright, Lat. torvos, fierce, grim, Skr. tárjati, he threatens ; ф́́ßoн $\alpha$, I flee from, Lith. bégu, I flee, run.
$\delta \epsilon \lambda \phi u ́ s$, Skr. gárbhaḥ, matrix ; áóñ, gland, Lat. inguen, groin ; Dor. $\delta \dot{\eta} \lambda \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota:$ Att. $\beta$ ov́ $\lambda \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota$.

In a few words $\beta$ occurs before $\iota$ where we should regularly expect $\delta$, as $\beta i \bar{\alpha}$, bodily strength, force, might, Skr. jyă, jiyắ, supreme power, upper hand; Bios, life, Lat. vīvos, O.Ir. bīu, Goth. qius, Skr. jīváhe, alive ; $\beta$ lós, bow, Skr. jyă, bow-string. These forms have never been satisfactorily explained. Some scholars assume that $\mathrm{g}^{\text {wi }}$ regularly became $\beta \iota$ and that $\delta \iota \epsilon \rho o{ }^{\prime}$ is not etymologically connected with Skr. jīráḥ.
$\gamma \nu \nu \eta$ : Boeot. $\beta \alpha \nu \bar{\alpha}$; $\phi \in u ́ \gamma \omega$, $\notin \phi u \gamma o \nu: \phi \in ́ \beta o \mu \alpha \iota$; gen. oivó- $\phi \lambda v y$ os : gen. $\phi \lambda \epsilon \beta$ ós ; $\dot{v}-\gamma i \eta$ и́s, sound, healthy, lit. well living : $\beta$ íos.

Note.-I. In the Aeolic dialects $\beta$ occurs beside $\delta$ before palatal vowels, as Lesb. $\beta \bar{\epsilon} \lambda \phi \bar{i} \nu$,, Boeot. $\beta \epsilon \lambda \phi i v-$ : Att. $\delta \epsilon \lambda \phi i v-$; Boeot. $\beta \epsilon i \lambda o ́ \mu \epsilon v o s$, Thess. $\beta^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \epsilon \tau \alpha l$ : Dor. ס́ndєтal, Att. $\beta$ oú $\lambda \epsilon \tau \alpha l$.
2. Forms like $\phi о \beta \epsilon \omega$, фо $\beta \dot{\epsilon}$ о $\alpha$, were new formations after
 with $\beta$ from ${ }^{\prime \prime} \rho \epsilon \beta$ مos.
§ 206. $\mathrm{g}^{\mathrm{wj}}$ became $\zeta$, as $\nu i \zeta^{\prime} \epsilon \ell$, O.Ir. nigid, he washes,

Skr. nij., wash; $\lambda \alpha ́ \zeta о \mu \alpha \iota: \lambda \alpha \mu \beta \alpha ́ \nu \omega, \lambda \alpha \beta \epsilon i ้ \nu ; \zeta \hat{\eta} \nu: \beta \iota \omega ิ \nu \alpha \iota$, ínos. See § 129, $8 . ~_{8}$
§ 207. $\beta \nu$ became $\mu \nu$, as $\dot{\alpha} \mu \nu$ ós from * ${ }^{\alpha} \beta \nu o ́ s$, Lat. agnus ; $\sigma \epsilon \mu \nu o ́ s: \sigma \epsilon \in \beta о \mu \alpha \iota$; є́ $\rho \in \mu \nu$ о́s : ${ }^{\epsilon} \rho \in \beta$ Коs. See § 117.

## $q^{w h}$

§ 208. $q^{w h}$ was a rare sound in the parent language. In Skr. it fell together with original qh, in Lat. and Gr. with $\mathbf{g}^{\mathbf{w}} \mathrm{h}$, in Keltic and Germanic with $\mathbf{q}^{\mathrm{w}}$, in Lith. and O.Slav. with q, q". qúd $^{\mathrm{N}} \lambda \eta$, OE. hwæl, whale ; $\sigma \phi \alpha ́ \lambda \lambda о \mu \alpha \iota$, I stumble, Skr. skhalatē, he stumbles. See § 102.

## $g^{w h}$

§ 209. Indg. $\mathrm{g}^{\mathrm{w} h}$ (= Lat. finitially, v medially except that after n it became gu, O.Ir. g, Germanic $\mathbf{3 w}, \mathbf{3}, \mathbf{w}$, Skr. gh but $\mathbf{h}$ before $\mathbf{i}$, and $\mathbf{a}=$ Indg. e, Lith. g, O.Slav. $\mathbf{g}$ but $\check{z}$ before palatal vowels) had a threefold development in Greek. It became $\phi$ before all sounds except $\epsilon, v$ and $j$; $\theta$ before $\epsilon$; $\chi$ before and after $v$, as фaтós, Skr. hatáh for *ghatáḥ, killed, slain : фóvos, $\theta$ eiva ; фaıofós, beaming,
 ${ }_{\alpha} \lambda \phi \dot{\eta}$ older ${ }^{*} \dot{\alpha} \lambda \phi \bar{\alpha}$, produce, gain, Lith. algà, pay, reward; ò $\sigma$-фраívo $\mu \alpha$, I smell, Skr. ghrắti, he smells; acc. ví申a, Lat. nivem, nom. Lith. snẽ̃gas, Goth. snáiws, OE. snāw, snow ; $\nu \epsilon i \phi \epsilon \iota, \nu \grave{t} \phi \in \iota$ with $\phi$ for $\theta$ from forms like $\nu i ́ \phi \omega \nu$, $\nu \iota \phi o ́ \mu \in \nu o s$, Lat. ninguit, Lith. sniñga, it snows, O.Ir. snigid, it rains; ô $\phi \iota s$, Skr. áhiḥ, Lith. angis, Lat. anguis, snake, serpent.
$\theta \epsilon \rho \mu$ ós, Lat. formus, OE. wearm, warm, Skr. gharmáḥ, glow, heat, O.Ir. guirim, I heat, O.Slav. gorěti, to burn; $\theta \epsilon i v \omega$, Lat. of.fendo, I strike, O.Ir. gonim, I wound, kill, Skr. hánti, he strikes, slays, ghnánti, they strike.
 єن̈Xo $\quad \mu \alpha \iota, I$ pray, Skr. vāghát., institutor of a sacrifice;
 nail.
 See § 129, 7.

## The Spirants.

§ 211. The Indg. parent language had at least the two spirants $\mathbf{s}$ and $\mathbf{z}$. $\mathbf{s}$ occurred both initially, medially and finally. $\mathbf{z}$ only occurred in combination with a following media or media aspirata. In those languages where the mediae and mediae aspiratae became voiceless the $\mathbf{z}$ also became voiceless at the same time, as Goth. asts beside ó $\wp o s$, Indg. *ozdos, branch, twig; $\mu$ 渴ós beside Goth. mizdō, O.Slav. mǐzda, pay, reward. See §§ 224-6.
§ 212. Indg. s remained in the oldest Greek in the following cases :-
I. In combination with voiceless explosives, as $\sigma \pi \alpha i \rho \omega$, I struggle convulsively, Lith. spiriù, I push with the foot: Lat. spernere, to despise, OE. spornan, spurnan, to kick; ধ́ $\sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \circ$, Lat. vesper; $\sigma \tau \alpha \tau o ́ s$, Lat. status; ' $\sigma \sigma \tau i ́$, Skr. ásti, Lat. est, Goth. ist, Lith. ẽsti, is ; бкóтos, darkness, gloom, Goth. skadus, OE. sceadu, shade, shadow ; $\gamma \iota \gamma \nu \omega$ $\sigma \kappa \omega$, Lat. nōsco; $\sigma \phi \alpha ́ \lambda \lambda о \mu \alpha \iota, ~ I ~ s t u m b l e, ~ S k r . ~ s k h a l a t e ̄, ~ h e ~$ stumbles; $\sigma \chi i ́ \delta \omega$, Lat. scindo; $\lambda \epsilon i ́ \psi \omega, \gamma \rho \alpha ́ \psi \omega$ : $\lambda \epsilon i \not \beta \omega$, $\gamma \rho a ́ \phi \omega$; $\nless \xi \xi \omega \nu$, Lat. axis; $\lambda \epsilon \epsilon \xi \omega: \lambda \epsilon \gamma \omega$. But $\tau \sigma$ became $\sigma \sigma, \sigma$, as Hom. $\pi o \sigma \sigma i$, Att. $\pi \circ \sigma i ́$ beside Skr. patsú, see § 166.

Note.-Forms like téyos, OE. pæc, roof, O.Ir. teg, house, beside $\sigma \tau$ '́́रos, Lith. stógas, roof, probably existed already in the parent language, see § 112.
2. Intervocalic $\sigma \sigma$ became simplified to $\sigma$ in Attic, as aor. Hom. $\zeta^{\prime} \epsilon \sigma \sigma \alpha$, Att. ${ }^{\epsilon} \xi \in \epsilon \sigma \alpha: \zeta \xi \in \omega$, Skr. yásāmi, I seethe, bubble;

 after consonants $\sigma \sigma$ became simplified to $\sigma$ in all the dialects, as $\delta \dot{v} \sigma \tau \eta \nu 0$ from ${ }^{*} \delta \tilde{v} \sigma \sigma \sigma \tau \bar{\alpha} \nu o s ;$ loc. pl. Att. $\mu \eta \sigma i ́$, Cret. $\mu \eta \nu \sigma i ́$ from ${ }^{*} \mu \eta \nu \sigma-\sigma \iota$; late Gr. aor. $\tau \epsilon ́ \rho \sigma \alpha \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$ from ${ }^{*} \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \sigma \sigma \alpha \sigma \theta \alpha \iota: \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \sigma о \mu \alpha \iota$.
3. In combination with a preceding liquid (see however

 кó $\rho \sigma \eta$. This $\rho \sigma$ became $\rho \rho$ in Att., as $\theta$ 人́ $\rho \rho o s, ~ \ddot{\alpha} \rho \rho \eta \nu$, ко́рр $\eta$.
4. Finally, as $\lambda$ úkos, Lat. lupus, Goth. wulfs, wolf;
 Goth. baíráis, thou mayest bear.
§ 213. s became $\mathbf{h}$ in prim. Greek initially before vowels and medially between vowels, and then in the latter case the $\mathbf{h}$ disappeared altogether.

1. Initially: $\alpha^{\prime} \lambda \lambda o \mu \alpha \iota$, Lat. salio ; ${ }_{\alpha} \lambda$ s, Lat. sā1, OE. sealt, salt; ধ̈סos, Skr. sádas•, Lat. sēdes, seat; Є̈vos, Skr. sánaḥ, Lat. sen•ex, Goth. sin-eigs, Lith. sẽnas, old;
 Lat. septem, O.Ir. secht, Goth. sibun, Lith. septynì, seven; ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\prime \prime} \pi \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota$, Skr. sácatē, Lat. sequitur, he follows ; $\grave{\eta} \mu l$-, Skr. sāmí, Lat. sēmi., half; jó, Skr. sá, Goth. sa, the; it is difficult to account for $\sigma \hat{v} s$ beside $\hat{v} s$, Lat. sūs, OE. sū, sow, pig.

Initial h- disappeared in the prehistoric period of Greek when the next syllable or the next but one began with an aspirate, as ${ }^{\epsilon} \chi \chi \omega$ : ${ }^{\prime \prime} \xi \omega, \sigma \chi \bar{\eta} \sigma \omega$; ${ }^{\prime} \sigma \chi \omega$ from ${ }^{*}{ }^{i} \sigma \chi \omega$ older * $\sigma i ́ \sigma \chi \omega$; av̉os from *av̉hos older *havhos, Lith. saũsas,
 $\dot{\alpha} \mu \omega \hat{\omega}$. See § 115 .

Note.-In the prehistoric period of some of the Doric dialects and in the Lesb., Elean and Asiatic-Ionic dialects the spiritus asper became the spiritus lenis.
2. Medially (=Lat. $\mathbf{r}$, Goth, $\mathbf{z}$ but $\mathbf{r}$ in the other Germanic


 sutiza, OE. swētra, sweeter ; ťós, Lat. vìrus; gen. $\mu v o ́ s$, Lat. mūris; ע́́o $\mu \alpha \iota, I$ come, Skr. násatē, he joins; ov̋ar-, Lat. auris, OE. ēare, ear ; gen. pl. fem. Hom. $\tau \frac{\alpha}{\alpha} \omega \nu$, Skr. tấsam, Lat. is-tārum, Goth. pizō, masc. Goth. pizē, OE. pāra, of the; $\phi \epsilon ́ \rho \epsilon \alpha l, \phi \in ́ \rho \eta=$ Skr. bhárasē, Goth. baíraza.

See § 129, 9 for initial and medial sj; and § 124, 5 for initial and medial sw.
§ 214. Initial sm, sn became $\mu, \nu$ through the intermediate stage of $\mu \mu, \nu \nu$, as $\mu \epsilon \iota \delta \alpha^{\alpha} \omega$, I smile, Skr. smáyatē, he smiles: Hom. $\phi \iota \lambda o-\mu \mu \epsilon \iota \delta \dot{\eta} s ; \mu \epsilon i \rho o \mu \alpha \iota, I$ receive as my due, Skr. smárati, he remembers : Hom. 光- $\mu \mu о \rho \epsilon$; $\mu \in ́ \lambda \delta \omega$, OHG. smilzu, I melt ; $\mu i ́ \alpha$ from ${ }^{*} \sigma \mu \iota \alpha: \notin \nu$, Lat. sem•el; $\nu \epsilon \in, I$ spin, O.Ir. snāthe, thread: Hom. ${ }^{\epsilon}-\nu \nu \in o \nu$; acc. $\nu i ́ \phi \alpha$, Lat. nivem, nom. OE. snāw, Lith. snẽ̃gas, snow : $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \dot{\alpha}-$ v̀ı申os; vóos, mind, OE. snot(t)or, prudent, wise; vvós, Skr. snuṣ̆á, Lat. nurus, OE. snoru, daughter-in-law. It is difficult to account for the $\sigma \mu$-in $\sigma \mu \epsilon \rho \delta \alpha \lambda \epsilon \neq \rho, \sigma \mu \epsilon \rho \delta \nu o ́ s$, terrible, OE. smeortan, to smart; $\sigma \mu i \lambda \lambda$, knife for cutting or carving, OE. smip, smith, carpenter ; $\sigma \mu i k p o ́ s ~ b e s i d e ~$ $\mu i ̄ \kappa \rho o ́ s ; ~ \sigma \mu \bar{\nu} \chi \omega$, I burn in a smouldering fire, OE. smēocan, to smoke.

Medial sm, sn became $\mu \mu, \nu \nu$, which remained in Lesb. and Thess., but became $\mu, \nu$ with lengthening of the preceding vowel in the other dialects, as Lesb. Thess. $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \mu i$, Att. Ion. $\epsilon i \mu i ́$, Dor. $\grave{\eta} \mu i ́$, Skr. ásmi, Lith. esmì, I am; Att. $\hat{\eta} \mu \epsilon \nu$, Skr. ásma, we were; Lesb. ${ }^{\alpha} \mu \mu \in s$, Att. Ion. $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \hat{i} s$, Dor. Boeot. $\frac{\dot{\alpha}}{} \mu \epsilon ́ s$, Skr. asmá., we; Lesb. $\sigma \in \lambda \alpha ́ \alpha \nu \bar{\alpha}$, Att. $\sigma \epsilon \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \eta$, from * $\sigma \epsilon \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma \nu \bar{\alpha}$; Lesb. $\phi \alpha ́ \epsilon \nu \nu o s$, Ion. $\phi \alpha \epsilon \iota \nu o ́ s$, Att.

§ 215. Initial sr, sl became $\rho, \lambda$ through the intermediate stage of $\rho \rho, \lambda \lambda$, as $\rho \in \epsilon \hat{\imath}$, Skr. srávati, he flows: Hom. $\epsilon^{\epsilon}-\rho \rho \in o \nu$;

роф́́ $\omega$, Lith. srebiù, I gulp down; $\lambda \in i ́ \beta \omega$, Lat. lībo, I pour out, OHG. slifan, to slide, glide : Hom. ö $\phi \rho \alpha$ $\lambda \lambda \epsilon$ 'í $\alpha \nu \tau \epsilon$; $\lambda \eta ́ \gamma \omega, I$ cease, NE. slack : Hom. $\ddot{\alpha}-\lambda \lambda \eta \kappa \tau o s$.

Medial sr, sl became $\rho \rho, \lambda \lambda$, which remained in Lesb. after short vowels, but became $\rho, \lambda$ with lengthening of the preceding vowel in the other dialects, as Hom. $\tau \rho \eta \eta_{\rho} \omega \nu$ from ${ }^{*} \tau \rho \alpha ́ \sigma \rho \omega \nu: \tau \rho \epsilon ́(\sigma) \omega$; $\nu \alpha u ́ k \rho \bar{\alpha} \rho o s$ from ${ }^{*} \nu \alpha u ́ k \rho \alpha \sigma \rho o s ;$ Lesb. $\chi$ रé $\lambda \lambda \iota o l$, Att. Ion. $\chi$ єí $\lambda \iota o \iota$, Skr. sa-hásram, thousand; Lesb. ${ }_{i}^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \alpha 0 \%$, Att. $ٓ$ İ $\lambda \alpha o s$, from ${ }^{*} \sigma / \sigma \lambda \alpha F o s$.

Medial sr, sl became $\rho, \lambda$ after long vowels and diphthongs already in prim. Greek, as $\alpha u{ }^{\prime} \rho \iota o \nu$ from *av̉ $\sigma \rho \iota o \nu$, to-morrow, Skr. usráh, matutinal; $\sigma \epsilon \iota \rho o ́ s$ from * $\sigma \epsilon \iota \sigma \rho o ́ s:$ бध́ $\sigma \epsilon \iota \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$; $\theta \rho \alpha \nu \lambda o ́ s$ from * $\theta \rho \alpha v \sigma \lambda$ ós : $\theta \rho \alpha v \sigma \tau o ́ s$.
§ 216. Antevocalic ms, ns became $\mu \mu, \nu \nu$, which remained in Lesbian and Thessalian, but became $\mu, \nu$ with lengthening of the preceding vowel in the other dialects, as Lesb. ${ }_{\epsilon}{ }^{\prime} \nu \epsilon \mu \mu \alpha$, Att. Ion. ${ }^{\epsilon} \nu \nu \epsilon \epsilon \mu \alpha$, Dor. ${ }^{\epsilon} \nu \eta \mu \mu \alpha: \nu \epsilon \in \mu \omega ; \overleftarrow{\omega} \mu \sigma$ from * $\omega \mu \sigma \sigma$ s, Lat. umerus, Goth. ams, shoulder; ${ }^{\epsilon} \gamma \eta \mu \alpha$ from ${ }^{*} \epsilon \gamma \alpha \mu \sigma \alpha: \gamma \alpha \mu \epsilon \in \omega$. Gen. Lesb. $\mu \hat{\eta} \nu \nu o s$, Thess. $\mu \in \iota \nu \nu o ́ s$, Dor. Att. Ion. $\mu \eta \nu o ́ s$, Lat. mēnsis; gen. $\chi \eta \nu o ́ s: L a t$. anser, German gans, goose; Lesb. ${ }^{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \nu \nu \alpha$, Att. Ion. ${ }^{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \epsilon \nu \alpha$, Dor. ${ }_{\epsilon}{ }^{\prime} \mu \eta \nu \alpha: \mu \epsilon \in \nu \omega$; ${ }^{\prime \prime} \phi \phi \nu \nu \alpha$, ${ }^{\prime} \phi \bar{\alpha} \nu \alpha$ from ${ }^{* \prime \prime} \phi \alpha \nu \sigma \alpha: \phi \alpha i v \omega$; and


§ 217. Antevocalic 1s, rs. It is doubtful what is the regular development of these combinations in Greek. Some scholars assume that they regularly remained in prim. Greek when immediately preceded by the accent and that rs then became $\rho \rho$ in Attic, but that in other cases they had the same development as antevocalic ms, ns (§ 216). Other scholars assume that 1s, rs regularly remained except that the latter combination became $\rho \rho$ in

 $\delta \epsilon ́ \rho \omega$, ${ }^{\ell} \phi \theta \epsilon \iota \rho \alpha: \phi \theta \epsilon i \rho \omega,{ }^{\epsilon} \epsilon \sigma \bar{v} \rho \alpha: \sigma \bar{v} \rho \omega$ were new formations

 $\theta$ є́ $\rho \sigma o s$, Att. $\forall \alpha ́ \rho \rho o s ; ~ \theta \alpha \rho \sigma \epsilon ́ \omega, ~ A t t . ~ \theta \alpha \rho \rho \epsilon ́ \omega ; ~ H o m . ~ a ้ ~ \rho \sigma \eta \nu, ~$ Ion. Cret. ${ }^{\epsilon} \rho \sigma \eta \nu$, Att. ${ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \rho \rho \eta \nu$; кó $\rho \sigma \eta$, Att. кó $\rho \rho \eta$ : кov $\rho \in u ́ s$, oú $\rho \bar{\alpha}$ : Att. ỏppos. See however § 212, 3.
§ 218. $s$ between a tenuis and a following liquid or nasal became $\mathbf{h}$ and then combined with the preceding tenuis to form a tenuis aspirata, as $\sigma \tau \iota \phi \rho o ́ s$ from ${ }^{*} \sigma \tau \iota \pi \sigma \rho o ́ s: \sigma \tau \iota-$ $\beta \alpha \rho o ́ s ; \lambda u ́ \chi \nu o s$ from ${ }^{*} \lambda v k \sigma \nu o s: L a t$. lūna from ${ }^{*} l o u k s n a ̄$. For further examples see § 185.
§ 219. When intervocalic $\cdot \mathrm{h}$ - from $-\sigma$ - belonged to the second vowel it became transposed so as to stand in front of the first vowel, as Hom. $\epsilon \dot{v} \omega$, Lat. ūro, I burn, singe, Skr. óṣati, he burns; Hom. Att. ícpós, Dor. Boeot. Thess. ia oós, holy, Skr. ișiráh, swift, active, strong; єimó $\mu \eta \nu$ from
 was preceded by a tenuis the tenuis became tenuis aspirata, as $\phi \rho o \hat{\delta} \delta o s$ from ${ }^{*} \pi \rho o-h o \delta o s ; ~ \phi \rho o v \rho \bar{\alpha}$, Ion. $\phi \rho o v \rho \eta$ from ${ }^{*} \pi \rho o-h o \rho \bar{\alpha}$.
§ 220. When a tenuis came to stand before $\mathbf{h}$, it combined with the $\mathbf{h}$ to form a tenuis aspirata, as $\kappa \alpha \theta i \xi \omega$ : i" $\xi \omega$; $\epsilon \phi$ í $\sigma \tau \eta \mu \iota$ : í $\sigma \tau \eta \mu \iota$; and similarly in $\dot{\alpha} \phi i ́ \eta \mu \iota$ : í $\eta \mu \iota$; $\neq \phi \iota \pi \pi \circ$, $\tau \in \theta \rho \iota \pi \pi o \nu$ : ${ }^{\prime} \pi \pi \pi o s$.
§ 221. Interconsonantal $s$ disappeared when the first consonant was not a nasal and the last consonant was not $\mathbf{w}$ or $\mathbf{j}$, but in the combination $\mathbf{k s k}$ the first consonant disappeared (§ 186), as $\hat{\alpha} \lambda \tau o$, $\alpha^{\alpha} \lambda \mu \in \nu 0 s: \ddot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda o \mu \alpha \iota, \pi \alpha ́ \lambda \tau o:$
 $\pi \tau \epsilon \rho \nu \alpha$ from *$\pi \tau \epsilon \epsilon \rho \sigma \nu \alpha$; Hom. 入є́кто : ${ }^{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \xi \alpha$, and similarly
 *'єк $\sigma \tau \epsilon i ้ \nu \omega$, ${ }^{*} \epsilon \kappa \sigma \phi \epsilon ́ \rho \omega ; \gamma \epsilon \gamma \rho \alpha ́ \phi \theta \alpha \iota$ from ${ }^{*} \gamma \epsilon \gamma \rho \alpha ́ \pi \sigma \theta \alpha \iota:$ $\gamma \rho \alpha ́ \phi \omega$, and similarly $\delta \epsilon ́ \chi \theta \alpha \iota, \pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \epsilon \in X \theta \alpha \iota, \lambda \epsilon \lambda \epsilon i \not \subset \theta \alpha \iota$, $\tau \in \tau \rho \alpha ́ \phi \theta \alpha \iota, \tau \epsilon \tau \rho i \not \phi \theta \alpha \iota$.
 Thessal.) were due to sandhi relations. $\dot{\epsilon} \xi$ regularly
occurred before a following vowel, é $\kappa$ before consonants (except $\kappa$ ), and $\epsilon$ 's before $\kappa(\S 186)$.
§ 223. tsn became nn through the intermediate stage $\mathbf{z n}$,
 clay; $\delta \in ́ \nu \nu o s$ from $* \delta \epsilon \tau \sigma \nu 0$, see $\S 117$.

## $z$

§ 224. Indg. $z$ (generally written $\sigma$ before $\beta, \gamma$ ) remained before voiced mediae, but before voiced aspiratae it became voiceless at the same time the voiced aspiratae became voiceless (§ 103), as í $\zeta \omega$ from *sizdō, Lat. sido ; ó $\xi o s$, Lesb. vै $\sigma \delta o s$, Goth. asts, from *ozdos, branch, twig ; $\mu i \sigma \gamma \omega$ from *mizgō, I mix, Lith. mazgóti, to wash; and similarly $\pi \rho \epsilon ́ \sigma \beta v s, \sigma \beta \epsilon ́ \nu \nu \bar{v} \mu \iota$. $\mu \iota \sigma \theta^{\prime}$ ós from *mizdhos, Goth. mizdō, pay, reward; i' $\sigma \theta l$, Zend zdi from *zdhi, be thou; $\mu$ ó $\sigma$ Хos
 *ezghom.

## sh, zh

§ 225. The spirants $\mathbf{s h}$, $\mathbf{z h}$ only occurred in combination with tenues and mediae and arose in prim. Indo-Germanic from the combinations tenues aspiratae and mediae aspiratae + s, as tsh, psh, ksh, qsh; dzh, bzh, gzh, gzh from older ths, phs, khs, qhs; dhs, bhs, ghs, ghs. These combinations had in Greek the same development as the original tenues $+\mathbf{s}$, cp. fut. $\pi \epsilon$ í $\sigma o \mu \alpha \iota: \pi \epsilon ́ \nu \theta o s$, grief, sorrow, Lith. kę̃siu, I suffer, prim. Indg. *qent-sh- from *qenth-s•; $\psi \omega ́ \omega$, Irub in pieces: Skr. psấti, he chews, prim. Indg. *bzhō.
 *ghsen-

> p, ph ; đ, đh
§ 226. b and đ only occurred after palatals and velars which were originally unaspirated, as kp, qp, gđ, gđ. ph and đh only occurred after palatals and velars which were originally aspirated, as kph, qph, gđh, gđh from older
khp, qhb, ghđ, ghd. In the present state of our knowledge it is impossible to determine how these four spirants were pronounced in the parent language. In Greek they became t -sounds, and in Sanskrit, Latin, Germanic and the BalticSlavonic languages they became s-sounds:-(kp), krívis :
 tákṣ̌an-, carpenter; (qp), ктєiv : Skr. kṣ̌anṓti, he wounds, injures; (qph), $\phi$ Oivo : Skr. kṣ̆ịáti, he destroys; (gđh), $\chi \theta \omega \bar{\nu}$ : Skr. kṣ̌am-, earth.

## j

§ 227. It is doubtful whether the parent Indg. language had a spirant $\mathbf{j}$ beside $\mathbf{i}$-consonant (§ 118). The initial $\zeta$, which occurs in a few Greek words where the other Indg. languages have i-consonant, is probably due to a soundchange which took place in prim. Greek under conditions that have not yet been discovered. Examples are :- $\delta \epsilon \epsilon$ 向, spelt, Skr. yávaḥ, grain, corn ; ḉ $\omega$, Skr. yásāmi, I seethe, OHG. jesan, to ferment ; suyóv, Skr. yugám, Lat. jugum, Goth. juk, yoke ; $\varsigma^{\imath} \mu \eta$, leaven, Skr. yūṣ̌am, broth, Lat. jūs.

## CHAPTER VII

## SANDHI

§ 228. By sandhi is meant the changes which the initial and final sounds of words undergo when used in a wordgroup or sentence. The term is borrowed from the Sanskrit grammarians and means combination, lit. putting together. In dealing with sandhi it is necessary to distinguish between the sounds which begin and end a word-group or sentence and those which occur medially. In the former case the sound-changes are the same as those which take place at the beginning or end of a word when used alone, but in the latter case the changes are subject to the same laws which
obtain for the medial parts of a word. The result of these twofold changes often gives rise to what are called sentencedoublets. At a later period these sentence-doublets not unfrequently come to be used beyond their original sphere and then one of the forms becomes generalized and the other dies out. Greek like all the other Indg. languages has numerous examples of this kind, but for our present purpose two or three examples will suffice. In prim. Indg. -j alternated with -i in sandhi. The former was used when the next word began with a vowel and the latter when it began with a consonant, as in $\pi \rho o{ }^{\prime}$ from ${ }^{*} \pi \rho o \tau j$ (§ 167) beside $\pi \rho o \tau i ́, ~ c p . ~ \pi \rho o \sigma-\epsilon \in \theta \eta \kappa \alpha$ like Skr. práty adhām, but $\pi \rho о \tau \iota-\theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$ like Skr. práti dhāsyāmi. $\pi \rho \rho_{s}$ then came to be used before consonants and became generalized in Attic, whereas $\pi \rho o \tau i$ survived and $\pi \rho o ́ s$ disappeared in other dialects. Prepositional forms like $\dot{\alpha} \nu^{\prime}, \dot{\alpha} \pi^{\prime}, \kappa \alpha \tau^{\prime}, \dot{v} \pi^{\prime}$, regularly arose by elision when the next word began with a vowel, but already in Homer they came to be used before a following consonant and even underwent assimilation with it, as $\kappa \alpha \beta \beta \alpha ́ \lambda \lambda \omega, \dot{v} \beta \beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega$ beside $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha-$ $\beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega, \dot{v} \pi \pi \beta \alpha \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega$. The original ending of the acc. plural of o-stems was ons. This remained in prim. Greek in pausa and when the next word began with a vowel, but became os when the next word began with a consonant (§ 153). The former became generalized in Att. Ion. mild Dor. -ous, Boeot. and severe Dor. - $\omega$ s, Lesb. ools, and the latter in Arcad. and Thess. oos, whereas in Cretan the oovs and oos existed side by side. The nom. singular of n -stems originally ended partly in -ēn, -ōn and partly in -ễ, .ö̃ (§ 29). The former became generalized in Greek, the latter in Sanskrit, Latin and Lithuanian, whereas in prim. Germanic the two forms were preserved side by side. We have already seen in other parts of the Phonology that the sound-laws, which govern the pausa form of a word, vary considerably in the different languages, but
this is infinitely more so in regard to the laws of sandhi. It would therefore be beyond the plan and scope of this grammar to treat the subject from a comparative point of view. The phenomena of sandhi can be conveniently divided into two categories according as they relate to the end or the beginning of a word.

## i. Final Sounds.

§ 229. All vowels and diphthongs remained when abso-

 $\alpha \hat{v}, Z \in \hat{v}, \theta \in \hat{\alpha}, \lambda, \lambda u^{\prime} \omega, \& c$.

The vowels $-\alpha,-\epsilon,-o$ were elided before a following vowel in prim. Greek, and then after the analogy of these $-\iota$ was

 became extended to the final vowel of the first element of
 $i \pi \pi-\alpha \gamma \omega \gamma$ ós, $\begin{gathered}\epsilon \\ \pi \\ -\alpha \rho \omega \gamma o ́ s . ~ T h e ~ o ~ i n ~ \\ \pi \rho o ́, ~ \tau o ́ ~ w a s ~ n e v e r ~\end{gathered}$ elided. The antevocalic forms of prepositions were sometimes used for the anteconsonantal, cp. Hom. $\stackrel{\alpha}{\alpha} \nu$, к $\alpha$ át, $\pi \alpha ́ \rho$ for $\dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha ́, \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha ́, \pi \alpha \rho \alpha ́$. Elision also took place before a following ' and after the loss of $F$-, as $\nu \dot{\prime} \chi \theta$ ' ${ }^{\circ} \lambda \eta \nu=\nu$ v́кт


Beside elision we also find contraction with a following vowel (crasis). The reason for this twofold treatment is unknown. These contractions originally followed the rules for contraction in medial and final syllables (§§ 79, 80 ), and then at a later period the product of the contraction was determined by the quality of the initial vowel of the second word, as $\tau \hat{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha=\tau \grave{\alpha} \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha, \tau \frac{\dot{\alpha}}{} \gamma \alpha \theta \dot{\alpha}=\tau \grave{\alpha}$
 $=\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \dot{\omega}$ oì $\alpha, \dot{\omega} \gamma \alpha \theta \epsilon \in=\bar{\omega} \dot{\alpha} \gamma \alpha \theta \dot{\epsilon}$, Ion. Dor. $\dot{\omega} \nu \dot{\eta} \rho$ beside Att. $\frac{\hat{\alpha}}{\alpha} \eta \eta \rho=\dot{o} \dot{\alpha} \nu \eta \eta \rho$, and similarly Att. $\tau \frac{\alpha}{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho o ́ s, \tau \dot{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho i ́$.

Consonantal $-\iota$ in the combinations - $\alpha$, ,ol regularly dis-
appeared in prim. Greek before a following vowel (§ 128), and then the $-\alpha,-o$ was either elided or contracted with the



 the pausa and anteconsonantal form came to be used before vowels and then the $-\iota=\cdot \mathbf{j}$ was preserved and pronounced as the initial of the following word, as $\kappa \alpha i \dot{\epsilon} \pi i=$ $\kappa \alpha-\jmath \epsilon \pi \iota$, Hom. ${ }^{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho \alpha \mu o \iota{ }^{\epsilon} \not \subset \nu \epsilon \pi \epsilon=\mu$ ŏ $j \epsilon \nu \nu \epsilon \pi \epsilon$.

Simple long vowels were shortened when the next word began with a vowel, hence the metrical rule :-'vocalis ante vocalem corripitur,' as Hom. $\pi \lambda \alpha ́ \gamma \chi$ Ө̆̆ $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \iota$ T $T \rho o i ́ \eta s$, Att.


Long diphthongs were shortened in prim. Greek when the next word began with a consonant (cp. §70), hence -ol, $-\alpha \iota$ beside $-\omega,-\alpha$ in the dat. singular of $o$ - and $\bar{\alpha}$-stems, the former of which became generalized in some dialects, and the latter in others, see $\$ \S 321,325$.
§ 230. All originally final explosives disappeared, as

 quid, ${ }^{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \omega$, O.Lat. estōd, $\tau$ ó, Skr. tád, Lat. is-tud, ${ }^{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \lambda_{0}$, Lat. aliud, $\kappa \hat{\eta} \rho$, cp. $\kappa \alpha \rho \delta i \bar{\alpha}$, Lat. cord-is, voc. $\pi \alpha \hat{\imath}: \pi \alpha \iota \delta o ́ s$.
 from ${ }^{*} \hat{\eta} \kappa \tau$, he spoke, voc. ä้ $\alpha \alpha: \not \alpha^{2} \nu \alpha \kappa \tau o s$.

Note.-Prepositional forms like $\dot{a}^{\prime} \pi^{\prime}, \dot{v} \pi^{\prime}, \kappa \alpha \tau^{\prime}$ regularly preserved their final consonant after the apocope of the vowel or else became assimilated to the following consonant (§ 228), and similarly with the negative oviк, oủx (before a rough breathing).

Indg. final $\cdot \mathrm{m}$ became $\cdot \mathrm{n}$ in prim. Greek and thus fell together with original $\cdot \mathrm{n}$, as ${ }^{\epsilon} \phi \in \rho \rho \nu$, Skr. ábharam, $\epsilon^{\prime \prime} \eta \nu$, Skr. syấm, O.Lat. siem, $\tau$ óv, Skr. tam, Lat. is.tum, 入úкov, Skr. vốkam, Lat. lupum, $\pi \alpha \tau \rho \omega \hat{\nu}$, Skr. piṭ̄nấm ; on ${ }^{\prime \prime} \nu$,
$\chi \theta \omega \nu, \chi \iota \omega \nu$, see $\S 141$. Original $\cdot \mathrm{n}$ and the $\cdot \mathrm{n}$ from older $\cdot \mathrm{m}$ became $-\mu$ before labials, $-\gamma(=\cdot \eta)$ before gutturals, and completely assimilated to a following liquid, nasal or $\sigma$-, although the $-\nu$ was often retained in writing, as $\bar{\epsilon} \mu \pi \dot{\imath} \pi \tau \tau$,

 $\sigma v ́ \sigma \sigma \omega \mu$ s. On the so-called $\nu \dot{\epsilon} \phi \in \lambda \kappa \nu \sigma \tau \iota \kappa o ́ v$, see $\S \S 306$, 316.

In prim. Indg. s alternated with $\cdot \mathbf{z}$. The former occurred in pausa and before voiceless explosives, and the latter before voiced explosives. The $\mathbf{z}$ was probably preserved in Greek before voiced mediae, although it was not indicated in writing. On forms with and without final $-s$, as in $\dot{\alpha} \mu \phi \dot{\prime} s, \pi o \lambda \lambda \alpha ́ \kappa \iota s$, ov́ $\tau \omega s$ beside $\dot{\alpha} \mu \phi i ́, \pi o \lambda \lambda \alpha ́ \kappa \iota$, ov̌ $\tau \omega$, see § 575.

Tenues became aspirates before a rough breathing, as
 ${ }_{i} \boldsymbol{\eta} \mu \iota, \kappa \alpha \theta \alpha \iota \rho \epsilon{ }^{\prime} \omega=\kappa \alpha \tau-\alpha i \rho \epsilon \epsilon \omega . \quad-\delta+$ rough breathing became $\theta$, as oú $\theta \epsilon i ́ s$, où $\theta \epsilon \in \nu=o u \delta^{\prime} \epsilon i \hat{s}$, oư $\delta^{\prime}{ }^{\epsilon} \nu$.

## 2. Initial Sounds.

§ 231. On the contraction which took place when one word ended in a vowel and the following word began with a vowel, see § 229 . On the development of prothetic
 see § 77.
 $\sigma \epsilon \lambda \lambda i i_{\S} \omega$ are probably sentence-doublets, but the conditions under which they arose are unknown.

Geminated consonants, which arose from assimilation, were preserved in prim. Greek, but became mostly simplified already in the prehistoric period of the language when the words containing them were used alone or began the sentence, as $\hat{\rho} \epsilon i$, Skr. srávati, beside $\begin{gathered}\epsilon \\ -\rho \rho \epsilon \iota, \text { Skr. }\end{gathered}$ á-sravat, $\rho \dot{\eta} \gamma \nu \bar{v} \mu \iota: \frac{\epsilon}{\epsilon}-\rho \rho \eta \xi \alpha, \alpha{ }^{\prime}-\rho \rho \eta \kappa \tau о s, \mu \epsilon i ́ \rho о \mu \alpha \iota: ~ \frac{~}{\epsilon}-\mu \mu о \rho \epsilon$,
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 $\sigma \alpha ́ \kappa o s: \phi \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon-\sigma \sigma \alpha \kappa \eta ́ s$, Boeot. $\tau \grave{\alpha} \pi \pi \frac{\grave{\alpha}}{\mu} \mu \alpha \tau \alpha: \pi \hat{\alpha} \mu \alpha$.

On forms like $\dot{\alpha} \phi \dot{\iota} \eta \mu \iota=\dot{\alpha} \pi-\dot{\imath} \eta \mu \iota$, see § 230. The rough breathing regularly disappeared after $-\sigma,-\nu,-\rho$, as in $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma$,
 again after the analogy of the simplex. The initial rough became the smooth breathing in Asiatic Ionic, Lesbian, Elean and in a part of the Cretan dialect.

## CHAPTER VIII

## THE FORMATION OF NOUNS AND ADJECTIVES

§ 233. In the formation of nouns and adjectives it is necessary to distinguish between the so-called root-nouns (§ 234) and nouns and adjectives which contain a suffix or formative element ( $\S \S 235-86$ ). Little is known of the origin of the numerous suffixes in the parent Indg. language and in the oldest periods of the separate languages. It is probable that most of the suffixes had originally an independent meaning and that in some cases they were independent words which sank down to be merely formative elements already in prim. Indo-Germanic. There is no reason to doubt but that many of the Indg. suffixes arose in the same or similar manner as we see them arise in the history of the individual languages, cp. the English suffixes -dom, -hood, -ly, all of which existed as independent words in the oldest period of the language, as cynedōm, kingdom, frēodōm, freedom, beside the simplex dōm, Goth. dōms, judgment; cildhād, childhood, prēosthād, priesthood, beside the simplex hād, rank, grade, Goth. háidus, manner; gēarlic, yearly, mennisclic, human, beside the simplex lic,

Goth. leik, body. It should be noted that when a suffix is added to a stem which already contains a suffix, it is called a secondary suffix, as in $\phi \epsilon \in \rho \sigma \sigma \alpha$ from * $\phi \epsilon \rho \sigma$ $\nu \tau-j \alpha, \mu \alpha \nu \tau \iota-\kappa o ́-s: \mu \alpha ́ \nu \tau t-s, \pi \epsilon \rho \nu \sigma t-\nu o ́ s: \pi \epsilon ́ \rho \nu \sigma \iota$. Prior to the time when case-endings, personal endings, \&c. came into existence, the only difference between nouns and verbs was one of meaning and not merely of form. And this is the reason why so many of the same suffixes occur in the formation both of nouns and verbs, and similarly with reduplication, as in $\beta \alpha \dot{\alpha} \rho \beta \alpha \rho o s, \gamma^{\epsilon} \rho \gamma \in \rho o s$,
 $\tau \in ́ \tau \alpha \nu 0 s, \& c . \quad$ See § 429.

In the following paragraphs the suffixes are divided into two great classes according as they end in a vowel (§§ 23568) or a consonant (§§ 269-86).

## I. Root-Nouns.

§ 234. Root-nouns, that is nouns in which the caseendings are added to the bare root without an intervening suffix or formative element. The root-nouns originally had various ablaut-grades in the different cases, but already in the parent Indg. language the levelling out of one or other of the ablaut-grades began to take place whereby one or more of the grades entirely disappeared. This process of levelling went still further in the prehistoric period of the separate languages with the result that one or other of the grades often became generalized throughout all the case-forms. In Greek the root-nouns may be divided into two categories, viz. those which preserve two or more ablaut-grades, and those which have the same grade throughout all case-forms.
I. Nouns which preserve two or more ablaut-grades, as $\pi o u ́ s$, Dor. $\pi \omega ́ s$, Skr. pắt, Lat. pēs, OE. fōt ; acc. $\pi$ ó $\delta \alpha$, Skr. pấdam, Lat. pedem (cp, prep. $\pi$ 白 $\delta \alpha$ ), OE. fōt ; gen. mooós, Skr. padáḥ, Lat. pedis, see § 342.

## 118 Formation of Nouns and Adjectives [§235

$\beta o v ̂$ from * $\beta \omega u$ s, Skr. gấuh ; acc. Dor. $\beta \hat{\omega} \nu$, Skr. gá́m; gen. ßoós, see § 339.
$Z$ é́s from *djếus, Skr. dyấuḥ ; acc. Z $\hat{\eta} \nu$, Skr. dyấm ; gen. $\Delta$ lós, Skr. diváh, see § 337.
 see § 346.
2. Nouns which have the same ablaut-grade throughout all case-forms. The strong grade was generalized in $\kappa \rho^{\prime} \epsilon \in \xi$, $\phi \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \psi, \delta o \rho \rho \xi, o ̛ \psi, \phi \lambda o ́ \xi ;$; the lengthened grade in $\theta \omega \bar{s}, \kappa \lambda \omega \psi$, $\rho \dot{\omega} \xi, \sigma \kappa \omega \dot{\psi}, \pi \tau \omega \bar{\xi}, \tau \rho \omega \xi, \phi \dot{\omega} \rho, \stackrel{\omega}{\psi} \psi,{ }^{\theta} \dot{\eta} \rho, \kappa \hat{\eta} \rho$ from ${ }^{*} \kappa \eta \rho \delta$ (§ 230), $\psi \eta \rho$; and the weak grade in $\theta \rho i \xi$, is (§ 330 ), vi申a
 (§ 334), and similarly $\mu \hat{\jmath} s$, ód $\phi \hat{v} s, \hat{v} s$.

In $\nu \alpha \hat{v}$ from ${ }^{*} \nu \bar{\alpha} v s$, Skr. nắuh the long diphthong was levelled out into all the cases already in the parent Indg. language, see § 336.

## 2. Suffixes ending in a Vowel.

§ 235. -jā.. This suffix was chiefly used in the formation of feminine nouns and adjectives from the masculine of $\mathbf{u}$ and consonant-stems, as $\dot{\eta} \delta \epsilon i \hat{i} \alpha$ from ${ }^{*} \sigma F \bar{a} \delta \epsilon F j \alpha$ : $\eta \quad \delta \tilde{v}_{s}=$ Skr. svādví : svādúh, sweet, and similarly $\beta \alpha \rho \epsilon i \alpha, \gamma \lambda v \kappa \in i ̂ \alpha$, $\pi \lambda \alpha \tau \epsilon i \alpha$; $\tau \in \kappa \kappa \tau \alpha \iota \nu \alpha$ from * $\tau \epsilon \kappa \tau \alpha \nu j \alpha: \tau \epsilon \in \kappa \tau \omega \nu=$ Skr. takṣ̆ṇí: tákṣ̌an-, carpenter, and similarly $\gamma \in i ́ \tau \alpha \iota \nu \alpha, ~ \theta \in p a ́ \pi \alpha \iota \nu \alpha$, $\lambda_{\epsilon ́ \alpha \iota \nu \alpha, ~ \& c . ; ~-\alpha \iota \nu \alpha ~ b e c a m e ~ e x t r a c t e d ~ a s ~ a n ~ i n d e p e n d e n t ~}^{\text {a }}$ suffix for the formation of the feminine of the names of persons and animals from o-stems, as $\dot{\eta} \mu \iota \theta^{\prime} \alpha \iota \nu \alpha, \kappa \alpha ́ \pi \rho \alpha \iota \nu \alpha$,
 rantī : bhárant-; $\chi \alpha \rho i ́ \epsilon \sigma \sigma \alpha$ from ${ }^{*}$ - $F \in \tau j \alpha$; סó $\tau \epsilon \iota \rho \alpha$ from
 from *-Fєбja, Ion. $\gamma \in$ yovvîa from *-vбja : Skr. -uṣ̌i (§ 552); $\gamma \lambda \omega \bar{\omega} \sigma \alpha$ from ${ }^{*} \gamma \lambda \omega \chi j \alpha, \theta \hat{\eta} \sigma \sigma \alpha$ from ${ }^{*} \theta_{\eta} \tau j \alpha, \& \mathrm{c}$.; in this manner was also occasionally formed the feminine from o-stems, as $\pi \bar{t} \epsilon \iota \rho \alpha: \pi \bar{\iota} \epsilon \rho o ́ s=$ Skr. pīvarí $:$ pìvaráḥ; єं $\tau \alpha i ́ \rho \alpha$ : є́т $\tau \rho o s, \mu o i ̂ \rho \alpha: \mu o ́ \rho o s$.

On the form of the nominative singular in Greek and for further examples see § 322.
§ 236. The suffixes $\cdot \mathbf{0} \cdot$, - $\bar{a}$.. The $\cdot 0$ originally formed the second syllable of dissyllabic light bases and was regular in such words as $\lambda$ úkos, Skr. vŗkaḥ, Lat. lupus, from an original Indg. form *wlóqós, wolf, and similarly in suyóv, Skr. yugám, Lat. jugum, yoke. From such words the $\cdot \boldsymbol{o}$ - became extracted as a suffix and was extended to bases which had not originally the accent on the second syllable (cp. § 456). The -o- stood in ablaut relation to -ejust as in the verbal forms $\phi \epsilon ́ \rho о-\mu \in \nu: \phi \epsilon ́ \rho \epsilon-\tau \epsilon$, cp. $\lambda \tilde{́} \kappa о-s$, Skr. vf̆ka-h, Lat. lupu-s: voc. $\lambda$ úкє, vf́ka, lupe. In like manner the $\cdot \bar{a} \cdot$ probably formed originally the second syllable of dissyllabic heavy bases (cp. § 458) from which the -ā- was extracted as a suffix already in the prim. Indg. period and then became used for the formation of the feminine.

With the suffixes $\cdot 0 \cdot$, $\cdot \bar{a}$ - were formed a large number of nomina actionis, nomina agentis, verbal abstract nouns, and adjectives, as $\beta \rho o ́ \mu o s, ~ \gamma o ́ v o s, ~ \delta \rho o ́ \mu о s, ~ \lambda o ́ \chi o s, ~ \pi \lambda o ́ o s, ~ \tau o ́ k o s, ~$
 with changed meaning, as $\delta \delta o \rho o s$ (Skr. dámaḥ) : $\delta € \epsilon \mu \omega$, and
 (Skr. véśaḥ, Lat. vīcus), $\pi \lambda$ ókos, poóos, $\sigma \tau$ pó $\phi o s, \sigma \tau o i ̂ \chi o s$,

 precārī.
$\dot{\alpha} \mu o \iota \beta \dot{\eta}, \dot{\alpha} \circ \iota \delta \dot{\eta}, \beta \alpha \phi \dot{\eta}, \beta о \lambda \dot{\eta}, \gamma о \nu \dot{\eta}, \nu о \mu \dot{\eta}, \pi \lambda о \kappa \dot{\eta}, \pi о \mu \pi \dot{\eta}$, $\sigma к о \pi \dot{\eta}, \sigma \pi о v \delta \dot{\eta}, \sigma \tau \in \gamma \eta, \sigma \tau \rho о \phi \eta_{1}, \tau о \mu \eta_{1}, \tau \rho о \pi \eta ́, \tau \rho о \phi \dot{\eta}, \tau \rho \circ \chi \eta$, $\phi \theta_{\circ} \rho \bar{\alpha}, \phi о \rho \bar{\alpha} ; \delta i ́ k \eta, \mu \alpha ́ \chi \eta, \rho i \tau \eta \dot{\eta}, \phi \cup \gamma \eta$ (Lat. fuga). $\beta \circ \rho \bar{\alpha}$,
 $\kappa о ́ \rho \eta$, \&c.
aiӨós, ßopós, 入oıтós, $\sigma \tau \rho \alpha$ ßós, то $o$ ós, форós.
With $\cdot \mathbf{o} \cdot, \cdot \overline{\mathrm{a}} \cdot$, as secondary suffixes, were formed nouns
 $\pi i ̂ \alpha \rho$. $\pi \epsilon \in \delta o \nu$ (Skr. padám) : *ped•, foot, $\pi \epsilon \in \lambda \epsilon \kappa \kappa o \nu$ from

* $\pi \epsilon ́ \lambda \epsilon \kappa v o \nu: \pi \epsilon ́ \lambda \epsilon \kappa v s, ~ \ddot{\alpha} \sigma \tau \rho о \nu: \dot{\alpha} \sigma \tau \eta ́ \rho, \hat{\eta} \tau \rho o \nu: \hat{\eta} \tau \rho \rho . \pi \tau v \chi \eta \dot{\eta}:$ $\pi \tau \hat{v} \xi, \phi \rho \bar{\alpha} \tau \rho \bar{\alpha}: \phi \rho \bar{\alpha} \tau \eta \rho, \phi \rho \hat{\kappa} \kappa \eta$ : $\phi \rho \stackrel{i}{\xi} \xi$.
§ 237. -(i) jo-, (i) jā-. These suffixes were chiefly used in the parent Indg. language for the formation of ( I ) denominative adjectives, (2) verbal adjectives, and (3) adjectives with a comparative meaning. The neuter and feminine of (I) and (2) often became used as nouns in Greek.
I. Denominative adjectives, as ï $\pi \pi / \iota o s$, Skr. áśvyaḥ:
 äyplos, äptıos, youфíos, dios (Skr. divyáḥ), סóx $\mu$ oos,

 after the analogy of which were formed nouns like $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda i \bar{\alpha}$, бофía.
$\lambda_{\iota} \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \iota o s: \lambda \iota \mu \dot{\eta} \nu, \delta \alpha \iota \mu o ́ \nu \iota o s: \delta \alpha i ́ \mu \omega \nu$, and similarly $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \omega \bar{\nu} \iota \iota o s$,

$\pi \alpha ́ \tau \rho l o s$, Skr. pítr(i)yaḥ, Lat. patrius: $\pi \alpha \tau \eta{ }^{\prime} \rho$, pitár., pater, $\sigma \omega \tau \dot{\eta} \rho \iota o s: \sigma \omega \tau \eta \rho$, and similarly $\alpha i \theta \epsilon ́ \rho \iota o s, \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \iota o s$,
 $\theta \epsilon \lambda \kappa \tau \dot{\eta} \rho \iota o \nu . \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \kappa \tau о \rho i \bar{\alpha}, \sigma \omega \tau \eta \rho i \bar{\alpha}$. From forms like $\theta \epsilon \lambda \kappa \tau \dot{\eta}-$ pıos was extracted the suffix - $\tau \eta \rho \iota o$ - which became used in
 $\tau \dot{\eta} \rho \iota o s ; \dot{\alpha} \kappa \rho о \bar{\alpha} \tau \eta ́ \rho \iota o \nu, \delta \epsilon \iota \pi \nu \eta \tau \eta \dot{\eta} \iota \circ \nu$.
$\pi \epsilon$ §ós (Skr. padyáḥ) from *$\pi \epsilon \delta j o s, \grave{\eta} \mu \alpha ́ \tau \iota o s: ~ \grave{\eta} \mu \alpha \rho$ (gen.

 $\dot{o} \rho \nu i t i o v, \pi \alpha \iota \delta i o v$. From forms like $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \pi i \delta i o \nu: \dot{\alpha} \sigma \pi i s$ (gen. $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \pi i(0) s)$ was extracted the suffix -ídıo- which became used in forming neuter diminutives like $\alpha \gamma \rho i ́ \delta \iota o \nu, \alpha \dot{\alpha} \delta \in \lambda \phi i \delta \delta o \nu$,


 joios; after the analogy of which were formed díkalos, סoú $\lambda \epsilon \iota o s, ~ i ̈ \pi \pi \epsilon \iota o s, ~ \chi \rho u ́ \sigma \epsilon l o s, ~ \& c$.
$\dot{\alpha} \gamma o \rho \alpha i ̂ o s: ~ a \dot{\alpha} \gamma \rho \bar{\alpha}$, and similarly $\dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \gamma \kappa \alpha \hat{i} o s, \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \iota \pi \epsilon ́ \rho \alpha l o s$,
$\pi \epsilon \tau \rho \alpha i o s$, after the analogy of which were formed ódaios, $\nu \eta \sigma \alpha i ̂ o s$.
With -ejo- (=-єo-, Skr. -aya., Lat. •eo-) were formed
 $\phi \lambda o ́ \gamma \epsilon о \varsigma, \chi \rho v ́ \sigma \epsilon o s ; ~ c p . ~ L a t . ~ a u r e u s, ~ i g n e u s, ~ l a p i d e u s . ~$

 $\gamma^{\prime} \varphi \nu \nu \varsigma, \chi^{\prime} \lambda \epsilon \iota \nu \nu: \chi^{\prime} \lambda \nu s$.

Att. $\beta \alpha \sigma^{\prime} \lambda \epsilon i o s, \chi^{\alpha} \lambda \kappa \epsilon \iota o s$, Ion. $\beta \alpha \sigma i \lambda \dot{\eta} \iota o s, \chi^{\alpha} \lambda \kappa \dot{\eta} \iota o s$, from $-\eta$ Ftos older $-\eta$ Fijos, after the analogy of which was formed Att. $\pi o \lambda \epsilon ́ \mu \epsilon \iota o s$, Ion. $\pi o \lambda \epsilon \mu \eta$ $ו o s: \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \mu o s$.
 $\pi \alpha ́ \gamma l o s, \sigma \tau u ́ \gamma l o s, \sigma \phi a ́ \gamma l o s . ~ \sigma \phi a ́ \gamma i o v . \mu \alpha \nu i \bar{\alpha}, \pi \epsilon v i ́ a ̄$.
3. With originally comparative meaning, as $\alpha \vec{\alpha} \lambda$ 入os ( $\S$ 129, 2), Lat. alius, Goth. aljis, other; $\mu \bar{\epsilon}(\sigma) \sigma o s$ from * $\mu$ ' $\theta j$ jos, Skr. mádhyaḥ, Lat. medius, Goth. midjis, middle.
4. From adverbs ending in $-t$, and from the locative in $-t$, as $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau i ́ o s: \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau i ́, \dot{\alpha} \rho \tau \iota o s: \ddot{\alpha} \rho \tau \iota, \pi \rho \omega \iota \iota o s: \pi \rho \omega i ́ ; ~ \dot{\epsilon} \nu \alpha ́ \lambda \iota-o s$,

§ 238, $\cdot$ wo., •wā-. These suffixes were comparatively rare in the parent Indg. language, and did not become very productive in any of the separate languages. Examples are : ím $\pi$ os (§ 124, 2), Skr. áśvaḥ, Lat. equos, horse, Att. ${ }_{0}{ }^{\prime} \lambda o s$, Ion. oû̀os (Skr. sárvaḥ) from * $\sigma 0 \lambda$ Fos, Att. $\sigma \tau \in \nu o ́ s$, Ion. $\sigma \tau \epsilon \tau \nu$ ós from * $\sigma \tau \epsilon \nu F o s$, ópOós (Skr. ūrdhváḥ, Lat. arduus), Hom. $\tau \in ́ \lambda \epsilon \cos$ from ${ }^{*} \tau \in \lambda \in \sigma$ Fos, and similarly $\beta \alpha \lambda$ cós, $\delta \epsilon \xi \in \iota o ́ s, \dot{\eta} i \theta \in o s, \lambda a \iota o ́ s$ (Lat. laevos), oios, $\pi \in \lambda \iota o ́ s, \pi 0 \lambda \iota o ́ s$, $\sigma \kappa \alpha l o ́ s ~(L a t . ~ s c a e v o s), ~ \phi \alpha ı o ́ s, ~ \phi a \lambda ı o ́ s, ~ к \in \nu o ́ s, ~ I o n . ~ к \in i v o ́ s, ~$
 Ion. oûpos, Att. kópos, kóp $\eta$, Ion. kồpos, кoúp $\eta$, Hom. îoos, Att. ívos from *Fito Fos. $\pi$ oíā.
§ 239. $\cdot$ mo-, -mā were chiefly used in the formation of verbal abstract nouns, many of which became concrete in Greek, as $\alpha^{\nu} \nu \epsilon \mu o s, \dot{\alpha} \rho \delta \mu \mu^{\prime} s, \dot{\alpha} \rho \mu o ́ s, \dot{\alpha} \rho \pi \alpha \gamma \mu o ́ s, \theta \bar{v} \mu o ́ s, \theta \omega \mu o ́ s$, ī̄ $\gamma \mu o ́ s, \kappa \alpha ́ \lambda \alpha \mu о \varsigma, ~ к \epsilon ́ \rho \alpha \mu о \varsigma, ~ \kappa \in \nu \theta \mu o ́ s, ~ к \eta \rho \bar{v} \gamma \mu o ́ s, ~ к \nu \eta \mu o ́ s, ~ к о \rho \mu o ́ s, ~$

 like $\delta 0 \chi \mu o ́ s, ~ \theta \epsilon \rho \mu o ́ s(S k r . ~ g h a r m a ́ h, h e a t, ~ L a t . f o r m u s), ~ \sigma \tau \mu o ́ s . ~$
$\dot{\alpha} \kappa \mu \dot{\eta}, \gamma \nu \dot{\omega} \mu \eta$, $\theta_{\epsilon} \rho \mu \eta$, к $\nu \dot{\eta} \mu \eta$, $\lambda_{o ́ \chi} \mu \eta$, $\mu \nu \dot{\eta} \mu \eta$, ó ó $\mu \dot{\eta}$, ó $\rho \mu \dot{\eta}$, $\pi v \gamma \mu \dot{\eta}, \sigma \kappa \alpha ́ \lambda \mu \eta \eta, \tau \bar{\iota} \mu \dot{\eta}, \phi \dot{\eta} \mu \eta, \chi^{\alpha} \rho \mu \eta$.

Beside -mo-, -mā- there also occur -dhmo-, dhmā-, where -dh- is the so-called root-determinative found in verbs like $\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \omega$ (§ 475), and more rarely -smo-, smā-, tmo-, tmā-, as $\dot{\alpha} \rho \theta \mu o ́ s, \dot{\alpha} \rho i \theta \mu o ́ s, \beta \alpha \theta \mu o ́ s, \gamma \in \nu \theta \mu o ́ s, \kappa \eta \lambda \eta \theta \mu o ́ s, \kappa \lambda \alpha v \theta \mu o ́ s$,

 and with regular loss of interconsonantal $-\sigma$ - (§ 185) in


-i.mo., where $\cdot \mathbf{i}$ - was of various origin, was used as a secondary suffix in the formation of adjectives like $\alpha{ }^{\prime \prime} \sigma \iota \mu \circ$,



§ 240. -meno•, -menā- were used in the formation of the medio-passive participles. The original forms probably were -méno- (preserved in the perfect participles, as $\pi \epsilon \pi v$ -
 participles like bódhamānaḥ), and -mnó (preserved in Greek in forms like $\sigma \tau \dot{\alpha} \mu \nu \nu \varsigma, \beta \in \bar{\epsilon} \epsilon \mu \nu \nu \nu$, крí $\mu \nu \nu \nu$; cp. Lat. alumnus, autumnus), see § 553.
§ 241. $\cdot$ no•, $\cdot \mathrm{na} \cdot$ - occur as primary and secondary suffixes in the formation of a large number of nouns and adjectives.
I. Primary in aîvos, ả $\mu \nu o ́ s, \theta \rho o ́ \nu o s, \theta \hat{v} \nu o s, \kappa \alpha \pi \nu o ́ s, ~ \kappa u ́ k \nu o s$, oìvos, ơkvos, $\tau$ óplos, v̌rvos (Skr. svápnaḥ), фр̂̂vos, xpóvos,


áyvós (Skr. yajñaḥ̣), Hom. $\alpha \lambda \alpha \pi \alpha \delta \nu o ́ s, ~ \gamma \nu \mu \nu o ́ s, ~ \delta \epsilon \iota \nu o ́ s$, $\lambda \alpha \dot{\gamma} \nu \nu o s, \lambda i ́ \chi \nu o s$, рiкvós, $\sigma \in \mu \nu o ́ s, \sigma \mu \in \rho \delta \nu o ́ s, \sigma \pi \alpha \rho \nu o ́ s, \sigma \tau \epsilon \gamma \nu o ́ s$, бтvy ós.
 $\nu v \kappa \tau \epsilon \rho \iota \nu o ́ s, \pi \epsilon \rho v \sigma \iota \nu o ́ s: \pi \epsilon \rho v \sigma \iota, \chi \epsilon \iota \mu \in \rho \iota \nu$ ós，\＆c．фаєєขós from ＊$\phi \alpha F \epsilon \sigma \nu 0 s: \phi \dot{o} o s$, and similarly $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu o ́ s$, é $\lambda \epsilon \epsilon \iota \nu o ́ s, k \in \lambda \alpha-$ $\delta \epsilon \iota \nu o ́ s ; \sigma \epsilon \lambda \eta \eta_{\nu} \eta: \sigma \epsilon \in \lambda \alpha s$ ．
§ 242．$-\alpha \nu 0$－，$-\alpha \nu \bar{\alpha}$－in nouns and adjectives，as koípavos，

 $\theta \eta \gamma \alpha ́ \nu \eta, \mu \eta \chi \alpha \nu \eta$ ，$\sigma \tau \epsilon \gamma \alpha ́ \nu \eta, \sigma \tau \epsilon \phi \alpha ́ \nu \eta$ ．
$\beta \dot{\alpha} \sigma \kappa \alpha \nu 0 s$, édavós，iк $\alpha \nu o ́ s, ~ o ̈ \lambda i ́ \sigma \theta \alpha \nu o s, ~ \pi \iota \theta \alpha \nu o ́ s, ~ \sigma \kappa \in \pi \alpha \nu o ́ s, ~$ $\sigma \tau \epsilon \gamma \alpha \nu$ ós．
§ 243．－ino－，used in forming adjectives denoting material，

 ф入óyıvos，$\chi$ útpılvos．
§ 244．－ino．，－inā－，used in forming adjectives and nouns， as $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \chi \iota \sigma \tau i v o s, \gamma \in \lambda \alpha \sigma i v o s, ~ \grave{\epsilon} \rho v \theta \rho i ̀ \nu o s, k \in \sigma \tau \rho i ̀ \nu o s$, коракivos，
 dīvinus，equīnus，suinus．
$\delta \in \lambda \phi \alpha \kappa i ̀ \eta, \pi o \lambda \nu \pi 0 \delta i t \nu \eta, \chi o \iota \rho \frac{1}{\nu} \eta$ ．
§ 245．－s•no－，－s－nā－，used in forming nouns and adjectives， as $\dot{\alpha} \rho \alpha ́ \chi \nu \eta$ from＊$\dot{\alpha} \rho \alpha \kappa \sigma \nu \bar{\alpha}, \lambda \tilde{\chi} \chi^{\nu}$ os from＊$\lambda \nu \kappa \sigma \nu o s(\S 185)$ ， and similarly $\alpha^{\alpha} \chi \nu \eta, \pi \alpha ́ \chi \nu \eta$ ；$\lambda \alpha ́ \chi \nu 0 s, \mu o ́ \rho \phi \nu o s, \sigma \nu \chi \nu o ́ s$, $\delta^{\prime} \varphi \nu \nu 0 s$ from＊$\delta \epsilon \tau \sigma \nu 0 s$ ．
§ 246．$\cdot \sigma v v o \cdot,-\sigma v \nu \bar{\alpha}-$ ．The origin of these secondary suffixes is unknown．They were used in forming adjectives the feminine of which became used as abstract nouns，as $\gamma \eta \theta_{o ́ \sigma v \nu o s, ~ \delta o v \lambda o ́ \sigma v \nu o s, ~}^{\text {Ó́ } \rho \sigma v \nu o s ~ f r o m ~ * ~} \theta \alpha \rho \sigma o-\sigma v \nu o s, ~ \pi i ́ \sigma v \nu o s ~$
 $\mu o \sigma \dot{v} \nu \eta, \sigma \omega \phi \rho \circ \sigma v ́ \nu \eta$ ；after the analogy of these were formed $\kappa \in \rho \delta o \sigma v ́ v \eta$ ：кє́ $\rho \delta o s$（neut．），$\mu \alpha \nu \tau o \sigma v ́ \nu \eta: \mu \alpha ́ \nu \tau \iota s, \& c$ ．
§ 247．－lo．，lā－，used both as primary and secondary suffixes，especially the latter，in the formation of nouns and adjectives．

I．Primary，as $\beta \eta \lambda o ́ s, ~ \gamma a v ̂ \lambda o s, ~ \gamma a v \lambda o ́ s, ~ к a v \lambda o ́ s, ~ \sigma \tau v ̂ \lambda o s, ~$ тú入os；そú入入ov，$\sigma \kappa u ̂ \lambda o \nu, ~ \phi u ̂ \lambda o \nu, ~ \pi \epsilon ́ \tau \alpha \lambda o \nu ; ~ \zeta \epsilon u ́ \gamma \lambda \eta, ~ \theta \eta \lambda \eta ́$,
 $\kappa \in \phi \alpha \lambda \eta$.


 $\pi \omega \lambda \dot{\eta}, \phi \epsilon \iota \delta \omega \lambda \dot{\eta}$.
$\dot{o}^{\mu} \alpha \lambda o ́ s, \pi^{1} \alpha \lambda o s, \chi \theta \alpha \mu \alpha \lambda o ́ s, \dot{\alpha}(F) \in \dot{\prime} \delta \in \lambda o s, \delta \in \epsilon \lambda o ́ s, \sigma \tau v \phi \in \lambda o ́ s$, áyкú入os, $\delta \rho i ̄ \mu v ́ \lambda o s, ~ \dot{\eta} \delta u ́ \lambda o s, \pi \alpha \chi v \lambda o ́ s, \alpha \dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \tau \eta \lambda o ́ s, \sigma i ̄ \eta \eta$ ós, $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \rho \bar{\gamma} \eta \lambda$ ós, $\mu \bar{\iota} \mu \eta \lambda$ ós, $\sigma \tau \rho \circ \beta \bar{\imath} \lambda o ́ s, \phi \epsilon \iota \delta \omega \lambda$ ós. From forms like $\dot{\eta} \delta u ́ \lambda o s, \pi \alpha \chi v \lambda$ ós with diminutive meaning was extracted the suffix -v $\mathbf{\lambda} 0$ - which became extended to forms like
 extensions $-v \lambda \lambda o^{-},-v \lambda \lambda \iota \sigma^{-},-v \lambda \lambda \iota \delta \cdot, v \lambda \lambda \iota \delta \iota o$, as $\kappa \alpha \theta \dot{\alpha} \rho v \lambda \lambda o s: ~$
 (-ídos) : $\alpha<\alpha \nu \theta i ́ s ~(-i ́ \delta o s), ~ \mu \epsilon \iota \rho \alpha к v \lambda \lambda i ́ \delta \iota o \nu: ~ \mu \epsilon \iota \rho \alpha ́ к \iota о \nu . ~ \pi i ̄ \alpha \lambda \epsilon ́ о s ~$
 $\kappa \rho \bar{v} \mu \alpha \lambda \epsilon$ 'оs, from which $-\alpha \lambda$ '́os was extracted as a suffix and ex-

§ 248. -ro-, •rā-, used both as primary and secondary suffixes in the formation of nouns and adjectives.
ı. Primary, as $\alpha$ 人 $\rho o ́ s$ (Skr. ájraḥ, Lat. ager, Goth. akrs),
 ő $\mu \beta \rho o s, \tau \alpha ́ \lambda \alpha \rho o s, ~ \tau \alpha \hat{v} \rho o s$ (Lat. taurus), Xí $\mu \alpha \rho o s ; ~ \delta \hat{\omega} \rho o \nu$, $\pi \lambda \epsilon v \rho o ́ v ;{ }^{\prime \prime} \delta \rho \bar{\alpha}, \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \phi \rho \eta, \chi^{\omega} \rho \bar{\alpha}$.
đ̛к $\rho o s$, є́ $\rho v \theta \rho o ́ s ~(S k r . ~ r u d h i r a ́ h ̣, ~ L a t . ~ r u b e r), ~ \lambda \alpha \mu \pi \rho o ́ s, ~$ $\lambda \epsilon \pi \rho o ́ s, \lambda v \pi \rho o ́ s, \quad \mu \alpha \kappa \rho o ́ s, \mu i k \rho o ́ s(\sigma \mu i k \rho o ́ s), \mu \hat{\omega} \rho o s, \pi \iota \kappa \rho o ́ s$, $\sigma \alpha \pi \rho o ́ s, ~ \sigma \iota \nu \delta \rho o ́ s, ~ \sigma \kappa \lambda \eta \rho o ́ s, ~ \tau \rho \eta \rho o ́ s, \phi \alpha \iota \delta \rho o ́ s, \chi \hat{\eta} \rho o s, \chi \lambda \omega \rho o ́ s$, Хоípos, $\psi v \delta \rho o ́ s, \psi \omega \rho o ́ s ; ~ \beta \rho \iota \alpha \rho o ́ s, ~ \gamma \epsilon \rho \alpha \rho o ́ s, ~ i a p o ́ s, ~ \lambda ı \pi \alpha \rho o ́ s, ~$ $\pi i ̄ \rho o ́ s, ~ v i \delta \alpha \rho o ́ s . ~$
2. Secondary, as $\pi \epsilon \nu \theta \epsilon \rho o ́ s, \pi \tau \epsilon \rho o ́ v$, ä $\rho \gamma v \rho o s$, $\zeta ́ \epsilon \notin v \rho o s$, $\mu \alpha ́ \rho т и р о s$.

 кıvuрós, $\lambda \iota \gamma v \rho o ́ s, ~ \mu \omega \lambda u \rho o ́ s, \psi ı \theta u \rho o ́ s, ~ a ̀ \nu \iota \bar{\alpha} \rho o ́ s, ~ \dot{\alpha} \sigma \eta \rho o ́ s, ~ o ́ d v-~$

§ 249. The suffixes .bho-, -bhā- became productive in Greek, especially in the formation of the names of animals, as $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \kappa \alpha ́ \lambda \alpha \phi o s, ~{ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \lambda \alpha \phi o s,{ }^{\epsilon} \rho \iota \phi o s, k \iota \delta \alpha ́ \phi \eta$, кídaфos, кípaфos, кópaфos, кó $\sigma \sigma v \phi o s$, Att. кótтvфos, $\sigma \epsilon ́ \rho \phi o s . ~ a ̀ \lambda \phi o ́ s, ~ \epsilon ้ \delta \alpha \phi o s$,
 $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \iota \phi o s$. From the nouns in - $\alpha \phi$ os was formed the diminutive suffix - $\alpha \phi \iota \circ \nu$, as in $\theta \eta \rho \alpha ́ \phi \iota \circ \nu$, $\xi v \lambda \alpha ́ \phi \iota o \nu$, छ̌v $\alpha$ á申ıv.
§ 250. -dhlo-, -dhlā-. The origin of these suffixes is unknown. Examples are: $\gamma^{\prime} \nu \in \theta \lambda o \nu$, $\epsilon^{\prime} \delta \in \theta \lambda o \nu, \theta^{\prime} \epsilon \in \Theta \lambda o \nu$, $\theta \dot{v} \sigma \theta \lambda o \nu ; \gamma \in \nu \in ́ \theta \lambda \eta$, $i \mu \alpha ́ \sigma \theta \lambda \eta$; $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \sigma \theta \lambda o ́ s$.
§ 251. dhro., dhrā-, used in formingnouns and adjectives,
 $\kappa o ́ \rho \eta \theta \rho o \nu, \mu \epsilon ́ \lambda \pi \eta \theta \rho o \nu, \pi \epsilon ́ \lambda \epsilon \theta \rho o \nu, \pi \lambda \epsilon ́ \theta \rho o \nu, \rho \in \hat{i} \theta \rho o \nu, \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \theta \rho o \nu$; $\kappa о \iota \mu \dot{\eta} \theta \rho \bar{\alpha}, \kappa \rho \in \mu \alpha \dot{\alpha} \theta \rho \bar{\alpha}$.
$\beta \lambda \omega \theta \rho o ́ s, \lambda \alpha ́ \lambda \eta \theta \rho o s, \sigma \kappa \in \theta \rho o ́ s, \sigma \kappa v \theta \rho o ́ s$.
§ 252. •ko-, -kā-, or •qo-, -qā-. These secondary suffixes were common in all the languages, especially in the forms -iko-, -ikā- which started out from i-stems ( $\mu \alpha \nu \tau \iota \kappa$ ós : $\mu \alpha ́ \nu \tau t-s)$ and then became extended to other kinds of stems,

 $\tau \bar{i} \mu \eta \tau \iota \kappa o ́ s, \phi \nu \tau \iota \kappa o ́ s ; ~ c p . ~ L a t . ~ m o d i c u s . ~ і є ́ \rho \overline{\alpha к о s, ~ \pi i ́ \theta \eta к о s, ~}$ Dor. $\pi i$ їа̄коs ; $\pi \rho о ́ к \alpha: ~ \pi \rho o ́ ; ~ Ө \eta ́ к \eta . ~$

In derivatives of jo-formations we have -九акоs, as кароьакós, кӣрıакós, $\pi \lambda о v \sigma \iota \alpha \kappa o ́ s, ~ \sigma к ı \alpha к o ́ s . ~$
§ 253. .sko., -skā- are related to the presents in -sko-
 * $\delta$ ıкбкos (§ 186).

It is doubtful whether the -sk- in -isko-, iskā- is of the same origin. These suffixes became productive, especially in the formation of diminutives, as $\dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi i \sigma \kappa o s, \delta \in \sigma \pi \sigma \tau i \sigma k o s$, $\nu \epsilon \bar{\alpha} \nu і ́ \sigma к о s, \quad$ оікі́бкоs, $\pi \alpha \iota \delta i ́ \sigma к о s, ~ \chi о \iota р і ́ \sigma к о s ; ~ \dot{\alpha} \sigma \pi \iota \delta i ́ \sigma к \eta$, оікїкк,$\pi \alpha \iota \delta i ́ \sigma \kappa \eta$, v̇סрí $\kappa \eta$.
§ 254, tero-, terā- were common suffixes in the forma-
tion of comparatives from adjectives, adverbs, nouns and pronouns, as коvф́́тєроs, $\sigma о \phi \dot{\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho о s, ~} \gamma \lambda v \kappa и ́ \tau \epsilon \rho о s, \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \tau \epsilon-$





§ 255. .tewo-, tewā-, used in the formation of verbal
 $\tau \bar{\iota} \mu \eta \tau$ є́ $\varsigma$, see § 556.
§ 256. -tlo-, -tlā. which are of doubtful origin, as in

§ 257. -tro-, used especially in the formation of neuter nouns denoting an implement, as áporpov (Lat. arātrum),

 $\tau \epsilon ́ \rho \epsilon \tau \rho \circ \nu, \phi \epsilon ́ \rho \epsilon \tau \rho о \nu(\phi \bar{\epsilon} \rho \tau \rho \circ \nu)$.
§ 258. to-, tā-, These suffixes were chiefly used in the parent Indg. language in the formation of verbal adjectives, and of ordinal numerals.
r. The verbal adjectives had originally the accent on the suffix and the base had accordingly the weak grade of ablaut, but in Greek as in other languages the verbal adjective was sometimes formed direct from the present with the strong grade of ablaut, as $\ddot{\alpha}-\iota \sigma \tau o s, \ddot{\alpha}-$ крı $\tau \sigma s, \ddot{\alpha}$ $\nu \iota \pi \tau o s$, ä- $\pi v \sigma \tau o s, \beta a \tau o ́ s$ (Skr. gatáḥ, Lat. in-ventus), $\delta \rho a \tau o ́ s(\delta \alpha \rho \tau o ́ s): ~ \delta \epsilon ́ \rho \omega$, , $\lambda \lambda v \tau o ́ s(S k r$. šrutáh, Lat. in-clutus),
 $\tau \alpha \tau o ́ s ~(L a t . ~ t e n t u s), ~ \phi a \tau o ́ s, ~ \phi \theta i \tau o ́ s, ~ d ं-\delta \alpha ́ \mu \mu \alpha \tau o s, \ddot{\alpha}-\kappa \rho \bar{\alpha} \tau o s$, $\beta \rho \omega \tau o ́ s, ~ \gamma \nu \omega \tau o ́ s$ (Skr. jñ̄̄̄táh, Lat. nōtus), סotós (Lat. datus), 白 $\lambda \alpha \tau o ́ s$, ' $\epsilon \mu \epsilon \tau o ́ s$ (Lat. vomitus), $\theta \in \tau o ́ s$ (Skr. hitáh), $\theta \nu \eta \tau o ́ s, \kappa \mu \eta \tau o ́ s, \sigma \tau \alpha \tau o ́ s$ (Skr. sthitáh, Lat. status), $\sigma \tau \rho \omega \tau o ́ s ;$ §єvктós beside Skr. yuktáh, and similarly $\gamma \in v \sigma \tau o ́ s, \phi \in \rho \tau o ́ s$, $\phi є \cup к \tau о ́ s, \pi \eta \kappa \tau o ́ s . \quad$ See § 555.

The masculine, feminine and rarely the neuter of the
verbal adjectives often came to be used as abstract nouns (sometimes with concrete meaning) in Greek as also in
 тоs, ка́ $\mu \alpha \tau о \varsigma, \nu \iota \phi \in \tau o ́ s, ~ \nu o ́ \sigma \tau o s, ~ o i ̂ \tau o s, ~ \pi \alpha \gamma \epsilon \tau o ́ s, ~ \pi \lambda o v ̂ \tau o s, ~$

 $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon v \tau \eta$. $\sigma \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \rho \tau о \nu, \phi u \tau o ́ v$.

The feminine abstract nouns, which came to denote persons, became masculine and then took - $s$ in the nominative and formed their gen. singular after the analogy of the o-declension (§ 323), and similarly with the denominatives


 $i \pi \pi o ́ \tau \eta s, ~ к о \rho v \sigma \tau \eta ́ s, ~ \pi o \lambda v \beta о u ́ \tau \eta s, ~ \sigma \tau \rho \alpha \tau i \omega ́ \tau \eta s, \tau \in \lambda \epsilon \sigma \tau \eta{ }^{\prime} s$, $\tau 0 \xi \underline{\sigma} \tau \eta s, \phi \bar{u} \lambda \epsilon ́ \tau \eta s$. After the analogy of ó申ìt $\eta s$ : ő $\phi \iota s$,
 $\tau \epsilon \chi \nu \grave{\tau} \tau \eta s: \tau \epsilon ́ \chi \nu \eta$.
2. In ordinals, as $\tau \rho i ́ \tau o s, ~ \tau \epsilon ́ \tau \alpha \rho \tau o s ~(L a t . ~ q u a r t u s), ~$ $\pi \epsilon ́ \mu \pi \tau o s($ Lat. quīntus, Lith. peñktas), ধ̈ктos (Lat. sextus, Goth. saíhsta), ס́́катоя, єikобтós, \&c. See §§ 389-93.

On the superlative ending - $\tau \alpha \tau 0-$, as in $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta^{\prime} \epsilon \sigma \tau \alpha \tau o s$,
 фє́ртатоs, фí入татоs, \&c., see § 377, 4.
§ 259. -is-to-, -is-tā- (Skr. -iștha-, Goth. -ista-), used in the formation of the superlative of adjectives, as in $\alpha{ }^{\prime \prime} \sigma \chi<-$

 $\sigma \tau o s, \pi \lambda \epsilon i ̂ \sigma \tau o s, \pi \rho \omega ́ \tau \iota \sigma \tau o s, \tau \alpha ́ \chi \iota \sigma \tau o s, \phi \epsilon ́ \rho \iota \sigma \tau o s, \chi \in i \rho \iota \sigma \tau o s$. See § 377, 2.
§ 260. -i. This suffix is probably identical in origin with the $\cdot \mathrm{i}$ - which occurs in the second syllable of dissyllabic heavy bases (cp. § 481). In Greek it is fairly common in nouns but rare in adjectives, as ${ }^{\alpha} \rho \delta \iota \iota, \delta \hat{\eta} \rho \iota s$ : $\delta \epsilon \in \rho \omega$, ${ }^{\prime \prime} \rho \iota s, \mu \hat{\eta} \nu \iota s$, őıs, oîs (Skr. áviḥ, Lat. ovis, Lith. avis),
 $\tau \rho o ́ \pi \iota s, \tau \rho o ́ \chi \iota s ; \tau \rho o ́ \phi \iota s$. On the various grades of ablaut which originally occurred in the different cases see § 328. The oblique cases of some $\mathbf{i}$-stems were often formed after
 enemy), acc. ${ }^{\epsilon} \rho \iota \nu$ beside gen. ${ }^{\epsilon} \rho \rho \iota \delta o s, ~ \& c ., ~ \mu \hat{\eta} \nu \iota s, \tau \rho o ́ \pi \iota s$, gen. $\mu \eta \nu_{\nu} \delta o s, \tau \rho o ́ \pi \iota \delta o s$.
§ 261. The suffixes -mi•, -ni., -ri• were very rare in Greek as also in most of the other Indg. languages, as ${ }^{\prime \prime} \lambda \mu \mu \mathrm{s}$, worm, $\theta^{\prime} \mu$ is (gen. $\theta^{\prime} \epsilon i \tau o s, \theta^{\prime} \mu i \delta o s$ after the analogy of stems ending in a dental), $\phi \hat{\eta} \mu \iota s$; $\epsilon \hat{v} v \iota s$; äkpıs, ơkpıs (Skr. ášrihe, Lat. ocris) ; íopis.
§ 262. The suffix -ti• became productive in all the Indg. languages in the formation of primary verbal abstract nouns of the feminine gender. The root-syllable had originally the weak grade of ablaut, as $\beta \alpha \dot{\sigma} \iota \iota$ (Skr. gátiḥ),

 $\theta \epsilon \in \sigma \iota s, \sigma \tau \alpha \dot{\sigma} \tau \iota$ (Skr. sthítih), $\phi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \iota s$; д̈ $\eta \sigma \iota s, \beta \rho \hat{\omega} \sigma \iota s, \gamma \in \nu \in \sigma \iota s$,
 $\phi \rho \dot{\sigma} \iota \iota, \phi \dot{\sigma} \sigma \iota s$. Forms with the strong grade of ablaut in the root-syllable were new formations, as ${ }_{\alpha} \mu-\pi \omega \tau \tau s, \delta \in i \hat{\xi} \iota s$ (cp. Skr. diṣ̆tih), ${ }^{\prime} \kappa-\lambda \epsilon \iota \psi \iota \varsigma, \zeta \in \hat{v} \xi \iota s(S k r$. yuktih), $\lambda \hat{\eta} \xi \iota \varsigma$,
 ко́ $\sigma \mu \eta \sigma \iota \iota$, ö $\bar{\alpha} \sigma \iota \iota, \phi o ́ \rho \eta \sigma \iota s$. The masculine $\mu \alpha ́ \nu \tau \iota s$ was also originally a feminine abstract noun. See § 169.
§ 263. -i. (but -ij. before vowels, cp. Skr. nadíh, river, gen. nadíyah, \&c.), used in forming feminine nouns and adjectives. The nouns and adjectives containing this suffix mostly came to be inflected after the analogy of dental-stems already in prim. Greek ( $\$ \mathbf{3 3 0}, \mathbf{3 4 3}$ ), cp. Hom. $\eta{ }_{\eta} \nu \bar{\iota} s$ (acc. $\left.\eta \nu \nu \bar{\nu} \nu\right), \kappa \nu \eta \mu i \bar{s}$, gen. $\kappa \nu \eta \mu i \hat{\delta} o s$, and similarly $\beta \lambda o-$ $\sigma v \rho \dot{\omega} \pi i \bar{s}, ~ \epsilon \dot{\jmath} \pi \lambda о к \alpha \mu i \bar{s}$.
§ 264. -u. This suffix was used in the tormation of nouns and adjectives, especially the latter, as $\beta \alpha \theta$ ús, $\beta \alpha \rho u ́ s$ (Skr.
gurúḥ, Goth. kaúrus), $\beta \rho \alpha \delta u ́ s, \beta \rho \alpha \chi u ́ s, \gamma \lambda u \kappa u ́ s, ~ e ̀ \lambda \alpha \chi u ́ s$,
 (Skr. bahúḥ), $\pi \lambda \alpha \tau u ́ s, \pi o \lambda u ́ s(S k r$. purúhe), $\tau \alpha \rho \phi u ́ s, \tau \rho \bar{\alpha} \chi u ́ s$,
 hánuḥ, Goth. kinnus), $\gamma$ ท̂pus, $\sigma \tau \alpha ́ \chi v s$; $\gamma \lambda \alpha \dot{\phi} v$, , $o ̛ v v$ (Skr. jấnu), סóov (Skr. đấru), $\mu$ é $\theta v$ (Skr. mádhu), $\pi \hat{\omega} v$. See § 343. On the various grades of ablaut which originally occurred in the different cases see § 331.
§ 265. The suffixes $\mathbf{l u} \cdot$, $\cdot \mathbf{n u} \cdot$, •ru• were very rare in Greek as also in the other Indg. languages, as $\theta \hat{\eta} \lambda \nu u s$ (Skr. dhārúḥ̆) ; 入ıvvús, Hom. Opŋ̂vvs; ßót $\rho v s, ~ \delta \alpha ́ \kappa \rho \nu v(L a t . ~$ lacru-ma).
§ 266. .tu-, especially used in the formation of verbal abstract nouns which are feminine in Greek, but masculine in Latin and mostly also in Aryan and the Germanic languages, as $\dot{\alpha} \kappa o \nu \tau \iota \sigma \tau u ́ s, \dot{\alpha} \lambda \alpha \omega \tau u ́ s, \dot{\alpha} \pi-\epsilon \sigma \tau u ́ s: ~ \in ̇ \epsilon \tau i ́, \dot{\alpha} \rho \pi \alpha-$ ктús, dं $\rho \tau u ́ s($ Lat. artus), ḋ $\sigma \pi \alpha \sigma \tau u ́ s, ~ \beta o \eta \tau u ́ s, ~ \beta \rho \omega \tau u ́ s, \gamma \rho \alpha-$ $\pi \tau u ́ s, ~ \delta \alpha \iota \tau u ́ s, ~ e ́ \delta \eta \tau u ́ s, ~ i ̌ \tau u s ~(L a t . ~ v i t u s), ~ k \lambda \epsilon i \tau u ́ s ~(\kappa \lambda i ̄ \tau u ́ s)$, ó $\rho \chi \eta \sigma \tau u ́ s, \pi i \not \tau v s$ (Skr. pitúḥ), $\pi \circ \theta \eta \tau u ́ s, \rho \dot{\rho} \sigma \tau \tau \alpha \tau u ́ s, \phi \rho \alpha \sigma \tau u ́ s$, $\chi^{\alpha \lambda \epsilon \pi \pi}$ ús. This type of noun became very productive in Ionic. The same suffix also occurs in the neuter nouns ä $\sigma \tau v$ (Skr. vástu, place), фîtv, and in feminine numerals like $\tau \rho \iota \tau \tau u ́ s, ~ \tau \epsilon \tau \rho \alpha \kappa \tau u ́ s, \pi \in \nu \tau \eta \kappa o \sigma \tau u ́ s$, ék $\kappa \tau о \sigma \tau u ́ s, \chi i ̄ \lambda \iota \sigma \sigma \tau u ́ s$.
§ 267. - $\overline{\mathrm{u}} \cdot$ (but •uw• before vowels, cp. Skr. tanû́h, body, gen. tanúvaḥ), used in forming feminine nouns, as i $\lambda \hat{u} s$,
 to this type preserved their original inflexion (§334) in Greek, Aryan and the Baltic-Slavonic languages, but in the other languages they went over into the $\mathfrak{u}$-declension.
§ 268. Prim. Greek •ēu• (but -ēw• before vowels) occurs almost exclusively in the formation of nomina agentis, as
 $\pi о \mu \pi \epsilon$ ús, токєús, фoveús, фopєús. For the inflexion of nouns belonging to this type see § 334. The origin of the - èu-, which is not found in the other Indg. languages, has
never been satisfactorily explained. According to Brugmann, Griech. Grammatik (§ 182) it probably started out from verbal adjectives in $-\eta-F(0)$ - to verbs in $-\epsilon \in$, as *фор $\eta F(o) s$ (cp. форךтós) : форе́ $\omega$ which would regularly become фopeús (§ 63).

## 3. Suffixes ending in a Consonant.

§ 269. -en- with the various ablaut-grades -en-, on', -ēn, -ōn, -n. but $\cdot \mathrm{n}$. before consonants, see § 345. This suffix had various functions. It was especially used in the formation of nouns denoting (I) animate objects, as $\dot{\alpha} \rho \eta \gamma \omega \varphi$, $\gamma \epsilon i \not \tau \omega \nu, \kappa v ́ \omega \nu$ (Skr. švván-), $\sigma \tau i \not \gamma \omega \nu, \tau \epsilon \in \kappa \tau \omega \nu$ (Skr. tákṣ̆an-), $\tau \rho \bar{u} \gamma \omega \nu, \dot{\alpha} \rho \dot{\eta} \nu, \alpha_{\alpha} \rho \sigma \eta \nu\left(\alpha{ }^{\prime} \rho \rho \eta \nu\right.$, Ion. $\left.{ }^{\prime} \rho \sigma \eta \nu\right)$ ) $\alpha \mathfrak{\alpha} \theta \omega \nu, \gamma \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma \tau \rho \omega \nu$, $\gamma \nu \alpha ́ \theta \omega \nu, \delta \rho o ́ \mu \omega \nu, \kappa \bar{v} \phi \omega \nu, \sigma \tau \rho \alpha ́ \beta \omega \nu, \tau \rho i ́ \beta \omega \nu, \tau \rho \eta ́ \rho \omega \nu, \psi v \theta \dot{\omega} \nu ;$ oúpavíco : oúpóvıos, from this and similar forms the -í $\omega \nu$ was extracted and extended to o-stems, as $\delta \epsilon i \lambda \alpha \kappa \rho i \omega \nu$ : $\delta \epsilon i \lambda \alpha \kappa \rho o s, \mu \alpha \lambda \alpha \kappa i \omega \nu: \mu \alpha \lambda \alpha \kappa o ́ s$. (2) Parts of the body, as $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \kappa \dot{\omega} \nu, \beta o v \beta \dot{\omega} \nu, \pi v \gamma \dot{\omega} \nu, \phi \alpha \gamma \omega \nu, \alpha \dot{\alpha} \dot{\eta} \nu, \alpha \dot{\chi} \chi \dot{\eta} \nu, \sigma \pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \nu$, $\phi \rho \dot{\eta} \nu$.

The origin of the formation of the nouns in - $\omega \nu$ (Ion. $-\epsilon \omega ́ \nu)$ denoting a place is unknown, as $\dot{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho \dot{\omega} \nu, \delta \alpha \phi \nu \omega{ }^{\prime}$, $i \pi \pi \epsilon \nu, \lambda \alpha \sigma \iota \omega \nu, \pi \alpha \rho \theta \epsilon \nu \omega \nu(\pi \alpha \rho \theta \in \nu \epsilon \omega \nu)$.
§ 270. •(i) jen- with the various ablaut-grades (i)jen-, -(i)jon-, (i) jēn, -(i)jōn, -in-, -in., the -inn of which became generalized in Greek, see § 348. This suffix only occurs in the formation of a small number of nouns, as $\dot{\alpha} k \tau i v \nu$, $\gamma \lambda \omega \chi i \nu=, \delta \in \lambda \phi i \nu^{-}, \omega^{\prime} \delta i v$.
§ 271. The suffix -wen with the same ablaut-grades as -en- was rare in Greek, as $\pi^{i} \omega \nu$ (Skr. pívan-), $\dot{\alpha}-\pi \epsilon i \rho \omega \nu$ from ${ }^{*} \dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \rho F \omega \nu$; $\delta \in \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \alpha \tau$ - from ${ }^{*} \delta \epsilon \lambda \epsilon F \alpha \tau$ - : $\delta \epsilon \in \lambda \epsilon \alpha \rho$, Hom.
 Infinitive Cypr. $\delta_{0} F \in \nu \alpha l$, Att. $\delta_{0}$
§ 272. .d-en- with the same ablaut-grades as eenoccurs in the formation of nouns from verbal stems, as $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \gamma \eta \delta \dot{\omega} \nu, \dot{\alpha} \chi \theta \eta \delta \dot{\sigma} \omega, \kappa \lambda \epsilon \eta \delta \dot{\omega} \nu, \mu \epsilon \lambda \eta \delta \dot{\omega} \nu(\mu \in \lambda \epsilon \delta \dot{\omega} \nu), \pi \epsilon \mu \mu \rho \eta-$
 $\chi \alpha \iota \rho \eta \delta \dot{\omega} \nu, \mathrm{cp}$. formations like Lat. frīgēdo, rubē̄o.
§ 273. -men• with the various ablaut-grades -men-, -mon., $\cdot \mathrm{mēn}, \cdot \mathrm{mō}$, $\cdot \mathrm{mn}$ - but $\cdot \mathrm{mn}$ - before consonants (§ $\mathbf{3 4 5}$ ) and $\cdot \mathrm{mn}$ in the nominative and accusative singular of neuter nouns ( $\$ 350$ ). This suffix was used partly in the formation of nomina actionis (masculine and neuter) which often came to be used for the names of objects, and partly in the formation of nomina agentis and adjectives, as $\ddot{\alpha} \kappa \mu \omega \nu$ (Skr. ášman-), $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \dot{\eta} \mu \omega \nu, \gamma \nu \dot{\prime} \mu \omega \nu, \dot{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \mu \dot{\omega} \nu, \theta \eta \mu \omega \dot{\nu}, \kappa \in \nu \theta \mu \dot{\omega} \nu$, $\kappa \eta \delta \epsilon \mu \omega \nu, \lambda \epsilon \iota \mu \omega \nu, \sigma \tau \eta \eta \mu \nu, \tau \epsilon \lambda \alpha \mu \omega \nu, \tau \epsilon \rho \rho \mu \omega \nu$ (Lat. termo), $\chi \in \iota \mu \omega \bar{\nu}, \lambda \iota \mu \dot{\eta} \nu, \pi o \iota \mu \dot{\eta} \nu, \pi \nu \theta \mu \dot{\eta} \nu, \frac{\tilde{v}}{\mu} \eta_{\eta} \nu$; used as a secondary suffix in $\dot{\alpha} \kappa \rho \epsilon \mu \dot{\omega} \nu: \ddot{\alpha} \kappa \rho \circ \varsigma$, $\delta \alpha \iota \tau v \mu \omega \nu \nu: \delta \alpha \iota \tau \cup ́ s$. Adjectives like $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \dot{\eta} \mu \omega \nu$, $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \dot{\eta} \mu \omega \nu, \epsilon \dot{v}-\epsilon i \mu \omega \nu, \epsilon \dot{v}-\theta \dot{\eta} \mu \omega \nu$, ${ }^{\delta} \delta \mu \omega \nu, \tau \lambda \dot{\eta} \mu \omega \nu$. Neuters, as $\epsilon i \hat{\mu} \alpha$ (Skr. vásma, cover), $\nu \hat{\eta} \mu \alpha$ (Lat. nēmen), ồ $о \mu$ (Skr. nấma, Lat. nōmen, Goth. namō), $\sigma \tau \rho \hat{\omega} \mu \alpha$ (Lat. strāmen), and similarly $\dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \dot{\alpha}-\theta \eta \mu \alpha, \beta \hat{\eta} \mu \alpha, \beta \lambda \hat{\eta} \mu \alpha$,
 $\mu i ́ \sigma \theta \omega \mu \alpha, \quad \mu \nu \hat{\eta} \mu \alpha, \nu \in \hat{v} \mu \alpha$, $\nu o ́ \eta \mu \alpha$, ó $\rho \bar{\alpha} \mu \alpha$, oै $\rho \in \gamma \mu \alpha, \pi \nu \in \hat{v} \mu \alpha$, $\pi \hat{\omega} \mu \alpha, \rho \hat{\epsilon} \hat{\nu} \mu \alpha, \sigma \epsilon \in \lambda \mu \alpha, \sigma \hat{\eta} \mu \alpha, \sigma \tau \epsilon ́ \mu \mu \alpha, \sigma \chi \hat{\eta} \mu \alpha, \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \mu \alpha, \dot{v} \pi \delta \dot{\delta}-\delta \eta \mu \alpha$, $\phi \epsilon ́ \rho \mu \alpha, \phi \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \mu \alpha, \phi \hat{v} \mu \alpha, \chi \epsilon \hat{\imath} \mu \alpha, \chi \in \hat{v} \mu \alpha, \chi \rho \hat{\eta} \mu \alpha$. For the inflexion of these nouns see § 350 .

The suffix -men- also occurs in the Lesbian and Homeric infinitives (dative) like $\begin{gathered} \\ \delta\end{gathered} \mu \epsilon \nu \alpha \iota(V e d i c ~ v i d m a ́ n e ̄), ~ \delta o ́ ~ \mu \epsilon \nu \alpha \iota ~$ (Vedic đấmanē), ${ }^{\epsilon} \delta \mu \epsilon \nu \alpha \iota, \gamma \nu \omega ́ \mu \epsilon \nu \alpha \iota, \theta^{\epsilon} \mu \in \nu \alpha \iota, \phi \alpha \nu \dot{\eta} \mu \in \nu \alpha \iota$, $\xi \in \nu \gamma \nu \dot{u} \mu \in \nu \alpha \iota$, $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \alpha ́ \mu \epsilon \nu \alpha \iota, \tau \epsilon \tau \lambda \alpha ́ \mu \in \nu \alpha \iota$, \&c., see § 546 ; and also in infinitives (endingless locative) like $\bar{\imath} \delta \mu \epsilon \nu, \tau \iota \theta \epsilon \mu \in \nu$,

§ 274. -t., •dh-, •s• (of various origin) +•men•, as in
 $\stackrel{\alpha}{\alpha} \sigma \pi \alpha \sigma \mu \alpha: \dot{\alpha} \sigma \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \oint \rho \alpha \iota, \nu o ́ \mu \iota \sigma \mu \alpha: \nu о \mu i ́ \xi \omega, \kappa \lambda \omega \sigma \mu \alpha: \kappa \lambda \omega \theta \theta \omega$,

§ 275. -nt- with the various ablaut-grades -ént., -ont-, -nt., $n$ nt. With this suffix were formed the masculine and neuter of all active participles except the perfect. For the
history of the various ablaut-grades in Greek and for the inflexion of the participles see $\S \S \mathbf{3 5 2 - 5}$. Here belong also a number of verbal nomina which became nominal in Greek and a few pure nominal forms, as ${ }_{\alpha} \rho \chi \chi \omega \nu, \gamma^{\epsilon} \rho \omega \nu, \delta \rho \alpha ́ \kappa \omega \nu$,
 (Skr. dánt-, dat-, Lat. dēns, dentis).
§ 278. -went- (=-FєvT-, Skr. -vant-), weak grade -wñt( $-f \epsilon \tau$ - with $-\epsilon-$ for $-\alpha$ - through the influence of $-F \epsilon \nu \tau$-, Skr. -vat-), see § 356. This suffix was used in Greek and Sanskrit in the formation of denominative adjectives denoting possessing, endowed with, as ómóєєs, juicy = Skr. ápavant.,
 forms like ${ }^{*} \sigma \tau o \nu o ́ f \epsilon \nu \tau-: \sigma \tau o ́ v o s ~ t h e ~-o f \in \nu \tau$ - was extracted and extended to other kinds of stems, as $\sigma \kappa$ кıó $\epsilon s, \mu \eta \pi \iota^{\prime} \epsilon \epsilon \iota$,
 $\alpha i \gamma \lambda \eta \epsilon \iota \iota, \lambda \alpha \chi \nu \bar{\eta} \epsilon \iota \varsigma, \tau \bar{\iota} \mu \bar{\eta} \epsilon \iota s$; from forms like ${ }^{*} \tau \bar{\tau} \mu \bar{\alpha} \bar{\alpha} \epsilon \nu \tau$ - : $\tau \bar{\imath} \mu \bar{\alpha}$ the $-\bar{\alpha} \mathcal{\sigma} \in \tau$ - was extracted and extended to other kinds

§ 277. -er• with the ablaut-grades -er-, -or., -ēr, -ōr, -rbut $\mathbf{r}$ before consonants, see $\S 359$. In Greek this suffix only occurs in a few nouns, as $\delta \bar{\alpha} \eta{ }^{\eta} \rho$ (Skr. dēvár-), $\dot{\alpha} \nu \eta \eta^{\prime} \rho$, à $\eta \rho, \alpha i \theta \eta \eta_{\rho}$.
§ 278. -ter- with the various ablaut-grades -ter., tor-, -tēr, -tōr, -tr. but -tr. before consonants, see §§ 359-61. This suffix was especially used in the formation of names of relationship and nomina agentis, as $\pi \alpha \tau \eta \rho^{\prime}$ (Skr. pitár-, Lat. pater, Goth. fadar), $\mu \eta \tau_{\eta} \rho$ (Skr. mātár-, Lat. māter, OE. mōdor), Өvyá $\eta \eta \rho$ (Skr. duhitar., Goth. daúhtar), $\phi \rho \dot{a} \tau \eta \rho, \phi \rho \bar{\alpha} \tau \omega \rho$, member of a $\phi \rho \bar{\alpha} \tau \rho i \bar{\alpha}$ (Skr. bhrátar., Lat. frāter, Goth. brōpar, brother), $\epsilon \dot{v}-\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega \rho, \pi \alpha \mu-\mu \dot{\eta} \tau \omega \rho$. д̈́к $\tau \omega \rho$ (Lat. actor), $\dot{\alpha} \phi-\eta \dot{\eta} \tau \omega \rho, \beta \dot{\omega} \tau \omega \rho, \gamma \in \nu \in \in \tau \omega \rho$ (Skr. janitár., Lat. genitor), $\delta \omega \tau \omega \rho$ (Skr. dātár•, Lat. dator), '̇ $\pi t-\beta \dot{\eta} \tau \omega \rho$, $\theta \eta \rho \bar{\alpha} \tau \omega \rho$, ${ }^{\prime} \sigma \tau \omega \rho, \kappa \alpha \lambda \dot{\eta} \tau \omega \rho$, $\kappa \tau i ́ \sigma \tau \omega \rho, \mu \eta \bar{\eta} \sigma \tau \omega \rho, \pi \alpha \nu-\delta \alpha \mu \alpha ́ \tau \omega \rho$ (Skr. damitár-), $\rho \dot{\rho} \eta \omega \rho, \sigma \eta \mu \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \omega \rho, \dot{\alpha} \lambda \in \xi \eta \tau \eta{ }^{\prime} \rho, \dot{\alpha} \rho о \tau \eta \rho^{\rho}($ Lat.

 $\pi о \tau \eta \dot{\rho}$ (Skr. pātár-, Lat. pōtor, drinker), фv入актйp. $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \tau \eta \eta_{\rho}$, $\gamma \alpha \sigma \tau \eta{ }^{\prime} \rho$.
§ 279. -es- with the ablaut-grades -es-, -os-, -ēs (§ 366), -ōs (§ 368). This suffix was used in the formation of neuter nouns (mostly abstract), see § 364, and compound adjectives related to such nouns, see § 366, as well as in the formation of a few masculine and feminine nouns, see § 368. (a) Neuter nouns, as $\gamma \in ́ \nu o s$ (Skr. jánas-, Lat. genus), $k \lambda$ éos




 ки̂ठos, $\lambda \epsilon ́ \chi o s, \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta o s, \lambda i ́ \pi o s, ~ \mu \hat{\eta} \kappa о s, \nu \in ́ \phi o s, \pi \alpha ́ \chi o s, \pi \epsilon ́ \kappa o s$,
 $\sigma \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \phi$ оs ( $\tau \epsilon ́ \rho \phi о s$ ), $\tau \alpha ́ \phi o s, \tau \alpha ́ \chi \circ s, \tau \in i ̂ \chi o s, \tau \epsilon ́ \kappa o s, \psi \in v ̂ \delta o s$. (b) Compound adjectives, as $\dot{\alpha}-k \lambda \epsilon \dot{\eta} s, \dot{\alpha}-\lambda \eta \theta \dot{\eta} s, \dot{\alpha} \nu-\alpha \alpha \delta \eta \dot{\eta}$,
 $\mu \epsilon \nu \eta{ }^{\prime} s$ (Skr. dur-manāḥ), $\epsilon \dot{v}-\mu \in \nu \eta \eta^{\prime} s, \epsilon \dot{v}-\gamma \epsilon \nu \eta \eta^{\prime} s$, and the back-


 productive in Latin, cp. O.Lat. arbōs, honōs, $\& c$.
§ 280. -n•es•, •w•es., -dh•es•, as in the neuter nouns
 from ${ }^{*} \epsilon \rho F o s, \pi i ̂(F)$ os (Skr. pívas-), $\sigma \tau \epsilon i{ }^{2} 0$ os from ${ }^{*} \sigma \tau \epsilon \nu F o s$,
 $\sigma \tau \hat{\eta} \theta o s$.
§ 281. .jes- with the ablaut-grades -jes-, -jos-, -jōs, -is-,
 of adjectives. This mode of forming the comparative was only preserved in Greek in the accusative singular masculine and feminine, the nominative plural masculine and feminine, and the nominative and accusative of the neuter plural
(§ 368). For the formation of the comparative in Greek see §§ 375-6.
§ 282. -wes• with the ablaut-grades $\cdot$ wes-, $\cdot$ wos., $\cdot$ wōs, -us-, and -wet-, -wot-, used in Greek, Aryan and the Baltic-Slavonic languages in the formation of the perfect active participle, see § 552.
§ 283. -əs• (=Gr.-as-, Skr. -iṣ̌.), the •ə of which probably belonged originally to the second syllable of dissyllabic heavy bases with the accent on the first syllable. The -as- is the weak grade of the -ös in paragraph 279, and became generalized already in the parent Indg. language. It occurs in a considerable number of neuter nouns, as

 $\tau \epsilon \rho \alpha s, \& c$. For the inflexion of these nouns see § 370.
§ 284. -tāt• (Skr. and Lat. -tāt•), used in the formation of feminine abstract nouns from adjectives, as $\nu \in$ ét $\eta s$, Lat. novitās : $\nu$ éos, novos; ó óót $\eta s$, Skr. sarvátāt. : ó入os, sárvaḥ, and similarly $\dot{\alpha} \pi \lambda o ́ \tau \eta s$, iбót $\eta s$, какót $\eta s$, óp $\theta$ ót $\eta s$,
 $\tau \alpha \chi \nu \tau \eta \eta_{s}$. From forms like ${ }^{*} \nu \in F o \tau \bar{\alpha} \tau$ - the -o $\tau \bar{\alpha} \tau-$ (cp. § 51 ) was extracted as a suffix and extended to consonantal stems є́vót $\eta \mathrm{s}, \mu \epsilon \lambda \alpha \nu o ́ \tau \eta s, \pi \alpha \nu \tau o ́ t \eta s, \chi \alpha \rho \iota \epsilon \nu \tau o ́ \tau \eta s . \quad$ See § 343.
§ 285. In a considerable number of nouns and adjectives the suffix seems to consist of a simple explosive ( $\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{k}$ ( $=$ Indg. $\mathbf{k}$ and $\mathbf{q}), \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{g}$ ) which in some cases at least was the weak grade form of an explosive $+\cdot 0 \cdot$ or $\cdot \bar{a} \cdot$, cp. $\dot{\alpha}-\gamma \nu \omega \omega_{s}: \ddot{\alpha}-\gamma \nu \omega$ $\tau o s$, Lat. i.gnō.tus; $\gamma v \mu \nu \eta \eta_{s}: \gamma v \mu \nu \eta \eta_{\tau} \eta s ; \mu \in i ̂ \rho \alpha \xi$ : Skr. maryaká-ḥ, manikin; \&c.
.t. It occurs especially in the formation of compound verbal adjectives and in masculine nouns, as $\dot{\alpha}-\gamma \nu \omega$ é, $\dot{\alpha}-\delta \mu \eta^{\prime} s$,
 $\pi \epsilon \in \nu \eta s, \chi \epsilon ́ \rho \nu \eta s, \pi \lambda \omega \varrho, \alpha{ }_{\alpha} \nu \alpha \xi ; \nu v \hat{\xi}$. It occurs as a secondary

-k. It occurs in the formation of nouns, as $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \dot{\omega} \pi \eta \xi$,
 $\beta \epsilon \epsilon \mu \beta i \xi \xi, \pi \epsilon ́ \rho \delta i ̄ \xi \xi, c p$. Lat. cornix, rādix, \&c.
-d. It occurs especially in the formation of nouns and adjectives in - $\alpha s$, gen. $\alpha \dot{\alpha} \delta o s$, and in nouns in $-\iota s$, gen. $-\iota \delta o s$, as $\gamma \in \nu \epsilon \epsilon \alpha ́ s, \delta \rho o \mu \alpha ́ s, ~ к \epsilon \mu \alpha ́ s, \lambda \alpha \mu \pi \alpha ́ s, \nu \iota \phi \alpha ́ s, \pi \in \lambda \epsilon \iota \alpha ́ s ; \mu l \gamma a ́ s$,

 cp . Lat. lapis, gen. lapidis; '́ $\mu u ́ s, \pi \eta \lambda \alpha \mu u ́ s$.
-g. It occurs especially in the combination $-\gamma \gamma$ - in diminutives and in nouns denoting a hollow or a musical instrument, as $\kappa \dot{v} \sigma \tau \imath \gamma \xi, \lambda \hat{\alpha} \ddot{\imath} \xi \xi, \lambda \alpha ́ \rho v \gamma \xi, \dot{\rho} \alpha \theta \dot{\alpha} \mu \iota \gamma \xi, \sigma \alpha ́ \lambda \pi \imath \gamma \xi$, $\sigma \hat{\eta} \rho \alpha \gamma \xi, \sigma \pi \hat{\eta} \lambda \nu \gamma \xi, \sigma \tau o ́ \rho \theta v \gamma \xi, \sigma \hat{v} \rho \iota \gamma \xi, \phi \alpha ́ \lambda \alpha \gamma \xi, \phi \dot{\alpha} \rho \alpha \gamma \xi$,


§ 286. For the formation and inflexion of nouns belonging to the $\mathbf{r}$ : : $\mathbf{n}$-declension see § $\mathbf{3 7 1}$.

## 4. The Formation of Compound Nouns and

 Adjectives.§ 287. Most of the Greek compound nouns and adjectives consist of the compounding of two words each of which had an independent existence in the historic period of the language. The number of compounds, in which the first or last member or both members did not exist as independent words, was comparatively small, as in compounds like $\ddot{\alpha} \cdot \theta \in o s, \dot{\alpha} \nu$-ó $\mu o l o s$ where $\dot{\alpha}$-, $\dot{\alpha} \nu$ - (= Indg. n. Lat. in., English un.) is the weak grade of the prim. Indg. negative particle *ne, not; $\dot{\alpha}-\pi \alpha \xi$, , $\dot{\alpha}-\pi \lambda$ óos where $\dot{\alpha}-=$ Skr. sa., Indg. *sm. the weak grade of *sem., one; $\delta \dot{\alpha}-\pi \epsilon \delta \delta \nu$ where $\delta \alpha$ - = Indg. *dm. the weak grade of $\delta о \mu$ - in $\delta o ́ \mu o s$;
 *- $\delta о \mu$ in $\delta o ́ \mu o s$; $\pi \epsilon ́ \rho-v \sigma \iota$ where the $-v \sigma$ - in $-v \sigma-\iota$ from older $-\nu \tau-\epsilon$ is the weak grade of $\mathcal{F}^{\prime} \tau \sigma \rho ; \tau \rho \alpha-\pi \epsilon \zeta \alpha$ where $\tau \rho \alpha$ - is the weak grade of $\tau \epsilon \tau \rho \alpha-$, four, and $-\pi \epsilon \zeta \alpha$ from ${ }^{*} \pi \epsilon \delta j a$ : $\pi o u ́ s ;$ " $\alpha \rho \iota \sigma \tau o \nu$ from * $\alpha j \epsilon \rho \iota$, in the morning, and *- $\sigma \tau o \nu$ from
*- $\delta \tau o \nu$, the participle to $\notin \delta \omega$; Ion. $\sigma \dot{\eta} \mu \in \rho 0 \nu$, Att. $\tau \eta \mu \in \rho o \nu$ from ${ }^{*} \kappa j \bar{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \rho \circ \nu(\S 129,7):{ }^{*} \kappa \iota o-$, this, and $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \bar{\rho} \bar{\alpha}$.
§ 288. The compounds may be conveniently divided into four classes. In Class I the first member was the stem of a declinable noun, adjective or pronoun, or an indeclinable numeral. In Class II the first member was an indeclinable particle which only occurred in compounds already in the parent Indg. language. In Class III the first member was an original adverb which also existed as an independent word. In Class IV the first member was a case-form or a form which came to be used as an adverb in Greek.

## Class I.

§ 289. To this class belongs a very large number of compound nouns and adjectives. In such compounds the first member consists merely of the stem. This mode of forming compounds goes back to the prim. Indg. period and arose before the so-called case-endings came into existence. Regular forms were : áкро́- $\pi о \lambda \iota s$, aùтó- $\mu \alpha \tau о s$,入оуо-үра́фоs, $i \pi \pi \sigma-\mu \alpha x^{\prime} \bar{\alpha}, \quad i \pi \pi o-\pi o ́ т \alpha \mu о s, \quad \mu о \nu 0-\gamma \in \nu \eta{ }^{\prime} s$, $\tau \alpha v \rho o-\phi o ́ v o s ; \quad \dot{\alpha} \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda \iota \bar{\alpha}-\phi o ́ \rho o s, \beta o v \lambda \eta$ - $\phi o ́ \rho o s, \mu о \iota \rho \eta-\gamma \epsilon \nu \eta \eta_{s}$; $\mu a \nu \tau \iota-\pi o ́ \lambda o s, \pi \tau 0 \lambda i ́-\pi o \rho \theta o s, ~ \tau \rho i ́-\pi o v s ; ~ \dot{\alpha} \sigma \tau v-\nu o ́ \mu o s, ~ \dot{\eta} \delta v-$ (F) $\epsilon \pi \eta$ й, $\pi 0 \lambda v-\alpha \nu \theta \dot{\eta} s, \dot{\omega} \kappa v-\pi \epsilon ́ \tau \eta s ; ~ \sigma v ́-\alpha \gamma \rho o s ; ~ \beta o v-\nu o ́ \mu o s$, ßoú- $\pi \alpha \iota s, \nu \alpha u ́-\alpha \rho \chi o s, \nu \alpha v-\pi \eta \gamma o ́ s, \nu \alpha v-\kappa \rho \alpha ́ \tau \eta s ; ~ \alpha ं \rho \rho \in \nu-\omega \pi o ́ s$, $\tau \in \kappa \tau o ́ v-\alpha \rho \chi \circ s, \kappa v \nu-\hat{\omega} \pi \iota \varsigma$, òvo $\mu \alpha ́-\kappa \lambda \nu \tau о \varsigma, \pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau-\alpha \rho \chi o s ; ~ \dot{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho-$

 $\phi$ ópos, $\mu \bar{v} \sigma$-фóvos, $\dot{\epsilon} \omega \sigma$-фópos. After the analogy of the $o$-stems the -o- became extended to all kinds of stems, as
入óyos ; ǐ $\theta$ vo- $\phi a ́ \gamma o s, ~ \sigma v o-к \tau o ́ v o s ; ~ \beta o-o ́-k \lambda \epsilon \psi s ; ~ a ̉ \gamma \omega \nu o-\theta \epsilon ́ \tau \eta s, ~$
 $\beta \alpha \phi \dot{\eta} s, \sigma \omega \mu \alpha \tau 0-\epsilon \iota \delta \dot{\eta} s, \pi \alpha \nu \tau o ́-\sigma \epsilon \mu \nu о s ; \quad \alpha i \theta \rho o ́-\tau o \kappa о s, \stackrel{\alpha}{ } \nu \delta \rho o-$



є́ $\pi 0-\pi o l o ́ s, ~ \epsilon i \rho o-k o ́ \mu o s$. The $-\bar{\alpha}-,-\eta$ - of the $\bar{\alpha}$-stems was often extended analogically to other stems, especially for metrical purposes in poetry, as $\dot{\alpha} \kappa \rho \bar{\alpha}-\chi o \lambda o s, \theta \alpha \nu \alpha \tau \eta-\phi o ́ \rho o s, \nu \in \bar{\alpha}-\gamma \epsilon \nu \eta \eta^{\prime} ;$ $\beta o-\eta-\nu o ́ \mu o s ; \dot{\alpha} \sigma \pi \iota \delta \eta-\phi$ ópos, \&c. Regular forms were $\tau \epsilon \tau \rho \alpha \dot{\alpha}-$ $\pi o v s$, é $\pi \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha}-\pi o u s, \delta \in \kappa \alpha-\pi o v s$, after the analogy of which were formed $\pi \epsilon \nu \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha}-\pi o u s$, é $\dot{\varepsilon} \alpha-\pi o v s, \& c$. Regularly contracted forms were Dor. $\sigma \tau \rho \alpha \tau \bar{\alpha} \gamma o ́ s, \kappa \rho \alpha \tau \epsilon \rho \hat{\omega} \nu v \xi, \phi i \lambda \eta \eta^{\prime} \in \tau \mu \circ s, \dot{\omega} \mu \eta$ $\sigma \tau \eta{ }^{\prime} s, \& c$., after the analogy of which were formed $\kappa v \nu-\bar{\alpha} \gamma o ́ s$, $\alpha i \gamma-\omega \nu v \xi, \pi o \lambda v-\omega \phi \in \lambda \eta \eta^{\prime}, \beta o-\eta \lambda \alpha \sigma^{\prime} \bar{\alpha}, \pi \alpha \nu-\eta \quad \gamma v \rho \iota s, \& c$.

The adjectives in - $\rho$ - have $-\iota$ in compounds, as $\alpha \rho \gamma \iota-$ $\kappa \epsilon ́ \rho \alpha v \nu o s: \alpha \dot{\alpha} \rho \gamma o ́ s$ from ${ }^{*} \dot{\alpha} \rho \gamma \rho o s, \kappa \bar{v} \delta \iota-\alpha ́ \nu \epsilon \iota \rho \alpha: \kappa \bar{\delta} \delta \rho o ́ s, \lambda \alpha \theta_{l}$ $\kappa \eta \delta^{\prime} \eta s: \lambda \alpha ́ \theta \rho \eta, \chi^{\alpha \lambda i ́-\phi \rho \omega \nu}: \chi^{\alpha \lambda \alpha \rho o ́ s . ~ T h i s ~ f o r m a t i o n ~ h a s ~}$ never been satisfactorily explained, see Hirt, Handbuch der griech. Laut- und Formenlehre, p. 328.

There are numerous Greek compounds in which the first member was either verbal or came to be felt as being
 $\dot{\alpha} \rho \kappa \in \sigma i-\gamma v l o s, \lambda \bar{v} \sigma i-\pi o \nu o s, \tau \alpha \nu v \sigma i-\pi \tau \epsilon \rho o s, \quad \tau \in \rho \psi i-\mu \beta \rho о \tau о s$, $\phi \bar{\sigma} \sigma i-$-oos. These latter formations came to be associated with the $s$-aorist and then became productive, as $\phi \theta \in \epsilon \sigma$ i$\mu \beta \rho о \tau о s$ : $\neq \phi \theta \epsilon \iota \sigma \alpha$.

## Class II.

§ 290. In this class the first member was an indeclinable particle which only occurred in compounds already in the parent Indg. language, as $\dot{\alpha}$-, $\dot{\alpha} \nu$ - (Skr. a., an., Lat. in., Engl. un-) the weak grade of Indg. *ne, not (§ 65, i), cp. $\ddot{\alpha}^{\alpha}-\gamma \nu \omega \tau 0$ s (Skr. á.jñātaḥ), ${ }^{\alpha}-\theta \epsilon o s, \vec{\alpha}-\tau \bar{\imath} \mu o s, \dot{\alpha}-\pi \alpha \iota s, \stackrel{\alpha}{\alpha} \nu-v \delta \rho o s$ (Skr. an-udráh), $\dot{\alpha} \nu$ - $\alpha$ ícoos, $\dot{\alpha} \nu$-ó $\mu o l o s . ~ \dot{\alpha}$ - (Skr. sa-) $=$ Indg. ${ }^{\text {s }}$ sm the weak grade of *sem., one, cp. $\dot{\alpha}-\pi \alpha \xi, \dot{\alpha}-\pi \lambda$ óos. $\delta v \sigma$. (Skr. dur-), cp. $\delta v \sigma-\alpha \lambda \gamma \dot{\eta} s, \delta \dot{v} \sigma-\theta \bar{v} \mu \circ s, \delta v \sigma-\mu \in \nu \dot{\eta} s$ (Skr. dur-manāhẹ), $\delta v \sigma-\mu \dot{\tau} \tau \eta \rho, \delta v \sigma-\tau v \chi \dot{\eta} s, \delta \dot{v} \sigma-\phi \alpha \tau o s$.

## Class III.

§ 291. In this class the first member was an original adverb which also existed as an independent word, as

 ápi-hitaḥ), $\epsilon \pi i-\chi \alpha \lambda \kappa o s, ~ \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha ́-\chi \rho \bar{v} \sigma o s, \pi \alpha \rho \alpha ́-\lambda o \gamma o s, \pi \alpha \rho \alpha-$ $\chi \rho \hat{\eta} \mu \alpha, \pi \rho о-\eta \gamma \epsilon \mu \omega \nu, \pi \rho o ́-\kappa \alpha \kappa о s, \pi \rho о \sigma-\epsilon ́ \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho о \varsigma, \pi \rho o ́ \sigma-\omega \pi о \nu$,



## Class IV.

§ 292. In this class the first member was a case-form or a form which came to be used as an adverb in Greek, as $\delta \omega \cdot \delta \epsilon \kappa \alpha$ (Skr. dvá -daša), $N \epsilon \frac{\alpha}{\alpha}-\pi o \lambda \iota s$; $\nu o v \nu-\epsilon \chi \eta$ йs, $\pi \alpha \nu-\hat{\eta} \mu \alpha \rho$;



 $\dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha-\tau \rho o \chi i \dot{\alpha}, \pi \alpha \lambda \alpha i ́-\phi \alpha \tau o s, \pi \alpha \nu-\alpha i o \lambda o s, \chi^{\alpha} \mu \alpha \iota-\gamma \epsilon \nu \eta \eta^{\prime}$.

## ACCIDENCE

## CHAPTER IX

## DECLENSION OF NOUNS

§ 293. In the parent Indg. language nouns and adjectives were declined alike without any distinction in endings. This system was preserved in Greek, Latin, Sanskrit and most of the other languages. They are divided into two great classes according as the stem ends in a vowel or a consonant. In the former case they belong to the vocalic and in the latter to the consonantal declension.
§ 294. Nouns had originally three numbers: singular, dual and plural. The singular and plural were used in the same manner as in the historic periods of the separate languages. The dual is in form a singular, the formative elements of which originally expressed the idea of what belonged naturally together in a pair or couple, as $\delta \phi \theta \alpha \lambda \mu \omega$, oै $\mu \mu \alpha \tau \epsilon$, oै $\quad \sigma \sigma \epsilon$, Skr. akṣ̆í, both eyes; $\chi \in i ̂ \rho \epsilon$, Skr. hástāu, both hands; $\pi \dot{\eta} \chi \in \epsilon$, Skr. bāhŭ́, both arms; $\pi$ ó $\delta \epsilon$, Skr. pádāu, both feet; and similarly $\mu \eta \rho \omega$, $\omega \mu \omega$, \&c. It then came to be used for two objects which were associated together, as Hom. $\beta$ óє, Skr. gấvāu, a yoke of oxen; Hom. ï $\pi \pi \omega$, Skr. ášvā, a pair of horses; Hom. áp $\rho \epsilon$, a pair of lambs for sacrifice ; $\tau \grave{\omega} \theta \epsilon \omega$, the two goddesses (Demeter and Persephone) ; $\tau \grave{\omega} \tau \alpha \mu i \alpha$, the two treasurers (of Demeter and Persephone). When two different objects were associated together only the first of them was named and put in the dual. This is called the elliptical dual, as Skr. uṣ̂ásā, morning and night ; áhanī, day and night; dyâvā, heaven and earth; pitárāu, father and mother, parents; Hom.

Aíavtє, Ajax and Teukros. In prim. Indo-Germanic the words for both (Skr. ubhắu, ${ }^{\alpha} \mu \phi \omega$, Lat. ambo) and two (Skr. dvấu, $\delta v(\omega, \delta v o ́$, Lat. duo) were also used along with the dual, the former to express collectivity and the latter separate objects or two out of many, i.e. plurality. At a later stage these two words came to be regarded as expressing the duality and then the noun was often put in the plural. This was the beginning of the loss of the dual in the separate languages. In Greek and Vedic the dual was rarely used without the word for two except when the objects referred to were regarded as a pair or couple. But even in prim. Indo-Germanic the dual was not a fully developed number like the singular and plural. Each of the latter numbers had many more case-forms than the dual. The dual had only one form for the nom. voc. and acc. masculine and feminine, one for the nom. voc. and acc. neuter, one for the dat. abl. and instr. all genders, and similarly one for the gen. and one for the locative. It was preserved in Aryan, Greek, Old Irish and also to a great extent in Baltic-Slavonic, but it disappeared almost entirely in the prehistoric period of all the other languages. The dual was fast becoming obsolescent in the oldest historic period of the Greek language. In Homer objects which go in pairs or couples were expressed more frequently by the plural than the dual, and it is remarkable that the word for parents is only used once by him in the dual- $\dot{\alpha} \tau \dot{\alpha} \rho$ oú
 ó $\phi \in \lambda \lambda o \nu, \theta_{3}{ }^{\text {I2 }}$. In some dialects the dual is not found at all. It occurs in Boeotian, Arcadian and also occasionally in Doric. It survived longest in Attic, in the oldest period of which it was used almost in the same manner as in Homer. After it had become obsolete in the Attic vernacular it was later restored again artificially in literature. By about the end of the fourth century в.с. it had disappeared in the vernacular of all the Greek dialects.
§ 295. It is now a generally accepted theory that nouns had the three genders-masculine, feminine and neuter-at the time the parent Indg. language became differentiated into the separate branches of Aryan, Greek, Italic, Keltic, Germanic, Baltic-Slavonic, \&c. But in an earlier period of the parent Indg. language there must have been a stage when there was no characteristic inherent in the form of a noun which indicated whether it belonged to the masculine, feminine or neuter gender ; compare for example the $\mathbf{r}$-, $\mathbf{n}$ and other consonantal-stems in Greek, Latin and Sanskrit. In the consonantal declension nouns denoting males must originally have been masculine and those denoting females must have been feminine, irrespective of their form. But the exact process whereby inanimate objects came to be masculine or feminine in this declension will probably always remain an unsolved problem. And these remarks also apply to the $\frac{\check{1}}{\mathbf{1}}$, पй- and diphthongal-declensions. In all these classes of nouns the gender could not be determined by the form, but only by the meaning or by an accompanying attribute such as a demonstrative pronoun, which in the earliest period of the Indg. language had distinctive forms for the masculine, feminine and neuter gender ; cp.
 sō, pat-a. Even in the $\overline{\bar{a}}$-declension the $\cdot \overline{\mathrm{a}}$ of the nominative had originally nothing to do either with gender or case, it was simply the bare stem-ending of a dissyllabic heavy base. It is probable that in this declension a certain number of nouns ending in $\overline{\bar{a}}$ originally denoted females, as Vedic ganá., wife of a god, Boeot. $\beta \alpha \nu \frac{\bar{\alpha}}{\alpha}$, Att. $\gamma v \nu \eta$, woman, and that then by analogy all nouns ending in $\cdot \bar{a}$ became feminine. The dem. pronoun may also have been an important factor in bringing it about that all nouns belonging to this declension became feminine. The Greek, Latin and Baltic-Slavonic masculines belonging to this declension were all nouns which had changed their gender
in these languages separately (§ 323). After the $\overline{\mathrm{a}}$-declension had become fully established as being the only declension which contained exclusively feminine nouns, it then came to be regarded as specially characteristic of the feminine gender in general. And from this declension or rather a sub-division of it (§ 322) there was formed the grammatical feminine to those classes of nouns which did not originally distinguish the masculine and feminine in form, viz. the $\mathbf{i} \cdot, \mathbf{u}$., $\mathbf{r}$., n-, nt., $\cdot \mathbf{s}$ - and other consonantalstems. And it even sometimes was used to form the feminine from o-stems, cp. Skr. vrkî́, she-wolf, dēví, goddess : to the masculine vśkaḥ, dēváh beside aśvā, mare, masculine ášvaḥ. And in like manner, apart from the neuter nouns about which we shall speak presently, it is also probable that a certain number of nouns whose stems ended in -o originally denoted males, as Skr. aśvaḥ, Lat. equus, horse ; גúkos, Skr. vf̣kaḥ, Lat. lupus, Goth. wulfs, Lith. vilkas, he-wolf, and that then by analogy all nouns whose stems ended in oo became masculine. See § 324. By comparing the oldest periods of the separate languages, it is clear that this development of grammatical gender in the $\overline{\mathrm{a}}$ - and o-declensions must have taken place during the prim. Indg. period. Through causes which it is now impossible to determine grammatical gender was further developed during this period whereby $\overline{\mathrm{i}}$ - and $\overline{\mathrm{u}}$-stems, monosyllabic abstract nouns, abstract nouns with the stem-endings •ti, -ni, -den, -don, -(i) jōn, -in, -t, -tāt and -tūt all became feminine; and abstract nouns with the stem-endings $\cdot \mathbf{t u}, \cdot \mathrm{nu}$ and nouns with the stem-endings -en, on denoting parts of the body, all became masculine (Brugmann, Grundriss, \&c., vol. ii, part 2, second ed., pp. 99-1or). From the above account of the masculine and feminine genders we have generally left out of consideration the change of gender which took place in the individual languages, such as that in Greek and Latin
grammatical gender sometimes became subordinate to natural gender, as $\dot{\eta} \stackrel{\alpha}{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi \pi o s, \dot{\eta} \theta \epsilon o ́ s$, haec lupus after the analogy of nouns like $\dot{\eta} \gamma v \nu \dot{\eta}$, haec fēmina; or that in Greek and the Germanic languages natural gender often became subordinate to grammatical gender, as in words like $\dot{\eta} \delta \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha \rho, \dot{\eta}$ ỏ ó $\alpha$, in diminutives like $\gamma u ́ v \alpha \iota o \nu$, $\pi \alpha \tau \rho i \delta \iota o v, \pi \alpha \iota \delta i o \nu$, or in OE. neuters like cild, child ; folc, folk; hors, horse ; lamb, lamb; wif, wife; or that o-stems denoting the names of trees are feminine in Greek and Latin and the names of rivers masculine, whereas in the Germanic and several other languages the latter are mostly feminine.

The neuter gender differed from the masculine and feminine insomuch that it only had one form for the nominative and accusative singular. As we have seen above, there was originally no characteristic inherent in the form of a noun to indicate whether it belonged to the masculine, feminine or neuter gender. The grammatical neuter gender, as such, only came into existence after the masculine and feminine had become fully established. In its earliest stage it was only used to represent inanimate objects and these only in the nominative and accusative singular, for which the bare stem was used in the $\mathbf{i} \cdot, \mathbf{u} \cdot$ and all consonantal-stems, and the accusative in the o-stems. The other cases of the singular were formed at a later period after the analogy of the masculines. The $\mathbf{i} \cdot, \mathbf{u}$ - and consonantal-stems mostly denoted the names of material, inert mass, or substance of being or action. The form in -om, as compared with the masculine nominative in os, expressed the passive or inactive recipient, that is the accusative, which practically agrees with the meanings of the former classes of nouns. But as in the $\mathbf{i} \cdot$, $\mathbf{u}$ - and con-sonantal-stems there was no distinction in form between the nominative and accusative, the accusative in om also came to be used for the nominative. Here as in the mas-
culines and feminines natural gender was often made subordinate to the grammatical gender in the individual languages, cp. $\dot{\eta} \delta^{\alpha} \alpha \mu \alpha \rho$, $\tau o ̀ ~ \gamma u ́ v \alpha \iota o \nu ~ o r ~ O E . ~ w i ̂, ~ w i f e, ~ c i l d, ~$ child.

What is called the neuter plural in the oldest periods of the separate Indg. languages was originally a feminine collective singular. This applies not only to the o-stems (§ 326) but also to the $\mathbf{i} \cdot \mathbf{,} \mathbf{u}$ - and consonantal-stems. The nominative and accusative ending $\cdot \bar{a}$ of the $\mathbf{o}$-stems agrees with the nominative singular ending of the $\bar{a}$-stems. -a (Skr. $-\mathrm{i}, \mathrm{Gr} .-\alpha$ ), the ending of the nominative and accusative of the consonantal stems, was in all probability the weak grade ablaut of the above $\cdot \overline{\mathrm{a}}$. The nominative and accusative endings of the $\mathbf{i} \cdot$ and $\mathbf{u}$-stems were $\cdot \bar{i}$ and $\cdot \overline{\mathbf{u}}$, which may also be a contraction of $\cdot \mathbf{i}, \cdot \mathbf{u}+\boldsymbol{\partial}$. The $\cdot \mathbf{i}$ however can also be the $-\bar{i}$ of the nominative singular of the $\mathrm{j} \overline{\mathrm{a}}$-stems (§ 322). During the prim. Indg. period these feminine collective singulars ceased to be felt as such and came to be regarded as plurals, and then the other cases of the plural were formed after the analogy of the masculines just as had previously been done in the singular. This accounts for the fact that in Greek and Sanskrit the nominative plural takes the verb in the singular, see § 326.
§ 296. The parent Indg. language had at least eight cases-probably more-if we call the vocative a case, which strictly speaking it is not because it does not stand in any syntactical relation to the other members of the sentence. These were: the Nominative, Vocative, Accusative, Genitive, Ablative, Dative, Locative and Instrumental, all of which were preserved in Sanskrit. The original functions and uses of these cases belong to comparative syntax. Of the origin of the case-endings practically nothing is known. Although much has been written upon the subject, it is all mere guess-work without any solid foundation. It is reasonable to suppose that the
case-endings were originally independent words, but what their precise meaning was in each particular case it is impossible to determine. It is remarkable that Greek, which in other respects is so archaic, should have lost so many of the original case-forms. In the following brief description of the formation of the case-endings in the parent Indg. language many details are omitted, especially such as relate to analogical formations in the individual languages. For details of this kind the student should consult the declensions themselves.
§ 297. In order not to have to repeat in each case the meanings of the Sanskrit, Gothic and Lithuanian words used to illustrate the various case-endings, a list of the words is given here for easy reference. Sanskrit : agníh, fire ; ákṣ̂i, eye ; ášvā, mare; ávih, sheep; bháran (stem bhárant-, bhárat-), bearing; bhứḥ, earth; dātá, giver; đāvánē, to give; đēví, goddess; dhárā, stream; dhíḥ, thought ; durmanāh (stem durmanas-), dispirited; dyấuh, sky, day; gấuḥ, cow, ox ; jánaḥ (stem jánas-), race; loc. mūrdhán, on the head; nadịh, river; nấma (stem nấman.), name ; nấuḥ, ship ; páśu, cattle; pất (stem pād•, pad•), foot; pitá (stem pitár.), father; purû́, much, many; rájā (stem rájan-), king; sūnúḥ, son; tanứḥ, body; neut. trí, three; vấri, water; vidmánē, to know; vf̣kaḥ, wolf; yugám, yoke. Gothic: ansts, favour; baírands, bearing; brōpar, brother; fadar, father; faíhu, cattle; giba, gift; guma, man; juk, yoke ; mawi, girl; sunus, son; tuggō, tongue; wulfs, wolf. Lithuanian: avis, sheep; rankà, hand; viĩkas, wolf.

## Singular.

§ 298. The nominative of the masculine and feminine was formed in four ways. (a) In the $\overline{\mathbf{a}}$ - and $\mathrm{j} \overline{\mathrm{a}}$-declensions by the bare stem without case-ending, as $\chi^{\omega} \rho \bar{\alpha}$; Skr. áš́vā, Lat. equa, mare, Goth. giba, gift (§ 321) ; -i beside -(i)jə,
the former occurs in Skr. dēví, goddess, Goth. mawi, girl,
 $\mathrm{n} \cdot, \mathrm{r} \cdot$ and s -stems by simply lengthening the vowel of the stem-ending, as $\pi о \iota \mu \dot{\eta} \nu, \delta \alpha i \mu \omega \nu$; Goth. guma, man, Skr. rájā, king, Lat. homo, sermo ; Goth. tuggō, tongue (§ 345) ; $\pi \alpha \tau \eta \rho$, Lat. pater, Goth. fadar, Skr. pitá, father (§ 360); $\delta \omega \tau \omega \rho$, Lat. dator, Skr. đātắ, giver (§ 361 ) ; $\delta v \sigma \mu \in \nu \eta \eta^{\prime} s$, hostile, Skr. durmanāḥ, dispirited (§ 366) ; $\gamma^{\prime} \lambda \omega \mathrm{s}$, ai̊ ${ }^{\circ} \omega$ s (§ 368). (c) The o. $\mathbf{i} \cdot \mathbf{i} \cdot, \mathbf{u} \cdot, \overline{\mathrm{i}} \cdot$ and $\overline{\mathrm{u}}$-stems and also stems ending in an explosive (except monosyllabic or root nouns) had simply the case-ending -s, as $\lambda$ úkos, Skr. vŕkaḥ, Lat. lupus, Goth. wulfs, Lith. viĩkas, wolf (§ 325) ; $\pi$ ó入ıs, őıs, Skr. áviḥ, Lat. ovis, Lith. avìs, sheep (§ 328) ; $\pi \hat{\eta} X u s$, arm, Skr. sūnúḥ, Goth. sunus, son, Lat. fructus (§ 331) ; кís, weevil, Skr. dhîh, thought (§ 330) ; ix $\begin{aligned} & \text { ùs, fish, Skr. }\end{aligned}$ tanû́h, body (§ 334); фv́ $\alpha \alpha \hat{\xi}, \mu \alpha ́ \sigma \tau \imath ̄ \xi, ~ \kappa \alpha \tau \hat{\eta} \lambda \iota \psi, \lambda \alpha \mu \pi \alpha ́ s$, $\kappa o ́ \rho v s, \nu \epsilon o ́ \tau \eta s$ from ${ }^{*} \nu \in \notin o \tau \bar{\alpha} \tau s$ (§§ 342-3) ; Skr. bháran from *bhárants, Lat. ferēns, Goth. baírands, bearing (§ 352) ;
 \&c. (§ 354); X $\alpha \rho i \epsilon \iota \iota$ from ${ }^{*} \chi \alpha \rho \iota F \in \nu T s$ (§ 356). (d) The diphthongal stems and the monosyllabic consonantal stems had the case-ending $\cdot \mathrm{s}$ and lengthening of the stem-ending,

 (§ 339) ; moús, Skr. pát, Lat. pēs, OE. fōt, foot (§ 342).
§ 299. The vocative of the masculine and feminine had no.special case-ending. In the $\overline{\mathbf{a}}$ - and $\boldsymbol{o}$-declensions it ended respectively in -ă and ee which stood in ablaut relation to the $\cdot \bar{a}$ and $\cdot \boldsymbol{o}$ of the nominative, as Hom. $\nu \dot{v} \mu \phi \breve{\alpha}$, $\delta \epsilon ́ \sigma \pi о \tau \check{\alpha}$ (§ 321 ) ; 入úкє, Skr. vf̂ka, Lat. lupe, Goth. wulf, wolf (§ 325). The original ending of the $\mathbf{i}$-stems was $\cdot \mathbf{i}$ when the preceding syllable had the chief accent of the word, and eei or -oi when the accent was on the ending. Greek and the Germanic languages generalized the former and Sanskrit the latter, as $\pi$ ó̀ı; Goth. anst, favour, beside

Skr. ágnē : nom. agníh, fire (§ 328). And similarly •u beside eut or -ou in the u-declension, as $\pi \hat{\eta} \chi v$, Goth. sunu, beside Skr. súnō (§ 331). The long $\overline{\mathrm{i}} \cdot$ and $\overline{\mathrm{u}}$-stems originally ended in $\cdot \mathbf{i}, \cdot \mathbf{u}$ beside $\cdot \bar{i}$, $\overline{\mathbf{u}}$, the former became generalized in Sanskrit and the latter in Greek, as Skr. nádi : nom. nadíh, river, tánu : nom. tanúh, body, $\sigma \hat{v}$, i $\chi \theta \dot{v}$. In the monosyllabic i-stems the nom. was used for the vocative in both languages, as $\kappa$ ís, dhíh (§ 330 ) ; and similarly with the monosyllabic $\bar{u}$-stems in Sanskrit, as bhứh, earth (§334). The diphthongal and the n-, nt-, went., r - and s -stems had the bare stem-ending, as $\beta$ ô (§ 339), $Z \in \hat{v}$, Lat. Jū $-\mathrm{piter}(\S 337), \beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon \hat{v}(\S 338)$; $\delta \alpha \hat{\imath} \mu 0 \nu$, cp. Skr. ráajan (§ 345); $\gamma^{\prime} \notin \rho \nu$, cp. Skr. bháran from *bhárant (§ 352) ; X $\alpha \rho i \in \nu$ from * $\chi \alpha \rho \iota \digamma \in \nu \tau(\S 356)$; $\pi \alpha ́ \tau \in \rho$, Skr. pítar (§ 360), $\delta \hat{\omega} \tau о \rho$, Skr. dấtar (§ 361 ) ; $\delta v \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu \in ́ \rho$, Skr. durmanah (§ 366). The nominative was used for the vocative of stems ending in a simple explosive (§ 342).
§ 300. The case-ending of the masculine and feminine accusative was $\cdot \mathrm{m}$ or $\cdot \mathrm{m}$ ( $=\alpha$, Skr. -a, Lat. -em, § 65, I ) according as the stem ended in a vowel or a consonant, as Х $\omega \rho \bar{\alpha} \nu$, Skr. áśvām, Lat. equam, Goth. giba ; $\lambda \tilde{́} \kappa \kappa \nu$, Skr. vśkam, Lat. lupum ; $\pi o ́ \lambda \iota \nu, ~ c p . ~ S k r . ~ a g n i ́ m, ~ f i r e, ~ L a t . ~$ sitim, partim; $\pi \hat{\eta} \chi v \nu$, cp. Skr. sūnúm, Lat. fructum; $Z \hat{\eta} \nu, \mathrm{cp}$. Skr. dyấm, sky, from *djế(u)m; $\beta \hat{\omega} \nu$, Skr. gấm, cow, ox, from *gó $(\mathrm{u}) \mathrm{m}$; the long $\overline{\mathrm{i}}$ - and $\overline{\mathrm{u}}$-stems had i i , -ūm beside •ijm, -uwm, as $\kappa i v v, ~ i \chi \theta \hat{v} \nu$, Skr. dhíyam, tanúvam; Hom. $\nu \hat{\eta} \alpha$, Skr. nấvam, Lat. nāvem, ship, from *nấwm ; $\beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \hat{\eta} \alpha,-\epsilon \bar{\epsilon}$, from ${ }^{*}-\eta F \alpha$; $\pi o ́ \delta \alpha$, Skr. pádam, Lat. pedem; $\pi о \iota \mu \epsilon ́ v a$, $\delta \alpha i ́ \mu o \nu \alpha$, Skr. rájānam; $\phi \in ́ \rho o \nu \tau \alpha$, Skr. bhárantam, Lat. ferentem; $\chi^{\alpha \rho i ́ \epsilon \nu \tau \alpha ~ f r o m ~}{ }^{*} \chi \alpha \rho l-$ $F_{\epsilon \nu \tau \alpha} ; \pi \alpha \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \alpha$, Skr. pitáram, Lat. patrem; $\delta \dot{\omega} \tau о \rho \alpha$, Skr. dātấram, Lat. datōrem ; $\delta v \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu \in ́ \alpha,-\hat{\eta}$, Skr. durmanasam ; $\alpha i \delta \hat{\omega}$ from *aiסoбa. The Sanskrit ending -am of the consonantal stems had the $\cdot \mathrm{m}$ from the accusative of the vocalic
stems ；and similarly $-\alpha \nu$ for $-\alpha$ in the Cyprian dialect and also occasionally in other dialects．
§ 301．The case－ending of the nom．voc．and acc．neuter was $\cdot \mathrm{m}$ in the o－declension，as §uyóv，Skr．yugám，Lat． jugum，yoke（§ 326）．All other neuters had the bare stem－
 pásúu，Lat．pecu，Goth．faíhu，cattle ；к $\hat{\eta} \rho, \gamma{ }^{\alpha} \lambda \alpha, \mu^{\prime} \lambda \iota$ ，from ${ }^{*} \kappa \eta \rho \delta,{ }^{*} \gamma \alpha \lambda \alpha \kappa \tau$ ，${ }^{*} \mu \epsilon \lambda \iota \tau$ ；ơvo $\mu \alpha$ ，Skr．nắma，Lat．nōmen， name；$\phi$ є́pov from ${ }^{*} \phi \epsilon \rho о \nu \tau$ ，cp．Skr．bhárat（§ 353），bear－ ing ；and similarly $\delta \alpha \mu \nu \alpha ́ v$, ，$\delta \epsilon \iota \kappa \nu v ́ \nu, \delta \iota \delta o ́ \nu, \tau \iota \theta \epsilon \in \nu, \& c ., \chi \alpha \rho i ́ \epsilon \nu$ ； $\dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha ́ \tau o \rho ; ~ \gamma^{\prime} \nu o s$, Skr．jánaḥ，Lat．genus，race；$\delta v \sigma \mu \in \nu \in ́ s$, Skr．durmanah．
§ 302．The original genitive case－ending was es，os and－s，which stand in ablaut relation to each other． －s occurred after vowels and－es，os after consonants．－es was originally used when it had the chief accent of the word，and－os when the accent preceded the case－ending． Latin generalized the former and Greek the latter．It cannot be determined whether the Sanskrit ending ah represents es or os because e and o regularly fell together in a．Examples are：$\chi^{\omega} \rho \bar{\alpha} s, \sigma \kappa l a ̂ s, \tau i ̄ \mu \eta ̂ s, c p . ~ S k r$ ．ášvāy． āh，of a mare，Goth．gibōs，of a gift，Lat．familiās，all from ．ã̃；Skr．agnéh，of fire，Goth．anstáis，from eeĩ or oĩs； Skr．sūnốh，Goth．sunáus，of a son，from eeũs or－oũs； on the Greek forms，see $\S \S 328, \mathbf{3 3 1}$ ；kıós from＊кijos，cp． Skr．dhiyáh ；ix⿴囗́os from＊iXOvFos，cp．Skr．tanúvah ； Ion．youvós，סov oós from＊oovFos，＊סopFos，cp．Skr．pašváh， of cattle；Ion．市ós，Att．$\nu \epsilon$ €́s，Skr．nāváḥ，Lat．nāvis； $\Delta$ oós，Skr．điváḥ ；Boós，Vedic gávaḥ ；moóós，Skr．padáḥ， Lat．pedis ；$\pi о \iota \mu \in ́ v o s, ~ \delta \alpha i ́ \mu o \nu o s, ~ c p . ~ S k r . ~ r a ́ j n ̃ a h ̣ ~ ; ~ \phi ~ ́ ́ \rho o \nu \tau o s, ~$ Skr．bhárataḥ，Lat．ferentis；$\pi \alpha \tau \rho o ́ s, ~ \delta ळ ́ \tau o \rho o s, ~ L a t . ~ p a t r i s, ~$
 $\delta \nu \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu \epsilon ́ \sigma s$, －ov̂s，Skr．durmanasaḥ ；ai̊oûs from＊ai̊ooos； $\eta ँ \pi a т о$ ．

The genitive of the $\mathbf{0}$－stems was formed after the analogy
of the genitive of the demonstrative pronoun in prim. IndoGermanic, cp. Hom. $\lambda u ́ k o \iota o ~=~ S k r . ~ v र ̊ ́ k a s y a, ~ b e s i d e ~ \tau o ̂ ̀ o, ~$ Skr. tásya, Indg. *tosjo; and also prim. Greek *F ${ }^{2}$ ккобо $=$ Att. Ion. and mild Dor. 入úkov, Boeot. Lesb. and severe Dor. $\lambda$ úк $\omega$, beside $\tau o \hat{v}, \tau \omega \hat{0}$ from Indg. *toso.
§ 303. The ablative case-ending was originally the same as that of the genitive in all stems, but during the prim. Indg. period special case-endings for the ablative (-ë̃d, .ö̃d) and the genitive (-sjo) of the o-stems were formed after the analogy of the pronominal endings (§ 408). This ablative case-ending was preserved in Sanskrit and Old Latin, as vŕkāt : nom. vr̊́kaḥ, yugát : nom. yugám, O.Lat. Gnaivōd, meritōd, inscrip. facilumed $=$ facillumēd. But it disappeared in Greek except in isolated forms, as Delph. Fоі́к $\omega$, domo, Cret. $\tau \hat{\omega}-\delta \epsilon$, hinc, $\hat{\omega}$, ö $\bar{\pi} \omega$, unde. Its disappearance was doubtless due to the analogy of the other declensions in which the genitive and ablative were alike in form. The adverbial particle $-\theta \epsilon \nu$, which originally belonged to words like $\pi \delta^{\prime} \theta \in \nu$, came to be used to express the ablative, as oíko $\theta \in \nu$, oú $\rho \alpha \nu o ́ \theta \in \nu$.
§ 304. The dative case-ending was originally -ai for all stems. In the $\bar{a} \cdot$ and o-declensions it became contracted in prim. Indo-Germanic with the stem-ending whereby $\cdot \overline{\mathrm{a}}+$ ai became $\cdot \frac{\tilde{i} i}{}$ and $\cdot 0+$ ai became $\cdot o ̃ i$, as $\chi \omega \rho \alpha, \tau \bar{\iota} \mu \hat{\eta}$, Skr. áš́vāy.āi, Lat. equae, Goth. gibái; $\theta \in \widehat{\varphi}, \lambda, \lambda \kappa ́ \kappa \omega$, Skr. vfrkāy-a, Lat. lupō (O.Lat. populoi). In the other stems the old dative was supplanted by the locative in Greek, but the original dative was preserved in isolated forms, such as inf. Att. $\delta o v \nu \alpha \iota \iota$, Cypr. $\delta o f \in \nu \alpha \iota=$ Skr. dāvánē, Hom. $\neq \delta \mu \in \nu \alpha \iota$ $=$ Skr. vidmánē, adv. $\chi \alpha \mu \alpha i ́$, Lat. humī. It was regularly preserved in Sanskrit and Latin, as agnáy-ē, hostī; sūnávē, fructuī; gávē, bovī; nāvế, nāvī; pađê, pedī; rấjñē, hominī ; ná́mnē, nōminī; bháratē, ferentì ; pitré, đātré, patrī, datōrī ; jánasē, generī.
§ 305. The locative case-ending was $\cdot \mathrm{i}$ in the $\overline{\mathrm{a}} \cdot, \mathrm{o} \cdot, \overline{\mathrm{i}} \cdot \mathrm{u} \overline{\mathrm{u}}$ -
and consonantal-stems (but see below). In the $\mathbf{i}$. and u-stems the locative ended in $\cdot \bar{e} i(\cdot \bar{e}, \S 63)$ and $\cdot \bar{e} \mathbf{u}$ which were the lengthened form of the full stems. The $\mathbf{n} \cdot, \mathbf{r} \cdot$ and $\mathbf{s}$-stems had -i beside no special case-ending. Forms of the latter have only been preserved in isolated forms, as $\alpha i \hat{e} v$, $\alpha i \epsilon \epsilon$, inf. $\delta o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu$, ${ }^{\prime} \delta \mu \in \nu$; Skr. mūrdhán, on the head.

In the $\bar{a}$ - and $o$-declensions the $\cdot i$ combined with the stem-endings to form the diphthongs ãi and -oĩ, eĩ beside -oi and -ei. The locative of the àdeclension thus fell together with the original dative. In Greek the locative of the o-declension only occurs in isolated forms. Examples are : $\chi \omega \rho \rho \alpha, \theta \in \hat{q}, \tau \bar{\imath} \mu \hat{\eta}$, Lat. Rōmae, O.Lat. Rōmai ; 'I $\sigma \theta \mu o \hat{\imath}$
 Skr. vŕk $\bar{k}$, Lat. bellī, domì. kuí from *$\kappa ı j$, Skr. dhiyí;
 Lat. nāve; $\beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \hat{\eta} \iota$ from * $\beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \eta F \iota$; $\beta$ oit, Skr. gávi, Lat. bove ; $\pi 0 \delta i ́$, Skr. padí, Lat. pede ; $\pi о \iota \mu \notin \nu \iota$, $\delta \alpha i ́ \mu o \nu \iota$, Skr. rájani, Lat. homine ; $\phi \in ́ \rho o \nu \tau \iota$, Skr. bhárati, Lat. ferente; $\pi \alpha \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \ell$, Skr. pitári, Lat. patre; $\gamma^{\prime} \nu \in \iota$, Skr. jánasi, Lat. genere ; $\delta v \sigma \mu \in \nu \epsilon i ̂$, Skr. durmanasi ; ai̊ô̂ from *aỉooı. The adverbial particle $-\theta_{\iota}$ also came to be used to express the locative, as ${ }_{\alpha} \lambda^{2} \lambda_{0} \theta_{l}$, ou ${ }^{\prime} \rho \alpha \nu o \theta_{l}$.

The locative of the $\mathbf{i}$ - and $\mathbf{u}$-stems was remodelled in prim. Greek after the analogy of the consonantal and other stems where -i was regular ( $\$ \S 328,331$ ). The regular forms were preserved in Sanskrit, Latin and Gothic, as Vedic agná (see above), Lat. hosti, Goth. anstái ; Skr. sūnắu, Goth. sunáu, Lat. senatū, fructū. In the i-stems the dative and locative regularly fell together in Latin.
§ 306. The instrumental was not preserved in Greek except in isolated forms. It is doubtful what was its original ending in most of the stems, because there is no clear agreement in its formation among the languages which have an instrumental in historic times. In the $\overline{\mathbf{a}} \cdot, \mathbf{o} \cdot$, i. and $\mathfrak{u} \cdot$ declensions it ended in $\cdot \bar{a}, \cdot \bar{o}(\cdot \bar{e})$, $\cdot \boldsymbol{i}$ and $\cdot \bar{u}$, as Vedic áš́vā,
with a mare; dhấrā, with the stream ; $\kappa \rho v \phi \hat{\eta}, \lambda \dot{\alpha} \theta \rho \bar{\alpha},-\eta$; Vedic vs̊́kā, Goth. wulfa, Lith. vilkù, $\pi \omega^{\omega}-\pi o \tau \epsilon$, Hom. $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \tau \sigma \chi \epsilon \rho \dot{\omega}, \dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha \rho \tau \hat{\eta}$. In the other stems it probably ended in $\cdot \mathrm{a}$ beside -bhi and -mi which resulted from the endings of three originally different cases being used for the instrumental. The -bhi is the same as the instrumental plural ending in Sanskrit -bhi-h. In Greek it only occurs in the epic language of Homer and his imitators, and there mostly with the $\overline{\mathrm{a}}$ - and o-stems, rarely with other stems. In Homer it had more frequently a plural than a singular meaning, and it was used to express both the instrumental, ablative and locative, seldom the genitive and dative. The -mi occurs in the Baltic-Slavonic languages in the singular and the plural and in the Germanic languages only in the latter. The a occurs in adverbs like $\ddot{\alpha} \mu \alpha, \pi \alpha \rho \alpha ́, \pi \epsilon \delta \dot{\alpha}$, and possibly also in the Latin consonantal stems, homine, patre, \&c., but as the locative (-i) and instrumental (-a) endings regularly fell together, the ee can represent either case. Examples of -bhi are: $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \lambda \eta \phi \iota, \beta \operatorname{in} \phi \iota(\nu), \kappa \in \phi \alpha \lambda \hat{\eta} \phi \iota \nu$;
 The $\nu$ was of the same origin as in the locative plural (§ 316).

## Dual.

§ 307. For an account of the original case-forms and uses of the dual in the parent Indg. language see § 294.
§ 308. The nominative, vocative and accusative of the masculine and feminine was formed differently in the different stems. In the $\bar{a}$-stems the ending was $\cdot \mathbf{a i}$, as Skr. áśvē, on Gr. $\chi^{\omega} \rho \bar{\alpha}, \tau \bar{\iota} \mu \bar{\alpha}$, see § 321. In the o-stems it was -ōu beside -ō, Greek generalized the latter, as $\lambda$ úk $\omega$, Lith. vilkù, Vedic vŕkkāu beside vr̊́kā. In Sanskrit the -āu, $\cdot \bar{a}$ was extended by analogy to the $\overline{\mathbf{1}}, \overline{\mathrm{u}}$ - and all consonantalstems. In the $\mathbf{i} \cdot$ and $\mathfrak{u}$-stems it was $\cdot \bar{i}$ and $\cdot \bar{u}$, as Skr. agní, sūnú, on Gr. $\pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \epsilon, \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota$, see § 328, and on $\pi \eta \eta^{\prime} \chi \epsilon, \pi \eta ́ \chi \epsilon \iota$,
§ 331. In the $\overline{\mathrm{i}} \cdot$, $\overline{\mathrm{u}}$-, diphthongal and consonantal-stems Greek has $-\epsilon$ which seems to be the original case-ending in all these stems, but it is not certain because just as the -āu, $\cdot \bar{a}$ of the $o$-stems was extended by analogy to the $\overline{\mathrm{i}}, \overline{\mathrm{u}} \cdot$ and consonantal-stems in Sanskrit, so also the Greek $\epsilon$ may be a new formation after the relation of the old nom. plural ending ${ }^{*}-\omega s$ (§ 324) : to the nom. plural ending $-\epsilon s$ so to the dual ending $-\omega$ an $-\epsilon$ may have been formed. Examples
 $\pi \alpha \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \epsilon, \delta v \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu \epsilon \in \epsilon,-\epsilon \hat{\imath}$.
§ 309. The nominative, vocative and accusative neuter ending was -oi in the o-stems, as Vedic yugé, on Gr. s s $\quad \gamma \dot{\omega}$, see § 326. In all the other stems the ending was probably $-\mathbf{i}$, which was supplanted by the $-\epsilon$ of the masculine and feminine in Greek, as Skr. akṣ̂́, nấmanī, jánasī = ơ $\sigma \sigma \epsilon$, óvó $\mu \alpha \tau \epsilon, \gamma^{\prime} \nu \epsilon \epsilon$.
§ 310. It is impossible to determine what was the original case-ending of the genitive and locative in the various declensions because there is no agreement among the languages which have preserved the dual in historic times. Some scholars assume that it was $\cdot$ oũs $=$ the Skr. - öh in aš́vayōḥ, vf̛́kayōḥ, agnyớḥ, sūnốḥ, padớḥ, rấjñōḥ, pitrốh, \&c. The dative, ablative and instrumental ending contained the element •bh. (Skr. bhyām) beside $\cdot \mathrm{m} \cdot$, but what the Indg. vocalism was it is impossible to determine. In Greek Hom. oulv, Att. Ion. \&c. oolv became used in all stems except the $\bar{a}-$ stems to express the functions of all the five cases. On the origin of -oul, ool and - $\alpha u \nu,-\alpha \iota \nu$, see §§ 321, 325.

## Plural.

§ 311. The separate languages show that the nominative was used for the vocative already in prim. Indo-Germanic. The original case-ending of the masculine and feminine nominative and vocative was ees in all stems. The es
became contracted with the stem-endings of the $\overline{\mathrm{a}}$. and 0 -stems in prim. Indg. whereby $\cdot \bar{a}+$ es became $\cdot \tilde{\mathrm{a}} \mathrm{s}$ and $\cdot 0+$ es became .õ̃s, as Skr. ášvāḥ, Osc. scriftas, scriptae, Umbr. urtas, ortae, Goth. gibōs. Skr. vf̊́kāḥ, Goth. wulfōs, Osc. Núvlanús, Nolani. On the endings in Greek and Latin see $\S \S 321,325$. $\pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \varsigma$, Skr. agnáyaḥ, Lat. hostēs, Goth. ansteis, all from ejes; Ion. $\pi \dot{\eta} \chi \in \epsilon \varsigma$, Att. $\pi \eta \eta_{\chi} \epsilon \iota$, Skr. sūnávaḥ, from eewes; кíєs, Skr. dhíyah, from ijes ; i$\chi \theta \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon s$, Skr. tanúvaḥ, from uwes; Dor. $\nu \hat{\alpha} \in \varsigma$, Att. Ion. $\nu \hat{\eta} \epsilon s$, Skr. ná́vaḥ ; $\beta$ óєs, Skr. gávaḥ; $\pi o ́ \delta \epsilon \varsigma$, Skr.
 rantaḥ ; $\pi \alpha \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \in \varsigma$, Skr. pitáraḥ ; $\delta v \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu \epsilon \in \epsilon S,-\epsilon i ̂ ̧$, Skr. durmanasah.
§ 312. The case-ending of the masculine and feminine accusative was -ns or $\cdot n \mathrm{~s}$ ( $=-\alpha \mathrm{s}$, Skr. $\cdot \mathrm{ah}$, Lat. -ēs, Goth. -uns) according as the stem ended in a vowel or a consonant, as Cret. $\tau \bar{\iota} \mu \alpha ́ \nu s$, Att. Ion. Dor. $\tau \bar{\iota} \mu \bar{\alpha} s$, Lat. equās; on the endings in Skr. áśvāh and Goth. gibōs see § 321; Cret. $\lambda$ úkovs, Att. Ion. and mild Dor. -ovs, Boeot. and severe Dor. - $\omega$ s, Lesb. -oıs, Lat. lupōs, Goth. wulfans; Cret. $\pi o ́ \lambda \iota \nu s$, Ion. $\pi o ́ \lambda i s$, Lat. hostīs, Goth. anstins; Cret. viúvs, Goth. sununs, Lat. fructūs. kías, Skr. dhíyah ; i¿Ov́as, Skr. tanúvaḥ; Ion. $\nu \hat{\eta} \alpha \varsigma$, Skr. nấvaḥ, Lat. nāvēs; $\beta$ óas,
 Skr. rájñaḥ, Lat. hominēs; ф'́povtas, Skr. bhárataḥ, Lat. ferentēs; $\pi \alpha \tau \epsilon \in \rho \alpha s$, Lat. patrēs, cp. Goth. brōpruns, brothers ; $\delta v \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu \epsilon \in \alpha s$, Skr. durmanasah. The Cret. dialect had - $\alpha \nu$ s after the analogy of the vocalic stems.
§ 313. The ending of the nominative, vocative and accusative neuter was $\cdot \bar{a}$ in the $\mathbf{0} \cdot$ stems, $\cdot \bar{i}$ in the $\mathbf{i}$-stems, $\cdot \overline{\mathrm{u}}$ in the $\mathbf{u}$-stems, and $\partial(=-\alpha$, Skr. $\cdot \mathbf{i}$ ) in the consonantal stems, see § 295. Vedic yugá, Lat. juga, Goth. juka, yokes, on § $v \gamma \alpha ́$, see § 326 ; Vedic trí, tria, on $\tau \rho i ́ a$, íi $\rho ı \alpha$, see § 329 ; Vedic purû̀, much, many, on ${ }_{\alpha} \sigma \tau \tau \eta, \dot{\eta} \delta \notin \epsilon$, see § 333. óvó$\mu \alpha \tau \alpha$, Skr. nấmāni ; $\phi$ ¢́ $\rho o \nu \tau \alpha$, Skr. bháranti.
§ 314. The original genitive ending was probably $\cdot$ ã̃ $m$, a contraction of $\cdot \overline{\mathrm{a}}+\bar{o} \tilde{m}$, in the $\overline{\mathrm{a}} \cdot$-stems, and $\cdot \bar{o} \tilde{m}(=-\hat{\omega} \nu$, Skr. -ām, Lat. -om, -um) in all other stems. In prim. Greek and Latin the genitive of the $\overline{\mathbf{a}}$-stems was remodelled after the analogy of the pronouns, cp. Hom. $\tau \frac{\dot{\alpha} \omega \nu}{}$ from ${ }^{*} \tau \frac{\dot{\alpha}}{} \sigma \omega \nu$, Skr. tásāa, Lat. is-tārum, Indg. *tấsōm, whence Hom. (Aeolic) $\theta \epsilon \frac{\alpha}{\alpha} \omega \nu$, Boeot. $-\frac{\alpha}{\omega} \omega \nu$, Ion. ${ }^{\prime} \epsilon \omega \nu$ from older $-\eta \not \omega \nu$, Att. $-\hat{\omega} \nu$, Dor. $-\hat{\alpha} \nu$ Lesb. $-\bar{\alpha} \nu$, Lat. equārum. $\lambda u ́ k \omega \nu, \theta \epsilon \hat{\omega} \nu$, O.Lat. Rōmānom, deum, class. Lat. lupōrum with pronominal ending; $\pi 0 \lambda i \omega \nu, \tau \rho \iota \omega \nu$, Lat. hostium, trium ; Lat. fructuom, -uum, •um, on $\pi \eta \dot{\chi} \epsilon \omega \nu$, see § 331 ; $\kappa \iota \omega \hat{\nu}$, Skr. dhiyấm ; ix $\theta$ v́ $\omega \nu$; Hom. $\nu \eta \hat{\omega} \nu$, Skr. nāvấm; $\beta o \omega ̂ \nu$, Skr. gávām, Lat. bovom, boum; $\pi 0 \delta \grave{\omega} \nu$, Skr. padấm, Lat. pedum ; $\pi о \iota \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \omega \nu$, Skr. rájñ̃ām, Lat. hominum ; $\phi \in \rho o ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu$, Skr. bháratām ; $\pi \alpha \tau \rho \hat{\omega} \nu$, Lat. patrum ; $\gamma \epsilon \nu \epsilon \in \omega \nu, \gamma \epsilon \nu \omega ิ \nu$, Skr. jánasām, Lat. generum; $\delta \nu \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu \epsilon \epsilon \omega \nu,-\omega \nu$, Skr. durmanasām.
§ 315. The dative and ablative ending contained the element •bh• (Skr. -bhyaḥ, Lat. •bos, -bus) beside -m•, but it is uncertain what was the Indg. vocalism.
§ 316. It is doubtful what was the original case-ending of the locative. Sanskrit and Lithuanian (dial.) has .su and Old Slavonic -chŭ = su. Greek has -si. Most scholars assume that $\cdot$ su is the original ending and that -si was a new formation with the substitution of $\cdot \boldsymbol{i}$ for $\cdot \mathbf{u}$ after the analogy of the $\mathbf{i}$ of the locative singular. It is however possible that the original ending was simply $\cdot \mathbf{s}$ and that $\cdot \mathrm{u}$ and $\cdot \mathrm{i}$ were deictic locative particles, the latter of which became generalized in Greek and the former in the other languages. In the vocalic and n - and r -stems the intervocalic .s. would regularly have disappeared in Greek ( $\S 213,2$ ), but it was restored again after the analogy of stems ending in an explosive or $\cdot \mathbf{s}$, as in $\pi o \sigma \sigma^{\prime}, \pi o \sigma i$, Skr.
 Such new formations are: $\theta \dot{v} \rho \bar{\alpha} \sigma l$ (§ 321), Skr. aśsū̄su;


 $\pi \alpha \tau \rho \alpha ́ \sigma \iota$, Skr. pitf́ş̣̣u. In the Aeolic dialect including Homer the ending $-\epsilon \sigma \sigma \iota$ later $-\epsilon \sigma \iota$ of the $s$-stems was extended by analogy to all stems except the $\overline{\mathrm{a}}$-, jā- and o-stems, as $\pi 0 \lambda i ́ \epsilon \sigma \sigma \iota, \tau \alpha \chi \bar{\epsilon} \epsilon \sigma \sigma \iota, \sigma v \epsilon ́ \sigma \sigma \iota, \nu \eta \epsilon \in \sigma \sigma l$, 及ov́ $\epsilon \sigma \sigma \iota$,
 $\tau \epsilon \rho \in \sigma \sigma \iota$. The ending $-\sigma \iota \nu$ had its $-\nu$ from pronouns like $\dot{\eta} \mu i \nu, \stackrel{\eta}{\eta} \mu \hat{\imath} \nu$, Lesb. $\ddot{\alpha}^{\prime} \mu \mu(\nu) ; \dot{v} \mu i v, \dot{v} \mu i v$, Lesb. $\ddot{v}^{\prime} \mu \mu(\nu)$.
§ 317. The case-ending of the instrumental was -bhis (Skr. -bhiḥ) beside -mĭs except in the o-stems which had .ōĩs, as $\theta \in o i ̂ s, \lambda u ́ k o \iota s$, Skr. vf̣kāiḥ, Lat. lupīs, Lith. vilkaĩs. On the $\cdot \mathrm{bh}$ - and $\cdot \mathrm{m}$ - forms, see the instrumental singular (§ 306). And on $\chi$ 〒́paıs, $\sigma \kappa \iota \alpha i ̂ s$, see § 321.
§ 318. Few Indg. languages preserved the eight cases described in the foregoing paragraphs. They were all preserved in Sanskrit as also in the Baltic-Slavonic languages with the exception of the ablative. Through syncretism it arose in Greek that in the place of several case-forms with different meanings one case-form became used which united the functions of these. Thus the case which we call the dative in Greek grammar embraces both a dative, locative and instrumental meaning. But the dative forms of Greek grammar were originally partly old dative forms as $\lambda \tilde{\kappa} \kappa \varphi$, , partly locative forms, as $\pi 0 \delta i$, , $\pi \sigma \sigma i ́$, and partly instrumental forms as $\lambda$ úkoıs. Hence it arose in Greek that certain dative forms had at the same time the functions of the locative and instrumental ; certain locative forms at the same time the functions of the dative and instrumental ; and certain instrumental forms at the same time the functions of the dative and locative. Also what is called the genitive and dative dual in Greek grammar was used to express the functions of both the genitive, locative, dative, ablative, and instrumental. By syncretism it also
arose in Greek that the genitive acquired both the functions of the old genitive and ablative. And similarly the case, which we call the ablative singular in Latin grammar, embraces both an ablative, locative and instrumental meaning. But the Latin ablative forms were originally partly old ablative forms, as equō(d), and partly old locative and instrumental forms, as pede, patre, homine. And in like manner what is called the dative singular in Gothic is originally the instrumental in the a- and masculine $\mathbf{i}$-stems, the locative in the feminine $\mathbf{i}$., the $\mathbf{u}$-, and all consonantalstems ; and the dative only in the $\overline{\mathbf{0}}$-stems. And what is called the dative plural is in form the instrumental.
§ 319. In the declension of nouns and adjectives it is not only necessary to take into consideration the caseendings, but also the stem-endings which often formed an important factor especially in the declension of the $\mathbf{i} \cdot, \mathbf{u}$ and diphthongal stems as well as in most of the consonantal stems. These classes of nouns and adjectives originally contained various grades of ablaut either in the rootsyllable, as in the monosyllabic consonantal stems and in some of the diphthongal stems, which contained no suffix or formative element, cp. $\pi \omega$ ¢́s, Lat. pēs : $\pi o \delta$-, ped• (§ 342 ); nom. *djéus, $Z$ eús : loc. *djéwi, Vedic dyávi : gen. *diwós, Skr. diváh (§ 337) ; or in the stem-ending, as in the i-, u-, $\mathrm{n} \cdot \mathrm{r}$ r- and s -stems, cp . nom. sing. $\cdot \mathbf{i} \cdot \mathrm{s}$, $\cdot \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathrm{s}$ : nom. pl. ej-es, -ew-es : loc. sing. •ēi, •ei, -ēu, -eu (§§ 328, 331) ; $\pi o c-\mu \eta \eta^{\prime}$ :
 $\pi \alpha-\tau \rho-o ̋ s, \pi \alpha-\tau \rho \alpha ́-\sigma \iota$ (§ 360 ) ; $\gamma$ '́vos, Hom. iठрóa from *i $i \delta \rho o ́ \sigma-\alpha: \gamma^{\epsilon} \nu \epsilon \sigma-$ : iठ $\rho \omega \bar{s}$. According as the stem-ending in the diphthongal and consonantal stems originally contained the strong or weak grade of ablaut, the various cases are divided into strong or weak case-forms. The strong caseforms were: the nominative, vocative and accusative singular and dual, the locative singular and nominative plural, and possibly also the accusative plural (§ 345).

All the rest were weak case-forms. This original distinction between strong and weak case-forms was most faithfully preserved in Sanskrit, but in most of the other Indg. languages it became considerably obliterated through new formations caused by levelling out one or other of the stem-forms, cp. the $\mathbf{n}$-declension in Greek (§ 345).

## A. THE VOCALIC DECLENSION

## i. The ā-declension.

§ 320. The ā-declension originally contained only feminine nouns as in Sanskrit and the Germanic languages, but in Greek, Latin and the Baltic-Slavonic languages a certain number of original abstract nouns acquired a concrete meaning and then became masculine (§ 323). The $\overline{\mathrm{a}}$-declension is divided into $\overline{\mathrm{a}}$-stems and ja -stems. On the change of $\overline{\mathbf{a}}$ to $\overline{\mathrm{e}}$ in Attic and Ionic see § 51.
§ 321.
a. Feminine ā-stems.

Indg. Singular.

| Nom. | -ā | $\chi{ }^{\omega}{ }^{\text {¢ }} \bar{\alpha}^{\text {a }}$ | $\sigma \kappa \iota \dot{\alpha}$ | $\tau \bar{\mu} \mu \dot{\eta}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Voc. | -ă | $\chi{ }^{\omega}{ }^{\rho} \bar{\alpha}$ | $\sigma \kappa<\dot{\alpha}$ | $\tau \bar{\mu} \mu \dot{\eta}$ |
| Acc. | -ām | $\chi$ ¢́¢ $\bar{\alpha} \nu$ | $\sigma \kappa \iota \stackrel{\alpha}{\alpha} \nu$ | $\tau \bar{\mu} \mu \dot{\eta} \nu$ |
| Gen. | -ã̃ | $\chi{ }^{\omega}{ }^{\rho} \bar{\alpha} \bar{s}$ | $\sigma \kappa \iota \hat{\alpha}_{s}$ | $\tau \bar{\mu} \mu \bar{\dagger}$ |
| Dat. | -ã̃i | $\chi$ ¢оря | $\sigma K<\hat{c}$ | $\tau \bar{\mu} \hat{\eta}$ |
|  |  | Dual. |  |  |

Nom. Voc. Acc. -ai
Gen. Dat. .?
$\quad \chi^{\chi} \omega \bar{\alpha}$
$\chi^{\omega} \omega \alpha \iota \iota$
Plural.
$\sigma \kappa \iota \bar{\alpha} \quad \tau \bar{\iota} \mu \bar{\alpha}$

| Nom. Voc. | .ãs | $\chi^{\hat{\omega}} \rho \alpha^{\prime}$ | $\sigma \kappa \kappa \alpha i ́$ | $\tau i \bar{\mu} i$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Acc. | -āns | $\chi^{\underline{\omega}} \boldsymbol{\chi} \bar{\alpha} \bar{s}$ | $\sigma k ı \bar{\alpha}{ }^{\text {a }}$ | $\tau \bar{\iota} \mu \bar{\alpha}{ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| Gen. | -ãm | $\chi{ }^{\omega}{ }^{\omega} \omega \bar{\nu}$ | $\sigma \kappa \iota \omega\rangle$ | $\tau \bar{\iota} \omega \hat{\nu}$ |
| Dat. | -āsu (loc.) | $\chi$ ¢ ${ }^{\text {¢ }}$ 人ıs | бкı ıîs | $\tau \bar{\iota} \mu \boldsymbol{i} \mathrm{s}$ |

Singular: The $-\bar{\alpha}, \cdot \eta$ corresponds to the nom. endings in Skr. áśvā, mare, Lat. equa; Goth. giba, gift, Lith. rankà, O.Slav. rąka, hand, with regular shortening of the $\cdot \bar{a}$ in all these languages except Sanskrit.
$\cdot \breve{ }$, the original voc. ending was preserved in Homeric $\nu v ́ \mu \phi \alpha$ and in Homeric masculines like ${ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \tau \tau \alpha, \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \pi \pi \alpha$, $\sigma v \beta \hat{\omega} \tau \alpha$, Att. $\delta^{\prime} \epsilon \sigma \pi \sigma \tau \alpha$, $\tau 0 \xi \hat{\sigma} \tau \alpha, \Pi \epsilon ́ \rho \sigma \alpha$, and in O.Slav. rako beside nom. raka. In Greek and Goth. the nom. came to be used for the voc. already in the prehistoric period of these languages, probably owing to the fact that these two cases were alike in the plural in the parent Indg. language. The regular voc. would have been *gif in Gothic. As final Indg. -ä and -a regularly fell together in Lat. and Lith. it cannot be determined whether equa, rankà represent the original voc. or whether they are the nom. used for the vocative.

The $-\bar{\alpha} \nu,-\eta \nu$ (§ 141) regularly corresponds to the acc. endings in Skr. áśvām, Lat. equam, Goth. giba, Lith. rañką, O.Slav. rąką.

The $-\bar{\alpha} s,-\hat{\alpha}_{s},-\hat{\eta} s$ regularly corresponds to the gen. endings in Skr. áš́vāy-āḥ, O.Lat. familiās, fortunās, viās, \&c., Goth. gibōs, Lith. rañkos; Arcad. $\gamma \alpha \hat{\alpha}, \zeta \bar{\alpha} \mu i \bar{\alpha} v, ~ o i k i \bar{a} v, \& c .$, beside $-\bar{\alpha} \varsigma,-\hat{\alpha} \varsigma$, with $-\bar{\alpha} v$ from the masc. $\bar{a}-$ stems (§ 323).

The $-\alpha,-\hat{\alpha},-\hat{\eta}=$ Indg. -ã̃i and the dat. endings in Skr. áš́vāy-āi, Lat. equae, Goth. gibái, Lith. rañkai.

By contraction of the original case-endings with the stem-vowel, the dat. ( $\cdot \overline{\mathrm{a}}+\mathrm{ai}$ ) and loc. ( $\cdot \overline{\mathrm{a}}+\mathrm{i}$ ) fell together in .ã̃i in the parent Indg. language (§ 79). The long diphthong -ãi was shortened to -ai before consonants in prim. Greek (§ 63), as in $\mu \in \sigma \alpha l-\pi o ́ \lambda l o s, ~ \Theta \eta \beta \alpha l-, \pi \alpha \lambda \alpha l$-, $\chi^{\alpha \mu \alpha} \alpha-\gamma \epsilon \nu \eta$ 's. In some dialects, e.g. the Arcadian, Boeotian, Elean, the -ai became generalized for the dat. and loc. (cp. § 325), whereas the other dialects, with the exception of a few isolated forms, generalized the antevocalic or pausa form for both cases.

The original ending of the instrumental was $\cdot \bar{a}$ which was preserved in Vedic áśvā. In Greek the case-form disappeared except in adverbs like Att. $\pi \hat{\eta}, \tau a u ́ \tau \eta$, Dor. $\tau \alpha v \tau \hat{\alpha}$, Att. $\kappa \rho v \phi \hat{\eta}$, Dor. $\kappa \rho v \phi \hat{\alpha}$, Att. $\lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \theta \rho \bar{\alpha}$, Ion. $\lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \theta \rho \eta$, Lesb. ${ }^{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \bar{\alpha}$, ơ ${ }^{\prime} \pi \pi \bar{\alpha}$.

Dual: The original ending of the nom. voc. and acc. was -ai as in Skr. ášvē = Indg. *ékwai. Some scholars assume that the Gr. nom. pl. represents the old dual form, but it is highly improbable that the old dual should have become used for the plural and that then a new dual was created. The ending $\cdot \bar{a}$ is doubtless a new formation because it does not correspond to the dual ending in any of the other Indg. languages. It must also have come into existence in late prehistoric Greek, otherwise it would have become $-\eta$ in Ionic and partly also in Attic (§ 51). The nom. voc. and acc. dual of this declension does not occur in Homer except in a few masculines like ' $A \tau \rho \in \epsilon^{\prime} \delta \bar{\alpha}$, $\dot{\omega} \kappa v \pi \epsilon \in \tau \bar{\alpha}$. It is probable that the ending $-\bar{\alpha}$ was an analogical formation due to the influence of the $-\omega$ of the o-declension, cp . the similar new formations in the endings $-\alpha \iota \nu,-\alpha \iota,-\alpha \iota s$. The fact that the Gr. o-declension contained both masculine and feminine nouns ( $\S$ 324) might have helped to bring about the new formations in the dual and in the nom. and dat. plural.

It is quite uncertain what were the original endings of the gen. dat. loc. abl. and instr. cases, as there is no agreement among the Aryan, Greek, Irish and BalticSlavonic languages which preserved the dual in historic times. The Greek gen. and dat. ending - $\alpha \iota \nu$, $-\alpha \iota \nu \nu$ was a new formation made after the analogy of $-0 / \nu$, ooll of the o-declension.

Plural: The Indg. ending of the nom. and voc. pl. was -ãs from older $\cdot \bar{a}+$ es, which regularly corresponds to the endings in Skr. ášvāh, Oscan scriftas, scriptae, Umbrian urtas, ortae, Goth gibōs, Lith. rañkos. The Gr. nom.
pl. was remodelled after the analogy of the -0 of the $o$-declension, cp. the similar process in Lat. equae from older *equai beside equī from older *equoi.
-ans the original ending of the acc. corresponds to the endings in Att. Ion. Dor. $\tau \bar{\iota} \mu \bar{\alpha} s$, Cret. $\tau \bar{\iota} \mu \alpha ́ \nu s$, Lesb. - $\alpha \iota s$ (§ 153), Lat. equās, Osc. víass, vias, Lith. rankàs. -āns was shortened to ans in the prehistoric period of these languages and then became -ās in Att. Ion. Dor. Lat. Osc. and Lith. through the intermediate stage of a long nasal vowel. This change of eans to -ās was later than that of Indg. $\bar{a}$ to $\eta$ in Att. and Ion., otherwise we should have * $\tau \bar{\iota} \mu \eta$ 's in these dialects. The $\mathbf{n}$ in ans regularly disappeared in prim. Greek before consonants without lengthening of the preceding vowel, as in 'AÓnva̧ ${ }^{\prime}$ from *'A $\theta \dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \alpha z-\delta \epsilon, \theta \dot{v} \rho \alpha \zeta_{\epsilon}$ (§ 153). Some scholars regard -ās as the original ending of the acc. in order to account for Skr. ášvāḥ, Goth. gibōs, but it is far more reasonable to assume that the Skr. and Goth. forms are the nom. used for the acc. than to suppose that $\overline{\text { and }}$ was a new formation in the other languages with $\mathbf{n}$ from the $\mathbf{o}$-, $\mathbf{i}$ - and $\mathbf{u}$-declensions.

The original Indg. gen. ending was probably aĨm, a contraction of older -ā $+\bar{o} \tilde{m}$. Skr. áš̌vā-nām for *aśsām was a new formation with nām from the n -declension (§ 345). In prim. Greek and Italic the gen. was remodelled after the analogy of the pronominal declension, cp. the Homeric fem. gen. pl. $\tau \frac{\alpha}{\alpha} \omega \nu$ from ${ }^{*} \tau \frac{1}{\alpha} \sigma \omega \nu=$ Skr. tásām, Lat. is•tārum $=$ Indg. *tássōm, whence Hom. (Aeolic) $\theta \epsilon \frac{\alpha}{\alpha} \omega \nu$, Boeot. $-\frac{1}{\alpha} \omega \nu$, Ion. $-\epsilon \in \omega \nu$ from older $-\eta \omega \nu$ (§ 72), Att. $-\hat{\omega} \nu$, Dor. $\cdot \hat{\alpha} \nu$, Lesb. $-\bar{\alpha} \nu$ (§ 80). And similarly Lat. equārum, Osc. •azum, Umbr. -arum from **āzōm older *-āsōm.

It is uncertain what was the ending of the loc. of this declension in the parent Indg. language. Skr. has -āsu (ášvāsu), Lith. -osu (rañkosu), and Gr. - $\bar{\alpha} \sigma \iota,-\eta \sigma \iota ;-\alpha \sigma \iota$, $-\eta \sigma \iota$; and $-\alpha \iota \sigma \iota,-\alpha \iota s$ (Hom. $-\eta s$ ). It is possible that the
original ending was $\cdot \overline{\mathrm{a}} \mathrm{su}$ and that it was changed to -āsi in early prim. Greek through the influence of the $\mathbf{i}$ in the loc. singular (§ 305). This -āsi would regularly have become $-\eta$ in Ion., $-\eta,-\alpha$ in Att. and $-\alpha$ in the other dialects ( $(\mathbf{2 1 3}, 2$ ), but no such endings have been preserved in the historic period of any of the dialects. After the law had ceased to operate whereby intervocalic $-\sigma$ - disappeared, a new loc. was formed by adding $-\sigma \iota$ from the loc. of the consonantal stems direct to the stem, as in the inscriptional forms Ion. $\delta \epsilon \sigma \pi o ́ v \eta \sigma \iota \nu$, Att. $\delta i ́ \kappa \eta \sigma \iota, \delta \rho \alpha \chi \mu \eta \bar{\eta} \iota, \tau \alpha \mu i \bar{\alpha} \sigma \iota$, preserved later only in adverbial forms like $A \theta \dot{\eta} \nu \eta \sigma \iota, ~ \Theta \hat{\eta} \beta \eta \sigma \iota$, $\theta \dot{u} \rho \bar{\alpha} \sigma \iota$, $\omega_{\rho} \rho \bar{\alpha} \sigma \iota$. It is generally assumed that the endings Ion. $-\eta \sigma \iota$, Att. $-\eta \sigma \iota,-\alpha \sigma \iota$ were new formations after the analogy of -oı $\iota$ of the o -declension, but it is also possible that they really represent double loc. endings formed by adding $-\sigma \iota$ to $-\eta,-\alpha$ (see above). The endings $-\eta \sigma \iota,-\eta \sigma \iota$ (Att. also $\cdot \bar{\alpha} \sigma \iota,-\alpha \sigma \iota$ ) disappeared on Att. inscriptions after about 420 b. c. and on Ion. inscriptions after about the beginning of the fourth century в. с., and their place was taken by $-\alpha \iota s$. The endings - $\alpha \iota s$ (Hom. $-\eta s$ ), $-\alpha \iota \sigma \iota$ were formed on analogy with the -oıs, -oıvı of the o-declension. Cp . the similar formation in Lat. -is, Osc. -ais.

## b. jā-stems.

§ 322. In Greek the jā-stems only differ from the declension of the $\overline{\mathbf{a}}$-stems in the nom. voc. and acc. singular. The suffix •jā- was chiefly used in the parent Indg. language to form feminine nouns and adjectives from the masculine of u- and consonant-stems, as $\dot{\eta} \delta \epsilon \hat{i} \alpha$ from ${ }^{*} \sigma F \bar{\alpha} \delta \epsilon F j \alpha$ : $\eta \quad \delta \dot{u}$ s $=$ Skr. svādví: svādúh, sweet; $\tau \in ́ \kappa \tau \alpha \iota \nu \alpha$ from ${ }^{*} \tau \epsilon \kappa \tau \alpha \nu j \alpha$, older * $\tau \epsilon \kappa \tau n j a: \tau \epsilon \in \kappa \tau \omega \nu=$ Skr. takṣ̌ṇí : tákṣan•, carpenter; $\delta_{0 ́ \tau \epsilon \iota \rho \alpha ~ f r o m ~}{ }^{*} \delta о \tau \epsilon \rho j \alpha: \delta о \tau \eta ́ \rho=$ Skr. dātrí : dātár•, giver; $\phi \in ́ \rho о \nu \sigma \alpha$ from * $\phi є \rho о \nu \tau j \alpha: \phi \in ́ \rho о \nu \tau-=$ Skr. bhárantī : bhá-rant-, bearing; and similarly $\beta \alpha \rho \epsilon i ̂ \alpha, \gamma \lambda v \kappa \epsilon i ̂ \alpha, \pi \lambda a \tau \epsilon i \alpha \alpha$;
$\delta_{\epsilon} \sigma \pi \sigma \iota \nu \alpha, \theta \epsilon \rho \alpha ́ \pi \alpha \iota \nu \alpha, \lambda \epsilon \in \alpha \iota \nu \alpha, \mu \epsilon ́ \lambda \alpha \iota \nu \alpha, \tau^{\prime} \rho \epsilon \iota \nu \alpha ; \gamma \in \nu \epsilon ́ \tau \epsilon \iota \rho \alpha$, $\mu 0 \hat{\imath} \rho \alpha, \pi \epsilon i ̂ \rho \alpha, \sigma \phi \alpha \hat{\rho} \rho \alpha ; \delta \epsilon \iota \kappa \nu \hat{v} \sigma \alpha, \delta i \delta o \hat{v} \sigma \alpha, \tau i \theta \epsilon \hat{i} \sigma \alpha, i \sigma \tau \hat{\alpha} \sigma \alpha$, $\lambda \hat{v} \sigma \bar{\alpha} \sigma \alpha, \mu o v ิ \sigma \alpha, \pi \hat{\alpha} \sigma \alpha, \chi^{\alpha} \hat{\imath} \epsilon \sigma \sigma \alpha$. Pf. part. act. $\pi \epsilon \phi v v i ̂ \alpha$ from ${ }^{*} \pi \epsilon \phi v v \sigma j \alpha: \pi \epsilon \phi v \omega$ © $=$ Skr. babhūvúṣī̀ : babhūvą̣s- for

 from * ${ }^{*} о \kappa \tau j \alpha, \theta \hat{\eta} \sigma \sigma \alpha$ from ${ }^{*} \theta \eta \tau j \alpha$, $\rho i \zeta \alpha$ from ${ }^{*} F \rho i \delta j \alpha, \phi u ́ \zeta \alpha$ from * $\phi v \gamma j \alpha,{ }_{\alpha} \mu \alpha \xi \alpha, \delta i \psi \alpha, \theta \alpha ́ \lambda \alpha \sigma \sigma \alpha, \sigma \chi i \xi \alpha$. The $\mathbf{j}$ disappeared after a consonant + nasal ( $\S 130$ ), as ${ }^{\epsilon} \mathrm{X} \downarrow \delta \nu \alpha, \mu \epsilon ́-$ $\rho \iota \mu \nu \alpha, \pi \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \nu \alpha, \tau o ́ \lambda \mu \alpha$. Some scholars assume that these words had simply the ending $\cdot \partial$ in prim. Indg., whilst others regard them as being new formations from original stems in -ā. $\pi o ́ \tau \nu \iota \alpha: \pi o ́ \sigma \iota s=$ Skr. pátnī : pátih, master, husband; $\psi \underset{\alpha}{\text { d }} \tau \rho \iota \alpha, \mu i ́ \alpha$ from * $\sigma \mu ı \alpha$.

The nom. sing. originally ended in -i beside (i)jo. The reason for this difference is unknown. The various Indg. languages generalized one or other of the two forms in prehistoric times. The former occurs in Sanskrit, Gothic and Lithuanian, as Skr. dēvî, goddess, brhatî, great, svādví, sweet; Goth. mawi, girl, frijōndi, friend; Lith. veżantil, vehens, and the latter in Greek. In prim. Greek -(i)jo regularly became $-j \alpha$ after short and $-\iota \alpha$ after long syllables, but this differentiation was greatly obscured at a later period owing to numerous analogical formations whereby forms with long syllables were remodelled on the analogy of those with short syllables and vice versa ( $\S 119$ ).

It is uncertain what was the original ending of the vocative. In the Aryan branch it is $\cdot \mathrm{i}$, as Skr. dévi, bŗ̣hati, svádvi, but in the other languages the nom. was used for the voc., as in Gr. $\mathfrak{\eta} \delta \in \epsilon i \alpha, \pi o ́ \tau \nu ı a$, Goth. mawi, frijōndi.

There is not sufficient agreement among the different branches of the Indg. languages to enable us to determine what was the original ending of the accusative. It was probably -(i)jām beside -(i)jom, the former of which is represented by Goth. máuja, frijōndja, Lith. vẽżanczą,
O.Slav. veząštą, vehentem, and the latter by Gr. $\hat{\eta} \delta \epsilon \in i \alpha \nu$, $\tau \epsilon \in \kappa \tau \alpha \iota \nu \alpha \nu, \phi \in ́ \rho o v \sigma \alpha \nu, \pi o ́ \tau \nu \iota \alpha \nu, \& c$. The Aryan ending -im, as in Skr. đēvím, brhatím, svādím would then be a new formation with $\cdot 1 \cdot$ from the nominative.

Gen. $-\eta s,-\bar{\alpha} s=$ Indg. $\cdot(\mathbf{i}) j$ ã̃ and corresponding to the endings in Skr. dēvyấh, svādyấḥ, Goth. máujōs, frijōndjōs, Lith. veżanczõs.

Dat. $-\eta,-\alpha=$ Indg. $\cdot(\mathrm{i})$ jã̃i and corresponding to the endings in Skr. đēvyāí, svādyāí, Goth. máujái, frijōndjái, Lith. vẽżanczai.

## c. Masculine ā-stems.

§ 323. As we have seen above ( $\S$ 320) the nouns belonging to this class were originally feminine abstract nouns which acquired a concrete meaning and then became masculine. In declension they only differ from the feminine $\overline{\mathbf{a}}$-stems in the nom. voc. and gen. singular. The masculine nouns of this type were declined in Latin exactly like the feminine $\overline{\mathrm{a}}$-stems. It is however possible that in the oldest Latin, as in Greek, the nominative took -s after the analogy of the o-declension, and that this ending is preserved in the two isolated O.Latin forms hosticapas, hostium captor; paricidas, parricide.

After the change of gender had taken place the nouns of this class took -s in the nom. after the analogy of the odeclension, as $\nu \epsilon \bar{\alpha} \nu i \bar{\alpha} \bar{\alpha}, \pi 0 \lambda i t \tau \eta s, \Pi$ ' $\rho \sigma \eta s$.

In the vocative two forms are to be distinguished, viz. $-\alpha$ and $-\bar{\alpha},-\eta$. The former is the original voc. ending of $\bar{a}-$ stems and occurs in nouns which have $-\tau \eta s$ in the nominative, in names of peoples, and in compound nouns, as
 $\gamma \epsilon \omega-\mu \epsilon \epsilon \tau \rho \alpha$; and the latter is the original nominative used for the vocative ( $\$ 321$ ) and generally occurs in all other nouns, as $\nu \epsilon \bar{\alpha} \nu i ́ a$, , K $\rho o \nu i ́ \delta \eta$. Forms like $i \pi \pi o ́ \tau \alpha$ ( $N \notin \sigma \tau \omega \rho$ ),

epic poetry and occur almost exclusively in combination with proper names, are probably old vocatives which came to be used attributively as nominatives. And similarly it is probably more correct to regard the Boeot. nominatives $N \epsilon \sigma \tau i \delta \bar{\alpha}, \Pi \bar{u} \theta_{\iota} \stackrel{\nu}{\iota} \kappa \bar{\alpha}, \& c$. as vocatives which came to be used as nominatives than to assume that the original asigmatic nominative was preserved in this dialect. The genitive originally ended in $-\bar{\alpha} s$, as in the feminine $\overline{\mathbf{a}}$-stems. To $-\bar{\alpha} \bar{s}$ was added $-o$ from the old genitive ( ${ }^{*} \lambda \tilde{́} к о о, ~ \lambda \tilde{́ к о ь о) ~ o f ~ t h e ~}$ o-declension. ${ }^{*}-\bar{\alpha} \sigma o$ regularly became $-\bar{\alpha} o$ in Boeot., Thess. and Hom. ( $A \tau \rho \in i \delta \bar{\alpha} o),-\bar{\alpha} v$ in Arcad., Cypr., and Pamphylian, $-\epsilon \omega$ from older $-\eta o$ ( $\S \mathbf{7 2}$ ), $-\omega$ in Ionic, $-\bar{\alpha}$ by contraction of $-\bar{\alpha} o$ in Dor. ( $A \tau \rho \epsilon \bar{i} \delta \bar{\alpha})$, Lesb. and Elean. Att. $\pi$ onítov, \&c. had oov direct from the o-declension. Boeot. - $\bar{\alpha} s$ beside $-\bar{\alpha} o$ was a new formation due to the influence of the nominatives in $-\bar{\alpha}$, see the voc. above. Beside Ion. $-\epsilon \omega,-\omega$ there also occurs $-\epsilon v$ from older ${ }^{*}$ - $\epsilon$ o with $-o$ for $-\omega$ re-introduced from * $\lambda$ úкоo.

Note.-In some dialects and especially in Ionic the accusative and genitive singular were often formed after the analogy of the masculine es-stems (§ 366) owing to the nominative singular being alike in both declensions.

## 2. The o-declension.

§ 324. Greek and Latin are the only Indg. languages in which the o-declension contains masculine, feminine and neuter nouns. It is far more probable that a number of originally masculine nouns became feminine in these two languages than that the feminine was lost in the prehistoric period of all the other languages. The masculines and the feminines are declined alike in Greek and Latin.
§ 325．a．Masculine and Feminine o－stems．
Singular．
Indg.
Nom．os

Voc．ee
Acc．．om
Gen．．osjo，so
Dat．．õi
Loc．$\left\{\begin{array}{l}\text {－oi，}, \text { ei } \\ \cdot \mathrm{oĩ}, \cdot \mathrm{ei}\end{array}\right.$
Dual．
Nom．Voc．Acc．
－ōu，．ō
Gen．Dat．－？
Plural．
Nom．Voc．．õ̃s
Acc．．ons
Gen．．ōm
Dat．－ōis，－ō̃̃s（instr．）
Loc．－oisu
$\lambda$ र́кos
$\lambda u ́ \kappa \epsilon$
入и́ког
入úкоьо，$\lambda$ úкоv
$\lambda u ́ \kappa \varphi, \theta \in \widehat{Q}$ оǐkoı，оїкєє
＇I $\sigma \theta \mu o \hat{\imath}$ ，$\in \kappa \in \hat{\imath}$
$\lambda u ́ \kappa \omega$
入úкои८ข，入úкoı兀
$\lambda$ и́коц
入úkovs，入úkous
$\lambda u ́ \kappa \omega \nu, \theta \epsilon \omega ิ$
גúkols，$\theta \in o i ̂ s$
$\lambda$ र́коıб！

Singular：The Indg．endings were remarkably well pre－ served in Greek．Nom．$\lambda$ úkos＝Skr．vŕkkaḥ，Lat．lupus， Goth．wulfs，Lith．viĩkas，wolf．Voc．$\lambda$ úk $\epsilon$ Skr．vŕka， Lat．lupe，Goth．wulf，Lith．vilkè．Acc．$\lambda$ úкov＝Skr． vŕkam，Lat．lupum，Lith．viľą．

It is impossible to determine what was the original Indg． ending of the genitive．In the declension of all other stems the genitive and ablative were originally alike，but in the o－declension the form of these two cases seems to have been partly differentiated during the prim．Indg． period，whereby a special genitive form with pronominal ending was created， cp ．Indg．${ }^{*}$ tosjo $=$ toîo，Skr．tásya ： $\lambda$ úкoьo，Skr．vŕkasya，beside Indg．＊toso $=\tau o \hat{v}, \tau \hat{\omega}:$ prim． Gr．＊F $\AA$ úкобo，whence Att．Ion．and mild Dor．入úкov，

Boeot. Lesb. and severe Dor. $\lambda \tilde{v} \kappa \omega$, Goth. wulfis with -is from pis, of the. The Greek, Aryan and Germanic languages accordingly have pronominal endings. What corresponds to the ablative in the other languages is used for the genitive and ablative in Baltic-Slavonic, as Lith. viîko, O.Slav. vlŭka. The Latin ending -i, which must also have existed in prim. Keltic, is of unknown origin. -oıo and $-o v$, the latter of which can often be read as -00 , exist side by side in Homer. The ending -olo was however archaic already in Homer, but through imitation of him it is found in the language of poets of all periods. In Thessalian the ending -ot occurs beside $-0 v,-\omega,-0 \iota o$. It is difficult to account for the -oc unless we may suppose that it arose from -ooo by elision of -0 . Some scholars regard it as the locative ending used for the genitive, and others as being of the same origin as the Latin genitive ending $-\bar{i}$, but both these proposed explanations are very doubtful.

The Indg. ending of the dative was -õi, from older $\cdot 0+\mathrm{ai}$, corresponding to the endings in $\theta \in \widehat{\omega}, \lambda u ́ \kappa \omega$, Lat. lupō, O.Lat. populoi Romanoi, Numasioi, Numerio, Lith. vil. kui, Skr. vŕkkāy-a for older *vf̆́kāi. -ời was shortened to -oi before consonants in prim. Greek (§ 63). Anteconsonantal oi then became generalized for the dative in Arcadian, Boeotian, Elean, Thessalian and the NorthWest group of dialects. The locative and dative thus fell together in these dialects (cp. § 321). On the other hand what is called the dative in these dialects may simply be the original locative used for the dative.

In the parent Indg. language the locative seems to have ended in -oi, -ei beside oiñ, -eĩ. The former occur in oiko , oik $k \in \iota$, Lat. bellī, domī, humī, Corinthī, and Skr. vf́kkē, and the latter in ' $I \sigma \theta \mu o \hat{\imath}$ and in adverbs like $\pi o \hat{\imath}$, whither; ' $\epsilon \in \epsilon \hat{\imath}$, there; Dor. $\tau \in \hat{\imath}-\delta \epsilon$, here; $\tau \eta \nu \epsilon \hat{\imath}$, there ; $\pi \epsilon \hat{\imath}$, where.

The original ending of the ablative was .õd, .ẽ̃d, which was preserved in Skr. vŕfkād, vŕkkāt, O.Lat. inscriptions

Gnaivōd, meritōd, facilumēd = later Lat. Gnaeō, meritō, facillimē. This case-form disappeared in Greek except in a few isolated adverbial forms, as Delph. Foík $\omega$, domo; Cret. $\tau \hat{\omega}-\delta \epsilon$, h $n n c$; Cret. $\grave{\omega}, o ̈ \pi \omega$, Locr. $\bar{\omega}$, ö $\pi \omega$, unde. It probably also occurs in adverbs like oṽ $\tau \omega$, oṽ $\tau \omega$-s, $\sigma 0 \phi \hat{\omega}-\mathrm{s}$. In the Germanic languages the old ablative of adjectives came to be used adverbially, as sinteinō, continually, nom. sinteins, continual.

The original ending of the instrumental was $\cdot \overline{\mathbf{o}}, \cdot \overline{\mathbf{e}}$, which is found in Vedic vr̊́kā, Goth. wulfa (used for the dative), Lith. vilkù. The case-form disappeared in Greek except in a few isolated adverbial forms, as $\pi \omega-\pi o \tau \epsilon$, ouv- $\pi \omega, \not{\alpha} \phi \nu \omega$, $\dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha \rho \tau \hat{\eta}, \stackrel{o}{\pi} \pi \eta$, Laconian $\pi \tilde{\eta}-\pi о к \alpha$, иsquam or unquam.

Dual: The original ending of the nom. voc. and acc. was $\cdot \boldsymbol{0} u$ beside $\cdot \boldsymbol{0}(\S \mathbf{6 3})$, the latter of which was generalized in Greek and Baltic-Slavonic, as $\lambda u ́ k \omega$, Lith. vilkù, O.Slav. vlŭka. Both endings occur in Vedic vŕkkāu, vŕkā, but only the former in classical Sanskrit.

It is impossible to determine what were the original endings of the gen. dat. loc. abl. and instrumental, as there is no agreement among the languages which preserved the dual in historic times (cp. § 321). Greek -oulv, -olv, which came to be used in all kinds of stems except the $\bar{a}-s t e m s$, has never been satisfactorily explained. The most probable explanation is that it arose from $o l$, the original ending of the nom. voc. acc. neuter ( $\$ \mathbf{3 2 6}$ ), to which was added the dual pronominal ending $\iota \nu$ from $\nu \omega \ddot{\omega} \nu, \sigma \phi \omega \hat{\nu} \nu=$ Att. $\nu \hat{\varphi} \nu$, $\sigma \phi \hat{\omega} \nu$ (§§ 402, 404). It may possibly also have arisen from $-o \iota$ + the ending $-\sigma \iota(\nu)$ from the loc. plural of conscnantal stems, but this would presuppose that $\nu{ }^{\prime} \phi \in \lambda \kappa v \sigma \tau \iota \kappa o ́ v$ became a fixture in this form at a very early period. -ouv is the regular ending in Homer and ool in Attic.

Plural: The Indg. ending of the nom. and voc. was -õs from older $\cdot 0+e s$, which corresponds to the endings in Skr. vf̆́kāḥ, Goth. wulfōs, Osc. Núvlanús, Nolani. Greek,

Latin and Baltic-Slavonic have the pronominal ending. The Germanic languages also have it in the adjectives, cp. nom. toí, Lat. is-tī, Goth. pái, O.Slav. ti, Skr. té, Indg. *toi, the : 入úkoı, Lat. lupī, O.Slav. vlŭci, wolves; Goth. blinđái wulfōs, blind wolves.

The original ending of the accusative was ons which corresponds to the endings in Lat. lupōs, Goth. wulfans, Cret. $\lambda$ úkovs beside oos, Att. Ion. and mild Dor. -ovs, Boeot. and severe Dor. -ws, Lesb. -ols, Arcadian and Thessalian -os. -ovs remained in prim. Greek in pausa and when the next word began with a vowel, but became os when the next word began with a consonant (§ 153). The different dialects mostly generalized one or other of the sandhi forms, as Att. Ion. -ovs, Boeot. - $\omega$ s, Lesb. -ots from older -ovs through the intermediate stage of a long nasal vowel.

The Indg. ending of the genitive was -õ $\tilde{m}$ which corresponds to the endings in $\theta \epsilon \bar{\omega} \nu, \lambda u ́ \kappa \omega \nu$, Skr. vr̊́kāṇ-ām (with -āṇ. from the $\mathbf{n}$-stems), O.Lat. Rōmānom, deum, modium, classical Lat. lupōrum with pronominal ending, cp. istōrum, Osc. Núvlanúm, Nolanorum, OE. wulfa, Lith. vilkũ with regular loss of the final nasal in the last two languages.
$\theta$ єoís, $\lambda$ úkoıs and Lat. lupīs were originally the instrumental which came to be used for the dative. The Indg. ending of the instrumental was -oĩs corresponding to the endings in Skr. vfŕkāih, Lith. vilkaĩs. On the shortening of the long diphthong in Greek see $\S 63$.

The original ending of the locative was probably oisu which corresponds to the ending in the Skr. loc. vfrkeeṣu. -oisu may have become -oisi in prim. Greek through the influence of the -i in the loc. singular (§ 305), and then -oisi would have become *.oii during the same period. $\lambda$ úкoı $\sigma \iota$ admits of a twofold explanation. Either the ending -ols (see above) was changed to -olol through the influence of the $\cdot \sigma \iota$ of the consonantal stems or else it was formed direct from the nom. pl. $\lambda$ úko $\iota$ with $-\sigma \iota$ from the consonantal
stems. In either case the 0 ol $\sigma$ must have come into existence after the law had ceased to operate whereby intervocalic $-\sigma$ - disappeared $(\S \mathbf{2 1 3}, \mathbf{2})$. $\quad-\boldsymbol{\sigma} \sigma \iota$ is the regular form in Homer (and then later imitated by other poets), Herodotus, Lesbian and O. Attic. Until 444 в.c. -olo८ beside -ots was equally common on Attic inscriptions, but the longer form had disappeared by the end of the century. And in like manner -olv $\iota$ beside oos was common on Ionic inscriptions in the fifth century в. c., but the longer form had disappeared by about the beginning of the fourth century. 入úкољб like $\lambda$ úkoıs was used for the dative.

## b. Neuter o-stems.

§ 326. In Greek the declension of the neuter o-stems only differs from the masculine in the nom. voc. singular and the nom. voc. and acc. plural.

The original ending of the nom. voc. and acc. singular was om which corresponds to the endings in suyóv, Skr. yugám, Lat. jugum, yoke. The ending regularly disappeared in the Germanic languages, as Goth. juk, yoke.

The Indg. ending of the nom. voc. and acc. dual was oi which occurs in Skr. yugế, and in dvé, Vedic duvé = OE. twā, two. In Greek the regular form would have been * $\varsigma v o i ́$ which was changed to $\varsigma u \gamma \omega$ after the analogy of the masculines.

What is called the nom. voc. and acc. plural was originally a feminine collective singular which accounts for the fact that in Greek and Sanskrit the nom. pl. neuter takes the verb in the singular. It also accounts for the double plurals like $\delta \epsilon \sigma \mu о$ í, кúк $\lambda о \iota, \sigma \tau \alpha ́ \delta \iota o \iota$ beside $\delta \epsilon \sigma \mu \alpha ́$, $\kappa u ́ k \lambda \alpha, \sigma \tau \alpha ́ \delta \iota \alpha$, Lat. jocî, locī beside joca, loca, the former of which originally meant separate objects and the latter the objects taken collectively. The original ending was -ā which corresponds to the endings in Vedic yugá beside classical Skr. yugá -ni with -ni from the $\mathbf{n}$-stems, Lat. juga,

Goth．juka with regular shortening of the final vowel in these two languages．§uvá was formed after the analogy of the consonantal stems．This new formation must have taken place in prim．Greek，otherwise we should have had the regular ending ${ }^{*}-\dot{\eta}$ in Attic and Ionic，and ${ }^{*-\dot{\alpha}}$ in the other dialects．
§ 327．The so－called Attic declension had in prim． Greek the same case－endings as the ordinary o－declension． The prim．Greek forms of a noun like $\nu \in \omega$ ©́s（Dor．$\nu \bar{\alpha} o{ }^{\prime}$, Ion．$\nu \eta o ́ s)$ were：sing．${ }^{*} \nu \bar{\alpha} o s,{ }^{*} \nu \bar{\alpha} o \nu,{ }^{*} \nu \bar{\alpha} o o,{ }^{*} \nu \bar{\alpha} \omega \iota$ ；dual ${ }^{*} \nu \bar{\alpha} \omega,{ }^{*} \nu \bar{\alpha} o \iota \nu$ ；pl．${ }^{*} \nu \bar{\alpha} o \iota,{ }^{*} \nu \bar{\alpha} o \nu s,{ }^{*} \nu \bar{\alpha} \omega \nu,{ }^{*} \nu \bar{\alpha} \omega \iota \iota$ ，which with the regular change of $-\bar{\alpha}$－to $-\eta$－（§ 51 ）together with shorten－ ing（§71）and quantitative metathesis（§ 72）became in Attic $\nu \epsilon \omega$＇s，$\nu \epsilon \omega \nu$（sometimes also $\nu \epsilon \omega$ after the analogy of $\eta$ グp $\omega$ from＊$\eta \boldsymbol{\eta} \omega \omega$ ，see § 540 ），$\nu \epsilon \omega$ or $\nu \epsilon \hat{\omega}$ from ${ }^{*} \nu \epsilon \omega 0$ older ${ }^{*} \nu \eta \circ 0$ ， $\nu \in \varrho^{\prime} ; \nu \epsilon \omega, \nu \epsilon \not \varphi^{\prime} \nu ; \nu \epsilon \omega^{\prime}, \nu \epsilon \omega \bar{s}, \nu \in \omega \nu, \nu \in \omega_{\varphi} s$ ．

3．The Ï－declension．
§ 328．a．Masculine and Feminine short i－stems．

| Singular． |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nom． | －is | то́入ıs |
| Voc． | －i，－ei or－oi | $\pi o ́ \lambda \iota$ |
| Acc． | －im | $\pi$ о́入ı $\downarrow$ |
| Gen． | －eĩs，－oĩs | $\pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \omega s, \pi o ́ \lambda \eta o s, \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon о$ s，$\pi o ́ \lambda l o s$ |
| Dat． | $\begin{aligned} & \text {-ēi (loc.), eei } \\ & \text { (loc.) } \end{aligned}$ | $\pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota, \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon i, \pi_{0} \lambda^{\prime} \eta$ i，$\pi o ́ \lambda \bar{\imath}$ |

Nom．Voc．Acc．－ $\bar{i} \quad \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \epsilon, \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota$ Gen．Dat．？$\pi 0 \lambda \epsilon \in \iota \nu$

## Plural．

Nom．Voc．－ejes
Acc．－ins
Gen．（i）jō̃̃
Dat．－isu（loc．）
$\pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota s, \pi o ́ \lambda l \epsilon s, \pi o ́ \lambda \eta \epsilon \varsigma$
то́̀єıs，$\pi o ́ \lambda ı a s, \pi o ́ \lambda \eta a s, \pi o ́ \lambda i s$, $\pi o ́ \lambda \iota \nu s$
$\pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \omega \nu, \pi о \lambda i ́ \omega \nu$
$\pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \sigma \iota, \pi o ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \iota, \pi 0 \lambda i ́ \epsilon \sigma \sigma \iota$

In the original Indg. declension the stem-forms contained various grades of ablaut nearly all of which disappeared in Greek owing to various new formations in several of the cases.

Singular: The Greek nominative ending corresponds to the endings in the other languages, as Skr. agníh, fire; Skr. ávih, ờıs, Lat. ovis, Lith. avis, sheep ; Goth. ansts, favour.

The original ending of the vocative was -i when the preceding syllable had the chief accent of the word, and -ei or -oi when the accent was on the ending. Greek and the Germanic languages generalized the former and Sanskrit the latter form, as $\pi$ ó $\iota$, Goth. anst, beside Skr. agné. In Latin the nom. was used for the vocative.
$-\iota \nu$ from Indg. -im (§ 141) corresponds to the accusative endings in Skr. agním, ávim, Lat. sitim, partim. Forms like Lat. ovem, hostem were new formations with eem from the acc. of the consonantal stems. The ending -im regularly disappeared in Gothic, as anst.

The endings in Skr. agnéh, Goth. anstáis, Lith. naktẽs (nom. naktis, night) were regularly developed from the original endings of the genitive, which disappeared entirely in Greek and their place was taken by various new formations after the analogy of the $\mathbf{u} \cdot$ and $\mathbf{i} \cdot$ declensions. módcos, which occurs in all the dialects except Attic, had -oos from
 $-\epsilon F$ - from the $\mathbf{u}$-declension. Hom. $\pi$ ó $\lambda \eta$ os with $-\eta$ - from the dative. Attic $\pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \omega s$ from older * $\pi o \lambda \eta o s$ by quantitative metathesis (§ 72). Lat. ovis, partis, hostis had is from the genitive of the consonantal stems.

The original locative ending eè became ái in Gothic, as anstái. The .ī in Lat. ovī, hostī can represent both Indg. eēi and eei. All the Greek forms were new formations. Att. and Hom, $\pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota, \mathrm{Hom} . \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon i ̈$ from ${ }^{*} \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon j \iota$ with $-l$ from the dative of the consonantal stems in all the

Greek forms of the dative. Hom. and Att. (inscriptions $4 \mathrm{IO}-335$ в. c.) $\pi o ́ \lambda \eta i \ddot{i}$ is difficult to explain. Two solutions of the difficulty have been proposed, but neither of them is quite satisfactory. Some scholars assume that a locative ending ee existed beside -ēi in the parent Indg. language (cp. §63), and that the former occurs in the Vedic locative agná beside agnấu (a new formation after the analogy of the $\mathbf{u}$-declension) and in Greek $\pi o ́ \lambda \eta+\ddot{\imath}$ with $-\iota$ from the dative of the consonantal stems. If this explanation is right тó̀ $\eta$ ïmust have been formed in fairly late prehistoric Greek, otherwise it would not have remained trisyllabic. Others assume that $\pi o ́ \lambda \eta \ddot{i}$ stands for an older $* \pi o ́ \lambda \eta F+\ddot{i}$ with $-\eta F$ from the $\mathbf{u}$-declension like the -á́u in agná́u, but no trace of $\cdot \eta F$ - exists in any of the dialects (§ 331). Ion. Cret.


Dual: The nom. voc. and acc. originally ended in $\mathbf{i}$, as in Skr. agní. $\pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \epsilon, \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota$ were from ${ }^{*} \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon j \epsilon$ with $-\epsilon j$ from the nom. plural and $-\epsilon$ from the dual of the consonantal stems. On the ending oolv in the genitive and dative see § 325.

Plural: The endings in $\pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \epsilon s$, Skr. agnáyah, Lat. ovēs, hostēs, Goth. ansteis were all regularly developed from the Indg. nominative ending eejes. Ion. Cret., \&c. módles was from forms like kíєs, Hom. tód $\eta \in s$ had the same $-\eta$ - as in $\pi o ́ \lambda \eta i$.

The original ending of the accusative was preserved in Cret. $\pi o ́ \lambda ı \nu s$ and Goth. anstins. Ion. $\pi o ́ \lambda i \bar{s}$ like Lat. ovis, turris had regular loss of the nasal and lengthening of the preceding vowel (§69, i). Lat. ovēs, hostēs may be either the nom. used for the acc. or else have ees from the acc. of the consonantal stems. Att. Ion. $\pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \iota$ was the nom. used for the accusative. Hom. Dor. and Lesb. mólıas had tıas from forms like kías. Hom. mó̀ $\eta$ as (see $\pi o ́ \lambda \eta i$ ) with -as from кías.

The endings in $\tau \rho \iota \omega \nu$, Lat. trium, Ion. Dor, and Lesb.
$\pi o \lambda i \omega \nu$, Lat. ovium, hostium correspond to the original Indg. genitive ending -(i)jōõ. Att. $\pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \omega \nu$ had $-\epsilon$ - from the nominative.

The original locative ending was preserved in Skr. triṣ̆ú, tribus, agníṣúu. $\tau \rho \iota \sigma i ́$, Ion. $\pi o ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \iota$ had $-\sigma \iota$ from the dat. of the consonantal stems, and similarly $\pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \sigma \iota$ but with $-\epsilon$ - from the nominative. Hom. $\pi 0 \lambda i \epsilon \sigma \sigma \iota$ had $-\epsilon \sigma \sigma \iota$ from the dat. of the s-stems (§ 364). $\pi$ o $\lambda$ éo $\iota$ in the NorthWest group of dialects was a new formation after the analogy of the dative of the o-declension.

## b. Neuter short i-stems.

§ 329. In Greek the declension of the neuters only differed from the masculines and feminines in the nom. and acc. singular, and the nom. voc. and acc. plural. The nom. voc. and acc. singular originally ended in -i which was preserved in Skr. vári, water, i̊ $\delta \rho \iota$, but became ee in Latin, as mare, leve. The nom. voc. and acc. plural originally ended in -i which was preserved in Vedic trí, tria. $\tau \rho i \alpha$, , ${ }^{\prime} \delta \rho \iota \alpha$ had $-\alpha$ from the plural of the consonantal stems, whereas Lat. tria, Goth. prija, three were new formations after the analogy of the $\mathbf{o}$-declension.

## c. The long i-stems.

§ 330. The long i-stems originally contained monosyllabic nouns like Skr. dhíḥ, thought, $\kappa \frac{i}{\iota}$ s, $\lambda_{i}^{\prime}$ s, îs, Lat. vīs, and nouns of more than one syllable like Vedic nadíh, river. The latter class of nouns went over into the consonantal declension in prim. Greek (§ 343).

Indg. Singular.

| Nom. | -is | ${ }_{\kappa}$ ¢́s | dhíh | nadíh |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Voc. | -i, -ī | кı̇s | dhîh | nádi |
| Acc. | -ijm, i im | Kıv | dhíyam | nadíyam |
| Gen. | -ijos | кıós | dhiyáh | nadíyah |
| Dat. | -iji (= loc.) | kıí | dhiyí | (nadiyám) |

Dual.

| Nom. Voc. Acc. | -ije | кí |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Gen. Dat. | $?$ | кıoìv |

Plural.

| Nom. Voc. -ijes | кíts | dhíyah | nadíyah |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Acc. -ijns | kías | dhíyah | nadíyah |
| Gen. - ijōm | $\kappa \iota \omega \bar{\nu}$ | dhiyấm | (nadínām) |
| Dat. .isu ( $=$ loc.) | $\kappa \iota \sigma i ́$ | dhiṣ̂́u | nadíșu |

-ij. $=$ Skr. -iy. alternated with -i. . The former was regular before vowels and the latter before consonants. In Greek the -ij- regularly became -i. (§ 128).

All the Greek forms, except the voc. singular, gen. and dat. dual, and dat. plural, were regularly developed from the original Indg. forms. The nom. was used for the voc. in Greek and in Skr. dhîh. The regular ending of the acc. singular would have been *-íya in Skr. (§65, I), but $\cdot \mathrm{m}$, which originally belonged only to the $\overline{\mathrm{a}} \cdot, \mathrm{o} \cdot, \mathrm{i} \cdot$ and $\mathbf{u}$ declensions, was extended to the masc. and fem. acc. sing. of all declensions. Acc. iva for *iv, vim, with $-\alpha$ added from the acc. of the consonantal stems. From ${ }_{i v}^{\prime \prime}$ was then formed a new gen. ìvós, pl. îves, cp. the similar new formations in $Z \hat{\eta} \nu \alpha: Z \hat{\eta} \nu$ (§ 337), $\tau i v \alpha:{ }^{*} \tau^{i} \nu$. The gen. and dat. dual kıoiv from *kıoì had -olv from the o-declension. The dat. plural $\kappa \iota \sigma i$ had $-t$ - from the other cases of the plural and $-\sigma \iota$ from the dat. of the consonantal stems.

$$
\text { 4. The } \breve{\mathrm{u}} \text {-declension. }
$$

§ 331. a. Masculine and Feminine short u-stems. Indg. Singular.

| Nom. | -us | $\pi \chi^{\chi} \times \nu$ | $\eta{ }^{\text {joús }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Voc. | $\cdot \mathrm{l}$, - eu or -ou | $\pi \hat{\eta} \chi \nu$ | ท̀ $\delta$ v́ |
| Acc. | -um | $\pi \hat{\eta} \chi \nu \nu$ | $\eta$ خ̀ov́v |
| Gen. | -eũs, .oũs | $\pi \eta \chi^{\prime} \epsilon \omega \Phi, \pi \eta \chi^{\prime \prime}{ }^{\circ}$ | ท̀déos |
| Dat. | -ēu (loc.), .eu (loc.) | $\pi \eta \chi^{\prime} \in \iota, \pi \eta \chi^{\prime} \in i$ |  |

## Dual.



The stem-forms of the $\mathbf{u} \cdot$ like the $\mathbf{i}$-declension originally contained various grades of ablaut nearly all of which disappeared in Greek owing to various new formations in several of the cases.

Singular: The Greek nominative ending corresponds to the endings in the other languages, as Skr. sūnúh, Goth. sunus, Lith. sūnùs, son, Lat. fructus, manus.

The original ending of the vocative was $\mathbf{u}$ when the preceding syllable had the chief accent of the word and -eu or -ou when the accent was on the ending. Greek and the Germanic languages generalized the former and Sanskrit and Lithuanian the latter, as $\pi \hat{\eta} \chi v$, $\dot{\eta} \delta \dot{v}$, Goth. sunu, beside Skr. súnō, Lith. sūnaũ. In Latin the nom. was used for the vocative.
$-v v$ from Indg. $\cdot$ um ( $\S 141$ ) corresponds to the accusative endings in Skr. sūnúm, Lat. fructum, Lith. súnụ, Goth. sunu with regular loss of the -m. Hom. $\epsilon \dot{v} \rho \epsilon^{\prime} \alpha$ for $\epsilon \dot{v} \rho \dot{v} v$ was formed after the analogy of the acc. plural.

The endings in Skr. sūnốh, Goth. sunáus, Lith. sūnaũs, Lat. fructūs were regularly developed from the original endings of the genitive, which disappeared entirely in Greek and their place was taken by new formations. The ending in $\pi \dot{\eta} \chi \epsilon \omega \varsigma$, which only occurs in the nouns, was formed after the analogy of $\pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \omega s$ of the i-declension. The cause of the new formation was probably due to the fact that in Greek the endings of the dat. sing. $-\epsilon(j) \iota,-\epsilon(F) \iota$
and nom. pl. $-\epsilon(j) \epsilon \varsigma,-\epsilon(F) \epsilon s$ fell together in these two declensions. $\dot{\eta} \delta \dot{\delta} \epsilon \rho$, Hom. $\pi \eta \dot{\eta} \chi \in \sigma$, older $*-\epsilon$ Fos with $-\epsilon F-$ from the dative.

The endings in Skr. sūná́u, Goth. sunáu were regularly developed from the original locative ending $\cdot \bar{e} u$. The $\cdot \bar{u}$ in Lat. fructū can represent both eēu and eeu. The Gr. endings $-\epsilon \iota$, $-\epsilon$ ï are from older *- $\epsilon \neq \iota$ with $-\iota$ from the dative of the consonantal stems, cp. the similar new formation in Vedic sūnávi beside sūná́u.

Dual: The original ending of the nom. voc. and acc. was preserved in Skr. sūnū́. $\pi \eta \eta^{\prime} \epsilon \epsilon, \pi \eta \eta^{\prime} \epsilon \iota$ was from older ${ }^{*}-\epsilon F \epsilon$ with $-\epsilon F$ - from the nom. plural and $-\epsilon$ from the dual of the consonantal stems. On the ending oolv in the gen. and dat. see § 325.

Plural: The endings in Att. $\pi \dot{\eta} \chi \epsilon \epsilon s$, Ion. $\pi \eta \dot{\eta} \chi \in \epsilon$, and Skr. sūnávah were regularly developed from the Indg. nominative ending eewes. Lat. fructūs was the acc. used for the nominative.

The original ending of the accusative was preserved in Cret. viúvs, sons and Goth. sununs. $\pi \dot{\eta} X \in \iota s, \eta j \delta \in i \hat{s}$ were the nom. used for the accusative. Ion. $\pi \dot{\eta} \chi \in \alpha s, ~ \epsilon \dot{v} \rho \in \epsilon^{\alpha} \alpha$ were new formations after the analogy of the $\overline{\mathrm{u}}$-stems (§ 334). Lat. fructūs was from older ${ }^{*}$ fructuns with regular loss of the $\cdot \mathrm{n} \cdot$ and lengthening of the preceding vowel.
$\pi \eta \chi \epsilon \omega \nu$ from older ${ }^{*} \pi \eta \chi \epsilon F \omega \nu$ was a new formation with $-\epsilon F-$ from the nom. plural. The normal development of the original genitive ending occurs in Lat. fructuom, -uum, -um.

The original ending of the locative was preserved in
 the nom. plural and $-\sigma \iota$ from the dative of the consonantal stems. The Hom. ending $-\epsilon \sigma \sigma \iota$ was from the $s$ sstems (§ 364).
§ 332. In the declension of the word for son two stems
are to be taken into consideration, viz. prim. Greek *sǔijos $=v i o ́ s$ which was declined like an ordinary o-stem (§ 325) ; and prim. Greek *sǔijus = viús, Cret. viús, acc. Arcadian viúv, Cret. viưv, acc. pl. Cret. viúvs. The remaining cases of the singular, dual and plural were formed from the

 $v i \epsilon \epsilon \alpha, v i \epsilon \epsilon a s$ were new formations after the analogy of the consonantal stems. At a later stage vi- came to be regarded as the stem-form, from which was made a new declension after the analogy of the inflected forms of
 *vị̂, víáб८.

## b. Neuter short u-stems.

§ 333. In Greek the declension of the neuters only differed from the masculines and feminines in the nom. and acc. singular, and the nom. voc. and acc. plural. The nom. voc. and acc. singular originally ended in $\cdot \mathbf{u}$ which was preserved in Skr. mádhu, mead; Skr. páśsu = Goth. faíhu, cattle; $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \tau v, \dot{\eta} \delta \dot{\delta}$. The origin of the ending in Lat. cornū, genū, pecū is obscure. The nom. voc. and acc. plural originally ended in $-\bar{u}$ which was preserved in Vedic purū́, much, many; mádhū, beside purứni, mádhūni. Lat. cornua, genua was a new formation after the analogy of the o-declension. In Greek the nouns and adjectives differed in the formation of the nom. plural. The former had $-\eta$, as $\ddot{\alpha} \sigma \tau \eta$, from older $*-\epsilon \sigma \alpha$, the ending of the neuter $s$-stems (§ 364), and the latter had $-\epsilon \alpha$, as $\eta \quad \delta \epsilon \in$, from older ${ }^{*}-\epsilon F \alpha$ with $-\epsilon F$ - from the masc. and fem. nom. plural, and $-\alpha$ from the nom. plural of consonantal stems.

## c. The long ū-stems.

§ 334. The long $\bar{u}$-stems contain monosyllabic nouns like $\sigma \hat{v}$, $\hat{\nu}$ s, Lat. sūs, OE. sū, pig, sow ; and $\mu \hat{\jmath}$ s which
originally belonged to the s-declension; Skr. bhúh, earth;
 tanúh, body.

Indg. Singular.
Nom. -ūs $\quad \sigma \hat{v} s$ bhứh $i \chi \theta \hat{u} s$ tanứh

Voc. -u, $\overline{\mathrm{u}}$
Acc. -uwm, -ūm
 Dat. -uwi (=loc.) oví bhuví i¿đúi tanúvi

## Dual.

Nom. Voc. Acc. .uwe Gen. Dat. ?

бט́є ovoî

## Plural.

Nom. Voc. -uwes
Acc. uwns
Gen. -uwō̃̃

-uw- $=-v F$-, Skr. $\cdot \mathbf{u v}$ - alternated with $\cdot \bar{u} \cdot$. The former was regular before vowels and the latter before consonants. In Greek the -vF- regularly became -v-(§ 119).

All the Greek forms except the gen. and dat. dual, and the dat. plural were regularly developed from the original Indg. forms. $\sigma v o i ̂ v, ~ i \chi \theta v o u v ~ f r o m ~ * \sigma v F o i ̂ v, ~ * i \chi \theta u ́ f o u v ~ h a d ~$ -oıv from the o-declension. $\sigma v \sigma i ́, ~ i \chi \theta v i \sigma \iota$ had $v$ for $\bar{v}$ from the other cases of the plural and $-\sigma \iota$ from the dative of the consonantal stems. Hom. $\sigma v \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \sigma \iota$ with $-\epsilon \sigma \sigma \iota$ from the s -stems. In the Sanskrit monosyllabic nouns the nom. was used for the vocative. Beside the regular acc. sing. ${ }^{i} \chi \theta u ̛ v \nu$ there also occurs in later Greek ix $X$ v́ $\alpha$ formed after the analogy of the acc. plural. On the ending in Sanskrit bhúvam, tanúvam, see $\S 330$. Beside the regular acc. pl. $\sigma v u^{\prime}$, í $X \theta \dot{v} \alpha s$ there also occurs in Attic and Ionic $\sigma \hat{v} s$,
${ }^{i} \chi \theta \hat{\nu} s$ from older $-\nu \nu s$ which was formed after the analogy of the acc. singular. This new formation was also occasionally used for the nominative. For nouns which have $v$ throughout all cases see §§ 265-6.

## 5. The Diphthongal Declension.

§ 335. This declension contains monosyllabic nouns and nouns of more than one syllable. It is subdivided into four categories according as the stem ends in $\cdot \bar{a} u$-, -ēu--our or -ōi-. The stem-forms of each category originally contained various grades of ablaut, but in Greek as in the other Indg. languages one or other of the stem-forms was generally extended to all the cases by levelling.

## a. āu-STEMS.

§ 336.
Nom. Voc.
Acc.
Gen.
Dat. (=loc.) *nāwí $\nu \eta \eta_{i}, \nu \bar{\alpha} \hat{i}$

## Dual.

Nom. Voc. Acc. *nấwe $\nu \hat{\eta} \epsilon$
Gen. Dat. ? $\nu \in o i ̂ \nu$

## Plural.

Nom. Voc.
Acc.
Gen.
Dat. (=loc.) *nāusú $\nu \alpha v \sigma i ́, \nu \eta v \sigma i ́, \nu \eta \epsilon ́ \sigma \sigma \iota, \nu \epsilon \in \epsilon \sigma \sigma \iota$, $\nu \frac{\alpha}{\alpha} \epsilon \sigma \sigma \iota$
$\cdot \bar{a} w \cdot=$ prim. Gr. $-\bar{\alpha} F=$, Skr. and Lat. $\cdot \overline{\mathrm{a}} \mathrm{v}$. regularly alternated with -āu. The former occurred before vowels and the latter before consonants. The aud-stems seem to have levelled out the $\cdot \bar{a}$ - of $\cdot \bar{a} w$-, $\overline{\mathrm{a} u}$ - already in the parent

Indg. language. Intervocalic -F. regularly disappeared in Greek (§ 122). The - $\epsilon$ - in forms like $\nu$ é́a, $\nu \epsilon$ 'ós, $\nu \in ́ \alpha s, \& c$. which occur in Homer and Herodotus was due to the shortening of older $-\eta$ - before the following vowel (§7).

Singular: In the nominative $\nu \alpha \hat{v} s$ the first element of the diphthong was shortened in prim. Greek (§ 63), cp. Skr. nấuḥ, Lat. nāvis with the ending of the $\mathbf{i} \cdot$ declension in all its cases. The $\eta$ in Hom. $\nu \eta \hat{v}_{s}$ and also in the dat. pl. $\nu \eta v \sigma i$ was due to levelling out the $\eta$ of the other cases where it was regular.

The accusative form $\nu \alpha \hat{v} \nu$ was a new formation from the nominative. Hom. $\nu \hat{\eta} \alpha$ from older ${ }^{*} \nu \hat{\eta} F \alpha,{ }^{*} \nu \hat{\alpha} F \alpha$ corresponds to Indg. *nấwm, Skr. nắvam (see § 330), Lat. nāvem.

The original genitive *nāwós corresponds to Dor. $\nu \bar{\alpha} o ́ s$, Ion. $\nu \eta$ ós and Att. $\nu \epsilon \omega$ s with quantitative metathesis (§ 72), Skr. nāváḥ, Lat. nāvis.
The dative Dor. $\nu \bar{\alpha} \hat{i}$, Lesb. $\nu \hat{\alpha} \hat{i}$, Att. Ion. $\nu \eta \dot{\imath}$ were all from prim. Greek ${ }^{*} \nu \bar{\alpha} F i=$ Indg. ${ }^{*}$ nāwí, Skr. nāví, cp. Lat. nāvī.

Dual: Nom. voc. and acc. $\nu \hat{\eta} \epsilon$ from prim. Greek $\nu \hat{\alpha} F \epsilon=$ Indg. *nấwe, Skr. nấvāu probably had its ending from the u-declension. Gen. dat. $\nu \in o i \imath v ~ f r o m ~ o l d e r ~ * ~ \nu \eta F o i ̂ \nu, ~$ ${ }^{*} \nu \bar{\alpha}$ Foì (§ 325), see $\nu \epsilon ́ \alpha, \& c$. above.

Plural: The nominative Dor. $\nu \hat{\alpha} \epsilon s$, Att. Ion. $\nu \hat{\eta} \epsilon s$ were from prim. Greek ${ }^{*} \nu^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha}} F \in s=$ Indg. *nấwes, Skr. nấvaḥ, Lat. nāvēs.

The Attic accusative $\nu \alpha \hat{v} s$ was a new formation after the analogy of the accusative singular. Dor. $\nu \hat{\alpha} \alpha$, , Ion. $\nu \hat{\eta} \alpha{ }_{s}$ $=$ prim. Greek ${ }^{*} \nu \frac{\alpha}{\alpha} F a s$, Skr. nấvaḥ, Lat. nāvēs.

The Att. Ion. genitive $\nu \epsilon \hat{\omega} \nu$ was from older $\nu \eta \hat{\omega} \nu$ with shortening of $\eta$ to $\epsilon(\S 71)$. Dor. $\nu \bar{\alpha} \omega \bar{\omega}$, Hom. $\nu \eta \bar{\omega} \nu$ from prim. Greek ${ }^{*} \nu \bar{\alpha} \bar{\sigma} \hat{\omega} \nu=$ Indg. ${ }^{*}$ nāwóm, $\mathrm{m}, \mathrm{Skr}$. nāvấm, Lat. nāvium.

The dative ${ }^{*} \nu \bar{a} v \sigma i ́$ was shortened to $\nu \alpha v \sigma i ́$ in prim. Greek (§ 83 ), cp. the nom. singular. Ion. $\nu \eta \nu \sigma \mathfrak{i}$ like $\nu \eta \hat{\nu}$ s had $\eta$
from the other cases. The ending $-\sigma \iota$ was from the dat. of the consonantal stems. Dor. $\nu \bar{\alpha} \epsilon \sigma \sigma \iota$, Hom. $\nu \eta \eta^{\prime} \epsilon \sigma \sigma \iota$ with $-\epsilon \sigma \sigma \iota$ from the $s$-stems.

## b. ēu-STEMS.

§ 337. Some of the original ablaut-grades were preserved in the declension of $Z$ eús; Skr. dyắuḥ, sky, day, Lat. diēs, Jov-, viz. djēu- in $Z \in u ́ s, S k r$. dyấuḥ, Lat. diēs, and O.Lat. Diēspiter ; djeu- in $Z \in \hat{v}$, Lat. Jū-piter, Jov- ; and diw. in $\Delta$ lós, Skr. diváḥ.

> Indg.

| Nom. | *djétus | $Z$ cús | dyấuh | (diēs) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Voc. | *djéu | $Z \in \hat{v}$ | (dyấuụ) | Jū-piter |
| Acc. | * ${ }^{\text {jeéé(u)m }}$ | $Z \hat{\eta} \nu$ | dyáam | diem, (Jovem) |
| Gen. | *diwós | $\Delta$ iós | diváh | (Jovis) |
| Dat. (= loc.) | *djéwi | $\Delta i t, \Delta_{i}^{\prime}$ | dyávi | Jove |

The nominative $Z$ eús was regularly developed from the original form *djé́us ( $(\S \S 63,129,8$ ). Latin diēs was a new formation from the acc. before *diēm was shortened to diem.
$Z \epsilon \hat{v}$ corresponds to the original vocative *djéu and to the $\mathrm{J} \bar{u}-$ in $\mathrm{J} \overline{\mathrm{u}} \mathrm{piter}=Z \epsilon \hat{v} \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \epsilon \rho$. Jūpiter then came to be used as a nominative.

The accusative $Z \hat{\eta} \nu$ corresponds to Vedic dyáam, Lat. diem, Indg. *djéf(u)m (§ 63). From $Z \hat{\eta} \nu$ a new acc. $Z \hat{\eta} \nu \alpha$ was formed with $-\alpha$ from the acc. of consonantal stems. From $\boldsymbol{Z} \hat{\eta} \nu \alpha$ was then formed a new gen. $Z \eta \nu o{ }^{\prime}$, dat. $Z \eta \nu i ́$.
$\Delta_{i ́ \alpha}$ from ${ }^{*} \Delta i ́ f \alpha$, like classical Skr. dívam beside Vedic dyám, was a new formation from the gen. with $-\alpha$ from the acc. of consonantal stems. And similarly Lat. Jovem, gen. Jovis were formed after the analogy of Jove.

The genitive $\Delta$ tós from * $\Delta$ ८fós, Skr. diváḥ was regularly developed from the original form *diwós.

The dative $\Delta u i t, \Delta_{\imath}^{t}$ from * $\Delta \iota f i$, like classical Skr. diví beside Vedic dyávi = Lat. Jove, was formed after the analogy of the genitive.
§ 338. In the declension of $\beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon$ és and similar words the ablaut-grade eeu- originally belonged only to the stem of the nom. singular. The -ēu- (= eèw before vowels) was in prim. Greek levelled out into all the cases except the voc. singular which retained the old ablaut-grade eu. To this declension belonged also the Hom. proper names like A A $\tau \rho \in \cup ́ s, ~ \Pi \eta \lambda \epsilon$ ús which generalized the ablaut-grade -eu- (= ew. before vowels) in the oblique cases, as voc. $-\epsilon \hat{v}$, acc. $\epsilon^{\epsilon}(f) \alpha$, gen. $-\epsilon(F)$ os, dat. $-\epsilon(F) \iota$. The nom. ending - $\epsilon$ ús was a shortening of older *- $\eta$ ús (§ 63).

## Singular.

## Prim. Greek.

Nom.
Voc.
Acc.
Gen.
Dat.

- $\eta$ Us $\quad \beta a \sigma i \lambda \epsilon u ́ s$
- $\epsilon \quad \beta \alpha \sigma i \lambda \epsilon \hat{v}$
- $\eta F \alpha \quad \beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon ́ \bar{\alpha}, \beta \alpha \sigma i \lambda \hat{\eta} \alpha, \beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon \in \alpha$

- $\eta$ Fl $\quad \beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon i ̂, \beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \hat{\eta} \iota, \beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon \in i$

Dual.
Nom. Voc. Acc.
$-\eta F \epsilon \quad \beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon \epsilon, \beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \hat{\eta} \epsilon$
Gen. Dat. - $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ Foıl $\beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon \in \iota \iota$

## Plural.

Nom. Voc.
Acc. $\quad-\eta f a s \quad \beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon \bar{\alpha} s, \beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \hat{\eta} \alpha s, \beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon \in \alpha$ Gen. $\quad \eta F^{\circ} \omega \nu \quad \beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \nu, \beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \eta{ }^{\prime} \omega \nu$
Dat. $\quad$ चvo $\iota \quad \beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon \hat{v} \sigma \iota$
In the nom. singular and dat. plural the $-\eta \nu$ - was shortened to $-\epsilon v$ - in prim. Greek. In the Arcadian and Cyprian dialects a new nom. singular in $\eta \rho$ was formed with $\cdot \eta$ -
from the gen. and dative. The endings $-\eta F \alpha,-\eta F o s,-\eta F \alpha S$ regularly beame $-\epsilon \bar{\alpha},-\epsilon \omega s,-\epsilon \bar{\alpha} s$ in Attic by loss of $-F$ - and quantitative metathesis (§ 72). The - $\epsilon$ - in the Ionic and Doric endings $-\epsilon \alpha,-\epsilon \sigma S,-\epsilon i$, $-\epsilon \epsilon \rho,-\epsilon \alpha \rho$ was due to the shortening of $\eta$ - before the following vowel ( $(\mathbf{7 1})$; and similarly in the Attic endings $-\epsilon \hat{\imath},-\epsilon \epsilon$ (nom. dual), $-\epsilon \circ \tau \nu$, $-\epsilon \omega \nu$. The forms with $-\eta$ - belong to the Hom. Cypr. Lesb. and Boeotian (written - $\epsilon \hat{\imath}$ - in Boeot.) dialects. - $\hat{\eta} s$ contracted from $-\eta \in s$ (on inscriptions) was the regular ending of the nom. plural in Attic until after the middle of the fourth century b.c. At about this time a new nom. ending - - ís was formed after the analogy of the nom. of the $\mathbf{u}$-declension owing to the gen. plural being alike in both declensions. From about the end of the fourth century $\beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \in i$ is came to be used also for the accusative. The older nom. $\beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \hat{\eta} s$ was used for the accusative at a much earlier period. See § 268.

## c. ōu-STEMS.

§ 339. In the original declension of the word for cow, ox the stem-forms had the three ablaut-grades gōu-, gou(= gow• before vowels) and gu•. The form gu- does not occur in the declension of *góus (§ 205) in any of the languages. It is therefore probable that it disappeared already in the parent Indg. language and that its place was taken by the stem-form gou- in the gen. singular, gen. and dat. dual, and in the gen. and loc. plural. In writing down the hypothetical Indg. forms the accent has been omitted in the gen. and dat. of the singular and plural, because of the difference in the accentuation of the Greek and Sanskrit forms. The Greek doubtless represents the original accentuation except in the dat. singular.

Singular.

| Indg. |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nom. | *gốus | $\beta o v$ s, $\beta$ ¢̂s | gáuh | bōs |
| Voc. | *góu | $\beta$ ov | (gáuḥ) | (bōs) |
| Acc. | *gố(u)m | $\beta \circ \hat{v} \nu, \beta$ ¢ $\nu$ | gám | (bovem) |
| Gen. | *gowos | $\beta$ oós | (gớh) | bovis |
| Dat. (=loc.) | *gowi | $\beta$ oí | gávi | bove |
| Dual. |  |  |  |  |

Nom. Voc. Acc.
Gen. Dat.
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { *gó́we } & \text { ßóє } \\ ? & \text { ßooiv }\end{array}$
Plural.
Nom. Voc. Acc.
*gówes $\beta$ óes
*gówñs $\beta$ ôvs, $\beta$ Bóas, $\beta \hat{\omega} s$
Gen. *gowōm $\beta$ ô̄ $\nu$
gávāu
gávaḥ bovēs (gấḥ) bovēs
gávām bovom, boum

Dat. (=loc.) *gousu $\quad \beta$ ovoí, $\beta o ́ \epsilon \in \sigma \iota$ góṣṣu
Singular: The prim. Greek nominative ${ }^{*} \beta \omega v$ s was regularly shortened to $\beta$ oûs (§ 63). Dor. $\beta \hat{\omega} s$ was a new formation from the original accusative, and probably also Lat. bōs (a loan word from one of the other Italic dialects).

The accusative $\beta$ ôv $\nu$ was a new formation after the analogy of the nominative. Dor. $\beta \hat{\omega} \nu=$ Skr. gấm and Indg. *gố(u)m. Lat. bovem was a new formation after the analogy of bovis, bove.

The genitive $\beta$ oós corresponds to Vedic gávah beside classical Sanskrit góh, Lat. bovis, Indg. *gowos.

The dative $\beta$ oit, Skr. gávi and Lat. bove were all regularly developed from the original form *gowi.
Dual: The Greek dual forms were new formations with $\beta$-, older $* \beta_{0}$ F-, from forms where it was regular, as in ßoós, $\beta$ óєs. The original stem *gōw. occurs in Skr. gávāu with the ending -āu from the $\mathbf{u}$-declension.

Plural: The nominative $\beta$ óss was from the original form *gówes. Skr. gâvaḥ can represent a prim. Aryan form *gávas ( $=$ *gówes) or *gávas in which case the latter would be a new formation. Lat. bovēs was the acc. used for the nominative.
$\beta o v ̂ s, \beta \omega ̂ s$ and Skr. gáth were new formations after the analogy of the acc. singular. Some scholars assume that there existed in the parent Indg. language an acc. form *góf(u)ms beside *gówñs, and that the former occurs in Dor. $\beta \hat{\omega} s$, Skr. gấh and the latter in Hom. ßóas, older Skr. gāvaḥ, and Lat. bovēs.
$\beta o \omega ̂ \nu$, Skr. gávām and Lat. bovom, boum were all regularly developed from the original genitive form *gowōm.
The stem in the dative $\beta$ ovoí corresponds to the original stem *gou- and to the gó• in Skr. góṣ̣u; - $\sigma \iota$ was from the dat. ending of the consonantal stems. Hom. $\beta$ ó $\epsilon \sigma \sigma \iota$ was a new formation with $\beta$ o-, older * $\beta$ oF-, from the other cases of the plural and $-\epsilon \sigma \sigma \iota$ from the dat. plural of the $\mathbf{s}$-stems.
§ 340. It cannot be determined with certainty whether
 $\overline{\mathrm{o}} \mathrm{u}$-stems or whether they were o -stems which underwent contraction after the loss of intervocalic - - -, as $\pi \dot{\alpha} \tau \rho \omega s$ from ${ }^{*} \pi \alpha \tau \rho \omega F o s$, and then became declined like consonantal stems. If they were originally our-stems we must assume that the ablaut-grade -ōu• (=-ōw before vowels), which belonged properly to the stem of the nom. singular only, was levelled out into all the cases in prim. Greek, and that then there were formed a new nom. singular $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \rho \omega$ for ${ }^{*} \pi \alpha \tau \rho \omega v s$, and dat. plural $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \rho \omega \sigma \iota$ for ${ }^{*} \pi \alpha \tau \rho \omega v \sigma \iota$, the $\omega \nu$ of which would have been shortened to $-\mathrm{ov}, \mathrm{cp} . \beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon u^{\prime}$, $\beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon \hat{v} \sigma \iota$.

Singular.
Prim. Greek.

Nom. Voc.
Acc. $\quad-\omega F a$
Gen.
Dat. (=loc.) - $\omega$ F $\iota$
Dual.
Nom. Voc. Acc. $\quad-\omega F \epsilon$
Gen. Dat. $-\omega F \circ \iota \nu$
Plural.
Nom. Voc.
Acc.
Gen. $\quad \omega F \omega \nu$
Dat. (=loc.)
$-\omega F \in S$
$-\omega F a s$
$\cdot \omega v \sigma \iota$ or $-\omega \sigma \iota$
$\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \rho \omega s$
$\pi \alpha ́ \tau \rho \omega \alpha, \pi \dot{\alpha} \tau \rho \omega, \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \rho \omega \nu$
$\pi \alpha ́ \tau \rho \omega o s$
$\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \rho \omega і ̈, \pi \dot{\alpha} \tau \rho \underset{\varrho}{ }$
$\pi \alpha ́ \tau \rho \omega \epsilon$
$\pi \alpha \tau \rho \omega о \iota \nu$
$\pi \dot{\alpha} \tau \rho \omega \in \varsigma, \pi \alpha ́ \tau \rho \omega s$
$\pi \alpha ́ \tau \rho \omega \alpha s, \pi \alpha ́ \tau \rho \omega s$
$\pi \alpha \tau \rho \omega \omega \nu$
$\pi \alpha ́ \tau \rho \omega \sigma \iota$

In Attic $\pi \dot{\alpha} \tau \rho \omega \alpha, \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \rho \omega \in s, \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \rho \omega \alpha s$ were generally contracted into $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \rho \omega, \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \rho \omega$. Att. Ion. $\pi \dot{\alpha} \tau \rho \omega \nu, \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \rho \omega$ were formed after the analogy of $\nu \epsilon \omega \nu, \nu \epsilon \varphi^{\prime}: \nu \epsilon \omega$ ' (§ 327); and similarly a gen. $\pi \alpha ́ \tau \rho \omega$ beside the regular form $\pi \alpha ́ \tau \rho \omega o s$ also occurs. The Cretan acc. plural $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \rho \omega \alpha \nu s$ was formed after the analogy of the acc. plural of $\overline{\mathrm{a}} \cdot, \mathrm{o} \cdot, \mathrm{i} \cdot$ and $\mathbf{u}$-stems.

> d. Ōi-STEMS.
§ 341. To this declension belong the feminine nouns $\epsilon \dot{\iota} \epsilon \sigma \tau \omega, \eta \chi^{\omega}, \lambda \epsilon \chi \bar{\omega}, \pi \epsilon \epsilon \theta \dot{\omega}$ and proper names like $K a \lambda \nu \psi \omega$, $\Lambda \eta \tau \omega$. It is doubtful whether nouns like $\dot{\alpha} \eta \delta \dot{\omega}$, єiк $\omega$ beside $\dot{\alpha} \eta \delta \omega \nu$, єiк $\kappa \nu$ originally belonged to this class or to the n -declension. The stem-forms originally had the three ablaut-grades -ōi-, oi- and -i. with regular change of $\cdot \mathbf{i}$ - to -j before case-endings beginning with a vowel. All three grades occur in the Sanskrit declension of sákhā, friend, as singular acc. sákhāyam, voc. sákhē, gen. sákhyuh ; plural nom. sákhāyaḥ, loc. sákhiṣ̆u. In Greek the oigrade was generalized in the oblique cases. The nom. singular may have ended in -ōi beside -ō (nom. Skr. sákhā,

Gr．$\pi \in(\theta \omega$ ）in the parent Indg．language（ $\S 63$ ），and it is possible that the ending $\omega t$ ，which occurs on old Corinthian inscriptions，represents the original－ōi．The $-\iota$ however may have come from the vocative．Skr．sákhā and similar nouns were declined in the singular，dual and plural，but few of the words belonging to this declension admit of a plural in Greek．Those which do have a plural form it after the analogy of the $\mathbf{o}$－or $\mathbf{n}$－declension．

Prim．Greek．

| Nom． | －$\omega$ or－$\omega \iota$ | $\pi \epsilon \iota \theta \omega \dot{,} \pi \epsilon \iota \theta \omega_{\llcorner }$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Voc． | －ol | $\pi \epsilon \iota$ Oой |
| Acc． | －oja | $\pi \epsilon \iota \theta$ ¢́ |
| Gen． | －ojos | $\pi \epsilon \iota$ Oôs |
| Dat．（＝loc．） | －oji | $\pi \epsilon \iota$ Өой |

The Dor．Boeot．and Lesb．dialects had the case－endings $-\omega,-\omega \nu,-\omega s,-\omega$ after the analogy of the similar quantitative endings of the $\bar{a}$－declension．The origin of the Ion．acc． ending－ov̂（Herodotus $\Lambda \eta \tau 0 \hat{\nu} \nu, \& \mathrm{c}$ ．）is obscure．Ion．had the gen．ending－óos beside Att．Ion．－ov̂s．If nouns like $\alpha \eta \delta \omega ⿱ ⿻ 上 丨 𣥂 丷 ~ o r i g i n a l l y ~ b e l o n g e d ~ t o ~ t h i s ~ c l a s s ~ t h e ~-~ \nu ~ w a s ~ f i r s t ~ a d d e d ~$ in the nom．singular and then they passed over into the n－declension．

## B．THE CONSONANTAL DECLENSION

I．Stems ending in an Explosive．
§ 342．The stems of nouns belonging to this class end in a dental，labial or guttural．The stem of the monosyllabic nouns had originally various grades of ablaut in the differ－ ent cases，but in Greek as in the other languages one or other of the grades was generally levelled out into all the cases，thus the ablaut－grade $\overline{\mathbf{o}}$ ，which originally belonged only to the nom．singular，was generalized in Sanskrit vák $=$ Lat．vōx，ő $\psi$ ，voice ；acc．vắcam，vōcem，ő $\pi \alpha$ ；gen． vācáḥ，vōcis，ómós ；loc．vācí，vōce，ỏmí，whereas in Greek
the grade $\mathbf{0}$, which originally belonged to the oblique cases, was levelled out into the nominative ; and similarly Lat. lēx, rēx beside $\phi \lambda \epsilon \in \psi$, $\phi \lambda o ́ \xi$; and conversely $\kappa \lambda \omega \psi \psi, \sigma \kappa \omega \psi \psi$, $\ddot{\omega} \psi$ beside Lat. nex, ops. The original ablaut-grades were better preserved in the declension of the Indg. word *pōts, *pēts, foot. See § 234, i.

## Singular.

Indg.

Nom. Voc.
Acc. -m

Gen. -os, es
Dat. (=loc.) -i

| ús, $\pi$ ós, $\pi$ ¢́s | pất | pēs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\pi o ́ \delta \alpha$ | pádam | pedem |
| modós | padáh | pedis |
| тodí | padí | pede |

## Dual.

Nom. Voc. Acc. ee Gen. Dat. ? $\pi o ́ \delta \epsilon$
(pádāu)
modoiv
Plural.
Nom. Voc.
Acc.
Gen.
Dat. (=loc.) •su
$\pi o ́ d \epsilon s$
$\pi o ́ \delta \alpha s$
$\pi o \delta \omega \bar{\nu}$
$\pi о \sigma \sigma i, \pi o \sigma i$
pá́dah
padáh padám pedum

Dor. $\pi \omega$ śs from *pōts represents the original form. $\pi \sigma^{\prime} s$ was a new formation with -o- from the oblique cases. It is difficult to account for moús which seems to be merely a lengthening of $\pi$ ós. Hom. $\pi 0 \sigma \sigma i ́$ beside $\pi o \sigma i(\S 212)$. Hom. $\pi o \delta \delta \epsilon \sigma \sigma \iota$ was formed from the stem $\pi o \delta$ - with the dat. ending of the s-stems. In Lat. the acc. pedēs from *pedens was used for the nominative. The e grade of ablaut occurs in $\pi \epsilon \in \delta o \nu$ and in the Boeot. Lesb. Cret. and Arcadian preposition $\pi \epsilon \delta \dot{\alpha}$, with, after.
§ 343. The stem-endings $\cdot \mathrm{d}, \cdot \mathrm{b}, \cdot \mathrm{g}$ became $\cdot \mathrm{t}, \cdot \mathrm{p}, \cdot \mathrm{k}$ before the case-endings $\cdot \mathbf{s}$, $\mathbf{s u}$ in prim. Indo-Germanic (§ 106). The original stem-endings $\cdot \mathrm{dh}$, -th, -bh, -ph, -gh, -kh likewise became $\cdot \mathbf{t}, \cdot \mathbf{p}, \cdot \mathbf{k}$ before these case-endings in prim.

Greek (§ 109). Prim. Greek ps and ks remained in the historic period of the language. ts became ss, which was simplified to s finally. Medial ss remained in the oldest Greek, but already in Homer s existed beside ss (§ 166). Examples are : $\kappa \lambda \omega \psi \psi, \kappa \lambda \omega \psi{ }^{\prime}: \kappa \lambda \omega \pi-, \phi \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \psi: \phi \lambda \epsilon \beta-, \kappa \alpha \tau \hat{\eta}-$ $\lambda \iota \psi: \kappa \alpha \tau \eta \lambda \iota \phi-, \phi u ́ \lambda \alpha \xi, \phi u ́ \lambda \alpha \xi \iota \iota: \phi u \lambda \alpha \kappa$-, $\mu \alpha ́ \sigma \tau \tau \bar{\xi}: \mu \alpha \sigma \tau \imath \bar{\gamma}$-,
 $\tau \bar{\alpha} \tau s$, Lat. novitās : $\nu \in о \tau \eta \tau$-, novitāt-, $\nu v \tilde{\xi}: \nu v \kappa \tau$-, cp. Lat.



The nom. singular of stems ending in $-\iota \tau,-\iota \delta,-\iota \theta,-v \delta,-v \theta$ regularly fell together with the nominative of the $\mathbf{i}$ - and $\mathbf{u}$ declensions which gave rise to various new formations especially in the voc. and acc. singular, as voc. ' $A \rho \tau \epsilon \mu \mu$, $\bar{\epsilon} \lambda \pi i$,


 кópv $\theta \alpha$. And similarly accusatives like $\pi 0 \lambda u ́ \pi o v \nu, ~ \tau \rho i ́ m o v \nu ~$ (Hom. $\tau \rho i \pi \pi о \delta \alpha$ ) were formed after the analogy of $\epsilon \dot{\nu} \nu o v \nu$ : єüvous.

It is improbable that the vocatives ${ }_{\alpha} \nu \alpha, \gamma \dot{v} \nu \alpha \iota$ from ${ }^{*} \dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \kappa \tau,{ }^{*} \gamma \nu \nu \alpha \iota \kappa$ represent an original distinction between the nom. and voc. in this class of nouns.
§ 344. The bare stem was originally used for the nom. voc. and acc. neuter. In Greek the operation of the laws of final consonants has to be taken into consideration (§ 230), as $\kappa \hat{\eta} \rho$ from *$\kappa \eta \rho \delta$; the gen. к $\hat{\eta} \rho o s$ was a new formation from the nominative, cp. Lat. cor, cordis ; $\gamma \alpha{ }^{\prime} \lambda \alpha$ from * $\gamma \alpha \lambda \alpha \kappa \tau$, cp. Lat. lac, lactis; $\mu^{\prime} \lambda \iota$ from ${ }^{*} \mu \in \lambda \iota \tau$.

## 2. The n-declension.

§ 345. The stems in $-\mu \nu \nu-,-\mu \epsilon \nu-(\delta \alpha i \mu \omega \nu: \delta \alpha \iota \mu \nu \nu, \tau \epsilon \in \rho \mu \omega \nu$ : $\tau \epsilon \rho \mu о \nu$-, $\pi о \iota \mu \eta \nu$ : $\pi о \iota \mu \epsilon \nu$-) and in $-\circ \nu$-, $-\epsilon \nu$ - ( $\pi \epsilon \pi \omega \nu: \pi \epsilon \pi о \nu$-, $\tau \epsilon \in \kappa \tau \omega \nu: \tau \epsilon \kappa \tau o \nu-, \tau \epsilon \in \rho \eta \nu: \tau \epsilon \rho \epsilon \nu$-, $\phi \rho \eta^{\prime} \nu: \phi \rho \epsilon \nu^{-}$) originally had various grades of ablaut in the stem-endings of the different
cases, as -mōn, -mēn ; -mon•, -men• ; •mn before vowels, but -mñ. before consonants; -ōn, -ēn; -on•, een•; -nbefore vowels, but $\cdot \mathrm{n}$. before consonants. The alternation between $\check{\text { éc }}$ and $\overline{\text { ö }}$ originally depended upon the position of the accent of the word. The former stood in the syllable containing the chief accent and the latter in the next syllable following it, as $\pi \circ \iota \mu \dot{\eta} \nu, \pi о \iota \mu$ évєs : $\tau \lambda \dot{\eta} \mu \omega \nu, \tau \lambda \dot{\eta} \mu \circ \nu \in s$; $\phi \rho \dot{\eta} \nu, \phi \rho \in ́ \nu \in s: \not{\alpha} \phi \rho \omega \nu$, ä $\phi \rho o \nu \epsilon s$ (cp. § 83). When the accent was shifted to the case-ending the vowel disappeared and then the $\mathbf{n}$ remained consonantal or became vocalic according as the next syllable began with a vowel or a consonant, as $\dot{\alpha} \rho \eta \nu^{\prime}, \kappa v ́ \omega \nu$, gen. $\dot{\alpha} \rho \nu o ́ s$, dat. pl. * $\dot{\alpha} \rho \alpha \sigma i ́$, *кvací. In the parent Indg. language e alternated with o in the declension of the same word. This distinction was preserved in Gothic, as guma, man, dat. gumin, acc. guman where the endings in, an represent original eni, -onm ; and similarly in the Baltic-Slavonic languages. In Sanskrit Indg. e and o fell together in a (§ 42) whereby the original distinction became obliterated. It may be however that the two vowels only regularly fell together in closed syllables, but that in open syllables the former vowel became a and the latter $\overline{\bar{a}}$. This would account for the long $\bar{a}$ in the acc. sing. rájāānam, king, nom. pl. rầjānah, beside loc. sing. rấj-ani = Indg. eni. In Greek the distinction became entirely obliterated by the levelling out of one or other of the two vowels. Then those stems which levelled out the e came to have $\eta$ in the nom. singular and those which levelled out the o came to have $\omega$. In the present state of our knowledge it cannot be determined with any degree of certainty which of the strong cases originally had $\mathbf{e}$ and which had o . In reconstructing the primitive stem-forms we shall therefore not attempt to distinguish between $\mathbf{e}$ and $\mathbf{o}$ in the declension of the same word. -mōn, -mēn, -ōn, -ēn regularly belonged to the nom. singular only; -mon-, -men•, -on•, en- to the voc, acc, and
dat. (=loc.) singular, the nom. plural, and the nom. voc. and acc. dual ; -mn-, n - to the gen. singular and plural, gen. and dat. dual, and acc. plural ; and -mn-, -n- to the dat. ( $=$ loc.) plural (§ 319). In Greek $\overline{\mathrm{e}}$ or $\overline{\mathbf{o}}$ regularly appears in the nom. singular. The oblique cases have generally levelled out the e or $\mathbf{o}$, but in some words the $\overline{\mathbf{e}}$ or $\overline{\mathbf{o}}$ of the nominative was levelled out into the oblique cases, and in others the stem-form of the weak cases became generalized, as $\pi о \iota \mu \dot{\eta} \nu, \pi о \iota \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \alpha, \pi о \iota \mu \epsilon ́ \nu o s$ for ${ }^{*} \pi о \iota \mu \nu о s ; \delta \alpha i ́ \mu \omega \nu, \delta \alpha i ́ \mu о \nu \alpha$, סаípovos for ${ }^{*} \delta \alpha \iota \mu \nu o s ; \pi \epsilon v \theta \hat{\eta} \nu, \pi \epsilon \nu \theta \hat{\eta} \nu o s, k \lambda u ́ \delta \omega \nu, \kappa \lambda u ́ \delta \omega \nu o s ;$ $\kappa v ́ \omega \nu$, кúva, кvขí for *кvova, *кvovı; ${ }^{\epsilon} \rho \sigma \eta \nu$ regular gen. $\alpha \dot{\alpha} \rho \sigma \nu^{\prime} s$ to which was formed a new nominative $\alpha^{\alpha} \rho \sigma \eta \nu$, gen. ${ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \rho \sigma \in \nu o s$. Cp. the similar levellings in Lat. homo, hominem, hominis, homine, hominēs, hominum, hominibus; sermo, sermōnem, sermōnis, sermōne; caro, carnem, carnis, carne ; and in Goth. tuggō, tongue, acc. tuggōn, gen. tuggōns, dat. tuggōn.

> Indg.

Nom.
$\left.\begin{array}{l}\text {-ēn, -ōn } \\ \text { - } \mathrm{ẽ}, \text {.ō }\end{array}\right\}$

Voc.
Acc.
Gen.
Dat. (=loc.) $\cdot \mathrm{en} \cdot \mathbf{i}$, $\cdot \mathrm{on} \cdot \mathbf{i}$
oc. .en, .on
-en•m, on-m
-n-os, -n-es

Singular:
$\pi о \iota \mu \dot{\eta} \nu \quad \delta \alpha i ́ \mu \omega \nu$
ঠaî $\mu \nu$
баípova
סаípovos
баípovı

## Dual.

rájāa, king
rájan rájā̄nam rắjñah rấjani,
ráajñi
(rájānāu)
тогнє́voı̀ ঠаıцо́voı̀

## Plural.



Singular: The nominative ended in the parent Indg. language in -ēn, .ōn beside .ẽ, .õ. The reason for this difference is unknown (cp. § 29). The former was generalized in Greek (but see § 341) and also in the Gothic masculines, as guma, man, with •a from older -ēn or -ōn; and the latter in Sanskrit, Latin and also in the Gothic feminines and neuters, as homo, sermo; tuggō, tongue, haírtō, heart.

The vocative originally ended in -en, -on, which occurs in Skr. rấjan and in Gr. barytones with nominatives in $-\omega \nu$, as $\delta \alpha \hat{\imath} \mu o \nu, \kappa \dot{v} o \nu, \pi \epsilon ́ \pi \sigma \nu$. In the oxytones with nominatives in $-\omega \nu$ and in all $-\mu \epsilon \nu$-, $-\epsilon \nu$-stems the nominative came to be used for the vocative, as $\dot{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \mu \dot{\omega} \nu, \pi o \iota \mu \dot{\eta} \nu, \& c$. In Latin and Gothic the nominative was also used for the vocative.

The accusatives $\pi о \iota \mu$ éva, $\delta \alpha i ́ \mu o \nu \alpha$, Lat. hominem, Goth. guman regularly correspond to the original stem- and caseending. Forms like ${ }^{\alpha} \rho \nu \alpha$ for ${ }^{*}{ }^{\alpha} \rho \bar{́} \nu \alpha$, кúv $\alpha$ for ${ }^{*} \kappa \dot{v} v \nu \alpha=$ Skr. svấnam were new formations after the analogy of the gen. singular and plural ; and similarly Lat. carnem for *carinem.
 šúnaḥ), Skr. rájñ̃aḥ, Lat. carnis. The stem-forms $\dot{\alpha} \rho \nu-$, $\kappa v \nu$ - then became levelled out into all the cases except the nom. singular and dat. plural ; and similarly with the Lat. stem carn. $\pi о \iota \mu$ évos, $\delta \alpha i ́ \mu o \nu o s, \& c$. were new formations with $-\epsilon \nu$,,$o \nu$ - from cases like the accusative ; and similarly Lat. hominis, Goth. gumins.

Regular forms of the original locative were $\pi o \iota \mu \in ́ \nu \ell$, סaímovl, \&c., Skr. rấjani, Lat. homine, Goth. gumin. Skr. rájñi was a new formation with -jñ. from the genitive.

Dual: The genitive and dative had en., on from the strong stem-forms. On the ending oolv see § 325.

Plural: It has been assumed above that the accusative had originally the weak stem-ending n - corresponding to äp $\nu \alpha$ s, кúvas and Skr. rájunaḥ, but the Greek forms prove
nothing because the weak stem-ending of these two words was generalized in prim. Greek (see gen. singular). And Skr. rájiñah may be a new formation after the analogy of the genitive. It is therefore not improbable that the accusative originally had the strong stem-ending en-,
 languages. Goth. gumans is the nom. used for the accusative.

The regularly developed forms of the genitive were
 hominum, Goth. gumane were new formations after the analogy of the nominative.

Skr. rájasu with -asu from -nsu represents the original locative. The $-\alpha$ - = Indg. -n. was preserved in $\phi \rho \alpha \sigma i$ (beside the later new formation $\phi \rho \in \sigma_{i}^{\prime}$ ) which occurs in Pindar and on an Attic inscription belonging to the beginning of the sixth century в. с., and also in $\dot{\alpha} \rho \nu \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma \iota$ for ${ }^{*} \dot{\alpha} \rho \alpha \sigma i$ with $-\nu$ - from * ${ }^{\alpha} \rho \nu$ ós, \&c. But in other words the dative was a new formation with the substitution of the vowel in the generalized stem-form for $-\alpha$-, and with $-\sigma \iota$ from the dat. of consonantal stems where the $-\sigma$ - was not originally intervocalic, as in $\pi \circ \sigma \sigma i, \pi o \sigma i ́ f r o m ~ * \pi о \tau \sigma i ́(§ 343)$, as $\pi о \iota \mu \epsilon ́ \sigma \iota$, $\delta \alpha i \mu \sigma \sigma \iota, ~ к \lambda \dot{\delta} \delta \omega \sigma \iota$ with $-\epsilon \sigma \iota$, -o $\iota \iota$, - $\omega \sigma \iota$ for $-\alpha \sigma \iota$; кv $\iota \iota$ for *кvaбí after the analogy of $\kappa v \nu o ́ s$, \&c.
$\S$ 346. Here may conveniently be placed: $\chi \theta \omega \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \chi \theta \omega \mu$, cp. $\chi \alpha \mu \alpha i ́$, Skr. kṣ̌ámi, on the ground, $\chi \iota \omega \nu$ from ${ }^{*} \chi{ }^{\iota} \omega \mu$, cp. Lat. hiems, neut. ${ }^{\epsilon} \nu$ from ${ }^{*} \sigma \epsilon \mu$, cp. Lat. sem-per, where final $-\mu$ regularly became $-\nu(\$ 141)$ and then the $-\nu$ was levelled out into the oblique cases, as gen. $\chi$ Oovós,

§ 347. Att. $\mu \dot{\eta} \nu, \chi \dot{\eta} \nu$ were originally s-stems. Nom. Ion. $\mu \epsilon i ́ s$, Dor. $\mu \dot{\eta} s$ from ${ }^{*} \mu \in \nu s$, older ${ }^{*} \mu \eta \nu$ (§ 70), gen. Lesb. $\mu \eta \nu \nu 0 s$, Att. Ion. Dor. $\mu \eta \nu o \sigma_{s}$ from ${ }^{*} \mu \eta \nu \sigma o s(\S 216)$, from which was formed a new Attic nom. $\mu \eta \boldsymbol{\eta}$ after the analogy of the $\mathbf{n} \cdot d$ declension ; and similarly prim. Greek ${ }^{*} \chi \bar{\alpha} s$ from
${ }^{*} \chi^{\alpha \nu s}$, gen. $\chi^{\bar{\alpha} \nu}{ }^{\nu}{ }^{\prime}, ~ \chi \eta \nu o ́ s$ from ${ }^{*} \chi^{\alpha \nu \sigma o s ~}(\S 69,2)$, from which was formed a new nom. Dor. $\chi^{\frac{1}{\alpha} \nu}$, Att. $\chi \dot{\eta} \nu$.
§ 348. Beside the stems -men-, -mon-, -en-, -on there also existed in the parent Indg. language stems in -(i)jen-, (i) jon- with the ablaut-grades -(i)jēn, -(i) jōn; (i) jen-, -(i)jon-; -in-, -in. and with the same distribution of the grades as in the -men-, $\cdot$ mon-stems (§ 345). The original type of inflection was preserved in the Gothic jan-stems, as nom. arbja, heir, acc. arbjan, gen. arbjins, dat. arbjin. In Sanskrit the weak stem-ending -in- became generalized, as masc. nom. balî for *balyā, strong, voc. bálin, acc. balínam, gen. balínah, loc. balíni. In Latin the -(i)jōn grade became generalized, as in legio, legiōnem, legiōnis, legiōne; and similarly in Greek words like $i \theta v \pi \tau i \omega \nu$, $\mu \alpha \lambda \alpha \kappa i \omega \nu$, oúpaví $\omega \nu$, gen. -í $\omega \nu 0$ s. But the weak stemending -īn. became generalized in stems like $\dot{\alpha} \kappa \tau \hat{\imath} \nu^{-}, \gamma \lambda \omega \chi\left\langle\nu^{\prime}\right.$-, $\delta \in \lambda \phi i \nu$, $\theta i \nu v$, $\hat{\rho} \nu \nu$, gen. -ivos; and similarly in Gothic feminine nouns like managei, multitude, gen. manageins. From the stem-form in $-i \nu$ - a new nominative was formed in prim. Greek after the analogy of the nominatives in -s. And then the $\nu$ - disappeared ( $\S 154$ ). At a later period new nominatives in $\nu$ were formed after the analogy of the nominative of the -men-, -mon., -en-, -on-stems, as

§ 349. From the generalized stem $\mu^{\prime} \hat{\text { én }} \alpha \nu$ - (gen. $\mu$ é $\lambda \alpha \nu 0 s$ ) was formed the nom. $\mu$ é $\bar{\alpha} \bar{s}$ older ${ }^{*} \mu^{\prime} \lambda^{\lambda} \alpha \nu s$ (§ 154) after the analogy of the nominatives in -s. It is probable that this word originally belonged to the o-declension, cp. Skr. malináḥ, Indg. *melənos, Gr. * $\mu$ é $\lambda \alpha \nu o s$, black, dirty, and $\mu \in \lambda \alpha \nu o ́-\chi \rho o o s$ beside $\mu \in \lambda \alpha{ }^{\prime} \gamma$ - $\chi$ poos. $\mu \bar{\epsilon} \lambda \alpha \nu$ - may have come to be regarded as the stem in prim. Greek through the influence of the feminine $\mu^{\prime} \dot{\lambda} \lambda \alpha \nu \alpha \alpha$ from * $\mu$ é $\lambda \alpha \nu j \alpha$ (§ 322).
§ 350. The neuter nouns and adjectives were originally declined alike as in Sanskrit and Gothic, but in prim. Greek the generalized stem-form of the masculine became
used for the nom. voc. and acc. singular of the adjectives, as $\tau \epsilon \in \epsilon \nu, \alpha_{\alpha} \rho \sigma \epsilon \nu, \pi \epsilon \in \pi o \nu, \sigma \hat{\omega} \phi \rho o \nu, \mu \epsilon ́ \lambda \alpha \nu$. Nom. voc. and acc. plural $\tau \epsilon \in \epsilon \nu \alpha, \pi \epsilon \in \pi o \nu \alpha, \mu \epsilon ́ \lambda \alpha \nu \alpha, \& c$. with $-\alpha=$ Skr. $\cdot \mathbf{i}$, Indg. $\cdot \boldsymbol{\text { ( }}$ § 353).

The original declension of the nouns was preserved in Sanskrit and Latin, but in Greek all the inflected forms were new formations.

## Singular.

Indg.

| Nom. Voc. Acc. |  | övo $\boldsymbol{\sim}$ a | nấma | nōmen |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gen. | -mn.os, -es | о̀уо́латоs | námnah |  |
| Dat. (=lo | -men i , -mon-i | óvóцать | nấmani | nōm |


|  | Nom. Voc. Acc. | -en $\cdot \mathrm{i}$, -1 | ỏvópatє nấmanī |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Gen. D | ? | ỏvo $\mu$ áтоıข |

## Plural.

| Nom. Voc. Acc. | -mēn $\cdot \boldsymbol{\partial}$-mōn•ə |  | nấmāni |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | -men $\cdot$, -mon | óvó $\mu \alpha \tau \alpha$ |  | nōmina |
| Gen. | -mn o ¢ ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | nấmnām | nōminum |
| Dat. (=loc.) | -mnosu | òvó $\mu$ абı | nấmasu |  |

The endings in ơ $\nu o \mu \alpha$, nắma, nōmen, name correspond to the original ending of the nom. acc. singular. Latin generalized the stem-form nōmen. The Sanskrit ending of the nom. plural corresponds to Indg. -mōn•ə, and the Latin ending to Indg. -men-ə, except that the $\cdot$ a for $\cdot \mathrm{e}$ was from the nom. pl. of the neuter o-stems. The dual obvó $\mu a \tau \epsilon$ had $-\epsilon$ from the masculines.

Prim. Greek probably had the generalized stem-form *ob $\nu о \mu \alpha \nu$ - except in the dat. plural, as óvo $\boldsymbol{\circ} \alpha$, *ỏvó $\mu \alpha \nu o s$ for
 óvó $\mu \alpha \sigma \iota$ which can also be from *óvó $\mu \alpha \tau \sigma \iota(\$ 166)$. It is difficult to account satisfactorily for the $-\tau$ - in historic Greek. It may have arisen from the Indg. adverbial particle -tos which occurs in ék-Tós, év-Tós = Lat. in-tus,
cp. also Skr. i.táh, inde. In Sanskrit tah came to have the meaning of the ablative, as nāma-tah, by name, with which the gen. óvó $\mu \alpha-\tau o s$ corresponds in form. óvó $\mu \alpha \tau о$ may then have come to be used for the gen. instead of the regular form ${ }^{*}{ }^{\prime} \nu o \mu \nu \nu=S \mathrm{Sk}$. námnah, and the $-\tau$ - of the gen. have become levelled out into all the inflected forms. But Brugmann's explanation (Grundriss, \&c., vol. ii, second ed., p. 237) is probably the right one. He assumes that it probably arose from the blending of emenand $\cdot \mathrm{m} \mathrm{m} \cdot \mathrm{to}$ - into one paradigm, as Lat. strāmen : strāmina, strāminum $={ }^{*} \sigma \tau \rho \omega ́ \mu \alpha \nu \alpha,{ }^{*} \sigma \tau \rho \omega \mu \alpha ́ \nu \omega \nu$ beside strāmentum : strāmenta, strāmentōrum $=\sigma \tau \rho \omega \mu \alpha \tau \alpha, \sigma \tau \rho \omega \mu \alpha ́ \tau \omega \nu$. After the analogy of $\sigma \tau \rho \omega \mu \alpha \tau \alpha, \sigma \tau \rho \omega \mu \alpha ́ \tau \omega \nu$ beside * $\sigma \tau \rho \omega$ $\mu \alpha \nu \alpha$, * $\sigma \tau \rho \omega \mu \alpha \alpha_{\nu} \omega \nu$ there were formed $\sigma \tau \rho \omega \mu \alpha \tau \sigma s, \sigma \tau \rho \dot{\omega} \mu \alpha \tau \iota$ beside * $\sigma \tau \rho \omega \mu \alpha \nu o s,{ }^{*} \sigma \tau \rho \omega \mu \mu \nu \iota$ and then all the forms with the stem ${ }^{*} \sigma \tau \rho \omega \mu \alpha \nu$ - eventually disappeared. There is however a third possible explanation which has much in its favour, viz. that in the parent Indg. language consonantal and o-stems of the same word often existed side by side, as $\tau \epsilon ́ \rho \eta \nu: \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \epsilon \nu o s, \pi i ̂ \alpha \rho: \pi i \alpha \alpha \rho^{\prime} s, \pi o u ́ s: \pi \epsilon ́ \delta o \nu$, cognōmen, strāmen : cognōmentum, strāmentum. A large number of similar examples in the various languages has been collected by Brugmann in Indogermanische Forschungen, vol. ix, pp. 366-8. It is therefore quite possible that -mnt- existed beside -mnt-o. and that some of the Greek neuters in $-\mu \alpha$ originally ended in -mnt which became generalized, whereas Latin generalized -mnt-o-. ${ }^{\circ} \nu \quad \mu \alpha$ may therefore stand for older *ơขо $\mu \alpha \tau$ ( $\$ 230$ ) with $-\tau$ - regularly preserved in the inflected forms. Cp. óvo $\mu \alpha$, $\sigma \tau \rho \bar{\omega} \mu \alpha, \zeta \epsilon \hat{v} \gamma \mu \alpha$ beside cognōmentum, strāmentum, jūmentum from *jouxmentom.

## 3. Stems ending in -nt.

§ 351. To this class belong the masculine and neuter of all active participles except the perfect (§552).
a. Thematic Participles.
§ 352. These comprise the participles of the present and second aorist together with a few isolated participles which were no longer used as such in the oldest Greek, as $\gamma \epsilon \rho \rho \omega \nu$,
 an n -stem which passed into this class owing to the nom. and voc. singular being alike in both declensions, cp . the feminine $\lambda \in ́ \alpha \iota \nu \alpha$, and Lat. leo, leōnis.

Singular.
Indg.

| Nom. | -ont-s | $\phi ¢ ¢ \rho \omega \nu$ | bháran | ferēns |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Voc. | -ont | $\phi \epsilon$ ¢ $\rho \omega \nu$ | bháran | (ferēns) |
| Acc. | -ont-m | ф'́¢povia | bhárantam | ferentem |
| Gen. | -nt-os, -es | ф'́¢огтos | bháratah | ferentis |
| Dat. (=loc |  | фє́poutı | bhárati | ferente |

Nom. Voc. Acc. -ont-e $\phi \in ́ \rho o \nu \tau \epsilon \quad$ (bhárantāu)
Gen. Dat. ? ¢єро́vтoıv

| Nom. Voc. | -ont-es |  | bhárantah | (ferentēs) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Acc. | -nt-ns | ф'́polvas | bháratah | ferentes |
| Gen. | -nt-ōm | $\phi \in \rho о ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu$ | bháratām | (ferentium) |
| Dat. (=loc.) | -nt-su | ф'́povaı | bháratsu |  |

The strong form ont- originally belonged to the nom. voc. and acc. singular and dual and the nom. plural, and the weak form -nt- to all the other cases. The original distinction between the strong and weak forms of the suffix was preserved in Sanskrit. But Greek generalized the -ont- and Latin the nnt-form. Some scholars assume that this class of words had ont- in all the cases in the parent Indg. language, and that the Sanskrit forms with at =

Indg. -nt- were new formations after the analogy of the stems in -went- (§ 356), but this would not account for the Latin forms all of which point to the ablaut-grade $\cdot n \mathrm{nt}$-.

The original nom. singular was *bhéronts, bearing, which corresponds to Skr. bháran with regular loss of the final tts, and Goth. baírands. Lat. ferēns was from *ferents with ent- from the gen., \&c. $\phi \in ́ \rho \omega \nu$ was a new formation after the analogy of the n -stems. The new formation first took place in words like $\epsilon \kappa \kappa \omega \nu, \mu \hat{\epsilon} \lambda \lambda \omega \nu$ where

 was formed after the analogy of $\pi \hat{i} o \nu: \pi i t \omega \nu$. And then to the neuter $\phi$ 白 $\rho o \nu$ a new masc. nom. $\phi \bar{\epsilon} \rho \omega \nu$ was formed.

The vocative $\phi \epsilon \in \rho \omega \nu$ like Lat. ferēns was the nom. used for the vocative. The old voc. was preserved in forms
 from * $\phi$ є́ $о \nu \tau \sigma$.
§ 353. The Indg. form of the nom. voc. and acc. singular neuter was *bhérñt which became bhárat in Sanskrit. Lat. ferēns can also be from *bhérnt, because not would regularly become e-ens in Latin. Or it may simply be the masc. used for the neuter. $\phi$ é $\rho o \nu$ from older * $\phi$ '́ $\rho o \nu \tau$ with -ovt from forms where it was regular.

The original form of the nom. voc. and acc. plural was *bhérontə $=\phi$ '́́ $\rho o \nu \tau \alpha$, Skr. bháranti. Lat. ferentia like ferentium was a new formation after the analogy of the i.declension.

## b. Athematic Participles.

§ 354. Three categories are to be distinguished in the participles belonging to this class. (I) Participles which originally had eént- in the strong and -ñt- in the weak cases (§ 319). (2) Those which had -nt- in all cases. (3) Those which had -nt- in all cases. The first and second categories were preserved in Sanskrit, but the third was
remodelled after the analogy of the first. The original distinctions in the three categories were almost entirely obliterated in prim. Greek by analogical formations. The -nt-, which originally belonged only to the third category, was extended by analogy to all participles. And then the vowel preceding the $\cdot \mathrm{nt}$ - was made the same as the vowel in the plural of the corresponding indicative. Examples are: ( I ) Skr. krịn-ánt. with •ánt- from *ént-, krị̣-atwith -at- from -ñt- : krị̄ámi, I buy, krīṇanti, they buy, but Gr. $\delta \alpha \mu \nu \bar{\alpha} s$ from ${ }^{*} \delta \alpha \mu \nu \alpha \nu \tau s$ for ${ }^{*} \delta \alpha \mu \nu \epsilon \nu \tau s$, gen. $\delta \alpha \mu-$ $\nu \alpha ́ \nu \tau o s$ for $* \delta \alpha \mu \nu \alpha \tau o s: ~ \delta \alpha ́ \alpha \nu \eta \mu \nu, \delta \alpha ́ \mu \nu \alpha \mu \in \nu$; Skr. sunv-ánt-, sunv-at- : sunómi, I press out, sunvánti, they press out;
 for ${ }^{*} \delta \epsilon \iota \kappa \nu v a \tau o s: \delta \epsilon i ́ k \nu \bar{v} \mu l$, $\delta \in i ́ \kappa \nu v \mu \epsilon \nu$. The only certain trace of the original ablaut-grade eént- occurs in the Doric nom. pl. ${ }^{\prime} \nu \tau \tau \epsilon$ from *sentes, being, with ${ }_{\epsilon}{ }^{\prime}$ for ${ }^{* \prime \prime}$ after the analogy of other parts of the verb; and similarly with the smooth breathing in Ion. $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \omega \nu$, Att. $\stackrel{\omega}{ } \nu$. $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \omega \nu$, $\omega \nu$, stem *sont-, Skr. sánt-, sat-, being, and $i \omega \nu$, stem *iont- for *jont- (with i- for j- after the analogy of ${ }^{\prime} \mu \in \nu, i^{\prime} \tau \epsilon$ ), Skr. yánt-, yat-, going, went over into the thematic declension in prim. Greek. This ont- grade of ablaut was also preserved in the old isolated participle $\dot{o}$ - $\delta o u$ ús from ${ }^{*} \dot{d}$ - $\delta o \nu \tau s$, gen. ò-סóvzos, Skr. dánt-, dat-, tooth.
(2) Skr. dádat, gen. dádatah with $\cdot a t$ from $\cdot n \mathrm{nt}$ : dádāmi, I give, dádati, they give, but Gr. סiסoús from *סiסovis for ${ }^{*} \delta i \delta a \tau s$, gen. $\delta i \delta o \delta \nu \tau o s ~ f o r ~ * \delta i \delta a \tau o s ~: ~ \delta i \delta \omega \mu$, $\delta i \delta o \mu \in \nu$; Skr. dádhat, gen. dádhataḥ : đádhāmi, I put, place, dádhati, they put, place, but $\tau \iota \theta \in i ́ s$ from ${ }^{*} \tau \iota \theta \in \nu \tau s$ for ${ }^{*} \tau \iota \theta \alpha \tau s$, gen. $\tau i \theta \epsilon \in \nu \tau o s$ for ${ }^{*} \tau i \theta \alpha \tau o s: \tau i \theta \eta \mu \iota, \tau i \theta \in \mu \in \nu$; and similarly $i \sigma \tau \bar{\alpha} s, i \sigma \tau \alpha ́ \nu \tau o s: i ̈ \sigma \tau \alpha \mu \epsilon \nu$, and aorists active like $\lambda \bar{v} \sigma \bar{\alpha} s$,
 $\epsilon \neq \eta \nu \alpha \nu$.
(3) In this category the -nt- was originally preceded either by a long vowel in all the cases or by a long vowel in the
strong cases and by $\cdot 2 \cdot(=$ Gr. $\alpha$, Skr. $\mathbf{i}, \S 49$ ) in the weak cases. To the former belong aorist active participles like र $\nu 0$ ús from ${ }^{*} \gamma \nu 0 \nu \tau s$ older ${ }^{*} \gamma \nu \omega \nu \tau s$ (§ 70), gen. $\gamma \nu o ́ \nu \tau o s:$ $\epsilon \not \epsilon \nu \omega \nu$; $\delta \rho \bar{\alpha} s$ from ${ }^{*} \delta \rho \alpha \nu \tau s$ older ${ }^{*} \delta \rho \bar{\alpha} \nu \tau s$, gen. $\delta \rho \alpha ́ \nu \tau o s:$ $\bar{\epsilon} \delta \rho \bar{\alpha} \nu$; and similarly the aorist passive participles in $-\epsilon \iota \varsigma$,
 And to the latter belong the aorist active participles סov́s, $\theta \epsilon i ́ s ~(C r e t . ~ к \alpha \tau \alpha-\theta \epsilon ́ \nu s), ~ \sigma \tau \frac{\alpha}{s}$, from ${ }^{*} \delta o \nu \tau s,{ }^{*} \theta \epsilon \nu \tau s$,
 ${ }^{\prime} \epsilon \sigma \tau \eta \mu \epsilon \nu$ older ${ }^{*} \epsilon \sigma \tau \bar{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \nu$. The original inflection of these participles was nom. *dốnts, *dhếnts, *stắnts, gen. *dəntós, *dhəntós, *stəntós, and it is possible that doús, $\theta$ eís, gen. סóvtos, $\theta$ évzos represent the generalized forms *dốnt-, *dhênt- which would regularly become $\delta o \nu \tau-$ - $\theta \in \nu \tau$ - (§ 70). $\sigma \tau \frac{1}{\alpha} s, \sigma \tau \alpha ́ \nu \tau o s$ can be from the strong stem *stánt- or the weak stem *stənt- (§ 49) ; and similarly with the old isolated participial form $\pi \hat{\alpha} s$ from ${ }^{*} \pi \alpha \nu \tau s$ older ${ }^{*} \pi \bar{\alpha} \nu \tau s$, gen. $\pi \alpha \nu \tau$ ós, Indg. *kwấnts, gen. *kwəntós. The neuter $\pi \hat{\alpha} \nu$ had $\hat{\alpha}$ from $\pi \hat{\alpha} s, ~ с р . ~ \pi \rho o ́ \pi ~ а \check{~} \nu$.
§ 355. The nom. voc. and acc. neuter singular has the bare stem with regular loss of the final - $\tau(\$ 230)$, as $\delta \alpha \mu \nu \alpha$, $\delta \epsilon \iota \kappa \nu v ́ v$, $\delta \iota \delta o ́ v, ~ \tau \iota \theta \epsilon \in \nu$, i $\sigma \tau \alpha ́ \nu, \lambda \hat{v} \sigma \alpha \nu, \gamma \nu o ́ \nu, \delta o ́ \nu, ~ \theta \epsilon ́ \nu, \sigma \tau \alpha ́ \nu$, $\pi \hat{\alpha} \nu$ with $\hat{\alpha}$ from $\pi \hat{\alpha} s$. The prim. Greek ending $\nu \tau$ and the vowel preceding it were of the same origin as in the stem of the corresponding masculines.

The nom. voc. and acc. plural originally ended in $\cdot \partial=-\alpha$, Skr. -i, as $\delta \iota \delta o ́ v \tau \alpha$, Skr. dáda(n)ti, giving.

## 4. Stems ending in -went.

§ 356. The suffix of the adjectives belonging to this class had originally two grades of ablaut. The strong form -went-, Skr. -vant-, Gr. -F $\epsilon \nu \tau$ - belonged to the nom. voc. and acc. singular and dual, and the nom. plural. The weak form -wnt-, Skr. -vat-, Gr. *-Fat-belonged to all the other cases. Sanskrit preserved the original distinction
between the strong and weak form of the suffix, as acc. sing. bhágavantam, blessed, gen. bhágavataḥ. But in Greek the strong form $-F \in \nu \tau$ - was levelled out into all the cases except the dat. plural.

## Singular.

Indg.

| Nom. | -went-s | X $^{\alpha \rho i ́ \epsilon \iota s}$ | bhágavān |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Voc. | -went | $\chi^{\alpha \rho i ́ \epsilon \nu}$ | bhágavan |
| Acc. | -went-m | $\chi^{\alpha \rho i ́ \epsilon \nu \tau \alpha}$ | bhágavantam |
| Gen. | -wñt-os, $\cdot$-es | $\chi^{\alpha \rho i ́ \epsilon \nu \tau o s ~}$ | bhágavatah |
| Dat. (=loc.) | -wñt-i | $\chi^{\alpha \rho i ́ \epsilon \nu \tau \iota}$ | bhágavati |

Dual.
Nom. Voc. Acc. -went-e $\quad \chi^{\alpha \beta i ́ \epsilon \nu \tau \epsilon ~(b h a ́ g a v a n t a ̄ u) ~}$ Gen. Dat. $\quad \chi$ a 1 éévoıl

Plural.
Nom. Voc. -went-es $\quad \chi \alpha \rho i ́ \epsilon \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma \quad$ bhágavantaḥ
Acc. -wñt-ns $\quad \chi \alpha \rho i ́ \epsilon \nu \tau \alpha s \quad$ bhágavatah

Gen. wñt-ōm $\quad \chi \alpha \rho l e ́ v \tau \omega \nu \quad$ bhágavatām
Dat. (=loc.) -wñt-su $\quad \chi \alpha \rho i ́ \epsilon \sigma \iota \quad$ bhágavatsu
The nom. singular may originally have ended in $\cdot$ wēnt-s corresponding to the Sanskrit ending •vān. The ending $-\epsilon \iota s$ can be from either prim. Gr. $-F \eta \nu \tau-s(\$ 70$ ) or $-F \in \nu \tau$-s ( $\S 69, \mathrm{I}$ ). The prim. Greek dat. pl. was * $\chi \alpha \rho \iota F \alpha \tau \sigma \iota$ which became * $\chi \propto \rho \iota F \epsilon \tau \sigma \iota$ through the influence of the $\epsilon$ in $-F \epsilon \nu \tau$ Then ${ }^{*} \chi \alpha \rho \iota \digamma \epsilon \tau \sigma \iota$ regularly became $\chi \alpha \rho i \epsilon \sigma \iota$ through the intermediate stage ${ }^{*} \chi \alpha \rho \iota(F) \in \sigma \sigma \iota(\S 166)$. Of like origin is the $\epsilon$ in the fem. $\chi \alpha \rho i \epsilon \sigma \sigma \alpha$, prim. Gr. ${ }^{*} \chi \alpha \rho \iota F \alpha \tau j \alpha$, and in

§ 357. The regular form of the nom. voc. and acc. neuter singular would have been * $\chi$ 人 ${ }^{\prime} \alpha$ from ${ }^{*} \chi \alpha \rho \iota F \alpha \tau$, cp. Skr. bhágavat. $X \propto \rho i ́ \epsilon \nu$ from ${ }^{*} \chi \alpha \rho \iota F \epsilon \nu \tau$ was a new formation with $-F \in \nu \tau$ for $-F a \tau$ as in the gen. singular, \&c.

The nom. voc. and acc. plural $\chi \alpha \rho i \epsilon \nu \tau \alpha$ was from ${ }^{*} \chi \alpha \rho \iota$ $F \in \nu \tau \alpha$, cp. Skr. bhágavanti, with $-F \in \nu \tau \alpha$, Skr. -vanti from Indg. -wentə.
5. Stems ending in a Liquid.
§ 358. The only stem ending in -1 is $\alpha{ }_{\alpha} \lambda_{s}(\dot{\alpha} \lambda \alpha, \dot{\alpha} \lambda o ́ s, \& c$.) which regularly has -s in the nominative.

## Stems ending in -r.

§ 359. To this class belong: (I) The nouns of relationship $\pi \alpha \tau \eta \dot{\rho}, \mu \dot{\eta} \tau \eta \rho, \theta v \gamma a ́ \tau \eta \rho$ and $\delta \bar{\alpha} \eta \rho_{\rho}$ from * $\delta \alpha \iota\lceil\eta \rho(\S 57)$; $\phi \rho \frac{\alpha}{\alpha} \tau \eta \rho, \phi \rho \bar{\alpha} \tau \omega \rho=$ Skr. bhrấtar-, brother, became isolated from this category owing to their change in meaning. (2) The nomina agentis, as $\delta о \tau \eta \rho, \delta \omega \tau \tau \omega \rho, \gamma \in \nu \in \tau \eta \rho, \gamma \in \nu \in ́ \tau \omega \rho$, $\dot{\rho} \eta \tau \dot{\eta} \rho, \dot{\rho} \eta \boldsymbol{\eta} \tau \omega \rho$, \&c. (3) A few other nouns which belong to neither of these two categories, as $\dot{\alpha} \eta \dot{\eta} \rho, \alpha i \theta \dot{\eta} \rho, \dot{\alpha} \theta \dot{\eta} \rho, \dot{\alpha} \sigma \tau \eta \dot{\eta} \rho$, $\gamma \alpha \sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \rho, \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{\eta} \rho$, and the monosyllables $\theta \dot{\eta} \rho, \phi \omega \rho \rho$.

The stem-endings originally had various grades of ablaut in the different cases, as tēr, tōr; -ter., tor-; -tr- before vowels, but -tr- before consonants, and similarly -ēr, eer-,
 in the n -declension (§ 345). In the weak case-forms the vowel disappeared and then the $\cdot \mathbf{r}$ - remained consonantal or became vocalic according as the next syllable began with a vowel or a consonant, as $\pi \alpha \tau \rho o ́ s, \pi \alpha \tau \rho \hat{\omega} \nu, \pi \alpha \tau \rho \alpha ́ \sigma \iota$, cp . Skr. pitŕṣ̣̆. -tēr, tōr, -ēr regularly belonged to the nom. singular only ; ter-, -tor-, -er- to the voc. acc. and dat. (=loc.) singular, the nom. plural, and the nom. voc. and acc. dual ; -tr-, -r to the gen. singular and plural, gen. and dat. dual, and acc. plural ; and -tr., .r. to the dat. ( $=$ loc.) plural. In Greek $\overline{\mathrm{e}}$ or $\overline{\mathrm{o}}$ regularly appears in the nom. singular. In the nouns of relationship the original distinction between teēr, -ter-, -tr-, -tr- was preserved in Sanskrit and also in Greek apart from the new formations
explained below, but in Latin the weak stem-ending trbecame generalized in the oblique cases.

The nomina agentis were originally declined like the nouns of relationship as in Sanskrit, but in Latin tōrbecame generalized. In Greek the $-\eta$ - of the nom. of nouns ending in $-\tau \eta \rho$ was levelled out into all the cases, as $\delta o \tau \eta \dot{\eta}, ~ \rho ं \eta \tau \eta ́ \rho, ~ \sigma \omega \tau \eta \rho, ~ g e n . ~ \delta o \tau \hat{\eta} \rho o s, ~ \dot{\rho} \eta \tau \hat{\eta} \rho o s, \sigma \omega \tau \hat{\eta} \rho o s$ except that the voc. of $\sigma \omega \tau \eta \rho$ was $\sigma \hat{\omega} \tau \epsilon \rho$; and similarly the monosyllable $\theta \dot{\eta} \rho$, $\theta \eta \rho o ́ s$. Those ending in - $\tau \omega \rho$ generalized the ablaut-grade - $\tau \rho \rho-$, as $\delta \omega \tau \tau \omega \rho, \dot{\rho} \dot{\eta} \tau \omega \rho$, gen.
 $\mu \dot{\eta} \sigma \tau \omega \rho, \mu \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega \rho o s$ and the monosyllable $\phi \dot{\omega} \rho, \phi \omega \rho o ́ s$ the $-\omega$ - of the nom. was generalized.
§ 360.
Indg.

| Nom. | -tēr, .tẽ̃ | $\pi \alpha \tau \eta \dot{\rho}$ | pitá | r |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Voc. | -ter | $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\rho}$ | pítar | ater |
| Acc. | -ter-m | $\pi \alpha \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \alpha$ | pitáram | atrem |
| Gen. | -tr-os, .es | тат ${ }^{\text {ós }}$ | pitúr | patris |
| Dat. (=loc.) | -ter-i | $\pi \alpha \tau \epsilon \rho \iota$ | pitári | atre |

## Dual.

Nom. Voc. Acc. -ter-e Gen. Dat. ?
$\pi \alpha \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \epsilon \quad$ (pitárāu)
$\pi \alpha \tau \epsilon ́ \rho o \iota \nu$

## Plural.

Nom. Voc.
Acc.
Gen.
Dat.
-ter-es
-tr-ns
-tr-ōm
-tro-su

| ¢es | pi |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\pi \alpha \tau \epsilon$ ¢ ${ }^{\text {as }}$ | (pitión) |
| $\rho \omega$ ט | (pitrṇán |
| $\alpha \tau \rho \alpha \dot{\sigma}$ ८ | pitt́şu |

(patrēs)
patrēs patrum

The nom. singular ended in the parent Indg. language in ttēr beside -tē̃ (cp. § 29). The reason for this difference is unknown. The former was generalized in Greek, Latin and the Germanic languages and the latter in Sanskrit and
the Baltic-Slavonic languages. The Greek stem-and caseendings of the inflected forms given above correspond to the Indg. stem- and case-endings except the acc. and dat. plural. It is possible that the accusative originally had the stem-ending ter $\cdot$ corresponding to $\pi \alpha \tau$ '́ $\rho \alpha s . \pi \alpha \tau \rho \alpha \sigma_{\imath}$ had $-\sigma \iota$ from the dat. of consonantal stems where the $-\sigma$ was not originally intervocalic as in $\pi 0 \sigma \sigma i, \pi o \sigma i(\$ 342)$. On the final $-\iota$ see $\S \mathbf{3 1 6}$. Beside the regular forms the nouns of relationship often have analogical formations in the oblique cases, especially in the gen. and dat. singular and gen. plural, as Hom. $\pi \alpha \tau \epsilon \in \rho o s, \mu \eta \tau \epsilon ́ \rho o s$, Hom. and Att. $\pi \alpha \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \omega \nu, \theta v \gamma \alpha \tau \epsilon ́ \rho o s$ with the substitution of $-\tau \epsilon \rho$ - for $\cdot \tau \rho$ after the analogy of the strong stem-endings and vice versa $\pi \alpha \tau \rho i ́, \theta \dot{v} \gamma \alpha \tau \rho \alpha, \theta \dot{v} \gamma \alpha \tau \rho \in s$.

Like $\pi \alpha \tau \dot{\eta} \rho$ was also declined $\gamma \alpha \sigma \tau \eta \rho$. The regular

 $-\nu \rho$ - regularly became $\cdot \nu \delta \rho$ - (§ 152) in the weak stem-forms. $\dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \rho o s$ for $\dot{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho o ́ s$ was formed after the analogy of forms like $\ddot{\alpha}^{\nu} \nu \epsilon \rho, \dot{\alpha} \nu \epsilon \in \rho \alpha$; and similarly ${ }^{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho \alpha, \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho i ́, \alpha \not \partial \nu \delta \rho \epsilon, \dot{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho \epsilon s$ after forms like $\dot{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho o ́ s, \dot{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho \omega \bar{\omega} \nu$.
$\delta \bar{\alpha} \eta \dot{\rho} \rho(\mathrm{voc} . \delta \hat{\alpha} \epsilon \rho), \phi \rho \dot{\alpha} \tau \eta \rho, \dot{\alpha} \dot{\eta} \rho, \alpha i \theta \dot{\eta} \rho, \dot{\alpha} \theta \dot{\eta} \rho$ and $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \tau \eta \dot{\eta} \rho$ generalized the strong stem-endings $-\tau \epsilon \rho \cdot,-\epsilon \rho$ - in all the oblique cases, as gen. $\delta \bar{\alpha} \epsilon ́ \rho o s, \phi \rho \frac{1}{\alpha} \tau \epsilon \rho o s,{ }^{\alpha} \epsilon ́ \rho o s, \alpha i \theta \in ́ \rho o s$, $\dot{\alpha} \theta$ '́ $\rho o s, \dot{\alpha} \sigma \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \sigma s$, but dat. pl. $\alpha \quad \alpha \tau \rho \alpha \sigma \iota$.
§ 361

## Singular.

Indg.
Nom. -tēr, ttōr $\} \quad \delta о \tau \eta ́ \rho ~ \delta \omega ́ \tau \omega \rho$ -tẽ, -tồ-
Voc. -ter, tor
Acc. -ter-m, tor-m
Gen. -tr-os, -es
Dat. (=loc.)


## Dual.

Nom. Voc. Acc.
-ter-e, tor-e $\delta o \tau \hat{\eta} \rho \epsilon \quad \delta \omega ́ \tau o \rho \epsilon \quad$ (dātârău)
Gen. Dat.
? $\quad$ ठоти́poı̀ $\delta \omega \tau$ ópotv

## Plural.

Nom. Voc. -ter-es,tor-es $\delta o \tau \hat{\eta} \rho \epsilon s$ 的тopєs dātáraḥ datōrēs


Dat. (=loc.)

On the levelling out of the ablaut-grades $-\tau \eta \rho-$, $-\tau 0 \rho$ - see § 359. On the ending of the nom. singular in Sanskrit see § 360. The -á. in Skr. dātấram, giver, dātârāu, dātấraḥ is of the same origin as in rấjānam (§ 345). Beside the gen. case-endings os, es the parent Indg. language had also -s (§ 302) which occurs in dātúr, pitúr; -rs regularly became ur through the intermediate stages -rṣ̆, -rž, -rr. The acc. and gen. plural dātị̂n, pitî́n, dātrinnấm, pitronnám were new formations after the analogy of the $\mathbf{i}$ - and $\mathbf{u}$-declensions (Thumb, Handbuch des Sanskrit, § 302). The regular forms would have been *dātráh, *pitráh, *dātrấm, *pitrá́m. The old gen. was preserved in Vedic narám $=\dot{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho \hat{\omega} \nu$.
§ 362. It is difficult to account satisfactorily for Att. Ion. $\chi \in i \rho$ and the inflected forms, because it is not certain what was the original stem: The most probable explanation is that beside the stem $\chi \in \rho$ - there once existed a stem $\chi \in \rho \iota$ with nom. acc. dual $\chi \in \epsilon \rho \in \in$ from ${ }^{*} \chi \epsilon \rho j \epsilon$. From the dual a new nominative singular Att. Ion. $\chi \in i ́ \rho$ was formed.
 $\chi \in \hat{i} \rho \in \varsigma, \chi \in i \rho \rho \alpha, \chi \in \iota \rho \omega \bar{\nu}$, but $\chi \in \rho 0 \hat{\nu}, \chi \in \rho \sigma i$ from stem $\chi \in \rho$. And Ion. generalized the stem $\chi \in \rho$, as $\chi$ ' $\rho \alpha, \chi \in \rho \rho^{\prime}$, $\chi \in \rho i$;
$\chi$ Х $\rho \in \varsigma, \chi^{\prime} \rho \alpha \Omega, \chi \in \rho \hat{\omega} \nu, \chi \in \rho \sigma i ́$, but Hom. $\chi \epsilon i \rho \in \sigma \iota,-\epsilon \sigma \sigma \iota$ from $\chi \in \iota \rho$. The nom. $\chi$ ' $\rho \rho$ in Timocreon 9 was, like
 analogy of the nominatives in -s.

## 6. s-STEMS.

§ 363. The s-stems contain masculine, feminine and neuter nouns and adjectives. They can be conveniently divided into five sub-divisions: (a) The large class of neuter nouns with the ablaut-grades ees-, os-. (b) Nouns and adjectives of the type $\delta v \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu \eta^{\prime} s$. (c) Nouns with the ablautgrades $\cdot \overline{\mathrm{o}} \mathrm{s}$, os-. ( $d$ ) The comparative of adjectives with the ablaut-grades $\cdot \mathbf{j e s}$-, -jos-, -jōs. (e) Neuter nouns with the stem-ending - es .

## a. Neuter stems in -es-, oss-

§ 364. To this sub-division belongs a large number of nouns in Greek, Sanskrit and Latin. In the Germanic languages nearly all of them went over into other declensions. They originally had either the strong grade of ablaut in the root and the weak in the stem-ending or the weak grade in the root and the strong in the stemending. A comparison of the forms in the various languages shows that this original distinction must have become obliterated during the prim. Indg. period by the ablaut-grade es- being levelled out into all the inflected forms.

## Singular.

Nom. Voc. Acc. os jévos jánaḥ, race genus
 Dat. (=loc.) -es-i $\quad \gamma^{\prime} \nu \epsilon \iota, \gamma^{\prime} \nu \epsilon \in i \quad$ jánasi genere Dual.
Nom. Voc. Acc. -es-ì, -ī $\gamma^{\prime} \nu \in \iota, \gamma^{\prime} \varphi \in \epsilon \quad$ jánasī Gen. Dat. ? $\quad \gamma \in \nu o i ̂ \nu, \gamma \in \nu \in \in \iota$

## Plural.

Nom. Voc. Acc. -es-ə, -ōs•ə $\gamma^{\epsilon} \nu \epsilon \alpha, \gamma^{\epsilon} \nu \eta$ (jánạ̄si) genera Gen. -es-ōm $\quad \gamma \in \nu \epsilon \in \omega \nu, \gamma \epsilon \nu \omega \bar{\omega} \nu$ jánasām generum Dat. (=loc.) ees-su $\quad \gamma^{\epsilon} \nu \epsilon \sigma \sigma \iota, \gamma \epsilon ́ v \epsilon \sigma \iota$ jánaḥsu

Intervocalic -s. disappeared in prim. Greek (§ 213, 2), but became -r- in Latin. In Sanskrit es- and os- regularly fell together in as- ( $\S$ 42). The Ionic uncontracted and the Attic contracted forms correspond to the Indg. stemand case-endings except $\gamma^{\prime} \nu \in \ddot{\iota}$ and $\gamma^{\epsilon} \nu \in \epsilon$. The $-i$ in the Ionic trisyllabic form $\gamma^{\epsilon} \nu \in i ̈$ was due to the influence of datives like $\pi$ oofi. The dual $\gamma \in \operatorname{l} \boldsymbol{\nu} \epsilon \iota$ represents an older $\gamma^{\epsilon} \nu \in \epsilon$ which is common in manuscripts. $\gamma^{\prime} \nu \epsilon \epsilon$ from older * $\gamma \epsilon \nu \epsilon \sigma \epsilon$ had $-\epsilon$ after the analogy of forms like $\delta v \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu \epsilon \epsilon$, $\pi o ́ \delta \delta$. Hom. has $\gamma^{\prime} \nu \in \epsilon \sigma \iota \iota$ beside $\gamma^{\prime} \nu \in \sigma \iota($ ( 212, 2). After the analogy of $\gamma^{\epsilon} \nu \in \sigma \sigma \iota$ the ending - $\epsilon \sigma \sigma \iota$ became used to form the dative plural of $\mathbf{i} \cdot, \mathbf{u}$-, and of all kinds of conso-nantal-stems. In Homer even forms like é $\pi$ é $\epsilon \sigma \sigma \iota$ occur owing to the stem being regarded as $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \in$ '. Sanskrit jánặsi (with nasalized -ă.) was a new formation after the analogy of the nt-stems. The regular form would have been *jánāsi or *jánasi. jánaḥsu = jánassu.
§ 365. Att. $\phi \hat{\omega} \mathrm{s}$, light $=$ Hom., \&c. ф́́os from * $\phi \alpha$ Fos, gen. $\phi$ áous from * $\phi a F o \sigma o s$, Hom. dat. $\phi \dot{\alpha} \epsilon \iota$ from * $\phi \alpha F \in \sigma \iota$, nom. pl. $\phi \dot{\alpha} \in \alpha$ from ${ }^{*} \phi \alpha F \in \sigma \alpha$. The other cases were formed after the analogy of the dental stems, as $\phi \omega \tau o ́ s, \phi \omega \tau i, p l$. $\phi \hat{\omega} \tau \alpha, \phi \dot{\omega} \tau \omega \nu$.

There seems to have been in prim. Greek two forms for the word ear, oûs from *oos, older *ov́ $\sigma o s$ and Dor. Ion. $\hat{\omega} s$
 *ov́ $\alpha \alpha 0$ os, \&c. after the analogy of the stems in $-\mu \alpha$ (§ 350), and Attic, \&c. $\dot{\omega} \tau o ́ s, ~ \dot{\omega} \tau i ́, ~ p l . ~ \hat{\omega} \tau \alpha, \dot{\omega} \tau \omega \nu, \dot{\omega} \sigma \dot{\iota}($ also Hom.) from the form $\bar{\omega} s$ after the analogy of the dental stems. oùs, ovuaros, \&c. had the smooth for the rough breathing after the analogy of $\hat{\omega} s, \dot{\omega} \tau \sigma$ s, \&c. See § 219.

## b. $\delta v \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu \eta{ }^{\prime} s$.

§ 368. Nouns and adjectives of the type $\delta v \sigma \mu \in \nu \eta$ भ́s, illaffected, hostile, Skr. durmanāh, dispirited, only exist in Greek and Sanskrit. And originally they occurred only in compounds. Simple forms like $\mu \iota \gamma \eta{ }^{\prime} s, \phi \rho a \delta \dot{\eta} s, \psi \in v \delta \delta^{\prime} s$ beside $\sigma v \mu \mu \iota \gamma \eta^{\prime}, \dot{\alpha} \phi \rho \alpha \delta \eta^{\prime} s, \phi i \lambda 0 \psi \in v \delta \delta_{\eta} s$ were back-formations made direct from the compounds. These compounds are closely related to the neuter stems in -es-, os., the eeshaving become generalized in the parent Indg. language,
 $\dot{\alpha} \psi \in \cup \delta \tilde{\eta} s: \psi \in \hat{v} \delta o s$.

Singular.
Indg.

| Nom. | -ês | $\delta v \sigma \mu \in \nu \eta{ }^{\prime}$ | durmanāh |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Voc. | -es | $\delta v \sigma \mu \in \nu$ '́s | durmanạ |
| Acc. | -es-m. | $\delta \nu \sigma \mu \in \nu \in \dot{\alpha},-\hat{\eta}$ | durmanasam |
| Gen. | -es-os, -es | $\delta \nu \sigma \mu \in \nu \in ́ o s$, -ov̂s | durmanasah |
| Dat. (=loc.) | -es-i | $\delta \nu \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu \epsilon \hat{l}$, $-\epsilon$ 'il | durmanasi |

Dual.

Nom. Voc. Acc. -es-e Gen. Dat. ?

Plural.
Nom. Voc. -es-es
Acc. es.ns
Gen. es-ōm
Dat. (=loc.) -es-su
$\delta v \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu \epsilon \in \epsilon,-\epsilon i ̂ s ~ d u r m a n a s a h ̣$ $\delta v \sigma \mu \in \nu$ е́as
$\delta \nu \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu \epsilon \in \omega \nu,-\widehat{\omega} \nu$
$\delta \nu \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu \in ́ \sigma \iota$
(durmanasāu)

The intervocalic .s. regularly disappeared (§213, 2). The - $\eta$ s of the nom. singular is a lengthening of the stemending ess. It is improbable that the original ending was -ēs.s. The $\ddot{i}$ in $\delta v \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu \epsilon i$ is of the same origin as in $\gamma \epsilon \nu \epsilon i$ (§ 364). Apart from the dat. plural all the other forms
both contracted and uncontracted represent the original stem- and case-endings. $\delta v \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu \epsilon \in \iota$, older $\delta v \sigma \mu \in \nu \epsilon \sigma \sigma \iota$, on the final $\iota$ of which see § 316. In Attic the nom. plural was used for the accusative. In Attic the compounded proper names in -крát $\eta s,-\mu \epsilon ́ \nu \eta s,-\sigma \theta \in ́ \nu \eta s,-\phi \alpha ́ \nu \eta s$ and also other compounds often had $-\eta \nu$ in the accusative after the analogy of the masculine $\overline{\mathbf{a}}$-declension. This also occurred occasionally in the Ionic, Aeolic, Cretan, Arcadian and Cyprian dialects. And in like manner the Attic genitive, and more rarely the dative, were sometimes formed after the analogy of the $\bar{a}-$ declension. The Lesbian voc. gen. and dat. endings $-\epsilon,-\eta,-\eta$ were also similar analogical formations.
§ 367. The original ending of the nom. voc. and acc. neuter singular was ees, as in $\delta v \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu \epsilon$ '́s $=$ Skr. durmanaḥ; and of the plural ees-ə as in $\delta v \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu \epsilon \in, \cdot \hat{\eta}$.

## c. Stems in -ōs, -os•.

§ 368. These nouns had originally the ablaut-grades $\cdot \overline{\mathrm{o}}$, -os-, but the os- became generalized in prim. Greek in the inflected forms. Nouns of this type occur only in Greek, Latin and Sanskrit.
 the analogy of $\pi \epsilon \iota \theta 0 \hat{\imath}(\S 341)$, acc. ai $\delta \hat{\omega}$ from * $\alpha i \delta o \sigma \alpha$, Hom.
 and similarly acc. $\alpha i \omega \hat{\omega}$ from ${ }^{*} \alpha i F o \sigma \alpha$ beside $\alpha i \omega \hat{\nu} \alpha$ : nom. $\alpha i \omega \nu$, gen. aî̄vos. Cp. O.Lat. arbōs, arbŏrem beside honōs, honōrem with $\cdot \overline{0}$. of the nom. levelled out into the
 declined after the analogy of the dental stems (§ 342), gen.
 $\gamma \bar{\epsilon} \lambda \omega$, i $\delta \rho \hat{\varrho}$ after the analogy of the o-stems (§ 327), acc. $\gamma^{\prime} \in \lambda \omega$ after the analogy of the $\overline{0} u$-stems (§ 340).

Hom. $\eta^{\omega} \omega$ from *āusōs, cp. Skr. ự̂áạ, dawn, Lat. aurōr-a from *āusōs- $\bar{a}$ with $\cdot \bar{a}$ from the $\bar{a} \cdot d e c l e n s i o n, ~ v o c . ~$
$\dot{\eta} \hat{\imath}$ after the analogy of $\pi \epsilon \epsilon \theta_{0} \hat{\imath}(\S 341)$, acc. $\dot{\eta} \hat{\omega}$ from ${ }^{*} \dot{\eta} \sigma \sigma \alpha$,

 over into the so-called Attic second declension (§ 327).

## d. The Comparative of Adjectives.

§ 369. One of the numerous ways of forming the comparative of adjectives in the parent Indg. language was by means of a suffix with the ablaut-grades -jes-, .jos-, jōs, -is. The grades -jes- and .jos- regularly fell together in -jas- (§ 42) in Sanskrit. In Latin -jos- only occurs in the nom. voc. and acc. neuter, as O.Lat. majos, later majus. In all the other forms of the masculine, feminine and neuter -jōs, which originally belonged only to the masculine nom. singular, became generalized, as O.Lat. majōs, noviōs, acc. majōrem, noviōrem. In Greek -jes-, jōs do not occur at all, and -jos- only occurs in three forms, viz. in the acc. singular masculine and feminine, as $\mu \epsilon_{i}^{\prime} \xi^{\xi} \omega$, Ion. $\mu$ é $\xi \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \mu$ é $\gamma j o \sigma \alpha$, Indg. ${ }^{*}$ mégjosm, masc. and fem. nom.

 § 375.

## e. Neuter stems in -as-.

§ 370. Nouns of this type are found only in Greek and
 -ōs in paragraph 368, but the -əs- grade became generalized already in the parent Indg. language.

Singular.
Indg.

| Voc. Acc. | -2s | $\gamma$ ¢'pas | , |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gen. | -as.os, -es |  | víšah |
| Dat. (= loc.) | -2s-i | $\gamma$ ¢'́paï, $\gamma$ 'ө́paı | havíṣi |

## Dual.

Nom. Voc. Acc. -əs-i, -ī
Gen. Dat. ?
havíṣi
$\gamma \in \rho \alpha ́ o \iota \nu, \gamma \in \rho \hat{̣} \nu$

## Plural.

Nom. Voc. Acc. -əs-ə $\quad \gamma^{\epsilon} \rho \alpha \alpha, \gamma^{\prime} \rho \bar{\alpha} \quad$ (havíṣsịi) Gen. $\quad \cdot \mathrm{s}-\overline{o ̄} \tilde{\pi} \quad \gamma \in \rho \alpha \dot{\alpha} \omega \nu, \gamma \in \rho \hat{\omega} \nu \quad$ haviṣ̦̄àm Dat. (=loc.) -əs-su $\quad \gamma^{\prime} \rho \alpha \sigma \sigma \iota, \gamma^{\prime} \rho \alpha \sigma \iota$ havíhṣ̣̣u

The dat. $\gamma \epsilon$ ' $\rho \alpha \ddot{a}$ and dual $\gamma \epsilon \epsilon \rho \alpha \epsilon, \gamma \epsilon \rho \bar{\alpha}$ were new formations of the same kind as in $\gamma^{\prime} \nu \epsilon і ̈$ and $\gamma^{\prime} \nu \epsilon \epsilon, \gamma^{\prime} \nu \in \epsilon$ (§ 364). On the $\iota$ in $\gamma^{\prime} \rho \alpha \sigma \sigma \iota$ see § 316. The remaining Ionic uncontracted and the Attic contracted forms are normally developed from the corresponding Indg. stem- and case-endings. But most of the nouns belonging to this class were also declined after the analogy of the stems in $-\mu \alpha(\S 350$ ),


 $\beta_{\rho} \epsilon \tau^{\prime} \epsilon \omega \nu$ were formed after the analogy of the corresponding cases of $\gamma^{\prime} \boldsymbol{v}^{\prime}$ OS (§ 364). The - ${ }^{\text {a }}$ in the nom. acc. plural of forms like $\gamma^{\epsilon} \epsilon \rho \breve{\alpha}$, кр $\epsilon \check{\alpha}$ beside the regular forms $\gamma^{\epsilon} \epsilon \bar{\rho}, k \rho \epsilon \in \bar{\alpha}$ was due to the analogy of the nom. acc. of other consonantal stems. It is difficult to explain datives like $\kappa \rho^{\prime} \epsilon \in, \gamma \eta \eta^{\prime} \rho \alpha$ which occur in Attic texts. They seem to be new formations after the analogy of the dat. of the $\bar{a}-$ declension, but it is not clear how the change could have come about.

## The r-: n-declension.

§371. The parent Indg. language had a declension of neuter nouns which consisted of the blending of two stems. The stem of the nom. and acc. singular generally ended in one of the ablaut-grades er (Skr. -ar, Lat. -er) ; - or (Gr. $-\omega \rho$ ) ; and $\cdot \mathrm{r}$ (Gr. $-\alpha \rho$, Lat. -ur), but also occasionally in -r + a consonant, as Skr. áhar, day, údhar, udder, Lat. iter; ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\prime \prime} \lambda \omega \rho, \pi \epsilon \in \lambda \omega \rho, v ँ \delta \omega \rho$; $\hat{\eta} \pi \alpha \rho$, ov̀ $\theta \alpha \rho$, Lat. femur, jecur ; Skr.
yákrt, heart, ásrok, blood. The stem of the oblique cases ended in -n or -n, as gen. Skr. áhn-ah, údhn-aḥ, udn-áh, of water, Gr. $\eta \pi \pi \alpha-\tau o s$, v́ $\delta \alpha-\tau o s$, Lat. feminis, *itinis, *jecinis (femoris, iteris, itineris, jecoris, jecinoris were analogical formations through the mixing of the two stems); Skr. jakn•áh, asn•áh.

This declension was best preserved in Sanskrit and Greek, in the other languages one or other of the stems mostly became generalized, as in Lat. ūber, OE. ūder, udder; OE. wæter beside Goth. watō (dat. watin = Skr. udáni), water; and similarly in the three Greek words ${ }_{\epsilon} \epsilon \alpha \rho$ from ${ }^{*} F \in \sigma \alpha \rho$ (gen. $\left.{ }^{\prime} \in \alpha \rho \sigma s\right)$, Lat. vēr; $\pi \hat{v} \rho$, gen. $\pi v \rho_{0}{ }^{\prime}$ beside Goth. fōn, fire, gen. funins; $\theta^{\prime} \nu \alpha \rho$, gen. $\theta^{\prime} \nu \alpha \rho o s$.

Many of the words belonging to this declension are found in Greek only in the nom. and acc. singular, as
 $\dot{v} \pi \alpha \rho$. Inflected forms of the following nouns occur, all of which were formed after the analogy of the stems in $-\mu \alpha$ (§ 350): $\ddot{\alpha}^{\lambda} \lambda \epsilon \alpha \rho$, from ${ }^{*} \dot{\alpha} \lambda \epsilon F \alpha \rho$, ${ }_{\alpha} \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \phi \alpha \rho$, $\delta \in \hat{\lambda} \lambda \epsilon \alpha \rho$ from
 ${ }^{\circ} \nu \eta \alpha \rho$ from ${ }^{\circ} \dot{\partial} \nu \bar{\alpha} F \alpha \rho$, oû $\theta \alpha \rho$, $\pi \epsilon \hat{\imath} \rho \alpha \rho$ from ${ }^{*} \pi \epsilon \rho F \alpha \rho$, $\sigma \kappa \hat{\omega} \rho$,


Many attempts have been made to explain the origin of this declension, but none of them are satisfactory. The original inflexions were better preserved in Vedic than in classical Sanskrit. The declension of Vedic áhar, day and Greek $\hat{\eta} \pi \alpha \rho$ will serve as models for all nouns belonging to this class. The stem- and case-endings of the inflected forms in both languages correspond to those of the neuter n -declension (§ 350).

## Singular.

Nom. Voc. Acc. Gen.
Dat. (=loc.)
ท゙татоS
$\eta ँ \pi \alpha \tau \iota$
áhar
áhnạ̣
áhani, áhan

|  | Dual. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nom. Voc. Acc. Gen. Dat. | $\eta \pi \pi \alpha \epsilon$ <br> $\grave{\eta} \pi \alpha ́ \tau o \iota \nu$ | áhanī |
|  | Plural. |  |
| Nom. Voc. Acc. | $\eta \pi \alpha \tau \alpha$ | áhāni |
| Gen. | $\dot{\eta} \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega \nu$ | áhnām |
| Dat. (= loc.) | $\eta{ }^{\prime} \pi \alpha \sigma \iota$ | áhasu |

## CHAPTER X

## ADJECTIVES

## A. THE DECLENSION OF ADJECTIVES

§ 372. The development of grammatical gender in nouns was older than in adjectives, but adjectives had before the close of the prim. Indg. period come to be inflected for number, gender and case like nouns. At an earlier period there must however have been a stage when the bare stem of the adjective was used along with the noun without anything to indicate its number, gender and case, something like Modern English which has got rid of the superfluous luxury of inflexion and gender. After the $\bar{a}$-stems of nouns had become characteristic of the feminine gender, and the 0 -stems of the masculine and neuter genders (§ 295), the adjectival o-stems began to have inflexions for number, gender and case after the analogy of such nouns when used along with them as attributes. Nouns of the type
 genders, and words like *ékwos, Lat. equus : *ékwā, Lat. equa, were probably also an important factor in the development. At a still later period the adjectives of the type -os, $\cdot \overline{\mathrm{a}}, \cdot \mathrm{om}(-o s,-\bar{\alpha}, \cdot \eta$; $\cdot o \nu$, Skr. $\cdot \mathrm{ah}, \cdot \overline{\mathrm{a}}, \cdot \mathrm{am}$, Lat. -us, $\cdot \mathrm{a}, \mathrm{um}$ ) came to be used along with nouns belonging to the $\mathbf{i} \cdot, \mathbf{u}$-, diphthongal- and consonantal-declensions. The
development of the feminine gender in the other adjectival stems went parallel with the formation of the feminine gender in the corresponding substantival stems，i．e．they were formed after the analogy of the jā－stems（§ 322）．The adjectives of this type then acquired the gender and inflexion of the corresponding masculine and neuter nouns and became used along with all kinds of nouns．
§ 373．In Greek the adjectives are declined like the corresponding nouns，but as we have seen above the feminine of the $\mathbf{u} \cdot, \mathbf{n}$ ．and nt －stems is declined like a jā－ stem．There is however a large number of adjectives in Greek，which has only one ending（－os）for the masculine and feminine．The adjectives of this type are partly com－ pound and partly simple．They were originally nouns， denoting living beings possessing the characteristic implied in the word，which later came to be used as adjectives，as pododákтv入os，lit．a man with rosy fingers；$\theta \bar{v} \mu \circ \beta$ ópos，lit． soul－devourer；$\lambda \alpha$ ános，lit．a chatterer，babbler；グ $\sigma v x o s$, lit． a quiet，gentle kind of man；and similarly $\left.\epsilon^{\epsilon \prime \kappa}\right\rceil \lambda о s, \eta ँ \mu \epsilon \rho o s$ ， ì $\lambda$ oos，$\lambda \alpha \dot{\beta} \beta$ pos，$\lambda o i ́ \delta o \rho o s, \& c$ ．After the analogy of such ad－ jectives，simple adjectives which were not originally nouns denoting living beings came to have only the two endings，
 pound nouns was determined by the second element．When such compound nouns came to be used attributively in apposition to other nouns（cp．John Lackland）they became adjectival and were inflected like ordinary adjectives，except that they preserved their original masculine ending when used along with a feminine noun，as pododákтvлos $\dot{\eta}$ е́s； and similarly neuter compounds like＊$\kappa \alpha \lambda \lambda i \sigma \phi v \rho o \nu$ ，beauti－ ful ankle，when they became adjectives，had os for both the masculine and feminine．But when the second element of the compound was originally an adjective，it regularly had the three endings．The adjectives of this type had sometimes however only two endings after the analogy of
the first type. The compound adjectives in - $\eta$ s like $\delta v \sigma \mu \in \nu \eta \eta^{\prime}(\S 366)$ never had different forms for the masculine and feminine. On the simple adjectives like $\mu \iota \gamma \eta$ 's, $\phi \rho a \delta \eta^{\prime} s$, $\psi \in v \delta \eta$ и́s, see § 366.

Note.-The inflexion of contracted adjectives like $\dot{\pi} \pi \lambda o v{ }^{\text {s }}$ from $\dot{\alpha} \pi \lambda$ óos was regular in the masculine and neuter except in the nominative and accusative neuter plural. The feminine $\dot{\alpha} \pi \lambda \hat{\eta}$ (for ${ }^{*} \dot{\alpha} \pi \lambda \hat{\omega}$ from $\dot{\alpha} \pi \lambda o ́ \eta$ ), \&c. and $\dot{\alpha} \pi \lambda \hat{a}$ (for ${ }^{*} \dot{\alpha} \pi \lambda \hat{\omega}$ from $\left.\dot{\alpha} \pi \lambda_{o}^{\prime} \alpha\right)$ were formed after the analogy of forms like $\sigma o \phi \dot{\eta}, \& c$. and $\sigma o \phi a ́$.
§ 374. In the following adjectives the declension is made up of the blending together of two different stems: nom. acc. masc. sing. $\pi 0 \lambda u ́ s, \pi o \lambda u ́ v$, neut. $\pi 0 \lambda u ́$, stem $\pi 0 \lambda u ́ v$, and fem. nom. sing. $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda \bar{\eta}$ from ${ }^{*} \pi 0 \lambda(F) j \bar{\alpha}$, gen. $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda \hat{\eta} s$ from ${ }^{*} \pi o \lambda(F) j \bar{\alpha} s$, from which was formed a masc. and neut. stem ${ }^{*} \pi o \lambda(F) j 0-=\pi 0 \lambda \lambda o$ - for all the other forms of the masculine and neuter. The old forms of the $\mathbf{u}$-stem were preserved in Hom., as $\pi 0 \lambda \epsilon ́ \sigma s, \pi 0 \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon s, \pi 0 \lambda \epsilon ́ \alpha s, \pi 0 \lambda \epsilon ́ \sigma \iota$. And similarly nom. acc. masc. sing. $\mu^{\prime} \hat{\gamma} \alpha \rho, \mu^{\prime} \gamma \alpha \nu$, neut. $\mu \notin \gamma \alpha$, and fem. nom. sing. $\mu \in \gamma \alpha \lambda \eta$ from which was formed a masc. and stem $\mu \in \gamma \alpha{ }^{\prime} \lambda$ - for all the other forms of the masculine and neuter.

## B. THE COMPARISON OF ADJECTIVES

## i. The Comparative Degree.

§ 375. The parent Indg. language had several suffixes by means of which the comparative degree was formed. But in the individual branches of the parent language one of the suffixes generally became more productive than the rest, and in course of time came to be the principal one from which the comparative was formed, the other suffixes only being preserved in isolated forms.

The oldest and most original mode of forming the comparative of adjectives in prim. Indo-Germanic was by
means of the suffix -jes- with the ablaut-grades .jos-, jōsand -is-, which was added direct to the root-syllable. The root-syllable originally had the strong grade of ablaut. This suffix became the normal one in Latin for the formation of the comparative (§ 369), but in Greek and the Germanic languages it practically remained unproductive. In the oldest Sanskrit it was more productive than in the later language. In classical Sanskrit only a limited number of comparatives occur with this suffix. -is- the weak grade form of the suffix occurs in Latin adverbs like magis, nimis, satis, and in Gothic adverbs like mins, less, waírs, worse, from *minniz, *wirsiz. -jes-, -jōs- do not occur at all in Greek, and -jos- only occurs in three forms of the declension, viz. in the masc. and fem. acc. singular, as $\mu \epsilon i ́ \xi \omega$, Ion. $\mu \bar{\epsilon} \xi \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \mu \epsilon ́ \gamma j o \sigma \alpha$, Indg. *mégjosm, masc. and fem. nom. plural $\mu \epsilon i ́ j o v s, \mu \epsilon ́ \xi o v s$ from ${ }^{*} \mu \epsilon \in j \sigma \sigma \epsilon s$, and neut. nom. acc. plural $\mu \epsilon i \hat{j} \dot{\sigma}, \mu \bar{\epsilon} \xi \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \mu \epsilon \in \gamma j \sigma \sigma \alpha$. And similarly $\beta \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \omega, \beta \rho \alpha ́ \sigma \sigma \omega, \gamma \lambda \hat{v} \sigma \sigma \omega$, 白 $\lambda \alpha ́ \sigma \sigma \omega, ~ \eta \eta \tau \tau \omega(\eta ँ \sigma \sigma \omega)$, $\theta \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \omega, \kappa \rho \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \sigma \omega, \mu \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \omega, \pi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \omega$. From these and similar forms a new nom. $\mu \bar{\epsilon} \xi \omega \nu, \mu^{\prime} \xi \delta \nu, \beta \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \omega \nu, \beta \alpha ́ \sigma \sigma o \nu$ was
 came to be declined like $\eta \delta \delta \check{\omega} \omega \nu$. Why the stem-vowel was long in Att. $\mu \epsilon i \hat{i} \oint \omega, \kappa \rho \in i \tau \tau \omega$, $\bar{\epsilon} \lambda \frac{\alpha}{\alpha} \tau \tau \omega, \theta^{\prime} \bar{\alpha} \tau \tau \omega$, but short in the corresponding Ionic forms, is still an unsolved problem. Beside the suffix form -jes-, jŏ̃s. there was also in prim.
 in ablaut relation to each other. The $\cdot \frac{1}{1}$. was preserved in Greek, but Sanskrit generalized the -i., as Skr. svádiyas., sweeter; masc. and fem. acc. singular $\dot{\eta} \delta t \hat{t} \omega$,
 neut. nom. acc. plural $\dot{\eta} \delta i \not \omega$, from ${ }^{*} \sigma F \bar{\alpha} \delta \bar{j} j \sigma \alpha \alpha$, ${ }^{*} \sigma F \bar{\alpha} \delta \bar{i} j \sigma \sigma \epsilon \varsigma$,
 All the other forms of the declension in Greek were formed from the weak grade $\cdot \mathbf{i s} \cdot+$ an $n$-suffix with the ablaut-grades

from ${ }^{*} \sigma f \bar{\alpha} \delta \iota \sigma \omega \nu,{ }^{*} \sigma F \bar{\alpha} \delta \iota \sigma o \nu \alpha,{ }^{*} \sigma F \bar{\alpha} \delta \iota \sigma o \nu o s,{ }^{*} \sigma F \bar{\alpha} \delta \iota \sigma o \nu, \mathrm{pl}$.
 similarly in Goth. masc. nom. sŭt-iz-a, sweeter, acc. sŭt-izan, gen. sŭt-iz-ins. The $-\iota$ was generally long in Attic poetry and short in Doric and the old epic poetry. This fluctuation between the long and short $l$ - was due to the levelling out of $\bar{\iota}$ or $\check{\iota}$ in the forms where it was regular, as
 $\rho \eta^{\prime} \omega \omega$. The feminine of this type of comparative was originally formed as a jā-stem (§ 322), as Skr. náv-jas-ī, newer, gár-iyas-ì, heavier, but in Greek and Latin the masculine became also used for the feminine.

Note.-From what has been said above it will be seen that the Greek declension of words of the type $\dot{\eta} \delta i \omega \omega \nu$ is made up of the two different stem-forms ${ }^{*} \sigma F \bar{a} \delta-\bar{i} j o \sigma-$ and ${ }^{*} \sigma F \bar{\alpha} \delta-\iota \sigma-o v$-, which originally had different meanings. The former denoted the adjectival form of the comparative, sweeter, and the latter the substantival, the sweeter. But this original distinction in the meaning of the two stem-forms was obliterated in prim. Greek whereby the substantival form became adjectival. And similarly in the Germanic languages, as Goth. sŭt-iz-a (acc. sŭt-izan, gen. sŭt-iz-ins) which originally meant the sweeter.
§ 376. The secondary suffixes -ero-, -tero- were originally confined to words relating to place and to certain pronominal forms, as Skr. úparaḥ, ádharaḥ, lower, Lat. s-uperus, inferus; Goth. unsar, our, izwar, your. Skr. kataráh, $\pi$ ó $\tau \epsilon \rho o s$, Goth. buapar, which of two ; $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \in \tau \in \rho o s$, $\frac{\bar{v}}{\mathbf{v}} \boldsymbol{\mu}$ '́ $\tau \in \rho \circ \mathrm{s}$, Lat. noster, vester; Lat. exterus, dexterus. The suffix eero- remained unproductive in all the languages. The suffix tero- remained unproductive in Latin and the Germanic languages, but in Greek and Sanskrit it had become in the prehistoric periods of these languages the ordinary suffix for the formation of the comparative of adjectives. The tero was originally added to the ad-
verbial form, which in the $\mathbf{i} \cdot, \mathfrak{u} \cdot$ and consonantal-stems was identical with the neuter singular, as $\rho \dot{\eta} i-\tau \epsilon \rho \cdot s, \dot{v} \psi i-$
 from ${ }^{*} \chi \alpha \rho \iota F \epsilon \nu \tau-\tau \epsilon \rho o s ; \pi \epsilon \nu \epsilon \in-\tau \epsilon \rho o s$ from ${ }^{*} \pi \epsilon \nu \epsilon \tau-\tau \epsilon \rho o s ; \mu \alpha-$ $\kappa \alpha ́ \rho-\tau \epsilon \rho o s ; \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \epsilon \in \sigma-\tau \epsilon \rho o s, \epsilon \dot{v} \mu \in \nu \in ́ \sigma-\tau \epsilon \rho o s ;$ Skr. šúci-tarah, purer ; cấru-tarạ̣, dearer; bhágavat-taraḥ (stem bhaga-vant-), more blessed; tavás-taraḥ, stronger; $\pi \alpha \lambda \alpha i$ i- $\tau \in \rho o s$, $\mu \in \sigma \alpha i-\tau \epsilon \rho o s$ which at a later period came to be felt as being formed from $\pi \alpha \lambda \alpha \iota o ́ s, ~ \mu ' \epsilon \sigma o s$, and then after the analogy of these were formed such comparatives as $\gamma \in \rho \alpha \dot{i}-\tau \epsilon \rho o s, \dot{\eta} \sigma v-$ $\chi^{\alpha i}-\tau \epsilon \rho o s, i \sigma \alpha i-\tau \epsilon \rho o s, \mu \nu \chi \alpha i ́-\tau \epsilon \rho o s, \sigma \chi o \lambda \alpha i-\tau \epsilon \rho o s, \pi \lambda \eta \sigma \iota \alpha i-$ $\tau \in \rho o s$. And in like manner from such comparatives as $\chi \alpha \rho \iota \epsilon \sigma-\tau \epsilon \rho 0 s, \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \epsilon \epsilon \sigma-\tau \epsilon \rho \sigma s$, the $-\epsilon \sigma-\tau \epsilon \rho \rho s$ was abstracted and used for forming comparatives like $\sigma \omega \phi \rho o \nu$ - $\epsilon \sigma-\tau \epsilon \rho o s$,
 from * $\epsilon \dot{\nu} \nu 0-\epsilon \sigma-\tau \epsilon \rho o s: \epsilon \mathcal{\nu} \nu o u s$. And similarly from comparatives like $\dot{\alpha}^{\chi} \alpha \rho i ́ \sigma-\tau \epsilon \rho o s: \ddot{\alpha} \chi \alpha \rho \iota s,-\iota \tau o s, \gamma \alpha \sigma \tau \rho i ́ \sigma-\tau \epsilon \rho o s:$ $\gamma$ d́cт $\rho \iota s$, was extracted the $-i \sigma-\tau \epsilon \rho o s$, which became used for forming comparatives like $\lambda \alpha \lambda$ - $i \sigma$ - $\tau \epsilon \rho o s: ~ \lambda \alpha ́ \lambda o s, ~ \pi \tau \omega \chi$ - $i \sigma$ $\tau \epsilon \rho o s: \pi \tau \omega \chi$ о́s, $\beta \lambda \bar{\alpha} \kappa$-і́ $\sigma-\tau \epsilon \rho o s:$ gen. $\beta \lambda \bar{\alpha} \kappa o ́ s, ~ \kappa \lambda \epsilon \pi \tau-i \sigma \cdot \tau \epsilon \rho o s:$ $\kappa \lambda \epsilon ́ \pi \tau \eta$.

In the ordinary formation of the comparative of 0 -stems, as in $\dot{\alpha} \xi \iota \omega \cdot \tau \epsilon \rho o s, \sigma о \phi \omega$ - $\tau \epsilon \rho o s$ beside коифó-тєроs, $\pi \iota \kappa \rho o ́-$
 from older ${ }^{*} \kappa \epsilon \nu F \sigma^{\prime}-\tau \epsilon \rho \sigma s,{ }^{*} \sigma \tau \epsilon \nu \neq \sigma \cdot-\tau \epsilon \rho \sigma \rho$, there is a difference of opinion among scholars about the explanation of the $-\omega$ beside -0 . Some scholars assume that the -0 - became $-\omega$ in prim. Greek by rhythmic lengthening when the preceding syllable was short, but that it remained short when the preceding syllable was long by nature or position. Other scholars maintain, and probably rightly, that the comparative of o-stems was formed precisely in the same manner as in the other stems, that is, from the adverbial form which in the o-stems was originally the ablative (§303) of the adjective used adverbially and accordingly
ended in $-\omega$. This explanation agrees with the formation of the comparative in the Germanic languages ( cp . Goth. swinpō-z-a : swinps, strong), where the - $\overline{0}$ - can have no connexion with what is called rhythmic lengthening. It is therefore probable that all comparatives of o-stems had originally $-\omega$ - irrespective of the quantity of the preceding syllable. The $-\omega$ - only remained in those comparatives in which a succession of short syllables would have arisen by the substitution of 0 -. In other cases the comparative came to be formed direct from the o-stem of the adjective after the analogy of the $\mathbf{i} \cdot, \mathbf{u}$ - and consonantal-stems. Then the relation of $\omega$ - to -0 - gave rise to what is improperly called rhythmic lengthening.

## 2. The Superlative Degree.

§ 377. The superlative, like the comparative degree, was formed in the parent Indg. language by means of several suffixes. But in the individual branches of the parent language one of the suffixes generally became more productive than the rest, and in the course of time came to be the principal one from which the superlative was formed, the other suffixes only being preserved in isolated forms. The principal suffixes were:
r. -to which was only preserved in the formation of ordinal numerals, as ধ́ктos, Skr. ṣ̆aṣṭháḥ, Lat. sextus, Goth. saíhsta, sixth ; ס'́кктos from *dekmtos.
2. .is-to.. This suffix is made up of -is- the weak grade of the comparative suffix -jes- (§ 375), as in Lat. magis, and the to- which occurs in ordinal numerals like ëктоя, \&c. In the comparative the root-syllable originally had the strong grade of ablaut, but in the superlative the weak grade with the accent on the ending of the suffix -is-tó-, cp. $\kappa \rho \epsilon i \sigma \sigma \omega \nu$, ó $\lambda \epsilon i \bar{j} \omega \nu$ (inscriptional form) beside $\kappa \rho \alpha ́ \tau-\iota \sigma \tau o \varsigma$, ó $\begin{gathered}\text { í } \gamma-\iota \sigma \tau o s . ~ T h i s ~ o r i g i n a l ~ d i s t i n c t i o n ~ b e c a m e ~ a l m o s t ~ e n t i r e l y ~\end{gathered}$ obliterated in Greek and Sanskrit by analogical formations.

The suffix disappeared completely in Latin, but became productive in the Germanic languages, and also in Greek and Sanskrit for those adjectives which had $-\omega \nu$, -ĭ $\omega \nu$,
 Skr. máhīyas- : máh-iṣ̂thaḥ; $\mathfrak{\eta} \delta I ̆ \imath \omega \nu ~: ~ \eta ँ \delta-\iota \sigma \tau o s=S k r . ~$ svádīyas- : svád-iṣ̆ṭah, Goth. sŭt-ists, sweetest.
3. $\cdot \mathrm{m} \cdot \mathrm{o} \cdot$, $\cdot \mathrm{m} \cdot \mathrm{o} \cdot$, which like -to- appears chiefly in ordinal numerals, as Skr. dašamáh, Lat. decimus, from *dekm.os, tenth; Lat. summus from *sup-mos, infimus; Skr. upamáh, uppermost; adhamáh, lowest; Goth. fruma, first; innuma, innermost. It remained unproductive in Greek, and almost so in Latin, Sanskrit and the Germanic languages. -m.o. would have become $-\alpha \mu$-0- $(\S 65,2)$ in Greek, but it was supplanted by the -atos in 'ै $\nu \alpha \tau \circ s, \delta^{\prime} \epsilon-$ кatos, from *newntos, *dekmtos, as ${ }^{\prime \prime} \sigma \chi \alpha \tau o s, \mu \notin \sigma \sigma \alpha \tau o s$, $\nu$ е́atos, v́tazos. This change of $-\alpha \mu-0$ - to $-\alpha \tau-0$ - was doubtless also partly due to the influence of the suffixal ending to.
4. $\mathrm{tm} \cdot \mathrm{o}$. which appears in ordinal numbers, as Skr. saptamáh, Lat. septimus, from *septm.os, seventh. Skr. ántamạ̣, next; uttamáh, highest, best. In Latin and the Germanic languages it was only preserved in isolated forms, as Lat. intimus, extimus, ultimus, optimus, dextimus; Goth. aftuma, next, posterus ; iftuma, the following, next. In Sanskrit it was productive and became the regular superlative ending tama-h to adjectives which formed their comparative in -tara-ḥ (§ 376), as cấrutaraḥ, dearer : cấrutamaḥ; tavástaraḥ, stronger : tavás-tamaḥ. tmo•owould have become $-\tau \alpha \mu-0$ - in Greek, but $-\tau \alpha \mu$-o- became $-\tau \alpha \tau-0$ - in the prehistoric period of the language through
 the superlative ending $-\iota \sigma \tau 0-s$. $-\tau \alpha \tau-0$ - then became the ordinary superlative suffix for adjectives which had - $\tau \epsilon \rho 0$ in the comparative.

## 3. Irregular Comparison.

§ 378. It is a peculiarity of all the Indg. languages that certain adjectives, especially those denoting good, bad, great, small, much, little, do not admit of a comparative and a superlative being formed directly from them. It is usually said that such adjectives are defective or that they form their comparatives and superlatives from a different root than the positive or that the comparatives and superlatives have no positives with which they are etymologically related. The real explanation is that such adjectives escaped from being brought into the grammatical system of comparison. In the early prim. Indg. period the comparative and superlative stood in no grammatical relation to the so-called positive. It was not until a relatively late period of the prim. Indg. language that the comparative and superlative came to be associated grammatically with what we call the positive. The forms in -jes- (§ 375) and -is-to( $\$ 377,2$ ) originally partook of the nature of participles or verbal adjectives and denoted that the verbal action was especially prominent in the object with which they stood attributively, as Vedic tárīyas-, easily piercing through, Gr. ф'́pıctos, lit. bringing best. After such forms had also become purely nominal they were brought into relation with adjectives which were not comparative in form and which in regard to the comparative forms were called the positive. The forms in ero-, tero- ( $\$ 376$ ) were originally confined to words relating to place and to certain pronominal forms, and were primarily used to express contrast of comparison, as *upero-s, above and not below, *ndhero-s, below and not above, $\delta \in \xi \in \tau \in \rho \cdot-s$, the right and not the left ( $\dot{\alpha} \rho \iota \sigma \tau \in \rho o ́-s$ ), $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \in \tau \in \rho o-s$, our and not your ( $\bar{v} \mu \epsilon ́ \tau \in \rho o-s$ ), $\theta \eta \lambda v^{-}$$\tau \in \rho o-s$, feminine and not masculine (Arcad. àp $\rho \in ́ \nu \tau \epsilon \rho o-s)$. Then e.g. forms like *newotero-s ( $\nu \epsilon \omega ́ \tau \epsilon \rho \rho s)$, new, became used not only in contrast with *senotero-s, old, but also
with the contrasted meaning not so new, less new, and then older. At this stage *senotero-s became associated to *seno-s ( $\left.{ }^{(\epsilon \nu} \nu 0 s\right)$. These formations thus came into the sphere of gradation which the -jes- forms already possessed and entered into competition with them. Although the two pairs of suffixes had originally different meanings, the difference entirely disappeared already in prim. Greek so far as the comparison of adjectives was concerned. After the three-membered series of gradation had been established in which the positive was regarded as the fundamental form, comparative and superlative forms began to be created from all kinds of adjectives, see Brugmann, Grundriss, \&c., vol. ii (second ed.), pp. 654-60, and Delbrück in vol. iii, pp. 4II-I5.
$\dot{\alpha} \gamma \alpha{ }^{\alpha} o ́ s: ~ \dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon i \nu \omega \nu, \dot{\alpha} \rho \epsilon i \omega \nu, \beta \epsilon \lambda \tau i ́ \omega \nu, \beta \in \lambda \tau \epsilon \rho o s$, крєít $\tau \omega \nu$,

 $\phi \epsilon ́ \rho \tau \alpha \tau о s, \phi \in ́ \rho \iota \sigma \tau o s, \lambda \hat{\varphi} \sigma \tau o s . \dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon$ ívol has the pure diphthong $-\epsilon \ell$ - and therefore cannot be from ${ }^{*} \dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \nu j \omega \nu$. It is probably not a comparative in form. крєíтт $\omega \nu$, крєí $\sigma \sigma \omega \nu$ probably had - $\epsilon \iota$ - from $\dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon i \nu \omega \nu$.
$\kappa \alpha \kappa o ́ s: ~ \chi \epsilon i ́ \rho \omega \nu$ from ${ }^{*} \chi \epsilon \rho \sigma j \omega \nu, \chi \in \rho \in i ́ \omega \nu$ from stem $\chi \in \rho \in \sigma$-,


$\pi 0 \lambda \hat{v}_{s}: \pi \lambda \epsilon i \omega \nu$ with - $\epsilon \iota$ - from the superlative, $\pi \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \omega \nu$ from stem $\pi \lambda \epsilon$-, Att. $\pi \lambda \epsilon i \bar{\nu}$ (neut.) was a remodelling of ${ }^{*} \pi \lambda \epsilon \iota s$ from *plēis: $\pi \lambda \epsilon$ î $\sigma$ тos from *plēis-to-s.
 ${ }^{\epsilon} \lambda \alpha \alpha^{\chi}$ ı $\sigma \tau о$.

## C. NUMERALS

## i. Cardinal.

§ 379. The cardinal numbers one to nineteen were adjectival, one to four being declinable and five to nineteen indeclinable, but in eleven to fourteen the units were
originally declined. The decades and the words for hundred and thousand were originally substantives.
§ 380. The parent Indg. language had several words with slightly different meanings to express the idea of one. In the ordinary Greek word for one four stem-forms are to be distinguished :
(a) *sem-. Masc. nom. Att. Ion. $\epsilon i \hat{s}$, Dor. $\hat{\eta}_{s}$, Cret. $\epsilon^{\prime} \nu s$,
 for ${ }^{*} \dot{\epsilon} \mu$ ós with $-\nu$ - from the nominative ( $\S 346$ ), and similarly, є́ $\nu$ í, cp. Lat. sem-per.
(b) *som-. ó $\mu$ ós, one and the same, Skr. sama-, Goth. sama, same.
(c) *sm.. $\quad \stackrel{\alpha}{\alpha} \mu \alpha ; \ddot{\alpha}-\pi \alpha \xi$, Lat. sem•el, Skr. sa-kf̂t, once;
 * $\alpha$ - $\tau \epsilon \rho$ os with $\stackrel{\epsilon}{\epsilon}$ - for $\dot{\alpha}$ - from $\stackrel{\iota}{\epsilon} \nu$. See § 290.
(d) ${ }^{*} \mathrm{sm} \cdot$. Fem. nom. sing. $\mu i \alpha$ from ${ }^{*} \sigma \mu i \alpha(\S 322)$, cp. $\mu \hat{\omega} \nu v \xi \in$ for $* \tau \mu \hat{\omega} \nu v \xi$, having one hoof.

Indg. *oinos, oivós, oivń, oilv, the ace on dice, O.Lat. oinos, later ūnus, Goth. áins, OE. ān, one.

Indg. *oiwos, O.Pers. aiva-, one, oìos, alone, by oneself, Cypr. oîfos, alone.

Fem. Hom. Lesb. and Thessalian ${ }^{\prime} \alpha$, Hom. gen. ins, dat. $i \hat{\eta}$, and Hom. neut. dat. i仑̂ were probably of pronominal origin ; cp. § 411.
§ 381. Indg. *duwō(u), *dwō(u) was inflected like a dual. Hom. $\delta v ́ \omega$ (indeclinable) from * $\delta \dot{v} F \omega=$ Vedic duvá (u) beside * $\delta \digamma \omega=$ Skr. dvá, in $\delta \omega \delta \epsilon \kappa \alpha$; gen. dat. $\delta v o i ̂ \nu$ probably from a plural form ${ }^{*} \delta v o i ̂ \sigma \nu$. The original nom. acc. neuter was *duwoi $=$ Vedic duvé, prim. Gr. * $\delta v F o \iota$ which became $\delta$ vóo when the next word began with a vowel (§ 229). סv́o then became generalized and indeclinable for all genders in Att. Dor. \&c. and often also in Homer. In some dialects, e. g. in Herodotus, it became inflected like a plural just as in Latin and the Germanic languages, as Herod. $\delta v \hat{\omega} \nu$, $\delta v o i \sigma \iota$, Ion. also $\delta v \omega ิ \nu, \delta v \sigma i$ after the analogy of $\tau \rho \iota \omega \nu, \tau \rho \iota \sigma i$.

Indg. *dwi-, *di- in compounds with $\cdot \mathrm{i}$ - after the analogy of *tri., as in $\delta i$ - $\pi$ ovs, Skr. dvi-pád-, Lat. bi-pēs, OE. twifēte, two-footed.
§ 382. Masc. and fem. nom. Att. \&c. $\tau \rho \in i ̂ s$, Cret. $\tau \rho \in ́ \epsilon \in$, Skr. tráyaḥ, Lat. trēs, from *trejes; acc. Cret. $\tau \rho i$ ivs, Ion. Dor. Boeot. $\tau \rho$ ís, Goth. prins, from *trins, Att. $\tau \rho \in i ̂ s ~ l i k e ~$ Lat. trēs was the nom. used for the accusative ; nom. acc. neut. Indg. *trī, Vedic trí, on $\tau$ pía, Lat. tria, Goth. prija, see § 329 ; gen. $\tau \rho \iota \omega ิ \nu$, Lat. trium, from *trijōñ ; dat. $\tau \rho \iota \sigma i ́$, Skr. triṣ̌ú, Lith. trisè.

Indg. ${ }^{\text {tri- }}$ in compounds, as $\tau$ pi-movs, Skr. tri-pád-, Lat. tri-pēs, OE. pri-fēte, three-footed.
§ 383. The Indg. word for four had various grades of ablaut in the stem-ending of the different cases, as masc. nom. *qetwores, Skr. catváraḥ, Lat. quattuor, Goth. fidwōr, Dor. and North-West Gr. $\tau$ é $\tau о \rho \in s$ with $-\tau$ - from $\tau \epsilon \tau \rho \omega \kappa \kappa \nu \tau \alpha$ (§ 386), Att. $\tau \epsilon \in \tau \tau \rho \epsilon \varsigma$, Hom. $\tau \epsilon \in \sigma \sigma \alpha \rho \in \varsigma$, Boeot. $\pi \epsilon \in \tau \tau \alpha \rho \in s$ with $-\alpha$ - from the dative, Ion. $\tau$ '́ $\sigma \sigma \epsilon \rho \in s$ for -opєs by assimilation, Hom. $\pi i \sigma v \rho \in s$ with $\cdot v$ - from the acc. and genitive ; acc. masc. *qeturns, Skr. catúrah, Hom. $\pi i ́ \sigma v \rho a s$; Att. $\tau \in ́ \tau \tau \alpha \rho a s$ with the first $-\alpha$ - from the dative ; nom. acc. neut. *qetworə, Skr. catvấri, Att. $\tau$ '́ $\tau \tau \alpha \rho \alpha$, Hom. $\tau \epsilon \in \sigma \sigma \alpha \rho \alpha$, Boeot. $\pi \pi^{\prime} \tau \tau \alpha \rho \alpha$ with $-\alpha$ - from the dative, Lesb. $\pi \epsilon ́ \sigma \sigma v \rho \alpha, \pi i \sigma v \rho \alpha$ with $-v$ - from the genitive ; gen. *qeturōm, Lesb. $\pi \iota \sigma \dot{v} \rho \omega \nu$; Att. $\tau \in \tau \tau \alpha \dot{\rho} \rho \omega \nu$ with $-\alpha$ - from the dative; dat. $=(\mathrm{loc}$.$) *qetwrsu, poet. \tau$ '́ $\tau \rho \alpha \sigma \iota$ from ${ }^{*} \tau \epsilon ́ \tau F \rho \alpha \sigma \iota$, Att. $\tau \in ́ \tau \tau \alpha \rho \sigma \iota$.

Indg. *q(e)twr. beside ${ }^{*} \mathrm{q}(\mathrm{e})$ tru- in compounds, as in $\tau \epsilon \tau \rho \alpha \dot{\alpha}-\delta u \gamma o s$ from * $\tau \epsilon \tau F \rho \alpha-, \tau \rho \alpha ́-\pi \epsilon \xi \alpha$, beside $\tau \rho v-\phi a ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota \alpha$.
§ 384. Indg. *pénqe, $\pi \epsilon \in \nu \tau \epsilon$, Skr. páñca ; Aeol. $\pi \epsilon ́ \mu \pi \epsilon$, Lat. quīnque, O.Ir. cōic, Goth. fimf, OE. fif, all with assimilation of consonants. In compounds $\pi \epsilon \nu \tau \epsilon$ - beside $\pi \epsilon \nu \tau \alpha$ - with - $\alpha$ - from forms like $\epsilon \in \pi \tau \dot{\alpha}, \delta$, $\epsilon \kappa \alpha$.

Indg. ${ }^{*} \mathbf{s}(\mathbf{w})$ eks $=$ prim. Gr. ${ }^{*} \sigma \neq \epsilon \in \xi$, Lac. $F^{\prime} \xi \in$, beside ${ }^{*} \sigma \epsilon \in \xi$ $=$ Att. Ion. Dor. Boeot. \&c. ${ }^{\epsilon} \xi \xi$, Lat. sex, O.Ir. sē, Goth.
saíhs, Skr. șáṣ with unexplained initial ṣ้. In compounds $\hat{\epsilon} \xi$ - beside $\dot{\epsilon} \dot{\xi} \alpha-$ with $-\alpha$ - from $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \tau \alpha$, \&c.

Indg. *septm, é $\pi \tau \not \subset \alpha$, Vedic saptá, classical Skr. sápta, Lat. septem, O.Ir. secht, Goth. sibun.
Indg. *októ(u), which is dual in form, óкт白, Elean ò $\pi \tau \boldsymbol{\omega}$ after the analogy of $\dot{\ell} \pi \tau \dot{\alpha}$, Lesb. Boeot. ók ${ }^{\prime}$ ó, probably like סv́o the old neut. form, Skr. aṣtā́(u), Lat. octō, Goth. ahtáu.

Indg. *néwn beside *énwn, the former occurs in Skr. náva, Lat. novem with $\cdot \mathrm{m}$ for $\cdot \mathrm{n}$ after the analogy of septem, decem, cp. nōnus, Goth. niun, and the latter in
 never been satisfactorily explained. Some scholars assume that it stands for ${ }^{*}{ }_{\epsilon} \nu \nu \in F \alpha$, lit. nine in all, and others that it arose from a contamination of ${ }^{*} \epsilon \nu F \alpha$ and ${ }^{*} \nu \epsilon F \alpha=$ Skr. náva. In compounds $\epsilon i \nu \alpha$ - beside $\epsilon \nu \nu \epsilon \alpha$-, as in $\epsilon i \nu \alpha ́-\nu v \chi \epsilon s$ beside '̇ $\nu \nu \in \alpha ́-\mu \eta \nu 0 s$.

Indg. *dekm, סє́кк, Skr. đáš́a, Lat. decem, O.Ir. deich, Goth. taíhun.
§ 385. In the cardinals eleven to nineteen the units originally preceded the decade, as in ${ }_{\epsilon} \overline{ } \nu-\delta \epsilon \kappa \alpha$ where $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$ - is the nom. acc. neuter, Lat. un-decim from *oinom-decem, Skr. ékā-dắsa; $\delta \dot{\omega}-\delta \epsilon \kappa \alpha(H o m . \delta v \omega-\delta \epsilon \kappa \alpha)$ where $\delta \omega$ - is the masc. form beside Hom. סv́o кגi $\delta \epsilon ́ \kappa \alpha ~(\delta v o-k \alpha i-\delta \epsilon \kappa \alpha$ ), Lat. duo-decim, Skr. dvá-daš́a; Lat. trē-decim from *trēsdecem, Skr. tráyō-daš́a, but from thirteen onwards only with каí in Greek, as $\tau \rho \epsilon i$ is or $\tau \rho i ́ a ~ к \alpha i ̀ ~ d e ́ к \alpha . ~ B u t ~ i n ~ G r e e k ~$ and Latin the units could follow the decade, as $\delta$ 'єк $\kappa \hat{i} s$, $\delta \epsilon ́ \kappa \alpha$ dío, $\delta \epsilon \in \kappa \alpha ~ \tau \rho \epsilon i ̂ s$, Lat. decem et ūnus, decem et trēs, decem trēs, decem novem. ס'́́к $\alpha$ dúo, déк $\alpha \tau \rho \epsilon i ̂ s, ~ \& c$. were used when the substantive or a larger number preceded, but $\delta v o-k \alpha i-\delta \epsilon \kappa \alpha, \tau \rho \epsilon i \hat{S}$ каì $\delta \epsilon \epsilon \kappa \alpha$ when the substantive followed, as $\delta \rho а \chi \mu \alpha i ̀ \delta \epsilon ́ \kappa \alpha ~ \tau \rho \epsilon i ̂ s, ~ b u t ~ \tau \rho \epsilon i ̂ s ~ к а \grave{\imath}$ סє́ка $\delta \rho \alpha-$ $\chi \mu \alpha i$. The units in eleven to fourteen ceased to be inflected in the prehistoric period of most languages. A remnant
of the inflected forms of the units occurs in $\tau \rho \iota \sigma \kappa \alpha i \delta_{\epsilon} \kappa \alpha$ where $\tau \rho / s^{\prime}$, prim. Gr. ${ }^{*} \tau \rho / \nu s^{-}$, is the masc. accusative.
§ 386. The Indg. word for twenty was a dual form *wĭkmti, lit. both decades. The expressions for thirty to ninety originally meant three decades, four decades, \&c. The unit and the word for decade, a neuter substantive *komt- from *dkomt- and related to *dékm, ten, were both inflected so far as the units were declinable and governed the following substantive in the genitive case. Regular forms were: *trī komta, thirty; *qetworə komta, forty ; *penqe komta, fifty. Various new formations seem to have taken place already in the parent language, thus after the analogy of *trī komtə were formed *qetw коขта (§ 68), Lat. quadrā-gintā ; ${ }^{*}$ pe引qē komtə $=\pi \epsilon \nu \tau \eta$ ๆ́коขт $\alpha$, Skr. pañcā-šát-, the $-\eta$ - of which was extended in

 Att. Ion. also Hom. '́ $\nu \in \nu \eta \eta^{\prime} \kappa о \nu \tau \alpha$; and similarly in Lat. quinnquà-gintā, sexā-gintā, nōnā-gintā with medial -āfrom quadrā-gintā.

Indg. *wĭ-kmti, Dor. Boeot. Elean, Pamphylian and Arcadian $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{t}}$-kađı, Skr. vịi-šatíh, Lat. vì-gintī, O.Ir. fiche, twenty; Att. Ion. \&c. $\epsilon^{\prime \prime}-k o \sigma \iota$ from ${ }^{*} \epsilon f_{i}^{\prime}-k \circ \sigma \iota$ with prothetic $\epsilon$ and -0 - for $-\alpha$ - after the analogy of the other decades. Att. \&c.
 of $\tau \epsilon \tau \rho \omega \cdot$-, $\pi \epsilon \nu \tau \eta$ '-коע $\alpha$. The original form of the unit was preserved in Lat. tri.gintā. The old neuter of the unit occurs in $\tau \epsilon \sigma \sigma \alpha \rho \alpha ́-, \tau \epsilon \tau \tau \alpha \rho \alpha ́-$, Boeot. $\pi \epsilon \tau \tau \alpha \rho \alpha$-kov $\alpha$. It is difficult to explain why the Greek first element of the decades for seventy to ninety should contain the ordinal instead of the cardinal form of the unit. With év $\nu \dot{\eta}-\kappa 0 \nu \tau \alpha$,
 *nowenos. All the decades became adjectival in construction in prim. Greek.
§ 387. The Indg. word for hundred was *kntóm, lit.
a decade of tens, corresponding to Skr. šatám, Lat. centum, O.Ir. cēt, Goth. hund, and -кaтóv in $\mathfrak{\epsilon}-\kappa \alpha \tau o ́ v$, lit. one hundred, with $\dot{\epsilon}-$ for $\dot{\alpha}$ - after the analogy of $\stackrel{\epsilon}{\epsilon} \nu$. It was a neuter substantive, related to *dékm, ten, and governed the gen. case as in Sanskrit and the Germanic languages, but in Greek and Latin it had become adjectival in construction in the prehistoric period of the languages.

The hundreds from two to nine hundred were originally expressed in two ways. (a) Either both members were inflected for two, three and four hundred, and the second member only for the others, as in Skr. dvé šaté = Indg. dual *dwoi kmtoi, Goth. twa hunda, two hundred; Skr. páñca šatáni, Goth. fimf hunda, five hundred; and similarly in the Keltic and the Baltic-Slavonic languages. (b) Or both members formed a compound without either of them being inflected, as in Skr. dvi-š̆atám, two hundred, tri-šatám, three hundred; O.Lat. du-centum aurī, argentī ses-centum, but already at an early period the hundreds became plural adjectives and were inflected as such, as ducentī homines, ducentae mulieres. To this manner of forming the hundreds also belong the prim. Greek compound forms: * $\delta 1-\kappa \alpha \tau o \nu,{ }^{*} \tau \rho \iota-\kappa \alpha \tau o \nu,{ }^{*} \tau \epsilon \tau \rho \alpha-\kappa \alpha \tau o \nu$, ${ }^{*} \pi \epsilon \nu \tau \alpha-\kappa \alpha \tau o \nu,{ }^{*} \dot{\epsilon} \xi \alpha-\kappa \alpha \tau o \nu,{ }^{*} \in \pi \tau \alpha-\kappa \alpha \tau o \nu$, ${ }^{*} \dot{\kappa} \kappa \tau \omega-\kappa \alpha \tau o \nu,{ }^{*} \dot{\epsilon} \nu F \alpha-$ кatov. When the second element of these compound nouns became adjectival in meaning there was formed beside *-k $\alpha \tau o \nu$ an adjectival form -к $\alpha \tau \iota \iota,-\alpha \iota,-\alpha=$ Dor. Boeot. -катıol, Arcad. -kaбıol, Att. Ion. Lesb. -koбıoь with -o- from -kov $\alpha$, and then various analogical formations took place in the first element of the compounds. $\tau \rho \iota-$ became $\tau \rho \iota \bar{\alpha}$-, Ion. $\tau \rho \iota \eta$ - after the analogy of $\tau \rho \iota \frac{\bar{\alpha}}{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ кov $\tau \alpha$; $\delta \iota$ - became $\delta \iota \bar{\alpha}$-, Ion. $\delta \iota \eta$ - after $\tau \rho \iota \bar{\alpha}$ - ; and $\delta \kappa \tau \omega$ - became ${ }_{0} \kappa \tau \alpha-$ after $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \pi \tau \tau \alpha$-, \&c. The forms thus became Att. $\delta_{\iota} \bar{\alpha}-$

 ко́бıоь.
§ 388. If we compare the word for thousand in the various languages we see that it is practically impossible to determine what was the original form of the word for thousand in the parent Indg. language, cp. Lat. neut. mille, O.Ir. fem. mīle, Goth. fem. pūsundi, Lith. masc. túkstantis, O.Slav. fem. tyseş̌ta, Skr. neut. sa-hásram, lit. one thousand, where sa- = Indg. sm. (§ 380), prim. Gr. neut. ${ }^{*} \chi \in \sigma \lambda o \nu=$ Skr. -hásram, Indg. *gheslom. ${ }^{*} \chi \in \sigma \lambda o \nu$ became adjectival in meaning in prim. Greek, and then from it was formed the adjectival form ${ }^{*} \chi \in \sigma \lambda \iota o \iota,-\alpha \iota,-\alpha=$ Ion. Boeot. $\chi \in i ́ \lambda \iota o \iota$, Lesb. $\chi^{\epsilon} \lambda \lambda \iota o \iota$, Dor. $\chi$ ŋ́ $\lambda \iota o \iota$, Att. $\chi^{i ́ \lambda} \lambda \iota \iota$, which corresponds in form to the Sanskrit adjective sa-hasríya..

## 2. Ordinal.

§ 389. The ordinal numbers in the various languages were with few exceptions superlatives in form and were formed from the cardinal numbers with the same suffixes which we have already had in the formation of the superlative of adjectives (§ 377).
§ 390. The word for first was not related to the word for one in any of the languages, as $\pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau o s$, Dor. $\pi \rho \hat{\alpha} \tau o s ~ e i t h e r ~$
 and related to Skr. púrvaḥ, pūrvyáh, prior, first, or from ${ }^{*} \pi \rho o-\alpha \tau o s: \pi \rho o ́$, Skr. prá, before, in front of ; Lat. prìmus from *pris-mos : adv. ${ }^{*}$ pris, prus, Goth. fruma, prius,
 superlative.

סєút $\epsilon p o s$ denoted originally standing off from anything, at a distance from, inferior in rank and is related to the verb $\delta \in \dot{\prime} \circ \mu \alpha \iota$ and to Skr. dávīyah, farther; Skr. dvitíyaḥ : dvi., two ; Lat. secundus : sequor; Lat. alter, Goth. anpar, Lith. añtras all lit. meaning the other as compared with one who is first. סev́ratos with -atos as in тє́тратоs.
$\tau \rho i ́ \tau o s$, Lesb. $\tau$ є́ $\tau \tau o s=$ Lat. tertius, Goth. pridja. Hom.

т $\boldsymbol{i} \tau-\alpha \tau o s$ after the analogy of $\tau \in ́ \tau \rho \alpha \tau о s, \delta \epsilon ́ \kappa \alpha \tau о s$, and similarly Hom. є́ $\beta \delta \delta o ́ \mu \alpha \tau о s$, ó $\gamma \delta \delta o ́ \alpha \tau о s$.
 тos, Skr. caturtháh, OE. fēo(we)rpa, Indg. *qetwrrtós.
$\pi \epsilon ́ \mu \pi \tau o s$ (Cret. $\pi \epsilon \nu \nu \tau o s$ from ${ }^{*} \pi \epsilon \nu \tau \tau o s$, older $\pi \epsilon \epsilon \mu \pi \tau o s$, cp. $\grave{\epsilon} \tau \tau \alpha ́ \alpha=\dot{\epsilon} \pi \tau \tau \alpha ́)$, Lat. quīntus, OE. fifta, Lith. peñktas, Indg. *penqtós; Skr. pañcathaḥ beside pañcamáh.

ধ́ктоs, Skr. ṣ้aṣṭháḥ, Indg. *s(w)ektós ; Lat. sextus and Goth. saíhsta were formed direct from sex, saíhs.
${ }_{\epsilon} \beta \delta \delta o \mu o s$ ( $\S 107$ ) probably for older ${ }^{*} \epsilon \beta \delta \alpha \mu 0$, Skr. saptamáh, Lat. septimus, Indg. *septm.ós, *? sebdmós, Hom. є́ßסб́датоя, see трі́тоs.
ó $\gamma \delta o o s$ from ${ }^{*}$ ' $\gamma \delta 0$ Fos with the mediae $\cdot \gamma \delta$-after the analogy

 beside Lat. nōnus, Skr. navamáḥ with •m• from dašamáḥ, Indg. *newn.ós.

ס́́кктоs (Lesb. Arcad. ס́́котоs with -o- from -kov taíhunda, Indg. *dekmtós beside Skr. dašamáḥ, Lat. decimus, Indg. *dekm-ós.
§ 391. The ordinals from eleventh to nineteenth could be formed in two ways: (a) Either with the cardinal units +the ordinal for tenth, as évסє́катоs, $\delta \omega \delta$ '́катоs (Hom. סvшס́єккатоs), these two forms were used in all the dialects; and similarly in Lat. ūndecimus, duodecimus, Skr. èkādašáḥ, dvā-dasáạ or -daš้amáh. In this way were also formed the other ordinals in Ion. and Boeotian, as $\tau \rho \iota \sigma \kappa \alpha l-$

 катos; and similarly Skr. trayō-dašáh, thirteenth, caturdašáạ, fourteenth, pañca-dašáh or -dašamáh, fifteenth, \&c. (b) Or with ordinals in both components, as rpítos kai סє́катоs, тє́тартоs каi סе́катоs, \&c.; and similarly Lat. tertius decimus, quartus decimus, \&c.; Goth. fimftataíhunda, fifteenth, with the first element uninflected.
§ 392. The original second element of the ordinals of the tens was *.kmt-tós beside *.kmt-tm.ós, the former occurs
 with the first -0 - for $-\alpha$ - after the analogy of $\tau \rho \iota \bar{\alpha} \kappa о \sigma \tau о ́ s,-\kappa о \nu \tau \alpha$. The other ordinals were formed in prim. Greek either direct from the stem of the corresponding cardinal + - $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ ós, thus *трıккоу $+\tau$ ós became *трıакоубтós (§110) and then later $\tau \rho \iota \bar{\alpha} \kappa о \sigma \tau o ́ s ~(§ 153)$, or else with -кобтós for *-кабтós $=$ Indg. *kmt-tós, with the first -0 - for $-\alpha$ - after the analogy of $-\kappa о \nu \tau \alpha$; and similarly $\tau \in \sigma \sigma \alpha \rho \alpha$-, $\tau \in \tau \tau \alpha \rho \alpha$-, $\tau \in \tau \rho \omega \kappa о \sigma \tau o ́ s$,
 koбtós; beside Lat. vīcēsimus, vīgēsimus, trīcēsimus, trigēsimus, quadrāgēsimus, quīnquāgēsimus, \&c. = Skr. vịišatitamáḥ, trịśsattamáḥ, catvārịišattamáh, pañcāšattamáh, \&c., from Indg. *-kmt-tm•ós.
§ 393. The ordinals of the hundreds were formed in prim. Greek from the corresponding cardinals with -ootós
 $\tau \rho \iota \bar{\alpha} к о \sigma t-о \sigma \tau o ́ s, \& c . ;$ and similarly in Latin, cent-ēsimus, ducent-ēsimus, trecent-ēsimus, \&c. In like manner were also formed the ordinals of the thousands, as $\chi^{\bar{\imath} \lambda \iota-o \sigma \tau o ́ s, ~}$ $\delta \iota \sigma \chi \bar{\iota} \lambda l-o \sigma \tau o ́ s, \& c .$, cp. also Lat. mîll-ēsimus.

## 3. Other Numerals.

§ 394. The multiplicative numeral adverbs were formed differently in the different languages. Greek, Latin and Sanskrit have similar words for twice and thrice, as dis, $\tau$ ís, Lat. bis, ter from *tris, Skr. dvíh, tríh, but for the other numerals they had different formations, as $\ddot{\alpha}-\pi \alpha \xi$ : $\pi \dot{\eta} \gamma \nu \bar{v} \mu$ l, Lat. sem•el, Skr. sa-kf́t (§ 380) ; $\tau \in \tau \rho \alpha ́ \kappa \iota s$, Lat. quater, Skr. catúh ; $\pi \epsilon \nu \tau \alpha ́ k<s$, Lat. quīnquiēs, Skr. pañ. cakrtvah, \&c. From four times onwards the Greek numerals were formed from the cardinals by means of the suffix -kıs in Attic beside $-\kappa \iota$ in various other dialects. - $\kappa \iota s$ had its -s from dis and $\tau \rho i s$, and $-k \iota$ - corresponds to the

Sanskrit adverbial particle cid which was originally the neuter of the interrogative pronoun, Indg. *qid, Lat. quid (§ 202, note I), cp. Hom. $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda \alpha ́-\kappa \iota$ for older ${ }^{*} \pi 0 \lambda \lambda \hat{v}-\kappa \iota=$ Skr. púru cid, many times (cp. § 202, note 2). From forms
 -áкıs became extended by analogy to all the other numerals,
 - $\tau \alpha ́ \kappa \iota \iota$ after the analogy of $\tau \rho \iota \bar{\alpha} \kappa о \nu \tau \alpha ́ \kappa \iota s, \tau \epsilon \sigma \sigma \alpha \rho \alpha к о \nu \tau \alpha ́ \kappa \iota \varsigma$, $\& c . ;$ ठ $\iota \bar{\alpha} \kappa 0 \sigma \iota-\alpha ́ \kappa \iota s, \chi \bar{\imath} \lambda \iota-\alpha \kappa \iota \iota$.
§ 395. The multiplicative adjectives were formed by
 numerals as they appear in the multiplicative adverbs, as $\dot{\alpha}-\pi \lambda o \hat{u}_{s}, \delta l-\pi \lambda o \hat{v}_{S}, \tau \rho l-\pi \lambda o \hat{v}_{S}, \tau \in \tau \rho \alpha-\pi \lambda o \hat{v}_{s}, \pi \in \nu \tau \alpha-\pi \lambda o \hat{v}_{S}, \& c$. And similarly $\dot{\alpha}-\pi \lambda o ́ s, \delta 1-\pi \lambda$ ós, the $-\pi \lambda o ́ s$ of which corresponds to the -plus in Lat. sim-plus, du-plus. With $-\pi \lambda$ ós is also related the $-\pi \lambda \alpha \sigma \iota o s$ from ${ }^{*} \pi \lambda \alpha \pi i j o s$ in $\delta \iota-\pi \lambda \alpha \dot{\sigma} l o s$, $\tau \rho \iota-\pi \lambda \alpha ́ \sigma \iota \circ \varsigma, \tau \epsilon \tau \rho \alpha-\pi \lambda \alpha ́ \sigma \iota \circ s, \& c$.
 $\chi j$ jos were formed from the stems $\delta \iota \chi$-, $\tau \rho \iota \chi$ - in the adverbs
 $\pi \epsilon \nu \tau \alpha \xi \xi^{\circ}$, from ${ }^{*} \delta \iota \chi \theta j o s, \& c$. were formed from the adverbs $\delta \iota \chi \theta \dot{\alpha}, \tau \rho \iota \chi \theta \dot{\alpha}, \& c$. The formation of these adverbs in - $\chi^{\alpha}$, $-x \theta \alpha$ has never been satisfactorily explained.
$\S$ 396. The feminine nouns of number in -ás gen. -ádos with $\alpha \dot{\alpha}$ - from -m., -n., which was original in $\epsilon \in \pi \tau \alpha ́ s, ~ \epsilon ่ \nu \nu \epsilon \alpha ́ s$ ( $\epsilon i \nu \alpha{ }^{\prime} s$ ) and $\delta_{\epsilon \kappa \alpha}^{s}$. After the analogy of these were then formed, $\mu \circ \nu \alpha \alpha^{\prime}, ~ e ̀ v \alpha ́ s, ~ \delta v o ́ s, ~ \tau \rho \iota a ́ s, ~ \tau \epsilon \tau \rho \alpha ́ s, ~ \pi \epsilon \nu \tau \alpha ́ s ~(~ \pi \epsilon \mu \pi \alpha \alpha ́ s), ~$
 the $-\delta$ - suffix in the above forms unless we may suppose that -d- stood beside -t. in prim. Indg., cp. the stem $\delta \epsilon \kappa \alpha{ }^{\circ} \delta$ beside Skr. dašát-, Lith. deszimt., O.Slav. desęt. (§ 111). It is probable however that the suffix was originally $\cdot \mathbf{t}$-, as it certainly was in cikás, \&c. and that the new formation in the inflected forms went out from the nom. singular where t. and d-stems regularly fell together (§ 343). In ǐkás,
 represents Indg. *-kmt-s and the Sanskrit stem -šát. éka $\alpha o \nu-\tau \alpha ́ s$ with the second $-\tau$ - from the ordinal ékatoбтós.

For feminine numerals like $\tau \rho \iota \tau \tau u ́ s, ~ \tau \epsilon \tau \rho \alpha \kappa \tau u ́ s$, \&c. see § 266.

## CHAPTER XI

## PRONOUNS

§ 397. The most difficult chapter in works on compara. tive grammar is the one dealing with the pronouns. It is impossible to state with any degree of certainty how many pronouns the parent Indg. language had and what forms they had assumed at the time it became differentiated into the various branches which constitute the Indg. family of languages. The difficulty is rendered still more complicated by the fact that most of the pronouns, especially the personal and demonstrative, must have had accented and unaccented forms existing side by side in the parent language itself; and that one or other of the forms became generalized already in the prehistoric period of the individual branches of the parent language. And then at a later period, but still in prehistoric times, there arose new accented and unaccented forms side by side in the individual branches, as e. g. beside the accented form *mē, $m e$ there existed in prim. Indg, the unaccented form *me, the former of which became generalized in Latin. In Sanskrit the original accented form mā=Indg. *mē came to be used for the unaccented form and then a new accented form má́m was created with $\cdot \mathrm{m}$ from ahám, I. In Greek the accented form died out and then to the old unaccented form $\mu$ є̀ a new accented form $\epsilon_{\epsilon} \mu^{\prime}$. was created with $\epsilon$ - from $\dot{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\gamma}$; and similarly Skr. tvā = Indg. *twē, thee beside tvấm ; Gr. $\sigma$ è from Indg. *twe beside the new accented
form $\sigma$ '́. And in like manner Indg. *tū, thou beside *tu, both forms of which were preserved in Greek and Old English, as Hom. $\tau \hat{v}-\nu \eta$, OE. pū̀, thou beside Dor. $\tau \dot{v}$, Att. $\sigma \dot{v}$, OE. pu, but the former became generalized in Latin and the latter in most of the Greek dialects. The original accented accusatives nōs, vōs became generalized in Latin whereas Sanskrit preserved the old distinctions between the accented (asmấn, yuṣ้mắn) and the unaccented (naḥ, vaḥ) forms. The following examples will illustrate the manner in which such double forms come into existence: The prim. Germanic accented form for $I$ was *ek beside the unaccented form ${ }^{*}$ ik. The separate Germanic languages generalized one or other of these forms before the beginning of the oldest literary monuments and then new accented beside unaccented forms came into existence again. And similarly during the historic periods of the different languages. Thus, e.g. the OE. for $I$ is ic, this became in ME. ich accented form beside i unaccented form, ich then disappeared in standard ME. (but it is still preserved in one of the modern dialects of Somersetshire) and $i$ came to be used as the accented and unaccented form. At a later period it became $\bar{i}$ when accented and remained $\mathbf{i}$ when unaccented. The former has become NE. $I$, and the latter has disappeared from the literary language, but it is still preserved in many northern Engl. dialects, as $\mathbf{i}$. In these dialects $\mathbf{i}$ is regularly used in interrogative and subordinate sentences ; the ME. accented form $\mathbf{i}$ has become ai and is only used in the dialects to express special emphasis, and from it a new unaccented form a has been developed which can only be used in making direct assertions. Thus in one and the same dialect (Windhill, Yorks.) we arrive at three forms: ai, a, $i$, which are never mixed up syntactically by genuine native dialect speakers. This old distinction between the accented and unaccented forms of the personal pronouns has given
rise in many of the South Midland dialects to an entirely new classification whereby the old subjective form has come to be used for the subject and object when accented, and the old objective form for the subject and object when unaccented, as she saw she, her saw her, she saw her, her saw she, which have quite different meanings according as she and her are accented or unaccented. Something similar to what has happened, and still is happening in the modern dialects, must also have taken place in the prehistoric and historic periods of all the Indg. languages ; hence in the prehistoric forms of the pronouns given in the following paragraphs, it must not be assumed that they were the only ones existing in prim. Indo-Germanic or prim. Greek. They are merely given as the nearest ascertainable forms from which the historic Greek forms were descended.
§ 398. The pronouns are usually divided into personal, reflexive, possessive, demonstrative, interrogative, and indefinite pronouns. There is among the various languages considerable agreement in the formation of the personal pronouns of the first and second persons, and of the simple reflexive, simple demonstrative and interrogative pronouns. But all the other classes or parts of classes of pronouns were formed more or less differently in each branch of the parent Indg. language, so that the words used to express such pronouns do not stand in any etymological relation to each other. Owing to this great multiplicity of forms in the oldest historic period of the individual languages, it is impossible in most classes of the pronouns to reconstruct the prim. Indg. paradigms with any degree of certainty or accuracy.
§ 399. In the parent Indg. language the formation of most of the cases of pronouns which had special forms for the masculine, feminine and neuter differed considerably from that of the nouns, cp. $\delta$, Skr. sá, Goth. sa beside $\lambda$ úkos, Skr. vốkaḥ, Goth. wulfs, wolf; tó, Skr. tát, Lat.
is-tud beside suróv, Skr. yugám, Lat. jugum, yoke; nom. pl. oí, roí, Skr. té, Goth. pái beside Skr. vṛ́kāḥ, Goth. wulfōs. This original distinction was not so well preserved in Greek as in most of the other Indg. languages. In Greek there were few differences between the case-endings of nouns and pronouns because of various analogical formations whereby the pronouns came to have noun-endings and vice versa, cp. $\tau \omega \bar{\omega}(\S 408)$ : $\lambda$ úk $\omega \nu$ beside Skr. téṣām : vr̂́kānām, but גúkol (§ 325) : oi, тoí beside Skr. ṿ̛̂kāḥ : té, Hom. $\theta \epsilon \frac{\alpha}{\alpha} \omega \nu(\S 321): \tau \frac{\alpha}{\alpha} \omega \nu$ beside Skr. áśvānām, of mares : tấsām.
§ 400. In the personal pronouns we have not only to take into consideration the distinction between original accented and unaccented forms, but also between the different stems and different words which go to form the paradigms of the first and second persons. Many forms had no real case-endings at all, and the so-called cases were formed from entirely different words which were not etymologically related, as in English I, me; we, us ; thou, you, corresponding in meaning to Skr. ahám, mấm; vayám, asmấn; tvám, nom. yūyám, acc. yuṣ̆mấn, but in Greek and Latin the original distinction between we and us became obliterated, as $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \bar{i} \bar{s}$, acc. $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \in \alpha s, \dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\alpha} s$ from the same stem as the nominative, Lat. nom. and acc. nōs. The reason why the plural of $I$ was formed from an entirely different word is obvious, because it not only includes the speaker but also the person or persons spoken to or of. But why the plural of thou should be an entirely different word in all the Indg. languages is not known. The plural endings of these pronouns in Greek and the other languages are not original. So far as the forms for the plural were inflected at all, they were originally inflected as singulars. Such personal pronouns as have real case-endings have them mostly after the analogy of the nouns. This is especially so in Greek. The pronouns of the third person
were originally demonstrative in origin. In the parent language as in Greek, Latin, Sanskrit, \&c. the nominative of the personal pronouns was rarely used except to express emphasis, because it was sufficiently indicated by the personal endings of the verb.
§ 401. In many of the Indg. languages certain particles occur, which are attached enclitically to the personal pronouns, and in some forms have become an integral part of the pronoun, as in $\hat{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \gamma \omega^{\prime}-\nu$, ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \gamma \omega \cdot \nu \eta$, ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \gamma \omega \gamma \epsilon,{ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \gamma \epsilon$ ( $=$ Goth. mik, OE. mec, OHG. mih, where the particle became an integral part of the word), Skr. ahá-m, $I$, vay-ám : OE. wē, Goth. weis, Indg. *wei, we; Lat. ego-met; and similarly in demonstrative pronouns, as ö $\delta \epsilon$, ovivo ${ }^{\imath}$; Lat. id-em, Skr. id-ám, beside Lat. id ; Lat. hic for older hi-ce; Skr. nom. fem. a-sá́-u, that ; and even medially in oûtos from *so $+\mathfrak{u}+$ to-s ( $\$ 411$ ). Many of these particles are of obscure origin and it is therefore impossible to determine in all cases what was their original force or meaning.

## i. Personal.

## First Person.

§402. Singular: It is impossible to determine with certainty what was the original form or forms of the
 (mostly before vowels, entirely so in Homer), є́ $\gamma \omega \cdot \nu \eta$, Boeot. $i \omega \nu$, $i \omega \omega \nu$ from $\epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\omega}-\nu$ through the intermediate stages ${ }^{*} \epsilon j \omega \nu,{ }^{\prime} \iota j \omega \nu$, beside $i \omega \nu-\epsilon \iota$, O.Lat. egō, beside the unaccented form *ego = Lat. ego, Goth. ik, Skr. ahá-m from *egho-m with the same interchange between $\mathbf{g}$ and $\mathbf{g h}$ as in $\mu^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \gamma \boldsymbol{s}$ beside Skr. mahấn, great. This interchange between media and media aspirata existed in the parent Indg. language under certain unknown conditions (§111).

The original form of the accusative was *mē beside *me,
the former occurs in Skr. mā, mắ-m, Lat. mē, and the


The stem-form *me was probably used for the genitive in the parent language. From *me was formed in each branch of the various languages a new genitive in different ways, cp. $\epsilon^{\mu} \mu o \hat{v}$, Skr. máma, Lat. meī, mīs, Goth. meina. In Greek it was mostly formed from ' $\dot{\epsilon}^{\prime} \mu^{\epsilon}, \mu \grave{\epsilon}$ by means of $-\sigma j 0$, $-\sigma 0$ from the simple demonstrative pronoun (§ 408),
 $\mu \epsilon \hat{v}$, from ${ }^{*} \epsilon \mu \epsilon \sigma \sigma,{ }^{*} \mu \epsilon \sigma \sigma$; Dor. Lesb. ${ }^{\epsilon} \mu \circ \hat{v} s$, Dor. ${ }^{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \in \sigma$, ${ }^{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \hat{v}$, from ${ }^{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon+o s$ from the genitive of the consonantal stems (§ 302) ; Hom. Lesb. and Dor. ${ }^{\epsilon} \mu \dot{\epsilon}-\theta \in \nu$ with the same ablative adverbial particle which occurs in $\pi o ́ \theta \in \nu$ (§568).
 original unaccented form *moi which was also used for the genitive. The original accented form seems to occur in Skr. máhya-m, Lat. mihī. Dor. ${ }^{\epsilon} \mu i ́ \nu$ was formed after the analogy of the dative $=$ locative plural $\frac{\dot{\alpha}}{} \mu i v$; Hom. ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \in \cdot \theta \in \nu$ is the same as in the genitive.

Dual : The nom. and acc. $\nu \omega$ belongs, like the Skr. unaccented form nāu, to the plural stem nōँ which occurs in Skr. naḥ, Lat. nōs, we; Hom. $\nu \hat{\omega}$ ï from ${ }^{*} \nu \omega F \iota$ with the numeral $F \check{\text { L̆, }}$, both, two (§ 386).

The gen. and dat. $\nu \widehat{\varphi} \nu$, Hom. $\nu \hat{\omega} \ddot{\nu}$ from $\nu \omega F \iota \nu$ with $-\nu$ from the dat. plural.

Plural: The original form of the nominative was *wei, which occurs in Skr. vay-ám, Goth. wei-s, we. The Greek nominative was formed from the stem of the accusative $=$ Indg. ${ }^{\text {n }} \mathrm{n}$-me, and with $\cdot \mathrm{s}$ after the analogy of the consonantal stems (§ 311). *ns-me-s regularly became ${ }^{*} \dot{\alpha} \sigma \mu \in \epsilon$ in prim. Greek, and corresponds to Hom. Lesb. ${ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \mu \mu \epsilon s(\S 214)$, Dor. Boeot. $\dot{\alpha}^{\alpha} \mu \epsilon^{\prime}$; Att. Ion. Hom. $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon i \bar{s}$ with $-\epsilon$ is after the analogy of the masc. $s$-stems (§ 366). All the forms of the nom. acc. gen. and dat. plural with the spiritus asper had it from $\dot{v} \mu \in i \hat{s}$, \&c.

The original form of the accusative was *ns-me, probably from older *ns-sme, where ns- ( $=$ Goth. uns, $u s$, $\alpha$ s-, Skr. as-) is the weak grade of nō-, which occurs in Skr. nah, Lat. nōs, we, and -sme corresponds to the Sanskrit enclitic particle sma, ever; indeed, certainly, cp. the Skr. acc. asmán, $u s . \quad{ }^{*}$ ns-me regularly became $* \dot{\alpha} \sigma \mu \epsilon$ in prim. Greek $=$ Hom. Lesb. $\ddot{\alpha}^{\prime} \mu \mu \epsilon$, Dor. $\stackrel{\dot{\alpha}}{ } \mu^{\prime}$, but Ion. $\dot{\eta} \mu \mu^{\prime} \alpha s$ with -as from the accusative of the consonantal stems (§ 312), and similarly Att. $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\alpha} s$ from older - $\epsilon \alpha$ s, the regular contraction of which would have been $\cdot \hat{\eta}$.

The genitive plural was originally inflected like a singular. In Greek it was formed from the stem of the accusative plural and a pluralized form of the ending of the gen. singular, as Hom. $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \dot{i} \omega \nu$, Hom. and Ion. $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \in \omega \nu$, Att. $\grave{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$, Dor. $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \epsilon \omega \nu, \stackrel{\dot{\alpha}}{ } \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$, Lesb. $\dot{\alpha} \mu \mu \epsilon ́ \omega \nu$.

The original locative ending was probably -smin which occurs in the Sanskrit loc. sing. tásmin : nom. sá, this (§ 408). The Greek dative $=$ locative was formed from the prim. Greek stem-form ${ }^{*} \dot{\alpha} \sigma \mu(\epsilon)$. with the addition of the ending $\iota \nu \nu$, as Aeolic $\stackrel{\alpha}{\alpha} \mu \mu \iota \nu$ beside $\stackrel{\alpha}{\alpha} \mu \mu \iota$ with $\iota \iota$ from the ending of the dat. plural of consonantal stems (§ 316), Dor. ${ }_{\alpha}^{\dot{\alpha}} \mu \nu \nu$, Att. Ion. $\dot{\eta} \mu i \nu$ beside Att. $\dot{\eta} \mu i \nu \nu$ with long $-\hat{\imath}-$ after the analogy of the long vowel in the other plural case-endings; Lesb. ${ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \mu \mu \epsilon \sigma \iota \nu$ was formed from the nom. plural + the ending $-t \nu$.

## Second Person.

§ 403. Singular : The original nominative was *tū beside *tu, the former occurs in Hom. Dor. $\tau \hat{v}-\nu \eta$, Lac. $\tau 0 v^{\prime}-\nu \eta$ $(o v=\overline{\mathbf{u}})$, Boeot. $\tau o v^{\prime}-\nu(o v=\bar{v})$, Lat. tū, OE. pū, and the latter in Dor. Lesb. $\tau \dot{v}$, Att. Ion. Lesb. $\sigma \dot{v}$ with $\sigma$ - from the accusative, OE. pu.

The original accusative was *tē, *twē beside *te, *twe. The *tē corresponds to Lat. tē, and *twē to Skr. tvā, tvá-m. *te corresponds to Dor. $\tau$ '́, unless the $\tau$ - was from
the nominative, OE. pe-c, OHG. di-h, and *twe to Att. Ion. \&c. $\sigma \epsilon \in$ from ${ }^{*} \tau F \epsilon(\S 168)$. Dor. Boeot. $\tau i \nu$ was the locative in form, cp. $\epsilon^{\prime} \mu i \nu(\S 402)$. In Dor. the nom. $\tau v ́$ was also used for the accusative.

The original form of the genitive was *tewe, which occurs in Skr. táva, of thee. In Greek, Lat. and the Germanic languages it was formed in the same manner as the genitive of the first person, as Hom. $\sigma \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} 0$ from ${ }^{*} \tau \tau \epsilon \sigma \jmath 0$; Att. $\sigma o \hat{v}$, Ion. $\sigma \epsilon \in, \sigma \in \hat{v}$, from ${ }^{*} \tau F \epsilon \sigma o$; Dor. $\tau \epsilon \in, \tau \epsilon \hat{v}$, from ${ }^{*} \tau \epsilon \sigma o$; Dor. Boeot. $\tau \epsilon \in \rho, \tau \epsilon \hat{\delta} s$ from $\tau \epsilon+o s$ from the genitive of the consonantal stems (§ 302); Dor. Boeot. $\tau \epsilon 0 \hat{v}$ from $\tau \epsilon o+o s$ with double genitive ending; Dor. $\tau \epsilon \hat{v}$ with - $\epsilon \hat{v}$ from $\tau \epsilon o \hat{v}_{s}$; Lesb. $\sigma \in \hat{\epsilon} \theta \in \nu$ as in $\epsilon_{\epsilon} \mu \hat{\epsilon} \theta \in \nu$. Lat. tuī, tī̀, Goth. peina.

The original form of the locative was *twoi beside *toi which was also used for the genitive, the former occurs in the Greek dative ooi from ${ }^{*} \tau F o l$, and in the Sanskrit accented form tvé, and the latter in Hom. Dor. toí and in the Sanskrit unaccented form tē. Dor. $\tau^{\prime} \nu$ and Hom. Dor. $\tau \epsilon i ้ \nu$ were locatives formed like $\epsilon$ ć $\mu i v$.

Dual: The nominative and accusative was in prim. Greek ${ }^{*} \sigma F \omega$ from older ${ }^{*} \tau F \omega$, which was changed to $\sigma \phi \omega$ either through the influence of the ending in ${ }^{\alpha} \mu-\phi \omega$ or of the $\sigma \phi$ - in the reflexive pronominal form $\sigma \phi^{\prime}(\nu)$; Hom. $\sigma \phi \hat{\omega} \ddot{\text { was }}$ formed like $\nu \omega \hat{\omega}$.

The genitive and dative $\sigma \phi \hat{\omega} \nu$, Hom. $\sigma \phi \hat{\omega} \ddot{\nu}$, was formed like $\nu \hat{\varphi} \nu, \nu \omega ̂ \ddot{\nu}$.

Plural: The original nominative was *jūs which occurs in Goth. jŭ̌s, Lith. jũs; Skr. *yūṣ-ám was changed to yūyám after the analogy of vayám, we. The Greek nominative was formed from the stem-form of the accusative as in the first person, as Att. Ion. $\frac{\hat{v}}{} \mu \in \hat{i}$, Ion. $\frac{\dot{v}}{\mu} \in \hat{i} \hat{s}$,


The original form of the accusative was *us-me probably from older *us-sme, where us- is the weak grade of *wŏs which occurs in Skr. vaḥ, Lat. vōs. From prim. Greek
${ }^{*} \dot{v} \sigma-\mu \epsilon$ were formed with the same endings as in the first person, Hom. Lesb. ${ }_{v} \mu \mu \epsilon$ ( $\S \S 214,402$ ), Dor. $\bar{v} \mu \notin$, Ion.


The genitive was formed in the same manner as in the first person, as Hom. $\frac{\dot{v}}{} \mu \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \omega \nu$, Ion. Dor. $\frac{\hat{v}}{} \mu^{\prime} \epsilon \nu$, Ion. $\frac{1}{v} \mu \mu^{\prime} \omega \nu$, Att. Dor. $\hat{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$, Lesb. $\dot{v} \mu \mu \not{ }^{\prime} \omega \nu$.

The Greek dative $=$ locative was formed from the prim. Greek stem-form ${ }^{*} \dot{v} \sigma \mu(\epsilon)$ - with the same endings as in the first person, as Aeolic $\ddot{v} \mu \mu \nu \nu$ beside $\ddot{v} \mu \mu$, Dor. $\stackrel{v}{v} \mu i v$, Att. Ion. $\hat{v} \mu \hat{v} v$, Ion. also $\hat{v} \mu \hat{v} \nu$.

## 2. Reflexive.

§ 404. The reflexive pronoun originally referred to the chief person of the sentence (generally the subject), irrespectively as to whether the subject was the first, second, or third person singular or plural. This usage was in a great measure preserved in Sanskrit and the BalticSlavonic languages, but in Greek, Latin and the Germanic languages the original reflexive pronoun became restricted to the third person, and then the reflexive pronouns for the first and second persons came to be expressed differently in the different languages. The original stem-forms of the reflexive pronoun were *se- and *sewe- beside *swe-. *se-, the strong grade form, occurs in Lat. sē, si-bi and in Goth. si-k, himself, and s-, the weak grade form, in $\sigma-\phi_{i}^{i}(\nu)$ where $-\phi l(\nu)$ is the same suffix which often appears in nouns (§ 306). After the analogy of the datives $\sigma \phi^{i} \nu$ : Fiv there was formed $\sigma \phi^{\prime}$ beside $F^{\prime}$. At first the forms $\sigma \phi i \nu, \sigma \phi^{\prime}$ were used beside $f^{\prime} \nu, f^{\prime} \in$ without any distinction in meaning, but at a later period the $\sigma \phi$-forms gradually came to be used more and more for the plural only, and then special plural forms for the other cases were made chiefly after the analogy of the personal pronouns of the first and second persons. For examples of *sewe- beside *swesee below.

Singular : The original form of the accusative was *se beside *sewe, *swe, the former occurs in Lat. 'sē, Goth. si-k, himself, and the latter in Hom. $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \epsilon$ from ${ }^{*} \sigma \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon$, Att. Hom. Dor. ${ }^{\epsilon \prime}$, Lesb. $f^{\prime}$, from ${ }^{*} \sigma F \epsilon$.

The original form of the genitive was *swe which was also used for the accusative. In Greek the two cases became differentiated by the creation of a new form for the genitive just as in the personal pronoun of the first

 F'́os, from * $\sigma F \epsilon+$ os from the genitive of the consonantal
 $F^{\epsilon} \theta \in \epsilon$, Hom. Dor. ${ }^{\prime} \theta \epsilon \nu$ with $\theta \epsilon \nu$ as in $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon ́ \theta \epsilon \nu$ (§ 402).

The Att. Ion. Dor. dative oî can be from prim. Greek * $\sigma$ Fol or from *ool, eius, ei, Lesb. Foî, Cypr. Fol from * $\sigma$ Fol;
 were old locative forms like $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \mu i \nu(\$ 402)$.

Dual : From $\sigma \phi^{\prime}$ and $\sigma \phi^{\prime} \nu$ were formed the Hom. nom. and acc. $\sigma \phi \omega$ é, and gen. and dat. $\sigma \phi \omega_{i}^{*} v$.

Plural: The nom. $\sigma \phi \in i \hat{s}$, acc. Ion. $\sigma \phi^{\prime} \alpha s$, Att. also Hom. $\sigma \phi \hat{\alpha} s$, gen. Hom. Dor. Lesb. $\sigma \phi \epsilon i ́ \omega \nu$, Ion. $\sigma \phi \epsilon \epsilon \omega \nu$, Att. also Hom. $\sigma \phi \hat{\omega} \nu$, were all formed after the analogy of the personal pronouns of the first and second persons. On the Dor. Lesb. acc. $\sigma \phi \epsilon ́$, and Ion. Dor. Lesb. dat. $\sigma \phi^{\prime}(\nu)$, see above ; the Att. Ion. dat. $\sigma \phi_{i} \sigma \iota(\nu)$ was formed after the analogy of the dative of the consonantal stems (§ 316).
§ 405. The singular of the compound reflexive pronouns was formed from the personal pronouns + aútós, which in Homer is always written as two separate words, as $\dot{\epsilon} \mu o \grave{ }$
 one word, as acc. Att. ' $\epsilon \mu \bar{\alpha} v \tau o ́ v, ~ \sigma \epsilon \bar{\alpha} v \tau o ́ v, ~ \sigma \bar{\alpha} v \tau o ́ v, ~ \epsilon \in \bar{\varepsilon} v \tau o ́ v$, āù $\tau o ́ v$, Ion. ${ }^{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \omega \nu \tau o ́ \nu, \& c$. ; gen. Att. $\epsilon \epsilon \mu \bar{\alpha} v \tau o \hat{v}, \sigma \epsilon \bar{\alpha} v \tau o \hat{v}$,

 forms were Att. $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \bar{\alpha} v \tau \bar{\varphi}$, Ion. $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \omega u \tau \hat{\varphi}$, from $\mathfrak{\epsilon} o \imath ̂$ (dat. of the
possessive pronoun) $+\alpha \dot{v} \tau \hat{\varphi}$, Att. $\bar{\alpha} \dot{v} \tau \hat{\varphi}$ from $\hat{i}+\alpha v ่ \tau \hat{\omega}$, then after the analogy of these the $\bar{\alpha}$ and $\omega$ were extended to the other cases.

In the plural the two pronouns were inflected separately in the first and second persons and often also in the third,
 aủtoús.

The origin of aúrós is uncertain. Some scholars assume that it is from ${ }^{*} \dot{\alpha} \sigma v \cdot+$ the pronominal stem $\tau 0$, where $* \dot{\alpha} \sigma v$ corresponds to Skr. asu-, life, life of the soul. Others assume that it is composed of the adverb $\alpha \hat{v}$, again $+\tau 0$-s. The oblique cases of aúzós were used to express the personal pronoun of the third person. The reflexive forms $\sigma \phi \epsilon i \hat{\imath}, \sigma \phi \hat{\alpha} s, \sigma \phi \hat{\omega} \nu, \sigma \phi i \sigma \iota$ were also used to express the plural of the third person.

## 3. Possessive.

§ 406. The possessive pronouns were inflected like ordinary adjectives: $\epsilon^{\prime} \mu_{o ́ s}$; Att. $\sigma$ ós, Skr. tváh, Indg. *twos, thy, beside Hom. Dor. Lesb. $\tau$ tós, Boeot. tiós, O.Lat. tovos, later tuos, tuus, Indg. *tewos; Att. Hom. ös, Cret. Fós, Skr. sváḥ, Indg. *swos, his, beside Hom. €ós, Boeot. €́fós, O.Lat. sovos, later suos, suus, Indg. *sewos; Hom. $\sigma \phi^{\prime} s$ was formed after the analogy of ös, éós. Att. Ion. $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon ́-\tau \epsilon \rho o s$, Dor. $\dot{\alpha} \mu \mu^{\prime}-\tau \epsilon \rho o s$, Lesb. $\dot{\alpha} \mu \mu \mu^{\prime}-\tau \epsilon \rho o s$, Att. Ion. Dor.
 nos-ter, ves-ter, were formed with the comparative suffix -tero- (§ 376) ; Lesb. वّ $\mu \mu o s, ~ \ddot{v} \mu \mu o s$, Dor. $\dot{\alpha} \mu o ́ s, ~ \grave{v} \mu o ́ s ~ w e r e ~$ formed direct from the accusative stems of the personal pronouns.

## 4. Demonstrative.

§407. In the parent Indg. language the nominative singular masculine and feminine was *so, *sā $=\dot{\delta}$, Dor. $\dot{\alpha}$, Att. Ion. $\dot{\eta}$, Skr. sá, sấ, Goth. sa, sō, this, that, the. All
the other cases of the singular, dual and plural were formed from the stems to-, te-, fem. tā.. On the Greek caseendings of the inflected forms see § 399.

## a. Masculine and Neuter.

§408. Singular: The nominative masculine $\dot{o}$ corresponds to Skr. sá, Goth. sa, Indg. *so. The accusative masculine $\tau o ́ v=$ Skr. tám, Lat. is•tum, Goth. pan•a, Indg. *tom. The nom. and acc. neuter $\tau$ ó $=$ Skr. tát, Lat. is-tud, Goth. pat-a, OE. pæt, Indg. *tod. The original form of the genitive was *tosjo beside *toso, *teso, the former occurs in Hom. toîo from * roojo, Skr. tásya, and *toso in Att. Ion. $\tau o \hat{v}$, Dor. $\tau \hat{\omega}$, and *teso in Goth. pis, OHG. des. The original form of the dative was *tōi beside *tosmōi, the former occurs in $\tau \hat{\varphi}$, Lat. is-tō, and the latter in Skr. tásmāi.

Dual : The original case-endings of the nominative and accusative dual were the same as those of the o-declension of nouns (§ 325). Masc. *tōu = Skr. tấu, beside *tō $=\tau \bar{\omega}$, Skr. tá ; neut. *toi $=$ Skr. tê, Gr. $\tau \omega$ for ${ }^{*}$ rol was a new formation like $\varsigma v \gamma \omega$ (§ 326). On the gen. and dat. roî̀v, roîv see § 325.

Plural: The original masculine nominative was ${ }^{*}$ toi $=$ Dor. \&c. тoí, Skr. té, Lat. is-tī, Goth. pái ; Att. Ion. Cret. Lesb. Thess. Arcad. and Cyprian oi was a new formation after the analogy of $\dot{\delta}$. The original masculine accusative was *tons $=$ Cret. $\tau o ́ v s$, Att. Ion. \&c. $\tau$ oús, Skr. tấn, Lat. is-tōs, Goth. pans. Nom. and acc. neut. Indg. *tā = Vedic tá, Lat. is-ta, Goth. pō; Gr. $\tau \alpha ́$ was a new formation like § $\cup \gamma \alpha$ (§ 326 ). The Greek gen. $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ was formed after the analogy of the o-declension of nouns (§ 399), the original genitive was *toisō̃̃ which occurs in Skr. téṣãã. The original form of the locative was *toisu $=$ Skr. téṣ̌u; $\tau o i ̂ \sigma \iota$ with $-\sigma$ - restored as in $\lambda$ úкoו $\sigma \iota$ (§ 325). The Greek dative
roîs corresponds to the original instrumental *tōis $=$ Skr. táih, Lat. is-tis, Lith. taĩs.

## b. Feminine.

§ 409. Singular : Nominative Indg. ${ }^{*}$ sā $=$ Dor. $\dot{\alpha}$, Att. Ion. $\dot{\eta}$, Skr. sấ, Goth. sō. Accusative Indg. *tám $=\tau \tilde{\eta} \nu$, Skr. tấm, Lat. is-tam, Goth. pō. The Greek gen. and dat. $\tau \hat{\eta} s, \tau \hat{\eta}$ had the endings of the $\overline{\mathrm{a}} \cdot \mathrm{declension}$ of nouns (§ 321), the original forms were gen. *tosjās or *tesjās = Skr. tásyāḥ, beside *tesās = Goth. pizōs ; dat. *tosjāi or ${ }^{*}$ tesjāi $=$ Skr. tásyāi, beside *tesāi $=$ Goth. pizái.

Dual: Nominative and accusative Indg. *tai = Skr. tế; Gr. $\tau \frac{\alpha}{\alpha}$ was a new formation like $\chi \omega \bar{\omega} \bar{\alpha}(\S$ 321); instead of $\tau \dot{\alpha}$ the masc. $\tau \dot{\omega}$ was mostly used, and similarly gen. and dat. $\tau 0 i ̂ \nu$ for $\tau \alpha i v$ (see § 325).

Plural: Nominative Indg. *tās = Skr. táh, Goth. pōs, Lith. tõs; Gr. $\tau \alpha i$ i, $\alpha i$ were new formations after the analogy of $\tau 0 i ́$, oi (cp. § 321). Accusative Indg. *tāns $=$ Cret. $\tau \alpha ́ \nu s$, Att. \&c. $\tau \dot{\alpha} \dot{\alpha}$, Lat. is $\mathrm{tā} \mathrm{~s}$; Skr. táh, Goth. pōs were the nom. used for the accusative. Genitive Indg. *tásām (cp. § 314) or $\cdot \bar{o} m=$ Hom. $\tau \frac{1}{\alpha} \omega \nu$, Dor. $\tau \hat{\alpha} \nu$, Att. \&c. $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$, Lat. is-tārum. Locative Indg. *tāsu = Skr. tásu; on the Gr. dative forms $\tau \alpha \hat{\imath}, \tau \alpha \hat{\imath} \tau \iota, \tau \hat{\eta} s, \tau \hat{\eta} \sigma \iota$ see § 321.
§ 410. The origin of the second element of $\dot{o}-\delta \epsilon, \eta \eta-\delta \epsilon$, $\tau \delta-\delta \epsilon$ is unknown. Inflected forms of the second element occur in Hom. $\tau 0 i \bar{\sigma}-\delta \epsilon \sigma \sigma \iota$, $\tau 0 i \sigma-\delta \epsilon \sigma \iota$ and in the Lesb. gen. pl. $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu-\delta \epsilon \omega \nu$. Traces of similar compounds of the simple demonstrative with particles of unknown origin occur in the Thessalian neut. nom. sing. $\tau o ́-v \epsilon$, pl. $\tau \alpha ́-\nu \epsilon$ and with both elements inflected in the gen. sing. toîveos and gen. pl. $\tau o v \nu-\nu \epsilon o v \nu$; in the Arcadian gen. sing. $\tau \omega-\nu \hat{l}$, acc. fem. $\tau \bar{\alpha} \nu-$ $\nu i ́$, neut. pl. $\tau \alpha-\nu v$; and in the Cyprian nom. ${ }^{\circ}-\nu v$.
§ 411. The prim. Greek forms corresponding to oûtos, $\alpha \tilde{v} \tau \eta$, $\tau 0 \hat{\tau} \tau 0$ were: ${ }^{*} \dot{\delta} \cdot v-\tau 0,{ }^{*} \dot{\alpha}-v \cdot \tau o,{ }^{*} \tau o \delta-v-\tau o ;$ acc. ${ }^{*} \tau o v-v-\tau 0$, ${ }^{*} \tau \bar{\alpha} \nu-v-\tau o,{ }^{*} \tau o \delta-v-\tau o ;$ gen. ${ }^{*} \tau o \sigma o-v-\tau o,{ }^{*} \tau \bar{\alpha} \sigma-v-\tau o,{ }^{*} \tau о \sigma o-v-\tau o, \& c$.,
consisting of the simple demonstrative + the deictic particle $v$, which is also common in Sanskrit pronouns (cp. nom. fem. asấu $=\mathrm{a}+\mathrm{sâ}(=\mathrm{Gr} . \hat{\alpha}-)+\mathfrak{u}$, that, acc. masc. amúm $=\mathbf{a m}+\mathbf{u}+\mathrm{m}$, that), together with the uninflected pronominal stem $\tau 0$-. During the prehistoric period of the language the inflexion was then transplanted from the first to the last element of the compound, as acc. $\tau o \hat{v} \tau o \nu, \tau \alpha v ́ \tau \eta \nu$, $\tau 0 \hat{\tau} \tau$, from ${ }^{*} \tau o-v-\tau o \nu,{ }^{*} \tau \bar{\alpha}-v-\tau \bar{\alpha} \nu,{ }^{*} \tau 0 \cdot v-\tau o \delta$; gen. тov́тov, $\tau \alpha u ́ \tau \eta s$, from ${ }^{*} \tau 0-v-\tau o o,{ }^{*} \tau \bar{\alpha}-v-\tau \bar{\alpha} s, \& c$. ; and the old nomina-
 the nom. singular of adjectives. The Att. Ion. nom. pl. oû̃oı, aरें $\alpha \iota \iota$ beside Dor. $\tau 0 \hat{v} \tau o \iota, \tau \alpha \hat{\tau} \tau \alpha \iota$ were new formations after the analogy of the nom. singular. The nom. acc. pl. neut. $\tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau \alpha$ had $-\alpha v$ - from the feminine stem. The masc. forms of the dual were used for all genders; and similarly in Att. Ion. the gen. pl. тoút $\omega \nu$ beside Dor. and Lesb. fem. $\tau \alpha v \tau \hat{\alpha} \nu$.

In the Boeotian dialect the stem-form of the masc. nom. singular became generalized, as acc. oîtov, neut. oîto, gen. oű $\tau \omega$, nom. pl. oن̂ $\tau o \iota$, neut. oû $\alpha$, acc. ov̋ $\frac{1}{}$ s, gen. oṽ $\tau \omega \nu$.

The deictic particles $-\bar{\imath}$, $-\bar{\imath} \nu$, originally the feminine nominative and accusative singular of a demonstrative pronoun, were often attached to the above compound demonstratives to express emphasis, as ódt, $\dot{\eta} \delta t \hat{t}$, $\tau 0 \delta t \hat{t}$, ovivo $\frac{t}{t}$ or $-\frac{t}{\iota} \nu$,
 Sanskrit fem. nom. sing. iyám from ${ }^{1} \cdot \mathrm{am}$, this, and in the Gothic fem. acc. ija, her, and is related to Hom. ${ }^{\prime} \alpha,{ }_{l}{ }^{\prime} \alpha \nu$, $i \hat{\eta} s, i \hat{\eta}$ (cp. § 380).

 pronominal particle which occurs in Skr. asá́u, that, and $\kappa \epsilon i v o s$ from ${ }^{*} \kappa \epsilon$ - $\mathcal{E} \nu o s$ where $\kappa \epsilon$ - corresponds to the Latin particle ce in ce-do, huius-ce, and $\dot{\epsilon} \nu o$ - is an old pronominal stem (§ 416) ; and similarly Dor. $\tau \hat{\eta} \nu 0$ from ${ }^{*} \tau \epsilon-\mathcal{E} \nu 0 s$. On


## 5. Relative.

§ 413. The Indg. stem-forms of the relative pronoun were masculine and neuter jo-, feminine $\mathbf{j \overline { a }}-=\dot{\delta} \cdot$, , $\dot{-}$, Skr.
 yấ, yát, Indg. *jos, *jā, *jod ; gen. oî from *jooo, $\hat{\eta} s$ (a new formation like $\tau \hat{\eta} s$, § 409), Skr. yásya, yásyāḥ ; the Hom. gen oov ( $B_{325}, \alpha 70$ ) and ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \eta S(\Pi$ 208) are incorrect forms; pl. nom. oil, aí (a new formation like $\alpha i, \S 409$ ), ${ }^{2}$, Skr. yế, yấḥ, Vedic yấ, Indg. *joi, *jās, *jā. The simple demonstrative, especially the $\tau$-forms, was often also used for the relative in Homer, Herodotus, Dor. Lesb. Boeot. and Arcadian.

## 6. Interrogative and Indefinite.

§ 414. The parent Indg. language had several stems from which the interrogative pronoun was formed, viz. qo-, qe., fem. qā-; qi., qu-, with labialized q(§ 202). It is impossible to determine to which cases the various stems originally belonged owing to the levelling which took place in the prehistoric period of the separate languages.
qo- occurs in Skr. káh, Goth. vuas, Lith. kàs, who?, neut. Lat. quod, Goth. Jua, OE. hwæt, what?, Indg. *qos, *qod. In Greek it only occurs in pronominal adjectives and adverbs, as пótєpos, Skr. kataráḥ, Goth. luapar, which of two?, поîos, $\pi o ́ \sigma o s ; \pi o ̂ ̀, \pi o ́ \theta \epsilon \nu, \pi o ́ \tau \epsilon, \pi \dot{\omega}-\pi о \tau \epsilon$, $\pi \hat{\omega} s$, Cret. $\hat{o}-\pi \omega$.
qe- occurs in the gen. sing. Goth. hvis, O.Slav. česo, Hom. $\tau \epsilon \in o$ (Att. $\tau o \hat{v}$, Ion. $\tau \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ ), from Indg. *qeso, whose? From $\tau^{\prime} \epsilon_{o}$ was formed $\tau^{\prime} \omega \nu$ and then further $\tau^{\prime} \epsilon \varphi$ (Att. $\left.\tau \hat{\varphi}\right)$,

 ö́cols). It also occurs in Dor. $\pi \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ for ${ }^{*} \tau \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ and in the conjunction $\tau \epsilon$, Skr. ca, Lat. que, and.
qā- occurs in the fem. nom. Skr. kắ, Goth. ऊō̄, who?,
acc. Skr. kấm, Goth. huō, whom?, and in Dor. $\pi \hat{\alpha}$, Att. $\pi \hat{\eta}$.

The stem qu- is only found in adverbs, as Dor. $\bar{o}-\pi \bar{u} s$ (Rhodes), ö- $\pi v \iota$ (Gortyn), $\pi \hat{v} s$ (Syracuse), whither; Skr. kú, Lith. kur̃, where; Lat. ali-cu•bi, ne-cu•bi, \&c.

It is probable that qi- belonged originally only to the masc. and neut. nom. and acc. singular, cp. $\tau i ́ s, \tau i ́$, Lat. quis, quid, Indg. *qis, *qid; masc. acc. *Tiv, Lat. quem for older *quim. In Greek the stem $\tau \iota$ - became generalized for all cases and genders. From *Tiv was formed a new accusative $\tau i v \alpha$ after the analogy of such words as ${ }^{\epsilon} \nu \alpha$, cp . also § 330. The $-\nu$ - in $\tau i v \alpha$ was then levelled out into the other cases, as tivos, tivi; tive, tivoiv; tives, tivas, $\tau i \nu \alpha, \tau i \nu \omega \nu$, but $\tau i \sigma \iota:$ tives after the analogy of such forms as $\phi \rho \in \sigma i, k v \sigma i$ : $\phi \rho \in ́ v \in s, \kappa v ́ \nu \in s$. From the stem $\tau \iota$ - were also formed Lesb. $\tau i ́ \varphi$, , $i{ }^{\prime} o \iota \sigma \iota \nu$; Cret. ob- $-\tau \bar{\iota} \mu \iota$ from ${ }^{*}-\tau \iota \sigma \mu$, Indg. *qismi beside the Skr. loc. kásmin. Megarian neut. pl. $\sigma \alpha$ from ${ }^{*} \tau j \alpha$ for $\tau^{i} \nu \alpha$ (Arist. Ach. 757, 784) ; indef. Att. $\ddot{\alpha} \tau \tau \alpha$, Ion. $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \alpha$ for initial ${ }^{*} \tau \dot{\alpha},{ }^{*} \sigma \alpha ́(\S 167$ ), which arose from a mistaken division of the words in such combinations
 $\sigma \sigma \alpha, \tau$ 218), $\sigma \mu \kappa \kappa \rho \alpha ́ \tau \tau \alpha$; indef. rel. Att. $\alpha \ddot{\tau} \tau \alpha$, Ion. $\ddot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \alpha$, from ${ }^{*}{ }_{\alpha}-\tau j \alpha$. In like manner is also declined the simple indefinite pronoun which only differs from the interrogative in accent.
§ 415. $\delta \in i ̂ v a$ is always accompanied by the def. article whether it remains uninflected for both numbers and all genders and cases or whether it is inflected. It is originally a compound of $\ddot{o l}^{\circ} \delta+$ the pronominal stem - $-\dot{\nu} \nu 0$ which occurs in $\epsilon \in \epsilon \in \mathcal{L} 0 s$ from ${ }^{*} \epsilon-\kappa \epsilon-\epsilon \nu 0-s(\S 412)$, so that the original nominative masc. was *ód $\epsilon \hat{\nu} o s$, acc. ${ }^{*} \tau o \nu \delta \epsilon i v 0 \nu, \& c$. For the explanation of $\delta \epsilon i \nu \alpha$ we have to start out from the neut. plural form $\tau \alpha \delta \in i \hat{\imath} \alpha \alpha={ }^{*} \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \delta-\epsilon^{-\ell} \nu \alpha$ which, by a mistaken division of the compound, came to be regarded as being for $\tau \alpha-\delta \epsilon \hat{i} \alpha a$. At a later period $\delta \epsilon i v a$ in the combination
$\tau o ̀ \nu ~ \delta \epsilon i v a$ came to be regarded as the accusative of a consonantal stem (cp. riva, rivos, § 414) to which were then formed $\delta \epsilon i v o s, \delta \in i v l, p l$. $\delta \in i v \in s, \delta \in i v a s, \delta \in i v \omega \nu$.

## 7. Other Pronouns.

§ 416. The parent Indg. language had several pronouns besides those dealt with in the preceding paragraphs. Some of these were not preserved in Greek and others were only preserved in scanty fragments, as
e.. The original forms were nom. *es, acc. *em, neut. *ed, gen. *esjo (Skr. asyá, of this) beside *eso (OHG. es, Goth. is, of $i t$ ), fem. *esjās (Skr. asyáh), loc. *ei (preserved in $\epsilon i, \epsilon \hat{i}-\tau \alpha$, and the Goth. relative particle ei), instr. ${ }^{*} \overline{\mathbf{e}}$ (preserved in $\ddot{\eta}, \vec{\eta}-\tau o \iota$, $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \epsilon-\eta$ ). The stem e- occurs in
 a-sáu, that, Lat. e-quidem.
eno-, ono-, the former of which occurs in é $\kappa \in \hat{\nu} \nu 0 s, ~ к \in i ̂ \nu o s$, Dor. $\kappa \hat{\eta} \nu 0 s$, from ${ }^{*} \kappa \in-\mathcal{\epsilon} \nu 0 s$, Dor. $\tau \hat{\eta} \nu 0 s$ from ${ }^{*} \tau \in-\mathcal{E} \nu o s$, and ${ }^{\prime} \notin \eta$, and the latter in Lith. anàs, that, O.Slav. onŭ, that, he.

The locative of an old fem. stem $\overline{\mathbf{a}}$ - is preserved in the Dor. conj. ai, if.
i., Lat. is, Goth. is, he ; acc. Indg. *im, Cypr. iv, O.Lat. im, Goth. in-a, him, Skr. im-ám, this. The stem also occurs in Hom. iđ́́, and, Skr. i-dá, now, in this moment, i-há, here. With ${ }^{i} \nu$, O.Lat. im are also probably related Hom. $\mu^{i} \nu$ used for all genders but only in the singular, and post-Homeric poet. $\nu i v$ used for the singular and plural all genders. The exact formation of these two pronouns is obscure.

The feminine stem i. which occurs in the Skr. nom. iyám from *i.ám, this, and the particle $\cdot \bar{i}$ as in ovitoo- $\hat{i}$, $\epsilon \in \epsilon \epsilon \mathcal{L} \sigma \sigma-\frac{1}{\imath}, \& c$. ; the acc. Indg. *ijām (Goth. ija, her) beside ${ }^{*} \mathrm{im},{ }^{\mathrm{ijm}}$ ( $\mathrm{cp} . \S 330$ ) occurs in the particle $-\bar{\tau} \nu$, as oú $\sigma \sigma-\bar{i} \nu$. With this pronoun is also related Hom. $i^{\alpha} \alpha,{ }_{l} \alpha \nu, ~ i \hat{\eta} s, i \hat{\eta}$,
to which was formed a masc. los, dat. ị̂ in Hom. and Cretan.

The fem. pronoun ${ }^{\text {sin }}=\frac{\bar{\imath}}{\boldsymbol{\imath}}$, O.Ir. OHG. sī, Goth. si, she.
 in Lat. ce-do, huius-ce, and in $\dot{\epsilon}-\kappa \epsilon \hat{l}, k \in \hat{\imath}-\theta \in \nu, k \in \hat{\imath}-\theta l$, \&c. where $\kappa \in \hat{\imath}$ is the old locative.

## CHAPTER XII

## VERBS

§ 417. The forms constituting the Greek verbal-system are of two kinds: the finite and the infinite forms. The finite forms consist of the indicative, subjunctive, optative, imperative and the so-called injunctive (§ 524). Their special characteristics are the personal endings, the augment, reduplication and the distinction of voice, tense and mood. The infinite forms are the infinitive, participles, and the verbal adjectives. The participles had become a part of the verbal-system in the parent Indg. language, and accordingly had voice- and tense-forms ; whereas the infinitive, which is originally an isolated singular case-form of a nomen actionis, became for the most part associated with the verbalsystem in the prehistoric period of the separate languages ( $\S 545$ ). On the verbal adjectives see $\S \$$ 555-6.

Primitive Greek inherited almost the entire verbalsystem of the parent Indg. language, to which it added considerably by the creation of numerous new formations, so that in course of time its verbal-system became more extensive than that of any other Indg. language. Such new formations were the passive aorist in $\cdot \theta \eta \nu$, the future passive in $-\theta \eta \sigma o \mu \alpha \iota$, the passive participle in $-\theta \epsilon \iota$, the so-called future perfect, the pluperfect, the future optative, the optative of the s-aorist, $\& c$.

In the following paragraphs most of the remarks con-
cerning the finite forms of the verb properly belong to the province of syntax. And only such points are mentioned here as are necessary for understanding the finite forms. For the full treatment of the subject the student should consult Brugmann's Griech. Grammatik, third ed., pp. 458-568.
§ 418. Number: The Indg. finite forms of the verb had like nouns the three numbers-singular, dual and plural - which were preserved in the oldest period of Greek as also in the Aryan, Gothic and Baltic-Slavonic languages, but the dual had practically disappeared in the prehistoric period of the other languages. And even in prim. Greek the first person of the dual was supplanted by the plural. The second and third persons of the dual remained longer in Attic than in the other dialects, but even in this dialect they had become obsolete in the vernacular from about the beginning of the fourth century в.c.
§ 419. Voices: The parent Indg. language had two voices-the active and the middle. The former was preserved in the historic period of all the separate languages, and the latter was preserved in Greek, Aryan and Latin and partly also in Gothic. It had no special forms which were exclusively used to express the passive, but before the parent language had become differentiated into the separate languages the middle forms had to some extent begun to be used to express the passive. This mode of expressing the passive underwent further development in Greek, Sanskrit and Latin. And such middle forms as were preserved in Gothic became exclusively passive in meaning. The Greek second aorist passive in $-\eta \nu$ was originally active in form ( $\S 458$ ), and the first aorist passive in $-\theta \eta \nu$ was a special Greek new formation (§514).
$\S 420$. The middle denoted that the action of the verb was directed towards the agent. The use in which the agent was the direct object was rare, as in $\lambda^{\prime}$ ó́o $\mu \alpha \iota$ ( $\lambda o \hat{v} \mu \alpha \iota$ ),

I wash myself. The original difference in meaning between the middle and active was probably very slight, and this would account for the fact that many verbs with only middle forms have purely an active meaning without any idea of the reflexive meaning, cp. $\hat{\eta} \sigma \tau \alpha \iota$, Skr. ástē, he sits; Skr. sácatè, he follows, Gr. ধ́ $\pi о \mu \alpha \iota$, Lat. sequor ; $\mu \eta \tau i ́ \rho \mu \alpha \iota$, Lat. mētior; $k \in i ̂ \tau \alpha \iota$, Skr. šétē, he lies down; and similarly

 $\phi$ ́́ $\beta \circ \mu \alpha \iota, \& c$. To such middle forms were often created active forms in the historic period of the language, as
 based on the analogy of verbs which originally had active and middle forms side by side.
§ 421. Already in the parent Indg. language middle verbs sometimes had an active perfect, and some such verbs were also preserved in Greek, Sanskrit and Latin, as - $\beta^{\prime} \epsilon$ $\beta$ ov $\lambda \alpha$ :
 ко $\mu \alpha \iota, \mu \epsilon ́ \mu \eta \nu \alpha: \mu \alpha i \nu о \mu \alpha \iota$, ö $\lambda \omega \lambda \alpha$ : ờ $\lambda \lambda \nu \mu \alpha \iota$; Skr. papá́da : pádyatē, he falls, vavárta : vártatē, he turns; Lat. revertī : revertor, assensī : assentior.
§ 422. Many verbs, which are otherwise active in form, have a future middle with active meaning. This is especially the case with such verbs as have a second aorist in use, as $\tau \epsilon \dot{v} \xi^{\prime} \rho \mu \alpha \iota:{ }^{\prime} \epsilon \tau v \chi o \nu, \pi \epsilon i ́ \sigma o \mu \alpha \iota:{ }^{\prime} \in \pi \alpha \theta o \nu$,

 $\xi \circ \mu \alpha \iota, \phi \in \dot{\varepsilon} \xi_{0} \mu \alpha \iota, \& c$. This phenomenon is peculiar to Greek and is connected with the intransitive use of the second aorist. To aorists like ${ }_{\epsilon} \epsilon \sigma \tau \eta \nu,{ }^{\prime} \oint \bar{v} \nu \quad$ were formed the future $\sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma o \mu \alpha \iota, \phi \hat{v} \sigma o \mu \alpha \iota$, because $\sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$, $\phi \hat{v} \sigma \omega$ were transitive ; $\beta \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$ became transitive after the analogy of $\sigma \tau \eta \sigma \omega$, and then to ${ }_{\epsilon} \beta \eta \eta \nu$ was formed the future $\beta \dot{\eta} \sigma o \mu \alpha \iota$. This mode of forming a middle future then became extended to other verbs.
§ 423. Mode or manner of action: It is important to note that tenses in the sense in which we generally use that word were of comparatively late development in the Indg. languages. The verbal forms-whether presential or preterite-had originally in themselves no inherent characteristic to indicate whether an action referred to the present, past or future. If we compare together the augmented tenses we see that they originally expressed something other than what we generally understand by the word tense. In the imperfect, aorist and pluperfect the verbal form itself merely denoted the mode or manner of the action according as it was durative or only momentary, as in English seek beside find, and it was merely the augment which denoted the past time, but the fact that the augment does not appear in the Latin, Old Germanic and Baltic-Slavonic languages shows that even the augment was not originally necessary to express past time. When the time of the action was sufficiently indicated by the context the augment was not used in the parent Indg. language, see § 430.
§424. In the following classification of the mode or manner in which the action takes place (actio verbi, or Aktionsart as it is generally called in German), it is as a rule only necessary to grasp clearly the difference between the momentary and the durative action. The mode or manner in which an action takes place can be conveniently divided into five types :-
(I) An action is said to be momentary, perfective or aoristic when it is practically completed at the moment it begins, as in English find, strike. Since this mode of action has no duration it was seldom used to express the present, therefore unaugmented momentary formations generally have a future meaning, as $\epsilon \hat{i} \mu \iota, \nu \epsilon \in \rho \alpha \alpha$. A verb became perfective by the addition of a preposition, cp . $\dot{\alpha} \pi{ }^{\circ} \theta \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \kappa \epsilon \iota$ beside $\theta \nu \eta \eta^{\prime} \sigma \kappa \epsilon \iota$; Lat. consequor beside sequor;
this distinction in form and meaning was most fully developed in the Slavonic languages and became one of the most distinctive features of the verbal-system. The aorist is characteristic of this type.
(2) An action is said to be cursive, durative or imperfective when it denotes continuous action without any reference to its beginning or end, as in English I am striking as compared with I strike; 系 $\sigma \theta^{\prime} \omega, \pi, \pi \nu \omega$ beside
 had durative action, as in $\chi \alpha i \rho \omega$, \&c.
(3) The perfect action, that is the mode of action expressed by the perfect stem, denotes a state of the subject which has resulted from a previous action, as in oî $\alpha, \tau \in \in \theta \nu \eta \kappa \epsilon$ as compared with $\gamma \iota \gamma \nu \omega \sigma \kappa \kappa \omega, \theta \nu \eta \eta^{\prime} \sigma \kappa \epsilon \iota$.
(4) An action is said to be iterative when it consists of repeated acts. Here belong especially the reduplicated presents, as $\beta i \beta \eta \mu \iota, \beta \iota \beta \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \omega$ as compared with ${ }_{\epsilon} \epsilon \beta \eta \nu$. This meaning easily develops into the intensive, and in all languages the desire for emphasis in time reduces the intensive to the value of the simple verb, as in $\mu \dot{\mu} \mu \nu \omega$, ${ }^{\prime} \sigma \chi \omega$ beside $\mu \epsilon \nu \omega \omega$, ${ }^{\prime} € \chi$. To this type also belong the verbs in -éjo-, as in фор $\epsilon$ (§ 497).
(5) An action is said to be terminative when it indicates the beginning or the end of the action, as in English aim, start, throw beside hit. To this class originally belonged the nasal-presents (§§ 460-7) like ${ }^{\alpha} \gamma \nu \bar{v} \mu \iota$, ơ $\rho \bar{v} \mu \iota, \delta \alpha \mu \nu \nu \mu t$; and also the presents in $-\sigma \kappa \omega$ (§ 469), as $\beta \dot{\alpha} \sigma \kappa \omega$, which however often became iterative.
§ 425. No one Greek verb has or could have all the forms which are associated with the full verbal-system. A present could not be formed from a base or stem which expressed momentary or aoristic action unless the base or stem was modified by a formative element; and on the other hand no base or stem expressing cursive action could occur in the second aorist. Hence arose the series
of defective verbs with presents but no aorists or with aorists but no presents, as $\phi \epsilon \in \rho \omega: \eta \eta^{\prime} \nu \epsilon \gamma \kappa \circ \nu$, cp. Lat. fero:
 ò $\rho \alpha ́ \omega$ : єîठo
§ 426. Tense-formation: In the parent Indg. language there were strictly speaking only two tense-formations, viz. the present-aorist-system and the perfect. The present-aorist-system contained a present and an aorist form which arose from the same base or stem through a difference in accent. The forms mostly used as presents with cursive meaning had the accent in the singular of the active on the first syllable of the base which had the strong grade of ablaut, and in all other forms the accent was on the personal ending and the base had the weak grade of ablaut. The forms with momentary or aoristic meaning had the accent on the second syllable of the base in all forms and it therefore had the strong grade of ablaut. This is called the second or strong aorist. The reason why this difference of meaning should be associated with the difference in accent is uncertain, see Brugmann, Kurze vergleichende Grammatik, pp. 507-8. In Greek the tense-system was most completely carried out in the denominative verbs, because such verbs originally possessed no particular mode or manner of action.

The present in the narrower sense had no special characteristic to denote time unless we may regard the primary personal endings as such.

The imperfect belongs to the present stem. The difference between this tense and the second aorist was often one of syntax rather than of form, because forms of the same nature were used partly as imperfects and partly as
 similarly formed aorists, 光 $\sigma \tau \eta \nu$, ${ }^{\epsilon} \tau \rho \alpha \phi o \nu$, ${ }^{\epsilon} \phi \nu \gamma o \nu$.

There were originally no special forms which were exclusively used to express the future, But forms with
momentary meaning could be used for the future, as $\epsilon i \mu \mu$, $\nu$ éo $\mu \alpha \iota$. The ordinary future in Greek was originally the subjunctive of the s-aorist ( $\S 499$ ). The future passive and future perfect were special Greek new formations (§ 501).

The second aorist and the s-aorist had come to have the same meaning already in the parent Indg. language (§ 502). The passive aorist in $-\theta \eta \nu$ was a special Greek new formation (§ 514).

So far as syntax is concerned the perfect was originally a special kind of present which denoted a state of the subject resulting from a previous action. For the special characteristics of the perfect see $\S 515$.

The Greek pluperfect is simply a preterite form developed from the perfect stem. See § 523.
§ 427. Moods: The parent Indg. language had four moods-the indicative, subjunctive ( $\$ \S 525-9$ ), optative ( $\S 5530-8$ ), and imperative ( $\S 5539-44$ )-all of which were preserved in Greek and Vedic. The so-called injunctive is strictly speaking not a mood, because it merely consists of unaugmented indicative forms with secondary personal endings ( $\$ \mathbf{5 2 4}$ ). Greek and Vedic are the only languages which preserved the original distinction between the subjunctive and optative in form and meaning. But even in Vedic the distinction began to disappear and with the development of the sjo-future (\$498) the subjunctive disappeared entirely in classical Sanskrit, and the optative came to be used for both. It was also supplanted by the optative in the prehistoric period of the Germanic and Baltic-Slavonic languages. And although subjunctive and optative forms were preserved in Latin, they became confused in usage already in the prehistoric period of the language. Some scholars doubt whether the parent Indg. language possessed a subjunctive with the function and meaning that we usually associate with it. They are
inclined to regard it as being originally an indicative with momentary meaning which was used to express the future action. In this manner they account for the fact that what we call the subjunctive in Greek partly corresponds in form to the future in Latin, as ${ }^{\epsilon} \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \omega, \phi \epsilon \rho \rho \eta \tau \epsilon=$ Lat. ero, ferētis.
§ 428. It is not always easy to draw a hard and fast line between indicative and subjunctive forms. In Greek we have the original subjunctive of the s-aorist used as the future ; in Homer forms like $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \gamma \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \tau \epsilon, \dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \dot{\prime} \psi \in \tau \alpha \iota$, \&c. (§ 526) are sometimes futures and sometimes aorist subjunctives; the subjunctive of the athematic verbs corresponds in form to the indicative of the thematic, cp. Hom. ${ }^{\prime} \circ \rho \in \nu$ beside $\phi^{\prime} \rho о \mu \in \nu$.

Possibly the optative (§§ 530-8) was originally merely a characterized present denoting wish. The s-aorist of the optative was a special Greek new formation.
Already in the parent Indg. language the imperative system was made up of several distinct formations which included (a) injunctive forms, (b) forms with the bare stem, and (c) compound forms. See §§ 539-44.

## Reduplication.

§ 429. Reduplication had become a part of the verbalsystem already in the parent Indg. language, and was originally used to express iterative or intensive action. At a later period it also came to be used as a tense-forming element. It was preserved in Greek, Aryan, Latin, Gothic and Old Irish. There were originally three types of reduplication, type (a) with $\check{1}$ in the reduplicated syllable, type (b) with $\overline{\text { ex }}$ in the reduplicated syllable, and type (c) with the whole syllable reduplicated. The tenses which had reduplication were the present, aorist and perfect.

The reduplicated presents originally had $\check{\mathbf{I}}$ beside $\mathbf{e}$, but the exact relation in which $\check{\mathbf{1}}$ stood to $\mathbf{e}$ is unknown. The
i became generalized in the Greek presents except perhaps in one or two isolated forms like Hom. $k \in \in-k \lambda v-\theta l$, pl. $\kappa^{\prime}-\kappa \lambda \nu-\tau \epsilon$, whereas both types were preserved side by side in Sanskrit, as $\gamma i \neq \nu \rho \mu \alpha \iota$ : Lat. gigno, $\mu i \mu \nu \omega$, $\delta i \delta \alpha \sigma \kappa \omega$, ì $\delta \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \sigma \iota \sigma \delta \omega$, ${ }^{\prime} \sigma \chi \chi \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \sigma \iota \sigma \chi \omega$, $\pi i \mu \pi \pi \lambda \eta \mu$ (Skr. pí-parmi, I fill), $\pi i \mu \pi \rho \eta \mu \iota$, both verbs with $-\mu$ - after the analogy of $\pi \iota \mu \pi \lambda \alpha \alpha^{\nu} \omega$ (§ 466); ï $\sigma \tau \eta \mu \iota$ from ${ }^{*} \sigma \iota \sigma \tau \bar{\alpha} \mu \iota$ : Lat. sistit, Skr. ti-şthati, he stands; but $\tau i \theta \eta \mu \iota$ from ${ }^{*} \theta_{\iota} \theta \eta \mu \iota$ beside Skr. đá-dhāmi, $\delta i ́ \delta \omega \mu l$ beside Skr. dá-dāmi.

The aorist had e which was regularly preserved in Greek, as ${ }^{\epsilon}-\pi \epsilon-\phi \nu o \nu$, inf. $\pi \epsilon-\phi \nu \epsilon \in \mu \epsilon \nu$, ${ }^{\prime \prime}-\sigma \pi o \mu \eta \nu$ from ${ }^{*} \sigma \epsilon-$
 $\lambda \epsilon \lambda \alpha \beta \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \theta \alpha \iota, \pi \epsilon ́ \phi \rho \alpha \delta_{o \nu}: \phi \rho \alpha ́ \xi \omega, \pi \epsilon ́ \pi \iota \theta o \nu, \tau \epsilon \tau v \kappa \epsilon i v, \& c$.

The perfect generally had e, as $\delta^{\prime} \delta_{\varnothing} \rho \rho \kappa \alpha, \gamma^{\epsilon} \gamma o \nu \alpha=$ Skr. dadárša, jajána, for other examples see $\S \S 516-22$. Beside e there also existed $\overline{\mathbf{e}}$ which is rare in Greek (cp. Hom. $\delta \eta-\delta \epsilon ́ \chi \alpha \tau \alpha \iota: \delta \epsilon ́ \chi о \mu \alpha \iota)$ but common in Vedic as vā-várta beside va-várta, he has turned, see Whitney, Sanskrit Grammar, § 786. On the consonants in the reduplicated syllable of the perfect see § 517.

Type (c), which consisted of the reduplication of the whole syllable, was the oldest mode of reduplication. Here it is necessary to make two sub-divisions according as the base or stem began with a consonant or a vowel. (i) When it began with a consonant the reduplication was not a tenseforming element but belonged to the whole verb, as $\gamma \alpha \rho$ $\gamma \alpha i \rho \omega, \mu \alpha \rho \mu \alpha i \rho \omega, \pi о \rho \phi \dot{v} \rho \omega, \pi \alpha \mu \phi \alpha i \nu \omega$, cp. also Lat. murmurāre, tintinnāre. In a small number of verbs the formation of the reduplicated syllable is not clear, $(a)$ with $\iota$ in the reduplicated syllable, as $\delta \alpha \iota \delta \alpha \lambda \lambda \omega, \pi \alpha \iota \pi \alpha \lambda \lambda \omega$ (Hesych.), $\mu \alpha \iota \mu \dot{\alpha} \omega, \pi \alpha \iota \phi \alpha ́ \sigma \sigma \omega, \pi o \iota \pi \nu v ́ \omega, \pi o \iota \phi \dot{\sigma} \sigma \sigma \omega,(b)$ with a nasal or liquid, as $\gamma \circ \gamma \gamma \dot{v} \lambda \lambda \omega, \gamma \alpha \gamma \gamma \alpha \lambda i ́ s \omega$ beside $\gamma \alpha \rho \gamma \alpha-$






The reduplicated aorist was common in the language of the epic, but in the later language only a few examples were preserved, as $\eta^{\prime} \gamma \alpha \gamma o \nu, \eta ँ \nu \in \gamma \kappa о \nu$.

## The Augment.

§ 430. The augment (Indg. e. = ' - -, Skr. a-, Arm. e.) was originally a temporal adverb denoting the past, and gradually became used in the so-called imperfect, aorist and pluperfect indicative to express the past tense, because the verbal forms as such possessed no inherent characteristic which indicated the past tense. When it stood in the parent Indg. language before consonants it is called the syllabic augment, as in Indg. *ébherom $={ }^{\epsilon} \phi \in \rho \rho \nu$, Skr. ábharam; and when it underwent contraction with a following vowel it is called the temporal augment, as in Indg. *ếsm from *é-esm $=$ Hom. $\hat{\eta} \alpha$, Skr. ásam. The augment had become an integral part of the verbal system already in prim. Indo-Germanic and always had the principal accent of the compound form, as in *ébherom beside *bhérom. It was preserved in Greek, Aryan and Armenian, but in the other Indg. languages it either disappeared altogether or was only preserved in isolated forms. When the time of the action was sufficiently indicated by the context the augment was not used in the parent language, so that forms like *ébherom and *bhérom existed side by side without any distinction in meaning. After the analogy of the augmented forms the unaugmented forms also acquired in the course of time a preterite meaning independently of the context. This accounts for the optional use of the augment in Vedic, Homer and in later Greek poetry. The augmented forms became generalized in Sanskrit. They had also become general in the oldest
period of Greek prose except in the pluperfect where both
 beside $\pi \epsilon \pi \delta \partial \nu \theta \eta$, $\pi \epsilon \pi \sigma \delta \partial \theta \epsilon \nu \nu$, and in the Ionic iterative forms in - $\sigma \kappa o \nu$ which never have the augment, as $\phi \in \dot{v} \gamma \in \sigma \kappa o \nu$, $\phi \dot{u} \gamma \epsilon \sigma \kappa \circ \nu, \lambda \alpha ́ \beta \epsilon \sigma \kappa 0 \nu$. $\dot{\epsilon} X \rho \hat{\eta} \nu$ was a new formation beside the regular form $\chi \rho \hat{\eta} \nu$ which was a contraction of $\chi \rho \bar{\eta} \hat{\eta}^{\eta} \nu$.

In verbs compounded with a preposition the augment stood between the component parts, as in $\dot{\alpha} \pi-\epsilon-\beta \alpha \lambda o \nu$, $\pi \epsilon \rho l-\epsilon \in-\beta \alpha \lambda \lambda o \nu, \pi \alpha \rho-\epsilon \in-\sigma \chi o \nu$, cp. Skr. imperf. ud-á-patat beside the pres. ut-pátati, he flies up. In a few cases the compound verb came to be regarded as a simplex and then had the augment in front of the preposition, as $\epsilon^{\prime} \kappa \alpha ́ \theta \iota \zeta o \nu$, $\epsilon \in \alpha ́ \theta \epsilon v \delta o \nu$ beside $\kappa \alpha \theta \eta \hat{v} \delta o \nu$, epic $\kappa \alpha \theta \epsilon \hat{v} \delta o \nu$ with temporal augment ; or with both elements augmented, as $\eta \nu-\epsilon \iota$ Xó $\mu \eta \nu$, $\grave{\eta} \nu-\epsilon \sigma \chi o ́ \mu \eta \nu, \grave{\eta} \mu \phi-\epsilon \sigma \beta \dot{\eta} \tau o v \nu$.

Verbs compounded with the inseparable particle $\delta v \sigma$ have the augment in front of it, as é $\delta v \sigma \tau v \chi^{\prime} o v v$; the same rule also applies to verbs derived from compound nouns, as $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \bar{\nu} \theta_{0} \lambda o ́ \gamma \eta \sigma \alpha$, but if the first element was a preposition the augment was sometimes placed after it on analogy with verbs of the type $\dot{\alpha} \pi-\epsilon-\beta \alpha \lambda o \nu$, as $\dot{\alpha} \pi-\epsilon-\lambda o \gamma \eta \sigma \alpha \mu \eta \nu$.

The syllabic augment also occurred originally in verbs which began with $\mathbf{s}$ - and $\mathbf{j}$-, but these sounds disappeared in prim. Greek and the loss of them gave rise to various contractions and analogical formations. दौ- $\epsilon$ - regularly underwent contraction (Att. $\epsilon \ell-$, Dor. $\eta-$ ) after the loss

 cp. Lat. serpo ; єimó $\mu \eta \nu$ from ${ }^{*} \epsilon \sigma \epsilon \pi о \mu \eta \nu$, cp. Lat. sequor (§ 219) ; єi $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \tau \dot{\eta} \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu$ from ${ }^{*} \epsilon \sigma \epsilon \tau \eta \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu$; $\epsilon \hat{\mu} \mu \epsilon \nu$ from ${ }^{\prime} \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon \mu \in \nu$. In all other combinations we have the temporal augment after the analogy of verbs which originally began with a vowel,

 double consonants in the original initial combination $\mathbf{s}+$
nasal or liquid, see the phonology, as in Hom. ${ }^{\prime \prime} \lambda \lambda \alpha \beta \beta$,


Verbs, which originally began with $\mathbf{w} \cdot=F$ - have the syllabic augment in Homer, but contraction in Attic where possible, as Hom. $\epsilon \iota i \delta o v$, Att. $\epsilon i \hat{i} o v$, Lesb. єv̈ı $\delta o \nu$ from
 beside $\dot{\eta} \rho \gamma \alpha \zeta o ́ \mu \eta \nu, \eta ้ \kappa \alpha \varsigma o \nu$ with temporal augment; Hom.
 with temporal augment. Forms like Att. $\oplus \kappa \eta \sigma \alpha$, $\omega \rho \gamma i \sigma \theta \eta \nu$, ${ }_{\omega} \rho \theta \omega \omega \sigma \alpha, \& c .$, Hom. $\begin{gathered} \\ \\ \epsilon \lambda \lambda o \nu \text { were new formations with the }\end{gathered}$ temporal augment. ${ }^{\xi} \rho \rho \bar{\imath} \pi \tau \tau \nu$ from $\dot{\epsilon} F \rho \bar{\imath} \pi \tau \tau \nu: \rho \dot{\rho} \grave{\imath} \tau \omega$, and similarly ${ }^{\epsilon} \rho \rho \eta \xi{ }^{\kappa} \alpha$.

Beside e- there seems also to have been a form $\overline{\mathrm{e}}$ ( $=$ Skr. $\overline{\mathrm{a}}$-) in prim. Indo-Germanic, which occurred before verbs beginning with $\mathbf{w} \cdot, \mathbf{j}$ - or $\mathbf{r} \cdot$, as in Hom. $\dot{\eta}$ - $\epsilon i \delta \eta$, Att. ${ }^{\eta} \delta \epsilon \iota \nu$, Hom. $\dot{\alpha} \pi-\eta$ - $\dot{\rho} \alpha \alpha$ from ${ }^{*} \dot{\alpha} \pi-\eta-F \rho \alpha$, cp.Skr. impf. á-vrọ̣ak: pres. vrṇ̣akti, he turns round. Some scholars assume that such an $\dot{\eta}$ - occurs in $\dot{\eta} \beta o v \lambda o ́ \mu \eta \nu: \beta o v ́ \lambda o \mu \alpha \iota, ~ ク ゙ \mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda o \nu: ~ \mu ́ ́ \lambda \lambda \lambda \omega$, $\eta \delta \delta \nu \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu: \delta \dot{v} \nu \alpha \mu \alpha \iota$, but it is more probable that these were new formations after the analogy of $\ddot{\eta}^{\theta} \theta \in \lambda o \nu$ : ${ }^{\epsilon} \theta \in \in \lambda \omega$ beside $\theta$ ө́ $\lambda \omega$.

It is difficult to account satisfactorily for forms like $\bar{\epsilon} \dot{\alpha} \lambda \omega \nu$ : $\dot{\alpha} \lambda i \sigma \kappa о \mu \alpha \iota, ~ \dot{\epsilon} \omega \rho \omega \nu$, $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \omega \rho \omega \nu$ : $\dot{\rho} \rho \dot{\alpha} \omega$, with the rough breathing from the present, $\epsilon^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} \gamma \eta \nu: \dot{\alpha}^{\prime} \gamma \nu \bar{v} \mu l, \dot{\alpha} \nu-\epsilon \in \omega \xi \alpha$ : $o^{\prime \prime} \gamma \nu \bar{v} \mu$. They contain either both the syllabic and the temporal augment or else they had originally the syllabic augment $\eta$ - and then underwent quantitative metathesis whereby $\dot{\eta} \alpha$-, $\dot{\eta} o$ - became $\dot{\epsilon} \bar{\alpha}$, $\epsilon^{\prime} \omega \cdot-(\S 72)$.
§ 431. The augment became contracted in prim. IndoGermanic with verbal forms beginning with e-, as Indg. *ésm from *é-esm $=$ Hom. $\hat{\eta} \alpha$, Skr. ấsam, I was; Indg. éjm from *é-ejm $=\hat{\eta} \alpha$ for ${ }^{*} \hat{\eta} \alpha$ ( ( 453), Skr. áyam, I went.
 ${ }_{\alpha} \quad \gamma \omega$, cp. Skr. impf. áàjam : pres. ájāmi, I drive, Lat. ēgī : ago) also became contracted in the parent Indg. language.

After the analogy of these and similar forms there arose in prim. Greek the system of simply lengthening the vowel in the augmented tenses of verbs beginning with a vowel, as




The long diphthong, which occurred in the augmented tenses of verbs beginning with a diphthong, was regularly shortened in prim. Greek (§ 63), as in Ion. $\alpha \not \approx \tau \epsilon \epsilon, \alpha \cup \jmath \xi \in \tau 0$, $\epsilon \mathcal{U}^{\chi} \in \tau \%$. Later new formations were forms like $\eta_{\eta} \tau \epsilon \circ \nu$,
 oidéc.

## The Personal Endings.

§ 432. The parent Indg. language had two kinds of personal endings-primary and secondary-, the former occurred in the present indicative active and middle, the so-called s- or sjo- future, and the indicative perfect middle, and the latter in all the augmented tenses of the indicative active and middle, the so-called injunctive forms of the imperative, and the optative. The subjunctive had originally partly primary and partly secondary endings. In Greek it has the same endings as in the present indicative. The indicative perfect active had its own special endings for the three persons of the singular. On the endings of the imperative see §§ 539-44.

The original system and distribution of the personal endings were better preserved in Sanskrit than in any of the other Indg. languages. The original distinction between the primary and secondary endings was only preserved in Greek in the first and second persons of the singular and in the third person of all numbers. Only scanty fragments of the athematic conjugation were preserved in Latin and the Germanic languages, and even in Greek many verbs passed over into the thematic conjuga-
tion, which remained athematic in Sanskrit. In Sanskrit the ending $\cdot \mathrm{mi}$ of the athematic conjugation was extended by analogy to the thematic.

Of the origin of the personal endings nothing is known with any degree of certainty or even probability notwithstanding all that has been written upon the subject. It is sometimes assumed that they were partly or entirely of pronominal origin, but this is a theory which can neither be proved nor disproved. It is also unknown which of the two kinds of endings is the older or in what etymological relation they originally stood to each other. And in like manner the formal relation between the active and middle primary and secondary endings is equally obscure.

## i. The Endings of the Active.

## Singular.

§ 433. The primary endings of the first person were -mi in the athematic and $\cdot \bar{o}$ in the thematic verbs, as Lesb. $\epsilon \mu \mu i$, Att. Ion. єi $\mu i$, Skr. ásmi, Goth. im, Lith. esmì, O.Slav. jesmĭ, $I$ am; $\delta i ̂ \delta \omega \mu \iota, ~ \tau i ́ \theta \eta \mu \iota=$ Skr. đáđāmi, đádhāmi;
 but Skr. bhárā-mi with -mi from the athematic verbs; fut. $\lambda \epsilon i \psi \omega \omega, \lambda \hat{v} \sigma \omega, \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega, \delta \dot{\omega} \sigma \omega, \sigma \tau \eta \dot{\eta} \omega \omega, \delta \epsilon i \xi \omega$; subj. $\epsilon \omega, \widehat{\omega}$ from *esō = Lat. ero (fut.), $\lambda \epsilon i ́ m \omega, \tau \iota \theta \hat{\omega}, \delta \iota \delta \hat{\omega}, \delta \epsilon \iota \kappa \nu v ́ \omega$.

Note.-In Boeot. Lesb. Thess. Arcad. and Cyprian the denominative verbs in -á $\omega$, - $\epsilon$, , -ó $\omega$ often had the ending - $\mu$ after the analogy of the athematic verbs; and similarly in


The original secondary ending was $\cdot \mathrm{m}$ or $\cdot \mathrm{m}$ according as the preceding sound was a vowel or a consonant, as
 $\epsilon \epsilon \sigma \tau \eta \nu=$ Skr. ádadhām, ásthām, ${ }^{\epsilon} \delta \bar{\delta} \bar{\nu} \nu ; \epsilon^{\epsilon} \eta \nu \nu$ from * $\epsilon \sigma j \eta \nu=$ Skr. syấm, Lat. siem, sim ; $\tau \iota \theta \epsilon i \eta \nu$, $\delta \iota \delta o i \eta \eta \nu, \theta \epsilon i ́ \eta \nu$, $\delta o i ́ \eta \nu$. $\hat{\eta}$, Hom. $\hat{\eta} \alpha$ from Indg. *ésm $=\mathrm{Skr}$. ásam for *ása with
-m from forms like ábharam; ${ }^{\prime} \pi \epsilon \epsilon \psi \alpha=$ Skr. ápākṣ̌am, ${ }_{\epsilon} \ell \lambda \bar{v} \sigma \alpha$; opt. of the thematic verbs, as Skr. bhárēya-m, but Gr. $\phi^{\epsilon} \rho \circ \iota \mu \iota$ for ${ }^{*} \phi \in \rho \circ j \alpha$ or ${ }^{*} \phi \epsilon \rho \circ \iota j \alpha$; after the analogy of $\tau i \theta \eta \mu \iota: \tau i \theta \eta s$ so to $\phi$ '́poıs was formed $\phi \epsilon ́ \rho o \iota \mu l$, and similarly $\delta \in \iota \kappa \nu v ́ o \iota \mu l, \& c$.
§434. The primary ending of the second person was -si which was only preserved in Homer and Syracusan $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \cdot \sigma \boldsymbol{i}$, Indg. *es-si, beside $\epsilon \hat{i}$, Skr. ási, Indg. *esi ; $\epsilon \hat{i}$ from ${ }^{*} \in i-\sigma \iota=$ Skr. é-ṣ̌̌, Lith. ei-sì。In Greek the other athematic verbs had the secondary ending, cp. $\tau i \theta \eta s, ~ d i \delta \omega s$ beside Skr. dádhāsi, dádāsi。 The regular form of the thematic verbs would have been * $\phi^{\prime} \rho \epsilon \iota$ from ${ }^{*} \phi \epsilon ́ \rho \epsilon \sigma \iota=$ Skr. bhárasi, Indg. *bhéresi; * $\phi \in ́ \rho \epsilon \iota$ became $\phi \in ́ \rho \epsilon \iota \varsigma$ with secondary ending after the analogy of $\epsilon \phi \in \rho \epsilon s$; and similarly Hom. $\epsilon i \hat{i}$ for $\epsilon \hat{i}$ after the analogy of forms like $\tau i \theta \eta s$; the regular form of the subjunctive would have been * $\phi \in \rho \eta$ from ${ }^{*} \phi \epsilon \rho \eta \sigma \iota=$ Skr. bhárāsi, Indg. *bhérēsi ; $\phi$ '́ $\rho \eta s$ was a new formation like $\phi \epsilon \in \epsilon \iota \iota$; and similarly $\tau \iota \theta \hat{\eta} s, \delta \epsilon \iota \kappa \nu \cup \not v \eta s, \& c$.

The secondary ending was -ś, as ${ }^{\prime} \epsilon \phi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \varsigma$, $\neq \sigma \tau \eta s, \phi \in ́ \rho o \iota s$ (Goth. baíráis), cilns (Lat. siēs, sīs) = Skr. ábharah, ásthāḥ, bhárēḥ, syấḥ.
§ 435. The primary ending of the third person was -ti which was preserved in all the dialects in $\epsilon \sigma-\tau i ́=S k r$. ásti, Lat. est, Goth. ist, Lith. ẽs-ti ; it remained in the athematic verbs in Dor. Boeot. and the North-West Greek dialects, but became $-\sigma \iota(\S 169)$ in Att. Ion. and Lesbian, as Dor. $\tau i \theta \eta \tau \iota, \delta i ̂ \delta \omega \tau \iota$, Att. $\tau i \theta \eta \sigma \iota$, $\delta i \delta \omega \sigma \iota=$ Skr. dádhāti, dádāti. The regular form of the thematic verbs would have been Dor. * $\phi^{\prime} \rho \in \tau \iota$, Att. * $\phi^{\prime} \rho \in \epsilon \iota=$ Skr. bhárati, but all the dialects have $\phi$ '́ $\rho \in \iota$ which was formed after the analogy of $\phi$ ' $\rho \epsilon \iota$. The regular form of the subjunctive would have been Dor. \&c. * $\phi \in ́ \rho \eta \tau \iota$, Att. \&c. * $\phi \in ́ \rho \eta \sigma \iota=$ Skr. bhárāti, Indg. *bhérēti ; Att. \&c. $\phi$ '́ $\rho \eta$ was formed after the analogy
 $\& c$., with $-\sigma \iota$ from $\tau i \theta \eta \sigma \iota, \& c$. ; i $\sigma \tau \hat{\eta}, \tau \iota \theta \hat{\eta}, \sigma \tau \hat{\eta}, \theta \hat{\eta}, \& c$.

The secondary ending was $\mathbf{t}$ which regularly disappeared in prim. Greek (§ 230), as ${ }^{\prime} \phi \in \rho \epsilon$, ${ }^{\prime} \epsilon \tau \tau \eta, \phi \in ́ \rho o \iota, \epsilon^{\prime \prime} \eta$ (Lat. sit) $=$ Skr. ábharat, ásthāt, bhárēt, syắt; Dor. \&c. $\hat{\eta}_{s}$ from ${ }^{*} \bar{\eta} \sigma \tau=$ Indg. *ést, he was.

## Dual.

§ 436. The first person of the dual was preserved in Sanskrit, Gothic and the Baltic-Slavonic languages, but it disappeared in the prehistoric period of Greek, and its place was taken by the first person plural.

The original primary ending of the second person was -t(h)es (= Lat. -tis which became used for the plural) or -t(h)os, Skr. -thah can be from either form, beside the secondary ending tom $=-\tau o \nu$, Skr. -tam. The original distinction was preserved in Sanskrit, but in Greek the secondary ending came to be used for both kinds, cp. '̇ $\sigma$ - $\tau o ́ \nu, ~ \tau i \theta \epsilon \tau \tau \nu, \phi^{\prime} \rho \in \tau о \nu$ beside Skr. s-tháh, dhat-tháḥ,
 ás-tam, ádhat-tam, ábhara-tam.

The original primary ending of the third person was $\cdot$ tes $=$ Skr. $\cdot$ tah, beside the secondary ending $\cdot \mathbf{t a} \mathrm{m}=-\tau \bar{\alpha} \nu$, $-\tau \eta \nu$, Skr. -tām. In Greek the - $\tau 0 \nu$ of the second person came to be used for the primary ending, as $\epsilon \sigma-\tau o ́ \nu$, $\tau i \theta \epsilon \tau o \nu$, $\phi \in ́ \rho \in \tau o \nu$, but Skr. s.táḥ, dhat-táh, bhára-taḥ, beside
 tām, ábhara-tām, bhárē-tām. Owing to the fact that - $\tau 0 \nu$ was used both as primary and secondary ending in the second person it also became used occasionally for the secondary ending of the third person, and conversely $-\tau \bar{\alpha} \nu, \cdot \tau \eta \nu$ instead of $-\tau o \nu$ also became used occasionally in the augmented tenses of the second person.

## Plural.

§437. The original primary ending of the first person was -mes beside -mos, the former corresponding to Dor.
$-\mu \epsilon s$ and the latter to Lat. -mus, Skr. -mah can be either form. The secondary ending was probably -men beside $\cdot \mathrm{mn}$, the former corresponding to Att. \&c. $-\mu \in \nu$ and the latter to Skr. -ma. Sanskrit preserved the original distinction between the primary and secondary endings, but in Greek $-\mu \epsilon s$ became generalized in Doric and the dialect of Delphi and $-\mu \epsilon \nu$ in the other dialects, as Dor. ф'́ро $\mu \epsilon$,
 $\tau i \theta \epsilon \mu \epsilon \nu$, but Skr. bhárā-maḥ, s-máḥ, dadh-máḥ ; Att. \&c. є́ $\phi \epsilon ́ \rho о \mu \epsilon \nu$, $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \tau i \theta \epsilon \mu \epsilon \nu=$ Skr. ábharā-ma, ádadh-ma.
§ 438. The original primary ending of the second person was probably the $=$ Skr. tha beside the secondary ending -te $=$ Skr. .ta. $\quad$ This distinction was not preserved in the other branches of the Indg. languages. In all these languages te was used for both kinds of endings, as ${ }_{\epsilon} \sigma \cdot-\tau^{\prime}$ (O.Slav. jes.te), $\tau i \theta \epsilon \tau \epsilon, \phi \epsilon ́ \rho \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ (O.Slav. berete), but Skr. s.thá, dhat-thá, bhára-tha, beside $\hat{\eta} \cdot \tau \epsilon(\hat{\eta} \sigma-\tau \epsilon)$, $\epsilon \tau \neq 1$ $\theta \epsilon \tau \epsilon$, є́ $\phi \in ́ \rho \epsilon \tau \epsilon, \phi \in ́ \rho o ı \tau \epsilon=$ Skr. ás-ta, ádhat-ta, ábhara-ta, bhárē-ta.
§ 439. The original primary endings of the third person were: -énti, -nti, -nti beside the corresponding secondary endings •ént, •nt, •nt.

The accented form eenti only occurred after consonants in the present indicative of the non-reduplicated athematic verbs. It regularly became ánti in Sanskrit, as s-ánti = Dor. '̇ $\varepsilon \tau i$, Att. $\epsilon i \sigma i ́$ (both forms with the smooth for the rough breathing after the analogy of the singular), Goth. sind, Indg. *s-énti, they are; Skr. sunv-ánti : sunó-mi, I press out; krị̣-ánti: krịnáa-mi, I buy, corresponding to prim. Gr. ${ }^{*} \delta \epsilon \iota \kappa \nu F-\epsilon \nu \tau \iota: \delta \epsilon \in \mathcal{i} \nu \bar{v}-\mu \iota$, ${ }^{*} \delta \alpha \mu \nu-\epsilon \nu \tau \iota: \delta \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \nu \eta-\mu \iota$. The only regular form preserved in Greek was Dor. $\begin{gathered}e \\ \tau \\ \text { í, }\end{gathered}$ Att. cioí. In all other verbs belonging to this type eénti was supplanted either by the postvocalic form $\cdot \mathrm{nti}$ of the thematic verbs like Dor. $\phi$ є́ $\rho o-\nu \tau \iota$, Att. $\phi \in ́ \rho o v \sigma \iota$ or by the analogical formation $-\alpha \nu \tau \iota$ (see below), and then the third
person came to be formed from the stem-form of the dual and of the other persons of the plural $+-\nu \tau \iota$ or $-\alpha \nu \tau \iota$, as Dor. $\phi \alpha-\nu \tau i$, Att. $\phi \bar{\alpha} \sigma i$, Ion. $\delta \epsilon \iota \kappa \nu \hat{v} \sigma \iota$ from ${ }^{*} \delta \epsilon \iota \kappa \nu v-\nu \tau \iota$ but with the circumflex accent after the analogy of $i \sigma \tau \hat{\alpha} \sigma \iota$, $\delta \alpha \mu \nu \hat{\alpha} \sigma \iota$ from $* \delta \alpha \mu \nu \alpha-\bar{\alpha} \sigma \iota$ older $-\alpha \nu \tau \iota, \delta \epsilon \iota \kappa \nu \dot{v}-\bar{\alpha} \sigma \iota,{ }^{\prime} \bar{\alpha} \sigma \iota$ from $*_{i-\alpha \nu \tau \iota}$ beside Skr. y-ánti from Indg. *j.énti (§ 453).

The regular prim. Greek primary ending of the present of the reduplicated athematic verbs was $-\alpha \tau \iota=$ Indg. $n$ nti, as in ${ }^{*}{ }^{\prime \prime} \sigma \tau-\alpha \tau \iota$, ${ }^{*} \tau i \theta-\alpha \tau \iota=$ Skr. dádh-ati, ${ }^{*} \delta_{i} \delta-\alpha \tau \iota=$ Skr. dád-ati. This ending was preserved in the Hom. perfects $\pi \epsilon \phi u ́ \kappa-\breve{\alpha} \sigma \iota, \lambda \in \lambda o ́ \gamma \chi-\breve{\alpha} \sigma \iota$, but it disappeared in the present and its place was taken either by the postvocalic form $-\nu \tau \iota$ or by the analogical form $-\alpha \nu \tau \iota$, as Dor. $\tau i \theta \epsilon-\nu \tau \iota$, $\delta i \delta o-\nu \tau \iota$, $i^{\prime} \sigma \tau \alpha-\nu \tau \iota$, but Att. $\tau \iota \theta^{\prime} \bar{\epsilon} \bar{\alpha} \iota, \delta \delta \delta \delta \bar{\alpha} \sigma \iota, i \sigma \tau \hat{\alpha} \sigma \iota$, from ${ }^{*} \tau \iota \theta \epsilon-\alpha \nu \tau \iota$, * $\delta \iota \delta o-\alpha \nu \tau \iota$, ${ }^{\text {i } \sigma \tau \alpha-\alpha \nu \tau \iota \text {, formed in both dialects from the }}$ stem-form of the dual and of the other persons of the plural ; and similarly Hom. $\tau \iota \theta \epsilon \hat{\imath} \sigma \iota, \delta \iota \delta o \hat{v} \sigma \iota=$ Dor. $\tau i \theta \in \nu \tau \iota$, Sidovil, but with the circumflex accent after the analogy of $i \sigma \tau \hat{\alpha} \sigma \iota$.

The primary ending of the thematic verbs was $n$ nti, as in Dor. $\phi \epsilon ́ \rho o-\nu \tau \iota$, Att. Ion. $\phi \bar{\rho} \rho 0 \nu \sigma \iota$, Boeot. - $\nu \theta \iota$, Arcad. - $\nu \sigma \iota$, Lesb. $-0 \iota \sigma \iota$ from $-0-\nu \tau \iota=$ Skr. bháranti, Lat. ferunt, Goth. baírand, Indg. *bhero-nti ; subj. Dor. $\phi \in ́ \rho \omega-\nu \tau \iota$, Att. Ion. фє́ $\omega \sigma \sigma$.

The original secondary endings were : -ént, -nt and •nt. The accented form eént occurred after consonants in the imperfect of the non-reduplicated athematic verbs and in the optative, as Hom. $\hat{\eta} \epsilon \nu, \hat{\eta} \nu$, Dor. \&c. $\hat{\eta} \nu$ which came to be used for the third person singular $=$ Skr. ás-an with regular loss of final -t, Indg. *és-ent, they were (§ 452); Skr. ásunv-an, they pressed out; ákriṇ-an, they bought, corresponding to prim. Gr. ${ }^{*} \in \delta \in \epsilon \kappa \nu F-\epsilon \nu \tau$, ${ }^{*} \in \delta \alpha \mu \nu-\epsilon \nu \tau$, see below; opt. $\epsilon i \in \nu$ from ${ }^{*} \epsilon \sigma j \epsilon \nu \tau(\S 230$ ), O.Lat. sient, later sint; $\phi \epsilon ́ \rho o \iota \epsilon \nu$ from * $\phi \epsilon \rho o \iota j \epsilon \nu \tau$, and similarly $\delta \epsilon \iota \kappa \nu v o \iota \iota \epsilon \nu$, iб $\sigma \alpha a i \epsilon \nu$, $\tau \iota \theta \in i ̂ \epsilon \nu, \delta \iota \delta o \hat{\imath} \epsilon \nu, \sigma \tau \alpha \hat{\imath} \epsilon \nu, \theta \in \hat{\imath} \epsilon \nu, \delta o i ̂ \epsilon \nu ; \lambda i ́ t o l \epsilon \nu, \phi \alpha \nu o i ̂ \epsilon \nu$,
$\lambda \hat{v} \sigma o l \epsilon \nu, \lambda \hat{v} \sigma \alpha \iota \epsilon \nu$, but $\lambda \hat{v} \sigma \epsilon \epsilon \alpha \nu, \delta \epsilon i \xi \epsilon \epsilon \alpha \nu$ with $-\alpha \nu$ for $\cdot \epsilon \nu$ after the analogy of the aorist indicative.

The secondary ending $\cdot \mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{n}}=$ prim. Gr. $-\alpha(\tau)$ occurred after consonants in the imperfect of the reduplicated athematic verbs and in the s-aorist, as prim. Gr. ${ }^{*} \dot{\delta} \delta \iota \delta-\alpha(\tau)$, * ${ }^{\prime} \tau \tau\left(\theta-\alpha(\tau)\right.$, ${ }^{*} \in \delta \epsilon \epsilon \ell \xi-\alpha(\tau)$. The ending $-\alpha(\tau)$ was not preserved in the historic period of any of the dialects. From the stem-form of the dual and of the other persons of the plural were formed ${ }^{\prime} \tau \iota \theta \epsilon-\nu,{ }^{\prime} \in \delta \iota \delta o-\nu$ with $-\nu$ after the analogy of thematic verbs like ${ }^{\xi} \epsilon \phi \in \rho 0-\nu$, and similarly ${ }^{\prime} \epsilon \theta \epsilon-\nu$, ${ }^{\prime} \delta \delta O-\nu$, ${ }^{\prime} \epsilon \sigma \tau \alpha-\nu$; and in like manner ${ }^{*} \epsilon \delta \epsilon \iota \xi \alpha$ became ${ }^{\epsilon} \delta \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \xi \alpha \nu$ after the analogy of ${ }^{\prime \prime} \phi \in \rho 0-\nu$, and similarly ${ }^{\prime \prime} \lambda \bar{v} \sigma \alpha \nu$, ${ }^{\prime} \phi \eta \nu \alpha \nu, \hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \nu$ (for ${ }^{*} \hat{\eta} \alpha \nu$ after the analogy of $\hat{\eta} \sigma-\tau \epsilon$ ). Forms like $\hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \nu$, ${ }^{\epsilon} \epsilon \delta \epsilon \ell \xi \alpha \nu$, ${ }^{\prime} \lambda \bar{u} \sigma \alpha \nu$ gave rise to two kinds of new formations. (I) To the new secondary ending $-\alpha \nu$ there was formed a new primary ending $-\alpha \nu \tau \iota=-\bar{\alpha} \sigma \iota$ after the analogy of
 $i \sigma \tau \hat{\alpha} \sigma \iota$, see above. (2) The ending $-\sigma \alpha \nu$ became extracted as a personal ending and then extended to the imperfect and aorist of athematic verbs and also to the optative, as

 $\theta \epsilon i \eta \sigma \alpha \nu, \delta o i ́ \eta \sigma \alpha \nu$.

The secondary ending -nt regularly occurred after vowels,
 from ${ }^{* \prime \epsilon} \gamma \nu \omega \nu \tau,{ }_{\epsilon} \beta^{\prime} \beta \breve{\alpha} \nu$ from ${ }^{* \prime \epsilon} \beta \bar{\alpha} \nu \tau(\S 70)$.

## Perfect.

§ 440. Singular: The Indg. ending of the first person was $\cdot \mathrm{a}$ which remained in Greek, as oî $\delta \alpha, \delta \in \delta \delta о \rho к \alpha=\mathrm{Skr}$. véda, dadárš̌a.

The original ending of the second person was tha which was regularly preserved in $\hat{\eta} \sigma \cdot \theta \alpha$ (originally the perfect), Indg. *és-tha, cp . Skr. ásitha; oî $\theta \alpha=$ Skr. vét-tha, and likewise originally with all stems ending in a dental, as

* $\pi \epsilon ́ \pi \sigma \circ \sigma \theta \alpha$, * $\lambda$ é $\lambda \eta \sigma \theta \alpha$ (§ 110). In these and similar forms the $-\sigma \theta \alpha$ came to be regarded as a personal ending and was then extended to other tenses, as Hom. $\tau i \theta \eta \sigma \theta \alpha$,
 The ordinary ending -as, as in $\lambda \in ́ \lambda o l \pi a s$, was a new formation from the first aor. indicative owing to the ending of the first person being alike in both tenses. And conversely the first aor. ending $-\epsilon$ of the third person was from the perfect for a like reason.

The original ending of the third person was ee which remained in Greek, as oî $\delta \epsilon, \delta \in ́ \delta o \rho \kappa \epsilon=$ Skr. véda, dadárš̆a.
§441. With the exception of the first person plural the Greek and Sanskrit endings of the dual and plural are entirely different, cp. Skr. dual -vá, -áthur, -átur ; plural -má, •á, -úr. On Skr. •má beside Gr. - $\mu \in \nu$ see § 437. In Greek the endings are the same as in the present indicative, as $i^{\prime} \sigma-\tau o \nu$, $\grave{i} \sigma-\tau o \nu$; ${ }^{i} \sigma-\mu \epsilon \nu$ (Hom. $i_{\delta} \delta-\mu \epsilon \nu$, Skr. vid-má), ${ }^{\prime} \sigma-\tau \epsilon$, $\stackrel{\iota}{\iota} \sigma-\bar{\alpha} \sigma \iota$ from - $\alpha \nu \tau \iota(\S 6 \theta)$; $\lambda \epsilon \lambda o i ́ \pi-\alpha-\tau o \nu, \lambda \in \lambda o i \pi-\alpha-\mu \epsilon \nu, \lambda \in \lambda o i ́ \pi-$ $\alpha-\tau \epsilon, \lambda \epsilon \lambda o i ́ \pi-\bar{\alpha} \sigma \iota$. The $-\alpha$ - in these forms was of the same origin as in the first aor. indicative, $\bar{\epsilon} \lambda \hat{v} \sigma \alpha-\tau o \nu, \hat{\epsilon}^{\lambda} \hat{v} \sigma \alpha-\mu \in \nu$, $\& c$. (§ 507). On the perfect ending - $\check{\sigma} \iota$ in Hom. $\pi \epsilon \phi u ́ k$ $\alpha \sigma \iota, \lambda \in \lambda o ́ \gamma X-\alpha \sigma \iota$ see § 439.
2. The Endings of the Middle.

## Singular.

§ 442. It is impossible to determine what were the original primary and secondary endings of the first person. The Greek primary ending $-\mu \alpha \iota$ and the secondary ending $-\mu \eta \nu,-\mu \bar{\alpha} \nu$ are not found in any of the other Indg. languages. It is possible that $-\mu \alpha \iota$ was originally the primary ending of the athematic verbs which became generalized in Greek. The original ending of the perfect seems to have been -ai which corresponds to the - $\bar{e}$ in Skr. tutud-é $=$ Lat. tutud-ī (originally the middle). Sanskrit then generalized the eè, cp. $\tau i \not \theta \epsilon \mu \alpha \iota:$ Skr. dadh•ê, ф́́ $\rho o \mu a \iota: S k r$. bhár.è, and
 Skr. dad-é, and similarly $\delta \in ́ \delta \epsilon \iota \gamma \mu \alpha \iota, \lambda \in ́ \lambda v \mu \alpha \iota, \gamma \in ́ \gamma \rho \alpha \mu \mu \alpha \iota$.

 $\delta \epsilon^{\prime} \gamma \mu \eta \nu,{ }^{\prime} \lambda \epsilon \lambda \dot{\lambda} \mu \eta \nu$. The origin of this ending is obscure.
§ 443. The original primary ending of the second person was -sai $=-\sigma \alpha \iota$, Skr. -see, Goth. -za, as $\tau i \theta \epsilon \sigma \alpha \iota$, díסoб $\alpha l$, $\delta \epsilon ́ \delta o \sigma \alpha \iota=$ Skr. dhat-sé, dat-sế, dadi-ṣ้ê; $\phi \in ́ \rho \in \alpha \iota, \phi \in ́ \rho \eta$ (written - $\epsilon$ l on Attic inscriptions from the fourth century в.с. onwards) $=$ Skr. bhára-sē, Goth. baíra-za ; ф'́ $\eta \alpha \iota$, $\phi \epsilon \bar{\rho} \eta$ for the regular form ${ }^{*} \phi \epsilon \rho \in \alpha ; \gamma_{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \rho \alpha \psi \alpha \alpha$, $\tau \in \tau \rho \bar{\imath} \psi \alpha \alpha$. The intervocalic $-\sigma$. regularly disappeared, as in $\phi$ '́ $\rho \in \alpha \iota$, $\phi \epsilon ́ \rho \eta$ (§ 213, 2), but in Attic and Ionic the - $\sigma$ - was restored in the present and perfect of the athematic verbs after the analogy of perfects the stem of which ended in a consonant, as in $\gamma^{\epsilon}$ ' $\gamma \rho \alpha \psi \alpha \iota$, and similarly in the imperfect and pluperfect.

The original secondary ending was -so in the thematic and $\cdot$ thēs $=-\theta \eta s$, Skr. -thāh in the athematic verbs. Greek generalized the former and Sanskrit the latter form, cp.


 $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \bar{\epsilon} \lambda \lambda v \sigma o$. On the intervocalic $-\sigma$ - see above. The secondary ending thēs was preserved in the aor. passive $\epsilon^{\prime} \delta \dot{\circ} \theta \eta s=$ Skr. ádi-thāḥ.
§ 444. The original primary ending of the third person present was -tai ( $=\cdot \tau \alpha \iota$, Boeot. $\cdot \tau \eta$, Thess. $-\tau \epsilon \iota$, Arcad. and Cyprian - $\tau 0 \iota$ for $-\tau \alpha \iota$ after the analogy of the secondary ending - то, Skr. -tē, Goth. -da) which remained in Greek, as $\tau i ́ \theta \in \tau \alpha \iota, \hat{\eta} \sigma \tau \alpha \iota, \phi \in ́ \rho \in \tau \alpha \iota=$ Skr. dhat-té, ấs-tē, bhára-tē (Goth. baíra-da). The perfect had the ending $\cdot \mathrm{ai}=$ Skr. -ē, but in Greek the ending of the present was extended to the perfect, cp. $\delta^{\prime} \dot{\delta} о \tau \alpha \iota, \pi \epsilon ́ \pi v \sigma \tau \alpha \iota$ beside the Skr. dad•é, bubudh-é.

The original secondary ending was $\cdot$ to $=\cdot \tau 0$, Skr. $\cdot$ ta,
 (Lat. da-tu-r from *da-to-r), ábhara-ta, dadhī-tá, bhárē-ta.

## Dual.

§ 445. It is impossible to determine what were the original personal endings of the three persons of the dual, because the Greek and the Sanskrit endings do not agree in form.
$-\mu \epsilon \theta_{o v}$, the ending of the first person, is from the plural ending $-\mu \epsilon \theta \alpha$ with $-o \nu$ from $-\sigma \theta o \nu$. According to Kühner, Ausführliche Grammatik der griech. Sprache, vol. ii, p. 70, it only occurs three times in good authors, viz. $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \delta \dot{\omega} \mu \in \theta o \nu$, Hom. Il. xxiii. 485 ; о́ $\rho \mu \omega ́ \mu \in \theta o \nu$, Soph. Ph. то79, and $\lambda \in \lambda \epsilon \epsilon$ ' $\mu$ $\mu \in$ Oov, El. 950 .

The origin of the Greek endings of the second and third persons is unknown.

The primary and secondary ending of the second person is $-\sigma \theta_{o \nu}$, cp. $\tau i \theta \epsilon \sigma \theta o \nu, \phi \in ́ \rho \in \sigma \theta o \nu$ beside Skr. dadh-áthē,
 ábharēthām.

The primary ending of the third person is $-\sigma \theta o \nu$ and the secondary $-\sigma \theta \eta \nu$, Dor. $-\sigma \theta \bar{\alpha} \nu$, as $\tau i \theta \epsilon \sigma \theta o \nu$, $\phi \epsilon \rho \in \sigma \theta o \nu$ beside Skr. dadh-ắtē, bhárētē ; '̇ $\tau \theta \theta \in ́ \sigma \theta \eta \nu$, $\epsilon \phi \epsilon \rho \in ́ \sigma \theta \eta \nu$ beside Skr. ádadh-ātām, ábharētām.

## Plural.

§ 446. The original primary ending of the first person was $\cdot$ medhai $=$ Skr. $\cdot$ mahē, beside the secondary ending $\cdot$ medh $=-\mu \epsilon \theta \alpha$, Skr. $\cdot$ mahi. Greek generalized the latter form, cp. $\tau \iota \theta \in \epsilon \mu \in \theta \alpha, \phi \in \rho o ́ \mu \epsilon \theta \alpha$ beside Skr. dádh-mahē, bhárā-mahē ; '̇є $\tau \theta \epsilon \in \mu \epsilon \theta \alpha$, $\epsilon \phi \in \rho o ́ \mu \epsilon \theta \alpha=\mathrm{Skr}$. ádadh-mahi, ábharā-mahi. The poet. ending $-\mu \epsilon \sigma \theta \alpha$ had its $-\sigma$-from $-\sigma \theta \epsilon$.
§447. $-\sigma \theta \epsilon$ was used for the primary and secondary ending of the second person in all the dialects. The origin
of this form is unknown．In Sanskrit the primary ending is $\cdot \mathrm{dhve}$ and the secondary $\cdot \mathrm{dhvam}, \mathrm{cp} . \tau_{i} \theta \in \sigma \theta \epsilon$ ，$\dot{\epsilon} \tau i \theta \in \sigma \theta \epsilon$ ， $\phi \epsilon ́ \rho \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$ ，白 $\phi \in ́ \rho \in \sigma \theta \epsilon$ beside Skr．dhad－dhvé，ádhad－dhvam， bhára－dhvē，ábhara•dhvam．On forms like ${ }_{\epsilon} \neq \pi \alpha \rho \theta \epsilon$ ， ${ }^{\prime} \epsilon \sigma \tau \alpha \lambda \theta \epsilon$ from ${ }^{*} \epsilon \sigma \pi \alpha \rho \sigma \theta \epsilon$ ，${ }^{*} \epsilon \sigma \tau \alpha \lambda \sigma \theta \epsilon$ see § 221.
§ 448．The original primary endings of the third person were $\cdot n t a i(=-\nu \tau \alpha \iota$, Skr．$\cdot n t e \bar{e}$ Goth．•nda）after vowels and－ngtai（ $=-\alpha \tau \alpha \iota$ ，Skr．－atē）after consonants．The former ending occurred in the present of the thematic verbs and the latter in the athematic，as $\phi$＇́ $\rho o \nu \tau \alpha \iota=$ Skr． bhára－ntē，Goth．baíra－nda；Hom．$\eta$ グ－$\alpha \tau \alpha \iota=$ Skr．ás－atē， Indg．＊és－ntai，Att．$\hat{\eta}$－$\nu \tau \alpha \iota$ was a new formation after the analogy of the thematic presents like $\phi^{\prime} \rho o \nu \tau \alpha \iota$ ；prim．Gr． ${ }^{*} \tau \iota \theta-\alpha \tau \alpha \iota,{ }^{*} \delta \iota \delta-\alpha \tau \alpha \iota=$ Skr．dádh－atē，dád－atē．$\tau i \theta \in \nu \tau \alpha \iota$ ， $\delta i \delta o \nu \tau \alpha \iota, \delta \epsilon i ́ k \nu v \nu \tau \alpha l, \& c$ ．were new formations formed from the stem－form of the dual and the other persons of the plural $+-\nu \tau \alpha \iota$ after the analogy of the thematic verbs like $\phi \epsilon \rho_{\rho} \rho \tau \tau \alpha \iota$ ；and similarly with the stem－form of Ion．$\tau \iota \theta_{\epsilon}^{\prime}-$ $\alpha \tau \alpha \iota, \delta \iota \delta \delta-\alpha \tau \alpha l, \& c$ ．for ${ }^{*} \tau \iota \theta-\alpha \tau \alpha l,{ }^{*} \delta \delta \delta-\alpha \tau \alpha \iota$, \＆c．The perfect had the ending $-\nu \tau \alpha \iota$ beside $-\alpha \tau \alpha \iota$ just as in the present． Regular forms were：$\delta \in \delta$ oú $\omega \omega \nu \tau \alpha \iota, \beta \epsilon \in \beta \lambda \eta \nu \tau \alpha \iota$ beside $\tau \epsilon \tau \rho \alpha ́ \phi \alpha \tau \alpha \iota, \tau \epsilon \tau \alpha ́ \chi \alpha \tau \alpha \iota, \kappa \epsilon \kappa \lambda i ́ \alpha \tau \alpha \iota, k \in \chi$ v́ $\alpha \tau \alpha \iota$ ，and then after the analogy of these and similar forms were made on the one hand forms like к＇́крııг $\alpha \iota$ ，$\lambda$ é $\lambda \nu \nu \tau \alpha \iota$ ，and on the other hand Hom．$\beta \epsilon \beta \dot{\eta}-\alpha \tau \alpha \iota$ ，\＆c．After about the beginning of the fourth century в．с．the perfects in $-\alpha \tau \alpha \iota$ and the pluperfects in－a $\alpha 0$ disappeared and their place was taken by periphrastic forms．

The secondary endings were－nto（ $=-\nu \tau 0$ ，Skr．－nta， Lat．•ntu•）after vowels and $\cdot n$ nto（ $=-\alpha \tau 0$ ，Skr．－ata）after consonants，as $\bar{\epsilon} \phi \epsilon ́ \rho o \nu \tau o=$ Skr．ábhara－nta，cp．Lat．feru－ ntu－r；${ }^{\prime} \mu \mu-\pi \lambda \eta \nu \tau o$ ，cp．Lat．im－ple－ntu－r．Hom．$\eta^{\prime \prime}-\alpha \tau o=$ Skr．ás－ata，Indg．＊és－ñto，Att．$\hat{\eta}$－$\nu \tau 0$ was a new formation after the analogy of $\epsilon \notin \epsilon ́ \rho о \nu \tau 0, \& c . ;$ prim．Gr．${ }^{*} \epsilon \tau \iota \theta-\alpha \tau 0$ ，

$\dot{\epsilon} \delta \in i ́ k \nu v \nu \tau 0, \& c$. were new formations of the same kind as in the present ; and similarly with the aor. $\hat{\epsilon}^{\prime} \lambda \hat{v} \sigma \alpha \nu \tau 0,{ }_{\varepsilon}^{\varepsilon} \delta \epsilon i-$ $\xi \approx \alpha \nu \tau$, $\grave{\epsilon} \pi \rho i ́ a \nu \tau o$ for older ${ }^{*} \hat{\epsilon} \lambda \bar{v} \sigma-\alpha \tau o, \& c$.; opt. Hom. $\phi \in \rho o i ́ a \tau o ~ b e s i d e ~ t h e ~ n e w ~ f o r m a t i o n s ~ \phi ' ́ \rho o \iota \nu \tau o, ~ \lambda \hat{v} \sigma \alpha \iota \nu \tau o$,
 forms of the pluperfect were : $\dot{\epsilon} \delta \epsilon \delta \delta o ́ \lambda \lambda \omega-\nu \tau o$ beside $\dot{\epsilon} \tau \epsilon \tau \rho \alpha \dot{\phi} \phi$ $\alpha \tau 0,{ }^{\epsilon} \tau \epsilon \tau \alpha ́ \chi-\alpha \tau 0$; new formations after the analogy of the former were $\bar{\epsilon} \lambda \bar{\epsilon} \lambda \nu \nu \tau о$, є́ккє́крьขто, \&c. and after the latter Ion. ${ }^{\epsilon} \beta \epsilon \beta \lambda \eta \cdot \alpha \tau 0, \& c$.

## Formation of the Present.

§ 449. The classification of the various ways in which the present was formed in Greek must be more or less arbitrary according as we regard this or that factor as being a sufficient characteristic to constitute a distinct class. In this grammar the formations of the present are divided into twelve classes, viz. Class I containing monosyllabic athematic light or heavy ablaut-bases ; Class II containing reduplicated monosyllabic athematic heavy ablaut-bases; Class III containing verbs of the type $\phi \epsilon \in \rho \omega$, formed from dissyllabic light bases; Class IV containing heavy ablautbases with and without reduplication; Classes V-VIII containing the nasal-presents; Class IX the s-presents; Class X the sko-presents; Class XI the dental-presents ; and Class XII the j-presents. The characteristic elements -sko-, \&c. used in forming the present stem were often extended to other tense-stems. It should be noted that the word present as used above not only includes the present in the narrower sense but also the imperfect and aorist.
§ 450. In the parent Indg. language the conjugation of the present was divided into two great classes-athematic and thematic. In the athematic conjugation the personal endings were added direct to the bare base. In monosyllabic bases the accent was on the base in the active singular and on the personal endings in the dual and
plural. And the base had accordingly the strong grade of ablaut in the active singular, but the weak grade in all other forms, as *éi-mi, I go, *éi-si, *éi-ti, pl. *i•més, *i.t(h)é, *j-énti. In dissyllabic heavy bases the accent was on the first syllable of the base in the active singular and on the personal endings in the dual and plural. The first syllable of the base had accordingly the strong grade of ablaut and the second syllable the weak grade in the active singular, but in the dual and plural both syllables had the weak grade. Thus from an original base *genō- we have the two types *génə•, *gnó ( (§ 458). The present indicative was *génə-mi, *génə-si, *génə•ti, pl. *gnə-més, *gnə•t(h)é, *gn(ə)-énti, but the aorist *gnó-m, *gnó:s, *gnó-t, pl. *gnó́-m• (§ 437), *gnóte, *gnó-nt $=\stackrel{\digamma}{\epsilon}-\gamma \nu \omega \nu, \& c$. Only middle forms of the type *génə• were preserved in Greek, all the active forms passed over into the thematic conjugation in the prehistoric period of the language (see § 458). The athematic conjugation was well preserved in Aryan and to a great extent in Greek, but in most of the other languages, including the Latin and the Germanic, the verbs originally belonging to this conjugation almost entirely passed over into the thematic conjugation.

The thematic conjugation had the thematic vowels ee, -o. before the personal endings ( $\$ 456$ ). The accent was on the root-syllable throughout the present and on the thematic vowel throughout the aorist, as *léiqō, *léiq-e-si, ${ }^{*}$ léiq-e-ti, pl. *ééq-o-mes, *léiq-e-t(h)e, *léiq-o-nti $=\lambda \epsilon i ́ m \omega$, $\lambda \epsilon i \pi \pi \rho \epsilon \nu, \& c$., beside the aorist *liqó-m, *liqé-s, *liqé-t, pl. *liqó-m., *liqé-te, *liqó-nt $=\frac{\epsilon}{\epsilon} \cdot \lambda \iota \pi o \nu,{ }^{\epsilon}-\lambda i \pi \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu, \mathrm{cp} . \lambda \iota \pi \epsilon i \nu$ with preservation of the original accent. The presents of primary verbs of the type $\lambda \epsilon i \not \pi \omega, \phi \in ́ \rho \omega, \& c$. originally belonged to the athematic conjugation, but already in the parent Indg. language nearly all of them passed over into the thematic conjugation with the ee., oo- from the aorist type ${ }_{\epsilon}{ }^{\prime}-\lambda \iota \pi \sigma-\nu$, ${ }^{\epsilon} \lambda \iota \pi \epsilon-\mathrm{s}, \& \mathrm{c}$. The $\cdot \mathrm{e} \cdot, \cdot \mathrm{o}$ - in the aorist type
*liqe., *liqo. was originally an integral part of the base, but in course of time *liq- came to be regarded as the base and the ee., $\cdot \mathrm{o}$ as part of the ending. But seeing that the accent was originally always on the ee., $\cdot \mathbf{o} \cdot$ it is difficult to account for the difference in their quality. How the ocame to be confined to the first person singular and the first and third persons plural, and the ee- to the other forms of the singular, dual and plural, remains an unsolved problem.
§ 451. Before beginning to compare the Greek paradigms with those of the other languages the student should read carefully $\S \$ 432-48$ dealing with the personal endings, because what is stated there about these endings will not as a rule be repeated in the following paragraphs.

## Class I.

UNREDUPLICATED MONOSYLLABIC ATHEMATIC LIGHT OR
HEAVY ABLAUT-BASES.


| Gr. | Skr. |
| :---: | :---: |
| cipi | ásmi |
| $\epsilon \hat{i}$ | ási |
| $\epsilon \in \sigma \tau i$ | ásti |
| ¢̇ढтóv | stháh |
| ¢́¢тóv | stáh |
| $\hat{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \mu^{\prime \prime} \boldsymbol{\nu}^{\prime}$ | smáh |
| $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \bar{\epsilon}$ | sthá |
| єící | sánti |

Indg. *és-mi regularly became $\epsilon i \mu i$, Dor. $\grave{\eta} \mu i$, Lesb. Thess. ${ }_{\epsilon} \mu \mu \mu^{\prime}$ (§ 214), Skr. ásmi, Goth. im, Lith. esmi. $\epsilon \bar{i}$ from Indg. *ési = Skr. ási, Lat. es, Goth. is, beside Hom. $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma-\sigma i=$ Indg. *és-si ; Hom. $\epsilon i \hat{s}$ with -s added after the analogy of forms like tí白s. '́ $\sigma \tau i ́=$ Skr. ásti, Lat. est, Goth. ist, Indg. *és-ti. In Greek the $\epsilon$ - of the singular was levelled out into the dual and plural. On the personal
endings, see $\S \S$ 433-9. Att. $\epsilon \sigma \mu \epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \nu$ with $-\sigma$. from $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \tau^{\prime}$, the regular form occurs in Ion. єi $\mu \notin \nu$, Dor. $\epsilon i \mu \epsilon ́ s$. $\epsilon i \sigma i ́=$ Dor.
 $\dot{\epsilon}$ - after the analogy of other forms of the present ; Hom. $\stackrel{\epsilon}{\epsilon}-\bar{\alpha} \sigma \iota$ from * $\hat{\epsilon} \sigma \alpha \nu \tau \iota(\S 439)$.

## Imperfect.

| Sing. I | Indg. | Gr. | Skr. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | *és-m | $\hat{\eta} \alpha, \stackrel{\eta}{\eta}, \hat{\eta} \nu$ | ásam |
|  | *és-s | $\hat{\eta} \sigma \theta \alpha$ | ás(i) $\mathbf{1}_{\text {¢ }}$ |
| 3. | *és-t | $\hat{\eta} \nu$ | áas(ī)t |
| Dual 2. | *és-tom | $\hat{\eta} \sigma \tau 0 \nu, \dot{\eta} \tau 0 \nu$ | ástam |
| 3. | *és-tām | $\eta ้ \sigma \tau \eta \nu, \eta ้ \tau \eta \nu$ | ástām |
| Plur. 1. | *és-men, -mn | $\grave{\eta} \mu \in \nu$ | ásma |
| 2. | *és-te | $\hat{\eta} \sigma \tau \epsilon, \hat{\eta} \tau \epsilon$ | ásta |
| 3. | *és-ent | $\hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \nu$ | ásan |

$\hat{\eta}$ contracted from older (Hom.) $\hat{\eta} \alpha=$ Indg. *és-m. $\hat{\eta} \nu$ was a new formation with $-\nu$ from forms like $\dot{\epsilon} \tau i \theta \eta \nu ; \hat{\eta}, \bar{\eta} \alpha$ regularly fell together with the perfect = Indg. *és-a, Skr. ása (§ 517); and similarly $\hat{\eta} \sigma \tau o \nu, \hat{\eta} \mu \epsilon \nu, \hat{\eta} \sigma \tau \epsilon . \quad \grave{\eta} \sigma \theta \alpha$ was the old perf. form used for the imperfect ; the regular form would have been ${ }^{*} \hat{\eta}_{s}=$ Vedic áh ; the late form $\hat{\eta} s$ was a new formation. $\hat{\eta}^{j} \nu$ contracted from older (Hom.) $\bar{\eta} \in \nu$ was originally the third pers. plural which came to be used for the singular, see below; the regular form was preserved in Dor. $\hat{\eta} s=$ Vedic áh, Indg. *és-t. $\hat{\eta} \tau o \nu, \hat{\eta} \tau \eta \nu, \hat{\eta} \tau \epsilon$ beside the regular forms $\hat{\eta} \sigma \tau o \nu, \eta \ddot{\eta} \sigma \tau \eta \nu, \hat{\eta} \sigma \tau \epsilon$ were new formations after the analogy of $\hat{\eta} \mu \epsilon \nu$ (§ 214), Dor. $\hat{\eta} \mu \epsilon s$ with primary ending. $\hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \nu$ was a new formation with $\hat{\eta} \sigma$. from $\hat{\eta} \sigma \tau \epsilon$ and the $-\alpha \nu$ in forms like $\left.\epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \lambda \bar{v} \sigma \alpha \nu,{ }^{\ell} \epsilon \in \epsilon \epsilon \xi \alpha \nu(\S) 439\right)$; after this form had come into existence the regular old plural $\hat{\eta} \in \nu, \hat{\eta} \nu$ ( $=$ Indg. *és-ent, Skr. ásan) came to be used for the singular. The long é of the singular was levelled out into the dual and plural already in the Indg. period.
§ 453. Sing. I. *éi-mi $\begin{array}{ll}\text { 2. } & \text { *éi-si } \\ \text { 3. } & \text { *éi-ti }\end{array}$ Dual 2. *i.t(h)és
3. ${ }^{\text {i-tés }}$

Plur. I. *i-més
2. ${ }^{*} \cdot \mathrm{t} \cdot \mathrm{h}(\mathrm{h})$ é
3. $\quad$ j-énti

Gr. Skr.
єì $\mu$ ềmi
$\epsilon \bar{i}$
єî $\sigma \iota$
ǐтov
ǐтov
${ }^{i} \mu \in \nu$
'it $\tau \quad$ ithá
’"ā $\begin{aligned} & \text { l yánti }\end{aligned}$
$\epsilon \hat{i}$ from older ${ }^{*} \hat{i} \sigma \iota=$ Skr. éṣì, Lat. eis, îs, Indg. *éi $\cdot \mathrm{si}$; Hom. єi$\sigma \theta \alpha$ with $-\sigma \theta \alpha$ from $\hat{\eta} \sigma \theta \alpha$ (§ 452). єì $\sigma \iota$ from $\epsilon i \not \tau \iota$
 $\grave{\chi} \bar{\alpha} \iota \iota$ for ${ }^{*} \dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \iota\left(=\right.$ Skr. yánti, Indg. ${ }^{\text {j }}$ jénti) was a new formation like $\epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \bar{\sigma} \sigma \iota(\S 452)$.

Imperfect.

| Sing. | Indg. | Gr. | Skr. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | *éj-m | $\hat{\eta} \alpha, \eta \nmid \epsilon \iota$ | áyam |
|  | *êi-s | $\ddot{\eta} \in \epsilon \zeta, \eta \vec{\eta} \epsilon \tau \sigma \theta \alpha$ | áaih |
| 3. | *éi.t | $\eta{ }^{\square} \in \iota(\nu)$ | a àit |
| Dual 2. | *éi-tom |  | áaitam |
| 3. | *êiritām | $\ddot{\eta} \tau \eta \nu$ | âaitām |
| Plur. 1. | *ét-men, -mn | $\hat{\eta} \mu \in \nu$ | áima |
| 2. | *eíi.te | $\hat{j} \tau \epsilon$ | áita |
| 3. | *éj.ent | $\hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \nu, \eta$ ท̈ $\epsilon \sigma \alpha \nu$ | áyan |

The stem-form of the singular was levelled out into the dual and plural already in the Indg. period. Regular forms were $\hat{\eta} \tau \nu \nu, ~ \check{\eta} \tau \eta \nu, \hat{\eta} \mu \epsilon \nu, \hat{\eta} \tau \epsilon$. $\hat{\eta} \alpha$ for ${ }^{*} \hat{\eta} \alpha(\S 128)$ with $\hat{\eta}$ after the analogy of $\hat{\eta} \tau o \nu, \& c$. $\ddot{\eta} \epsilon \iota(\nu)$ and $\eta \boldsymbol{\eta} \epsilon \sigma \alpha \nu$ were aorist forms, the former of which gave rise to the new formations $\eta_{\eta} \epsilon \iota \nu, \eta \neq \epsilon \iota, \eta \neq \epsilon \sigma \theta \alpha$. The regular forms of the singular would have been ${ }^{*} \hat{\eta} \alpha,{ }^{*} \hat{j} s, * \hat{\eta}$. The Hom. forms $\hat{\eta} \epsilon(\nu), \eta{ }_{\eta} 0 \mu \epsilon \nu$ were formed after the analogy of the thematic verbs.
§ 454. Other examples of verbs belonging to Class I are $\phi \eta \mu i ́$, Dor. $\phi \bar{\alpha} \mu i ́$ with shifted accent : $\phi \alpha \mu \epsilon \in \nu,{ }^{\epsilon} \phi \eta \nu \nu$ : $\neq \notin \alpha \mu \in \nu$;

 Skr. á-sthā-m : *á-sthi-ma. In Sanskrit the long vowel of the singular was levelled out into the dual and plural, whence ádāma, ádhāma, ásthāma, and similarly ${ }^{\prime} \epsilon \sigma \tau \eta \mu \epsilon \nu$ for * ${ }_{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \alpha \mu \epsilon \nu$. Middle $\kappa \epsilon i \tau \tau \alpha \iota=$ Skr. šếtē, he lies down, $\ddot{\eta} \sigma \tau \alpha \iota$ (with the rough breathing from $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \delta$-, sit) $=$ Skr. ástē, he sits, with $\epsilon \hat{\imath}, \hat{\eta}$ from the original active singular.

## Class II.

REDUPLICATED MONOSYLLABIC ATHEMATIC HEAVY ABLAUT-BASES.
§ 455. The presents of this class were formed from the aorist of monosyllabic bases to which the original presents had been lost already in the Indg. period, as $\tau i-\theta \eta-\mu \iota$ :
 Skr. dá-dā-mi : á•dā-m. On the difference between the Greek and the Sanskrit vowel in the reduplicated syllable, see § 429. The inflexion was the same as in Class I except in the third person plural.


In Sanskrit the dh- of the third person plural became generalized in the dual and plural, and conversely in Greek
the $-\theta \epsilon$ - became extended to the third person plural. Like $\tau i \theta \eta \mu \iota: \tau i \theta \in \mu \epsilon \nu, \tau i \theta \in \mu \alpha \iota$ are also inflected $\delta i \delta \omega \mu \iota: \delta i \delta o \mu \in \nu$,

 formed after the analogy of the thematic verbs, and similarly ' $\dot{\delta} i \delta o o v \nu,-o v s,-o v$, and the imperative $\tau i \theta \epsilon \iota$, $\delta i \delta \delta o v$.

## Class III.

## DISSYLLABIC LIGHT BASES WITH OR WITHOUT REDUPLICATION.

## a. Without Reduplication.

§ 456. The verbs of this class belong to the so-called thematic conjugation (§ 450). Two types are to be distinguished according as the first or the second vowel of the base originally had the accent, as *léiq(e)., *liqé., leave, cp.
 from * $\sigma \in ́ \pi о \mu \alpha \iota:$ : $\epsilon \sigma \pi o ́ \mu \eta \nu$. The type *1éiq(e). with regular loss of the final e ( $\S 450$ ) was originally inflected like a verb of Class I, as *léiq-mi, pl. *liq-més $=* \lambda \epsilon i \pi \mu l$, * $\lambda \iota \pi \mu \epsilon \epsilon^{\prime} \nu$. But already in the parent Indg. language nearly all the verbs of this type passed over into the thematic conjugation, as ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\prime \prime} \rho \pi \omega, \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \omega, \phi \epsilon ́ \rho \omega, \delta \epsilon ́ \epsilon \kappa о \mu \alpha \iota, \tau \rho \epsilon ́ \phi \omega, \pi \epsilon i \theta \omega$,
 $\theta \dot{\eta} \gamma \omega, \& c$. , cp. Skr. bhárati beside bhárti, he bears, $\phi \in ́ \rho \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ beside $\phi$ '́ $\rho \tau \epsilon$, Lat. fero, volo beside fert, vult. The type *liqé-with preservation of the original accent in the infinitive $\lambda \iota \pi \epsilon \hat{\nu}$-was chiefly aorist in function, as ${ }^{\prime} \epsilon \lambda \iota \pi \sigma \nu$,

 this difference in function between the two types originally came about is unknown (cp. § 426). Side by side with the type *liqé- with the function of an aorist, there exists in all the Indg. languages a certain number of presents the
stem-syllable of which is aorist in form, as $\gamma \lambda \dot{v} \phi \omega, \tau v(\phi \omega$, $\gamma \rho \alpha ́ \phi \omega, \gamma \lambda \alpha ́ \phi \omega$, Dor. $\tau \rho \alpha ́ \pi \omega, \tau \rho \alpha ́ \phi \omega$; Skr. dášati = Indg. *dnkéti, he bites, jívati, he lives; Goth. trudan, to tread; OE. cuman, to come, \&c. Such presents are usually called aorist-presents in contradistinction to presents like $\lambda \epsilon i \pi \omega$, $\phi \in ́ \rho \omega$ which are called imperfect-presents. The inflexion of $\phi \hat{\epsilon} \rho \omega$ will serve as a model for all presents of this class. On the endings in the Greek forms see the paragraphs dealing with the personal endings.

| Sing. 1 | Indg. | Gr. | Skr. | Goth. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | *bhérō | $\phi^{\prime} \rho \omega$ | bhárāmi | baíra |
|  | . *bhére-si | $\phi$ ¢́p $\dagger$ ı | bhárasi | baíris |
|  | *bhére-ti | $\phi$ ¢́¢ $¢ \iota$ | bhárati | baírip |
| Dual 2 | * *bhére-t(h)es | ф'́petov | bhárathạ |  |
|  | * bhére-tes | фє́ $¢ \tau \tau о \nu$ | bháratah |  |
| Plur. | . *bhéro-mes | $\phi \in ́ \rho о \mu \in \nu$, Dor. $-\mu \in s$ | bhárāmạ̣ | baíram |
|  | 2. *bhére-t(h)e | $\phi \epsilon ¢ \rho \in \tau \epsilon$ | bháratha | baírip |
|  | . *bhéro-nti | $\phi \in ́ p o v \sigma \iota$, Dor. oovt | bháranti | baírand |

Imperfect.

|  | Indg. | Gr. | Skr. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sing. I. | *é-bhero-m | ${ }^{\prime} \phi \in \epsilon \rho \circ \nu$ | ábharam |
| 2. | *é-bhere-s | ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\prime \prime} \phi \in \rho \in \mathcal{S}$ | ábharặ |
| 3. | *ébhere-t | ${ }^{\prime} ¢ \phi \in \rho \epsilon$ | ábharat |
| Dual 2. | *é-bhere-tom |  | ábharatam |
| 3. | *é-bhere-tām | ¢́¢є¢¢́ $\tau \eta \nu$ | ábharatām |
| Plur. I. | *é-bhero-men, -mn | ${ }_{\epsilon} \phi$ '́́ $\rho о \mu \in \nu$ | ábharāma |
| 2. | *é-bhere-te | $\bar{\epsilon} \phi$ ¢́¢ $¢ \tau \epsilon$ | ábharata |
| 3. | *é-bhero-nt | Є' $\phi \in \rho \circ \nu$ | ábharan |

In like manner is also inflected the second or strong aorist, $\epsilon^{\text {€ }} \lambda \iota \pi o \nu, \& \mathrm{c}$. (§§ 503, 505).

## b. With Reduplication.

§ 457. In the reduplicated verbs belonging to this class three sub-divisions are to be distinguished according as the reduplicated syllable contains $\iota, \epsilon$ or a fuller reduplication (§ 429).

1. Verbs with $\iota$ in the reduplicated syllable have weak grade stems of the type *liqé., as $\gamma i-\gamma \nu 0-\mu \alpha \iota$, cp. Lat. gi-gno;
 with $\bar{\imath}$ after the analogy of $\rho \dot{\imath} \pi \tau \omega: \pi \epsilon \in \tau o-\mu \alpha \iota$, $\nu \bar{t} \sigma о \mu \alpha \iota$ from ${ }^{*} \nu l-\nu \sigma o-\mu \alpha \iota: \nu \epsilon \in o \mu \alpha \iota$ from ${ }^{*} \nu \epsilon \sigma o-\mu \alpha \iota$, $\tau i \kappa \tau \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \tau \iota-\tau \kappa \omega$ :
 tíșṭha-ti, he stands, Lat. sistit.
2. Verbs with $\epsilon$ in the reduplicated syllable, preserved only in aorists like $\epsilon-\pi \epsilon-\phi \nu 0-\nu$, inf. $\pi \epsilon-\phi \nu \epsilon \in-\mu \epsilon \nu$ : base *ghén(e)., ghné- ; $\underset{\epsilon}{\prime \prime} \sigma \pi \epsilon-\tau 0$, inf. $\epsilon-\sigma \pi \epsilon \in-\sigma \theta \alpha \iota$, cp. Skr. sá-š́ca-ti, Indg. *se-sqe-ti, he follows : Lat. sequi-tur ; '́ $\epsilon$ - $\epsilon$ ' $-k \lambda \epsilon-\tau o: k \in ́ \lambda o-\mu \alpha \iota$, $\tau \epsilon-\tau \alpha ́ \rho \pi \epsilon-\tau o: \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \pi \omega$, ${ }^{\epsilon}(F) \epsilon \iota \pi o \nu$, єĩoov, Indg. *e-we-wqo-m.
3. Verbs with fuller reduplication, preserved only in aorists like $\eta^{\eta} \gamma-\alpha \gamma o-\nu$, inf. $\dot{\alpha} \gamma-\alpha \gamma \epsilon \hat{i} \nu: \dot{\alpha} \gamma \omega$; $\ddot{\eta} \rho-\alpha \rho o-\nu$, inf.


## Class IV.

## DISSYLLABIC ATHEMATIC HEAVY ABLAUT-BASES WITH OR WITHOUT REDUPLICATION.

## a. Without Reduplication.

§458. In the dissyllabic heavy ablaut-bases the first syllable contained a short vowel or diphthong and the second a long vowel or a long diphthong, as *petā-, *genō-(*genē-), *menēi-. According as the accent was originally on the first or second syllable we get the two types *péto( $\pi$ é $\tau \alpha-\mu \alpha \iota$ ), *génə-, *ménі̆- (where $\bar{i}$ is a contraction of ai (§88) and $i$ is the weakest grade of ablaut), and *ptá.
( $\pi \tau \hat{\eta}-\nu \alpha \iota$, Dor. $\left.{ }^{\epsilon}-\pi \tau \bar{\alpha}-\nu\right)$, *gnór ( ${ }^{\prime \prime}-\gamma \nu \omega-\nu$ and *gné. in OE. cnā-wan, to know), *mñ.è́(i) ( $\grave{c}-\mu \alpha ́ \nu \eta-\nu)$.

Only middle forms of verbs of the type *pétə. were preserved in Greek, all the active forms passed over into the thematic conjugation in the prehistoric period of the language and similarly in all the other languages except the Aryan branch, as $\pi \epsilon \in \tau \alpha-\mu \alpha \iota, \ddot{\alpha} \gamma \alpha-\mu \alpha \iota$, ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \rho \alpha-\mu \alpha \iota$ beside the
 є́ $\rho \alpha ́ \omega)$, кр'є $\mu \alpha-\mu \alpha \iota$. But on the other hand Lat. vomo, $\epsilon_{\epsilon} \mu$ '́ $\omega$ for ${ }^{*} F \epsilon \mu \alpha-\mu l$ or ${ }^{*} F \epsilon \mu \epsilon-\mu l=$ Skr. vámi-mi, cp. ${ }^{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon-\sigma \sigma \alpha$, $\eta \not \mu \epsilon-\sigma \alpha$; $\delta \alpha \mu \alpha ́ \omega$ for ${ }^{*} \delta \alpha \mu \alpha-\mu$, and similarly $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \lambda \alpha ́ \omega, \gamma \in \lambda \alpha \alpha \omega$, d́póo, \&c., cp. Skr. áni-mi, I breathe; svápi-mi, I sleep; rốdi-mi, I weep.

The long vowel in the type *ptá., *gnór belonged in the parent Indg. language to all numbers of the active and middle. The forms of this type often had the function of an aorist, as Hom. $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta}-\tau 0$ : Skr. á-prā-t, he filled, base *plé. beside *pélə-; $\pi \tau \hat{\eta}-\nu \alpha \iota, \stackrel{\epsilon}{\epsilon}-\pi \tau \eta-\nu: \pi \epsilon \in \tau \alpha-\mu \alpha \iota ; ~ \stackrel{ }{\epsilon}-\delta \rho \bar{\alpha}-\nu$ beside Skr. dráa.ti, he runs; ${ }^{c}-\gamma \nu \omega-\nu$ : Skr. jñā-táh, Lat. (g)nō-tus, known; and similarly ${ }_{\epsilon} \beta \lambda \eta \nu \nu,{ }^{\prime} \sigma \beta \eta \nu,{ }^{\prime} \epsilon \tau \lambda \eta \nu$ Dor. ${ }_{\epsilon}{ }^{\prime} \tau \lambda \bar{\alpha} \nu,{ }_{\epsilon}{ }^{\prime} \beta \eta \nu$ Dor. ${ }^{\epsilon} \beta \bar{\alpha} \nu=$ Skr. ágām, Att. ${ }^{\epsilon} \gamma \eta{ }^{\prime} \rho \bar{\alpha} \nu: \gamma \eta \rho \alpha \dot{\alpha}-$ $\sigma \kappa \omega$; Hom. $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \tau 0: \pi \epsilon \lambda \alpha \alpha^{\xi} \omega$, cp. Dor. $\ddot{\alpha}-\pi \lambda \bar{\alpha} \tau o s$. The $\bar{e}-$ formations with intransitive meaning became productive in Greek in the shape of the so-called passive aorist, which was originally active both in form and meaning (§§ 503, 506). Examples of $\cdot \mathrm{e} \cdot$ in other than aorist forms are : $\ddot{\alpha} \eta \cdot \sigma \iota=$ Skr. vá́-ti, he blows; Lat. im.plè-s, Skr. prấ-si, thou fillest.

Beside the type *petā-, \&c. with long vowel in the second syllable there also existed the type *menēi- with long diphthong. These two types began to be mixed up already in the parent language owing to the frequent loss of the second element of long diphthongs (§ 63). It is often therefore no longer possible to keep the two types rigidly apart. When the Indg. accent was on the first syllable,
the long diphthong became weakened to -əi which regularly became -i- (§ 88) and in its weakest form -i., cp. Skr. ámìti, he injures; brávi-ti, he says, and forms like Lat. farcis beside cupis. The presents of this type partly went over into the thematic conjugation already in the parent Indg. language and became mixed up with the jo-verbs (§481), as $\mu \alpha i ̂ \nu o \mu \alpha \iota, ~ ф \alpha i ́ v o \mu \alpha \iota, ~ \chi \alpha i \rho \omega, ~ \tau и ́ \pi \tau \omega, ~ H o m . ~$ $\rho \dot{\eta} \sigma \sigma \omega$, from ${ }^{*} \mu \alpha \nu j o \mu \alpha \iota,{ }^{*} \phi \alpha \nu j o \mu \alpha \iota,{ }^{*} \chi \alpha \rho j \omega,{ }^{*} \tau v \pi j \omega,{ }^{*}{ }^{\circ} \eta \kappa j \omega$;
 $\dot{\rho} \oint \dot{\eta}-\sigma \omega$ for ${ }^{*} \dot{o} \delta \eta-\sigma \omega$. The -i. also occurs in characterized presents like $\epsilon \dot{\rho} \rho i-\sigma \kappa \omega$ : $\epsilon \dot{v} \rho \eta \dot{\eta}-\sigma \omega, \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho i ́-\sigma \kappa \omega$ : $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \eta \cdot-\sigma \omega$, $\dot{\alpha} \lambda i-\sigma \kappa о \mu \alpha \iota: \dot{\alpha} \lambda \hat{\omega}-\nu \alpha \iota$. When the Indg. accent was on the second syllable, the longvowel-originally long diphthongremained, whence ${ }^{\epsilon} \mu \alpha ́ \nu \eta \nu \nu$ beside $\mu \alpha i ́ v o \mu \alpha \iota$, and similarly
 we have seen above became productive in Greek and eventually came to be passive aorist in meaning.

## b. With Reduplication.

§ 459. $\beta i \cdot-\beta \eta-\sigma l$, Skr. jí-gā-ti, he goes; $\delta i--\xi \eta-\mu \alpha \iota$ from * $\delta \iota-\delta j \bar{\alpha}-\mu \alpha \iota$ beside $\delta i-\delta \sigma-\mu \alpha \iota$ from $* \delta l-\delta j o-\mu \alpha \iota$; $\bar{\tau} \lambda \eta-\mu \iota$ from $* \sigma \iota-$ $\sigma \lambda \eta-\mu \iota$ beside ${ }_{I}^{\prime} \lambda \alpha-\mu \alpha \iota$ from ${ }^{*} \sigma l-\sigma \lambda \alpha-\mu \alpha l ; \kappa i \quad-\chi \rho \eta-\mu l: \kappa i ́-\chi \rho \alpha-\mu \alpha \iota$. Presents like $\pi i \mu-\pi \lambda \eta-\mu l, \pi i \mu-\pi \rho \eta-\mu \iota$ had the nasal in the reduplicated syllable after the analogy of verbs of the type $\lambda \iota \mu \pi \alpha ́ \nu \omega$ (§ 467), and forms like $\pi i \mu \pi \lambda \breve{\alpha} \mu \in \nu: \pi i \mu \pi \lambda \eta \eta \iota$ were


## Classes V-Vili.

§ 460. There can hardly be any reasonable doubt that the general principle underlying the formation of the various classes of nasal-presents was originally identical in all the classes, cp. ( I ) Skr. ašñá-mi, I eat ; ašnī-máḥ, we eat ; aš́n-ánti, they eat; Gr. $\delta \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \nu \eta-\mu \mu, \delta \alpha ́ \mu \nu \alpha ̆-\mu \epsilon \nu=$ Indg. *dmoná́-mi, *dmonə-més. (2) Skr. strọ̣óomi, strọu•máh $=$

Gr. $\sigma \tau o ́ \rho \nu \bar{v}-\mu l, \sigma \tau o ́ \rho \nu u ̌-\mu \epsilon \nu$, Indg. *strnéu-mi, *strnu-més. (3) Skr. yunáj-mi, I yoke; pl. yuñj-máh, we yoke, Indg. *junég-mi, *jung-més ; Skr. chinád-mi, I destroy; pl. chindmáḥ: Lat. scindo, Gr. $\sigma \chi i{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\circ} \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \sigma \chi \iota \delta j \omega$. (4) Skr. vindá-ti, he finds; Skr. yuñjá-ti, lumpá-ti = Lat. jungit, rumpit, cp. also Engl. stand : stood. Besides having the characteristic feature of nasal-infix it should be noted that the root-syllable of all these types of verbs had originally the weak grade of ablaut. In verbs of the type $\delta \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \nu-\mu$, $\sigma \tau o ́ \rho \nu \bar{v}-\mu \iota$ the nasal was infixed before the last element of the dissyllabic base, Indg. *dm.á., *str.éu•. The •ná $\cdot$, -nə•, and $\cdot n e ́ u \cdot$-, $n u$ - came to be regarded as suffixes already in the parent language, and then became extended by analogy to root-forms to which they did not originally belong. In verbs of the type Skr. yunaj-mi, -ne-, the strong grade form of $\cdot \mathrm{n} \cdot$, was infixed before the final consonant of the root-syllable. This type of present was only preserved in the Aryan group of languages. The types (I), (2), and (3) were inflected according to the athematic conjugation with the accent in the singular on the second syllable of the base which had full grade vowel, and in the dual and plural on the ending, as *dmnań-mi, *strnéu-mi, *junég-mi, pl. *dmnə-més, *strnu-més, *juyg-més. In verbs of the type Skr. yuñjá-ti, lumpá-ti = Lat. jungit, rumpit, Indg. *juygé-ti, *rumpé-ti the nasal was infixed before the final consonant of the root-syllable. The verbs of this type belonged to the thematic conjugation.

In the present state of our knowledge of the parent Indg. language it is impossible to determine what was the original function and meaning of the nasal-infix. It is also unknown how it came about that the nasal became infixed, because the infixing of formative elements is otherwise unknown in the Indg. languages.

## Class V.

§461. To this class belong verbs of the type $\delta \dot{\alpha} \mu \nu \eta \mu \tau$ :
 as̆nnấmi, I eat ; krịnámi, I buy; $\mu a ́ \rho \nu \alpha \mu \alpha \iota: \mu \alpha \rho \alpha-\sigma \mu o ́ s$, cp. Skr. mrọā́mi, I crush, destroy. Sanskrit has nin- for -ni- in the dual and plural after the analogy of verbs of Class IV (§ 458).

|  | Indg. | Gr. | Skr. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sing. I. | -nấ-mi | $\delta \alpha \dot{\mu} \nu \eta \mu$ | kriṇắmi |
| 2. | -ná -si | $\delta \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \eta{ }^{\text {d }}$ | krīnási |
| 3. | -ná-ti | $\delta \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \nu \sigma \iota$ | krịnâti |
| Dual 2. | -nə.t(h)és | ¢а́ $\mu \nu \alpha \tau о \nu$ | kriṇịtháh |
| 3. | -nə.tés | ¢а́идатор | kriṇitáh |
| Plur. I. | -nə-més | $\delta \alpha \dot{\mu} \nu \alpha \mu \in \nu$ | krịīimáh |
| 2. | -nə-t(h)é | $\delta \dot{\alpha} \mu \nu \alpha \tau \epsilon$ | krị̂ịthá |
| 3. | -n(z)-énti | $\delta \dot{\alpha} \mu \nu \bar{\alpha} \sigma \iota(\$ 439)$ | krị̄ánti |

And similarly Att. $\pi \epsilon \quad \rho \nu \eta \mu \iota$ with $-\epsilon$ - after the analogy of $\pi \epsilon \rho \alpha{ }^{\omega} \omega, \dot{\epsilon}^{\prime}-\pi \epsilon \in \alpha-\sigma \sigma \alpha$. The $-\iota$ in the root-syllable of the following verbs has never been satisfactorily explained:-

 $\sigma \kappa i ́ \delta \nu \alpha \mu \alpha \iota: \frac{\epsilon}{\epsilon}-\sigma \kappa \epsilon \in \delta \alpha-\sigma \alpha$ (cp. § 44, note r ). In $\delta \dot{v} \nu \alpha \mu \alpha \iota$ the $-\nu \alpha$ - was levelled out into all forms of the verb.
§ 462. Most of the verbs which originally belonged to Class V went over into the thematic conjugation with preservation or loss of the $-\alpha$ - in $-\nu \alpha$-, as $\delta \alpha \mu \nu \alpha ́ \omega$, $\kappa \iota \rho \nu \alpha ́ \omega$, ópıү $\alpha$ áo $\mu \alpha \iota, \pi \iota \lambda \nu \alpha ́ \omega, \pi \iota \tau \nu \alpha ́ \omega$ beside $\delta \alpha \dot{\alpha} \kappa \nu \omega, \kappa \alpha ́ \alpha \nu \omega$ : ка́ $\mu \alpha$ $\tau o s, \pi i \tau \nu \omega$, Hom. Dor. $\tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \nu \omega, \pi \frac{1}{\iota} \nu \omega$. It is difficult to account for the strong grade vowel in the root-syllable of Att. $\tau \epsilon \mu \nu \nu \omega$, Dor. $\delta \dot{\eta} \lambda o \mu \alpha \iota$ from * $\delta \epsilon \lambda \nu \rho \mu \alpha \iota$ beside Att.
 from ${ }^{*} F \epsilon \lambda \nu o \mu \alpha \iota$. Some verbs went over into the jo-conjugation (§ 478), as Lesb. $\kappa \lambda i v \nu \omega$, Hom. Att. $k \lambda i ̀ \nu \omega$ from
*к $\lambda \iota \nu j \omega$ : Lat. in-clī-nā-re; $\kappa \rho i ̂ \nu \omega$ from * $\kappa \rho \iota \nu j \omega$ : Lat. cerno from *crinō; ỏ $\tau \rho \tilde{v} \nu \omega$ from *ỏ $\rho \rho \nu \nu j \omega$. This change from the athematic to the thematic conjugation probably began already in the parent Indg. language, cp. Skr. grnáti, he calls, miná-ti, he lessens, mrná-ti, he destroys, beside grnáa-ti, mináa-ti, mrnắ-ti ; Goth. and-bundnis, thou becomest unbound, beside Skr. badhnắ-si, Indg. *bhndhnā́-si, thou bindest; Lat. sternit beside Skr. strnấti, he strews.

## Class VI.

$\S$ 463. To this class belong verbs of the type $\sigma \tau o ́ \rho \nu \bar{v} \mu \iota$, Skr. strṇómi, I strew : Goth. stráujan, to strew ; ő $\rho \nu \bar{v} \mu \iota$, Skr. rịọ́mi, I move ; Hom. $\tau \alpha ́ \nu v-\tau \alpha \iota=$ Skr. tanu-té : Skr. tanómi, Indg. *ñonó-mi, I stretch. In Greek the singular had $-\nu \bar{v}$ - for $-\nu \epsilon \nu-:-\nu v$ - after the analogy of $-\nu \bar{\alpha}-$, Att. Ion. $-\nu \eta$ - : $\nu \alpha$ - in Class V.

| Sing. 1. | Indg. | Gr. | Skr. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | *str-néu-mi | $\sigma \tau o ́ \rho \nu \bar{v} \mu \iota$ | strı̣ómi |
|  | *stro-néu-si | $\sigma \tau$ óp $\nu \bar{u} s$ | stronôṣ̂i |
|  | *str-néu-ti | $\sigma \tau o ́ \rho \nu \bar{v} \sigma \iota$ | strṇốti |
| Dual 2. | *str-nu-t(h)é | бтóplutov | strọutháh |
| 3. | *str-nu-tés | бтóplutov | strınutáh |
| ur. | *str-nu-més | $\sigma \tau o ́ \rho \nu \nu \mu \in \nu$ | strọumáh |
| 2. | *strinu-t(h)é | бто́pขvтє | strnụuthá |
| 3. | *str-nw-énti | $\sigma \tau 0 \rho \nu v ์ \bar{\alpha} \sigma \iota$ (§ 439) | strı̣nvánti |

And similarly Hom. ${ }_{\alpha} \nu \bar{v} \mu l$, $\ddot{\eta} \nu v-\tau o$ : Skr. sanómi, I gain, acquire; ${ }_{\alpha} \rho \nu v \mu \alpha \iota, ~ \breve{\alpha} \chi \nu v \mu \alpha \iota, ~ \kappa \grave{c} \nu v \mu \alpha \iota, ~ \pi \tau \alpha ́ \rho \nu v \mu \alpha \iota: ~ L a t . ~$ sternuo.
This type of present became productive in Greek which gave rise to numerous new formations. The $-\nu \bar{v} \mu l$ came to be used-irrespectively whether the root-syllable had the weak or strong grade of ablaut-to form the present of bases ending in a guttural, when such bases had an s-aorist, as


 Ion. $\epsilon^{\prime \prime} \nu \bar{v} \mu \iota$, Att. $\epsilon^{\prime} \nu \nu \bar{v} \mu l$ from $* F \epsilon \sigma \nu \bar{v} \mu \iota:{ }^{\epsilon \prime} \sigma \sigma \sigma \alpha$, ${ }^{\circ} \lambda \lambda \bar{v} \mu \iota$ from
 for ${ }^{*} \dot{\alpha} \rho \nu \bar{v} \mu l, \sigma \tau o ́ \rho \nu \bar{v} \mu l$ for $* \sigma \tau \rho \alpha$ - or ${ }^{*} \sigma \tau \alpha \rho-\nu \bar{v} \mu l$.
§ 464. The regular form $\epsilon i \nu \bar{v} \mu \iota$ from prim. Gr. ${ }^{*} F \epsilon \sigma \nu \bar{v} \mu \iota$ (§ 214) was preserved in Ionic, but in the prehistoric period of Attic a new present ${ }^{*} F \epsilon \sigma \nu \bar{v} \mu \iota$ was formed with $-\sigma$ - from forms like ${ }^{\prime \prime} \sigma \sigma \sigma \alpha$, $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma-\theta \hat{\eta} \nu \alpha \iota$. This $-\sigma \nu$ - became assimilated to $-\nu \nu$ - (§ 214), whence ${ }^{\epsilon} \nu \nu \nu \mu l$, and similarly $\sigma \beta \hat{\epsilon} \nu \nu \bar{v} \mu \mu$, § $\varphi \nu \nu \bar{v} \mu$. And then after the analogy of these verbs were
 $\dot{\rho}^{\omega} \nu \nu \bar{v} \mu \ell$, $\sigma \tau \rho \dot{\omega} \nu \nu \bar{v} \mu l, \quad \kappa \in \rho \alpha ́ \nu \nu \bar{v} \mu l$, к $\kappa \epsilon \mu \alpha ́ \nu \nu \bar{v} \mu l, \pi \epsilon \tau \alpha ́ \nu \nu \bar{v} \mu l$, $\sigma \kappa \in \delta \alpha ́ \nu \nu \bar{v} \mu$.
§ 465. A large number of the verbs which originally belonged to Class VI went over into the thematic conjugation partly in the historic and partly in the prehistoric period of the language. The presents in $-\nu v v^{\prime} \omega$ are common in Att. Ion. and Doric, as $\dot{\alpha} \nu v v^{\omega}, \delta \epsilon \iota \kappa \nu v v^{\omega}, \mu \iota \gamma \nu v ́ \omega$, ó $\mu \nu v ́ \omega$, ó $\rho \nu v ́ \omega, \tau \alpha \nu v ́ \omega, \kappa \in \rho \alpha \nu \nu v ́ \omega, \sigma \tau \rho \omega \nu \nu v ́ \omega$. These presents mostly came into existence in the historic period of these dialects. But many verbs passed over into the thematic conjugation in the prehistoric period of the language, as Hom. $\stackrel{\ddot{\alpha}}{\square} \nu 0 \mu \alpha l$,

 ${ }^{*} i \kappa \alpha \nu F \omega,{ }^{*} \kappa \iota \chi \alpha \nu F \omega$; Hom. $\tau_{i}^{\prime} \nu \omega$, Att. $\tau_{i}^{\prime} \nu \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \tau \iota \nu F \omega$ : Skr. cinốmi, I collect ; Hom. $\phi \theta^{\alpha} \nu \omega, \phi \theta^{i} \nu \omega$, Att. $\phi \theta \dot{\alpha} \nu \omega, \phi \theta^{i} \nu \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \phi \theta \alpha \nu F \omega,{ }^{*} \phi \theta \iota \nu F \omega$. In the verbs $\theta \bar{v} \nu \epsilon(f) \omega$ (Hesiod),
 the one conjugation to the other probably took place at the time when the singular still had ${ }^{*}-\nu \in \nu \mu \iota,{ }^{*}-\nu \in \nu \sigma,{ }^{*}-\nu \in \nu \tau \iota$ for later $-\nu \bar{v} \mu l,-\nu \bar{u} s,-\nu \bar{v} \sigma \iota$. This explains the $-\epsilon$ - which it would be difficult to account for otherwise. As in the verbs of Class V the change from the athematic to the thematic conjugation probably began already in the parent Indg.
language, cp. Skr. cinvá.ti beside cinó.ti, he collects; rṇvá-ti beside roṇóti, he moves ; miná-ti beside minótti, he lessens. In Latin and the Germanic languages all the verbs originally belonging to this class went over into the thematic conjugation.

## Class VII.

§ 466. To this class belong the verbs which have a nasal infixed before the final consonant of the root-syllable (§ 460). This type of verbs was well preserved in Sanskrit and Latin, cp . Skr. vindáti, he finds; yuñjáti, lumpáti $=$ Lat. jungit, rumpit ; krntáti, he cuts; limpáti, he smears ; Lat. findo, fundo, linquo, pango, scindo, tango, vinco, \&c. But in Greek the original formation was only preserved in $\dot{\rho} \dot{\epsilon} \mu \beta o \mu \alpha \iota, \sigma \phi^{\prime} \gamma \gamma \omega$, and possibly in $\dot{\alpha} \tau \epsilon ́ \mu \beta \omega, \sigma \tau \epsilon ́ \mu \beta \omega$. All the other verbs originally belonging to this class went over either into Class VIII or into the jo-conjugation (§ 478), cp. $\lambda \iota \mu \pi \alpha ́ \nu \omega$ : ${ }^{*} \lambda \iota \mu \pi \omega$, Lat. linquo; $\pi v \nu \theta \dot{\alpha} \nu 0 \mu \alpha \iota:{ }^{*} \pi v \nu \theta \omega, \pi \epsilon v \dot{\theta} 0$ $\mu \alpha \iota ; \kappa \lambda \alpha \gamma \gamma \alpha ́ \nu \omega$ : *$\kappa \lambda \alpha \gamma \gamma \omega$, Lat. clango, beside $\kappa \lambda \alpha \dot{\xi} \xi \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \kappa \lambda \alpha \gamma \gamma j \omega ; \pi \lambda \alpha ́ \xi \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \pi \lambda \alpha \gamma \gamma j \omega$ : ${ }^{*} \pi \lambda \alpha \gamma \gamma \omega$, Lat. plango (§156); $\pi \tau i ́ \sigma \sigma \omega, \pi \tau i \tau \tau \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \pi \tau \iota \nu \sigma j \omega$ : Lat. pinsio, pinso; $\lambda \dot{v} \xi \omega$ from * $\lambda v \gamma \gamma j \omega$. The type of present like $\dot{\alpha} \nu \delta \alpha \dot{\alpha} \omega \omega: \dot{\alpha} \delta \epsilon \epsilon \bar{i} \nu$,
 $\chi^{\alpha \nu \delta \alpha ́ \nu \omega}$ : ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \chi \alpha \delta o \nu$, all of which occur in Homer, became productive in the post-Homeric period. After the analogy of these verbs were formed many new presents to strong aorists, as $\delta \alpha \gamma \kappa \alpha ́ \nu \omega$ : $\notin \delta \alpha \kappa o \nu$, $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \rho v \gamma \gamma \alpha{ }^{\prime} \nu \omega: ~ ' \epsilon \rho v \gamma \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$, and similarly $\theta \iota \gamma \gamma \alpha ́ \nu \omega, \lambda \alpha \mu \beta \alpha ́ \nu \omega, \mu \alpha \nu \theta \alpha ́ \nu \omega, \pi \alpha \nu \theta \alpha ́ \nu \omega, \phi v \gamma \gamma \alpha ́ \nu \omega$. After the analogy of $\lambda \iota \mu \pi \alpha \alpha^{\nu} \omega$ were also formed $\pi \iota \mu \pi \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \omega \omega$, $\pi \iota \mu \pi \rho \alpha ́ \nu \omega$.

## Class VIII.

§ 467. To this class belong the verbs in -ávo. The original type was probably denominative verbs like $\theta \eta \gamma \alpha ́ \nu \omega$ :
 similarly formed denominative presents are also found
in Sanskrit, Armenian, and Lithuanian. The suffix $-\alpha \nu \omega$ then became productive in the formation of new presents, partly to forms which were already present, and partly to forms with the function of aorist, as $\alpha i \sigma \theta \alpha \dot{\nu} \nu \mu \alpha \iota: \dot{\alpha} \dot{\iota} \sigma \theta \omega$,



 $\sigma \tau o \nu, \delta \alpha \rho \theta \alpha ́ \nu \omega: \notin \delta \alpha \rho \theta o \nu$. It can hardly be an accident that in all verbs of this class the root-syllable is long either by vowel quantity or by position. After the analogy of verbs like $\lambda \eta \theta \alpha ́ \nu \omega$ : $\lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \omega$, í $\chi \not{ }^{\alpha} \nu \omega$ : i̋ $\sigma \chi \omega$ were formed $\lambda \iota \mu \pi \alpha ́ \nu \omega$ : ${ }^{*} \lambda \iota \mu \pi \omega$, к $\lambda \alpha \gamma \gamma \alpha{ }^{\alpha} \nu \omega:{ }^{*} \kappa \lambda \alpha \gamma \gamma \omega$, and then - ${ }^{\prime} \nu \omega$ became extended to nearly all the verbs of Class VII (§ 466).

Note.-In a few verbs beside -ávo there are also forms in $-a v \alpha ́ \omega$ (with - $\alpha \omega$ after the analogy of denominative verbs like




## Class IX.

§ 468. To this class belong the original s-presents. The presents of this type were not numerous in the parent Indg. language nor did they become productive in the separate languages. The $\cdot \mathrm{s}$ - was of the same origin as the -s- which occurred in the aorist (§507) and in the future (§ 499), and possibly also in the sko-presents (§ 469), and was doubtlessly closely connected with the $\cdot \mathrm{s}$ in the s-stems of nouns, but it is unknown what was the original function or meaning of the $\cdot \mathbf{s} \cdot$.

This class originally contained both athematic and thematic presents. The athematic forms except in the aorist were not preserved in Greek, but were well pre-
served in Sanskrit where however the -s. was levelled out into all forms of the verb, as dvé-ṣ̆-mi, I hate, pl. dvi-ṣ้máḥ, we hate, dvi-ṣ-táḥ, hated: Gr. * $\delta F \epsilon \iota$-, * $\delta F \iota$-, fear. Of the thematic presents several were preserved in Greek, as Skr. rák-ṣ้-a-ti, he rescues, pl. rák-ṣ-a.nti, they rescue, Gr. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \epsilon \hat{\xi} \xi \omega: \dot{\alpha} \lambda-\alpha \lambda \kappa-\epsilon \hat{\nu}, \dot{\alpha} \lambda \kappa-\dot{\eta}$; Skr. úk-ş-a-ti, he grows, Gr. $a u \not{ }^{\xi} \boldsymbol{\xi} \omega$ : Skr. ó́j-as-, strength, Lat. augēre; Skr. trá-s-a-ti, he trembles, Gr. $\tau \rho \epsilon \in \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \tau \rho \epsilon \sigma \omega$ : $\tau \rho \epsilon ́ \mu \omega$, Lat.

 $\tau \alpha \iota, \sigma \pi \alpha ́ \omega \mathrm{cp} . \stackrel{\epsilon}{\epsilon}-\sigma \pi \alpha \sigma-\tau \alpha \iota$. It should be noted that no sharp line of distinction can be drawn between primary $\mathbf{s}$-verbs and denominative verbs formed from s -stems, cp . $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \in \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \sigma j \omega, \gamma \epsilon \lambda \alpha ́ \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \gamma \epsilon \lambda \alpha \sigma j \omega$ (§ 492) : $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \sigma$ $\sigma \alpha \iota, \gamma \in \lambda \alpha ́ \sigma \cdot \sigma \alpha \iota$, beside $\kappa \lambda \alpha^{\omega} \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \kappa \lambda \alpha \sigma \omega: \kappa \epsilon ́-\kappa \lambda \alpha \sigma-\tau \alpha \iota$.

## Class X.

§ 469. To this class belong the verbs the present of which was originally formed by the addition of the formative suffix -sko- to the weak grade form of the base which could be either monosyllabic or dissyllabic. The presents of this type were rare in Sanskrit and the Germanic languages, but became productive in Greek and Latin. They appear in Greek both with and without reduplication, the former do not appear in Sanskrit, and Latin has only the one example disco from *di-dc-sco. The accent was originally on the suffix in all forms of the present, as sing. -skố, -ské-si, .skéti, pl. -skómes, -ské-t(h)e, -skó•nti. It is doubtful whether the suffix in the Ionic imperfect and aorist iterative forms like $\phi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \kappa \epsilon, \phi \in \dot{\gamma} \gamma \epsilon \sigma \kappa \epsilon \nu, \phi i \lambda \epsilon \in \epsilon \sigma \kappa \epsilon$, $\delta^{\prime} \sigma \kappa о \nu, \phi \dot{\chi} \gamma \epsilon \sigma \kappa \epsilon, \& c$. is of the same origin, because the meaning of the suffix and the absence of the augment (§ 430) in such forms have never been satisfactorily explained.

## a. Without Reduplication.

§470. I. Monosyllabic heavy bases, as $\phi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \kappa \omega$ : $\phi \eta \mu i$ (§ 454), $\beta$ ó $\sigma \kappa \omega: \beta \omega \cdot-\tau \omega \rho$.
2. Dissyllabic light bases, as $\beta \dot{\alpha} \sigma \kappa \omega, \beta \alpha ́ \sigma k \epsilon \iota$, Skr. gác-chā-mi, I go, gáccha-ti, he goes, Indg. *gmoskô, *gmsské-ti : $\beta a i \nu \omega$ from * $\beta \alpha \mu j \omega$ (§ 142), Indg. *gmjó, beside Goth. qimip, he comes, Indg. *géme-ti; Skr. prochá.ti, Lat. poscit from *porc-scit, Indg. *pros-ské-ti, he asks ; l' $\sigma \kappa \omega$ from *Fıк- $\sigma \kappa \omega$
 ${ }^{*} \mu \mu \kappa-\sigma \kappa \omega$, with $-\gamma$ - for $-\kappa$ - after the analogy of $\mu i \gamma \nu \bar{v} \mu l$, ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \mu i \gamma \eta \nu$,

3. Dissyllabic heavy bases, as $\dot{\alpha} \rho \epsilon ́ \sigma \kappa \omega$ : $\eta \not \rho \epsilon \sigma \alpha, \gamma \eta \rho \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma \kappa \omega$ : $\gamma \eta \rho \alpha ́ \omega, \quad \theta \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \kappa \omega$ (Dor. $\theta \nu \bar{\alpha} \sigma \kappa \omega)$, $\beta \lambda \omega \sigma \kappa \omega$, $\theta \rho \omega \sigma \sigma \kappa \omega$. In presents like єن์pí $\kappa \kappa$ : єن์p $\eta \sigma \omega$, $\sigma \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \iota \sigma \kappa \omega: \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \eta ́ \sigma о \mu \alpha \iota$, $\dot{\alpha} \lambda i \sigma \kappa о \mu \alpha \iota: \dot{\alpha} \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu \alpha \iota, \dot{\alpha} \mu \beta \lambda i \sigma \kappa \omega$ : $\ddot{\eta} \mu \beta \lambda \omega \sigma \alpha$, the $-\iota-$ was the weak grade form of an original long diphthong -ēi., -ōi(§ 458). After the analogy of such presents were formed Att. $\theta \nu \eta \eta^{\prime} \sigma \kappa \omega, \mu \iota-\mu \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \kappa \omega$ (§ 471), $\theta \rho \varphi \sigma \kappa \kappa \omega$, Ion. к $\kappa \eta \eta_{i} \sigma \kappa \omega$, хрпїкконаь.

## b. With Reduplication.

§ 471. In the reduplicated verbs belonging to this class three sub-divisions are to be distinguished according as the reduplicated syllable contains $-t-\epsilon \epsilon$, or a fuller reduplication.

І. $\beta \iota \beta \rho \omega \sigma \kappa \kappa \omega$, $\gamma \iota \gamma \nu \omega \sigma \kappa \kappa \omega$ : Lat. (g)nōsco, $\delta \iota \delta \alpha ́ \sigma \kappa \omega$ from * $\delta \iota-\delta \alpha \kappa-\sigma \kappa \omega$ : Lat. disco, $\delta \iota \delta \rho \bar{\alpha} \sigma \kappa \omega$, і̀ $\lambda \alpha ́ \sigma \kappa о \mu \alpha \iota$ from * $\sigma \iota-\sigma \lambda \alpha-$ $\sigma \kappa о \mu \alpha \iota: ~: \bar{\tau} \lambda \alpha \theta_{l}$ from ${ }^{*} \sigma \iota \cdot \sigma \lambda \alpha-\theta_{l}$; кıк $\lambda_{\eta} \sigma \kappa \omega, \mu \iota \mu \nu \eta$ $\sigma \kappa \omega$ beside $\kappa \iota \kappa \lambda \eta \eta^{\prime} \sigma \kappa \omega, \quad \mu \iota \mu \nu \eta \eta^{\sigma} \sigma \kappa \omega(\S 470,3), \quad \pi \iota \pi \rho \frac{\alpha}{\sigma} \sigma \kappa \omega, \quad \tau \iota \tau \cup ́ \sigma \kappa о \mu \alpha \iota$, $\pi \iota \pi \grave{\iota} \kappa \kappa$.

3. $\dot{\alpha} \rho \alpha \rho i \sigma \kappa \omega, \dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \phi i \sigma \kappa \omega$.

## Class XI.

§ 472. To this class belong the verbs the present of which contains a dental suffix -to-, -do-, or -dho-. The presents of this type were rare in the parent Indg. language and
remained unproductive in the various individual languages with the exception of the dho- presents in Greek. In Sanskrit, Latin and the Germanic languages the dental was generally levelled out into all forms of the verb, and occasionally also in Greek. It is sometimes difficult to determine how far the dental can be regarded as a formative verbal suffix and how far it is merely a so-called rootdeterminative. The -to- presents are rare in all the Indg. languages. In these presents the -to was closely connected with the nominal suffix-to-, cp. Lat. plecto, $\pi \lambda \in \kappa \tau$ ós: $\pi \lambda \epsilon ́ \kappa \omega, \pi \epsilon \epsilon \kappa \tau \omega: \pi \epsilon \kappa \tau o ́ s$, 解 $\beta \lambda \alpha \sigma \tau o \nu: \beta \lambda \alpha \sigma \tau o ́ s$. It is doubtful what was the origin and original function of the dental in the do- and dho presents. Some scholars regard it as being connected with the -d., -dh- of the roots *dor- in $\delta i-\delta \omega-\mu l$, and *dhē- in $\tau i-\theta \eta-\mu$.

## -to-presents.

 $\pi \epsilon \in \kappa \tau \omega$, Lat. pecto, cp. OE. feohtan, to fight : $\pi$ '́к $\omega$; Lat. plecto: $\pi \lambda$ '́к $\kappa$. In forms like ${ }^{\ell} \beta \beta \lambda \alpha \sigma \tau \nu \nu: \beta \lambda \alpha \sigma \tau \alpha ́ \nu \omega$, $\eta{ }_{\eta} \mu \alpha \rho \tau o \nu: \dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha \rho \tau \alpha, \alpha \omega$ the dental is not a present suffix but belongs to all forms of the verb. тik $\tau \omega$ is from older ${ }^{*} \tau \iota \tau \kappa \omega$ (§ 457). All or nearly all the other -to-presents in Greek are of a different origin, as in $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \tau \rho \dot{\alpha} \pi \tau \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \dot{\alpha} \sigma \tau \rho \alpha \pi j \omega$ (§ 129, I) : $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \tau \rho \alpha \pi \eta \dot{\eta}$; and similarly $\delta \dot{\alpha} \pi \tau \omega$ : $\delta \alpha \pi \alpha ́ \nu \eta, \kappa \lambda \epsilon ́ \pi \tau \omega$ : Lat. clepo, Goth. hlifa, I steal; $\chi^{\alpha \lambda \epsilon ́ \epsilon \tau \omega}$ : $\chi^{\alpha \lambda \epsilon \pi o ́ s ; ~ к o ́ \pi \tau \omega, ~} \sigma \kappa \alpha ́ \pi \tau \omega, \tau u ́ \pi \tau \omega$, and many others. These and similar presents, where the $-\pi \tau$ - was regularly developed from older $-\pi j$ ( (§ 129, 1 ), gave rise to numerous new formations. After the analogy of the future and aorist in verbs like $\tau \dot{\prime} \psi \omega$, ${ }^{\epsilon} \tau v \psi \alpha: \tau u ́ \pi \tau \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \tau v \pi j \omega$, new presents in $-\pi \tau$ were formed to stems ending in $-\beta$ and $-\phi$, as $\kappa \alpha \lambda \dot{\pi} \pi \tau \omega$ :
 ${ }^{\epsilon} \beta \alpha \dot{\alpha} \phi \eta \nu$; and similarly ${ }^{\alpha} \pi \tau \omega, \beta \lambda \alpha ́ \pi \tau \omega, \delta \rho v ́ \pi \tau \omega$, $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \rho \in ́ \pi \tau \omega, \mathrm{cp}$. '́ $\rho \in ́ \phi \omega, \theta \alpha ́ \pi \tau \omega, \kappa \rho u ́ \pi \tau \omega, \kappa \dot{\pi} \pi \tau \omega$, \&cc. And in like manner were
formed new presents to stems originally ending in a velar guttural (§§ 202, 205), as $\pi \epsilon \in \pi \tau \omega: \pi \epsilon ́ \psi \omega$, ${ }^{\prime} \pi \epsilon \psi \alpha$, beside the regular form $\pi \epsilon \in \sigma \sigma \omega$, Att. $\pi \epsilon \epsilon \tau \tau \omega$ from Indg. *peqjō, cp. Lat. coquo, Skr. pácāmi, I cook; $\nu i ́ \pi \tau \omega: \nu i ́ \psi \omega$, ${ }^{\epsilon} \nu \nu \psi \alpha$, beside the regular form $\nu i j \varsigma \omega$ from Indg. *nigjō.
-do-presents.
 from ${ }^{*} F \epsilon \lambda \delta о \mu \alpha \iota$ : Lat. vel-le ; $\mu \epsilon ́ \lambda \delta о \mu \alpha \iota: \mu \alpha \lambda \alpha \kappa o ́ s . ~$

## -dho-presents.

§ 475. $\alpha \dot{\alpha} \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \omega: \alpha \dot{\alpha} \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \omega$, $\alpha \lambda \theta о \mu \alpha \iota, \alpha \dot{\alpha} \lambda \theta \alpha \prime \nu \omega: \not ้ \nu-\alpha \lambda-\tau o s$, Lat.
 $\beta \rho \iota ̂ \theta \omega: \beta \rho \iota-\alpha \rho o ́ s, \gamma \eta \eta^{\frac{1}{2}} \mu \alpha \iota$, Dor. $\gamma^{\frac{1}{\alpha} \theta o \mu \alpha \iota}$ from ${ }^{*} \gamma \bar{\alpha} F \alpha \theta o \mu \alpha \iota$ : $\gamma \alpha i ́ \omega$ from * $\gamma \alpha F j \omega$, cp. Lat. gaudeo from *gāvideō ; ' $\epsilon \mu \epsilon ́ \theta \omega$ :
 $\theta \alpha \lambda \epsilon ́ \theta \omega: \theta \alpha ́ \lambda \lambda \omega, \quad \kappa \nu \eta \dot{\eta} \theta \omega: \kappa \nu \alpha ́ \omega, \quad \pi \epsilon \lambda \alpha \dot{\theta} \theta \omega: \pi \epsilon ́ \lambda \alpha \varsigma, \quad \pi \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \theta \omega$ : $\pi i ́ \mu \pi \lambda \eta \mu \iota, \pi \hat{v} \theta \omega$ : Skr. pú́yati, he stinks, $\pi v ́ o \nu ; \phi \lambda \epsilon \gamma \in ́ \theta \omega$ : $\phi \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \omega, \mu \iota \nu v ́ \theta \omega$ : Skr. mi-nó̀-mi, I lessen, Lat. minuo; $\phi \theta \iota \nu v ́ \theta \omega$ : Skr. kṣ̆i-nó-mi, I destroy.

## Class XII.

§ 476. To this class belong the various types of $j$-presents which from the point of view of Greek can be conveniently divided into the so-called primary verbs, the denominative verbs, and the causative together with the iterative verbs. In the so-called primary verbs two originally distinct types of presents fell together in Greek, viz. the thematic jopresents and the athematic $\overline{1}$-presents $(\$ 481)$. Before reading the account of the history of the $\mathbf{j}$-presents in Greek, the student should consult $\S \S 127-30$, because what is stated there about $\mathbf{j}$ will not be repeated in the following paragraphs.

## i. Primary Verbs.

## a. Thematic Presents.

§ 477. The thematic presents were formed by adding -jo., je- direct to the root-syllable which could have either the strong or the weak grade of ablaut, as $\lambda \epsilon \dot{\sigma} \sigma \sigma \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \lambda \epsilon \nu \kappa j \omega ; \pi \epsilon \in \sigma \sigma \omega=$ Indg. ${ }^{*}$ péqjō: Skr. pácyatē = Indg. *péqjetai, he cooks; Skr. páśyati, he sees : Lat. specio; beside $\beta$ ai $\nu \omega$ from * $\beta \alpha \nu j \omega$, Lat. venio (§ 142), Indg. *gmjó ; $\sigma \chi i{ }^{\circ} \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \sigma \chi ı \delta j \omega$ : Goth. skaidan, to divide. The original inflexion of the present was : sing. $\cdot \mathrm{jo}$, $\cdot \mathrm{je} \cdot \mathrm{si}, \cdot \mathrm{je} \cdot \mathrm{ti}$, pl. .jo•mes, •je•t(h)e, jo•nti, and the thematic vowel had or had not the accent according as the root-syllable contained the weak or the strong grade of ablaut, as *gmjéti, he goos, beside *péqjeti, he cooks. But the accent in presents of the type *gmjéti probably became shifted on to the root-syllable already in the prim. Indg. period, cp. Skr. kúpjati, he is angry, Lat. cupio; dívyati, he plays; híṣ̌yati, he rejoices, beside páśyati, he sees. The oldest stratum of both types was the denominative presents formed from monosyllabic root-nouns. A distinction in the accent between them and the ordinary denominatives thus arose insomuch as all presents of the former type came to have the accent on the root-syllable, whereas the latter type had it on the thematic vowel -jó., -jé. Greek, Sanskrit, and the Baltic-Slavonic languages regularly preserved the primary .jo-presents, but in Latin and the Germanic languages they became mixed up with the originally athematic $\check{1}$-presents ( $\$ 481$ ).
§478. The root-syllable of the primary jo-presents could end in a vowel or in a consonant, as $\delta \rho \alpha^{\prime} \omega$, $\delta \rho \hat{\omega}$ from ${ }^{*} \delta \rho \bar{a} j \omega$, Att. $\zeta \hat{\omega}, \kappa \nu \hat{\omega}, \chi \rho \hat{\omega}$ from ${ }^{*}\left\{\eta j \omega,{ }^{*} \kappa \nu \eta j \omega,{ }^{*} \chi \rho \eta j \omega\right.$; $\delta^{\epsilon} \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \delta \epsilon j \omega ; ~ \phi v ́ \omega$, Lesb. $\phi v i ́ \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \phi v j \omega ; \pi \tau v ̃ \omega$ from Indg. *spjūjō, Lith. spiáuju, I spit.

баío $\alpha \iota, ~ к \nu \alpha i ́ \omega$ from * $\delta \alpha \iota j о \mu \alpha \iota,{ }^{*} \kappa \nu \alpha \iota j \omega . \quad \gamma \alpha i \omega, \delta \alpha i ́ \omega$, $\kappa \lambda \alpha i \not \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \gamma \alpha F j \omega, * \delta \alpha F j \omega$, ${ }^{*} \lambda \lambda \alpha F j \omega$.
 and similarly $\theta \alpha ́ \lambda \lambda \lambda \omega, \pi \alpha ́ \lambda \lambda \omega, \sigma \kappa \alpha ́ \lambda \lambda \omega, \sigma \phi \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega, \quad \mu \hat{\epsilon} \lambda \lambda \omega$, $\sigma \tau \epsilon \bar{\lambda} \lambda \omega, \tau i ́ \lambda \lambda \omega, \sigma \kappa u ́ \lambda \lambda \omega, \& c$.
$\sigma \pi \alpha i \rho \omega$ from *$\sigma \pi \alpha \rho j \omega$, Indg. *sprjjō : Lith. spiriù, I push with the foot, and similarly $\sigma \kappa \alpha i \rho \omega$, Dor. $\phi \theta \alpha i \rho \omega$ beside Att.
 ${ }^{*} \dot{\alpha} f \in \rho j \omega$, $\delta \in i ́ \rho \omega$, Lesb. $\delta^{\prime} \epsilon \rho \rho, \kappa \in i ́ \rho \omega$, Lesb. кє́ $\rho \rho \omega, \mu \epsilon i ́ \rho о \mu \alpha \iota$, $\pi \epsilon i \rho \omega, \sigma \pi \epsilon i ́ \rho \omega, \phi \theta \epsilon i ́ \rho \omega$, Lesb. $\phi \theta \in \epsilon \rho \rho \omega, \kappa \hat{v} \rho \omega, \mu \nu \hat{v} \rho \sigma \mu \alpha \iota, \phi \hat{v} \rho \omega$.
 and similarly $\delta \rho \alpha i ́ \nu \omega, к \alpha i \nu \omega, к р \alpha i \nu \omega$, Lesb. ктаívш beside Att. $\kappa \tau \epsilon \dot{i} \nu \omega$, Lesb. $\kappa \tau \in ́ \nu \nu \omega, \sigma \alpha i \nu \omega$, храív $\omega$.
$\beta \rho \alpha ́ \sigma \sigma \omega$, Att. $\beta \rho \alpha ́ \tau \tau \omega$ from * $\beta \rho \alpha \tau j \omega$, andsimilarly $\lambda i ́ \sigma \sigma o \mu \alpha \iota$, $\pi \alpha ́ \sigma \sigma \omega$. $\quad \beta \lambda \dot{v} \xi \omega$ from * $\beta \lambda \nu \delta j \omega$, and similarly $\kappa \nu i ́\} \omega, \sigma \chi \alpha ́\} \omega$, X ${ }^{\alpha}$ §о $\mu \alpha \iota, \& c$.
$\delta \rho \alpha ́ \sigma \sigma \omega \omega$, Att. $\delta \rho \alpha ́ \tau \tau \omega$ from * $\delta \rho \alpha k j \omega$, and similarly $\theta \rho \alpha ́ \sigma \sigma \omega$, $\tau \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \omega, \phi \rho \alpha ́ \sigma \sigma \omega, \lambda \epsilon \dot{v} \sigma \sigma \omega, \pi$ 白 $\sigma \sigma \omega$ (Indg. *péqjō), $\pi \rho \bar{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \omega$, $\pi \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \sigma \omega, \phi \rho i ́ \sigma \sigma \omega, \dot{\alpha} \mu \dot{v} \sigma \sigma \omega$, oे $\rho v ́ \sigma \sigma \omega, \pi \tau v ́ \sigma \sigma \omega$.



$\nu \alpha i ́ \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \nu \alpha \sigma j \omega: \nu \alpha ́ \sigma-\sigma \alpha \iota$, and similarly $\mu \alpha i ́ \rho \mu \alpha$, , кєí $\omega$.
On the presents ending in $-\pi \tau \omega$ from $-\pi j \omega$ see $\S \S 129, ~ i$, 473.
§ 479. The -jo- in primary verbs was sometimes a secondary suffix added to other present-formative elements, as $\kappa \lambda i \nu \omega \omega$, Lesb. $\kappa \lambda i \nu \nu \omega$, from ${ }^{*} \kappa \lambda \iota \nu j \omega: \kappa \lambda i \sigma \iota \varsigma, \kappa \rho i \nu \omega: \kappa \rho i \sigma \iota s$,
 clango, $\pi \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \delta \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \pi \lambda \alpha \gamma \gamma j \omega$ : Lat. plango, $\lambda \dot{u} \oint \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \lambda \nu \gamma \gamma j \omega$ (§ 460). $\kappa \bar{v} \delta \alpha i \nu \omega \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \kappa \bar{v} \delta \alpha \nu j \omega: \kappa \bar{v} \delta \alpha \dot{\alpha} \omega$, and similarly oỉaív $\omega$, ò $\lambda \iota \sigma \theta \alpha i ́ \nu \omega$ ( $\$ 467$, note).
§ 480. The reduplicated presents of this division generally have a fuller reduplication, and rarely $-t$ - in the reduplicated syllable, as $\nu \eta-\nu \epsilon \in \omega, \mu \alpha l-\mu \alpha ́ \omega . \quad \pi \alpha l-\pi \alpha \lambda \lambda \lambda \omega . \quad \gamma \alpha \rho-\gamma \alpha i \rho \rho \omega, \kappa \alpha \rho-$
$\kappa \alpha i ́ \rho \omega, \mu \alpha \rho-\mu \alpha i \rho \omega, \mu о \rho-\mu \hat{v} \rho \omega, \pi о \rho-\phi \hat{v} \rho \omega . \quad \beta \alpha \mu-\beta \alpha i \nu \omega, \pi \alpha \mu-$
 ${ }^{i} \alpha \bar{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega$ from * $\sigma \iota-\sigma \alpha \lambda-j \omega$ (cp. § 213, $\mathbf{~ ) ~ : ~}{ }^{\alpha} \lambda \lambda о \mu \alpha \iota$, Lat. salio, $\tau l-\tau \alpha i \nu \omega, \lambda l-\lambda \alpha i ́ o \mu \alpha \iota$ from ${ }^{*} \lambda l-\lambda \alpha \sigma-j o-\mu \alpha \iota$.

## b. Athematic Presents.

§ 481. To this division belong the primary presents which were formed from dissyllabic heavy bases containing the long diphthong eid. in the second syllable (cp. §458). The presents of this type originally belonged to the athematic conjugation. In the singular the accent was on the first syllable of the base and in the dual and plural on the personal endings, as base *menēer, think, sing.
 *mnjj-énti. The original athematic inflexion was not preserved in all forms of the present in any of the Indg. languages in historic times. Judging from the Baltic-Slavonic languages (see below) it is probable that the first person singular went over into the jo-presents already in the parent Indg. language. In Greek all the presents of this type went entirely over into the thematic conjugation and thus fell together with the jo-presents. And the weak stem-form of the dual and plural became generalized, as $\mu \alpha i \nu o \mu \alpha \iota$ from ${ }^{*} \mu \alpha \nu j o \mu \alpha \iota$, older *mnjomai :

 Sanskrit most of the presents of this type went over into the thematic conjugation, whereas in Latin and the Germanic languages the two types of presents became mixed, cp. Lat. capio from *capjō, capis, capit, capimus, capitis, capiunt from *capjont, beside farcio from *farcjō, farcīs, farcit from older *farcit, farcimus, farcïtis, farciunt from *farcjont, where the first person singular and the third person plural belong to the thematic conjugation and all the other forms to the athematic. The original distinction
between the inflexion of the two types of presents was best preserved in the Baltic-Slavonic languages, cp. O.Slav. sing. mĭnją, I think, mĭni-ši, mĭni-tŭ, pl. mĭni-mŭ, mĭni-te, mĭn-ętŭ, beside sing. borją, I fight, borje-ši, borje-tŭ, pl. borje-mŭ, borje-te, borjątŭ. Whether a present originally belonged to the athematic or to the jo-presents can generally be determined by the fact that the former type of present usually has an $\overline{\mathrm{e}}$ - or an $\mathbf{i}$-stem beside it in the non-present forms, cp. $\mu \alpha \dot{i} \nu о \mu \alpha \iota: ~ \frac{\epsilon}{\epsilon} \mu \alpha ́ \nu \eta \nu, \mu \epsilon \mu \alpha \nu \eta \omega ́ s, \mu \epsilon \mu \alpha ́-$ $\nu \eta \mu \alpha \iota, \mu \alpha \nu i \bar{\alpha} ; \chi^{\alpha i} \rho \omega: \epsilon \in \chi \alpha ́ \rho \eta \nu, \chi^{\alpha} \rho \iota s$.

## 2. Denominative Verbs.

§ 482. The formation of the denominative presents was in principle the same as that of the so-called primary jopresents (§478). Apart from the position of the accent in the two types of presents they were identical in formation. In the denominative presents the accent was originally on the -jó-, -jé-, thus sing. -jó, -jé-si, -jé-ti, pl. -jó-mes, -jé-t(h)e, -jó-nti. This system of accentuation was preserved in Sanskrit, as sing. dēva-yát-mi, I cultivate the gods, am pious, đēva-yá-si, dēva-yá-ti, pl. đēva-yắ-mah, dēva-yá-tha, dēva-yá-nti, formed from đēvá-, god; but in prim. Greek the accent was shifted from the -jó-, -jé- on to the stem, cp .
 prim. Gr. ${ }^{*} \phi \iota \lambda \epsilon j \dot{\omega}: \phi i ́ \lambda o s,{ }^{*} \tau \bar{\imath} \mu \bar{\alpha} j \omega$ : $\tau \bar{\imath} \mu \bar{\alpha},-\dot{\eta},{ }^{*} \mu \eta \nu \iota j \omega \dot{\omega}: \mu \hat{\eta} \nu \iota s$, *фīтvjळ́ : $\phi \grave{\imath} \tau v,{ }^{*} \tau \epsilon \kappa \tau \alpha \nu j \dot{\omega}$ (where - $\alpha \nu$ - $=$ Indg. *-n., the weak
 $\epsilon \in \pi i ́ \delta-$. By comparing the various languages with one another it can be shown that denominative presents were capable of being formed from all kinds of nominal stems already in the parent Indg. language, and that such presents were formed by the addition of -jó-, -jé- to the bare stem. The denominative verbs can be conveniently divided into two great groups according as they were formed from stems ending in a vowel or a consonant.

## a. Vocalic Stems.

§ 483. The formation of denominative verbs in $\cdot \bar{a} j \bar{o}, \cdot e j o \overline{0}$, .ijō, and -ujō, from $\bar{a} \cdot, \boldsymbol{o} \cdot, \mathrm{i}$, and $\mathbf{u}$-stems, was common in the parent Indg. language, and making allowance for the special sound-laws of the individual languages, this type of verb was preserved and often became very productive in the oldest period of all the languages. The Greek verbs in -ó $\omega$ (see below), fromed from the o-form of o-stems, was a special Greek formation which does not occur in any of the other languages. Before reading the following paragraphs dealing with the contract verbs the student should consult $\$ \S 79-80$ on vowel contraction. In Greek as also in other Indg. languages the denominative verbs, formed from $\overline{\mathbf{a}} \cdot, \mathbf{o} \cdot, \mathbf{i} \cdot$, and $\mathfrak{u}$-stems, have a long vowel in the nonpresent forms and in the nomina derived from them, as


 $\delta \eta \rho i ́ o \mu \alpha \iota, ~ c p . ~ L a t . ~ f i ̄ n i ̄ r e m, ~ f i ̄ n i ̄ t u s ~: ~ f i ̄ n i o ; ~ d ̉-\delta \alpha ́ к \rho \rho u ̄ \tau o s: ~$ $\delta \alpha \kappa \rho v ́ \omega$, cp. Lat. statūtus : statuo; $\mu / \sigma \theta \dot{\omega} \sigma \omega$, $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \mu \prime \sigma \theta \omega \sigma \alpha$, $\mu \iota \sigma \theta \omega \tau o ́ s: \mu \iota \sigma \theta o ́ \omega$, cp. Lat. aegrō.tus. This development of the verbal system took place in prehistoric Greek partly through the influence of the verbs in Class IV (§§ 458-9) and partly through the influence of the verbal adjectives in $-\eta$ тos, - $\omega$ Tos, -ītos, - $\bar{v}$ тos, which themselves were new formations formed after the analogy of the denominative and verbal adjectives in - $\bar{\alpha}$ Tos. In some dialects the long vowel in the non-present forms was levelled out into the present. This was especially the case in Boeot. Lesb.
 in Attic and Ionic. In the Boeot. Lesb. Thess. Arcad. and Cyprian dialects the denominative presents in $-\alpha^{\alpha} \omega$, ${ }^{-\epsilon} \omega$, - ó $\omega$ often went over into the athematic conjugation after the analogy of the original athematic presents (§ 433, note).
§484. The verbs in -á $\omega$ were originally formed from $\bar{a}$-stems, as $\tau \bar{\imath} \mu \alpha ́ \omega$, older ${ }^{*} \tau \bar{\imath} \mu \bar{\alpha} j \omega$, Indg. -ājó : $\tau \bar{\iota} \mu \bar{\alpha},-\dot{\eta}, \mathrm{cp}$. Skr. protanā-yā́-mi, I fight, protanā-yá-ti, he fights : pŕtanā-, fight, battle ; Lat. planto, older *plantājō : planta. Some verbs have a long vowel in the root-syllable as compared with the vowel in the corresponding nouns, as $\nu \omega \mu \alpha{ }^{\prime} \omega$ : $\nu о \mu \dot{\eta}, \sigma \tau \rho \omega \phi \alpha ́ \omega$ : $\sigma \tau \rho \circ \phi \dot{\eta}, \pi \omega \tau \alpha ́ \sigma \mu \alpha \iota: \pi о \tau \dot{\eta}, \& c$. $\overline{\mathbf{a}}$-stems with collective and abstract meaning existed in the parent language by the side of o-stems, whence verbs like $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau 1 \alpha \dot{\alpha} \omega$ :
 $\lambda о \chi \alpha ́ \omega: \lambda o ́ \chi o s, \mu \omega \mu \alpha ́ о \mu \alpha \iota: \mu \hat{\omega} \mu о$ s, фоьßác : фоîßos. The short - $\alpha$ - in $\tau \bar{\imath} \mu \alpha ́ \omega, \& c$. was due to the analogy of the short vowel of the verbs in - $\epsilon \omega$, -ó $\omega$, - $i \omega$, -v́ $\omega$ and partly also to verbs formed from jā-stems, as $\tau 0 \lambda \mu \alpha ́ \omega: \tau o ́ \lambda \mu \alpha$. Cp. §§ 73-4.
§ 485. In the parent Indg. language the denominatives in eejó (Gr. - $\epsilon$ ( $\omega$, Skr. -ayà́-, Lat. -eo) were formed from the e-form of the o-stems, cp. Lat. albeo: albus, lenteo: lentus, Skr. dēva-yắ-mi, I am pious, amitra-yắ-mi, $I$ am hostile, 3. pers. sing. dēva-yá-ti, amitra-yá-ti : đēvá-, god, ámitra-, enemy, Gr. $\phi \iota \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \omega$, $\dot{\alpha} \rho \iota \theta \mu \epsilon \epsilon \omega$, from ${ }^{*} \phi \iota \lambda \epsilon j \omega$, * $\alpha \rho \iota \theta$ -
 Through the shifting of the accent in prim. Greek the denominatives in - $\epsilon \omega$ fell together with the causative and iterative verbs $\phi \circ \beta \epsilon \in \omega, \tau \rho \circ \pi \epsilon \epsilon \omega, \& c$. from Indg. 'éjō (§ 497). Beside the more general form in ejoó there was also a form in -jó with omission of the final ee of the stem. This was probably due to the fact that numerous vocalic and consonantal stems existed side by side in the parent Indg. language, cp. Skr. turaṇ-yắ-mi, I hasten, adhvar-yá -mi, I sacrifice, 3. pers. sing. turaṇ-yá-ti, adhvar-yá-ti : turaṇá-, hasty, quick, adhvará-, sacrifice; Gr. á $\gamma \gamma \epsilon ́ \lambda \lambda \omega$ from *á $\gamma$ $\gamma \in \lambda j \omega$ : $\alpha^{\alpha} \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda o s$, and similarly $\alpha i o ̛ \lambda \lambda \omega$, $\delta \alpha \iota \delta \alpha ́ \lambda \lambda \omega, \kappa \alpha \mu \pi v i \lambda \lambda \omega$, $\pi о \iota i ́ \lambda \lambda \omega, \& c$; $\phi \alpha \epsilon i ́ \nu \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \phi \alpha F \in \sigma \nu j \omega$ : $\phi \alpha \epsilon \iota \nu o ́ s$ from * $\phi a F \epsilon \sigma \nu \circ s, \mu \in i \lambda i \quad \sigma \sigma \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \mu \epsilon i \lambda \iota \chi j \omega: \mu \epsilon i ́ \lambda \iota \chi o s, \chi^{\alpha \lambda \epsilon ́ \pi \tau \omega}$ from ${ }^{*} \chi \alpha \lambda \epsilon \pi j \omega\left(\S § 129\right.$, г, 473) : $\chi^{\alpha \lambda \epsilon \pi o ́ s . ~}$
$\S 486$. The denominatives in -ó $\omega$, which are generally factitive in meaning, were a special Greek new formation and came to be formed from the o-form of o-stems already in the prehistoric period of the language, as $\delta o u \lambda o \omega$ :
 $\mu o ́ \omega: \pi о \lambda \epsilon \mu \epsilon ́ \omega$ : $\pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \mu \sigma \varsigma, \chi \rho \bar{v} \sigma o ́ \omega: \chi \rho \bar{v} \sigma o ́ s, \& c$. This type of present became productive and was extended to other than o-stems, as $\S \eta \mu i o ́ \omega: \S \eta \mu i \bar{\alpha}, \gamma \epsilon \phi \bar{v} \rho o ́ \omega: \gamma \epsilon \epsilon \phi \bar{v} \rho \alpha, \pi \lambda \alpha \tau o ́ \omega:$

 $\mu \eta \tau i o \mu \alpha \iota$, Lat. mētior : $\mu \hat{\eta} \tau \iota$, and similarly $\delta \eta \rho i o \mu \alpha \iota, \mu \alpha-$ $\sigma \tau i ́ \omega, \mu \eta \nu i ́ \omega, \& c .$, cp. Skr. jani-yá.ti, he seeks a wife : jáni-, wife; sakhi.-yá-ti, he desires friendship : sákhi., friend; Lat. finio, grandio, lēnio : fīnis, grandis, lēnis.
§488. $\delta \alpha \kappa \rho v ́ \omega ~ f r o m ~ * \delta \alpha \kappa \rho u j \omega ~(I n d g . ~-u j o ́, ~ S k r . ~-u ̆ y a ́) ~:$. $\delta \alpha \dot{\alpha} \rho \rho v$, and similarly $\dot{\alpha} \chi \lambda \hat{v} \omega, \gamma \eta \rho v v^{\prime} \omega, i \theta \dot{v} \omega, \mu \in \theta \dot{v} \omega, \phi \bar{\tau} \tau v ́ \omega, \& c$., cp. Skr. gātu-yá-ti, he sets in motion : gātú•, motion; šatrū-yá-ti, he treats as an enemy : šátru., enemy; Lat. acuo, statuo: acus, status.
$\S$ 489. The denominatives in - $\epsilon \cup(\omega$, prim. Gr. $-\eta\lceil j \omega$, were formed from the stem of nouns of the type of $\beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon$ ús from * $\beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \eta{ }^{2}: ~ * \beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \eta F-(\S 338)$. The - $\eta F j \omega$ would regularly have become - $\epsilon i \omega \omega$ (through the intermediate stages $-\eta \iota F \omega$, $-\epsilon \iota F \omega)$ which is found in the dialect of Elis. In $\beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon \cup \cup \omega$ for * $\beta \alpha \sigma i \lambda \epsilon i ́ \omega$ the $-\epsilon \dot{v}$ - was introduced into the present after the analogy of the other tenses, and it may also in part be due to the influence of the nominative singular of the corresponding noun, and similarly $\dot{\alpha} \rho \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon v ́ \omega, i \in \rho \in v ́ \omega$, , $i \pi \pi \epsilon v \in \omega$, $\nu 0 \mu \epsilon \dot{v} \omega, \pi о \mu \pi \epsilon \dot{v} \omega, \tau о \rho \in \dot{v} \omega, \phi \circ \nu \epsilon \dot{v} \omega, \chi^{\alpha \lambda \kappa \epsilon v ́ \omega}, \& c$. This type of present became productive in the oldest period of the language and was extended to other than e $\epsilon \dot{v}$-stems, as
 Хоєv́ $\omega$ : oivoХóos, $\mu \alpha \nu \tau \epsilon \dot{v} о \mu \alpha \iota: \mu \alpha ́ \nu \tau \iota s, \delta \rho \alpha \gamma \mu \epsilon v ́ \omega: \delta \rho a ́ \gamma \mu \alpha$, $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \omega: \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \dot{\eta} s$.

## b. Consonantal Stems.

§ 490. From n-stems, as ${ }^{\circ} \nu о \mu \alpha i \nu \omega$ from * ${ }^{\prime} \nu о \mu \alpha \nu j \omega(=$
 similarly $\epsilon \dot{v} \phi \rho \alpha i ́ \nu \omega$ : $\epsilon \cup \cup \cup \rho \rho \omega \nu, \kappa \bar{v} \mu \alpha i v \omega$ : $\kappa \hat{v} \mu \alpha, \mu \in \lambda \alpha i \nu \omega$ : $\mu_{\epsilon} \lambda \alpha \nu$-, $\pi \bar{\imath} \alpha i \nu \omega \omega: \pi i t \omega \nu, \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \mu \alpha i \nu \omega: \sigma \pi \epsilon ́ \rho \mu \alpha, \tau \epsilon \kappa \tau \alpha i \nu \nu \omega$ : $\tau \epsilon \in \kappa \tau \omega \nu$, \&c. This type of present became productive in the oldest period of the language and after the analogy of it were formed a large number of verbs from other than n -stems. These new formations generally had a factitive meaning, as $\beta \alpha \sigma \kappa \alpha i ́ \nu \omega: \beta \alpha ́ \sigma \kappa \alpha \nu 0 s, k \in \rho \delta \alpha i \nu \omega: \kappa \epsilon ́ \rho \delta o s$, and similarly $\lambda \epsilon \iota \alpha i ́ \nu \omega, \lambda \epsilon v к \alpha i \nu \omega, \lambda \iota \tau \alpha i ́ \nu \omega, \pi \iota \kappa р \alpha i \nu \omega$, \&c. ; $\gamma \lambda v$ $\kappa \alpha i v \omega$ : $\gamma \lambda v \kappa u ́ s$. After the analogy of the verbs in - $\alpha$ iv $\omega$

 And then further after the analogy of these were formed new denominatives like $\alpha i \sigma \chi \chi \hat{v} \nu \omega$ : $\alpha i ̂ \sigma \chi o s, ~ \kappa \alpha \kappa \bar{v} \nu \omega$ : $\kappa \alpha \kappa o ́ s . ~$
§ 491. From r-stems, as $\tau \epsilon \kappa \mu \alpha i \rho \omega$ from * $\tau \epsilon \kappa \mu \alpha \rho j \omega$ ( $=$ Indg. -rjó) : $\tau \in \kappa \kappa \alpha \rho$. Analogical formations from other than $\mathbf{r}$ stems were $\gamma \in \gamma \alpha i ́ \rho \omega: \gamma \epsilon \gamma \alpha \rho o ́ s, ~ \epsilon ́ \chi X \alpha i ́ \rho \omega: ~ \in ́ \chi \theta \rho o ́ s, ~ \kappa \alpha \theta \alpha i ́ \rho \omega:$ $\kappa \alpha \theta \alpha \rho o ́ s, \& c . \quad \mu \alpha \rho \tau \hat{v} \rho \rho \mu \alpha \iota$ from ${ }^{*} \mu \alpha \rho \tau v \rho j о \mu \alpha \iota: \mu \dot{\alpha} \rho \tau v-\rho$,

§ 492. From s-stems, as $\tau \in \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \omega$, Hom. $\tau \in \lambda \epsilon i ́ \omega$, Att. $\tau \epsilon \lambda \hat{\omega}$ from ${ }^{*} \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \sigma j \omega$ : $\tau \in ́ \lambda o s$, stem $\tau \in ́ \lambda \epsilon \sigma$-, cp. Skr. apas-yắ-mi, I am active, apas-ya.ti, he is active : ápas-, Lat. opus, work; Goth. riqizjan, to become dark : riqis, darkness;


 $\gamma \in \lambda \omega \omega$, iठp $\omega \omega$ were formed direct from the nominative

§493. From dental stems, as $\alpha i \mu \alpha ́ \sigma \sigma \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \alpha i \mu \alpha \tau \jmath \omega$ : $\alpha i \not \mu \alpha \tau-, \beta \lambda i \tau \tau \omega, \beta \lambda i ́ \sigma \sigma \omega(\$ 129,6): \mu \epsilon ́ \lambda \iota \tau$, кори́ $\sigma \sigma \omega$ from


§ 494. From guttural stems, as $\kappa \eta \rho \dot{v} \sigma \sigma \omega$ from *кприкjш : $\kappa \hat{\eta} \rho \nu \xi,-\bar{v} \kappa o s, \beta \dot{\eta} \sigma \sigma \omega$ from * $\beta \eta \chi j \omega: \beta \grave{\eta} \xi, \beta \eta \chi$ о́s, $\theta \omega \rho \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega \omega$ :
 and similarly $\mu \alpha \sigma \tau i j \omega, \sigma \alpha \lambda \pi i \xi \xi \omega$ from * $\sigma \alpha \lambda \pi \iota \gamma \gamma j \omega$ ( $\S 156$ ).
$\S$ 495. The denominatives in $-\alpha \oint \omega$, $-i j \omega$ from $-\alpha \delta j \omega,-\alpha \gamma j \omega$, $-\iota \delta j \omega$, $-\iota \gamma j \omega$ became productive and gave rise to a large number of analogical formations from all kinds of stems,


 $\alpha i \mu \alpha \tau i ́ \zeta \omega: \alpha i ̂ \mu \alpha$.
§ 496. The formation of the denominatives in - $\omega \sigma \sigma \omega$, $-\omega \tau \tau \omega$ is uncertain insomuch as it cannot be determined whether it originally arose from dental or guttural stems. It is possible that this type of verb started out from $\dot{\alpha} \mu \beta \lambda \nu \omega \sigma \sigma \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \dot{\alpha} \mu \beta \lambda \nu \omega \kappa j \omega: \dot{\alpha} \mu \beta \lambda \nu \omega \pi o ́ s, \quad \tau v \phi \lambda \omega \sigma \sigma \omega$ : $\tau v \phi \lambda \omega \psi$, and that they were formed before the velar guttural became $\pi$ in $-\omega \pi$-, cp. the parallel forms Skr. akṣíl, Gr. ${ }^{\text {oै }} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \sigma \epsilon$ from * ${ }^{*} k j \epsilon$, Indg. *oqī, both eyes, Lat. oc-ulus, beside ó $\psi о \mu \alpha \iota$, ó $\pi \tau \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \nu$. The $-\omega \sigma \sigma \omega$ in these verbs may have become productive and extended by analogy to other than guttural stems, as $\lambda \bar{\iota} \mu \omega \sigma \sigma \sigma \omega: \lambda \bar{\imath} \mu o ́ s, \quad o \partial \nu \iota \rho \omega \sigma \sigma \omega: o ̋ \nu \epsilon \iota \rho o s$, $\dot{v} \gamma \rho \omega \sigma \sigma \omega$ : $\dot{v} \gamma \rho o ́ s, ~ \dot{v} \pi \nu \omega \sigma \sigma \omega$ : v̈ $\pi \nu 0$, \&c.

## 3. Causative and Iterative Verbs.

§ 497. Causative and iterative verbs were common in the parent Indg. language and were also preserved in the oldest period of all the separate languages. This type of present was formed by the addition of the formative suffix -éjo-, eéje- to the root-syllable which contained the o grade of ablaut ( $=$ Gr. o, Lat. o, Goth. a, Skr. ${ }_{\text {ä }}$ ), as Indg. sing. *sod-éjō, I cause to sit, set, *sod-éje-si, *sod-éje-ti, pl. *sod-éjo-mes, *sod•éje-t(h)e, *sod•éjo-nti = Skr. sād-áyā-mi, sād-áya-si, sād-áya-ti, sād-áyā-maḥ, sād-áya-tha, sād-áya-nti, Goth. sat-ja, sat-jis, sat•jip, sat-jam, sat-jip, sat-
jand : root *sed-, sit; $\phi \circ \beta \epsilon \in \omega$ from * $\phi \circ \beta \epsilon\rfloor \omega$ : $\phi \in ́ \beta o \mu a \iota$, and similarly $\sigma о \beta \epsilon \epsilon \omega$ : $\sigma \epsilon ́ \beta o \mu \alpha \iota, ~ c p . ~ L a t . ~ n o c e o ~: ~ n e c o, ~ m o n e o: ~$ meminī; Engl. fell, set : fall, sit.
$\pi о т є ́ о \mu \alpha \iota$ from ${ }^{*} \pi о \tau \epsilon j о \mu \alpha \iota$, Skr. păt-áyā-mi : $\pi$ є́то $\mu \alpha$, Skr. pátā-mi, I fly, and similarly $\beta \rho о \mu \epsilon ́ \omega$ : $\beta \rho \bar{\epsilon} \mu \omega$, ó $\chi$ є́о $\mu \alpha \iota$ : Lat. veho, $\sigma к о \pi \epsilon ́ \omega$ : $\sigma \kappa \epsilon ́ \pi \tau о \mu \alpha \iota, \sigma \tau \rho о \phi \epsilon ́ \omega: \sigma \tau \rho \epsilon ́ \phi \omega$, , $\tau \rho о \mu \epsilon \epsilon \omega$ :
 \&c.

After the shifting of the accent in the denominative presents formed from o-stems, as $\phi i \lambda \epsilon$ 的 from * $\phi i \lambda \epsilon j \omega$, older $-\epsilon j \omega$ (§ 482) verbs like $\phi о \beta \epsilon \epsilon \omega$, фо $\rho^{\prime} \epsilon$ came to be regarded as being formed from the nouns $\phi o ́ \beta o s, \phi o ́ \rho o s$, and then after the analogy of $\phi \iota \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \omega: \phi i \lambda \eta \sigma \omega$, ${ }^{\prime} \phi i \lambda \eta \eta \sigma \alpha, \phi i \lambda \eta \tau o ́ s$, to $\phi о \rho \epsilon ́ \omega$ were formed $\phi о \rho \eta \dot{\sigma} \sigma$, 'є $\phi$ ó $\eta \sigma \alpha, \phi о \rho \eta \tau o ́ s$ for *форıтós where -ıós was the regular Indg. ending of the verbal adjective belonging to this type of present, cp. Lat. monitus : moneo, Goth. satips : satjan, to set, Skr. vartitáh : vart-áyā-mi, I turn.

## The Future.

§ 498. It it doubtful whether the parent Indg. language had special forms which were exclusively used to express future meaning. By comparing together the oldest periods of the different languages we are forced to the conclusion that it must have been expressed in various ways. In Sanskrit and Lithuanian the future was formed by means of the formative element $\cdot$ sjó-, sjé- which was.an extension of the -s. element occurring in Class IX of the presents (§ 468). This $\cdot$ sjo- future belonged to the thematic conjugation and was inflected like a present, as Skr. dā-syá -mi (Lith. dừ-siu), I shall give, dā-syá-si, dā-syá-ti, pl. đā-syámaḥ, dā-syá-tha, dā-syá-nti = Indg. *dō-sjố, *dō-sjé-si, *dō-sjé•ti, pl. *dō-sjó•mes, *dō-sjé-t(h)e, *dō-sjó-nti. This formation may also exist in Greek in the future formed from bases or stems ending in an explosive, as $\delta \in i(\xi \omega$, Skr.
dēk-ṣyáa-mi, Indg. *deik-sjó, but it is far more probable that such is not the case, because the future formed from the other bases or stems cannot be explained as being of this origin.

The present with momentary meaning was also originally used with a future meaning, and a few such forms also occur in Greek, as $\delta \eta^{\prime} \omega$, $\epsilon i \mu \iota$, $\nu \epsilon \in \circ \mu \alpha \iota$ (§ 424). This mode of expressing the future became productive in the old Germanic and Slavonic languages. And in like manner the subjunctive of a presential or second aorist stem was also used with a future meaning, as $\begin{gathered}\epsilon \\ \epsilon \\ \circ \\ \mu \alpha \iota \\ \text { (Skr. pres. indic. ád-mi, } I \text { eat), }\end{gathered}$
 *ésō.
§ 499. The ordinary Greek future was originally the subjunctive of the s-aorist which came to be used for the future, cp . also the similar forms in Lat. capso, dixo, faxo, \&c. This subjunctive of the s -aorist had the same rootvowel as the present indicative. It belonged to the thematic conjugation and was inflected like a present, as sing. -sō, $\cdot$ se-si, -se-ti, pl. $\cdot$ so-mes, $\cdot$ se-t(h)e, -so-nti, whereas the indicative of the s-aorist belonged to the athematic conjugation (§ 507). The Greek future can be conveniently divided into two great categories according as it appears with or without the medial $-\sigma$. The medial $-\sigma$ - regularly remained in bases or stems ending in an explosive, as $\lambda \epsilon i \not \psi \omega$,



 $\dot{\alpha} \rho \pi \pi \dot{\alpha} \dot{\xi} \omega, \kappa \eta \rho v \dot{\xi} \omega, \sigma \alpha \lambda \pi i \gamma \xi(\omega, \& c$. After the analogy of these and similar forms the medial $-\sigma$ - was restored in all verbs the base or stem of which ended in a long vowel or diphthong (see § 213, 2), as $\theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega, \delta \dot{\sigma} \sigma \omega$ (Hom. also $\delta \iota \delta \omega \sigma \omega$ ), $\sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$; $\lambda \hat{v} \sigma \omega ; ~ \dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha \rho \tau \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \mu \alpha \iota, \beta о \sigma \kappa \eta \quad \eta \omega, \beta o v \lambda \eta ́ \sigma o \mu \alpha \iota, \quad \gamma \in \nu \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$, $\epsilon i \delta \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega, \epsilon \dot{v} \delta \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega, \mu \alpha \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma o \mu \alpha \iota, \mu \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega, \dot{o} \S \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega, \pi o \prime \eta \quad \sigma \omega, \sigma \chi \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$,
$\tau v \pi \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega, \chi \alpha \iota \rho \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega, \gamma \nu \omega ́ \sigma o \mu \alpha \iota ; \tau \bar{\iota} \mu \eta ́ \sigma \omega, \phi \iota \lambda \eta ́ \sigma \omega, \delta \eta \lambda \omega \sigma \omega$; $\tau \epsilon i ́ \sigma \omega, \pi \lambda \epsilon \dot{v} \sigma \circ \mu \alpha \iota$, oí $\sigma \omega$. In the primary verbs the long vowel had its origin in monosyllabic (\$§ 454-5) and dissyllabic (§ 458) heavy bases.

The medial $-\sigma$ - generally disappeared $(\S 213,2)$ in the future formed from dissyllabic heavy bases with a short vowel in the second syllable, as $\epsilon \lambda \alpha \alpha^{\omega} \omega$, крє $\mu \alpha ́ \omega$, ó $\mu o ́ o \mu \alpha \iota$, $\kappa \alpha \lambda \epsilon ́ \omega$, ò $\lambda \epsilon ́ \omega, \beta \alpha \lambda \epsilon ́ \omega, \gamma \alpha \mu \epsilon ́ \omega, \tau \epsilon \nu \epsilon ́ \omega$, Hom. $\pi \epsilon \sigma \epsilon ́ o \mu \alpha \iota$ from ${ }^{*} \pi \epsilon \tau \epsilon \sigma \circ \mu \alpha \iota=$ Att. $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \hat{\omega}, \kappa \rho \epsilon \mu \hat{\omega}$, o’ $\mu \circ \hat{v} \mu \alpha \iota, \kappa \alpha \lambda \hat{\omega}, o b \lambda \hat{\omega}, \beta \alpha \lambda \hat{\omega}$, $\gamma \alpha \mu \hat{\omega}, \tau \epsilon \nu \hat{\omega}, \pi \epsilon \sigma o \hat{v} \mu \alpha \iota(\S 80)$, and similarly $\sigma \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \omega, \sigma \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \sigma-$ $\mu \alpha \iota, \nu \epsilon \mu \epsilon \epsilon \omega, \tau \epsilon \mu \epsilon \epsilon, \theta \epsilon \nu \epsilon \epsilon \omega, \mu \epsilon \nu \epsilon \epsilon, \phi \alpha \nu \epsilon \epsilon, \phi \theta \epsilon \rho^{\prime} \epsilon, \& c$. The $-\sigma$ - was sometimes restored again, especially in epic Greek, as $\delta \alpha \mu \alpha ́ \sigma \omega$, $\epsilon \lambda \alpha ́ \alpha \sigma \omega, \kappa \rho \epsilon \mu \alpha ́ \sigma \omega$, ò $\lambda \epsilon ́ \sigma \omega$; кє́ $\lambda \sigma \omega$, ő $\rho \sigma \omega$, ф $\theta \in ́ \rho$ $\sigma \omega, \& c$. (cp. §§ 212, 3, 217).

After the analogy of forms like $\kappa \alpha \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \omega, \tau \epsilon \nu \epsilon \in \omega, \phi \theta \epsilon \rho \epsilon \in \omega$ were formed futures to denominative verbs with stems ending in a nasal, liquid, dental or $\mathbf{s}$, and to verbs with a nasal suffix in the present, as Ion. ov่vo $\mu \alpha \nu$ '́ $\omega$ : óvo $\mu \alpha i ́ \nu \omega$,
 beside $\delta \iota \kappa \alpha ́ \sigma(\sigma) \omega$ : $\delta \iota \kappa \alpha ́ \zeta \omega$ from * $\delta_{\imath \kappa \alpha \delta j \omega \text {, ко } \mu \iota \omega \text { beside }}$ $\kappa о \mu i \sigma(\sigma) \omega: \kappa о \mu i \zeta \omega$ from *$\kappa о \mu \iota \delta j \omega, \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \omega, \tau \epsilon \lambda \hat{\omega}$ beside Hom. $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \sigma \sigma \omega$ : $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \in \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \sigma j \omega$; $\kappa \lambda \iota \nu \epsilon \in \omega: \kappa \lambda \grave{\iota} \nu \omega$ from *к $\lambda \iota \nu j \omega$, крıv́́ $\omega$ : крі̂̀ $\nu \omega$, Hom. ả $\nu v ́ \omega, \tau \alpha \nu v ́ \omega$ beside á $\nu v ́ \sigma \omega$, $\tau \alpha \nu \tilde{v} \sigma \omega$.
§ 500. The so-called Doric future, which also occurs in a few Attic verbs, was a new formation and arose from the contamination of the futures in $-\sigma \omega$ with those in $-\epsilon \omega$ from
 $\pi \lambda \epsilon v \sigma o \hat{v} \mu \alpha \iota: \pi \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \omega, \pi \nu \epsilon v \sigma o \hat{v} \mu \alpha \iota: \pi \nu \epsilon$ ' $\omega$, also Att. $\kappa \lambda \alpha v \sigma o \hat{v} \mu \alpha \iota$ :

§ 501. Special Greek new formations were the futures formed from the perfect and from the passive aorists in $-\eta \nu$ (§506), $-\theta \eta \nu(\$ 514)$. The futures formed from the perfect active are rare, but those formed from the perfect middle are common, as Att. $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \eta \dot{\eta} \xi \omega$ : ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \eta \kappa \alpha, \tau \epsilon \theta \nu \eta \dot{\eta} \xi \omega: \tau \in \in \theta \nu \eta \kappa \alpha$.
$\gamma \epsilon \gamma \rho \alpha ́ \psi \circ \mu \alpha \iota, \lambda \in \lambda \epsilon i ́ \psi \circ \mu \alpha \iota, \quad \mu \epsilon \mu \nu \eta{ }_{\eta} \sigma о \mu \alpha \iota, \tau \epsilon \tau \rho i ́ \psi о \mu \alpha \iota, \& c$. This formation came to be regarded as a reduplicated future and then futures like $\delta \in \delta \dot{\eta} \sigma \sigma \mu \alpha \iota, \lambda \epsilon \lambda \hat{v} \sigma o \mu \alpha \iota, \tau \epsilon \tau \epsilon \dot{v}-$ $\xi o \mu \alpha \iota$ were formed direct from the simple future $\delta \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$, $\lambda \hat{v} \sigma \omega, \tau \in \dot{v} \xi \omega$. Examples of futures formed from the passive aorists in $-\eta \nu,-\theta \eta \nu$ are $\phi \alpha \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma o \mu \alpha \iota$ : द́ $\phi \alpha ́ \nu \eta \nu, \sigma \beta \dot{\eta} \sigma o \mu \alpha \iota$ : ${ }_{\epsilon} \epsilon \sigma \beta \eta \nu$, and similarly $\beta \lambda \alpha \beta \dot{\eta} \sigma о \mu \alpha \iota$, $\gamma \rho \alpha ф \dot{\eta} \sigma о \mu \alpha \iota, \mu \alpha \nu \eta \quad \sigma о \mu \alpha \iota$,
 $\theta \dot{\eta} \sigma o \mu \alpha \iota$ : $\dot{\epsilon} \tau \bar{\iota} \mu \dot{\eta} \theta \eta \nu$, and similarly $\kappa \lambda \iota \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma o \mu \alpha \iota, \lambda v \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$, $\pi \epsilon \iota \sigma \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma o \mu \alpha \iota, \tau \alpha \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma о \mu \alpha \iota, \phi \iota \lambda \eta \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma o \mu \alpha \iota, \delta \eta \lambda \omega \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma o \mu \alpha \iota$, \&c. It should be noted that the future in - $Ө \eta \sigma \circ \mu \alpha \iota$ does not occur in Homer and that in Doric both types of futures have active personal endings, as $\dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \gamma \rho a \phi \eta \sigma \epsilon \hat{\imath}, \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \mu \epsilon \lambda \eta \theta \eta \sigma \epsilon \hat{v} \nu \tau \iota=$ Att. $\dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \gamma \rho \alpha \phi \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota, \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \mu \epsilon \lambda \eta \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma o \nu \tau \alpha \iota$.

## The Aorist.

§ 502. The parent Indg. language had two kinds of aorists, the root-aorist, also called the strong or second aorist, and the s-aorist. Although there was doubtless originally a difference in meaning and function between the root- and the s-aorist, the difference had disappeared before the parent language became differentiated into the separate languages. These two kinds of aorists were preserved in Greek, Aryan and the Slavonic languages, but in the other languages they either disappeared entirely or came to be used for other tenses. The aorist in $\theta \eta \nu$ (§ 514) was a special Greek formation which does not occur in the other languages.

## i. The Root- or Strong Aorist.

§ 503. The strong aorist has for the most part been already dealt with in the formation of the present with which it is morphologically closely related, but even at the risk of repetition it is advisable to treat it here in a con-
nected manner．In the dissyllabic bases the only distinction between the base of the aorist and of the present was that caused by the original difference in the position of the accent and the consequent difference in the ablaut－grade， cp．$\lambda \epsilon i \pi \epsilon-: \lambda \iota \pi \epsilon$－，Indg．＊léiq（e）：：＊liqé－，in $\lambda \epsilon i \pi m \omega: \lambda \iota \pi \epsilon \hat{\nu} \nu$ ； $\pi \epsilon ́ \tau \alpha-: \pi \tau \frac{1}{\alpha}$ ，$\pi \tau \tau \eta^{\prime}$ ，Indg．＊pétə－：＊ptá－，in $\pi \epsilon \in \tau \alpha-\mu \alpha \iota: \pi \tau \hat{\eta} \nu \alpha \iota$ ， Dor．${ }^{\epsilon} \pi \tau \tau \bar{\alpha} \nu(\S 458)$ ．On the other hand it is not always possible to draw a hard and fast line between the forma－ tion of the aorist and the imperfect in Greek，cp．aor． ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \beta \eta \nu$ ，${ }^{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \eta \nu$ ，${ }^{\epsilon} \delta \rho \alpha \kappa o \nu$ beside impf．$\epsilon \notin \eta \nu: \phi \eta \mu i,{ }^{\prime} \epsilon \gamma \rho \alpha \phi o \nu$ （and similarly with other aorist－presents，§ 456）．气ै $\tau \in \kappa \circ \nu$ ， є＇$\gamma \epsilon \nu \dot{\partial} \mu \eta \nu$ were properly the imperfect of the lost verbs ＊$\tau \epsilon \in \kappa \omega$ ，＊$\gamma^{\prime} \nu о \mu a \iota$ ，but they came to be regarded as the aorist of $\tau i \kappa \tau \omega$ and $\gamma^{\prime} \gamma \nu \nu \mu \alpha \iota$ ．In the strong aorist we have to distinguish three types ：－

## a．Monosyllabic heavy Ablaut－bases（§§ 454－5）．

§ 504．In the aorists of this type the root－syllable had the strong grade of ablaut in the active singular，but the weak grade in the dual，plural and the whole of the middle，
 ＊$\neq \sigma \tau \alpha \mu \epsilon \nu=$ Skr．ádām，ádhām，ásthām，pl．ádāma， ádhāma，ásthāma（for＊ádima，＊ádhima，＊ásthima）with $-\bar{a}$－levelled out from the singular，and similarly ${ }^{\epsilon} \sigma \sigma \tau \eta \mu \in \nu$ for ${ }^{*} \epsilon \sigma \tau \alpha \mu \epsilon \nu$ ．The regular form with $\cdot \mathbf{i}$ ．occurs in the middle，as ádita $=$ ぞ®oto．The Greek third person plural ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \delta o \sigma \alpha \nu,{ }^{\epsilon} \theta \theta \epsilon \sigma \alpha \nu,{ }^{\prime} \epsilon \sigma \tau \eta \sigma \alpha \nu$ had the ending $-\sigma \alpha \nu$ from the $\mathrm{s}-$
 ${ }^{\prime} \theta \theta \eta \kappa \alpha$ with the same $-\kappa \alpha$ which occurs in the $\kappa$－perfect （§520）were used for the sing．${ }^{* \prime \prime} \delta \omega \nu$ ，${ }^{*} \epsilon \theta \eta \nu$ in Old Attic until the fourth century в．c．and from then onwards the $-\kappa \alpha$ became extended to the dual and plural ；cp．also $\hat{j} \kappa \alpha$ ：Lat．jē－cī，pl．$\epsilon i \hat{\mu} \mu \nu$ from ${ }^{\prime \prime} \epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \epsilon \mu \epsilon \nu$ ．

## b. Dissyllabic light Bases (§§ 456-7).

§ 505. This type of aorist, without and with reduplication, belonged to the so-called thematic conjugation, as $\lambda \iota \pi \epsilon i \bar{\nu}$, ${ }^{\prime} \lambda \iota \pi$ ו



 terized presents, as $\lambda \alpha \beta \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu,{ }^{\prime \prime} \lambda \alpha \beta o \nu: \lambda \alpha \mu \beta \alpha \nu \nu, \lambda \alpha \theta \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$,

 $\beta \alpha \lambda \epsilon i \nu$, ${ }^{\epsilon} \beta \alpha \lambda \lambda \nu \nu: \beta \alpha ́ \lambda \lambda \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \beta \alpha \lambda j \omega$.
 $\kappa_{\epsilon} \lambda о \mu \alpha \iota, \pi \epsilon-\pi \iota \theta-\epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu, \pi \epsilon \in \pi \iota \theta o \nu: \pi \epsilon i ̂ \theta \omega, \tau \epsilon-\tau v \kappa \epsilon i ̂ \nu: \tau \epsilon \dot{\chi} \chi \omega$,
 ávōcam from *a-va-uc-am, Indg. *é-we-wqom ; $\bar{\epsilon}-\tau \epsilon-\tau \mu \rho-\nu$,
 inf. $\alpha \rho-\alpha \rho \epsilon i v ; ~ \check{\omega} \rho-о \rho o \nu: o ̋ \rho-\nu \bar{v} \mu \nu$.

## c. Dissyllabic heavy Bases (§§ 458-9).

§ 506. The aorists of this type belonged to the athematic conjugation and originally contained a long vowel or the long diphthong eei- in the second syllable of the base. The long vowel including the -ē- from older $\cdot \bar{e} \mathrm{i} \cdot$ (§ 458) belonged to all forms of the active and middle, but it was regularly shortened in the third person plural in prim. Greek (§70), as $\pi \tau \hat{\eta} \nu \alpha \iota$, Dor. ${ }^{\epsilon} \pi \tau \bar{\alpha} \nu: \pi \epsilon \epsilon \tau \mu \mu \iota$, $\epsilon \in \delta \rho \bar{\alpha} \nu$ : Skr. drá.ti, he runs, Hom. $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \tau o$ : Skr. á-prā-t, he filled,

 ${ }^{\epsilon} \not \subset \bar{v} \nu,{ }^{\prime} \epsilon \phi \bar{v}=$ Skr. á-bhū-t, from *é•bhū-t, older *é-bhwo•t, he was: base *bhewā-, be. It is not clear in what relation
 Lat. venio. These aorists in $\eta \nu=$ Indg. •ēm with in-
transitive meaning became productive in Greek and came to be used as passive aorists (§514), as ' $\epsilon \kappa \lambda \alpha ́ \pi \eta \nu: \kappa \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \pi \tau \omega$,



## 2. The s-Aorist.

§ 507. The s-aorist, also called the weak or first aorist, belonged to the athematic conjugation and originally had the following endings :-sing. $\cdot \mathrm{s} \cdot \mathrm{m}, \cdot \mathrm{s} \cdot \mathrm{s}, \cdot \mathrm{s} \cdot \mathrm{t}$, pl . $\cdot \mathrm{s} \cdot \mathrm{men}$ or $\cdot \mathrm{s} \cdot \mathrm{mn}$ (§ 437), $\cdot \mathbf{s} \cdot \mathrm{te}$, $\cdot \mathrm{s} \cdot \mathrm{n}$. . In formation it was morphologically related to the s-presents of Class IX (§468) and stood in the same relation to those presents as the strong aorist did to its corresponding presents (§ 456). The s-aorist was preserved in Greek, Aryan and the Slavonic languages, whereas in Latin it came to be used for the
 rēxī, vēxī), and in the other languages it disappeared entirely except in a few isolated forms. This type of aorist became very productive in Greek, especially as an aorist-formation for denominative verbs and for those verbs which did not have a root-aorist. The inflexion of an aorist like ${ }_{\epsilon} \delta \delta \epsilon \epsilon \xi \alpha$ was in the parent Indg. language :-sing. *é-dēik-s-m, *é-dēik-s•s, *é-dēik•s-t, pl. *édik-s-men (-mn), *é-dik-s-te, *édik-s-ngt. In Sanskrit the long diphthong or long vowel of the singular was levelled out into the dual and plural, cp. Skr. árāikṣam, árāikṣ̌ma $={ }_{\epsilon} \lambda \lambda \epsilon \iota \psi \alpha$,
 ákṣ̆ārṣ̌am, ákṣ̆̄̄rṣ̌ma $={ }^{\xi} \phi \theta \epsilon \iota \rho \alpha$ from ${ }^{*} \notin \phi \theta \epsilon \rho \sigma \alpha$ (§ 217), ${ }^{\prime} \phi \theta \in i ́ \rho \alpha \mu \epsilon \nu$; cp. the similar levelling in Latin diximus, rēximus : dīxī, rēxī. The long diphthong of the singular was regularly shortened in prim. Greek (§ 63) and then levelled out into the dual, plural and extended by analogy to the whole of the middle which originally contained the weak grade of ablaut, cp . Skr. middle ádikši, áyukṣi beside Gr . $\epsilon \delta \epsilon \epsilon \xi \dot{\xi} \alpha \mu \eta \nu,{ }_{\epsilon} \dot{\xi} \xi \varepsilon v \xi \dot{\xi} \mu \eta \eta \nu$. The old weak grade of ablaut
was preserved in $\mathfrak{i} \sigma \alpha \nu$, and $\hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \nu$ from ${ }^{*} \dot{\eta} F \iota \tau \sigma \alpha \nu$, they knew, but apart from a few such isolated forms the vowel in the stem-syllable of the active and middle of the s-aorist to dissyllabic bases was due to the analogy of the present stem and the stem of the aorist subjunctive $=\mathrm{s}$-future (§ 499). This is especially clear in such forms as ${ }^{\epsilon} \notin \lambda \lambda v \psi \alpha$,
 $\gamma \nu \bar{v} \mu l, \sigma \tau i\} \omega, \sigma \chi i\} \omega,{ }^{\prime} \pi \eta \eta \lambda \alpha$ from ${ }^{\epsilon} \dot{\epsilon} \pi \alpha \lambda \sigma \alpha: \pi \alpha \hat{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega$. Aorists like ${ }^{\ell} \delta \delta \in l \xi \alpha,{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \xi \in v \xi \alpha$ can represent the original forms with long diphthongs or be new formations with $-\epsilon \epsilon$, $-\epsilon v$ - from the present. The prim. Greek inflexion of the active and middle of ${ }^{\mu} \delta \epsilon \epsilon \iota \xi \alpha,{ }^{\epsilon} \lambda \bar{\nu} \sigma \alpha$ and similar aorists was:-

| Sing. | * $\epsilon$ ¢ $\delta \epsilon \iota K \sigma$ - $\alpha$ | * $\hat{\text { e }} \lambda \bar{\nu} \sigma$ - $\alpha$ | * $\epsilon \delta \delta \epsilon \iota K \sigma-\mu \bar{\alpha} \nu$ | ${ }^{*} \hat{\epsilon} \lambda \bar{\nu} \sigma-\mu \bar{\alpha} \nu$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | * $\epsilon \delta \epsilon \epsilon$ וK $\sigma$-s | ${ }^{*} \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \bar{\nu} \sigma$-s | * $\epsilon$ ¢ $\epsilon \iota \kappa \sigma$ - $\sigma$ o | * $\epsilon \lambda \bar{\lambda} \bar{u} \sigma$ - $\sigma$ o |
|  | * $\hat{E} \delta \epsilon \epsilon \kappa \sigma$ - $(\tau)$ | ${ }^{*} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \lambda \bar{\nu} \bar{\nu} \sigma-(\tau)$ | * $\epsilon \delta \epsilon \epsilon \kappa \sigma$ - $\tau 0$ | ${ }^{\text {¢ }}$ ' $\lambda \bar{\nu} \sigma$ - $\tau о$ |
| Plur. | * $\in \delta \in \epsilon$ IK $\sigma-\mu \in \nu$ | ${ }^{*} \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \bar{\nu} \sigma \cdot \mu \in \nu$ | * $\epsilon \delta \delta \epsilon$ IK $\sigma-\mu \in \theta \alpha$ | ${ }^{*} \dot{\epsilon} \hat{\lambda} \lambda \bar{v} \sigma-\mu \epsilon \theta \alpha$ |
|  | * $\epsilon \delta \epsilon \epsilon \mathcal{L} \sigma \cdot \tau \epsilon$ | * $\hat{\epsilon} \lambda \bar{v} \sigma$ - $\tau \epsilon$ | * $\epsilon \dot{\delta} \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon \ll \sigma \cdot \sigma \theta \epsilon$ | ${ }^{*}{ }^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \bar{u} \sigma \cdot \sigma \theta \epsilon$ |
|  | * $\epsilon \delta \epsilon \epsilon$ IK $\sigma-\alpha(\tau)$ | ${ }^{*} \hat{\epsilon} \lambda \bar{\nu} \bar{\nu} \sigma-\alpha(\tau)$ | ${ }^{*} \in \delta \delta \epsilon \iota \kappa \sigma$ - $\alpha \tau 0$ | ${ }^{*} \hat{\epsilon} \lambda \bar{\nu} \sigma$ - $\alpha \tau 0$ |

The $-\alpha$ in the first person singular of the active regularly corresponds to Indg. $\cdot \mathrm{m}(\S 65, \mathrm{I})$ and in the third person plural to Indg. $\cdot \mathrm{n}(\S 65, \mathrm{I})$. The ending of the first person singular thus fell together with the ending of the perfect
 was formed $\epsilon \delta \epsilon \iota \xi \epsilon$, and then the $-\alpha$ of the first person singular was levelled out into the second person, and at a later period the -as was extended analogically to the perfect ( $\lambda_{\text {édoı }}$ os ). The $-\alpha$ of the third person plural was levelled out into the dual and the other persons of the plural. Hence arose the usual forms: ${ }^{\prime \prime} \delta \in \epsilon \in \alpha$,


 ${ }^{\epsilon} \lambda \hat{\nu} \bar{v} \sigma \alpha \tau \epsilon,{ }_{\epsilon} \hat{\epsilon} \lambda \bar{v} \sigma \alpha \nu$. From the active the $-\alpha$ - was then extended to all forms of the middle ( $\bar{\epsilon} \delta \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \dot{\xi} \alpha \dot{\alpha} \eta \nu, \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \bar{v} \sigma \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu$;

 the optative, imperative, infinitive and participle.
Before this levelling out of the $-\alpha$ - took place the $-\sigma$ - in the dual and the first and second persons plural of the active and in the whole of the middle except the third person plural regularly disappeared in prim. Greek when the stem ended in a consonant ( $\$$ 214, 221), but it was generally restored again at a later prehistoric period after the analogy of forms where it regularly remained. The regular old middle was preserved in Homeric forms like

 $\epsilon \pi \eta \lambda \alpha$ from * $\epsilon \pi \pi \lambda \sigma \alpha$; ${ }^{\rho} \rho \tau о: \widehat{\omega} \rho \sigma \alpha, \& c$.
§ 508. When the base ended in a nasal the $-\mu \sigma$ - and $-\nu \sigma$ became assimilated to $-\mu \mu$-, $-\nu \nu$ - which remained in Lesb. and Thess. but became simplified with lengthening of the preceding vowel in the other dialects as ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \nu \in \iota \mu a$, Lesb.

 similarly with the verbs in - $\alpha i \nu \omega$, as $\dot{\epsilon}^{\prime} \epsilon^{\prime} \eta \nu \alpha: \lambda \in \alpha i \nu \omega$, Hom.
 є́ $\pi \epsilon \rho \bar{\alpha} \nu \alpha: \pi \epsilon \rho \alpha i ́ \nu \omega$.
§ 509. When the base or stem ended in a liquid assimilation also generally took place, with simplification of the double liquid and lengthening of the preceding vowel in Att. Ion., as ${ }_{\epsilon} \pi \pi \eta \lambda \alpha$ from ${ }^{*} \epsilon \pi \alpha \lambda \sigma \alpha: \pi \alpha ́ \lambda \lambda \omega$; ${ }^{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \epsilon \iota \lambda \alpha$, Lesb.
 ${ }^{\epsilon} \phi \theta \epsilon \epsilon \rho \rho \alpha$ from ${ }^{*} \epsilon \phi \theta \epsilon \rho \sigma \alpha: \phi \theta \epsilon i \rho \omega ;{ }^{\epsilon} \epsilon \sigma \bar{v} \rho \alpha(\S 217), \& c$., beside ${ }^{\epsilon} \kappa \epsilon \lambda \sigma \alpha$, ${ }^{\prime \prime} \kappa \in \rho \sigma \alpha$, $\hat{\omega}^{\omega} \rho \sigma \alpha$. In bases or stems ending in a dental the dental $+-\sigma$ - became $-\sigma \sigma$ - which was simplified to $-\sigma$-, as ${ }_{\epsilon} \epsilon \lambda \lambda \iota \sigma \alpha: \beta \lambda i \tau \tau \omega, \beta \lambda i \sigma \sigma \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \beta \lambda \iota \tau j \omega$;

 $\zeta$ in presents ending in $-\zeta \omega$ came from $-\delta j$ - and $-\gamma j$ - $(\S \mathbf{1 2 9}, 8)$.

When it came from the former the aorist regularly had $-\sigma$ from older $-\sigma \sigma$-, and $-\xi$ - when from the latter, but in consequence of the presents being alike confusion arose in the aorist, cp. Hom. $\eta \rho \rho \pi \alpha \sigma \alpha$ beside $\eta \eta \rho \pi \alpha \hat{\xi} \alpha$ : $\dot{\alpha} \rho \pi \alpha ́ \hat{\xi} \omega$ from
 from ${ }^{*} \sigma \alpha \lambda \pi \imath \gamma \gamma j \omega$. In Doric the - $\xi$ became generalized for both kinds of aorists. On forms like Hom. ${ }^{\prime} \xi \xi \in \sigma \sigma \alpha$,
 $\tau \rho \epsilon \epsilon, \tau \in \lambda \epsilon \epsilon$ from ${ }^{*} \zeta \epsilon \sigma \omega$, ${ }^{*} \tau \rho \epsilon \sigma \omega$, ${ }^{*} \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \sigma-j \omega$, see § 212, 2. This $-\sigma \sigma$ - from bases or stems ending in $\sigma$ became productive in the oldest period of the language and is common in Aeolic, Homer and his imitators, as $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \gamma \epsilon \lambda \lambda \sigma \sigma \alpha,{ }^{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \sigma \sigma \alpha$,
 $\sigma \alpha \iota, \& c$.
§ 510. The $-\sigma$ - also regularly disappeared in prim. Greek in several of the forms of bases or stems ending in a vowel, viz. in the first person singular of the active, the third person plural of the active and middle (§ 213, 2), in the first person singular of the middle and the first person plural of the active and middle ( $\S 214$ ), but here again the $-\sigma$. was mostly restored after the analogy of those forms of the vocalic and consonantal bases and stems where it regularly remained. In aorists like $\dot{\eta} \lambda \epsilon \dot{\prime} \alpha \tau 0$ : $\eta^{\prime} \lambda \epsilon \nu \sigma \alpha$,
 $\sigma$-less form became generalized. Apart from a few such isolated aorists without $-\sigma$, all the vocalic bases and stems had intervocalic $-\sigma$ - already in the oldest historic period of the language, as ${ }^{\eta} \mu \epsilon \sigma \alpha,{ }^{\epsilon} \delta \dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha \sigma \alpha, \stackrel{\omega}{\omega} \mu \sigma \sigma \alpha$, ${ }^{\epsilon} \chi \rho \eta \sigma \alpha$ (§ 512);

§ 511. The stem-syllable of dissyllabic light bases had originally a lengthened vowel or diphthong in the singular of the active and weak grade vowel in the dual, plural and the whole of the middle ( $\$ 507$ ), but this original distinction was not entirely preserved in any of the languages in historic times. As we have already seen the Greek stem
of the aorist was a new formation formed direct from the present-stem and the stem of the aorist subjunctive (§507),





 Є́ $\chi \epsilon \alpha ́ \mu \eta \nu$, \&c. In forms like ${ }^{\epsilon} \tau \epsilon \iota \sigma \alpha$ : Skr. ácāișam, ${ }^{\prime} \pi \pi \lambda \epsilon v \sigma \alpha$ the intervocalic $-\sigma$ - was restored after the analogy of forms like $\epsilon \delta \delta \iota \xi \alpha, \& c$. where the $-\sigma$ - was not intervocalic. ${ }^{\epsilon} \epsilon \sigma \phi \eta \lambda \alpha$, € $\notin \theta \epsilon \iota \rho \alpha$ from ${ }^{* \prime \prime} \epsilon \phi \alpha \lambda \sigma \alpha$, ${ }^{*} \epsilon \notin \theta \epsilon \rho \sigma \alpha$ (§ 217), and similarly
 ${ }^{\prime} \epsilon \tau \epsilon \iota \nu \alpha$ from ${ }^{*} \neq \tau \epsilon \nu \nu \sigma \alpha$ (§ 216), and similarly ${ }^{\prime \prime} \kappa \tau \epsilon \epsilon \iota \nu \alpha,{ }^{\prime \prime} \mu \epsilon \iota \nu \alpha$,

 $\epsilon \hat{v} \sigma \alpha: \epsilon \tilde{v} \omega$.
§ 512. The aorists formed from dissyllabic heavy bases belong to the presents of Class IV (§ 458) and may be divided into two types according as the second syllable of the base contained the weak or the strong grade of ablaut. To the former belong aorists like $\eta \mu \epsilon \sigma \alpha:{ }^{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \epsilon \omega$, $\omega \lambda \epsilon \sigma \alpha$;
 $\lambda \alpha \sigma \alpha, \stackrel{\epsilon}{\epsilon} \eta \dot{\eta} \rho \alpha \sigma \alpha ;{ }^{\eta} \rho \rho \sigma \alpha,{ }^{\omega} \mu \mu \sigma \alpha$; ${ }^{\prime \prime} \phi \bar{v} \sigma \alpha:{ }^{\epsilon} \phi \bar{v} \nu$. And to the
 $\epsilon \delta \rho \bar{\alpha} \sigma \alpha$; $\dot{\alpha} \nu-\epsilon \in \gamma \nu \omega \sigma \alpha$ : Skr. ájñ̄̄sam. The intervocalic $-\sigma$ in all these and similar aorists was restored after the analogy of aorists like $\epsilon \in \delta \epsilon \iota \xi \alpha, \& c$.
§ 513. The formative element of characterized presents was often extended to the aorist, as ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \kappa \lambda \bar{\imath} \nu \alpha$ from ${ }^{*} \epsilon \kappa \lambda \iota \nu \sigma \alpha$ : $\kappa \lambda \grave{\iota} \nu \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \kappa \lambda \iota-\nu j \omega$; $\eta^{\eta} \mu \bar{v} \nu \alpha, \dot{\eta} \mu \bar{v} \nu \dot{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu \quad: \dot{\alpha} \mu \bar{v} \nu \omega ; \quad{ }^{\epsilon} \pi \lambda \alpha \gamma \xi \alpha$ : $\pi \lambda \alpha ́ \xi \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \pi \lambda \alpha \gamma \gamma j \omega$, cp. Lat. plango, plānxī; $\in \delta i ́ \delta \alpha \xi \alpha$,


## The Passive Aorist in $\cdot \theta \eta \nu$.

§ 514. The parent Indg. language had no special forms which were used exclusively to express the passive voice, but already at that period the middle came to have also a passive meaning which was preserved in Greek in such forms as $\dot{\epsilon}-\delta \delta o-\theta \eta s, \dot{\epsilon}-\tau \epsilon \in-\theta \eta s, \quad \dot{\epsilon}-k \tau \alpha ́-\theta \eta s=$ Skr. á-di-thāh, á-dhi-thāh, á•kș̣a-thāḥ. The forms of the passive voice are accordingly expressed variously in the different Indg. languages. In Greek the only passive forms distinct from the middle are the second aorist in $-\eta \nu$ and the first aorist in $\cdot \theta \eta \nu$. The aorist in $-\eta \nu$ is, as we have already seen (§ 458), originally an active athematic formation with intransitive meaning which came to be used to express the passive in Greek. This aorist in $-\eta \nu$ was also an important factor in the origin and development of the aorist in $\theta \eta \nu$ which was a special Greek new formation and probably in part of the same origin as the preterite of denominative verbs in the Germanic languages. The origin of the aorist in $-\theta \eta \nu$ is difficult to account for satisfactorily. It is probable that several factors played an important part in its origin and development. Starting out from the second person singular of the aorist middle with the secondary ending $\theta \eta s$ ( $=$ Indg. thēs, Skr. •thāh, § 443) which occurs in such forms as $\epsilon^{\epsilon}-\delta \delta^{-}-\theta \eta s, \epsilon^{\prime}-\tau \epsilon \in-\theta \eta s, \epsilon^{\prime}-\sigma \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha}-\theta \eta s, \epsilon^{\prime}-\kappa \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha}-\theta \eta s=$ Skr. á-di-thāḥ, á-dhi-thāḥ, á-sthi-thāḥ, á-kṣ̌a-thāḥ, there was formed $\epsilon_{\epsilon}^{\prime}-\delta \delta^{\prime}-\theta \eta \nu, \epsilon^{\prime}-\delta o ́-\theta \eta$, \&c. : $\epsilon-\delta \delta^{\prime}-\theta \eta s$ after the analogy of aorists like $\epsilon \in-\mu \dot{\alpha} \nu-\eta \nu, \dot{\epsilon}^{\prime}-\mu \alpha{ }^{\prime} \nu-\eta$, \&c. : $\mathfrak{c}-\mu \alpha ́ \nu-\eta s$, thus creating a complete new aorist out of a single form. But it is improbable that the aorist in $\theta \eta \nu$ had its origin solely in the $-\theta \eta s$ of forms like $\epsilon-\delta o ́-\theta \eta s, \& c$. In part at least it was probably also a periphrastic formation which was originally confined to denominative verbs, as in $\hat{\epsilon}^{\prime}-\tau \bar{\iota} \mu \eta \cdot-\theta \eta \nu,{ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon}-\phi \iota \lambda \eta \cdot-\theta \eta \nu$, $\dot{\epsilon}-\delta \eta \lambda \omega \cdot \theta \eta \nu, \eta \eta^{\prime} \delta \epsilon \sigma-\theta \eta \nu, \& c$., and then at a later period became extended to primary verbs as well. In this respect it
corresponds exactly in formation with the preterite of denominative verbs in the Germanic languages, as Goth. salbō-da, $I$ anointed, salbō-dēs, salbō-da, where -da, -dēs, $\cdot$ da = Indg. •dhēm, .dhēs, dhēt, which was originally an aorist of the root *dhē- which occurs in $\tau i \cdot \theta \eta-\mu \mu$. If the assumption is right that the aorist in $-\theta \eta \nu$ was in part a periphrastic formation, there must have been a time when two types of the dual and plural existed side by side,
 (ср. ${ }^{\mathrm{c}}-\theta \epsilon-\mu \in \nu$ ), \&c. and that then the form $-\theta \eta \mu \in \nu$ with $-\eta$ became generalized. The periphrastic formation was originally active both in form and meaning as in the Germanic languages, but in Greek it became passive in meaning through the influence of the aorists of the type $\dot{\epsilon} \delta \dot{\delta} \theta \eta \nu, \dot{\epsilon} \mu \alpha ́ \nu \eta \nu$. The aorist in $-\theta \eta \nu$ became very productive in the prehistoric period of the language and already in Homer it was far more common than that in $-\eta \nu$. Its great expansion was doubtless due to the large mass of denominative verbs.

## The Perfect.

§ 515. The perfect had originally certain well-defined characteristics which clearly distinguished it from the other tenses. The more important of these characteristics were :-
(a) The personal endings in the active singular, as Indg. *wóid-a, *wóit-tha, *wóid-e =oî $\delta-\alpha$, oì $\sigma-\theta \alpha$, oì $\delta \cdot \epsilon$, Skr.véd-a, vêt-tha, véd-a. What the original endings of the dual and plural were cannot be determined, because there is little or no agreement amongst the languages which have preserved the perfect forms in historic times (see $\$ \S 440-1$ ). (b) Reduplication with e (rarely $\overline{\mathbf{e}}$ ) in the reduplicated syllable. (c) A different grade of ablaut in the active singular as compared with the active dual, plural, and the whole of the middle. (d) A special participial ending (\$ 552).
§ 516. The perfect generally had reduplication with e in the reduplicated syllable, as $\delta^{\prime}$ - $-\delta \rho \rho \kappa \alpha=$ Skr. da-darš́a ; $\pi \epsilon ́-\pi \eta \gamma \alpha=$ Lat. pe-pigì. Beside e there also existed $\overline{\mathbf{e}}$ which is rare in Greek (cp. Hom. $\delta \eta-\delta \epsilon ́ \chi \alpha \tau \alpha \iota: \delta \epsilon ́ \chi o \mu \alpha \iota)$ but common in Vedic. Latin and especially the Germanic languages show that unreduplicated perfects were also common in the parent Indg. language. But the reason why the perfect was originally formed partly with and partly without reduplication is unknown. The forms with reduplication became productive in Greek and Sanskrit and those without it in Latin and the Germanic languages. Already in the prim. Germanic period the old perfect active came to be used as a simple preterite and then a new periphrastic perfect was formed. What is called the perfect in Latin was a mixture of various kinds of formations, e. g. old perfects, as tu-tudī, de-dī, vēnī, lēgì; old strong aorists, as te-tigì, pe-pulī, fidī, scidī; and old s-aorists, as dīxī, 1ēxī, \&c. (§ 507).

Greek, Old Latin and Gothic show that the reduplicated syllable originally contained e, cp. O.Lat. me-mordī, pepugī, te-tulī, classical Lat. ce-cidī, de-dī, \&c. ; Goth. haí. háit, he called, ga-raí•rōp, he reflected upon: inf. háitan, ga-rēdan. But in classical Latin the vowel in the reduplicated syllable became assimilated to that of the root-syllable when the present and perfect had the same vowel, as momordī, pu-pugī : mordeo, pungo. In Sanskrit the reduplicated syllable generally had $\mathrm{a}=$ Indg. e (§ 42), as da-dárša $=\delta \epsilon-\delta \circ \rho \kappa \alpha$, but when the root-syllable contained the ablaut $\overline{\mathrm{e}}: \mathrm{i}=$ Indg. oi: $\mathrm{i} ; \overline{\mathrm{o}}: \mathrm{u}=$ Indg. $\mathrm{ou}: \mathrm{u}$, the vowel in the reduplicated syllable became assimilated to that in the rootsyllable of the active dual and plural, and of the middle, as ri•rếca $=\lambda$ é- $\quad$ oı $\pi \alpha$, pl. ri•ricimá; tu•tóda, I have pushed $=$ Goth. staí-stáut, pl. tu-tudimá.
§517. In dealing with the reduplicated syllable it is necessary to distinguish between bases or stems which
began with a consonant and those which began with a vowel. When the base or stem began with a single consonant the reduplication consisted of this consonant $+\epsilon$, as $\delta \epsilon ́-\delta o \rho \kappa \alpha, \lambda \epsilon \in-\lambda o \iota \pi \alpha$, but with dissimilation of aspirates, as $\pi \epsilon \in-$ $\phi \epsilon v \gamma \alpha, \tau \epsilon \in-\theta \epsilon \iota \kappa \alpha, \kappa \epsilon \in-\chi \nu \mu \alpha \iota(\S 115)$. When the base or stem began with an explosive plus a nasal or liquid, the reduplication generally consisted of the explosive $+\epsilon$, as $\pi \epsilon-\pi \nu \in \nu \kappa \alpha$, $\tau \epsilon \in-\theta \nu \eta \kappa \alpha$ (with dissimilation of the aspirate), $\gamma^{\epsilon}-\gamma \rho \alpha \phi \alpha$, $\gamma^{\prime}-\gamma \lambda v \mu \mu \alpha \iota$. But combinations like $\gamma \nu$ - $\beta \lambda-$-, $\xi^{-}, \xi^{-}, \psi-\kappa \tau$-, $\pi \tau$ - generally had simply ${ }_{\epsilon}$ - for the reduplicated syllable, as ${ }^{\epsilon} \notin \nu \omega \kappa \alpha$, ${ }^{\epsilon} \beta \lambda \alpha ́ \sigma \tau \eta \kappa \alpha$ beside $\beta \epsilon \beta \lambda \alpha ́ \sigma \tau \eta \kappa \alpha$, ${ }^{\prime \prime} \leqslant \eta \kappa \alpha$, ${ }^{\prime} \xi \xi \alpha \mu \mu \alpha \iota$, ${ }^{\epsilon} \psi \psi \alpha \lambda \kappa \alpha$, ${ }^{\epsilon} \kappa \tau о \nu \alpha$, ${ }^{\epsilon} \pi \tau \tau \alpha \iota \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$. In these and similar perfects the form of reduplication was due to the analogy of perfects like ${ }^{\prime} \epsilon \sigma \chi \eta \kappa \alpha$, ${ }^{\prime \prime} \sigma \chi \chi \eta \mu \alpha \iota: ~ \epsilon^{\epsilon} \chi \omega$. In bases or stems originally beginning with $\mathbf{s}, \mathrm{w}$; $\mathbf{s}$ or $\mathbf{w}+\mathrm{a}$ consonant we have
 $\epsilon_{i}^{\prime \prime} \mu \alpha \rho \tau \alpha \iota$ from ${ }^{*} \sigma \epsilon-\sigma \mu \alpha \rho \tau \alpha \iota$, $\epsilon^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \eta \chi^{\alpha}$ from ${ }^{*} \sigma \epsilon-\sigma \lambda \eta \chi \alpha$, $\epsilon^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \eta \phi \alpha$, $\epsilon^{\prime \prime} \lambda o \chi^{\alpha}$; є" $\omega \theta \alpha$ from ${ }^{*} \sigma \epsilon-\sigma F \omega \theta \alpha$, "ै $\sigma \tau \alpha \lambda \kappa \alpha$ from ${ }^{*} \sigma \epsilon-\sigma \tau \alpha \lambda \kappa \alpha$, ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \eta \kappa \alpha$ from ${ }^{*} \sigma \epsilon-\sigma \tau \eta \kappa \alpha$; ${ }^{\epsilon} \rho \rho \rho \omega \gamma \alpha$, єil $\rho \eta \kappa \alpha$, from ${ }^{*} F \epsilon-F \rho \omega \gamma \alpha$, * $F \in-F \rho \eta \kappa \alpha$.

In bases or stems originally beginning with a vowel the e would regularly become contracted in the parent Indg. language, but it is not certain what were the rules governing this contraction in all cases, cp. $\hat{\eta} \chi^{\alpha}$ (with prim. Greek $\bar{\alpha}$ ) : ${ }_{\alpha} \quad \gamma \omega$ beside Lat. $\overline{\mathrm{e}} \mathrm{g} \mathrm{i}:$ ago; $\hat{\eta} \sigma-\theta \alpha$ which is properly the perfect of $\epsilon i \mu i(\S 452)$. In Greek it became the rule that the perfect had a long vowel. This occurs in the perfects with the so-called Attic reduplication, as Hom. $\bar{\epsilon} \delta \cdot \eta \delta \delta^{\prime}$ s :
 $\dot{\eta} \lambda \alpha \kappa \alpha,{ }^{\epsilon} \lambda \lambda-\eta \quad \lambda \alpha \mu \alpha \iota$; after the analogy of which were formed Att. $\dot{\alpha} \kappa-\dot{\eta} \kappa о \alpha, \alpha \dot{\alpha} \lambda-\eta \lambda_{\iota} \phi \alpha, \alpha \dot{\alpha} \lambda-\eta \lambda_{\iota} \mu \mu \alpha \iota, \dot{\epsilon} \lambda-\eta \quad \lambda \nu \theta \alpha, \& c$. This type of perfect with the so-called Attic reduplication was a special Greek new formation, and the reduplication was based on the analogy of the reduplicated presents and aorists.
§ 518. The perfect belonged to the athematic conjugation and accordingly had a difference of ablaut in the active singular as compared with the active dual, plural, and the middle. In verbs belonging to the e-series of ablaut the active singular had the strong grade o in the root-syllable, and the weak grade in all other forms, as oî $\alpha a$, Skr. véda,
 Goth. wit-um ; $\gamma^{\epsilon}-\gamma \circ \nu-\alpha: \gamma^{\epsilon}-\gamma \alpha-\mu \epsilon \nu, \pi \epsilon \in-\pi o \nu \theta \alpha: \pi \epsilon-\pi \alpha \theta \nu i ̂ \alpha$, $\tau \epsilon \in-\tau \rho o \phi \alpha: \tau \epsilon-\tau \rho \alpha \dot{\alpha} \alpha \tau \alpha$. Other examples with 0 in the

 $\lambda \epsilon ́ \lambda o \gamma \chi^{\alpha}$, $\lambda \in ́ \lambda o \iota \pi \alpha, \pi \epsilon ́ \pi o \iota \theta \alpha, \tau \epsilon ́ \tau о \kappa \alpha$. Or a long vowel in the active singular and $\partial(=$ Gr. $\alpha, \S 49)$ in all other forms,
 active singular the accent was originally on the rootsyllable, as in Skr. da-dárš́a, ja-jấna beside Gr. $\delta \in \in-\delta \rho \rho \kappa \epsilon$, $\gamma^{\prime}-\gamma^{\prime} \nu \epsilon$. Sanskrit and the old Germanic languages preserved almost entirely the original distinction between the strong grade of ablaut in the active singular and the weak grade in the dual and plural, but in Greek the original distinction was in a great measure obliterated by levelling and new formations already in the oldest period of the

 $\gamma \in \gamma^{o} \nu \alpha \mu \in \nu$ with -0 - from the singular, and similarly Hom. $\epsilon i \lambda \hat{\eta} \lambda o v \theta \mu \epsilon \nu$ beside $\epsilon i \lambda \hat{\eta} \lambda \nu \theta \mu \in \nu$ : $\epsilon i \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \lambda o v \theta \alpha$. In nearly all other verbs either the vowel of the singular was levelled out into the dual and plural, as in éoíк $\alpha \mu \epsilon \nu, \lambda \in \lambda о i ́ \pi \alpha \mu \epsilon \varepsilon$,
 $\pi \epsilon ́ \pi o \iota \theta \alpha, \tau \in ́ \tau \rho о ф \alpha,{ }^{\prime} \epsilon \rho \rho \omega \gamma \alpha$; and similarly with a large number of other verbs. Or more rarely the vowel of the dual and plural was levelled out into the singular, as in Att. $\epsilon^{\wedge} \lambda \eta \dot{\lambda} \lambda v \theta \alpha, \tau \epsilon ́ \tau \rho \alpha \phi \alpha$. In many verbs the perfect active had its vowel direct from the stem of the present, as $\pi$ 白 $\phi \in v \gamma \alpha$ for * $\pi \epsilon \in \phi o v \gamma \alpha: \phi \epsilon \dot{\gamma} \gamma \omega$, and similarly $\beta^{\prime} \not \beta \lambda \epsilon \phi \alpha$, $\gamma^{\epsilon} \gamma \rho \alpha \phi \alpha$,
 $\kappa \lambda \alpha ́ \zeta \omega \omega$ from ${ }^{*} \kappa \lambda \alpha \gamma \gamma j \omega$.

The weak grade of ablaut was mostly preserved in the middle, as $\delta \dot{\delta} \delta \alpha \rho \mu \alpha \iota, \delta \epsilon \delta \alpha \rho \mu \epsilon ́ \nu o s: \delta \epsilon ́ \rho \omega$, and similarly
 $\tau \epsilon \tau \rho \alpha ́ \phi \alpha \tau \alpha \iota, \tau^{\prime} \theta \rho \alpha \mu \mu \alpha \iota, \pi \epsilon ́ \phi \alpha \tau \alpha \iota, \pi \epsilon \phi v \gamma \mu \notin \nu 0 \Omega, \& c$. But the middle had also sometimes its vowel direct from the stem of the present, as $\lambda \epsilon \bar{\lambda} \lambda \epsilon \iota \mu \mu \alpha \iota, \lambda \epsilon \bar{\lambda} \epsilon \iota \pi \tau \alpha \iota, \lambda \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \iota \mu \mu \epsilon \in \nu \rho$ :
 $\sigma \tau \alpha \iota$, Hom. $\tau \epsilon \tau \epsilon \underset{\chi}{\chi} \alpha \tau \alpha \iota: \tau \epsilon \tau v \gamma \mu$ évos.
§ 519. The original inflexion of the active was fairly well preserved in a perfect like oi $\delta \alpha$, as

| Sing. I. | Greek. oî $\delta \alpha$ | Skr. véda | Goth. wáit |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2. | oī $\theta$ a | vêttha | wáist |
| 3. | oì $\overline{\text { c }}$ | véda | wait |
| Plur. I . | ${ }^{i} \delta \mu \in \nu$ ( $i \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu$ ) | vidmá | vitum |
| 2. | ${ }^{\prime} / \sigma \tau \epsilon$ | vidá | witup |
| 3. | ${ }^{\prime} \sigma \bar{\alpha} \sigma \iota$ | vidúr | witun |

On the Greek personal endings of the plural see § 441. The $-\sigma$ - in ${ }^{i} \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu$, ${ }^{\prime} \sigma \bar{\alpha} \sigma \iota$ from *i ${ }^{\prime} \sigma \alpha \nu \tau \iota$ was due to levelling out of the $-\sigma$ - in í $\sigma \tau \epsilon$, and in the dual ${ }^{\prime} \sigma \tau \sigma \nu$ where it was regular ( $\$ 110$ ). This mode of inflexion was only preserved in a few verbs in Greek. All others had an $-\alpha$ - between the stem ending in a consonant and the personal ending beginning with a consonant, as $\lambda \epsilon ́ \lambda o \iota \pi \alpha, \lambda \epsilon ́ \lambda o \iota \pi-\alpha-s, \lambda \in ́ \lambda o \iota \pi \epsilon$, $\lambda \epsilon \lambda o i ́ \pi-\alpha-\tau o \nu, \lambda \epsilon \lambda o i ́ \pi-\alpha-\mu \in \nu, \lambda \epsilon \lambda o i ́ \pi-\alpha-\tau \epsilon, \lambda \epsilon \lambda o i ́ \pi \bar{\alpha} \sigma \iota$, cp. also
 The most commonly accepted explanation of this $-\alpha$ - is that it first arose in the s-aorist ( $\$ 507$ ) and then became extended by analogy to the perfect. The $-\alpha \sigma$ of the second pers. sing. $\lambda$ énormas was undoubtedly of this origin. On the discussion of other explanations which have been proposed see Brugmann, Kurze vergl. Grammatik, pp. 544-5.
§ 520. The $\kappa$-perfect, also called the first or weak perfect, was a Greek new formation which does not occur in the other Indg. languages. Although much has been written upon the subject, no really satisfactory explanation has ever been given of the origin of this formation. The $\kappa$ is generally regarded as being a root-determinative, found in the aorists ${ }_{\epsilon} \epsilon-\theta \eta \kappa \alpha=$ Lat. fēcī : facio, $\widehat{\eta} \kappa \alpha=$ Lat. jēcī : jacio, which became productive in Greek, cp. $\epsilon \delta \omega \kappa \alpha$ : $\epsilon \delta \circ \mu \epsilon \nu$ after the analogy of ${ }^{\prime} \theta \eta \kappa \alpha$ : ${ }^{\prime} \theta \epsilon \epsilon \mu \epsilon \nu$. Then after the analogy of these aorists were formed the perfects $\tau \epsilon \in \eta \eta \kappa \alpha, \delta \dot{\epsilon} \delta \omega \kappa \alpha$,
 $\tau \epsilon \in \tau \lambda \eta \kappa \alpha: \pi \epsilon \phi \dot{\alpha} \bar{a} \sigma \iota, \tau \epsilon \in \tau \lambda \alpha \mu \epsilon \nu$. From perfects of this type the $\kappa$-formation became extended in the first instance to all bases or stems ending in a vowel, and the $\kappa$ was levelled out into the dual and plural, as $\tau \in \in \eta \eta \kappa \alpha, \tau \in \theta \dot{\eta} \kappa \alpha \mu \in \nu$ (later $\tau \in \theta \in \iota \kappa \alpha, \tau \in \theta \in i \in \alpha \mu \epsilon \mathcal{L}$ with $-\epsilon \epsilon$ after the analogy of $\epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \kappa \alpha)$, and

 $\tau \in ́ \tau \alpha \kappa \alpha: \tau \epsilon ́ \tau \alpha \mu \alpha \iota, \& c$. It was afterwards extended to those verbs which in the future and s -aorist had bases or stems that came to be felt as ending in a vowel, as $\pi \epsilon \in \pi \epsilon \iota \kappa \alpha$ :
 $\tau \epsilon \tau^{\prime} \lambda_{\epsilon \in \kappa \alpha,} \& c$. And then lastly in the post-Homeric period it was extended to bases and stems ending in a consonant, as ${ }^{\epsilon} \phi \theta \theta \rho \kappa \alpha,{ }^{\prime} \epsilon \sigma \tau \alpha \lambda \kappa \alpha:{ }^{\prime} \phi \theta \alpha \rho \tau \alpha \iota,{ }^{\prime \prime} \sigma \tau \alpha \lambda \tau \alpha \iota$; ${ }^{\prime \prime} \gamma \gamma \epsilon \lambda \kappa \alpha$, $\pi \epsilon ́ \phi \alpha \gamma к \alpha, \& c$. So that in the classical period the perfect of the majority of Greek verbs was formed with the suffix $-\kappa \alpha$ and the original difference of ablaut-grade between the active singular, and the dual and plural was disregarded.
§ 521. The aspirated perfect was also a Greek new formation and consisted in the aspiration of $\kappa, \gamma, \pi, \beta$ when the perfect stem ended in one of these consonants. This new formation took place earlier in the third person of the middle than in the active. In Homer it is only found in the middle, as $\epsilon^{\prime \prime} \rho \chi \alpha \tau \alpha \iota$, $\epsilon_{\epsilon} \rho \chi \alpha \tau о$ : ${ }^{\epsilon} \rho \gamma \sigma \omega$; $\delta \eta \delta \epsilon \epsilon-$
$\chi^{\alpha \tau \alpha \iota}: \delta^{\prime} \kappa о \mu \alpha \iota ; \tau \epsilon \tau \rho \alpha ́ \phi \alpha \tau \alpha \iota, \tau \epsilon \tau \rho \alpha ́ \phi \alpha \tau о: \tau \rho \epsilon ́ \pi \omega$. With the exception of $\pi \epsilon ́ \pi о \mu \phi \alpha: \pi \epsilon ́ \mu \pi \omega$ and $\tau \epsilon ́ \tau \rho \circ \phi \alpha: \tau \rho \epsilon ́ \pi \omega$ it is not found in the active in the early classical period. From about the time of Aristophanes and Plato onwards it became more and more common, as $\pi \epsilon ́ \pi \lambda \epsilon \chi \alpha: \pi \lambda \epsilon \in \kappa \omega$, ${ }_{\eta}^{\eta} \chi^{\alpha}: \stackrel{\alpha}{\alpha} \gamma \omega, \beta \epsilon \epsilon \beta \lambda \epsilon \phi \alpha: \beta \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \pi \omega$, and similarly $\delta^{\prime} \epsilon \delta \circ \chi^{\alpha},{ }^{\prime \prime} \pi \tau \eta \chi^{\alpha}$,
 $\beta \epsilon ́ \beta \lambda \alpha \phi \alpha$, 'є $\rho \rho і ̄ \phi \alpha$, кє́клофа, кє́кофа, тє́т $\rho \iota \phi \alpha, \& с$. Both the middle and the active forms were analogical formations, starting out from verbs originally ending in an aspirate $(\chi, \phi)$ which regularly fell together with those ending in $\kappa, \gamma, \pi, \beta$ in all the middle forms except in the third person ending in - $\alpha \tau \alpha \iota,-\alpha \tau o$, as $\gamma$ '́ $\gamma \rho \alpha \mu \mu \alpha \iota, \gamma \in \gamma \rho \alpha \psi \alpha \iota$, $\gamma^{\prime} \gamma \rho \alpha \pi \tau \alpha \iota: \tau \epsilon ́ \tau \rho \alpha \mu \mu \alpha \iota, \tau \in ́ \tau \rho \alpha \psi \alpha \iota, \tau \epsilon ́ \tau \rho \alpha \pi \tau \alpha \iota$ after the analogy of which were formed $\tau \epsilon \tau \rho \alpha ́ \phi \alpha \tau \alpha \iota, \tau \in ́ \tau \rho \circ \phi \alpha$ beside $\gamma \in \gamma \rho \alpha ́ \phi \alpha \tau \alpha \iota, \gamma \in ́ \gamma \rho \alpha \phi \alpha$.
§ 522. Various phonological changes took place in the middle which have already been mostly dealt with in the Phonology. When the stem ended in a labial the labial became assimilated to a following $\mu$, as $\lambda \in ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota \mu \mu \alpha \iota$, $\tau \epsilon ́ \tau \rho \iota \mu$ $\mu \alpha \iota, \gamma \epsilon \in \gamma \rho \alpha \mu \mu \alpha \iota: \lambda \epsilon i ́ \pi \omega, \tau \rho \grave{\iota} \beta \omega, \gamma \rho \alpha ́ \phi \omega(\S 117)$. Stems ending in $\kappa, \chi$ have $\gamma$ before a following $-\mu$, as $\pi \epsilon \pi \pi \epsilon \boldsymbol{\gamma} \mu \alpha \iota, \dot{\alpha} \phi \hat{\iota} \gamma \mu \alpha \iota$,
 * $\phi v \lambda \alpha \kappa j \omega, \tau \epsilon \dot{u} \chi \omega$. This $\gamma$ was due to the analogy of forms like $\lambda \epsilon ́ \lambda \epsilon \gamma \mu \alpha \iota$ beside $\lambda \epsilon ́ \lambda \epsilon \xi \in \iota \iota$, $\lambda \epsilon \in \lambda \epsilon \kappa \tau \alpha \iota$ where $\gamma$ regularly became $\kappa$ before $\sigma$ and $\tau$ and thus fell together in these forms with stems ending in $\kappa, X$. Stems ending in $\sigma$ and a dental generally have the endings $-\sigma \mu \alpha \iota,-\sigma \mu \epsilon \theta \alpha,-\sigma \mu \in \nu 0 s$ with $\sigma$ restored (§ 214) after the analogy of endings like $-\sigma \tau \alpha \iota$ where the $\sigma$ was regular, as ${ }^{\prime} \leqslant\left\{\epsilon \sigma \mu \alpha \iota\right.$ for $\left.{ }^{* \prime \prime} \epsilon\right\} \epsilon \iota \mu \alpha \iota$ : ${ }^{\prime} \epsilon \oint \epsilon \sigma \tau \alpha \iota$, and similarly ${ }^{\prime \prime} \sigma \pi \alpha \sigma \mu \alpha \iota,{ }^{\prime} \epsilon \oint \omega \sigma \mu \alpha \iota, \tau \epsilon \tau \epsilon \in \in \epsilon \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$, $\& c$. beside the regular forms $\bar{\epsilon} \xi\{\omega \mu \alpha \iota$ (Attic inscriptions), $\gamma^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \epsilon v \mu \alpha \iota$ from which was formed $\gamma \in ́ \gamma \epsilon v \tau \alpha \iota$ for ${ }^{*} \gamma \epsilon \gamma \in \nu$ $\sigma \tau \alpha \iota$; $\lambda \epsilon \in \lambda \alpha \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$ for ${ }^{*} \lambda \epsilon \in \lambda \alpha \theta \mu \alpha \iota$ after the analogy of $\lambda \epsilon ́ \lambda \alpha \sigma \tau \alpha \iota: \lambda \epsilon ́ \lambda \eta \theta \alpha$, and similarly $\pi \epsilon ́ \pi \epsilon \iota \sigma \mu \alpha \iota, \pi \epsilon ́ \pi v \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$,
$\pi ' \epsilon \phi \rho \alpha \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$ for ${ }^{*} \pi \epsilon ́ \phi \rho \alpha \delta \mu \alpha \iota, \mathrm{cp} .-\pi \epsilon \phi \rho \alpha \delta \mu_{\epsilon}{ }^{\prime} \sigma$. The $\sigma$ was also introduced analogically into stems ending in $\nu$ or a vowel, as $\pi \epsilon ́ \phi \alpha \sigma \mu \alpha \iota: \pi \epsilon ́ \phi \alpha \nu \tau \alpha \iota,{ }_{\epsilon} \xi \dot{\eta} \rho \alpha \sigma \mu \alpha \iota, \quad \ddot{v} \phi \alpha \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$, beside the regular forms $\tilde{\eta} \sigma \chi \nu \mu \mu \alpha \iota, ~ \varpi \xi \xi v \mu \mu \alpha \iota$ with assimilation of $\nu \mu$ to $\mu \mu(\S 150)$; $\tau \in \tau \tau \epsilon \sigma \mu \alpha \iota, \tau \in \tau \tau \epsilon \sigma \tau \alpha \iota$, ' ${ }^{\epsilon} \gamma \nu \omega \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$, $\kappa \epsilon ́ \kappa \lambda \alpha v \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$ beside the regular forms $\kappa є \kappa \lambda \alpha \nu \mu \epsilon ́ \nu о \varsigma, \kappa \in ́ \kappa \lambda \alpha \nu \tau \alpha \alpha$.

## The Pluperfect.

§ 523. The parent Indg. language had no special forms which were used exclusively to express the pluperfect. It accordingly came to be expressed differently in the different languages. Greek had two distinct formations of the pluperfect.
I. The augmented perfect forms together with secondary personal endings. In this formation the active dual and plural were athematic, but the singular was thematic after

 '́ $\delta \epsilon i ́ \delta \iota \sigma \alpha \nu$, Є̈ $\sigma \tau \alpha \sigma \alpha \nu, \mu \epsilon ́ \mu \alpha \sigma \alpha \nu$, '̈ $\sigma \alpha \nu$ from ${ }^{*} F i ́ \delta \sigma \alpha \nu$, \&c., but

 $\tau \epsilon \tau \alpha \dot{\sigma} \theta \eta \nu, \beta \in \beta \lambda \dot{\eta} \alpha \tau \sigma, \dot{\eta} \lambda \eta ́ \lambda \alpha \tau \tau$.
2. But the usual mode of forming the active pluperfect started out originally from dissyllabic heavy bases ending in $-\epsilon$ in Greek (§ 458), to which were added in the singular the personal endings $-\alpha,-\alpha s,-\epsilon$ of the perfect, contracted with the $-\epsilon$ in Attic into $-\eta$, $-\eta s,-\epsilon \iota$ (= Herodotus $-\epsilon \alpha,-\epsilon \alpha s$, $-\epsilon \epsilon$ ) ; but dual $-\epsilon-\tau o \nu,-\epsilon-\tau \eta \nu$, pl. $-\epsilon-\mu \epsilon \nu$, $-\epsilon-\tau \epsilon,-\epsilon-\sigma \alpha \nu$ where the $-\epsilon$ - belonged to the base as in $\dot{\omega} \dot{\omega} \lambda \epsilon-\mu \epsilon \nu$. The $-\epsilon$ then became extended to other verbs, as $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \lambda o i ́ \pi \eta$, $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \lambda o i ́ \pi \eta \rho$,
 $\pi \epsilon \tau \epsilon$, $\epsilon^{\lambda} \lambda \epsilon \lambda o i ́ \pi \epsilon \sigma \alpha \nu$. At a later period in Attic were formed the endings $-\epsilon l \nu,-\epsilon \iota \varsigma$ with $\epsilon \iota$ from the third person singular, and then the $\epsilon \iota$ was levelled out into the dual and plural.

Note.-The prim. Greek preterite to oi $\delta \alpha$ was formed from
the stem $F \epsilon i \delta \eta$ - (cp. $\epsilon i \delta \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$, and Lat. vidē-re) with $-\eta$ - in all forms of the tense, as ${ }^{*} \hat{\eta} F \epsilon \delta \eta \nu,-\eta s,-\eta$ (Hom. $\dot{\eta} \epsilon i \delta \eta$ ), pl.
 new formations after the analogy of $\epsilon \lambda \epsilon \lambda \frac{1}{} \pi-\epsilon-\mu \epsilon \nu$, \&c. The regular form of the first person singular would have been * $\eta \partial \eta \eta$. The form $\eta \delta \delta a$, Att. $\eta \not \partial \eta$ was either a new formation after the analogy of $\lambda_{\epsilon} \lambda_{0} i \pi \epsilon \alpha,-\eta$ or else it was an aorist formation corresponding to a prim. Greek form ${ }^{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \boldsymbol{\eta} \epsilon \epsilon \delta \epsilon \sigma a(\$ 430)$.

## The Injunctive.

§ 524. Beside the subjunctive there also existed in the parent Indg. language the injunctive which in appearance consisted of unaugmented indicative forms with secondary personal endings, cp. $\phi^{\prime} \notin \epsilon, \phi \not \phi^{\prime} \rho \epsilon \tau \epsilon=$ Skr. bhárat, bhárata,
 á-bharata; $\theta^{\prime}$ ś, dós for ${ }^{*} \theta$ '́s, ${ }^{*} \delta \dot{\omega} s=$ Skr. dhắḥ, dấh, beside the aorist á-dhāḥ, á-dāḥ. This mood, also sometimes called the impure subjunctive, was fully developed in Vedic and was used with an indicative and subjunctive meaning, but in classical Sanskrit it was only preserved in imperative forms and in combination with the negative particle $\mathrm{m} \overline{\mathrm{a}}=\mu \dot{\eta}$ to express prohibitions, as mắ krthāh, do not do, má dhāḥ, do not place, beside the aorist á-krthāḥ, ádhāh. The injunctive was originally used partly with a present meaning, e.g. when the verbal form was unaccented, as in *pró bheret beside *bhéret $=\phi \epsilon ́ \rho \epsilon$, partly with a past meaning, and partly also with a voluntative or future meaning. But already in the prim. Indg. period the second and third persons (except the second pers. sing. active) had become part of the imperative system in making positive commands (§ 539 ), as $\stackrel{\epsilon}{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon 0$, $\neq \pi \pi o v=$ Lat. sequere, Indg. *séqeso ; $\phi$ ¢́ $\rho \tau \epsilon, \phi \epsilon ́ \rho \epsilon \tau о \nu, \phi \epsilon \rho \epsilon ́ \tau \omega \nu$ for ${ }^{*} \phi \epsilon \rho \epsilon ́ \tau \bar{\alpha} \nu=$ Skr. bhárata, bháratam, bháratām; middle $\phi \in ́ \rho \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$, $\phi \epsilon \in \rho \epsilon \sigma \theta o \nu, \phi \in \rho \epsilon \in \sigma \theta \omega \nu$. In Sanskrit and prim. Greek the
second pers. sing. of the aorist active also came to be used for the imperative, as dhấh, dấh = $\theta^{\prime}$ śs, סós, and similarly


## The Subjunctive.

§ 525. The original subjunctive, also called conjunctive, was preserved in Greek, Latin and Vedic, but in classical Sanskrit it had practically disappeared and its place was taken by the optative. It was also supplanted by the optative in the prehistoric period of the Germanic and Baltic-Slavonic languages. The original personal endings were partly primary and partly secondary. In the parent Indg. language the subjunctive was formed in various ways according as the stem of the indicative ended in (a) a consonant or (b) in ee, oo (dissyllabic light bases) or (c) in a long vowel (monosyllabic and dissyllabic heavy bases).
§ 526. Type (a). The subjunctive to indicative stems ending in a consonant had the characteristic formative element $\cdot$ e., $\cdot \mathbf{o} \cdot$. The ee., $\cdot \mathbf{o}$ - was doubtless of the same origin as the $\cdot \mathrm{e} \cdot, \cdot \mathrm{o} \cdot$ in the present and strong aorist of the thematic verbs, as $\lambda \epsilon i ́ m o-\mu \epsilon \nu, \lambda \epsilon i ́ \pi \epsilon-\tau \epsilon$, $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda i \not i \pi o-\mu \epsilon \nu$, $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda i ́ \pi \epsilon-\tau \epsilon$, so that the subjunctive of this type was the same in form as the present indicative of the thematic verbs. To this type belong presents and strong aorists like $\notin \omega, \widehat{\omega}=$ Lat.

 \&c. which came to be used as futures (§ 498). s-aorists, common in Homer and his imitators, as $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \gamma \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \tau \epsilon, \dot{\alpha} \gamma \epsilon \dot{C}-$

 peratives $\not \partial \hat{\xi} \epsilon \tau \epsilon$, oî $\sigma \epsilon$, ő $\psi \in \sigma \theta \epsilon, \lambda \in \hat{\xi} \xi \in$, \&c. Perfects like
 $\theta_{0} \mu \in \nu$.

From the time of Homer onwards the $-\epsilon-,-0$ - began to be supplanted by $\cdot \eta \cdot,-\omega$ - in all tenses except in those forms
which became used for the future and imperative. This change in Greek as in other Indg. languages was doubtless due to the fact that the latter was a more distinctive formation of the subjunctive, cp. $\imath^{\imath} \omega \mu \in \nu$ beside Hom. $\iota \circ \mu \epsilon \nu$, $\tau \epsilon i \sigma \omega \mu \epsilon \nu, \pi \epsilon \pi o i ́ \theta \omega \mu \epsilon \nu, \& c$.
§ 527. Type (b). The subjunctive to thematic indicative stems (dissyllabic light bases) had in Greek $-\eta-$-, $\omega$ - corresponding to the $-\epsilon,-\infty$ of the indicative. It is uncertain whether this $-\eta$ - and $-\omega$ - existed in the parent Indg. language or whether the $\eta$ - alone belonged originally to all forms of the subjunctive. So far as Greek is concerned the $-\eta-,-\omega$ might be a contraction of the $-\epsilon$, -0 in dissyllabic light bases like $\phi \in \rho \epsilon-, \phi \in \rho \sigma$ - with the $-\epsilon$-, -0 - which occurs in the subjunctive of type (a), but this explanation does not account for the long $\overline{\mathbf{a}}$ - in forms like Lat. ferā-mus, ferā-tis beside the fut. fere-mus, ferē-tis. Sanskrit unfortunately throws no light upon this difficult point, because in this language Indg. $\bar{e}, \bar{o}, \bar{a}$ all fell together in $\bar{a}(\S 42)$. It is, however, far more probable that the $-\eta$ - originally belonged to all forms of the singular, dual and plural, and that * $\phi \in \rho \eta \nu$, * $\phi \epsilon ́ \rho \eta \mu \epsilon \nu$, * $\phi \epsilon ́ \rho \eta \nu \tau \iota$ then became $\phi^{\prime} \rho \omega$, $\phi \epsilon ́ \rho \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$, $\phi \epsilon ́ \rho \omega \nu \tau \iota$ ( $\phi \epsilon ́ \rho \omega \sigma \iota$ ) after the analogy of the present indic. $\phi \bar{\epsilon} \rho \omega$, $\phi \epsilon ́ \rho о \mu є \nu, \phi \in ́ \rho о \nu \tau \iota(\phi \epsilon ́ \rho о \nu \sigma \iota$ ). This $-\eta$ - had its origin in dissyllabic heavy bases ending in $\cdot \overline{\mathrm{e}}(\S 458)$, cp. subj. í $\delta \eta-\tau \epsilon$ : Lat. vidē-te, $\pi i \theta \eta-\tau \alpha \iota: \pi \epsilon \pi \iota \theta \dot{\eta}-\sigma \omega, \beta \alpha \alpha_{\lambda} \eta$ : ${ }^{\epsilon}-\beta \lambda \eta-\nu$, and it is probable that the whole formation originally started out from the injunctive forms of the strong aorist of such bases as regularly had $\eta$ in all forms of the singular, dual and plural (§528). And in like manner the $\overline{\mathbf{a}}$, which occurs in Latin, Keltic and the Slavonic languages, probably started out from the injunctive forms of dissyllabic bases ending in $\cdot \bar{a}$ (§ 458). The inflexion of type (b) in Vedic was sing. bhárā-ni, bhárā-s(i), bhárā-t(i), pl. bhárā-ma, bhárātha, bhárā-n, but in Greek $\phi^{\prime} \rho \omega$, $\phi \epsilon ́ \rho \eta s, \phi \in ́ \rho \eta, \phi \in ́ \rho \omega-\mu \epsilon \nu$, $\phi \epsilon ́ \rho \eta-\tau \epsilon, \phi \epsilon ́ \rho \omega-\nu \tau \iota(\phi \epsilon ́ \rho \omega-\sigma \iota)$, where $\phi \bar{\rho} \rho \eta s, \phi \epsilon ́ \rho \eta$ from older

* $\phi \epsilon ́ \rho \eta-\epsilon \iota s,{ }^{*} \phi \epsilon \bar{\rho} \eta-\epsilon \iota$ had $\epsilon \iota$ from the endings of the present indicative. The regular forms would have been * $\phi \bar{\epsilon} \rho \eta-s$, * $\phi \epsilon ́ \rho \eta$. For $\phi \epsilon ́ \rho \omega-\nu \tau \iota$ ( $\phi \epsilon ́ \rho \omega-\sigma \iota$ ) we should have expected ${ }^{*} \phi \epsilon ́ \rho \rho-\nu \tau \iota\left({ }^{*} \phi \epsilon ́ \rho o v \sigma \iota\right)$ with shortening of the $-\omega \cdot(\S 70)$, but either the $\omega$ - was introduced into the third person plural after the law for the shortening of long vowels in this position had ceased to operate, or else it was re-introduced from $\phi \epsilon \in \rho \omega-\mu \epsilon \nu$ in order to preserve the distinction between the subjunctive and indicative.

In like manner was formed the subjunctive of denominative verbs from vocalic stems, as $\tau \bar{\iota} \mu \alpha ́ \alpha \omega \mu \epsilon \nu, \tau \bar{\tau} \mu \alpha ́ \eta \tau \epsilon, \phi \iota \lambda \epsilon ́ \omega-$ $\mu \epsilon \nu, \phi i \lambda \epsilon \in \eta \tau \epsilon$, Att. $\tau \bar{\iota} \mu \hat{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu, \& c$. The contracted forms of the subjunctive and indicative of $\tau \bar{\iota} \mu \alpha ́ \omega$ regularly fell together in Attic in the second and third persons singular, and then after the analogy of these the indicative forms $\delta \eta \lambda o i ̂ s, \delta \eta \lambda o \hat{\imath}$ also came to be used for the subjunctive of $\delta \eta \lambda$ ó $\omega$.
§ 528. Type (c). The subjunctive to indicative stems ending in a long vowel. Here a distinction must be made according as the final long vowel of the indicative stem originally belonged ( I ) to all forms of the singular, dual and plural or (2) belonged only to the active singular. The regular old subjunctive forms of (I) were preserved in some Doric dialects, as Mess. र $\rho \alpha ́ \phi \eta \nu \tau \iota$ beside Att. $\gamma \rho \alpha ́ \phi \omega \sigma \iota$, Heracl. оікод́ó $\eta \tau \alpha \iota$ : indic. оікодо $\mu \in і$ í $\alpha \iota$, Cret. $\pi \epsilon \in \pi \bar{\alpha} \tau \alpha \iota$, Ther. $\pi \epsilon \in \pi \rho \bar{\alpha} \tau \alpha \iota$. But already in Homer the original forms were remodelled after the analogy of types (a) and (b), as $\delta \alpha \mu \eta^{\prime} \omega$, $\delta \alpha \mu \eta \epsilon \tau \epsilon: \frac{\epsilon}{\epsilon}-\delta \alpha \dot{\mu} \eta \nu, \tau \rho \alpha \pi \dot{\eta} о \mu \epsilon \nu$ :
 $\gamma \nu \omega ́ \eta, \gamma \nu \omega \omega \omega \sigma \iota, \& c$. Prim. Greek had in (2) the long vowel in all forms, but it cannot be determined what were the original Indg. forms of the dual and plural active and of the middle. A few such forms have been preserved in various dialects, as Cret. $\delta \dot{v} \nu \bar{\alpha} \mu \alpha \iota$, $\nu u ́ \nu \bar{\alpha} \tau \alpha \iota, ~ \nu v ́ v \bar{\alpha} \nu \tau \iota, ~ i ́ \theta \theta \bar{\alpha} \nu \tau \iota$ $=i ̈ \sigma \tau \bar{\alpha} \nu \tau \iota$, Mess. $\pi \rho o-\tau i \theta \eta \nu \tau \iota$, Arcad. $\epsilon \pi \iota \sigma v \nu-\iota \sigma \tau \bar{\alpha} \tau o \iota, \delta \in \bar{\alpha} \tau o \iota$ ( $\S 444$ ), \&c. But already in Homer the prim. Greek forms
were also here remodelled after the analogy of types (a) and (b), as $\delta \omega о \mu \epsilon \nu, \theta \dot{\eta} \circ \mu \epsilon \nu, \sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \circ \mu \epsilon \nu, \sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \epsilon \tau \circ \nu$, and with quantitative metathesis, Hom. $\theta_{\epsilon} \epsilon \mu \mu \epsilon \nu, \sigma \tau \epsilon \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$, \&c. (§ 72), beside $\delta \omega \omega \omega \tau \iota(\nu), \sigma \tau \eta\left(\omega \sigma \iota, \delta \omega \eta \sigma \iota(\nu), \sigma \tau \eta \eta_{n s,} \theta \dot{\eta} \eta, \& c\right.$. Attic regularly has the contracted forms, as $\delta i \delta \hat{\omega}, \delta i \delta \omega ิ s, \delta i \delta \hat{\varrho}$, $\delta_{\iota} \delta \hat{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu, \delta_{l} \delta \hat{\omega} \tau \epsilon ; \tau \iota \theta \hat{\omega}, \tau \iota \theta \hat{\eta} s, \tau \iota \theta \hat{\eta}, \tau \iota \theta \hat{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu, \tau_{\imath} \theta \hat{\eta} \tau \epsilon, \& c$.
§ 529. In some verbs Attic and Ionic had new formations in the middle. After the analogy of $\phi \phi^{\prime} \rho \omega \mu \alpha \iota: \phi{ }^{\prime} \rho \eta \tau \alpha \iota$ was formed $\tau i \theta \omega \mu \alpha \iota$ : тí $\eta \tau \alpha \iota$. After $\bar{\alpha}$ had become $\eta$ in Attic and Ionic (§51) we then also have $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i \sigma \tau \omega \mu \alpha \iota: \hat{\epsilon} \pi i-$ $\sigma \tau \eta \tau \alpha \iota$, and similarly $\delta \dot{v} \nu \omega \mu \alpha \iota, \kappa \rho \epsilon ́ \mu \omega \mu \alpha \iota, \mu \dot{\alpha} \rho \nu \omega \mu \alpha \iota$. The circumflex in $\tau \iota \hat{\omega} \mu \alpha \iota$, $\delta \iota \delta \hat{\omega} \mu \alpha \iota$, i $\sigma \tau \hat{\omega} \mu \alpha \iota$ was due to the analogy of the active.

## The Optative.

§ 530. The optative was originally formed in two ways according as the corresponding tense-stems of the indicative were athematic or thematic. The optative to the athematic indicative stems had the formative element -(i)jē-, - i- where $\cdot \mathrm{i}$ - was the weak grade of $\cdot \mathrm{je}$ - (§ 90), and the optative to thematic indicative stems had -1 - which combined with the thematic vowel $\cdot 0$ - to form the diphthong $\cdot \mathrm{oi} \cdot$. Both types of optatives had secondary personal endings.
§ 531. In the first type of optative the active singular had -(i)je- and all other forms of the active and the whole of the middle had $\cdot \overline{\mathrm{i}}$ - before endings beginning with a consonant, but -(i) )j before endings beginning with a vowel. In the active singular the accent was on the - $\bar{e}$-, but in all other forms on the personal endings, and the stem had accordingly the weak grade of ablaut. The weak form of the stem was however generally supplanted by the strong form already in prim. Greek, i.e. the optative came to be made direct from the strong grade form of the stem. The original manner of forming this type of the optative was only preserved in the historic period of the language when the stem originally
ended in a vowel or came to end in a vowel after the loss of intervocalic $-\sigma$ - (§ 213, 2), as $\sigma \tau \alpha-i \eta \nu, \theta \in-i \eta \nu ; \epsilon-l^{\prime} \eta \nu, \epsilon-\hat{i} \mu \in \nu$
 ${ }^{*} F \epsilon \epsilon \delta \epsilon \sigma-\bar{\tau} \mu \epsilon \nu$. The original inflexion of $\epsilon \neq \eta \nu$ was :-

|  | Indg. | Gr. | Skr. | O.Lat. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sing. 1. | *s-(i)jét-m | cilp | syắm | siem |
| 2. | *S-(i)jé-s | cilns | syâh | siēs |
| 3. | *S-(i)jét-t | cil $\eta$ | syát | siet |
| Plur. I . | *s-i.m' | $\epsilon \hat{l} \mu \epsilon \nu$ | syáma | sīmus |
| 2. | *S-ī-té | $\epsilon \hat{i} \tau \epsilon$ | syáta | sitis |
| 3. | *s-(i)j-ént | $\epsilon \hat{i} \epsilon \nu$ | [syúr] | sient |

In Greek the stem had the strong grade of ablaut which occurs in $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma-\tau i$, so that the prim. Greek forms were
 From the time of Homer onwards the $-\iota \eta$ - of the singular became levelled out into the dual and plural, as ein $\eta o \nu$,
 $\mu \epsilon \nu$, $\delta o i \eta \mu \in \nu$. A similar levelling out of the -yā- also took place in the prehistoric period of Sanskrit, as syấma for *simá, whereas in classical Latin the -i. of the plural was levelled out into the singular, as sim, sis, sit, and similarly in prim. Germanic, as in Old High German sī, sìs, sī, pl. sìm, sitt, sīn.

But the optative to indicative stems ending in a consonant came to be formed after the analogy of the thematic type already in prim. Greek, as $\lambda \epsilon-\lambda o i ́ \pi-o t-\mu l$, $\lambda \epsilon-\lambda o i ́ \pi-o \iota-\mu \in \nu$ :
 $\alpha l-\mu l, \lambda \bar{v} \sigma-\alpha \iota-\mu \in \nu:{ }^{\prime}-\lambda \bar{v} \sigma-\alpha$; cp. on the other hand Skr. vid•yá $\cdot \mathrm{t}$ : indic. véd $\cdot \mathrm{a}=0 \hat{\delta} \delta$; ri.ric.yā.t : indic. ri-rếc.a $=\lambda \epsilon-\lambda o \iota \pi-\epsilon$; third pers. sing. of the s-aorist middle dikṣ̆-i-ta : indic. á-dikṣ.i, cp. Lat. dīx-i-mus.
§ 532. The regular optative to dissyllabic heavy bases, which had a long vowel in the second syllable of all forms of the indicative, was in prim. Greek ${ }^{*} \delta \rho \bar{\alpha} j \eta \nu,{ }^{*} \gamma \nu \omega j \eta \nu$, pl.
${ }^{*} \delta \rho \bar{\alpha} \iota \mu \epsilon \nu,{ }^{*} \gamma \nu \omega \iota \mu \epsilon \nu$ : indic. ${ }^{\epsilon}-\delta \rho \bar{\alpha} \nu,{ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon}-\gamma \nu \omega \nu, \mathrm{pl}$. $\bar{\epsilon}-\delta \rho \bar{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \nu$, ${ }_{\epsilon}{ }^{-}-\gamma \nu \omega \mu \epsilon \nu$, which would regularly have become ${ }^{*} \delta \rho \bar{a} \eta \nu$, ${ }^{*} \gamma \nu \omega \eta \nu(\S 128)$, pl. ${ }^{*} \delta \rho \alpha \iota \mu \epsilon \nu,{ }^{*} \gamma \nu o \iota \mu \epsilon \nu$ with shortening of the long vowel ( $\S 63$ ). The historic forms $\delta \rho \alpha i \eta \nu, \gamma \nu o i \eta \nu$ were new formations either after the analogy of $\theta \in i \quad \eta \nu$, doi $\eta \nu$, $\sigma \tau \alpha i \eta \nu$ or else with $\alpha \iota$, o from the plural ${ }^{*} \delta \rho \alpha \iota \mu \in \nu,{ }^{*} \gamma \nu \circ \iota \mu \in \nu$; and similarly $\dot{\alpha} \lambda o i \eta \nu, \beta \alpha \lambda \epsilon i \not \eta \nu, \beta \lambda \epsilon i \not \eta \nu, \gamma \eta \rho \alpha i \eta \nu$, кıхєí $\nu$, $\phi \alpha \nu \epsilon i \eta \nu, \& c$. The circumflex in the pl. $\delta \rho \alpha \hat{\imath} \mu \in \nu, \gamma \nu 0 \imath \hat{\mu} \epsilon \nu$, $\dot{\alpha} \lambda o \hat{\imath} \mu \epsilon \nu, \beta \alpha \lambda \epsilon \hat{\jmath} \mu \epsilon \nu, \beta \lambda \epsilon \hat{\imath} \mu \epsilon \nu, \kappa \iota \chi \epsilon \hat{\iota} \mu \epsilon \nu, \phi \alpha \nu \epsilon \hat{\imath} \mu \in \nu, \& c$. as also in forms like $\tau \epsilon \theta \epsilon \hat{\mu} \mu \epsilon \nu, \theta \epsilon \hat{\imath} \mu \in \nu$ (§533) has never yet been satisfactorily explained, see Brugmann, Griech. Grammatik, third ed., p. $33^{8}$.
§ 533. The optative to monosyllabic heavy ablaut-bases had the weak form of the base, as $\tau \tau-\theta \epsilon-i \eta-\nu, \theta_{\epsilon-i} \eta-\nu$, pl. $\tau \iota-\theta \epsilon \hat{\iota} \mu \epsilon \nu, \theta \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \nu$ : indic. $\tau i \cdot-\theta \eta-\mu, \tau i \cdot \theta \epsilon-\mu \epsilon \nu$. The $\iota$ in the sing. $\theta$ єi $\eta \nu, \& c$. was either due to levelling out of the $\iota$ of the dual and plural (except the third person which was also a similar new formation) into the singular or else it represented Indg. -ij., as *dhə-ijē-m corresponding to Sanskrit dhēyấm. An Indg. form *dho-jē-m would have become * $\theta \in \eta \nu$ in Greek. The circumflex in $\theta \epsilon \hat{\imath} \mu \in \nu, \tau i \theta \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \mu \in \nu$, $\theta \epsilon i \tau o, \tau i \theta \in i \tau o$ presents the same difficulty as in $\delta \rho \alpha \hat{\imath} \mu \in \nu$ for * $\delta \rho \alpha i ́ \mu \epsilon \nu$ (§ 532) ; and similarly $\delta \iota \delta o i ́ \eta \nu$, $\delta o i ́ \eta \nu(S k r$. dēyấm),
 $i \sigma \tau \alpha \hat{\mu} \mu \epsilon \nu, \sigma \tau \alpha \hat{\iota} \mu \in \nu, \phi \alpha \hat{\imath} \mu \epsilon \nu$; pf. ̇̇ $\sigma \tau \alpha i \not \eta \nu, \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \alpha \hat{\imath} \mu \epsilon \nu, \tau \in \theta \nu \alpha i \not \eta \nu$. In Herodotus and later Attic the $-\iota \eta$ - of the active singular was levelled out into the dual and plural, as $\theta \in i \quad \eta \mu \in \nu$, סoí $\mu \epsilon \nu, \sigma \tau \alpha i ́ \eta \mu \in \nu$ (cp. § 531).
§ 534. The original formation of the optative to dissyllabic heavy ablaut-bases was not preserved in Greek. The original optatives of this type were remodelled after the analogy of the thematic type, as кр'є́ $\mu \iota \iota \tau$ : indic. кр'́-
 the optative to presents in $-\nu \bar{v} \mu \iota$ would regularly have had

i．tá ：indic．r－ṇố－ti，he moves ；$\mu \alpha \rho \nu o i ́ \mu \eta \nu, \mu \alpha \rho \nu o i ́ \mu \in \theta \alpha$ ：
 šrr－nị－tá ：indic．š̆r－ṇáa－ti，he breaks in pieces．
§ 535．The Greek optative to the s－aorist was a new formation after the analogy of the thematic type，as in $\lambda \hat{v} \sigma \alpha \iota \mu \iota, \lambda \hat{v} \sigma \alpha \iota s, \lambda \hat{v} \sigma \alpha \iota ; \lambda \hat{v} \sigma \alpha \iota \tau o \nu, \lambda \bar{v} \sigma \alpha i \not \tau \eta \nu ; \lambda \hat{v} \sigma \alpha \iota \mu \in \nu$ ， $\lambda \hat{v} \sigma \alpha \iota \tau \epsilon, \lambda \hat{v} \sigma \alpha \iota \epsilon \nu$ ；middle $\lambda \bar{v} \sigma \alpha i ́ \mu \eta \nu$ ：${ }_{\epsilon}-\lambda \bar{v} \sigma-\alpha, \epsilon \in-\lambda \bar{v} \sigma-\alpha-\mu \eta \nu$ ， where the $\alpha$－of the s－aorist indicative（ $(507$ ）came to be regarded as a thematic vowel like the $-o$－in $\phi$＇́рог $\mu, \phi \in \rho o i-$
 $\phi \dot{\eta} \nu \alpha \iota \mu \iota, \phi \dot{\eta} \nu \alpha \iota \mu \epsilon \nu, \phi \eta \nu \alpha i ́ \mu \eta \nu$ ：$\epsilon \in-\phi \eta \nu \alpha$ from ${ }^{*} \epsilon \in-\phi \alpha \nu \sigma \alpha, \& c$ ．

The so－called Aeolic optative of the s－aorist which occurs in Homer and Attic was also a Greek new formation with reduplication of the s－element of the aorist and with $\epsilon$ from the original s－aorist of the subjunctive，as $\delta \epsilon i \xi \epsilon \epsilon \alpha s, \delta \in i j \in \epsilon \epsilon$ ， third pers．pl．$\delta \epsilon i \xi \in \epsilon \alpha \nu$ from ${ }^{*} \delta \epsilon \epsilon \kappa \sigma \epsilon \sigma j \alpha \nu$ ，and similarly in Lat．dixerim，dixerimus beside the regular old forms dixim，dixximus．
§ 536．The optative to thematic indicative stems had originally $\cdot \mathbf{i}$－which combined with the thematic vowel $\cdot 0 \cdot$ to form the diphthong－oi－，but－oj－before endings beginning with a vowel．This type of optative was preserved in Greek，Sanskrit and also in the old Germanic languages， but with the function of the subjunctive，whereas in Latin it disappeared already in the prehistoric period of the language．The original inflexion of this type of optative was：－

Sing．I．
Indg． 2

Dual 2．＊bhéroi－tom
3.

Plur．I．＊bhéroi－m．
3.

3．＊bhéroi－t

2．＊bhéroi－te
＊bhéroj－m
＊bhéroi－s
＊bhéroi－tām
＊bhéroj－ñt

Gr．
$\phi$ є́ $\rho о \iota \mu$
ф＇́pous
$\phi$ ф́poı
фе́рогто⿱
$\phi \in \rho о i ́ \tau \eta \nu$
ф́́рогдє⿱
фє́роıтє
申є́polє̀

Skr．
bhárēyam
bhárẹ̄
bhárēt
bhárētam
bhárētām
bhárēma
bhárēta
bhárēyur

Goth．
baíráu baíráis baírái
baíráima
baíráip
baíráina

The regular forms of the first pers. singular and the third pers. plural were not preserved in the historic period of any of the languages. Both forms would regularly have become *ф'́ $\rho \omega$ from older *ф'́ $\rho о j a$. $\phi \epsilon ́ \rho о \iota \mu \iota$ had the stem $\phi$ '́pol- from the other persons where it was regular and $-\mu \iota$ after the analogy of the athematic presents, and similarly $\phi \epsilon$ ' $\rho o l-\epsilon \nu$ with $-\epsilon \nu$ from the optative of the athematic type (§531). And in like manner both forms would regularly have become *bháraya in Sanskrit, but the stem bhárēy- had •ē- from the other forms.
$\S 537$. In the $-\epsilon \omega$ class of contract verbs the optative plural $\phi i \lambda \epsilon \sigma \iota \mu \epsilon \nu$, \&c. regularly became contracted into $\phi i \lambda o i ̂ \mu \in \nu, \& c$. , and thus fell together with the athematic type $\delta \iota \delta o \hat{\imath} \mu \in \nu$. And then after the analogy of $\delta \iota \delta o \hat{\imath} \mu \in \nu$ : $\delta i \delta o i ́ \eta \nu$ to $\phi i \lambda o i ̂ \mu \epsilon \nu$ a new singular $\phi i \lambda o i \not \eta \nu$ was formed, and at a later period the -oi $\eta$ - of the singular was levelled out into the dual and plural. After the analogy of the optative of this type were also formed new optatives to the contract verbs in $\alpha \dot{\alpha} \omega$, - 0 .
§ 538. The prim. Greek forms of the middle were ${ }^{*} \phi \in \rho о \iota \mu \bar{\alpha} \nu,{ }^{*} \phi \in \rho o \iota \sigma o,{ }^{*} \phi \in \rho o \iota \tau o\left(=\right.$ Skr. bhárēta); ${ }^{*} \phi \in \rho o \iota \sigma \theta o \nu$, ${ }^{*} \phi \epsilon \rho \circ \iota \sigma \theta \bar{\alpha} \nu ;{ }^{*} \phi \epsilon \rho \circ \iota \mu \in \theta \alpha,{ }^{*} \phi \in \rho o \iota \sigma \theta \epsilon$, ${ }^{*} \phi \epsilon \rho o j \alpha \tau о$ ( $=$ Indg. *bhérojnto), on the personal endings see $\S \S 442-8 .^{*} \phi \in \rho o j$ $\alpha \tau o$ would regularly have become * $\phi \in \rho \omega \tau о$. $\phi$ ́́ $\rho o \iota \nu \tau o$ was a new formation with the stem $\phi \in \rho \circ$ - from the other forms and the ending - $\nu \tau o$ from forms like $\hat{\epsilon}^{\prime}-\phi$ '́ $\rho o \nu \tau o$. The old ending - $\alpha \tau 0$ is found in Homer, Herodotus and the Attic dramatists in the combination -ol- $\alpha \tau 0$ where -ol was from the other forms.

## The Imperative.

§ 539. Already in the parent Indg. language the imperative system was made up of several distinct formations which included ( $a$ ) injunctive forms, as $\phi$ '́ $\rho \epsilon \tau \epsilon$, Skr. bhárata;

ex-ì; and (c) compound forms, as ${ }_{i} \sigma \cdot-\theta l,{ }_{l}{ }_{l} \sigma \cdot \tau \omega=$ Skr. vid-dhí, vit-tád. It had injunctive forms for the second person singular of the middle, the second person plural of the active and middle, and the second and third person dual of the active and middle, as ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \sigma=$ Lat. sequere ; $\phi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \tau \epsilon$, $\phi \epsilon ́ \rho \in \sigma \theta \epsilon$; $\phi \epsilon ́ \rho \epsilon \tau о \nu, \phi \epsilon \rho \epsilon ́ \tau \omega \nu$ for older ${ }^{*} \phi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \in \tau \bar{\alpha} \nu$ after the analogy of $\phi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \epsilon \tau \omega, \phi \epsilon ́ \rho \epsilon \sigma \theta \circ \nu, \phi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \in \sigma \theta \omega \nu$, see § 524. To these were added in prim. Greek the injunctive forms of the second aorist active, as $\epsilon \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \sigma-\phi \rho \epsilon \varsigma$, ${ }^{\epsilon} \kappa-\phi \rho \in \varsigma$, $\bar{\epsilon} \nu \dot{l}-\sigma \pi \epsilon \varsigma$,
 injunctive require no further comment and will therefore be omitted in the following paragraphs.

## I. The Active.

§ 540. The second person singular was expressed (a) by the bare stem, as $\phi \notin \rho \epsilon$, Skr. bhára, Goth. baír ; $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \epsilon$, Lat. age ; $\beta \dot{\alpha} \sigma \kappa \epsilon$, Skr. gáccha; $\tau^{i} \mu \bar{\alpha}, \phi i ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota, \delta \dot{\eta} \lambda o v$, from $\tau_{i}^{\prime} \mu \alpha \epsilon, \phi i \lambda \lambda \epsilon \epsilon, \delta \dot{\eta} \lambda 0 \epsilon ; \tau \epsilon \in \lambda \epsilon \iota$ from ${ }^{*} \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \sigma j \epsilon, \phi \alpha i ̂ \nu \epsilon$ from * $\phi \alpha \nu j \epsilon$;
 where the former preserved the old accent when such imperatives were originally used at the beginning of the sentence, and the latter represented the original enclitic form
 $\delta \epsilon i ́ \kappa \nu \bar{v}, \kappa \rho \dot{\eta} \mu \nu \eta$, Lesb. $\pi \hat{\omega}$ beside $\pi \hat{\omega}-\theta \iota$. At a later period the $-\epsilon$ in $\phi \epsilon \in \epsilon$, \&c. came to be regarded as an ending and was then extended to athematic verbs, as $\kappa \alpha \theta$ - $\bar{\sigma} \tau \bar{\alpha}$ from *-í $\sigma \tau \alpha \epsilon, \tau i \theta \epsilon \iota$ from ${ }^{*} \tau i \theta \epsilon \epsilon$, and similarly $\delta_{i ́ \delta o v, ~} \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha ́-\beta \bar{\alpha}$, ${ }^{\circ} \mu \nu \nu \epsilon, \& c$.
(b) By the addition of the accented adverbial particle -dhí (= Skr. -dhí, later -hí) to athematic stems. This formation only occurs in Greek, Aryan and the BalticSlavonic languages, but the fact that the stem had the weak grade of ablaut shows that it was very old. Examples are
 $\kappa \lambda \hat{v} \cdot \theta l$, Skr. šru-dhí; $\pi i \cdot \theta \iota$ beside $\pi \hat{\omega} \cdot \theta l$, Skr. pā-hí. Heavy
ablaut-bases, as $\phi \dot{\alpha}-\theta_{l}: \phi \eta-\sigma_{l},{ }_{i}^{\prime \prime} \lambda \alpha-\theta_{l}$ from ${ }^{*} \sigma l-\sigma \lambda \alpha-\theta_{l},{ }^{\circ} \rho \nu v v-\theta_{l}$,
 from * $\delta \in \delta F l-\theta l$. Heavy bases with a long vowel (§ 458), as $\gamma \nu \hat{\omega}-\theta l, \tau \lambda \hat{\eta}-\theta l, \phi_{\alpha} \nu \eta-\theta_{l}$. After the analogy of second aorists like $\tau \lambda \hat{\eta}-\theta l, \phi \alpha \alpha^{\nu} \eta-\theta_{l}$ it was added to the new first aorist passive (§514) with dissimilation of the $\theta$ after the preceding aspirate, as $\lambda$ eí $\phi \theta \eta-\tau \iota, \lambda \dot{v} \theta \eta-\tau \iota, \& c$. At a later period such imperatives were also formed from the strong grade stem of heavy ablaut-bases, as $\bar{i} \lambda \eta-\theta c$ beside the regular form ${ }_{\iota}^{\nu} \lambda \alpha-\theta l, \pi \hat{\omega}-\theta_{l}$ beside $\pi \hat{\imath} \cdot \theta_{l}, \sigma \tau \hat{\eta}-\theta_{l}$, Hom. $\delta i \delta \omega-\theta l$, \&c.

The ending oo of the second person singular of the
 never been satisfactorily explained.

Note.-Att. $\pi i \epsilon t$ (also extended to $\pi i \epsilon-$-s after the analogy of injunctive forms like $\sigma \chi^{\epsilon} s$ ), $\delta i \delta o \iota$ (Pindar), and Dor. ä $\gamma \epsilon \iota$ probably contain the deictic particle $\check{\iota}$ which occurs in such forms as ovivoo-it, vivv-í (§ 411).
§ 541. In Greek the third person singular was formed by the addition of $-\tau \omega$ to the bare stem. This $-\tau \omega(=$ Skr. .tád, Lat. -tō, Indg. *-tōd) was not originally a personal ending, but simply the ablative singular of the neuter demonstrative pronoun *tod ( $=$ Gr. tó, Skr. tád, Lat. is-tud, Engl. $^{\text {. }}$ that) used adverbially with the meaning from that time, after that, then. The combination was originally used to express the second and third persons of all numbers, but already in prim. Greek it became restricted to the third person singular, and in Latin to the second and third person singular, whereas in Vedic it was almost exclusively restricted to the second person singular, but it also occurred occasionally for the third person singular, and the second person dual and plural. In Vedic it had the function of a kind of future imperative, expressing an injunction
which was to be carried out at a time subsequent to the present. Originally the tōd had the principal accent and the stem of ablaut-bases had the weak grade of ablaut, as í $\sigma \cdot \tau \omega$ from ${ }^{*} F \iota \tau \cdot \tau \omega$, Skr. vit-tád, $\delta o ́-\tau \omega$, Lat. da-tō, Skr. dat-tád, and similarly $\delta \iota \delta o ́ \tau \omega, \tau \iota \theta \in \epsilon \tau \omega$, ${ }^{\prime} \sigma \tau \alpha ́ \tau \omega$, ${ }^{\prime} \tau \omega$, ф $\dot{\alpha} \tau \omega$, ठ $\mu \nu u ́ \tau \omega, \delta \alpha \mu \nu \alpha ́ \tau \omega, \delta \rho \bar{\alpha} \tau \omega, \gamma \nu \dot{\sigma} \tau \omega, \& \mathrm{\& c}$. ; perfects like $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \alpha ́ \tau \omega$, $\tau \epsilon \theta \nu \alpha ́ \tau \omega, \mu \epsilon \mu \alpha ́ \tau \omega$, Lat. mementō. This formation was probably confined originally to athematic verbs, but it must have been extended to thematic verbs at a very early period as is shown by examples like $\phi \in \rho^{\prime} \tau \omega$, $\epsilon i \pi \epsilon ́ \tau \omega$, Lat. vehitō beside Skr. bharatād, vōcatād, vahatād, $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \epsilon ́ \tau \omega$ beside Lat. agitō.
§ 542. The third person plural. The restriction of the formation with tōd to the third person singular in prim. Greek gave rise to several new formations for expressing the third person plural. The exact chronological order in which these new formations took place cannot bedetermined with certainty. The oldest type seems to be $\phi \in \rho$ óv $\tau \omega$ which occurs in Doric, Boeotian and Arcadian. This type probably arose in prim. Greek by the addition of $-\tau \omega$ to the injunctive form ${ }^{*} \phi \in \rho \circ \nu, \mathrm{cp}$. the similar formation in Lat. ferunt-ō. From $\phi \epsilon \rho \frac{\sigma}{\nu} \tau \omega$ was formed $\phi \epsilon \rho^{\circ} \nu \tau \omega \nu$ by the addition of the secondary plural ending $-\nu$ of the third person. The type $\phi \epsilon \rho o ́ v \tau \omega \nu$ occurs in Homer, Attic, Ionic and some Doric dialects, and was the only good one in Attic until Aristotle's time. The type ${ }^{\epsilon} \sigma \sigma \tau \omega \nu$, ${ }^{\prime} \tau \omega \nu, \& c$., which occurs in Homer, Attic, and Ionic (on inscriptions), arose from the pluralizing of the singular by the addition of $-\nu, \mathrm{cp}$. the similar process in Latin agito-te with -te after the analogy of agi.te. After the analogy of forms like $\dot{\epsilon} \delta i \delta \delta_{0} \sigma \alpha \nu \nu: \notin \delta \delta \delta o \nu$ was formed the type $\phi \epsilon \rho o ́ \nu \tau \omega \sigma \alpha \nu: \phi \epsilon \rho o ́ \nu-$ $\tau \omega \nu$, which is found on Attic inscriptions of the fourth century в. с. And then lastly arose the type $\phi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \in \tau \omega \sigma \alpha \nu$, $\delta \iota \delta o ́ \tau \omega \sigma \alpha \nu$ from a pluralizing of the singular by the addition of the plural ending $-\sigma \alpha \nu$. This type occurs in Attic prose
since the time of Thucydides and on Attic inscriptions from 300 в. c. onwards and also on inscriptions in the later Doric and North-Western dialects.

## 2. The Middle.

§ 543. For the second person singular of the present and second aorist the injunctive forms were used, as ${ }^{\prime \prime} \pi \epsilon \epsilon$, $\epsilon^{\prime \prime} \pi{ }^{\prime} \pi$ from * $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \epsilon \sigma o=$ Lat. sequere, and similarly $\lambda \epsilon i \pi \pi o v, \lambda \iota \pi o \hat{v}$, $\theta o \hat{v}, \delta o \hat{v}, \& c$. In forms like $\tau i \theta \epsilon \sigma o, \delta i ́ \delta o \sigma o$, í $\sigma \tau \alpha \sigma o, \delta \in i ́ k \nu v \sigma o$ the $-\sigma$ - was restored after the analogy of the other forms, $\tau \iota \theta \in ́ \sigma \theta \omega$, \&c.

The second person singular of the s-aorist $\delta \epsilon \hat{\imath} \xi \alpha, \lambda \hat{v} \sigma \alpha \iota$, $\phi \hat{\eta} \nu \alpha \iota$ from * $\phi \alpha \nu \sigma \alpha \iota, \& c$. is difficult to account for, because this form does not occur in any of the other languages. Most scholars are inclined to regard it as being originally the active infinitive which came to be used for the imperative through the influence of the personal ending - $(\sigma) \alpha \iota$ (as in $\phi^{\prime} \rho \in \alpha \iota$, $\tau i \theta \epsilon \sigma \alpha \iota$ ) of the second person singular of the present indicative, cp. also the Latin passive imperative plural legi-mini which in form corresponds to the infinitive $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon$ ' $-\mu \in \nu \alpha \iota(\$ 546)$.
§ 544. The other forms of the middle contain the element $-\sigma \theta$ - which is of the same origin as in the infinitive $\phi$ '́ $\rho \in \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$, $\tau i \theta \epsilon \sigma \theta \alpha \iota, \& c$. , but in other respects they have the same endings as the active. In prim. Greek the form $\phi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \in \sigma \theta \omega$ arose beside the active form $\phi \in \rho \in \epsilon \tau \omega$ after the analogy of $\phi \bar{\epsilon} \rho \in \sigma \theta \epsilon: \phi \in \epsilon \in \epsilon \tau \epsilon$. The history and development of the middle forms of the third person plural went parallel with those of the active, but with regular loss of the $\nu$ - in the combination $-\nu \sigma \theta-(\S 153)$, cp. $\phi \in \rho \epsilon ́ \sigma \theta \omega \nu$, $\tau \iota \theta \epsilon \in \sigma \theta \omega \nu$ beside the active $\phi \epsilon \rho \delta ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu, \tau \iota \in \epsilon \nu \tau \omega \nu$.

## The Infinitive.

§ 545. The infinitives of the Indg. languages were originally isolated singular case-forms of nomina actionis, and as with other kinds of nouns the case-form used depended upon the construction of the sentence. Such isolated forms became associated with the verb as soon as they were no longer regarded as being connected with the declension of the type to which they originally belonged. This isolation took place with some nomina actionis already in the parent Indg. language. The original Indg. nomina actionis were best preserved in the Aryan, Old Germanic and Baltic-Slavonic languages, whereas in Greek and Latin they became in a great measure associated with the verbal system. The infinitive being a noun in form had originally nothing to do with the distinction between active, passive, and middle. The association of particular forms to particular voices took place at a much later period.
As there were in the parent Indg. language a large number of suffixes which were used to form nomina actionis, there are accordingly a large number of different forms of the infinitive in the separate languages, cp . Lat. regere from *reges-i; Goth. OE. nim-an, to take; Lith. dư-ti, O.Slav. da-ti, to give; Vedic yúdh-am, to fight, át-tum, to eat, yujế, to yoke, dá-man-ē (Hom. $\delta \delta \cdot-\mu \in \nu-\alpha \iota)$, dā-ván-ē, to give, át-tav-ē, to eat, sak-ṣán•i, to abide. Of all these and various other Vedic forms only the one in tum-identical with the Latin supine in tum-was preserved in classical Sanskrit. In Vedic the case-form of the infinitive could be the accusative, dative, locative, and ablative-genitive. In classical Sanskrit and the Old Germanic languages the case-form was restricted to the accusative, in Latin to the dative, locative and accusative
( $=$ the supine in tum), and in Greek to the dative and locative. Datives were the infinitives in $-\mu \epsilon \nu \alpha \iota,-\nu \alpha \iota,-\epsilon \in \alpha \iota$, $-\sigma \alpha \iota,-\sigma \theta \alpha \iota$, and locatives those in $-\mu \in \nu,-\epsilon \nu \nu, \& c$.

## I. Datives.

§ 546. $-\mu \epsilon \nu \alpha \iota$ is the dative ending of a $-\mu \epsilon \nu$-stem (§ 345). This form only occurs in Homer and the Lesbian dialect and was originally confined to athematic verbs, as Hom. $\delta o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu \alpha \iota$, Ved. dấmanē, ’’ $\delta \mu \in \nu \alpha \iota$, Ved. vidmánē, and
 $\mu \in \nu \alpha \iota, \tau \epsilon \tau \lambda \alpha \dot{\mu} \epsilon \nu \alpha \iota$; and then later extended to thematic
 which corresponds in form to the Latin second person plural of the passive imperative (legimini).

The dative ending - $\nu \alpha \iota$ in Attic, Ionic, Arcadian and Cyprian probably arose from older $-\mu \nu \alpha \iota$ where $-\mu \nu$ - was the weak grade form of $-\mu \epsilon \nu-(\S 273)$ and which became simplified to $-\nu$ - after long vowels (§ 146), as $\dot{\alpha} \hat{\eta}-\nu \alpha \nu, \gamma \nu \hat{\omega}-$ $\nu \alpha \iota, \delta \hat{v}-\nu \alpha \iota, \sigma \tau \hat{\eta}-\nu \alpha \iota$, beside $\dot{\alpha} \hat{\eta}-\mu \in \nu \alpha \iota, \gamma \nu \hat{\omega}-\mu \epsilon \nu \alpha \iota$, $\delta \hat{v}-\mu \in \nu \alpha \iota$, $\sigma \tau \eta \cdot-\mu \in \nu \alpha \iota$. The $-\nu \alpha \iota$ then came to be used after short vowels and supplanted the old locative ending in $-\mu \epsilon \nu$
 $\tau \epsilon \theta \nu \alpha ́ \nu \alpha \iota$.

After the analogy of $-\mu \epsilon \nu \alpha \iota$ ( $\delta o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu \alpha \iota, \& c$.) : - $\epsilon-\mu \epsilon \nu \alpha \iota$ ( $\lambda \epsilon \gamma^{\prime} \epsilon \in \nu \alpha \iota, \& c$.) to $-\nu \alpha \iota$ a new ending - $\epsilon \nu \alpha \iota$ was formed which became productive especially in the perfect infini-
 $\gamma \in \gamma_{0 \nu \in ́ v a l, ~ \& c . ~ I n ~ C y p r . ~ \delta o f e v a l, ~ A t t . ~ \delta o u ̂ v a t ~ i t ~ i s ~ d o u b t f u l ~}^{\text {. }}$ whether the $F$ belongs to the stem or to the suffix, cp. also Ved. đāvánē.
§ 547. The infinitive of the s-aorist $\delta \in \hat{\imath} \hat{\xi} \alpha \iota, \lambda \hat{v} \sigma \alpha \iota, \phi \hat{\eta} \nu \alpha \iota$, $\& c$. is an old dative of an s-stem which became associated with the verbal system after the analogy of ${ }^{\ell} \delta \epsilon \ell \xi \alpha$ and the participle $\delta \in i \in \bar{\xi} \bar{\alpha} s$. It corresponds in form to Vedic infinitives like jiṣ̆-é, to conquer, stuṣ̆-é, to praise, and to the Latin
passive infinitive darī from *das-ai, cp. also $\tau \bar{\iota} \mu \hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \iota$, $\phi \iota \lambda \hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \iota$ beside Lat. amārī, habērī.
§ 548. The ending of the middle infinitive in $-\sigma \cdot \theta \alpha \iota$ is probably related to the Vedic infinitives in -dhyāi, -dhyē, as in dhiyádhyāi, to deposit, gamádhyē, to go, beside which there was originally a form in dhē corresponding to Greek $\theta \alpha$. The origin of the formation of this type of infinitive is uncertain. The most commonly accepted theory is that it was a compound consisting of an es-stem, as in $\epsilon i \delta \epsilon \sigma-$ : $\epsilon \hat{i} \delta o s$ ( $\$ \S 279,364$ ), and the dative of a rootnoun *dhē-, *dh- : $\tau i \cdot \theta \eta-\mu l$, and that from forms like $\epsilon i \delta \in \epsilon \sigma$ $\theta \alpha \iota: \epsilon^{*}(\delta \epsilon-\tau \alpha \iota$ the $-\sigma-\theta \alpha \iota$ came to be regarded as the ending and was then extended to all kinds of tense-stems, as $\lambda \hat{v} \epsilon \sigma \theta \alpha \iota, \lambda \hat{v} \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta \alpha \iota, \lambda \hat{v} \sigma \alpha \sigma \theta \alpha \iota, \lambda \in \lambda \hat{v} \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$, and similarly
 $\theta \in ́ \sigma \theta \alpha \iota, \lambda \iota \pi \epsilon \in \sigma \theta \alpha \iota, \pi \epsilon \pi \dot{v} \sigma \theta \alpha \iota, \& c$. ס'́ $\chi \theta \alpha \iota, \gamma \epsilon \gamma \rho \alpha ́ \phi \theta \alpha \iota$ from ${ }^{*} \delta \epsilon \kappa \sigma \theta \alpha \iota,{ }^{*} \gamma \epsilon \gamma \rho \alpha \pi \sigma \theta \alpha \iota($ (§ 221), and similarly $\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \epsilon \in \Theta \theta \alpha \iota$, $\lambda \epsilon \lambda \epsilon i ́ \phi \theta \alpha \iota, \tau \epsilon \tau \rho \alpha \dot{\phi} \phi \theta \alpha \iota$, é $\sigma \tau \alpha ́ \lambda \theta \alpha \iota, \pi \epsilon \phi \alpha ́ \nu \theta \alpha \iota, \& c$. This type of infinitive became medio-passive in meaning through the influence of the middle personal endings $-\sigma \theta \epsilon,-\sigma \theta o \nu$, \&c.

## 2. Locatives.

§ 549. The ending $-\mu \epsilon \nu$, which occurs in Homer and in the Aeolic, Doric, Thessalian, Boeotian, Elean, Arcadian and the North-Western group of dialects, is an endingless locative of a $-\mu \epsilon \nu$-stem ( $\$ \S 273,345$ ), as in ${ }^{\prime} \delta \delta \mu \in \nu, \tau \iota \theta \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \nu$, $\theta \epsilon ́ \mu \epsilon \nu$, סó $\mu \epsilon \nu$, ò $\rho \nu \dot{v} \mu \epsilon \nu$, é $\sigma \tau \alpha ́ \mu \epsilon \nu, \& c$. Cretan infinitives like $\delta o ́ \mu \eta \nu, \eta ँ \mu \eta \nu$ had $-\eta \nu$ after the analogy of $\phi \bar{\epsilon} \rho \eta \nu=\phi \epsilon \in \epsilon \iota \nu$; and similarly $\delta \delta \dot{\sigma} \mu \epsilon \tau, \theta^{\prime} \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ in the dialect of Rhodes were formed after the analogy of $\phi^{\epsilon} \rho \epsilon \epsilon \nu$.
§ 550. It is difficult to account satisfactorily for the formation of the infinitive in $-\epsilon / \nu$. The difference between the ending $-\epsilon \ell \nu$ in Attic, Ionic, \&c. and the $-\eta \nu$ in Doric, Lesbian and Elean shows that the $-\epsilon \nu,-\eta \nu$ is the result of contraction. This contraction probably arose from $-\epsilon \sigma \epsilon \nu$
and represented an old endingless locative, but as this exact type of infinitive ending does not occur in the other languages, it is uncertain whether the $-\epsilon \sigma \epsilon \nu$ represents an original formation eesen- or ees-i. In the former case it would correspond to the Vedic forms in -san-i, as nē-șán-i, to lead, sak-șán.i, to abide; and in the latter to Vedic forms like jéṣ.i, to conquer, stóṣ̌i, to praise, and to Lat. dare from *das-i, which are locatives of s-stems. We should then have to assume that prim. Greek ${ }^{*} \phi \epsilon \rho \in \sigma \iota$ became ${ }^{*} \phi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \sigma \epsilon \nu$ through the influence of the $-\epsilon \nu$ in the ending $-\mu \epsilon \nu$.

The Doric and Arcadian ending - $\epsilon \nu$ in $\phi \epsilon \in \rho \in \nu$, ${ }_{\epsilon} \chi \in \nu$, $\tau \rho a ́ \phi \epsilon \nu, \& c$. was due to the analogy of the ending $-\mu \in \nu$.

## Participles.

§ 551. All active participles except the perfect had originally the formative element ent- with the various ablaut-grades ont-, -nt-, -nt-. For the declension of these participles see $\$ \S$ 352-5.
§ 552. The formative element of the masculine and neuter of the perfect active participle consisted of the blending of the two distinct elements -wes- with the ablautgrades -wos-, -wōs, -us•, and -wet-, -wot. . The relation in which the elements -wes-, -wos-, and -wet-, -wot- originally stood to each other is unknown. It is also uncertain which cases originally had the $-s$-form and which the -t-form. In Greek the -wot- became generalized in the oblique cases, whereas in Sanskrit it only occurred in the instrumental, dative and ablative dual and plural (vidvádbhyām, vidvádbhị̣, vidvádbhyaḥ), the locative plural (vidvátsu), and the nominative and accusative neuter singular (vidvát, knowing). This mode of forming the perfect active participle was preserved in Greek, Aryan and the Baltic-Slavonic languages, but in the other
languages only scanty fragments are found. For a similar blending of two distinct formative elements see § 371.
In the masculine nominative singular the -wos- was regularly lengthened to -wōs (§ 368), cp. єiठ́ós beside єióóra, єioóros, \&c., neut. єioós. In forms like Hom. $\tau \epsilon \theta \nu \eta \hat{\omega} \tau \alpha, \mu \epsilon \mu \alpha \hat{\omega} \tau \epsilon \varsigma, \pi \epsilon \phi \nu \hat{\omega} \tau \alpha s$ the $-\omega$ - of the nominative singular was levelled out into the oblique cases. The stem-syllable had originally the weak grade of ablaut, but in Greek it generally had either the strong grade vowel of the present indicative or the stem-syllable was formed direct from the perfect indicative, cp. cioós beside Skr.


 beside $\dot{\epsilon}^{\prime} \lambda \eta \lambda v \theta \dot{\omega} s$; and in all $\kappa$-perfects, as $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \eta \kappa \omega ́ s, \tau \epsilon \tau \overline{-}$ $\mu \eta \kappa \omega ́ s, \& c$. The weak grade of ablaut occurs in $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \alpha \omega$ s : ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\prime \prime} \sigma \tau \alpha \mu \epsilon \nu, \beta \epsilon \beta \alpha \omega \dot{s}: \beta \epsilon \in \beta \alpha \mu \epsilon \nu, \gamma \epsilon \gamma \alpha \omega ́ s: \gamma^{\epsilon} \gamma \alpha \mu \epsilon \nu, \mu \epsilon \mu \alpha \omega \bar{s}$ : $\mu_{\epsilon}^{\prime} \mu \alpha \mu \in \nu$.

The feminine of the perfect active participle had also originally the weak grade of ablaut in the stem-syllable, as in io-vî $=$ Skr. vid-úṣī̀, $\lambda \in \lambda \alpha \kappa v i ̂ \alpha, \pi \epsilon \pi \alpha \theta v i ̂ \alpha: \lambda \in \lambda \eta \kappa \omega ́ s$,
 Forms like єídvîa, $\lambda \in \lambda o \iota \pi v i ̂ \alpha, \gamma \in \gamma o v \epsilon i ̂ \alpha ~ w e r e ~ n e w ~ f o r m a-~$ tions from the stem-form of the masculine. Both in Greek and Sanskrit it belonged to the jā-declension (§ 322). The original sing. nom. was -wes-jo, gen. -us-jã̃s which in Greek would regularly have become - $\epsilon \hat{\alpha} \alpha$, gen. -viâs. Levelling then took place in both directions whereby partly - $\in \hat{i} \alpha$ and partly -vıâs became generalized, as $\gamma \in \gamma 0 \nu \in \hat{i} \alpha$, \&c. beside iovia, \&c.
§ 553. The formative element $-\mu \in \nu 0$ - was used in forming all Greek middle participles, as $\lambda \epsilon \iota \pi o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu \circ$, $\lambda \iota \pi o ́ \mu \in \nu \circ \varsigma$, $\lambda \epsilon \iota \psi o ́ \mu \in \nu o s, \lambda \epsilon \iota \psi \alpha ́ \mu \epsilon \nu 0 s, \lambda_{\epsilon} \phi \theta \eta \sigma o ́ \mu \in \nu o s, \lambda \in \lambda \epsilon \iota \mu \mu \in ́ v o s, \lambda \epsilon-$ $\lambda \epsilon \iota \psi o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu 0 s ; i \sigma \tau \alpha ́ \mu \epsilon \nu 0 s, \tau \iota \theta \epsilon \in \mu \epsilon \nu 0 s, \delta i \delta o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu 0 s, \delta \epsilon \iota \kappa \nu v ́ \mu \in \nu 0 s$, $\theta \epsilon ́ \mu \in \nu O s, \delta o ́ \mu \in \nu O s, \& c$. The formative element originally
had the three grades of ablaut -meno-, -mono-, -mno- (cp. § 240). The first became generalized in Greek, and probably also in Latin in the second person plural of the passive (legiminī $=\lambda \in \gamma \sigma$ ó $\mu \in \nu \circ \iota$ ), the second in Sanskrit thematic verbs, as bódha-māna $\cdot \hat{h}=\pi \epsilon v \theta^{\prime} \cdot \mu \epsilon \nu 0 \cdot s$, and the third occurs in isolated forms like Latin alumnus, autumnus.
§ 554. The passive participle in $-\theta \epsilon i ́ s$, as in $\lambda u \theta \in i ́ s, ~ \& c$. (cp. §514) was a special Greek new formation formed after the analogy of participles like $\phi \alpha \nu$ eís.

## Verbal Adjectives.

§ 555. The verbal adjectives in tó• originally denoted completed action, but they were not passive in function. They preserved their original function and meaning in Greek, but in the Sanskrit, Latin, Old Germanic and BalticSlavonic languages they generally came to be used as perfect or past participles, mostly with a passive meaning, especially when related to transitive verbs. The accent in Greek and Sanskrit shows that the stem-syllable originally had the weak grade of ablaut, cp. $\kappa \lambda \nu \tau$ ós, Skr. šrutáh, Lat. in-clutus; $\sigma \tau a \tau o ́ s$, Skr. sthitáh, Lat. status, סo $\quad$ ós, Lat. datus; and similarly крıтós, $\lambda v \tau o ́ s, ~ \chi v \tau o ́ s, ~ \sigma \chi \in \tau o ́ s, ~ \tau \alpha \kappa \tau o ́ s, ~$ $\phi \alpha \nu \tau o ́ s, \& c$. beside new formations like $\lambda \in \iota \pi \tau o ́ s, \sigma \tau \rho \in \pi \tau o ́ s$, $\tau \rho \in \pi \tau$ ós formed from the stem of the present. See § 258.
§ 556. The verbal adjectives in - $\tau \in \notin \mathcal{S}$ from older* $-\tau \in$ fos, as

 special Greek formation which has no parallel in the other languages.

## CHAPTER XIII

## ADVERBS

§ 557. Greek adverbs are for the most part of twofold origin. They are partly isolated case-forms of pronouns, nouns, substantivized adjectives, and occasionally predicative adjectives used adverbially, and partly formed by means of suffixes the origin of which is often unknown. It is probable that some at least of these suffixes were the remnants of case-endings which became isolated from the inflexional system already in the parent Indg. language and were then crystallized as adverbial suffixes.

## I. Case-forms.

§ 558. The nominative occurs in $\dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \mu i \xi, \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \xi, \alpha^{\alpha} \lambda \iota s$, $\lambda_{\epsilon ́ \chi \rho \iota s, ~} \mu o ́ \lambda \iota s, \chi \omega \rho i s$, é $\gamma \gamma u ́ s$, єủ $\theta u ́ s, \& c$., cp. also Skr. paráh, far off, Lat. prorsus, satis.
§ 559. The accusative was often used adverbially in all

 pleasure, willingly, Lat. đomum, rūs, multum, OE. ealne weg, always. $\dot{\alpha} \kappa \mu \dot{\eta} \nu, \alpha \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \eta \dot{\eta} \nu, \delta \delta \dot{\eta} \nu$, Dor. $\delta \bar{\alpha} \nu$ from * $\delta \digamma \bar{\alpha} \nu$, $\delta \omega \rho \epsilon \frac{\alpha}{\alpha} \nu, \mu \alpha \kappa \rho \frac{\alpha}{\alpha} \nu, \pi \rho \notin \not \eta \nu, \sigma \chi \epsilon \delta i \eta \nu, \tau \alpha \chi i \sigma \tau \eta \nu$. $\pi \rho o ́ \phi \alpha \sigma \iota \nu$, $\chi^{\alpha} \rho \iota \nu, \mathrm{cp}$. Skr. kím, why?, Lat. furtim, partim, facile. $\epsilon \dot{v} \theta \dot{v}, \pi o \lambda \dot{v}=$ Skr. purú, Goth. filu. Att. $\tau \eta \bar{\eta} \epsilon \varsigma$, Ion. $\sigma \hat{\eta} \tau \epsilon \varsigma$, $\chi \theta^{\prime} \epsilon_{s}=$ Skr. hyáh. $\pi \rho o i ̂ k \alpha$, ơ $\nu \alpha \rho, \mu_{\epsilon}^{\prime} \gamma \alpha$, \&c., cp. Skr. nấma, by name. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha ́, \pi о \lambda \lambda \alpha ́, \pi \rho o ́ k \alpha, \pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau \alpha, \mu \alpha ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau \alpha$, $\tau \alpha ́ \chi \iota \sigma \tau \alpha$, \&c. Here belong also the adverbs in $-\delta o \nu,-\delta \eta \nu$, $-\delta \alpha$ (neut. pl.), the $-\delta$ of which was probably the same as in verbal abstract nouns like хоó $\mu a \delta o s$, and Skr. samád-, fight, battle. Examples are: $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \epsilon \lambda \eta \delta o ́ v, \dot{\alpha} \mu \phi \alpha \delta o ́ v, \dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \sigma \tau \alpha \delta_{o} \nu$,

$\dot{\alpha} \nu \epsilon ́ \delta \eta \nu, \beta \alpha \dot{\alpha} \eta \eta \nu, \beta \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \eta \nu, \kappa \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \delta \eta \nu, \kappa \rho v ́ \beta \delta \eta \nu, \lambda i ́ \gamma \delta \eta \nu, \sigma \pi o \rho \alpha ́ \delta \eta \nu$, $\sigma \tau \alpha ́ \delta \eta \nu, \sigma v \lambda \lambda \eta ́ \beta \delta \eta \nu, \chi$ र́ $\eta \eta \nu$; $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \epsilon \lambda \eta \delta \dot{\alpha}, \dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \phi \alpha \nu \delta \alpha ́, \alpha \dot{\alpha} \pi \sigma \sigma \tau \alpha \delta \alpha ́ \alpha$, $\kappa \rho v ́ \beta \delta \alpha, \mu^{\prime} \gamma \delta \alpha, \phi \dot{\gamma} \gamma \delta \alpha, \chi^{\alpha \nu \delta \alpha ́ \alpha, ~ \& c . ~}$
§ 560. The genitive occurs in adverbs of time and place, as $\epsilon_{\epsilon} \sigma \pi \epsilon ́ \rho \bar{\alpha} s, \dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \epsilon \rho \bar{\alpha} s,{ }^{\prime} \nu \nu \eta s$, Dor. ${ }^{\prime} \nu \bar{\alpha} \bar{s}, \nu v \kappa \tau o ́ s=$ Goth. nahts, OE. nihtes. $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \chi \circ \hat{v}, \tau \eta \lambda o \hat{v}, \pi \alpha \nu \tau \alpha \chi \circ \hat{v}, \dot{v} \psi \circ \hat{v}, ~ \epsilon ่ \pi \iota \pi o \lambda \hat{\eta} s$; $\alpha u ̛ \tau o v ̂, ~ \grave{o} \mu o v ̂, \pi o \hat{v}, \pi o v ́, ~ o ̋ \pi o v$.
§ 561. The adverbial use of the dative was rare, as in X $\alpha \mu \alpha i$, Lat. humì, $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha i, \quad \pi \alpha \rho \alpha i$. The dative supplanted the original instrumental in forms like Attic, Ionic $\dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha ́ \gamma \kappa \eta$,
 Cret. $\ddot{\alpha}^{2} \lambda \lambda \alpha$, ón $\pi \alpha$. As the dative and locative regularly fell together in the $\bar{a}$-declension it is possible that some of the above forms may be originally locative (§ 305 ).
§ 562. The locative was common both in nominal and pronominal forms, as oikol, oik $\epsilon$, cp. Lat. domī, bellī, ${ }^{\prime} I \sigma \theta \mu o \hat{i}, \Pi \bar{v} \theta \theta i ̂, \pi \alpha \nu \tau \alpha \chi o \hat{,}, \dot{\alpha} \theta \epsilon \epsilon i ́, \pi \alpha \nu \delta \eta \mu \epsilon i, c$ cp. Skr. āké, near at hand, durê, at a distance ; oî, $\pi \circ \hat{\imath}$, Dor. av̉ $\tau \in \hat{\imath}, \dot{\text { o }} \pi \in \epsilon \hat{\imath}$, $\pi \epsilon \hat{\imath}, \tau \epsilon \hat{\imath}-\delta \epsilon, \tau \eta \nu \epsilon \hat{\imath}, \tau o v \tau \epsilon \hat{\imath}$, Att. $\epsilon \kappa \epsilon \hat{\imath}, \mathrm{Cret} . \delta \iota \pi \lambda \epsilon \hat{\imath}, \Theta_{\eta} \beta \alpha \iota-$

 $\pi \epsilon ́ \rho \rho \tau \tau \iota$ Att. $\pi$ '́ $\rho v \sigma \iota=$ Skr. parut; endingless locatives were $\alpha i \epsilon \in \nu$, Dor. $\alpha i \epsilon ́ s, \nu u ́ k \tau \omega \rho$, cp. the similar -r in Lith. kur̃, where, Lat. cūr, why, Goth. lvar, where, Lat. nocturnus.
§ 563. The ablative (= Indg. -õd, -ē̃d) was mostly preserved in pronominal forms, as ov̀ $\tau \omega$, Dor. $\hat{\omega}$, ơ $\pi \omega, \pi \hat{\omega}$, unde, $\tau \hat{\omega}-\delta \epsilon, \tau o v \tau \hat{\omega}$, hinc, $\tau \eta \nu \hat{\omega}$, istinc, Locr. $\bar{\omega}$, ö ö $\pi \omega$, unde, cp. Skr. tất (= Indg. *tỡd), then, in this way, kásmāt, why, yắt, in so far as. Delph. Foik $\omega$, domo, cp. O.Lat. meritōd, rectēd, Goth. sinteinō, continually, piubjō, secretly.
§564. The instrumental occurs in both nominal and pronominal forms, as $\epsilon \in \pi-\sigma \chi \in \rho \omega$, Dor. $\kappa \rho \nu \phi \hat{\alpha}$, Att. Ion. $\kappa \rho v \phi \hat{\eta}, \dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha \rho \tau \hat{\eta}$, Att. $\lambda \dot{\alpha} \theta \rho \bar{\alpha}$, Ion. $\lambda \dot{\alpha} \theta \rho \eta$. ov́- $\pi \omega, \pi \dot{\omega}-\pi o \tau \epsilon$, cp. Lat. quō, $\tau \hat{\omega}-\delta \epsilon$, Ion. $\hat{\omega}-\delta \epsilon$, Lesb. $\tilde{\alpha}^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \bar{\alpha}$, ó $\pi \pi \bar{\alpha}$, Dor. $\hat{\alpha}-\tau \epsilon$,
$\tau \alpha v \tau \hat{\alpha}$, Att. $\tau \alpha u ́ \tau \eta, \eta_{\eta}, i f, \pi \hat{\eta}$, Cret. ò- $\pi \hat{\eta}$, Lac. $\pi \eta$ ๆ$-\pi o \kappa \alpha, ~ с р . ~$ Goth. ऊuē, wherewith; Dor. $\hat{\alpha}-\chi \iota$, Hom. $\hat{\eta}$ - $\chi \iota$. Instrumental were also the adverbs in $\omega$ like $\stackrel{\alpha}{\alpha} \nu \omega$, ${ }^{\epsilon} \dot{\xi} \xi \omega$, $\kappa \alpha ́ \tau \omega, \pi \rho o ́ \sigma(\sigma) \omega$;
 probably also occurs in the adverbs in - $\alpha$, as $\alpha \hat{i} \psi \alpha, \not{ }_{\alpha} \mu \alpha$,
 $\sigma \dot{\alpha} \phi \alpha, \sigma \hat{\gamma} \gamma \alpha, \tau \alpha ́ \chi \alpha, \hat{\omega} \kappa \alpha$.
§ 565. The so-called positive of adverbs of quality is originally the ablative singular of the adjective used adverbially to which was added the particle -s (§ 575). The ending $\omega$ s belonged originally to o-stems only, as in $\kappa \alpha \lambda \omega \bar{\omega}$, $\sigma o \phi \hat{\omega} s, \phi i ́ \lambda \omega s, \delta \iota \kappa \alpha i \omega s, \& c$. From these it became extended to all kinds of stems, as $\eta \dot{\eta} \delta \epsilon \epsilon \omega s, \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \hat{\omega} s, \pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \omega s, \epsilon \dot{u} \delta \alpha \iota \mu o ́ \nu \omega s$, X $\alpha \rho \iota^{\prime}$

In the comparison of adverbs it is necessary to distinguish between the adverbs derived from adjectives and those derived from adverbs. For the comparative of adverbs derived from adjectives the accusative neuter singular of the corresponding adjective was used, as $\sigma o \phi \omega \epsilon \epsilon \rho \circ \nu, \eta \eta \delta \iota \nu \nu$, and similarly in Sanskrit and Latin. And for the superlative the accusative neuter plural was used, as $\sigma \circ \phi \omega \tau \alpha \tau \alpha, \eta \eta \delta \iota \sigma \tau \alpha$, and similarly in Sanskrit, whereas in Latin we have the ablative singular of the corresponding adjective, as O.Lat. (inscription) facilumed $=$ facillumēd, later facillimē.

The comparative and superlative of adverbs derived from adverbs had the instrumental ending $-\omega$ just as in the so-called positives, as $\ddot{\alpha}^{\nu} \nu \omega, \dot{\alpha} \nu \omega \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \omega, \dot{\alpha} \nu \omega \tau \alpha ́ \tau \omega ; \kappa \alpha ́ \tau \omega, \kappa \alpha \tau \omega$ $\tau \epsilon \rho \rho \omega, \kappa \alpha \tau \omega \tau \alpha ́ \tau \omega$.

## 2. Suffixes.

§ 566. - $\theta_{l}$ (= Indg. *-dhi, cp. Skr. á-dhi, above, upwards, and the $\cdot \mathbf{b} \cdot$ in Lat. ubi, ibi) denoting where, as in Kopi $\nu \theta_{0}-\theta l$,
 $\tau o ́ \cdot \theta_{l} ;{ }^{\prime} \epsilon \kappa \tau \sigma-\theta l, \epsilon^{\prime} \nu \delta o-\theta l$.
§ 567. $-\theta \alpha$ beside $-\theta \epsilon(\nu)$ denoting place. The relation in which these suffixes stand to each other is unknown, but they are doubtless related to the -ha in Skr. i-há, here, kú-ha, where. Examples are: ${ }^{\epsilon} \nu-\theta \alpha, \dot{\epsilon}^{\prime} \nu \tau \alpha \hat{v}-\theta \alpha, \stackrel{v}{\prime} \pi \alpha \iota-\theta \alpha$, Dor. Lesb. ${ }^{\epsilon} \nu \epsilon \rho \cdot-\theta \alpha, \pi \rho o ́ \sigma \cdot \theta \alpha$ beside Hom. $\epsilon^{\prime} \nu \in \rho \cdot \theta \epsilon(\nu), \pi \rho o ́ \sigma-$ $\theta \epsilon(\nu)$, ơ $\pi \iota-\theta \epsilon(\nu)$, ớ $\pi \tau \sigma-\theta \epsilon(\nu)$, v́ $\pi \epsilon \rho-\theta \epsilon(\nu)$.
§ 568. - $\theta \in \nu$ denoting whence, as ${ }_{\alpha} \kappa \rho \sigma \cdot \theta \in \nu, \Delta \grave{o}-\theta \in \nu, \eta \hat{\eta} \omega-\theta \epsilon \nu$, $i \pi \pi \delta^{\prime}-\theta \epsilon \nu, \kappa \lambda \iota \sigma i \eta-\theta \epsilon \nu$, ở $\rho \alpha \nu \nu^{\circ}-\theta \epsilon \nu ; \quad \ddot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda o-\theta \epsilon \nu, \dot{\alpha} \mu \phi o \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \omega-\theta \epsilon \nu$,
 ${ }^{\prime} \epsilon \nu-\theta \in \nu,{ }^{\epsilon} \xi \xi \omega-\theta \epsilon \nu, \dot{v} \psi o ́ o \theta \epsilon \nu$.
§ 569. $-\delta \epsilon$ denoting whither is originally a preposition and is related to Lat. dē, O.Slav. do, OE. tō, to, Indg.
 pl.) beside Hom. oîkóv- $\delta \epsilon$, $\pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \mu o ́ v-\delta \epsilon$, фи́ $\alpha-\delta \epsilon$, ' $A \theta \dot{\eta} \nu \alpha \varsigma \epsilon$

§ 570. $-\sigma \epsilon$ with the same meaning as $-\delta \epsilon$, as $\kappa v \kappa \lambda o ́-\sigma \epsilon$, $\pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau 0-\sigma \epsilon, \tau \eta \lambda \hat{o}-\sigma \epsilon ; \ddot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda o-\sigma \epsilon, \dot{\alpha} \mu \phi о \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \omega-\sigma \epsilon, \alpha \dot{u} \tau \dot{\sigma}-\sigma \epsilon, \kappa \in \hat{\imath}-\sigma \epsilon$, $\dot{\delta} \mu \dot{o}-\sigma \epsilon, \pi \dot{o}-\sigma \epsilon$. The $-\sigma \epsilon$ may be the same as Goth -p, cp. ${ }_{\alpha}{ }^{\prime} \lambda \lambda o-\sigma \epsilon, \pi \dot{o}-\sigma \epsilon$ beside Goth. aljab, elsewhere, luap, whither, but it is difficult to see why the ${ }^{*}-\tau \epsilon$ became $-\sigma \epsilon$ in adverbs of place whilst it remained in adverbs of time.
§ 571. - $\tau \epsilon$ denoting time, as $\alpha^{\prime} \lambda \lambda o-\tau \epsilon, \alpha \hat{v}-\tau \epsilon, o ̊-\tau \epsilon, \pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau 0-\tau \epsilon$,
 also Att. $\epsilon i-\tau \alpha,{ }^{\prime} \pi-\epsilon \iota \tau \alpha$.
§ 572. - $\tau o s(=$ Skr. -taḥ, Lat. -tus), as ék-Tós, év-тós, cp. Skr. i-táh, from here, tá-tah, from there, Lat. in-tus, caelitus, fundi-tus.
§ 573. $-\kappa \alpha$ the origin of which is unknown, as in av่тi-k $\alpha$,

§ 574. $-k \alpha s$ in $\mathfrak{e}-k \alpha \alpha_{s}$ from * $\sigma F \in-k \alpha s, \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho \alpha-k \alpha ́ s$ is probably the same suffix as in Skr. dēva-šạ̣ (= Indg. *.kñs), god for god.
§ 575. Quite a number of adverbs have forms with and without a suffixal -s, as $\dot{\alpha} \mu \phi i-s$, ov́ $\tau \omega-s, \pi \epsilon ́ \rho v \tau t-s$ beside $\dot{\alpha} \mu \phi \dot{\phi}$, oṽ $\omega, \pi \pi^{\prime} \rho v \tau \iota(\pi \epsilon ́ \rho v \sigma \iota)$, Delph. oî-s beside the usual form oî,
 The -s became generalized in adverbs of quality formed from adjectives already in the prehistoric period of the language. The origin of this $-s$ is uncertain. It probably arose from various sources, such as the adverbial forms where the -s was originally a case- or stem-ending, as nom. ${ }^{\alpha \prime \lambda} \lambda \iota$; gen. $\nu v \kappa \tau o ́ s$; acc. neut. sing. $\chi \theta^{\theta}$ s, and the -s in multiplicative numerals, as סís, Skr. bhíh, Lat. bis. See Brugmann, Grundriss, \&c., vol. ii, second ed., p. 737.
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ảqávıı ${ }^{\text {os }} 214,232$.
à áóo $^{2} 458$.
à $\gamma a \pi a ́ \zeta \omega 495$.
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à $\theta \in \epsilon i{ }^{2} 562$.
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 569.
'А $\begin{aligned} & \eta \\ & \nu\end{aligned} \eta \sigma 1321,562$.
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A＂avte 294.
ai＇y $\operatorname{los}$ 128， 237.
aiyióov 237.
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aíyóßotos 289.
aiү⿳亠䒑⿻上丨 289.
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aỉoios 237.
àtion（Boeot．） 58 note． ai̊ós 237，279，298， 300，302，305，368， 492.
aíci $57,562$.
aíćv 305， 562.
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aḯ́plos 237.
aïض＇p 277，359， 360.
aîӨos 236， 279.
aiӨро́токоs 289.
aî $\theta \omega$ II， 56 ， 177 ．
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аіра 493， 495.
аірал́́оs 247.
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aíцат́́єєs 276.
aimoßaфض́s 289.
aivetós 32.
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aité $\omega$ 43I．
aì $\mu{ }^{\prime} 239$.
aiభa 564.
aì̀ 56，57， 368.
äка⿱⺌兀＇s 247.
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азкє́одає 492.
а́кそ́коа 429， 517.
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ảк $\boldsymbol{\imath}$ خ́ 239.
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${ }^{\alpha} \kappa \mu \omega \nu 273$.
äкоутіऍॅ 495.
àкоขтıбти́s 266.
äкоs 279， 492.
àкоv́ш 62.
äк $\rho \bar{a} \tau о s 258$.

а́к $\rho \epsilon \mu \omega \dot{\nu} 273$.
äкрıs 119，261．
ӓкритоs 258.
ảкроа̄ти́рьод 237.
äк $\rho о$ өє 568.
а̀кро́тол ıs $^{28} 28$.
äкроs 248， 273.
ảктŋ́ 258.
äкт $\omega \rho 278$.
$\frac{\ddot{\partial}}{\text { á }} \kappa \omega \nu 80,495$.

＇А入алía 135.
ả $\lambda a \lambda \kappa \in i ̂ \nu 468$.
ả $\lambda a \pi a \delta \nu^{2} o ́ s ~(H o m) ~ 241 .$.
ả $\lambda a \omega \tau$ ús 266.
à $\lambda \boldsymbol{\gamma \epsilon i v} 134$.

ả $\lambda \gamma \eta \delta \omega \nu 272$.
ả $\gamma^{\prime} \eta \sigma \in \tau \epsilon$（Hom．）428， 526.
ä $\lambda$ yos 40.
ả $\bar{\delta}$ aive $^{2} 474$.
äл $\delta о \mu а \iota ~ 474$.
ä $\lambda \in a \rho 37 \mathrm{I}$ ．
ä入́́á $\begin{gathered}\text { á } \\ 510 .\end{gathered}$
ä入єıфар 37 I ．
ä $\lambda \epsilon$ і＇$\phi \omega$ 77， 109.
ả $\lambda \epsilon \xi \eta \tau \eta \rho 278$.
ả入є́ ${ }^{\circ} \omega 468$.
ä $\lambda \in \tau а \iota 526$.

ả入ท́n $\theta$ єєa 76.
à $\eta$ خ $\theta$ écтатоs 258.

à $\lambda \eta \theta$ ध́v 489 ．
ả $\lambda \eta \theta$ そ́s 76，279， 489.
ả $\lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \omega 475$.
à $\lambda \eta \theta \hat{\omega} \mathrm{s} 565$.
à $\lambda \dot{\eta} \lambda \epsilon \mu a \iota 429$.
ả $\lambda \dot{\lambda} \lambda \iota \mu \mu a \iota 517$.

à $\lambda \dot{\eta} \mu \omega \nu 273$.
ä $\lambda$ 日aiv 475 ．
ä $\lambda$ өоцає 475.
à $\lambda t \in$ ús 79.
ä入ı 2 yos 243.
ả入ìv 77.
ädıos（Lesb．） 80.
ä́ $\lambda_{\text {ıos }}$（Dor．） 80 ．
ä ${ }^{2}$ ıss 558.
á入і́бкодає 88，430，458， 470.

${ }^{a} \lambda \kappa \alpha \rho 37 \mathrm{I}$ ．
ả $\lambda \kappa \grave{\prime}$ 134， 469.
à $\lambda_{\kappa i}$（Hom．） 239.
${ }_{\text {ä }}{ }^{\lambda} \kappa \iota \mu$ оз 239 ．
ä $\lambda \kappa \omega 475$.
à入入á 40， 559.
$\stackrel{a}{ } \lambda \lambda \lambda a$（Cret．） 561.
${ }_{a}{ }^{a} \lambda \lambda \bar{a}$（Lesb．） 32 I ， 564.
à $\lambda \lambda \dot{\beta} \xi 55$ ．

$a ̈ \lambda \lambda \eta$ 56I．
ä入入 $\eta \kappa$ тоs $215,232$.
$a ̈ \lambda \lambda o \quad 230$.
ä $\lambda \lambda 0 \theta \in \nu 568$.
${ }^{a} \lambda \lambda_{0} \theta_{\iota} \quad 305,566$.
ä入入ока（Dor．） 573.
ă $\lambda$ лодає 129，213， 221 ， 232，420，478，480， 507.
ä $\lambda$ dos 40，43，I19，129， 132， 237.
ä $\lambda \lambda о \sigma \epsilon 570$.
ä入入ота（Lesb．） 57 I ．
${ }^{a} \lambda \lambda$ дотє 57 I ．
${ }_{a} \lambda \lambda \omega{ }^{2} 40$ ．
ä $\lambda \mu \in \nu 0 s$（Hom．）221， $\mid a ̈ \mu \mu \iota \nu$（Aeol．） 402. 507.

व入oín 532.
à̀оїнеン 532.
ä $\lambda$ s 43，132，213， 358.

ả $\lambda_{\text {то }}$（Hom．）221， 507.
ả $\lambda \nu \sigma \kappa \alpha ́ \nu \omega ~ 467$.
ả入и́өка 467.
ä ${ }^{\text {anves }} 37$.
à入фáv 467.
ả $\phi^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} 209$.
ả入 $\phi o ́ s ~ 249 . ~$
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à $\hat{\omega}$ ขat $88,458,470$ ．

ä $\mu a$ 96， $380,564$.

ä $\mu \alpha \xi_{a} 322$.
á $\mu а \rho т а ́ \nu \omega ~ 467, ~ 473 . ~$
á $\mu а \rho \tau \grave{~ 306, ~} 325,564$.
а́ артіпбонаь 422， 499.
аиатрохıă 292.
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а̉ $\mu \beta \lambda \boldsymbol{i} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \omega$ 467， 470.
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à $\mu \beta \lambda \nu \omega \dot{\sigma} \sigma \omega \omega 496$.
ä $\mu \beta$ ро́ттos 169.
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ај $\mu$ єі $\psi \in \tau а \iota$（Hom．）428， 526.
à $\mu \hat{\lambda} \lambda \gamma \omega$ 20，77，132， 188.
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ả $\mu \mu$ е́тєроs（Lesb．） 406.
${ }_{\text {ä }} \mu \boldsymbol{\mu}$（Aeol．） 402.
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а́ло－65．
ả $\mu o ́ \theta \in \nu$ 65， 213.
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á $\mu$ ós（Dor．） 406.
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ả $\mu v ́ \sigma \sigma \omega 478$.
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àvéón 559.

àvektós 109.
ävє $\mu$ оs 43，49， 239.
${ }^{a} \nu \in \cup 575$ ．
ävevs（E1．） 575.
àv́́रонаı 109.
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àvөрюті́ткоs 253.
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ả้ $\theta^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \iota o \nu 247$.
ảvtāpós 248.
ävıтtos 106， 258.
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àvó $\mu$ оооs 287， 290.
àti 24，43， 237.
àvtıáa 484.
àvtiós 237， 484.
àvтıтє́́patos 237 ．
${ }_{\text {ä }}{ }^{2} \tau \lambda 0 \nu 143$.
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ăvvofos 65， 290.
${ }^{a} \nu \bar{v} \mu \iota$（Hom．）430，463， 473.
àvvorós 110.
àvúvo 499.
ảvute IIO， 473.
àvve 465，473， 499.
ä $\nu \omega 564,565$.
ảขめтát 564， 565.
ảvஸ́тєроs 254.
àvळт ${ }^{\rho} \rho \omega$ 564， 565.
á $\xi \in \mu \in \nu a \iota$（Hom．） 546.
ágínots 262.

ás ${ }^{3}$ 499， 526.
ä $\xi \omega \nu, 43,212$.
aotón 236.
ảoiós 236.
ätats 290.
ä $\pi a \xi$ 65，89，90，287， 290，380， 394 ．
äта⿱㇒木тоs $110,170$.
à $\pi a$ atך ${ }^{\prime}$ ós 247.
àтáт $\omega \rho$ 301．
а̀тафібк 47 I.
à $\pi$ є́ $\beta$ àлод 430.
＇А $\pi \epsilon i \lambda \omega \nu$（Cypr．） 129 note I ．
${ }^{\alpha} \pi \pi \epsilon \epsilon \tau \epsilon 38$ ．
$\dot{a} \pi \epsilon i \rho \omega \nu 271$.
$\stackrel{a}{a} \pi \in \lambda \theta \epsilon 38$.
à $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \ell \lambda \omega$（Lesb．）148， 462.
＇A $\pi \epsilon \bar{\lambda} \lambda \omega \omega 129$ note I．
à $\pi \epsilon \sigma \tau$ ús 266.
àтє $\chi$ Өávo $\mu a \iota 467$.

ä $\pi \lambda \bar{a}$ àos（Dor．） 458.
án入óos 80，287， 290.
á $\pi$ 入ós 395 ．
á $\pi \lambda$ óт $\eta \mathrm{s} 284$.
ám $\pi$ ov̂s 80,373 note， 380， 395.
àmó 24，43，228， 230 note．
à $\pi о \theta \nu \eta \eta^{\prime} \sigma \kappa \omega 424$.

ӓлодоүє́олає 430.
àтобта⿱㇒日́á 559.
àто́тtбts 30， 291.
àmoúpās（Aeol．） 123.
à áó申ovos 291.
$\ddot{\pi} \pi \tau \omega$ I 21 note， 473.
äтvatos 258.
äpa 564.
äра̄ра 429.
àpa $є \in і$ ì 457， 505.
арарібкш 429， 47 I．
ảoapuía 552.
ä $\bar{a} \bar{a} s{ }^{2} 80$.
åра́ $\downarrow \eta$ 185， 245.
àpүалє́os 135.

ảpyós 289.

ä $\rho \gamma$ upos 248.
ä $\rho$ yvфos 249.
ä $\rho \delta$ os 260.
à $\rho \delta \mu$ о́s 239.
а́реішу 378.


а́рє́ $\sigma к \omega ~ 253,470$.
á $\rho \in \tau^{\prime} \eta$ 73， 258.
ả $\rho \eta \gamma \omega \dot{\nu} 269$.

ä $\rho \dot{\nu} \nu 269,345$.
à $\rho \eta \rho \omega \dot{s} 552$.
ả $\rho \theta \mu$ ós 239.
${ }^{\alpha} \rho \theta \rho o \nu 25 \mathrm{I}$.
á $\rho \ell$ ө $\mu$ є́ 485.
á $\rho \iota \theta \mu$ ós 239， 485.
ápıбтєрós 32， 378.
ảןเбтєúш 489.

ápıттоs 259， 378.
á $к к є \sigma$ íरuıos 289.
ä $\rho$ ктоs 226， 247.
á $\rho к т$ údos 247.
äpкus 264.
ü $\rho \mu \in \nu=s$（Hom．）22I， 507.
á $\rho \mu$ ós 239.
ápviov 237.
ảpvós 294.
ä $\rho \nu v \mu a \iota 463$.
ад $\rho о \tau \dot{\eta} \rho 278$.
ä $\rho о т \rho о \nu 257$.
ảро́ш 43，І36， 458.
á $\rho \pi а \not a \mu o ́ s ~ 239$.
ápTá̧ळ 129，190，494， 509.
áртактús 266.
á $\rho \pi a \xi 494$.
д́ртág 499.
а’ $\rho \rho \in \nu$ и́таus 289.
à $\rho$ р́́vtє $\rho o s$（Arcad．） 378. á $\rho \rho \in \nu \omega \pi$ ós 289.
ä $\rho \rho \eta к \tau$ оs 123， 232.
ä $\rho \rho \eta \nu$（ $\epsilon \rho \rho \sigma \eta \nu$ Ion．）212， 217， 269.
ä $\rho \rho$ ртоs 123.
à $\rho \rho \omega \delta \epsilon i \downarrow$（Ion．） 73.
ä $\rho \sigma \eta \nu$（Hom．）67，212， 217，269， 350.
＂ А $\rho \tau \epsilon \mu$ н 343.
＂рть 237.
áp $\rho$ los 237.
ả $\rho \tau$ v́v 490.
àpтús 266， 490.
áри́ть 473.
à $\rho$ v́ $\omega 473$.
адрХє́какоз 289.
аं $\rho \chi$ ๆ̆ 559.
ảp ós 236.
${ }^{a} \rho \boldsymbol{a} \rho \chi \omega \nu 275$.
à $\rho \bar{\omega} 80$.
ås（Dor．）79， 80.
à aŋpós 248.
à $\sigma \theta \in \nu \eta \eta^{\prime}{ }^{2} 279$.


ä $\sigma \mu \in \nu$ os $89,376$.
á $\sigma \pi a ́ \zeta о \mu a \iota 274$.
äбтабца 274.
ả $\sigma \pi a \sigma \tau u ́ s 266$.
à $\sigma \pi \iota \delta \eta \phi$ о́ $о$ оs 289.
äбтítıo 237.
à $\sigma \pi \iota \delta i ́ \sigma \kappa \eta 253$.
à $\sigma \pi \iota \delta o \pi \eta \gamma$ ós 289.
à $\sigma \pi i{ }^{2}$ 237， 285.
à $\sigma \pi \iota \sigma \pi \grave{\prime} \leq 258$.
ä $\sigma \sigma a$（Ion．）129， 414.
â $\sigma \sigma o \nu$（Ion．）69， 156.
à́такós 73.
àбтафis 73 ．
à $\sigma \tau \epsilon i=o s 237$.

áवтє́ $\rho$ ооs 237.

ä $\sigma \tau \eta \rho$ 236，278，359， 360.

ảatıkós 252.
à $\sigma \tau \rho a \pi \eta$ そ́ 473.
à $\sigma \tau \rho a ́ \pi \tau \omega 473$.
ä $\sigma \tau \rho o \nu 236$.
äб $\sigma$ 237，266，301，313， 333.
à ãтvขópos 289.
å $\tau \epsilon$（Dor．） 564.
ḋт $\epsilon \not \mu \beta \omega 466$ ．
ätє pos（Dor．） 254.
ӓ $\tau \eta$（Hom．） 80.
àтīца́㇒ 484.
äті̄ $о$ оs 290， 484.
＇Aтрєíōn 80， $32 \mathrm{I}, 323$.
àт $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \mu$ а 575.
àтрє́ $\mu$ аs（Hom．） 575.
＇Aт $\boldsymbol{\text { ® }}$ ús 338.
äтриттоs 109.
äтta 129， 414.
ätra 32 I.
ă $7 \tau \tau$（Att．）57， 480.
av̉ 60， 229.
a $\mathbf{y} y \epsilon i v$（Cret．） 134.
av̉ $\theta_{\iota} 566$.
aủk $\bar{a}$（Cret．） 134.
$a u \lambda \eta \tau \eta \rho 278$.
 431， 467.
av゙ ${ }^{\circ} \omega$ 60，97，106，199， 467， 468.
av̉os $60,115,213$.

aũptov $215,237,559$.
aủ่t 60 ， 57 I．
av̀т $\in i$（Dor．） 562.
àv̄テŋ́ 258.
aṽ̃ท 4II．
aúrŋit 41 I ．
a ข่ті́ка 573.
àüт $\mu \neq \downarrow 274$.
av̉го́ $\theta \in \nu 568$.
à̉тóOı 566.
av̉тó
aủrós 40， 405.
av̉тó $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} 570$ ．
à̉̃ov̂ 560.
aủ̃офún 279.
aủxévios 237.
aủ そे $^{2} 269$.
aṽّs（Aeol．）71， 213.
áфа́ртєроs 254.
áф́́шка（Dor．）96， 520.

д̀ $\phi \boldsymbol{\eta} \tau \omega \rho 278$.
aै $\phi \theta$ וтоs 37.
àфíy $\mu a \iota 522$.
á申і̀ $\mu$ 220，230， 232.
àфıкиє́одає 522.
ä $\phi \nu \omega 325$.

à $\phi$ pós III， 248.
ӟ $\phi \rho \omega$ 83， 345.
ä $\quad$ apıs 376.
àхаріштєроs 376.

ä $\chi$ Өоиаı 475.
ả̉ ${ }^{\iota}$（Dor．） 564.

ả $\chi \lambda \dot{\nu} \omega$ 128， 488.
＂$\chi \nu \eta 245$.
ả $\chi \nu v \mu a \iota 463,475$.
áXos 279.

ßáóv̀ 559.
ßá̧a 478.
$\beta$ a $\theta \mu$ ós 239.
ßáOos 279.
ßá̈ $\rho o \nu 25 \mathrm{I}$.
及aÓv́s 264.
及aìv 11，65，75，142， 205，470，477，478， 506.

阝а́ктрог 257.
ßádavos 205.
$\beta a \lambda \epsilon$ í $\nu 532$.
$\beta a \lambda \epsilon i \mu \in \nu 532$.
ßалєíl 67， 505.
ßалє́ 499.
阝a入ıós 238.
$\beta a \lambda \lambda i \zeta{ }^{\circ} \omega 159$.
$\beta a ́ \lambda \lambda \omega$ 67，129，205， 478，505， 527.
$\beta a ́ \lambda \lambda \omega \nu 166$.
$\beta a \mu \beta a i v \omega 480$.
$\beta a \nu a ̆$（Boeot．）65，205， 236， 295.
ва́ттє 473.
ßарárरos 78.
ßápa $0 \rho$ ov 68， 25 I ．
ßápßapos 159， 233.
ßарєía 235.
ßapú $\theta \omega$ 475.
ßapv̂̀ 490.
Bapús 33，47，67，205， 264，322， 475.
阝apúrทs 284.
及aбíरetos 237.
ßa⿱亠乂厶儿ús 30 note，71， 72，79，122，268，298， 299，300，305，316， 338，340， 489.
及абı入єuтє $\rho=s{ }^{2} 54$.
$\beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon$ ย́ $128,489$.
$\beta a \sigma i \lambda \eta$ и́os（Ion．） 237.
ва́́тıгоs 239.
ßáaıı 65，141，169，239， 262.
ßабкаіуш 490.
ßáбкадоs 242， 490.
ßáбкш 424，470， 540.
阝á $\sigma \sigma \omega 375$.
阝atós 258.
阝аф́̆ 236.
阝 ठ́є́ $10 \%$.
$\beta \in ́ \beta a \sigma a \nu$（Hom．） 523.
$\beta_{\epsilon} \beta \hat{a} \sigma \iota 8$ 。
$\beta \in \beta a \omega ́ s 552$.
вє́ $\beta$ ŋка 520.
$\beta \in \beta \lambda a ́ \sigma \tau \eta к а 517$.
$\beta^{\beta} \beta \lambda a \phi a{ }^{2} 2 \mathrm{I}$.
$\beta \epsilon \beta \lambda \epsilon ф{ }^{\prime} 518,521$.
$\beta \in \beta \lambda$ йато（Hom．） 523.
$\beta \epsilon \beta \lambda \eta \kappa a 520$.
$\beta \epsilon ́ \beta \rho \in к т а \iota 107$.
及є́ßpiӨa 518.
в́́ßршка 520.
$\beta \in \lambda \lambda o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o s(B o e o t)$. note I ．
вєіораи（Hom．） 498.
$\beta \in ́ \lambda \epsilon \mu \nu 0 \nu 240$.
$\beta \epsilon ́ \lambda \lambda \epsilon \tau a \iota$（Thess．） 205 note $I$ ．
$\beta \in ́ \lambda \lambda о \mu а \iota ~(T h e s s) ~ 148.$.
$\beta \in$ є́dos 67，80， 279.
$\beta$ é itatos $^{258}, 378$.
阝́́ $\lambda \tau \in \rho o s{ }^{2} 37$.
$\beta \epsilon ́ \lambda \tau \iota \sigma \tau 0 s 259,378$.
$\beta \in \lambda \tau i ́ \omega \nu 378$.
$\beta \epsilon \lambda \phi i \nu-$（Boeot．） 205 note I ．
$\beta \epsilon \lambda \phi \bar{\nu}-\quad$（Lesb．） 205 note I ．
$\beta \epsilon ́ \mu \beta \bar{\iota} \xi 285$.
ßévOos 279.
ßévitiotos（Dor．） 133.
ßŋクós 247.
ß $\eta \mu a 273$.
$\beta \eta{ }^{1} \xi 44$.
$\beta \dot{\eta} \sigma о \mu \in \nu$（Hom．） 526.

$\beta \dot{\eta} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \sigma \omega 494$.
$\beta \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega 422$.
ßiā 51， 205.
ßıßác 424.
$\beta i \beta \eta \mu \iota 424,459$.
$\beta \iota \beta \lambda i o v 73$.
Bıßрஸ́бк 47 I．
$\beta$ in（Ion．） 51.
$\beta$ in $\phi \iota(\nu) 306$.
Biós 205.
Bios 205， 206.
ßıoт̀́ 258.
ві́тоя 258.
$\beta \iota \omega ̂ \nu a \iota 206$.
$\beta \lambda a \beta$ ¢ 0 ós 248.
$\beta \lambda a \beta$ ク́бонає 501.
$\beta \lambda a \delta a \rho o ́ s ~ 145$.
$\beta \lambda a ̄ к i ́ \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho о s 376$.
$\beta \lambda a ́ \xi ́ \xi ~ 145, ~ 376 . ~$
$\beta \lambda a ́ \pi т \omega$ 473，511．
$\beta \lambda a \sigma \tau a ́ v \omega 467,473$.
$\beta \lambda \alpha ́ \sigma \tau \eta 258$.
$\beta \lambda a \sigma \tau$ ós 258， 472.
阝入áчонає 499.
$\beta \lambda a ́ \psi \omega 499$.
$\beta \lambda \epsilon i \eta \nu 532$.
$\beta \lambda \in і \bar{\mu} \epsilon \nu 532$.
$\beta \lambda \epsilon ́ \mu \mu а$ ІІ7， 158.
$\beta \lambda$ év 10 © $117,223$.
$\beta \lambda \epsilon \pi \tau$ ós 109 ．
$\beta \lambda \epsilon ́ \pi \omega$ 92，109，117， 158， 52 I ．
$\beta 入 \eta \chi^{\delta} \eta \nu 559$.
$\beta \lambda \bar{\eta} \mu \alpha 273$.
$\beta \lambda \eta$ र рós 145.
$\beta \lambda i \sigma \sigma \omega$ 493， 509.
$\beta$ ііттш 145，493， 509.
$\beta$ добvрஸ́mis 263.
$\beta \lambda u ́ \zeta \omega 478$.
$\beta \lambda \omega \theta$ ó́s 68，145， 251.
$\beta \lambda \omega \dot{\sigma \kappa \omega}$ 145， 470 ．
$\beta \lambda \omega \dot{\psi} 92$.
阝опдро́ $\mu \mathbf{\circ} 32$.

ßопла⿱㇒木ià 289.
阝опио́коз 289.
ßoףтús 266.
阝óOpos 248.
阝оли́ 236.
$\beta$ ó̀ $\lambda \bar{a}$（Lesb．）69， 148.
阝óллоцає（Lesb．）117， 148.

乃ódos 236.
ßоóклє $\psi 289$.
३ора̄ 236.
ßopéās 80.
ßop $\bar{s}$（Ion．） 80.
Bopós 236.
阝обкク̣́ 253.
アобкク́ $\sigma \omega 499$.
ßо́тка 253， 470.
ßот $\quad$ ūסóv 559.
ßótpus II9， 265.
ßovß้́̀ 269.
ßov入єヒ́㇒ 489.
ßov入 ${ }^{2} 69,489$.
ßоvえ $\bar{\sigma} \sigma$ онає 499.
ßovえŋфópos 289.
阝oú入онає 69，148，205， 205 note I，420， 42 I， 430， 462.
及ov̀óros 289.
ßoúnats 289.
ßoûs 18，29，63，96，205， 234，287，294，298， 299，300，302，305， 308，3II，312，314， 316， 339.
阝ра́ 7 хоs 78.
$\beta \rho a \delta ̄ \check{v} \nu \mathrm{\omega} 490$.
Bpaôús 264.
阝рaঠuтís 284.
ßра́ббш 375， 478.
ßра́ттш 478.
ßpaxús 264.
$\beta \rho \epsilon ́ \gamma \delta \eta \nu 107$.
ßрє́ $\mu \omega$ I43， 497.
ßре́tas 283， 370.
вре́ $\chi \omega$ І 109.
Bpıapós 248， 475.
$\beta$ ріऽॅ 478.
阝рítos 280.
アрї $\theta \omega$ 88， 475.
阝ролє́ 497.
阝ро́моs 236.
ßроут 1 143， 258.
Bpotós 145.
$\beta \rho \omega \bar{\sigma}$ ts 262.
$\beta \rho \omega \tau \eta{ }^{\beta} \rho 8$.
Bpotós 258.
$\beta$ р $\omega \tau$ ús 266.
阝úßìlos 243.
$\beta u \beta \lambda$ iov 73.
Búkrŋs 159.
$\beta \omega \theta \in \epsilon \omega$（lon．） 80.
$\beta \omega ิ \nu$（Dor．）54， 63.
$\beta \dot{\omega} \tau \omega \rho$ 278， 470.
$\gamma \hat{a}$（Dor．） 80.
raүүа入ís 429.
raí 475， 478.
үáda 230，285，301， 344.

банє́ш 216， 499.
үаруаіры 429， 480.
rapya入ís 429.
үабтท́ $278,359,360$.
үáбтрıs 376.
үабтрívтє $\rho \mathbf{o s} 376$.
үа́ $\sigma \tau \rho \omega \nu 269$.
रav̂（Arcad．） 32 I ．
रav̂入os 247.
$\gamma \in 40$ ．
$\gamma \in$ yaíp 491.
$\gamma^{\epsilon} \gamma a \mu \in \nu 96,518$.
$\gamma \in \gamma а ́ \mu \eta к а 520$.
$\gamma \in \gamma$ a ós 491.
$\gamma \in \gamma$ át $\eta$（Hom．） 523.
$\gamma \in$ үа́̈s 552.
$\gamma \in \gamma \in v \mu a \iota 518,522$.

$\gamma \epsilon ́ \gamma \lambda v \mu \mu a \iota 517$.
$\gamma^{\prime}$ јора $65,96,42 \mathrm{I}, 429$ ， 518.
$\gamma \in$ үоขєía $235,546,552$.
$\gamma \in \gamma o v v i ̂ a ~(I o n) ~ 235.$.
$\gamma \in \gamma_{0} \nu \omega$ © 552.
үє́ $\gamma \rho а \mu \mu а \iota ~ I 17$.
үє́ $\gamma \rho а т т а є 107$.
үє́ $\gamma \rho а ф а$ а17，518， 521.
үєүрафє́vaı 546.
$\gamma \in \gamma \rho a ́ \phi \theta a \iota 22 \mathrm{I}, 548$.
$\gamma є$ бра́чодає 501.
reitalva 235.
$\gamma \in і$ іт $\omega \nu 26$.
$\gamma \in \lambda a \sigma$ inos 244.
$\gamma \in \lambda a ́ \omega 458,468$.
$\gamma^{\prime} \lambda \omega \mathrm{L}$ 279，298，368， 492.
$\gamma \in \lambda \omega \dot{\omega}$（Hom．） 492.
$\gamma \in \nu \in \bar{a} \quad 5 \mathrm{I}$.
$\gamma \in \nu \epsilon \eta^{\prime}$（Ion．） 5 I．
$\gamma \in \nu_{\epsilon}^{\prime} \theta \lambda \eta 250$.

$\gamma \in \nu \in \epsilon a ́ s 285$ ．
үє́vєLOン 237.
ү́́vєбєь 97， 262.
$\gamma \in \nu \epsilon ́ \tau \epsilon \epsilon \rho a 322$.
$\gamma \in \nu \in \tau \eta \eta^{\prime} 258$.
$\gamma \in \nu \in T \dot{\eta} \rho 33,278,359$.
$\gamma \in \nu$ ér $\eta$ S 258.
$\gamma \in \nu$ ย́т $\omega \rho$ 49， 49 note， 278， 359.

$\gamma^{\prime}$ vos $20,30,33,44,46$ ， 47 note $2,80,89,97$ ， 147，188，213，279， 301，302，305，309， 3I4，316，319，364， 366，370，
ү́́vio 143.
ү́́vus 44，III，237， 264.

үє́ $\rho a \iota 8$ ．
$\gamma \in \rho a$ ós 237.
уєраітєроя $254,376$.
$\gamma є \rho a \nu o s 197$.
$\gamma \in \rho a \rho o ́ s 248$.
$\gamma^{\prime}$ pas 283， 370.
$\gamma \in \rho \gamma \in \rho о$ о 233.
रєроvбוos 237.
$\gamma \in \rho \omega \nu$ 230，275，299， 352.
$\gamma \in v \theta \mu o ́ s 239$.
үє́⿱亠䒑oцає 188.
$\gamma$ ยuctós 258.
$\gamma \in \dot{v} \omega$ I6，6I．
$\gamma є ́ \phi \bar{v} \rho a 486$.
$\gamma \in \phi \bar{v} \rho o ́ \omega 486$.
$\gamma \in \omega \mu \epsilon \tau \rho \eta s 323$.
クウ́ $\theta$ одаı 475.
rŋӨórvuos 246.
ขグ̈̀os 243.
クпраiŋ» 532.
ү $\eta$ ра́ós 237.
रйpas 237， 283.
үпра́ткш 458，470， 506.

гпра́ш 470．
$\gamma \bar{\eta} \rho u s 264$.
үクри́ш 128， 488.
$\gamma_{i} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \bar{a} \bar{s} 69,154,166$.
үіүvoцаи 20，89，96，97， 117，189，421，429， 457， 503.
रıүעஸ்бкढ I89，212，354， 424，471．
रігонає 189.
$\gamma \iota \nu \omega ́ \sigma \kappa \omega 189$.
$\gamma \lambda a ́ \phi v 264$.
रлафирós 248.
$\gamma \lambda a ́ \phi \omega 456$.
$\gamma \lambda \hat{\eta} \nu 0 \leq 280$.
$\gamma \lambda \nu \kappa a i \nu \omega 490$.
$\gamma \lambda$ лкєї́a 235.
र入vкús 264，322， 490.
$\gamma \lambda v к u ́ t \in \rho o s ~ 254,376$.
$\gamma \lambda v \kappa u ́ t \eta s 284$.
$\gamma \lambda \dot{\sigma} \sigma \sigma \omega 375$.
$\gamma \lambda \nu \phi i s 285$.
$\gamma \lambda u ́ \phi \omega$ 426，456， 507.
$\gamma \lambda u ́ \psi \omega 499$.
$\gamma \lambda \omega \sigma \sigma a$（Ion．）129，235， 322.
$\gamma \lambda \omega \hat{\omega} \tau \tau 129$.
$\gamma \lambda \omega \chi$ ts 348.
$\gamma \nu a ́ \theta \omega \nu 269$.
रעๆтós 90.
रขoíp 532.
$\gamma \nu 0 i ̂ \mu \in \nu 532$.
$\gamma$ рои́uā（Thess．） 54 note．
qvoús 354,355 ．
रvúg 97
$\gamma \nu \hat{\omega} \theta \iota \stackrel{5}{2} 5$.
$\gamma \nu \omega ิ \mu a 273$.
$\gamma \nu \dot{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu a \iota$（Hom．）146， 273， 546.
$\gamma \nu \dot{\mu} \mu \eta 54$ note， 239.
$\gamma \nu \omega \mu \omega \nu 273$.
дขผิขає 146， 546.
$\gamma \nu \omega ิ \sigma$ เs 262.
душ́бо $\mu$ а 422， 499.
$\gamma \nu \omega \tau$ ós $54,97,147,188$ ， 258.

ү $\nu \dot{\tau} \tau \omega$ 541．
үoá 484.
боүүú入入 429.
roнфios 32， 237.
रó $\mu$ фоs，46，140，162， 236.

үóvaтa 69.
yoveús 267.
रoví 236， 372.
róvos 236， 372.
Yóve 97，II8，188， 264.
qóos 484.
бóp $\gamma$ vpa 73.
үồva（Ion．）69， 118.
yovvós（Ion．） 302.
ү $\alpha \dot{\beta} \beta \delta \eta \nu 107$.
үрáóóo 80.
үра́циа 117.
үраттє́os 255， 556.
र $\rho a \pi \tau u ́ s 266$.
y $\rho$ aф́eús 267.
$\gamma \rho a ́ \phi \eta \nu \tau \iota($ Mess．） 528.

үра́фш 18，25，63，109， 117，163，212，221， 426，456，503，506， 507， 522.
бра́чодає 499.
र $\alpha$ áч $\omega 499$.
$\gamma v \mu \nu \eta ́ s 285$.
$\gamma v \mu \nu \eta \eta^{\prime} \eta s 285$.
rư $\mu \nu o ́ s 241$ ．
rúvaı 230.
yúvalò 295.
үvע＇́ 20，205，236，295， 343.

бшıiā 97.
ठаүкávш 466.
סáSaOaı（Cret．） 166.
סaŋ̂vat 146.
$\delta \bar{a} \eta{ }^{\prime} \rho$ 57，122，277，359， 360.

бaı $\delta a ́ \lambda \lambda \omega$ 429， 485.
סàmóvios 237.
баí $\mu \omega \nu 82,92,96,237$ ， 298－300，302，305， 345.

баivū $\mu 463$.
баіораи 478.
oais 285.
баєтข $\mu$ ஸ́ 273 ．

8alrús 266， 273.
8aí 75，125，129， 478. ठакє́өй $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ оs 289.
бакєì 505.
ठа́куш 462，468， 505. 8ákos 279.
סákpv 5，43，47，119， 229，265， 488.
סакрибіттактоs 292. бакри́ш 483， 488.
бááa 295.
סанávaı 46 I.
§а а́́⿱㇒木баı（Hom．） 509.
ঠаца́бш 499.
ঠада́㇒ 458， 512.
סa $\mu \nu$ ás 298，301，354，355． ठациа́тн 54I．
8ацעáف 462.
ס́́ $\mu \nu \eta \mu \iota 424,433,460$ ， 46I．
ठâцos（Dor．） 52 note I．
8ávos 96，24I， 280.
סatavá㇒ 467 note．
סađávך 467 note， 473.
ठа́тєєор 287.
סánte 473.
ঠарӨávш 467.
סaptós 67.
8áóarӨà 166.
8á $\mu$ ós 239.
סávテaбӨaı（Hom．） 166. סáús 65.
סатє́оцає 166， 239.
סaáńpios 237.
סáträӨal（Cret．） 166.
סavخós 80 ．
ठафиஸ́ข 269.
ठ́єа̄тоь（Arcad．） 528.
ס́́óapuaı 518.
סєбарич́́vos 67，89， 518.
$\delta \epsilon ́ \delta \in \iota \tau \mu a \iota$ III．
ठє́ठєка 520.
$\delta \epsilon ́ \delta \in \mu a \iota 520$.

סє́diévaı 546.
סєठїккодає 471 I．
ठ́́́оорка 30，38，44，46， 96，182，421，429， 516－18．

סє $\delta$ оркш́s 552.
סéסóo 52 I ．
ठ́є́ $\rho \overline{\text { āk }} 520$.
ठ́́ठ́шка 520.
$\delta \in \epsilon$ 人ós 247.
סeíite（Hom．） 523.
$\delta \epsilon i ́ \delta i \theta_{\imath}$（Hom．） 540.
$\delta \in i ́ \delta \iota \mu \epsilon \nu$（Hom．） 124.
ठєíкє $\quad$ ol 247.
$\delta \in \epsilon \kappa \nu \cup ́ \mu \in \nu O S 553$.
$\delta \epsilon i ́ \kappa \nu \bar{\mu} \mu \iota$ 58，354，433，
$\delta \in \iota \kappa \nu$ vivat 546.
סєєкขv́oıцı 534．
SєıKขv́s 298，301，354， 355.

ठєєкvṽซa 322.
סєíkvvбӨaı 548.
ठєíkvvao 543.
$\delta \epsilon \iota \kappa \nu \dot{\omega} \omega 465$.
$\delta \epsilon і к \sigma \epsilon \iota$（Cret．） 526.
ठєілакрíw 269.
סєídaкроs 269.
סeilóśs 247.
$\delta \in i ̄ \mu a 273$.
סєíva 415.
סetvós 24 I ．
סєíkaı 543， 547.

$\delta \in i \xi \bar{\xi} a \bar{s} 547$.
$\delta \in t \xi \in \epsilon$ 500.
$\delta \in i \xi \notin \leq 262$.
$\delta \epsilon i \xi \omega$ 498， 500.
$\delta \epsilon!\pi \nu \eta \tau \dot{\eta} \rho 10 \nu 237$.

סєítuol 495.
$\delta_{\epsilon \iota \rho \eta}$（Ion．） 5 I.
$\delta \in i \rho \omega 478$.
ठ́є́ка $5,44,65,171,182$, 384.

ठєкákıs 394.
бєка́тоия 289.
סєкás 11 I， 396.
ס́́́катоs $97,258,377,390$ ．
ठє́кодая 52 I ．
ठ́́котоs（Lesb．Arcad．） 390.

ס́́ктทs 258.

434，463，504， 540.

סénteap 271， 371.
ס́́̇єєт $\quad 257$.
סє $\lambda$ факív 244.
$\delta \epsilon ́ \lambda \phi{ }^{\boldsymbol{\prime}} \boldsymbol{\xi} 285$.
$\delta \epsilon \lambda \phi i \nu-205$ note $I$.
$\delta \in \lambda$ фís 348.
§ $\epsilon \lambda$ фús 205.
סє́ $\mu$ as 90， 283.
ס $\dot{\mu} \mu \omega$ 68， 236.
$\delta \in \nu \delta \rho \bar{\rho} \epsilon \iota \leq 276$.
סévdos 223， 245.
$\delta \in \xi$ tós 238 ．

ס́́ós 79，128， 279.
ঠধ́rā（Hom．） 80.
ס́́tas 283.
סє́p $\eta$ 51．
б́ќкоцає 64，67，83，89，
96， $42 \mathrm{I}, 456,505$.
ס́́f $\rho a 273$.
§́́ $\rho \rho \bar{a}$（Lesb．） 5 I.
ס́́ $\rho \rho \omega$（Lesb．） 478.
$\delta \epsilon ́ \rho \omega 67,89,217,258$ ， 260， 518.
ס́́GIS 262.
$\delta \in \sigma \mu$ ós 326.
$\delta \epsilon \sigma \mu \omega ́ \tau \eta{ }^{\prime} 258$.
ठ́́єтона 322.
$\delta \epsilon \sigma \pi o ́ v \eta \sigma \iota \nu$（Ion．） 321.
 321， 323.
סєбтоті́коя 253.
$\Delta$ cús（Boeot．Cret．Lac．） 129.

סєúrépos 390.
ठ́́申ф 468.
ס́́ $\chi$ Өaı 221， 548.
ठ́́хоиаи 429，507， 516.
ठє $\epsilon \omega 468$.
8є́ $\omega$ 79，128， 478.
ঠпŋ́є́ $\chi a \tau a \iota$（Hom．）429， 516， 52 I ．
סŋпкти́pıos 237.
 205 note I， 462.
ठŋ̂ $\lambda$ os 486.
סך入ów 8，17，80，486， 527， 540.

A a
$\delta \eta \lambda \omega \sigma \sigma \omega 49$.
бпиоßópos 32.
б $\eta \mu$ о́тє $\rho$ оs 254.
ס $\eta \mu$ ór $\eta \boldsymbol{s} 258$.
$\Delta \eta \mu \omega ิ \nu a \xi 80$.
$\delta \dot{\eta} \nu 59$.
іпріораи 483， 487.
$\delta \eta$ ŋिps 260.
סŋ $\ddagger$ óv 559.
$\delta \eta \sigma \omega 501$.
© $1-45$.
סıaßatи́plos 237.
סıāкобıákıs 394.
סıāко́бıо 387.
סıā̄кобıобтós 393.
סıס́á̧̆ 499.
סıס́áซкш 186，429， 47 I， 513.

8íiol 540 note．
סьooin 533.
סiÓó $\mu \in \nu$ оs 553.
dıóóva 546.
סíסor $\theta a \iota 548$.
ঠі́ঠобо 543.
סıóór 541．
ס七ó́r $\omega \sigma a \nu 542$.
díoov 540.
Siooús $17,69,154,166$, 298，301，354， 355.
סiठoû $\sigma a$ 154， 322.
ठıठра́á $\kappa \omega 47 \mathrm{I}$ ．
dí $\omega \mu \mathrm{c} 8,33,38,49$ note， 54，82，83，85，87，96， 169，171，354，429， 433，434，455，472， 529.

סเठ்َ́ $\sigma$（Hom．） 499
סiєfós 205.
סı́́ $\phi \theta о \rho a 518$.

סі广орає 459.
$\Delta$ it 337.
סıка̧́ム 495， 499.
סíканоs 237.
סıкаıобúvך 246.
бıка́б（ $\sigma) \omega 499$.
סıка́ш 499.
סıкєīl 182.
סík 111 ，236， 495.

סікп 56 r.
סíkクбt 32 I ．
סıÉós（Ion．）129， 395.
diólotos 2 I ．
$\Delta$ tó $\theta \in \nu 568$.
Sios 125，129，234，237， 302， 337.
$\Delta$ เóvסотоs 21，23，37， 292.

Аเóткоvрои 37， 292.
ठı $\pi \lambda \epsilon \hat{i}$（Cret．） 562.
סı $\pi \lambda$ रós 395 ．
סıा 入ov̂s 395.
dímovs 38 I ．
סís 124，394， 575.
סívkos 186， 253.
ठเซх̄̄̀ıобтós 393.
סıттós（סıббós） 395.
סí申роs 37，82，89，96， 97.
dixa 395.

סı $\chi$ Өádıos 237.

סıұалє́os 247.
díwos 247.
$\delta \mu \eta \tau \eta \eta^{\rho} 68,278$.
$\delta \mu \eta \tau o ́ s 68$.
$\delta \mu \omega ́ s ~ 340$.
סoFevai（Cypr．）79，27I， 304， 546.

סoí $\mu \in \nu 53$ I．
סoín 5 532， 533.
ঠокıда́ऽऽ 495.
סóкıцоs 495.
Sonıरós 201.
סo入ótis 276.
סó $\mu \epsilon \iota \nu$（Rhodes） 549.
סó $\mu \in \nu$（Hom．）273，305， 549.

ס́ó $\mu \in \nu a \iota$（Hom．）273， 545， 546.
סó $\mu$ ยуоs 553.
ठó $\mu \eta \nu$（Cret．） 549.
סо́́pos 46，171，236， 287.

סóga 129，167， 322.
סорıкцй＇s 285.

סopitovos 292.
סóp ${ }^{2} 234$.
Sopós 69，II9， 124.
סópv 264.
Oós 524， 539 ．
סórөaı 548.
סóvts 169， 262.
סó́ког（Ion．） 469.
סót єipa 235， 322.
סoт́́os 255， 556 ．
ठоти́ $82,235,278,322$ ， 359， 361 ．
סotós 49 note， 87,96 ， 258， 555.
סót 54 I ．
סovิ 543.
סoúdelos 237.
סoú入 $\eta 236$.
סov̂̀os 486.
סov入oov́vŋ 246.
סov入órvvos 246.
סov入óف 486.
ठoì $\mu \in \nu 80$ ．
Soûvą 79，271，304， 546.

Soupós（Ion．）17，69， 119，124， 302.
סoús 354 ， 355.
סó $\chi \mu$ ноs 237.
סoхuós 73， 239.
бра́ $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ а 489.
боаүиєن́ш 489.
ठрaiŋ 532.
браі̄цєע 532.
браіцш 129， 478.
ठ оа́кшу 275.
бранойцає 422.
ס $\rho$ ấs 354.
ס $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \sigma \omega 478$.
ठра⿱亠т́́os 255.
סрatós 67， 258.
бра́ттш 478.
ठрӑ́ть 54 I ．
брах $\mu \bar{\eta} \sigma$ 321．
ठрáш 18，63，354， 478.
ठ $\rho \in \pi a ́ v \eta 242$.
ठрє́талоу 242.
брї $\mu$ úлоs 247.
б $\rho о \mu$ ás 285.

б $\rho о ́ \mu \omega \nu 269$.
סробє pós 248.
бри́лтш 473.
ठ $\rho \dot{\omega} \psi$（Hesych．） 152.
dvás 396.
$\delta \hat{v} \mu \in \nu a \imath$（Hom．） 546.
ס仑̂vaı 546.
סúvalto 534.
ঠن́vā $\mu a \iota$（Cret．） 528.
ঠívaцаı 430， 46 I ．
$\delta u ́ v \omega \mu a l 529$.
Sóo 294， 38 r．
ס̀́o каi ঠéка（ঠvoкаíðєка）
（Hom．） 385.

ס́v́r $\theta \bar{v} \mu$ os 290.

$\delta v \sigma \mu \in \nu \eta{ }^{\prime}$ 82，279，290， 298－302，308，312， 314，363，364，366， 367， 373.
$\delta v \sigma \mu \eta \tau \eta \rho 290$.
ס́vot $\quad 1212$.
סvбтvхє́ต 430.
סvarvx ${ }^{2} \mathrm{~s} 290$.
ס́́vфатоs 290.
ס $\dot{\omega} \omega$ 54，171， 229.
б́ผठєка 37，124，292， 381， 385.
סшঠ́є́катоs 391.
б́єє（Boeot．Cret．） 129.

ठळо $\boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{\nu} 528$.
ס $\omega \rho \in a ̆ ̃ \nu ~ 559$.
ठิิpov 54，96， 248.
ठ்́न 499.
$\delta \omega \tau \dot{\eta} \rho 278$.
бผ́т $\omega \rho 8,33,54,82$ ， 278，298－300，302， 359， 36 I.

Є 124，354， 404.
＇єàà $\eta \nu 430$.
є́à̀ $\lambda \omega 430$.
є́ávóavє（Hom．） 430.
є̈ap 22，67，79，97， 121 ， 371.

є＂apı 241.

éapıvós 24 I ．
${ }^{\prime} \beta$ ßãò 129， 505.
$\epsilon$＇ßā̀ $($ Dor．）50，51，506， 708.
éßôouás 396.
є́ßóó $\mu$ атоs（Hom．） 390.
є $\beta$ бо $\mu$ и́коута 386.
є́ $\beta$ боо $\eta$ кобто́s 392.

$\epsilon \beta \eta \nu 70,205,422,424$ ， 458，503， 506.
є́ $\beta \lambda a ́ \sigma \tau \eta к а ~ 517$.
є́ß入a

${ }_{\epsilon} \beta \beta \lambda \eta \nu 458,506$.
$\epsilon \beta \lambda \iota \sigma a 509$.
є＇$\gamma \gamma \in \nu \eta{ }^{\prime} s 230$.
＇̇yyús 558.
$\epsilon \gamma \epsilon \epsilon \omega \nu \epsilon$（Hom．） 523.
$\epsilon \gamma \epsilon i \rho \omega 129$.
є́ $\gamma \in \lambda \lambda \sigma \sigma \sigma a$（Hom．） 509.
ধ́ $\gamma \in \nu o ́ \mu \eta \nu 503$.
єү $\gamma$ риа 216.
＇́ $\gamma \eta \eta^{\prime} \rho \bar{\nu} \nu 458,506$.
є́ $\eta$ भ́pā $\sigma a 512$.

$\epsilon{ }_{\epsilon}{ }^{\prime} \gamma \lambda v \psi a 507$.
є́ $\gamma \nu \omega$ ка 517， 520.
$\epsilon \not \epsilon \nu \omega \nu 63,70,97,450$ ， 458，506， 528.
＂ $\bar{\prime} \nu \omega \sigma \mu a \iota 522$.

є́ $\gamma \rho a \psi$ а 507， 5 II．
є́үри́yopa 429.
є่रXénvos 73.
є $\gamma \dot{\omega}$ 44，III，188，397， 402.



そ́ $\delta a \iota \sigma a 463$.
є̇дакоу 466， 505.
є́dááa⿱㇒木 510， 512.
є́ $\delta a ́ \mu \eta \nu 528$.
é oavós 242.
є́dáp $\quad 67$.


$\bar{\epsilon} \delta \delta \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \epsilon \nu$（Hom．） 124.

$\epsilon$＂$\delta \in \theta \lambda o \nu 115,213,250$.
的 $\delta i \delta i \partial \mu \epsilon \nu$（Hom．） 523.

є́סєє $\xi=463,507,511$ ， 531， 547.

є́ $\delta \in u ́ \eta \sigma a 512$.
 552.

є́ $\delta \eta \lambda \dot{\omega} \theta \eta \nu 514$.
є́ $\delta \eta$ тús 266.

є $\delta \mu \in \nu a \iota$（Hom．）273， 546.

є́óóOŋ 501， 514.

$\epsilon$ $\epsilon \delta о \mu \epsilon \nu 454,504$.
є́ $\delta$ os 44，89，115，171， 213，279， 457.
є́סoбаข 504．
є́סото 504.
Є＇סovkє（Thess．） 54 note．
$\epsilon ̋ \delta \rho \bar{a} 248$.
є́бракоу 64，67，83，89， $96,456,503,505$.
$\epsilon<\bar{\epsilon} \rho \bar{\alpha} \nu 458,506$.
ধ́ठpavov 242.


ढ＇$\delta \omega$ 6，44，171，287，425， 475.

є́ $\delta \omega \kappa a 54$ note，504， 520.
€́ ${ }^{\prime}$（Hom．） 404.
Є゙єוாov（Hom．） 505.
ย́є́бनатo（Hom．） 430.
${ }^{\epsilon}(F) \epsilon{ }^{\prime} \rho \sigma \eta$（Hom．） 77.
éfós（Boeot．） 406.

$\epsilon \zeta \zeta \epsilon \sigma \mu a \iota 522$.
${ }^{\epsilon} \zeta \zeta \epsilon \sigma \sigma a$（Hom．） 509.



Є゙Souaı 129，458，481．

|  |
| :---: |
| $\epsilon$ |$\omega \sigma \mu a \iota 522$.

€̈ $\theta$ Ovò 505.
€ै $\theta$ єıка（Boeot．） 52 note 2.

＇̇ $\theta$ ध́ $\lambda \eta \sigma a{ }^{2} 12$ ．
$\dot{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \theta \in \hat{\epsilon} \lambda \omega$ 430， 43 I ．
$\epsilon_{\epsilon} \theta \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \omega \mu \iota$（Hom．） 433 note．
$\neq \theta \epsilon \mu \epsilon \nu 454,504$.
є $\theta \in \epsilon \nu$（Dor．） 404.
${ }^{\prime \prime} \theta \in \epsilon \sigma a \nu 504$.
є̈ $Ө$ Пка 52 note 2,504 ， 520.
＇̇ $\theta$ Lıкós 252.
${ }^{\prime} \theta$ vos 280 ．
$\epsilon \theta \rho \in \psi a 5$ II．
ei $40,416$.
tỉ 80 ．
Eidoa 271， 371.
єiठठєiŋע 531.
єi̊̀́vą 546.
єióéの日al 548.
єїठ $\eta \sigma \omega$ 499， 500.
єїठодає 96.
є $і$ i $\delta о \mu \epsilon \nu$（Hom．） 526.
cíoo $425,430$.
eídos 279.
єìovía 322， 552.
єìós $122,322,552$.
єïท 76，129，230，433， 531.
tilns 6， 52.
tîka 520.
єїка Зор 430.
єiкка́s 396.
єікоба́кıs 394.
єіккобє III，121， 386.
єǐкобто́s 258， 392.
є̈iктクノ（Hom．） 523.
єїктоу 518.
єík $\mathbf{\omega} 34 \mathrm{I}$ ．
єікผ́ン 34 I ．
єỉdap 371.
єìíńगovӨa（Hom．）96， 518.

єї̀ $\eta$ ŋ $\quad 517$.
єỉ $\eta$ Х ${ }^{a} 517$.
є＂лодаи（Hom．）69， 462.
єі＂

єì $\omega \omega$（Hom．） 148 ．
єíयа 273.
єїцартає 517.
є $\bar{\mu} \mu \in \nu 430$.
єi $\mu i 38,40,44,44$ note $\mathbf{I}$ ， $45,69,85,89,117$ ， 140，164，169，212， 214，229，427，433， 434，452，498， 526.
єi $\mu \iota 7,12,38,58,83,85$ ， 96，424，428，453， 498， 524.
モív（Boeot．） 404.
єìáeтes 384.
єivakó́тоь $384,387$.
єìvávvđєs（Ion．） 384.
elvatos（Ion．）69，124， 390.

єiv̄̄ $\mu \iota$（Ion．）214，463， 464.

єísa 5 II．
cio（Hom．） 404.
єinć 38 ， 540.
єілє́єєขal（Hom．） 546.
єілє́тढ 541.
єіто́м $\eta \nu$ 219， 430.
єîmov $425,430,457$.
єiँ $\pi \omega \mu$（Hom．） 433 note．

єір рпка 517.
єіроко́цоя 289.
єіродає（Ion．） 124.
єípos 280.
єiptov 430.
tis 153.
tís $12,69,89,96,144$, 154， 380.
єi大i $\theta \mu \eta 239$.
є́̈́кк 186，471．
єїт $\eta$ кєเ 430.
є $\ell \quad \sigma \phi \rho \in s 539$.
єîra 416， 57 I ．
єỉxov 6，12，80， 430.
$\epsilon i \omega \theta a 517$.
єiós 552.
є́K 222.
＇Ека́ßך 73.
є́кацоу 505.
éxús 574.

є́кабтáть 564.
є́каттє́曰ю 564.
є́като́ $\mu ३ \eta$ 37，96， 287.
є́като́ข $65,73,141,182$ ， 380， 387.
є́катоутáкıs 394.
є́катоутás 396.
éкатобтós $393,396$.
éкатобтús 266.
є́k $\kappa \in v^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{S} 291$.
Є́кє
$\epsilon \in \kappa \in i ̂ \theta \in \nu 416,568$.
ékeivos 412， 415,416 ．

є́кє́к $\lambda$ єто 457.
ढ̈кє $\lambda \sigma a$ 212，217，509， 511.

є́кє́ $\rho а \sigma а ~ 512$.
ย́кє́ $\rho \delta a ̄ \nu a 216$.
є́кє́ $\rho \delta \eta \nu a$（Ion．） 216.
єौкє $\rho \sigma a$ 217，509， 51 I．
є́кплоs 373.
є́ккаıס́є́катоs 391.
є่к $\kappa a ́ \pi \eta \eta \nu$ 67，89，96， 506.
є́клаба 512.
$\epsilon \epsilon \kappa \lambda \epsilon \iota \psi \stackrel{s}{ } 262$.
є́к $\kappa \bar{\prime} \epsilon \not \phi \theta \eta \nu 116$.
є́клі̀да 513.
є̈кขоноs 291．
є́ко́рє $\sigma a 464$.
ย์котóv（Arcad．） 73.
є́кои́ $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ os 237.
є́ко廿а 51 II ．

є́крє́ $\mu а \sigma а{ }_{5} 12$.
єкрі̀га 69.

є＂ктєєขа 216， 511.
ékтєive 22 I ．
єєктоӘし 566.
є́ктоуа 517， 518.
є́ктоs $22 \mathbf{I}, 258,350,377$ ， 572.

є̈киӨо้ 456， 505.
ékvoós 124.
є̇кфє́ $\rho \omega=22 \mathrm{I}$.
${ }^{\epsilon} \kappa \varnothing \phi \rho \in s 539$.
є́кผ́ע 12I note，275， 352.
€ौaßov 38， 38 note，422， 505.

єौлакоу 470．
є’入áoбat 509.
є̇ $\lambda a ́ \sigma \sigma \omega ~ 375$.
é $\lambda a ̆ ́ \sigma \sigma \omega \nu$（Ion．）69，80， 129，156， 210.
є́ $\lambda a ́ \sigma \omega 499$.
єं $\lambda a \tau \eta \eta_{\rho} 278$.
é $\lambda$ atós 258.
єं $\lambda \frac{1}{\tau} \tau \tau \omega \nu 69,80,129,156$ ， $210,378$.

Є $\lambda a \phi$ os 249 ．
є́ $\lambda$ аф $\rho$ ós 209.
є́лáхıбтоs 259， 378.
ढ̈лахор 466， 505.
é $\lambda a \chi u ̛ ́ s ~ 209,210,264,378$.
є̇ $\lambda a ́ \omega$ 458， 499.
єौлооає 474 ．
$\epsilon \quad \lambda \epsilon \gamma \chi$ ŋ́s 279.
$\epsilon{ }^{\epsilon} \lambda \in \gamma$ Oos 279 ．
é $\lambda \in \epsilon \in \nu$ ós 24 I ．
$\epsilon \lambda \epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \mu \omega \nu 273$.
е́лє́ $\eta$ ขа 508.
${ }^{\epsilon} \lambda \in \in \tau=63,507,511$ ．
$\epsilon \lambda \epsilon \xi a \quad 507,511$ ．
є́ $\lambda \epsilon \dot{v} \theta \epsilon \rho$ os 248.
е́ $\lambda$ є́́vouaı 62， 96.
є $\lambda \epsilon \epsilon \in \theta \eta \nu 116$.
$\bar{\epsilon} \lambda \hat{\lambda} \lambda$ лaкa 517.
є́ $\lambda \eta \dot{\lambda} \lambda a \mu a \iota 517$.

$\epsilon^{\epsilon} \lambda \dot{\eta} \lambda \nu \theta a \quad 517,518$.
＇́ $\lambda \eta \lambda \nu \theta$＇̀s 552.
${ }^{\epsilon} \lambda \theta \hat{\theta}$＇ 38,540 ．
द́ $\lambda \theta \in i=1$
${ }^{\epsilon} \lambda \iota \pi$ ит $38,82,97,118$ ， 450，456， 505.
€ $\overline{\text { п коя }} 279$.
é $\lambda \lambda \bar{a}$（Lac．） $117,172$.
єौ $\lambda \lambda a \beta \varepsilon$（Hom．） 430.
є́ $\lambda \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \pi \omega 149$.
є＇$\lambda \lambda \epsilon i \pi \omega \omega 230$.
＇ $\mathbf{E \lambda}$ и́бтоитоs 37.

€ $\lambda \mu$ \％ 26 I ．
є̄ $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ os 279.
 493， 509.
е́ $\lambda \pi i$ is 343，393， 482.
$\bar{\epsilon} \lambda \bar{\nu} \sigma a$ 507， 53 I ．
єौ $\lambda \tau \tau \rho о \nu 257$.
$\epsilon \lambda \omega \rho 37 \mathrm{I}$ ．
є́ュávךข 458，481，506， 514.

ধ́ $\mu$ ßá $\lambda \lambda \omega 230$.
＇$\mu \epsilon$＇ $397,402$.
$\epsilon_{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon ́ \gamma \in 35,401,402$.
${ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon ́ \theta \epsilon \nu$（Hom．） 402.
є́ $\mu \epsilon ́ \theta \omega 475$.
є＂$\mu є \tau \nu а$ 69，216，508， 51 I．
є́ $\mu$ єío（Hom．）76， 402.
є $\mu \epsilon ́ \mu \eta к о \nu$（Hom．） 523.
є́ $\mu \in \nu \nu a$（Lesb．）69，216， 508.

є́нє́́o（Ion．） 402.
є́ $\mu$ ́́о（Dor．）80， 402.
${ }^{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \sigma \iota \stackrel{262}{ }$.
${ }_{\epsilon}{ }^{\prime \prime} \mu \epsilon \sigma \sigma a$（Hom．） 509.
${ }^{\prime \prime} \mu$ етоо 258.
$\bar{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \hat{v}$（Ion．） 402.
$\epsilon \in \mu \in \hat{v} s$（Dor．） 402.
є́ $\mu \epsilon ́ \omega$ 140，458，475， 512.

єєппиа（Dor．）69， 216.
$\epsilon_{\epsilon} \mu i \gamma \eta \nu \quad 70,506$.
є́ $\mu к т о$（Hom．）221， 507.
є́ $\mu \nu \nu$（Dor．） 402.

є́ $\mu i \sigma \theta \omega \sigma a{ }_{5} \mathrm{I}$ о．
$\epsilon^{\prime} \mu i \chi \theta \eta \nu \quad 116$ ．
${ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \mu \mu a \theta \epsilon \nu$（Hom．） 430.
є́ $\mu \mu \in ́ \nu \omega$ II7，150， 230.
$\dot{\epsilon} \mu \mu i ́$（Lesb．）69， 214.
${ }^{\epsilon} \mu \mu$ ора 518.
є $\mu \mu о р є$（Hom．） $214,232$.
${ }_{\epsilon} \mu \nu \eta \sigma a$ 512．
є́ ноі 402.

є́ $\mu$ ós 33， 406.
$\epsilon{ }^{\epsilon} \mu \circ \hat{0} 402$.
ढ́भov̂s（Dor．Lesb．） 402.
є́ $\mu \pi \epsilon \delta o ́ \omega$ 43I．
$\epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \mu i \pi \pi \tau \omega 230$.
${ }_{\epsilon}{ }^{\prime} \mu \pi \lambda \eta \nu \tau о 70$.
є́ $\mu \nu \dot{s} \mathbf{s} 285$.

є́ $\mu \hat{\omega} s$（Dor．） 80.
๕゙ข 65，141，214，230， 346， 387.
évákıs 394.
évádıos 237.
évás 396.
€゙עaтos 69，124，377， 390.
є̈ $\nu \delta є \kappa a 37,385$.
є́vס́́ќкатоs 391．
$\epsilon \notin \delta o \theta_{\iota} 566$.

Є่ $\nu \in \gamma \kappa \in i ้ \nu 429,457,505$.
є้ขєєца 69，ІІ7，216，508， 5II．
Є้ $\downarrow є \mu \mu a$（Lesb．）69，117， 216， 508.
є̀vєขض́коעта 386.
évє $\nu \eta к о \sigma \tau$ ós 392.
${ }_{\epsilon}{ }^{\prime} \nu \in \rho \theta a$（Dor．Lesb．） 567.
${ }^{\epsilon} \nu \in \rho \theta \epsilon(\nu) 567$.
є่ $\nu \epsilon \tau \dot{\prime}{ }^{\prime} 258$.
${ }^{\epsilon} \nu \eta \eta^{2} 147$.

є̀ $\nu \eta \mu a$（Dor．）69，117， 216.

ぞ $\downarrow \eta$ चа 512 ．
${ }_{\epsilon}^{\prime} \nu \theta a \quad 567$.
${ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \nu \theta \epsilon \nu 568$.
$\epsilon \downarrow \theta \omega \dot{\omega} \nu$（Dor．） 133.
ধ́vıav́alos 169.

＇́vívies 524， 539.
évע́́a 79，122， 384.
є̀ עуєакаио́єкатоs 391.
є̇ข $\nu \in \alpha ́ \mu \eta \nu 0$ os 384.
évpeás 396.
$\epsilon \nu \nu \epsilon o \nu$（Hom．）214， 430.
є̀ $\nu \nu \eta$ ๆ́корта（Hom．） 386.
${ }^{\epsilon} \nu \nu \bar{v} \mu \iota$ I 2 I note， 463,464 ．
є゙vos 44， $213,378$.
є́vót $\eta \mathrm{s} 284$.
ṫvs 153.
E゙vs（Cret．）12，69，154， 380.

Є̇ขraû $\theta a 567$.
${ }^{\epsilon}$＇$\nu \tau \in s$（Dor．） 354.
ṫ $\nu \tau$ ós 350,572 ．

ย̇ขúтขıov 237.

＇ $\mathfrak{\prime}$ IO9， 222.
డ゙ฏ 221， 384.
́́લ̇ákıs 394.

є＇$\xi а \mu \mu а \iota ~ 517$.
є́ॄátovs 289.
€́gás 396.
€ $\ddagger \in \in 亡$ 539， 540.
$\epsilon \xi \in \cup \rho \in 38$ ．
є́єŋंкоута 386.


є́ $\dot{\xi} \eta \rho а \sigma \mu a \iota 522$.
$\epsilon \in \xi \omega 115$.
$\epsilon \xi \xi \omega 564$.
$\epsilon \epsilon \xi \omega \theta \in \nu 568$.
€̋（Hom．） 404.
є́ô（Hom．） 404.
єоска 186，470，471， 517 ， 518.
€өлла 517， 518.
єоруа 518.
éós（Hom．）33， 406.
є́ov̂（Dor．） 404.
éoùs（Dor．Boeot．） 404.
є゙тäov 64，65，89，422， 470.

є̇тактйр 278.
$\epsilon \epsilon \pi \bar{a} \xi \bar{a}$（Dor．） 80.

ढ̈тєєба 166，509，511， 520.

＂＇$\pi \epsilon \iota \tau=57 \mathrm{I}$ ．
є́r $\pi$ é $\bar{\lambda} a \sigma a$ 461， 512.
$\epsilon \quad \pi \epsilon \epsilon \mu \phi \theta \eta \nu 116$.

єँ $\pi \epsilon \sigma$ 543．
є́ $\pi \in ́ \pi \iota \theta \mu \in \nu$（Hom．） 523.
є́ $\pi \epsilon ́ \pi \lambda \eta \gamma \circ \nu$（Hom．） 523.
$\epsilon \in \pi \epsilon \pi$ óv $\theta \in \iota \nu 430$.
є́ $\pi \epsilon \pi$ о́v $\begin{aligned} & \eta \\ & 430 .\end{aligned}$
є̇пє́ $\rho \bar{\nu} \nu a 508$.
є̇ $\pi \epsilon \in а \sigma \sigma a$（Hom．） 509.
є̈тєрба 166， 509.
є $\pi \epsilon \sigma$ бó̀ os 289.
є่тє́та⿱㇒木 461．

Є̈тєфขоข 429，457， 505.
є̈ $\pi \eta \lambda a \quad 217,221,507$, 509.

є̇пißઠаı 82，89，96，107， 158.

є́ $\pi \iota$ ß́グт $\omega \rho 278$.
є́тíratos 291.
ধ́ $\pi$ เүovvís 285 ．
є́ $\pi i \theta$ єтоs 291.

$\epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \pi \lambda i \lambda \eta=\omega 274$ ．
$\epsilon \in \pi \lambda \eta \sigma \mu \omega \nu 274$.

є̇ $\pi \iota \sigma \sigma \epsilon^{i} \omega \nu$（Hom．） 124.


énı兀vvíбтātoı（Arcad．） 528.

є́ $\pi \iota \sigma \chi \epsilon \rho \omega ́$ 306， 564.
ётіхалкоs 291.
є́ $\pi \iota \chi$ Өóvios 237.

${ }^{\epsilon} \pi \pi \lambda \in \xi a$ 1I．
$\ddot{\epsilon} \pi \lambda \epsilon \cup \sigma a 511$ ．
є́ $\pi \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \chi \theta \eta \nu 116$.
є́moi申иそ̆a 513.
є̈тоиає 44，89，96，202， 213，219，420，456， 505，524， 539.
є̇тотооós 289.
є゙ $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ os 121， 202 note 3 ， 212，247， 279.
ध̈ $\pi \rho a{ }^{2}$ ò 67.
є̇т ${ }^{\text {á }} 33,44,64,107$ ， 157，I58，213， 384.
єँ $\pi \tau а \iota \sigma \mu a \iota 517$.
єпттакаıб́ккатоs 391 ．
є́ $\pi$ тáкıs 394.
є́лтако́тıo 387.
Є̈ $\pi \tau \bar{a} \nu$（Dor．）458， 506.
є̈ $\pi \tau \bar{a} \xi a$（Dor．） 96.
є́ $\pi \tau$ т́́тovs 289.
є́ $\pi \tau a ́ s 396$.
ধ゙ $\pi \tau \eta \nu 458$.
є＂$\pi \tau \eta \chi a{ }^{5} 2 \mathrm{I}$ ．
є̇пúл入เò 247.
є＂рании 458.
є́ áo $_{\boldsymbol{\prime}}{ }^{2} 458$.
є́ $\rho \alpha^{\omega} \omega 458$.

E＇pyov 44 note 2,121 ， 188.
${ }^{\prime} \rho \rho \gamma \omega 52 \mathrm{I}$.
є＂$\rho \delta \omega 129$.
$\epsilon \epsilon \rho \epsilon ́ \beta \epsilon \sigma \phi \stackrel{ }{ } 306$.
 205 note 2，207，231， 279.

є́ $\rho \in i ́ \delta \omega$ IIO， 274.
є́ $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ і́ка 456， 505.
є́ $\rho \in і$ ít 456 ， 505.
є＂$\rho \in \iota \sigma \mu a 274$.
＇ $\mathrm{E} \rho \in \mu \hat{\eta} \boldsymbol{s} 78$.
є́ $\rho \in \mu \nu$ о́s $117,207$.
є́ $\rho \in ́ \pi \tau \omega 4$ 473．
द́ $\rho \in ́ \sigma \sigma \omega 129$ note 2.
є’ $\rho \in \tau \eta \eta^{\prime} 73$.
є́ $\rho$ ध́t $\eta$ S 129 note 2， 239 ．
є’ $\rho \in \tau \mu$ о́s 239.
є́ $\rho$ є́ттє 129 note 2.
є́рєи́yoцаи 420，456， 505.
є́ $\rho$ є́ $\phi \omega$ 473.
＂́pis 260，285， 343.

є́ркєíos 237.
єркоя 279.
є́ $\rho \mu$ а 273.
＇ $\mathrm{E} \rho \mu \mathrm{\eta} \mathrm{~s} 78$.
€＂plos 280.
＂́родає 124.
є̈ $\rho \pi \omega$ 44，136，157， 213 ， 430， 456.
ś $\rho \rho a ́ \gamma \eta 123$.
є́рра́ $\gamma \eta \nu 458$.
є＇िрєор（Hom．）215， 430.
є́ $\rho \rho \eta_{\eta} \theta \eta \nu 123$.
＂$¢ \rho \rho \eta \xi a$ 123，232， 430.

＂́िрі̄тто⿱ 430.
＂$\rho \rho \bar{i} \phi$ а 52 I.
є’рі́фө $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{\nu} 116$.
є’ $\rho \rho u ́ \eta \nu 506$.
є＂$\rho \rho \omega \gamma a 82,83,96,123$, 517.

＂$\epsilon \sigma \eta 77,236$.
є＇$\rho \sigma \eta \nu$（Ion．）67，212，217， 345.

є̇ $\rho \cup \gamma \gamma a ́ v \omega ~ 466$.

є́pryєiv 466， 505.
épuӨpìvos 244.
épu $\theta$ pós $9,22,30$ note， $33,47,77,136,177$, 231， 248.
є́рйкаког 429.
є́pūкаעám 467 note．
є́ри̃кávต 467.
є’ри́кк 429， 467.
є̈ $\rho \chi$ атає 52 I ．
Є̈ $Р Х о \mu a t 425$.
＇Е $\rho \chi о \mu \in \nu$ о́s 73.
ё $\rho \omega$ м 279， 368.
ส̃s 524， 539.
e＇s 153 ．
és（Boeot．Thess．） 222.
Є̇ $\sigma a ́ \lambda \pi \iota \gamma \xi{ }^{2} 153,509$.
є́vá入 $\pi \iota \sigma a 509$.
є́ $\sigma a ́ \pi \eta \nu ~ 506$.
${ }^{\epsilon} \sigma \beta \beta \eta \nu 458,501,506$.
є́a日ं́s 121,121 note．
${ }^{\epsilon} \sigma \sigma \theta \iota 44$ note $\mathbf{I}$ ．
є́a Oíw 424，425，$^{2} 475$.
є́a $\theta$ 入ós 250.
$\epsilon \not \epsilon \sigma \theta \omega 475$.
є́øкє́óaбa 461．
Є̈бтака 520.

є̈бтартає 518.
＂＇テтабала！ 522.
テ̈бтабтаь 468.
Є̈ $\sigma \pi \in \epsilon к а ~ 520$.
Є゙ $\sigma \pi \epsilon \epsilon \sigma a$ 166， 511 ．
光 $\sigma \pi \in \iota \sigma \tau a \iota 153$ note．
$\epsilon \sigma \pi \epsilon \nu \sigma a$（Cret．） 166.
є́ $\sigma \pi \epsilon ́ \rho a ̄ s ~ 560$.
ध́ $\sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \nu o ́ s 241$ ．
Є̈ $\sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ os 121 note， 212.
є́бтє́धөaı 89，96，457， 505.

є̈ $\sigma \pi о \mu \eta \nu 429$.
デซ $\sigma a 463$.
$\neq \sigma(\sigma)$ єva 5 Io．
＂̈ $\sigma \sigma \epsilon v \epsilon$（Hom．） $129,232$.
є́テтáधŋข 514.
テ̈́тта日८ 540.
є̇สта́入 $\eta \nu 67$.
є́oтá入Aat 548.
є̈бталка 517， 520.

Є̈ $\sigma \tau а \lambda \mu a \iota 67$.

є́ $\sigma \tau \alpha ́ \mu \in \nu$（Hom．）273， 549.

ধ゙ $\sigma \tau a \mu \in \nu$（Hom．） 523.
є́ $\tau$ а́ $\mu \in \nu a l$（Hom．）273， 546.

Є̈́ $\sigma \tau \bar{a} \nu$（Dor．）50， 504.
єัซтатє（Hom．） 523.
є̈бтатор（Hom．） 523.
є́ $\sigma \tau$ át $\omega$ 541．
є́ $\sigma \tau a \omega ́ s 552$.

ぞ $\sigma \tau \epsilon \lambda \lambda a$（Lesb．） 509.
ধ̈́бт $\eta$ ка $501,517,520$.
є $\sigma \tau \eta \kappa \omega ́ s ~ 552$.
Є゙テTทD 422，426，454， 503， 504.
є́ $\sigma \tau \eta \eta^{\prime}{ }^{5} 501$.
є̈ $\sigma \tau \eta \sigma a \nu 38$ note， 504.
є́ $\sigma \tau \eta$ ळ́s 552.
є́ $\sigma \tau i ́ i 266$.
є́ттiáa 44 note I， 121 note．
є́ $\sigma \tau \iota \xi=507$.

є́бто́рєєа 90.
є́ $\sigma \tau \rho о ф а ~ 518$.
є゙ $\sigma \tau \omega 230$.
$\epsilon \not \epsilon \sigma \tau \omega \nu 542$.
є́ $\sigma \tau \hat{\omega} \tau \in{ }^{2} 3 \mathrm{I}$ ．
$\epsilon \sigma \bar{v} \rho a \operatorname{217,509,511.~}$
ぞَ $\sigma \emptyset \lambda a$ 217，509， 511.
є́ $\sigma \chi$ атоs 109， 377.
$\epsilon \sigma \chi \in$ Єo 475.


＂́v $\chi$ เба 507.

є́таіра 235.
є́тáкпข 506.
є́rá $\lambda a \sigma \sigma a$（Hesych．）90， 97.

є́tapos 235.
є́тáp $\ddagger \eta \nu{ }^{2} 506$.
Єँ $\tau \in a 44$ note 3.
＇́тє́ $\theta \eta \nu 514$.
є̋тєเขa 216， 5 II．
є̈́telos 237.

є゙тєєซa 463， 511.
ย゙тєКоу 457， 503.
є́ $\tau$ モ́ $\lambda \in \sigma \sigma a$（Hom．） 509.
ส $\tau \in \rho o s, 94,254,380$.
$\epsilon \tau \tau \rho \psi{ }^{2}{ }^{2}$ II．
モ́є́ $\rho \omega \theta \in \nu$（Hom．） 94.
モ̇ $\tau \in \rho \omega \theta \iota$（Hom．） 94.
єं $\tau \in \rho \omega \sigma \epsilon$（Hom．） 94.
є́єє́такто（Hom．） 523.
є̈тєт $\quad 505$.
є́тє́трŋขа 513.
є́єє́тикто（Hom．） 523.
є́ $\tau \in v \xi a 511$.

є̈ті̄入a 217，509， 511.
$\epsilon \tau \bar{\iota} \mu \eta \theta \eta \nu$ 5O1， 514.
є́т $\grave{\mu \eta \sigma a} 5$ 10．
$\epsilon \tau \lambda \bar{a} \nu$（Dor．）70， 506.
є $\epsilon \tau \lambda \eta \nu$ 70，458， 506.

є́tós 96.
ёtos 121，164， 279.

є́тра́т $\eta \nu$ 506， 528.
єँт $\tau а ф о \nu 426,456,505$.
＂＇$\tau \rho \in \sigma \sigma a$（Hom．） 509.
є́т $\bar{\epsilon} \phi \eta \nu 116$.
є́т $\rho i \phi \quad \phi \eta \nu 116$.
є́т $\tau$ á（ $=\hat{\varepsilon} \pi \tau a ́) 390$.
є่тúm 1458.
ย゙тขхор 422，456， 466.
$\epsilon \tilde{\text { U }}$（Ion．） 404.
єن̉ $\gamma \in \nu \eta \eta^{\prime}$ 279， 366.

єن̉סaı $\mu$ óvตs 565.

$\epsilon \dot{\in \epsilon i \mu \omega \nu} 273$.

$\epsilon \dot{\imath} \in \sigma \tau \omega$ 341．
єن̇Ө $\theta$ eiv（Cret．） 134.
єن่ $\theta \dot{\eta} \mu \omega \nu 273$.
єú $\theta \dot{u} 559$.
Ė̇U＇s 558.
єข้เ $\delta$ ov（Lesb．） 430.
єن̀ $\mu \in \nu$ ย́ $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho o s ~ 376$.
є $\dot{v} \mu \in \nu \dot{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{s} 279,366$.
єủvis 26I．
єびvoos 80 ．
єข้้ovs 33，80，343， 376 ．

єن̉עov́atepos $376 . \quad \mid \epsilon ้ \chi \in \nu$（Dor．） 550.
є ̇̇兀úт $\omega \rho$ 82，83，85，96， 278.

є $\dot{\boldsymbol{\nu} \pi \lambda о к а \mu i ́ s ~} 263$.
єű áq $^{\prime}$（Aeol．） 123.
є $\tau \rho \in ́=38,540$.
єủpeía 129.
є́ข́рєт́́os 556.
єірібкк 88，458， 470.
є ט̉pos 279.
củpús 264， 33 I ．
є $\mathfrak{v i} \sigma a 5 \mathrm{II}$ ．
єंфраіиш 490.
$\epsilon \nu ँ \phi \rho \omega \nu 96,490$.

єข้Хоцаเ 209， 431.
$\epsilon \grave{\chi} \chi \omega \lambda \dot{\prime} 247$.
єขّ้ 61， 2 19， 5 II．
є́фаүо» 425.
є́фā̀a（Dor．）6，69， 216.

є́фф́vŋข 458，501， 506.
$\epsilon$ є́фáv $\theta \eta \nu$ II 5 note．
є́ $\phi \epsilon \iota \sigma a ́ \mu \eta \nu 509$.
є’фє́тทs 239.
єंфєт $\boldsymbol{\prime}{ }^{2} 239$.
$\epsilon \not \epsilon \emptyset \nu 426,503$.
єф $ф \nu а$ 6，69，216， 508.
є $ф$ Өарка 520.
є＇$\phi \theta \in \iota \rho a$ 217，507，509， 511.
＂$\phi \theta \in \epsilon \sigma a 289$.
$\ddot{\epsilon} \phi \theta \in \rho \rho a$（Lesb．） 509.
$\epsilon{ }^{\epsilon} \phi \iota \lambda a ̈ \theta \in \nu \quad$（Dor．） 38 note．
$\epsilon_{\epsilon} \phi_{i} \lambda \lambda_{\eta} \theta_{\eta \nu} 514$.
é ${ }^{\prime} \lambda \eta \sigma a 510$.

є́фїтпц 220.
є́фо́рŋба 5 Io．
є＇фиүоу 96，118，426， 456， 505.
$\epsilon \epsilon \bar{u} \nu 70,87,90,97,422$ ， 506， 512.

є＇申ūтov 9， 55.
є́ $\chi$ ао̊ò 466.

$\epsilon^{\epsilon} \chi \in a 510,511$ ．

Є́ $\chi \epsilon ́ \tau \lambda \eta 256$.
é $\chi$ aíp $67,129,491$.

éx | és 416 ． |
| :---: |


єौ Өัّ 375.
є́хӨодає 467.
é $\chi$ O คós 491．
＇́Хьода 322.
є́ $\chi \rho \bar{\eta} \nu 430$.
є́Х $\varnothing \eta \sigma а=5$ 10， 512.
Є́ $\chi \dot{\prime} \theta \eta \nu$ II 5 note．
éxupós 248.
Є＇$\chi \omega$ 25，89，96，115，424， 457， 517.
є＂$\psi$ алка 517.
є＂$\psi \in v \sigma a$ 509， 511 ．
€̈ $\ddagger$ evatat 110， 174.
є゙ $\psi \omega 468$.
є́ف́Oov 430.
$\epsilon{ }^{\epsilon} \omega$ خ os 373 ．
$\epsilon \epsilon \omega \nu$ оú $\mu \eta \nu 430$.
є́ف́ $\rho \omega \nu(\epsilon \in \omega \rho \rho \omega \nu) 430$.
${ }^{\epsilon} \omega{ }^{\circ} \omega s$（Att．）79， 80.
है $\omega$（ $7 \mathrm{I}, \mathrm{I}$ 12， 213 note， 279， 368.
$\epsilon \omega \omega \iota \iota 44$ note 3 ．
є́ $\omega \sigma$ фó ${ }^{\prime}$ os 289 ．

Fака́ßā（Corinth．） 73.
Fápyov（El．Locr．） 44
note 2， 12 I ．
F＇́ 404.
$F^{\prime} \in \in \mathcal{\theta}$（Lesb．） 404.
Fєíkatı（Dor．） 121.
Féos（Locr．） 404.
F＇́pyov（Cret．） 121.
Fétıa（Boeot．） 44 note 3.

F́́tos 287.
F＇́x ${ }^{\omega}$（Pamph．）121， 193.

F＇$\lambda \omega$（Dor．） 148.
Fí $\mu \epsilon \nu$（Hom．） 45.
Fīkaбтós（Boeot．） 392.
Fíkatı（Boeot．）97， 12 I
Fiv（Dor．） 404.
Fiofos（Cret．） 166.

Foî（Lesb．） 404.
Foîkos（Cypr．） 121.
Foik （Delph．）303，325， 563.
（F）oíros 97.
Fós（Cret．）33， 404.
F解 $\rho \overline{\text { à }}$（El．）121， 138.
F $\rho \hat{\eta} \xi$ เs（Lesb．） 121.
Fpivos（Lesb．） 123.
̧̄ā $\mu i a ̄ v$（Arcad．） 32 I.
ऍ́á 80.
らє 1 á 227.
ऍє $\hat{\gamma} \mu a \mathrm{6I}, 273,350$.
$\zeta \in \cup \gamma \nu \dot{u} \mu \epsilon \nu a \iota($ Hom．）273， 546.
$\zeta \in \dot{\cup} \gamma \nu \bar{\nu} \mu \iota 463$.
ऽยîyos 279.
کєขкти́р 278.
乌єvкто́s 106，195， 258.
$\zeta \in \hat{\imath} \xi \iota s{ }^{262}$.

Zeús 6，16，18， 21,29 ， 30 note， $36,52,61$ ， $63,80,118,122$, 129，173，229，234， 298－300，319，330， 337.

ऍ́єфvoos 248.
ک＇́ ，212，227，509， 511.
گৃ～ià 486.
گŋ $\mu$ เóш 486.
ऽॅ้̄ 206.
らuүóv 9， $2 \mathrm{I}, 46,47,106$, 118，14I，197，227， 236，301，306，309， 313， 326.
كv̄̀ $\mu \mathrm{\eta} 227$.
ऍへ̂ 478.
ऽ $\omega \neq 129$.

ऽ＇$\omega \nu \nu \bar{\nu} \mu \iota 464$.
$\zeta \hat{\sigma} \tau \rho \rho{ }^{2} 257$.
i $80,141,213,407-8$ ， 409.

च 564 ．
\＃゙ 413.
433.
230.
561.
${ }_{\eta}{ }^{a}$（Hom．）52，65，79，
93，213，430，43I， 433.

ทีaтaı（Hom．） 65.

ウ $\boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\beta} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \omega$ 73．
ŋ̉ßovло́ $\mu \boldsymbol{\eta} 430$.

グ $\gamma \gamma \in \iota \lambda a$ 217， 509.
$\vec{\eta} \gamma \gamma \in \lambda \kappa a 520$.
$\dot{\eta} \gamma \in \mu \dot{\omega} \nu 29,273,345$.
$\eta$ クु $\delta \in 410$ ．
ท̄ठєía 235.
$\eta$＂$\delta \in L \nu 430$.
$\eta$ ク＇$\dot{\prime} \sigma \theta \eta \nu 514$.
ท̇ $\delta$ é $\omega$ s 565.
$\eta{ }^{\prime \prime} \delta \eta 80$.
そ $\delta t \hat{t} 4 \mathrm{II}$ ．
グ $\delta$ เov 565.
グ $\iota \iota \tau \tau$ 565．
グס८ттоs 212， 259.
$\eta$ $\begin{aligned} & \delta i ́ \omega \nu ~ 30, ~ 213, ~ 375, ~ \\ & \eta 77 .\end{aligned}$
$\dot{\eta} \delta v(F) \epsilon \pi \eta ; 289$.
خ̊ ठúnos 247.
ท̉ธvvá $\mu \eta \nu 430$.
ทֹరひ́vต 490.
ท̇סús 45，47，51，79， 124，141，235，264， 301，313，322，33I， 333.

ท̄eío （Hom．）430， 523 note．
そ̇iteos 122， 238.
خेंка 504， 520.
${ }^{3} \kappa \alpha 564$.
ทैкаऍоข 430.
П゙кıбта 129 note 2.
П̈к८бтos 183， 378.
ぞкоvба 40.
$\eta \neq \lambda a \sigma a 512$.
ŋ̈入єúaro 510.
クุク $\lambda \in \cup \sigma a 5$ IO．
ท̄ $\lambda \dot{\eta} \lambda a \tau o$（Hom．） 523.
ทỉos I2I note．
ぞ $\lambda \pi \iota \sigma a 509$.

グ $\lambda v \theta o \nu 96,425$.
${ }_{\eta}^{\eta} \mu$ а 31，96， 273.
$\eta{ }_{\eta} \mu a \rho$ 67，237， 37 I．
ท̈นартор 467.
${ }_{\eta}^{\eta} \mu \mathrm{a}$ s（Att．） 402.
ך $\mu$ áтıos 237.
$\grave{\eta} \mu$ éas（Ion．）400， 402.
$\grave{\eta} \mu$ eis 69，214，400， 402.
$\eta{ }^{\eta} \mu \in \lambda \lambda o \nu 430$.
$\grave{\eta} \mu \epsilon ́ \rho \bar{a} 67,145,287$.

خ̀ $\mu \in \rho \iota \nu o ́ s 241$.
ŋॅ $\mu \in \rho о \delta \rho o ́ \mu о s ~ 289$.
${ }^{\eta} \mu \in \rho$ оs 37 ．．
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кoıvós 129，142， 237.
koíos（Ion．） 202 note I．
коєраขє́ш 485.
кoípavos 242， 485.
кoital 129 note 2.
коітт 258.
ко́ккӣ $\begin{gathered} \\ 285 .\end{gathered}$
кó入афоs 249.
ко入 $\omega$ дós 195.
коціб $(\sigma) \omega 499$.
коніڤ 499.
кóves 487.
коขíف 128， 487.
коעtَ 129.
ко́таขоข 242.
ко́т $\tau \omega 473$.

коракìдоs 53， 244.
ко́раध 285.
кópaфos 249.
ко́pōā II2．
корє́ข $\nu \bar{v} \mu \iota 464$.
ко́рFā（Dor．） 69.
кópFā（Arcad．）51， 124.
кóp ${ }^{51}$ 1，69，124，236，
238.

ко́ $\rho \eta$ Ө ò 25 I.
Kорıข日ó日ı 566.
Kо́ркӣра 73.
корио́s 239.
кópos 238.
ко́ $\rho \rho \eta 212,217$.
ко́ $\sigma \sigma \eta$（Ion．）212， 217.
kó $\rho$ vs 129 note 2,166, 298，343， 493.
корv́ббн 129 note 2， 493.

корvбти́s 258.
кориф $\quad 249$.
$\kappa о \sigma \mu \eta \sigma \iota s 262$.
ко $\sigma \mu \eta \tau \eta{ }^{2} s 258$.
kóvos（Ion．） 202 note $I$.
ко́ббифоs 249.
кór $\epsilon \rho 0 s($ Ion．） 202 note I．
ко́ттифоs 249.
кoû（Ion．） 202 note I．
kovpєús 21 ．
койр $\eta$（Ion．）51，69，124， 238.

кov̂pos（Ion．） 238.
коифо́татоs 258.
коифо́тє $о$ оs 254.
кохळ́ข 73.
крабín（Ion．）51， 67.
крá乌๘ 478.
краі́рш 129， 478.
крávò 67， 241.
кра́⿱亠乂， 67.
кратєро́s 248.
кратє $\omega \hat{\nu} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \xi 28$.
кра́тьттоs 259，377， 378.
кра́тоs 67，90， 279.
кратús 264， 378.
кре́as 49，79，195，283， 370.

крєі́ $\sigma \sigma \omega \nu 377$.

крєіттш 129 note 2，378．
крєі́ $\omega \nu$ 275， 352.
к $\rho є \mu a ́ \theta \rho \bar{\rho} 25 \mathrm{I}$ ．
крє́цаıто 534.
крє́цацає 420， 458.
 464.

кр $\epsilon ́ \mu a \sigma \iota s ~ 262$.
$\kappa \rho є \mu a ́ \sigma \sigma a t$（Hom．） 509.
крє $\kappa$ а́бш 499.
к $\rho \in \mu а ́ \omega ~ 499 . ~$
крє́ $\mu v o \nu$（Hesych．） 73.
крє́ $\mu \omega \mu а \iota 529$.
к $\rho \in ́ q \neq 234$.
крє́धб 375.
$\kappa \rho \epsilon ́ \sigma \sigma \omega \nu$（Ion．） 129 note 2.

крє́тоs（Aeol．） 67.
крî 230.
крі彳ь 478.
крїө́ 230.
крі́ $\mu \nu \eta \boldsymbol{\text { и }} 44$ note I， 46 I ．
крі́цдод 240.
крьує́ш 499.
крі̀ $\omega$ 129，462，479， 499.
крібıs 479.
крıтís 258.
крітєкós 252.
крıто́s 555.
кро́дขоу 73.
K $\rho$ oviôךs 323.
кро́тафоs 249.
к $\rho u ́ \beta \delta a=559$.
кри́ßঠŋך 559.
к $\rho \bar{v} \mu a \lambda \bar{\epsilon} о \boldsymbol{\circ} 247$.
к $\rho \bar{v} \mu o ́ s ~ 239$.
кри́тт 473 ．
$\kappa \rho v \phi \hat{\alpha}$（Dor．） 564.
крифŋ̀ $306,32 \mathrm{I}, 564$.
ктаірш（Lesb．）65， 478.
ктауєíय 65.
ктєірш 12，65，69，129， 226， 478.
ктє́vעळ（Lesb．）69，129， 478.

ктías 226， 262.
$\kappa \tau і \sigma \tau \omega \rho 278$.
ки́ßठб $\eta \nu 107$.
$\kappa \bar{v} \delta a_{i} \nu \omega 467$ note， 479.

кūסávo 467， 479.
кӣd́távєє $\rho a 289$.
кv́ठıцоs 239.
кúdıгтоs 259.
ки̂ठos 279.
küסoós 289.
ки́кл $\cos 237$.
кúкл os 202， 326.
кขк入óvє 570.
кúк $\lambda \omega$ 561．
кúкдоs 24 I ． кर̂ $\mu a 490$.

кขvā $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ ós 289.
Kvขסvєús 73.
кúveos 128， 237.
кขขокє́申а $\begin{aligned} \\ \text { os } \\ 289\end{aligned}$.
кuvóб ov 292.
кúvтєpos 254.
кขขิิтıs 289.
ки́ттш 107， 473.
$\kappa \bar{v} \rho l a \kappa o ́ s ~ 252$.
$\kappa \bar{u} \rho \omega$ I29， 478.
ки́ $\sigma \tau \succ \xi 285$.
$\kappa \bar{\chi} \phi \omega \nu 269$.
кíш $47,65,147,182$, 269， 345.
$\kappa \omega ́ \rho \bar{a}$（Cret．） 124.
$\kappa \hat{\omega}$（Ion．） 202 note I．

入âas（Hom．） 80.
$\lambda a \beta \epsilon$＇ 38 ， 540 ．
$\lambda a \beta \in i \nu 206,505$.
入áßeбкоу 430.
入aßô 38.
$\lambda a ́ ß \rho o s ~ 373$.
入a a após 87， 96.
入aүХáv 466，505．
入áSoцaı 206， 478.
$\lambda a \theta$ दíl 505.
$\lambda a \theta \iota \kappa \eta$ ờs 289.
$\lambda a ́ \theta \rho \bar{a} 306,321,564$.
$\lambda a ́ \theta \rho \eta 289$.
$\lambda a ̂ t y \xi{ }^{285}$.
$\lambda$ ầ $\nu 0$ os 243.
$\lambda$ atós 56，122， 238.
入áлos 373， 376.
خацßávo 206，466， 505.
$\lambda a \mu \pi a ́ s ~ 285, ~ 298, ~ 343 . ~$
$\lambda a \mu \pi \rho o ́ s 248$.
入av $\begin{gathered}\text { áv } \omega ~ 466,505 .\end{gathered}$
入ầos（Dor．） 90.
$\lambda a \bar{o}{ }^{\prime}$（Hom．） 72.
入ápvyگ 285.
入âs 80.
$\lambda a ́ \sigma \iota o s 121$.
入a⿱宀எ由́ข 269.
入а́бка 186， 470.
入átá 285.
入áx $\downarrow$ ท 185.

入áx $\chi$ vos 245.
तéalva 75，119，122，
235， 322.
$\lambda \epsilon a i \nu \omega 508$.
$\lambda \in ́ \beta \eta \eta^{2} 285$.
$\lambda \in у \epsilon ́ \mu \in \nu a \imath ~ 543,546$.
$\lambda \in \gamma o ́ \mu \in \nu 0 \iota 553$.
$\lambda_{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \omega$ 25，92，106，109， 191，212，425，456， 511， 522.
入єєаіры 490， 508.
$\lambda \in i \beta \omega 159,212,215$.
$\lambda \epsilon і ̈ \mu a \xi 285$.
入єїца 273.
$\lambda \epsilon \epsilon \mu \dot{\omega} \nu 273$.
$\lambda \in \iota \pi o ́ \mu \in \nu$ vos 553.
$\lambda$ єímov 543.
$\lambda \epsilon \iota \pi \tau$ є́os 255， 556.
$\lambda_{\text {eıt }}$ ós 555.
入єїты 12，25，29，30， $58,64,82,83,85,89$ ， 92，96， 117 ，118， 132 ， 202， 202 note 3，204， 433，450，456，503， 505，518，522，523， 526.
$\lambda \epsilon \iota \phi \theta \eta \sigma$ ó $\mu \in \nu=s 53$.
$\lambda \epsilon і 申 \theta \eta \tau \iota 540$.
лєі́र $\omega$ 24，132， 193.
$\lambda \in \iota \not \subset a ́ \mu \in \nu=s 553$.
$\lambda \in \psi o ́ \mu \in \nu 0 s 553$.
$\lambda \epsilon і ́ \psi \omega 499$.
$\lambda \in \kappa a ́ v \eta 73$.
$\lambda$ е́кто（Hom．）22I， 507.

入єктós 109．
$\lambda \epsilon ́ к т \rho о \nu 257$.
$\lambda_{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\lambda} a \beta$ éc $\sigma$ Oat 429.
$\lambda \in \lambda a \theta \in ́ \sigma \theta a t 429$.
$\lambda \in \lambda а к \cup i ́ a ~ 552$.
$\lambda_{\epsilon ́ \lambda}{ }^{\prime} \sigma \mu a \iota{ }_{518,} 522$.
$\lambda \in \lambda a \sigma \mu \epsilon ́ \nu$ оs 518.
$\lambda \in \lambda \epsilon \gamma a{ }^{18} 8$.
$\lambda \epsilon ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota \mu \mu а \iota$ 117， 204.
$\lambda_{\epsilon} \lambda_{\epsilon} \epsilon \mu \mu$ е́ $\nu 0$ оs 240， 553.
$\lambda \in \lambda \epsilon i ́ \phi \theta a \iota 22 \mathrm{I}, 548$.
$\lambda_{\epsilon} \lambda$ є́ $\psi$ о $\mu \mathrm{a}$ 501．
$\lambda \in \lambda \in \iota \psi o ́ \mu \in \nu=s 553$.
$\lambda \epsilon \bar{\lambda} \in \chi a{ }^{52 \mathrm{I}}$.
$\lambda \epsilon ́ \lambda \eta \theta a{ }_{518,} 522$.
$\lambda \epsilon ́ \lambda o \gamma \chi^{a} 518$.
$\lambda \in \lambda$ ó $\gamma \chi$ ă $\sigma \iota$（Hom．） 439.
入єлоוта 59，82，83，96， 97，516－19，531．
入єлоぃтє́vaı 546.
$\lambda \in \lambda$ мıтvía 552.
$\lambda \in \lambda \cup к \omega ́ s 552$.
$\lambda \in \lambda \nu \mu$ и́vos 32.
$\lambda \varepsilon \lambda \bar{u} \sigma о \mu a \iota 501$.
$\lambda \in \pi \rho o ́ s 248$ ．

$\lambda$ ликаіуш 490.
$\lambda \epsilon \dot{\prime} \sigma \sigma \omega$ 477， 478.
入é $\chi$ os 109，132，201， 279.

入є́ $\chi \rho$ ооs $115,185$.
入є́хрıs 558.
$\lambda \in \chi \omega$ 34 r ．
$\lambda \epsilon \epsilon^{\omega} \nu 352$.
$\lambda \in \omega ́ s 72$.
$\lambda \eta$＇ु $\omega$ 87，96，215， 232.
$\lambda \eta$ дáv 467.
$\lambda \grave{\eta} \theta$ os 279.
$\lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \omega 467$.
$\lambda$ そiö̀os 237.
$\lambda$ ís 285.
$\lambda \bar{\eta} \xi$ เs 262.
$\lambda \dot{\eta} \xi$ оцає 422.
＾ทтஸ́ 341．

$\lambda i$ ya 564.
$\lambda$ íyoŋ̀ 559.
$\lambda$ eyvús 265.
$\lambda_{\imath}$ रupós 248.
$\lambda$ ivús 264.
$\lambda i \zeta \omega 478$.
入ı $\begin{aligned} & \text { áśs } \\ & 493 .\end{aligned}$
入í $\theta$ eos 128， 237.
入ıкрıфіs II 5.
$\lambda_{\iota \lambda \text { aiopal 76，129，}} 480$.
入ı $\mu$ évios 237.
$\lambda \iota \mu \not \nu_{\nu}^{237,} 273$.
入є $\mu$ vio 237.
$\lambda i ̄ \mu o ́ s ~ 239,496$.
$\lambda \iota \mu \pi a ́ v \omega 155,459,466$ ， 467.
$\lambda \bar{\imath} \mu \omega \dot{\sigma} \sigma \omega 496$.
$\lambda_{i \pi а} 564$.
入ıтаро́s 248.
$\lambda \iota \pi$ єi้ $85,89,96,456$ ， 503， 505.
$\lambda_{\iota}$ є́́ $\sigma \theta a \iota 548$.
$\lambda_{l \pi o ́ \mu}^{\mu} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ оs 553.
入itos 77， 279.
$\lambda_{l} \pi o v$ 38， 543 ．
$\lambda i{ }^{\prime}$ 330．
入íббонає 129 note 2， 478.

入ıтаіу 490.
$\lambda_{\iota \tau \epsilon ́ \sigma \theta a \iota}$ I29 note 2.
入íx vos 241．
入oүoүрá申os 32， 289.
入óyos 47 note 2,230 ， 236.

入оєт оо́ 80.
入oídopos 373 ．
入осцо́s 239.
入oumós 236.
入ogós 185.
入ov́ouaı 420.
入очт óv $^{2} 8 \mathrm{o}, 257$.
入оха́㇒ 484.
入о́хи 239.
入óxos 236， 484.
$\lambda \hat{v} \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota 548$.
$\lambda \dot{\prime} \zeta \omega$ 466， 479.
入u $\begin{aligned} & \text { eis } 354,554 .\end{aligned}$

$\lambda \dot{́} \theta \eta$ тı 540.
入úкаıуа 235.
入úkots 318.
入úkovs（Cret．）312， 325.
入úкоя 13，17，18，23，44， $46,54,59,63,64$ ，

66，69，80，82，121， 141，153，202，212， 229，230，236，295， 298－300，302，304， $308,314,316,323$, 325.
$\lambda \imath ́ \kappa \omega 318$.
$\lambda u ́ \kappa \omega s$（Boeot．） 312.
$\lambda u \pi \rho o ́ s 248$.
$\lambda \hat{v} \sigma a \iota 543,547$.
$\lambda \hat{v} \sigma \alpha \iota \mu \iota 535$.
$\lambda \hat{u} \sigma a ̄ s 354,355$.
$\lambda \hat{\sigma} \sigma \bar{a} \sigma a 322$.

$\lambda \bar{v} \sigma i \pi o \nu$ os 289.
入ú $\sigma \omega$ 433，499， 501.
入vтє́os 255， 556.
גuтós 555.
入úx Dos $^{185}$ ，218， 245.
$\lambda \hat{v} \omega 38$ note，354， 433.
$\lambda$ шітєроs 378 ．
$\lambda \omega ్ \sigma \tau o s ~ 378$.
$\lambda \omega_{\varphi} \omega \nu(\lambda \omega \hat{\epsilon} \omega \nu) 378$.
$\mu a ̀$（El．） 52 note 2.
$\mu$ a̧ós 110.
$\mu a \theta \eta \tau \eta \eta^{\prime}=258$.
$\mu a \forall \eta \tau \iota к o ́ s 252$.
дає $\mu$ á $429,480$.
наіронає 65，89，129， 42I，458， 48 I．
маіодає 478.
на́кар 495.
накалі́sњ 495.
нака́pıos 237.
нака́ртєроs 376.
накрӑ́v 559.
накрós 248.
нáлa 564.
Малаүко́ $\bar{\mu} \mathbf{s} \quad$（Arcad．） 73.

малакішу 269， 348.
رaлakós 129 note 2 ， 145，269， 474.
$\mu a \lambda a ́ \sigma \sigma \omega ~ 129$ note 2.
$\mu a \lambda a ́ \tau \tau \omega 129$ note 2.
лáдıбта 559.

дари́бодає 499，501．
$\mu a \nu$ बáv 466.
наvià 237，481．
Măvós 65， 238.

ца⿱亠乂兀ко́s 233， 252.
на⿱亠乂兀ıтódos 289 ．
Mávits 233，246，252， 262， 489.
маขтобúvך 246.
Mapâڤ̂vl 562.
нарабно́s 46 r ．
дар даіра 429， 48 ．
ма́руанає 46I．
маруоі́ $\boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{5} 54$.
да́р $\nu \omega \mu а \iota 529$.
$\mu а р т и ̆ \rho о \mu а \iota ~ 49 \mathrm{I}$ ．
ма́ртироs 248.
нápтvs 362.
$\mu a ́ \sigma \sigma \omega 375$.
набтi\} 494.
ма́бтїॄ̆ 285，298， 343.
наттї 128， 486.
$\mu a ̆ ́ \tau \eta \rho ~(D o r) ~ 5,. ~ 6, ~ 50, ~$ 5I， 140.
на́хך 236.
$\mu \epsilon 402$.
н́́үа 559.
Mєyádeıs（Pamph．） 52 note 2.
Mєyá $\eta$ ） 52 note 2.
Mé $\mathbf{\gamma a \rho a ́ o ́ ~} 569$.
$\mu$＇́yas III， 374.
$\mu \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon$ Oos 280.
$\mu$ ќviotos 259.
$\mu \epsilon \subset \omega \nu 275,352$.
$\mu \epsilon ́ \theta \eta$ 124．
$\mu^{\prime} \theta v v 9,33,47,177,229$ ， 264.
$\mu \in \theta \dot{v} \omega$ 128， 488.
$\mu \epsilon i$（Boeot，） 52 note 2.
$\mu \epsilon i \gamma \nu \bar{\nu} \mu \iota 463$.
$\mu \in \iota$ óá 214.
$\mu \epsilon i \delta \eta{ }^{2} \sigma a \iota 232$.

$\mu \epsilon і$ ени 377.
$\mu \epsilon \iota \lambda \boldsymbol{\sigma} \sigma \omega 485$.
$\mu \in \iota \lambda i ́ x \cos 237$.
$\mu$ еілı $\quad$ os 485.
$\mu \in \iota \rho$ а́кьо 247.
нєєракил入íóıo 247.
$\mu \in i ́ \rho a \xi ً$ 195， 285.
нєіродаи 129，214，232， 478.
$\mu$ eís 70，117，216， 347.
$\mu$ кíтоs 378.
$\mu \epsilon i ́ \omega \nu 378$.

$\mu \in \lambda a ́ \gamma \chi \rho$ ооs 349.

$\mu \in \lambda$ аív $129,490$.
$\mu \in \lambda a \nu o ́ t \eta s 284$.

$\mu \in \lambda a ́ v \tau a t o s ~ 258$.
$\mu \in \lambda a ́ v \tau \epsilon \rho o s 376$.
$\mu^{\prime} \lambda_{\text {Aà }}^{s} 5,69,154,322$ ， 349，350， 490.


$\mu \in \lambda \epsilon ́ \tau \eta 258$.
$\mu \in \lambda \eta \delta{ }^{\omega} \nu 272$.
$\mu e ́ \lambda ı 129$ note 2，140， 145，230，285，301， 344， 493.
$\mu$ еौл $\iota \sigma \sigma a 129$ note 2.
$\mu^{\prime} \lambda$ ııт 129 note 2.
$\mu e ́ \lambda \lambda \omega$ 129，430， 478.
$\mu \epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \lambda \omega \nu 275,352$.
$\mu \epsilon ́ \lambda \pi \eta \theta \rho o \nu 25 \mathrm{I}$.
$\mu \epsilon ́ \mu а \mu є \nu \quad 96$.
$\mu \epsilon ́ \mu а \sigma a \nu$（Hom．） 523.
$\mu є \mu a ́ \tau \omega ~ 65,54$ I．
$\mu \epsilon ́ \mu а \chi а ~ 521$.
$\mu є \mu$ а́s 552.
$\mu \epsilon \mu a \omega ̂ \tau \epsilon s$（Hom．） 552.
$\mu \epsilon ́ \mu \beta \lambda \omega к а 145$.
$\mu \epsilon ́ \mu \eta \nu a 42 \mathrm{I}$ ．
$\mu \epsilon \mu \nu \eta{ }^{\prime} \sigma о \mu a \iota 501$.
нє́ цога 65，89，96， 518.
$\mu \epsilon ́ \mu ф о \mu а \iota 420$.
$\mu \epsilon ̀ \nu 40$.
$\mu \in \nu \in \tau$ ós 32.
$\mu \in \nu \epsilon \omega \omega 49$.
$\mu \in \nu$ оiveov（Hom．） 73.
$\mu$ úvos 96，279， 366.
$\mu \in ́ \nu \omega$ 83，89，96， 216 ， 424，457， 508.
$\mu \epsilon \rho i k o ́ s 252$.
$\mu \epsilon \rho \iota \mu \nu a 130,322$.
$\mu \in \sigma a u \pi$ ólıos 63，292， 321.
$\mu \epsilon \sigma a i ́ \epsilon \rho 0$ 25 25， 376.
$\mu \in \sigma \eta$ и́єis 276.
$\mu \in \sigma \eta \mu \beta \rho i \bar{a} 145$.
н́́ध $\sigma a \tau$ os 377.
$\mu \epsilon ́ \sigma(\sigma)$ os $44,119,129$, 178，237， 376.
$\boldsymbol{\mu}$ е́троу 257.
$\mu \epsilon \hat{v}$（Ion．） 402.
$\mu \eta{ }^{\prime} 52$ note $1,2,524$.
$\mu \eta{ }^{\prime} \kappa о$ о 279.
$\mu \dot{\eta} \nu$ 52， $117,212,216$, 347.
$\mu \eta \nu i \theta \mu$ ós 239.
$\mu \bar{\eta} \nu \iota s$ 260， 482.
$\mu \eta \nu i \omega$ 482， 487.

$\mu \eta$ pós 294.
$\mu \eta \sigma \tau \omega \rho 278$.
$\mu \dot{\eta} \tau \eta \rho$ 6，45，140，278， 359，360．
$\mu \eta \tau i \epsilon \tau a$（Zeús） 323.
$\mu \eta \tau$ tótis 276.
$\mu$ птіодаı 420， 487.
$\mu \eta$ चis 487.
$\mu \eta \boldsymbol{\eta} \rho \omega \mathrm{s} 340$.
$\mu \eta \chi a \nu \eta{ }^{\prime} 242$.
$\mu i a$ 214， 322.
нıүа́ऍоцає 129， 493.
$\mu$ ızás 285.
$\mu i \gamma \delta a 559$.
$\mu \mathrm{l} \eta$ ض́s 366， 373.
$\mu i \gamma \nu \bar{\nu} \mu \iota 463,470,506$.
$\mu \iota \gamma \nu \dot{v} \omega 465$.
нıккós 247.
мікки́入os 247.
$\mu i ̄ \kappa$ о́s 214，248， 378.
$\mu i ̄ \mu \lambda$ ós 247.
$\mu \mu \nu \eta \eta^{\prime} \sigma \kappa \omega$ 470， 47 I.
$\mu i \mu \nu \omega$ 83，89，96，424， 429， 457.
$\mu^{\prime \nu}$（Hom．） 416.
$\mu \iota \nu v ́ \theta \omega 45,475$.

$\mu \iota \nu v \rho o ́ s ~ 491 . ~$
$\mu i \sigma \gamma \omega$ 23，224， 470.
$\mu$ F $\sigma$ Oós 211，224， 486. $\mu$ цбӨón 80，483， 486.
$\mu i \sigma \theta \omega \mu a 273$.
$\mu \nu \theta \omega \tau$ ós 483.
$\mu \nu \eta ิ \mu a \sim 273$.
$\mu \nu \eta \mu \eta 239$.
$\mu \nu \eta \mu о \sigma v ̌ \nu \eta 246$.
$\mu \nu \eta \sigma \omega 499$.
$\mu$ ó $\theta$ os 102， 175.
mot 402.
بoîpa 75，129，235， 322.
$\mu о \iota \rho \eta \gamma \in \nu \eta \eta^{\prime} 289$.
رódıs 558.
uovás 396.
ноуоуєขŋ́s 289.
بóvov 559.
нóvos I19，124， 238.
но́ряноs 239.
нориоли́ттоиає 135.
но́р $\mu$ оооs 135， 233.
$\mu о \rho \mu \nu \bar{\rho} \rho \omega 480$.
нópos 75， 235.
мо́рф $\quad$ os 245.
но́г $\chi$ os 224.
$\mu$ ко 40.
$\mu 0 \hat{v} 402$.
بovvaôó 559.
$\mu$ ôvvos（Ion．）I19，124， 238.
$\mu$ ниิ $\sigma a$ 69， 322.
нохӨ $\quad$ ро́s 36.
$\mu \nu \gamma \mu o ́ s 239$.
$\mu \nu ́ \zeta \omega 478$.
$\mu \bar{\nu} \theta_{0} \lambda_{0} \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\epsilon} \omega 430$.
$\mu \nu \lambda \omega \theta \rho o ́ s ~ 251$.
$\mu v \bar{\mu} \rho_{\rho} 88$.
$\mu \nu \bar{\rho} \rho о \mu а \iota ~ 129,478$.
$\mu \hat{v} \mathrm{~s} 9,47$ note 2，55， 140，213， 234.
$\mu \bar{\sigma} \sigma \phi o ́ v o s ~ 289$.
$\mu v \chi$ aít $\rho$ роs 376 ．
$\mu \nu \chi$ रós 185.
$\mu \nu \chi \mu o ́ s ~ 239$.
$\mu \omega \bar{\lambda} v 88$
$\mu \omega \lambda \nu \rho o ́ s 248$.
$\mu \omega \mu \dot{о} \boldsymbol{\mu}$ ає 484.
$\mu \omega ̄ \mu а \rho 88$.
$\mu \bar{\omega} \mu \mathrm{os} 484$.
$\mu \omega ิ \nu v \xi ̧$ 380．
$\mu \omega \rho a i \nu \omega 150$.
$\mu \omega ิ \rho o s 88,248$.
$\mu \omega ิ \sigma a$（Dor．） 69.
vaí 76，129， 478.
$\nu$ āós（Dor．）69，72， 124.
váббal 76， 129.
עavápos 289.
$\nu a u ́ k \rho \overline{a ̄ \rho o s ~} 215$ ．
ขavкрати́s 289.
vauா $\eta$ үós 289.
$\nu a \hat{s}$ 18，29，31，63，71， 72，234，298，302，305， 308，311，312，314， 316， 335.
ขаvбıк入vто́s 292.
$\nu a v ̂ \phi l(\nu) 306$.
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oíoaiva 467 note， 479.
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о＂ко粈 303.
oikı0ı 566.
оїкоь 305，325， 562.
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ӧка（Dor．） 573.
ỏk $\quad$ прós 248.
őк $\nu 0$ о 24 I ．
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ỏ $\lambda$ є́ $\omega 499$.
ö入íytotos 259， 377.
ỏ ízos 20.
òへı $\sigma$ Oiv» 467 note， 479 ．

ỏ̉íatavos 242，467．｜ỏgúratos 258.
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ő $\rho \sigma \omega 499$.
ỏ $\rho \dot{\rho} \sigma \sigma \omega$ ． 478.
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ô $\rho \hat{\text { on }} 80$.
оै $\rho \omega \rho a 429,517$.
os 46，127， 413 ．
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ö廿оцає 89，92，96，496， 499， 526.
$\pi a ̂ ̣$（Dor．） 414 ．
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таขтахо仑 560.
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$\pi \in i ̂$（Dor．）305，325， 414， 562.
$\pi \epsilon i \theta \omega$ 12，24，58，96， IIO，II5， 115 note， 166，177，179，341， 456，499，505，509， 511，520，526－7．
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$\pi є і$ іоодає 225， 422.
$\pi \in \iota \sigma$ т́́os 556.
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$\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \epsilon \not \subset \theta a \iota 22 \mathrm{I}, 548$.
$\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \gamma \mu \epsilon ́ \nu 0$ о 32.
$\pi \in ́ \pi \lambda \nu \tau а \iota 479$.

$\pi$ те́тоı $\theta a \operatorname{96,108,~} 518$.
$\pi$ є́тонфа 52 I.
$\pi$ т́тод $\theta a \quad 65,89,518$.
$\pi \epsilon \pi \Delta ́ \nu \theta \eta 430$.
$\pi \epsilon \pi o ́ \nu \theta \epsilon \tau \nu 430$.
$\pi \in \pi o \nu \theta$ ต́s 552.
$\pi \epsilon ́ \pi \rho a ̄ \tau a \iota$（Ther．） 528.
$\pi \epsilon ́ \pi \rho a \chi a 521$.
$\pi \epsilon \pi$ rós $89,202,203$, 258.
$\pi \epsilon ́ \pi \tau \omega 473$.
$\pi \in \pi v ́ \sigma \theta a \iota 548$.
$\pi$ є́тибдаı 518， 522.
$\pi \epsilon \pi v \sigma \mu \epsilon ́ \nu 0 s 240$.
$\pi \epsilon ́ \pi \omega к а 54$.
$\pi \epsilon ́ \pi \omega \nu$ 345， 350.
$\pi \epsilon \rho a i \nu \omega 1508$.
тє́pas 283， 370.
$\pi \in \rho a ́ \omega 46 \mathrm{I}$ ．
$\pi \epsilon ́ \rho \delta i \grave{\iota} 285$.
$\pi \epsilon ́ \rho \theta \omega 67,166,509$.
$\pi \in \rho^{\prime}$ ，34，40， 44 ．
$\pi \in \rho l \in ́ \beta a \lambda \lambda o \nu 430$.
Пєрьклє $\eta^{\prime} \mathrm{s} 79$.
Пє $\rho \iota \kappa \lambda \hat{\eta} s 80$.
$\pi \epsilon \rho \nu \eta \mu \iota 46 \mathrm{I}$ ．
Пє́ $\rho \sigma \eta s$ 32I， 323.
$\pi$ є́ $\rho v \sigma \iota 233,241,287$, 562， 575.
$\pi \epsilon \rho v \sigma \iota \nu$ ós 233，241．
$\pi \epsilon ́ p u t \iota$（Dor．）562， 575.
$\pi \epsilon ́ \rho v \tau \iota s 575$.
$\pi \epsilon \sigma є ́ \sigma \mu a \iota$（Hom．） 499.
$\pi \epsilon ́ \sigma \sigma v \rho \epsilon s$（Lesb．） 202 note 2.
$\pi \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \sigma \omega$（Ion．）129， 129 note 2，203，433， 473，477， 478.
$\pi$ є́та入ор 247.
$\pi$ е́́тадоs 247.
тє́тацає 97，458，503， 506.
$\pi \epsilon \tau a ́ v \nu \bar{v} \mu \iota 44$ note 1 ， 464.
$\pi \epsilon \tau a ́ \sigma a \iota ~ 46 \mathrm{I}$ ．
$\pi$ тє́тонає 82，89，96，457， 458， 497.
$\pi \in \tau \rho a i ́ o s ~ 237$.
$\pi$ т́тратоs（Boeot．） 390.
 386.
$\pi$ т́тларєs（Boeot．）124， 168， 202 note 2， 383.
$\pi$ т́ттш 129， 129 note 2， 203， 473.
$\pi \epsilon v$ भों 245.
 II5 note，456，466， 505.
$\pi \in v \theta$ ó $\mu \in \nu$ о 553 ．
$\pi \epsilon$ v́бopaı II5 note．
$\pi$ т́фаука 520.
$\pi$ т́фабдає 522.
тє́фатає 65， 518.
$\pi \epsilon ́ \phi \in v \gamma a 517,518$.
$\pi є \phi \nu \epsilon ́ \mu \in \nu 429,457$.
$-\pi \epsilon \phi \rho a \delta \mu$ е́vos 522.
$\pi \epsilon ́ \phi \rho а б о г 429$.
$\pi є ́ \phi \rho а \sigma \mu а \iota ~ 522$.
$\pi \epsilon \phi \nu \gamma \mu$ évos 32， 518.
$\pi$ є́фйка 520.
$\pi \epsilon ф$ и́кй $\sigma \iota$（Hom．） 439.
$\pi є \phi$ viía 322.
$\pi \in \phi \nu \omega ́ s 322$.
$\pi \epsilon ф \cup \omega ิ \tau a s(H o m) 552.$.
$\pi \epsilon ́ \psi \omega$ 203， 499.
$\pi \eta$ 321， 564.
$\pi \hat{\eta} 414,561$ ．
$\pi \dot{\eta} \gamma \nu \bar{v} \mu \iota 111,394,463$.
$\pi \eta \kappa \tau o ́ s ~ 258$.
$\pi \eta \lambda a \mu u ́ s 285$.
П$\eta \lambda$ єús 338.
$\pi \eta \lambda i к о s 252$.
$\pi \eta \xi$ ıs 262.
ті́тока（Lac．）325， 564. $\pi \eta ̂ \chi$ ड 193，264，294， 298－300，308，31I， 314，316， 331.
тiaive 490.
тīàє́os 247.
тía入os 247.
riáa 236，350， 371.
míapós 236，248， 350 ．
$\pi \iota \epsilon ́ S \omega 74$.
$\pi i \in t 540$ note．
ті́єєра 235.
тíc $o ́ s ~ 235$.
$\pi i(F)$ os $53,280$.
$\pi i t(F) \omega \nu 53$.
$\pi i \theta \overline{\text { äкos（Dor．）} 252 .}$
$\pi \iota \theta a \nu o ́ s ~ 242$.
$\pi \iota \theta \epsilon ́ \sigma \theta a \iota ~ 96,505$.
тіӨпкоs 252.
$\pi i \theta_{1} 7,53,88,540$.
$\pi \iota к р а і \nu \omega ~ 4 ¢ 0$ ．
тıкро́s 248.
$\pi i \lambda \nu a \mu a \iota 148,46$ 1．
$\pi \iota \lambda \nu a ́ \omega ~ 462$.
$\pi i \lambda \nu \eta \mu \iota 148$.
$\pi ı \lambda \nu o ́ s ~ 148$.
$\pi \bar{\imath} \mu \epsilon \lambda \dot{\eta} 247$.
$\pi \iota \mu \pi \lambda a ́ v \omega$ 429， 466.
$\pi i \mu \pi \lambda \eta \mu i \quad 429, \quad 459$, 475.
$\pi i \mu \pi \rho \eta \mu \iota 429,459$.
$\pi \iota \nu v \tau \grave{\prime} 258$.
$\pi i \nu \omega$（Dor．）424， 462.
тіорає 424，498， 526.
$\pi \iota \pi i ́ \sigma \kappa \omega 47 \mathrm{I}$ ．
$-\pi i \pi \lambda a \mu \in \nu 67$.
$\pi \iota \pi \rho a ̆ ́ \sigma \kappa \omega 47 \mathrm{I}$ ．
$\pi i \pi \tau \omega 457$.
пíraa（Ion．）23，45， 129.
$\pi i \sigma \pi$ Is 169， 262. $\pi$ ívovos 246 ．
mírvpes（Hom．） 44 note
1， 202 note 2， 383.
$\pi$ ттváe 462.
$\pi i \tau \nu \eta \mu \iota 44$ note $1,46 \mathrm{I}$ ．
$\pi i \tau \nu \omega 462$.
пітта 23，45， 129.
$\pi i$ itus 266.
Tím 7，122，271，352， 490.
$\pi \lambda \dot{a}$ ऽopaı 420.
$\pi \lambda a ́ \zeta \omega 153,156,466$, 479， 513.
$\pi \lambda$ átavo 102，111， 175.
$\pi \lambda a ́ \sigma \mu a 274$.
$\pi \lambda a ́ \sigma \sigma \omega 274$.
П入aratẫı 562.
$\pi \lambda a \tau \epsilon$ ía 235.
$\pi \lambda a ́ t o s ~ 279$.
$\pi \lambda a \tau o ́ \omega ~ 486$.
$\pi \lambda a t u ́ s ~ 5, ~ 67, ~ 111, ~ 264, ~, ~, ~$ 322， 486.
$\pi \lambda \epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \delta \eta \nu$ 107， 187.
$\pi \lambda$ 白 $\theta \rho о \nu 25$ I．
$\pi \lambda \epsilon$ єi้ 378.
$\pi \lambda$ єívтos 259， 378.
$\pi \lambda \epsilon i \omega \nu(\pi \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \omega) 378$.
$\pi \lambda$ екто́s 109， 472.
$\pi \lambda$ ќкс 107，109，157， 187，472，473，51I， 521， 522.
$\pi \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \omega 499$.
$\pi \lambda \epsilon \cup \rho o ́ \nu 248$.
$\pi \lambda \epsilon \dot{\sigma} \sigma о \mu а \iota 499$.
$\pi \lambda \epsilon v \sigma o v ̂ \mu a \iota 500$.
$\pi \lambda$ е́ $\omega$ 79，122，395， 500.
$\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \eta \nu \bar{v} \mu<463$.
$\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta$ os 280.
$\pi \lambda \eta \theta \bar{u} s$ 14， 267.
$\pi \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \theta \omega$ 52，239， 475.
$\pi \lambda \eta \overline{\kappa \tau} \rho \frac{\nu}{257}$ ．
$\pi \lambda \tilde{\eta} \nu \tau \circ$（Hom．） 70.
$\pi \lambda \eta \sigma \iota a i \tau \epsilon \rho o s 376$.
$\pi \lambda \eta \sigma$ io 559.
$\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma \sigma \omega$（Ion．）129，196， 478.
$\pi \lambda \eta$ ๆิт（Hom．）458， 506. $\pi \lambda \eta \hat{\tau}$（Hom．） 506.
$\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \tau \tau \omega$ 129， 196.
$\pi \lambda i \nu \theta$ os III．
$\pi \lambda$ о́каноя 185 ．
$\pi \lambda о к \grave{\prime} 236$.
$\pi \lambda$ д́́коs 236.
$\pi \lambda$ óos 122， 236.
$\pi \lambda$ оvбıaкós 252.
$\pi \lambda$ oúvios 169.
$\pi \lambda$ गûtos 258.
$\pi \lambda o \chi \mu$ о́s 185， 239.
$\pi \lambda \bar{\nu} \nu \omega$ 129， 479.
$\pi \lambda$ ú $\sigma$ ıs $88,262$.
$\pi \lambda \omega$ śs 285.
$\pi \lambda \omega$ тós 54，63， 88.
$\pi \nu \epsilon \hat{\mu} \mu a 273$.
$\pi \nu \in v \sigma \circ \hat{\mu} \mu \mathrm{t} 500$.
$\pi \nu \epsilon$＇́ $\omega$ 122， 500.
$\pi о \delta a ́ \rho \kappa \eta{ }^{2} 289$.
$\pi$ odi 318.
$\pi o ́ \theta \in \nu$ 202，303，414， 568.
$\pi$ тö $\eta \tau$ ús 266.
$\pi \grave{O} \ell\llcorner 566$.
moî 305，325，414， 562.
$\pi$ oíà 238.

$\pi$ oıŕr $\sigma \omega 499$.

токкіл $\lambda \omega$ 129， 485.
токкílos 32， 111 ．
тог $\mu$ аірш 65，129， 490.
то兀 $\mu$ ย́vlos 237.
$\pi о \mu \eta{ }^{\prime} \nu$ 65，82，92，96， 273，298，301，302， 305，308，3II－12， 314，316，319，345， 490.
$\pi о і \mu \nu \eta$ 82， 96.
$\pi о i \mu \nu t o \nu 237$.
$\pi o \iota \nu \grave{\prime}$ 202，241．
$\pi$ oíos 414．
$\pi о \iota \pi \nu \dot{v} \omega 429$.
тоьфи́ $\sigma \sigma \omega$ 429， 513.
то́ка（Dor．） 573.
$\pi о \lambda \epsilon ́ \mu \epsilon \operatorname{los} 237$.
$\pi о \lambda \epsilon \mu \epsilon \epsilon \omega 486$.
$\pi 0 \lambda \epsilon \mu \eta{ }^{\prime} \iota \circ$（Ion．） 237.

$\pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \mu о \boldsymbol{\wedge} 40,237,486$.
$\pi о \lambda є \mu$ о́ ${ }^{2} 86$.
$\pi$ ó̀ıथs（Cret．）312， 328.

тo八九ós 238.
$\pi$ ódıs $7,30,45,72,80$ ， 82，230，258，260， 298－300，308，311， 314，316，328， 331.
mónis（Ion．） 312.
$\pi 0 \lambda i ́ \tau \eta s$ 258， 323.
то入入á 559.
толла́кц 230.
$\pi$ тл入ákıs 40， 202 note I， 230.
$\pi о \lambda \lambda \dot{\eta} 126$.
$\pi$ oरú 559.
толvaveńs 289.
$\pi$ о入vßoúr 258.
$\pi 0 \lambda \nu \pi o \delta t \nu \eta 244$.
тоди́тоия 343.
－$\pi$ oरús 157，264，374， 378.
$\pi \circ \lambda \nu \omega \phi \epsilon \lambda \eta \dot{\prime} 289$.
тонтеús 268.
$\pi о \mu \pi \epsilon$ ข́ш 489.
$\pi о \mu \pi \dot{\eta} 236$.
$\pi о \mu \pi o ́ s 236$.

то́тауоу 242.
$\pi$ rop $\theta$ 关 239.
$\pi$ ópts 260.
по́ркоз 46， 136.
$\pi о \rho \phi \bar{\nu} \rho \omega$ 429， 480.
$\pi$ т́́ध 570.
побі 318.
тóvis 46，169， 322.
Tór（ $\sigma$ ）os 129， 414.
по́та（Lesb．） 57 I．
тотаио́s 30 note， 40.
тота́лиає 97.
то́те 414， 571 ．
тотє́орає 82，96，128， 497.
$\pi$ т́тєроs 8，30，36，40， 46，202，376， 414.


по́тขıa 322.
$\pi o v ́ ~ 40,560$.
тov̂ 560.
Toús 54，65，82，92，96， 106， $157,166,171$ ， 212，234，287，294， 298，300，302，305， 308，311，312，314， 316，342，343，345， 350， 364.
$\pi \rho a \xi \omega 499$.
$\pi \rho a ̆ \sigma \sigma \omega 478$.
тра̂тos（Dor．Boeot．） 80， 390.
$\pi \rho a ̆ ̃ \tau \omega 5$ I， 129.
$\pi \rho a ̆ t \tau \omega \nu 23$.
$\pi \rho \epsilon ́ \sigma \beta v s 23,224$.
$\pi \rho \eta \tilde{\delta}^{\circ} \dot{\omega} \nu 272$.
$\pi \rho \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \sigma \omega \nu$（Ion．）23， 51 ， 129.
$\pi$ рía $\begin{aligned} & \\ & 202 .\end{aligned}$
$\pi \rho o ́ ~ 8, ~ 46, ~ 157, ~ 229, ~$ 252.
$\pi \rho \circ \beta \lambda \lambda^{\prime} s 285$.
$\pi$ рódoбıs 37.
$\pi \rho о \eta \gamma \epsilon \mu \omega \boldsymbol{\nu} 291$.
троїка 559.
$\pi \rho$ о́ка 252， 559.
тро́какоз 291.
$\pi \rho о ́ \pi a ̆ \nu 354$.
$\pi$ pós 228.
$\pi \rho о \sigma є і$ रिо 38.
$\pi \rho о \sigma \epsilon ́ \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho о s 291$.
$\pi \rho o ́ \sigma \theta a(L e s b) 567.$.
$\pi \rho o ́ \sigma \theta \in(\nu) 567$.
$\pi \rho o ́ \sigma \lambda a \beta \in 38$.
$\pi \rho o ́ \sigma(\sigma) \omega 129,564$.
$\pi \rho o ́ \sigma \omega \pi \pi \nu 291$.
$\pi \rho$ о́тєроs 254.
$\pi \rho о т \epsilon ́ \rho \omega 1564$.
$\pi \rho о т і 228$.
$\pi \rho о т і \theta \eta \nu \tau \iota$（Mess．） 528.
$\pi$ то́фа⿱㇒⿻二亅⿱八乂， 559.
$\pi \rho о \phi \dot{\eta} \tau \eta s=258$.
$\pi \rho v \mu \nu o ́ s ~ 89$.
$\pi \rho \oplus \eta \nu 559$.
$\pi \rho \omega i{ }^{2} 27$.
$\pi \rho \omega \dot{\iota}$ os 237.
$\pi \rho \omega \pi \epsilon ́ \rho v \sigma \iota \iota 4$.
$\pi \rho \omega ิ \tau a 559$.
$\pi \rho \omega ́ т \iota \sigma \tau 0 s 259,390$.
$\pi \rho \omega ิ т$ ข 559.
$\pi \rho \hat{\tau o s ~ 40, ~ 68, ~ 80, ~} 390$.
$\pi \tau a i ́ \rho \omega 67$.
ттар ós $^{6}$ 7， 239.
$\pi \tau a ́ \rho \nu v \mu a \iota 463$.
$\pi \tau є ́ \rho \nu a \operatorname{70}, 22 \mathrm{I}, 322$.
$\pi \tau \epsilon \rho o ́ v 248$.
$\pi \tau \epsilon ́ \rho v \xi{ }^{285}$.
$\pi \tau$ ย́бӨає 83.
$\pi \tau \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota$ 97，458，503， 506.
$\pi \pi i \sigma \sigma \omega 466$.
$\pi$ тітт 466.
тто入іторӨог 289.
$\pi$ тópos 67.
$\pi \tau \dot{\prime} \xi 236$.
$\pi \boldsymbol{\tau} \dot{\sigma} \sigma \sigma$ 129， 478.
$\pi \tau \cup \chi \dot{\eta} 236$.
$\pi \tau \hat{v} \omega$ 129， 478.
$\pi \tau \dot{\xi} \xi 234$.
$\pi \tau \omega \chi i \sigma \tau \epsilon \rho$ оs 376.
$\pi \tau \omega \chi$ ós $96,376$.
$\pi$ úa入os 74．
$\pi v \gamma \mu a ́ \chi o s ~ 289$.
$\pi v \gamma \mu \dot{\eta} 239$.
$\pi v \gamma \dot{\omega} \nu 269$.
$\pi \dot{v} \in \lambda=574$.
$\pi v \theta$ Є́ $\sigma$ Oau 505.
$\pi \bar{v} \theta ı o \nu^{\imath} \kappa \bar{a}($ Boeot．） 323.
$\pi v \theta \mu \eta \eta_{\nu}$ III， $115,273$.
חī̀ ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{oi} 562$.
$\pi \stackrel{v}{v} \theta \omega$ 55， 475.
ти́ка 564.
$\pi$ úvסág III．
$\pi v \nu$ ®ávo $\mu$ а 466.
$\pi \grave{\prime} \xi \iota \operatorname{los} 243$.
$\pi$ テ̛́o 475.
$\pi$ úos 279.
$\pi \hat{\nu} \rho 371$.
$\pi v$ рікаибтоs 292.
$\pi \hat{s}$（Syrac．） 414.
$\pi$ и́ $\tau \div$ 96， 262.
$\pi \bar{\omega}$（Dor．） 563.
$\pi \omega \hat{\theta} \stackrel{\iota}{ } 540$.
$\pi \hat{\omega} \mu a \mathrm{88}, 273$.
тต́тотє 306，325，414， 564.
$\pi$ ส́s（Dor．）33，54，82，｜ $\mathfrak{v o ́ v t s} 262$. 92，96，234，319，p̀vбтakтús 266. 342.
$\pi$ た̂s 414.
$\pi \omega \tau$ т́онає 96，97， 484.
$\pi \hat{v} 264$.
р́aүŋ̄ขaı 82，87， 96.


fáфavos 242.
péó8（Boeot．） 129.

$\rho \in i \theta \rho o \nu 25$ I．
р́є́колаь 466.
$\dot{\rho} \in \hat{\imath} \mu \boldsymbol{\alpha} 273$.
ค́v̂नاs 262.
ค́é $\omega$ 44，96，122，137， 232， 506.
$\dot{\rho} \eta \boldsymbol{\eta} \gamma \nu \bar{v} \mu \mathrm{l} 82,83,87,96$ ， 232， 463.
р $\eta$ іт $\tau \in \rho$ роs 376.
ṕグん 375.

ค́ $\eta \sigma \sigma \omega$（Hom．） 458.

ค́ $\boldsymbol{\tau} \eta \dot{\rho} 359$.

p̣qтós 123.

р́ $\eta \tau \omega \rho 278,359$.
ṕíyos 279， 492.

pí ${ }^{\prime}$ 121， 322.
pı́kvós 24 I ．
คīn！ 236.

pís 348.
คْоӑ 96 ．
คо о оодákтv入оs 373.
fófos（Cypr．） 122.
คón 236.
póos 122， 236.
ро́талоу 123.
portós 109.
poûs 122.
ค́оф́є $109,137,215$. puóóv 559.

péṽós 88，96， 258.
$\dot{\rho} \omega \nu \nu \bar{\nu} \mu<464$.

р $\omega \chi \mu o ́ s 229$.
$\sigma a ́$（Megar．） 414. баive 478.
бакє $\sigma$ ф́́pos 289.
ба́коs 124，232， 279.
бá入 $\pi \iota \gamma \xi$ 285， 343.
$\sigma a \lambda \pi i \gamma \xi \omega 499$.
бaл $\pi i \zeta \omega 153,156,494$, 509.
$\sigma a ̂ \mu a$（Dor．） 129.
бatرós 248.
ミápatıs（Att．） 73.
бараvióєs 73.
бá申a 73， 564.
$\sigma \beta \epsilon ́ \varphi \nu \bar{v} \mu l 23,224,464$.
$\sigma \beta$ п́бораь 501.
б́є́ 124，168，397， 403.
б́є́ßонає 117，207，420， 497.

бє́ $\beta \omega 420$.
$\sigma \in ́ \theta \in \nu$（Lesb．） 403.
$\sigma \in i ̂ o ~(H o m) ~ 403 .$.
$\sigma \epsilon \iota$ ós 215 ．
$\sigma \epsilon \epsilon^{\prime} \omega$ 124， 468.
$\sigma \epsilon \lambda a ̆ \nu \bar{a}$（Dor．）6， 69.
$\sigma \epsilon \lambda a ́ v \nu \bar{a}$（Lesb．）69， 214.

$\sigma \in \lambda a \sigma \phi$ ó $о$ os 289.

$\sigma \epsilon \lambda \lambda i \zeta \omega \omega 232$.
бढ́л $\mu a 273$.
$\sigma \epsilon \mu \nu$ ós 117，207， 241.
$\sigma \epsilon ́ \sigma, \sigma \in \hat{v}$（Ion．） 403.
इ́́patıs 73.
бє́ $\rho \phi=s 249$.
$\sigma \epsilon ́ \sigma \epsilon \iota \sigma \mu a \iota 215$ ．
б́́ $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \epsilon \sigma \tau a t 468$.
$\sigma \in \hat{\epsilon} \epsilon$（Hom．）129， 232.
$\sigma \in \hat{\tau} \tau \lambda o \nu$（Ion．）129， 256.

бŋิ $\mu a$ 129， 273.
б $\eta \mu a ́ \nu \tau \omega \rho 278$.
$\sigma$ б́ $\mu є \rho о \nu($ Ion．）129，184， 287， 559.
$\sigma \eta \pi \epsilon \delta \dot{\omega} \nu 272$.
$\sigma \dot{\eta} \pi \omega 506$.
$\sigma \eta \bar{\rho} a \gamma \xi 285$.
$\sigma \hat{\eta} \tau \epsilon \mathrm{S}$（Ion．） 559.
$\sigma$ बévos 279.
бíya 564.
бíynतós 247.
бเঠ́ńpeos 237.
бі́єло⿱ 74.
бīuós 239.
бıvapós 152.
бועO̊oós 152， 248.
$\sigma \kappa a ́ \zeta \omega 478$.
бкatós 56， 238.
бкаוótクs 284.
бкаірр 67，112，129， 478.
бка́ $\lambda \lambda \omega$ 67，129， 478.
бка́л $\mu \eta 239$.
бкатávך 111.
бка́лтш 473.
$\sigma \kappa \in \delta a ́ v \nu \bar{v} \mu \ell 44$ note I ， 464.
$\sigma \kappa \in \theta$ Oós 25 I ．
бке́dos 279.
бкє́тауод 242.
бкєта⿱亠䒑ós 242.
бкє́тtas 283.
бкќтттиає 420， 497.
$\sigma \kappa \eta$ $\pi \tau \rho o \nu 88$.
бкıâ 302， 32 I ．
бкıакós 252.
бкíóvapaı 44 note 1 ， 461.

бкıєрós 74.

$\sigma \kappa \grave{i} \pi \omega \nu 88$.
бк $\lambda \eta \rho \frac{\prime}{s} 248$.
бкотєє 497.
бколй 236.
бко́ $\delta \delta \boldsymbol{\nu} 78$.
бко́родоу 78.
бко́tos 212.
$\Sigma \kappa u ́ \theta \eta s 323$.
$\sigma \kappa v \theta$ pós 251.
$\sigma \kappa u ́ \lambda \lambda \omega 478$.
$\sigma \kappa u ̂ \lambda o \nu 247$.
бкѝтоs 55.
$\sigma \kappa \omega ̂ \rho 371$.
бкต́廿 234， 342.
$\sigma \mu \in \rho \delta a \lambda$ е́о 214.
$\sigma \mu \epsilon \rho \delta \nu o ́ s ~ 214,241$.
$\sigma \mu \bar{\eta} \nu 0 s 280$.
$\boldsymbol{\sigma} \mu$ ikpós 214 ．
$\sigma \mu i \lambda \eta 214$ ．
$\sigma \mu \bar{v} \chi \omega 214$.
бов $\epsilon$ І 129， 497.
бoí 403.
бopós 124.
кора $\quad 73$ ．
бós $33,124,406$.
สov̂ 403.
бoû $\mu a \iota 8$ o．
бофíā 337.
oóós 30 note，73， 373 note．
бофิ̂s $325,565$.
тофஸ́тата 565.
бофө́татоs 258.
бофө́тєроу 565.
бофஸ́тєроs 376， 254.
$\sigma \pi a \delta \dot{\nu} \nu 272$.
бтaíp $67,75,129,212$ ， 478.

бтapvós 24 I ．
$\sigma \pi a ́ \rho \tau \eta 258$.
бта́ $\boldsymbol{\text { тог }} 258$.
$\sigma \pi a ́ \omega 468$.
$\sigma \pi \epsilon i \rho \omega ~ 67,478$.
$\sigma \pi$ tévó 153 note，166， 511.

бтє́ $\rho \mu$ а 490.
бтєр $\mu$ аір $65,490$.
$\sigma \pi \epsilon ข ́ \delta \omega$ 62， 166.
$\sigma \pi \hat{\eta} \lambda \nu \gamma \xi 285$.
$\sigma \pi \lambda \eta \eta_{\nu} 269$.
бтора́ó $\eta \nu 559$.
$\sigma \pi o v \delta \check{\eta}^{\prime} 62,236$.
बтovốn 561．
бтáoŋ̀ 559.
бтádıoı 326.
бтá $\theta \mu \eta 239$.
бта日 $\mu$ ós 236.
бтаí $\eta \mu \in \nu 531$ ．
бтаiŋp 531－33．
$\sigma \tau \bar{a} \lambda \bar{a}$（Dor．） $69,148$.
бтал $\eta$ боцаь 501.
$\sigma \tau a ́ \lambda \lambda \bar{a}$（Lesb．Thess．） 69， 148.
бтá入 $\sigma \iota s 67$.
бталт́́os 556.
$\sigma \tau a ́ \mu \nu o s 240$.
$\sigma \tau$ ás $354,355$.
$\sigma$ тáбts 262.
otarós 5，23，49，87，96， 212，258， 555.
テтáरus 264.
ттéap 37 I ．
бтєүávך 242.
бтєүадós 242.
бтє́ $\gamma \alpha \sigma \tau \rho о \nu 25$.
$\sigma \tau \epsilon ์ \eta \eta 236$.
$\sigma \tau \epsilon \gamma \nu o ́ s 241$ ．
otévos 112，197， 212 note， 279.
бтє́ $\gamma \omega$ 197， 199.
бтєıvós（Ion．）69，238， 280.

бтєіхळ 58，109，201， 456， 505.
бтєлє́оная 499.
бтєле́ $\omega 499$.
бтé̀ $\lambda \omega$ 67，129，217， 22I，478， 509.
бт $\epsilon \mu \beta \omega$ III， 466.
бтє́ $\mu \mu a \operatorname{273.}$
$\sigma \tau \epsilon \nu$ ós $69,238$.
бтєиóтє $\operatorname{\rho os} 376$.
$\sigma \tau \epsilon \in \nu \omega 112$.
бтєрі́бка 458， 470.

$\sigma \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \nu 0 \nu 241$.
$\sigma \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \phi$ os 279.
$\sigma \tau \epsilon \phi a ́ \nu \eta 242$.
бтє́申avos 242.
$\sigma \tau \epsilon \in \omega \mu \boldsymbol{\nu}$（Hom．） 72.
$\sigma \pi \bar{\eta} \theta_{L} 540$.
$\sigma \pi \bar{\eta} \theta_{o s} 280$.
$\sigma \tau \eta \eta \eta \eta$ 69， 148.
$\sigma \tau \eta \mu \omega \nu 273$.
$\sigma \tau \eta ̂ \nu a \iota ~ 146,546$.
$\sigma \tau \eta \dot{\rho} \rho \in \nu$ 72， 528.
$\sigma \tau \eta \sigma о \mu а \iota 422$.
$\sigma \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\eta} \sigma \omega$ 422， 499.
бтıßapós 218.
бтіүна 198.
$\sigma \tau i \gamma \omega \nu 269$.
$\sigma \tau i \zeta \omega 198,478,507$.
$\sigma \tau \iota \phi$ pós 169， 218.
бroî os 236 ．
бто⿱亠乂寸生 276.
बтóvos 276.
бторє́vעv̄ $\mu \mathrm{c} 464$.
бто́р $\theta v \gamma \xi{ }^{\prime} 285$.
$\sigma \tau \tau \dot{\rho} \rho \nu \bar{\nu} \mu \iota 460,463$.
oт $\alpha$ aßós 236.
$\sigma \tau \rho a ́ \beta \omega \nu 269$.
бтрaтāyós（Dor．） 289.
бтрать́́тクs 251.
бт $\quad$ atós 90.
бтраф́ウбоцаи 501．
$\sigma \tau \rho \epsilon ́ \beta \lambda \eta 247$.
$\sigma \tau \rho \epsilon \beta \lambda$ ós 247.
$\sigma \tau \rho \in \pi \tau$ ós 555 ．
$\sigma \tau \rho$ е́ф 497.
$\sigma \tau \rho \circ \beta$ ì $\overline{\text { ós }} 247$.
бтрофє́ $260,497$.
$\sigma \tau \rho о \phi \dot{\eta}$ 236， 484.
$\sigma \tau \rho o ́ \phi i s ~ 260$.
बтрó申os 236.
бтр⿳⺈ $\mu$ а 273， 350.
$\sigma \tau \rho \omega ́ \nu \nu v ̄ \mu \iota 464$.
ฮт $\rho \omega \nu \nu$ v́c 465.
бт $\boldsymbol{\omega} \boldsymbol{\tau}$ о́s $68,258$.
$\sigma \tau \rho \omega \phi$ á 484.
बтvyєpós 248.
atúyıos 237.
бтvyขós 189,241 ．
бтû̀os 102，176， 247.
$\sigma \tau \cup ́ \xi 234$.
बтuфє入ós 247.
oú 397，403．
бv̂ 299.
бúaypos 289 ．
$\sigma v \beta \dot{\omega} \tau \eta \eta^{32}$ I．
бvүХ́є́ 230.
aúSuyos 153.
oúdıvos 232.
$\sigma v \lambda \lambda \dot{\eta} \beta \delta \eta \nu 559$.
бú入入oyos 117，149， 230.
$\sigma v \mu \beta a i \nu \omega 230$.
$\sigma v \mu \beta a ́ \lambda \lambda \omega$ 117，151．
бі́лиахоя 117， 150.
бv́ $\mu \mu \in \tau \rho о s 150$.
$\sigma v \mu \mu \tau \eta \eta^{\prime} s 66$.
$\sigma \nu \mu \pi \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \omega 151$. бv $\mu \pi$ тóés 38.

テúv 232.
बúvơou入os 291.
б⿱́vidpets 291.

$\sigma \hat{v} \rho \iota \gamma \xi{ }^{2} 25$.
бvрра́лть 117 ．
ovppéc 117， 230.
बv̀p $\omega 217$.
бv̂s 213，316， 334.
бv́ $\sigma \omega \mu$ оs 230.
बux ${ }^{2}$ ós 245.
бфáyıo 237.
бфáyıos 237.
$\sigma \phi a ́ \delta \delta \omega$（Boeot．） 129.
$\sigma \phi a ́ \zeta \omega ~ 129,478$.
бфаîpa 322.
$\sigma \phi a ́ \lambda \lambda о \mu а \iota ~ 102,208,212 . ~$
$\sigma \phi{ }^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \omega 217,478$.
бфараує́одая 102，161．
$\sigma \phi$ є́ 404.
бф́́as 404.
бфєís 404.
бфе̄as 102，161， 283.
$\boldsymbol{\sigma} \phi$ е́т $\epsilon$ pos 406.
$\sigma \phi \dot{\eta} \nu$ 102， 161.
бфi $\gamma \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\omega} 466$.
$\sigma \phi_{i} \gamma \xi 2$.
$\sigma \phi^{\prime}(\nu) 404$.
$\sigma \phi i \sigma \iota(\nu) 404$.
$\sigma \phi \omega \omega^{2} 4$.
$\sigma \phi \omega \epsilon ́ 404$.
$\sigma \phi \omega ̂ ̃$（Hom．） 403.
$\sigma \phi \omega ิ ้ \nu$（Hom．）325， 403.
$\sigma \phi \omega i t \epsilon \rho o s$（Hom．） 406.
テ申ஸ้̂ 325.
$\sigma \chi a \delta \dot{\omega} \nu 272$.
$\sigma \chi \alpha ́ \zeta \omega 478$.
б $\chi$ á $\omega$ 102， 192.
$\sigma \chi \epsilon \delta i \eta \nu 559$.
$\sigma \chi \in$ סóv 559 ．
б $\chi$ єiv $115,258$.
бXє pós 248.
$\boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\chi} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{S} 524,539$.

$\sigma \chi$ єтós 258， 555.
$\sigma \chi \hat{\eta} \mu a 273$.
$\sigma \chi \eta ́ \sigma \omega 499$.
oxi\}a 322.
$\sigma \chi i \zeta \omega$ 102，129，192， 212，460，477， 507.
бxívis 262.
б $\chi$ г $\sigma \mu$ ós 239.
бұо入аітє $\rho$ оs $254,376$.
$\sigma \omega \bar{\mu}{ }^{2} 40$.

$\sigma$ जिs 80.
$\sigma \omega \tau$ そ́ 237， 359.
бштทрiáa 237.
$\sigma \omega$ бทplos 237.
бшфроує́ттєроs 376.
$\sigma \omega \phi \rho \circ \sigma$ úv 246.
$\sigma \omega \dot{\phi \rho \omega \nu} 350$.

taí 56， 409.
такєро́s 96.
такто́s 555.
тấк（Dor．） 96.
тáлaıva 75.

тá入apos 248.
тádās 67，69， 154.
та入аúpìvos 123 ．
тả入入a 80.
танєiv 65.
тa $\mu \bar{i} \bar{s} s 294$.
тацї̄̃ı 32 I ．
$\tau \alpha ́ \mu \nu \omega$（Dor．） 462.
тávє（Thess．）410．
та⿱亠乂寸́броноs 65.
тavínous 65.
таขvбítтє 289.
$\tau а \nu \dot{v} \sigma \omega 499$.
távvtaı（Hom．）65， 463.

та⿱亠乂兀́ 465， 499.
Tápagıs 262.
$\tau а р а ́ \sigma \sigma \omega$（Ion．） 129.
тара́ттш 129.
тápßos 205.
тарбós 67.
тapфús 264.
тá̃ts 262.
т $́ \sigma \sigma \omega 478$.
тáta 233.
ratós 5，65，164， 258.
Tav̂pos $15,60,248$.
тavpoфóvos 289.
та⿱亠тá（Dor．） 564.
таútך 321， 564.
таúт！ 56 I ．
тádos 279.
та́фр 248.
тá又 564.
тáxเбтa 559.
тахїтワข 559.
тáxıбтos 115， 259.
тáxos 279， 316.
taxús 129， 194.
тaxvtク́s 284.
$\tau_{\bar{a} \omega} \omega \nu$（Hom．）314， 321.
$\tau \in 35,40,44,202,414$.
$\tau \epsilon$（Dor．） 403.
T＇́jos 112，197， 212
note， 279.
тє $\begin{aligned} \text { àvía } 552 .\end{aligned}$
тє́ $\theta$ єіка 517， 520.
$\tau \in ́ \theta \eta к а 520$.
$\tau \in \theta \eta \lambda \omega \prime s 552$.
тé $\theta \mathrm{D} a \mathrm{~A} \stackrel{5}{ } 540$.
$\tau \in$ ®vaín 533.
тé $\theta \nu a \mu \in \nu 90$.
$\tau \in \theta \nu a ́ v a \iota ~ 546$.
$\tau \in \theta_{\nu}$ át 541 ．
тє́ $\theta \nu \eta$ ка $501,517$.
т́́ $\theta$ ข $\eta$ кe 424.
$\tau \in \theta \nu \dot{\prime} \dot{\xi} \xi \mathrm{E} 5 \mathrm{I}$ ．
$\tau \in \theta \nu \eta \omega َ \tau a$（Hom．） 552.
тє́ $\theta \rho а \mu \mu а \iota ~ 518$.
$\tau \in \in \rho \iota \pi \pi o \nu 220$.
$\tau \in i ̂ \delta \epsilon$（Dor．），325， 562.
$\tau \epsilon i \nu$（Hom．Dor．） 403.
$\tau \epsilon i \nu \bar{v} \mu i 463$.
тєívo 129， 164.
$\tau \epsilon і \rho \omega 129$.
т $\epsilon$ íval 202 note 2.
$\tau \epsilon i \sigma \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu$（Hom．） 526.
$\tau \epsilon i \sigma \omega 499$.
$\tau \epsilon i ́ \sigma \omega \mu \in \nu 526$.
тeîरos 279.
тєкцаіродаь 499.
$\tau \epsilon \kappa \mu а і \rho \omega$ 49I．
тє́ккар（тє́ккшр）371， 491.

тєкцарє́о $\boldsymbol{\text { ть }} 499$.
тє́кขоข 24 I ．
тékos 279.
тéктацца II，75，235，322．
тєктаі̀ш 482， 490.
тєкто́vархоя 289.
тє́ктшу 54，226，235， 269，322，345，482， 490.

тєланш́v 90，97， 273.
тètelos $69,238$.
$\tau \in \lambda \epsilon^{\prime} \omega$（Hom．）76，I29．
$\tau \in \lambda \epsilon \sigma \tau \eta \eta^{s} 258$.
$\tau \in \lambda \in \sigma \phi$ ó $\rho$ os 32.
$\tau \in \lambda \epsilon v \tau \dot{\prime} 258$.
тє $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ é $\omega 76,129,212,468$ ， 482，492，499，509， 540.
$\tau \in \lambda \boldsymbol{\eta} \in \boldsymbol{i s}$（Hom．）69，124， 276.
$\tau \in \lambda \lambda \omega$ 67， 129.
тểos 202，212，482， 492.
$\tau \epsilon \bar{\lambda} \sigma{ }^{2} 212$.
$\tau \in \lambda \hat{\omega}$（Att．） 76.
тє́ $\mu$ ахоs $90,97$.
$\tau \in \mu \epsilon \omega 499$.
тє́ $\mu \nu \omega 6$ 65， 462.
тє $\boldsymbol{\nu}$＇́ $\omega$ 499．
тє́o（Hom．）202， 414.
$\tau \in ́ 0, \tau \in \cup ́$（Dor．） 403.
тєós（Hom．）33， 404.
тéos，$\tau \in \hat{\jmath}$（Dor．Boeot．） 403.

тєoû（Dor．） 403.
т́́pas 283， 370.
т т́́pevos 350.
$\tau \varepsilon \rho \in \tau \rho \circ \nu 257$.
$\tau \epsilon ์ p \eta \nu 322,345,350$.
тє́ $\rho \theta \rho o \nu 251$.
тє́риа 273.
тє́ $\rho \mu \omega \nu$ 273， 345.
T $\epsilon$ рот $\rho \nu 78$.
тє́ $\boldsymbol{\tau} \omega$ 457，505， 506.
$\tau \epsilon \rho \pi \omega \lambda \dot{\eta} 247$.
T＇$\rho \pi \omega \nu 78$.
тє́ $\rho \sigma a \sigma \theta a \imath 212$.
тє́рбонає 67，212， 420.
$\tau \epsilon ́ \rho т о s(L e s b) 390.$.

те́ $\rho \phi$ os 279.
тєр $\boldsymbol{\tau}^{\prime} \mu \beta$ ротоя 289.
$\tau \epsilon ́ \rho \psi$ וs 262.
т $\epsilon \not \rho \psi \omega 49$.
T $\in \rho \omega \dot{\nu} \eta 73$.
тєббара́ßotos 125，129， 237.

тєббара́коута（тєттара́－ коута） 386.
тєббаракодта́кเs 394.
тєббара（тєттара－）кобто́s 392.

т́́テбapes（Hom．）124， 168， 202.
$\tau \epsilon \sigma \sigma \epsilon \rho \epsilon \sigma(\tau \in \sigma \sigma a \rho \epsilon \sigma-) \kappa a l-$ ঠ́́катоs 391.

тє́така 520.
т́́тадлаı 67.
тє́тадає 518， 520.
тє́tavos 233.
тєта́ртєто 505.
тє́тартоs $67,258,390$.
тєтáo $\theta \eta \nu$（Hom．） 523.
т́́тєєбдаı 518， 522.
$\tau \epsilon \tau \in ́ \lambda \epsilon к а 520$.
тєтє́̀є $\sigma \mu a \iota 522$.
тєтєข́乡o $\mu a \iota 501$.
тєтєن́Xaтац（Hom．） 518.
$\tau \epsilon \tau і \bar{\mu} \eta \kappa a 520$.
$\tau \in \tau \bar{\tau} \mu \eta \kappa \omega ́ s 552$.
т́́т $\lambda a \theta \iota$ 90， 540.
$\tau \in \tau \lambda a ́ \mu \in \nu a \iota$（Hom．）273， 546.

тє́т $\lambda \eta$ үка 520.
$\tau є ́ \tau \mu \eta к а$ 90， 97.
тє́тока 518.
тєтокळ́s 552.
те́торєs（Dor．） 383.
тєт $\tilde{a}$ Śvyos 383.
тєтраіцш 513.
тєт $\quad$ ákıs 394.
тєтрако́бъоь 387.
тєтрактús 266， 396.
тєєра ̧́ós 129， 395.
тєтра́тєто 457.
тєтратл oûs 395 ．
тєтра́тоия 289.
тєт ${ }^{2} a^{s} 396$.

тétpatos（Hom．）67， 126， 390.
тéт $\rho a \phi a 518$.
тєт $\quad$ áфатаı 518， 52 I ．
тєтрáфөaı 221， 548.
тєт ${ }^{2}{ }^{\circ} \theta a ́ 129$.
тє́трьциає 117 ．
т́́т $\rho \iota \phi а{ }^{2} 2 \mathrm{I}$.
$\tau \in \tau \rho i \phi \phi \theta a \iota 22$ I．
$\tau \in \tau \rho i \not \psi о \mu a{ }^{501}$ ．
тє́т $\rho о ф а$ 518， 521.
тєтрळ́коута（Dor．Ion．） 68，126，383， 386.
тєтрюкобто́s 392.
тétrapes 44 note 1，124， 168，202， 202 note 2， 383.

Tヒ́тTī̆ 285.
$\tau \epsilon \tau \cup ́ \gamma \mu \in \nu$（Hom．） 523.
$\tau \in \tau v \gamma \mu$ évos 518.
тєтvкєì 429， 505.
тє́́goцаı 422， 499.
$\tau \in \cup ́ \xi \omega 501$.
$\tau \epsilon \hat{\tau} \tau \lambda 0 \nu 129$.
$\tau \in \dot{\chi} \chi$ 62，456，505，511， 522.

тєфрás 285.
т́́ $\chi \nu \eta$ 40， 258.
тeरvítทs 258.
$\tau \in ́ \omega s$（Hom．） 72.
$\tau \hat{\eta} \delta \in 56 \mathrm{I}$.
тぞ白 233.
$\tau \eta \kappa \in \delta \dot{\omega} \nu 272$.
$\tau \eta \kappa \omega \omega 506$.
rүлікоз 252.
т $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ 人ó́ 570.
тท入oû 560.
т $\boldsymbol{\eta} \mu \in \rho о \nu$ 129，184，287， 559.

т $\eta \nu \in \hat{i}$（Dor．）325， 562.
тпиіка 573.
$\tau \eta$ グ生（Dor．）412， 416.
$\tau \eta \nu \omega ิ$（Dor．） 563.
т y os 72.
$\tau \hat{\eta} \tau \in S 559$.
ti 230.
тi $\begin{aligned} & \epsilon \epsilon \\ & 540 .\end{aligned}$
$\tau \iota \theta$ єín 533.
$\tau \iota \theta \in i \mu \in \nu 532,533$.
rı日eis 12，69，154， $\mid$ rגāтós（Dor．） 97. 166，298，301，354， 355.

тוӨєiซa 154， 322.
төє́ $\mu \in \nu$（Hom．）273， 549.

тıө́́ $\mu \in \nu$ os 553.
тı日évaı 546.
тi $\theta \in \sigma \theta a \iota 548$.
тı $\Theta$ є́ $\sigma \theta \omega 544$.
ті́Єєбо 543.
гıӨ่́ $\omega$ 541．
тiӨпиi 6，24，33， 49 note， $52,85,87,96,115$, I69，I77，I80，354， 429，433，434，455， 472， 529.
тı日ิैual 529.
тікта 457，473， 503.
ті̀入 $216,478$.
тī ${ }^{1}$（Dor．）50， 5 I， 276.
тīцávs（Cret．） 312.
тíдáш 5，40，80，128， 467 note， $482-4,527$ ， 540.

тínŋ́ 5，18，69，229，237， 239，302，304，305， 308，312，32I，482， 484.

тī $\mu \eta$ ض́ $\sigma$ о $\mu$ 501．
тī $\bar{\eta} \sigma \alpha \iota 547$.
ті́лךбтя 483.
тї $\boldsymbol{\eta} \sigma \omega 499$.
тілитє́os 255， 556.
тїцךтікós 252.
тíцךтós 483.
тípios 237.
тív（Dor．Boeot．） 403.
тíva 69.
$\tau i t \nu \omega$（Ion．） 69.
ті゙v $124,465$.
tıós（Boeot．） 406.
tis 40， 414.
Tís 39，45，202，212， 414.

тívis 169，202， 262.
тıтаíyш 480.
тเтยбкоцає 47 I．
$\tau \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta \iota 540$.
$\tau \lambda \eta{ }_{\eta} \mu \omega \nu 273,345$.
т $\lambda$ пт тós 90， 97.
tó 46，76，164，230，399， 408.

тóde 410 ．
тoót 4 II ．
тó日し 566.
тоí 59，325， 399. тoí（Hom．Dor．） 403. тoîzos 236.
то́ка（Dor．） 573.
тока́s 285.
токєús 268.
то́коs 236.
тó $\lambda \mu$ а $130,322,484$.
тол áa $^{2} 48$.
то $\mu \dot{\eta}$ 236， 372.
то ós 236， 372.
tóve（Thess．） 410.
то६ót $\eta$ 258， 32 I ．
торєи́ш 489.
то́р $\mu$ оs 239.
то́р 10 78， 24 I.
тópovos 78.
Topóv 73.
tó $\sigma(\sigma)$ os $129,167$.
то́тє 571.
тoúv（Boeot．） 403.
тоข́ข （Lac．） 403.
тоขтєî（Dor．） 562.
тov̂тo 4II．
тоขтิ̂（Dor．） 563.
$\tau 0 \tau \tau \hat{\omega} \theta \epsilon \nu$（Dor．） 568.
тра́тєఢЦа 73，287， 383.
тратєî̀ 67，96，456， 505.
$\tau \rho a ́ \pi \omega$（Dor．） 456.
т $\rho а ф є і \nu ~ 67$.
т $\rho a ́ \phi \epsilon \nu$（Dor．） 550.
$\tau \rho a ́ \phi \omega$（Dor．） 456.
$\tau \rho a ̄ \chi u ́ s 264$.
трє́єs（Cret．）44，128， 382.
tреis $7,12,29,44,45$ ， 58，69，I19，128， 136，164， $313-14$ ， 316，328－9， $381,385$.

трє́ $\mu \omega$ 164，468， 497. $\tau \rho \epsilon ́ \pi \epsilon \delta \delta a$（Boeot．） 73.
т $\rho \in \pi$ тós 555.
т $\rho є ́ \pi \omega ~ 67, ~ 96, ~ 456, ~ 497, ~$
505－6， 52 I ．
$\tau \rho \epsilon(\sigma) \omega 215$ ．
тре́фш 24，67，115，456， 499， 505.
Т Т $\boldsymbol{\text { б }} \boldsymbol{\omega}$ ขıos 73.
т $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \chi \chi$ II 5 ．
тре́ш 468， 509.
т $\quad$ тро́s 248.
т $\eta_{\eta} \rho \omega \nu$ 69， $215,269$.
трıāка́s 396.
трเа̄́коขта 386，387，392， 396.

трıāкодта́кıs 394.
трเа̄ко́бเо七 387.
трıāкобьоттós 393.
трıāкобто́s I53， 392.
т тıás 396.
т $\boldsymbol{\iota} \boldsymbol{\imath} \beta \omega$ 106，109， 117 ，
160， 522.
$\tau \rho i \beta \omega \nu 269$.
$\tau \rho i \zeta \omega 478$.
т pívs（Cret．）69， 382.
т $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ เگ́ós 129， 395.
трıт入oûs 395.
трítovs 289，343， 382.
трís（Heracl．）69， 394.
трьбкаі́ঠєка 385.
трьткаьঠ́́катоs 391．
трі́татоs（Hom．） 390.
трі́тоs 258， 390.
трıттús 266， 396.
т
т $\boldsymbol{\tau} \chi$ Øá 129， 395.
$\tau \rho о \mu \epsilon ́ \omega ~ 128,497$.
тро́ $\mu$ оs 236.
тротє́ $\omega$ 128，485， 497.
троти́ 96， 236.
тро́tıs 260.
тро́тоs 236.
трофи́ 236.
т
трофós 236.
трофஸ́vıos 73.
т $\rho о \chi \dot{\eta} 236$.
трóxıs 260.

т то́又os 236.
т $\rho \overline{\text { ü }} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\omega} \nu 269$.
т $\grave{\text { ús }} \mathbf{\omega} 478$.
т рифа́入єıа 383.
$\tau \rho \dot{\omega} \xi 234$.
т $\boldsymbol{\omega} \pi \pi^{2} \omega^{2} 96$.
Tpós 340.
тú（Dor．Lesb．）397， 403.

тvүХávต 466.
тú入ך 247.
тúdos 247.
тúm $\pi$ avov 242.
rù̀ $\eta$（Hom．Dor．）397， 403.

ті́тт $458,473$.
тvpavi＇s 343 ．
$\tau \bar{u} \phi \in \delta \dot{\omega} \nu 272$.
тиф入ívos 244.
тиф $\lambda$ ós 247.
$\tau \nu \phi \lambda \omega \sigma \sigma \omega 496$.
тифлஸ́廿 496.
ти́ф $\mathbf{\tau} 456$.
тขХєi้ 505.
ти́廿 499.
$\tau \hat{\delta} \epsilon \epsilon$（Cret．）303， 325.
$\tau \omega ิ \delta \epsilon$（Dor．）563， 564.
$\tau \omega \nu i ́$（Arcad．）4io．
$\dot{v} \beta \beta a ́ \lambda \lambda \omega$（Hom．）107， 228.
viylaive 430， 43 I．
îvís 205.
íypós 496.
í $\gamma \rho \omega \sigma \sigma \sigma \omega 496$.
ídapós 248.
v̌ $\delta \rho \bar{a} 48$.
íठріَкп 253.
vi $\delta \rho o s 48,236$.
$\tilde{v} \delta \omega \rho$ 236， 37 I ．
ví $\overline{0}$ os 74 ．
viós 14,332 ．
viúvs（Cret．）312， 331.
viús 332.
viús（Cret．） 332.
í入ото́ $\mu$ оз 289.
$\frac{\grave{v}}{\mathrm{v}} \mathrm{a} \mathrm{s}$（Att．） 403.
$\stackrel{i}{v} \mu \epsilon ́$（Dor．） 403.
ข̂ $\mu$ éas，兀̀̉ véas（Ion．） 403. $\frac{\tilde{v}}{\mu} \mu i$ is $118,127,403$.
$\stackrel{v}{v} \mu \mu^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$（Dor．Boeot．） 403. v́ $\mu$ ध́тєроs $254,376,378$ ， 406.
$\bar{v} \mu \eta^{\prime} \nu$ 129， 273.
$\bar{v} \mu i \nu$（Dor．）316， 403.
$\bar{v} \mu i v$, v̀ $\mu i \nu$（Ion．） 403.
$v ँ \mu \mu \varepsilon$（Hom．Lesb．） 403.
$v^{v} \mu \mu \epsilon s$（Hom．Lesb．） 403.
$v^{\nu} \mu \mu \nu, v^{\nu} \mu \mu \iota$（Aeol．）316， 403.
$v^{v} \mu \mu$ оs（Lesb．） 406.

$\hat{v} \mu$ ós（Dor．） 406.
ข゙тaı $\begin{aligned} & \text { a } \\ & 567 .\end{aligned}$
ṽinap 37 I ．
ข̈ $\pi a \rho \chi$ os 291.
ข゙тatos 377 ．
$i \pi \epsilon ́ \rho 48,157$.
íтєра́ллораь 232.
ข̀тє $\rho a ́ \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi$ os 291.

$\dot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho \theta \epsilon(\nu) 567$.
ілтє́ $\mu$ орог 37.
ขітє́ $т$ тероs 254.
ímepфíaो os 124.
ím $\nu a \lambda$ е́os 247.
v̈ $\pi \nu$ os 118 ，147，157， 241， 496.
$\dot{v} \pi \nu \dot{\sigma} \sigma \sigma \omega 496$.
ímó 228， 230 note．
víroßá入入 228.
íóó $\eta \mu a 273$.
$\dot{v} \tilde{o}^{\theta} \theta \epsilon \sigma \tau S 291$.
ínó $\theta$ єтos 291.
ímógu入os 291.
ímoхєíptos 237.
ĩs 80 ．
îs 55， $213,234,334$.
vै $\sigma \delta 0$（Lesb．） 224.
vítepos 48，IIo， 170.
iфаіи $43 \mathrm{I}, 508$.
í申ávins 258.

v̌ф $\downarrow$ ขa 216， 508.
í廿itєроs 254， 376 ．
í $\psi \underset{o}{ } \theta_{\epsilon \nu} 568$.
ú $\psi o \hat{} 560$.

фāyós（Dor．） 50.
фаүஸ́v 269.
$\phi$ ає́ $\theta \omega \nu 275$.
фaєıvós（Ion．）58，69， 80，117，122，214， 24I， 485.
фаєíve I30， 485.
фáє $\nu \nu 0$（Lesb．）69， 117 ， 214.

фá̈ı 540.
фаírıus 239.
фaí $\rho$ ós 209， 248.
фаïv 533.
фаі̀ораи 458.
фаìw 75，80， 115 note， 216，354，478，508， 540.

фatós 238 ．
фá入ay 285.
фалıós 238.
фá $\lambda \lambda \eta$ IO2， 208.
$\phi \bar{a} \mu i$（Dor．）51，82，83， 85，87，96， 454.
фávaı 546.
фаveínv 532.
$\phi а \nu \in і$ í 5532.
фaveís 354， 554.
фале́ف 499.
фávŋŋ̀l 540.
фаиض̣́неvaє 273.
фа⿱亠䒑𧰨ораи 501.
$\phi$ à $\theta$ eis 354.
фā̀ós（Att．）58，69，80， 117， 214.
фavtós 555.
фáos 24 I ．
фа́раүگ́ 285.
фарє́т $\boldsymbol{\text { à }} 82$.
фа́рך $(\mathrm{El}$. Locr．） 44 note 2.
фápos 124， 280.
фâpos（Ion．）124， 280.
фápuy 285.
фáбıs 262.
фа́бкє（Ion．） 469.

фа́бка 470.
фatós 65，209， 258.
фа́т 54 I ．
фє́ßоцаı 205，420， 497.
фєі́оодаı 509.
$\phi \epsilon \iota \omega \lambda \lambda \dot{\prime} 247$.
$\phi \in i \delta \omega \lambda$ ós 247.
фєрє́картоз 289.
фє́ $\rho \in \nu$（Dor．） 550.
$\phi \in \rho \in ́ \sigma \theta \omega \nu$ 153， 544.
фєрєббакйs 124， 232.
фє́рєтрог（ф́́ $\tau \tau \rho о \nu) ~ 85$, 257.
$\phi \in \rho \in ́ \tau \omega 541$.
ф́́pıгтоs 259， 378.
фє́р $\mu а 273$.
фєрии́ 241.
фє́рогцг 535－6．
фє́роьдто 538.
$\phi \in \rho o ́ \mu \in \nu o s 29$.
$\phi є \rho о ́ \nu \tau \omega 542$.
$\phi \leqslant \rho o ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu 542$.
$\phi \leqslant \rho o ́ v \tau \omega \sigma a \nu 542$.
ф＇́povaa 69，233，235， 298， 322.
фє́ртатоз 258， 378.
ф́́ $\boldsymbol{\tau \epsilon} \boldsymbol{\rho}$ оз 378.
фєртós 258.
фє́ $\boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\rho} \boldsymbol{\nu} 97$.
фє́р $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ 6，8， 1 1，13， 17 ， 22，24，29，30，44， 44 note $2,45,46,49,54$ ， 56，69，80，82－83，85， 89，96－97，136，140－1， 147，162，164，169， 212－13，229，230，236， 425，427－8，430，433－ 4，449，456，497， 524，527，529，539， 540.

фє́ршу 65，300－02，305， 308，3II－14，352－ 53.
$\phi \in \check{y} y \in \sigma \kappa \in \nu$（Ion．） 469.
$\phi \in \dot{\gamma} \epsilon \sigma \kappa \circ \nu$（Ion．） 430.
фєن́y $24,62,64,83$ ， 89，96， $118,163,205$ ， 456，505， 518.
феиктós 258.
$\phi \in \hat{e}$ క̂s 262.
фєúǧouat 422， 500.
фที่үしขos 243.
ф $\eta \mu \eta 239$.
$\phi \eta \mu i \quad 38,40,454,470$ ， 503.
$\phi \bar{\eta} \mu \mathrm{s} 26 \mathrm{I}$ ．
ф ท̂vaı 543， 547.

ф $\eta$ vās 354.
$\phi \dot{\eta} \rho($ Lesb．） 124.
$\phi \theta$ ai $\rho \omega$（Dor．） 478.
$\phi \theta$ ăv $\omega$ 69，124， 465.
$\phi \theta$ кip $12,69,129,217$,
578， 509.
$\phi \theta \in \iota \sigma i \mu \beta$ ротоя 289.
$\phi \theta \in \rho \in ́ \omega \omega$
$\phi \theta$ є́ $\rho \rho \omega$（Lesb．）69，129，
478.
$\phi \theta \epsilon ́ \rho \sigma \omega 499$.
$\phi \theta \dot{\eta} \rho \omega$（Arcad．） 129.
$\phi \theta i \in \tau a l 526$.

$\phi \theta_{i v \omega} 69,226$.
$\phi \theta_{i}^{\nu} \nu \omega$（Ion．） 69.
$\phi \theta_{\imath \imath}^{\nu} \nu \omega$ 124， 465.
ф $\begin{aligned} & \text { ícis } 262 .\end{aligned}$
$\phi \theta_{\text {ITós }} 258$.
фӨорӑ́ 236.
фÓ́óos 236.
$\phi \iota \in ́ \lambda \eta 74$.
$\phi \iota \lambda \epsilon ́ \epsilon \sigma \kappa \epsilon$（Ion．） 469.
фi入́́ 6 6，12，80， 128 ， $482-3,485,497,527$, 540.

фı $\lambda \eta \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma о \mu a \iota ~ 501$.
філ ${ }^{\prime} \rho \epsilon \tau \mu$ оs 289.
фı $\lambda \bar{\eta} \sigma a \iota 547$.
ф८え $\eta \sigma \sigma \omega 49$.
$\phi \iota \lambda \eta \tau o ́ s ~ 483,497$.
філoín 537.
 232.

фí入os $40,482,485$.
філо́бoфos 38 note．
фı入ótグs 284.
філоти́бוos 237.
$\phi \iota \lambda о \psi \in \cup \delta \eta^{\prime} s 366$.
філтатоs 258.
$\phi i \lambda \omega s 565$.
фіртатаи（Dor．） 133.
фítv 124， 482.
фїт́v́㇒ 482， 488.
$\phi \lambda \epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \theta \omega 475$.
флє́ $\gamma \mu а 273$.
$\phi \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \omega 475$.
флє́ч 205，234，316， 342， 343.
$\phi \lambda$ д́vaфos 249.
ф入ó $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ еоs 237.
ф入ó $\mathbf{\gamma}$ ıvos 243.
ф入оү $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ ós 239.
ф入óg 234， 342.
фовє́oдая 205 note 2， 497.

фоßєрós 248.
фо乃є́ف 128， 205 note 2， $485,497$.
фóßos 236， 497.
фоィßá㇒ 484.
фoîßos 484.
фоьขض́fis 276.
фoivis 129 note 2.
фoìvoनa 129 note 2.
фоעєús 268.
фovéve 489.
фóvos 65，209， 236.
фoĝivos 244.
форӑ 236.
форєús 268.
форє́ш 29，96，128，268， 424， 497.
фо́ $\eta \sigma$ тs 262.
форŋтós 268， 497.
фо́р $\mu \succ \xi 285$.
фориós 239.
фópos 82－3，97，236， 497.

фо́pтos 258.
$\phi \rho a ́ \gamma \nu \bar{v} \mu \stackrel{163 .}{ }$
фрaón＇s 279，366， 373.
фра̧̧́ 429.
$\phi \rho a ́ \sigma t s 262$.
$\phi \rho a ́ \sigma \sigma \omega 478$.
фрa⿱宀⿻三丨口и́s 266.
ф $\rho \bar{a} \tau \eta \rho$（Dor．）50，162， 236，278，359， 360.
$\phi \rho a ̈ т \rho a ̈ 236$.

ф $\rho a ̈ ́ \tau \omega \rho$ 33，278， 359. ф $£ \in$ éa 37 I． ф $\rho$ éves $64,65$.
фрє $\frac{1}{} \mu a \nu \eta$＇s 289.
ф $\eta_{\eta}^{\nu}$ 13，89，92，96， 269， 345.
фрїкך 236. ф $\rho \stackrel{\xi}{\xi}$ 234， 236.
ф $і$ í $\sigma \sigma \omega 478$.
ф $\rho$ ov̀óos 219.
ф oovpà 219 ．
ф $\rho \tilde{v} \nu \eta 24 \mathrm{I}$. $\phi \rho u ̂ v o s ~ 24 \mathrm{I}$ ． фúzaঠ́ 569. фuyás 285. фvүүávш 466. фúүба 559. $\phi u \gamma \in i v ~ 83, ~ 89, ~ 456 . ~$ фи́yєбкє（Ion．） 469.
фи́ $\gamma \epsilon \sigma \kappa о \nu$（Ion．） 530.
фuyń 236.
фúşa 322.
фvíw（Lesb．） 478.
филакт $\eta \rho 278$.
фúえa $\underset{\text { E 298，}}{ }$ 316， 343.
фu入á $\sigma \sigma \omega 522$.

ф $\bar{u} \lambda \dot{\eta} 247$.
фúдло⿱ $66,129$.
фù̀ov 247.
фúdomis 343.
фv́ǵıиоs 239.
$\phi \bar{v} \rho \omega 478$.
фū $a \hat{\nu} \nu r \epsilon s$（Boeot．） 80.
фӣ $\sigma i \zeta o o s ~ 289$.
фиन
фvбıo入ó $\mathbf{y}$ os 229.
фи́бıs 87，97，169， 262.
фи́бонаı 422.
$\phi \bar{v} \sigma \omega 422$.
фитóv 258.
фúف 478.
$\phi \omega \nu a ̂ \nu \tau a$（Dor．） 80.
ф $\omega \nu \dot{\prime}$ ท2，83， 96.
фஸ́р 82，92，96，97，234， 359.

ф＇́plos 237.
$\phi$ ôs $40,166,365$.
$\chi$ व́گораı 478.

хаєр $\sigma \omega \omega 499$.
хаірш 67，424，458， 481．
$\chi^{\text {a }}$ após 289.
$\chi^{a \lambda \in \pi o ́ s} 473,485$.
$\chi^{a \lambda \epsilon \pi \tau u ́ s} 266$.
$\chi^{\text {алє́ттн 129，473，} 485 .}$

$\chi$ ব́лкеเos 237.
$\chi^{a \lambda \kappa \epsilon ข ́ \omega ~} 489$.

$\chi$ дако́s 201.
Ханаí 193，304，346， 561．

$\chi^{\frac{a}{a} \nu}$（Dor．） 69.
$\chi^{\alpha \nu \delta a ́ ~} 559$.
$\chi^{\text {avóáv }}$ 201， 466.
харádєos（Heracl．gen．） 73.

ұарŋ̆ขaı 88.
$\chi$ apiets 12，69，230，276， 298－301，308，322， 356， 357.
харเєขто́тทs 284.
харІ́́итшs 565.
$\chi$ хрі́єбба 235.
ұарı́́⿱㇒木татоs 356.
$\chi$ хаıı́́лтє $\rho$ os 254，356， 376.

Ха́рьд 559.
ұápıs 88，285，343，481． ха́р $\quad 239$.
$\chi$ र́́Sळ 500.
$\chi$ єí̀ьo 44 note 1,69 ， 215，237， 388.
хєіра 273.
$\chi \in \iota \mu \in \rho \iota \nu o ́ s 241$ ．
$\chi \in \varphi \omega \dot{\omega} 24$, 193， 273.
xєí 294， 362.

 378.
$\chi \epsilon i \rho \omega \nu(\chi \epsilon \rho \epsilon i \omega \nu) 378$.

$\chi \bar{\chi}$ 入ıot（Lesb．） 44 note I，69， $215,388$.
$\chi \bar{\lambda} \hat{\lambda} \bar{\nu} s 237,267$.
$\chi$ х́радоs 73.
хєри́о́ठод 237.
$\chi \epsilon ́ \rho \nu \eta s 285$.
хє́ $\rho \sigma$ оs 373.
$\chi \in \sigma$ ой $\mu \iota{ }^{2} 500$ ．
$\chi \in \hat{\nu} \mu a 273$.
$\chi \neq \omega$ 24，89，115， 115 note，193，498， 51 II ， 526.

хク̣ィぇо七（Dor．） 388.
Хंท 69，193，216， 347.
$\chi \grave{\eta} \rho o s 248$.
$\chi$ ұaцa入ós 247.
$\chi$ もés 44 note I， 559.
$\chi \chi_{\iota}$ 亿́óv 559.
$\chi \chi_{1}$ Sós 44 note 1 ．
$\chi^{\text {Góndos }} 237$.
$\chi \theta \dot{\omega} \nu$ 141，226，230，234， 287， 346.
$\chi$ đī̀ákıs 394.
$\chi^{\dot{t}} \lambda_{\text {ıo }} 44$ note $\mathrm{I}, 388$.
$\chi$ đ̄̀七oбтós 393.
$\chi^{i \lambda \lambda} \lambda \iota \sigma \tau u ́ s 266$.
$\chi^{i} \mu$ ароs 248.
$\chi$ 七ஸ́ $141,193,230,234$ ， 346.
$\chi^{\lambda} \iota \in \rho$ ós 74.
$\chi \lambda \omega$ рós 248.
хоа́v 79.
रóavos 79.
Xódavos 242.
$\chi \circ \rho \stackrel{\iota}{\nu} \eta 244$.
хоьі́ткоs 253.
$\chi$ оípos 248.
रóos 122， 236.
Хо́ртоз 258.
$\chi$ хаілш 478.
х рáo $\mu$ а 115.
хр ұїткоиає（Ion．） 470.
хр $\bar{\mu} \boldsymbol{\mu} 273$.
$\chi \rho \eta ̣ \nu 430$.
$\chi \rho \eta \dot{\sigma} \iota \boldsymbol{\mu} 239$.
$\chi$ रóvos 241 ．
$\chi \rho \tilde{\sigma} \sigma \epsilon \cos 237$.
$\chi \rho \bar{v} \sigma \epsilon o s 237$.
$\chi \rho \bar{u} \sigma o ́ s ~ 486$.
$\chi \rho \bar{u} \sigma o v ิ s 33$.
$\chi \rho \bar{v} \sigma o ́ \omega 486$.
$\chi \rho \hat{\omega} 478$.
रúסŋン 559.
Xúgis 262.
$\chi$ ข́т入оข 256.
$\chi$ uтós 555.
रúтрıขos 243， 244.
$\chi \omega \dot{\rho} \overline{1} 5,18,51,63,70$ ， 14I，248，298，300， 302，304，305，308， 321.
$\chi^{\omega} \rho \eta$（Ion．） 5 1．
$\chi \omega$ is 558.

廿akás 73.
廿á入Tクラ 258.
$\psi a ́ \lambda \tau \iota \xi{ }^{285}$.
廿á入трıa 322.
廿а́м $\quad$ о 117.
廿aфapós 117.
$\psi \in \kappa a ́ s ~ 73$.
$\psi \in \lambda \lambda i \zeta \omega 232$.
$\psi \in v \delta a \lambda$ є́os 247.
$\psi \in v \delta i ́ s=279,366,373$.
$\psi \in \dot{\delta} \delta o \mu a \iota 174$.
$\psi \in \hat{v}$ ôos 279， 366.
$\psi \in \cup ́ \delta \omega ~ I I O, 509,51$ I．
$\psi \dot{\eta} \lambda \eta \xi 285$.
$\psi \eta ́ \rho 234$.
廿íधOos 74.
廿i $\theta$ upós 248.
$\psi v \delta \rho o ́ s 248$.
$\psi u \theta \dot{\omega} \nu 269$.
$\psi \bar{u} \chi о \pi о \mu \pi$ ós 289 ．
$\psi \omega \rho o ́ s 248$.
$\psi \omega \dot{\omega}$ IO9， 225.

ฝี（Cret．）303， 325.
$\oint$（Locr．）325， 563.
む（Dor．） 563.
ఱో $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$（Ion．） 564.


$\ddot{\omega} \theta$ ove 430.
ढ̈ка 564.
ஸ்кขтध́тทs 289， 32 I.
ஸ̋кús 33，54，182， 264. ต̈ $\lambda \epsilon \sigma a 463,512$.

ต̀ $\mu \eta \sigma \tau \eta \eta^{\prime} 289$.
ஸんоßро́s 285.
${ }_{\omega}{ }^{\circ} \mu \circ \rho \xi а \mathbf{~} 507$.
ఉ $\mu$ оs 216， 294.
$\stackrel{\omega}{\omega} \mu \sigma \sigma \alpha 463,510,512$.
$\stackrel{\Phi}{\omega} 24$.
${ }_{\omega}{ }^{2} \nu 54$ ．

ш̀є́одаи 128.
ఉ̀ท́ 241．
ఱュó $\mu \eta \nu а$ 216， 508.
${ }^{6}{ }^{2} \operatorname{DOS} 24 \mathrm{I}$ ．

む̄ра̄б८ 321， 562.
$\omega \quad$ ఉ $\boldsymbol{i} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \theta \eta \nu 430$.
${ }_{\omega}^{\omega} \rho \in \xi a \mathrm{a} 507$.
${ }_{\omega}^{\omega} \rho \theta \omega \sigma a 430$.
${ }_{\omega}{ }^{\omega} \rho о \rho о \nu 457,505$.
ढן $\rho \sigma a$ 217，221，507， 509， 51 I．
борто 221， 507.
ف̀ $\rho \bar{\delta} \delta o ́ v 259$.
бта 80.
$\omega \phi \epsilon \lambda \lambda o \nu$（Hom．） 430.
䚿 92，96，234， 342.

## CORRIGENDA．




[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ In Greek Philology.

