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PREFACE

Since Corssen's great work (last edition, Leipzig, 1868-70), there has been no book devoted to a separate investigation by Comparative Philological methods of the Latin Language, its declensions, its conjugations, its formation of the various parts of speech, and the changes of its pronunciation and orthography, if we except the short summary (last edition, Nördlingen, 1889) written by Professor Stolz for the Iwan Müller Series of Handbooks of Classical Antiquity. And yet the additions to our knowledge of the subject since Corssen's time have been very great. Not only has the whole Science of Comparative Philology been, by the help of men like Johannes Schmidt, Osthoff, and Brugmann, set on a sounder basis, but a vast amount has been added to our knowledge of the Early Latin authors, especially Plautus, of the Umbrian, Oscan, and other dialects of ancient Italy, of Romance, and above all of the Celtic family of languages, a family closely united with the Italic group. The time has surely come for a new treatment of the subject, such as I venture to offer in the ten chapters of this volume.

I should have liked to have added to them a fuller discussion of the relation of Latin to the other languages of Italy. But I had already exceeded the generous limits

1 I take this opportunity of acknowledging to the fullest extent possible my indebtedness to Brugmann, *Grundriss der Vergleichenden Grammatik* in chaps. iv-viii, and to Seelmann, *Aussprache des Latein* in chap. ii.
allowed by the Delegates of the Press, and it seemed to me that until more evidence is forthcoming in the shape of dialectal inscriptions certainty can hardly be attained. It is much to be desired that some of the money which is being raised every year for excavations should be devoted to this field of research. The records of peoples like the Samnites, who fought so gallantly with Rome for the rule of Italy, and whose religion and manners so greatly influenced the ruling race, should not be allowed to lie neglected. And yet, while the Latin, Greek, and Etruscan inscriptions of Italy are carefully sought after year by year, there has been practically no organized search for the remains of Oscan, Umbrian, Pelignian, and the rest. I trust that some step may be taken ere long in this direction.

It remains for me to acknowledge with gratitude the kind help which I have had from numerous correspondents, both in this country and abroad, as well as from my Oxford friends, such as my colleague, Mr. E. R. Wharton. My special thanks are due to Mr. Sweet for looking through the proof-sheets of my chapter on Latin Pronunciation, and to Professors Mommsen, Bormann, Huelsen, and Dressel for giving me access to the advance-sheets of the Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum. My friend, Mr. J. A. Smith, Fellow of Balliol College, has been good enough to go over the whole book in proof, and to give me many valuable suggestions, especially on one of the most difficult problems of the language, the formation of the Perfect Tense.

Oxford, August, 1894.
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CHAPTER I.

THE ALPHABET.

§ 1. If an alphabet is to express the sounds of a language properly, each nation must construct one for itself. But this ideal was not realized by the ancient languages of Italy. The Oscan and Umbrian stocks borrowed for the expression of their language the alphabet used by the Etruscans, who had themselves borrowed it at an earlier period from the Greeks; and so neither Oscans nor Umbrians were at first able to express in writing some common sounds of their language, such as $d$ and $o$, which were wanting in the Etruscan speech (von Planta, Osk.-Umbr. Dial. i., p. 44). The Latin Alphabet, consisting in the later Republic of twenty-one letters, $ABCDHGHIJKLMNOPQRSTVX$, was borrowed from some Chalcidian colony (e.g. Cumae), to judge from the form of the letters, which more nearly resemble those of the Chalcidian inscriptions than of any other Greek stock. So few Latin inscriptions earlier than the second Punic War have been preserved, that it is difficult to trace each separate stage in the process of adapting the Greek alphabet to the exigencies of the Latin language. The symbols for the Greek aspirate mutes, $\Theta$ (the $th$-sound of our 'ant-heap'), $\Phi$ (as in

---

1 Hübner's article in Müller's Handbuch d. Klass. Alterthumswissenschaft, vol. i. pp. 492 sqq. 1886, gives a summary of what is known and a list of the authorities.
'uphill'), \( \Psi \) (the symbol for the \( kl \)-sound of our 'inkhorn' in the Chalcidian alphabet, while \( X \) was the symbol for the \( ks \)-sound, Attic \( \Xi \)), were found superfluous by the Latins, in whose language these sounds were unknown, and were retained as symbols for numbers merely, \( \Theta \) for 100 (later modified to \( C \), the initial of \( centum \)), \( \Psi \) (later \( L \)) for 50, \( \Phi \) for 1000 (later \( M \), the initial of \( milles \)), while the right-hand half of the symbol, viz. \( D \), was used for the half of 1000, \( i.e. \) 500, just as \( V \), for 5, seems to have been the upper half of \( X \) (used probably in the Etruscan adaptation of the Greek alphabet for \( 10 \) (Ritschl, \( Opusc. \) iv. 704 and 722; Mommsen in \( Hermes \) xxi. 59). For the \( f \)-sound, the bilabial spirant, a sound which in Quintilian's time was quite unknown in Greek (Quint. xii. 10. 29), the nations of Italy seem to have taken the Greek combination of symbols \( FH \) (digamma with aspiration), a combination found in a few of the earliest Greek inscriptions to express a sound which seems to have been a development of an original \( sv- \) (\( e.g. \) \( \delta \kappa \varepsilon \kappa \alpha \beta \delta \omega \nu \)oe, in the proper name Hecademus, on an inscription of Tanagra (Röhl, \( Inschr. \) Gracc. 131), and which may have been at that time some adumbration of the \( f \)-sound. This double letter \( FH \), which we find in a very old Latin inscription on a brooch found at Praeneste with \( FHEFHAKED \) (=\( fecit \)) (\( C. I. L. \) xiv. 4123), in the earliest Etruscan inscriptions,\( e.g. \) \( \varphi \)\( \upsilon \)\( \chi \)\( \varepsilon \)\( \nu \)\( \xi \)nas (the proper name \( Fulciniius \)) (Fabr. \( Suppl. \) iii. 306), and in the inscriptions of the Veneti, an Illyrian tribe of N.E. Italy (Pauli, \( Altitalische \) 'Forschungen iii. p. 97 sqq.), was in the Etruscan alphabet reduced to a symbol like the figure 8 (a modification of \( H \), the \( F \) being dropt), while in the Latin alphabet the second element of the compound was discarded, and \( F \) alone was used. The exact course of events which led to the use of the Greek symbol for the \( g \)-sound (in Chalcidian inscriptions written \( c \) not \( f \)), to express the Latin \( k \)-sound as well as the Latin \( g \)-sound, and in time to the almost total disuse of the symbol \( K \), cannot, with the evidence at present forthcoming, be determined (for a conjecture, see ch. ii. § 75). On the very old Dvenos inscription, for example (\( Annali dell' Inst. \) 1880), we find \( FEKED \) (or \( FEKED \) corrected into \( FEKED \)), (\( fecit \)), \( PAKARI, COSMIS (c\( \omicr \))is), \( VIRCO (virgo?) \) side by side. The inconvenience of this practice led in time to the use
of a modified form of the symbol C to express the \( g \)-sound, the earliest example of which is found on the as libralis of Luceria (between 300 and 250 B.C. according to Mommsen), with \( Ga. f. \) (\( Gai filius \)) (LÉdon, Écriture et Prononciation, p. 145 sqq.). It was received into the Roman alphabet at the time possibly of Appius Claudius Caecus, censor 312 B.C., and took the place of Z, the symbol apparently for soft or voiced \( s \), a sound which had by this time passed into the \( r \)-sound (see ch. iv. § 148). The symbols of the Greek vowels \( i \) and \( u \), but also for the \( y \)- and \( w \)-sounds of words like \( jam \), \( vos \), a confusion frequently remarked on by the grammarians (e.g. Quint, i. 4. 10 'iam' sicut 'etiam' scribitur, et 'vos' ut 'tuos'), which persisted till very late times; though on Inscriptions from the beginning of the Empire onwards we often find a tall form of I used for the \( y \)-sound (Christiansen, \( de Apicibus et I longis \), p. 29); and the Emperor Claudius tried without success to introduce a new symbol, an inverted digamma, for the \( w \)-sound.

The third guttural symbol of the Greek Alphabet, Koppa, was retained for the \( g \)-sound of Latin, a sound at first expressed by Q, e.g. QOI (\( qui \)) on the Dvenos inscription, then by QV.

In the second century B.C. the cultivation of literature at Rome, in particular possibly the imitation of the quantitative verse of Greece, led to two usages, perhaps borrowed, the one from the Greek, the other (if not both) from the Oscan alphabet, viz. the doubling of a consonant to express the repeated or lengthened sound (see ii. 127), the doubling of a vowel (\( a, e, u, \) and \( o ? \)) to express the long quantity. The earliest example of the former is the Decree of Aemilius Paulus, 189 B.C. (\( C. I. L. \) ii. 5041), with POSIDERE, &c., besidePOSEDISENT, &c., for all the older inscriptions write the consonant single in such cases; of the latter, the Milarium Popillianum, 132 B.C. with PASTORES. Ennius is mentioned as the introducer of the double consonant, while the practice of doubling the vowel is ascribed

---

1 In Oscan this is normally confined to long vowels in the first syllable. (But tristaamentud, 'testamento').

2 As do the oldest Oscan inscriptions and all the Umbrian inscriptions written in the native alphabet.
by the Roman tradition to the poet Accius, another of whose spelling reforms was the use of _gg_ for the velar nasal followed by _g_ (see ch. ii. § 63). The practice of doubling the consonant remained to the latest times, in spite of a temporary resort in the reign of Augustus to the use of the _sicilius_, a sickle-shaped mark placed above the single consonant, to express its repeated or lengthened sound; but the double vowel was soon discarded in favour of the _apex_, a mark placed above the single vowel, to express length, originally of a shape like a sickle, or like the figure 7, later of the form of the acute accent. The apex was much in fashion till about 130 A.D., when it came to be used at random over short and long vowels alike, but never attained so universal use as the doubled consonant. Long _i_ was indicated by the tall form of _i_¹, a form likewise employed to denote the _y_-sound, and often also for initial _i_ (Christiansen, _de Apicibus et It longis_).

In the last century of the Republic, when Greek Grammar, and even Greek Phonetics, came to be studied at Rome, the necessity was felt for the more exact expression of the sound of Greek loan words, which were more and more entering into the language especially of the upper classes. For the Greek aspirates, which had hitherto been represented by the Latin tenues _T, P, C_, compound symbols _TH, PH, CH_ were introduced; and the mispronunciation of these sounds was considered as great a fault in polite society as the dropping of _h_ is with us (see ch. ii. § 60). The Greek _v_ (earlier represented by Latin _V_), which had by this time the _ü_-sound (see ch. ii. § 14), was now expressed by the Greek letter itself in its Attic form _τ_, just as we use Spanish _ü_ in loan words like 'cañon,' while for Greek _ζ_ (formerly denoted by _ς_, _ςς_, e.g. _setvs_, for _Zethus, C. I. L_. i. 1047, _patrisso_, &c., Plaut.), the old symbol _Z_ was revived. The reforms proposed by the Emperor Claudius, the use of the Greek symbol of the rough breathing for the _ü_-sound (see ch. ii. § 14), of the reversed _C_ for the _ps_-sound of _scripsi, urbs_, &c. (see ch. ii. § 78), of the inverted digamma for the _w_-sound of _vōs_, &c., did not survive his own reign (see Bücheler, _de Ti. Claudio Caesare grammatico_).

¹ Was this too borrowed from an Oscan inscription earlier than Oscan? We have fliet, 'fleint,' on 211 B.C. (_Rhein. Mus._ 1888, p. 557).
§ 2. The Alphabet of twenty-one letters. Cicero (Deor. Nat. ii. 37. 93) argues against the Atomic Theory by showing the improbability of any chance combinations of the twenty-one letters of the alphabet ever producing a single line, much less an entire poem, of Ennius: 'hoc qui existimet fieri, non intellego cur non idem putet, si innumerabiles unius et viginti formae litterarum, vel aureae vel quaelibet, aliquo coiciantur, posse ex iis excussis annales Enni, ut deinceps legi possint, effici; quod nescio an ne in uno quidem versus possit tantum valere fortuna.' This Alphabet, A to X, is often found on coins of the last century of the Republic (e.g. C. I. L. i. 374, c. 100 B.C.); and Quintilian (first cent. A.D.) speaks of $x$ as the last letter of the alphabet (nestrarum ultima, i. 4. 9). But $Y$ and $Z$ are added on some coins (e.g. C. I. L. i. 393. 454, both with $YZ$; 417 with $Y$—all belonging to the last century of the Republic).

§ 3. The letter $F$. That early Greek $fh$, a development of I.-Eur. $sr$, had some kind of $f$-sound is made not improbable by the analogy of other languages. In Old Irish, where I.-Eur. $sr$ between two vowels became (like $sr$- in Greek $peyusa, porodos$), hr, $rh$, (e.g. a 'his' prefixed to struth, 'stream,' is pronounced a rhoe), I.-Eur. $sr$- when preceded by a vowel became $f$, e.g. a fiur, 'his sister' (I.-Eur. *esyo sucesor'), which points to a connexion between $hr$ (v$h$), and the $f$-sound. It must however be added that I.-Eur. $w$- in Irish regularly becomes $f$, e.g. $faith$, 'a prophet' (cf. Lat. vates). A still better analogy is furnished by the Aberdeenshire dialect of Scotch, where the $w$- or $wh$-sound of Scotch 'what,' 'when,' &c., appears as $f$, 'fat,' 'fan.'

§ 4. $X$. $x$, the last letter of the alphabet (Quint. i. 4. 9: 'x nostrarum (litterarum) ultima, qua tam carere potumius quam psi non quaerimus,' was also written $xs$ from early times (e.g. extradd for extra, on the S. C. de Bacchanalibus, 186 B.C. C. I. L. i. 196), especially at the period of the poet and grammarian, Accius (e.g. saxsvm on an epitaph of one of the Scipios, c. 130 B.C., i. 34; proxymemis for proximis, exigitro, lex$u$s on the Lex Bantina, bet. 133 and 118 B.C., i. 197), and is common in the Augustan age and in plebeian inscriptions of a later epoch (for examples, see Index to C. I. L. viii. &c.; exempla Comm. Lud. Sacct. A. 26; and for instances in Virgil MSS., see Ribbeck, Ind. p. 445). Terentius Scaurus, second cent. A.D., condemns the spelling 'nuxs,' 'truxs,' 'feroxs' as an unnecessary repetition of the sibilant element of the $x$-sound. The guttural element is repeated in the spelling $cx$, e.g. vexor for vxor (a misspelling which has led to the corruption vxor in MSS. of Plautus, Class. Rev. v. 293), vxexri (C. I. L. v. 5735). (For examples in Virgil MSS., see Ribbeck, Ind. p. 391.) We also find $xc$, e.g. ivxcta (C. I. L. vi. 14614), and $sx$, e.g. visxtr (viii. 67), all various ways of expressing the same sound (a $c$-sound followed by an $s$-sound), for which we also find a more accurate expression, namely $cs$, e.g. visxtr (vii. 5723). This last combination was used to express the sound in the Etruscan alphabet, the symbol $X$ being retained only as a numerical symbol, for the number 10.

§ 5. $Z$. If we are to believe Velius Longus (7. 51 K), this symbol was found in the Carmen Saliare; though whether the mysterious jumble of letters which the MSS. of Varro, L. L. vii. 26, offer as a fragment from this hymn, coxaludorleo, &c., can be fairly quoted as an instance of Old Latin $z$ is doubtful, for the reading suggests $o$ zeu (Greek & Zeu) more than anything else; and Varro quotes the passage as exemplifying the old use of $s$
(not z) for later r. It is found on coins of Cosa [C. I. L. i. 14 cozano (after 273 B.C.), where the letter should have the ordinary z-form and not the form printed in the Corpus (see Ritschl. Opusc. iv. 721 n)]. The dzenoine of the Dvenos inscription is too doubtful to quote; for the letters may read not only dze noine, 'on the ninth day,' but also die noine, or even Dvenoi ne. This old Latin z seems to have expressed the sound of soft or voiced s (but see ch. ii. § 121), the sound in our verb 'to use'; while our noun 'use' has the hard or unvoiced s. Between vowels in Latin s had once this soft sound, and was presumably written z; but this sound passed at an early time into the r-sound (c. 350 B.C.), to judge from the remark of Cicero, Fam. ix. 21, 2, that L. Papirius Crassus, dictator 415 A. U. C. (=339 B.C.), was the first of his family to change the name from Papisius to Papirius; in the Digests (i. 2, 2, 36) Appius Claudius is mentioned as the author of the change: R litteram invenit ut pro Valesii Valerii essent, et pro Fusisi Furi). Martianus Capella tells us that the letter was removed from the alphabet by Appius Claudius Caecus, the famous censor of 312 B.C., adding the curious reason that in pronouncing it the teeth assumed the appearance of the teeth of a grinning skull (Mart. Cap. iii. 261: z vero ideCreo Appius Claudius detestatur, quod dentes mortui, dum exprimitur, imitatitur). In the Ocean language this soft s-sound was retained without passing into r. The native Oscan alphabet (derived from the Etruscan), expresses it by the letter s, which is also used for the hard s-sound, while the z-symbol denotes the ts-sound; but in the later inscriptions, which are written in Latin characters, z is used (e.g. eizavunc egnamum (in Latin, earum rerum), on the Bantia tablet, c. 130 B.C.). (On the question whether the z-Latin character) of Osc. zicolo, 'dieculus,' represents the soft s-sound or the ts-sound of the letter written in the Ocean alphabet like a capital I with top and bottom strokes prolonged, and in the Umbrian alphabet with the same strokes slanting instead of horizontal, and on the occasional use of the native letter for the s-sound, e.g. Umbr. zefef, 'sedens,' see von Planta, Osk.-Umbr. Dial. p. 71.)

§ 6. The Guttural-symbols. A special symbol for the g-sound, made by adding a small stroke to the symbol C, is said by Plutarch (Quaest. Rom. 54 and 59; cf. Ter. Sear. 7. 15 K.) to have been the invention of Sp. Carvilius Rupa c. 293 B.C., presumably because he was the first to write his name Rupa with the new symbol, as L. Papirius Crassus, dictator 339 B.C., was the first to conform the spelling of the family-name Papisius to the new pronunciation Papirius. The remark, however, of Martianus Capella about the action of the censor of 312 B.C., Appius Claudius Caecus, with regard to the letter Z, whose position in the Latin alphabet was occupied by the new symbol G, suggests that the differentiation of the C and G symbols was the work rather of that many-sided reformer. The exclusive use of the symbol C for the k-sound led to the disuse of the symbol K, which however, thanks to the conservative instinct of the Roman nation, was still retained as abbreviation for the proper name Kaeso, and in a few words before the vowel a, e.g. Kalendae, a common spelling on inscriptions (see C. I. L. i. Index, p. 583), interkalaris, kaput, kalvmnia. Terentius Scaurus, second cent. A. D. (p. 15 K.) tells us that the letter K was called ka, while the name of C was ca, and that these letters themselves had been before his time used to indicate the syllables represented by their names, e.g. krus (for ka-rus), cra (for cera). Velius Longus, first cent. A. D., speaks of some sticklers for old usages in his own age, who in their corre-
spontaneous always spelt karissime with k not c (p. 53 K.) see also Quint. i. 7. 10; Prisc. i. 12. 5 II.; Diom. 424. 29 K.; Cledonius 28. 5 K.; Maximus Victorinus 195. 19 K.; Probus ro. 23 K.; Serv. in Don. p. 422 K.; Donatus, p. 368 K. For spellings with ka in Virgil MSS., see Ribbeck, Index, p. 429; and for similar spellings elsewhere, Georges, Lex. Lat. Worlf. s. vv. Carthago, caput, carus, &c., and Brambach, Lat. Orth. p. 208.) The symbol C was similarly retained in its old use for the g-sound in the abbreviations of proper names, C. for Galius, Cn. for Graecus; just as an old five-stroke form of the symbol M seems to be the original of the abbreviation for the name Manius, later written M with apostrophe. That it persisted in other words also to the beginning of the literary period, we see from the fact that a large number of archaic words, quoted by the grammarians from the early literature, are spelt with c not g, e.g. acetare for agitare (Paul. Fest. 17. 30 Th.). The proper spelling of those obsolete words was occasionally a subject of discussion, e.g. whether pacvnt in the XII Tables, ni ita pacvnt, stood for pagunt (cf. pepigi, pantry), or for pacunt (cf. paciscor); (Quint. i. 6. 10-11; Ter. Scaur. 7. 15 K.; cf. Fest. 330 23 Th.); and probably the μεταφραστήριον of early C to c and g was almost as fruitful a source of error as that of E to e, η, ε, of O to o, ο, ω in the Homeric text. Thus frico, not frigo, may be the proper form of the Old Latin verb, used by Accius frigit suctus (of a bear) Trag. 443 R., &c. (cf. Greek φρίζωσα for φρίκω-ω); déceo (cf. δέκωμαι, προδομάω) of Old Latin degero, 'expectare' (Paul. Fest. 51. 32 Th.). (On the use of C for the g-sound see also Mar. Victorin. p. 12 K. who quotes Cabino, lece, acua; Fest. 242 and 284 Th. &c.: C is invariably used for g on the Columna Rostrata (C. I. L i. 195), an Imperial restoration which probably followed with some fidelity the spelling of the old inscription. The letter Q often takes before u the place of classical Latin e, especially in inscriptions of the time of the Gracchi, e.g. peqynia, qvyare, qvra (for a list of the instances, see Bersi, Die Gattungen, p. 49; though whether Ritschl (Opusc. iv. 492 n, 687), is right in his suggestion that one of the grammatical reforms of the poet Accius may have been the restriction of k to the e-sound before o, and of q to the e-sound before u, is quite uncertain. (For Accius' use of gg for ny in aggyus, &c., yc for nc in ageops, &c., in imitation of the Greek use of γ for the nasal guttural, see below). Marius Victorinus says (12. 19 K.): Q et fuisse apud Graecos, et quare desiderat fungi vice litterae, cognoscere potestis, si pontificem libros legeritis.

§ 7. Y- and W-Sounds: - j and v were not distinguished in Latin MSS. nor indeed in the earlier printed editions. In Italian some writers keep up the old Latin habit of using i for j, e.g. Gennino for Gennajo (Lat. Jarnavius); others use j for -i, e.g. vizj. 'vices.' Even now we generally print the texts of the older Latin writers, Plautus, Terence, &c., with i, u, not j, v, partly to give their language an archaic appearance, but mainly because a large number of words which in the Classical period, or the Empire, had the y- and w-sounds, had in earlier times the sound of the vowels (sometimes of the half-vowels); lāura, for example, is a trisyllable in Plautus, never a disyllable. The minuscule forms v and u are developments of the Y, of Capital, and the U of Uncial writing. The use of the tall I form on Inscriptions for the y-sound has already been mentioned, as well as its use for initial i, and for long i. How far the I-symbol (in ordinary form or tall form) might be employed for -yi- or V for -iv- is very doubtful. Sittl, in Juris. Jahresber. 1891, p. 250, quotes ablire for abvye- (?), vesvvs for Vesuv- (?); cf. Brambach, Orth. p. 94.
On the Monumentum Ancyranum we have iventvitis (3. 5 M.), and in Virgil MSS. invenis, fluitus, exuiae, &c. (Ribbeck, Ind. p. 448). Equally doubtful is the occasional usage in the earlier history of the Latin alphabet of the Greek digamma-symbol (whether in the F-form or in the Etruscan form, viz. an E wanting the middle horizontal line) for the u-sound. Cornutus (ap. Cassiodor, 148. 8 K.): itaque in prima syllaba digamma et vocalem oportuit ponis, 'Fotum,' 'Firgo,' quod et Aeoles tecerunt et antiqui nostri, sicut scriptura in quibusdam libellis declarat) implies merely that some of his grammatical predecessors made a hobby of writing F for v (cf. Prisc. i. 35. 17 H.). The second symbol in the phrase dvenoine on the Dvens tablet may be a variety of this symbol in the later form Dvenoi ne, but it may also be z, oze noine or (most likely) a form of i. (See above.)

Cicero wrote ii to express the sound of the second element of an ï-diphthong before a vowel (see ch. ii. § 55), e.g. aïo, Maiia, Aiiax (Quint. i. 4. 11; Vel. Long. 7. 54 K.): et in plerisque Cicero videtur auditu emensus scriptionem, qui et 'Aiiacem' et 'Maiam' per duo i scribenda existimavit. He mentions also Triaüta, and with three i's, coïllet. Cf. Prisc. i. 393 and i. 14 H., who ascribes the spelling Pompeiiii to Julius Caesar.

On inscriptions we find ïIVs and ïIVs (see Weissbrodt in Philologus, xliii. pp. 444 sqq.), and in MSS. like the Ambrosian Palimpsest of Plautus, eiûs, aiunat, &c. for examples in MSS. of Plautus and Virgil, see Studemund's Apographi, Ind. p. 509; Ribbeck, Prod. p. 138).

In the Umbro-Oscan alphabets, which are derived from the Etruscan, the u-sound is expressed by the digamma, in the form of a capital E wanting the middle horizontal stroke, while V expresses both the u- and the o-vowels (the Oscan alphabet came in time to discriminate the o sound by inserting a dot between the two arms of V). On the question whether Osc. ii and i correspond to ἵ Eur. iy and y in words like Osc. heriadi and heriam, see ch. iv. § 63.

§ 8. Double Consonant. Festus in his discussion of the word solitanurilia (p. 412 Th.), which he derives from taurus, in the sense of κατάνυν, and the Oscan solo- (in Latin fuit), declares the doubling of the consonant to have been a practice introduced by the poet Ennius (239-169 B.C.) into Latin orthography in imitation of the Greek usage (per unum 1 enuntiari non est mirum, quia nulla tune gaminabatur littera in scribendo. quam consuetudinem Ennius mutavitse furtur, utpote Graecus Graeco more usus). The Roman tradition, which ascribes this spelling reform to Ennius, as well as the doubling of the long vowel to Accius, is supported by the dates at which these spellings are first found on inscriptions (double consonant 189 B.C., double vowel 132 B.C.); though it is quite possible that Ennius followed, not the Greeks, but the Oscans, who used double consonants much earlier than the Romans, and to whose nationality he belonged quite as much as to the Greek. We do indeed find a double consonant before 189 B.C. in the spelling hinnad (the town of Enna in Sicily), 211 B.C. (C. I. L. i. 530), which is a mere reproduction of the Greek spelling found on coins, e.g. hennaon (Head, Historia Numorum, p. 119); but even after 189 B.C. the double consonant-sound is often written with the single letter till the time of the Gracchi, when the double letter became the established spelling (see Ritschl, Opusc. iv. 165 sqq.).

The stellicus is only found on a few inscriptions of Augustus' time: Mumsae
§ 9. Signs for long vowels. No instance of oo for o is found on the extant Latin inscriptions, though we have vocum on an inscription in the Faliscan dialect, whose orthography was very like the Latin: præd值 de senatus sententia vocum dedet (in Latin, 'praedor de senatus sententia votum dedit'), Zvetaieff, *Inscr. Ital. Inf.* 70. For  Accius wrote ei (Mar. Victorinus 8, 14 K.), either because the diphthong ei had by this time become identical with the i sound, or in imitation of the Greek orthography (§ 12); for Greek ε had taken the same course as Latin ei, and expressed the same sound as original long i (Blass, *Greek Aussprache*, p. 51). Lucilius prescribed rules for the use of ei and 'i longa'; but instead of keeping ei for the original diphthong, and the single letter for the original long vowel, he used foolish distinctions 1, if we are to believe Velius Longus (56. 7 K.) such as that the double symbol was suitable for a plural, e.g. *pueri* Nom. Pl., the single symbol for a singular, e.g. *pueri* Gen. Sg. (alii vero, quorum est item Lucilius, varie scriptitaverunt, si quidem in iis, quae produceuntur, alia per i longam, alia per e et i notaverunt, velut differentia quadam separantes, ut cum diecremen 'viri,' si essent plures, per e et i scriberemus, si vero esset unius viri, per i notaremus, et Lucilius in nono:—

'iam puerei uenere;' e postremo facito atque i.

ut puerei plures fiat. i si facis solum,

'pupilli,' 'pueri.' 'Lucili,' hoc unius fiet;

item

'hoc illi factum est uni;' tenue hoc facies i:.

'haec illei fecere;' addes e ut pinguius fiat.)

The same absurd reason seems to be assigned for the differentiation of *meille, meillia* and *miles, militia*; of *pilum*, a mortar (Sing.) and *peilla*, javelins (Plur.) in another fragment of Lucilius (9. 21-24 M.).

'meille hominum,' ' duo meillia;' item hue E utroque opus; 'miles,'

'militiam;' tenues i, 'pilam,' qua ludimus, 'pilum,'

quo pisunt, tenues. si plura haec feceris pila,

qua iacimus, addes e, 'peilla,' ut plenius fiat.

Another fragment (or rather two fragments), of more doubtful reading, seems to prescribe single i in the Gen. Sg. of IO-stems, but ei in the Voc. Sg. (9. 17-20 M.):—

(1) porro hoc 'filius Luci;'

feceris i solum, ut 'Corneli,' 'Cornificique;'

(2) 'mendaci' 'Furique.' addes e cum dare, 'Furei,'

iusserseris

(unless we read 'date, Furei,' and make the ei-form Voc. Plur.).

Whether the persistent use of -i in the Gen. Sg. of O-stems on inscriptions is due to the rule which Lucilius supports, or whether it is to be otherwise explained, is hard to say (see ch. vi. § 20). Varro, while disapproving of Lucilius' arguments, seems to have followed his practice, for Ter. Scaurus (p. 1)

1 Or should we call them mnemonic, as opposed to scientific, distinctions, meant to impress the orthographic rules on the memory of the common people for whom Lucilius wrote his book? (see Lucil. 26. 1 M.).
10 K.), after quoting the passage from Lucilius beginning ‘meille hominum,’
go on to say: quam inconstantiam Varro arguens in eundem errorem diversa
via delabitur, dicens in plurali quidem numero debere litterae i e (om. MSS.)
praeponi, in singulari vero minime. But in general the spelling ei on
Inscriptions seems to occur for any i-sound (see the Index to C. l. l. i., and
cf. below, ch. iv. § 34). From the time of Sulla the symbol in use is the tall
I (Christiansen, p 28), though EI shows itself even later, while from
c. 130 A.D. the tall I is used at random for the short and long vowel alike
(Christiansen, p. 29). This tall I may be indicated by Lucilius’ phrase ‘i
longa,’ and even by Plautus’ allusion to the ‘littera longa’ in Aul. 77, where
the miser’s old serving-woman in a fit of despondency thinks of hanging
herself:—

neque quiequam meliust mihi,

Ut opinor, quam ex me ut unam faciam litteram Longam.

(Cf. Ausonius ‘iota longum,’ of a hanging body, Epigr. exxviii. 11.) But the
absence of the long form from the Inscriptions till Sulla’s time makes this
doubtful, especially in the case of Plautus. The remark in the Rudens
(v. 1305) that mendicus has ‘one letter more’ than medicus shows that the
long i of the first word was not expressed by ei.

The reason which induced Accius to use EI, and not II, for the long i-sound
was probably the fear of confusion with a common symbol for E, viz. II, in
which a long vertical stroke is substituted for the three horizontal strokes.
There was a similar symbol for F, viz. I, with a short vertical stroke; both
these by-forms of F and E being probably more used in writing than on
inscriptions, though they are common enough in plebeian inscriptions of
later times, along with a by-form of M with four horizontal strokes IIII.
(See Hübner, Exempla Scripturae Lat. Epigr.).

In Greek inscriptions a double vowel is found perhaps only in the name
Marcus and its cognates. In the second century B.C. the spelling Maapkellos,
Marepio, Maapros is the rule, and it is common till 50 B.C. But the aa is not
found in derivatives where the Greek accent does not fall on this vowel, e.g.
MarpIanov, MapkelIeivos, &c. (Eckinger, p. 8).

In the first century A.D. the use of uu for a seems to have been affected for
a time, for the spelling nuuili occurs on wax tablets found at Pompeii
(Notizie degli Scavi, October, 1887), and uu is often found for a of fourth deci-
nouns in Virgil MSS. (see Ribbeck, Ind. p. 449), e.g. mepus, carrus; also uuus
for suis (cf. Probi Appendix, p. 202. 27 K.). In the Bamberg MS. of the elder
Pliny uus is the regular spelling in the Gen. Sg. and (Nom. and) Acc. Pl. of
fourth dec. nouns (see preface to Sillig’s edition), so that this must have been
Pliny’s own practice (Probus, Inst. Art. 116. 33 K., refers to this spelling).
Lucilius seems to have objected to Accius’ rule of doubling the vowels, at
least in the case of A, which he points out, has the same quality when short
and when long (see ch. ii. § 1); hence a and å, he argues, should be written
in the same way, like Greek å and å (9. 4-7 M.):—

a primum longa, et breuis syllaba. nos tamen unum
hoc faciemus, et uno eodemque ut dicimus pacto
scribemus ‘pacem,’ ‘placide,’ ‘Ianum,’ ‘aridum,’ ‘acetum,’

(On vehemens for vimens, see ch. ii. § 56.)

§ 10. gg for ng. The guttural nasal of English ‘sing’ (ch. ii. § 61) was ex-
pressed before a Guttural by γ in Greek, e.g. ἀγγαλός, ἀγκάλη, and was called by Greek grammarians the 'Agma.' Accius proposed to follow the example of the Greeks, and express this sound in Latin by g instead of n, e.g. 'aggulus' for angulus, 'aggens' for angens, 'iggerunt' for ingērant, 'ageeps' for anceps. (Varro ap. Prisc. i. p. 30 H.: ut Ion scribit, quinta vicecima est litera, quam vocant agma, cuius forma nulla est, et vox communis est Graecis et Latinis, ut his verbis: 'aggulus,' 'aggens,' 'aggula,' 'iggerunt.' in eiusmodi Graeci et Accius noster bina g scribunt, ali n et g, quod in hoc veritatem videre facilé non est. Similiter 'ageeps,' 'ageora.' The Inscriptions offer no example of this spelling (cf. Eph. Epigr. vii. 928); but a trace of its existence is perhaps found in the spelling 'ager' for agger, which the MSS. offer with singular persistence for a line of Lucilius (26. 81 M.; cf. 11. 5 M.). If Lucilius and his contemporaries used gg for ng, they would be forced to use the single letter in words like agger, aggira, &c.

§ 11. New Letters for Greek Sounds: Y, Z, CH, PH, TH, RH. Our name for y, viz. 'vy,' comes from the Latin name for the letter which was 'ui' (Mém. Soc. Ling. vi. 79). Greek ν is often represented by Latin vi, and vice versa, e.g. quinioi for κυνιοί, and Ακυλαι for Aquila (ibid. viii. 188; Eckinger, p. 123). Before the introduction of the Greek letter, Latin u was used in loan-words like tumba, &c., while at a later time i was employed, e.g. cignus; and the Romance forms of these earlier and later-loan words indicate that these spellings represented the pronunciation of the time (see ch. ii. § 28). Y was not allowed in native Roman words (Caper vii. 105. 17 K.), though it sometimes gained a footing through a mistaken idea that a word was borrowed from the Greek, e.g. συλα supposed to be the Greek ἀλη, lympha identified with Greek νυμφή, &c. (see ch. ii. § 28). Greek ζ, if we are to believe the grammarians, was expressed in earlier times by d also (Prisc. i. p. 36: y et z in Graecis tantum modo ponuntur dictionibus, quamvis in multis veteres habe quoque mutasse inveniantur, et pro ν u, pro ζ uero . . . s vel ss vel d posuisse, ut . . . 'Sagunt.,' 'massa' pro Ζάκυνθος, μαάς, . . . 'Sethus' pro Ζῆθος dicentes, et 'Medenti' pro Mezentius) (see ch. ii. § 120).

The earlier expression of Greek θ, φ, χ by t, p, c (e.g. adelphus, Metradati on an inser. of 81 b c. (?)), Not. Sear. 1887, p. 110) remains in words like tus, Greek θός, Poeni for Φοίνικες, calx, Greek χάλιξ (cf. Quint. i. 5. 20 dui indinde servatum ne consonantibus (veteres) adspirarent, ut in 'triumpis'). We find b for φ in Old Latin Bruges for Φωιτες, and in ballaena for φάλλανα, the former of which was used by Ennius, and was still to be found in copies of his poems in Cicero's time (Cic. Orat. xlvii. 160 Ennius . . . 'ui patefecerunt Bruges,' non Phryges, ipsius antiqui declarant libri), while the latter remained in current use. (F was not regularly used for φ till the middle of the fourth century A.D. (Hermes xiv. p. 70), though it is often found on plebeian inscriptions from Severus' time, and even on Pompeian graffiti we have, e.g. Dafne, C. I. L. vi. 686). But as early as 146 B.C. we find th, ph, ch in the dedicatory inscriptions 1 of the Graecizing L. Mummius (C. I. L. i. 546 Corintho (?), 146 B.C.; i. 541 in Saturnians:

ACHAIA CAPTA CORINTO DELIEI
ROMAN REDEIIT TRIUMPHANS).

The importance attached in polite society at Rome to the correct pronunciation

---

1 They may be later restorations.
of these aspirated consonants in Greek loan-words led to their wrong use in native Latin words (ch. ii. § 60), e.g. pulcher, referred to Greek πολύχρονος, a spelling found as early as 104 B.C. on a denarius of Claudius Pulcher (C. I. L. i. 380), much in the same way as 'antem ' (O. Engl. antefn from Gk ἀντεφάνυ through Low Lat.) has come to be written with th, 'anthem.' For Greek initial β, and for -β-, the older spelling was r, rr, e.g. Regiam, Burrus (the invariable form of the name Πάππος in Ennius, according to Cic. Ovat. xviii. 160). The use of rh for initial β was not approved by Varro, who preferred to write 'Rodus,' ' retor ' (Varro, L. L. iii. fr. 57. p. 182 Wilm.).

In Oscan inscriptions similarly Greek aspirates are usually expressed by tenues, e.g. Arkia (for Ἀρχίας), Meelikies (for Μελίκιος Gen. '), and so Pelignian Perseponas, 'Proserpinae,' Gen., but we have also Osc. thesavrei, 'in thesauro,' Loc., &c.

§ 12. Influence of Greek Orthography.—The use of υ for the guttural nasal, advocated without success by Accius (see above), was clearly borrowed from the Greeks. The spelling ei for the long i-sound, and the employment of double consonants, may possibly, as we have seen, have come from the same source. But however natural it may appear for the Romans to have adopted Greek spelling along with Greek terminology in matters of Grammar and Phonetics, there is hardly a single instance of the practice that can be established by proof (see Zarncke's attempt in Comm. Ribbeck, 1888).

§ 13. Syllabic Writing.—The remark of Ter. Scaurus (p. 15 K., quoted above, that k had been employed to denote the syllable ka, c the syllable ce, suggests (unless indeed he is merely alluding to the common practice of abbreviating words by writing only the initial letter of each syllable), that spellings on early inscriptions like LVBS for lubē, on a Marso-Latin inscription (C. I. L. i. 183), may be not really evidences of syncopated pronunciation, but rather traces of an old custom of syllabic writing (see ch. iii. § 14). The syllabaries found on Etruscan inscriptions (e.g. Fabretti 2403 and 450), as well as the use of the dot (like the Sanscrit virama), to indicate those consonants which are not followed by a vowel, in the inscriptions of the Veneti, an Illyrian tribe of N.E. Italy, are perhaps other indications that syllabic writing prevailed at an early period in the Italian peninsula.
CHAPTER II.

PRONUNCIATION.

§ 1. A. In the words 'man,' 'father,' the vowels which we are in the habit of classing roughly as 'short a' and 'long a,' are really very different from each other, and would be phonetically expressed by two distinct symbols. In Sweet's Handbook of Phonetics, while the second is written a, the first is denoted by a combination of the letters a and e, viz. æ, a symbol which implies that the vowel has something of the nature of an E-sound. If we compare our pronunciation of the words 'man,' 'hat,' with the German of 'Mann,' 'er hat,' we see that the German vowel is the same as the a of English 'father' or German 'Vater,' while we might say that our 'man,' 'hat,' 'bat,' have in them something of the sound of 'men,' 'bet.' Seelmann, who classifies the varieties of $A$ as 'normal a,' 'a inclined to an E-sound,' and 'a inclined to an O-sound' (this last being something not quite so definitely an O-sound as the vowel of our words 'all,' 'awe'), is of opinion that the Latin a had a leaning to e rather than to o, and goes so far as to give to Latin a of the Imperial age the æ-sound of English 'man.' This however is not the sound of modern Italian a, e.g. padre, which Sweet now judges to be identical in quality with the a of English 'father,' though, owing

---

1 Seelmann, Aussprache des Latein, Heilbronn, 1885, is the chief book on Latin Pronunciation.
to our smaller use of lip-action in utterance, the vowel has with us what he terms a more 'muffled' sound. And the evidence at our disposal is not at all strong enough to allow us to determine with precision under which class of A-sounds Latin a should be placed, nor yet how far its quality was altered by the consonants which accompanied it, nor even whether it had to some extent a different quality as a long and as a short vowel. On this last point indeed we have some evidence of weight. We can be sure that Latin ā and ā, if they differed at all in quality, did not differ so markedly as Latin ē and ē, į and į, ī and ī. For Lucilius (ix. fr. 4 M), in criticizing the proposal of the poet and grammarian Accius to write a single vowel for a short, a double for a long vowel (thus a for ā, aa for ā), says that the vowel a has the same sound in pronunciation when long as when short, and should be written in the same way, e.g. pācem, plācide, &c., just as the Greeks write ā and ā in the same way, e.g. Ἀρες and Ἀρές (the passage is quoted on p. 10).

And his remark is borne out by the evidence of the Romance languages. In them there are no means of tracing the quantity of a Latin vowel, unless the long and the short vowel differed in quality as well as in quantity. This difference did exist in the case of other vowels, e.g. ĭ and ĭ; and so in the Romance languages Latin ĭ appears as close ē, Latin ĭ as close ī (e.g. Ital. misi for Lat. missī; Ital. beve for Lat. bibit). Latin ā and ā, however, show no divergence in any Romance language; and, when we are in doubt whether a Latin a was long or short, in a syllable long by position for example, we have to refer to some other family of languages, which happens to have borrowed the word at an early period from the Latin. A word like saccus is shown by its Welsh and Breton forms, sach, not to speak of Gothic sakkus, O. H. G. sac, O. Engl. secc, to have had a short a; but this could not have been told from its Romance forms, Ital. sacco, Span. saco. Long a appears in a different guise in Welsh and Breton (e.g. poc, a kiss, representing Latin pācem in the formula of the priest at absolution, pācem do tibi), but not in Romance, e.g. Ital. pace, Span. paz.

The accounts of the pronunciation of a, given by the Latin writers on phonetics, do not much help us to determine the shade
or shades of the A-sound, which the Latin vowel expressed, nor are any of their descriptions free from the suspicion of Greek bias. The evidence to be drawn from the phenomena of the language itself is equally indecisive. It is true that a becomes e in the unaccented syllable (long by position), as anürfex from aurum and facis, and in Early Latin in open syllables too, e.g. übügit, classical übügit, from üb and ügo, an e retained in classical Latin before r, e.g. impéro from pāro. But this was the fate of every short vowel in the unaccented syllable, and not of a alone, so that e was the natural sound which any short Latin post-tonic vowel tended to assume, unless attracted by a following Labial to an O-, U- or Ü-sound, e.g. occüpo from ob and cüpio, testümonium (C. I. L. i. 197, 3) from stem testi- (see iii. 18). Varieties in the spelling of foreign names like Sarüca and Serüca, Delmätia and Dalmätia prove nothing for Latin a. More important is the fact that jä-, jej- seem to have tended to the pronunciation je-, jej-, with open e. Thus Jënnärius became Jënnärius; jajünus is the Plautine form of the classical jejünus. Here the change of a to e was due to the influence of the palatal j (our y) preceding, just as the ü of jünipèrus was changed to i by the same palatal in Vulgar Latin jiniipürus (Probi Appendix, 199. 8 K.) (Ital. ginepro, Fr. genièvre, Span. enebro). No such influence is at work in the mispronunciation stetim for stätim, a Roman cockneyism like London 'keb' for 'cab,' mentioned by a grammarian of the fifth (?) century A.D. (Consentius, p. 392, 16 K.: per immutatior nem fiunt barbarismi sic: litterae, ut siquis dicat 'bobis,' pro vobis, 'peres,' pro pedes, 'stetim' pro statim, quod vitium plebem Romanam quadam deliciosa novitatis affectione corrumpit). This is quoted by Seelmann as a strong argument for his assertion that Latin a had in Imperial times the sound of English a in 'man'; though on the other hand we might argue for an A-sound more inclining to o from Vulg. Lat. *nötare, a by-form of nätare, to swim, which ousted the a-form in Vulgar Latin about 100 B.C. In Plautus' time and later vocare was pronounced like vocare; the o-sound apparently having been produced by the influence of the labial v (our w) (cf. Kødoratos, Kødoratos for Quadrátus on Gk. inscriptions), as e was by the palatal j (our y) in Jënnärius. In one of Phaedrus' fables (App. 21) a man
mistakes the caw of a crow for *ave! ave!* It is worth mentioning that Oscan ū, the representative of Ind.-Eur. O, Ō, and, when at the end of a word, of Ind.-Eur. Ā, which must have had a sound something like our *a* in ‘all,’ ‘awe,’ and which is in those inscriptions which are written in Latin characters expressed by *o* (e.g. *tovto*, ‘state,’ ‘community, Nom. Sing. of Ā-stem; *petiro-pert*, ‘four times,’ Acc. Pl. Neut.), rarely by *u* (e.g. *petiru-pert*), as in Greek characters by *o* (e.g. τωρτο), is yet written by Festus and by Paulus, his epitomator, with *a*. Festus, when he mentions the Oscan word for ‘four,’ writes it *petora* (p. 250, l. 33 Th.); and Paulus gives *veia*, not *veio*, as the word for ‘cart’ (p. 560, l. 17 Th.); though Lucilius, if Festus (p. 426, l. 7 Th.) quotes him accurately, makes *ơ* the Latin equivalent of the Oscan Neut. Pl. suffix in *sollō* (Lat. *lota*),

*uasa quoque omnino dirimit non solo dupundi.*

The evidence then of the Latin language itself points to Latin *a* having had a sound which was liable to influence in the direction of *o* as well as of *e*. Into the modifications of Latin *a* in each several Romance language, it is hardly necessary to enter, for they are as likely to be due to the vocal peculiarities of the nations conquered by the Romans, as to the nuances of sound in the language of the conquering race. French is the language where Latin *a* has been most widely replaced by *e* (e.g. chef, Lat. *cāpīt*, while in champ, Lat. *campus*, though *e* is not written, the preceding guttural has been palatalized); and in Portuguese it is something between the *a* of ‘father’ and the *a* of ‘man,’ though before *l* the sound is more guttural. But in Italy *a* has what may be called the normal A-sound, that of English *a* in ‘father,’ not that of *a* in ‘man.’ It is only in two districts, Emilia (i.e. the Po-valley), and the coast of Apulia, that it has an E-sound, while in some parts of Italy it tends to an O-sound (Meyer-Lübke, *Ital. Gram. §§ 18–21*). Speaking generally, we may say that the influence of a palatal or *r* often changes *a* into an E-sound in the Romance languages (e.g. Corsican berba), whereas an O-sound is produced under the influence of such letters as *l*, *v*, *b* (e.g. *oltro* for Latin *aller* in some dialects of N. Italy), while before *n* Latin *a* is in some
places changed to e, in others to o. So that the evidence, taken as a whole, is rather more in favour of attributing to Latin a a sound which varied to some extent in character, according to the consonant which accompanied it, than of giving it definitely the E-character of our a in 'man.' And in the absence of more definite proof, it will be best, for practical purposes, to use in reading Latin the sound which the vowel bears in the language of the direct descendants of the Roman people, the normal A-sound of Italian padre.

§ 2. Descriptions of the A-sound by Latin phoneticians. The formation of the (Greek or Latin?) sound is described very cleverly by Terentianus Maurus (second cent. A.D.) (p. 328 of Keil's edition), in spite of the limitations of the difficult Sotadean metre (\[-\circ\circ \mid -\circ\circ \mid -\circ - \circ \mid -\circ\]):

\begin{itemize}
  \item a prima locum littera sic ab ore sumit:
  \item immunia rictu patulo tenere labra,
  \item linguamque nesse est ita pendulam reduci,
  \item ut nisus in illam valcat subire voceis,
  \item nec partibus utulis aliquos ferire dentes.
\end{itemize}


§ 3. Interchange of a and e. Delmätia and Dalmätia: Vel. Longus, p. 73 K. placet etiam Delmatiam quoque, non 'Dalmatiam' pronuntiemus, quoniam a Delmio maxima ejusdem provinciae civitate tractum nomen existimatur. On Inscriptions, we have sometimes a, e.g. Dalmat. (C. L. L. vi. 1607), sometimes e, e.g. Delmatia (C. L. L. iii. p. 280) (see Georges, Lex. Lat. Worf. s. v.), jā-, jēs for jā-, jēs:—The Vulg. Lat. name of the month was Januarius (C. L. L. vi. 1708, of 311–314 A.D., and other inscriptions) (see Schuchardt, Vok. i. 185). So in Greek inscr. 'ēpovíaov C. I. G. 9486 (Catana); 'ēpovíaov I. I. S. 62 (Syracuse)], which has developed into the Italian Gennaio (cf. Span. Enero), with open e. Jējānus (with ē according to Ter. Maur. 343 K.), jejentaculum supplanted the older jājānus, jejentaculum, the Plautine forms (A. L. L. 7. 528). Jēnua, for jēnua, is indicated by Sardinian enna, genna, and is sometimes found in MSS. (see Schuchardt, Vok. i. p. 185). Jējānus reappears in late Latin (in the Itala, e.g. Luc. iii. 20), and in Span. ayunar, while the shortened forms jentaculam, jentāre are found in MSS. along with the usual jentaculum, jentāre (see Georges, Lex. Worf. s. v.); and jantare is indicated by Old Span. yantar, Port. yantar. On Vulg. Lat. jecto for jacto (Ital. gettare, Fr. jeter), see I. F. ii. Anz. p. 35; and for other examples of a-e, Georges, Lex. Worf. s. v. Sarapis, serracum, Sēridica, metaxa, Sabadius, and Dict. s. v. Serranus.

§ 4. Interchange of a and o. Nātāre is the form reflected in the languages of those countries which were earliest colonized (Sard. nadare, Span. nadar, Port.
nadar, Prov. nadar), while *nūhāre appears in O. Fr. noer, Raet. nudar, Roum. innotá, Ital. nuotare, which shows that *notare did not find its way into Vulgar Latin till about 100 B.C. *Vocatio is the Vulg. Lat. original of Ital. voto. O. Fr. voit, 'empty,' and vocare, *voc(ụ)us (see Georges, Lex. Wortf.) of Sard. bogare, Span. huceo. Vocalio for vādīlio is found on the Lex Repetundarum of 125-2 B.C. (C. I. L. i. 198: militiaeque eis vocatio esto), and is the spelling of Julius Caesar in his Lex Municipalis of 45 B.C. (i. 206. 93 and 103; vocatio rei militaris). Plautius puns on vocare, 'to be empty,' and vocare 'to call,' in Cas. 527: Fac habeant linguam tuae aedes. Quid ita? Quom ueniam, uocent. Marmor (Greek μάρμαρος) follows the analogy of Nouns in -or. (For other examples of a-o, see Schuchardt, Vok. i. p. 177 sqq., and Brambach, Hufsichjein s. v. Tyngris, and cf. below, ch. iv. § 55.)

§ 5. Anomalies in Romance. Accented Latin a sometimes shows o, sometimes e in Romance from a variety of causes. Thus Ital. chiovo, from Lat. clāeus, shows o by influence of e; Ital. (dialectal) ocre for apre, Fr. ouvrir, hardly point to Vulg. Lat. *operio for apōrīo, but are rather influenced by o(v)ērīo, Fr. couvrir, Ital. coprire; Ital. moneo from Lat. mānecus is due to the synonym tronceo from truneus. Vulg. Lat. *grevis (Ital. greve and grave) may have adapted itself to levīs; mānum, not mātum, the original of the Romance words for apple (Ital. melo, &c.), and is indicated by the pun in Petronius, chap. lvi. (p. 37. 19 Büch.) contumelia . . . contus cum malo (leg. melo). The appearance of e for a in the unaccented syllable, e.g. Vulg. Lat. allecr (with stem alecrv-) for alēcīv- (Ital. allegro, Span. alegre), cerasio- (ceresium and cerasium in Marc. Emp.) from *cēresus for κερας (Greek κερας) in the Romance words for cherry (Ital. ciriegio, &c.) is due to the same law which produced consecvo from sacvo (ch. iii). The mispronunciations felīgo Prob. 212. 4, secratum Mar. Vict. x. 6, are to be similarly explained. (On the variation of Italian ì with I.-Eur. ĕ in words like Lat. pāteo (Osc. pate-) besides Gk. πέτανυμι, see ch. iv. § 61.)

§ 6. E. The evidence for the pronunciation of Latin e is much stronger than the evidence at our disposal for Latin a. In the Romance languages we have clear proof that short and long e had in the parent-speech a different quality, ē being an open E-sound like Engl. 'men,' ē a close E-sound like Fr. été. (Our 'fail,' 'fate' have a diphthong of this close e combined with an I-sound.) These sounds are retained without a change in Italian at the present day in such words as bello (Lat. bēllus) with open e, stella (Lat. stēlla) with close e, though in open syllables in many Romance languages open e has developed to ie (Ital. cirepa, Span. erieba, from Lat. crēpat) (cf. Schuchardt, Vok. ii. p. 328). All this harmonizes so wonderfully with the evidence we can draw from the Latin language itself, and from the statements of the Latin grammarians, as to leave little room for doubt. According to the grammarians long e is 'an E inclining to an I-sound,'
precisely what phoneticians nowadays call ‘close e’ (open e would
be ‘an E inclining to an A-sound’), while short e approaches the
sound of the Latin diphthong æ, which in the Romance lan-
guages is undistinguishable from Latin ë (e.g. Ital. cielo, Span.
cielo, from Lat. caelum, exactly as Ital. criepa, Span. crieba, from
Lat. crēpat). Latin ë and i are merged in the same way in
Romance (Ital. fendo from Lat. finder, like vendo from Lat.
vëndo; messo from Lat. missus, like mesa from Lat. mē(n)sa; all
with close e), being distinguished only in the oldest Romance
dialect, viz. Sardinian (Sard. veru from Lat. vërus, but pira from
Lat. *përa, përum, for which the Italian words are vero, pera), so
that the two sounds must have become very like one another in
quality at an early period of Vulgar Latin. They were not
however identical, for they are clearly distinguished in Latin
loanwords in other languages (e.g. Lat. fīdes, cēra, loanwords of
the second to the fourth cent. A.D., are in Welsh ffydd, ewyr).
And so the probable history of the change of ë to i in unaccented
syllables (e.g. eligo from lego), is that the open e first became
close e, and then passed into i. Italian e in unaccented syllables
is similarly close e, for example, the final e of diece, ‘ten’;
and English speakers of Italian often fail to give this sound
correctly. It is only in the unaccented syllable that we find
i substituted for e in the mispronunciations censured by the
grammarians, pinaria for penaria, pīdato for pedatu, decēm for
decem, &c., though on plebeian epitaphs, and the like, we find
instances of i for accented e, some of which may be a mere
graver’s mistake of dropping a stroke of II, a common way of
writing E. Before another vowel ë seems to have approached
the sound of i, to judge from the frequent confusion of suffixes
like -eus and -ius, -olus and -iolus. Before i, older ei, the ë-sound
was recognized as the correct pronunciation, or at least the correct
spelling, e.g. micēs, miēs, contracted to mis; dīi, diēs, contracted
to dī, dis; iī, iēs, contracted to i, is in Plautus, &c. The con-
trary tendency, to substitute ë for i before a vowel, was a feature
of rustic Latin; and some of these ‘rustic’ forms, especially in
names of agricultural implements and the like, have found their
way into ordinary Latin, e.g. mateola for *matiola (Sanscr.
matyâm). Another dialectal change was to replace ë by i before
rc, e.g. stircus for stercus. The remark of Quintilian (i. 4. 8) that some new letter was required to express the sound of the final vowel of heri, here (in 'here' neque e plane neque i auditur), is discussed in § 16.

In Oscan, as we shall see (§ 14), the short and long E-sounds seem to have corresponded to Latin ē; ē, in being the one open, the other close. A short E-vowel, however, when lengthened by 'compensation' or any other cause, appears to have retained the open sound; for it is expressed by doubling the symbol of the short vowel (e.g. eestīnt, Lat. exstant; keenztur, Lat. censor, censores), and not by the symbol of the long vowel. For Latin nevertheless the evidence points to ē- for ēv, -ē(n)s- for -ēns- having had the close sound; for ēvitat is the instance given by a grammarian (see below) of the close E-sound of ordinary Latin ē, and the Romance and Celtic forms of Lat. mensa, mé(n)sã (Ital. mesa, Welsh mwys, &c.) point to the ordinary ē-vowel. But Vulg. Latin Jēnarius (for Jānarius) is shown by Italian Gennajo (with open ē) to have had the E-sound which is most near a, that is, the open sound. (On ens see § 144.)


> e quae sequitur vocula dissona est priori,
> quia deprimit altum modico tenore rictum,
> et lingua remotos premit hinc et hinc molares,

curiously omits all reference to the difference between short and long ē. There must, however, have been such a reference in some part of his writings, for Pompeius, as we shall see, quotes him as an authority on this very point. Marius Victorinus, whose account always closely corresponds with his, after describing ē as follows (33. 1 K.): e quae sequitur, depresso modice rictu oris reductisque introrsum labis effertur, goes on to say: o, ut e, geminum vocis sonum pro condicione temporis promit. Martianus Capella (iii. 261) has: E spiritus facit lingua paululum pressiore. More valuable are the remarks of those grammarians who give practical hints on the correct pronunciation of actual Latin words. Servius (fourth cent. A. D.) (in Don. 421. 17 K.) is very clear: vocales sunt quinque, a e i o u. ex his duae, e et o, aliter sonant productae, aliter correetae ... e quando productur vicinum est ad sonum i litterae, ut 'meta'; quando autem correetum, vicinum est ad sonum diphthongi, ut 'equus.' (By the 'diphthong' he means ae of aequus, &c.) Cautions against the confusion of 'equus' and 'aequus' occur more than once in the writings of the grammarians. Thus Pompeius (fifth cent. A. D.) says the one vowel-sound is short, the other long (285. 6 K.): plerumque male pronuntiamus et facimus vitium, ut brevis syllaba longo tractu sonet ... siqui
§ 8. i for unaccented ē. Caper (first cent. a.d.) (93. 3 K.) : cella penaria, non 'pinaria,' dicendum; ibid. 100. 23 K. primo pedatu, non 'pidato,' dicendum; Velius Longus (first cent. a.d.) (76. 9 K.) : 'comprimo' quoque per i mako scribi, quamvis 'compressus' dicatur; et e contrario 'decem' audacius dixerim, quamvis inde 'decies' trahatur, quoniam, ut supra dixi, sono usitato gaudet auditus, referring to the form 'decim,' which is found now and then on inscriptions. (For other examples, see ch. iii. § 22.)

§ 9. i for ē in hiatus. The Appendix Probi censure vinia (198. 3 K.), caevia (198. 5), brattia (198. 6), cocia and coccharium (198. 6), lancea (198. 8), sola (198. 10), calcius (198. 10), tinia (198. 19), ballius (198. 23), lintium (198. 31), palliarium (198. 9), fassius (198. 26). Arsim (e. g. C. I. L. vi. 541, of 88 A. D.), horriorum (e. g. vi. 8680, of 68 A. D.), are frequent spellings on inscriptions. Cf. Greek ἱππα, ἱρα from the end of the first cent. A. D.; πελιον in the Edict of Diocletian, 301 A. D.; Poιολοι, Poιωλοι. Vulg. Lat. *mia for mea, &c., is shown by Sard. mia, O. Fr. moie, Roum. mea. Velius Longus (first cent. A. D.) says (77. 16 K.) : nostris auribus placet . . . 'miis' per i, non 'meis' per e, ut Terentius:—

at enim istoe nihil est māgis, Syre, miis nūptiis aduērum.

Our MSS. of Terence have not preserved the old spelling in this passage (Heaut. 699); but that it was a spelling current in the older period we see from meis on one of the Scipio Epitaphs (C. I. L. i. 38, of 130 B. C.). In the Lex Parieti Faciendo (C. I. L. i. 577), a copy of an inscription of 105 B.C., we find the Abl. Pl. ab igneis, aesculneis, distinguished in spelling from Acc. Pl. ab ignes (K. Z. xxx. 500). Similarly ċī, diī, duīs represented the pronunciation, although spelt dei, deis to agree with the other cases, as we learn from Caper (first cent. A. D.) (109. 6 K.): dei non 'diī'; nam et deabus Cicero dixit: igitur deiis ratio, diis consuetudo; and the same must hold of iti, īīs (īīs, C. I. L. vi. 877, time of Augustus; īei, īei, but eos, &c., on the Regulations for the Ludi Saeculares of 17 B. C. (Monumenti Antichi i. iii.) ; cf. Caper 106. 11 K. eam (MSS. iam) semper dicendum, quia nihil est 'iam.' item non 'iamus,' sed eamus. (On the spelling of the Plur. of is and deus see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s.v.) By-

1 But the use of ī may have been a mere usage of orthography to avoid the awkward collocation -eī-, which might be misread as the symbol for the long ī-sound (i. 9), or -cei-, which followed by ī.
forms in -ea and -ia are sometimes differentiated by the subtility of grammarians, a practice very properly censured by Cornutus (ap. Cassiod. 150. 18 K.): vineas per e quidam scribendas tradiderunt, si haee significarentur, quas in agris videmus; at contra per i, vinias, illas sub quibus latere miles solet, quod discrimen stultissimum est. nam neque alium vineae castrenses dictae sunt, quam quod vineis illis agrestibus similres sunt. (For other examples of -ea, -eus varying with -ia, -ius, see Schuchardt, Vok. i. p. 424; Brambach Orth. p. 133; and consult Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. vv. glarea, linea, janues, muscaecus, virgineus, vitreus, gallinaceus, cavea, urceolus, adorea, lancea, oraeae, ostrea, paeua, laeae, lindeo, phaseolus, nauseo, coprea, clocka, hordearius; and Brambach, Hülfsbäcklein s. vv. batleus, sola, tinea, bractea.) They have been explained by that tendency to change i and e in hiatus into consonantal i (γ), which turned litiwm &c. into 'lilyum: área &c. into 'arya,' so that -eus, -eu, -ius, ium were merged in the same sound (see ch. iv. § 63). But they are more easily explained by the tendency to give a vowel in hiatus the close sound (§ 18).

§ 10. 'Rustic' e for i in hiatus. Varro (R. R. i. 2. 14): rustici . . . viam 'veham' appellant. (The Ocean word is vía, the Umbr. vea- and via-); -e0 for -io is common in inscr. of Etruria, Praeneste, &c. (Siti, Lok. Versch. p. 10), e.g. Praenestino filioi (C. I. L. i. 54); the Praenestine form of ciciónia is given by the MSS. of Plautus, Truc. 690, as conea not 'coniá': ut Praenestinis conea est ciconia; in Plant. Most. 48 the MSS. read ádrato 'on garlic.' Charisius (70. 27 K.) censures the pronunciation of 'alii disertí' alevum, dolcém, palleum; the Appendix Probi rejects alevum (198. 18 K.), lilium (198. 19), laneo (197. 29), ostevum (198. 5). [For other exx. see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. vv. alium, ascia, dolcém, folium, lania, ostium, paitium, solium, spoitium; and Brambach, Hülfsbäcklein s. vv. feriaé, lilium, sobíus. Both spongia and spongea were used, the latter being, for example, the normal spelling in the MSS. of Martial (see Georges, s. v. and Friedländer's edition, i. p. 118). Schuchardt (Vok. ii. p. 37) gives a number of misspellings of the kind from MSS. and inscriptions.]

§ 11. i for e. Schuchardt (Vok. i. p. 227) quotes a large number of spellings from inscr. of the fourth cent., and later in which an i appears for é. It is not easy to decide how many represent a pronunciation of i for é (thus Auriílus (third cent.), Cornílius seem to represent that change of é to i before a syll. with i (γ) in hiatus, which appears in fílius, with the ordinary Latin long i-sound (close i, § 14), to judge from its Romance descendants, Ital. figlio, Span. hijo, &c.; on this possible change of é to i, see ch. iv. § 7], how many a pronunciation of i for é (e.g. filíciert?), how many are dialectal (the equivalent of Lat. é is an i-sound in several of the Italian dialects, e.g. Osc. lúid 'lego' ch. iv. § 5], and how many are mere mistakes. In Greek inscr. i for Lat. é is late, probably dating from the time when Greek η came to take the i-sound; but ἀπερία (állaia) is found beside ἀφερία in the second cent. (Eckinger, p. 24). The rare spelling deervít for deervít on an inscr. of 189 B.C. from Spain (C. I. L. ii. 5041) cannot be quoted as an example of the transition of é to i. The use of ei for é in the unaccented syll. in the word impérvator (for impérvator) on the same inscr. suggests that ei in deervít may have been meant to indicate the close e-sound [cf. leigíluis xiv. 2892 (Praeneste), pleib. (Eph. Epigr. i. 9)]. Délírus and débrus are rightly explained by Velius Longus (73. 2 K.), who follows Varro: débrus is the proper form, derived from tira a furrow, while the form débrus is due to a fanciful connexion of the word with Gk. ἄπερια.
(On the comparative prevalence of the two spellings see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v., and cf. App. Probi 198. 19: delirius non 'delerus'); torpido beside torpido (Caper 106. 8 K.) is merely the substitution of a more familiar for a less familiar suffix (cf. grávido for grávido; see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v.), and the same is true of Vulg. Lat. *cēnīnum (Fr. venin), Bizzainus for Bizacinus (App. Probi, 198. 1), *pergāminum (Ital. pergamo, Fr. parchemin), *pūlicininum (Ital. pulcino, Fr. poussin) (-ēnum, -ēnum have been in fact supplanted by -ino- in Romance languages, e.g. Ital. Saracino, Messina, &c., Fr. serin, a canary, if from Silēn), *rācīmus (Ital. racimolo, Fr. raisin), *cēradoinum (Ital. berbice, Fr. brebis), *manītīle (Ital. mantile), &c. (See also Georges, s. v. crūmēna, sēnīnum, sēricus; cf. App. Probi 199. 6: hermeneumata non 'erminomata.')

§ 12. 1 for accented ē (see Schuchardt, Vok. i. p. 329 sqq.). Bēpīnīs for bipennis, censured in App. Probi 199. 6 K. (cf. Quint. i. 4. 12), is due to confusion of pīnna with penna (cf. Caper 100. 17 K.); cārictum beside cārectum (de Dub. Nom. v. 573. 2 K. Virgiliius in bucolicius 'tu sub carecta latebas,' nune caricta), may follow the analogy of sēlīctum, &c., but it is more likely that the true reading here is corica, Plur. of coricum (Nonius 21. 24 M. ?), the original of Span. carrizo. On vīgeo and vīgeo, fītīx and fītēx, fīber and fīber, pīnna and penna, see ch. iv. § 11; and on bēnēcodus and bēnēcodus, bēnficus and bēnīficus, &c., ch. iii. § 37. Sēdā, sēchēda for schēda (see Georges, s. v.) seems to follow the analogy of cēnōd; spīcīo, sīco, &c., of prospīcīo, prōsīco, &c. The use of ē for ī is discussed in § 17. Before ng every Latin ē became by a phonetic law of the language i (see ch. iv. § 8), e.g. tingo, congringo, atingo; and other consonant-combinations may have influenced ē towards the close e-sound or the ī-sound (see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v. Vergilius, Vergīliae, Verginius, hernia, segmentum, Personna, and cf. § 144); dignus has been explained as *de-nus from dōcet, and spellings like frumintium (Schuchardt, Vok. i. 354) may point to a modification of ē like that of ő (ch. iv. § 20) before nt.

§ 13. ā for ĕ. Before re we find a for e in the mispronunciation novarea (for nāvarea) mentioned in the Appendix Probi (198. 34 K.); but forms like awar (ib. 198. 22 and 23), passar (ib. 198. 33), carcar in the Acts of the Arval Brothers. &c. (cf. App. Prob. 197. 32), are better explained as cases of assimilation to the vowel of the accented syllable (see ch. iii. § 33); and calandae, the Vulg. Lat. form of cīlindae [in Greek always kālāndai (cf. Eckinger), Welsh calan, New Year's Day, Mod. Gk. kālānta], may be a i Conj. Gerundive form. (Schuchardt, Vok. i. p. 206 sqq., has collected a list of examples of doubtful validity.)

§ 14. 1. The Romance languages show us that Latin ū, ī differed in quality, like Latin ū, ē. Latin ū, as we have seen, they merge in Latin ē, while Latin ī remains i, e.g. Ital. beve, from Latin bīlet, misi from Latin mīšī. This ī from Latin ī is, of all Romance vowels, the least liable to change. In almost every Romance language it preserves its character unaltered, and resists every influence of neighbouring consonants, so that there is great likelihood that it has remained the same on Italian soil from Roman times till now. Italian si will then exactly repre-
sent the vowel sound of Latin *sic, finito of Lat. finitus. This Italian *i has the close I-sound, like French si, fini, Germ. sie, our 'see' being rather a diphthong, while our *i in 'bit,' 'fish,' 'kin,' is an open I-sound, but, according to Sweet, 'nearer e of "men" than *i of German Kind, bitten.' The Latin grammarians similarly speak of the sound of *i as fuller (plenior) than that of *i, while the latter is 'a sound between e and *i.' They add a third I-sound, which in the Romance languages is not distinguished from ordinary Latin *i, viz. the *i of optimus older optimus, &c., which they style 'a sound between i and u.' The natural inference is that Latin *i and *i differed as Latin *e and *e, the short vowel being open, the long close, while *i before a labial, in words like optimus, had some sound like that of German *ii in schützen, Hütte. This *ii is the same sound as Germ. i of 'Kind,' 'bitten,' modified by labialization, or as it is usually called, 'rounding,' i.e. lateral compression of the cheek passage, and narrowing of the lip-aperture (Sweet, Handbook, p. 13).

The relation of the E- and I-sounds in Oscan seems to offer a close parallel to that in Latin. I.-Eur. *e is in the Oscan alphabet *e, e.g. edum (Lat. édère, esse 'to eat'), estud (Lat. esto); *i is i, e.g. bivus (Lat. vivi, Nom. Pl.). For *e and *i they have the same sign (except that for *e it is often written double to indicate length), a modification of this last, which we conventionally write í, e.g. fiísnam, a temple, Acc. Sg. (cf. Lat. féstus), píd (Lat. quíd). In Greek characters the three signs are ε, ι, υι; in Latin characters e, i, i. Everything points to their e having been, like Latin *e, an open E-sound, their i the close I-sound of Latin *i, while like the Romance languages they have merged close e and open i in one sound í. Whether the íu of Oscan últiumam (Lat. ultimam) indicates the Latin íu-sound is, with the scarcity of material at our disposal, uncertain (see ch. iv. § 23).

In rustic Latin, as we saw (§ 10), í before a vowel was replaced by e, e.g. mateola for *matiola, while in the ordinary language accented *i before a vowel, e.g. dies, seems to have had the quality of long i. It had possibly the same quality in words like audit, where the i, originally long (e.g. audít, Plaut.), has been shortened owing to the difficulty felt by the Romans in pronouncing a long vowel before final *t (see ch. iii. § 49). Rustic Latin
§ 15. Descriptions of the I-sound by Latin phoneticians. The phoneticians describe only the i-sound. Terent. Maur. (329. 179 K.) :

i porrigit ietum genuinos prope ad ipsos, minimunque renidet supero tenus labello ;


§ 16. by Grammarians. The i-sound attracted a good deal of attention from Latin grammarians, and had the honour of being noticed by various rulers of the Roman Empire. Julius Caesar effected the adoption of the spelling optimus maximus, and the like, on State inscriptions; his successor Augustus, we are told, reverted in these forms to the old spelling with u; the Emperor Claudius took a course different from both of his illustrious predecessors, and tried to introduce into the Latin alphabet a new letter to express this particular sound. The statements of the Latin grammarians about the various sounds of Latin i are not always perfectly clear, and must be examined in detail. Quintilian (middle of first cent. A. D.), speaking of the letters wanting to the Latin alphabet says (1. 4. 8) that some special sign is required for the sound between i and u in words like optimus, and similarly for the sound between e and i in words like hère (older héri), sibi, quaéi (older sibe, quase) [cf. nise, ube in Virgil MSS., Ribbeck, Index, pp. 436, 451, nise in Lex Rubria of 49 B. C. (C. I. L. i. 205), and (with ube, sebe, &c.) on late inscr. (see Georges). In the Appendix Probi 199. 16 K.) we have : nescio ubi non nescioceube'] : medius est quidam u et i litterae sonus ; non enim optimum' dicimus aut 'optimum', et in 'here' neque e plane neque i auditur. In another passage he tells us that the change in spelling, optimus, &c., from optimus, &c., was made by the influence of Julius Caesar, a statement repeated by Velius Longus in the passage quoted below, and first uttered, according to Cornutus (ap. Cassiodor. 150. 11 K.) by Varro : Quint. i. 7. 21 : iam 'optimus maximus,' ut mediam i litteram, quae veteribus u fuerat, accipierat, Gai primum Caesaris inscriptione traditur factum. 'here' nunc e littera terminamus ; at veterum comicerum adhuc libris invenio 'heri ad me uenit,' quod idem in epistulis Augusti, quas sua manu scripsit, aut emendavit, reprehenditur ... 'sibe' et 'quase' scriptum in multorum libris est, sed an hoc voluerint autore nescio ; T. Livium ita his usum ex Pediano comperii, qui e ipse eum sequeratur ; hae nos i littera finimus. This example, here and heri, has given rise to some doubt; for we are accustomed to regard heri and heri as differing in quantity, like rare and rari, Tiburé and Tiburé (the e being the Cons.-stem Locative suffix -i, the i being the I-stem Abl. suffix -id,

1 V. i. non enim sic 'optimum' dicimus ut 'optimum.' Perhaps, non enim sincere . . . aut. The reading of one MS., optimum for optimus, is certainly wrong. Cf. Quint. i. 7. 21, 22.
ch. iv). We have herē, for example, in Martial i. 44 est positum nobis nil here praeter aprum, but herī in Terence, Eur. 169 herī minas pro ambōbus uigintī dedi, often shortened by the peculiar metrical law of the comedians by which āvē was scanned as āvē, cāvē as cāvē, &c. (see ch. iii), as in the line, Hec. 329 herī nēmo uluit Sōstratam intro admittere. Some have been led by this into the mistaken idea that what Quintilian is referring to, is that interchange of ē and ī, which we see on old inscriptions in rendering the diphthong ei, e. g. pōrīnme for pōrīnmei, later pōrīmi, on an epitaph of one of the Scipios (C. I. L. i. 32). But, as we shall see from the passages quoted from other grammarians, the phrase ‘a sound between e and i’ is the designation for Latin i in such a word as hominēm; and we may be sure that in Quintilian’s time the word herē, as well as here, would invariably have in the utterance of everyday speech a short final syllable. He tells us expressly of the word are (hāvē) that, although it ought by right to have a long final vowel, being an Imperative of a verb of the second conjugation, like splendē, audē, it was never, except by precisians, pronounced otherwise than hāvē (i. 6. 21). (A fuller account of this shortening is given in ch. iii. § 40.) Velius Longus, who like Quintilian belonged to the first cent. A. D., talks of the ‘elisus sonus’ of the Latin vowel i and, in some cases, of ī, e.g. in 3 Sg. Pres. Ind. of verbs of the fourth conjugation, audīt, &c. (In Plautus and the oldest literature this ī is long. audīt, the shortening having been effected by the influence of the final ī, just as with us the vowel of ‘note’ is shorter than the vowel of ‘node.’ See ch. iii. § 49.) Ordinary ī, as in 3 Sg. Pres. Ind. of the third conjugation, ponīt, &c., he calls the ‘latus sonus,’ while the ī of optimus is ‘pinguis.’ Of this last sound he says that the spelling and pronunciation of ū for ī in optimus, manūbiae, &c., was regarded in his time as old-fashioned and countrified (49 K.): i vero littera interdum elixis est, interdum pinguis, ut in eo quod est ‘prodit’ ‘vincit’ ‘condit’ elixius volo sonare in eo vero quod significatur prodire vineire condire usque pinguescit ut jam in ambiguitatem cadat utrum per i quaedam debeant dici an per u ut est ‘optumus maxumus.’ In quibus adnotandum antiquum sermonem plenioris soni fuisset et, ut ait Cicero, rusticanum, atque illis fere placuisse per u talia scribere et enuntiare, erravere autem grammatici qui putaverunt superlativa per u enuntiari, ut enim concedamus illis in ‘optimo,’ in ‘maximo,’ in ‘pulcherrimo,’ in ‘justissimo,’ quid facient in his nominibus, in quibus aequo manet eadem quaeque superlatione sublata, ‘manūbiae’ an ‘manūbiae,’ ‘libido,’ an ‘lubido’? nos vero, postquam exilias sermonis selectae coepit, usque i littera castigavimus illam pinguitudinem, non tamen ut plene i litteram enuntiaremus, et concedamus talia nomina per u scribere etsi qui antiquorum voluntātes sequuntur, ne tamen sic enuntient, quo modo scribunt; et again (67 K.): variae etiam scriptūm est ‘mancupium’ ‘aecupium’ ‘manubia,’ siquidem C. Caeser per i scripsit, ut appareat ex titulis ipsius, at Augustus per u, ut testes sunt ejus inscripitiones1. . . . relinquitur igitur electio, utrumque per antiquum sonum, qui est pinguissimus et u litteram occupabat, velit quis enuntiare, an per hunc, qui jam videtur eligiuntor, exilium, id est per i litteram, has proferat voces; and a little further on (68. 6 K.): mihi videtur nimis rusticana enuuntiatio futura, si per u exulatorim. Ita tamen existimo enuntiandum, ut nec nimis i littera elixis

1 But the Comm. Lud. Sac. has optimus maximus.
sit, nec, u litteram si scripseris, enuntiationis sono nimis plena. Here his account of the 'sound between i and u' is perfectly clear. {Optimus} had in old times been written and pronounced with a U-sound; but such pronunciation was old fashioned and countrified in his own time, the sound used in polite circles being something between a normal U-sound and a normal I-sound. But the beginning of the first passage, where he discusses the other two kinds of I-sound, is not so intelligible. His examples are evidently carefully chosen synonyms of the third and fourth conjugations; and one cannot but suppose that he meant to contrast the i of prodiit (from prodo), vincit (from vincö), condit (from condö), with that of the third person singular of prodiire, vincire, condire. Keil supplies a sentence between the words sonare and in eo, and reads: exilius volo sonare, si dico ab eo quod est prodere, vincere, condere; in eo vero quod significat prodire, &c. He refers the 'pinguescit' to the sound of ē, not to the ē of optimus, &c., understanding Velius Longus to distinguish ā from ō as 'exilis sonus' and 'pinguis sonus.' These words, 'exilis,' 'latus,' 'pinguis,' unfortunately lack the precision of the terminology of modern phoneticians. They remind us of Lucilius' use of 'tenmare' and 'plenius facere' some two centuries earlier, in a passage not less obscure (9. 14 M.):—

'pilam' qua ludimus, 'pilum'
quo piscant, tenues, si plura haec feceris pila
quaæ faciamus, addes e, 'peila,' ut plenius flat;

whereas a later grammarian, Pompeius (fifth cent. A.D.), uses 'tenuis' and 'pinguis' to distinguish vocalic from consonantal i and u (103 K.): ecce adverte, quomodo sonat u, 'unus,' ecce u vides quam tenuiter sonat. jungite illam ad aliam litteram, et vide quia non sic sonat, sed pinguius sonat, 'vulnus,' 'vanus,' numquid sic sonat 'unus' quando u sola est? non, sed tenuiter sonat. 'Vanus' quando dico pinguius sonus est. numquid dicens 'u-a-nus'? ergo vides quia, si ponantur solae, tenuem sonum habent, si junguntur ad alias litteras, pingues sonant. similiter et i sic patitur. 'itūr,' ecce tenuius sonat; si dicas 'Titius,' pinguius sonat, et perdit sonum suum, et accipit sibilum. (i palatalized.) This confusion of terms must be borne in mind in reading the passage we now quote from Consentius (fifth cent. A.D.?), a passage interesting from its account of the Gaulish and Greek mispronunciations of Latin i (394. 11 K.): iotacismum dicunt vitium quod per i litteram vel pinguius vel exilii prolatam fit. Galli pinguius hane utuntur, ut cum dicunt 'ite,' non expresse ipsam proferentes, sed inter e et i pinguiorem sonum nescioquem ponentes. Graeci exilius hanc proferunt, adeo expressioni ejus tenui studentes, ut, si dicant 'jus,' aliquantulum de priori littera sic proferant, ut videos disyllabum esse factum. Romanæ linguae in hoc ērit moderatio, ut exilis ejus sonus sit, ubi ab ea verbum incipit, ut 'ite,' aut pinguius, ubi in ea desinit verbum, ut 'habui,' 'tenui'; medium quendam sonum inter e et i habet, ubi in medio sermone est, ut 'hominem.' mihi tamen videtur, quando producta est, plenior vel acutior esse; quando autem brevis est, medium sonum exhibere debet, sicut eadem exempla, quae posita sunt, possunt declarare. Consentius hère uses 'pinguis' and 'tenuis' or 'exilis' like Pompeius, not like Velius Longus, while he distinguishes long ē as 'plenior vel acutior,' short ē in hominem as 'a sound between e and i.' What he means by saying that in habui, tenui, ē had the 'pinguis sonus,' must
be that the words were pronounced in his time 'habui,' 'tenuyi.' (Seelmann gives quite a different explanation.)

These three accounts of Latin i, i, taken in connexion with the evidence supplied by the Romance languages, where Latin i has become a close E-sound, while Latin i is invariably close I, give us the right to suppose that the usual Latin i was different in quality from Latin i, being an open I, like Engl. 'bit' or Germ. Kind, while i was the ordinary close I of Italian and other languages; though they suggest the further possibility of there having been a short variety of this latter i in such words as the aaj Sing. Pres. Ind. Act. of the fourth conjugation, prodiit, audii, conaiti, where the i, long in the time of Plautus, was shortened through the difficulty felt by the Romans in pronouncing a long vowel before final -t. Seelmann is of opinion that this short variety of close i came gradually to replace open i in the language of the educated classes at Rome in the first centuries of the Empire (postquam exilitas sermonis delectare coepit, Vel. Long.), and so explains the strange statement of the fourth century commentators on Donatus, quoted in our discussion of the sound of e (§ 7), that i, i, with n, n, were not distinguished like e, i, o, o; though Consentius a century later enlarges on this very distinction in the case of i. It is more probable that these commentators, though they refer to some Latin instances (meta, demens, equus), are really quoting remarks of Greek phoneticians on the sounds of Greek vowels, designed to explain the presence of separate signs for long and short e and o in the Greek alphabet (e, o, o, o); and, if this be so, it cannot but suggest the alarming suspicion that their phrase, 'i is like the diphthong, i like i,' may really mean that Greek e had the sound of a (as was the case in Attic Greek by the second cent. A. D.), o of e (the itaism of modern Greek. Blass ascribes the change of a to i to the fifth cent. A. D.).

To pass to the ü-sound of optimus, which in the Romance languages is merged in ordinary Latin i. The statements of the grammarians we have quoted, particularly that of Velius Longus (49 K.), show us clearly that in the first century A. D. the vowel had a sound between u and i, having had at an earlier period a U-sound. Still earlier it was an o (see ch. iii. § 18), and we may regard it as the sound which ü (whether originally o or u or a, &c.) took in open syllables after the accent, when influenced by the presence of a labial; whereas accented ü remained, e.g. cibo. The passage which we now quote from Velius Longus extends the same sound to i in accented syllables influenced by the labial sibilant r, as in vir, virtus (75 K.): 'aurifex' melius per i sonat quam per u. at 'aucupare' [et aecupium] mihi rursus melius videtur sonare per u quam per i; et idem tamen 'aucipis' malo quam 'aucupis,' quia scio sermonem et decori servire et aurium voluptati. unde fit ut saepe aliud scribamus, aliud enuntiemos, sicut supra locutus sum de 'vio' et 'virtute,' ubi i scribitur et paene u enuntiatur. unde Ti. Claudius novam quandam litteram excoxitavit similem ei notae quam pro admissione Graeci ponunt, per quam scriberentur eae voces, quae neque secundum exilitatem i litterae, neque secundum pingui-tudinem u litterae sonarent, ut in 'vio' et 'virtute,' neque rursus secundum latum litterae sonum enuntiaretur, ut in eo quod est legere, scribire. In the last words he seems to refer to i of the third conjugation, legitimus, legiti, &c., the sound of which he calls 'latus' as opposed to the 'exilis sonus' of i, and the 'pinguis sonus' of i/u; and this confirms our view that in the passage first quoted from him, the same threefold distinction was
explained between prodit of third conj. with 'latus sonus,' prodit of fourth conj. with 'exilis sonus,' and optimus with 'pinguis sonus.' There are a large number of references to this i/u sound (see Seelmann, p. 203). Of these we need only quote two; one from Marius Victorinus (fourth cent.), who points out that this vowel is really the Greek u (Latin y) (see § 28); and one from Priscian, who, like Velius Longus, gives this sound of Greek u to accented i influenced by a preceding v. Mar. Victor. 19. 22 K. sunt qui inter u quoque et i litteras supputant deesse nobis vocem, sed pinguius quam i, exilium quam u. sed et pace eorum dixerim, non vident y litteram desiderari: sic enim 'gylam,' 'myserum,' 'Syllam' (MSS. syllabam), 'proxy- mum' diecant antiqui. sed nunc consuetudo paucorum hominum ita loquentium evanuit. ideoque voces istas per u (vel per i) scribite. The spelling myserum, which is found on some inscriptions, may be explained by Greek μυσάρος, just as silva was spelt sylva through a fanciful connexion with ðæ, and so Sylla for *Syrla (cf. App. Probi 197. 26 crista non 'crysta'); but it is difficult to explain gylā (for gylā) in the same way. All the Romance languages point to gula as the Vulgar Latin form (Ital. Span. gola, Fr. gueule). The 'antiqui' alluded to are merely former grammarians, whose innovation in spelling met with little favour, to judge from the instances found on inscriptions (Schuchardt, Vok. ii. pp. 197 sqq., 218 sqq.). Priscian i. 6 i et u vocales, quando mediae sunt, alternos inter se sonos videntur confundere, teste Donato, ut 'vir,' 'optimus,' 'quis'; et i quidem quando post consonan- tem loco digamma functam Aeolici nonitur brevis, sequente d vel m vel r vel t vel x, sonum y Graecae videtur habere, ut 'video,' 'vim,' 'virtus,' 'vitium,' 'vix.' Schuchardt, Vok. ii. p. 221, gives a few examples of vy- for vi- in late inscriptions; and in the Appendix Probi (198. 20 K.) we have: viro non 'vyr,' virgo non 'vyrgo,' virga non 'vyrga,' so that the existence of this tendency to pronounce accented i as ù after v can hardly be doubted. (The Latin name for y, Greek υ, was 'ui.' See below.) But Greek v does not represent Latin i in this position on Greek inscriptions. Other examples of accented i/u are sīmus, written for sīmus by some purists of the Augustan age (Mar. Victor. 9. 5 K. Messala, Brutus, Agrippa pro sumus 'símus' scripturum), and by Augustus himself (Suet. Aug. 87) (cf. C. I. L. ix. 3473. 14); libet and libet; clipeus and clipeus (see Georges, Lex. Worff. s. vv.); though two of these, símus and libet, might be explained as enclitic words and so wanting the accent, e. g. amati- sumus, libet-ire, quodlibet, &c. (see iii. 12.) (See also Georges, Lex. Worff. s. vv. Brutti, cliens (earlier cluen), tinter, scruptus.) The Romance forms point to both sīmus (e. g. Fr. somme) and símus (e. g. Ital. siamo from *semo, O. Roum. se mo). Supparum, with byform siparum (see Georges s. v.) seems to be an Oscan word (Varro, L. L. v. 131), and the mispronunciations 'imibicus' (Prob. App. 198. 4 K.; cf. Ir. imblíu), 'scoriscus' (ib. 198. 32 K.), 'arispe' (Vel. Long. 73. 9 K.) have been variously explained.) (On the ù-sound, see Parodi in Studi Italiani, i. 385.)

§ 17. Interchange of i and e. The misspellings on inscriptions testify abundantly to the close relation between i and e (close e), e. g. kavessemo merentessemo (C. I. L. ii. 2997) (see Schuchardt, Vok. ii. pp. 1-67); but i is rarely written e except in Gaul and Britain, where ù too appears as u. In rustic Latin indeed such words as spica were pronounced spēca (Varro, R. R. i. 48. 2); but it is not clear whether this was not confined to words which originally had the diphthong ei (cf. vellu, Varro, R. R. i. 2. 14). If so, the e is that dialectal e for
I.-Eur. ei which is found in the Umbrian language, e.g. prevo- (Lat. præcus, privatus; Osc. prȋvatu.), and in various parts of Italy. Demidius for dimōdius (App. Prob. 198. 27 K.) is due to confusion of diē with diē (dis) [cf. demōdius, C. I. L. vii. 140; x. 3428; and in MSS. (see Schuchardt, Vok. ii. 71). Fr. demi]; Serva for Svirna (App. Prob. 199. 16) to confusion with dērēnu (cf. Fr. serin, canary ?). On dērēnu and dēsērēnu, see ch. iii. The vowel of the open unaccented syllable was in Old Latin ē, not i (see iii. 18; and this ancient sound remained in Rustic Latin. So that ĕ for i of hominem, &c., as well as ĕ for i of spēca, &c., and ĕ for i in hiatus of via, &c., characterized the pronunciation of the country districts. Cicero often alludes to the ‘rustic’ substitution of the e- for the i-sound in the utterance of his friend L. Aurelius Cotta, the author of the famous jury-law, the Lex Aurelia Judiciaria of 70 B. C.: quare Cotta noster, cujus tu illa lata, Sulpici, nonnumquam imitatur, ut iota litteram tollas et e plenissimum dicas; non mihi oratores antiquos, sed messores videtur imitari. (de Orat. iii. 12. 46. Cf. iii. 11. 42; Brut. xxxvi. 137; lxxiv. 259; and Quintilian xi. 3. 10).

The frequent occurrence on Greek inscriptions of ε for Lat. i (e.g. Τεθεός, λευτής) may point to Greek ē having had (unlike Latin ē) the close E-sound (see Bluss, Aussprache des Griechichen, p. 23). But it may often be merely a retention of the early Latin spelling, of the form in which the word was first borrowed by the Greeks. This ē for i is the usual spelling in κοπεῖνον at all periods, while Καυκάσης is replaced by Καυκάς after 50 B. C., Κατεστάλιον by Κατεστάλων in the first cent. A. D.; Λευκάδος is the form of the Republican, Λευκόδωρ of the Imperial Age. (For other examples see Eckinger, p. 29 sqq., and for examples of i e in Latin, Georges, Lex. Wortf. s.vv. gillo, habiscum, minus, minister, sinus, sine, sinapi, vindica, comissor, solidus. On the late Lat. emitari, see Schuch. Vok. ii. 20, and cf. Prob. App. 199. 2, and 198. 22 K.)

§ 18. i in hiatus. The Romance forms of the word for day (Ital. di, Sard. die, Span. dia; O. Fr. dî) have all i, which is the normal representative of Latin i; and on inscriptions we have sometimes the lengthened form of the letter, which usually denotes long i, e.g. dîes (C. I. L. vi. 7527); dîe (10239, also prîvesquâ). (On dîvs see § 143.)

§ 19. Anomalies in Romance. Ital. freddo, Fr. froid, from Lat. frigidus, point to *frîddus, from frîg, ɪdus (cf. App. Probi 198. 3 K. frigida non frigida), where the i has been referred to the analogy of rigidus (but see § 127); *sîlēm replaces sīlēm in Celtic countries (Fr. loir, O. Prov. glīs), but not elsewhere (Ital. ghīro); Vulg. Lat. *sâbīlo, *sâfilo, beside sībīlo, *sīfīlo, to whistle (e.g. Ital. sulīfare, subillare, siblare, O. Fr. subler, sifler), have been explained by reference to sūflare, or to sūbulo, the Etruscan word for a fluteplayer; Greek i in χιρήμα is treated like Latin i in Fr. chôme, Ital. cresma.

§ 20. O. Having discovered that Latin ē is open E, Latin ē close E, we are almost entitled to infer that Latin ḏ will be open O, Latin ḏ close Ō. For each language has what phoneticians call a ‘basis of articulation,’ according to which all its sounds are regulated; and if one set of sounds is treated in a particular way, any set of corresponding sounds is likely to
receive a similar treatment. The Teutonic languages, for example, changed the I.-Eur. Aspirate Mediae to voiced Spirants ( dł to ȳ, the sound of our ɪh in 'this,' &c.). They correspondingly moved the Tenues to unvoiced Spirants (t to th of 'thin,' &c.); and similarly the Mediae to Tenues (d to t, &c.), a movement or gradation of sounds first discovered by Grimm, and known as 'Grimm's Law.' From detecting one sound in a language, we are thus often able to guess what other sounds will be; and we could in the absence of other evidence infer the quality of the O-sounds in Latin from that of the E-sounds. Evidence, however, is not wanting. The Romance languages, for example, show Latin ò as open O, Latin ò (with which Latin ò is merged) as close O. This open O is in many languages developed in open syllables to no (e.g. Ital. ruota, from Lat. rúta), as open E to ie (§ 6), while in Spanish no has further developed to ne (e.g. rueda), a change that reminds us of the substitution of ve- for vo- in Latin words like verto, older vorto. In Italian we have molle (with open O) for Latin mollis, sole (with close O) for Latin sōl, sōlem, the open O having the O-sound of German voll, Stock, the close that of German so, Fr. chaud. Our 'short o' in 'stock,' 'folly,' is a 'lower' sound, formed with the tongue lower in the mouth, than the open O of German (our O-sound in 'oar' is nearer this), while our 'long o' in 'so' is a diphthong.

In unaccented syllables in Latin open O, before a Labial or l, seems, like open E before other consonants, to have become close, and then to have passed into a U-sound, as e into an I-sound, e.g. sēlūō from sē dōlō, consūlo (Early Lat. cosol-). In Italian, ò, like ē, takes the close sound in syllables after the accent. This u, as we saw (§ 14), might sink to i, e.g. consilium; but as a rule o is retained in the spelling of compounds more persistently than e, e.g. accolo,a grēcola (agricula, Schuch. ii. 133). Even when accented, ò seems to have had the close sound before certain groups of consonants, such as l with another consonant (not ll), m or n with another consonant, vn, &c., to judge from such varieties of spelling as Old Latin Colchides for Colchides (Quint. i. 4. 16), Old Latin and Rustic Latin frundes for frondes, Vulg. Lat. turtuus for borus; and this is confirmed by the misspellings on plebeian inscriptions, and the like (collected by Schuchardt, Vok. ii. pp. 114,
&c.). In Celtic countries u is often found on Latin inscriptions instead of ŏ, e.g. nepus (for nēpōs). (C. I. L. xii. 5336.)

The O-sounds of the Osca language offer the same analogy to the Latin, as the E-sounds (§ 6). The Osca alphabet, being borrowed from the Etruscan, had originally no sign for o, but only the sign for u. This u-sign was used for ŏ as well as for u, while for ŏ a modification of the sign was used, conventionally written by us ú. In Latin characters u expresses Osca u, and o Osca ú, though in the final syllable before a labial u sometimes takes its place [e.g. Osc. estd, in Latin writing estud (Lat. estō, older estād), Osc. pūd, in Latin writing pod (Lat. quīd)], Osc. deikum, in Latin writing deicum (Lat. dicėre, older dieicere), and dolum, dolum (Lat. dōtum). In Greek characters Osca u is ov, and sometimes o, Osca ú is o. This Osca ú, as was noticed before (§ 1), represents I.-Eur. final Ā of Nom. Sg. of Ā-stems and Acc. Pl. Neut. of O-stems, and can hardly have been anything but some form of open O.


igitur sonitum reddere cum voles minori,
retrorsus adactam modice teneto linguam,
rietu neque magno, sat erit patere labra.
at longior alto tragíeum sub oris antro
molita rotundis acuit sonum labellis.

This 'tragic tone in the mouth-cavern' of ŏ is perhaps more applicable to Greek ω, which was open O (Blass, Aussprache des Griechischen, p. 26), than Latin ŏ, and the whole description is possibly, as we have seen, borrowed from Greek writers on Phonetics. Marius Victorinus (vi. 33. 3–8 K.) summarizes the older account: o, ut e, geminum vocis sonum pro condicione temporis promit . . . igitur qui correptum enuntiat, nec magnō hiatus labra resorabat, et retrorsum actam linguam tenebit. longum autem productis labris, rīctu tereti, lingua antro oris pendula sonum tragium daibi. The commentators on Donatus (Servius, in Don. p. 421. 17–19 K.) say the same: o productum quando est, ore sublato vox sonat, ut 'Roma'; quando correptum, de labris vox exprimitur, ut 'rosa'; Sergius, in Don. p. 520. 30–31 o quando longa est, intra palatum sonat; 'Roma,' 'orator'; quando brevis est, primis labris exprimitur: Opus,' rosa.' Martianus Capella (iii. 261) says merely: O rotundi oris spiritu comparatur.

§ 22. Close for open o in accented syllables before certain consonant-groups. (See Schuchardt, Vok. ii. p. 114 sqq.) Before l and another consonant ŏ became u in classical Latin, e.g. consulto (early consoltō, C. I. L. i. 548, latter part of second century B. C.); pulcer (but Pud[er], C. I. L. i. 552 of 151 B.C., cf. Prisc. i. 27. 12 H.); colpa (Old Lat. colpā Prisc. i. c.). Before m or n when these nasals are followed by a consonant we see the same tendency.
The classical spelling is *u* in *umbo, lumbus, unguis, unius* (see ch. iv. § 20). Before *nd* in Vulg. Lat. *u* replaced classical *o* (K. Z. xxx. 336), as is shown by the Romance forms (e.g. Ital. risponde, with close *o*, Sard. respondit); and in Italian we have close *o* in ponente, fronte, fonte, which corresponds with Priscian’s remark that *funtes, frundes, &c.*, were the older forms retained in Rustic Latin. (Prisc. i. 26. 35 H. multa praeterea vetustissimi etiam in principalibus mutabant syllabis; ‘gongrum’ pro gongrum, ‘cunchin’ pro conchin, ‘huminem’ pro hominem proferentes, ‘funtes’ pro fontes, unde Lucretius in libro .. tertio:—

atque ea nimium quae cunctumque Acherunte profundo,

... quae tamen a junioribus repudiata sunt quasi rusticō more dicta. Cf. Velius Longus p. 49. 15 K. unde in multis etiam nominibus variae sunt scripturae, ut fontes frundes, frondes frundes; and Charis. p. 130. 29 K.; sic ab Ennio est declinatum annalium libro vii.; russelsent frundes, non frondes.) *Rumpia* is the Latin form of *ρομπαία*, the long two-edged sword of the Thracians, quoted from Ennius by Gell. x. 25. 4, and read in the MSS. of Livy xxxi. 39. 11. Before *nu* a close sound of *o*, and not the long vowel, is perhaps indicated by the apex on the *o* of *ornare* in some inscriptions (e.g. C. I. L. x. 6104. 1839. 6009) (a fuller discussion of this point in § 145). Greek *κωδόρος* is *cothurnus*; Greek τόρος was in Vulgar Latin *tornus* (so spelt in the MSS. of Symmachus, *Epq. v*. 10), e. g. Span, tornar, Ital. torna (with close *o*). The vowel of *tornus* has been referred to the close sound of Greek *o* (while *ω* had the open sound) (K. Z. xxx. 336), and the *u* of *surna* (Greek ἀπόρρης), and other Greek loanwords in Latin (cf. App. Probi 198. 22 botroun not ‘butro.’ Cf. *Butrio*, C. I. L. ii. 668 and Sard. budrone), might be explained in the same way. But it is unlikely that the nuances of Greek vowels would be retained in words naturalized in Latin, and the tendency to give *o* the close sound before these consonant-groups is visible in genuine Latin words. Perhaps *bb* is another group of the kind. *Obba* was in the time of Nonius (fourth cent. A. D.) *ubba* (Nom. 146 M. obba, peculi genus, quod non ubba dicitur).

In Greek Inscriptions we have *Μοῦνταρος* for Lat. *Montanus* (C. I. A. iii. 1138, of 174–8 A.D.; but usually *Μοῦνταρος*, *Βουλκαχις*, *Κουβούλων* (and *Κορό*), *Πουστουμος* (see Eckinger, p. 54). For other examples of *o*–*u* before consonant-groups in the accented syllable, see Georges, *Lex. Worf.* s.vv. *conchis, dupundius, formo(n)sus, Corsi, Volcocius, proboscis, colostra, bulbus, furnus, fornox, Forcius, triumphus, cochlea*; and in the unaccented syllable, s.vv. *vokella, to(n)sillaes, promunturium*; also Brambach, *Hulfsb.* s.vv. *furnus, formica*. For classical -ur–we have O. Lat. -or- in *floirus, clevies* (see Georges s.vv.). *Curium* (for *corium*) on the Edict of Diocletian viii. 6 is a strange variety. The Appendix Probi censures *furnica* (197. 27 K.), *formunsus* (198. 9, *detundo* (199. 1), *purpureticum marmur* (197. 19), as well as *torna* for *turma* (198. 4 and 28). We have *tundunt* on two Rustic Calendars (C. I. L. ii. p. 280) for class. *tendent*. Cf. Sard. *tundere*.

§ 23. *u* for unaccented *ơ*. The mispronunciation *puentia* for *pōlenta* (Charis. 96. 13 K. ; Caper 106. 4 K.) shows this change in the pretonic syllable. Cf. *hiliigo* for *lolligo* (Georges s.v.), &c. In the post-tonic syllable the change to *u* is normal; see ch. iii. § 18.

§ 24. *u* for *ơ*. These two sounds are, as was mentioned above, merged in the Romance languages. In Late Latin inscriptions the expression of *ơ* by *u*
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§ 25. Other changes of ὐ and ū. Curtina, a mispronunciation of cortina (Dub. Nom. 575 7 K., may follow the analogy of curtus; faeniris, &c., for faenoris, &c. Vel. Long. 72 and 73 K.) are influenced by genēris and the like; praestolor and praestilor (Curt. Valerian. ap. Cassiodor. 157. 23 K.; Alcuin 306. 12 K.; Bede 286. 19 K.) depend on praestō and praestū; istium was in Vulg. Lat. īstum (vadei Gen. is found in Marc. Emp. xxviii. 37) (Ital. uscio, O. Span. uzo, Fr. huis);  spons, an egg, was *sōnum (Ital. uovo, Span. huevo, O. Fr. uef); cūralium and čūralium are two different forms (Greek κοράλλων and κοράλλων); and the same must be said of opilio and opilīo. (The note of Servius on Ecl. x. 19 venit et upilio, &c., implies these quantities: proper metrum ait ‘upilio,’—nam opilio dicimus—et graecō usus est schemate, sicut illi dicunt ovōma pro eo quod est ovōma, et ὤμη pro eo quod est ὤμη. Cf. Caper 112 K. upilio, nune opilio.)

§ 26. U, Y. The Latin grammarians do not speak so much about the difference of short and long u as they do about ৎ and ữu, perhaps because the first distinction did not so much appeal to the ear. But in Romance ữu and ữu take quite different paths, ữu being merged in ữu, and ữu preserved, as we found ৎ merged in ē and ữu preserved. Short ữu and ữu of Latin are distinguished not only in Sardinian (the only Romance language which distinguishes Latin ৎ and ữu), but also in Romanian and in the Latin element of the Albanian language, though in the two latter ữu may have first become close ữu, and changed back again to u. (A.L.L. vii. 61.) They are distinguished also in Latin loanwords in Welsh.

Latin ữu is little altered in Romance, except that in some countries it has taken a ĕ-sound, in France (lune, for Latin lūna), a Celtic country, and, perhaps by Greek influence, through the south-east coast of Italy. Italian ữu, which seems to retain the sound of Latin ĕ, as Italian ữu of Latin ĕ, has the close U-sound of Fr. sou, Germ. gut, du, while our ‘two’ is a diphthong ending with a w-sound. Our short u, e.g. ‘full,’ ‘put,’ is open U, the German ữu of und, Lust, &c. being, according to Sweet (Handb. p. 28),
rather closer than the English. The 'obscure vowel' of 'but,' which is sometimes carelessly spoken of as 'short u' is an entirely different vowel, not to be called a U-sound at all. In Welsh and Breton some Latin loanwords show ï for ù, e.g. Bret. dir (Lat. dûrus), but this is probably due to the Celtic tendency to turn u-sounds into ù-sounds (see however K. Z. xxix. 46). Vulg. Lat. jînîpîrus (e.g. Ital. ginepro) for jûnîpîrus (Probi Append. 199.8 K.) shows the same influence of the palatal spirant j (our y) as Vulg. Lat. Jenuarîns for Jânnarîns (§ 1). But there is little reason to believe that Latin û had naturally a ù-sound. Plautus, Men. 654, compares the reiterated tu tu 'you! you!' to the hooting of an owl:—

Matrona. Tu tu istic inquam. Peniculus. Vin adferri noctuam,
Quae 'tu tu' usque dicat tibi? Nam nos iam defessi sumus.

This seems to point to the oo-sound of our 'too-whoo,' though such comparisons should never have too much stress laid on them. The palatalization of c before û is hardly known in the Romance languages (K. Z. xxix. 46). The connexion between û and close O is seen in the numerous misspellings of o for û in plebeian inscriptions (Schuchardt, Vok. ii. 149, &c.). In unaccented syllables, as we have seen (§ 14), û tended to the û-sound of optûmus, optûmus, which was written u to the time of Julius Caesar, afterwards i, and which in the Romance languages is not distinguished from i. This was the sound of Greek u, which in older Latin was treated like Latin u, but afterwards was with more exactness spelt (and pronounced) with the Greek letter θ (y); though in ordinary usage we often find it, like the û-sound of optûmus, represented by i. In Oscean û took after certain letters a ye-sound, e.g. tiurî (Lat. turrîn), Diumpaîs (Lat. lumpîs, lymphîs), as in the Boeotian dialect τύχη was τιοίχα, or in English 'tune' is pronounced 'tyûn;,' but there is no trace of this sound in Latin ¹ (see ch. iv. § 7).


hane edere vocem quotiens paramus ore
nitamur ut u dicere, sic citetur ortus:
productius autem coeuntibus labellis
natura soni pressior altius meabět.

¹ The confusion of Carthaginian miuulec (?) with Lat. musîres in Plaut. Poom. 1009 is no evidence.
§ 28. Greek υ in Latin. Ter. Scaurus says (vii. 25. 13 K.) y litteram supervacuam latino sermoni putaverunt, quoniam pro illa u eaderet, sed cum quaedam in nostrum sermonem græca nomina admissa sint, in quibus eviderter sonus hujus litterae exprimitur, ut ‘hyperbaton’ et ‘hymnus’ et ‘hyacinthus’ et similia, in eisdem hac littera necessario utimur. Y, as a Greek letter, was not allowed in Roman words (see ch. i.), for the custom of writing γυλα, &c., never gained acceptance (Caper vii. 105. 17 K. y litteram nulla vox nostra adsecit. ideo insultabzs ‘gylam’ dientibus. Cf. Bede vii. 273. 33 K.; Ter. Scaur. vii. 22-23 K.; Vel. Longus vii. 81. 5-8 K.; Mar. Victorin. vii. 33. 11 K.), unless the word was mistaken for a Greek one, e. g. sygra referred to Greek ἕλαγχα ‘nympha’ to Greek νύμφη1 (Cf. crista non ‘crysta, App. Probi 197. 26 K.). The new letter invented by the Emperor Claudius to express the υ-sound of optimum, optimum is used for Greek υ in words like Nymphius, Bathyllus in the Fasti Antiates written in the reign of Claudius (C. I. L. ii. p. 247.). But before the use of the Greek letter Τ, the Greek vowel was written ι (Cassiod. 153. 11 K. Y littera antiqui non semper usi sunt, sed aliquando loco illius u ponebant: itaque in illorum quidem libris hanc scripturam observandam consee, ‘Suriarm’ ‘Suracusas’ ‘sumbola’ ‘sucophantas,’ at in nostris corrupmi non debet; cf. ibid. 160. 16 K.; and the MSS. of Plautus indicate such spellings as Hīlīrīa for Illīria, &c. Burus and Bruges were the forms used by Ennius for Pyrrhus and Phīrīgēs (Cicero, Orator xviii. 160 ipsius antiqui declarant libri). That it was also pronounced like ordinary Latin ι we see from the Romance forms of these earlier Greek loan-words which make no distinction (e. g. Lat. tomba for Greek τύμβος, is in Ital. tomba, in Sard. tomba, in Fr. tombe), not to speak of Plautus’ pun on ἔλυς and τάῦς (Bacch. 129), and on chry̓ςiūs and crū̓cīsūs (ib. 362). After the υ-sound of optimum, optimum came to be spelt with ι, the same letter was in ordinary usage employed for Greek υ, e. g. χιγνυς (Greek χικνως), in Ital. cecero, being pronounced probably in the same way as the ι of optimum, which in Romance is not distinguishable from ordinary ι. Tūmārus for Tymārōs on an old Praenestine cista (C. I. L. xiv. 4109) is perhaps to be explained by the υ-sound of ο before ϊd (ch. iv. § 20). Greek υ is often spelt qui, e. g. Vulg. quītās for cythāsus (see Schuch. Vok. ii. p. 273 sqq. for examples), as Latin qui is often expressed by Greek ιβ &c. (e. g. Ακῦλα, Κυρῆνος and Κυρῆνας for Quīrīνας on Greek inscriptions (see Eckinger, p. 123). Ου is found for Greek υ in guerus, coelocephiva, byforms of γυρυς, νυφία, &c. (see Georges s. vv., and Schuch. ii. 278). Latin υ is in Greek inscriptions always expressed by ι till the beginning of the Empire, when ωv takes its place. We find υ especially in the suffixes -ullus, -ulus, -virius, &c. (Eckinger, p. 58 sqq.) Sūla, Sylva for Sfyrula (§ 16) is always Σύλλας.

(For spellings of Greek υ and the Latin υ-sound with y, u, ι, see Schuchardt’s examples from inscriptions and MSS., Vok. ii. p. 218 sqq., and consult Georges, Lex. Worlf. s. vv. cumbra, murra, myrrētum, myrrēum, lympha, nymphaeaeus’ arrepticus Gl. Sangall. 912; Plur. lymphon. In Glossaries we have nymphaeous for lymphaeous, e. g. *nym-

1 Varro Men. 50 B. makes the Gen. phaticus’ arrepticus Gl. Sangall. 912; Plur. lymphon. In Glossaries we have nymphaeous for lymphaeous, e. g. *nym-
marmilla, Thymania, Syrus, sorcyllum, and Brambach, Hülfsbüchlein s.vv. thynnus, syllaba, stitus. The Appendix Probi has: tumum non 'tumum' (199. 6); myrta non 'murta' (199. 7); Marsyas non 'Marsuas' (197. 24); clamys non 'clamus' (198. 20); gyrus non 'girus' (197. 27); Byzacenus non 'Bizeinus' (198. 1); amygdala non 'amiddula' (198. 26).}

§ 29. o for û. The coincidence of Latin ə and û in the Romance languages makes it natural that we should find ə written for û on late inscriptions, and in plebeian forms. Roman tiles, for example, from the figlina Bucconiana are in the earlier period marked Bucconiana, but from Diocletian's time often Bocconiana (C.I.L. xv. p. 386); and Greek στφαζ appears in late Latin as storax (Georges s.v.). [In addition to the large number of instances of o for û collected by Schuchardt, Vok. ii. p. 149 &c., see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s.vv. columna, urecdus, curnus, luxurio, ceredundus, and cf. App. Probi 198. 23 puella non 'poella'; 198. 12 cluaca non 'cloaca'; 197. 25 columna non 'colomna' (on the last example, see § 68 and ch. iii. § 33).]

§ 30. ù for û. This interchange, as we have seen (§ 24), is properly confined to words which had originally the diphthong ou, which became in Latin a sound expressed variously by û and û (ch. iv. § 41). Some examples of the interchange have been mentioned in § 24. To them may be added bocula, occasionally in MSS. of Virgil for bacula (Ribbeck, Index, p. 391), jucundus for jucundus (Georges s.v.), and the examples (many of doubtful worth) collected by Schuchardt, Vok. ii. p. 181 sqq.

§ 31. Other changes of û and û. Gälber was in Vulg. Lat. colber, the බ being assimilated to the accented o (see ch. iii. § 33). Hence Vulg. Lat. colobra, with open o accented before br (cf. ch. iii. § 11). (Sicil. culevria, Span. culebra, O. Fr. culuevre); cf. Append. Probi 199. 2 K. coluber non colober; so colober on inscr. e.g. Mur. 1144. 3, and in MSS. (Schuch. ii. 149); nurus was nurus (see Georges s.v.) or rather *nora (cf. App. Probi 198. 34 nurus non 'nura'), with open o (Ital. nuora, Span. nuera), perhaps by analogy of süor. Luridus was *lûridus (Ital. lordo, Fr. lourd); pûmez shows *pûm-, in Ital. pomice, Span. pomez, Fr. ponce); nûptiae was *nuptia (Ital. nozze, Fr. noces), explained by analogy of noxa nupta (?). Ùpioio and òpioio, córallium and córallum were explained in § 25. Aurûgo and aurigo are due to interchange of suffixes, not to transition of vowel-sound. (So grâvido and grâvida, § 10.)

A curious tendency to interchange u-i and i-u appears in Vulg. Lat. stûpîla (seen in Ital. stopiua, O. Fr. estoble, Fr. étéule, &c.), unless s- and st- are original byforms. (On mitulûs and mytîlus, see Brambach, Hülfsbüchel. s.v., cf. Gk. Mυτυλήνη and Mυτυλήνη, Lat. Útica and Greek Írob.)

§ 32. Diphthongs. We have no reason to doubt that Latin au, ae were in the classical period, and for some time after, diphthongal sounds. None of the grammarians who discuss these diphthongs suggests that they were anything else. But in various dialects of Italy au had been early reduced to a single sound o, ae to a single sound e, a dialectal or 'rustic' pronunciation which shows signs of its presence in the speech of everyday life. The Romance languages indicate that in Vulgar Latin ae
had become hardly distinguishable from an open E-sound; and the reiterated warnings of grammarians, from the fourth cent. A.D. onwards, against the confusion of words like aequus and equus tell the same story. Welsh praidd (Latin praeda, for *prae-heda or *prae-hula, from prehendo, prae-hendo) must have been borrowed before this decay set in; but Varro’s use of ae, instead of e, to express the sound of Greek η (probably open e), in scaena, seems to show that the process of development had at least begun before the Imperial Age. On the other hand, an has been preserved intact by several of the Romance languages; and in the others (e.g. Italian and French), where it has developed to o (Ital. cosa, poco, &c., with open o; Fr. chose), this development can be proved to be post-Roman. In Latin loanwords in Welsh we have sometimes an, e.g. aur (Lat. aurum), sometimes close o. The pronunciation of these diphthongs must have been a combination of the simple sounds of which they are composed; an, an a rapidly followed by a u (or o), something like German an; ae, an a rapidly followed by an e, something like Welsh ae; but how modified from century to century, it is impossible to say. In (originally) unaccented syllables in compounds, an was reduced to ã (through eu?), e.g. dëfrüdo, from fraudo (see ch. iii. § 18) (cf. Ital. udire, from Lat. audire); ae, or rather the earlier ai, to i (through ei?), e.g. distiñum, from taedeo (ibid.); but in later Latin the reduction was seldom carried out (ch. iii. § 23). The interjection an, only used by women, seems to have been a cry expressing wonder or indignation, e.g. Ter. Adelph. 336 au, au, mi homo, sanusne es? while the diphthong ae occurs in several exclamations, such as vae (the Lettish wai), hahae and hahahae, &c. (Cf. banbarn to bark.)

Ac had been in early times ai; and this old spelling was often used by lovers of antiquity in the Imperial period, though the pronunciation was of course ae, and not ai. A curious feature of Vulgar Latin, reflected in Romance, was the substitution of a for an in syllables before the accent, when the next syllable contained the vowel u, e.g. Agustus, found on Inscriptions for Augustus. (Ital. agosto.) The same tendency is shown in the Sardinian dialect of Italian, where Lat. laurus is laru, &c., and in our ‘laughter’ au has an a-sound.
Oī, a diphthong used in early times, had been reduced first to oe, then to a simple sound ū (through some ō-sound probably) before the classical period. What was the exact sound of the later diphthong oe, which we find in words like coelnus (from co(m)-itūs), is difficult to determine; and the small number of words which possessed this diphthong makes it impossible to ascertain its treatment in Romance. We have already seen (§ 28) that it is occasionally found as an expression of Greek ē, e.g. goerus (beside γγρύς), coloephia (beside κολυφία). The interjection oiei was a cry of pain. Thus in Plautus, Mil. 1406, when the soldier is being thrashed, he shouts: oiei, satis sum verberatus; and in Terence, Phorm. 663, the miserly father, hearing of the large sum demanded by the parasite, cries out, as if he had received a blow: oiei, nimium est.

Eu is another diphthong, which arose at a later period through fortuitous combination, e.g. nēnter, a trisyllable (Consentius p. 389. 28 K.) (from uē and uter, with the accent on the uē, § 149), seu (so nev, ceu, ch. x. § 16 and 11) (by reduction of sē-ve, sei-ve, ch. x. § 4); while I.-Eur. eu was, like I.-Eur. on, in the Italic languages on, a diphthong found in early Latin, but reduced to ū (as I.-Eur. ei to ī) by the second cent. B.C. (ch. iv. § 26). Latin eu of the Interjection heu (cf. Greek φευ) must have been pronounced like e followed rapidly by u (or o); for a fifth century grammarian (Agroecius 122. 11–16 K.) dwells on the distinction between eo, eho, and heu. Greek ϵυ seems to have been usually pronounced as a disyllable in Latin. Uī, which can hardly claim to rank as a Latin diphthong, is seen in the interjection hva, where it may express the sound of a whistle, our 'whew!' and in the Dative cui, which does not seem to have much differed in pronunciation from the Nominative qui.

§ 33. Grammarians' account of diphthongs. Nigidius (first cent. B.C.), ap. Ged. xix. 14. 6 a et o semper principes sunt, i et u semper subditae, e et subit et præit; præit in 'Euripo,' subit in 'Aemilio'; Ter. Scaurus (second cent. A.D.) vii. 16. 5 K. a igitur littera praeposita est ... e litterae ... et apud antiquos i littera pro ea scribebatur, ... ut 'pietati vestis,' et 'aulai medio' ... sed magis in illis e novissima sonat (cf. Quint. i. 7. 18; Marius Victorinus; fourth cent. A.D.) vi. 32. 4–6 K. duae inter se vocales jugatae ae sub unius vocis enuntiatione prolatae syllabam faciunt natura longam, quam Graeci diphthongon vocant, veluti geminae vocis unum sonum, ut ae, oe, au; cf. Ter. Maur. vi. 338. 418–427 K. and 365. 1326–1334; [Probus] de ult.
§ 34. Ter. Maurus on au. Terentianus Maurus makes a distinction between Latin āu and āū, while Latin eu, he says, is like Greek eu always ēu. Āū, as in 'aut āgē,' 'aut āūbi,' 'Aurunci' of Virgil, he compares to Homer's αὐθέρων (presumably αὖθερων) and ἀὔρῳ for ἀὐράpios, in contrast to the (accented) āu of aurum, auspicēs, Greek αὐρὸν:

'aut age' inquit ille vates, saepe dixit 'aut ubi'
<snip>

If this means anything, which is doubtful, it ought to mean that in 'aut age, 'aut ubi' the diphthong had a more reduced sound than the au of aurum, a reduction which was similar to that seen in pretonic au followed by a syllable with u, Aruncus like Agustus (Cf. Arvnche, C. I. L. vi. 13416; Arunc in Virgil MSS., &c.; Ribbeek, Ind. p. 388.)

§ 35. au in Romance. Had au been an open O-sound in Vulg. Lat. it would have been merged in Latin ē, has ae as been merged in ë. But that the ē of Ital. počo, Fr. chose, is a late development we see from the forms of the words, which would otherwise have been *pogo, *cose (Meyer-Lübke, Rom. Gram. i. p. 235). We may similarly infer the diphthongal character of au, ae, at the time of the Empire, from the frequently-repeated statement of the grammarians that after a diphthong it was impossible to pronounce a double consonant, e.g. paulum (not paulum), Paulus (usually spelt Paulo, but not so pronounced), while after a long vowel double l was common, e.g. stella, Polla, villum (Diminutive of vinum) (see § 127).

§ 36. u for accented au. The change of au to ē in the (originally) unaccented syllable is in conformity with the rule in défūra, the spelling recommended for Plautus and Terence on the strength of the MSS. by Ritschl (Parerga, i. 540) (see also Georges s.v.). But we find also sed frude in the Lex Repetundarum (123–122 b.c.) (C. I. L. i. 198, § 64) (but sed fraudē, § 69), where there seems no reason for supposing the syllable to have been unaccented [Another instance of the confusion of au and ē in this word is the spelling franstra, often found in MSS. of Virgil (see Ribbeek, Index s.v.), which also exhibit fraude for fraudē in A. iv. 675, as the MSS. of Lucretius have frudem ii. 187, frudi vi. 186 (see Lachm. p. 85]). Similarly the u for unaccented au which appears regularly in the compounds of claudo, seems to have called into life a byform of the simple verb, cludo, in the first cent. a.d. (Georges, Lex. Lat. Wortf. s.v. claudo, and p. 750), which remains in the Italian chiudo. (For cludam, lame, in Plaut. Pseud. 659, read with the palimpsest claudam.)

§ 37. o and au. o for au is a feature of the Umbrian language (e.g. ote, Lat. aut) and other dialects, and was preserved in 'rustic' Latin, and even in the Latin of the streets of Rome. Festus tells us of a millionaire who was nicknamed Orata (i.e. aurāta, goldfish), because he wore two gold ear-rings [Festus 202. 13 Th. orata, genius piscis, appellatur a colore aurī quod rustice 'orum' dicebant, ut auriculas 'oriculas,' itaque Sergium quoque quendam
praedivitem... Oratam dicunt esse appellatum, &c. (For oricula, cf. App. Probi 198. 11 auris non ‘oricula.’ Oricula occurs as a cognomen on inscriptions, C. I. L. xii. 5686, no. 652.)] Cicero’s rival Clodius, was the first of the gens to change the name Claudius to the plebeian form Claudus, no doubt with the view of conciliating the mob. Cicero himself in his letters often uses the more homely forms with o, e.g. torecolum (Att. v. 20. 4), pollalium (Fam. xii. 12. 2; oricula (quint. Fr. ii. 12. 4), like oricilla, Catull. xxv. 2 (see A. L. L. vi. 84), while plodo is quoted from his ‘De Gloria’ by Diomede (p. 382. 26 K.), and in Plautus we seem to find assonance of aurum with ornamentos, ornatus, of auspiciam, with omen, of auribus with oculus (Barsian’s Jahresbericht, 1881, p. 33). So too Priscian (i. 52; p. 39 H.) says: (au) transit in o productam more antiquo, ut ‘lotus’ pro lautos, ‘plostrum’ pro plaustrum, ‘cotes’ pro cautes: sic ut etiam pro o, au, ut ‘austrum’ pro ostrum, ‘ausculum’ pro osculum, frequentissime hoc faciebant antiqui. This usage of au for o [cf. Paul. Fest. 21 (apparently referring to a passage of Plautus) auscellari dicebat antiqui pro osculari] is found in Plautus, not merely in auviculam (Greek ὄψιχαλκος), where it is due to confusion with aurum, but also in auscellutum (Bacch. 897, &c.). Auula, or auilla as in the palimpsest) of Plautus became olla, as Paulla, Paulla became Pella. It is perhaps confined to derivatives of os (see Georges s.vv. areae, ostium, osculum, osculus), which seems to have had two parallel stems in early Latin, aus- and os- (cf. jecor and jecur); so this gives no evidence on the pronunciation of Lat. ő. In the Lex Metalli Vipasensis of the first cent. A. D. (Eph. Epigr. iii. p. 180) we have sœnia for the Greek σκοφία, which the Romance languages show us to have been scoria in Vulgar Latin. Rustic or dialectal o for au is found in the name M. Lornti (= M. Laurenti), on a jar in the old Esquiline cemetery (c. 200 B. C.) (Ann. Inst. 1880, p. 260), while on plebeian inscriptions we have such forms as Oli (for Auil) on the tombstone of a praeco (Eph. Epigr. iv. p. 297), Olipor (C. I. L. xi. 1973), &c. In Greek inscriptions we have ογλος from the time of Augustus, but always Παῦλος (though often Παῦλα and Παῦλα, like Lat. Pella). (See Eckinger, p. 13.) In caula (Lith. kūdas) the original vowel may be ō, and the spelling au be due to the similarity of sound between ō and au. (See K. Z. xxviii. 157 for this and other doubtful instances.) [For other examples of au-0, see Schuchardt, Vok. ii. p. 301 sqq., and Georges, Lex. Wortf. s.vv. caupe, auspicer (Diom. 383. 10 K. Claudius octavo Historiarum ‘Flacco ospicitur’), caulis, cauiculus, carus, raudus (also raidus), parca, lauretum, plaudo, claudus, claustrum, sorix (cf. Mar. Vict. 26. 7 K. sorix vel saurix. C. G. L. v. 242. 33), cedex.] (See Diomedes, pp. 382–3 K., Probus Inst. 118–9 K.) Suetonius (Vesp. viii. 22) tells us an anecdote of the homely Vespasian: Mestrium Florum consularem, admonitus ab eo plaustra potius quam plostra dicenda, postero die ‘Flaurum’ salutavit [cf. the glosses: plostrum dicimus magis quam ‘plaustrum’ (C. G. L. v. 93. 13), and: ‘edit’ audit (ibid. 89. 7 and 125. 26).]

§ 38. a for au. (Schuchardt, Vok. ii. p. 305 sqq.) Augustus for Augustus, e. g. C. I. L. ix. 1365 (411 A. D.) (cf. Greek Αὐγούσταλος, Mitt. Inst. xiii. p. 236 n. 5; Eckinger, p. 12). The Romance name of the month points to Vulg. Lat. Augustus, e. g. Ital. agoito, Span. agosto, Fr. août, and shows that the a was not merely a conventional symbol for o. Ausculto was the Vulg. Lat. form of auscultare (cf. Caper 108. 6 ausculta non ‘auscula’), as we see from the Romance forms, e.g. Ital. ascoltare, Span. ascuchar; *agurium of augurium (Raet. far agur, to consider, Ital. seigurato, from *exaguratus, unlucky,
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Span. jauro'. Claudius often occurs for Claudius on inscriptions (e.g. C.I.L. ii. 4638, of 275 A.D.) (cf. Greek Φαστός, C. I. A. iii. 10, of 209–210 A.D.; Bull. viii. p. 247, of 11 A.D., from Eumenia). For similar spellings in Glossaries (e.g. ‘agustae’ sanctora; fustus for faustus, &c.), see Löwe, Prodr. p. 421. In MSS. of Virgil, &c., we find Arunaei for Arunaei (Ribbeck, Ind. p. 388, cf. Arunaeo, C. I. L. vi. 13416); and modern Italian place-names like Metaro, Pesaro show a similar change.

§ 39. Greek transcriptions of au. In Greek inscriptions we find usually au for Latin au; but also ao, e. g. Φαστόν, C. I. L. ix. 6229 and 6230; Φαστήνα 6209 (the form Πασός does not occur till the fourth or fifth cent. A.D.); also aov, e. g. Παυκλία, C. I. G. 6665; Αὐλόν (2656 b add.) (see Eckinger, p. 13).

§ 40. ae for au. Ae is found now and then on inscriptions for au, e. g. maeos(tuon), C. I. L. i. Fast. min. ix of 1 A.D.; Paetinus, &c.

§ 41. e for ae. (Brambach, Orthogr. p. 205; Schuchardt, Vok. i. p. 224 sqq.) E for ae (ai) is a feature of the Umbrian language, e. g. pre (Lat. praee), and is found on Latin inscriptions in the Umbrian territory, e. g. Cesula, C. I. L. i. 168 (Pisaurum), and elsewhere (see Sittl, Lok. Verschied. p. 4). It was a feature too of rustic Latin, as we see from Varro, L. L. vii. 96 rustic pappum Mesium, non Maesium; v. 97 in Latio rure edus; qui in urbe, ut in multis, a addito aedus; and from Lucilius' ridicule of a praetor who called himself Cecilius instead of Cucelius (ix. 10 M. Cecilius pretor ne rusticus fiat. Cf. Diom. 452. 17 K.). The same variation of e and ae found its way into ordinary pronunciation in the case of country-terms, e. g. faenisicia and fenestitia, the hay-harvest. The Romance forms point to sèpes, not saepes; sèpton, not sèptum (e. g. Port. sebe, Span. seto) (Gröber, A. L. L. v. 465). From Varro's remark that scaena (and sceptrum ?) represented the pronunciation of Greek ακρή; σκῆπτρον at his time, we should infer that this ae had a sound approaching to long open e, for Greek η probably still had at this period the open sound (Varro, L. L. vii. 96 obscaenum dictum ab scaena; cam ut Graeci Accius scribit 'scena.' In pluribus verbis a ante e alii ponunt, alii non, ut quod partim dicit 'sceptrum,' partim 'sceptrum,' alii Plauti 'Faenetracem,' alii 'Feneratracem'; sic 'faenisicia' ae 'feniscitia'). This spelling of the title of a play of Plautus, Feneratrix, for Faenetratrix, the Usurers, agrees with another remark of Varro that fenus, not faenus, was the pronunciation of Old Latin, used by Cato and others (Non. 54 M.; Varro lib. iii de sermone Latino: 'faenus autem dictum a fetu, et quasi seta quadam pecuniae.' Nam et Catonom et ceteros antiquiores sine a littera fenus' pronuntiassen contendit, ut fetus et fecunditas). How thoroughly ae (through ee ?) became identified with the long sound of open e at a later time, we see from the remark of a fifth century grammarians, that aeus, when the first syllable, through being accented, was unduly lengthened in pronunciation, became aequus (Pompeius 285. 6 K. plerumque male pronuntiamus, et facimus vitium ut brevis syllaba longo tractu sonet ... si (quis) velit dicere 'aequus' pro eo quod est equeus). (Cf. prehendo, with shortening of prae before a vowel, as dìavno di, and Marius Victorinus' use of -aeus to express the disyllabic pronunciation of Gk. -eus (67 K.).) Another grammarian of the same century gives a caution against the confusion of vae and æ (Agroecius 114. 21 K., of quaeritur and quæritur (id. 116. 18 K.); while he speaks of the first syllable of
praemium, prētium, prēcor, as if they were distinguished in writing only, not in pronunciation (id. 115 K. praemium cum diphthongo seribendum; prētium, prēcor sine diphthongo. Vetere enim majoris rei sermones cum diphthongo, et quadam dignitatum scribi voluerunt). Even in the fourth cent. Servius, in a note on Virgil, Aen. i. 344:

huic conjux Sycaecus erat, ditissimus agri

Phoenicum, et magno miserae dilectus amore,

thinks it necessary to point out that miseræ is the Adjective, not the Adverb misere. The 'Orthographies' of Bede and Alcuin (the latter served as a text-book for Carolingian scribes of MSS.) abound in similar distinctions (e.g. quæritur and quæritus, Alcuin 308. 16 K.; Bede 287. 8 K.; quaestus and questus, Alcuin 308. 17 K.; saevit and sevit, Alcuin 310. 5 K.; Bede 289. 30 K.; caelo and celo, Alcuin 299. 6 K.; Bede 268. 27 K.), some of which may have been taken from earlier grammarians [cf. Charisius (fourth cent.), p. 98 K. on the spelling erumna for aerumna; Marius Victorinus (fourth cent.), p. 25 K. on the spelling cesuries for caesaries]. Philagryius, the Virgil Scholarist, on Ed. iii. 39, defends the ae of haedora (for ἡδώρα) by connecting the word with haeréo (cf. Paul. Fest. 71. 26 Th. hedera dicta, quod haeret, sive quod edita petat, vel quia id, cui adhaeserit, edit.). With all this it is no wonder that it is often difficult to decide whether the proper spelling of a word is with ae or e. [For the rival claims of e and ae in some words, see Georges, Lex. Worf. s.vv. meles, nemiu, globa, maena, muraena, paelx, fæles, etra, ve (the Interjection), gaesum.]

On Greek inscriptions we find e for Latin ae from the middle of the second cent. A.D., e.g. Keka̱ios, but never η. (Eckinger, p. 78.) Instances of Latin ae for Greek η in inscriptions and MSS. are given by Schuchardt, Vok. i. p. 227 sqq., a very frequent case being that Genitive ending of female names in -aes (Greek -ης) from the last century of the Republic, e.g. Laudicaes (C. I. L. i. 1212), which is discussed in ch. vi. § 18.

§ 42. aι for ae. The old spelling aι is found on Imperial inscriptions, especially in the reign of the grammarian-emperor Claudius (e.g. C. I. L. vi. 353, of 51 A.D., Caisare); but we have the express testimony of Terentius Scaurus (second cent.) (16. 7 K. sed magis in ills e novissima sonat, not to speak of Quintilian (first cent.) (i. 7. 18 cujus secundam num e litteram ponimus), that the second element, as pronounced, was e, not i. The change of the earlier aι to the classical form of the diphthong, ae, took place in the second cent. B.C. (e.g. aedem, beside aiquom, tabelai, datai, &c., on the S. C. Bacch. of 186 B.C., C. I. L. i. 196). The spelling aei, found once or twice towards the end of the second cent. B.C., e.g. conqueisivei, Caeceilius, Cae-cian[us], may mark the transition (see ch. iv. § 29). In aei for aisne, aibat (disyll.) the diphthong must have had the sound of O. Lat. aï.

§ 43. Greek α. Before a consonant Greek α is always ι in Latin, e.g. Afrīdes. Before a vowel it is ί till the first cent. A.D., then ι. Thus Alexandrā, Darīus, &c., are the earlier spellings; Alexandrā, Darīus the later. (See Brambach, Hülfsbühlein, p. 4.) The ι, -ι was often shortened (cf. § 143), e.g. βαλνέων (Gk. βαλλειων) (cf. Prise, i. p. 71 H. and p. 73 H. on ἄθρειος, Hectorius, &c.). The Greek diphthong which probably passed into the ι-sound about 100 B.C. is a common expression of Latin ι, e.g. 'Aρτείος, but of Latin ι only in hiatus, e.g. ἄτρειον (for atrium), ἴωλος (for Publius) (see
Eckinger, p. 42). Latin ei in words like Pompeius is in Greek η; but from the first century A. D. we find also ei, e. g. Постовъ (Eckinger, p. 81).

§ 44. oe and e. Alcuin and Bede give almost as many rules for the distinction of oe and e, as for the distinction of ae and e [e. g. cepit and coepit, coepit and incepit, Alcuin vii. 299. 18 K.; Bede vii. 269. 14 K.; fecundus (quod est deformis) and foedus, Alcuin vii. 301-302. 2 K.; Bede vii. 273. 4 K.; cf. Orthogr. Bern. 293. 9 K.; pene, penes, and poena, Alcuin vii. 306. 35 K.; Bede vii. 286. 1 K.], some of which may come from earlier grammarians. [For variations in spelling between oe, e, ae see Schuchardt, Vok. ii. p. 288 sqq., and consult Georges and Brambach s. vv. cena, caenam, faeo (cf. Span. hiede), amoenus, fenus, maecae, poane, proelium, caelebs, caedum, caecus, oboedia, foedus, fecundus, obscenus, pomerium, femina, feotis, &c.] Greek φ is in classical Latin o, e. g. melodia, but earlier oe, e. g. comoeds (cf. Thraex and Thrax, Blass, p. 43).

§ 45. oe in Romance. *pēva for poena is indicated by the Romance forms (e. g. Ital. pena, Span. pena, Fr. peine), and probably *fedus for foedus, foul (e. g. Span. heda, feo). Cena (e. g. Ital. cena, Span. cena) is thought to have been the correct spelling (cf. Oec. kersna-), though the spelling with oe (due to confusion with Greek σωφρος, as coelum, for caelum, confused with κελερ) is very old (coen- on a Praenestine cista. Med. Arch. 1890, p. 303).

§ 46. Greek ε. Marius Victorinus vi. 66-67 K. consimili ratione quaeritur, Orpheus in metro, ut

non me carmiuibus vincat nec Thracius Orpheus, ut

utrum trisyllabum an disyllabum sit, an idem nomen duplici enuntiatio promatur, aut sine a littera, ut Peleus Penetheus, aut cum a, ut ita declinetur Orphaeus, ut Aristaeus. visum est tamen hoc posse discerni, ut illa sine a littera graeca sit enuntiatio, haec latina, quae per diphthongon effertur. The proper spelling is euhoi, Evikia, evhan, not evae, Evius, evan (see Brambach, Hülfsbüchlein s. vv.). For a corruption of Greek ευ in vulgar pronunciation, see App. Probi 199. 6 hermeneumata non 'erminomata.' Ou an old mirror of Praeneste we have Tassos (Tasei, Gen.) for Θασιος (Eph. Epigr. i. 23).

§ 47. υ of cui. Quint. i. 7. 27 illud nunc melius, quod 'cui' tribus quas posui litteris enotamus, in quo pueros nobis ad pinguem sane sonum qu et oi utebantur, tantum ut ab illo 'qui' distinguereetur. Ter. Scaur. 28. i K. c autem in dativo ponimus, ut sit differentia cui et qui, id est dativi [et vocativi] singularis et nominativi et vocativi pluralis. Annaeus Cornutus ap. Cassiod. 149. 8 K. 'qui' syllaba per qu u i seribitur; si dividitur, ut sit cui et huic, per c.

§ 48. J, V. That Latin j and v had some sound like our y, w, and not like our j, v, there can be no doubt whatever. We see this from the close relation that exists between i and j, u and v in different forms of the same word in Latin, e. g. *jam and nunciam (3 syll.), tenuis and tenvia (3 syll.), as well as from the express testimony of grammarians. The signs j and v, which suggest to us a difference between the sound of these letters and
of the corresponding vowels, are, as we saw (ch. i. § 7), of quite a late date. In the Roman period *jus* and *vos* were written with *i* and *u, ius, vos,* exactly like *pius* and *tuos* (ch. i. § 1). The only question is whether *j* and *v* were actual consonants (*y, v*) or half-vowels (*i, y*). Our *y,* for example, in 'you' is a spirant consonant, but is often in pronunciation weakened into a half-vowel (Sweet, *Handb.* p. 37). The distinction is so slight a one that it seems impossible to determine the exact pronunciation of *j* and *v* in a dead language like Latin; and probably the pronunciation varied at different times; but we certainly have one or two clear testimonies to the consonantal character of these sounds. Thus a fifth (?) century grammarian remarks on the difficulty experienced by the Greeks of his day (as by the Greeks of our own time) in pronouncing this *y*-sound in such a word as *jus.* They make the word, he says, almost a disyllable (Consentius v. 394 K.). And the same writer in another passage mentions a corresponding mispronunciation of the *v*-sound in *veni* (v. 395. 15 K. *u* quoque litteram aliqni pinguius eceferunt, *ut,* cum dicunt 'veni,' putes trisyllabum incipere). And much earlier, in the first cent. A.D., we have a distinction drawn between *v* of *valente, primitivo,* &c., and the *u* of *quis.* The former is said to sound 'cum aliqua aspiratione' (Velius Longus vii. 58. 17 K.), much as Varro, the contemporary of Cicero, says that *v-* had a strong thick sound (crassum et quasi validum) in *vafer, velum, vinum, vonis, vulnus,* &c. (*L. L.* iii. fr. p. 148 Wilm.). That this consonantal character of *j* and *v* intensified and developed itself as the centuries went on, we see from the Romance languages, e.g. Italian, where Latin *v* has become our *v-,* Latin *j* our *j*-sound (e.g. *vostro,* Lat. *vosterr, giurare, Lat. jùràre*); and it is possible that the further back we go in the history of the Latin language the less consonantal was the sound of *j* and *v*1. But there is no evidence of this, unless we count as such the scansion *úbicio* in Plautus and Terence, where the *j* appears to be so entirely sunk in the following *i* (*e*), as not to make the first syllable long by position,

---

1 I.-Eur. *swé-* became Latin *só-,* e.g. *soror* (through *so-*?), but not I.-Eur. *wé-,* e.g. *vetus,* which may indicate that the *v* of *swe-* was more consonantal than ordinary *v.*
whereas in *ābicīo* of the classical poets the first syllable is so lengthened (*A. L. L. iv. 560*) (but see ch. iii. § 25). This merging of *j* in a following *i* has been compared with the merging of the *n* of *qu*, which Velius Longus tells us was more vocalic than the *v* of *valente*, &c., in a following *u*, e.g. *cum* (earlier *quom*) for *quum*, *locuntur* (earlier *loquuntur*) for *loquuntur* (cf. § 93). A similar unconsonantal character for *v* in early Latin has been inferred from the reduction of *iīvi* to *i* in such Plautine forms as *oblīscor* for *oblīvīscor*, *dīnus* for *dīvīnus*; but in the absence of express testimony, such as we have for the consonantal character of *j* and *v* at a later time, it is impossible to decide positively so minute a point. An untrained ear can hardly distinguish between the spirants *y*, *w*, and the half-vowels *i*, *y*, nor yet between the various nuances of the *w*-sound, such as our *wh*, e.g. 'which,' the unvoiced *w*, differing from the voiced *w* of 'witch' as *p* from *b*, *t* from *d*, *c* from *g*, or such as in French 'oui,' the consonant of the vowel of French 'sou,' while our *w* is the consonant of the vowel of English 'full,' 'put' (Sweet, *Handbk*, p. 42). So much we can say, that the pronunciation of *j* and *v* certainly became more and more removed from the half-vowels in the centuries of the Empire; and it is natural to infer a movement in the same direction in the Republican period. But when exactly *j* and *v* ceased to be half-vowels and became consonants, or how far their character varied according to their position in the word it is impossible to determine with precision.

The same tendency to syncopate a short unaccented syllable that produced *calda* out of *cālīda* affected the vowels *i*, *u* when they preceded other vowels. The word *lārna* is a trisyllable in Plautus; it has become a disyllable in classical Latin, just as *lāridum* of Plautus became *lārdum*. The only forms known to Plautus are *miluos*, *vēlicenos*, *grātīs*, which in classical Latin are *milvos*, *reliquos* (by the middle of the first cent. A.D. *relicus*), *gratis*. In the first cent. A.D. *tēnvis* wavered between a disyllable and a trisyllable (Caesellius ap. Cassiod. vii. 205 K.).

This reduction of the vowel *i* after *t*, *c* led, as we shall see (§§ 90, 94), to the assimilation of these consonants. *Titius* became *Tityus* and then something like *Titus* (cf. our 'orchard' for 'ort-yard'), as we learn from the remark of a fifth cent.
grammarians, quoted below: si dicas ‘Titius’ (i) pinguius sonat
et perdit sonum suum et accipit sibilum.

As to the pronunciation of words like Maiia, Pompeius, ejus,
where the diphthong is followed by a vowel, we have very clear
information from the grammarians that the i-sound was shared
both by the first and the second syllable, Mai-ia or Mai-ya, not
Ma-ja, Ma-ya. To express this sound Cicero proposed to write
Maiia, Aiiax with two i’s (Velius Longus vii. 54. 16 K. ; Quint.
i. 4. 11); and on inscriptions we find spellings like MAIIOREM
(C. I. L. ii. 1964, col. iii. 10) (see ch. i. § 7), where the long form
of I may express the consonantal or half-vocalic sound j, as in
conIVNX (C. I. L. vii. 8. &c.) (ch. i. § 1). Whether it was this
already existing practice of writing long I for j, which made
Claudius abstain from proposing a new letter for j, when he
introduced the inverted F-sign for v, or whether he followed the
Greek alphabet which had a sign for w (the digamma), but none
for y, we cannot say. Possibly the reason is to be found in the
more rapid development of the w-sound (Latin v) than of the
y-sound (Latin j).

V and b (which had by this time become between vowels the
bilabial spirant) were, as early as the third cent. a.d., hardly
distinguishable, as is seen from the frequent warnings given by
the grammarians against confusion of labat and lavat (Probi
Appendix 199. 22 K.), libido and livido (ib. 201. 4 K.), &c., &c.
Indeed one grammatical treatise (of the fifth century) is
devoted to this very subject: Adamantii sive Martyrii de
B vocali et V vocali. It was summarized by Cassiodorus for
the book on Orthography which he compiled for the use of

At some time before the fifth cent. a.d., when precisely we
cannot say, initial v, and possibly v in other positions too, seems
to have passed from the bilabial spirant (Spanish b) to the
labio-dental spirant (our v). After l, r it assumed in time the
sound of the voiced mute b.

§ 49. Testimony of grammarians. Quintilian i. 4. 10, 11, after saying that
a letter is wanting to the Latin alphabet to express the sound of v in serueus,
vulgaris, the Aeolic digamma, goes on to speak of the consonantal (pro consonan-
tibus) character of the vowels i, u, e.g. iam but etiam, vos but tuos. Of conjunct
he says, littera i sibi insidit, and so with u in vulgaris, serueus. In another passage
(i. 7. 26) he tells us that servus was the spelling of his teachers, servus that of his own time, but that neither spelling quite expressed the sound, so that the emperor Claudius had good reason to introduce a new letter like the Acolic digamma (cf. xii. 10. 29). The usual expression of the grammarians for \( j \) and \( v \) is \( \{j, u\} \) transunt in consonantium potestatem’ (e.g. Mar. Victorin. vi. 5. 18 K.; Donat. iv. 367. 12 K.; Charisius i. 8. 1 : cf. Diom. i. 422. 14 K.; Ter. Maur. vi. 341. 536 K.). Later they talk of the ‘pinguis sonus’ as opposed to the ‘exilis’ or ‘tenuis’ (vocalic), the first to use this term being Servius (fourth cent.) (iv. 422. 1 K.), e.g. Pompeius (fifth cent.) (v. 103 K. ‘vanus’ quando dico pinguior sonus est. numquid dicis u a nus? ergo vides quia, si ponantur soleae, tenuem sonum labent, si jungantur ad alias litteras, pingues sonant. similiter et i sic patitur. ‘itur,’ ecece tenuius sonat; si dicas ‘Titius,’ pinguius sonat et perdit sonum suum et accipit sibilum). Finally Priscian (sixth cent.) speaks of the ‘diversus sonus’ of \( j \) and \( v \) from \( i \) and \( u \), and questions the soundness of Censorinus’ (third cent.) contrary opinion (i. p. 13 H. non sunt in eisdem, meo judicio, elementis accipienda: quamvis et Censorino, doctissimo artis grammaticae, idem placuit) (cf. Nigidius ap. Gall. xix. 14. 6). In another passage Priscian talks of \( v \) and \( b \) as quite similar in sound (i. 18. 10 H.), where he says that caelebs should be written *caelebs, the word being derived from caelum and vita, and meaning literally caelestium vitam aquens (!), were it not that \( v \) is never allowed to stand before a consonant. He goes on to say that \( b \) had this sound in very early Latin, because Quintillian quotes Belena for Belena (Belena) (cf. Serv. in Don. 422. 2 K., and C. I. L. i. 1501) from early literature. This remark is interesting as showing how early MS. corruptions showed themselves. When we turn to the passage in Quintilian (i. 4. 15), we find that he is discussing the use of \( b \) for Greek \( π \) and \( φ \) in early Latin. His examples are Burrus (for Πυρρός), Bruces (for Φρόης) and balaena (for φάλαλανα). The whole passage is taken from Verrius Flaccus, who used these same examples. In our MSS. of Quintilian there is the corruption Belena for balaena, a corruption which must have also existed in the MS. used by Priscian, and which led him to make this mistake (Flecke. Jahrb. 1889, p. 394). We notice that Consentius (fifth cent. ?) happens to use pinguis in precisely the opposite sense when he speaks of that mispronunciation of veni which made the word almost like a trisyllable (v. 395-15 K.), unless indeed he is referring to the bilabial \( u \) as opposed to the labiodental spirant sound \( v \) (see below). Other barbarisms which he mentions as ‘in us cudic loquentium’ are so-lu-it for disyllabic solvit, uam for uam, induruit (a trisyllable) (v. 392. 35 K.).

§ 50. \( j \) and \( v \) in early Latin. Priscian (i. p. 17. 3 K.) is certainly wrong in explaining the sine invidia of Terence (Andr. 66) by the vocalic character of \( v \) (see ch. iii. § 34); Accius’ augura (Trag. 624 R.): prō certo arbitrābor sortis, òracles, aditus, aúgura, may be a byform, and not a case of suppression of \( i \) (\( y \)); progenie mi genui on a hexameter line of a Scipio epitaph of c. 130 B.C. (C. I. L. i. 38) is perhaps a graver’s error for progeniem genui; the use of -i, not -ii, in the Gen. Sing. of 10-stems in the older writers has nothing to do with the sound of \( j \) (see ch. vi. § 20), nor have the Plautian forms aīn (always), aībat (occasional) (see ch. viii. § 35); peīra, where the \( r \) of the preposition has been dropped, owing to the consonantal nature of the \( i \), seems to be a later spelling than pericero (see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v.); and the true account of puleium fleabane (also pulegium, see Georges) is a matter of doubt (see ch. iv. § 116).
Between i and another i, v disappears at a very early time, e.g. obiscor, dimus in Plautus (see *Rhein. Mus.* xxxv. 627); and Plautus' trisyllabic avunculus (avunculus or avunculus) seems to be a suppression of pretonic v like the later Noembris for Novembris (see below). The vocalic nature of v in cane (pronomounced with e, ch. iii. § 44) is seen from Cicero's story (Dir. ii. 84) of the confusion of Cauneas (sc. ficus vendo) with cane ne eas, as well as from the spelling causis for care sis in Juvenal ix. 120; of v in cane (pronounced with -z Quint. i. 6. 21) from Phaedrus' fable (App. 21) of the man who mistook the caw of a crow for this word (*família* for *família* on an inser. of Ameria in Umbria, *C. I. L.* xi. 4488, may be a dialectal variety, like the Oscan famebo *família* of Bantia, *Zv.* l.i. i. 231). Our e is similarly suppressed in 'Ha(w)arden,' 'Main(w)aring,' &c.

§ 51. in late Latin and Romance. With Latin j (our y) were merged in Vulgar Latin g before e, i, and d before i followed by a vowel (see below), for these three Latin sounds are indistinguishable in the Romance languages. Spellings therefore on late inscriptions like *diulul* (Rossi 1118, of 566 A. D.), *Madias* (Rossi 1712), *Giove* (*I. R. N.* 695), *Gianuaria* (Fabr. x. 632, Interamna, of 503 A. D.) do not indicate that j had passed from the y-sound (see *A. L. L.* i. 220), but that -dix-, -dix-, giō-, giō were pronounced like -yu-, -ya-, yo-, &c. The occasional spelling with Lat. z, Greek ζ, e.g. *Zanuario* (C. I. L. x. 2466), ζωντεα (*I. S.* 826. 22, Naples), koivov (Lat. co(v)jvov, *C. I. L.* x. 719, Surrentum) is probably nothing but an attempt to indicate the spirant sound of j (our y) as opposed to the vocalic sound of i; for Lat. z, Greek ζ had at this time the soft or voiced s-sound of our verb *to use,* and not our j-sound, nor the sound of -dz- in *adze* (see § 120). (For other examples see Schuchardt, *Vok.* i. pp. 66 sqq.) This Vulgar Latin y-sound of triple origin is y in Spanish (in most situations), in Sardinian, and (by Greek influence?) in South Italian, but in ordinary Italian (except when pretonic, e.g. rione from Lat. regiūnum, ajuta, pronounced ayuta, from Lat. adjūtum) it has become the sound of our j; while in French (in most situations) it has assumed the sound which we write s in 'pleasure,' z in 'azure.' Thus Latin jugum is Span. yugo, Ital. giogo, Fr. joug; Lat. majus is Span. mayo, Sicilian mayu, Ital. maggio; Vulg. Lat. Jenarius is Sicil. yennaru, Ital. gennaio, Fr. janvier. In loanwords in Welsh Latin j has the y-sound, e.g. Ionawr (Lat. Iannarius), dydd Iau (Lat. dies Jovis). In Greek inscriptions, besides the usual τ, e.g. ιωνίως, Παντίς, we have sometimes η and ζ, e.g. Ἰςπιός, Εἴπιος, Παντός and Πάνος (see Eckinger, p. 80).

The barred d of the Pelignian dialect (Petieddu, uildedu, Uibdù, aśed in the same inscription, Zvetaieff, *Inscr. Ital. Inf.* 13) expresses some sound into which consonantal i(y) and di in hiatus had developed (Lat. Pettiedia, *viam-do, Vibidia, abii* (Rhein. *Mus.* xliii. 348; *Class. Rev.* vii. 104), and seems to be a dialectal anticipation of the coincidence of di in hiatus and j in Vulgar and late Latin. After a short accented vowel y suffered some similar change in Teutonic, witness Goth. iddja I went, from the root EI to go.

§ 52. v confused with b in late Latin and Romance. From the beginning of the second century A. D. we begin to find b and v interchanged on inscriptions (see Schuchardt, *Vok.* i. 131 and iii. 67; Brambach, *Orth.* p. 238), and by the third century the confusion is complete. The ι-symbol is, as is natural, used for the v-sound more frequently than the vowel symbol (capital V, uncial U, see i. 7) for b. Latin b had probably by this time become, when between
vowels, a spirant (see § 78), so that the tendency is to restrict V, U to the vowel- (u), B to the spirant-sounds (b, v). (For examples of the interchange see the Indices to the Corpus.) In Greek inscriptions ow is the earliest spelling for Lat. v, and continues to be the usual spelling throughout the Imperial period, e.g. ἀψωλις Mon. Aneg., ὄσεπασιανς (never Beσντ), ὀὐστεραχ and ὀὐστεραμος, &c. But we find β occasionally even in the first cent. A.D., the earliest examples being Φαβις, Δεβις (the usual spelling), Συλβανς, Βαλεριον. This use of β may have been stimulated by the preference of a single to a double symbol. Δεβίς is more pleasing to the eye than Νιουος; and in this way we may explain why Latin ow is more often οβ than οου. (It is often ow, e.g. Νουος) (see Eckinger, pp. 82 sqq.) Little light however is thrown on the pronunciation of Latin v by this Greek use of β; for in the first place, the pronunciation of β itself in the Imperial age is uncertain. Blass supposes it to have become a spirant, as in modern Greek, in the second cent. A.D. Aussprache d. Griech. p. 91), and in the second, the use of β followed in all probability the use of b in the Latin spelling. (Thus on the Edict of Diocletian vulca is spelt bulla in the Latin inscription, βουκβυ in the Greek.) We sometimes find ow and β on the same inscription, e.g. Νερων and Νερηα (second cent.), Φαουνανς and Φαβις on an inscr. of Cyrene, 117-125 A.D. (see Eckinger). The remarks however of the Grammarians point, as we have seen, to v having retained its connexion with the vowel u till a later time in correct pronunciation; and the same thing is indicated by the loss of inter-vocalic v in paimentum, &c, for paimentum (see below). At what time the bilabial spirant v (our w) became the labiodental spirant v (our v) is not easy to say. It would be rash to conclude from spellings like convivum, convivio (where the m of com is changed to n) on the Lex Municipalis of Julius Caesar (C. I. L. i. 205), and still more from invitae, invileis (where the n of in is retained) on the Sententia Minuciorum of 117 B.C. (i. 199), that the change had taken place in the Republican period; for as early as 189 B.C. we have imperator (Wilm. 2837), and in the Sen. Cons. de Bacchanalibus of 186 B.C. compromise (i. 195), clear instances of n before an undoubted bilabial. The facts certainly point to com-, im- being the oldest spellings before v- and f-, see § 64), e.g. conviviose (and corventionid) i. 196; convolem, convulant (but also convolunt) i. 199; and the im vita of the Palimpsest of Plautus (Merc. 471), comitias (Men. 224), may rest upon old tradition; but the substitution of -n for -m of a preposition before a consonant in a compound is no certain evidence for the nature of the consonant (see § 65). More weight may be attached to Cicero's deliberate preference of the spelling com before v, mentioned by Marius Victorinus (fourth cent. A.D.) (18. 14 K.): item consonantes inter se, sed proprie sunt cognatae, quae simili figuratione oris dicuntur, ut est b, f, m, p, quibus Cicero adicit u, non eam quae accipitur pro vocali, sed eam quae consonans obtinet veicm, et anteposita vocali fit, ut aliae quoque consonantes. quotiens igitur praepositionem sequetur vox equis primis syllaba incipit a supradictis litteris, id est b, f, m, p, v, quae vox conjuncta praepositioni significationem ejus confundat, vos quoque praepositionis litteram mutate, ut est 'combibit,' 'comburit,' 'comfort,' 'confundit,' 'commemorat,' 'communuit,' 'comparat,' 'compellit,' 'comvalescit,' 'convocat,' non 'conhibit,' 'conburit,' et similia. sic etiam praepositio conjuncta vocibus quae incipiant a supradictis litteris n commutat in m, ut 'imbitit,' 'imbutit,' 'imfurt,' 'imfictit,' 'immemor,' 'immritis,' 'impius,' 'impotens.' The ordinary rule that com-, im- are used before p, b,
m is quoted by Priscian (i. p. 31. 2 H.) from Pliny, Papirian, and Probus (cf. Papir. ap. Cassiod. 162. 6 K.; Prob. 150. 6 K.) with no mention either of f (which Mar. Vict. must have taken from some older grammarian), or of r. It is true that Cicero’s spelling, commocat, &c., might equally well be taken as a proof of the more vocalic nature of v in his time; for before a vowel com is often the form in use, e. g. comido, comitor, &c. [Caesellius Vindex (end of first cent. a. d.) (ap. Cassiod. 206. 17 K.) recommends com- before a vowel, con- before a consonant or v; tune pro m littera n litterae sonum deuntius effe- remus]. But the Latin and Teutonic loanwords give a similar indication of a change in the pronunciation of v (at any rate of initial v), during the period of the Western Empire. The early Latin loanwords in Teutonic languages show invariably w for Latin v-, e. g. Goth. wins, our ‘wine,’ ‘wall,’ ‘wick’ (Latin vimum, vallum, vieus). But Teutonic loanwords in Italian &c., which date from the Gothic occupation in the fifth cent. a. d., show gu- for Gothic w- (e. g. guaire from Gothic warjan; guisa, our ‘-wise’), an indication that the initial w- sound had passed out of use in Latin. An examination of the Romance languages does indeed suggest that the change from the bilabial to the labiodental spirant was not completed in the Vulgar Latin of all the provinces; but on the other hand the close connexion of the w- and the r-sounds, and the frequent passage of a language from either sound to the other, weaken the force of the evidence. In Vulgar Latin intervocalic b had been merged in r. This r, of double origin, has the labiodental sound in Italian and French; but is bilabial in Spain, and (possibly through Greek influence) in South Italy. Spanish and South Italian also merge initial b and v. Thus, while initial and intervocalic b of Latin bibo receive a different treatment in Italian bevere, they have the same spirant sound in Spanish beber, Sicilian viviri, Calabrian vivere. The identification of Latin v and intervocalic b in all the Romance languages, and therefore in Vulgar Latin, shows that it was in this position, in the middle of a word between vowels, that b first became a spirant sound (see below). Confusions of spelling between b and v are usually of this sort, e. g. Danireius, the spelling of the classical period, later Danubius (see Georges, Lex. Worf. s. v., and for other examples, s. v. abellana, gabata, viducium, Sweb, sebum, Vevirus, seviv). That the development also of v differed according to its position in a word is a natural inference, and is confirmed by the evidence. Initial accented v would, owing to the stress with which a con- sonant was pronounced in this position, develop its consonantal character more rapidly than intervocalic v, especially than pretonic intervocalic v (see below). A good instance of a confusion of spelling due to this is the word vincerius, which so often assumed the form beneficus, that it produced in late Latin a new word for a sorcerer, maleficus (A. L. L. i. 79) (cf. Probi App. 200. 9 K. inter beneficem et veneicum hoc interest, quod beneficem bene facientem significat, veneicum autem veneni datorem esse demonstrat). Viditium is the correct spelling, not bātīlīnum (Nettleship, Contributions to Lat. Lexic. s. v.).

After r and l the same thing seems to have happened; cf. late Lat. albus (Agrim. 82. 24.), arba (75. 19.), Vulg. Lat. curbus, curbus (Fr. corbeau, courbe, &c.). Pliny’s example of preconsonantal l is the word silva (§ 99); and the classical spelling of the Perfect of ferco, where rv is followed by u is ferbui not ferrei (ferui) (cf. Georges, Lex. Worf. s. v. vulca, erum, gilve); Probi App. 198. 7 alveus non ‘albeus.’ Albeus occurs often on inserr., e. g. C. L. L. x. 1.
§ 53. Intervocalic v dropped. Between vowels v seems to have retained a vocalic character much longer. It was dropped before v of the Nom. Sing., thus *deivus (older *deir-) became *deius, dens, Gnaevus became Gnaeus, &c. (ch. iv. § 70), but was usually restored from the other cases, e. g. rives from rivo, &c., but Vulg. Lat. had ruis, &c. (Ital. rio, Prov. rius, O.Fr. riu); between similar vowels it is very prone to disappear, e. g. rîs, sîs, for sì vis, obîscor, dimus (Plaut.), just as in Mod. Tuscan between e-e, bee for beve; late spellings like noicius, for novicius, Novembris for Novembris, &c., are very frequent, especially when v stands before the accent. (For examples see Schuchardt, Vok. ii. pp. 471 sqq., e. g. Flaus C.I. i. 277, viii. 9422, oo E.E. v. 777; cf. the remarks of grammarians like Probus, Inst. 113. 17 K. hoc ovum et non hoc 'oum'; Probi App. 198 5. K. flavus non 'flans'; ib. 199. 2 K. rius non 'rius'; ib. 198. 8 K. favilla non 'failla'; ib. 199. 2 K. pavor non 'paor'; ib. 197. 28 avus non 'aus' ; similarly on Greek inscriptions Noeµbrìos is the usual form (as early as 73 b. c. in S. C. of Oropus); cf. 'Ωκταίος (time of Augustus); 'Αίαρος (C.I. i. 4750); Ξέρβος, &c. (Eckinger, p. 92) (see also Georges, Lex. Worfl. s. vv. longiao, boa, bov, Ribbeck, Index, p. 448 for spellings in Virgil MSS. like fluventa, bocum, fluvidus, fluctianem, ingrunt, tenwia).

§ 54. Postconsonantal v dropped. Vulg. Lat. v (in classical Latin the vowel u) is also dropped after consonants not only before u (for examples see Schuchardt, Vok. ii. pp. 464 sqq., e. g. mortus for mortuus, cardus for cardus (cf. cardelis Petron. 46. 4) (Ital. morto, cardo; Span. muerto, cardo; Fr. mort, chardon from *cardo, -onis), just as -quv- became -cu- in the beginning of the first cent. A. d. e. g. ecut, locuntur, locatus (see § 93), but also when pretonic in words like Jät(u)ărius, Febrr(u)ărius, batt(u)ère, cons(u)ère, contin(u)ari (see Georges and Brambach s. vv. and for contin(u)ari, A. L. L. viii. 129, 136. Examples of this spelling in Inscriptions and MSS. have been collected by Schuchardt, Vok. ii. pp. 467 sqq. Compare the Romance forms, e. g. Ital. gennaio, febraro, battere, cucire, &c.) (see ch. iii. § 15). In the App. Probi we have: 199. 12 Februarius non 'Febrarius'; 197. 23 vacua non 'vaqua,' vacui non 'vaqui' (cf. Febrarius in various Latin inscriptions, such as C.I. i. 3160; xiv. 58. 2795). Pituía must have had in ordinary speech the triasyllabic pronunciation which Horace gives it (Epp. i. i. 108 nisi cum pituita molesta est), and not the quadrasyllabic of Catullus (xxiii. 17 mucusque et mala pituita nasii). For Aelius Stilo's derivation of the word was 'quia petit vitam' (ap. Quint. i. 6.
§ 55. *ai, ei before a vowel.* Velius Longus says that Cicero wrote *Maia,* &c., because he thought these words should be written as they were pronounced (*auditu emensu scriptioem*) ; so *coiicit* might be written *coiiicit* to express the sound of the first syllable *coi* and the second and third syllables *iiicit* (Vel. Long. viii. 54. 16 K.) : in plerisque Cicero videtur *auditu emensu scriptioem,* qui et *Aiaiecem* et *Maiam* per duo i scribenda existimavit : quidam unum esse animadvertunt, siquidem potest et per unum in enuntiari, ut scriptum est. unde illud quod pressiue et plenius sonet per duo i scribi oportere existimat, sic et *Troiam,* et *siqua* talia sunt. unde crescit ista geminatio, et incipit per tria i scribi *coiicit,* ut prima syllaba sit coi, sequentes duae iicit. . . . at qui Troiam et Maiam per unum i scribunt, negant onerandam pluribus litteris scriptingem, cum sonus ipse sufficiat. hanc enim naturam esse quarrandum litterarum, ut morentur et enuntiantia sonum detinente, quod accedit et in eo quod dicimus *hoe est* [pronounced *hoecest* p. 54. 12], cum ipsa vastitas litterae in enuntiatione pinguescat. atque ipsa natura i litterae est ut interjecta vocalibus latinis enuntietur, dum et prior illam adserit et sequens sibi vindicat. So Priscian (x. r. 494) says that *aiio* was spelt *aiio* in former times, and is still pronounced *aiyo* (*iloco consonantibus habet duplicitis*). Our ordinary pronunciation *Tröjo,* *ejus* is wrong. The first vowel of the diphthong retained its natural quantity, *ejero,* *Gáius,* but *ejus,* *aiio,* *májo* (see Arch. Glott. Ital. x.), as we see from Romance forms like Ital. peggio (with open e) for Latin *pêjor,* and from the remark of Terentianus Maurus (p. 343 K.), that in Troja, *Maia, pêjor,* *jejunium* the vowel preceding *j* is short in each of these words, though the syllable is long. Similarly *ejilo,* to utter the cry *ei* (Plant. Aud. 796 ei mihi! . . . Cur eiulas? must have been pronounced *ei-julo.* In unaccented syllables *j,* *aiio* seem to have been dropped after a short vowel in Latin, e.g. the Adj. suffix *-ens for *-eyes* (Riv. Filolog. 1891 p. 18) (ch. v.). Spellings like *aiio* are sometimes found in MSS. of classical authors, e.g. *aiio* in the archetype of Hor. *Epî.* 15. 45 was written *aiio,* whence the corruption *aiio* in several MSS (Class. Rec. v. 296) ; *eiuis* in the Ambrosian Palimpsest of Plautus, Most. 981 &c. ; *piaculum* (in the Vetus Codex *piiaculum*) Truc. 223.

§ 56. H. Latin *h,* the representative of Indo-European GH (e.g. *hostis,* our *guest*) must in prehistoric times have had some sound like German *ch* in *ach,* Scotch *ch* in *loch,* but by the literary period had been reduced to the mere spiritus fortis, our *h.* We have no reason to doubt that the sound was dropped in Vulgar Latin as early as the middle of the third cent. B. C., for we have not a trace of initial or medial *h* in any of the Romance languages, not even the oldest; and one of the earliest tasks of grammarians at Rome was to draw up rules for the correct use of
initial $h$, their usual practice being to appeal to the Sabine dialect where I.-Eur. $gh$ had become $f$ (e. g. *fostis*), as $gh$ in our 'enough' (ch. iv. § 121). The Greek aspirated consonants $\theta, \chi, \phi$ (t-h, k-h, p-h, as in 'an-h-eap,' 'in-k-horn,' 'up-hill') were expressed by the simple tenues $t, c, p$ in the Latin of the Republic, until at the time of Cicero it was felt necessary to express them more accurately by $th, ch, ph$ (ch. i. § 11); and this pronunciation was carefully followed in polite circles. The struggle to attain the new shibboleth of fashion led to ludicrous misapplications of the $h$-sound by the uneducated classes, which have been satirized by Catullus in his famous epigram on Arrius (84):

 `'Chommoda' dicebat siquando commoda vellet
dicere et insidias Arrius 'hinsidias';`

and the dropping of $h$ seems to have been even in the time of St. Augustine an unpardonable breach of manners. (On $rh, rrh$ for Greek $\rho-, \rho\rho-$ see ch. i. § 11.)

Between vowels the omission of $h$ was sanctioned by current usage in a number of words such as $nēmo$ (for *ne-hemo), $dēbeo$ (dehībeo), $p r a e b e o$ (prachībeo), $p r a e d a$ (for *praeheda, *prachīda). By the first cent. $p r e n d o$ and $n i l$ had established themselves in pronunciation, also $d e p r e n d o$, through $r e p r e h e n s u s$ was heard as well as $r e p r e n s u s$.

In the Umbrian language the length of a vowel was often indicated by writing it before and after an $h$, e. g. $c o m o k o t a$ (Lat. commōda); and it has been suggested that this usage may have been adopted in Latin in a few words like $v e h e m e n s$, just as the Oscan habit of doubling a vowel to express its length (e. g. trístaa-mentud, Latin testamento abl.) was adopted by Accius (ch. i. § 9). $V e h e m e n s$, according to this theory, is derived from $vē$ and $mēns$, like $vēsānus$ from $vē$ and $sānus$ (*Etym. Lat.* p. 113). We have $n a h a r t i s$ (*C. I. L.* xi. 4213, time of Augustus), as well as $n a r t i s$ (ib. 4201, 240 A.D.), &c., in Latin inscriptions from the Umbrian territory, and Cicero (*Orat.* xlv. 153) speaks of the name $Ālā$ (Ahala) as representing $A v i l l a$ (but cf. *Dion.* p. 424, Dositheus, p. 382 K.). We find $h$ put to the same use in modern German, through analogy of words like stahel 'steel' (with $h$ for I.-Eur. $k$; cf. O. Pruss. stakla) which became stäl.
§ 57. Testimony of grammarians: Quint. i. 5. 19 quamquam per adspirationem, sive adicitur vitiose sive detrahitur, apud nos potest quaeani, an in scripto sit vitium, si h littera est, non nota. cujus quidem ratio mutata cum temporibus est saepius. pareissime ea veteres usi etiam in vocalibus, cum 'aedos iresosque' diebant. diu deinde servaturum, ne consonantibus adspirent, ut in 'Graciss' et 'trumpis.' erupit brevi tempore nimiun usus, ut 'choronae chenturiones praechones' adhuc quibusdam inscriptionibus manequant, qua de re Catulli nobile epigramma est. inde durat ad nos usque 'vehemen'te' et 'comprehendere' et 'mihi': nam 'mehe' quoque pro 'me' [leg. mi?] apud antiquos tragoediarum praeipue scriptores in veteribus libris invenimus. Similarly Gellius ii. 3. 1-4: h litteram sive illam spiritum magis quam litteram dici oportet, inserebant eam veteres nostri plerisque vocibus verborum firmandis rororandisque, ut sonus earum esset viridior vegetiorque; atque id videntur fecisse studio et exemplo linguae Atticae. satis notum est, Attieos ἱγαναι et ι pronomen et multa itidem alia, contra morem gentium Graeciae ceterarum, inspirantis primae litterae dixisse. sic 'lachruras,' sic 'sepulchrum,' sic 'ahenum,' sic 'vehemens,' sic 'iocoare,' sic 'helmari,' sic 'balueinari,' sic 'honera,' sic 'honustum' dixerunt. In his enim verbis omnibus litterae seu spiritus istius nulla ratio visa est, nisi ut firmitas et vigor vocis, quasi quibusdam nervis additsis, intenderetur. Then he goes on to tell of a bookhunting friend of his who had bought for twenty gold 'sigillari' a MS. of the second Aeneid, 'mirandae vetustatis,' which was reputed to have belonged to Virgil himself. In v. 469 telis et luco coruscus aena, the last word had been corrected to ahen, just as aheni, not aeni, was the reading of the 'optimi libri' in Georg. i. 296. This account of h as (like the Greek spiritus asper), a mere 'nota adspirationis,' not properly called a 'littera' is a commonplace of the grammarians, e. g. Mar. Victor. vi. 5. 27 K.; ib. vi. 3; Charisius i. 265. 20 K.; Priscian i. 47, &c. The only contradiction is the absurd remark of Pompeius (v. 147. 14 K.,) that in Virgil's line (Aen. ix. 610) terga fatigamus hasta, the h causes length by position, a remark often repeated by the later writers on metre and followed in practice by the Christian poets.

Terentianus Maurus in his description of the sound of h discusses its claims to stand in the alphabet (vi. 331. 213) (Cf. Quint. i. 4. 9):

nulli dubium est faecibus emicet quod ipsis
h littera, sive est nota, quae spiret anhelum.
quin hane etiam grammatici volunt vacare,
quia non adicit litterulis novum sonorem,
sed gravella quaedam scholicae nitela vocis
vocalibus apte sedet ante posta eunctis,
'hastas' 'hederas' cum loquor 'Hister' 'hospes' 'hujus.'

Marius Victorinus says (vi. 34. 7 K.) profundo spiritu, anhelis faecibus, exploso ore fundetur; and Martianus Capella (iii. 261) H contractis [con- rasis Eius] paululum faecibus ventus exhalat. Cf. Priscian i. 24; Alcinini vii. 303. 18 K.

Rules for the use and omission of initial h are very frequent in the grammarians. Nigidius (first cent. E.C.) emphasized the importance of correctness in the use of this letter: rusticus fit sermo si adspires perperam, a dictum quoted by Gellius (xiii. 6. 3), who explains that by 'rusticism' Nigidius meant what grammarians of a later date called barbarismus. Velius Longus
quotes Varro's argument for the pronunciation hārena, viz. that the Sabine form of the word is fasena. Similarly haedus is supported by faedus, hircus by fircus (Vel. Long. vii. 69, 4–10 K.). Quite a number of dialectal forms have been preserved for us through the grammarians’ practice of using dialectal f as a criterion for Latin h, e.g. fordeum (with fasena, firci, faedi) (Vel. Long. vii. 81 K.): the doubtful foriolus (Ter. Scapir. 11 K.) (with faedus, fordeum, and p. 13 fircus): Falisean haba (id. 13 K.): fibra (=herba) (Nigidius ap. ‘Serv.’ ad Georg. i. 120): forda bos, a cow in calf, Fœdicidia (Paul. Fest. 59 ; 73 Th. folus, fostis, fostia (id. 59 : horctus, good (id. 73): hanulum, a shrine (id. 73): fuma (= humus), Haunii (= Faunii) (glosses ap. Löwe, Prodr. 426) ; and a large number of etymologies were made on the strength of this relation between f and h, such as Formiae ‘velut Hormiae’ from Greek ὑπος (Paul Fest. 59): horremum from far (id. 73): firmus from Greek ἡμι (id. 64). So Servius (ad Aen. vii. 695): Faliseso Halesus condidit. ha autem, in mututato h in f, Falisci dicti sunt, sicut festis dicitur quae ante ‘hebris’ dicebatur, Formiae quae ‘Hormiae’ fuerunt, ut quò fœbus: nam posteritas in multia nominibus f pro h posuit. These dialectal words are often loosely called ‘old Latin’: haba, for example, which Terentius Scaurus expressly declares to have been a Falisean word (13 K.), is referred by Velius Longus (69 K.) to the ‘antiqui’; and Quintilian (i. 4. 13), amongst other genuine instances of old Latin, such as Valesii, Fusi, mertare, says: quin ‘fordeum’ ‘faedosque’ [dicebant], pro adsipiratione f ut simili littera utentes. There is however no reason to believe that in Latin itself these forms were used, though they may have been heard in the country districts about Rome, where dialectal influence often strongly asserted itself. At other times grammarians defend the use or omission of h by more or less ingenious etymologies, e.g. Servius in Don. iv. 444. 28, 29 K. dicta est enim [harena] quod harida sit terra; Charisius i. 103. 21, 22 K. harena dicitur quod haeret, et arena quod areat; gratius tamen cum adsipiratione sonat. Velius Longus (vii. 68. 18, 19 K.) defends allica : cum ab alendo possit alica dici, et aliculum existimam dictum, quod alas nobis injecta contineat, and ortus : quod ibi herbæ oriantur. Charisius says of this word alica that Verrius Flaccus approved of the form without h, whereas a line of Luellius ran : nemo est haficiarius posterior te (i. 96. 9 K.). Capers’s dictum is: alica non halica (vii. 107. 12 K.). Another doubtful case was the salutation dve. Quintilian (i. 6. 21) tells us that though the proper form was dve, the verb being aedere and not havere, yet no one, except a precisian, thought of saying anything else than havè: multum enim litteratus, qui sine adsipiratione et producta secunda syllaba salutarit (’avere’ est enim), ... recta est hæc via : quis negat ? sed adjacent alia et mollior et magis trita, &c. (For examples of uncertainty in the use of h, see Georges and Brambach, s. vv. Hiberus, harena, haurio, exaurio, harundo, haruspex, hebenus, hedera, hellebor, Henna, haja, huilo, Hiloæ, Aedvi, alica, allic, halucinor, Hadria, Halaesa, Halicarnassus, Hamilcar, Hammon, Hannibal, Hanno, elleborum, ercisco, erctum, erus, Hadrumetum, haedus, hamus, hariolus, hibiscum, himnules, hircus, hostia, holus, holitor, onustus, ono, onerus, olus, Hister, Hirpinæ, omero, Ilerda, Illitria.) Cf. Probi App. 199. 17 K. ad hue non ‘aduc’ (aduc in C. I. L. v. 6244).

The right employment of h is a leading subject in Alcuin’s handbook of Orthography (vii. 300. 27 K.; 303. 11, 13 and 19; 306. 2) ; and St. Augustine (Confess. i. 18) playfully remarks that the dropping of an h was generally regarded as a more heinous sin than an offence against the law of
§ 58. *h* between vowels. Quintilian (ix. 4. 59) says that *deprehendere*, not *deprehendere*, was the form in use in his time. Gellius (second cent.) (ii. 3) speaks of *ahenum* (cf. *ahenam*, Comm. Lud. Saec. A. 60, &c.), *vemenens*, *vrehore* (along with *luchrenae*, *sepulchren*, *helluari*, *halucinari*, *homer* and *hominatus*) as old-fashioned forms now obsolete. A fourth century grammarian, called Probus, says that *trüho* retains the *h* in spelling merely to indicate that the *a* and *o* are pronounced separately, the word being spoken ‘*trao*’ (iv. 185. 5 K.). On the other hand in the second century Terentius Scaurus while declaring that *preno*, never *prehendo*, was the form in use, says that *vého* ‘sine dubio aspiratur,’ and speaks of *vemen* and *vemenens*, *reprens* and *reprensus* as optional (vii. 19. 14 K.) [cf. Velius Longus (second cent.), vii. 68. 15 K., who gives *vemen* and *reprehendo* as the usage of the ‘elegantiores,’ *preno* as universal, and Annaeus Cornutus (first cent.), the friend of Persius, who mentions *vreno*, *vemen*, *nil* as the pronunciation of his day (ap. Cassiodor. vii. 153. 7 K.) (see also Alcuin vii. 211. 26, 27 K.; Papirian vii. 159. 18–21 K.; Eutyches vii. 200. 8 K.; Caper vii. 98. 12 K.). (For examples of confusion in spelling, see Georges and Brambach s. vv. *cohors*, *ineo*, *aneus*, *Ahenobarbus*, *Dakar*, *Praates*, *coerceo*, *euhum*, *proenimium*, *periodus*. For Greek compounds with aspirate initial of second member following a consonant, see *exedra*, *exodus*, *symnodus*, *Panhornus*, &c. On the interjections *aha*, *ehem* cf. Richter in Studemund’s Studien, i. ii.)

§ 59. *h* in Old Latin. *H* was dropped earliest between vowels (e.g. *nemo*); and the disuse of initial *h* would no doubt begin with words which were preceded in the sentence by a word ending in a vowel. Teutonic loanwords with *h* in Romance lost their *h* rapidly in Italian, Spanish, and Portuguese, but retained it for some time in French, which in the Middle Ages abounded in consonantal terminations. This was doubtless the principle of elision of a final vowel before initial *h* in Latin poetry, whether the vowel was actually final, or was followed by the vague nasal ‘after-sound,’ *m* (see §§ 153, 61). There is no reason to suppose that initial *h* was in Early Roman poetry more resistive of elision, than in the classical period. The Plautine *flagitiám hóminis* formed really a single word (ch. iii. § 12), and the hiatus is to be compared to hiatus in compounds like *circuít* from *circum* *it*. The weak nature of early *h* is seen in compounds like *cohonesto* (co- before a vowel as in *coeo*, *coorior*, &c.) which in Accius, *Trag.* 445 R. appears as *cūnesto* (see § 149). *Nihil* is always a monosyllable in Plautus apparently. But the dropping of initial *h* on the older inscriptions is hardly known. (See Sittl. *Lok. Verschied.*, p. 39.)

§ 60. Greek aspirates in Latin. The Greek aspirates lost their aspiration in loanwords by the early writers, e.g. Plautus, as we gather from the MSS. (see the statistics given in *Fleck, Jahrb.* 1891, p. 658 n.), from puns like those on *Chrysalus* (*Crusalus*) and *crucisalus*, on *Charinus* (*Carinus*) and *careo*—*Pseud.* 136, non *Charinus mihi quidemst sed copia, on Thales and talentum Capt. 274, and from the statements of later grammarians (cf. the pun on *exceleaverrat* ‘cum aspiratione secundae syllabae’ (robbed of one’s money, *χαλκός*), and *exceleavrerrat*, i.e. taken off one’s boots, *calcei*) in Porphyry: ad *Hor.* S. i. 8. 39.)
Quintilian for example (i. 5. 20) says: diu deinde servatum ne consonantibus [veteres] adspirationem ut in 'Graciss' et in 'triumpis.' There are not wanting in Plautus indications that the vulgar Greek pronunciation of χ as k-kh (see Blass, p. 86) influenced some loanwords in popular use so as to lengthen (by position) the previous vowel. *Acc.h'eruns, Acc(h)i(l)les, like bracc(h)ium seem to be required by the metre (Baier, Philologische Abhandlungen zu Hertz. 1888). Similarly the word tricæ, whose origin has been traced to S. Italy, where the word was applied to hair-shakeles put on the legs of fowls to prevent their straying, seems to be nothing but the Greek τρίξες in a Latinized form (tricæ and *tricæ, like brāchium and brāchium, &c.). The proverb 'āpīnæ tricaeque,' used of trifles (Mart. xiv. 1. 7):—

sunt apinae tricaeque et siquid villus istis,

has likewise been referred to S. Italy, where ἀφάνα (Latinized apīnæ), 'the unseen realms,' was in popular story the name of an imaginary country of bliss, like Aristophanes' 'Cloud-cuckoo-land' (Ribbleck, Leipziger Studien, 1887). The Vulg. Latin muttus, a word, from which Fr. mot is derived (mutus, Non. 9. 16 M.?) seems to be similarly Greek μῦθος (muttus for mūtus), as tricæ for *tricoæ: also stūppus a rope is Gk. στρόφος (Festus, 452. 21 Th., says that at Tusculum the word had the sense of a wreath, and that a Faliscan 'Garland-festival' was called Strupparea; the Romance forms point to stūppus, a form found in this passage of Festus). Gk. φ was in early Latin transcription p, e.g. Pilīpus on a denarius of the time of the Graecī (C.I.L. i. 354), though sometimes (like Gk. π in Burrus, Πυπρός b, e.g. Βρίγες for Φρίγες, balaena for φάλανα (Quint. i. 4. 15, from Verrius Flaccus) (see § 49). F was not regularly used till the middle of the fourth cent. A.D. (see ch. i. § 11). Blass, Griech. Aussprache, p. 85, dates the change of Gk. φ from the p-h to the f-sound at about 400 A.D.; and the language of Diomede (fourth cent.) seems to imply that the difference between Lat. f and Gk. φ was in his time very slight (423. 28 K. 'et hoc seire debemus quod f littera tum scribitur, cum latina dictio scribitur, ut 'felix,' nam si peregrina fuerit, p et h scribimus, ut 'Phoebus,' ' Phaeton'). The difference between the two sounds in Cicero's time is seen from Quintilian's story of Cicero ridiculing a Greek witness who could not pronounce the first letter of Fundānius (Quint. i. 4. 14). Φ is however, as is natural, the Greek transcription of Latin f (Eckinger, p. 97); e.g. Φοβάναυς is the Greek transcription of this very name on an inscription of 81 B.C. (Bull. ix. p. 457, from Laguna in Caria). The old spelling persisted in a few words like ταῖς (Gk. θῶς), &c. (see ch. i. § 11). A curious interchange of s and th is occasionally seen in the Notae Tironianæ, e.g. agatho for ἀγασό, Apollopiśus for Pythius (Schmitz, Beitr. 109). With the introduction however of Greek grammatical studies at Rome a more exact transcription came into fashion (see ch. i. § 11), and it is to this tendency that we must refer the aspiration of some consonants even in Latin words about this time, not merely in words which were supposed to be borrowed from Greek, e.g. pulcher (ch. i. § 11) (referred to πολύχρονος, Ter. Scaur. vii. 20. 4–8), and σπευρχρισµόν (s8 and pulcher! Charis. i. 73 17; cf. C.I.L. i. 1007 heie est sepulcrum hau pulerum pulerai feminae), lachyrmā (to Gk. δάκρωμα), &c., but to others which could hardly be so misunderstood, e.g. praecho, lurcho. In the Orator xlvi. 160, Cicero tells us that he was forced in spite of his convictions to yield so far to popular usage as to pronounce pulcher, Cethēgus, triumphus, Karthago, though he
still adhered to Oracieus, Mito, Oto, Caepio, sepulcrum, corona, lacrina: quin ego ipse. cum seirem ita majores locutos esse, ut nasquam nisi in vocali aspiratione uterentur, logobar sic, ut 'pulceros,' 'Cetegos,' 'triumpos,' 'Cartaginem' diceerem. aliquando idque sero convicio aurium cum extorta mihi veritas essest, usum loquendi populo concessi, scientiam mihi reservavi. 'Oracivios' tamen et 'Matones,' 'Otones,' 'Caepiones,' 'sepulcra,' 'coronas,' 'lacrinas,' dicimus, quia per aurium judicium licet. Similarly Quintilian, in a passage already mentioned (i. 5. 20), says: diu deinde servatum, ne consonantibus [veteres] adspirarent, ut in 'Gracies' et in 'triumpis.' erupit brevi tempore nimius usus, ut 'chorona,' 'chenturiones,' 'praechones,' adhuc quibusdam in inscriptionibus maneat. qua de re Catulli nobile epigramma est. In the second cent. A.D. pulcher was the current pronunciation (Ter. Scaur. vii. 20. 4-8 K.; Vel. Long. vii. 69. 13-17 K.), also Carthago, Gracchus, Ótho, Bocchus; unaspirated were òto, coolea, cooleâre (Vel. Long. l. c.). In the fourth cent. Orcus, Videcinum, corâna, ancôra, sepulcrum (Mar. Victorinii vi. 21. 10 K.; Serv. ad Georg. iii. 223, but for ancora cf. Serv. ad Aen. vi. 4), but Gracchus (Charis. i. 82. 11 K.), pulcher (Serv. l. c.) were the forms in use. Pulcher held its ground most persistently in spite of the rule, first apparently stated by Varro (Charis. i. 73. 17 K.), and often repeated by the Grammarians (Ter. Scaur. vii. 20. 4-8; Probus Cath. iv. 10. 19 K.; Ter. Maur. vi. 332. 219-221 K.; Mar. Vict. vi. 34. 5-6 K.; cf. Vel. Long. vii. 69. 13-17 K.) that no consonant should be aspirated in a native Latin word. On the other hand thûs (Gk. òthos), corôna (from Gk. òphos, Etym. Lat. p. 25), with borchô, sepulcrum, Orcus, &c., were only adopted by imitators of the Ciceronian age (Probus Cath. iv. 10. 19 K., Serv. ad Aen. vi. 4; Mar. Victor. vi. 21. 20 K.; cf. Ter. Scaur. vii. 14 K.). Of corôna Festus (26 Th.), quoting probably from Verrius Flaccus (time of Augustus), says: corona cum videatur a choro dici, caret tamen aspiratione. For examples of these varieties of spelling on inscriptions, see Brandis, De consonantium aspiratione apud Romanos (in Curtius, Studien, ii. 1869). Consentius (v. 392. 19. 27) censures the mispronunciations Tracicia, Trachia, Chartago. For ðθ we have ðth in phoïbus in the Comm. Lud. Saeec. The use of rh for Gk. initial ð- was not approved by Varro (L.L. iii. fr. 58, p. 182 Wilm.) (see ch i. § 11). For examples of this confusion of spelling, see Georges and Brambach, s.vv. ancora, arcâ, tropaeum, baccar, Cethegus, Gracchus, murra, Orcus, Ótho, pulcher, Regium, rhombus, talosio, letum, simulacrum, charta, Bospurus (Boshporus not till third or fourth cent. A.D.), chiamys, chorda, clatri, colecnes, concha, ctherunns, cyathus, lucre, lumpa, schema, schola, sepulcrum, raeda, Raetia, Rhamnes, Rhodope, Rhodos, rhûs, Riphaeus, romphaeu, theatrum, Viriathus, triumphus, vacana, ciniphes (Kvîtes), trïcînium (AbL Plur. trïchînus, C.I.L. ix. 4971; xiv. 375. 17). On the spellings Calphurnius and Calpurnius, see Schuch. Vok. i. p. 18, and for the confusion of ph, p, f, see ibid. on the spelling phîdelis, and Georges on phæceus, sîfo, sulfur Late Latin culfus (see A.L.L. vii. 443) is the precursor of the Romance forms of Gk. κόλπος (Ital. Span. golfo, &c.). In the Probi App. we have (199. 7 K.) strofa non 'stropha'; (199. 17) amfora non 'ampora'; (197. 19) porphyreticum marmor, non 'purpurereticum marmor,' and perhaps (199. 8) zizífus [zizîbus MS.] non 'zizupus.'

The Romance forms show that Vulgar Latin retained the old equivalence of the Latin tenues to the Greek aspirates; e.g. Gk. κόλπος is Ital. colpo, O.Fr. colp, Fr. coup; χαλών is Ital. calare; Ḡâllo is Ital. tallo, Span. tallo, Fr. tale. [Cf. the cautions given in Prob. Appendix against stropa, ampora (see above).]
So that misspellings like ch for c, th for t, ph for p on plebeian inscriptions cannot have implied a different pronunciation. The aspirated forms were to the uneducated Romans mere equivalents of the tenues. Ch, the equivalent of c, was in Italian utilized to distinguish the guttural from the palatalized sound, e.g. chi (Lat. güi), chiave (Lat. clavìa) (see Schuch. Vok. i. p. 74). Similarly h is written, but not pronounced, in Italian to distinguish a few synonyms like ho (Lat. hōbes), and o (Lat. aut), &c.

§ 61. M, N. The pronunciation of the nasals varied according to their position. At the beginning of a word or a syllable m and n had their normal sound. What this was for m there can be little doubt. M, the lip-nasal, has in all Romance languages at the beginning of a word the same sound, that namely of our m. The N-sounds on the other hand vary considerably. There is 'dental n,' as Sweet calls it, the point-nasal, with many varieties according as the tongue touches the teeth (the true 'dental' n as in French, Italian, &c.), or the gums a little behind the teeth, as in English, and so on. There is 'palatal' n, Sweet's front-nasal, as in Fr. Boulogne, vigne, Italian ogni, Spanish señor, cañón (something like our 'vineyard'). There is 'velar' or 'guttural' n, Sweet's back-nasal, of English 'sing,' German singen. And n (like m), may be unvoiced, as in Icelandic knifi, hnut, a sound common in England 200 years ago in words beginning with kn like 'know,' 'knife,' which have now lost all trace of the initial k. Voiceless m is heard in the interjection 'hm!' Normal Latin n was not the true 'dental' (as Italian n is) according to the Latin phoneticians. The tongue touched not the teeth but the palate; what precise part of the palate, we are not told (Nigidius ap. Gell. xix. 14. 7). Before a guttural, n was 'velar' or 'guttural' n, like Greek γ in ἀγγελός, ἀγκάλη, a sound called the Agma by Greek phoneticians and by their Latin imitators (Nigidius l. c.; Priscian i. 39; Mart. Vict. vi. 19. 11 K.), to express which Accius proposed to follow the Greeks and write g, e.g. aggúlus, aggens, aggúla, iggérunt. At the end of a syllable, before a consonant, Latin m, n had again a parallel in Greek, and accordingly have received attention at the hands of the Latin grammarians. The sound is described as 'something that is neither m nor n,' as in Greek οὐμβυξ (Mar. Vict. vi. 16. 4 K.), a description that would apply to the sound of n in our own 'unpractical,' 'unmerciful' in
careless utterance, as well as to the preposition in Ital. impero, in tacco. There was however one sound of Latin \( \text{m} \) which had no parallel in Greek; and here the Latin grammarians do not give us so much information as we could wish. The curious usage of Latin poetry, by which a word ending with \(-\text{m}\) elides its final syllable before an initial vowel or \( \text{h} \), just as though it ended with a vowel, has nothing like it in Greek. Quintilian (ix. 4. 40) tells us that final \( \text{m} \) before an initial vowel was hardly pronounced, and had a sound not represented in the alphabet: neque enim eximitur, sed obscuratur et tantum in hoc aliquo inter duas vocales velut nota est, ne ipsae coeant. Cato, he adds, wrote ‘dicae’ ‘faciae’ for \( \text{dicam} \), \( \text{faciam} \) (cf. Quint. i. 7. 23; Paul. Fest. 20. 6 and 51. 10), although this spelling was often changed by ignorant persons: quae in veteribus libris reperta mutare imperiti solent, et dum librariorum insectari volunt incipientiam, suam confertur. And according to Velius Longus (80. 20 K.), Verrius Flaccus, in the time of Augustus, proposed a new letter, the first half of the ordinary letter \( \text{M} \), to express final \( \text{m} \) before an initial vowel: \( \text{ut} \) appararet exprimi non debere. Priscian (i. p. 29. 15 H.) says: \( \text{m} \) obscurum in extremitate dictionum sonat, \( \text{ut} \) ‘templum’; apertum in principio, \( \text{ut} \) ‘magnus’; mediocre in mediis, \( \text{ut} \) ‘umbra.’ What the exact sound of \(-\text{m}\) was, is not easy to determine. From Latin poetry we see that a word ending in \(-\text{m}\), e.g. \( \text{finem} \), is, when the next word begins with a vowel, treated like a word ending in a vowel, e.g. \( \text{fine} \). In both cases the final syllable suffers what is called ‘elision,’ \( \text{fin(em) onerat} \) and \( \text{fin(e) onerat} \) (see § 153). Final \(-\text{m}\) therefore lacks the weight of an ordinary consonant, the power to prevent two vowels from coalescing, and in this respect is on a par with initial \( \text{h} \). Before e.g. \( \text{honorat} \) the final syllable of \( \text{fine} \), \( \text{finem} \) suffers ‘elision’ in exactly the same way as before \( \text{onerat} \). But are we to say that in \( \text{finem} \) the \( \text{em} \) became a nasal vowel, an \( \text{e} \) spoken ‘through the nose,’ or in stricter terms, spoken with the passage into the nose not covered by the uvula? In this case \( \text{em} \) would have a sound like that of our exclamation ‘eh!’; spoken with something of a nasal twang; and to give this sound to the Latin interjection \( \text{hem} \) (expressing surprise, sorrow, indignation, &c., e.g. Ter. Anulr. 435: quid Davos narrat? ...
nilne hem? Nil prorsus), would not be unnatural. Or should we say that e had its ordinary sound, and that this sound was followed by some reduced form of m, probably some adumbration of unvoiced or whispered m, at any rate something of as slight a consonantal character as h? A very probable account is that -m was reduced through the lips not being closed to pronounce it. If instead of closing the lips, all that were done were to drop the uvula, a nasal sound would be given to the following initial vowel, so that finem onerat would be pronounced *finewonerat* with a nasalized o (Gröber, *Commentationes Woelflinianae*, pp. 171 sqq.). When the next word began with a consonant, final m seems to have had more weight in ordinary Latin, if not in Vulgar Latin, for it never fails to make its vowel long by 'position' in poetry of all periods, whereas final s in the earlier poetry usually does so fail. Plautus, for example, could not end an iambic line with *nullum fert*, though he does with *nullus fert* (which we often write *nullus furt*). But that it had not the definite m-character of initial m, that m of *viam continet* did not sound like m of *mira continet* we see from the remark of a first century grammarian, that in the phrase *etiam nunc*, although m was written, something else (like *etiannunc*), was pronounced (Vel. Longus vii. 78. 19 K. cum dico 'etiam nunc,' quamvis per m scribam, nescioquomodo tamen exprimere non possum). How far this differed from that sound of the nasal before a consonant in the middle of the word, which is described as 'something that is neither m nor n,' it is difficult to say. Compounds with prepositions at any rate, like *co(n)necto, comprīmit, contīnet* seem quite on a level with *etiam nunc* (or *etiannunc*?). In both these cases Latin m is treated like Greek v in *συγκαλέω, συντείνω, συμβάλλω*, and the spellings found on inscriptions ἵν κύκλῳ, ἔμ Πρυτανείῳ, τῆν γυναίκα, τῆν βουλήν, which has led in the Rhodian dialect of the present day to a complete assimilation of the nasal to the consonant, e.g. *tix χάρι* (*τὴν χάριν*) (G. Meyer, *Griechische Grammatik*, § 274). As close a parallel is offered by Sanscrit final m which is described as 'a nasal of a servile character always to be assimilated to a following consonant of whatever nature that may be' (Whitney, *Sanscrit Grammar*, § 71). This Sanscrit -m before initial y, v becomes 'a nasal semivowel, the counterpart of each respectively.' If
the same happened in Latin, if coniunctus, coniux were pronounced coiunctus, coiux, with the first i nasalized, and conventio were *conventio with the first u nasalized, it would explain why it is that, in spelling, the nasal is often omitted, conventionid (C. I. L. i. 196), coingi (id. 1c64) (cf. Sweet Primer, p. 104).

Final n had not this weak sound. Priscian tells us (1. p. 30) n quoque plenior in primis sonat et in ultimis partibus syllabarum, ut 'nomen,' 'stamen': exilior in mediis ut 'amnis,' 'damnum.' In the Umbrian language however it seems to have been on the same footing as Latin final m, for it is sometimes omitted, e.g. nome (Lat. nomen), and sometimes written m, e.g. numem. Both in Umbrian and Oscan final m shows the same character as in Latin, e.g. Umbr. ku and kum (Lat. cum), Osc. via and viam (Lat. viam), con privatud (Lat. cum privato) and cum atrud; and in both languages a nasal is often omitted before a consonant in the middle of a word, e.g. Umbr. iveauka and ivenga (Lat. juvenca), uzo- and onso- (Lat. humento-); Osc. aragetud (Lat. argentus) and praesentid (Lat. presentis): Umbr. apentu and ampentu (Lat. impendo); Osc. Λαύνως (Lat. Lamponius). This omission occurs on Latin inscriptions too, e.g. DECEBRIS (C. I. L. i. 930), MERETI (iii. 2702, &c.), but was a tendency not allowed to develop, as we see from the fact that in Romance n and m are always retained, e.g. Ital. Dicembre, Span. Diciembre, Fr. Décembre. The Plautine scansion of nempe in such a line as Cas. 599:—

quín tú suspendis tél? Nempe tu te díxeras,

has often been quoted as an instance of such a suppression of the nasal (nēpe) in ordinary speech. But the true scansion is nemp(e) with the same syncope of final -ē as in tun and tune, ac (for *altc) and alque, nec and neque. A nasal is only dropped before certain consonants in Latin according to fixed laws and never without doubling the consonant or lengthening the vowel (Skutsch, Forschungen, i. § 2). Before s, for example, this was the case; so mensa was pronounced mēsa, with the ordinary close sound of the long vowel, to judge from the Romance forms, e.g. Ital. mesa (with close e); in consiles the n, though written, was not sounded (Quint. i. 7. 28, 29). Whether this e, o were at any
period of the language nasal vowels we are not told. In O. Engl. 
\( n \) was dropped before \( th \) (of ‘thin,’ &c.), \( s, f \) with nasalization and 
lengthening of the preceding vowel, e. g. \( m \upmu p, \) ‘mouth’ (Germ. 
Mund), \( g \oslash s, \) ‘goose’ (Germ. Gans), \( f f, \) ‘five’ (Germ. fünf).

Another internal group that calls for notice is \( m n \). In most 
Romance languages this has become \( n n \), e. g. Ital. dannno (Lat. 
dammum), donna (Lat. domina and domina), colonna (Lat. columnna), 
but in French the \( n \) has yielded to the \( m \), e. g. dame (Lat. damnum 
and \( d \ddot{\text{o}}m(i)\)na) (colonne is a bookword). That in the Latin pro-
nunciation the \( n \) had here a weak sound seems to follow from 
Priseian’s remark (i. p. 30) : \( n \) exilior in mediis [sonat] ut ‘amnis,’ 
‘damnum’ (where the syllable begins with \( m \), \( a-mn\)is, \( a-mn\)num, 
while in \( \ddot{\text{et}}a-mn\)num the syllable begins with \( u \)), as well as from 
Quintilian’s many centuries earlier (i. 7. 28, 29): quid quae 
scrivatur aliter quam enuntiantur? \ldots ‘columnam’ et ‘cons-
ules’ exempta \( n \) littera legimus. \( qn \) likewise takes different 
paths in the Romance languages. Usually it becomes a palatal 
\( n \)-sound, e. g. Ital. legno (Lat. lignum), Span. leño, but in Sar-
dinian \( m n \), e. g. linna. There is no evidence to show that the 
\( g \) in this position in Latin took the velar guttural sound \( \ddot{\text{n}} \); and 
probably the pronunciation was merely ordinary \( g \) followed by \( n \). 
\( nct \) was pronounced at least in Vulg. Latin \( ut \) (probably not with 
velar \( n \)), with suppression of the \( c \), e. g. \( q\text{\textae}ntus \) (Ital. quinto, 
with close \( i \)) (see § 144). \( nd \) shows a tendency to \( nm \) (as in 
Oscan and Umbrian) in forms like Plautus’ dispennite, distennite; 
but this assimilation was not carried out in literary or Vulgar 
Latin (e. g. Ital. risponde, Lat. responsed).

\( M, n \) are ‘liquids’ (\( \ddot{\text{v}}\text{\textipa} \)) in Greek, because they readily com-
bine (like \( \lambda, p \)) in one syllable with a preceding mute. But in 
Latin, though this was the case with \( l, r \), it was not with 
\( m, n \). Greek loanwords in Latin which presented this com-
bination, tended to be pronounced with a parasitic vowel, e. g. 
\( T\text{\textae}m\text{\textae}ss\) for Greek \( T\text{\textae}m\text{\textae}\sigma\sigma\) ; and this is the form in which 
they appeared in the earlier literature. At the end of the 
Republic, when it was considered a requisite of polite speech 
to express with greater exactness the Greek sound of these loan-
words, this spelling was generally abandoned; though even in 
the literary language it persisted in some forms, such as \( m\text{\textae}a \).
(Greek μῦδος), and in Vulgar Latin, as the Romance languages testify, it never was given up (e.g. ciumus, Ital. cecero, for κύκος) (see § 154).

§ 62. Phonetic descriptions of normal m, n. Ter. Maur. vi. 332. 235:

at tertia [sc. littera m] clauso quasi mugit intus ore;
quartae [n] sonitus fitgitur usque sub palato,
quo spiritus anceps coeat naris et oris.

Mar. Vict. vi. 34. 12. 13 K. m impressis invicem labis magitum quendam intra oris speciem attractis naribus dabit; n vero sub convexo palati lingua
inhaerente gemino naris et oris spiritu explicabitur. Martianus Capella
(iii. 261), M labis imprimitur; N lingua dentibus appuls a collidit. Priscian
i. 29. 30. H. m obseruuum in extremitate dictionum sonat ut 'templum,' aper-
tum in principio ut 'magnus,' mediocre in mediis ut 'umbra,' . . . n quoque
plenior in primis sonat et in ultimis partibus syllabarum ut 'nomen,'
'stamen,' ex illor in medii ut 'amnis,' 'damnun.' Nigidius (ap. Gall. xix.
14. 7), speaking of the Agma, says: si ea littera [n] esset, lingua palatum
tangeret. Ter. Seaurus mentions the exertion necessary to produce the
labial m (as also b, p), vii. 14. 3 K. non sine labore conjuncto ore.

§ 63. The Agma. Nigidius (i. c.), in Augustus' time, speaks of the n in
words like anguis, inerpat, ingeninus as a sound 'between n and g,' a spurious
n (adulterinum), in which the tongue does not touch the palate, as in normal n.
Varro (ap. Priscian i. p. 3o) says it is a sound common to Greek and Latin,
written g in Greek, and by the poet Accius in Latin, e.g. aggulis, agceps (cf.
that this was the sound of the nasal before qu in nunquam, nunquam, quamquam,
which is a sound between n and g, though, he says, it is usually spoken by grammarians as if it were the sound between m and n of Greek σάμβως. Spellings on late inscriptions like nunquam (C. I. L. v. 154) nunquam (iv. 1837),
nunquam (x. 8192) may indicate this pronunciation, though in nunquam (ixii. 8692), &c., cx may be merely the common symbol for X as in
vexor (ii. 3330), a spelling which has led to the corruption vexor in MSS. of
Plautus (Class. Rev. v. 293).

§ 64. m, n before consonant. Marius Victorinus, speaking of nunquam, nun-
quam, &c. (vi. 16. 4 K.) says: clari in studiis viri, qui aliquid de orthographia
scriperunt, omnes fere aiunt inter m et n litteras mediam vocem, quae non
abhorreat ab utraque littera, sed neutram proprium exprimat, tam nobis deesse
quam Graecis: nam cum illi σάμβως serabit, nec m exprimere nec n. sed
haec ambiguitas in his fortasse vocabulis sit, ut in 'Ampelo,' 'Lycambe,'
nam in nostris supra dictis non est. The word σάμβως, apparently the stock
example of Greek phoneticians for this 'sound which is neither m nor n,' is
an unfortunate instance. It is not a native Greek word, but a loanword from
another language, and in its original form seems not to have had a nasal
[Aramaic sabb'kâ (Daniel iii. 5), Greek σάμβως]. [Is the word connected with
the Latin sambōcas, elderwood, where we have a similar variety of spelling
between sambōcas and sābōcas (sab- in Romance)? On Lat. lambrusca, in Vulg. Lat.
lambrusca (a MS. reading in Virg. Ec. v. 71), Ital. lambrusca, Fr. lambruche,
Span. lambrusca, see below.] We might be inclined from this to believe that
the Greek phoneticians were speaking of a sound that is not a native Greek sound, were it not for spellings on Greek inscriptions like πορνίς, Ολυνιζ, Cret. αὐφότας, &c. This Greek sound was appealed to by Latin grammarians to explain varieties of spelling like corundem and corundem, quantus and quantus, where \(m\) was required by the etymology, true or false (corum, quam) (Cornutus ap. Cassiod. vii. 152. 3), but \(n\) by the pronunciation, and even, as we have seen, to explain nunquam and nunquam, tamquam and tamquam, &c. Here again a doubt suggests itself whether the reference of this sound \('m\) and \(n\)' to the Latin language is not based on mere varieties of spelling which were not varieties of pronunciation; but an appeal to the inscriptions tends to remove it. Sententiam (C. I. L. i. 206), December (ii. 4587, &c.) (see Indices to C. I. L.) can most easily be explained on the supposition that this sound really existed in Latin, unless indeed they are due to the general confusion between \(m\) and \(n\), \(nb\) and \(mb\) caused by the co-existence of etymological and phonetic spellings like contèro and contèro, inibitus and imibitus. (The spelling sententiam is that of the Lex Julia Municipalis and may be due to some ortho- graphical theory of Julius Caesar; for on the same inscription we have damdum, damdum, faciunedi, tuemdam, tuemdarum, quamta, quantum, tamtae, tamtam.) The spelling of these verbs compounded with the prepositions in, cum (com) is discussed by the grammarians (see the passages collected by Seelmann, p. 279) (cf. jamdum for jamdum in Virgil MSS., Ribbeck, Index s. v.). To the ordinary consonants before which \(n\) becomes \(m\), viz. b, p, m (cited by Priscian, i. p. 31. 2 H., from the elder Pliny), Marius Victorinus (fourth cent.) adds \(f\) 'probably from some earlier grammarian', and on Cicero's authority \(v\), e.g. confort, convocat. Whether the change in the fashion of spelling compounds of com, in with verbs beginning with \(f\), \(v\), is a proof that these spirants passed from a bilabial to a labiodental pronunciation is discussed in § 52. It is possible that the nasal was not sounded before \(f\), \(v\) or only slightly sounded (as before \(h\), or a vowel initial), so that the variation of \(m\), \(n\) in the spelling would not indicate a change in pronunciation (cf. the suppression of Latin \(n\) before \(f\), \(v\) in Provençal: see below). The form co-often appears on inscriptions before \(j\), \(v\) in compounds as before a vowel or \(h\) (cośrior, coeo, cohoritor, cohaeoro, but also comest, and in the older spelling comauditum, &c.). Before \(v\) only on early inscriptions, e.g. coventvimus (C. I. L. i. 532), coventtis (i. 196); before \(j\) also on later, e.g. coctio (C. I. L. ii. 1964, col. ii. 51), covent (C. I. L. i. 1064, 1413, vi. 2516, &c.) (see Indices to C. I. L.). The nasal is also often dropped in simple words before mutes, \(m\) before Labials, e.g. Novebris, \(n\) before Dentals and Gutturals, e.g. eudem, provicia (Mon. Ancy.) (see Schuchardt, Vok. i. p. 105). Greek inscriptions treat the Latin nasals in the same way, e.g. Νοεβρ, Ποτωνίος, on the one hand; Νοεβριος, Ποτωνιος, on the other (Eckinger, pp. 109 sqq.). Occasionally a nasal is wrongly inserted in plebeian and later inscriptions, \(m\) before Labials, \(n\) before Dentals and Gutturals, e.g. semptem, sinqmifer. (Examples from inscriptions and MSS. are given by Schuchardt, Vok. i. p. 113 sqq.) (Co may be an original byform of com in cego, &c.; see ch. ix. § 22.)

In Romance, however, there is no trace of any variety of sound in these cases. The classical spelling is invariably reproduced, e.g. Ital. immobile (Lat. immobilitis), tanto (Lat. tantus); and this fact strengthens the doubt expressed above regarding the existence of this 'sound between \(m\) and \(n\)' in Latin. Vulg. Lat. *rendo (Ital. rendo, with open \(e\), Span. rendir, Fr. rendre, &c.) follows the analogy of prendo; and tambrusca, just quoted, for labrusca, should
probably be explained in the same way. But the dropping of the nasal in such a form as *infātibus*, quoted (perhaps from some older grammarian) as a 'barbarism' by Julian, Bishop of Toledo (end of seventh cent.) (Exe. in Don. v. 324. 9 K.) is not reflected in the Romance forms (Ital. *infante*, Span. *infante*, Fr. *enfant*, &c.). Before *s*, where we know that in Latin the nasal was dropped in pronunciation with lengthening of the preceding vowel, e. g. *mensa*, the pronounced form, *mēsa*, is the form reflected in the Romance languages, e. g. Ital. *mesa*, with close *e*. Before *f*, the same thing seems to have happened in Latin, but almost the only instances of Latin words with *n* in Romance are compounds with the preposition or particle *in*, e. g. *infons*. These show *n*, except in Provençal, where *n* is dropped, e. g. *effas*, *efrans*, *enfra* (Lat. *infringere*), *efern*, *afra* (Lat. *infra*), *cofes*, *cofondre* [as *n* before *v* in *evers*, *eveja* (Lat. *invidia*), *covens* (Lat. *conventus*), *covertir*]; but this *n* of Vulgar Latin may be due to what is called 'Recomposition' (see ch. iii. § 18).

§ 65. Final *m*. In the only other Indo-European language which has not changed final -*m* into *n* we are confronted with a curiously similar difficulty to that in Latin. The native grammarians of India, who at an early time devoted themselves to a minute and exhaustive analysis of the phonetics and accidence of Sanscrit, the sacred language of India, have left conflicting accounts of the sound of *m* at the end of a word. Some hold that in a word like Sanscr. *tam* (Greek *tār*), the sound was that of a nasalized (anuvāśa) vowel; others teach the 'intervention after the vowel of a distinct nasal element called the anuvāśa, or after-tone' (Whitney, Sanscrit Grammar, § 71). The Romance languages do not help us to decide whether one or any of these processes took place in Latin, for they offer no indication that in Vulgar Latin *finem* differed at all from *fine*. The only cases where Latin final *m* is preserved are a few monosyllables; and in these *m* has been changed to *n* (*rem*, French *rien*, *quem*, Span. *quien*). The Latin nasals in the middle of a word have passed into nasal vowels in countries under Celtic influence, viz. France and North Italy, and also in Portugal, where Latin *n* between vowels has passed into a nasal vowel, e. g. Romāno, Lat. *Romānus*, māno, Lat. *mānus*, lāna (contracted to *lā*), Lat. *lāna*. The Portuguese suppression of intervocalic *n* is not a complete parallel to the Latin usage; for it is in the middle of a word that the nasal is so treated, and *m* is never suppressed like *n*, e. g. *fumo*, Lat. *fāmus*, *fama*, Lat. *fāma*. The *n* is described as having first nasalized the previous vowel, *s* *m* *a* (with nasal *a*), and then having been dropped (Meyer-Lübke, Rom. Gram. i. p. 314). Nor is the suppression of intervocalic *m* in Irish in such a word as *fearail*, manly. This word is a compound of fear, *man* (cf. Lat. *vīr*), and *amhail*, like (cf. Lat. *similis*). Between two vowels in Irish *m* passed into a *v*-sound; and this *v* often combines with a preceding vowel into a nasal diphthong like German *au* nasalized. In an unaccented syllable, as in *féaramhail*, this diphthong is so far reduced, as to allow the last two syllables to coalesce into one. In Latin, *m* never had this tendency to become *v*; and so the elision in such a phrase as *fəram iǔləd* cannot be explained by the Irish reduction of *fearamhail* to *fəram*ail. A better parallel to the latter would be the reduction of *comuentio*, *comventio* to *contio*. (But see ch. ix. § 22). (On Port. *tam* with *m* sounded like nasal *w*, see Sweet Phil. Soc. xvii. 203.)

Final -*m* is omitted very frequently on the oldest inscriptions till 130 B.C. or thereabouts, and again on late plebeian inscriptions (see § 137). Still
there is no evidence that -m was more easily dropped in early Latin poetry than in the classical age. Indeed Priscian (i. p. 30 K.) speaking of final -m says: vetustissimi tamen non semper eam subtrahent, and quotes a hexameter of Ennius (A. 354 M.) ending with mitia militum octo (cf. Enn. A. 322 M. beginning dum quidem unius); but this remark need not drive us to the opposite extreme, of believing that -m was more sounded in early than in classical times. To the Roman ear at all periods a syllable ending in -m seems to have been the equivalent in hiatus of a syllable ending in a long vowel. This appears to be the rule in Saturnian versification (see Amer. Jour. Phil. xiv. 300); and Plautus, with the older poets, Horace, with the classical poets, allow prosodical hiatus in the one case as much as in the other. Lucilius, for example, scans as a short syllable without eliding, quam (i. 32 M. irritata canes quam homo planius dicat. He is speaking of the letter r), exactly as he shortens quo (xxx. 24 M. quid serus quō eam, quid agam? quid id attinet ad te?). Horace's num adeat is on a par with his si mē amas; and the prosodical hiatus quoted from Ennius by Priscian may be equated with the instance quoted by Cicero (Or. xiv. 152) from the same poet Scipii inviete (A. 345 M.). Nor was this a mere usage of poetry. The same thing is seen in compounds, such as cōnest, cóire (the spelling with com probably was the older usage before a vowel. cf. comauditum, and comagnustatum, Paul. Fest. 46 Th.: comegit Gl. Plac. xiv. 39 G.; on cóga, see above), which have the first syllable short, like prācre, praevaet. The compound of circum and it is a trisyllable circūt; of antī and it a dissyllable, antīt. (On flagitiun-hōminis in Plautus, see above, § 59.) But the disregard of -m in metre before an initial consonant except under the law of Breves Breviantes, like Plautus' almost invariable ēnīm) is unknown until late plebeian verse, e. g. umbrā(m) lexem (along with talēs amici) on the epitaph of a praeco (C. I. L. vi. 1951), moriēnte(m) viderent (vi. 7578), &c. Even in the careless hexameters of the dedicatory inscription of Mummius (i. 542; of 148 b. c.), which contain faciūs occupying the place of a dactyl, paccē need not represent pacaem (as in i. 1290: pacaem petit), but may be the Abl. (as in Plaut. Rud. 698: tua pace):

tua pace rogans te
cogendei dissolvente tu ut facilia faxseis.

The dropping of final -m in vulgar pronunciation is attested by the remarks in Probi App. (198. 27) triciinium non 'triciinu'; (199. 14) passim non 'passi'... numquam non 'numquā'... pridem non 'pride,' olim non 'oli'; (199. 17) idem non 'ide,' and by the spellings on late and plebeian inscriptions (see § 137'). Consentius (fifth cent. ?), p. 394 K., alludes under the name of 'Mytacismus' to a practice of joining -m to the initial vowel of the next word: sicut plerunque passim loquantur 'dixeram illis.' Similarly Pompeius (fifth cent.), p. 287. 7 K., quotes from Melissus (second cent.) the rule for the correct pronunciation of a phrase like hominem amicum as a mean between the two extremes, 'homine manicum' and 'homine amicum.' Velius Longus (54. K.) says: cnum dicitur 'illum ego 'et' omnium optimum,' 'illum' et 'omnium' aequē m terminat, nec tamen in enuntiatione apparat; with Quintilian (ix. 4. 39), quoted above, cf. Diom. 453. 9 K.; Serv. in Dom. 445. 14 K.

1 Cf. Enn. A. 287 non enim rumores ponebat ante salutem (with non enim in all MSS.).
§§ 66–68. PRONUNCIATION. NASALS

Before n the pronunciation alluded to by Velius Longus is found expressed in writing, in MSS. of Virgil (see Ribbeck, Index, p. 439); so ‘etiamnunc’ on the Here. Papyri (Class. Rev. iv. 443).

Tanne for tanne is quoted by Festus (p. 542 Th.) from Afranius: tanne arcula tua plena est araneorum? Cf. Quint. vii. 45 on the sound of can before a word beginning with n. (cf. Cic. Orat. xlv. 154; Fam. ix. 22.2). Final -n of the preposition in is sometimes changed to -m before an initial labial consonant (see Ribbeck, Ind. p. 433 for instances in Virgil MSS. like im barim, im flamman, im mare, im pappibus). So forsam and forstam in MSS. (see Ribbeck, Ind. p. 420, and Georges, Lex. Worft., and for other examples of the confusion of -m and -n, Schuchardt, Vok. i. pp. 117 sqq.).

§ 66. ns. (See § 144.) In Greek inscriptions we find n dropped before s in Latin words frequently, at all dates and in all localities. The nasal is usually dropped in the terminations -ans and -ins, also in -ensis, e.g. Κλημης, καστρεια. But Latin census and its derivatives usually retain n, e.g. κήρυς, Κρυσάρων; Mon. Anc.), also the combination -nd- (Eckinger, pp. 114, 115). [For the variation of s with ns in Latin spelling, see Georges, Lex. Worft. s. vv. centies, decies, Consentia (modern Cosenza), pinus, mensis, mensor, &c. Cf. Probi App. 198. 9 ansa non ‘asa’; 198. 2 Capsesis non ‘Capsessis.’] The pronunciation of ns as s, with lengthening of the preceding vowel, led to the use of ns for s after a long vowel, e.g. thesaurus for thesaurus [see Georges s.v. Other examples, e.g. occansio (cf. Rhein. Mus. xvi. 160), in Schuchardt, Vok. i. p. 112]. The Appendix Probi gives cautions against the use of ‘occansio’ for occasio (198. 21 K.), of ‘Herculens’ for Hercules (197. 25 K.). Velius Longus (p. 79. 1 K. says that Cicero ‘libenter dicebat foresia, Megaliesia, hortesia, and Papirian (ap. Cassiod. 160. 14 K.) says that taws, tusus, prasus were the older spellings, but that the rule of his time was to retain n in the P.P.P., not in Adjectives, e.g. formosus (cf. Probi App. 198. 14 K. formosus non ‘formunsus’; Caper 95. 18 K.: Ter. Scaur. 21. 10 K.; we have formosus, C. I. L. vi. 2738); in the P.P.P. the n seems to have been restored from the other part of the verb. Charisius (58. 17 K.) says: mensane sin littera dictam Varro ait quod media poneretur; sed auctores cum n littera protulerunt, Vergilius saepè, &c. (cf. Varro L. L. v. 118). On quotiens (the better spelling) and on vicensumus, &c., see Georges, Lex. Worft. s.v., and Brambah, Lat. Orth. p. 269.

§ 67. nx. Of the spellings conjux and conjux (statistics in Georges, s.v.), Velius Longus (first cent. A. D.) says (p. 78 K.) that the spelling without n is due to the analogy of the other cases, conjugis, conjugi, &c. In actual pronunciation, he declares, the n is heard; for ‘subtracta n littera, et difficilius enunsiabitur et asperius auribus accedit.’ The comparison of other I.-Eur. languages, e.g. Greek σύ-γι, Sanscr. सु-यु-, shows that the form without n must have been the original form of the Nom. too, and that the n has been introduced by the analogy of fungo (cf. Ter. Scaur. p. 28. 10 K.).

§ 68. mn. In the fifth cent. Pompeius (p. 283. 11 K.) mentions as a barbarism columna (cf. the Diminutive columnella) for columna, which looks very like the pronunciation mentioned by Quintilian as normal in his day (columnam exempta n legimus). This column(n)na seems to have become *coloma, as colibar became colober, by assimilation of unaccented o to accent ed o (see ch. iii. § 33), whence columna (Probi App. 197. 25) with open accented o, the origin of the Romance words for pillar, as colобра (open o) of the Romance words for snake.
But the analogy of cūtūmen may have had something to do with the pronunciation cūtum n'α (cf. scilmēllum and scammum. See Georges s. v.). Sollemnis is explained as a byform of sollemnis (from *anmo-, around, Osc. amno-), due to a supposed connexion with annus (Etym. Lat. p. 97). (On confusions of mn and nn, n, see Schuchardt, Vok. i. p. 147, and Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. vv. antenna, Portunus, lamina.) The insertion of p between m and n occurs in late plebeian spellings like catumpnīa, damnum, sollemnis (see Schuchardt, Vok. i. p. 149, and Georges, s. v. damnum). On mpt see below. Hiemps (cf. consumpsi, &c.), is the regular spelling of the Codex Mediceus of Virgil, and is accepted by Ribbeck; though this form is condemned by the grammarians, e. g. Caesellius ap. Cassiod. 161. 17 K.; Ter. Scaur. 21. 6 and 27. 3 K.; Alcuin 303. 8 K.

§ 60. gn. Spellings on inscriptions like ignonimia (C. I. L. i. 266, 45 B. c.), cognato (x. 1220) seem to be mere etymological spellings like inpello, &c. Sigmnifer, on a soldier's grave (C. I. L. vi. 3637), has been explained above in § 64 (cf. § 144). Nor are we entitled to conclude that g passed into a nasal sound before m from spellings like subūm and subegmēn, ecītum, and perhaps exagmen (Class. Rev. 1891, p. 294) (see ch. iv. § 116). (For instances of the spelling of ga-, consult Georges and Brambach s. v. conūco, conītor, dīnosco, cognosco, nactus, natus, naruīs, aprūgnus, and see Schuchardt, Vok. i. p. 115. On cōnītor, &c., but cognosco, &c., see ch. iv. § 119.)

§ 70. nct. The suppression of the guttural in quintus is something like the dropping of -γ of 'going' in the mispronunciation 'goin' to.' Quintetus is the spelling of the Republic, Quintus of the Empire, according to Brambach. So on Greek inscriptions of the beginning of the second cent. B. C. Κόυρτως, but also Κουτρός (Eckinger p. 122). For the byforms sanctus and nactus (see Brambach) we have a parallel in suctus (reflected in Welsh saith) beside sanctus, while Vulgar santus (see Georges) is Welsh sant. The -ct- is not a development of -nct- but a byform (see ch. viii. § 10).

§ 71. nd. In all S. and Central Italy nd has followed the course taken in Umbrian and Oscean and become vn; and similarly Latin mb is mm. In ordinary Italian, Latin nd has become mn (n) in the pretonic syllable, as is shown by ne for Lat. inde, manuēare for Lat. manūtācōre. Similarly we have mm for mb in amendue beside ambide (Lat. ambo duo), the same assimilation as we have in English, e. g. 'lamb' (mn for nd is seen in 'Lunnon town' for 'London town,' &c.). (For Latin confusions of nd and mn, see Schuchardt, Vok. i. p. 146. e. g. Secūnnus, and consult Georges s. v. grāndio). Nt competes with mpt in lanterna (better laterna) apparently from Greek λαυτή, and tempō (not tento), Pomptīnus (not Pontīnus), pedētentīm, &c. (see Georges and Brambach). Thus vidūntas and vēluptas are sometimes confused in MSS. through the intermediary form volemptas (Schuchardt, Vok. i. 5). But eemptum, redemptum, consępsumt are the established spellings, though Marius Victorinus (21. 12 K.) demands on etymological grounds eemptum, redemptum, consemptum, as also redeensi, consumsi, &c. (ch. iv. § 76).

§ 72. Parasitic vowel in Greek loanwords. The Early Latin instances have been discussed by Ritschl, Opusc. ii. 469 sqq., who on the strength of MSS. spelling, and the requirements of prosody, restored to Plautus such forms as drāchūna, tēchīna, Alcūmen, Alcīmeus, Cūcinus, gīmnātīnum, Prūcīna. Marius
Victorinus (8, 6 K.) tells us that the form *Tecmessaa* was first used by Julius Caesar Vopiscus (an older contemporary of Cicero) in the title of his tragedy of that name, and was so pronounced, at his orders, by the actors: *juxta autem non ponebant cm: inde nee Alemamam diebant nee Tecmessam, sed 'Aulemenam'; inde 'Aleumeo' et 'Aleumena' tragoediae, donec Julius Caesar, qui Vopiscus et Strabo et Sesquieculus dictus est, primus 'Teemessam' inscripsit illam, et in scena pronuntiari jussit* (cf. Prisc. i. p. 29 H. [u] saepe interponitur inter e vel cm in Graecis nominibus, ut 'Ἡρακλῆς Ἡρευς,' Ἀσκληπιός 'Aesculapius,' et antiqui 'Ἀλκμῆνη 'Alcumena,' 'Ἀλκμαῖν 'Alcumeon'). Similarly the Sardinian moufou was called in Latin *mūsīmo* (a name applied to a much-prized breed of diminitive horses; cf. Lucilius vi. 15 M. praedium emit, qui vendit equum musimonem), but in Gk. *μουσιμων* (Strabo). (On the parasitic vowel between a mute and *l* in Latin words, like *pērīc, u)lam*, see ch. iii. § 13.) The difference of Greek and Latin in this respect is seen in the fact that *Δεκμός* is the earliest and most usual form of the name *Dékimos*, older *Decimus*, on Gk. inscriptions, just as awkward combinations with *l*, e.g. *Δεύτερος, Ἀβδουάκα, Μασκός, Πατερκός, Πουρκά* (Lat. *Porcula*) are commoner on Greek inscriptions than on Latin (Eckinger, pp. 47-75). The parasitic vowel is really the visible expression of a 'voice-glissé' (Sweet, *Handb.* p. 84), as in Germ. *Knie* pronounced 'k'une'; cf. Fr. *canif* from Low Germ. *knif*. (For examples on inscriptions, e.g. *Himnins, C. I. L.* i. 982, see Seelmann, p. 251, and cf. below § 154.)

§ 73. *Tenues and Mediae.* In pronouncing *p, t, c* the vocal organs are in the same position as in pronouncing *b, d, g*, but the breath comes through the open glottis, as the space between the two vocal chords which stretch across the larynx is called. With *b, d, g* we close the glottis, by drawing these vocal chords together, and produce what phoneticians call 'voice.' *B; d, g* are now therefore usually termed 'voiced' mutes as opposed to *p, t, c*, the unvoiced or 'breath'-mutes. An older designation was *tenues* and *mediae*. In some languages what are called tenues and mediae do not really differ by the absence and presence of 'voice,' but merely by energy and weakness of articulation. In one German-Swiss dialect, for example, German *k* and *g* are really the same consonant pronounced strongly and pronounced weakly. For such languages the terms 'fortes' and 'lenes' are more suitable than 'breath-mutes' and 'voice-mutes.' In investigating the sound of the Latin mutes we have accordingly to consider whether the tenues differed from the mediae in being uttered with the glottis open, or merely in being articulated with greater energy. Another point to be taken into consideration is that mutes, especially voiceless mutes, have in many languages a 'breath-glissé,' what we roughly call *h*, after them. In Danish
every initial *t* is pronounced with this *h* following; and the same peculiarity in Irish-English is well known. That Latin *p*, *t*, *c* were not so pronounced we can infer from the fact that for the more exact expression of the Greek aspirates, *ph*, *th*, *ch* were brought into use in the last century of the Republic, which shows that *p*, *t*, *c* had not, at least at that period, the sound of ϕ, θ, χ (like our 'uphill,' 'antheap,' 'inkhorn'). The other question, whether the Latin tenues and mediae are more properly distinguished as breath- and voice-mutes, or as fortes and lenes, is more difficult to settle. The Latin phoneticians, who, as we have seen (p. 28), are not very safe guides on any point of Latin pronunciation, are especially at fault here; for neither they nor their Greek masters seem to have carried their analysis of sounds as far as the phoneticians of India, who had at an early time discovered the distinction between unvoiced (*aghôsa*) and voiced (*ghôsavant*) consonants, and its dependence on the opening (*vivâra*) or closure (*sauncâra*) of the glottis. The Latin phoneticians talk of *p* and *b*, of *t* and *d*, of *c* and *g* as entirely different types of sounds, produced by different positions of the vocal organs. Seelmann professes to find in their descriptions evidence that *p*, *t*, *c* had a more energetic articulation than *b*, *d*, *g*. This is certainly true of their account of *c* and *g*; but it is doubtful how far it is true of the others, and even if it were, how much authority should be allowed to these descriptions. A better reason for believing that the Latin tenues were pronounced with more energy of articulation than the mediae has been found in the fact that the Greek tenues, which must have lacked this energy, are often represented in Latin as mediae, e.g. Greek κωβίδος, Lat. *gòbins*. This is, as is natural, especially the case in the initial accented syllable, which seems in Latin to have been uttered with a strong stress. It must be added, however, that an examination of the instances shows that they are almost wholly confined to Greek κ, especially when preceding certain sounds; and that the same tendency is shown by Latin *c* to be weakened in the same position to *g*, e.g. Vulgar Latin *gâvia* for *câvea* (Ital., *gabbia*). On the other hand, when we consider the Latin loanwords in Welsh and the Teutonic languages, we are led to believe that this energy of articulation was not the only thing which distinguished
the tenues from the mediae in Latin. Had it been, we should probably have found the two classes of mute confused in their Welsh and Teutonic forms. But this is not the case; cf. Welsh poc, Lat. pācem; Welsh bendith, Lat. bēn(ĕ)dictio; Lat. cōquīna, cocina is our 'kitchen,' Lat. gemma our 'gem.'

And in Italian of the present day p, t, c are unvoiced, b, d, g voiced. So we have grounds for believing the Latin tenues to have been unvoiced, the Latin mediae to have been voiced; and the guttural mutes, if not all three classes, to have been also distinguishable as fortes and lenes.

In native Latin words the tenues and mediae are not confused to any great extent. The same tendency that turned I.-Eur. d into b before r in atro-, &c. (ch. iv. § 113) is seen in the old spellings mentioned by Quintilian (i. 4. 16) Alexanter and Cassantra (cf. C. I. L. i. 59, ALEXENTROM; 1501, ALEXENTER(a), both inscriptions from Praeneste, and in Ital. Otranto for Greek Ὄροις -ὄντως, Lat. Hydruntum). In very early times the single letter c (Greek γ) was used for the k-sound and for the g-sound; but, as we saw before, the two sounds must have been throughout this period distinguished in pronunciation, though not in spelling. It is perhaps only at the end of a word that we find a real variation between tenuis and media. Final syllables were pronounced as weakly in Latin as initial syllables were pronounced strongly; and we might expect to find the tenuis fortis at the end of a word replaced by the media lenis.

This is apparently the explanation of the Roman preference of the spelling ab, ob, sub to ap (as in ap-erio), op (as in op-erio, Oscan op), *s-yp; though in actual utterance these words were no doubt sounded with -p when followed by a word beginning with a tenuis, e.g. ab templo, ob templum (like oblīneō, pronounced op-tineō). The spelling was not so established in the case of similar subordinate or proclitic words ending in a dental, e.g. at, often written ad; but the change on plebeian and late inscriptions of final -t of verbs to -d, e.g. reliquid, is probably due to this weakening. On the other hand, a final is often reduced to a whispered sound—in languages, and a voiced consonant, if whispered, sounds more like an unvoiced.

In the Romance languages the Latin tenues and mediae, when
initial, and when the initial syllable, to which they belong, has the accent, retain their identity with wonderful persistence, e.g. Ital. puro (Lat. ſũrus), bene (Lat. ãnē), tale (Lat. tālis), duro (Lat. dũrus); but in the middle of a word, and when in the unaccented syllable (though not after the Latin diphthong au, e.g. Span. poco), the tendency is almost universal to turn the tenuis into a media, the media into a spirant. In one language, however, Roumanian, the tenuis is usually preserved, e.g. micã (Lat. mīca), ĭuptecã (Lat. lactūca), muta (Lat. mūtāre), and in Italian the reduction of the tenuis is of limited extent, e.g. amico (Lat. ėmīcus, Span. amigo), uopo (Lat. ėpus, Span. huebos), vite (Lat. vīlis, Span. vide), fuoco (Lat. fōcus, Span. fuego), &c., though before a we have the media in migã (Lat. mīca), strada (Lat. strata), lattuca (Lat. lactūca), &c., and when the vowel following has the accent, e.g. siguro (Lat. sēcũrus), mudare (Lat. mūtāre). Misspellings on plebeian inscriptions like Amada (le Blant, I. G. 576 a), iradam (Or. 2541, of 142 A.D.), Segundae (Mur. 2076. 10) are precursors of these changes. That they obtruded themselves into the recognized Latin pronunciation is more than doubtful. One tendency indeed of the Romance languages, to turn pr, tr, cr into br, dr, gr, e.g. Span. padre (Lat. pāter), sobra (Lat. sūpra), magro (Lat. mācer), lagrima (Lat. lācrima, cf. C. I. L. ix. 648 lagremas), is directly contrary to that treatment of d before r in early Latin (ādro- for *ādro-, &c.), which we have just mentioned. In Italian tr remains after any vowel except a, e.g. vetro (Lat. vītrum, Span. vedro), but padre (Lat. pāter), and pr is retained when it follows the accented vowel, e.g. soprã (Lat. sūpra), capra (Lat. cāpra), but cavriuolo (Lat. capreōlus), obbrobrio (Lat. opprobrium; cf. Or. Henz. 6086 ii).

(For the phonetic descriptions of the Latin tenues and mediae by Roman grammarians see §§ 79, 86, 92.)

§ 74. Greek tenues in loanwords. The most frequent instance of the change of a Gk. tenus to a Lat. media, is the change of Gk. κ to Lat. g, especially before the vowels a, o, u. Thus γυμνί for κάμμυ, γόδισ for καβίδος, γαβέναρε for καβέρναρε, Σάγυντιμον for Σάνυνθος, &c., have always, or usually, g in Lat. (see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s.vv.). The spelling varies in conger and gonger, görìtus and cortìtus, cammàrus and grammàrus (see Georges). Ter. Scaurus (xiv. 9, 10) says that some pronounced gaumàce, some caunace; so gamellius and
PRONUNCIATION. MUTES.

cāmellus [cf. Probi App. 198. 9 calathus non ‘galatus’; Gloss. ap. Mai, Cl. Auct. vi. 576 corax per e non per g; and see Georges and Brambach s.vv. Caïeta (now Gaeta), Agrigentum, grabadum']. In the modern Milanese dialect, the French cabriolet has similarly become cabriolé. Before n, c became g in Latin (ch. iv. § 116), so that the spellings cygnus, Gnōsus, Gnīdus are only natural (see Georges and Brambach). Of the final -ωω of Ómura (Gk. ὀμύρρη), Servius (ad G. i. 194) says that it was written with c, but pronounced with g. (A similar interchange of -ca, -ga, is seen in lauga and leuca, rauca, and raga, &c.) For Gk. π we find Latin b in the initial accented syllable before the vowel u in the word buxus, and in the Old Latin name of King Pyrrhus, Burrus (the form used by Ennius in his Annals, according to Cicero Or. xlvii. 160 Burrum semper Ennius, numquam Pyrrhum; ipsius antiqui declarant libri; cf. Quint. i. 4. 15, and Ter. Scaur. 14 K., who adds Byrria as the equivalent of Gk. Βυρρα). The form burrus was retained in rustic and colloquial Latin; burra was a name for a cow, burrus for a red-faced man, as we learn from Paul. Fest. (p. 22. 32 Th. burrum diecabant antiqui quod nune diecimus rufum; unde rustici ‘burrum’ appellant buculum, quae rostrum habet rufum; modo parie rubens cibo ac potione ex prando ‘burrus’ appellatur), who also mentions burranica potio; lacte mixtum supa, a rufo colore (p. 26. 19 Th.), and burranicam; genus vasis (p. 26. 7). Quintilian (i. 5. 13) quotes Cicero’s phrase Canepitarem exercitum with the remark, ipsi Canobon dicunt. (On Latin Cānōpis, Gk. Κάναβος see Brambach s.v.) In Probi Append. (199. 5 K.) we have, planta non ‘blasta.’ Gk. βατάνων for πατάνων is quoted by Hesychius as belonging to the Sicilian dialect (πατάνα . . . ψωθῆμα. των δὲ διὰ τὸν β βατάνα λέγονται, and βατάνα τὰ λοσάδα. ἐν δὲ λείξι Σικελική). So σερπίναια cērīnai of Catull. xcviii: 4 are in Gk. καρβάτιναι and καρπάτιναι. Old Lat. Ĥelis for Θελίς (C. I. L. xiv. 4102, on a Praenestine mirror) (cf. Varro, L. L. vii. 87 lymphata dicta a lympha; lympha a Nympha, ut quod apud Graecos θερίς, apud Ennius: Thelis illi mater, and R. R. iii. 9. 19 antiqui ut Thetim ‘Thelim’ diecabant, sic Medicam ‘Melicam’ vocabant) perhaps implies an intermediary form with δ for Gk. δ. The relation of cotonea, the origin of the Romance words for quince (Ital. cotogna, Fr. coing) to Gk. κότωνα is not clear (cf. Macrob. vii. 6. 13 mala cydonia quae cotonia Cato vocat; Pliny, N. H. xii. 10). In Vulg. Lat. we find additional examples of γ for Gk. K, such as *γρυρά (Ital. grotto), *γαροφύλια (from καρποφύλλον), *γόττιο: not to mention *γάττιο for (Teutonic?) gattius, and probably gambus. Of spellings on Gk. inscriptions may be instances καλίς for κάλις (from cotogna), καπαγάν, καπαγάν, all on the Edict of Diocletian; also Γαρτες for Cantius, and Γαντισ for Candidus (Eckinger, pp. 98, 100, 102). The same interchange of tenuis and mediae is seen in Gk., e.g. τῆκο and πῆγαν, especially in loanwords, e.g. τάπης, ταπίς and δάπης, ‘Αμπρακίτης and Ἀμπρακίατης: in dialects we have, e.g. κλάγος-γάλα, Κρητής, Hesych., and in later Vulg. Gk. τ often becomes δ between two vowels. It is thus often possible that the Roman word represents a Greek byform. [Other examples of the variety in Latin loanwords are carbasus. Gk. κάρπασος, στίμινα, Gk. γράβια a bag, galbānum, Gk. χαλάνη, σφένωσα, Gk. σφήλυγγα, not to mention incilega, Gk. ἱγγυρυθη. Cf. also λαίλος with Gk. λάταγγε, πλάγα with Gk. πλάξ. On citrus (also cedrus), and Gk. κιδρός, see ch. iv. § 113. Both Ciesita and Criaida occur on old Praenestine cistae for ‘Chryseis’ (C. I. L. xiv. 4109; i. 1501)].

§ 75. Confusion of mediae and tenses for ‘Chryseis’ (C. I. L. xiv. 4109; i. 1501).
but are survivals of that interchange of media and tenuis, which shows itself occasionally in I.-Eur. roots, e.g. sīcus and sügo. Many are dialectal variations; for in parts of Italy the tenuis was used where the Latin form had the media and vice versa, just as in modern Italian the Neapolitan dialect has t corresponding to the d of lapid(ī) (Lat. lāpidēs), &c.; the Roman dialect affects grosta, gautela, &c., with g- for c-. Thus Quint. i. 5. 12 tells us that a certain Tinca of Placentia used 'precula' for peregula (see K. Z. xxx. 345). Of the misspellings of this kind in inscriptions and MSS. (collected by Schuchardt, Vok. i. pp. 124 sqq.), not a few are due to the similar appearance of the letters G, C, B, P. But there is a residuum of undoubted instances of variation between the tenuis and the media, at least for c and g. For p and b we have the (dialectal?) word ropio, a red mullet, given as nickname to Pompey, who had a florid complexion. Mar. Sacerd. 462 K. quotes a lampoon, perhaps a Fesencini line sung by soldiers at his triumph, quēm non pudet et rūbet, nōn est homō sed rōpio). The word, which should probably be read in Catull. xxxvii. 10 (see Sacerd. I. c.), is evidently connected with robustus and rufus, for Sacerdos adds, ropio autem est minimum aut piscis robēs aut penis [cf. Ter. Scaur. 14 K. on the doubtful examples of Palatium and 'Balatium' (by analogy of bādo); Pubblica and O. Lat. Poplicola by analogy of populius]; pyropon on early coins for pyropha, C. I. L. i. 19; advocavit in the Carmen Arvalis. For t and d, probably not petiolus, 'a little foot' (?) Afranius ap. Non. 160 M. atque ādeo nolō núdo petiōlo ēsse plus (MSS. es pus), for this is better explained as peciolo-(Ital. picciuolo, O. Fr. peçuel, &c.). But the most examples are of g for c, as we found to be the case with Greek loanwords; and this perhaps throws some light on the early use in the Latin alphabet of the Greek Gamma-symbol as the symbol for Latin c as well as for g. In Vulgar Latin -cit- and -cer- in the proparoxytone syllable seem to have become -gil-, -ger-, e.g. *plagium, *fager, to judge from the Romance forms (see Arch. Glottol. ix. 104). (Is digitus a similar transformation of dicētus? Dicētus is censured in Probi App. 198. 10, and occurs in MSS. See Schuchardt, Vok. ii. 413); initial era- may have become gra, e.g. Ital. grasso, Span. graso, Fr. gras from Latin crusassus; Ital. grata, Span. grada from Lat. crātis (Meyer Lübke, Rom. Gram. i. p. 353); Lat. gavia for cavea is reflected in Ital. gabbia, Span. gavia, Prov. gabbia; so *gynfāre in Ital. gonzfara, &c. [For other examples of g-c, see Georges and Brambach s. vv. vicesimus, vicenici, triceni, triciv, nongenti, cremia, negleco, graculco, gurgulco, &c.; on the change of c before r to f, e.g. atroca for *adroca (cf. idium), see ch. iv. § 113, of c before n to g, e.g. dignus, see ch. iv. § 119; bibo (I.-Eur. *pibo) is due to the Latin tendency to assimilate adjacent syllables (ch. iv. § 163); cf. also Quint. i. 6. 30 nonnumquam etiam barbarab ab emendatis conatur discernere, ut cum Tríquetram dici Siciliam an 'Triquetram,' meridiem an 'medidiem' oporteat, quae ruit.]

§ 76. Mediae and Tenues at end of word. Quintilian, who includes among the points of inferiority of Latin to Greek the use of -b, -d at the end of syllables (xii. 10. 32 quid quod syllabae nostrarae in b litteram et d innituntur adeo aspere, ut plerique, non antiquissimorum quidem, sed tamen veterum, mollire temptaverint, non solum 'aversa' pro 'aversis' diciendo, sed et in praepositione b litterae absoneam et ipsam f [s edd.] subiciendo), mentions (i. 7. 5) with disapproval the practice of distinguishing ad, the preposition, from at, the conjunction. The right use of t and -d in words like ãt and ãd, sed, quit (from quo), and quid (from quis), quôt and quid, &c., is a subject of frequent remark in the grammarians, e.g. Ter. Scaurus (12. 8 K) approves sed on the ground that the
old form was sedum *cf. ib. ii. 8 K.; Vel. Long. 69–70 K.; Probi App. 202. 37 K.; Cassiod. 212. 5 K.; Alcuin 308. 8 K., and (on hand and hand) 309. 3 K.; on caput and apud Bede 264. 35 K., &c.]. Charisius (229 K.) quotes ad for at from a speech of Licinius Calvus; and Vel. Long. 70 K. says that sed in sed enim *d litteram sonat.* Instances of the confusion or suppression of final -d and -t in inscriptions and MSS. have been collected by Schuchhardt, Vol. i. pp. 118 sqq. and Seelmann, pp. 366 sqq. They include, beside the cases just mentioned, the use of -d for -t, or the suppression of -t, in verbal forms, like rogad, C. I. L. iv. 2388 (but on O. Lat. fored, &c., for freid, &c., see ch. viii. § 69), peria (for peread) iv. 1173; also the loss of -t in the combination -nt, feerun vi. 3351, just as -t is lost in the combination -ct, lac from lacte from older lacte, an I-stem. The preposition is spelt at in the Lex Col. Jul. Genetivae Urbanorum of 44 b.c., except when the next word begins with a-, e.g. at it judicium atsint, i. 2. 13; ateo, ad decuriones, iii. 8. 7 (Eph. Epigr. ii. p. 122), but always ad (even in attributionem, &c.), beside aput in the Lex Julia Municipalis of 45 B.C. (C. I. L. i. 206). This uncertainty of usage has been taken as evidence of the final dental having been uttered faintly, or having been a sound intermediate between d and t, like the final dental of German, written dt, in Stadt, &c. The instances, however, mentioned by grammarians are all words which would be closely joined in utterance with a following word, quid tibi?, quid dices, ad templum, ad eos, &c.; so that it is most natural to believe, as was suggested of the confusion between -m and -n, that the sounds adapted themselves to the initial of the following word. Quid tibi would be pronounced as quit tibi, and ad templum as at templum (like at-tineo, &c.). The spellings quid tibi, ad templum would be historical (like ad-tineo, not phonetic. The weakness of final d is better shown by its suppression after a long vowel. Thus the Abl. sg. ceased to be pronounced with -dt about the end of the third cent. b.c. (see § 137), though d remained till later in the monosyllables med, ted, while haud was retained before words beginning with vowels (Ritschl, Opusc. ii. 591, &c., v. 352); and the affection of -t by the spellings on plebean and late inscriptions of verb-forms like reliquid, &c. In Vulgar Latin -t cannot have been dropped till after the conquest of Gaul (A. L. L. i. 212.)

P is not found at the end of any Latin word, if we except volup, for volupei, the Neuter of an adj. *voluptis; but it is common in Oscan, e.g. op: Lat. ob), ip *there.* (On the spellings optineo, obtineo, &c., see § 80. On the other hand final y never appears in Latin, though we have e in ae (for auqu[e]; nec (for niqu[e]), lac (for lac[e]), illic for illi-c[e], &c.; but nec is written neg-invariably in negotium, and usually in neglego (see Georges, s.v.). (Cf. ch. x. § 18.)

§ 77. Mediae and tenues in the Dialects. There is a good deal of inter-change of tenues and mediae in Umbrian and Oscan (e.g. Osc. deketasiúi and degetasíu), which has led some to the theory that the Umbro-Oscan mediae were not voiced (Conway, Amer. Journ. Phil. xi. 306), while others refer the variation to the defects of the Umbrian and Oscan alphabets, which being derived from the Etruscan had not originally the means of distinguishing fully the tenues from the mediae (the Umbrian alphabet, for example, uses the t-sign for both t and d, the k-sign for both k and g, &c., see von Planta, Gramm. Osk.-Umbr. Dial. i. p. 547). In a Falisco-Latin inscr. (Zvet. I. I. I. 72) we have gondecoren, gonteriun, beside communia.
§ 78. B, P. Latin b, p were labial mutes, apparently with the same sound as b, p in Ital., e.g. bene (Lat. bēnē), pino (Lat. pīnus), and English b, p. Between vowels b became in course of time a labial spirant, and by the third cent. A.D. became identified with Latin v (v) (see § 52). In Spanish, b has a w-sound, which differs from our w, in that the back of the tongue is not raised, nor the cheeks narrowed. It is the same as the w of South German wie, wein.

B was often written, though p was pronounced, before s, t, in such words as urbs, obtineo. It was a frequent subject of discussion among Latin grammarians whether these words should not be spelt with p, so that the spelling might agree with the pronunciation. The b was defended in urbs, &c., on the ground that it would be unreasonable to spell a nominative case with p and the other cases with b, urbis, urbi, &c., and in obtineo, &c., because the form of the preposition when alone, and often in composition, had the b, ob, obduco, &c. The b of the preposition similarly assimilated itself in pronunciation to m in compounds like submitto, summitto. In omitto all traces of this b have disappeared (see ch. iii.).

Latin b represents an I.-Eur. aspirate in words like rūber, stem rubro-, I.-Eur. *rūdʰ-ro, Greek ἐ-ρυθρός. In these cases f in various parts of Italy corresponded to Latin b, e.g. Umbrian rufro-. This dialectal f for b is seen in forms like sūfīlus, beside genuine Latin sībilus, forms which do not prove anything about the pronunciation of Latin b, but are merely corresponding words to the Latin, which have come from some dialect or other. A good many of these dialectal f-forms have found their way into the Romance languages.

§ 79. Phonetic descriptions of b, p. To the usual phoneticians, Ter. Maur. vi. 331. 186–193 K.:

b littera vel p quasi syllabae videntur
junguntque sonos de gemina sede profectos:
nam muta jubet portio comprimī labella,
vocalis at intus locus exitum ministrat.
compressio porro est in utraque dissonora;
nam prima per oras etiam labella figit,
velut intus agatur sonus; ast altera contra
pellit sonitum de mediis foras labellis;
§ 78-81. PRONUNCIATION. LABIALS.

Mar. Vict. vi. 33. 15 K. (whose b seems to be the p of Ter. Maur.) b et p litterae conjunctione vocalium quasi syllabae (nam muta portio penitus latet: neque enim labis hiscere ullamne meatum vocis exprime nes is nus valet, nisi vocales exitum dederint atque orae reserarint) dispersi inter se oris officio expiruntur, nam prima exploso e mediis labis sono, sequens compresso ore velut introrsum attracto vocis ietu explicatur; Martianus Capella iii. 261 b labris per spiritus impetum reclusis edicimus . . . P labris spiritus [spiritu Eyss.] erumpit; we may add the remark of Terentius Scanus vii. i. 14. 3 K. b cum p et m consentit, quoniam origo earum non sine labore conjuncto ore respondet.

80. bs, bt. Latin bs had the sound of Greek υ. Vel. Long. vii. 61 K.), and was one of the sounds for which the Emperor Claudius proposed a new letter, on the ground that a separate sign for cs (x) justified a separate sign for ps. The general opinion however pronounced this new letter unnecessary. Some even went so far as to question the necessity of x (Quint. i. 4. 9 nostrarum ultima [sc. x], qua tam carere potuimus, quam psi non quaerimus). The spelling abs is defended on the strength of ab by Velius Longus (vii. 61 K.), who also tells us that some authorities always spelt opstitit, absoprsi, urps, nupsi, pleps (id. vii. 64 and 73-4 K.) (cf. Mar. Vict. vi. 21. 10 K. Ter. Scaur. vii. 14. 7; 21. 8 K.). It was Varro who laid down the rule that nouns with -p- in the Genitive should have -ps in the Nominative, nouns with -b- should have -bs, e.g. Pelops, Pelopus, but plebs, plebis, urbs, urbis (Ter. Scaur. vii. 27. 11 K.; cf. Varro, L. L. x. 56). [So in the Appendix Probi: (198. 4 K. and 199. 4) celebs non 'cleps'; (199. 3. plebs non 'pleps'; (199. 11) labsus non 'lapsus'.] That obvenit was pronounced optimut, we are told by Quintilian (i. 7. 7): secundam enim b litteram ratio poscit, aures magis audiant p. The spellings ps, pt are common enough in MSS. and inscriptions (see Indices to C. I. L.) (cf. Obscurs, Opuscus and Opicus, old forms of Oscus (as superscribo, subscrito of suscribo), Fest. 212 and 234 Th.; and see Georges, Lex. Wortf., s. v. cambsi, campsi]. Curtius Valerianus (ap. Cassiod. 157 K.) says ps belong to the same, bs to different syllables. In the Lex Col. Jul. Genetricae Urbanorum of 44 b. c. op- is used in opsecire, opaperare, opiturare, optimere, but always ab-, never ap- (Eph. Epigr. ii. pp. 122 and 221). Absinthium (vulgar absenceun), absida late Lat. for apsis follow the analogy of abs.

§ 81. ps, pt. In Romance the sounds of Latin pt and ps have been retained in Roumanian, but in other languages have passed into tt, ss, e. g. Ital. sette (Lat. septem), cassa (Lat. capsia), esso (Lat. ipsis), medesimo (Vulg. Lat. *met ipsimus, O. Fr. medesm, Fr. même). Isse for ipse found its way into colloquial Latin (see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v.), though, if the story mentioned, but discredited, by Suetonius (Aug. 88), be true, the use of issi (or ixi?) 1 for ipsi by a 'legatus consularis' led to his being cashiered by Augustus as 'rudis et indoctus.' Cf. susii for supsii, subtii; and for some examples of ss for ps in MSS. and later plebeian inscriptions, see Schuchardt, Vok. i. 148; for tt, t for pt, ib. i. 143, and see Georges s. v. scratta, septicus. The lap-dog, the subject of one of Martial's prettiest epigrams (i. 149) was called Issa (i. e. ipsa in the sense of domina), 'M'Lady.' Its master had made a painting of it: in qua tam similis videbis Issam, Ut sit tam similis sibi nec ipsa.

1 Plautus puns on opsecro and max secro, Mil. 1406.
§ 82. bm, mb. Ommentans was the spelling in a line of Livius Andronicus' translation of the Odyssey (ap. Fest. 218. 14 Th. aut in Pylus deuenies aut ibi ommentans. Cf. Gl. Plac. ommentat: expectat. Anmego occurs on inscriptions (C. I. L. vi. 14672); amnuo in Glosses (Löwe, Prodrumus, p. 421). On ámbito, submittito, pronounced summitto, &c., see Brambach, Hülfsb.² pp. 16–18. On mb becoming dialectally mm, see § 71.

§ 83. b and dialectal f. Alfus was the dialectal, Albius the Latin form of the name. The two forms are found, for example, on Interamna inscriptions (Albius, C. 1. L. xi. 4240. Alfus, 4242). So with other proper names like Orbilius and Orfilius. Siflīus, a mispronunciation of sībīus, censured in the Appendix Probi (199. 3 K.; cf. Non. 531. 2), was a dialectal variety; similarly seriōsa a sow has been connected with seriōsīs. In glosses we find cerefare with cerebrare, bufus with būbo (Löwe, Prodr. p. 421), and in modern Italian siffiare (cf. Fr. siffler) beside sibilare (Lat. sībīlare), tafano (Lat. tābēnus), &c. (other examples in Arch. Glott. Ital. x. 1).

§ 84. b and m. B became m in Latin before m, n (cf. summitto, amnego, above). But glōmus and glōbus (cf. Probi App. 198. 8 globus non 'glōmus') are two different stems, globus, -i and glómus, -cris (see Rom. Forsch. vii. 217).

§ 85. D, T. We have clear evidence that Latin n, the dental nasal, was, like our n, not a pure dental (see § 61). The dental mutes, d the voiced dental, t the unvoiced, cannot then have been pure dentals either. The Latin phoneticians speak of Latin d and t as differing in more respects than the mere presence or absence of what is technically called 'voice'; though the suspicion under which they stand of being unduly influenced by their Greek authorities makes them uncertain guides. In Italian, t, e. g. tu (Lat. tū), d, e. g. dono (Lat. dōno) are both pure dentals, differing like any other unvoiced and voiced mute. But there is on Italian soil a curious sound, a caecuminal d, exemplified by Sicilian cavāḍdu (Lat. căballus), on which see Meyer-Lübke, Ital. Gram. § 264.

Both l and r are sounds closely related to d, the position of the tongue, &c., being very similar in the formation of all three sounds. In d there is a complete closure of the mouth passage; in l the middle of the passage is closed, but the sides are left open; in r there is an opening in front at the tip of the tongue. Through neglect of the side closure d has passed into l in words like lācrūma (older dacrūma) (see ch. iv. § 111); through neglect of the front closure it passed into r in Old Latin in words like arψuīse (later arψuīse) on the Senatus Consultum de Bacchanalibus (C. I. L. i. 196, of 186 B.C.) before the bilabial spirants f and v.
(see ch. iv. § 112). A fifth (?) century grammarian speaks of the mispronunciation peres for pēlēs as one specially affected by the poorer classes at Rome in his time (Consentius v. 392. 15 K.); and the same change of sound is still found in dialects of Italy. In Naples, for example, pere is the word used for 'foot' to this very day. Before r, d seems to have been changed to t, e.g. āter, stem ātro- for *ādro (see ch. iv. § 113), a tendency seen in spellings like Alexander, Cassantra, which Quintilian tells us he had noticed on old inscriptions at Rome (i. 4. 16), and which is found on Praenestine cistae (see § 73). Of *dr, *dl, &c. we are told 'nullo modo sonare d littera potest' (Cassiod. 151 K.; 207 K.). Before l, t could not be pronounced, but passed into the sound of c, just as the phrase 'at least' often takes with us the sound 'a cleast.' The I.-Eur. suffix -tlo had on this account become -clo in Latin words like pēriclētum (ch. v. § 25); and when at a late period the Latin suffix -tulus became contracted by the syncope of the penult, it was changed to -clus, vētulus, for example, becoming veclus (Ital. vecchio). Another change of d, namely its tendency to be assimilated by a preceding n in words like distenno for distendo is discussed in § 71, and its assimilation in compounds like adjineo, pronounced attineo, adsum, pronounced assum, in ch. iv. § 160. The most important changes of d, t, however, are those which these letters experienced when they were followed by i before another vowel. The same syncope that reduced vetulus to veclus, calīda to calda, made 'Tityus' out of Titius, 'hodye' out of hödie. Through this combination of y with a preceding consonant in unaccented syllables, a new series of sounds, unknown in Latin, has arisen in Romance. Latin sīmīa has become French singe (through *simya), Latin apīum Fr. ache (*apyum), Lat. rābies Fr. rage (*rabyes), Lat. cambiare Fr. changer (*cambyare). Dy, as we saw before (§ 51), became identified with gi, ge, and Latin j (our y), and has assumed in Italian the sound of our j, e.g. Ital. giorno from Lat. diurnus; while ty has developed in Italian into the sound of ts, a sound reduced in French to an s-sound, in Spanish to a sound like our ih in 'thin' (written in Spanish z), e.g. Ital. piazza, Fr. place, Span. plaza, all from Latin plātēa, *platya. The grammarians of the later Empire have fortunately left us a good many remarks on the
palatalization of \(t\), so that we can trace pretty clearly the course of its development in Latin. It seems from their accounts to have begun in the fourth cent. A.D., and to have been fairly established by the fifth; and this is confirmed by other evidence, such as the fact that in the Latin loanwords in Welsh (borrowed during the Roman occupation of Britain which ceased in the fifth cent.), \(ty\) has not become an \(s\)-sound. About the same time \(cy\) became assimilated; and so confusions of \(-ci-\) and \(-ti-\) before a vowel are common in late inscriptions and in MSS.

§ 86. Phonetic descriptions of \(d\), \(t\). Terentianus Maurus makes the back of the tongue come into play in the formation of \(d\), which would make Latin \(d\) to have been what phoneticians call ‘dorsal’ \(d\) (from Lat. \(dorsum\), the back), like the \(d\) of Central and S. Germany. Seelmann understands \(t\), \(l\), \(r\), and \(n\) also to have been dorsal sounds. Ter. Maur. vi. 331. 199–203 K.:

\[
\begin{align*}
at \text{portio} & \text{ dientes quotiens suprema linguae} \\
pulsaverit \text{ imos modiceque curva summos,} \\
tun \text{c d sonitum perfect explicatque vocem;} \\
t, \text{ qua superis dentibus intima est origo,} \\
summa \text{satis est ad sonitum ferire lingua.}
\end{align*}
\]

Similarly Marius Victorinus speaks of the two sounds as having marked difference in their formation (vi. 33. 24 K.): \(d\) autem et \(t\), quibus, ut ita dixerim, vocis vicinitas quaadem est, linguae sublatione ac positione distinctuuntur. nam cum summos atque imos conjunctim dentes suprema sui parte pulsaverit, \(d\) litteram exprimit. quotiens autem sublimata partem, qua superis dentibus est origo contigerit, \(t\) sonore vocis explicabit. They represent the formation of \(t\), in conformity with what we have already learned about \(n\), as the contact of the tongue with the alveolars, or gums of the upper teeth, whereas in uttering \(d\) both the lower and the upper teeth are touched by the tongue, which is so bent down as to touch the lower teeth with its tip, and the upper with its blade. Martianus Capella (iii. 261): \(D\) appulu linguae circa superiores dentes innascitur. . . \(T\) appulu linguae dentibusque impulsis extunditur [extruditur \(E\)ys\(s\), extuditur MSS.].

§ 87. \(d\) and \(l\). In some Italian dialects \(d\) in the Latin suffix \(-\dot{d}h\)s becomes \(l\) if the stem ends in a labial. Thus Lat. \(t\)\(\acute{e}\)p\(\acute{d}\)hus is in the Neapolitan dialect \(t\)\(\acute{e}\)p\(\acute{e}\)lo. Some examples of \(l\) for \(d\) in MSS, and late inscriptions are collected by Schuchardt, \(V\)ok. i. 142.

§ 88. \(d\) and \(r\). In the Abruzzi (the ancient country of Oscan and Sabellian tribes) we find \(d\) (English \(th\) in ‘there’) and \(r\) for Latin \(d\), e.g. \(d\)icere and \(d\)icere (Lat. \(d\)icere), \(d\)a and \(r\)a (Lat. \(d\)at). The close connexion of \(d\) with \(r\), as phases of \(d\), we see from Spanish, where in the literary language \(d\) has assumed the \(s\)-sound in words like ‘Madrid,’ while in the Andalusian dialect this \(s\) has sometimes developed into \(r\), e.g. soleares, sometimes been dropped e.g. n\(a\), for *nada. Final \(d\) is weakly pronounced in Spanish, and often dropped; and the same is true of the Galician dialect of Portuguese, e.g. bond\(\acute{a}\) (Lat.
§§ 86–90. PRONUNCIATION. DENTALS.

bōnītālem). In Provençal too Latin _MED was dropped when final. All this throws light on the Umbrian treatment of L.-Eur. _MED, which in the middle of a word is expressed by a peculiar sign in the Umbrian alphabet (conventionally written  or  ), a sign rendered in Latin characters by  or  , in Latin  and  (Lat. čopīdī, Dat. of copis, a bowl), and which seems to interchange with  or  (Lat. dūto, or rather *dē̆ūtō), but which at the end of a word is often dropped, e.g. asam-a and asam-ad (Lat. ad āram, or rather *aram ad), always when a long vowel precedes, e.g. piacolu (Lat. pūcūlo, older pūcūtēd, Abl.). Not unlike is the Latin treatment of  in words like  (Lat. fīdes), and in the other Romance languages  in any two vowels is liable to the same thing; e.g. Latin mediulla is in Spanish medollo, in French moelle, though in Italian it is midolla; Italian preda (Lat. praeda) is in Sardinian prea, &c.

§ 89. t ـ. Vetus for vitulus, vidus for vitulus, capidum for capūtītum, were mispronunciations in vulgar speech (Probi App. p. 197, 20 and 198, 34 K.). Stīlus the old form of tīs (Quint. i. 4, 16) is spelled selis on inscriptions (e.g. C. I. L. x. 211 and 1249). Caper censors the use of sclātis for stētīris, a pirate ship, marculus for martīlūs, a priest of Mars (vii. 107, 1; 105, 21 K.). (For examples of  for  in MSS. and late inscriptions see Schuchardt, Vök. 1. 160.)

§ 90. Assibilation of ty, dy. In the fourth cent. we have an indication that  or  before a vowel were in process of change. Servius (in Don. iv. 445, 8–12 K.) tells us that they often pass into a sibilus (which need not imply an s-sound) when in the middle of a word, though often they retain a pronunciation in accord with their spelling (etiam sic posita sint diciuntur ita etiam sonandae sunt, ut ‘diēs’ ‘tiāras’). The same grammarian, in a note on Virgil, Georg. ii. 126, remarks that the Greek word Medīta must be pronounced in Greek fashion sine sībile, that is to say without that consonantal y-sound which Latin mediūs, medīa had in the time of Servius, that ‘pinguis sonus’ of  which the grammarians, as we saw before (§ 14), declared to be particularly alien to Greek pronunciation. In the early part of the fifth cent. Paprian (MS. ‘Papiriūs’) is more explicit. The letters ti before a vowel, in words like Tātius, ótia, justitīa, have, he says, a sound as if  (i.e. Greek ξ, which had at this time the soft or voiced s-sound) were inserted between them (ap. Cassiodor. vii. 216. 8 K.): ‘justitia’ cum scribitur, tertia syllaba sic sonat quasi constet ex tribus litteris t, z, i. This, he points out, is the case only when  is followed by a vowel, and not always even then, not, for example, in Genitives like  or when  precedes , e.g. justius, castius. In the same century Pompeius censures as a fault the very pronunciation allowed in the preceding century by Servius, whereby  or  were pronounced as spelled. He lays down the rule (v. 286, 10 K.): quotiescumque post ti vel di syllabam sequitur vocalis, illud ti vel di in sibilum vertendum est . . . ergo si volueris dicere ti vel di, noli, quem ad modum scribitur, sic proferre, sed sibilo profer. He goes on to say that this pronunciation is not found with initial  or  (or more exactly  or  ) for here ‘ipsa syllaba a litteris accepit sibilum,’ a remark which shows pretty clearly that Pompeius understands by sibilus an s-sound, cf. v. 104, 6 K. si dicas ‘Tītius,’ pinguius sonat [i] et perdit sonum suum et accepit sibilum. A grammāriam of the fifth cent.(?)
§ 91. K, C, G, QU, GU. What we call Guttural Consonants are more properly divided into (1) Gutturals proper, or Velar Gutturals, or simply 'Velars,' formed by the back of the convex surface of the tongue against the soft palate or velum, and (2) Palatals, formed by the middle of the convex surface of the tongue against the hard palate; and these two classes, which are also called back gutturals and front gutturals, might be still further subdivided according as the sound is made more to the back, or more to the front of the mouth. The Velars and Palatals may be found side by side in a language. German ch, for example, with a broad vowel like o, a, is a velar, e.g. 'ach,' but with a narrow vowel like i, in such a word as 'ich,' it is a palatal, being spoken more in the front of the mouth, so that it often sounds like English sh. Italian ch of chi, chiesa, is spoken more in the front of the mouth than c of casa, and the same is true of Engl. k of 'key' compared with c of 'caw.' The

Consentius (395. 3), describes the new sound of ti in òtiam as 'breaking something off the middle syllable' (de media syllaba infringant). He, like Pompeius, declares the old pronunciation to be a 'vitium,' and tells us that the Greeks in their anxiety to correct this fault were apt to go to the extreme of giving the new sound to ti even when not followed by a vowel, e.g. in optimus (medium syllabam ita sonent quasi post t, z graecum ammisceant). Finally Isidore in the seventh cent. tells us (Orig. i. 26. 28) that justitia 'sonum z litterae exprimit,' and (xx. 9. 4) that the Italians of his time pronounced hodie as ozie. The spellings on inscriptions confirm this account of the grammarians, though, as was to be expected, the assimilation shows itself on plebeian inscriptions even earlier than the fourth cent., e.g. Crescentian(us) (Gruter, p. 127, vii. 1, of 140 A.D.), and even in the case of accented ti, di; Isidore's statement about the pronunciation of hodie (now ozie) is perhaps supported by oxe (C.I.L. viii. 8424): z (= zes, for dies) (C.I.L. v. 1667), &c., this z being pronounced like our z in 'amaze.' But dy- first passed through the stage of y, unlike ty- (see ch. iv. § 52), and this z may be merely an attempt to express the y-sound. Seelmann, p. 323, gives a list of these spellings. Some may be dialectal, for in Oscan we have on the Bantia tablet (Zv. 231) Bansa-(Lat. Bantia), zicolo- (Lat. dicula) (pronounce z as above); and in Etruria the assimilation of ty seems also to have been known (see Sittl, Lok. Verschiedenheiten, p. 11); Marcus (cf. Martes Abl. Pl. on a Marsic inscr.) was the native name for Martius. The rationale of the change of sound is easy. While forming the t-sound the tongue unconsciously adapted itself to the position for the y-sound, so that the interval between the two letters was bridged over by a glide-sound which the Latin grammarians compare to Greek ζ, like the connecting p in the group mpt, from original mt, in words like emptus. (For a full account of the process see K.Z. xxix. 1 sqq., especially p. 48. On the interchange of ti- and ci-, see § 94.)
§ 91. PRONUNCIATION. GUTTURALS.

distinct lines of development which the Latin gutturals, c (k), g, took before broad and before narrow vowels, makes it possible, or even probable, that in Latin, as in Italian, c in centum had a more palatal sound than c in cantus, contus, &c., although this distinction is not mentioned by any of the Roman grammarians. The only guttural of which they give us a clear account is qu, in which the u-element seems to have been more of a vowel than Latin v (our w). A first century grammarian (Vel. Long. vii. 58. 17 K.) makes the difference to consist in the latter being sounded 'cum aliqua aspiratione;' i.e. as a consonantal spirant, not as a half-vowel, like u of quis, and in the fourth century v of quōniam, quidem is said to be 'neec vocalis nee consonans' (Donat. iv. 367. 16 K.). Priscian (seventh cent.) says the same of the u of sanguis, lingua (i. 37), so that Latin qu, gv must have had a sound very like their sound in Italian quattro, &c. The palatalization of c, g before a narrow vowel is found in all Romance languages, with the exception of a dialect in the island of Sardinia. It was also a feature of the Umbrian language, so that we should expect it to have appeared early in Vulgar Latin at least. But all the evidence points to as late a period as the sixth and seventh centuries A.D. as the time when the change of sound took place. No grammarian hints at a difference of sound in c, g before a broad and before a narrow vowel, although the assimilation of ti before a vowel is mentioned again and again. Greek transcriptions of Latin words with c invariably reproduce it by κ, in cases like ΚΗΝΣΟΝ for centum, ΚΡΗΣΚΗΝΣ for crescents; Latin loanwords in Welsh (first to fifth centuries) show that Latin c was hard in all positions, e.g. Welsh ewyr (Lat. cēra), ciwdawd (Lat. cīvītātem), and similarly German Keller (Lat. cellarium), Kiste (Lat. cista); it is not till the seventh century that spellings like paze for pace (Muratori, 1915. 3) assert themselves on inscriptions. At an earlier period, it is true, ci (cy) before a vowel in unaccented syllables, and ti (ty) in the same position, had been confused, so that ci was written ti in words like sōlātium, and expressed like genuine ti a sibilant sound. But this proves nothing for c in words like centum, cītra. G before e, i became (like dy) the y-sound, and is in the Romance languages indistinguishable from Latin j (our y) (see § 51). The
group *ct* has become *tt* in Italian, e.g. Ottobre, Lat. *Octobris*, and had assumed the sound in late Latin, to judge from spellings on inscriptions like *latina* in the Edict of Diocletian, *Otobris* (Rossi 288, of 380 A.D.) and *autor*.


utrumque latus dentibus applicare lingum

c pressius urget: dein hinc et hinc remittit,
quo vocis adhaerens sonus explicitur ore.
g porro retrosum coit et sonum prioris

obtusius ipsi prope sufficit palato.

... k perspicuum est littera quod vacare possit
et q similis; namque eadem vis in utraque est.

Mar. Vict. vi. 33. 20 K. c etiam et g, ut supra scriptae, sono proximae oris molimine nisuque dissentienti. nam c reducta introrsum lingua hinc atque hinc molares urgens haerentem intra os sonum vocis excludit: g vim prioris pari linguae habitu palato suggerens lenius reddid ... [q, k] quorum utramque exprimi faeicibus, alteram distento, alteram producto rectu manifestum est. Mart. Cap. iii. 261; G spiritus [facit] cum palato ... K faeicus palatoque formatur ... Q appulsu palati ore restricto. *Ter. Scaur.* vii. 14. 1 K. x littera cognata est cum c et g, quod lingua sublata paulum hae dicuntur. Bede (228. 21), in criticizing Donatus’ remark, quoted above, on the pronunciation of *u* in *qu*, explains him to mean that ‘tam leviter tum effertur ut vix sentiri quaet.’ Pompeius (v. 104. 25 K.) calls the *a* a ‘pars litterae praecedentis.’ Priscian (i. 6) seems to speak of it as the ‘contractus sonus’ of normal *u*; but the passage is corrupt and the meaning uncertain. The statement of the phoneticians that Latin *c* was uttered with more energy of articulation than *g*, is confirmed by certain phenomena of the language, as has been shown in § 73.

§ 93. *qu, gu*. In Oscan and Umbrian, where *I.-Eur. qu* had become *p*, Latin *qu* is expressed in loanwords by *kv* (Osc. kvāsstur, Umbr. kvestrette [Lat. *quaest''rae*]). In Faliscan the *qu*-sound is written *cv* (*cu* or *cv*) e.g. *cuando*. Greek transcriptions have normally *kou*, e.g. *Kouadáres*: but *kou-* is the earliest expression of *qui-*, e.g. *Koustitos* (C. I. G. ii. 770, of 196-4 B.C., see Eckinger, p. 120 sqq.). In the Augustan age when *o* before a final consonant was weakened to *u* even after *v*, *u* (ch. iv. § 20), *qu*, *gu* became before this *u* reduced to *c*, *g*, which points to their being more like *cu*, *gu* than *cv*, *gu*, *relicus* from *reliquos* (in the time of *Plautus* *rēlicus*, of four syllables), *secontur*, *sēcontur*, *extinguit*. The grammarians of the first cent. A.D. were puzzled by the want of correspondence between Nom. Sing. *ēs*, Nom. Pl. *equi*, and reconstituted the Nom. Sing. as *equeus* (in the time of Trajan) (Vel. Long. 59. 3 K. auribus quidem sufficiebat ut equus per unum u scriberetur, ratio tamen duo exigit); *guu* in *extinguit*, &c., followed somewhat later. In the fifth cent. we find *co* definitely ousting *quô*, and *go*, *guô*, though *quô* seems to have been pronounced *ō* as early as the beginning of the second cent. B.C. (see ch. iv. § 137). Grammarians find great difficulty in deciding which verbs should be written -*guo* and which with -*go*. The rule they usually follow is to write -*go* when the Perfect has -*XI*, *ungo*, *tingo* (see Bersu *Die Gutturalen*). (A Vulg. Lat. *lāceus for lāqueus* is the original of Romance words for ‘noose’.)
like Ital. laecio, Fr. lacs; cf. Probi App. 197. 27 K. exequiae non ‘execiae’; Cassiod. 158. 15 K. on ‘reliae’). The spelling of the Pronoun qui in its various forms was also matter of discussion as early as the time of Quintilian. He tells us (i. 7. 27) that in his younger days the Dative Singular used to be written quoi to distinguish it from the Nom. qui, but that the fashion had since come in of spelling it cui: illud nunc melius, quod ‘cui’ tribus quam possui litteris enotamus, in quo puercis nobis ad pinguem sane sonum qu et oii utebantur, tantum ut ab illo ‘qui’ distingueretur. Annaeus Cornutus, Persius’ teacher, tells us that at a much earlier period Lucilius laid down the rule that qu should be used when a vowel followed in the same syllable, otherwise cu, and this rule he himself accepts. His comments on it seem to show that there was not much difference in the sound. ‘Some,’ he goes on to say, ‘think we should spell as we pronounce, but I do not go so far as that’ (ego non omnia auribus dederim). Then he adds, ‘qui’ syllaba per qu scribitur; si dividitutur, ut sit cui ut huie, per e (ap. Cassiod. 149. 1 K.). So Ter. Scaurus (first cent.), 27. 18 K. quis quidem per ‘cuius’ scribunt, quioniam supervacuam esse q litterum putant. sed nos cum illa u litteram, si quando tertia ab ea vocalis ponitur, consentire jam demonstravimus. e autem in dativo ponimus, ut sit differentia cui et qui. Velius Longus (first cent.) (75. 10 K.) thinks it necessary to point out the distinction between aquam Noun and *aeuam Verb. Another tendency that appears in late Latin is to make a short vowel before qu long by position, as indeed any consonant followed by u (w), e.g. Ital. Gennaio with double n from *Jenvarius; aqua is scanned with the first syllable long by the Christian poets, and appears in Ital. as acqua (cf. Probi App. 198. 18 K. aqua non ‘aequa’). A sixth cent. grammarian ventures to give this quantity to the word in a line of Lucretius, vi. 868 quae calidum faciunt aquae tactum atque vaporem, where, however, the MSS. read laticis. Lachmann proposed to read aeqae of three syllables, but was not able to prove that this form (like Horace’s silvae) existed in Old Latin (see Schroeder in Studemund, Studien, ii. 20). In Plautus and the older dramatists, where the short syllable of a word like patti, loci has a shortening influence on the following long syllable, so that the words may be occasionally scanned patti, loci (see ch. iii. § 42). a short vowel before qu seems hardly to have had this shortening power, e.g. rarely (if ever) tōqui. So to the ear of Plautus qu almost made a preceding vowel long by position, unless we say that tōqui, &c., sounded to Plautus something like a trisyllable. At any rate qu can hardly have had merely the ‘rounded’ h-sound of Russian.

§ 94. c, g before narrow vowels. That c, g remained hard before e, i, &c. (when a vowel did not follow), down to the sixth and seventh centuries A. D. we have a superabundance of proof. For the earlier period we may point to the fact that in Umbrian, where c (k) before a narrow vowel became a sibilant, expressed by a peculiar sign in the native alphabet, the Latin c was not used for this sound in inscriptions (from the time of the Gracchi) written in Latin characters, but a modification of s, namely s with a stroke like a grave accent above it, e.g. dēben (Lat. dēcem), semna (Lat. cēna). That Plautus (who by the way was an Umbrian) makes a play on the words Sōsia and sócius, proves nothing (Amph. 383):

Amphitruonis te esse aiebas Sōsiam.—Peccaueram:
nam ‘Amphitruonis sócius’ dudum me esse volui dicere.
He makes a play on *arcem* and *arcam* in *Bacch.* 943: atque hic equos non in árcem verum in árcam faciet impetum.

At Cicero's time the spelling *pulcher*, *Gracchii* with *ch* for supposed Greek χ is evidence that in declension of nouns and adjectives (*acer, acris, &c.*) the *c* did not change to a sibilant when it came to stand before an *e* or an *i*, as it does in Italian (*amicc* with hard *c*, *amici* with sibilant *c*). Varro (ap. Prisc. i. 39) quotes *ageps* (another spelling of *anceps*) as one of the words where the Agma-sound (the *ng* of 'thing') was found in Latin before *c* (therefore presumably hard *c*). In the first cent. A.D. Plutarch and Strabo render Latin *c* before a narrow vowel by Greek κ, *Kύριος*, &c. None of the grammarians of the Empire hint at a variety of pronunciation for *c, g*, not even Priscian in the sixth cent.; and all through this period we have Greek κ for Latin *c* in all positions (on documents of the sixth cent. δεσμ, δονατρικη, &c.), and on Latin inscriptions an interchange of *c, k, q* (e.g. *paive*, *C. I. L. x.* 7173: *ceseuet* for *quiuevit*, viii. 1091) (see Seelmann, pp. 342 sqq.). This interchange is not regulated by any principle. We do not find *k* used for 'hard *c*,' for 'soft *c*,' &c., as would have been the case had there been a real difference of pronunciation. All the examples quoted for interchange of *c* before a narrow vowel (not in hiatus) with a sibilant earlier than the sixth cent. in S. Italy, the seventh cent. in Gaul, are illusory (see G. Paris in *Acad. Inscr.* 1893, *Comptes Rendus*, xxi. p. 81).

The evidence that Latin *c* was what we call hard *c* before *e, i* down to a late period is thus overwhelmingly strong. But while holding to this fact we may make two concessions. First, that *c* before *e, i* was probably more of a palatal (like Italian *ch* in *chiessa*) than a velar (like Italian *c* in *casa*). This palatal character was more and more developed in the Romance languages till *c* became a sibilant. Since however this assimilation is not known in the Sardinian dialect of Logudoru, it may be that at the time of the occupation of Sardinia (c. 250 B.C.) Latin *c* had still a velar character before narrow as before broad vowels. Second, that *ci* (ce) before a vowel underwent the same process of assimilation, as *ti* before a vowel did in the fifth cent. A.D., although interchange of spelling between prevocalic *ci* and *ti* before that time means merely that *cy, ty* were confused, as *cl, tl* were confused (cf. Quint. i. ii. 6), not that both *cy* and *ty* expressed a sibilant sound. (For instances of the confusion see Schuchardt, *Vok.* i. pp. 154 sq., and consult Georges and Brambach s. vv. *Mucius, munudities, negotium, atium, munitus, Parcs, propitius, provincia, spatium, Sulpicius, indutiae, infiliae, condicio, contio, convincium, dicio, fotalis, solacium, suspicio, uncia, &c.* The earliest examples date from the second cent. A.D.) On Greek inscriptions Latin *ci* and *ti* are similarly confused, the earliest example being 'Ἀρνικανος' (Ἀθηρ. iv. p. 104) of 131 A.D. In a Pisidian inscription (*Journ. Hell. Stud.* iv. p. 26), of 225 A.D., with *Μαρσανος*, the *σ* (written *C*) is no doubt merely a confusion with the Latin letter *c*.

*G* before *c, i* may have been a palatal, rather than a velar, even earlier than *c*; for in Sardinian *hard* *g* is not preserved as hard *c* is in this position. At what precise period it was developed to *y* we do not know. The Appendix Probi mentions as a mispronunciation 'calcosteis,' for *calcosteis*, though this may be a case of that spirant pronunciation of Greek γ, like Tarentine διάς for διάγος, Boeotian δάν for γαύς. In the Romance languages it is treated exactly like Latin *j* (*y*), e.g. Italian *genero*, Span. *yerno* (Lat. *gίνετε*), like Italian *giace*, Span. *yace* (Lat. *facét*). It is dropped between two vowels in spellings like
vinti for viginti (C. I. L. viii. 8573), the precursor of Ital. venti, &c.; so trienta, (xii. 5399), &c. (A. L. L. vii. 69. See the list in Schuchardt, Vok. ii. 461). Vulg. Lat. *mais is seen in Fr. mai, Ital. mai, &c. But this dropping of intervocalic *y is found also before other vowels in late inscriptions and MSS., e. g. frugalis for frugalitas (see Schuchardt’s list, Vok. i. 129), as in Vulg. Lat. eo (Ital. io, &c.) for ego, just as in Italian and other Romance languages, every intervocalic *y when pretonic is dropped, e. g. Ital. reale from Lat. regalis. So *y in this position may have become a spirant (like *y of German Tage), just as intervocalic *y became a w-sound in the third cent. (§ 72).

§ 95. ct, tt. For examples see Schuchardt, Vok. i. 134; Rhein. Mus, xlv. p. 493, and consult Georges and Brambach s. v. cottana, coturnix, setius (?), vettonica, pittucium, brattea, salapitta, viretca. So nictio, to ‘give tongue,’ of a dog who has picked up the scent, is spelled nittio in the lemma of Festus (p. 188. l. 16 Th.), where he quotes the spirited line of Ennius, Ann. 374 M.:

nare sagaci

Sensit; voce sua nictit ululatque ibi neuta.

Autor, with autoritas, is censured in the Appendix Probi (198. 30 K.), and is found on late inscriptions (C. I. L. viii. 1423; cf. xii. 2058, of 491 A. D.). For *nt, which became nt by loss of the guttural, see § 70. So mulcta became multa (Georges s. v.)

gm or at least Greek gm seem to have tended, like lm, to the sound um. In Vulg. Lat. sagma was *sauma (Prov. sauma, Fr. somme), Isid. Orig. xx. 16. 5 sagma quae corrupte vulgo ‘sauma’ dicitur (v. l. salma; cf. Span. salma, Ital. salma and soma). Cf. Probi App. 198. 17 pegma non ‘peuma.’ (For other examples, see Schuchardt, Vok. ii. p. 499.) For gn, see § 144.

§ 96. L,R. The liquids l, r are, as we have seen (§ 85), closely connected with the voiced dental mute d. The tongue has a similar position with each of the three sounds; but while with d the mouth passage is completely closed by pressure of the point of the tongue against the front, and of the edges of the tongue against the sides of the mouth, with l the sides are left open, and with r the front. The connexion of the three sounds in Latin is seen, as was before remarked, in the interchange of d with l in lingua, older digua, &c., of d with r in arduisse for adfuisse, &c., and, as we may now add, of r with l in words like caeruleus for *caeluleus, not to mention occasional occurrences of the dental nasal for r or l, like Vulgar Latin menetris for mēretrix, cuntellum for cultellum.

The grammarians give us a good deal of information about the pronunciation of l in different parts of the word. It had a ‘pinguis sonus,’ or ‘plenus sonus,’ in two cases, (1) when it ended a word, or syllable followed by another consonant, e. g. sōl, silva, albus; (2) in combinations like fl, cl, e. g. flāvus, clārus.
In contrast with this 'pinguis sonus' it has what is called an 'exilis' (or 'tenuis') 'sonus' (presumably its normal sound) in other two cases, viz. (1) at the beginning of a word, e.g. lectus, lāna, läpus, and especially (2) when it ends one syllable and begins the next, e.g. iltē, Mētel-lus, al-lia [pronounced with two l's as in our 'mill-lade,' 'hotel-landlord' (see § 127)]. When we examine the development of Latin l in the Romance languages we find the explanation of this distinction. In Italian, for example, Latin l, when initial, or when repeated, has the normal l-sound, e.g. lana, valle (Lat. vallis), pelle (Lat. pellis), but after a consonant l has become a ly-sound, now reduced to i (the half-vowel), e.g. chiaro (Lat. clārus), pieno (Lat. plēnus), fiume (Lat. flūmen). At the end of a syllable before a consonant, it has in most Romance languages been reduced to a u-sound, e.g. Fr. autre, Prov. autre, Span. otro (Lat. alter), and so in parts of Italy, e.g. Sicil. autru, while in other parts it is represented by an i-sound, e.g. aitro in the Florentine dialect. All this points to a l in clārus, &c., and in alter, &c., having been pronounced with what phoneticians call an 'off-glide' and an 'on-glide' clārus, allter, which glides have been more and more developed in the Romance languages, till they reduced, or even completely extinguished, the l-sound. In Sardinian, which reflects the oldest type of Vulgar Latin, l remains unaffected after a consonant to a large extent, e.g. klaru, plenu, flumen, so that this affection of l may not have been begun in Vulgar Latin till about 200 B.C.

With regard to r, we should expect from the analogy of the Romance languages that Latin r was trilled (i.e. formed with the tip of the tongue vibrating), like the German and Scotch r, not like English r in 'red.' This is confirmed by the Roman name for r, 'littera canina,' the growling letter, Pers. i. 109 (Latin hirrio must have expressed the sound better than English 'growl'), and by Lucilius' description of it as like the growl of a lazy dog, or as he puts it, like 'what care I?' in dogs' language (ix. 29, 30 M.):

\[ r \text{ non multum abest hoc caeosyntheton atque canina,} \]
\[ si lingua dico 'nihil ad me.' \]

This rough sound of Latin r explains the reluctance of the Romans to begin two successive syllables with a consonant
followed by r, a reluctance seen in forms like præstigiae for præstrigiae, increbui for increbrui, and in spellings on inscriptions like proprius for prōprium. Before s, r was assimilated, e.g. rūssus, rūsus for rūrus, as we see from Plautus’ pun on Persa and pessum (Persa 740 Persa me pessum dedit). It was assimilated too before l, e.g. perlīcio, pronounced, and often spelled, pellicio. Metathesis of r (and l) was as common in bad Latin as in bad English, as interpōtor ( interpōtor) for interpretor, coāca for cloāca testify, and other mispronunciations censured by the grammarians. Dr became tr in Latin, e.g. ātrox (cf. ōdium) (ch. iv. § 113). Neither r nor l remained unaffected by the palatalizing influence of y, that later sound of i in words like Jānnārīus, fācio, hōdie, which worked so great a transformation of the language in the later period of Roman history. The palatalization of r led to its disappearance in Italian, e.g. Gennajo (Vulg. Lat. *Jen(u)aryus), a process exemplified in earlier times by the form peivrō for periūro, while ly has become the l mouillée, written gl in figlia, miglia (cf. our ‘million’), bigliardo (our ‘billiards’), and in some dialects, e.g. the patois of Rome and the neighbourhood, has sunk to y. Some spellings on late Latin inscriptions seem to be precursors of these changes of ry, ly. (On Umbrian l-, see ch. iv. § 85.)


adversa palati supera premendo parte
obstansque sono quem eiet ipsa lingua nitens
validum penitus nescio quid sonare cogit,
quo littera ad aures veniat secunda nostras,
ex ordine fulgens cui dat locum synopsis;

Mar. Vict. vi. 34. 10 K.: sequetur l quae validum nescio quid partem palati,
qua primordium dentibus superis est, lingua trudente, diducto ore personabit;
Mart. Cap. iii. 261 l lingua palatoque dulcescit.

§ 98. of r. Ter. Maur. vi. 332. 238, 239 K.:

vibrat tremulis ietibus aridum sonorem
has quae sequitur littera;

Mar. Vict. vi. 34. 15 K. sequetur r quae vibrato † vocis palatum linguae fastigio
fragorem tremulis ietibus reddit; Mart. Cap. iii. 261 R spiritum lingua cris-
pante corradiitur. Ter. Scaurus (13. 10 K.) mentions the connexion of r and l
with d: item l et d et r et s [inter se mutuis vicibus funguntur], cujus rei
maximum argumentum est, quod balbi, qui r exprimere non possunt, aut l
dieunt aut s, nec minus quod capra per diminutionem capella dicitur et frater
fratellus.
§ 99. The grammarians on the pronunciation of l. The earliest taequent
(ap. Prisc. i. p. 29 H.) is that of Pliny the Elder, who gives l three varieties of
sound: (1) exilis: quando geminatur secundo loco posita ut 'ille' 'Metellus';
(2) plenus: quando finit nomina vel syllabas et quando aliquam habet ante se
in eadem syllaba consonantem ut 'sol' 'silva' 'flavus' 'clarus'; (3) medius, in
other positions: ut 'lectus' 'pectum.' Similarly in the fifth(?) cent. Consentius
(v. 394 K.) makes only two divisions (1) pinguis: cum vel b sequitur, ut in
'albo,' vel c ut in 'pulchro,' vel f ut in 'adellis,' vel g ut in 'alga,' vel m ut in
'pulmo.' vel p ut in 'scalpro' (2) exitis: ubicumque ab ea verbum
incipit, ut in 'lepore' 'lana' 'lupo,' vel ubi in eodem verbo et prior syllaba
in hac finitur, et sequens ab ea incipit, ut 'il-le' 'Al-lia.' Not so clear is
his account of the two mispronunciations to which ille was liable. The Greeks,
says, pronounce 'ille mihi dixit' subtillus as if ille had only one l; others
pronounce 'ille meum comitatus est iter,' or 'illum ego per flammias eripui'
pinguis, 'ut aliquid illici sonit etiam consonantis ammiserse videantur.'
Possibly this means that the Greeks made the double l into one as we
do in pronouncing Italian (see § 127), and that others (e. g. Spaniards) gave
it the by-sound that it now has in Spain, e. g. villa (Ital. villa), which is pron-
ounced like Italian viglia. Diomede (i. 453. 3 K.) remarks on the fault of
pronouncing l in lācem or atlam 'nimium plene.' Servius in Don. iv. 445.
12-15 K. calls it a 'labdacismus' (mispronunciation of l) to make a single l,
e. g. Lūcius, too 'tenuis,' or a double l, e. g. Metellus, too 'pinguis.' Pompeius
(v. 286-287 K.) makes the same remark, and explains it thus: debemus
dicere 'largus' ut pingue sonet; et si dicas 'lex,' non 'lex,' vitiosa sunt per
labdacismum. item in gemino l, si volueris pinguius sonare, si dicamus
'Metellus' 'Catullus,' in his etiam agnoscinus gentium vitia; labdacismis
scatent Afri, raro est ut aliquid dicat l: per geminum l sic locuntur Romani,
omnes Latini sic locuntur: 'Catullus' 'Metellus.' His explanation would
doubtless be intelligible to his auditors when accompanied by his oral examples
of the different sounds; to us, who have to infer these, it is not so clear. All
that seems certain is that initial l had some distinction of sound from the l of
Metellus, Catullus, &c., but whether this distinction consisted merely in the
more emphatic articulation which every initial consonant received in Latin
or in some other modification, such as the slight on-glide, which initial l has
in the Gaelic language, and which makes a word like long, a ship (Lat. longa
sc. naxis), sound almost like 'along;' it is impossible to say (cf. § 117; ch. iv.
§ 149). The sound of the initial is described as 'pinguis,' in comparison with the
l of Metellus, but as 'exilis' in comparison with the l of clārus, alter, &c.
(See also Isid. Orig. i. 31. 8). In O. Engl. also there were three different
kinds of l, (1) deep gutteral l, as in 'chalk,' (2) ordinary l, as in 'field,' (3)
palatal l, as in 'whil,lch' (Paul's Grundr. i. p. 860). The fact that e could
become o before l, but not before ll, in Latin (ch. iv. § 10) suggests that normal
Latin l was deeper, or less palatal, than ll.

§ 100. of r. Varro (L. L. iii. fr. p. 146 Wilm.) mentions the rough sound
('asperum') of crux, dōre, vēpres (also crura), beside viōuptas, mel, tēna.

§ 101. Interchange of r and l. On the confusion of frāgro and frāgro, and
the misspelling of both as fraglo, see A. L. L. iv. 8. In Probi App. 201. 19
the distinction between the two words is carefully pointed out (cf. ib. 198. 9
flagellum non 'fragellum') (Ital. fragello). Pliny gave the rule for the
¶¶ 99–102. PRONUNCIATION. LIQUIDS.

Employment of the suffixes -lis and -ris, that -lis should be used when the stem contained an r, -ris when it contained an l, e.g. augūrāle, mōlāre (ap. Charis. 135. 13; cf. Prise. i. p. 132 H.). So too the I.-Eur. suffix -clo-, Latin -clo-, became -cro- after a stem with l, e.g. lacvārum, fulcrum, simulācum. The same tendency to dissimilation is seen in Vulgar Latin forms like veltrahus, beside vertrāgus (see Georges s.v., and cf. Prov. veltres, O. Fr. viattrue), and pelgrinus (C.I.L. iii. 4222, &c.), from which come the Romance words, Ital. pelligrino, Fr. pèlerin, our 'pilgrim,' &c.; in the mispronunciations telēbra (see Georges s.v.), censured in Probi App. 198. 21 K.; in the spellings of MSS. and late Latin inscriptions, collected by Schuchardt, Vol. i. 136 sqq. (cf. melōtrix, Non. 202. 13; 318. 6); in spellings on Greek inscriptions like ἐβαβηλλεια, ἐβαβηλλος, beside ἐβαβηλλεια and ἐβαβηλλος, Φεβλαιεος, Μελκουφιανος, &c. (see Eckinger, p. 197); in Romance forms like Ital. albero (from Lat. arbor), reclutare (our 'recruit'), Mercoledi (from Mercūriī dies), urlare (from ἕστιλαρε), which show that the same process is going on in modern, as in ancient, times on Italian soil. The town Cūqiari in Sardinia was in Latin called Carales plur. or Caralis sing.; but we find byforms Caralis and Cararis. From Cūsturneria, or Cūsturnium, we have the adjective-forms Cūstūmīnus and Cūstūminus (Greek Κροστομείνα and Κλωστομουμείνα, Eckinger, p. 107).

§ 102. Parasitic Vowel with l, r. The sounds l, r were called 'liquidae' by Latin phoneticians, λ, μ, r, p, ἵγαι (by Greek), because they united easily with a preceding consonant. Cf. Mar. Vict. vi. 20 eadem autem 'liquidae' dicuntur, quando hae solae [he includes m, n] inter consonantem et vocalem immissae non asperum sonum faciunt, ut 'clamor' 'Tmolus' 'Cnosus' [MSS. consul] 'Africa.' But in Latin, especially after the time of Plautus, there was a tendency to facilitate the pronunciation of a mute followed by l, particularly when post-tonic by the insertion of a vowel, written on early inscriptions o, later u. Thus po-culum, which is formed with the I.-Eur. suffix -lo- (ch. v. § 25), became po-colom, po-culum. These forms with the parasitic vowel underwent at a later time the same process of syncope that reduced cellulā to celā, Titius to Tītigus, porcolus (from the stem porco- with the suffix -lo-) to porcolus, and so resumed their earlier appearance poculum, &c. Traces are not wanting of the same parasitic vowel-sound showing itself between a consonant and r. The development in Romance of a word like patrem, suggests that it must in Vulgar Latin have sounded almost like a trisyllable, *pat'rem (Meyer-Läbbke, Rom. Gram. i. p. 251); and the same is indicated perhaps by Varro's derivation of Graccus, or, as he spelt it, Graccus (quasi *Geraccus), from gero, 'quod mater ejus duodecim mensibus utero eum gestaverit' (ap. Charis. 82. 7 K.), certainly by spellings on inscriptions like Tertidini for Trēbōn- (Eph. Epigr. i. 116), though a good many of these may be dialectal. For this parasitic vowel was a marked feature of the Oscan language, and its kindred dialects, e.g. Oscan aragetud (Lat. argento Abl.), Pelignian Alafis (Lat. Albius). Bede cannot be right in explaining spondaic hexameters, like

illi continuo statuunt ter dena argenti,
as ending really with a dactyl and spondee, the last two words being pronounced 'denarigenti'; for it is not the case that all, or most, spondaic lines end in a word in which r is combined with a consonant. But his description of the sound is interesting, though of course he is not to be regarded as an authority on Latin pronunciation, except when he is quoting from some older
grammian. He says (p. 250, 11 K.), after instancing some spondeic hexameters ending with *argentl, incermenta* (!), *respergebat, interfectae, intercepto*, neque enim in quinta regione versus heroici spondeum ponere moris erat, sed ita tamen versus hujus modi scandere voluisse reor, ut addita in sono vocali, quam non scribant, dactylus potius quam spondeus existeret, verbi gratia, 'intercepto' 'incermenta' 'interfectae' 'respergebat' et per synaliphm 'denarigenti.' quod ideo magis r littera quam ceterae consonantes patitur, quia quae durius naturaliter sonat durior efficitur, cum ab alis consonantibus excititur; atque ideo non si vocalis apponitur, cujus temperamento ejus levigetur asperitas; et he goes on to say that this use of a parasitic vowel between *r* and a consonant was much affected by monks, when chanting the responses at divine service. At the same time it is possible that the existence of this parasitic vowel may explain another feature of Latin poetry, namely the optional treatment of a short vowel before a mute followed by *r* as long by position. Plautus, who, as we have seen, avoided the parasitic vowel with *i*, as alien to the conversational Latin of his time, also refuses to allow the first syllable of a word like *patri, atri* to be scanned long, though (see ch. iii. § 42) such a syllable is not so short as the first syllable of *pdti, agri, &c., for it cannot exercise a shortening influence (by the law of Breves Breviantes) on the following syllable. Plautus scans *pdti, atri*, but only *patri, atri*. In the same way he always scans *vehiculum* (the invariable form), *cubitum* (though this last word is an exception to the rule in being usually quadrisyllabic, *cubitum*), and never *vehiculum, cubitum*. And this is the usage in all the dramatic poetry of the Republic. But Ennius in his Epic, Lucilius in his Satires, allow themselves such scansion as *nigrum, latrat, fibras, triclini;* and this suggests that in poetry, where the words were sounded with more deliberation than the rapid conversational utterance of the drama allowed, the presence of this parasitic vowel was felt to add another unit of time, another 'mora' to these syllables, so that they might on occasion be treated as long. Lucilius' scansion *triclinium* (Inc. 145 M.), for example, reminds us of the form used by Varro, *triclinium* (R. R. iii. 13. 2. So the MSS.), and the forms found on inscriptions *trichilium* (C. I. L. ix. 4971; xiv. 375, 17, &c.), should perhaps be replaced by the quadrisyllabic form. In the time of Servius the accent rested on the second syllable of *maniplus*, so that the word was regarded in ordinary conversation, either as being almost a quadrisyllable, or as having a penult equivalent to a long syllable (Serv. ad *Aen.* xi. 463 *manipli* : *in hoc sermone ut secunda a fine habeat accentum usus obtinuit*); and the Vulgar Latin shifting of the accent from the first to the second syllable of words like *tenetrae, &c.* (see ch. iii. § 11), is no doubt to be justifed in the same way; though in Servius' time it was not allowed in correct pronunciation (Serv. ad *Aen.* i. 384 *peragro* : 'per' habet accentum . . . muta enim et liquida, quotiens ponuntur, metrum juvant, non accentum). This explanation of the optional scansion *patri, fabrum* competes with another (§ 142), according to which the consonant before the *r* was doubled in pronunciation, as it is in modern Italian fabbro, &c. (beside fabro), just as a consonant was doubled in later Latin before consonantal *u* (e) in *acqua* (Ital. *acqua*), and before consonant al *i* (y), the development of *i* in Ital. eccie (Vulg. Lat. *eccius*), &c. It is quite possible that the shifting of the accent to the second syllable of words like *tenetrae, may have had the effect of strengthening the sound of the mute. The doubling of the consonant in the
proparoxytone syllable is a feature of Italian, e.g. femmina, collera, legittimo (§ 131).

The parasitic vowel between a mute and $l$ is generally wanting on Greek inscriptions, perhaps because the Greeks were more conversant with combinations like γάλα, πάλα, &c. than the Romans, e.g. Ἀφτλοος, Βῆγαετία (Lat. Vigilantia), and the syncopated forms of -είλος (as in πορείλος, &c.) are usual in the instances quoted by Eckinger (p. 75). Αριβονακλα, Μασκλος, Πατεραλος, Πουνρκ, though it must be added that they mostly date from a time when Syncop had taken a strong hold of the Latin language itself. The Appendix Probi condemns several of these syncopated words (as he condemns calda, &c.), including with them some whose vowel in the classical spelling is not original but parasitic: speculum, masculus, rectus, vicinus (for vitinus), vernaculus, articulus, lacus, jugulus, clerus, tabula, stabulum, tribula, vaplo, capiculum. He also mentions nascel, figel, which may be South Italian, for the Ocean equivalent of famulus was fiunel (Paul. Fest. 62. 1 Th.). The early date of the parasitic vowel with $l$ is seen in the old Latin form piscolom, quoted by Mar. Vict. p. 12 K., and pocolom, the usual spelling on the Praenestine vases (C.I.L. i. 43 sqq.). Plautus seems to regard the use of these lengthened forms as a licence, only to be resorted to in cases of metrical necessity; for they are found, especially when a long vowel precedes the syllable with $l$, only at the end of a line or hemistich, e.g. Capt. 740,

periculum vitae meae tuo stat periculo (see ch. iii. § 13).

(For the parasitic vowel in Greek loanwords with $m$, $n$ preceded by a consonant, see § 154.) Calicaria, from calix, lime (Paul. Fest. 33. 8 Th. calicata aedificia, calce polita; ib. 41. 21 calicatis, calce politis; ib. 53. 16 decalicatum, calce litum; Gl. Cyrill. κοινω, decalico, calce albo; C.I.L. i. 1166 basilicam calecandam), apparently the normal spelling, and to be read probably in the Placidus Glossary (60. 19 G.), (where the MSS. have decalactis, de calce albatis), is not a case of parasitic vowel between $l$ and a following consonant (like Gk. Καλννορνοι), (Dittenb. Syll. 240 of 138 B.C.), and (on the edict of Diocletian) καλίως. It merely retains the Greek loanword χάλις in its disyllabic form, instead of syncopating it to its usual form in Latin, calx. (For examples of the parasitic vowel in misspellings on inscriptions, see Seelmann, p. 251.)

§ 103. Avoidance of two r's. (See A. L. L. iv. 1 sqq.) The changes of $r$ to $l$ in Vulg. Lat. pītērinus, &c., and the doubtful cases of $n$ for $r$, e.g. low Latin menétrix, may be considered as examples of this avoidance. The use of gnāritior for gnāriōr (not before Augustine), fērōcior, for *fērōr, māgis vērus beside veror, magis miris modis (Plaut. Mil. 539) for miōrīdus modis, dēcensor for dēcōrīor in Quintilian and Tacitus, sanctior for sācior, all exhibit the same tendency. Pompeius (283. 13 K.) mentions manor as a mispronunciation of marmor; and the form Maners, Mamertini beside Marmor of the Carmen Saliiare, also Fabaris, the Latin name of the Sabine river Farfarus, perhaps show the same dropping of $r$ in the reduplication-syllable. So too the form parrigus was preferred to *prorīgo. On praestigeā, from praestringo, to dazzle, crebresco and its compounds (crebresco, is like pūtesco, from a stem without $r$), see Georges, Lex. Worf. s. vv. On inscriptions, de proprio (Ital. proprio and proprio) for de próprio occurs (Not. Senv. 1890, p. 170), propiedades (C.I.L. ix. 2827 of 19 A.D.), &c. (see Schuchardt, i. p. 21, for other instances). Vulg. Lat. *trono, to thunder, for tōno
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(Ital. tronare and tonare, Span. O. Port. Prov. tronar), has inserted r for onomatopoeic effect; frustum (Probus 199. 3 K. frustum non ‘frustum’), found, with cru- strum and pristris, in MSS. of Virgil (see Ribbeck’s Index) and aplustrum (aplustra) for Greek ἀπλαστρον: cretaria (Caper. 106. 13 K. cetariae tabernae, quae nunc ‘cretariae’ non recte dicantur) by false analogy (see Schuchardt, i. 21 for other examples: and cf. Fr. trésor from Lat. thésaurus, beside Ital. tesoro; Span. estrella beside Lat. stella and (dialect) strella. In Italian we find the same tendency; e.g. Federico, Certosa (Fr. Chartreuse), arato (Lat. ārārum), frate (Lat. frātem), deretano (Vulg. Lat. *deretranus from retro*, &c.; gomito, a ball of thread, from Lat. glōmus, shows the same suppression of one of two r’s.

§ 104. rs. Velius Longus 79. 4 says: sic et dossum per duo s quam per r dorsum quidam ut lenius enuntiaverunt, ac tota littera r sublata est in eo quod est rumum et retossum. Cf. Probi App. 198. 29 persica non ‘pessica’ (a peach). [For other examples, see Georges, Lex. Worlf. s.vv. controversia (and other compounds of -versus, e.g. provas), Marspiter, Sessina, Thyrsogates, assa, &c.] In the Sententia Minuicorum of 117 B.C. (C. I. L. i. 199) we have controverseis, controversias, suso varsum, sursumvarsum, and sursumvarsum, dorsum and dorsum side by side. Since double consonants are usually written single on this inscription (posidebunt, posedeli, &c., beside posiderent) controversias probably represents the pronunciation controvsissas. (On these spellings in Plautine MSS., see Ritschl, Prolegg. p. civ.)

§ 105. r-n. Menetris, a byform of mērētrix (see A. L. L. iii. 539 and cf. Probi App. 198. 28 K. meretrrix non ‘menetris’) may have been influenced by mēnēre or Greek μίνα (cf. Non. 423. 11 M. menetrices a manendo dictae sunt). Nor is cancer a clear case of ‘Dissimilation’ for *career (Greek καρέ-ινοs), seeing that a nasal in the reduplication-syllable is not unknown in other L.-Eur. languages, e.g. Greek γογ-γόλλω, τον-θορόω, O. Ind. cañ-curryate, cf. gin-grive. In the Gaelic language n when following c, g becomes r, such a word as cnu, a nut, being pronounced cru (with nasal u). Some see this change in grōma, a land-measuring instrument, which they consider to be the Greek γράμμων. But other instances are wanting; and gn-in Latin became n, not gr, e.g. nosco, nātus. (Cf. Probi App. 197. 32 pancarpus non ‘parcarpus’) (see ch. iv. § 8o).

§ 106. l-n. Nusctiosus, ‘qui plus videret vesperi quam meridie’ (Fest. 180. 21 Th.), and muscisiosus, ‘qui plus vespere videt’ (Lōwe, Prodrumus, p. 17), are byforms of luscitisus and lasciusus, which may be due to the analogy of nosx. Leptis, ‘filla fratris’ (ib. p. 340) seems to be a byform of neptis. The Diminutive of colus, a spindle, was in Vulg. Lat. conue(u)la (Ital. conocchia, Fr. queueuille). A more certain example of n for l is the mispronunciation censured in Probi App. 197. 24 K. cutellum non ‘cumentlum’ (see below) (see also Seelmann, p. 327; Schuchardt, Vok. i. p. 143). When Latin n follows n in successive syllables we find l-n in Ital. veleno and veneno (O. Fr. velin) from Latin vinēnum, Bologna from Bōmōnia, Palestrina from Praeneste, Praenestinus, calonaco and canonico (cf. Ital. gonfalone, a banner, Fr. gonfalon, Span. confalon, O. Fr. gonfanon, Prov. gonfanons from O. H. Germ. grand-fano).

§ 107. l before consonant. For the u-affection of l before a consonant, see some instances collected by Schuchardt, Vok. ii. p. 493 sqq., e.g. cauculus for calculus in MSS. (cf. Georges). In the Edict of Diocletian (301 A.D.) we have
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καυκούλατορι for calcūlātori. The letters L and I are so similar that spellings like sātēm (le Blant. I. G. i.) may be nothing but a graver's error. On the other hand the Umbrian form of the Latin Volṣevus was certainly Voisienus; and in C. I. L. xi. 5389 and 5390 (= i. 1412) we have epitaphs of a father in Umbrian, and a son in Latin, with the father's name Voisieno- and the son's Volsieno-

In Probi Appendix 197. 24 K. the mispronunciation cunctillum for cultillum is mentioned. This treatment of r before a consonant is found in Central Italy (Latium, Sabina, la Marche, and Umbria) in modern Italian, e.g. unimo for ultimo in a fourteenth cent. text (see Wien. Stud. xiv. 315 n.). Cf. muntu from Pompeii (C. I. L. iv. 1593).

§ 108. rl. Velius Longus 65. 11 K. per vero praeposito omnibus integra praeponitur, nisi cum incidit in litteram, adfinem consonantem, quam elegantioris sermonis viri geminare malunt quam r litteram exprimere, ut cum 'pellabor' malunt dicere quam perllabor. nec aliter apud Lucilium legitur

in praeposito per,

'pelliciendo,' hoc est inducendo, geminato I (Lucil. ix. 32 M.);

'pellicie' malunt quam perliere, unde et apud Virgilium non aliter legimus 'pellacia Ulixii' (see ch. iv. § 160). In the Probi Appendix 198. 14 K. we have:
supellex non 'superlex,' with the (marginal?) note utrumque dicitur. (On the late spelling superlex, see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s.v.) The only example of r in the Indices of the Corpus is perlegere (vol. i).

§ 109. r before consonants. R is sometimes dropped before a consonant on Greek inscr., e.g. Κατα (Lat. Quarta) (C. I. G. add. 43151), Ξαρωνιασ (Brit. Mus. ii. 341, from Cos); and in Latin plebian inscr., we have misspellings like Fortanate (C. I. L. vi. 2236) for Fortānātēs (sometimes Fort-, i.e. Fort- with close o, see § 145). [Cf. the rude Faliscan inscr. Zvetaiiff. Inscr. Ital. Inf. 63 with Maci Accamelin (as Votilia for Voltitia) for the usual Marci Acerelinī of n° 62, &c.] But it would be unsafe to rely on these as evidence that Latin r ever became the mere voice-glide which English r always becomes when not followed by a vowel, e.g. in 'here,' 'hark' as opposed to 'herein,' 'harass.'

§ 110. final r. All final consonants were, as we have seen, weakly pronounced in Latin. Some instances of the omission of -r in spellings of inscriptions and MSS. have been collected by Schuchardt, Vok. ii. p. 390.

111. Metathesis. Quint. i. 5. 13 'Trasumennno, pro Tarsumennno, multi auctores; i. 5. 12 duo in uno nomine faciebat barbarismos Tinga Placentinus, si reprehendi Hortensio eredinimus, 'preculum' pro pergula dicens. Examples from Plautus are Phrygia, Aut. 508, corcolarii, Aut. 521. Consentius (392. 23 K.) censures perhum for prehum, reliquum for reliquum, interpertos for interpretor, coaca for cloaca, displicina (a schoolboy's joke surely) for disciplina: Diomedes (452. 30 K.), leriquiae for religiaue, lerigio for religio (and tanpister for tanrisper); Julian, in Don. v. p. 324. 18 K. intrepella for interpella; Probi Appendix has (199. 12 K.) glatri [leg. clatri?] non '克拉ś.' This late Latin克拉ś (cf. Probi App. 195. 23 K.) comes from *克拉ś as vēclus (ib. 197. 20) from *vēlusfor vētus. Clistrum for crūstum is found on inscriptions of the Empire (e.g. clastrum et milsum, Not. Socar. 1877, p. 246 of second cent. A.D., cf. κλαστρομπλακών, Athen. xiv. p. 647 c, d). Columnus is the adjective from corulēs. (On the confusion of fragro, flagro and the form fragio, see A. L. L. iv. 8.) In Italian nothing is
commoner than this Metathesis with \( r \). Thus in S. Italy crapa is used for capra (Lat. \( \text{c"apa} \) ), which reminds us of the statement of Paul. Fest. that the old Latin word for \( \text{capra} \) was \( \text{crepa} \) (33. 36 Th. caprae dictae, quod omne virgultum carpant, sive a crepitu crurum. Unde et \( \text{crepas} \) eas prisci dixerunt. The Luperci, who wore goatskins and ran about striking people with goatskin thongs, were called \( \text{crepi} \), ib. 39. 34 K. crepos, id est lupercos, dicebant a crepitu pellicularum, quem faciunt verberantes); so interprete for interpreto (should we read \( \text{interpetror} \) in Consentius 392. 23 K.?); and præta for petra is used in various parts of Italy; formento is Lat. \( \text{frumentum} \), farneticus Lat. \( \text{phr"eneticus} \), &c., &c. For I we have padule, a marsh (Lat. \( \text{p"aludem} \) ); falliva beside favilla, fiaba, a fable, for Lat. \( \text{fabla} \), \( \text{fi"abula} \). Paduan requilia for reliquia (should we read \( \text{re"quilum} \) in Consentius 392. 23 K.? is in Venetian reliquia (cf. \( \text{leriquias} \) of Diomedes 452. 30 K.); in many parts of Italy, grolia is used for gloria. [For some instances of Metathesis in late inscriptions and in MSS. spellings, see Schuchardt, \( \text{Vok. i. p. 29} \) on \( \text{Pricatus} \) for \( \text{Pancatus} \), \( \text{padules} \) for \( \text{paludes} \) (cf. Ital. padule), and Seelmann, p. 330 on \( \text{Procobera} \) for \( \text{Porcobera} \), &c.; and for examples in Latin byforms, see Georges, \( \text{Lex. Wortf. s. vv. pristis, crocodilus, Trasumenus, trapezita, and W"olflin, A. L. L. viii. 279 on accessor and accessor.} \) The Latin \( \text{Pr"oserpina} \) (C. I. L. i. 57 \( \text{prosepna} \) dat. case) for Greek \( \text{Προσερφονη} \) (Pelignian \( \text{Perseponas} \) gen. case) may be due to the analogy of \( \text{pr"oserpo} \); but Vulg. Lat. \( \text{*alenare} \) for \( \text{ανδηλαρε} \) (Ital. alenare, Fr. haileiner), \( \text{*plopus} \) for \( \text{poplus, p"oplus} \), poplar-tree (Ital. pioppo, Roum. plop, Catal. clop) are clear cases of metathesis of \( i \).

§ 112. \( \text{ly} \). For misspellings on late inscriptions and in MSS. like \( \text{fius for f"ilus} \), see Schuchardt, \( \text{Vok. ii. pp. 486 sqq.} \) Some of them may be due to the confusion of the \( L \) and \( I \) (see above). Ital. giglio, a lily, seems to come from a form \( \text{*ly"ilum} \).

§ 113. \( \text{ry} \). Servius ad Aen. ii. 195 approves \( \text{pejuro} \) for the Verb, but \( \text{perjurus} \) for the Adjective: in verbo \( r \) non habet: nam pejuro dicimus, corrupta natura praepositionis: quae res facit errorem, ut aliqui male dicant \( \text{‘pejurus’ ut pejuro} \).

§ 114. \( \text{F} \). The Latin phonetics cannot be suspected of any influence from Greek sources in their account of \( f \); a sound unknown to the Greek alphabet; so their description may be taken as a true account of the pronunciation of \( f \) at their time, or possibly even at an earlier, the date, namely, of the treatise on Latin phonetics from which they seem to have borrowed. That time was probably the Augustan age. Their words leave no doubt whatever that \( f \) was a labiodental spirant, as it is in Italian and most languages, formed by the upper teeth pressed against the lower lip, not a bilabial spirant, formed by the upper and lower lips pressed against each other:

\[ \text{im"um superis dentibus adprimens labellum spir"amine leni \ (\text{Terentianus Maurus, second cent. A. D.})} \]
The spiramen tene was more a feature of the normal f-sound when a vowel followed, than in combinations with consonants like fr, fl, as we learn from Quintilian, who, when discussing the more musical nature of the Greek language than the Latin, speaks of Latin f, especially in words like frangit (to a less extent when followed by a vowel), as rough and harsh compared with the softer sounds of Greek. This more vehement articulation of f before a consonant explains the different treatment of the Latin spirant in Spanish, in words like haba (Lat. füba), humo (Lat. fümus), but fraga (Lat. frägum, *fraga). Quintilian's account does not mention the labiodental character of the sound (xii. 10. 29 paene non humana voce vel omnino non voce potius inter discrimina dentium efflanda est), but is quite consistent with it. It is, in fact, very like the account given by phoneticians of our f, as 'formed with a strong hiss, by pressing the lower lip firmly against the upper teeth, and thus driving the breath between the teeth' (Sweet, Handb. p. 41).

But it is probably that Latin f was at some time bilabial, as it is to this day in Spanish, where v (v) is bilabial too. Bilabial f naturally tends to become labiodental, because by bringing the teeth into play it is possible to give a stronger and more distinct sound than can be produced by the lips alone. The voiced bilabial spirant v has, as we saw before (§ 48), become labiodental v in Italian and other Romance languages. And we have some evidence of f being still bilabial in the last centuries of the Republic from spellings like im fronte (C. I. L. i. 1104), not to speak of confluont beside confluent on the Sententia Minuciorum of 117 B.C. (C. I. L. i. 199), and possibly from the fact that ad, in composition with a word beginning with f (or v, b, &c.) became in Republican Latin ar, e.g. arfuise on the S. C. de Bacchanalibus of 186 B.C. (C. I. L. i. 196). Another passage of Quintilian tells us of the difficulty felt by Greeks in pronouncing this thoroughly Roman letter (i. 4. 14 Graeci adspirare f ut φ solent). He illustrates it by the story of Cicero's ridicule of a Greek witness who could not pronounce the first letter of Fundanius. By the fifth cent. A.D., however, the Greek aspirate had become a spirant, differing from Latin f only in being bilabial.
§ 115. Descriptions of the sound of f. Quintilian (xii. 10. 29) : nam illa, quae
est sexta nostrarum, paene non humana voce, vel omnino non voce potius,
inter discrimina dentium efflambia est: quae, etiam cum vocalem proximo
accipit, quasse quodammodo, utique quotiens aliquam consonantem frangit,
ut in hoc ipsa ‘frangit,’ multo fit horridior; Terent. Maur. 332. 227 K. :
imum superis dentibus adprimos labellum,
spiramine leni, velut hirta Graia [i. e. φ, p-h] vites,
hanc ore sonabls, modo quae locata prima est;

Marius Victorinus. 34. 9 K. f litteram imum labium superis imprimentes
dentibus, reflexta ad palati fastigium linguæ, leni spiramine proferemus; Mart.
Cap. iii. 261 F dentes [faciunt] labrum inferius deprimentes. In the sixth
cent. A.D., Priscian mentions as the only difference between Latin f and Greek
φ, that the former was not pronounced fixis labris (i. p. 11. 27 H. hoc tamen
seire debemus, quod non fixis labris est pronuntianda f, quomodo p et h ;
atque hoc solum interest) [Blass, Griech. Aussprache? p. 85 dates the change
of Greek φ (written in Latin ph, or as Priscian puts it ‘p et h’), from the
aspirante to the spirant sound at about 400 A.D.]. Two centuries earlier than
Priscian, the difference between Latin f and Greek φ seems to have been very
slight, for Diomedes (fourth cent. A.D.), from whom, or from whose original
authority, Priscian may be quoting, says (423. 26 K.): et hoc seire debemus
quod f littera tum scribitur, cum Latina dictio scribitur, ut ‘felix’ nam si
peregrina fuerit, p et h scribimus, ut ‘Phoebus,’ ‘Phaeton.’ F is the normal
equivalent of Greek φ in Greek loanwords from the middle or end of the
fourth century onwards, e. g. strofa, Greek στροφή (see ch. i. § 11).

The remark of Priscian (i. p. 35. 17 H.) that F, the Aeolic digamma, used
to have the sound of consonantal v (w), probably refers to a fashion of some
early grammarians of writing ‘Fotum,’ ‘Firgo,’ &c., alluded to by Cornutus
ap. Cassiodor. 148. 8 K. and by Donatus ad Ter. Andr. i. 2. 2 (see ch. i. § 7).

sibi succedunt], sed proprie sunt cognatae, quae simili figuratione oris dicuntur,
ut est b, f, [s], m, p, quibus Cicero adicet v, non eam quae accipitur pro vocali,
sed eam quae consonantis obtinet vicem, et anteposita vocali fit ut aliae
quae consonantes. quosquit igitur praepositionem sequetur vox eujus
prima syllaba incepti a supradictis litteris, id est b, f, [s], m, p, v, quae vox
conjugata praepositioni significationem ejus confundat, vos quoque praepo-
positionis litteram mutare, ut est ‘combit’ ‘combitū’ ‘combitūr’ ‘com fert’ ‘com-
fundit’ ‘commemorat’ ‘communitt’ ‘comparat’ ‘compellit’ ‘comvalescit’
‘convocat’ non ‘conbit’ ‘conbitū’ ‘conbitūr’ et similia. sic etiam praeposito
juncta vocibus quae inceptiunt a supradictis litteris n commutat in m, ut
‘imbit’ ‘imbuit’ ‘imfert’ ‘imfict’ ‘immict’ ‘immemor’ ‘immitis’ ‘impius’
‘impotens.’ He must be quoting from some grammarian of the Republic in
his rule about f; for the usual teaching of the grammarians of the Empire is
that the consonants before which m is used are b, p, m; and Priscian, i. p. 31.
2 H. quotes as early an authority as the elder Pliny to this effect (cf. Prisc.
i. p. 29. 18 H. ‘am’ praeposito f vel c vel q sequentibus in n mutat m :
anfractus ‘ancius’ ‘anquiro’). But the spelling with m before f (and v)
was undoubtedly an old usage, of which such MS. spellings as conferre, Poen.
1048, confragosus, Men. 591 in the Plautus Palimpsest, in flamman, Aen. xii. 214,
confert, Aen. iv. 116 in Virgil MSS. may be relics. On the other hand since
§ 117. S, X, Z. In the noun 'use' and the verb 'to use' the letter s has two different sounds, which we often call 'hard s' and 'soft s.' Hard s is more scientifically termed 'unvoiced,' soft 'voiced' s, the two sounds differing exactly as the unvoiced and voiced mutes, p and b, t and d, c and g. The Latin s in a word like urbs was hard or unvoiced s, we know from the frequently repeated statements of the grammarians, that the spelling urbs expressed the pronunciation; while the spelling with b was justified only by the analogy of other cases, urbis, urbi, urbem, &c. (see § 80); and p in sumpsi, hiemps tells the same tale. Initial s, whether in the accented or unaccented syllable, may also be put down as unvoiced s, since the Romance languages agree in giving it this sound (e.g. Ital. sì, Fr. si, Span. sí for Lat. si; Ital. sudare, Fr. suer, Span. sudar for Lat. sudare), and similarly when s is the initial of the second member of a compound, in words like Ital. risalire, Fr. résilier, Span. salír from Lat. résilire, later resilire. None of the Latin grammarians ever suggest that Latin s had anything but one and the same sound; and their silence is evidence of some weight that the soft or unvoiced variety of s was unknown in Latin. This voiced s-sound seems to have been the sound of Greek ζ in and after the Macedonian period (cf. ζύμαργος for συμαργός, ζύμρα for Συμρα), which explains why Oscan voiced s, which corresponds to Umbrian and Latin r, is in those inscriptions which are written in Latin characters, expressed by z, e.g. eizae (Umbr. erak), eizazure egnazum (in Lat. earum rerum) on the Bantia Tablet c. 130 B.C. Between vowels s had at an early time in Latin (c. 350 B.C. according to Cicero, Fam. ix. 21. 2) become r, as it did in Umbrian; and this earlier s may very well have had in this position the voiced sound (ch. iv. § 146). Intervocalic s in the classical and Imperial period is only found as a rule where there had been formerly some consonant combined with s, e.g. formōsus earlier formōnus, causa earlier caussa, usus earlier uusus (see ch. iv. § 148). In such words s has become voiced in many Romance
languages, e.g. Fr. épouse (Lat. sponsa), but only in those in which every Latin unvoiced consonant becomes voiced in this position. In Italian intervocalic s is unvoiced, except in the few cases where Latin unvoiced mutes also become voiced, e.g. sposare, like mudare (§ 73). There is hardly any evidence, therefore, that s in classical Latin was in any circumstances pronounced like our s in ‘to use’; and the opinion, a widely spread one, that the change of spelling from causse to causa, &c., indicated a change from hard to soft s is utterly wrong.

The pronunciation of double -ss- is discussed in § 131. Here we need only mention the curious practice that grew up in the later Empire of prefixing i to initial st, sp, sc, seen in spellings on inscriptions like istatnam (Orelli i120, of 375 A.D), ispose (i.e. sponsae C. I. L. viii. 3485), and in Romance forms like Fr. épouse. These last show that this spelling does not indicate an sh-sound of s before a mute like German stehen (pronounced ‘shtehen’), but that there was an actual i-sound before the s-sound, an i-sound which developed from a vowel-glide, due to beginning the word before the vocal-organs were properly in position for the initial consonant. These ‘initial on-glides,’ as phoneticians would term them, are a feature of Romance languages (cf. Greek ἐπυθός), but not of Teutonic. We have already seen that there is some indication of initial l having had an ‘on-glide’ in Latin (§ 99); and spellings on inscriptions suggest the same for other initial consonants. Can this have been the ‘circa s litteram deliciae’ which elocution teachers had to correct in their pupils (Quint. i. 11. 6), just as singers are taught nowadays to avoid the ‘breathy’ gradual beginning of an initial vowel?

X had, as the grammarians repeatedly tell us, the sound of c followed by the sound of s. The c (as the c of ct, § 95), tended to be dropped after a consonant, whence the spelling mers in Plautus for mera; and in careless pronunciation x in any position tended to ss (so ct became tt, § 95), as we see from forms like cossim for coxim, used in the farces of Pomponius (ap. Non. 40 M.). There are traces, too, of the substitution of sc for cs, e.g. ascella is the Late-Latin form of axilla. In Italian we have ss [as in ancient Pelignian, e.g. usur (Lat. uvōres), and
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other dialects], for example, sasso (Lat. saxum), but before a consonant (as probably in Vulgar Latin), s, e.g. destro (Lat. dexter) (as in ancient Umbrian destra, &c.). Latin loanwords in Welsh indicate cs, e.g. O.W. Saes for Latin Saxo, crös for Latin crõx, but s before a consonant, e.g. estron (Lat. extrānus), estynn (Lat. extendo).

Z of Old Latin had perhaps the soft or voiced sound of s, which passed into the r-sound about the time of Appius Claudius, the famous censor, when z was discarded from the alphabet (see ch. i. § 5). Greek ζ differed from it in causing length by ‘position.’

Final -s after a short vowel was weakly pronounced at all periods of the Latin language, and in the early poetry often did not constitute ‘position’ before an initial consonant, though by Cicero’s time it was regarded as an essential of correct pronunciation to give s at the end of a word its full sound.

§ 118. Phonetic descriptions of s, x : Ter. Maur. vi. 332. 239–243 K.:

mox duae supremae
vicina quidem sibila dentibus repressis
miscere videntur: tamen ictus ut priori
et promptus in ore est, agiturque pone dentes,
sic levis et unum ciet auribus susurrum.


§ 119. Latin s in Romance. Initial s becomes our sh (cf. Ital. scimmia) in Venice and some other parts (similarly intervocalic s becomes the voiced form of this sound, as in our ‘pleasure’), and was possibly voiced s in ancient Italian dialects (e.g. Faliscan Zexto- for Sextus (?)). On a late inscription of Tibur we have zabina (C. I. L. vi. 12236). Intervocalic -s- between the accented and unaccented vowels is unvoiced in Spanish (where however all sibilants are unvoiced), Roumanian and Italian, e.g. Italian mese (Latin mensis) [MHZES on a Naples’ inscription (C. I. L. x. 719), if it represent actual pronunciation, must have been a dialectal variety]. Italian sposa (with voiced s and open o) is influenced by sposare (Latin spo(n)are), where the o and the s precede the accent; the voiced s of rosa is anomalous, but may represent Greek ζ; or rosa may be a bookword and not a direct descendant of the Latin, for its French and Spanish forms too are irregular (Gröber’s Grundr. p. 532).

It is voiced in the other Romance languages, in which also (as in Spanish) unvoiced mutes between vowels become voiced, e.g. Fr. épouse (Lat. spo(n)are), chose (Lat. caussa) with voiced s, like O.Fr. ruede (Lat. rōda, Span. rueda), vide (Lat. vīda, Span. vida). It is voiced also in North Italian. Intervocalic -s-
before the accented vowel is voiced in Italian, e. g. sposare (Latin spo(n)sare), precisely as any Latin unvoiced mute becomes voiced in this position; e. g. mudare (Latin mūtare), pagare (Lat. pācare). So does any s which by Syoneo, &c. has come to stand before a voiced consonant, e. g. sdegno (Vulg. Lat. distigno), while in Spanish it has developed to ñ, r (though written s), e. g. desden.

§ 120. Greek ζ, Latin z. The letter z, the Greek letter ζ, was, as we saw (ch. i. § 1), brought into use at Rome in the transcription of Greek words (and of those only) about the close of the Republic. Previously to that time ss had been used, e. g. massa (Greek μᾶζα), which at the beginning of a word was s, e. g. Setus (C. I. L. i. 1047, 1299, Greek Ζῆθος) (Plautus makes this s- alliterate with ordinary s, e. g. sonam sustuli Merc. 925, solve sonam Truc. 954), and, if we are to believe the grammarians, ð, e. g. Medentius for Mezentius. [But Septizonium a mispronunciation of Septizónum, a building at Rome (Probi App. 197. 23), seems to be a popular etymology from dounum.] (Prisc. i. 49 y et z in graecis tantummodo ponuntur dictionibus, quamvis in multis veteres haec quoque mutasse inveniantur, et pro νυ, pro ζ vero . . . s vel ss vel d posuisse, ut . . . 'Saguntum,' 'massa' pro Ζάκννθος, μᾶζα . . . ' Sethus' pro Ζηθος dicentes, et ' Medentius' pro Mezentius.) Blass, in his book on Greek Pronunciation, gives the history of the Greek sound as follows. The combination zd in words like ὀζός (Germ. Ast), ὕζ (Lat. sīdo for *sīsdo), 'Αθήνας-δί (Σερβίας-δε) was expressed by the letter ζ (the Semitic letter Sain, a symbol in the Semitic alphabet of voiced s), as the combination ks by ζ (the Semitic Samech). This was the original use of ζ. It came to be applied to the combination dz (from dy), e. g. πεζός (for πεδής), ζάλποντος (for δάλποντος) and at this period came the transference of the Greek alphabet to Italy, with the result that in the Italic alphabets, Umbrian, Oscan, &c., the z-symbol had the sound of dz or ls. In course of time dz came round to the sound of zd, so that πεζός and ίζε had now the same sound of ζ. This zd-sound further developed into the sound of zz, or z, apparently in the Macedonian period; and so we find the town Gaza, whose Semitic name has voiced s or Sain, written in Greek characters Πάζα. This then was the sound which the Romans had to express in Greek loanwords, voiced s, not the earlier sound zd. Voiced s, as we have found reason to believe, was a sound unknown in Latin words since 350 B.C., which explains Quintilian's remark (xii. ro. 28; cf. Maxim. Victorinus, vi. 196. 3 K.) about the beauty of the sound of ζ, and its absence from the Latin alphabet. To express it, double or single s (the unvoiced s-symbol) was used by the early Republican writers and occasionally by later authors (e. g. saphitus, Petron. 37, for ζάλποντος), perhaps even d (with the sound of th in ' this ') until a later age felt the necessity of employing, for the sake of exactness, the Greek letter itself, as they did also in the case of Greek v, φ, χ, θ. The history of ζ is a common point of discussion among Greek grammarians who remark on its origin from the combinations σθ and δσ, and their remarks are repeated by their Latin imitators, but need not be taken to imply that ζ had at the time of the Empire any other sound than that of voiced s (Mar. Vict. vi. 6. 6 K.: Maxim. Vict. vi. 196. 3 K.; Audaeis exc. vii. 327 K.). Thus Velius Longus (vii. 50. 9 K.), in criticizing the remark of Verrius Flaccus: 'sciant z litteram per sd scribi ab iis qui putant illam ex s et d constare,' states positively that ζ had not the sound of a double letter, unlike ψ and ζ: denique siquis secundum naturam vult excutere hanc
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litteram, inveniet duplicem non esse, si modo illam aure sincereré exploraverit... et plane liquid supervenerit, me dicente sonum hujus litterae, invenies eundem tenorem, a quo coeperit. The interchange of ḏy and z on late inscriptions, e.g., baptismata, Rossi i. 805, of 459 a. d., and in spellings like zabulus for diābōlus (see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v.) implies merely that the spirant y-sound which ḏy had come to take in Latin (§ 51, cf. Mādīa for Māia) was felt to resemble the sibilant sound of voiced s. Z has however the ts-sound in alphabets derived from Latin, e.g. O. Engl. Bezabe 'Bathsheba.'

§ 121. Old Roman z, found in the Carmen Saliare (Velius Longus, vii. 51. 5 K.), and according to tradition discarded through the influence of Appius Claudius, one would naturally suppose to have had the same sound as that of z in the Umbrian, Oscan, and other Italic alphabets, viz. dz or ts1; so that Claudius might, like Papirius, Ruga, and other traditional reformers of spelling, have exemplified the new orthography in his own family-name by writing Claudius for an earlier *clausus. This would harmonize well with the fantastic remark of Martianus Capella, that Claudius objected to the letter because it gave the teeth the appearance of a death's-head (iii. 261 Z vero ideo co Appius Claudius detestatur, quod dentes mortui, dum exprimitur, imitantur), which happily describes the appearance of the mouth in uttering the dz-sound of our 'adze.' But this description will also suit for the voiced s-sound; and the contemporary change of intervocalic s to r, exemplified in the new spelling of Papirius as Pāpirius, as well as the use of z for voiced s on a very early coin of Cosa, suggests that this rather was the sound of early Roman z (see ch. i. § 5, though the matter is uncertain.

§ 122. Old Roman s (z), later r. The change of intervocalic s to r is a common one in various languages, and is generally taken to imply that the s first became voiced s, then passed into r (cf. Span. desden, see above). That Old Roman s of Fāsīus, &c. took this course is indicated by the fact that the Oscan sibilant, corresponding to Latin and Umbrian r, is in the inscriptions in Latin characters written z, and not s.

§ 123. Prosthetic vowel with st, &c. For instances of the prosthetic vowel in MSS. and late inscriptions, see the list given by Schuchardt in Vok. ii. pp. 338 sqq., who refers the earliest traces of its use to the second cent. A. D. It is written i or e, e.g. istudium, studium, sometimes hi-, he-, e.g. histudis (often misread in MSS. as hisstudiis'), rarely y, ae, and is often confused with the prepositions in, ex. Thus iscribere, escribere may represent either scribēre or inscribere or escribere. In late Latin where ab is used before an initial vowel, a before an initial consonant, we find ab normally before an initial sp-, se-, st-, even though the prosthetic vowel is not expressed in writing (A. L. L. iii. 149). Along with the dropping of this prosthetic vowel, and the restoration of the original form scribere, &c., went the dropping of the initial i-, e- of i(n)scribere, e(z)scribere, so that we get spellings like splorātor for explōrātor (Cagnat, Ann. Épigr. 1889, no. 55), Spania for Hispānia (see Schuchardt's list, Vok. ii. pp. 365 sqq.). In Italian, a language in which almost every word ends in a vowel, the prosthetic vowel has been dropped, e.g. studio, and with it the genuine

1 Initial Z, however, in Umbro-Osc. may have been a variety of s, e.g. Umbr. zē-serif 'sedens' (von Planta, i. p. 71).
initial vowels of words like Lat. historia, Hispania, instrumentum, Ital. storia, Spagna, stromento or strumento. But after words like con, in, non (all ending in a consonant), both vowels are restored in pronunciation, so that the spelling con studio, non estoria represents the actual sound. These forms studio and estudio (istudio), storia and estoria (istoria) are what are called 'doublets,' the one being used after a final vowel, the other after a (rare) final consonant; and that is, no doubt, the explanation of these double forms esplorator, esplorator, &c. on late inscriptions. In French, where consonant endings were far more preserved than in Italian, the prosthetic vowel remains, e.g. étude, écrire. It is before st-, sc-, sp-, &c., for the most part, that the prosthetic vowel asserted itself sufficiently to require expression in spelling; but its presence before other consonantal initials may be inferred from occasional spellings like ilocus, ireddere, imerto (misread in MSS. as immerito), &c. (see the list of examples in Schuchardt, Vok. ii. pp. 350 sqq.; some in MSS. are merely misreadings of critical signs). In Italian, where, as we have said, almost every word ends in a vowel, we could hardly expect this Latin prosthetic vowel to show signs of itself. Indeed the tendency is rather for a genuine initial vowel to be suppressed under the influence of a preceding final vowel. Thus la apecchia, the bee (Lat. ápicula) has become la pecchia, Lat. ecclesia has become chiesa, inimicus, nemico, and so on. Whether the same Procopers the explanation of the mispronunciation rabo for arrabo, which Plautus puts into the mouth of the slave in the Truculentus, for the sake of poking fun at the Praenestines, it is impossible to say:

STR. tene tibi
rabonem habeto . . .

AST. Perii, 'rabonem.' quam esse dicam hanc beluam ?
Quin tu arrabonem dicis?

STR. 'a' facio luceri,
Ut Praenestinis 'conea' est ciconia.

We do not find mention of the prosthetic vowel by Latin grammarians till quite late times, which shows that however far it had developed in Vulgar Latin, it did not threaten to encroach on the speech of the educated classes. Thus Isidore (seventh cent.) derives escarus (i.e. scaurus) from esca (Orig. xii. 6. 30 escarus dictus eo, quod escam solus ruminare perhibeaut), and iscurra (i.e. scurra), somewhat comically, from the same word (ib. x. 152 [under I not E] iscurra vocatur, quia causa escae quemiam consecetetur; cf. ib. xx. 4. 9 discus antea 'iscus' vocabatur a specie scuti). He warns his readers against the mispronunciations yspirsa, yscena, ystimulus, (4. 599. App. 3. 40. Ar. spissa, scena, stimulus et cetera similia y carent). Similar warnings are given in the Glosses ap. Mai, C. Auct. against iscona, iscandahum, isapha, iscriptura (vi. 580), and directions to write 'per solam s' sceca (vii. 578 b), stimulus, spissa, and splendor (vi. 581). Theophilus non 'izofillus,' Probi App. 198. 1, should perhaps read 'T. non zioflus,' and in 199. 10, stabilitus non 'istabilituus,' is a mere conjecture.) It is not found in the early Latin loanwords in Teutonic, e.g. O. H. Germ. scriban (Lat. scribo), or Celtic languages, e.g. O. Ir. scril, Bret. skol (Lat. sc(h)ol). But Welsh, which has the same tendency as late Latin to use a prosthetic vowel (written y, pronounced like u of our 'but'), before initial s followed by a consonant has subsequently added this y- to these Latin loanwords, e.g. ysgol, ysgrifo, as it has done to other words of a similar
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form, e.g. ysgrub, a sheaf. That Prœcopæ had shown itself in Vulgar Latin we see from the Romance forms, Ital. botega, Span. botica, Fr. boutique, which point to Vulg. Lat. *poteca for ṣpòtica, and Ital. morchia, Span. morga from Vulg. Lat. *murca for āmurca, both Greek words. (On ste for istē, see ch. vii. § 17.)

A further result of the confusion of a word like scriba with a compound, exscriba, inscriba, was that some words beginning with sc-, sp-, st-, &c. were regarded as compounds with the prepositions ex, in, and were deprived of their initial s. This, at any rate, seems to be the explanation of forms like Vulg. Lat. *pasmus for spasmus (Span. pasmo, Port. pasmo, and the French verb pâmer, to swoon) (see the list of examples in Schuchardt. Vok. ii. pp. 354 sqq.). Another result possibly was that such a form as sponere for exponere being regarded as the equivalent of ponere, the letter s- might occasionally be prefixed at random to words beginning in c-, t-, p-, &c., e.g. spicus for pîctus (Schuchardt, l.c., mentions a few doubtful examples; but includes cases where the s- was original, e.g. O. Lat. stricatus, later trîcatus. See ch. iv. § 146.)

§ 124. s before a consonant. L.-Eur. s before m, n, &c. was dropped in Latin or rather assimilated (iv. 159), e.g. primus (Pelignian Prism for Lat. Prima), cônis (on the very ancient Dvenos inscription cosmis), dâmus older dammus (cf. Dusmus). So tra(n)s became tra- before j, d, and optionally before m, p, according to Velius Longus, 66. 9 K., e.g. transulit, but trajcît, trâducît transmisit or trâmisit, transpositûs or trâposuit. Spellings on late plebeian inscriptions and in MSS., such as prepeteri for prebyteri (Rossi, i. 731, of 445 A.D.), have been collected by Schuchardt, Vok. ii. pp. 355 sq. But though s is suppressed in this position in some Romance languages, notably in French, e.g. château (Ital. castello, Span. castillo) from Lat. castellum; blâmer (Ital. bismare. Catal. blasmbar, Prov. blasmar) from Vulg. Lat. *blas(i)mare for blasphémare, this suppression is by no means universal, and was unknown in French itself at an earlier stage, e.g. blasmer; so that these spellings cannot convince us that Latin s in the middle of a word had at all the same weak sound that it had at the end of a word. (Schuchardt’s examples of the assimilation of c or t to s, with ss for sc and st, e.g. Crissana, Vok. i. pp. 145 sq., are perhaps better explained as cases of palatalization of c, t.)

A vowel before st, &c. is not shortened under the influence of a preceding short syllable in Plautine versification any more readily than a vowel before any other consonant group, e.g. vōlūtātem, beside potēstātem, ministērium. (See ch. iii. § 34.)

§ 125. x. On the spellings cs, cx, xs, &c. see ch. i. § 4, and for the interchange of x with ss and (with consonant) s, see Georges and Brambach s. vV. mixtus, Ulīxes, sesoventi, Esquiliae, Xerxes, Sestius, &c. Schuchardt, Vok. ii. p. 351, and i. 133, gives some instances of es- for ex- before c, t, p in late Latin inscriptions and in MSS. (Cf. Placidas’ Glossary, 67. 18 G. exspes, sine spe ... ‘espes’ vero sine x nihil est), and of -ss-, -s- for -x-, e.g. vissit for vixit, Alexsander for Alexander. Vissit for vixit is common on late Christian inscriptions (e.g. C. I. L. x. 4546), but the earliest instance of ss for x is probably on an epitaph of a cavalry soldier at Cologne, which cannot be later than Nero’s reign [re]ssillo (A. L. L. viii. 589.) On mers for merx (merc’s), like pars for par(t)s in MSS. of Plautus, see Ritschl, Opusc. ii. p. 656. Caper 98. 10 K. allows both calis and calx: calis diceendum, ubi materia est, per s; at cum pedis est, calx per x. In late Latin
final -s and -x are often interchanged. Thus x is written for the final s (originally ss) of miles, ãries, ãpiles, ãcúptes. All these are forms censured in the Appendix Probi (197. 28 K.; 198. 29; 199. 4, 5); and on inscriptions we have millex, millix, prænaæ, &c. (see Seelmann, p. 353). The similarity of the sound of this -s with x may be inferred from Probus, Inst. 126. 36 K. quae-ritur qua de causa miles per s et non per x litteram scribatur, &c. Similarly obstetrix was made opstetrix (Probi App. 198. 34 K., cf. 198. 28 meretrix non 'menetrix'); and on inscriptions we have conivs and corvs (Greek κόζοικς, C. I. L. x. 719), subornatris, &c. (see Seelmann, p. 353). The felatris (iv 1388 and 2292) on inscriptions of Pompeii reminds us of -s, -ss for x, cs, on Oscan inscriptions of the same town, e. g. meddiss (for *meddicēs Nom. Pl.) Zv. I. I. I. 140 (cf. Osc. Santia for Σανθία).

§ 126. Final s. (See Havet on '1'S latin caduc' in Études dédiées à G. Paris, 1891; he shows that it is the rule, and not the exception, that s does not constitute 'position' in the older poetry; cf. Plautine endings of lines like estis cos). Cicero (Orator, xlviii. 161): quin etiam quod jam subrusticum videtur, olim autem politius, eorum verborum, quorum eaem erant postremae duae litterae, quae sunt in 'optimus,' postremam litteram detrahentant, nisi vocalis insequebatur; ita non erat ea offensio in versibus, quam nunc fugiunt poetae novi; ita enim loquebamus:

qui est omnibus princeps,
non 'omnibus princeps,' et
uita illa dignus' locoque,
non dignus. quod si indocta consuetudo tam est artifex suavitatis, quid ab ipsa tandem arte et doctrina postulari putamus? Quint. ix. 4. 38 quae fuit causa et Servio, ut dixit, subtrahendae s litterae, quotiens ultima esset aliaque consonante suscipetur, quod reprehendit Luranius, Messala defendit. nam neque Lucilium putat uti eadem ultima, cum dicit 'Aeserninus fuit' et 'dignus locoque,' et Cicero in Oratore plures antiquorum tradit sic locutos. (On the dropping of -s on inserr. see § 137.)

§ 127. Double Consonants. No point of Latin pronunciation is more certain than that a double consonant in such a word as bucca was really pronounced as a double, and not as a single consonant, with the first syllable ending in one c, and the second syllable beginning with another c, as the Latin grammarians put it, or in more scientific language, with a new force-impulse beginning in the second half of the consonant. The word would be uttered, not, as we are accustomed to pronounce it, with one c-sound, but with the double c-sound of our 'book-case.' The statements of the grammarians are so clear on this matter as to leave no room for doubt; and even without their help, we might have inferred the Latin usage from the evidence of the Romance languages. For although it is only the Italian which has entirely preserved to this day the double pronunciation
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(e.g. Ital. boc-ca, but Span. boca, Fr. bouche), there are traces in
the others of its previous existence. Latin ss is hard s, where
Latin s has become soft, or voiced s. Latin rr, nn, ll have
developed into different sounds in Spanish from Latin r, n, l; and
in French a Latin vowel before a double consonant has been
differently treated from one before a single consonant: tālis
becomes tel, but vallis, val; mānus becomes main, but annus, an.
The only thing open to question is whether the spelling with two
consonants did not sometimes indicate a lengthened rather than
a doubled consonant, a consonant on which the voice dwelt for a
time, without dividing it between two syllables. This distinction
between a long and a double consonant is more clearly
marked in the case of a mute (e.g. long c and double c), than of
a liquid, nasal, or sibilant (e.g. long l and double l, long n and
double n, long s and double s). The greater force and abruptness
of the mute as compared with the liquid would make the syllable-
division in bucca more readily caught by the ear than in mille.

This lengthened pronunciation may have been given to m, &c.,
in āmitto for ammitto (cf. ammissam in the Medicean MS. of Virgil,
A. ii. 741); and it was probably a stage in the development of
words like mīlia older millia, causa older causā, casus older cassus.

From the statements of the grammarians, and from the
spelling of Inscriptions and the oldest MSS., we see that the
orthography, and presumably the pronunciation, of the Empire
did not allow ss after a diphthong, nor (with possible exceptions)
after a long vowel, nor yet ll between a long i and another i.
The causa, causās, glossa, missi, mīlia of an earlier time were
reduced to causa, ĉūsās, glossa, mīsī, mīlia, and show in Italian
to-day the single letter in spelling and pronunciation (cosa,
chiosa, misi, &c.). Seelmann's explanation is that the length of
the diphthong would detract from the length of the consonant
in caus-sa, and make it no longer than a single consonant causa,
while in mīlia the similarity of the articulation of i and l was the
reason why the vowel organs passed so quickly over the inter-
vening l-position back to the i-position, as to prevent the voice
from dwelling for the due period of time on the l itself. How-
ever that may be, we can at least be positive that the spelling ss
did not, as Corssen suggests, merely indicate the hard or unvoiced
quality of the s-sound (e.g. Engl. 'ass' with hard s, 'as' with soft s).

The practice of writing the consonants double was not adopted, as we saw (ch. i. § 8), until the time of Ennius. But there is no evidence, apart from this fact, to show that the pronunciation of *bucca, penna*, &c., in earlier times was not the same as the later pronunciation (like our 'bookcase,' 'penknife'). Plautus may have written these words with a single letter; still he always treats the first syllable as long by position; so that it would be as rash to infer that the older spelling was anything more than a mere usage of orthography, as to regard the temporary use of the sicilicus in the Augustan age (ch. i. § 8), e.g. *osa* (*C. I. L. x. 3743*), as an indication that the consonant had at that time a lengthened rather than a doubled pronunciation.

§ 128. Testimony of the grammarians. The grammarians' rule is 'Write two consonants, when two consonants are pronounced': ubi duarum consonantium sonus percutiet aures, Mar. Victorinus vi. 9–10 K.; who quotes sub-batris, succ-cis, ef-fert, ef-fugit, fal-lat, gal-lus, vel-lus, macel-lum, mul-lus, pal-tium, Pal-las, an-nu, Cin-nam, ap-paratum, lap-pam, Ar-ruminiat, bar-rum, cur-rit, fer-ram, as-siduum, Cas-sium, fes-sum, At-tius, Vel-tius, and adds: nam ut color oculorum judicio, saper palati, odor narium dinoctur, ita consonantia arbitrio subjectus est. Similarly Papirian (ap. Cassiodor. vii. 162. 10 K.) says: sono internoscemus, quoting ac-cedo, at-tuli, as-siduus, ap-paro, an-nuo, al-tigo. So Vel. Longus vii. 61–62 K.: ac-cipo, ac-curre, ag-gerat, Pliny (ap. Priscian, i. p. 29. 8): il-le, Metel-lus. They speak also of one syllable ending with the consonant, and the next syllable beginning with the same consonant (prior syllaba in hac finitur, et sequens ab ea incipit, Consentius, v. 394. 35 K., who quotes il-le, Al-lia). Similarly Priscian, i. p. 45. 5 of il-le, p. 46. 8 of Sab-burra, sub-bala, gib-lus, gib-erosus, gib-ber, ob-ba, ... sub-bibo, p. 47. 5 of vacca (MSS. baccu), buc-ca, soc-cus, ec-quis, qui-qua, p. 47. 9 of abad-dir, abad-dier, ad-dó, red-do, red-duco (‘quod etiam reduce dictur’), p. 48. 5 of of-ficio, suf-ficio, ef-ficet, ef-ficio, dif-ficilis, dif-fundo, p. 49. 29 of lip-pus, ap-pare, p. 50. 25 of mit-te, Cot-ta, at-tinet. Velius Longus' remarks on the pronunciation of reduco and redito must be understood in the same way (vii. 66. 3 K.).

§ 129. Reduction of *ll* to *l*, *ss* to *s*, after a diphthong or long vowel. Some grammarians ascribe this reduction to a diphthong, others to any long vowel. Quintilian (i. 7. 20–21) tells us that *causaes, causa, divisiones* was the spelling of Cicero's time, and that the double s was found in autograph MSS. both of Cicero and of Virgil, and adds that in still earlier times (i.e. before the introduction of double letters), *jussi* was spelt with a single s. Velius Longus (vii. 79. 20 K.) censures the proposal of Nisus (first cent. A.D.) to write *come, consuere*, and his argument 'quia juxta productam vocalem geminata consonans progredivit non solet,' and declares positively that 'geminari consonantes productis vocalibus junctas usus ostendit,' quoting
as examples *orasse, saltasse, abisse, calasse*. He inclines however to the spelling *paullum* on the ground that *paullum* ‘repetito codem elemento [sc. 1] . . . enuntiari nullo modo potest,’ and declares the true rule to be that the presence of a diphthong, not of any long vowel, forbids the doubling of a consonant (cf. Prisc. i. p. 109, 22 H.). Still he contrasts *dossum* (for *dörsum*), with *räsum, retrüsum*; and in another passage (72. 11 K.) he approves of the spelling and pronunciation *accüssor*, of *comüssor*. Annaeus Cornutus (ap. Cassiodor. 149. 12–15 K.), speaking apparently of the old spelling *caussa*, says: in qua enuntiatione quomodo duarum consonantium sonus exaudiatur, non invenio. Terentius Scaurus (21–22 K.) declares that neither *s* nor *r* are doubled, unless the preceding vowel is short; when it is long, the syllable ends with the vowel, and the consonant begins the next syllable, e.g. *plaus-sus, lüs-sus*. The spelling *caussa* he makes etymological (due to *caisssa*), not phonetic: apparent *causam* ‘causam’ geminatum *s* non recipere, quoniam neque in fine præcedentis alterum potest poni, neque a gemino sequens incipere. The remarks of Velius Longus (72. 19 K. *s* vero geminata vocis sonum exasperat), and of Marius Victorinus (viii. 5 6 K. idem [sc. antiqui] voces quae pressioe sono eduntur, ‘ausus,’ ‘causa,’ ‘fusus,’ ‘odiosus,’ per duo *s* scribant ‘aussus’), must be regarded in the light of the previously quoted statements; though the latter may imply that the sound of an *-s*, which represented a former *-ss* was not quite the same as the sound of ordinary *s*. That this was probably the case with final *-s* (e.g. *miles* for *miles* less) we shall see below (§ 133). Elsewhere Terentius Scaurus defends the spelling *paullum* on etymological grounds, comparing *paullum, paullum* (20. 15 K.); and Annaeus Cornutus (first cent. A.D., ap. Cassiodor. 149. 19 K.) speaks of some grammarians who wrote *malle* (the older spelling, as we shall see) for *mâlo*, because they connected the word with Greek *μᾶλλον*. Another reason apparently alleged for this spelling *melle, nolle,* was the analogy of the Infinitive *malle, nolle*, to judge from Papirian’s dictum ap. Cassiodor. 159. 1 K.: malo per unum *l*, quod est magis volo; malle per duo *l*, quod est magis velle; nolo per unum *l*, est enim non volo, nolle per duo *l*, quod est non velle (cf. Probi App. 201. 33 K. inter velit et vellit hoc interest quod, &c.) (cf. *vellint, C. I. L. v. 2090*; vii. 80; *vollis*, vii. 140). A further instance of the influence of an etymological theory on spelling is furnished by Alcuin (310. 32 K.), who defends the spelling *solennis* by referring the word to *sōlene*. But if we overlook spellings warped by etymological theories, and here and there a traditional spelling retained, we may lay down the rule that *l* after a diphthong, and *s* after a long vowel or diphthong, were not written, or pronounced double in the period of the Empire, so that it is unlikely, for example, that *cessi* (though from *ôdo*), *ussi* [though the spelling *juss* occurs on old inscriptions (see C. I. L. i¹. Index p. 583), and cf. *jüssus* (along with *Annús*!), vi. 77], *ussi* (though from *âro*; cf. A. L. L. ii. 607), had a long vowel in the Imperial age. (Cessi, ussi, according to Priscian, i. p. 466. 6, 7 H.) The use of *ll* after a long vowel, but not after a diphthong, shows that the diphthongs still retained their diphthongal sound.

The statements of the grammarians about the older spelling are borne out by a reference to the Republican inscriptions. On the Lex Rubria of 49 B.C. we have *promesseit, renesseit, repromesseit,* and on other inscriptions *caussa, accussasse, missit, paullum, miltia, miltharium* (see the Index to C. I. L. vol. i¹. pp. 601–2); on the Comm. Lud. Sac. both *caussa* and *causa,* but always *quaeso*; on the Mon. Anc. *miltia, clausum and claussum, causa, caesa, occasio.*
Paulus is the usual form even on later inscriptions; also Pollio and Pollio (see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s.vv.; cf. Polla with apex on o, C.I.L. xi. 4572, &c.). Aulla, the oldest spelling, preserved in the Ambrosian MS. of Plautus (see below), similarly became aura and olla (see Georges); crisso (with i, cf. crisius) became criso (ib.); glossa and glossema became glosa, glosema (Löwe, Prodromus, pp. 1 sqq.); nassiterna is the old spelling of this old word, like nassum (later násus) (see Georges). Thus abescio (from caedo), and abescissio (from scindo) were not distinguished in spelling till Tiberius’ reign.

In the best and oldest MSS. of Republican writers, and (archaistic) writers of the Augustan age, such as Plautus and Virgil, we have a good many spellings with ll, ss, where the later orthography used the single letter. Thus in Virgil MSS. we have examples of the old spelling, with double s, of the Perfect and Perf. Part. Pass. of verbs like edo (adessus, ambessus, exessus, obessus, peressus, semenus, i.e. adessus, &c.), video (provissa, &c.; also the verb incissus), audes (ausse), and other verbs in -do, -deo; haereo (haesit) and haeruo (haussere, haussseral): mitto (missi, missere); we have -nss- and -ss- for later -ns-, -s- in compressa and compresca, emensis, &c., lapidossa, undossi, &c.; similarly causse, incuss, &c.; and in foreign words cassia (Gk. kassía, a misspelling of kásía), Crinisso (A. v. 38), gessa (A. viii. 662), Passiphao, Rhessus; though some of these last may be a wrong spelling (e.g. gessa should be gaesa, for O. I. gae, O. H. Germ. gaison- point to gaiso- with g for I.-Eur. gh-, cf. Sanscr. hēsas). And in the Ambrosian Palimpsest of Plautus we have essum, essuiräre, esstibunt, excessus (Mast. 826), ussus, usura, incissus, ussio, missio, dimissio, quessio, causse, -ossus (laboriosse, odioossu, negotiossum, radiossus); also nassum, nassa, and even sse (perhaps rightly, for *sēd-s(d’)), Merc. 249, Stich. 356, and noss, Stich. 536; and in Greek words paussam, Alēssimarche, and (perversely) bōssilice, Poen. 577 (cf. bassim, C.I.L. i. 1181). For il we have in Virgil MSS. some words where s, x, &c. have been dropped before l with lengthening of the vowel, or rather have been assimilated, like quallus, G. ii. 241 (cf. quállitus), anhelitus and anellitus, tellum, tellum, along with some of doubtful origin, collum, a strainer, G. ii. 242 (probably first *xevilum, then caullum or collum, then cóllum, like Paulus, Paulus, Pollio and Pollio), illex, A. vi. 180, malínum, G. iii. 69 and A. iv. 108, pàullum, mitilla, opillo; as well as -alla, -ellus in loquella, querella (the normal spelling), Philomella, falsellus. (On elli Dat., élim Adv., see ch. vii.) And in the Plautus Palimpsest, anna, a jar (later anna and olla), millia, paulium (see Ribbeck’s Index, and the Index to Studemund’s Apograph of the Codex Ambrosianus). In the Palatine MSS. of Plautus we have also nollò (see Goetz, preface to the Stichus, p. xiv).

Of these, we know that millia, &c., where long i precedes and i follows the double l, became mília, &c. in the Imperial age. Pompeius (185. 16 K.) quotes the rule of the elder Pliny: Plinius Secundus in libris dubii sermonis ita expressit, ‘mille non debemus aliter dicere nisi per geminum l, in numero plurali unum l ponere debemus et dicere millia’ (cf. ibid. 172. 13 K.). Mília, vitice are the normal spellings on inscriptions, beside millae, villa, from the reign of Tiberius; but in earlier inscriptions (excepting in very early ones where no consonant is written double) we have il. In the Monumentum Anceyanum, that valuable evidence of the orthography of the Augustan age, we have mília, miliens. (On stillicidium from stilla, Diminutive of *stīra, stīra, see Lachmann ad Lucr. i. 313.) In other circumstances double l was retained after a long vowel, e.g. villa, stilla, which show the long vowel and double l,
or its traces, in the Romance languages, e.g. Ital. villa, stella (with close e), as in the Welsh loanword ystwyll, Epiphany. So mūle, villum, stella, villum (Dim. of stimum), trulla, corolla (Dim. of corona), illus (from unus), nilhus, &c. (Priscian i. p. 109. 21 H. attests villum, and illus; and on inscr. we have ùlla C.I.L. ii. 1473; ùlli, vi. 10290; villum, x. 4787; villani, ix. 348, &c.) But in a group of words, as before remarked, we have il in the older, i in the Imperial spelling, viz. words where there has been what is called ‘compensatory lengthening,’ e.g. quālus for *quas-lus (cf. quis-litus), vēllum for vex-lum (cf. vexillum). Of these words Cicero says (Orat. xlv. 153), quin etiam verba saepe contrahuntur non usus causa, sed aurium; quo modo enim vester ‘Axilla’ Ala factus est nisi fuga litterae vastioris? quam litteram etiam e ‘maxillis’ et ‘taxillis’ et ‘paxillo’ et ‘vexillo’ et ‘pauxillo’ consuetudo elegans Latinis sermonis evellit.

That the suppression of the s-sound was in the earlier period expressed by doubling the letter, we may infer from these spellings in Virgil MSS. and auxla (for aux-la, cf. auxilla) in the Palimpsest of Plautus. The change to the single l seems to have been made after the reign of Augustus, simultaneously with the adoption of l for l in paulum, milia, &c., of s for ss in causa, fūsus, &c., and, as we shall see, of m for mm in a similar case of ‘compensatory lengthening,’ vilmus from *dus-mus. Anhellaus, if for *anhenstus from stem *an-anslo-, must have had long e. Thus *l rogella for *loges-la, *quella for *queres-la may have been the older forms, which were banished for a time, and were restored in later Latin. (For statistics, see Brambach, Orth. p. 259.) Mallo, nullo are attacked by the grammarians of the Empire, along with milita, causa, fūsus, &c., and represent with these the older fashion of spelling and pronunciation. Diomedes (p. 386. 13 K.) blames those ‘qui geminant l litteram et enuant’ in these two verbs. (Does Velius Longus allude to the verb in p. 80. 5 K., where he says: quis autem nescit ‘malum’ una 1 littera scriptam multum distare a ‘mallo’ eodem elemento geminato?) How far other consonants were doubled after a long vowel is discussed below.

§ 130. Confusion of single and double letter in Latin. In the misspellings of inscriptions and MSS. we find a double written for a single consonant, especially in the case of (1) mute before r, e.g. fratre (C. I. L. viii. 111), suppre and suppremum in Virgil MSS. (Ribbeck, Ind.); (2) before consonantal w (w), e.g. tennuis in Virgil MSS., strenuor in MSS. of Lucil. xvi. 19 M. (cf. Probi App. 198. 18 K. aqua non ‘acqua’); (3) s before mute, e.g. dissecente (C. I. L. iv. 1278). We find the same doubling of a consonant in the first two cases in Italian in fabbro, acqua, &c. (see below); and in classical Latin we have perhaps traces of them in the normal spellings, quattuor, battue. The third type of misspelling probably reflects the attraction of s to the first syllable (see § 139). The opposite error, of writing a single consonant for a double, appears especially (1) after a long vowel, e.g. nula, Ephem. Epigr. iv. no. 557 (Consentius warns against mispronunciations like mille, villa, 392. 7 K.); (2) in syllables before the accent, usually in words compounded with prepositions, where the final consonant of the preposition has been assimilated to the initial of the verb or noun, e.g. acepi, comuniis, but also in other cases, such as Diminutives, e.g. secellus (see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s.v.). There are in the classical language a few traces of the reduction of a long syllable to a short in the pretonic syllable, possibly in Diminutives like ñella (from ñfa), mêmilla (from mamma) (cf. Ital. vanello), but certainly in prepositional compounds. Thus omitto
from ob and mitto has become ômitto (Priscian i. p. 46. 18 H. omitto dicimus pro 'ommitto'); in reddâce the preposition was changed, perhaps by the analogy of other compounds, to re, but not in reddo, where it is accented (unless the true explanation here is that reddo represents *re-dîdo with a reduplicated form of the verb found in Umbro-Oscan, ch. viii. § 9). (Velius Longus 66. 3 interdum haec d littera geminatur, quotiens ab eadem littera sequens vox incipit; nec tamen semper, siquidem 'reddere' dicimus geminata d. . . unde adnotanda imperitia eorum qui sic 'redduere' geminata d littera volunt enuntiare, quasi 'reddere,' tamquam neecessit sit totiens eam duplicem esse, quotiens sequens vox ab eadem littera incipit.) The versification of Plautus shows us that after a short syllable the preposition in the pretonic syllable of a compound was especially liable to be so slurred in pronunciation, that it might optionally be scanned as a short syllable, e.g. quid accipit? (see ch. iii. § 34). How far the weakness incident to the first syllable of accipit after a short syllable adhered to it in other circumstances, and tended to reduce the acc- to the sound of ac-, it is difficult to say. We have ore córpyto in Lucil. ix. r. M., expressly attested by Consentius (400. 8 K.); and there seems no reason for setting aside the reading of the MSS. in Lucer. vi. 1135 an eaelum nobis ulito natura córumpit Deferat, a reading confirmed by Isidore, Nat. Rei. 39. The usual practice, where the preposition is assimilated, is to write a double letter in some cases, e.g. correptus, ommentans (Liv. Andron.); in others to write a single letter and lengthen the vowel, e.g. âmitto. It is not always easy to draw a hard and fast line between these two practices. A scansion like Plautus' quid âmittis suggests that the second word was pronounced rather ammîtis (cf. ammisson in Virgil MSS., Ribbeck, *Ind.*) than âmittis; for Plautus does not shorten the first syllable of the compound in quid insanis, &c., where we know the i to have been a long vowel before the group ns (see ch. iii. § 34). The a of amîtis could then hardly be on precisely the same footing as a vowel long by nature. Adm-., though written amm- was not written âm-. (Amentum, beside ammentum and admentum, is probably non-existent. See Nettleship, *Contributions s.v.*) Again, Gellius says of the preposition com, compounded with tigo, and veedo (ii. 17. 8) coligatus et conexus producte dicitur. (Com before n-is always cón- in the best spelling, e.g. cónubium, but not before gn, e.g. cognatus, unless gn has previously become n, e.g. cómitur.) The late spelling aportum (see Georges) may be due to the analogy of empty; but on Greek inscriptions we often have ὅ, instead of the usual ο, in compounds with com, the assimilated m being sometimes omitted, e.g. Κωμόδος, sometimes expressed, e.g. κωμεκτωρ (Eckinger pp. 51-2). It is therefore an open question how far these late spellings, such as córigia in the Edict of Diocletian, indicate a real reduction of the double consonant to a single, córigia, or a transference to the vowel of the extra length of the consonant, córigia. Greek spellings of Latin words are very uncertain guides; for Consentius mentions as a fault of the Greeks their inability to pronounce the double consonant in words like füssit, ille, 395. 13 K. s litteram Graeci exiliter eferunt adeo, ut cum dicent 'füssit,' per unum s dicere existimes; 394. 25 K. ubi enim [Gracea] dicent 'ille mihi dixit,' sic sonant duae il primae syllabae, quasi per unum l sermo ipse consistat ¹; and on Greek inscriptions we find double confused with single, single with double consonant in Latin words to a very great extent, especially l and th, but not

¹ In Martial ii. 60 puer Hylle has assonance with puerile.
often s and ss (see Eckinger). Similarly in Latin inscriptions we find Greek words misspelt in this particular, e.g. tesera, eclesia (so in Vulg. Lat.; cf. Ital. chiesa, &c.), bassilica (e.g. C.I. L. iv. 1779), &c. So Probi App. (199. 9 K.) censures 'bassilica'; (198. 11) 'cammera' (cf. Sicil. Neap. cammara); (198. 17) 'dracco'; (198. 27) 'fassiolus.' (In each case the vowel is a, the quality of which was the same, whether short or long.) On a Republican inscription (C.I. L. i. 1181) we have bassin, and in the Palimpsest of Plautus bassilice. The Plautine form of the name ἴλαύπια is Ilāūria. In other foreign words we have a like confusion, e.g. Britanni and (later) Britanni (see Georges s.v.), as we have a confusion in the quantity of the vowel of Baďvi, &c. Very often a wrong etymology, or wrong association, is the cause of a misspelling; e.g. pellex, a late spelling of pađex (see Georges), was due to connexion with pellicio; and the established spelling accipiter for acųipeter [probably with ŏ, weak grade of ă of Greek ὀών-πίτερ (epithet of hawk in Hesiod, Op. 210), Sanser. aqūpātvan-, ch. iv. § 54] to connexion with accipio; cf. the vulgar form acceptor (Caper 197. 8 K. accipiter non 'acceptor') used by Lucilius (inc. 123 M.) exta acceptoris et unguis. The misspelling cominus for comminus (see Georges) is due to the analogy of ōminus; and the analogy of Diminutive terminations -ellus, -illus, -illus is generally believed to be responsible for the later spellings camellus, anguilla, cuciulus, &c. The corrupt form cāmellus instead of camēlus (Greek κάμηλος) is indicated by the spelling in the Itala (see Rösch, Itala, p. 460), and in the Edict of Diocletian (11. 6, &c.), as by the Italian cammello (with open e), Span. camello, Fr. chameau (cf. phasellus for phasēlus in Virgil MSS.); anguīta, the spelling of good MSS. of Latin authors, is reflected by Span. anguila (A. L. L. vii. 442); on cuciulus and cuciulus, see Brambach, Hülfsbüchlein, s.v. The same explanation is generally given of -ella for -eña of loquela, querela, suadela, tutela, medela, &c. (on which see Brambach. Orthographie, p. 258 sq.). The grammarians approve of the single l in these words (Ter. Saur. 11. 1 K. on querela; Mar. Vict. 17. 9 K. on loquela, querela, suadela, tutela, also camellus; Caper 96. 6 K. on querela, loquela); but by the time of Papirian, the latter part of the fourth cent. A.D., querela was the usual spelling (see Papir. ap. Cassiod. 159. 4 K. Cf. Bede 287. 6 K.; Alcuin 299. 6 K.; Quaes. Gram. Cod. Bern. 83. Suppl. 175. 7 K.). At the same time we have seen that querella (for *queres-la), loquella, &c. were probably the older spellings, and stand beside qualitus for *quas-litus in Virgil MSS., so that their use in Vulgar Latin may be really a case of adherence to the older form, just as we find vulgar spellings like ussus, vissus, messor, fressus, allium (on these see Georges), and Vulg. Lat. *ressica, attested by Ital. vescica, &c. (cf. Capsesis non 'Capsessis,' Probi App. 198. 2). Pīla was in late Latin *pīulla, pūllula (see Georges s.v. pūllula, and cf. the Romance forms). Fōno, for pō-ś(i)no, a compound with the preposition po, for *apo, a by-form of ab, was treated in vulgar speech as if *per-s(i)no, a compound with por-. Hence the double s (for rs, as dossum from dorsum) in possīlus (quasi 'por-situs'), possiui on plebeian inscriptions (e.g. possiui, C. I. L. v. 5623; vii. 167. 137. 246; dipossītus, Rossii, 193. of 438 A.D.). In the Appendix Probi 202. 12 K. one is warned against the confusion of sera, a bolt, with serra, a saw, a confusion seen in Ital. serrare, Span. cerrar (cf. 201. 33 on veit and veilt). Other misspellings depend merely on the substitution of a single consonant with long vowel for a double consonant with short vowel, and vice versa, e.g. Probi App. 199. 4 K. garrulus, non 'garculus' (probably gărulus); 198. 21 K. caligo, non 'calligo.' This substitution was allowed, as
we have seen, in prepositional compounds, like *āmittō, to which we may add *stipendium for stip[i]pendium (stipendiārum, C. I. L. vi. 2496, 2787, 2795; stipendiārum 3069, of 221 A. D. point to i in vulgar pronunciation), *trīcae (see § 60) for *trīco[ae] (cf. Ital. treccare, beside Neapolitan tricare). It appears to be consistently carried out in a group of words, cōpa (cf. Sanscr. kāpas) and cūppa, stīpa and stīppa (Greek στήπη and στύπη), mūicus and mūicus, pūpa (cf. pūppā, C. I. L. x. 4315; pūpia, P. R. vi. 6021) and pūppa, gūtus and gūtus, mātus (Greek μοθος, see C. R. v. 10) and mūtus, *būtis (Greek ἄφος) and *būtis (cf. Ital. botte, bottiglia). The forms with short vowel and double consonant seem to be those of late Latin and Romance (e. g. cuppa, Ulp. Dig. xxxii. 6, 3 § 1 and xxxiii. 7, 8 M.; Augustine, Conf. ix. 8, 18; Not. Tir. 156: μυππά, Aeron, in Hor. S. i. 5. 65; Ital. coppa, Span. copa, &c., while cōpa is reflected in Ital. cupola, Span. cuba and in the Welsh cib), so that the variety in form has arisen through the consonant being allowed to assert itself before the articulation of the vowel had been completed, and thus to take away from the vowel some of its force. [Similarly Middle High German muoter (L.-Eur. *mōter), with long vowel and single consonant has become n modern German mütter.] Strēna seems in the same way to have become strēnna at the end of the Republican period; for strēna is indicated by Span. estrena, &c., strēnna by Ital. strenna (with open e), Fr. étrenne, though the byform strēna (see Georges) may indicate confusion with strēnnaus, later strennaus (see above). In Italian the same thing is very common, e. g. veni for vēni, leggi for lēgi, brutto for brūto; and this may be the explanation of the puzzling form tutti for Latīn tōtus (see Köting, Lat.-Roman. Worterb. s. v.; and cf. Consent. 392. 1 K. ‘tottum’ pro toto, ‘cottidie’ pro cotidie), as of Latīn Juppīter (the usual spelling, see Georges) for Jūpīter (ch. vi. § 32). Sītus however retains this form in Vulgar Latin, and similarly brāca; while both classical and Vulgar Latin show bāca (see Georges, and cf. Ital. bag-ola, Fr. baie), which, if the ordinary derivation be correct (see Etyma Latina s. v.), should be bāca for *bat-ca. Latin cīces seems to have been in Vulg. Latin *cīces, to judge from Ital. cicia, cigolo, &c.

Scribes of Irish nationality were specially liable to miswrite a double for a single consonant in a Latin word; for in the orthography of their own language the double letter often indicated merely that the consonant had not degenerated into a spirant. Thus a repeated substitution of double for single consonants in a Latin MS. is frequently an indication that the MS. has been written in an Irish monastery (see Zimmer, Glossae Hibernicae, prol. xi). Again the confusion of single with double consonants in inscriptions may often be due to local influence. Thus the Greeks, as we have seen, had a difficulty in pronouncing the Latin double consonants; the Oscaii dialect often shows a double letter, where a single is etymologically correct, especially before a y-sound, e. g. Vitellii (Lat. Italia), before a w-sound, e. g. dekkviarim (cf. Lat. decem), before an r, e. g. alttrei (Lat. alteri), and similarly s before t, e. g. kvaisstur (Lat. quaestor), which remind us of Latin misspellings like aqua, frottre, disscent; in the Umbrian inscriptions a double consonant is never found in those written in the native alphabet, and very seldom (sometimes perversely, e. g. ennom, cf. Lat. ēnīm; avevel, cf. Lat. āveis) in those written in Latin characters.

1 Juppīter, quippe (ch. ix. § 7), ipsispe (ch. vii. § 20) suggest that this doubling of p was a usage in the literary language.
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But in spite of all these facts, it still remains true that there is usually a sufficient consensus between inscriptions and the best MSS. to enable us to decide with certainty on the single, or on the double letter, as the classical spelling of the word, a spelling with which the Romance forms, as well as the loanwords in Celtic and Teutonic languages, show a remarkable agreement. The classical form generally agrees with the form postulated by the etymology of the word, though there are some exceptions, e.g. bēca (see above) instead of bacca, damna (but in the proper name, Dāma; see Georges) instead of dāma. This implies that a sharp line was drawn in Latin between the single and double consonant 1 (e.g. mālūs and mūllum), a fact which should make us suspicious of etymologies which ignore this distinction, such as the identification of annus, a year (with ā, Terent. Maurus v. 1239, cf. perennis), with ānulus, a ring. For examples of this kind of uncertainty in Latin spellings, see Georges, Lex. Wortf. and Brambach, Hälsbächlein s.vv. lammina and lamina (syncopated lamma), vācillo and vaccillo, mēnīlla rarely mammilla, buccella and biccella, dīsicio and diāsicio (cf. pārricio), cotīdīe and cotīdīe (see Etyma Latina s.v.), muttonium and muttium, muttio and mutio, gluoto and gluto, margiō and margiss, mantissa and mantissae, faxiae and faxisses, fāxora and fāxissor, comissor and comisor, Masinissa and Massinissa, phaseolus and passeolus, Tissaphernes and Tissaphernes, Porsonia and Porsēna [cf. Pompeius, p. 284 K., who also censures (a supposition?) Catūlinna], medīx and medīx (Oscan meddis Nom., medikeis, Gen.), Apuleius and Appuleius (but Apulia better than App), Marcomann and (later) Marcomanni. (Pūnus and pannus may be different words. See Bér., Phil. Woch. 1887, p. 214.) The double consonant is declared by them to be the better spelling of bracchium (with cch for χ of Gk. βράχιον: see § 60), littera [cf. Romance, e.g. Fr. lettre, and Welsh llythyr. In the Lex Repet. (C.I.L. i. 196) of 123-122 B.C., once litteras, but the spelling of a single for a double consonant is usual on this occasion, and ei is used for i in séine], fultūlis, caccābus, cāleus, trūllēmn, cuppes, cuppēdo (for cīp-), lōlīgo (Fritzsche, ad Hor. S. i. 4. 100), fello (for fē-), hellior, sollers, sollemnis, sollicito, pappare (Plaut. Epid. Goetz. pref. p. xxx), cīngus, ligus, cāpero (see Netteship in Class. Rev. 1892, p. 168). Messalla (cf. Higallius with il on C.I.L. i. 39), Sallustius, barritus, Arruns, Arrētīon (now Arezzo), altīc, Allecto, Alīuiae, Sardānumpallus, baullena (Gk. φαλό- rather than φαλ-), ballista, Sollettīni, cīcinuns, pētorritum, Trāsīmennus, Appennīnus (and Ap-), nummus, immo, bissectum; the single of balbutio, litus (so Vulg. Lat., e.g. Ital. lito and lido), bucina, atueinor, besalīs, belva, sāria, muriola (cf. Paul. Fest. 125. 13 Th. murrina, genus potionis, quae Graece dicitur nectar. Hane mulieres vocabant muriolam), Erinys, Apulia, Sufes, bōpete, Lāvīsa, sarīsa, Gnosus, Parpassus, talasio, pelisequus, ilico; the double consonant appears to be the older spelling, the single the later in mantellium (Plaut.) and mantelē, stēlio and stelīo, pīleus (so, for example, in MSS. of Martian; see Friedländer's edition, i. p. 117), and pīleus (pīl- in Romance, K.Z. xxxiii. 308), marsuppium and marsāpium, Marpessos and Marxēsia, and possibly the legal pāret and pāret (Fest. 292. 25 Th., parret, quod est in formulīs, debuit et producta priore syllaba pronuntiari et non gemino r scribi, ut fieret 'paret,' quod est inventūr, ut comparēt, apparet).

The spelling paricida for parricida belongs to a period before the doubling of

---

1 Plautus, however, puns on mitis and mūlis in Mil. 1424, when the soldier is getting a thrashing:

Vérberon etiam, án iam mitis?  
Mitis sum equidem fūstibus.
THE LATIN LANGUAGE.

consonants was practised. Of Greek loanwords we have O. Lat. crebella (Gk. κριτήριον), perhaps grammus (from Gk. γράμμα), perhaps grammus (from Gk. γράμμα) in Caecil. Comm. 268 R. (but grammus Plaut. Curc. 318, Böckh, Rh. Mns. xxxv. 72), grabattus (Gk. κράβατος).

§ 131. Double consonants in Italian. These are not known in the dialects of Umbria and of North Italy; and their use varies a good deal in different parts. They form one of the greatest difficulties to English learners; for a double consonant is unknown in our language, except in compound words like 'bookcase,' 'penknife'; as they proved a stumbling-block in old times to Greeks (cf. §§ 99 and 117 on the Greek mispronunciation of β, σ). Double consonants have replaced Latin single consonants before y, e.g. oecchio (Lat. occhius), vendemmia (Lat. vindemia); before the w-sound of Latin aqua (Ital. acqua); before r, e.g. fabbro (Lat. fabric). (Compare the doubling of a consonant in these positions in Òscan orthography, and similar misspellings in late Latin inscriptions.) Doubling is very common under the accent of a paroxytone word, e.g. femmina (Lat. fémína), legittimo (Lat. legítimo), and on the first syllable, when it has a secondary accent, e.g. pellegrino, tollerare (cf. late Latin suppellectülis, see Georges). Forms like allodola (Lat. alaund), commedia (Lat. cómedía) seem to be due to the analogy of words compounded with prepositions, like Latin alládo, commínus (cf. Osc. Appellunéis 'Apollinis')?

§ 132. Double consonant (not l, s) after long vowel. We know that the e of fresus, for fresus, later fresus, was long; but we cannot tell whether the true explanation of the change from dummelum to dümelum (see Georges) is to make it similarly a reduction of a double to a single consonant after a long vowel, or merely a substitution of a vowel length (êt) for consonant length (émm), like armisam for armíssam (in MSS. of Virg. A. ii. 741), as the -amm- of flamen, a blast, in Virg. MSS. (see Ribbeck) seems to represent the usual -én- of flamen. A spelling like ruppes for répes in Virgil. MSS. (see Ribbeck) suggests rather the alternation of cúppa with cúpa, piúpa with pūpa (see above); and the quantity of the vowel before the double consonant of lamína (see Georges), vaccínnia (see Ribbeck, Index) is quite uncertain. Clear cases of a long vowel before mn are mercennarius (the correct spelling, according to Brambach, Hülfsböhöhl. s.v., later mercenarius), tiníre (for t and m are attested by Port. tinnir, Sard. tinníre), and perhaps hinuleus (also inüleus, see Georges) (cf. Agroecius 115. 14 K. hinuleus, ut i acutum sit, quia nomen a sono vocis accipit), and Winnia (also Viníus; see C. L. vi. 2897 sqq. Long i is indicated for Winnia, 28986); but before other double consonants they are difficult to establish. Nàrtem on the carefully written inscription of the Emperor Claudius (48 a. d.) at Lyons (Allmer et Dissard vol. i. p. 70e; Boissieu p. 136) may be due to the analogy of gnárus, nárus, which made the spelling naro (proposed by Varro, if we are to believe Papirian

1 Sometimes the interchange of single and double consonant is Í-Eur. In pet-names we often find a double consonant: e.g. Gk. árra beside O. Ind. náná; Lat. mammas atque tátas (ch. v. § 81) beside Gk. árra, O. Ind. attá; Lat. Æcca Larentia, Gk. 'Askó (a name of Demeter), O. Ind. akká; Gk. ζεράν, &c. The double consonant of Eppius, Seppius, &c. has been so explained, though others refer it to a dialectal doubling before y like Osc. Vitelliú.
ap. Cassiodor, 159. 8; cf. Varro. L.L. vi. 51) approved by some grammarians (e.g. Velius Longus 80. 9 K.), though never accepted in popular usage (see Georges) (cf. vārus and Varro. (On *trippa, the original of Ital. trippa, our *tripe,' &c., see Körting's Lexicon s. v.) A certain instance of the reduction of *tt to *t after a diphthong is the late form autor (censured, with autoritas, in Probi Appendix 196. 30 K., and found on late inscriptions, e.g. C. L. L. viii. 1423; cf. xii. 2058, of 491 A.D.), where the *t represents *tt for original ct (see § 95). Ital. freedo, Fr. froid point to *friddus, from frigidus, a vulgar form of frigidus (Probi App. 196. 3 frigida non 'frigda'); O. Span. frido to *friddus or *frigidus.

§ 133. Final double consonant. A final double consonant was not allowed in Latin orthography, but was written single, e.g. miles for *miles, from *mīlīs. But that it differed in pronunciation from an ordinary final single consonant, we may infer from the forms censured in the Appendix Probi, where -x is wrongly substituted for this -s (originally -ss) (197. 28 K. miles non 'miles'; 198. 29 aries non 'ariex'; 199. 4-5 poples non 'poplex,' locuples non 'locuplex'), forms which are found on inscriptions (e.g. miler, G. I. L. vi. 37, 2457, 2549, &c.). We may infer also that there was a change in its pronunciation in course of time; for in Plautus miles has the last syllable long (Adul. 528), while in Ennius, Lucilius, &c., its last syllable is short (A.D. 277 M.; so miles, Lucil. xi. 8 M.), though never shortened before an initial consonant like ordinary -us,-is. Plautus also scans ter for *terr (cf. terruncius, the true spelling; see Rhein. Mus. xlvi. p. 236) from *ters, *tris (Greek τῆς), as a long syllable (Bacch. 1127), as he scans es (2 Sg. Pres. Ind. of sām), prōdes, &c. like *ess, *prodess (contrast cór, Lucil. xv. 9 M.; prōdes, id. inc. 128). A relic of this usage remains in the scansion of hoc for *hoc from *hod-c-e as a long syllable by the classical poets; and the remarks of the grammarians on this scansion explain the reason of the change and uncertainty in the quantity of these final syllables. Thus Velius Longus (54. 6 K.), commenting on Virgil's 'hoc erat, alma pares' says: ergo scribendum per duo c, 'hoc erat alma pares,' ut confitendum quaedam aliter scribi, aliter enuntiari; Pompeius (119. 13): item c littera aliquando pro duabus consonantibus est . . . ut . . . 'hoc erat alma pares': 'hoc,' collide c, ut sit pro duabus consonantibus. in illo aliore exempli brevis est, 'solus hic inlexit sensum': sic lubrice et leniter currit. (Velius Longus also fails to make this proper distinction between hoc for *hod-c and hi-c.) They show us that in pronunciation *hoc (and presumably *corr, *ess) were actually sounded with double consonant when the next word began with a vowel, at least if the accent fell on them, while before a consonant initial, and probably when unaccented, the double consonant would be reduced to a single, hoc fuit but hoc erat. The unaccented nature of the Substantive Verb *ess, and of the final syllable of *miles, prodess, &c. explains their speedy reduction in Latin prosody (see ch. iii).

§ 134. Final consonants. A final consonant is always more liable to weakening than an initial, because of the general tendency of languages to pronounce with diminishing stress. It is especially so in English after a long vowel. Thus in the word 'cat' the t is uttered with less force than the c, while the same final after a long vowel, as in 'cart,' is still weaker. It is
a rule of our language that a final consonant is always short after a long vowel, as we may see, if we contrast a word like 'heel' with a word like 'hill.' The weakness of Latin final consonants has been already mentioned. Final -d was dropped in pronunciation after a long vowel about the end of the third cent. B.C.; final s does not constitute position before an initial consonant in that species of poetry which most closely imitated ordinary pronunciation, Dramatic Poetry; final -m offers but slight resistance to the elision of the vowel which precedes it; the tenues fortes seem to have been replaced when final in pronunciation by the mediae lenes, e.g. ab, sub, relíquid, &c. (cf. negotium?) (see § 73).

In considering the pronunciation of final consonants it is necessary to regard not isolated words, but words as they stand in the sentence. The accent of a word, when standing alone, is something different from its accentuation in the sentence; e.g. Greek πρός, but πρόσ πόλις ἡλίθε. And the same is true of its pronunciation. The Greek orthography indicates the first distinction, but rarely the second; though we find it to some extent on inscriptions τημ πολιν, ἐγ δικης, &c., especially in Cretan inscriptions (see ch. iii. § 41). But in writing Sanscrit the principles of 'Sandhi' (i.e. putting together, synthesis), to use the native term, were carefully followed by the grammarians of India. The neuter Demonstrative, for example, tad (Lat. is-tud) had its final d changed according to the following initial consonant in tat tapas, that heat (Lat. is-tud *tepns), tal lihati (Lat. is-tud lingit), tan nabyte (Lat. is-tud nectit), &c. There was something like this in Latin. Traces of it appear occasionally in inscriptions and MSS., e.g. im burim in MSS. of Virgil, G. i. 170; and we have 'doublets' like neque, atque before vowels, nec, ac before consonants; but for the most part it is not indicated in spelling.

Final consonants lingered longest in monosyllables, especially accented monosyllables, and before being entirely discarded in spelling, passed through the 'doublet' stage; that is to say, they were retained in pronunciation in certain positions in the sentence, before an initial vowel usually, and dropped in others; e.g. hau scio but haur habeo, just as the r-sound is found in English only before an initial vowel following without any pause,
e.g. ‘here he is.’ The same process went on in the Romance languages, of which French was the most retentive of final consonants till comparatively modern times; though now, for example, final -t, -s, -r exist only in pre-vocalic ‘doublets,’ e.g. vient-il? with t sounded, but il vien(t). An English example of ‘Sandhi’ is the different vowel-sound of the article ‘the’ before a vowel and before a consonant, and an example of the abandonment of one ‘doublet’ and the exclusive use of another is the preposition ‘with,’ which now ends only in the th-sound of thin, but which in early modern English had in certain collocations the th-sound of ‘this.’ Both ‘doublet’ forms remain in ‘my’ and ‘mine,’ ‘one’ and ‘a,’ ‘an,’ ‘naught’ and ‘not,’ &c.

The treatment of final vowels in Latin is most naturally considered in connexion with the changes produced by the accent; for they are affected much in the same way as the vowels in post-tonic syllables (see ch. iii. § 40).

§ 135. ‘Sandhi’ in Latin—Verrius Flaccus proposed a new symbol for final m, when the next word in the sentence began with a vowel, a symbol like the half of the ordinary letter M; while Cato the Elder wrote diceae for dicam, faciae for faciam (see § 61). The tendency of final -m, -n to adapt themselves to a following consonant-initial, is seen in spellings on inscriptions, like im balneum, C.I.L. iv. 2410, imibet, iii. 4835, im pace, viii. 10542 (for examples see Indices to C. I. L.) and in MSS. spellings like im mare, im medio, im pace, im puppin in Virgil MSS. (see Ribbeck, Ind. p. 433), im praeda, im vila in the Plautus Palimpsest (see Ind. to Studemund’s Apograph.). Caper (106. 17 K.) says: in Siciliam diceendum, non ‘is Sicilian,’ karó ñó r, non kartá ñó σ, quia nunquam sine n pronuntiatur (leg. insicia . . non ‘is’?). We have etiamnuc in the Herculanean papyri (Class. Rer. iv. 443), and etiamnum, jandudum, &c. in MSS. of Virgil (see Ribbeck), spellings which agree with the statement of Velius Longus (78. 19 K. cum dico ‘etiam nunc,’ ‘quamvis per m scribam, nescio quomodo tamen exprimere non possum’), and Cicero’s remarks on the sound of cum followed by n- (Or. xlv. 154; Fam. ix. 22. 2; cf. Quint. viii. 3. 45; Dinn. 450. 34 K.; Pompeius 293. 17 K.; Prisc. i. 372. 8 and 594. 21 H. &c.). Est was curtailed in writing, as in pronunciation, like our ‘is,’ in ‘it’s,’ ‘he’s’ &c., audicantus, audicandast, audicandum, &c., a spelling recommended by Mar. Victorinus (22. 14 K.), and found in MSS., e.g. in Virgil MSS. acerbiast, locustast, ventumst, amantemst, cupidost, suprast, &c. (see Ribbeck’s Index, p. 419), in the Plautus Palimpsest copiast, agrest, homost, olimest, palamst, meliust, &c., and similarly with es, iratas, dignus, iturus (generally printed by editors irata’s, &c.; once with es Imperat., viz. molestus, Most. 955) (see Studemund’s Index, p. 505). One may perhaps see the beginnings of the suppression of final consonants in the tendency of pronunciation mentioned by Consentius (fifth cent. ? A. D.) (395. 7 K.), the tendency to detach a final consonant from its word, and join it to a following initial, ‘si eludit’ for sic iudit, ‘si(o) custodit’
for *sic custodīt: item litteram c quidam in quibusdam dictionibus non latine ece rerunt, sed ita crasse, ut non discernas, quid dicant: ut puta sīquīs dicat *sic ludit,* ita hoc loquitur, ut putes eum in secunda parte orationis cludere dixisse, non ludere; et item si contra dicat illud, contrarium putabīs. ālii contra ita stubiltere hoc ece rerunt, ut eum duo c habeant, quasi uno c utrumque explicit, ut dicunt multi *sic custodīt.* [Cf. his remarks (394. 7 K.) on the pronunciation 'dixeram mille' for *diceram illis.]

§ 136. Latin 'Doublets.' By pretonic Syncope (see ch. iii. § 13) ac (for *aēc), nec, neu, seu, replaced atque, neque, nere, sive before a word beginning with a consonant. In Dramatic poetry the final *ē* is always suppressed, in similar circumstances, of nempe, and often of unde, inde, quiqque, ille, and perhaps iste. Similarly *proin, *deīn seem to have developed from *proinde, *deinde, when a consonantal initial followed. Final -d, after it had been dropped after a long vowel in the pronunciation of most words, remained in monosyllables like *hau, *med, ted; *hau being the form used before a vowel, *hau before a consonant (Caper. 96. 4 K. *hau dolo* [leg. *hau dolo ?] per d recte scribitur, etenim d inter duas vocales esse debet. *quod si consonans sequitur, d addi non debet, ut *hauceio*); Mar. Vict. 15. 21 K. So in Plautus, Ritschel Ovpusc. ii. 591 n. and v. 352) the same probably being true of *med, ted. (On qui(n)e, quandoc and quandoque, see ch. x. § 15, ch. ix. § 10.) Preposition 'doublet's' *ā, *āb, abs; *ē, ec, ex, &c., on which see ch. ix. §§ 12 and 29.

§ 137. Dropping of final consonant in Latin. It was a rule of Latin, pointed out by Julius Caesar, in criticizing Varro’s spelling lact, that no word could end in two mutes (Pompeius 199 K.; Caper 95 K. On lacte, lact, lac, see Georges, Lex. Wörf. s. v.). Nor was a double consonant allowed to end a word. Plautus gives to miles, es, &c. the scansion of miles (for *milit-s*’s, ess, &c. (see ch. viii. § 2); but almost the only trace (a doubtful one) of spelling with -ss is nass in the Ambrosian Palimpsest in Stich. 536; though Velius Longus (54. 6 K.), commenting on Virgil’s *hoc erat, alma pares,* half proposes to write hoccera: ergo scribendum per duo c, *hoccera alma pares*’ aut con-fitendum quaedam aliter scribi, aliter enuntiari (cf. Pompeius 119. 13 K.; Prisc. ii. p. 6. 1 H. So hoccina for *hocce-ne, *hod-ce-ne, Prisc. i. p. 592. 22 H.). Mel (for *mel, *melt), cor (for *corr, *cord), ter (for terr, cf. terr-uncius, *ters, *tris) are short in Ovid, &c., though long (neither mel nor met are found in Plautus; but the difference between *s* (from original -ss) and ordinary *s* is shown even at a late period by spellings like miler, praemax (see § 125).

Final -d after a long vowel is written throughout the S. C. de Bacchanalibus of 186 n. c. (C. I. L. i. 196, sententiaed, exstrad, faciument, &c.), though it is not found in the decree of Aeumlius Paulus Macedonicus of 189 B. c. (ib. ii. 5041, in turri Lascentana, en tempestate), and probably does not appear in Plautus, excepting in the Pronouns (Abl. and Acc.) med, ted, sed. Even these Pronoun forms are out of use by Terence’s time. The retention of *hau* along with *hau* shows the course which this final -d must have taken. Before vowels it would remain pronounced until the preconsonantal form had driven the full form from the field (so in post-Augustan poetry we find nec more and more supplanting neque); before consonants it would probably be first assimilated, e.g. *hau* ligo, pronounced *hauilligo, like alligo, haul scio, pronounced *hausscio like a(s)seisco, then dropped. After a short vowel, it is often written -t on late inscriptions (and indeed from the end of the Republican period), but is not dropped (see Seeckmann’s list, p. 366).
Final -m is dropped in early inscriptions before a consonant or a vowel-initial with equal frequency, in the earliest inscriptions more after o of the Gen. Plur. (perhaps not yet shortened before -m), than after o of the Acc. Sg. Mase. and Nom. Acc. Sg. Neut. On the older Scipio epitaphs it is usually dropped, e.g. *oih (Acc. Sg.), *duonom (Gen. Pl.) (C.I.L. i. 32). But from c. 130 it is regularly retained in spelling [as also on State inscriptions like the S. C. Baech. of 186 B.C., the (restored) Columna Rostrata, &c.], until the plebeian inscriptions of a later date (see § 65). On these it is not merely dropped but also is written -n, as final -n is occasionally written -m (see Seelmann’s lists, p. 364). It never fails, as final -s may fail, to constitute ‘position’ before an initial consonant in early poetry; though the frequency of the scansion enim before a consonant in Plautus (where the final syllable is shortened by the law of Breves Breviantes) suggests that this represents the usual pronunciation of the word. Final m before an initial vowel seems to have been equally adapted with a final long vowel or diphthong for what is called ‘Prosodical Hiatus,’ i.e. for being scanned as a short syllable, instead of being elided. Ennius, for example, ends a line with *millia million octo, as he begins another with *Scipio invict. (Cf. circ(m)ire, septu(m)ennis, septu(m)-aginta, but septimus, &c.) (On the treatment of -m in poetry, see § 65; and on its weak pronunciation in ordinary speech, § 61.) The course it took is perhaps indicated by Consentius (39). 7 K.), who says that the common way of pronouncing a phrase like ‘dixeram illis’ was to detach the -m from the first word, and join it to the initial of the second. (Cf. Pompeius 287, 7 K.) (see § 61.)

Final -s is dropped on early inscriptions especially in the Nom. Sing. of IO-stems, written -io, or -i (see Index to C.I.L. i. p. 602). That both io and -i represent the same sound /i(s) (ch. vi. § 2) is quite possible. (Cf. Cornelio on one Scipio epitaph, C.I.L. i. 31, c. 250 B.C., Cornelii on another, i. 35, c. 160 B.C.) But as a rule -s is dropped only after a short vowel, except in the dialect of Pissurum, e.g. *matroma’s (ib. i. 167 sqq.), and is more often retained than dropped.

Cicero speaks of its failure to prevent elision of a preceding i in the phrase vos’ argentes; and some have thought that it is occasionally elided before an initial vowel in Plautus, e.g. com(is) inconmodus, Baech. 401, amatu’s (es written in the MSS. amatus. But all the instances admit of other explanations; amatu’s is rather a case of prodelision, like our ‘it’s’ for ‘it is’ (the length of the u is due to the double s with which es ended in Plautus’ time, ch. viii. § 2); plur(is) existumo of Plaut. Pers. 353 may easily be a mistake for plur(e), which Charsius tell us was used in O.Lat., and so on. Whether aequānīmitas implies a pronunciation aequ(us) animus is doubtful; it seems rather to come from the Compound (ch. v. § 80) aequ-anīmus (cf. the gloss ‘Animus aequus’ due partes orationis; ‘animaequus’ ipse homo, C.G.L. v. 266. 11–12). (On final s not constituting ‘position’ before an initial consonant in the older poetry, see § 126.) The Latin loanwords in Teutonic seem to have still possessed -us (e.g. Goth. sakkus, a U-stem, Germ. kurz, from Lat. saccus, curtus), but to have lost the final consonant of -um (Zeitschr. Roman. Philologie. xvii. 559).

Final -t is often written -t on late inscriptions, e.g. reliquis, fecid (see Seelmann’s list, p. 366), which probably indicates change to the media lenis in pronunciation. It is dropped with great frequency in the graffiti of Pompeii, e.g. ralia, ama (see Index to C.I.L. iv.).
Final -nt loses the dental, and is written -n, or -m, on late inscriptions, e.g. fecerunt (see the Indices to the Corpus), though, no doubt, the -t was heard before an initial vowel, like the -t of Fr. vient in vient-il? Dedro (C. L. L. i. 177 Matre Matuta dono dedro matrona ‘Matri Matutae donum dederunt matronae’) is a form belonging to the dialect of Pisaurum in Picenum. The dropping of final consonants (-m, -d, -r, -f; -t, -n, -s) in this order of frequency is a feature of Umbrian (see von Planta i. 568).

§ 138. Dropping of final consonants in Romance. Lat. final consonants are better preserved in monosyllables than in other words. Et is in Italian e, before vowels ed; in O. Fr. and Prov. e and ed; in Span. y and e; aut is in Italian o, od; Fr. ou, Span. o; ad in Ital., Prov. and O. Fr. is a before consonants, ad before vowels, &c. -M remains in the monosyllables, Fr. rien (Lat. rem), Span. quien (Lat. quom), &c.; -t in a monosyllable like mel, Fr. miel, Span. miel, Ital. miele; -r in the monosyllable cor, Fr. cœur, O. Span. cuer, Ital. cuore; -n remains in non (Ital. no and non). In longer words, -m is dropped, e.g. Ital. dieci from Lat. decem, amava from Lat. amabam; -t is retained in Fr., e.g. O. Fr. aimet, but Ital. ama, Span. ama. In Sardinian the form used ‘in pause’ (at the end of a sentence, &c.) is amat, before a vowel amad, e.g. amad issu, before a consonant ama, e.g. ama su padre; -l and -r are lost in Italian, e.g. frate, tribuna, insieme (cf. Span. ensieme, but Fr. ensemble); -s is lost in Ital. (though in monosyllables it leaves an i, e.g. noi, crai, which is absorbed in a preceding e, e.g. tre), but it is retained in Fr. and Span., e.g. Ital. tempo, Fr. temps from Lat. tempus, and from Lat. cantas, legis, Fr. chantes, lis, Span. cantas, lees; -d is lost in Ital. chè, Span. que from Lat. quid, but remains in O. Fr. qued; -c has disappeared in Ital. di (Lat. dici), si (Lat. sic); -nt is -n in Ital., Span. e.g. Ital. aman-o, Span. aman, but remains in Fr., e.g. aiment; -x remains in Fr. six, Span. seis, but not in Ital. sei. It thus appears that French has been far more retentive of final consonants than Italian or Spanish. In the Sardinian dialect of Italian (Sardinia was the earliest province, and its dialect is a descendant of the earliest stage of Vulgar Latin), all final consonants remain, except -m, e.g. tempus, amas, amat, ses, amant, nomen, but adapt themselves to the following initial, e.g. est benni (pronounced ‘es b.’) (see Meyer-Lübke Ital. Gramm. p. 156). But in standard Italian there are still traces of these lost final consonants of monosyllables, e.g. ebbene for e bene (Lat. et bēne), ovvero for o vero (Lat. aut vērō), dimmi for di mi (Lat. dic mihi), cheecosa for chè cosa (Lat. quid causa), where the double consonant is due to the final having assimilated itself to the following initial, as Latin ã arose from a collocation like ab-bonis, am-me (for ab me), ap-patre (for ab pātre). In French we see ‘Sandhi’ carried to far greater lengths than Italian, where almost every word ends in a vowel. Before an initial vowel, French -s, -t, -r are heard in pronunciation, and a nasal vowel resolves itself into an oral vowel followed by n. And, more curious still, -l of words closely joined to a following word beginning with a consonant suffers the same change as l before a consonant in the middle of a word and becomes u; e.g. du père, au père, beau, like autre, &c. In S. Spain -s becomes h, or is dropped, e.g. ‘Cadi(h)’ (Storm. Engl. Phil. 2 i. p. 71).

§ 139. Syllable - Division. The Romance languages show a remarkable agreement in their division of the word into
syllables, their principle of division being to make the syllable end with a vowel, and begin with a consonant, or combination of consonants. Any combination of consonants, that is pronounceable at the beginning of a word is made to begin the syllable, with the one occasional exception of combinations beginning with s, where the s is in some languages allowed to end the preceding syllable. An Italian says o-bli-quo, te-ci-co, e-ni-gma, a-tle-ta, no-stro, be-ne, a pronunciation which often offers considerable difficulty to Englishmen, who would, for example, more naturally pronounce the last word as ben-e, like ‘any.’ A Spaniard says ha-blar, bu-lpir, but nues-tro, attaching the s to the first syllable. The Roman division of syllables was that of the Romance languages, not of the English, as is proved to certainty by the very precise and unmistakable statements of the grammarians on the subject. Their rule is ‘Never let a syllable end in a consonant if the consonant can possibly be pronounced at the beginning of the next syllable’; and they give examples like pôle-stas, no-ster, a-mnis, ma-gno, a-gmen. The same method is followed in those inscriptions which indicate the syllables by dots, e.g. C. I. L. vi. 77 t-an-nil-vs-he-dey-pnvs, 11682 vi-xit-an-nis, as well as by contractions, where the initial letters of the syllables are used, like mg (magnus), om (omnibus), pp (propter); though on inscriptions we often find s taken with the preceding syllable in words like cae-le-sti (vi. 77), ses-tv-le-tvs (ix. 4028), with which we may compare misspellings like disscente (vide § 130). Occasionally a grammarian urges the advisability of regarding the etymological formation of compounds like ab-stemius, ob-liviscor; but such remarks only show that the natural pronunciation of these words was ab-stemius, ob-liviscor, just as we in natural utterance disregard the formation of phrases like ‘at all,’ ‘at home,’ and pronounce ‘a-tall,’ ‘a-tome.’

§ 140. Testimony of grammarians. Servius, in Don. iv. 427. 20 K., states the rule as follows: quotiescumque quaerimus, quae consonantes in scribendo sibi cohaerent vel cui syllabae imputentur, utrum prior an sequenti, simililtudo aliorum nominum hunc solvit errorem. ut puta ‘aspe’ . . . intelligimus . . . s et p . . . consonantès sequenti tantummodo dare nos debere, eo quod invenitur sermo qui a dubius istis consonantibus inchoetur, ut ‘spica.’ similiter ‘amnis’: debemus m et n sequenti syllabae dare in scribendo, quoniam invenitur sermo qui ab his consonantibus inchoetur, ut
Mnestheus,' 'attulit': non possunus duo t sequenti syllabae dare, quia nullus sermo inventur, qui a duabus t consonantibus inchoetur, et hoc in ceteris consonantibus observabimus. plane scire debemus, conexiones quod dico consonantium non eas quae latinis syllabis congruent, sed etiam quae graecis, excepta sollicita ec syllaba quae constat de b et d, quae in latinum sermonem nunquam ita transit, ut cohaeret, ut est ἀπόλλα. quando enim scribimus 'abditur,' non possunus a in una syllaba ponere et b et d in sequenti. He thus testifies to a-spice, a-mnis, at-tulit, abditur. Similarly Caesellius (ap. Cassiod. vii. 205. i K.) to pote-stas, no-ster, ca-pto, plo-strum, lu-strum, capi-strum, clau-strum, ra-strum, campe-stre, a-stla (for astula), pes-stum (for pestum), car-po, dor-sum, Por-ciis, Pa-ris, tu-tus, sol-vo, nor-eus, vol-xo, lar-ca, pul-vo, te-ru-is, but dissyllabic ten-xis, be-le-a and be-la, ma-la-a and mal-va ; Terentianus Maurus (vi. 351, v. 879 K.) to o-mnis, a-mnis, and (v. 904 K.) ma-gnus, di-gnus, a-gnus, si-gnus, pu-gna (v. 941 K.), fa-xo, a-xis, ne-xus, u-xor, no-xia ; Marius Victorinus (vi. 29. 20 K.) to a-mnis, ar-ma, a-xis (cf. Charisius, i. 11. 19 K. ; Dositheus vii. 387. 4 K. ; Caper (vii. 96. 9 K.) to no-strum, ve-strum, ma-je-stas ; Dositheus (vii. 385. 5 K.) to a-gmine, ma-gno ; Priscian (i. p. 42 H.) to a-bdomen, My-gnonides, Ab-o-dlas, A-blas, Ae-tla, i-pse, nu-pse, scri-pse, scri-plum, dra-lana, a-gnen, vi-clir, see-stra, thus admitting, unlike Servius, bd into the list of pronounceable combinations, and (p. 50 H.) pa-seua, lu-seus, Co-smus, pro-spera, te-stis, &c. Bede and Alcuin insist on copyists of MSS. breaking up words at the end of a line according to these rules, ma-gnus, pro-pter, colu-mna, &c. Etymological division is recommended by Quintilian (i. 7. 9) with the instances haru-spe, abs-tenius (quia ex abstinentia temeti composita vox est) ; by Caesellius (ap. Cassiodor. vii. 206. i K.), ob-livisor, and (205. 18 K.), di-spicio, abs-tulit, trans-tulit, abs-condit ; by Alcuin (vii. 306. 4 K.), ob-stipui, ob-sum, ob-streo, obs-olevit (cf. Cassiodor. vii. 204. 19 K.). Priscian similarly says (i. p. 45 H.) si antecedens syllaba terminat in consonantem, necesse est etiam sequentem a consonante incipere, ut 'ar-tus' 'il-le' 'ar-duus,' nisi sit compositum, ut 'ab-co' 'ad-co' 'per-co,' but adds that Herodian in his treatise on Orthography declared it to be 'rationabilius sonoriusque' to follow the ordinary syllable-division in the case of Compounds too ; and in another passage (i. p. 42) he hesitates between a-bmuo and ab-muo. Terentius Scaurus (vii. 12. 1 K.) censures 'nes-cio' for ne-scio, a mispronunciation which shows the tendency already mentioned (§ 139) to detach s from a following consonant or consonant group, or perhaps rather to divide it between the two syllables, 'nes-scio.'

The law of Breves Breviantes in Plautine prosody, it may be mentioned, takes no account of syllable-division. Shortening is allowed (after a short syllable) of a pretonic syllable long by position in words like gubertum, cavillator, voluitatis, where the consonant group is divided between two syllables neither more nor less readily than in words like eguistati, venustati, where the consonant group is confined to one syllable.

§ 141. Quantity. The quantity and the quality of a vowel are two different things. We are apt to distinguish in our minds a long and a short vowel (say ē and ē) by quality, not by quantity, thinking of ē as an open E-sound, of ē as a close E-sound, whereas the terms 'long' and 'short' should be
applied only to the amount of time taken in pronouncing the vowel, so that there is, properly speaking, a long and a short open E and a long and a short close E. It is true that difference in quantity and in quality often go together; thus Latin ē was, like our ē, open E, Latin ē was close E, though the long sound of open E was also known in Latin, and was written ae (§ 6). The Romance languages, which have lost all other distinction of the Latin long and short vowels, distinguish them according to quality (e.g. Lat. bēllus is Ital. bello with open E, Lat. stēlla is Ital. stella with close E), though this distinction of quality does not always correspond to distinction of quantity (e.g. the ē of Lat. video and the ē of Lat. credo are similarly represented in Fr. vois, crois) (§ 6). Consonants, too, may differ in their quantity like vowels. For example, English final consonants are long after short, short after long vowels, e.g. ‘hill,’ ‘heel.’

We may distinguish at least three degrees of quantity or length,—long, short, and half-long,—an example of the last being the vowel of our ‘note,’ while ‘node’ and German ‘Noth’ have a long vowel. Latin half-long may be detected by the metrical scansion of a syllable as either long or short, e.g. in Plautus’ time the final syllables of āmat, lēnet, ēbilit, dōlor (ch. iii. § 40)¹.

The marked distinction between a long and a short vowel in Latin made it possible for the Romans to imitate the quantitative metre of the Greeks. Their own native metre, the Satur-nian, which is represented in literature by the ‘Odyssey’ of Livius Andronicus and the ‘Bellum Poenicum’ of Naevius, but which was banished from the domain of poetry by Ennius, was,

¹ A poetical scansion may of course be traditional. Thus Martial (iii. 95, 1) has hāveī, although Quintilian (i. 6, 21) tells us that in the ordinary pronunciation of his time the final vowel was short. Nor is variation in the scansion of proper names proof of half-long quantity; it is rather to be referred to ignorance or carelessness. The first syllable of Fīdenae, for example, was certainly long, the vowel being written with ei, or with the tall form of i (to indicate the long sound) on inscriptions, and being usually so scanned by poets; but Virgil (A. vi. 773) has urbemque Fide-nam. Scansions like Italia (an imitation of a Greek prosodical usage) are mere metrical licences, and prove nothing about actual pronunciation (‘Italiam’ . . . extra carmen non de-prendas. Quint. i. 5. 18).
like the metre of the Teutonic and other I.-Eur. stocks, accentual, not quantitative. But the Romance languages do not possess this distinction. We are in the habit of calling an accented vowel, such as the second vowel of the Italian word 'Toscana,' long; but in reality it is pronounced with no more length than the unaccented vowels of the same word. One of the chief differences of such a language as Italian from Teutonic languages is the equal length which it assigns to each vowel, even a final unaccented vowel. Contrast, for instance, the final e of Ital. notte with that of Germ. Gabe, or the final i of Tivoli in the Italian and in the usual English pronunciation of the word. Almost the only really long syllables in Italian are syllables long 'by position,' e.g. the first syllables of 'tanto,' 'tempo,' which, as we shall see (ch. iii. § 4), have in fact a circumflex accentuation, 'tânto,' 'têmpo.' Similarly the Spanish accent does not impair the quantity as the English accent does; and in French the usual quantity of every vowel is the half-long, e.g. jeune. (See Storm on Romance Quantity in the *Phonet. Stud. 1888.*) All this points to a period of 'Vulgar Latin' when all vowels were equally short or half-long, and when the only predominance of one vowel over another would be that conferred by the stress of accentuation. And we detect traces of this process of 'levelling' in the evident uncertainty of the grammarians of the fourth and fifth centuries A.D. about the quantities of words for which they have not one of the classical poets to appeal to, and above all in the errors in scansion of those

---

1 The Saturnian line had three accents (main or secondary, ch. iii. § 7) in the first hemistich (one always on the first syllable of the line), and two in the second, and like Romance poetry reckoned (with permissible variations) a definite number of syllables to the line, seven to the first hemistich, six to the second. Its two chief types were:

**A-type—**

\[ \hat{x}x(\hat{\cdot}) \hat{x}x, \hat{x}x \ \| \ \hat{x}x, \hat{x}x \]
dabunt maliōn Metelli Naevio poëstae,

**B-type (less usual)—**

\[ \hat{x}\hat{x}(\hat{\cdot}) \ \hat{x}x, \hat{x}x \ \| \ \hat{x}x, \hat{x}x \]

primus(a) incédit Céreriis Presérpina püber, a variety of the second hemistich of the A-type being \( \hat{x}x, \hat{x}x \) adlocuētus sūmi, and of the B-type \( \hat{x}x, \hat{x}x \) fuisse urum. (See *Amer. Journ. Phil.* vol. xiv.)

2 The passages quoted from the grammarians by Seelmann, p. 75, are not conclusive; e.g. Ter. Seaurus' distinction of *facilis* Sg. from *facileis* Pl. is a matter of orthography, not of pronunciation, and is suggested by Lucilius' proposed distinction of the symbols i and ei (see ch. i. § 9).
Christian poets who imitate the quantitulative verse of the Augustan poets. Grammarians often censure mispronunciations due to the overmastering of quantity by accent, e.g. Cēres (Mar. Sacerd. 451. 13 K.), pīcēs (Consent. 392. 18 K.), pūper and ōrator (ib. 392. 3, 11 quod vitium Afrorum speciale est); they frequently caution against the confusion of equns (with accented short open e) and aequns (with accented long open e) (Pompeius, 285. 8 K., &c.). Cf. the haphazard use of the apex and tall I on late inscriptions (ch. i. § 1). For a discussion of the influence of accentuation on the quantity of the Latin vowels (e.g. late Lat. ἱδόλον for εἴδωλον), see ch. iii. § 1; for variations like pāciscor and pācem, (I.-Eur. pāk- and pāk-), see ch. iv. § 51.

§ 142. 'Position.' In Latin poetry a syllable is scanned long, even though it have a short vowel, if the vowel precedes any consonant-group requiring a certain period of time for pronunciation. A long syllable of this kind is said to be long by 'position' (positio, e.g. Quint. ix. 4. 86; i. 5. 28); and the way in which a Roman apprehended this length by 'position' may be seen from a passage of a fifth cent. grammarian (Pompeius, 112. 26 K.): ut puta si dicas 'et,' unum semis habet. e vocalis est brevis, unum habet tempus. t consonans est, et omnis consonans dimidium habet tempus: ece 'et' unum semis habet tempus. adhue non est nec longa nec brevis; plus tamen habet a brevi, minus quidem habet a longa. adde ad 'et' s, etiam fit longa. quare? e brevis unum tempus habet, t dimidium tempus habet, s dimidium tempus habet: ece duo tempora sunt, feecerunt duo tempora longam syllabam. With a naturally long vowel there would be really extra-length, but there is no account taken in Roman poetry of the different length of, say, the second syllables of calesco (with e) and modestus (with ę), both being treated as long syllables. Plautus, however, seems not to shorten by the Brevis Brevians Law (ch. iii. § 42) a syllable with naturally long vowel, scanning quis incēdit? but not quis insitit? quis infērtur? (before s-, f- the vowel of in was long, § 144).

Consonant groups which admitted of more rapid pronunciation were not necessarily scanned long, viz. groups composed of a mute and a liquid (r, l). Thus in Virgil agrum (with ă) may
be scanned with the first syllable long or short as the poet chooses. Plautus and the older dramatists, who follow more the actual pronunciation of everyday life, never scan such a syllable long, though in other than dramatic poetry this scansion is found; e.g. Ennius in his epic has *nigrum* *(Ann. 187 M.), sacrificare* *(ib. 233), &c.,* with first syllable long, whence we may infer that in rapid unconventional utterance such a syllable was short, but in measured ceremonious speech the longer dwelling of the voice on the mute and liquid justified a long scansion. That such a syllable differed from an ordinary short syllable is seen in the avoidance by the dramatists of the shortening of a vowel after a mute and a liquid by the Brevis Brevians Law; e.g. Plautus scans *ābī* readily, but avoids a scansion like *āgrī*. The same pronunciation of a mute with *r* seems to have prevailed in Imperial times, to judge by Servius’ note on Virg. *A.* i. 384 Libyae deserta peragro] ‘per’ habet accentum; nam ‘a’ longa quidem est, sed non solida positione; muta enim etliquida quotiens ponuntur, metrum juvant, non accentum *(cf. Quint. i. 5. 28; ix. 4. 86),* but not of a mute with *l* in the word *maniplis,* according to the same authority *(Serv. ad A. xi. 463 in hoc sermone, ut secunda a fine habeat accentum usus obtinuit).* The establishment of the pronunciation *maniplus* with long second syllable (but short *ī*) has been plausibly referred to the longer form *manipulus* (on the presence and absence of the parasitic or svarabhaktic vowel in Latin between a mute and *l,* see § 102); but it may be objected that Plautus scans *poplus* with first syllable short, as well as trisyllabic *pōplūs*; and makes the suffix *īlo-* *(ch. v. § 25)* one syllable, with preceding vowel scanned short, in *vēhīclum,* though (normally) two syllables in *cūīclūm.* In the Romance languages the accent has been shifted to all penultimate vowels followed by a mute with *r,* e.g. Ital. allegro (with accent on second syllable) from Lat. *ālcris* *(Vulg. Lat. *alecro-*) *(see ch. iii. § 11),* which shows that in Vulgar Latin the combination of a mute with *r* came universally to constitute length by position. This, too, has been explained by the supposition of a parasitic vowel, *alecro-,* like the occasional spelling *arbiterium* *(in poetry, however, *arbitrium* is invariably scanned with short second syllable), but may also be referred to the practice which
we see most clearly in Italian of lengthening a mute before \( r \), e.g. fabbro (Lat. \( \text{f}a\text{b}r\text{O} \)-), febbre (Lat. \( \text{f}e\text{b}r\text{is} \)), and Ital. oechio from Lat. \( \text{oc}\text{u}l\text{s} \) (Vulg. Lat. \( \text{oc}\text{l}us \), \( *\text{oc}\text{l}u\text{s} \)), suggests a similar account of the Imperial Latin pronunciation of \( \text{m}a\text{n}i\text{i}p\text{l}u\text{s} \). We see the same doubling in English 'fodder' (from 'food'), 'bitter' (from 'bite'), 'apple.' Gröber ascribes this consonant lengthening (Comm. Woelffl. p. 171) to what is called the 'legato,' as opposed to the 'staccato' pronunciation; that is to say, \( *\text{f}a\text{b}r\text{o} \)-was pronounced with linking of the two syllables \( f\)- and \( b\)-, not with that marked break of one syllable from another that we see in Ital. be-ne (§ 139). The same 'legato' pronunciation of the two syllables of a word like \( \text{f}a\text{c} \text{t}u\text{m} \), \( \text{om}n\text{i} \) (but cf. § 139), he makes the scientific explanation of the scansion of the first syllable as long (similarly with \( \text{f}a\text{c} \text{t}u\text{m} \text{l}u\text{m} \), &c.), and by the tendency to attach an \( s \) in a group like \( st, sc, sp \) to the preceding syllable (seen in misspellings like \( \text{d}i\text{s}\text{s}c\text{e}t\text{e} \), § 136), he explains the scansion \( \text{e}\text{s}t\text{o} \), \( \text{n}e\text{s}c\text{i}o \), &c., with first syllable long. On the other hand, when a word ended in a vowel and the next began with \( st, sc, sp \), the 'legato' pronunciation did not equally assert itself, so that Lucretius allows a scansion like \( \text{l}i\text{b}r\text{e} \text{t}u\text{a} \text{sp}o\text{nt}e \) (v. 79) and the like, though Virgil does not. The Italian pronunciation of festa, pescare, aspro, &c., lengthens the \( s \), similarly the \( l \) in alto, the \( r \) in morte, the \( u \) in mondo, the \( m \) in campo, and so on.

In early Latin poetry final -\( s \) as a rule does not before an initial consonant constitute length by position, a fact due to the weak pronunciation of -\( s \) at that period (§ 126). Similarly initial -\( h \)-, both in early and classical poetry, has not the weight of an ordinary consonant. But final -\( m \) always has this weight (§ 65).

§ 143. Shortening of long vowel before another vowel. In the word \( \text{pi}u\text{s} \) the \( i \) was originally long (cf. Osc. Piilhioi 'Pio,' Dat. Sg.), and the scansion \( \text{pi}a \) (MSS. \( \text{di}u \), \( \text{di}a \)) has been ascribed to Ennius in his Epic (ap. Cic. Rep. i. 41. 64):

\[
\text{pectora pia tenet desiderium, simul inter sese sic memorant: O Romule, Romule die,}
\]

\[1 \text{In A. xi. 308—}
\text{spem siquam adseitis Aetolium habuistis in armis}
\text{ponite. spes sibi quisque, &c., a pause in the sentence intervenes between the two words.}
\]
though Plautus in his homelier dramatic poetry recognizes only \( \pi \). The shortening of the \( \iota \) is due to the difficulty found by the Romans in maintaining the long quantity of a vowel before another vowel. The same is true of diphthongs; we find, for instance, the compound of \( \textit{prae} \) and *\textit{heudo} assuming the form \( \textit{pra}-\textit{heudo} \) (and even \( \textit{prendo} \), § 58). The amount of length assigned to a long vowel or diphthong in such a position would differ at different periods, and even in the pronunciation of the same period. Plautus is no doubt using the colloquial pronunciation of his own day when he scans \( \textit{Chius} \) (Adj.) (\textit{Poem. 699; Cure. 78}); whereas \( \textit{uittus} \) was not in vogue at Quintilian's time (extra carmen non deprendas, sed nec in carmine vitia duenda sunt, Quint. i. 5. 18), and Servius (ad \textit{Virg. A. i. 451}) says that \( \textit{audit} \), and not \( \textit{audit} \), \( \textit{lenit} \) and not \( \textit{lenit} \), was the ordinary pronunciation, the forms with the short penult being a usage of poetry. Here the retention of long \( \iota \) in Servius' pronunciation may be ascribed to the presence of the forms with \( r \), \( \textit{audivit} \), \( \textit{lenivit} \), and similarly we find in Ter. \textit{Phorm. 573 audieras}. The \( \textit{fui} \) of Ennius, e.g. \( \textit{Ann. 431 M.} \):

\[ \text{nos sumus Romani qui fuimus ante Rudini,} \]

is sometimes used (especially at the end of a line, i.e. through metrical necessity) by Plautus, who makes similar use of \( \textit{fieri}. \)

\[ \text{f\textit{veit}.} \]

(On Ennius' \( \textit{adu\text{\'}it} \) Perf. &c. see ch. viii. § 50; we have \( \textit{f\text{\'}veit}. \text{\textit{C. I. L. i. 1051}}. \))

The same shortening must have appeared in the pronunciation of the sentence, when a word ending in a long vowel or diphthong preceded a word beginning with a vowel, so that the 'prosodical hiatus' of Latin poetry, e.g. Plaut. \( \textit{tu} \) \( \textit{amas} \), Enn. Scipio inuicte (cf. Enn\( \text{\'}i \) \( \textit{imaginis} \), \textit{Virg. qu\'i amant}, &c, was a native Latin usage and not an imitation of Greek versification. Final long vowels would, therefore, have a short variety or 'doublet,' which occurred as often as a vowel-initial followed, and this fact, coupled with the tendency of the accent to weaken a long final, especially in iambic words (ch. iii. § 40), explains the early shortening of final \( \textit{\&} \), e.g. \( \textit{terr\&} \), and the later shortening of final -\( \textit{\&} \), e.g. \( \textit{pon\&} \) in Imperial Latin (ch. iii. § 45).

\[ \textit{1 It seems to be the rule in Saturnian metre (Amer. Journ. Phil. xiv. 310).} \]
§ 144. PRONUNCIATION. VOWEL-QUANTITY.

On inscriptions we not unfrequently find a short i before another vowel in the middle of a word written with the tall form of the letter, the usual sign of i (ch. i. § 1), e.g. DIE, with PRIVSQUAM (C. I. L. vi. 10239); and in the Romance languages the i of dies is represented by the usual representative of Latin i, e.g. Ital. di, Prov. dia, Fr. di, Span. dia. This at first sight seems to be in direct opposition to the usual law of shortening a long vowel before another vowel. But it is unlikely that a short vowel was lengthened in this position; all that the Romance forms and the spelling with tall I need imply is that the i had the quality (not necessarily the quantity) of long i, in other words, had the close and not the open sound (§ 14). This is certainly the explanation of Romance *pio, with close i (Ital. pio, &c.), and of the PIVS of inscriptions, e.g. C. I. L. vi. 1058, for we have seen reason to believe that a long i shortened in Latin retained the quality of long i, and it, &c., of the classical and later period being pronounced with the close, not the open i-sound (§ 14). But the i of dies must have been originally short (ch. iv. § 63). (The examples from Romance are discussed in K. Z. xxx. 337; additional examples of tall I in dies, pins on inscriptions are given in Christiansen, De apicibus et I longis, p. 32.) (Cf. the sound of Engl. 'the' before a vowel.)

§ 144. Change in quantity of vowel before certain consonant-groups. The quantity of a vowel which stands before a group of consonants or a double consonant in Latin is not so easily determined as the quantity of a vowel followed by a single consonant. In a word like indeluctibili the scansion of the word by the Latin poets will fix the quantity of the vowel of every syllable except the third. The u of the third syllable is long by 'position,' as it is called, because it stands before the consonants ct, but we cannot tell from a line like—

venit summa dies et ineluctabile tempus,

whether it is also long by nature or not. To ascertain the natural quantity of these vowels which are long by position 1, we can refer to two main sources of information; first, the

---

1 For a list of them, see Marx, Hülfsbühlein², Berlin, 1889 (a book to be used with caution).
inscriptions which denote a long \( a, e, o, u \) by an apex, a mark like the symbol of the acute accent (and from c. 130 B.C. by doubling the vowel), a long \( i \) by the tall form of that letter; second, the Romance languages which, as we have seen, distinguish a long from a short \( e, i, o, u \), when, as seems usually to have been the case, the long and the short vowel differed in Vulgar Latin in quality as well as in quantity. Neither of these sources are wholly satisfactory. The apex and tall \( i \) seem to be often used at haphazard, especially on inscriptions later than 150 A.D., and the latter has other uses than to express long \( ì \), such as for initial \( i \), consonantal \( i \) (our \( y \)), and so on. The Romance languages, and the Teutonic and Celtic loanwords, often indicate a quantity different from that which can be inferred for a word in Classical Latin, a very natural thing if we consider how much the pronunciation of a vowel is liable to be influenced by the consonant-group next which it stands, and by the analogy of other words of a similar form. Some help is occasionally afforded by the statements of grammarians on the quantity of this or that vowel, though even they sometimes show by their hesitation that the pronunciation of such vowels was in their time not always definitely established. Aulus Gellius (second cent. A.D.), for example, discusses the proper quantity of \( e \) in \( quiesco \) (vii. 15), and decides for \( ë \) on the analogy of \( caléscō \), \( nitésco \), \( stupésco \) and other Inceptives, as well as of the noun \( quies \) (cf. \( quëscō \) C. I. L. vi. 25531), though he adds that a friend of his, an educated man, invariably pronounced the word with short \( e \), \( quīscō \). In another passage (ix. 6) he recommends the pronunciation \( áctito \), against a common pronunciation of his time, \( áctīto \), which was defended by the analogy of the short vowel of the simple verb \( ágo \). The grammarians of a later date, when the distinction between long and short quantity was beginning to disappear, are still more at a loss about those quantities for which they have not the authority of the classical poets to fall back upon. It is difficult to believe Priscian (ix. 28) (sixth cent.) when he posits a naturally long penult for all perfects with \( e \),

---

1 See Christiansen, *De apicibus et I longis inscriptionum latinarum*, 1889 (a Kiel dissertation).
e.g. *illexi*, and for no others, e.g. *dēxi*, nor yet when he makes the *a* of *mansī* long by position only (ix. 27). Greek transcriptions, too, are often dangerous guides; for the quality of Greek *ε* and *η*, *ο* and *ω*, differed, as we have seen (§ 32, § 21), from that of Latin *ē*, *ē*, *ō*, *ō*, the Greek short vowels being, at least in the Attic period, close and the long vowels open, while the Latin short vowels had the open, the long the close sound. Greek *ov* is no indication of the long *u* of Latin, but merely of the *iu*-sound of Latin *u*, as opposed to the *aj*-sound of Greek *v*. Greek *ei*, however, almost always indicates Latin *ī* (see Eckinger).

Etymology indeed will often help us. Thus we can infer a long vowel in the first syllable of *luctus*, grief (the *u* is marked long on inscriptions), from the analogy of *lūgeo*; though we should never have guessed that *hēsternus*, unlike *hērī*, had a long vowel, if we had not been informed of the fact by a Latin grammarian (Mar. Victorin. vi. 15. 15 K. *hesternum* proinde dixit: nemo enim est, qui latine modo sciat loqui, qui aliter quam producta syllaba *hesternum* dixerit). The metrical treatment of words by the early dramatists may also be appealed to, if it be granted that a vowel long by nature is seldom or never shortened by the influence of a preceding short syllable, in words like *vōlūptātem*, or phrases like *quid ignoras* (see ch. iii. § 34). With all these aids it is possible to gain a good deal of information about the quantity of vowels long by 'position' in Latin, quite enough to prove the irrationableness of our usual method of pronunciation which ignores all distinction of quantity in their case¹, though hardly enough to settle satisfactorily the question with which this paragraph proposes to deal, namely the extent to which the influence of one consonant-group tended to shorten a vowel naturally long, or to lengthen a vowel naturally short. To ascertain the limits of our knowledge and of our ignorance on this subject it will be necessary to make a more minute examination of the several words involved than is generally wanted.

¹ Our ordinary pronunciation of Latin makes no distinction, for example, between *illex*, 'alluring,' and *illex*, 'lawless.' We pronounce both 'illex'!
In one case at least we seem to have safe ground under our feet. Cicero (Orator, xlvi. § 159), tells us that in- and con-
lengthened their vowel when compounded with a word begin-
ning with s or f: quid vero hoc elegantius, quod non fit natura
sed quodam instituto, 'indoctus' dicimus brevi prima littera,
'insanus' producta, 'inhumanus' brevi, 'infelix' longa. et, ne
multis, quibus in verbis eae primae litterae sunt, quae in
'sapiente' atque 'felice,' producte dicitur, in ceteris omnibus
breviter. itemque 'cōmosuit' 'cōnsuevit' 'cōncrepuit' 'cōn-
fecit': consule veritatem, reprehendet; refer ad aures, probabunt.
That this rule should be extended to all vowels before us, (uf'),
we see from such statements of grammarians as that Present
Participles in -ens, -ans had in the Nominative a long vowel
(Probus iv. 245. 13 K.; Pompeius, v. 113. 23 K.), while the
original shortness of this e is indicated by the Romance languages
for the other cases (e.g. Ital. -ente with open e in the penult);
that e was long in the termination of Numeral Adverbs in -iens,
-ies (Probus iv. 247. 9. K.) (cf. O. Ind. kīyānt, &c.), and in the
Nominative Singular of dēns, gēns, mēns, &c., (Bede vii. 230.
15 K.), while ē in the other cases of these nouns is indicated by
the Romance forms (e.g. Ital. dente, gente, with open e, Span.
diente, miente). Probus, however, seems to inculcate insōns,
vii. 39). Inscriptions, too, show the apex in words like Clémèns
(C. I. L. ii. 4550), Prócedéns (vi. 1527 d 28), and a host of
other examples with us (see a list of them in Christiansen, De
apiébus, &c. p. 41); while Greek inscriptions have -ης, e.g.
Προυσινις (Eckinger, p. 115). Finally Romance forms like Ital.
teso (with close e) from Latin tē(n)sus, the participle of tendo
(with open e) from Latin tendo, not only indicate a long vowel
before us in Latin, but also seem to show that this long e had
the same quality as the usual Latin ē (close e), and was not
a mere protraction of the open e-sound of short e 1. Quintilian

---

1 The spellings t(h)ensaurus for θησαυρός, Scapensula for Σκαπτή ὤλη
or Σκαπτηράνη, Chersonensus for Χερ-
σόνησος (see Georges) do not then
offer -ens- as the equivalent of Gk. -ης- (with long open E, § 41), but
are to be compared with the mis-
spelling censored in Probi App. 198.
21 K., occasio for occasio (see § 66).
Long open E was written ae (§ 41).
(i. 7, 29) tells us that in the word consules the nasal was not sounded, a fact possibly expressed by the usual abbreviation of the word on inscriptions, cós. The dropping of the nasal is also indicated by spellings like novies beside novicus, and by the Romance forms, e.g. Ital. teso (Lat. té(n)sus), and Celtic and Teutonic loanwords, e.g. Welsh dwys (Lat. dē(n)sus), O.H.G. isila (Lat. ǐ(n)sula, cf. Diom. i. 409, 3 K.; Serv. in Don. iv. 442. 30 K.) (cf. Iferos, C. I L. vi. 19873).

The grammarians who repeat the rule of Cicero with regard to in- and con- (Gellius, ii. 17; Probus, iv. 149. 33 K. and 253. 22; Diomedes, i. 433. 15 K.; Serv. ad Aen. i. 187; Max. Viet. vi. 204. 16 K.; Audacis exc. vii. 354. 21 K.), often add the remark that the rule was not strictly followed in the pronunciation of their time. Thus Diomedes (i. 409. 3 K.) says of in- and con- before s, f, 'plerumque producuntur' (cf. Cledonius, v. 76. 9 K.); and Servius (in Don. iv. 442. 28 K.) intimates that the rule was often violated in practice, plerumque enim non observantes in barbarismos incurrimus. This probably indicates a tendency of later Latin to give in- and con- in these compounds the same short vowel-sound that they had in other compounds like incedo, cōncedo, and in the simple forms in, cām; and this will explain why it is, that on all but the earliest inscriptions of the Empire, the instances of apexed vowels before us are not so frequent in these compounds, as in other words (see the lists given by Christiansen), and also why, both on inscriptions and in Romance forms, instances of a long vowel before uf are rare. 1 For the combination uf hardly occurs except in the case of verbs beginning with f compounded with in- and con-. The word consul was perhaps not regarded as a compound; for the o is marked with the apex on inscriptions with great persistency. In Welsh, too, the Old Welsh form cusil points to a Latin cô(n)silium (cf. Diom. i. 409. 3 K.; Serv. in Don. iv. 442. 30 K.). But, for compounds, which were realized in popular usage to be compounds, the pronunciation of Cicero's time must have gone

1 The tall I of Infere (C. I. L. vi. 7579), quoted by Christiansen and Seelmann, is no certain indication of long i. Every initial i of this inscription has the tall form, e.g. Ita, Impetra. It is always difficult to be sure whether Ins-, Inf- on inscriptions indicate long i, or merely initial i.
more and more out of fashion under the Empire. Its prevalence in the time of Plautus may be inferred from the fact that Plautus is averse to ins-, inf- being shortened by the influence of a preceding short syllable (see § 142). In Umbro-Oscan we see lengthening of a vowel before us, uf in Osc. keenzstur, 'censor,' (with long open E, § 6), Umbr. aanfehtaf, 'infectas.'

The remark of Priscian (ii. 63), that the terminations -gus, -gua, -gnum are always preceded by a long vowel, has been extended by Marx and others into a rule that the combination -gu- always lengthened a preceding vowel. Of Priscian's examples (végnum, stágnum, benígus, malígus, abígus, prívígus, Paélígus), abígus, régnum, stágnum had probably originally a long vowel (cf. abíes, régem, stáre); prívígus gets a certain amount of confirmation from the spelling PRÍVIGNO on a soldier's epitaph (C. I. L. vi. 3541); but benígus, malígus receive none from Romance forms like Ital. benigno, maligno, which are probably 'bookwords,' acquired by recent borrowing from Latin, not naturally transmitted by continuous usage from Roman times.

The Romance forms (e.g. Ital. degno, Span. des-den, 'disdair'); possibly 'bookwords,' A. L. I. viii. 324), point to Vulg. Lat. dígus; but the word has the tall I in C. I. L. vi. 6314 DIGNE, and elsewhere. They point also to signum (cf. sígillum), (Ital. segno, Span. seña, &c.); but on inscriptions we have SIGNUM (C. I. L. vi. 10234, a carefully written inscription of 153 A.D., and elsewhere), SIGNIFICABO (vi. 16664). The grammatical Diomedes (fourth cent.), speaking of the rhythmic arrangement of some of Cicero's clauses (i. 470. 9 K.), seems to speak of dignitas as an anapaest, just as he calls justam a trochee; and if this be the right construction of his words, it suggests that he pronounced dignitas. Welsh swyn, a charm, Old Irish sén, blessing, sénaim, to bless, to sain, Old High German sēgan, charm against evil, blessing, are all from a late Latin signum in its Christian sense of 'the sign of the cross'; and their form indicates a form segum, with close e, a development of an earlier signum, not signum (cf. § 14). The Romance forms indicate, too, a short vowel in lignum, pigus, pugus, and show us that if the lengthening of a vowel before gu was a tendency of Latin pronunciation at all, it was not one so-
marked, and so persistent, as the lengthening before *us. [For further discussion of this question, see Bezz. Beitr. xvi. 189 sqq.; Mém. Soc. Ling. vi. 34 note; K. Z. xxx. 337, where it is suggested that the change in the vowel was one of quantity merely, not of quality, so that *dignus, *signum, would have the long open *i-sound. Before *gu, by a phonetic law of Latin, *e became *i (ch. iv § 8)]. The spelling *PIGMEN(tum) on an African inscription (C. I. L. viii. 1344) is not evidence enough for a lengthening of the vowel before *gu; nor is the exact relation clear between *subtegmen and *subtēmen, *exugmen (?) and *exāmen (Class. Rev. vol. v. p. 294: Etym. Lat. p. 126) (see ch. iv, § 116).

In the Perfect Participle Passive and kindred formations of verbs whose Present ends in -go, preceded by a short syllable, e.g. lēgo, āgo, we find a long vowel. Thus lēctor, lēctum, lēctum, lēctor (from a third-conjunctive form *ligere?) are attested by Aul. Gellius (xii. 3 and ix. 6), lēcto by Porphyrio (ad Hor. S. i. 6. 122), while on inscriptions we have lēctor (C. I. L. vi. 9447), the epitaph of a grammaticus, and so presumably correct in spelling; vi. 27140), a/lēctō, xiv. 376 (second cent. A.D.), &c., a/ctis (vi. 1527 d 59, b.c. 8–2), &c., infrāctā (ix. 60, c. 100 A.D.) (while ā for frango is proved by effringo, confringo (from ę), rēctē1 (xii. 2494, beginning of first cent. A.D.), lēctor (vi. 5205), and the like (see Christiansen, p. 47, and cf. λυκτος, προτηκτο[πος] on Gk. inserr., K. Z. xxxiii. 402.). The long vowel is also found in the Perfect (properly S.-Aorist, see ch. viii. § 39) of these verbs, rēxi, tēxi (Prisc. ix. 28, who adds illēxi 2), rēxit (C. I. L. v. 875, 105 A.D.), tēxit (x. 1793) (see Christiansen, p. 49). Whether it is due to the consonant-groups g and t, g and s, or is a lengthening peculiar to the Perfect and kindred forms of the verb (see ch. viii. § 39), it is difficult to say, but the latter supposition is certainly the more probable. The single instance on inscriptions of a form that is not Verbal, viz. māx(imo) (vi. 2080, the Acts of the Arval Brotherhood, c. 120 A.D.) is not sufficient

---

1 So that there was complete assonance between rēx and rēctē in the children's verse;
2 Plautus puns on illecutus, the Verbal Noun from illicia, and lectus (from lego), a bed, Bacch. 55.
evidence for the former. Diomedes (431. 17 K.) says the i of
nix is short. A similar difficulty presents itself in connexion
with the parallel formations from Verbs ending in -ngo. Gellius
(ix. 6) attests iunctus beside ungo; and on inscriptions we have
sejunctum (C. I. L. vi. 1527 e 38, b. c. 8–2), &c., defunctis (v. 1326),
&c., conjunctum (xii. 4333, time of Antonines), extinctos (vi. 25617,
A.D. 10), cinclus (x. 4104) (see Christiansen, pp. 44 sqq.). Here
the spelling sanctus (cf. Ose. saahitum, Unbr. sahata), frequent
on inscriptions, seems to show that the lengthening occurs
before original ne (sacer 1), as well as before ne from original ng;
but the few instances of non-verbal forms, viz. conjunctum (vi. 6592,
6593), the numeral quinctus, frequent on inscriptions (Christian-
sen, p. 46) (cf. quinque, quiini), are again insufficient evidence to
separate the lengthening from the ordinary lengthening of the
Latin Perfect. The absence of the nasal in iactus (beside
nactus), fictus (but iunctus Ter. Eum. 104), plebeian defactus
(ii. 4173), and saecissimae (vi. 15511; v. 6580) (cf. Welsh saith
beside sant, § 70), is explained in ch. viii. § 10. In iunctus it is the
guttural that disappears. All the Romance forms point to iunctus
(cf. Greek κουείτος and Κουείτος, though the earliest forms are
Κοιγκτιός and Κοιείτος: see Eckinger, pp. 122 sqq.), but declare
for the short vowel in pinctus, iunctus, cinctus, tinclus, cinxi, finxi.

In the absence of express testimony, such as we have for us,
uf, it is impossible to be sure that the combination of g with
a consonant, like n, m, t, s, whether preceded or not by a nasal,
had a lengthening effect on a preceding vowel; though there
certainly are a good many apparent indications of this. It is
equally impossible to decide whether the supposed influence
exerted on the vowel may have been a change of quality merely,
and not of quantity, just as the combination ngu had the effect
of changing an o to a u, e.g. unguis for *onguis (ch. iv. § 20).

145. r with consonant. Spellings on inscriptions like Fortuna (a), Fortunata
(C. I. L. vi. 7527) (cf. Fortunata vi. 2236) suggest that the o, which was certainly
originally short (Lat. or for L-Eur. j, see ch. iv. § 92), has been lengthened by
the influence of the following rt. If this be so, it could only have been a local
pronunciation, or at least one that never gained a secure footing in the

1 A fresh complication arises from a stem sācri- (sāres, Plautus), point-
the fact that beside sācro-, we have

a stem sācri- (sāres, Plautus), point-
ing to a root sāc- beside sāc-.
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language; for the Romance languages testify abundantly to short vowels in words like porcus, cornu, certus, &c. Marius Saccordos (vi. 451. 5 K.) quotes *pērmix as a barbarism; and Pompeius (v. 126. 5) censures the mispronunciation *ārna. So that the initial o of *ārno, if long, as attested by inscriptions, [*e.g. *ārn̄av(it)] C. I. L. x. 6104 (time of Augustus), *ārnare xii. 4333 (time of Antonines; (for other instances on inscriptions, see Christiansen. p. 53)), and by Celtic loanwords (e.g. Welsh addurn, *ornament, addurno, *to ornament, [lat. *adērno] must have been originally long and cannot owe its length to the influence of the following *rn. (Similarly *fūrnora, *ōrol, *ōrca.) But it is more likely that the o was not really long, but merely had the quality of long Latin ə, in other words was close o. Plautus seems to scan *ārn- after a short syllable; though the instances are so few as to leave a slight doubt (Trin. 840 might possibly be nono cum ōrnatu, Am. 721 co ōrnatho). There are not wanting indications that r with a nasal tended to modify the quality of a vowel, e. g. *forus and *fornus, *formica and *formica, *turnus (Greek ῥόπος), just as in Italian to-day (though not in the Toscana) close e becomes open before r with a consonant, e. g. verde, erpice (Meyer-Lübke, It. Gram. § 54). How far this may explain the discrepancy between the *firmus of inscriptions (Christiansen, p. 53), and the Vulg. Lat. *firmus, postulated by Romance forms like Ital. *fermo, and the Welsh loanword *flerf, it is difficult to say. *Arum with short ə expressly attested by Audacis exc. p. 328. 8 K., originally the neuter of the adjective *ārum, e. g. Plaut. Truc. 149 non arus hic sed paucos ager est, appears with long a in an inscription of Tiberius' time (*āruli, C. I. L. vi. 913). (For other cases of long vowel before r with consonant on inscriptions, see Christiansen, pp. 51 sqq.) [Arma, attested by Serv. in Don. 426. 11 and 36 K. Prisc. Acc. 521. 15. Audacis exc. 328. 6, is proved by *inermis, for ə is not weakened to e (ch. iii.); *ārx Pomp. 130. 7 is proved by *coecēs.)

§ 146. s with consonant. The short vowel before sp, sc, st, &c., attested by the Romance languages for words like *vōsperr, *pīscis, *crīsta, is quite strong enough evidence to disprove the theory that an originally short vowel was lengthened before these combinations, and to show that the long vowel indicated by inscriptions for pāstor, prīscus, trīstis, jūstus, &c. (see Christiansen, pp. 54 sqq.) must have been originally long. Diomedes (p. 431, 31; 432, 16.) attests fenēstrā, *āsperr; Quintilian (ix. 4. 85) agrēstis, Audax (359. 15 K.; campēdrīs, &c. Hēsternus (Mar. Victorin. vi. 15. 15 K.) beside hērī is puzzling; also the discrepancy between *crēstum of C. I. L. i. 1199 and Vulg. Lat. *crīsta indicated by the Romance forms, e. g. Ital. crosta. Festus (86. 8 Th.) distinguishes lūstra, wallowing-places, from lūstra, purifications.

§ 147. n with single consonant. Vēndo (Ital. vendo with close e', *fōntem (Probus 6. 12 K.; but Romance *fōnt- by analogy of other nt-stems), *prīnceps (Ital. principe, &c.) are enough to disprove the theory that this combination shortened a preceding long vowel. There are, however, points of difficulty. Servius (in Don. 426. 34 K.) attests *prīnceps; Diomedes 433. 18 *cōntio (by anal. of *cōm-?) (for corēntio, and so originally *cōntio, or perhaps *cōntio; French none, annoncer points to a Latin form *nōntius (for noventius, and so originally nōntius, Mar. Victorin. vi. 12. 18 K.); Romance words for 'eleven,' like Span. once, Fr. onze, point to a Vulg. Lat. *undecim (properly *undecim, from unus and decem) (*sīncēput is usually explained as *sēm(f)-caput). There are some indications that the quality of a vowel was liable to change before this combination. Thus *-ond- appears as *-und- in *frundes, a form ascribed to Ennius (see K. Z.
xxx. 336); ounxis seems to be for *ounxis (ch. iv. § 20). The remark of a late grammarian (Anon. Bern. Suppl. 111 H.), that *hirundo, arundo have utive, is a mistake based on a misunderstanding of Priscian i. p. 123. 7 H.

§ 148. 1 with consonant. Vulg. Lat. remituleum (Ital. rimorchio, Span. remolque, Fr. remarque), properly remituleum (from Greek ἰμολόκαια) is not evidence sufficient to justify us in supposing that this combination had the effect of shortening a preceding long vowel. Ultra, the form attested by the Romance languages, was in all probability also the classical form; in Varro, L. L. v. 50 read utive, miswritten in the Archetype vis, as in v. 83, and then changed by scribes to ovis: ultra, not utive, is the true reading of the Claudius Tablet at Lyons, col. i. l. 40 (Allmer et Dissard, Inscriptions antiques, Musée de Lyon, vol. i. pp. 70 sqq.). The influence of this combination, however, in changing the quality of a vowel is seen in culmen beside cóculmen, vult beside veo, &c. (see ch. iv. § 20).

The shortening of a long vowel before certain single final consonants, -r, -t, &c. is, like the shortening and change of final vowels, dependent on the Accent, and so is discussed in the next chapter. (On the Assimilation of Consonants, e. g. summitto for submitto, see ch. iv. § 159.)

§ 149. Crasis of vowels, Synizesis, &c. Two neighbouring vowels in the middle of a word became a Diphthong if the second was i or u, e. g. coetus for co-i-tus (used literally in Plaut. Amph. 657 primo coetu uicimus), suffered Crasis if they were suitable vowels, e. g. cómo from co-emo (cf. Engl. 'doff' for do-off, 'don' for do-on), while if the first was i or u (or in certain cases e or o) Synizesis was a common result, e. g. larva from lárva (a trisyllable in Plautus). Compounds of a Preposition ending in a vowel, and a Verb, &c., beginning with a vowel or h, show vowel-contraction more regularly in the early dramatists than in the Augustan poets, e. g. coeré (a dissyllable) Pacuv., côneslat (for cohoneslat) Accius, whether it be that these contracted forms are a relic of the earlier accentuation of the first syllable of every word, cêræce, and the uncontracted the result of the shifting of the accent, cê-êræce, or that the contracted belong to the conversational language of everyday life, the uncontracted to the artificial diction of the higher poetry. Possibly a tri-syllabic coeræce is a 're-composition' like i-nêco beside older enico (with weakening of unaccented vowel), or adecuro beside accurro (with assimilation of consonants) (see ch. iv. § 159). Synizesis went hand in hand with Syncope [lärva became larva at the same time that lärðum became lardum (see ch. iii.]), and asserted itself more and more under the Empire; e. g. ujetus (*guetus) for quiëtus is a common spelling on late inscriptions (cf. Ital. cheto, Span.
quiso, Prov. quetz). The palatalization of a consonant under the influence of a following i (become y) before a vowel has played a great part in the Romance languages, e.g. Fr. bras from bracchium, *braccyum (see § 48). A final vowel before an initial vowel suffered elision (see the next section), and the same thing may have happened to the e of ne- in ventiquam, &c., which is scanned with the first syllable short (or should we pronounce nydiquam, nyullus, nysquam?), while nêuter, in which the accent by the Penultima law fell on the ne-, was pronounced as a trisyllable.

§ 150. Vowel-contraction in compounds in the early dramatists. Coerce (dissyll.) is found in Ennius, Trag. 47 R.:

gradere àtique atrocem coerce confidéntiam
(cf. l. 345); and in Plautus dearture (Copt. 640, 672), deuclara (Mil. 884); deoseculari (Cas. 136, 453, 454, 467) are quadrissyllables. But dehortari (four syllables) stands in contrast to hortari in Poen. 674—

neque vós hortari nèque dehortari decet.

(Ennius, Ann. 401 has the same verb in Tmesis: de me hortatur.) The phrase coemptionalis sene, used of old, and therefore valueless, slaves who were bought not singly but in numbers (from coemere, to buy in a lump) is irreverently applied to his master by the cunning slave in the Bacchides, 976—

nunc Priámo nostro si est quis emptor, coemptionálém senem uendam ego,

where the word coemptionalem is scanned with five syllables, as cohonestat appears in the form conestat in a line of Accius (Trag. 445 R.)—

pró se quisque cùm corona clárum conestát caput. (MSS. conestat, constat.)

Of the compounds of hōbeo, ēbeo always has the contracted form in Plautus; cohibeo may in all cases scan as cībeo, and prohibeo as prōbeo; præbeo is sometimes spelt praehibeo in the MSS., but the scansion may always be trisyllabic, and must be so in Merc. 1023; and the same holds true of all the older poets. At Terence we find only prendo and reprendo, not prehendo (unless possibly Andr. 353), nor reprehendo (from præ and *hendo). (For other instances, see Klotz, Alröm. Metrik, p. 139.) In the classical literature the full forms of these verbs are generally restored [but e. g. cōgo from *co-agó, cōgito from *co-agito (ch. viii. § 31), ēbeo, præbeo, &c.], though Derivative words often retain the shorter form, e. g. cópula from *co-apula, from ὅπερ, to fasten; praeta for *praec-heda (cf. prehendo); praetium from *praec-emio (cf. eximius from ex-èmio), &c. (see ch. v. § 4).

Cópi Perf., with its O. Lat. Present coepio, comes from an old verb ὅπερ (cf. épisor) meaning ‘to fasten’ (Paul. Fest. 14. 2. Th. comprehendere antiqui vinculo ‘āpere’ dicebant), derivatives of which are aptus, aptare, as well as cópula just mentioned. In the Perfect we should expect cópí like cógí from cógo (co-agó), and this scansion is occasionally found, as in this hexameter line (usually referred to Ennius’ Annals) (536 M.)—

rex ambas intra fossam retinere coepit
Like dissyllabic coepi (the usual scansion both in the early and in the classical poetry) is Terence's trisyll. coemisse (Ad. 225).

§ 151. Synizesis in Late and Vulgar Latin. For a list of spellings from late inscriptions and from MSS. like quesco (for quiesco), Febrarius (Ital. Febraro, Span. Febro, &c.), see Schuchardt, Vok. ii. pp. 444 sqq., and cf. Georges, Lex. Wortf. s.v. vird(i)arium, sessu(i)alter, vac(i)facio, ventr(i)osus, sem(i)cernis, sem(i)-ustus, sem(i)uncia, vitr(e)arium, al(e)arium. All these show suppression of à (æ), í (y) before an accented vowel, long by nature or by position. Similarly Lat. coactus has become Ital. quatto, Prov. quait, Span. cacho, through Vulg. Lat. *quattus (from *creactus), Lat. coägatum, Ital. quagliao, Span. cuajío, and so on. Forms with Synizesis occasionally appear in the Latin Poets (classical as well as ante-classical), e.g. praemjatores, Naevius, Com. 17 R., injorjatum, Lucilius ii. 9. M., malvisti, id. Inc. fr. ix M., genea, tenzia, axtelae (with the first syllables of these three words scanned long by position) (see Luc. Müller, De Ré Metriæ, pp. 249 sqq.). (On 'seyo' or 'seiö,' see Charisius, p. 16. 9 K.)

§ 152. Other examples of vowel-contraction. Nil from nihil (always monosyllabic in Plautus); némo from *ne-hemo; dissyllabic deinde, pröinde (according to the grammarians these were accented on the first syllable; see next chapter, and cf. the Plautine scansion périnde, Stich. 520); oímbruro for *co-ambruro; hinsus for *bi-hinsus, 'of two winters' (cf. Engl. 'twinter,' meaning a two-year old beast) from hiems: òpia and O. Lat. òpí- Adj. for *co-opía, *co-öpis- (cf. in-öpi-); antelac (see § 58 for other examples of the loss of intervocalic h with contraction). The loss of intervocalic æ, y led to contraction in words like dittor for dicitor, áinus a form of ávhus, stò for *stàyó (Umbr. stahu, ch. viii. § 2) (but e and o do not coalesce in môme, pleo, &c., nor æ and accented æ in áhëmus); on these see ch. iv. §§ 66 and 70. So did the loss of intervocalic m in ògò for *öm ogłos, &c., (unless cò was a by-form of com, ch. ix. § 22). The tendency to contraction of vowels appears at all stages of the history of Latin, and asserted itself in colloquial Latin even more than in the literary language. (For a fuller list of examples see Stolz in Müller's Handbuch, ii. p. 275). (On the merging of ì in a following ì, ù in a following ù, see § 48.)

§ 153. Elision. Elision of a final vowel, or vowel preceding final -m, before the initial vowel (or h with vowel) of a following word is a feature of Latin poetry. That it was also practised in speaking we see from passages like Cicero, Orator, xliv. § 150; xlv. § 152; Quint. ix. 4. 33; xi. 3. 33–34; Seneca, Epp. 40 [cf. Cicero's story of Crassus mistaking Cauneas (se. ficus vendo) for cave ne eas; Div. ii. 40]. Marius Sacerdos (448. 6 K.) says that in reading a line like Virgil's monstrum horréndum, &c., the final -um of monstrum was entirely suppressed, but this does not quite agree with the statement of Probus (ap. Gell. xiii. 21. 6) that turrim had a more melodious sound than turrem in the line turrim in praecipiiti stantem, &c. In the Saturnian Poetry a final syllable ending in -m seems to have been not elided but left in
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prosodical hiatus (see § 65), like the -um of circum in the compounds circumago, circumeo, or of sublatum, &c., in the forms sublatuiri, &c. (ch. viii. § 87), and the same treatment is found occasionally in the older poets, e.g. Ennius (Ann. 354 M.) (quoted by Prisician i. p. 30 H.) millia militum octo, and even in the Augustan poets with monosyllables, e.g. nūm abest Hor.; a final long vowel was also shortened, not elided, like any long vowel before another vowel in the middle of a Latin word, e.g. pré-hendo, illūs, and so in the older poets frequently, occasionally in Augustan poetry, e.g. quī amant, Virg., Esquilinaē alites, Hor. (see § 143). This must be a native usage, and not an imitation of Greek poetry. Cicero’s remarks on this subject may be quoted (Orat. xlv. 152): nobis, ne si cupiamus quidem distrahere voces conceditur: indicant orationes illae ipsae horridulae Catonis, indicant omnes poetae praeter eos, qui, ut versum facerent, saepe hiabant, ut Naevius:

uos, qui accolitis Histrum fluuium atque algidam.

et ibidem:

quam numquam uobis Grai atque barbari;

at Ennius semel:

Scipio inuicete;

et quidem nos:

hoc motu radiantis Etesiae in uada ponti:

hoc idem nostri saepius non tulissent, quod Graeci laudare etiam solent. How far they indicate a change in actual pronunciation or in the mere technique of verse-making is doubtful (cf. ch. iii. § 41).

§ 154. Parasitic vowels (cf. §§ 72, 102, and ch. iii. § 13). When two adjoining consonants are not easily pronounced together a vowel is often inserted to facilitate pronunciation. This is called Anaptyxis. The inserted or ‘parasitic’ vowel (sometimes styled in the terminology of the Sanscrit grammarians ‘svarabhaktic’ vowel, from Sansc. svara-bhakti-‘partial vowel’) is often seen in the older Latin loanwords from Greek, when the Greek word contained a combination of consonants which was not easily pronounced by Roman lips. A Roman did not begin a word
with the letters \textit{mn}-, as the Greeks often did, so the Greek \textit{µvâ} took in Latin the form \textit{miva}, just as in French the Low German \textit{knif} became \textit{canif}; similarly we find in Plautus \textit{tēchina} (e.g. \textit{Poen. 817}), \textit{drāchīma} and the like. Marius Victorinus (8. 6 K.) says that the un-Latin character of the combination \textit{cm} produced the forms \textit{Alcīmeo}, \textit{Alcīmēna} (so on an old Praenestine mirror, \textit{C. I. L.} xiv. 4102), \textit{Tēcīmessa}, and adds that the tragedian Julius Caesar Vopiscus (an older contemporary of Cicero) was the first to conform the third word to the Greek \textit{Τέκμησσα}, writing the title of his tragedy \textit{Tecmessa}, and ordering the actors to pronounce the name in this way on the stage (cf. Prisc. i. 29. 5 H.). (For a list of Greek words so treated, see Ritschl, \textit{Opusc.} ii. pp. 469–523.) The same thing is found in native Latin words. The suffix \textit{tlo-} (ch. v. § 25), for example, which indicates the instrument with which an action is performed, or the place of its performance, is in Lat. -\textit{culo-}, as well as -\textit{clo-}, e.g. \textit{vēhīcūlum}, ‘that by which one is carried’ (in Plautus always \textit{vēhīcūlum}), \textit{cūbicūlum}, ‘the place where one lies down.’ In Plautus the -\textit{clo-} form is the more usual, especially after a long vowel; e.g. \textit{pēricūlum} is a quadrisyllable only at the end of a line (i.e. through metrical necessity) in his plays, so that in his time the parasitic vowel between \textit{e} and \textit{l} had not quite asserted its claim to rank as a separate syllable (see § 102), though between consonants of less affinity, e.g. \textit{b} and \textit{l} in the ending -\textit{būlum}, it is normal; he uses both \textit{pōpulus} and \textit{pōplus} (the latter only at the end of a line) (cf. \textit{pilumnoe poploe}, quoted from the Carmen Saliare by Festus, 244. 24 Th., a phrase for the javelin-bearing Romans). On the oldest inscriptions we have \textit{poplo-} (e.g. \textit{poplus}, \textit{C. I. L.} ii. 5041, of 189 B.C.; \textit{poplom} on the (restored) Columna Rostrata, \textit{pro poplo Ariminesi, Not. Scav.} 1887, p. 120); \textit{piaculum} (\textit{C. I. L.} xi. 4766) may be like \textit{cedre} ‘caedere’ due to Umbrian influence; but \textit{pocom} on the early Praenestine vases (\textit{C. I. L.} i. 43 sqq.), \textit{tabola} (i. 197, 198), &c. (Marius Victorinus, if we can trust the reading, quotes from the ‘libri antiqui foederum et regum’ \textit{piacolom} with \textit{populoi Romanoii}.) At a later time the spelling -\textit{cūl-} established itself so firmly in the language that it became impossible to discriminate an original -\textit{co-ło}, e.g. \textit{cor-cu-lum} (formed with the diminutive suffixes \textit{ko-} and \textit{lo-}, ch. v.), \textit{por-}
culus for *porco-lo-*, from an original -clo-; and still later the wave of Syncope which swept over the language reduced all these forms to the same type, porclus, stablum, cubiculum, &c. (see ch. iii. § 13).

Anaptyxis played a great part in the Oscan language, and its kindred dialect, the Pelignian. We have in Oscan aragetud for Lat. argento (Abl.), Helevis for Lat. Helvius, teremenniu for *terminia* (Lat. termini), with liquid preceding; and with liquid following, paterei (Lat. pātri), Sadiriis (Lat. Satrius), in Pelignian sacaracirix (Lat. sācrātrices), pristafalacirix (Lat. praeśtabūlātrices), and so on. The inserted vowel takes the quality of the vowel in the syllable containing the liquid, e.g. aragetud for *ar-getud*, paterei for *pa-trei* (so Lat. stabulum for *sta-blum*) stabulis for *sta-blis*. The long preceding syllable is the reason of its absence in Osc. maatreis (Lat. matris) (cf. O. H. G. hlūtres beside fōgales and Plautus’ preference of periclum, &c.). It is not found in the initial syllable, so that Terebonio (C. I. L. i. 190), if a dialectal form, does not belong to the Oscan dialect (cf. Terebuni, Eph. Epigr. i. 116; Ital. calabrone from Lat. crabro, a ‘hornet’). Accentuation often seems to influence its presence or absence in Latin; for example, Plautus has usually mānūplāris (once at least manipularis), as in classical Latin discēpus stands beside disciplina. But the cross-working of Anaptyxis and Syncope, and the difficulty of ascertaining in which words a suffix has been directly added to a stem ending in a consonant, and in which there was originally an intervening vowel (ch. v. § 21) has hitherto prevented the drawing up of exact rules for its use in the language. [A full list of Latin examples will be found in Stolz, Lat. Gram. (in Müller’s Handb. Klass. Alterthumswissenschaft) p. 277 (2nd ed.) (see also above, § 102)].

1 Varro’s derivation of the name Græchus, ‘a gerendo’ (Lib. Gramm. p. 184, Wilm.), suggests a pronunciation like G*racchus*. 
§ 1. Nature of the Latin Accent. Was the Latin accent one of pitch or stress? Did the accented syllable in a Latin word differ from the other syllables in being uttered at a higher note than they were, or with a greater force? The two things are obviously quite distinct. For a syllable to be sounded at a high or low note is one thing, with energy or with gentleness is another, just as a musical note may be sounded strongly or gently (forte or piano), a thing quite different from its being a note high or low on the musical scale. Most languages do indeed combine in a greater or less degree pitch-accent with stress-accent. The accented syllable, if pronounced with more energy than the unaccented, is generally at the same time pronounced at a slightly higher (or lower) pitch. But, for all that, it is usually possible to say decidedly of one language: this language has a stress-accent; of another: this language has a pitch-accent. Our own language for example is clearly a language of stress-accent. It distinguishes its accented syllables by giving them greater energy of articulation than the unaccented; and it shows the usual characteristics of a language with stress-accentuation, namely, a slurring or Syncope of short syllables immediately following the accented syllable (e.g. ‘méd(i)cine’; cf. dám(o)sel,’ ‘fánt(a)sy’ and ‘fancy,’) and an obscuring or reduction of unaccented vowels (e.g. ‘father,’ where the e has the sound of the

---

1 Seelmann, Aussprache des Latein, Heilbronn, 1885, is the chief exponent of the stress-theory; Weil et Benloew, Théorie générale de l’Accentuation Latine, Paris, 1855, of the pitch-theory. For sentence-accentuation, see the Class. Rev. v. pp. 373, 402.
'obscure' vowel of the word 'but'; 'savage,' 'minute,' 'orange'). In a long word, say the adjective 'characteristical,' we might number each syllable according to the amount of force with which it is uttered, the strongest (with the main accent) being the fourth syllable of the word, the next strongest (with the secondary accent) the first. The weakest syllables are, as is usually the case with stress-accentuation, those following immediately on the most strongly accented, thus 'characteristical.' In the Romance languages the accent is, like ours, an accent of stress, but this stress is much weaker than ours, corresponding to our secondary stress rather than to our main accent. This is notably the case in French, where the stress is weaker than it is, for example, in Italian. But the Romance languages show the same tendency to syncope of short unaccented syllables, and to the reduction of unaccented vowels, as our language does, though in a much less marked degree (e.g. Italian gridare from Latin quiritare, balsimo from Latin balsamum). Pitch-accentuation is seen in English more in the accentuation of the sentence than of single words. A question like 'Are you ready?' differs by its rising tone from a statement of fact like 'He is ready.' In some languages however, such as Swedish, Lithuanian, Servian, these tone-distinctions are clearly marked in single words, a word of the same spelling as another being often distinguished from it by the tone alone. In English we have no example of this, unless it be such a word as 'rather,' which by a difference of tone can imply two different meanings, in answer to a question like 'Is it raining?' If we are asked, 'Is it raining?' and reply 'Rather,' the word, if we give it one tone, will imply 'slightly,' 'not much,' with another tone will convey the notion of 'heavily,' 'violently.' But in the main the distinctions of tone are unknown in our language; and it is this that makes it difficult for us to understand the nature of a language which uses entirely or predominantly a pitch-accentuation, such as in ancient times the Greek language, and of living languages, Chinese. In the case of a dead language, we have two means of ascertaining whether its accent was one of pitch or of stress. We have the phenomena of the language itself on the one hand, and we have the statements of native grammarians, if they are
trustworthy, on the other. Both these means of evidence point to the pitch-character of the ancient Greek accent. The words of the language do not show that Syncope and Reduction of unaccented vowels, which we have seen to be characteristic effects of a stress-accent. The Greek grammarians' accounts of the accent of their own language point in the same direction. Modern Greek has, however, a stress-accentuation, so that the Greek accent must have changed its nature in the course of time, though at what precise period the change took place it is difficult to say. No doubt the nature of the accent differed more or less in different parts of Greece; and the accent in one dialect may have allowed stress to predominate over tone at an earlier period than in another (in the N. Greek dialects, for example, as in the N. Greek dialects of modern times; see Hatzidakis, K. Z. xxx. 388). The accent is taken into account in Greek metre in the verse of Babrius, a contemporary probably of Augustus, and author of a verse translation of Aesop's fables.

When we turn our attention to Latin, we are confronted with the difficulty that, while the Latin grammarians often speak of their accent in terms properly applicable only to a pitch-accent, all the features of their language point to its having been a stress-accent. The reduction of the unaccented vowel (e.g. ábígo, &c., but Greek ἀπάγω, &c.), the Syncope of syllables following the accent (e.g. obtúrgo from obtúrigo, caldus from cálidus), all indicate unmistakably the presence of a stress-accent. And the difference of its accentuation from Greek, though not a single grammarian definitely informs us of this difference, comes out clearly in the treatment of Greek loan-words, especially in the language of the less educated Romans. Greek Σωφία (with short ι) became Sófia, a stress-accent replacing the pitch-accent with the result of lengthening the accented vowel; Greek εἰδωλον became ιδολον. Instances like these show that the Romans had much the same difficulty as we have, in pronouncing Greek words with a short accented paenultima, or with an accented antepaenultima and long penult. The difficulty would not be so great for a Roman as for us, if his stress-accent, like that of his modern descendant, the Italian, was not so strong as ours; nor would it be so much felt at an earlier period, when
the distinctions of quantity were more vividly marked (see ch. ii. § 141) than in the later Empire. The Hungarian language, where the sense of quantity is equally vivid, accentuates the first syllable of every word without detracting from the quantity of vowels in the following syllables. No doubt too the nature of the stress-accent would differ in various parts of Italy in ancient times, as it does to-day (see Meyer-Lübke, Ital. Gram. § 122, p. 71). In Praeneste, if we are to believe such indications as the spelling mgolnia for the name Magolnia on inscriptions, and perhaps the form conea for ciconia, 'a stork,' Syncope was carried to greater lengths than in Latin, and the stress of the accent must have been stronger (see § 14 below). But that the Latin language of all periods, at which we have definite knowledge of it, was a language of stress-accentuation, is proved by all the evidence at our disposal, and disproved by nothing except the silence of the grammarians. The same tendency to Syncope, which before the literary period produced undecim out of *ūnō-decim, is seen working in the Early Literary time in words like objurigo (Plaut.), objurgo (Plant. and Ter.), and in the Augustan age in calidus and calidus (the form preferred by the Emperor Augustus, Quint. i. 6. 19), while viridis for vīridis asserted itself still later, and the same tendency, as we have seen, still shows itself in modern Italian. And hand in hand with Syncope goes the reduction and change of unaccented vowels. How then are we to explain the absence of comment on the part of the grammarians? We must, I think, take three things into consideration. First, that the study of Accentuation, and all the terminology used, came to the Romans from Greece. It was Tyrannio who in the first cent. B.C. brought this new lore to Rome, including among his earliest pupils possibly Varro and certainly Cicero's friend Atticus. Cicero, in a letter which has been preserved (ad Att. xii. 6. 2), banters his friend on his enthusiasm for so trivial a subject (te istam tam tenuem thēoplaβ tam valde admiratum esse gaudeo . . . sed quaeo quid ex ista acuta et gravi refertur ad τέλεστ;?), and in his own treatise, the 'Orator,' published at this time, makes mention of the wonderful 'law of nature' which prescribes that the accent shall never be further from the end of a word than the third syllable (Or. xviii.
The word *accentus* itself was nothing but the Greek word ἀκτήν in a Latin dress; and not only the terms employed, but the description of the phenomena of accentuation are taken directly from Greek authorities.

In the second place, the contrast between their accent and the Greek would not be felt so markedly by Roman grammarians as it would by us, whose accent has so much stronger a stress than the Latin, or modern Italian, a consideration which makes it less surprising that they did not remark on the essential difference between the two systems of accentuation. And thirdly, the Greek accent itself had probably at the time of these grammarians already entered that process of change which ended in the stress-accentuation of modern Greek. The Greek writers on accentuation would no doubt go on using the terminology of the earlier phoneticians, without perceiving that their terms and descriptions were no longer so applicable to the actual phenomena as they had once been; and if the Greek contemporary theorists on accent misused the terminology in this way, a Roman imitator might be excused for carrying the misuse a little further, in applying the same terminology to Latin accentuation. Indeed, the writers on Latin Grammar were seldom Roman by birth; they were usually Greeks, and would have the same difficulties in describing the Latin accent as a Frenchman in describing the strong stress-accent of English. These considerations may explain how it is that only a few statements of the writers on Latin Grammar are rid of the terms 'high' and 'low' (instead of 'strong' and 'weak') accent, such as the remark of a fifth-century grammarian, that the accented syllable in a Latin word is the syllable which would be heard at a distance, when the others were inaudible (quoted in § 2). We may then believe the Latin accent to have been in the main an accent of stress, like that of modern Italian, though like it (and the accent of the Romance languages generally), the stress-accent may have been accompanied by a higher tone than the tone of the unstressed syllables.

The discredit, which we have found it necessary to attach to the language the grammarians use in describing the nature of accentuation, makes us hesitate about accepting their distinction,
1.

**ACCENTUATION OF WORD.**

evidently borrowed from the Greek, of three kinds of accent,—grave, acute, and circumflex. They postulate a circumflex for those syllables with naturally long vowels which would have one in Greek, namely, long paenultimas followed by a short final syllable, e.g. *Róma* but *Rómae*. The quantity of the final syllable is the chief factor in Greek accentuation, but not in Latin, where the quantity of the paenultima takes its place, so that one would not expect the accent of the first syllable of *Romā* to differ from that of *Romae*. Other circumflex words are, according to the grammarians, long monosyllables like *rēs, flōs, mōs*, and final long syllables of words whose last vowel has been dropped by Apocope or Synecope, e.g. *illīc* from *illicē, nostrās* from *nostrālis*. In modern Italian these apocopated words have a strong acute accent on the final syllable, e.g. *bontā, cittā, virtū*, for *bonitatem, civitatem, virtutem*, but in Spanish a word like *amō* (Latin *āmāvit, Vulg. Lat. *āmāvit*) has a tone-circumflex in the last syllable, the voice rising first and then falling slightly. There is hardly evidence enough to enable us to test this theory of a circumflex in Latin, nor to show, supposing such an accent did exist, whether it was a tone-circumflex, formed of a rising and falling tone, like Spanish *amō* or our ‘Oh!’ when used sarcastically, or a stress-‘circumflex,’ formed by two impulses of the voice, something like our diphthongal pronunciation of a long vowel, e.g. ‘foe,’ ‘two.’ In modern Italian a paenultima long by position has a very long pronunciation, and we might write a circumflex accent over the first syllable of words like *tanto* (pronounce ‘tânto’), *tempo* (pronounce ‘tēmpo’), while the different treatment of a Latin penultimate from a Latin ante-penultimate vowel in words like *popolo* (Lat. *pōpolus*), *uopo* (Lat. *opus*), suggest the possibility of a Latin *Rōma, &c. as distinct from Rōmulus, &c.*

On the whole, then, we may say that a circumflex accent may have existed in Latin in words like *flōs, illīc*, and even in *Rōma* (though the grammarians’ distinction of *Rōma, Rōmae* is doubtful), but that certainty on this matter is not to be had. The Latin accent was an accent of stress, a stress which was not so strong as ours, and which may have been accompanied, as in Romance, by a high tone.
§ 2. Testimony of the grammarians. (1) On the Nature of the Latin Accent. The remarks of the Latin grammarians on accentuation have been collected by Schoell, De Accentu linguae Latinae (in the Acta Soc. Philolog. Lipsiensis, vol. vi. 1876). They include remarks not only on accentuation, but on proper pronunciation generally; for accentus is often defined as ‘viticorens vocis artificiosa pronuntiatio’ (ib. p. 78). Here are one or two of the more important descriptions of the Latin accent. Varro, who probably learnt the theory of accentuation from Tyrannio (Schoell, ib. p. 6), speaks of the attitudo of a word as opposed to its longitudo (i.e. the quantity of the syllable). By attitudo he means its accentuation, cum pars verbi aut in grave deprimitur aut sublimatur in acutum (ap. Serg. de Acc. p. 525. 28 K.) (cf. ib. p. 533. 4 cum verbum enuntiatur aliqua in eo syllaba necesse est summum illud vocis fastigium possis de). His imitator, Martianus Capella (fourth and fifth cent. a.d.) (iii. p. 65. 19 Eyss.), prettily describes accentuation as ‘ anima vocis et seminariwm musices,’ adding, quod omnis modulatio ex fastigii vocem gravitateque componitur; and Nigidius, a contemporary of Varro (ap. Gell. xiii. 26. 1–3 H.), describes the accentuation Videi by the words summatocono est prima, deinde gradatim descendunt (cf. Audae. exc. 7. 357. 14–358. 1 K.). On the other hand Pompeius (fifth century a.d.) (5. 126–7 K.) uses language suitable to stress-accentuation (plus sonat), when he says, illa syllaba, quae accentum habet, plus sonat, quasi ipsa habet majorem potestatem, and goes on to explain the accent of the syllable of the word optimus being the only syllable heard at a distance, finge tibi quasi vocem clamantis ad longe aliquem positam, ut puta finge tibi aliquem illo loco contra stare et clama ad ipsum. cum coeperis clamare, naturalis ratio exiguit ut unam syllabam plus dieas a reliquis illius verbi; et quam videris plus sonare a ceteris, ipsa habet accentum. ‘optimus,’ quae plus sonat? illa quae prior est. numquid hic sonat ‘ti’ et ‘mus’ quemadmodum ‘op’? Ergo necesse est, ut illa syllaba habeat accentum, quae plus sonat a reliquis, quando clamorem fingimus. [The same language is used by Servius (fourth cent.), in Don. iv. 426. 10–20 K.). Some would explain this difference of language by supposing the Latin accent in the time of Varro to have been more of a pitch-accent than it was in the time of Pompeius, while others try to make out that it is those grammarians who were themselves Greeks, or who follow implicitly Greek authorities, who speak of ‘high’ and ‘low’ accent, while the native grammarians of a more independent turn of mind use the more correct terms, ‘strong’ and ‘weak.’ I cannot see much ground for discriminating between the accent of Varro’s time and of a later age. The same processes of syncope and vowel-reduction are at work at both periods and the cause of these processes must have been the same stress-accentuation. But there may well have been a change in the Greek accentuation which became more and more apparent in each successive century.

(2) On the circumflex accent. Servius (in Don. 426. 10 K.) distinguishes the acute accent of ārma from the circumflex of Miṣṣa, acutus dicitur accentus quotiens cursim syllabam proferimus, ut ‘ārma’; circumflexus vero, quotiens tractim, ut ‘Miṣṣa’ (cf. Pompeius, 126. 4 K. non possimus dicere ‘ārma,’ non possimus dicere ‘Miṣṣa’; Cledonius, p. 31. 30 K. ‘ārma’ excusso sono dicendum est, while ‘Rōma’ is pronounced tractim). Similarly Priscian (i. p. 7. 11 H.) speaks of three different sounds of ā, with the acute, the grave, and the circumflex accent, as in hāmis, hāmorum, hāmus, or ārae, ārorum, āra,
and Vitruvius, in a passage borrowed apparently from Aristoxenus, says of the words sol, lux, flos, vox, nec unde incipit nec ubi desinit [sc. vox] intelligitur, sed quod [v. l. nec quae] ex acuta facta est gravis, ex gravi acuta. (Archit. v. 4. 2).

§ 3. Accentuation of Greek loanwords. (See the passages quoted by Schoell, pp. 201 sqq.) An educated Roman would of course pronounce a Greek word correctly with the same quantity and accentuation that the Greeks themselves gave to it. The grammarians of the Empire prescribe the Greek accentuation for such Greek words in a Latin author as retained their Greek form and declension. Thus in Virg. Georg. i. 59 Eliadum palmas Epiros equarum; Servius, in his note on the passage, says that the word Epiros, since it has its Greek form, must be pronounced with the accent on the first syllable, Ἐπίρος, unlike the Latinized form Epirus: sane ‘Epiros’ græce profertur, unde etiam ‘E’ habet accentum; nam si latinum esset, ‘Epirus,’ ‘pi’ haberet, quia longa est. But Greek loanwords which became naturalized at Rome were adapted to the Latin accentuation and declension. This was specially the case in the Republican period, according to Quintilian (i. 5. 60), who tells us that Julius Caesar followed the old habit of using Calypsomem, a form which Quintilian himself does not approve, though he accepts Castorem, Olympos, tyrannus. In the plays of Plautus, who uses the language of the educated society of his day, Greek words appear as a rule in a Latinized form with a Latin accent, but in some words of use among the common people the Greek accent is retained with the effect of altering the quantity. Thus the gold coin known as a ‘Philip,’ Greek Φίλαππος, is always Philippus with the second syllable shortened after an accented short syllable. The shortening of the second syllable, long by position not by nature, is, like the reduction of the vowel in Tarentum (Greek Τάραντα, Accus., now Táranto), an indication that the Roman accent in early times, as well as late, produced an effect on the word that the Greek accent did not produce, an effect always traceable to a stress-accentuation. But whether a naturally long vowel was at this period ever shortened by the accent in a Greek loanword is doubtful. Ancōra (Greek ἄγκυρα), with o instead of v, is not a certain example, and still less the hypothetical cūnīla (Greek κοῦνια, not κόνια) in Plaut Trin. 935 (Journ. Phil. xxi. 205). It
was frequently done at a later age when the long and short quantity had more approximated to each other (see ch. ii. § 141), e.g. *bilirrum* (Greek βούτρον), *bläsfeum* (Greek βλάσφημος), *údolum* (Greek εὐδωλον), *érwmos* (Greek ἔρημος beside ἄρημος), *selinnum* (Greek σέλινον), our 'celery.' In all these popular words which passed into the Romance languages (Ital. ermo, sedano, &c.) the rule seems to be that the Greek accent was always retained, even at the cost of the quantity, except in oxytone words, which followed rather the Latin accentuation, e.g. *tapinus* (Greek ταπίνος) [see Meyer-Lübke, Gram. Rom. Sprach. i. p. 34, and cf. Anecd. Helv. 177. 4 H, on 'abyssus' (ἀβύσσος): paenultima positione longa sed accuitur antepaenultima. So *abyssus* Paulinus of Nola (19. 651; 35. 228); Cyprian, Gall. gen. 288 P.]. This inability of the Romans to reproduce the Greek accentuation of a final syllable is a subject of frequent remark in the grammarians. A Greek writer of the sixth cent. (Olympiodorus in Aristot. Meteor. p. 27) makes the curious remark that the Roman paroxytone pronunciation of words like Γρακώί, &c., was due to their haughtiness (διὰ τῶν κόμπων), and had earned for them the epithet of the 'overweening' Romans (ὅθεν ὑπερηνορεόντες ἐκλήθησαν ὑπὸ τῶν πωμτῶν). I have heard a Frenchman ascribe the English mispronunciation of words like 'Francais' to the same cause.

§ 4. Romance Accentuation. The clearness with which each part of the word is pronounced in Italian and Spanish always strikes an English traveller. Every syllable has due effect given to it. There is nothing like the swallowing of parts of words, that is seen in our own and in other Teutonic languages. The unaccented vowel in Italian notte, Spanish noche, is clearer and more definite than in German Gabe; but on the other hand there is less difference in quantity between a long and a short vowel, the accented long vowel in the word 'Toscana,' for example, being hardly, if at all, longer than the unaccented vowels of the word. The accent is one of stress, but is accompanied by a high tone, the drop of the voice in a Spanish word like mano (Lat. manus), being about one-fifth, \[\text{\textipa{m\text{\'\text{n}}}}\], though sometimes in emphatic utterance the word is pronounced with
a lengthening of final vowel and a slight rise of the voice on
the second, the unaccented, syllable, \( \text{mano} \). The French accent
must have at one time been of very powerful stress, so great is
the reduction which French vowels and syllables have undergone,
but it is now much weaker than in any other Romance language,
so weak that it is usually difficult to say on which syllable the
accent rests. The difference of pitch, say between the two syl-
lables of the word ‘jamais!’ is often very considerable, especially
in excited utterance, \( \text{ja-mais!} \) or \( \text{ja-mais!} \) (see Storm in Phoun.
Stud. 1888).

§ 5. The Earlier Law of Accentuation. The Indo-European
accentuation, which we can generally ascertain from the Sanscrit
and Greek (e.g. Sansc. pitá, Greek \( \pi\alpha\tau\iota\rho \), father), has not left in
Latin the traces which it has left in the Teutonic languages.
According to a law discovered by Verner, and known as ‘Verner’s
Law,’ a Teutonic spirant, developed from an Indo-European
unvoiced mute, remained unvoiced when the immediately pre-
ceding vowel bore the accent in the Indo-European, but became
voiced when that vowel did not. The Indo-European verb
\( *\text{wértō } \), to turn or become (Sanscr. várťami, Lat. \( \text{vērītō} \)), is in
Goth, \( \text{vaɪrja} \) (our ‘worth’ in ‘Woe worth the day!’) with the
unvoiced-spirant sound (our \( \text{th} \) in ‘thin’); while Gothic fadar
(Engl. ‘father’) had the voiced-spirant sound of our \( \text{th} \) in ‘then.’
By the same law Indo-European \( s \) appears in Teutonic words as
unvoiced or voiced under the same conditions, e.g. unvoiced in
Old High Germ. \( \text{mūs} \), our ‘mouse’ from Indo-Eur. \( *\text{mūs} \) (Sanscr.
\( \text{mūs} \), Gk. \( \mu\varepsilon \), Lat. \( \text{mūs} \)), where the immediately preceding vowel
had the accent, voiced in Goth. \( \text{āiza-} \), our ‘ore’ from Indo-Eur.
\( *\text{āyos} \) (Sanscr. \( \text{āyās} \), Lat. \( \text{aes} \)), where the Indo-European accent fell
on another vowel. (On the change of voiced \( s \) to \( r \) in Latin, see
ch. iv. § 148). The Lithuanian accentuation, too, often enables us,
when we compare it with the Greek, to determine in what cases
the Indo-European accent was ‘circumflex,’ and in what cases
‘acute,’ e.g. circumflex in Gen. Sg. of Ā-stems (Greek \( \tau\omega\iota\varepsilon \), Lith.
\( \text{rankōs} \)), acute in Nom. Sg. of the same stems (Greek \( \tau\omega\iota\iota \), Lith.
\( \text{rankā} \) from \( *\text{rankā} \)) (see Hirt’s articles in Indogerm. Forsch. i. &c.).

We have, however, in Latin, as Corssen proved, traces of an
older accentuation than the system which prevailed in the classical period, which show us that at some early time the Indo-European accent-law had been replaced by a new law, namely, that the accent should fall on the first syllable of every word. A change of the same kind seems to have taken place in the Teutonic languages (see Paul's Grundriss Germ. Philol. i. p. 339), and probably also in Celtic (Thurneysen in Revue celtique, vol. vi); and in some languages of the present day, such as Lettish, this uniform accentuation of the first syllable prevails. The traces it has left in Latin are these:

(1) Syncope of the second syllable of a word when that syllable was short, e.g. *undecim, which under the ordinary Latin accentuation must have been *unódecim, a compound of unus and décem (see § 13).

(2) Reduction of vowels, which would by the accentuation of the classical period bear the accent, e.g. infringó from in and frango; concído from cum and caedo; triennium from tri- (tres) and annus; which point unmistakably to an earlier *cóncaido, *tríannniom, &c. (see § 18). At what precise period the change, no doubt a gradual one, from this earlier system to the Paenultima Law of Cicero's time began and completed itself, it is difficult to ascertain. But there is some evidence that it was still incomplete in one particular in the period of the Early Drama, for the metrical treatment of words like facilius, mulierem (ωω), in the plays of Plautus and Terence, indicate that the pronunciation of such words in their time laid the accent on the first, and not on the second syllable. A line in which the metrical ictus falls on the second syllable occurs very rarely in their plays (Philologus, li. 364 sqq.). At the same time the incidence of the metrical ictus in all other types of words points to the prevalence of the Paenultima Law for all words, except these quadrisyllables with the first three syllables short. But though we cannot fix the time when Latin words passed from the old to the new accentuation, when, for example, sápiéntia became sapíéntia, témpesťátibús became témpesťátibús, we can guess, partly from the analogy of other languages, partly from the inherent probabilities of the case, what the nature of that change was. A long word like sápiéntia, témpesťátibús must have had at all periods a secondary
as well as a main accent; it could hardly be pronounced otherwise, as we can see from our own pronunciation of such words as 'characteristical' (with secondary accent on first, main accent on fourth syllable). So that *säpiëntia would be more accurately written *säpiëntia. The change from the old accentuation to the new would be, in reality, nothing but a usurpation by the secondary accent of the prominence of the main accent; *säpiëntia would become säpiëntia, témpestatibus would become témpestatibus. Dimidius, unless it takes its -mi- by analogy of dimidiatius, &c. (which is unlikely), must have been accentuated on the first syllable about 250 B.C., for the change of unaccented e to i is not found on the oldest inscriptions (§ 22).

The Umbro-Oscan dialects seem to have passed through the same stages as Latin. Traces of the first stage, the accentuation of the first syllable, are e.g. Osc. Maakdiis, Vezkei, 'Vetusco' (with syncope of the second syllable), of the second stage (the Paenultima Law), Osc. teremenniu, 'terminia,' with doubling of consonant before the y-sound and after the accented vowel (see von Plantā, Gramm. Osk.-Umbr. Dial. i. p. 589).

§ 6. Traces of I.-Eur. accentuation in Latin. The occasional appearance of ā for I.-Eur. ē in Latin has been explained by the I.-Eur. accentuation by Wharton (Etyma Latina, p. 119), who thinks that ē (and ū) became ā when they preceded the syllable which bore the I.-Eur. accent, e.g. magnus from *meg-ōs, Gk. μέγας. For other theories of the kind, see Bugge in Bezz. Beitr. xiv. 60. 67. 70; Froehde, ib. xvi. 182. 191. 215; Stolz in Wien. Stud. viii. 149; Conway, Verner's Law in Italy, &c. (on a trace of the I.-Eur. accent in Umbro-Oscan, von Plantā, i. p. 491).

§ 7. Secondary and main accent. The Saturnian verse recognizes this secondary accent, if we are right in regarding it as accentual and not quantitative verse, with three accents in the first hemistich and two in the second (see ch. ii. § 141),
e.g. dábunt málum Metéli || Naéuio poëtae.
For a five-syllabled word always counts for two accents in Saturnian verse,
e.g. mágna säpiëntia || multásque uirtútes,
e.g. dédet Témpestatibus || aíde méretod,
e.g. òneráriæ onústae || stábant in flústris;
and a four-syllabled word (at any rate of the forms – x – x and x – x) does the same at the beginning of the line,
e.g. immolābat áuream || uictimam pūlehram,
e.g. supérbiter contémptim || cónèrīt legiónes,
e.g. Cochnèius Lúcius || Scipio Barbátus.

A Latin secondary accent in long words such as *ormatāra is indicated by the Romance forms, which treat the vowel of the first syllable in the same way
as they treat accented a. Italian Florentino beside Firenze may point to the secondary accent having been stronger in the first syllable of Lat. Florentinus than of Lat. Florentia (cf. Ital. tollerare, scellerato, &c., with doubling of the consonant which follows the vowel with secondary accent) (see Meyer-Lübke, Gram. Rom. Sprach., i. p. 501). There are some indications (e.g. Alliteration) that the first syllable was even in the classical period pronounced with a certain amount of stress.

§ 8. The Paenultima Law. The law of accentuation which prevailed in the classical and subsequent periods is that known as the 'Paenultima Law,' a very simple one, namely, that the accent falls on the antepenultimate syllable, if the paenultima be short, on the paenultima itself, if long, e.g. dōōres, decōres. The earliest notice of Latin accentuation, the remark of Cicero (Or. xviii. 58) mentioned above (§ 1), speaks of it as a law of nature that the accent should never go further back in a word than the third syllable from the end. We have seen reason to believe that at an earlier period this 'law of nature' was broken in the case of four-syllabled words, like fācīlius, beginning with three short syllables. These were at the time of Plautus accented on the fourth syllable from the end, fācīlius, &c. But in all other words the evidence to be obtained from the versification of Plautus, and such processes of language as syncope and reduction of unaccented vowels, points to the operation of the Paenultima Law in the earliest literary period.

The Latin grammarians agree in pointing out the difference between the Greek and Roman systems of accentuation, and the greater simplicity of the Roman, which (like the Aeolic, and unlike the Attic, &c.) never lets the accent fall on the last syllable of a word; though they are strangely silent on the difference, which one would have thought would have been quite as striking, between the pitch-accent of the Greek, and the stress-accent of their own language. They posit for Latin the three kinds of accent used by the Greeks, the acute, the circumflex, and the grave, understanding by the last term rather the absence of accent than any particular form of accent, and assigning the circumflex, as we have seen, to vowels long by nature in the penultimate syllable of words whose final syllable is short, and in monosyllabic words. Thus the name Cēthōgōs, with a naturally long paenultima and a short final, takes the circum-
flex on the paenultima, Cethégus, and the grave accent on the antepaenultima, Cethégus; the name Cátullus, with a naturally short vowel in the paenultima, takes the acute accent instead of the circumflex, Cátullus, with the grave on the antepaenultima, as before, Cátullus.

Monosyllables like lux, spes, flos, sol, mons, mos, fons, lis, whose vowel is naturally long, have the circumflex, lux, spes, &c., while ars, pars, pix, uix, fax, with vowel naturally short and lengthened only by ‘position,’ take the acute accent, árs, párs, &c. Apocopated words like illíc, nostrás retain their old circumflex accent, illíc(e), nostrát(í)s.

A compound word, or word-group, like respúlica, júsjuранdum, málésanus, intércálābōcī, has only one accent, respúlica, mâlésanus, intéricałācī, &c., though, if resolved into two independent words, each takes its separate accent, rèsquē pública, mâlé sănus, intérca lōcī. Thus Argılētum, which the etymological fancy of the Romans explained as Argi letum, ‘the death of Argus,’ is mentioned as a unique example of a word combining all three accents, the acute on the first, the grave on the second, and the circumflex on the third syllable, Ârgilētum. (On these word-groups, see below, § 12.)

The secondary accent, which, as we have seen (§ 7), must have existed in longer words like àrbōrētum, tēmpērātus, íntēmērātus, exāstǐmātus, is ignored by the Roman grammarians, unless we are so to understand the media prosodia, mentioned by Varro, in imitation of the μέση προσφώνα of Greek Accentual Theorists, an accent which he describes as something between the grave (i.e. entire absence of accent) and the acute accent. The secondary accent shows traces of itself in Italian in the doubling of the consonant in words like pellegrino (Lat. pērēgrīnus), scellerato (Lat. scēlērātus), tollerare (Lat. tolerare), &c. (see above, § 7).

The simplicity of the Latin accentuation made it unnecessary to indicate by written signs the accent with which a word was to be pronounced. The mark of the Greek acute accent, a line sloping up from left to right, and placed above the vowel of the syllable, was used in Latin inscriptions to indicate a long vowel, and was called the ‘apex’ (see ch. i. § 1). It was employed
especially where two words of similar spelling differed in quantity alone, e.g. *mālus* and *mālus* (Quint. i. 7. 2), and has remained with a quantitative use in several alphabets derived from the Latin, e.g. the Irish alphabet.

§ 9. Testimony of the grammarians. Quintilian’s remarks on Latin pronunciation are generally so free from Greek bias, that his account of the Paenultima Law is worth quoting in full (i. 5. 29-31): difficillior apud Graecos observatio est [sc. legis sermonis], quia plura illis loquendi genera, quas *διακέρτως* vocant et quod alias vitiosum, interim alias rectum est; apud nos vero brevissima ratio. namque in omni voce acuta intrarum numerarum trium syllabarum continetur, sive eae sunt in verbo solae, sive ultimae, et in iis aut proxima extremai, aut ab ea tertia. Trium porro de quibus loquor, media longa aut acuta aut flexa erit, eodem loco brevis utique grave habebit sonum ideoque positam ante se, id est ab ultima tertiam, acuet. Est autem in omni voce utique acuta, sed nunquam plus una, nee unquam ultima, ideoque in disyllabis prior; praeterea nunquam in eadem flexa et acuta: itaque neutra cludet voce Latinam. Ea vero quae sunt syllabae unius, erunt acuta aut flexa, ne sit aliqua vox sine acuta. In another passage (xii. 10. 33) he praises the variety of the Greek accent in contrast to the monotonous accent of the Romans, who never give the acute or the circumflex to the last syllable of a word, so that every word has its last syllable, sometimes both its last syllable and its paenultima, grave (i.e. unaccented); and adds that Roman poets like to give a charm to their lines by the use of Greek names pronounced with the Greek accent. (For other similar statements of the Paenultima Law, see the passages quoted by Schoell pp. 100 sqq.: e.g. Diomedes 431. 6 K.; Donatus 371. 2 K.; Servius in Don. 426. 15 K. &c.) Examples are sōl, dōs, Cātillus, Cēthēgus (Sergius, De Acc. p. 483. 11 K.) inōcissimus (Pomp. 127. 15 K.), Caētius, Saltātius, Curātiōs, cāthum, Cicero, Galēnus, Galēni, Camilli (Mart. Cap. iii. p. 65. 22 Eyss.), Romānius, Hispānus (‘Priscian,’ De Acc. p. 520. 17 K.), āb, mēl, fel, ārs, pārs, pīx, nīx, fāx, lāx, spēs, flōs, sōl, mōns, mōs, fōns, līs (Diom. 431. 15 K.), nūx, rōs (Don. 371. 8 K.), nēc, nāx (Serv. in Don. 426. 27 K.), rōs (Serg. De Acc. 524. 21 K.), ās, ēl, quē (Pomp. 128. 15 K.), dēus, cītus, ādur, ārat, pōntus, cōhors, lūna, Rōma (Diom. 431. 18 K.), hōra, lēges, sālūs, hōmo (Dositheus 378. 1 K.), mēta, Crēta, nēpos, bōnus, mālus (Don. 371. 11 K.), marīnus, Crīspinus, amīcicus, Sabīnus, Quīrinus, lectica, Mētilius, Marcellus, lātēbrae, tēnebrae, Fīdelae, Athēnae, Thēbae, Cīmæae, tabellae, fenīstrae, Sērīgus, Mālius, āscia, fūscina, Žillus, Clādiōrus, Romāni, legātī, procurōres, praedīones (Diom. 431. 23 K.), &c.

Of compound words and word-groups with one accent (like our ‘son-in-law,’ ‘man-of-war,’ ‘pockethandkerchief,’ we have examples such as *malebīnus*, *interēloci* (Don. 371. 22 K.; Diom. 433. 30 K.; Pomp. 130. 18 K.; Cledonius 33. 12 K.). *Argiletum* (Prisc. ii. p. 113. 10 H.; but with all three accents, Mart. Cap. iii. p. 68. 15 Eyss.), *propediēm* [Don. ad Ter. Ad. v. 5. 7 (888)], respublica, *jusjurandum* (Prisc. i. p. 177. 10 H.; i. p. 180. 12 H.), *jurisperitus*, *legislator*, *praefectusurbis* and *praefectusurbi*, *tribunusplebis*, *tribunamplebi*, *mentocaput*, *orbisterrae*, *orbisterrarium*, *paterfamilias*, *paterfamiliarum*, *armipotentis*, *armorumponentes*, *magistermilitum*, *assrelats*, *acaculis*, *aresponsis*, *abacits* (Prisc. i. p. 183. 5 H.), *istusi-modi*, *hujusmodi*, *cujusmodi* (Prisc. i. p. 440. 2 H.). Of *hujuscēmodi*, &c., Priscian (i. p. 205. 16 H.) says that some regard them as two separate words, but the accent, resting as it does on the last syllable of the pronoun, shows that they
are compounds. He distinguishes the separate accentuation of decimus et septimus, &c. from the single accent of septimus-decimus, &c. (de Fig. Num. xxi. p. 413. ii. K.).

§ 10. Exceptions to the Paenultima Law. The rule of Latin Accentuation, that final syllables are always unaccented, is, according to the grammarians, violated, or apparently violated, by certain classes of words. They are words which have dropped or contracted their last syllable, so that the accent, which in the uncurtailed form fell on the paenultima, remains in the curtailed form on the same syllable, which has now become the ultima. Under this category come:—

(1) Nouns, or rather Adjectives, in -us, Gen. -atis, indicating the country of one's birth, e.g. cujús, nostrás, Arpinás, with primás, optimás. Caper ap. Prisc. i. p. 128. 23. These words, which in Early Latin (e.g. Plautus) have the full form cujús, nostrás, when at a later time they became contracted, retained their old accentuation; and so nostrás, 'a countryman of ours,' was distinguished by its accent from nostras, Acc. Pl. Fem. of the Possessive Pronoun (Priscian i. p. 454. ii. K.).

(2) Some Verbal Forms; addic, adduc, &c., famít (for fámárt), audit (for audíret), and the like (Servius ad Aen. iii. 3). Another remark of Servius (ad Aen. i. 451), and other grammarians, throws some light on the last example. They tell us that audit and not audít, lenít and not lenit, was the ordinary pronunciation, the forms with the short penult being an artificial usage of poetry, much as in English the word 'wind' is allowed a different pronunciation in poetry from its ordinary one. From -it to -it is so short a step that it is difficult to justify a disbelief of the grammarians' statements about audiít. The third Sing. Perf. Act. in Romance languages (e.g. Span. amo, Latin amávit, Ital. dormì, Latin dormívit) points to Vulgar Latin forms in accented -aut, -it (cf. -aut on graffiti of Pompeii, C. I. L. iv. 1391, 2048).

(3) Words ending in -e (the Enitic -ë), whose last syllable is long by nature or by position, e.g. adhéc, poshác, antehác, istëc, illëc, istëc, illëc, illinc, istëc, illëc, istëc, illëc (Caper ap. Prisc. i. p. 130. 2 H.). Vulgar Latin accentuation of the final vowel of illëc, illëc, &c. is indicated by the Romance adverbs, e.g. Ital. là, là, Span. allì, allì.

(4) Words ending in -n (the Enitic -né), whose last syllable is long by nature or by position, e.g. tantén, Pyrrhén (Servius ad Aen. x. 668, &c.). This rule cannot however have been absolute, for forms like vidéns ut in Old Latin Poetry, and even in Augustan poets (Virg. Aen. vi. 779; Tib. ii. 1. 25) show that when the final vowel of the particle was elided, the verb might retain the ordinary accentuation, vidéns, like vidés. Servius (fourth cent.) tell us that vidéns was the usage of his time (ad Aen. vi. 779 vidéns ut geminae stant vertere cristae) 'den' naturaliter longa est, brevem eam posuit, secutus Enniun: et adeo ejus est inmutata natura, ut jam ubiue brevis inventur), and Plautus seems, when -què, -né is elided, to let the metrical ietus fall normally on the syllable which would have the accent in the absence of the particle, e.g. prósperèquè(e), surrítptasquè(e) (Amer. Journ. Phil. xiv. 313).

An accent originally on the antepaenultima remains in the curtailed form on the paenultima, according to the grammarians, in contracted vocatives and genitives of IO-stems, e.g. Vergúli, Valéri, tugúri (Serv. ad Aen. i. 451; Prisc. i. p. 301. 21 H.). Gellius (second cent. A. D.) tells us that Nigidius Figulus (first cent. B. C.) wished to distinguish Valeri Voc. from Valeri Gen., but adds
that in his own time such an accentuation as Valerii Voc. would sound very strange: siquis nunc Valerium appellans in casu vocandi secundum id praecipitum Nigidii acuerit primum, non aberit quin rideatur (N. A. xiii. 26).

Lastly, Interjections are excluded by the grammarians from the ordinary rule. They are said to have no ‘certi accentus,’ whatever that may mean; and the statement of a late grammarian (Audaeis exc. 361. 11 K. that papae and attāt (also ehem, MSS. hochem?) were accented on the last syllable, is confirmed, in the case of at least the former, by the incidence of the metrical ietus in Plautus (always papae, never pāpae). The Greek ἐγγεικτεωσ speaks in Plautus’ dramas with the last syllable lengthened1 (cf. the MSS. spelling eugae), and the phrase eugae-eugae always has the metrical ietus eugae-eugae.

Greek words, as was mentioned above (§ 3), when they were used by a Latin author with their Greek form and declension, retained also their Greek accent, e. g. Ἑπίρος in Virg. Georg. i. 59 (Serv. ad loc.).

§ 11. Vulgar-Latin Accentuation. The Latin accentuation is retained with wonderful tenacity by the Romance languages. Where they agree in deviating from the classical Latin accent, the accentuation which they reproduce is that of Vulgar Latin. There are four important cases of deviation:—

(1) First of all, in words ending in -tērem, -tērum, e. g. muliērem, filiōrem, the accent in Vulgar Latin was shifted from the i to the e and o, muliērem, filiōrum. The precept of an unknown grammarian (Aneed. Helv. p. ciii. K.) sanctions this usage (mulierem in antepenultimo nemo debet acuere, sed in penultimo potius), and in Christian poets of the third and fourth centuries we find scansions like insuper et Salomon, eadem muliere creatus, Drac. Satisf. 161; cf. Ital. figliulo, Span. hijuelo, Fr. filleul. Nouns in -tēs, Gen. -tēsis followed a somewhat different course. Their Nominative became -ēs, and this form was extended to the other cases, e. g. paretēs (C. I. L. vi. 3714), Acc. Sg. *pātētem is attested by the Latin loanword in Welsh, parwyd, and by the Romance forms, e. g. Ital. parete (with close e), Span. paréd, &c., while *muliērem is the original of Ital. moglière (with open e in the penult).

(2) Again the occurrence of a mute with the liquid r at the beginning of the last syllable seems to have attracted the accent to the penult. Thus Vulg. Lat. *tenēbrae is attested by Span. tinieblas, and other Romance forms. We cannot be wrong in connecting this with the practice of Latin poets of treating a short syllable before a mute with r as a long syllable, when it suits their convenience (see ch. ii. § 142).

Servius (fourth cent.) (ad Aen. i. 384) seems to say that the accent was not in his time attracted to the penult in correct pronunciation; for he remarks with regard to peragro in this line of Virgil; ‘per’ habet accentum... muta enim et liquida quotiens ponuntur metrum juvant, non accentum (cf. Diom. 431. 28 K.).

(3) In Compound Verbs the accent seems to have shifted to the stem-vowel of the verb in Vulgar or Late Latin, e. g. recīpit is indicated by Ital. ricevo, Fr. reçoit; renīgat by Ital. riniega, O. Fr. renie. With this we may connect the tendency in the spelling of post-classical inscriptions, and of our earliest MSS. to restore the vowels in compound verbs to their undecayed form, e. g. consacrum, compremo (§ 18).

1 Like our ‘bravo!’ ‘hillo!’ often pronounced with the voice dwelling on the final vowel.
(4) Lastly, the Romance forms of the Numerals give indications that the Vulgar Latin accentuation was *vinti*, *quaranta*, &c. (see Meyer-Lübke, *Gram. Rom. Sprach.* i. p. 494). *Trienta* is one of the barbarisms 'qua in usu cotidie loquentium animadvertere possimus,' enumerated by a fifth-century (?) grammarian (Consentius p. 392. 4 K.). On a fifth-cent. inscr. (vid. A. L. L. v. 106) we have *quaranta* for *quadragesinta* (Ital. quaranta), and an epitaph in hexameters has *vinti* for *vinti* (Ital. venti) [Wilm. 569 (cf. C. I. L. viii. 8573):

et menses septem diebus cum vinti duobus].

§ 12. Accentuation of the Sentence. Hitherto we have been considering only the accentuation of words by themselves. But there is also such a thing as the accentuation of the sentence; and the accent which a word would bear, if uttered separately, may be different from the accent assigned to it when standing with other words in a sentence. The Greek preposition *πρός*, for example, had, if mentioned by itself, an acute accent. But in the sentence its accent was obscured by the accent of the noun which it governed, e.g. *πρός πόλιν*, and this by the Greek system was expressed by replacing its acute by a grave accent. So that the Greek system of marking the accents recognized both the word-accent and the sentence-accent.

By the Indo-European sentence-accentuation the verb in a main sentence was treated as a subordinate word, and apparently occupied the position proper to enclitic words, namely, the second place in the sentence, while in dependent clauses it received the accent like any other word, and stood at the end of the clause, an arrangement which has been, curiously enough, preserved in German to the present day (see Wackernagel in *Indog. Forsch.* i. pp. 333 sqq.). Indefinite pronouns were enclitic or subordinate words, while interrogatives were accentted (cf. Greek *ἀνήρ τις* and *τις ἀνήρ*;). Other enclitics were the copula *quae* (Greek *τε*, Lat. *què*), the personal pronouns (unless specially emphasized), &c.

We can determine with a fair amount of accuracy the accen-
tuation of the Latin sentence, partly by the help of the remarks of Latin grammarians, partly from observing the phonetic changes of Latin words in the Romance languages, where an accented word or syllable is not subject to the same laws of development as an unaccented, partly from the analogy of other languages, and to a large extent from the versification of the
early dramatists. For Plautus and Terence leave, as a rule, the subordinate words of the sentence, the words, in fact, which we omit in writing telegrams, in the theses of the line, where no metrical ictus falls on them:

e.g. Plaut. Trin. 21 [rogat] ut liceat possidere hanc nomen fabulam,

where ut and hane, words which might be omitted without obscuring the meaning, are relegated to the theses of the first and fourth feet. The Latin grammarians, with their usual adherence to Greek terminology, speak of the ‘attraction’ of the accent by enclitics or subordinate words. But this statement of the facts is corrected by Quintilian (i. 5. 25, 26), who shows that a subordinate relative, like qualis in the sentence, talis est qualis Cicero fuit, or a subordinate preposition, like circum in Virg. Aen. iv. 254 quae circum litora, circum Piscosos scopulos, &c., is really in Latin united with the following word into a word-group, which takes the ordinary accent of a single word: cum dico ‘circum litora,’ tamquam unum enuntio dissimulata distinctione, itaque tamquam in una voce una est acuta. The Latin pronunciation would thus be qualis-Cicero, circum-litora.

Priseian (i. p. 183 H.) objects similarly to a statement of Hellenizing grammarians, that quis, the indefinite pronoun, in siquid, nunquam, &c., is an enclitic like τις in εἰτις, and prefers to call siquid a compound or word-group with the natural accent of a single word. With this correction, the rules of the Latin grammarians about enclitics and subordinate words are in the main probable enough in themselves, and are confirmed by the evidence of the Romance languages, and the early dramatists’ versification, though some of their distinctions between the accentuation of words of the same spelling; such as ne, ‘verily,’ nē, prohibitive, ne ‘lest’; dēeo, the verb, and adēo, the adverb; ut, ‘how,’ ut, ‘in order that’; ergo, ‘therefore,’ ergō, ‘on account of,’ require additional evidence before we can accept them.

§ 12a. Latin Sentence-Enclitics. Among Latin Sentence-Enclitics we may class:

(1) Enclitic Particles like quē (L-Eur. *quē, O. Ind. ca, Gk. τι, all unaccented), vē [I. Eur. *vē, O. Ind. vā (unaccented), Gk. *fē in ἅλκτος from *fē-tē, and so on. Their enclitic nature is shown by their being always joined in writing with the preceding word, e.g. atque, sive. In the rapid utterance of ordinary con-
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versation these words often lost their final vowel, and so appear also in the forms ac (for *aty), seu, &c. (see § 35).

(2) The various parts of the substantive verb. The mode in which es, est are written in the best MSS. of Plautus, for example, amatus (amatus’s), amatusst, amatunst for amatus es, amata est, amatum est (cf. centunst, &c. in Virgil MSS., Ribbeck, p. 419), shows that they were treated as mere appendages of the past participle passive. For the unaccented nature of erat, erit, &c. we have proof, if proof be needed, in Romance forms like Ital. era and Span. era (Lat. erat), O. Fr. ert (Lat. erit), for an accented Ī would have taken another form, such as Ital. *iera, Span. *yera (cf. Ital. niega, Lat. neōt). It need hardly be said that the extent to which these words, and indeed all ‘Sentence-Enelicities,’ were suppressed, would depend on the caprice of the speaker, on the nuance of thought, on the style of composition, &c. No hard and fast rule can be laid down about them, just as no rule could be made for the use of ‘s’ for ‘is,’ ‘re’ for ‘are’ in English. A sentence, for example, of Cicero, ending with the words itiam quod est, is quoted by a grammarian as an instance of a sentence ending with a monosyllable (Mar. Sacerd. 493. 14 K.).

(3) The personal and possessive pronouns, when unemphatic. In the Romance languages two distinct series have been developed for the personal pronouns: (a) the enelic, e.g. Ital. mi, ti; Fr. me, te: (b) the accented, e.g. Ital. me, te; Fr. moi, toi. Similarly a Vulgar-Latin possessive *mus, *mum, *ma, beside the regular meus, meum, me, is indicated by French mon, ma, and Vulgar-Italian ma-donna, padre-mo, &c., which resemble O. Lat. sis for suis, &c. (see ch. vii. § 11), in such a line as Ennius, Ann. 151 M., postquam lumina sis oculis bonus Ancus reliquit. It is true that Priscian (ii. p. 141. 15 H.) expressly says that there is no distinction in Latin corresponding to the Greek distinction between ιδέν με and ιδεν ιμε, ον ικαινον, apud nos autem pronomina eadem et discretiva sunt ut ‘vidit me’ vel, ‘vidit me, illum autem non’; but he seems to refer rather to the identity of the written form of the emphatic and unemphatic pronoun, than to that of their intonation in discourse. In Plautus and Terence the ictus always falls on the preposition in phrases like in me, ad me, intēr se, unless the pronoun is emphatic (or elided), just as in Greek we have πρός με, πρός σε, &c., or as in English we lay the stress on ‘for,’ ‘with’ in ‘for me,’ ‘with him,’ &c. In O. Irish this tendency of pronunciation reduced the pronouns to mere suffixes, e.g. for-m, ‘on me,’ for-t, ‘on thee,’ &c. (but cf. Censorin. ap. Prisc. ii. p. 51. 11 H.).

(4) The demonstrative pronouns, when unemphatic. The Romance forms point to (il)rum patrem, (il)ra mater, &c. as the origin of the definite article in all the Romance languages, while ille pater seems to have been pronounced sometimes il(le) patr, e.g. Ital. il padre, Span. el padre, Prov. el paire, sometimes (il)le pater, e.g. Fr. le père. Similarly (i)ste, indicated by Ital. stasera, ‘this evening,’ is actually found in old MSS. (see Neue, Formenlehre 3 ii. pp. 402 sq.; on sta in the Italia, see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v.), and iste is mentioned as a barbarism by a third-century grammarian (Mar. Sac. p. 451. 10 K.).

(5) The relative and indefinite pronouns, while the interrogative and exclamatory were accented, e.g. talis est qualis Cicero fuit, but qualis fuit Cicero! The grammarians often distinguish between the accentuation of quis, quālis, quantus, quōt, quōtus, cujus, ēbi, unde, &c. when used interrogatively, and when they are merely relative or indefinite pronouns (e.g. Prisc. i. p. 61. 5 H., interrogativum est quod cum interrogatione profertur, ut quis, quālis, quāntus,
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quam, quodus, cum suos servant accentus. Infinitum est interrogativorum contrarium, ut quis, qualsis, quantus, quot, quodus, cum in lectione gravi accentu pronunciantur, cf. ii. p. 127. 2 H. Partit., p. 501. 14 H. So for qui interrog. and rel. ib. ii. p. 9. 20 H.; cujus, interrogat. and rel. ib. ii. p. 179. 3 H.; quo, ubi, unde, quo, ib. ii. p. 132. 3 H.; ii. p. 83. 11 H. 'qua' quando relativum est gravatur; quanto, Charis. p. III. 27 K.; Prisc. ii. p. 82. 24 H.; quorum, ib. ii. p. 83. 11 H. &c.). Their usual expression for the subordination of the relative and indefinite forms of these words is that they 'have the grave accent' (gravi accentu pronuntiantur, gravantur), though sometimes they use language more applicable to Greek (e. g. τῶς interrog., πῶς rel.), and say that 'they take the acute accent on the last syllable'; and Charisius (p. III. 27 H.) gives an actual Latin example of this accentuation of the last syllable in the sentence quandō tot stragis acertos Vidimus. Quintilian, as we saw, corrects this statement of the case, and shows that the true account for the Latin language is to say that the relative is joined with the noun or important word beside it, this word-group taking the accent of any ordinary word. The line from Virgil would thus be really pronounced quandō-tot stragis aceros, &c., so that the accentuation of the final syllable of quando is due to the accident that it stands next to a monosyllabic word. The relative would have no accent in a sentence like quem testem te adducturum dixeras, for it would be joined with the noun into a word-group, quem-testem, with the accent on the first syllable of the noun. When in a line of poetry the relative followed the noun, as in Plautus (Amph. 919) Testŏm quem dudum te adducturum dixeras, the accentuation would presumably be by the same reasoning testēm-quem; and this presumption seems to be confirmed by the versification of the dramatists.

(6) Prepositions, while adverbs, are accented. Thus we should say siūra hābitat, but supra moēna est; ānte vēnīt, but ante Caesarem vēnīt. This distinction is often inculcatus by the grammarians; e. g. Palaemon (first cent. a. d.) (ap. Charis. p. 789. 10 K. = Dion. p. 407. 19 K.) insists on the different accentuation of infra, supra, extra, intra, ultra, citra, circa, juxta, contra, subitus, coram, ante, post, prope, usque, super, when adverbs, and when prepositions; cf. Charis. p. 231. 24 K.; Audax, p. 533. 22 K.; Probus, Inst. p. 149. 27 K.; Mart. Cap. lli. p. 67. 21 Eyss.; Prisc. ii. p. 28. 24 H.; ii. p. 30. 25 H.; ii. p. 33. 1 H.; ii. p. 42. 7 H.; ii. p. 45. 25 H.; ii. p. 51. 11 H. &c.). Priscian (ii. p. 27. 4 H.) says that Latin prepositions, like Greek, had, by themselves the acute accent on the last syllable (supér, inrép), but in the sentence lost this accent; (accentum habent praepositiones acutum in fine, tam apud Graecos quam apud nos, qui tamen cum aliis legendo, in gravem convertitur) (cf. Don. p. 391. II K.) and Quintilian, as before mentioned, says that what really happened in Latin was that the preposition was fused with its noun into a word-group, which was then accented like any ordinary word, e. g. circum-titora (accented like circumvisistra, circumvisisti). Indeed the words are often written together in old MSS. and inscriptions; cf. Mar. Vict. 23. 12 K. and Indices to C. I. L. (so Umbr. preveres 'ante portas'). This suggests that in collocations like in via, per dolum, in manus the preposition itself may have received the accent of the word-group, unless it was desirable for some special reason to give prominence to the noun. This view is supported by some word-groups, which established themselves in Latin usage, such as obviem, stātūlo (se, sine dolo), comminis, dēnīo (dē nōvo), admodum, affātim (but cf. Gell. vi. 7), as well as by the versification of the dramatists, which also points to in-rem,
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in-opem, in-jūs, &c. (cf. quamobrem.) A preposition placed after its noun received an accent, as in Greek, according to the grammarians (e.g. Prisc. ii. p. 27. 4 H. cum præpostere ponuntur, monosyllabae acute, disyllabae paenultimo acute proferuntur); but remained unaccented in phrases like virtutem proper imperatoris or justitiae in legum, where the preposition is followed by a genitive dependent on the noun (Censorinus ap. Prisc. ii. p. 33. 20 H.).

(7) That conjunctions, like prepositions, had a different pronunciation according as they came first or second in the sentence is asserted by Priscian (ii. p. 24. 21 H.) praepositae gravantur omnibus syllabis, postpositae acuentur in principio. He refers expressly to igitur, quōniam, saltem, so that he would have us pronounce, e.g. igitur Cicero vēnit, but vēnit igitur Cicero. That the monosyllabic conjunctions et, sed, and the like, were enclitic words in the sentence, may be proved, if proof be wanted, from the versification of the early dramatists, in whose lines these conjunctions are relegated as a rule to the theses, and do not receive the metrical ictus, and also from the Romance languages, where the Latin monosyllabic conjunctions have suffered the same phonetic changes as the unaccented syllables of Latin words. Et, for example, if the word had been accented, would have become *iēt, or some similar form, instead of Ital. e, Fr. et, Span. y.

(8) Auxiliary verbs in Latin must, like those in other languages, have been enclitic, or rather, according to the Latin practice, must have been joined with their verb into a word-group, e.g. volo-scire, coctīm-dabo, missīm-facit, cave-fćias. In Plautus volo-scire is always scanned volō-scire, never volō-seire; and the metrical ictus in his verses of phrases like factūm-velo, faciās-velo, missūm-face, cave-pāris, cave-fīcis supports our rule. Cicero's story about Crassus at his departure for Parthia mistaking the cry of a fig-seller, Cauneas! Cauneas! (sc. fīcus vendo) for cārē nē eas (Cic. ii. 40. 84) seems to show that in ordinary talk this verbal phrase was treated as a word-complex with a single accent ca(e)(e)-n(e)-eas. Similarly a verbal phrase like operām-dāre, filēm-dāre, dōnō-dāre would probably have ordinarily only one accent, just as we throw the stress on the noun 'noise' and not on the verb 'make' in the phrase 'to make a noise.' The dramatists let the metrical ictus fall on these phrases thus: fīcēm-dam, operām-dat, operām-dabam, donō-data. The reduction of other enclitic verbs to mere members of a compound word is indicated by the traditional way of writing quotībūt, quamvis, quantumvis, and the like. Sīs, 'if you please,' from sī vīs (cf. sūltis, Plur.), is an enclitic appendage of the imperative, e. g. prōpūrā-sis as much as dūm in excūtī-dūm, aspicio-dūm. (Plautus gives to these phrases the ictus properā-sis, excūtēdum, aspicio-dum, &c.)

(9) Some nouns too of subordinate meaning must have become members of word-groups. In English 'thing,' 'kind,' 'state,' 'part' are used in this way without stress, in such sentences as 'something (nothing) of that kind,' 'some parts of England.' That mūlūs, vīs were so used in Latin we see from the traditional spelling quōmūla? quadū? So dies in propōdīum (Don. ad Ter. Ad. 888), quotīdīe, postādīe. Gellius (x. 24) says that in the time of Cicero and the earlier period, the phrase diequipūnta or diequipūnti was in vogue, 'pro adverbio copulate dictum, secunda in eo syllaba corrupta,' and we may guess that dies formed a compound with trigintā (vigintī) from the fact that these two numerals are perhaps never found in Plautus and Terence with the ictus on the last syllable, except when dies (or minae) follows, e. g. Men. 951

ät ego te pendēntem fōdiam stimulīs trigintā dies,
where the last two words seem to make a compound noun, like our 'fortnight,' 'twelve-month.' *Locus* too might be subordinated in a phrase like *interea loci* (Don. ad Ter. Ecfr. 255), *ubi loci,* &c. The versification of the early dramatists, and the compound words in Romance suggest as similar word-groups phrases like *vaé-mihi,* *vaé-miseri-míhi,* bene-rém-gérít, *male-rém-gérít* (with metrical ietus normally on these accented syllables in Plautus), *ad-illum-hóram* (Ital. allora, Fr. alors), *ad-mentem-hábère* (Prov. amentaver, O. Fr. amentevoir), *axis-stráthio* (Fr. autruche, Span. avestruz), *axis-tardá* (Ital. ottarda, Fr. outarde, Port. abetarda), *foris-fácere* (O. Ital. forfare, Fr. forfaire), *male-hábitus* (O. Sp. malato, Prov. malapte, Fr. malade), &c., (cf. Engl. 'goodbye' for 'God be wi' ye').

§ 13. Syncope. The syncope or suppression of an unaccented vowel is a common feature of languages which have a stress-accent, and is carried to the greatest length by the language whose stress-accent is most powerful. The Celtic languages had a stronger stress-accent than Latin, and so we find in Old Irish some words borrowed from Latin (which the Romans had themselves borrowed from the Greeks), reduced by syncope to a much greater extent than they were in Latin, e.g. felsub, Latin *philósophus,* apstal, Latin *ápostólus.* And in countries under Celtic influence, such as France or the northern parts of Italy (e.g. in the Romagna *dmeng* for *dömínica,* Sunday), Latin words have been curtailed much more than in other parts of the Romance-speaking world. In ancient Italy, too, we see syncope more developed in some districts than in others, e.g. *Mgolnia* for *Magolnia* on a Praenestine inscription (C. I. L. i. 118), though it is not always easy to say when such forms are merely graphic, and indicate the use not of a contracted pronunciation, but only of a contracted system of writing. The conditions under which vowel-syncope was carried out differed at different periods. In Latin a vowel between *u* and *w* was not syncopated, because the consonant-group *nm* was difficult to pronounce, e.g. *ánǐma* not *anma.* But in the Romance languages syncope has been pushed a stage further, e.g. Prov. *anma,* alma, arma, Old Fr. *amne,* alme, armé, Span. alma, Sicil. arma, Ital. alma (in poetry), the unmanageable group *nm* being often changed to *rm,* just as original *nm* in Latin *can-mem* from *cāno,* *gen-mem* from *gēno,* *gigno* became *rm* in *carmen,* *germen* (ch. iv. § 78). Similarly *pertica,* which resisted syncope in Latin, in Italian (pertica), and in other languages, has succumbed in French (perche, our 'perch') and Provençal (perga). *Frígidus* appears in all the
Romance languages in a syncopated shape (Ital. freddo, Fr. froid, &c.) (ch. ii. § 132). *Viridis*, too, was in Vulg. Lat. *virdis* (Ital. verde, Span. verde, Fr. vert), and *calidus* appears early as *calidus*. Analogy also may often prevent syncope, or, after words have been syncopated, may restore them to their original form. Thus *porgo*, for example, was restored to *porrigo* by the analogy of the perfect *porexi*; and the analogy of other adjectives in *-idus* where this termination was preceded by some uncombimable consonant, e.g. *frigidus*, may account for the existence of unsyncopated adjectives like *calidus*; for the consonants in *calidus*, *l* and *d*, are of a kind that would be easily combined. A Nom. Sing. like *hortus*, if syncopated to *horts*, *hors*, would soon be restored to its old form by analogy of the other cases *horti*, *horto*, &c. In the compound *cohors* we do indeed find this monosyllabic form; and one might be tempted to think that the syncope of *hortus* to *hors* had led to the word becoming an I-stem for an O-stem, *hors*, *hortis*, from *hortus*, *horti*. But the I-stem of *cohors* is more easily accounted for by the Latin predilection for I-stem compounds of O-stem nouns, e.g. *exanimis*, *unanimingis* from *animus* (ch. v. § 34.). It is doubtful whether any clear case of a change of stem through syncope of the final syllable of a Nom. Sg. is to be found in Latin.

It appears, then, that vowels resisted syncope when they stood between consonants which did not easily combine, and that the analogy of unsyncopated forms might prevent or efface syncope in whole classes of words. With these exceptions, it seems to have been the law of Early Latin that ē, ĩ in the syllable after the accent always suffered syncope, unless they were long by 'position.' This ē, ĩ might be original ė, ĭ, or the reduced (posttonic) form of original ā, ď (§ 18). The Early Latin accent fell, as we have seen above (§ 5), on the first syllable of each word, so that every ē, ĩ in a second syllable not long by position must have suffered syncope.

The syllable *-rī-, precede*d by a consonant, followed laws of its own. It appears in the posttonic syllable as ēr, e.g. *pāternus* for *patrī-nus*. Similarly *-ī- appears in the posttonic syllable as ēl (*ēl*) in *făcultas*, &c. (see ch. iv. § 13). The syllable *-vē- also stands apart from others owing to the vowel-nature of its con-
sonant, which facilitated syncope. Thus we have syncope of a vowel preceded by e even in a syllable long by position, e.g. anneculus (Plautus), the ordinary conversational form of àruncëtus (cf. aneculus, C. I. L. viii. 3936, ix. 998); or rather the semivocalic w has dropped out between the two vowels. Similarly ditior for divitior, dèorsum (dissyllabic deorsum in Plaut,) for dèorsum, and the like, are different from the ordinary cases of syncope.

The tendency to syncope continued to assert itself at all periods of the language. Words which resisted it at an earlier period often, as we have seen, succumbed at a later. The new law of accentuation, the Paenultima Law (§ 8), brought with it the possibility of a new variety, namely, suppression of the syllable preceding the accent. Pretonic syncope is a feature of Indo-European, where indeed it was much commoner than post-tonic syncope, but it could play no part in Latin so long as the accent remained invariably on the first syllable. It is often difficult to say whether a case of syncope is pretonic or post-tonic. In words like àrdëre, àrdörem, for example, we say that the syncope of i of *àridëre, *àridörem is due to the new accent on the penult; *aridëre, *aridörem, but it might possibly be referred to the influence of the old accent on the first syllable, *àridëre, *àridörem. Words like artëna (Greek àpòrava), perströma (Greek περιστρῶμα) Lucil. (i. 41 M. and Löwe, Prodr. p. 347), both borrowed no doubt after the old accent law had ceased to operate, are clearer cases of pretonic syncope. So are enclitic or subordinate words which drop final e before an initial consonant, e.g. nempe, proinde, dein, while before a consonant often took the forms *nemp (so scanned by Plautus and Terence, ch. x. § 7), proin, dein, as atque, uèque became ac (for *atq, atc), nec. So beneficium, malficium, calificio, &c. And the influence of the following accent, rather than the mere addition of extra syllables, seems to be the real factor in the syncope in the literary period of such words as frigdária (Lucil. viii. 12 M.) beside frigdus, caldårus beside călidus, portórium beside pórtitor, postrúidie beside póstério, altrínsecus beside álteri. The weakening effect on an unaccented syllable of a following accent is shown by Plautine scansion like sëncëctátem, völüntátem, pötëstátem, perströma, where an additional weakening element is supplied by the short syllable
preceding. These scansion must reflect the pronunciation of these words in ordinary conversation. Similarly calē-fācere became calē-fācere and cal-fācere, and ministérium passed into ministérium or mistérium (cf. Plaut. Pseud. 772), the consonant-group st being specially adapted to combination with a preceding liquid or nasal (cf. per(i)stroma above). The unaccented -vē- of āvidus, which resisted syncope in the simple adjective-form, succumbs to the influence of the following accent in the lengthened derivative *avidēre, audēre, to have a mind for, to dare [e. g. *si audēs (Plaut.), if you please, in the classical period sōdes].

Arid- of āridus becomes arid- in ardēre, ardōrem, and by their analogy sometimes appears in the simple adjective (ardus, Lucil. xxvii. 40 M.). Similarly act- for aevēt- in aetēs may have come into use first in the lengthened cases aetētis, aetāti, aetātem, or in derivatives like actērīnus, though here the syncopated form of the trisyllable established itself in ordinary usage, unlike ardus. Forms like caldūrīnus may have had some influence in introducing caldus into the colloquial usage (it hardly came into the literary) of the Augustan period. Quintilian (i. 6. 19) tells us that Augustus stigmatized as a piece of affectation the use of calidus for caldus (non quia id non sit latinum, sed quia sit odiosum, et, ut ipse Graeco verbo significavit, πελεψων), and yet in the Appendix Probi we find calda under the same condemnation as frigda, virdis (198. 3 K.).

Post-tonic syncope, under the new accent law, seems, during the Republic and Early Empire, to occur only when the accented vowel is long ¹, e. g. jūr-go (in Plautus still jūrigo), usūripo for *usūripo, -ās for (Plautine) -ātis in nostrās, Arpūnās, summās, &c., though we find it in the period of the Early Literature after a shortened vowel in words of four or more syllables where three short syllables followed each other before the final syllable, e. g. bālīnēum [so Plaut. and Ter., and balineator, Rud., 527 (A.)], a spelling which did not yield for some time to later balneum [balinearum, C. I. L. i. 1166 (c. 130 B.C.); Caper (first cent. A.D.) (108. 7 K.) prefers balneum; cf. Gloss. Plac. 9. 29, and see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v.;

¹ Syncope after a long vowel is due to the tendency to make a long vowel extra long.
balineum occurs frequently on the Lex Metalli Vipascensis of the first century A.D. [Epigraph. iii. p. 166], òpitumus [the spelling oπtvmo of an archaizing inscription, C. I. L. i. 1016 (=vi. 1958) of the late Republic or early Empire shows that this form had not been so long obsolete as to be forgotten, though as early as the Scipio Epitaph, C. I. L. i. 32, c. 200 B.C., we have oπtvmo, 'optimum']. These words, as we saw above (§ 5), had in the time of Plautus and Terence the accent on the first syllable, bālīnēum producing balineum, *ópitumus oπtumus. Similarly òpisicīna, òpisicīna (Plaut. Mil. 880), produced officina, pueritia (with the ictus pueritia in all the instances, not many, of its occurrence in the early dramatists) produced the pueritia of Horace [C. i. 36. 8 actae non alio rege puertiae; Charisius (fourth century A.D.) still recognized pueritia as the correct form, 266. 7 K.]. But forms like caldus, viridis, domnus belong to colloquial or to Vulgar Latin, and were not as a rule established in the language till the later Empire, though valde, older vālide, Plaut. Pseud. 364, and a few other words, were current at a much earlier time. The same wave of syncope that reduced viridis, dōmnus, &c., to disyllabic form attacked u, i in hiatus (cf. ch. ii. § 48). As early as the latter half of the first century A.D. tēnīs varied between a disyllable and a trisyllable (Caesellius ap. Cassiod. vii. 205. 16 K.); cardus (for cardusus) (ch. ii. § 54), mortus (for mortuus), &c., are the precursors of the Romance forms (Ital., Span. cardo, Ital. morto, Span. muerto, Fr. mort); while the similar reduction of i (e), led to that palatalization of consonants which has so transformed the whole appearance of the Romance languages, e.g. Ital. piazza, Span. plaza, Fr. place from Vulg. Lat. *plātъa, Lat. pūtēa, &c. (see ch. ii. § 48).

Forms like saeculum beside saeculum are not to be classed with forms like jurgo beside jurigo, for saeculum is the older form, while in saeculum a vowel has been inserted between the c and the t to facilitate pronunciation, a vowel which is generally called a 'parasitic' vowel, or, in the terminology of the Sanscrit grammarians, a 'svarabhaktic' vowel (from Sanscr. svarabhakti-, 'partial vowel'); see chap. ii. § 154. The termination -culus, -cīlum in Latin sometimes represents the I.-Eur. suffix -tlo, which indicates the instrument with which an action is performed, or
the place of its performance, sometimes the suffix -colo, a compound of two I.-Eur. diminutive suffixes, -co and -lo. To the first class belong words like vehiculum, ‘that by which one is carried’; poculum, ‘that out of which one drinks’; cubiculum, ‘the place where one lies down’; periculum from *perior, perilus, experior: oraculum from orare. To the second, diminutives like corculum, ncorcula, succula. These two classes of terminations are not distinguished by us in our ordinary practice of writing Latin; they show, however, in the hands of Plautus a notable difference of metrical treatment. For in his verses the first suffix appears normally as one syllable, -clus, -clum, reflecting without doubt the current pronunciation of his time; the second as two syllables, -culus, -culum. Thus Plautus has always vehiculum, with that monosyllabic form of the suffix which we find invariably when by dissimilation the cl is changed into cr, e.g. ambitacrum, ‘a place for walking in,’ for *ambulaclum, while diminutives like auricula, pulvisculus retain the dissyllabic suffix in his plays as persistently as agricola, incola, or any other compound of the verb colo. So do nouns formed by the addition of the suffix -lo to -co-stems, in distinction to those formed by its addition to -e-stems, e.g. porculus, celloe-la, ‘a yacht.’ Probably not a single instance occurs in his verses of -col- reduced to -cl- by syncope, even after a long vowel, e.g. never *corculum from cor-culum, *porculus from porc-lus (Class. Rev. vi. 87). (But privicloes, ‘priviculis,’ Carm. Sal., ch. vi. § 49.)

Forms with the parasitic or svarabhaktic vowel, with -colo- for -clo-, are indeed not infrequent with him. Cubiculum, for instance, always or almost always, appears as a quadrisyllable. But he uses these expanded forms as a rule (especially when a long vowel precedes), only at the end of a line or half-line; that is to say he regards the equivalence of the parasitic vowel to an actual short syllable as a licence only to be resorted to in cases of metrical necessity. For example, periculum is the normal form of the word, while periculum occurs only at the end of a line or hemistich. Capt. 740 is a good example of this distinction:

periculum vitae meae tuo stat periculo;

and it is only at the end of a line that the phrase nullumst peri-
clum (e.g. Pseud. 1076) becomes nullum periculumst (e.g. Capt. 91). Poculum, too, shows this full form usually in a similar position, while saeclum is never allowed trisyllabic scansion at all. The Romance languages show that a later wave of syncope not only reduced saec(u)lum, &c. to their original form saeclum, but also words like porculus to porclus, e.g. Ital. cerchio, (Lat. circ(u)lus), teschio (Lat. test(u)la), spillo (Lat. spin(u)la). (Cf. oculus, C.I.L. x. 7756, &c., crustulum, xi. 3303, of 18 A.D., Proclaes, xv. 1157, of 123 A.D., Vitillus, viii. 9432, &c., Λευκλός, &c. on Greek inscriptions, Eckinger, pp. 73–5, Masculus (Gk. Μασκλός, &c.): so in Probi App. 197. 20–22 K. speculum non 'speculum,' masculus non 'masculus,' vetulus non 'veclus,' vitulus non 'viclus,' vernaculus non 'vernaclus,' articulus non 'articlus,' baculus non 'baclus,' angulus non 'anglus,' jugulus non 'juglus,' and 198. 18 oculus non 'oculus,' 198. 23 tabula non 'tabla,' 198. 27 stabulum non 'stabulum,' 198. 34 capitulum non 'capicism,' 199. 9 tribula non 'tribla,' 199. 14 vapulo non 'vaplo' (MS. baplo); and see George's Lex. Wortf. s.vv. coag(u)lo, aedic(u)la, assec(u)la, hub(u)lus, conch(u)la, Vist(u)la, cop(u)la, cop(u)lo, cubic(u)lum, vit(u)lus, discip(u)lina, extemp(ii)lo, fil(u)la, fig(u)linus, laterc(u)lus, Herc(u)le, jug(u)lans, manic(u)la, ment(u)la, masc(u)lus, orac(u)lum, poc(u)lum, peric(u)lum, pedi-c(u)lum, saec(u)lum, scrup(u)lus, sextula (sescla), surc(u)lus, spec(u)-lum, sub(u)la, temp(u)lum, trich(u)la, vinc(u)lum, vet(u)lus, ver-nac(u)lum, Asc(u)lum, Vist(u)la, &c.; cf. Schuch. Volk. ii. 402 sqq.). Fr. roule, &c. from unsyncopated vōtula points to a re-formed diminutive; so in Roumanian, e.g. teule or tiule (Lat. tēgūla) (Taverney in Études . . . G. Paris, p. 267). (See also § 21.)

Another case of syllable-suppression which differs from ordinary syncope is that of words like arcubii ('qui excubabant in arce,' Paul. Fest. 19. 10 Th.) for arcī-cūbii, where the proximity of two almost identical syllables ċē and ċē has caused or facilitated the dropping of the former. [Similarly semī-modius and semodius, debilitare for *debilitātare, fastīdium for *fastītīdium, īdolatria for īdīdīa-, limitrophus for limitotro-, Restītūtus for Restītūtus (A. L. L. viii. 368), &c., as in Greek ἄμ(φι)-φορέως, ψη(φο)φορία, λει(πο)πυρία, &c.].

And a large number of words, like dixem (beside dixissem),
audissem (beside audīvissem), audī-trīx (beside audītor), gi-guo (beside gēn-us), are often wrongly included with genuine cases of Latin syncope like lardum, jurgo. In some of these there is either no syncope at all (so some explain dixem for *dic-sem, like es-sem; but see ch. viii. § 3), or, if there is, it took place in the I.-Eur. period, e.g. I.-Eur. *gi-gūnō (ch. iv. § 51), -tri- (ib.); others, e.g. dixem, if a reduction of dixissem (ch. viii. § 3), are rather to be explained like ar(ci)cubii above; audissem, if a reduction of audīvissem (ch. viii. § 3), like sis for sī vis.

§ 14. Syncope in the Praenestine Dialect of Latin. On the Latin inscriptions found at Praeneste there are a large number of omissions of vowels, e.g. Decimus (for Dēcimus), C.I.L. i. 1133, Gminia (for Gēmīnia), Eph. Epigr. i. 72, Diespqr (for Diespiter), C.I.L. i. 1500; Ptronio (for Pētronio), Eph. Epigr. i. 92; a full list in Sittl, Lokal. Verschied. Lat. Sprache, p. 22. This tallies so remarkably with a reference by Plautus to a peculiar pronunciation of the Praenestines, conea for cicōnia, ‘a stork,’ that it is likely that these spellings represent the actual sound of the words. In the Truculentus of Plautus the surly, taciturn slave Truculentus, whose mispronunciations are more than once a subject of jest (cf. line 683), turns the word arrabo, ‘a prepayment,’ ‘earnest-money,’ into rabo, ‘a raver’ (cf. rabere, ‘to rave,’ rabula, ‘a bawling pettifogging lawyer’); and on being taken to task, says that he has pocketed a part of his arrabo as the Praenestines do with cicōnia (line 690):

‘ar’ facio luceri,

ut Praenestinis ‘conea’ est cicōnia.

(Cf. misisia for Ital. amicizia in the modern Parmese dialect; Ital. nemico for Lat. inimicus, &c.) The omitted vowel is e or i, once a (Mgōnia, C.I.L. i. 118) (besides Acememo for Āgānemno, on an old Praenestine cista, Eph. Epigr. i. 19), and the omission is easily explained by the influence of the accent in words like Diesp(i)tr(i)qr, P(e)trōnio, and, if we admit that the ante-paenultima was accented in these words in the Praenestine dialect at this period, in D(e)cumius, G(e)minia (cf. Cem(i)na, C.I.L. i. 99). But an accented vowel is omitted in Tertia (for Tertia), Eph. i. 108, Pol(i)dia, Eph. i. 95, and even a long accented vowel in Ατία (for Ατιά), Eph. i. 33.

A grammarian of the second cent. A.D. (Terentius Scaurus, pp. 14, 15 K.) tells us of a practice of an earlier date of substituting a letter for the name of the letter. The name of c was ‘ce,’ of d was ‘de,’ of k was ‘ka’; and so ca was written for cára, kra for kara (cāra). His example for d is almost exactly our first example of the Praenestine contraction, viz. Deimus for Decimus. These words of Terentius Scaurus suggest that spellings like Alōsi for Albēsi, Albensi on an insertion of Alba Fucentia, a town not far removed from the Praenestine district (Zvetaieff, Inscr. Ital. Inf. 46), lubs mereto (for lubēs, lubens merito) on an inscription found near Avezzano, in the same neighbourhood (C.I.L. i. 183), are indications of a syllabic system of writing in partial use in this region of Italy (ch. i. § 13), and leave us in doubt about the real nature of Praenestine pronunciation.

N
§ 15. Syncope under the Old Accent Law. (1) The preposition *ambi-
(Gk. ἀμφί) loses its second syllable in compounds like anéculus, ‘a servant,’ for
*ambi-cōlūs (Gk. ἀμφικτόλος, Sanscr. abhi-caras), an old Latin word from
which anunculare, ‘to serve’ (Paul. Fest. 15. 7 Th.) and ancillum; anępēs
(Plaut. Rod. 1158), later aneeps (from ambi- and cáput); am-pleur, &c.
The same shortening may have caused that confusion of the old preposition *indo
(endo) (ch. ix. § 27) with the preposition in (en) (indo)grēdīor, &c. becoming by
syncope identical with ingredōr) which led to the disuse of *indo and the adoption of in
in its place. Thus inaudīo (Plaut.) was completely ousted by inaudīo in the time of Terence, and in the classical period compounds with
*indo are only found as archaisms in poets, e.g. inādīpērōr Juv.

(2) The second syllable of the first member of a compound is syncopated in
hospes for *hoṣti-pes, princeps for *primi-cēps (cf. primi-gēnia, an epithet of the god-
dess Fortuna, unsyncopated because m and g do not easily combine); foขนes for
formi-ceipts (from formus, ‘hot,’ connected with Gk. θέρμος. Paul. Fest. 59. 18
gives us this etymology, foreciæs dicentur, quod his forma, id est calida, capiuntur; cf. Vel. Long. 71. 15 K.)
; quince dem from quānti and dēcem; undece from anus and dēcem; universus is a re-formation from an older syncopated
form which we find on the Decree of the Senate against the Bacchanalian
orgies, an inscription of the time of Plautus (186 n. c.) (though Plautus
himself uses the four-syllabled universus) (C. I. L. i. 196. 19 homines plous V
oinœursei irei atque mulieres sacra ne quisquam fecisse uelit) (this may be
a mistake for *oinuorœs, like *surrusor in the Sentent. Minuc. l. 15); vindemia
for *vini-dēmia; Marpor (C. I. L. i. 1076) for Marci-por, &c.

(3) The first syllable of a verb compounded with a preposition is suppressed in
pergo for *per-rīgo (cf. perrexī, perfecdīum); porgo, the old form of prorīgo, *por-rīgo (cf.
Fest. 274. 15 Th. antiqui etiam ‘porgam’ dixerunt pro porgīam), e. g. exporgere
lumbos, ‘to stretch one’s legs,’ Plaut. Pseud. prol. 1, cf. Epid. 733; the word, sanc-
tioned by the usage of Virgil (A. viii. 274 pocula porgē dextrīs, appears now
and then in the Silver Age poets (Val. Flacc. ii. 656; Stat. Theb. viii. 755, &c.),
but the classical form is prorīgo; surgo for surrīgo, *sub-rīgo; a deponent perf.
participēs sortus for *surcūs, formed on the analogy of the syncopated pres. ind.,
was often used by Livius Andronicus (Paul. Fest. 423. 1 Th.); beside sorrūpī
(classical surrūpū) we have the syncopated form sursūp in Plautus (e. g. Capt.
760), and even a perf. part. pass. formed after its type, surpūs (Rud. 1105).
Lucretius also uses the contracted form of the present (ii. 314 motus quoque
surpere debent), and Horace (S. ii. 3. 283 unum me surpīte morti; cf. C.
iv. 13. 20 quae me surpūrat mihi); pono for *pō-śino (the preposition is pō-
a byform of *άπο, *āb), postus, depostus, compositus, very common for pō-situs, &c.;
like postus is prae-stō, earlier prae-stā (Cassiod. 157. 22 K.), ready, at hand, for
*prae-sītū; these for *ceditē, *cē-dāte, where the particle cē, ‘here,’ ‘hither,’ is
prefixed to the verb, as in Oscon ce-bnust, ‘huc venerit’ (Zvetiaief, Inscr. Ital.
Inf. 231. 20). These syncopated forms were probably far more frequent in
the early period, than at a later time, when the same tendency to re-
composition which produced con-sacro out of conscero, ad-sun out of assum
(ch. iv. § 160) restored por-rīgo, surrīpūi, &c. The older forms might remain
undisturbed in derivatives whose connexion with the verb was unnoticed,
e. g. refīrīa fābo (refīrīa, Plin. xviii. 119), the bean brought back by the farmer
from the field for luck (in Fest. 380. 17 Th. we are told that the word was
also associated with refīrīgā, ‘to roast,’ ‘parc’); aprīcus, Aprilis may be similar
traces of an \emph{ap-(e)rio} (cf. \emph{ap-ério}), unless the syncope in all three words was pretonic syncope under the Paenuultima Law of Accentuation, \emph{ref(e)rica}, \emph{ap(e)ricus}, \emph{Ap(e)ritis}. Verbs beginning with a vowel unite it into one sound with the final vowel of the preposition, though to what period of the language this crisis should in each case be referred is uncertain, for it might be caused by a following as well as by a preceding accent. Crasis was the rule in such compounds in the early period, to judge from the usage of the older poets. \emph{Coerce}, for example, is dissyllabic in Pacuvius (\emph{Trag.} 47 R.),

gradere átque atrocem coercere confidéntiam (see ch. ii. § 150).

(4) The first syllable of a reduplicated perfect of a compound verb is dropped in \emph{regvéri}, \emph{rettáli}, \emph{rectál}, &c., where the double consonant seems to preserve a trace of the syncope (see ch. vii. § 44). The syncope would in these perfects be facilitated by the Latin tendency to drop one of two neighbouring syllables of like sound (see on \emph{arcubii} for \emph{arcí-citbii}, above § 13); and it is natural to suppose that the perfects without reduplication, like \emph{ex-scitl} O. Lat. \emph{scitédi}, \emph{con-curí} (and \emph{con-cicurí}, older *\emph{con-cicurí}), &c., originated in this way (ch. viii. § 44), just as in modern Greek \emph{βίβας} has become \emph{βάς} in compounds like \emph{διαβάς}, \emph{σιβάς}, &c. Another syncopated verb-form is \emph{cante} (2 Plur. Imperat. of \emph{caino}), quoted from the Carmen Saliare by Varro (L. L. vii. 27). But as a rule all traces of syncope in the declension of the verb have been obliterated, the full forms (e.g. \emph{cántile}) having been restored through the influence of forms where the consonants were not adapted for combination (e.g. \emph{sistíte}), or where the syllable in question did not immediately follow the (early) accent (e.g. \emph{cócciníte}), as well as from the analogy of other conjugations, e.g. \emph{amá-te}, \emph{moné-te}, \emph{auá-te}. In Umbrian and Oscan these imperatives are syncopated, e.g. Umbr. \emph{sístu}, Osc. \emph{actual} (Lat. \emph{ágito}). The same is true of derivative adjectives, e.g. in \emph{-idus}, \emph{húmíus}, \emph{frígíius}, \emph{cúlíus}, \emph{súlíus}, \emph{rigíus}, \emph{óridus}, &c. (but \emph{núdus} for \emph{*núridus} from a root \emph{nogw-}, Sanser. \emph{nag-nas}, our ‘naked,’ is syncopated; on \emph{údus} see below), in -\emph{ícus} c. e. \emph{únicus}, \emph{cícicus}, \emph{mécíus}, but the nouns \emph{Planicus}, \emph{turco}, ‘a glutton’ (from \emph{túra}, ‘the mouth of a sack,’ according to Paul. Fest. 86. 23 Th. \emph{lura}, os culleí, vel etiam utris; unde luroes capaces gulae homines), \emph{juncus}, &c. are syncopated (see below on \emph{ramus}). Similarly \emph{vivíus} is saved from syncope by the influence of other adjectives in -\emph{idus}, while the noun \emph{vita} for \emph{*vítía} (Lith. \emph{gvytā}) is not. The Umbrian adj. in -\emph{co-}, \emph{tótco-} (Latin \emph{públicus}) from \emph{tótas}, \*\emph{touts-}, ‘the community,’ ‘people,’ shows the contraction which Latin adjectives of this formation escape (cf. Osc. \emph{tòtico-}).

(5) Diminutives in -\emph{lo}, on the other hand, extended the syncope from dissyllabic to other forms, e.g. \emph{ullus} from \emph{*inolus}, \emph{vilíum} from \emph{*inol-lum}, Ter. \emph{Adelph.} 786, and from their analogy, \emph{corílla} for \emph{*corínula}, \emph{persílla} for \emph{*persínula}, \emph{ampylla} from \emph{amp(k)íra} (Greek \emph{ámporā}, Acc. of \emph{ámporeís}), &c.

(6) Greek words borrowed at an early period probably owe their syncope to the early accent, e.g. \emph{Hercúles} (Greek \emph{Hérúklēs}), \emph{Políuces} (the early form of \emph{Políax}), Plaut. \emph{Bacch.} 894 (Greek \emph{Polúðēwos}), \emph{calc} (Greek \emph{χάλις}, with \emph{a}); cf. Prænestine \emph{Acmenono} (above, § 14).

(7) Other examples are \emph{alter} from \emph{altér}; \emph{postulo} from \emph{*posaci-tálo}; \emph{ula} from \emph{*utína} (Greek \emph{áfuány}); original \emph{-in} becomes \emph{-i} in Latin, e. g. \emph{collis} from \emph{*colnís} (Lith. \emph{kátnas}, Greek \emph{kolóvòr}) ; \emph{proptér} from \emph{*própt-tér}.

(8) For the syllable -\emph{ri}, examples are : \emph{sícervós} from \emph{*sacrú-dós}, \*\emph{sácrí-dós}, \emph{N 2}
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from sacer and root dó, ‘to give’; ácerbus for *áeri-tho-, with the same termination (belonging to root dhí, ‘to make’) which becomes dus when not preceded by r, e.g. Frigidus, calidus (see ch. iv. § 114); sócellum for *sacer-lum, *sacri-lum, sacri-lum, &c. Nouns like áger (Greek ágôr), cáper (Greek kárrôr), and adjectives like ácer show this treatment of the unaccented final syllable of the Nom. case, whereas hortus, &c. are saved from syncope by the analogy of other cases, horti, hortus, hortum, &c., and of other Nominatives, whose final syllable did not immediately follow the (early) accent, like áninus, aútumnus. In the Italian dialects we find this -er- in similar positions, e.g. Osc. Aderla- from *Adrola- (Lat. Atella), Abella- probably from *Abrola- (Lat. *Apella), Umbr. ager, pacer, ‘propitious,’ from páciri, often spelt -r-, e.g. Sabine Atro- (Lat. Aternus), Osc. Tantrinaum (Gen. Pl.) (ch. iv. § 92). In Latin we seem to have -er- for -ri, in the accented syllable too, e.g. ter (Greek ῥῆς), in Plautus (e.g. Bacch. 1127) scanned as a long syllable, and so pronounced terr (cf. terruncius, the right spelling; see Büheler in Rhein. Mus. xlii. 236), from *ters. The substitution of er for r would then be due rather to metathesis (cf. N. Ital. fardor, &c., Meyer-Lübke, Rom. Gramm. i. p. 291, and see above, ch. ii. § i11). Ter would however be unaccented in phrases like ter-mille (cf. terdiciens written as one word on Mon. Anc. i. 29). On ter, see ch. vi. § 61, on er for r in ch. iv. § 13.

(g) For the syllable -eri, e.g. automo for áxi-tumo (Greek áw for ὧ-ω); claudio *cláti-do, from clátiis; cária for *cóviri (cf. Volsian covehriu, Zv. Inser. Ital. Inf. 47); gaudo for *gávadeo, part. gávium (Greek γαῦθεα for γαύφ-θεω); naufraquis for *návē-frágus1; niper, cf. adj. nuperum Acc. Sg., Plaut. Capt. 718 recéus captum hominem nuperum noulicium), for *nóvē-pérus from nóvus and páro; praeco for *prae-vico from prae and víco; praedes, earlier praévides (praévides Plur., prae Sing. on the Lex Agraria of Sp. Thorius, i11 b. c., C.I.L. i. 200, but only praedès on the older Lex Repetundarum, 123–2 b. c., i. 198), from prae and vos, perhaps suffered syncope after the new accent law, as did iūdus (as early as Lucil. inc. 172 M.), in Plautus only ávidus; ravmus for rácibus from ravus, ‘horsesness’; vîta for *vívita (see above); auxco for *ávi-eps; Opiter, a name given to a child ‘who had a grandfather for a father,’ cujus pater avo vivo mortuus est (Paul. Fest. 207, 15 Th.), Plur. Opiteres (Löwe, Prodr. p. 396), seems to be colloquial Latin for *Autper for *ávi-pâter from ávus and pâter. The form mátalo is found (with mátalo) in Plautus, but in the classical period only máto.

The syllable -ri, -e- is syncopated, even when long by ‘position,’ in auxespex for *ávi-spex; năntius, older nöcentius [the older form occurs in a prophecy of the famous Marcius, published 213 b. c. (ap. Fest. 164. 26 Th.) quamvis noventium duonum nungu num; quamvis bonum nuntium negante]; mândna for *növen-dinae from növen and din a system of dies (Sanscr. dinam, O. Slav. díni). And -i- is dropped even before a long vowel when a vowel of the same quality precedes, e.g. lábrum, earlier lábrum, Lucr. vi. 799. (Marius Victorinus, ix. 20 K. quotes lavabrum for lábrum among other instances of Old Latin forms such as hacedenus for hâcêmus, hocëdië for hâdëi; semol for sìnâl); latrina for látrârina, the old word for a bath, supplanted by the Greek loanwords baî(ê)neu̯m (βαῖναῖνον) (cf. Non. 212. 7 M. látrîna ... est látrârina, quod nunc balneum dicitur), as balneum itself was succeeded by lavârtum: déinus was early contracted to dînus (Leo in Rhein. Mus. xxxviii. 2), e.g. reidinai and

1 Or for *nânu-fragus, which became nânugram (ch. iv. § 45), and so with claudio, gaudeo (?).
res deina on an old inscription (C.I.L. xi. 4766), so obliscor for oblviscor in the early dramatists (see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v.), and in universal usage, sīs, for sī vis, from which a plural sultis was formed. (On loss of intervocalic -v- see ch. ii. § 53 and ch. iv. § 70.

This liability of every short second syllable to syncope under the Early Accent Law makes it dangerous to infer from Latin forms the presence or absence of a short vowel in the corresponding Indo-European forms, e. g. to infer from the distinction between Lat. ultrā, circā, infrā, suprā, extrā, contrā on the one hand, and uterius, citērīus, infrīvus, sūpērīus, extrīus on the other, that the original stem-suffix was -tr-, -r- in these adverbs and -ter-, -er- in these adjectives. Priscian (ii. p. 30. 1 H.) tells us that the older forms were supera, infera, extera, &c. quaedam etiam syncopeam passa sunt, ut ‘supra’ pro ‘supera,’ et ‘infra’ pro ‘infera,’ et ‘extra’ pro ‘extera,’ nam antiqui trisyllabae ea proferebant, ut Cicero in Arato:

Torvus Draco serpit supteraeque retorquens
Sese,
tenuit tamen, ut disyllaba magis ea proferantur (cf. ii. p. 55. 23 H.). Sūpērā is found in an elegiac epitaph, of the time of the poet Accius (to judge from its use of a double letter to indicate a long vowel), C. I. L. i. 1011. Rec fuit evero plus superaque parens, and on another inscription, with the same indication of date (cf. Ritschl, P. L. M. p. 46) (-ee for ż in seeds) we have infera, i. 1166 quae infera scripta sunt, but on the earlier S. C. de Bacch. (i. 196 of 186 n. c.) we have suprad and extrad, so that supera (which is used also by Lucretius) may be a form that is not genuinely antique. On the spelling arbitrium for arbitrum, see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v., and cf. magister- C. I. L. i. 73, ma[gi]steratus, Eph. Epigr. ii. 298; on dextera and dextra, see Brambach, Lat. Orth.; on sinistra for sinistra (e. g. Ter. Eun. 835), on Tībēris and Tībris, see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v., and for other examples of syncopated byforms, s. vv. sol(ī)duis, Virīdomarus, frig(ī)duus, ful(ī)co, Temese (Gk.) and Tempsa (Lat.) ; but audac-ter, later audāc-ter, prēti-genus beside prēti-genus (cf. Paul. Fest. 225. 2 Th. ‘œnigenos’ unigenitos), teg-men beside tegi-men, &c. admit of other explanations. (On the use of a Parasitic Vowel with r see ch. ii. § 102.)

Syncope is carried even further in Umbro-Oscan than in Latin, but in Umbrian the Perf. Part. Pass. is not syncopated, while the 3 Sg. Imper. is (but not -net-, e. g. kanetu, ‘let him sing’); thus sektu is Imper., sepetu is P. P. P. (see von Planta, i. p. 214). Contrast Osc. touito- with Umbr. toto-, ‘publicus,’ Osc. minstro- with Lat. ministro-, Osc. Vezkū- with Lat. Vetusco-.

§ 16. Syncope of Final Syllable. In Oscan and Umbrian, as in Gothic, ă, ę, ę, but not ă (?), in a final syllable are syncopated, e. g. Osc. hǔrz, Lat. hortus, Banīns, Lat. Bankus, tūvtiks for *tōtīcīos from tōtīna, ‘community,’ ‘people,’ Umbr. emps, Lat. emptus, pihaz, Lat. piātus, all with syncope of -ēs; Osc. μεδίκ for *med-đik-ēs Nom. Pl. of medīcīz, the title of the Oscan chief magistrate, cestur for *censtur-ēzs, Lat. censorezs, with syncope of -ēs of Nom. Pl. (see ch. vi. § 40). Umbr. pacer for *pāćer-ī-s, ‘propitious,’ with syncope of -ris. In Latin we have this syncope, unless it should rather be called metathesis (§ 15. 8), in Nom. Sg. of -ro-, and ri-stems, e. g. ęger for *ag-ro-s, in-īg-er for *en-īg-ro-s, ăcer for acer-ī-s, ălūcer, &c., but perhaps in no others. Quattuor might be for *quētīor-ēs, Masc. (Doric Gk. rētope, Sanscr. catvāras), but may
also be the Neuter form (Sanskrit. catavri) (see ch. vi. § 65). The contraction of -atis to -ās in the Nom. Sg. of adjectives or nouns denoting the place of one's birth, e.g. Arpinas, *Casīlas (Umbr. Casilos), is later than Plautus, who always uses the full form -atis: while Campans (Masc. not Neut.) in his cruel sneer at the conquered Campanians, Trin. 545:

Campans genus
Multo Surorum iam antidit patienstia,

seems intended to mimic an Oscan *Campans for Campānus, like Osc. Bantins for Bantimum. Like Arpīnātis, later Arpinas, are Samnītīs, later Samnīs, Laurentīs, later Laurenīs, Tiburtīs, later Tibūras, &c. (Prisc. i. p. 134 H.). Nominatives Sg. of i-stems like sors (in Plaut. Cas. 380 sortis), quīēs (if an I-stem like O. Pers. šiyātīs, Av. šycitiš) may have dropped i in their final syllable, not by syncope, but by analogy of consonant-stems; cf. nubes used by Liv. Andr. for nūbēs (Serv. ad Āen. x. 636), plesus and plesēs (for other examples, see Ritschl. Opusc. ii. 652). Or these may be instances of parallel stem-formations, like penu-, peno-, pene- of pēnus, Gen. penuī, penum, Gen. penu, penus, Gen. penōris. So viōlens and viōlentus, fluentus and fluentum, &c., epulōnus (Paul. Fest. 55, 15 Th. ‘epolōnus’ diecebat antiqui, quos nunc epulones dicimus), and epīlo, centurionis and centūriur, curiosus, decurionus and cūriō, decurió (Paul. Fest. 34. 36 Th. ‘centurionus’ antea, qui nunc centurio, et ‘curiosus’ et ‘decurionus’ diecebatur), infensus, once used by Accius (Trag. 189 R. infants facinus) in the sense of infandus. Compounds like in-ādēx, in(s)-ādēx, vin-ādēx differ from causī-ādīcūs, inī-ādīcūs, fātī-ādīcūs in being formed directly from the weak verb-stem dic-., like Sanscr. ā-diś-. So conjux (cf. Sanscr. sayuj-, Gk. ἄ(<i>κυ</i>) beside bījūgus and bījūgus, bīge, &c. So for(m)iceps, au-cepus, prin-cepus beside urbi-cōpus (Plaut.), hosti-cepas (Paul. Fest. 73. 10 Th. ‘hosticapas’ hostium captor); ēpī-fex, artī-fex, carnī-fex beside mānt-ficus, magnī-ficus; rēm-ex beside prōd-igus. Man-suetus (Acc. mansuēm and mansuētem) beside man-suetus, in-quiēs beside in-quiēs are like Gk. ἀμφύς and ἀμφύς, ἀκυμις and ἀκυμις. Praceps, ancepus from prae-, ambī- and cōnūs, in Plautus praecēpes (Rud. 671), ancēpes (Rud. 1158) (cf. procapis, Paul. Fest. 281. 22 Th. ‘procapiss’ progenies, quae ab uno capite procedit; and concepit (?) of the XII Tables ap. Fest. 356. 27 Th. tignum iunctum aedibus uineaue et concacit ne soluto) were afterwards assimilated to compounds of cōpio, e.g. prin-cepis (cf. Prisc. i. p. 280. 15 H. antiqui tamen ‘ancīpes’ et ‘pracepies’ et ‘bīcies’ proerebant in nominativo... idem tamen vetustissimi etiam ‘pracipiss’ genetivum... secundum analogiam nominativi protulerunt). Old Latin Polīāēs (Plaut. Bocch. 894, cf. Gk. Πολίανες) was shortened to Polīā, probably by analogy of lūx, Gen. lūcis. Priscian (i. p. 282. 12 H.) tells us that the old forms of concors, discors, &c. were concorāis, discorāis (cf. i. 354. 13 H.) (cf. late Lat. orbis, e.g. Ven. Fort. ix. 3. 14; orbis non ‘orbus’ Probi App. 198. 8 K.).

O-stem adjectives often have their Nom. Sg. shortened through their tendency, especially when compound (ch. v. § 34), to become I-stems. Thus hilārum (Gk. ἱλάρης), one of those loanwords from Greek to express sublunances of feeling, for which the Romans had no word of their own, like our loanwords from French, such as ‘triste’ became, after the time of Plautus, hilāris (ch. v. § 34); fortis was perhaps originally forctus (Paul. Fest. 73. 9 Th. ‘forctum’ pro bono diecebat), though as early as the XII Tables we find forctes for loyal allies, (ap. Fest. 524. 15 Th.), in XII cautum est, ut idem juris esset ‘Sanatibus’ quod
ACCENTUATION. SYNCOPE.

§ 17. Syncope under the Paenultima Accent Law. (1) Pretonic. Compounds of fācio like cāle-facio, which shortened their ē by the law of Brevis Brevians (see below), took the further step of suppressing the vowel altogether before

Forctibus,' id est bonis, et qui numquam defecerant a Populo Romano; cf. Paul. Fest. 59. 26 'foretes,' frugi et bonus, sive validus, where Paulus may have put the Nom. Pl. foretes by mistake for the Nom. Sg. foretis; sācro- and stēri- are parallel stems in O. Latin (sācrēs porci, 'pigs for sacrifice,' Plaut. Men. 289, Rud. 1208, cf. Fest. 464. 7 Th.), and similarly māno- and māni-, 'good,' though in classical Latin the only survival of this group was im-mānis 'bad,' 'hurtful,' and the dī Mānēs. In the Carmen Saliare occurred the phrase Cerus mānus, explained by Paul. Fest. 87. 29 Th. as creator bonus, and at Lanuvium the old word mānus was in use even in the time of Macrobius (fourth cent. A.D.) (Macr. i. 3. 13 nam et Lanuini 'māne' pro bono dicit; sīc apud nos quoque contrarium est 'immane'). Varro (L. L. vi. 4) connects with O. Latin mānus, 'good' the adverb māne, 'early,' and in support of his etymology mentions a curious Greek custom of uttering the words φῶς ἄραθῶν as a good omen when a light was brought into the room, dici principium 'mane,' quod tum manat dies ab oriente, nisi potius quod bonum antiqui dicebant 'manum,' ad cujusmodi religio pomum luim affertur, solent dicere φῶς ἄραθὼν (see ch. vi. § 38). The O-stem hortus became in the compound *co-horto- an I-stem *co-hortis, which (like pars, &c. above) changed its Nom. Sg. to co-hors. Even the Perf. Part. Pass. sānāthus appears in the form sanati- in the expression quoted from the XII Tables by Festus 524. 10 Th. for the repentant allies, who had first revolted and then returned to their allegiance, 'Sanates' dicti sunt, qui supra infræque Romam habitaverunt, quod nomen his fuit, quia, cum defeiciissent a Romanis, brevi post redierunt in amicitiam quasi sanata mente. And the Old Latin legal phrase dare damnas esto, tantum damnas esto (Cato ap. Gell. vi. 3. 37; Quint. vii. 9. 12, &c.) may be a case of substitution, for the usual O-stem damnāto-, of an I-stem damnati-, which has taken a cons.-stem Nom. Sg. damnas, like aetas, tempestas.

I0-stems had at all periods a tendency to pass into I-stems. The older adj. termination -ārius (frequent in Plautus, vid. Lorenz ad Pseud. 952, e.g. singularius, virginiarius) may have been often replaced by -āris in MSS. of Plautus (ch. v. § 4). Cf. Caper 112. 2 K. vates olim 'vatio' dicebant; so Verres and Verrius. In Vulg. Lat. -ius (-a) became -is in actuaris, abstemis, sobris, caerulis, consanguinis, &c. (Lōwe, Prodr. p. 420), thus repeating the early confusion between -io- and -i- in the declension of names like Caecilius, Acc. Caecilium, Caecilis, Acc. Caecilin (see ch. vi. § 5). But none of these are clear cases of the change of stem of a Latin word owing to the syncope of its final syllable in the Nom. Sg. Perhaps the most likely instance is Lucipor, from Lācīus and puer (stem pīfera-), of which the Plur. is given by Pliny, H. N. xxxiii. 26 as Lucipores (cf. Dat. Sg. Naepori on an inscription of the end of the Republican period, C. I. L. i. 1539 e), but even this might be otherwise explained. The weakening of final vowels in Latin (see below) gives an a priori probability to the syncope of final short syllables like -is, -os, -is as in Oscan and Umbrian, but it has not yet been satisfactorily proved that syncope did actually occur in any syllables except those immediately preceding or following the accent. (Schuchardt, Vok. ii. 394 sqq. has collected a number of instances on late plebeian inscriptions of the omission of a short vowel of the final syllable, e.g. fect for fecit.)
the accent of the next syllable, cal-facere, cal-factus. Quintilian (i. 6. 21) tells us that in his time the full form calificare was never used in ordinary talk. Ofacere, not *olefacere, is the regular form. Ritschl proposed to help the metre occasionally in Plautus by reading benficium, maleficium for beneficium, malificium, benefacta, malefacta (e.g. Trin. 185) for beneficata, malefacta of the MSS. He supported his proposal by the old spelling benventum on a coin of Beneventum (C. I. L. i. 19), c. 250 B.C. On later inscriptions spellings like benmerenti are frequent, also malefactum (see Ritschl, Opusc. ii. 716). So firmly established was the syncopated form of compounds of facio like ofacere that even ârēfacio, whose ë could not be shortened by ordinary phonetic change, since it is preceded by a long syllable, seems after their analogy to have been made a quadrasyllable by Cato, for the MSS. of the Res Rustica agree wonderfully in presenting the word in this form (c. 69; 125; 157. 12).

To pretonic syncope we must refer the currency of the forms disciplina, figitina beside discipulus, filigus, and on later inscriptions vetranus (cf. C.I.L. iii. Ind. p. 1159 for vêrânus, &c. (on Greek inscriptions almost always obervaros or Brieyvaros). Festus 466. 16 Th. tells us that scena, an old word for the priest's knife (used by Liv. Andr. Com. 2 R. corruit quasi iactus scena) had a byform secena; and another obsolete term secula, discussed by Gell. xx. 11, a synonym of séquester, was explained by a grammarian, who compiled a sort of 'Slang Dictionary' (Lavinius 'De Verbis Sordidis') as a contraction of *secula. Vulg. Lat. mät(i)tinus (Ital. mattino, &c.) may be explained either as a case of the suppression of one of two similiar neighbouring syllables, like Res(t)iquitus above (§ 13, p. 170) or of pretonic syncope, such as is seen in Ital. cervello (Lat. cerebellum), vergogna (Lat. vîrânundia'), bonata (Lat. bônitât), gridare (Lat. quiritare), dritto (Lat. directus), &c. Procope is common in Italian, owing to the frequency of final vowels, e.g. vescevo (Lat. episcopus), nemico (Lat. inimicus), cagione (Lat. occsion-), &c. Synizesis of the pretonic short vowel is seen in Vulg. Lat. qu(i)tus, *dyurnus (Ital. giorno); coacius became *quattus (Ital. quatto), &c. (cf. Georges, Lex. Worff. on Num(i)torius, Lug(u)zium).

(2) Post-tonic. A good example of syncope after a long accented syllable under the new Accent-law is the word barca (our 'barque?'), a word which seems to have been introduced at the time of the naval displays given by Caesar for the amusement of the people, and which is clearly a contraction of *b릭ra from the Egyptian bâris (Prop. iii. ii. 44) (see Rhein. Mus. xlii. 583). Another is lamna (Hor. C. ii. 2. 2 in inimice lamnae), in Vulg. Lat. lâma (Arnob. ii. 41), the other form of which was lamêna (e.g. Plaut. Asin. 549). And we have many words which appear in Plautus in their full form, but in later writers are reduced by syncope, such as obiârigo, by Terence's time always obiârigo, nouns or adjectives in -âtis denoting the country of one's birth, &c., e.g. infimatis (Stich. 493). The same shortening tendency attacked u, i in hiatus, e.g. lârva is a trisyllable in Plautus, a dissyllable later, so grâtilis, later grâtis, while it has left traces of itself in spellings of old inscriptions like tuara (for figùra) on the Lex Agraria of Sp. Thorius. 111 B.C. (C.I.L. i. 200. 14, 25), not to mention others which may be dialectal, such as proseptây (Dative) on a very old mirror of Cosa (C. I. L. i. 57. -At, not -ais, is what is written; see Rhein. Mus. xlii. 486), and cedere for uedere on an early inscription of Spoletium in Umbria (C. I. L. xi. 4766). Arûdis for âridus appears occasionally, e.g. Plaut. Aud. 297; Pers. 266; Lucil. 27. 40 M., and on an inscription copied in the Empire from an original of 105 B.C. (C. I. L. i. 577. 2. 21=
§ 18. Change of Unaccented Vowels. In a language with a stress-accent the unaccented vowels are liable to be obscured. We see this in our own language, where the unaccented vowels in words like 'father,' 'sister,' have become what we call par excellence 'the obscure vowel,' the vowel-sound of u in 'but.' We notice too a difference in this respect between Italian pronunciation and our own; for an Italian pronounces the vowels of the unaccented syllables more clearly, and does not slur them to the same extent as we do. But in Italian also the same tendency to weaken an unaccented vowel is present, though not in so marked a degree. The unaccented vowel often fails to preserve its individuality, and is open to influence from a neighbouring consonant, r, for example, changing a preceding short vowel to e, l changing one to o. Thus Latin arbor, or rather its oblique case-form arborem, &c. has become in Italian albero; Latin debilis has become debole. And in the pretonic syllable of signore (Lat. seniorem), midolla (Lat. medulla), the
unaccented vowel has become $i$. Exactly the same thing happened in Latin. In the last chapter we saw that a short vowel in the syllable following the accented syllable remained unsyncopated only when its syllable was long by position, or when some other cause prevented syncope. But though unsyncopated, it did not remain unaffected. Its quality was changed. In a syllable long by position we see a short unaccented vowel becoming $e$, e.g. *remex, from *rēmus and āgo, in other syllables $i$, e.g. *remigis, jūrigo (Plaut.), later jūrgo. Under the influence of a following labial consonant or $l$ it assumes a $u$- or $u$-sound (see ch. ii. § 16), e.g. occēpo, in-ĉēpio, from cāpio; a following $r$ makes it $e$, e.g. pēpēri, from pārio. Some vowels retained their individuality better than others. Short $o$ in compounds of verbs like voco, rogo, &c. remains unchanged, e.g. convoco, invoco, irrogo, arrogo; short $u$ in tu-tudi, &c.

Final syllables too cannot have been so liable to affection as others, or the difference between Nominatives Singular of different stems, such as clinis, ōpus (Old Lat. opos), mānus, &c. could not have been so well maintained. Perhaps they were saved by the analogy of trisyllables, and longer words, where the final syllable was not in the weakest of all positions, viz. immediately following the accent.

Even diphthongs were changed, their first element being affected, $ai$ becoming $i$ (through *ei), $au$ becoming $u$ (through *eu), just as single $a$ was originally weakened to $e$ (see below). Thus the compound of ob and caedo became, under the influence of the early accent, occīdo, of ob and clando, ocelūdo. But long vowels were more resistive of change, e.g. invādo, from vādo, irrēpo, from rēpo.

The regularity with which these changes of short vowels and diphthongs are carried out in the second syllables of Latin words is a strong proof of the fact discovered by Corssen, that the Latin accent at some early time rested invariably on the first syllable; for it is the syllable immediately following the accented syllable, which in a language with stress-accent is most liable to be affected. A syllable with a secondary accent, like the paenultima of *pārri-cai̯da- (under the old accent law) would not be liable, just as in the Romance languages the vowel of the
first syllable of words like classical Latin *armatūra*, &c. shows
the same treatment as the vowel of the syllable with the main
accent (cf. Ital. Fiorentino from *Flōrentīnus*, like fiore from
*flōrem*, but Firenze from *Flōrentia*). It might, however, change
its vowel after the analogy of kindred words where the same
vowel followed immediately on the accent, e.g. *ōc-caido*, and so
we get the Old Latin form *paricidas* (Paul. Fest. 278. 10 Th.).
On the other hand the analogy of the simple word with accented
root-vowel would often save the vowel of the compound from
being changed, e.g. *vades et subvades*, XII Tab., where the a of
vades is not weakened as it is in *praevides* (*C. I. L.* i. 200), later
*praedes*. And at any period in the language the sense of the
relation of a compound to a simple word might lead to the
restoration of the vowel in the compound to its accented quality,
e.g. *prōvicare* might become *provōcare*, though the noun *praeco*
(for *praevico*) was left unchanged; *enico* might become *e-neco*;
*consecro*, *con-sacro*. This restoration of compounds to their
unweakened form, 'Recomposition' as it is sometimes called,
is a feature of the late Republican and the Imperial period, and
possibly had some connexion with the grammatical studies
imported from Greece towards the close of the Republic, and
prosecuted with great zest for many centuries.

In the period of the earlier literature the change of unaccented
vowels is more the rule than it is later, e.g. always *enico* in
Plautus, &c., in spite of the old practice of separating the pre-
position from its verb by tmesis, *ob vos sacro*, for *obsecro vos,* *sub
vos placio*, for *suppllico vos.*

Analogy, however, was at work in all periods, and exerted its
influence now in one way, now in another. The analogy of the
Nominative preserved from change the vowel in the oblique cases
of *arborem*, *fulgiris*, &c., at least in the literary language
(cf. Ital. albero; *fulgerator*, Gruter. *Inscr.* xxi. 3); the analogy
of the Oblique Cases, *integri*, *integro*, &c. has substituted *e* for
*i* in the Nominative *integer*. Compounds, too, which were made
for the occasion, or were rarely used, like O. Lat. *hosti-capas,*
hostium captor (Paul. Fest. 73. 10 Th.), *urbi-capus* (Plaut.), would
escape the change which befel a word established in use, like
*prin-ceps*, *muni-ceps*. But with these exceptions the change of
short vowels of the second syllable is very regular in Latin, though the oldest inscription extant, Manios med fedaked Numasiot, on a brooch perhaps of the sixth cent. B.C. found at Praeneste, is suggestive of an epoch when this law was not in operation.

The exact rules of change seem to be these. The older representative of ī, the modification of a short vowel in an ordinary short unaccented syllable was e (Gk. ε); while the older representative of ū, the modification of an unaccented short vowel before a labial or l, was o (Gk. ω). E was replaced by i, o by u about 230 B.C. Up to that time the process of change might be so described. An unaccented short vowel was changed before a labial l to o, in all other circumstances to e. Thus on old Praenestine jeweices, &c. we find spellings like Belolai (C.I.L. i. 44) for Bellulae, Salutes (i. 49) for Sūlūtis, Aecetiai for Aequitiae (al. Angitiai), (i. 43); and these older spellings often persist to a much later period. The MSS. of Plautus, for example, preserve traces of abegit for abiget, Capt. 814; exsolatum for exulatum in Merc. 593 (B), Most. 597 (A), &c., and the Lex Repetundarum of 121 B.C. (C.I.L. i. 198) has, with the conservativeness of legal orthography, forms like detolerit, oppedcis side by side with detulerit, ediderit, &c. E was especially long retained after the vowel i, e.g. ēbrietas, pārietem. And after consonantal i (y) we find conieciant on the Lex Repetundarum, proieciant (for projicito) on the Titulus Lucerinus (Eph. Epigr. ii. 298); while the spelling inieciatis, Plant. Truc. 298 has led to the corruption ilieciatis in the Ambrosian Palimpsest (so in Lucretius MSS. traiēcēre, iii. 513. For other examples, see Lachmann ad Lucr. ii. 951); o was similarly retained after i, e, e.g. fīliolus, Pāteoli, lit. 'little wells,' and after vocalic or consonantal u (u, w), e.g. paruolus. (See ch. iv. § 70.)

The ĭē of compounds of jacio, &c. became ĭ, e.g. conicio, through loss of accent (ch. iv. § 51), and similarly uē of compounds of quatio, &c. became ū, e.g. concutio. This older e remained in short syllables before r, e.g. peperi. Also in syllables long by position, except where the first of the two consonants was a labial or l; and even into these it found its way in time with the exception of the combination of l with another consonant (not ll), e.g. condemno, older condumno (both forms are
found on the Lex Bantina of 130 b.c., C.I.L. i. 197); surreptum (surreptum Plaut.), but always insulto, insulsus, inculco (ch. iv. § 10). The o, proper to syllables whether short or long by position in which the vowel was followed by a labial or l, became u, which might pass into the ü-sound (ch. ii. § 16), written at first ū, later i. The spelling of MSS. of Plautus, testumonium, &c. became in time testimonium, &c. In Superlatives i for earlier ū was adopted for State Inscriptions through the influence of Julius Caesar (Quint. i. 7. 21; Varro ap. Cassiod. p. 150. 11 K.), so on the Lex Julia Municipalis of 45 b.c. (C.I.L. i. 206) maximam and maxymam, though we find it occasionally used long before his time, e.g. proximum (i. 1291, an inscription which Ritschl dates ‘not after 130 b.c.’). I came in earliest probably in syllables which were followed by a syllable with i in hiatus, e.g. recipio (recipit on a Scipio epitaph of c. 180 B.C., i. 33).

The same vowel appears in confringo, infringo, &c. in accordance with the phonetic law of Latin which gives us i for e in the accented syllables of words like tingo (Gk. τίγγα), ch. iv. § 11.

The succession of o, u, i in words like maxomos, maxumus, maximus is also seen in the parasitic or ‘Svarabhaktic’ vowel (ch. ii. § 154) of poculum (Plaut. poculum), &c. The earliest spelling is o, e.g. on the Praenestine vases of third cent. B.C. belolai pocolom (C.I.L. i. 44), Salutes pocolom (i. 49), Aisclapi pococolom (for pocolom), (Eph. Epigr. i. 5). The classical Latin spelling is u, poculum, stàbulum, &c. The i in I-stem Adjectives, &c., e.g. stabilis, āgilis, fàcilis, where i follows in the next syllable, is in O. Lat. e, e.g. famelïai (C.I.L. i. 166), on Greek inscriptions Kaiκeloïs, &c.

An o which had escaped the reduction to e became at the end of the third cent. B.C. u, e.g. ὄπος, earlier opos (ib. i. 52), Lúcius, earlier Luciom (ib. i. 32) (cf. ch. iv. § 17); industrius (older endustrno-, if we may believe Paul. Fest. 75. 28 Th.); -unt in 3 Pl. for older -ont, e.g. prædopiont of Carm. Sal. (Fest. 244. 13 Th. MS. -oti-) in the sense of præoptant. A u became ū, i, e.g. sàtūra, satīra.

The weakening of the diphthong ai (latter ae) to i was frequently abandoned in the late Republican and Imperial time, a number of forms which exhibit this weakening, e.g. consi iptum, obsi ptum, from sae pie, being recognized as Old Latin forms. The same weakening may have occurred when ai stood in hiatus,
but here by the Latin law of shortening a long vowel in hiatus (ch. ii. § 143), ī sank further to ī, e.g. Bovianum for Bovianum (Oscan Búvaianúd Abl.), Mārius (cf. Oscan Maraiio-). Similarly unaccented au in hiatus sank to ū in ēluo, eluācrum (Cato) from lāvre (Old Lat.), lavācrum. (For other examples, see Parodi in Stud. Ital. i. 385.) (For reduction of final vowels, see § 37.)

Greek loanwords in Latin show the same changes of the post-tonic vowels, though a vowel may be retained unchanged in words which were borrowed after the operation of the law affecting that particular vowel, or which never became part and parcel of the common language. The change is seen in balineum (Plaut. &c.), classical balneum (βαλανεῖον), trūtina (τρυτάνη), tālentum (τάλαντον), phālerae (φάλαρα), &c., but not in plātanus (πλάτανος), barbarus (βάρβαρος), &c. Vulgar Latin cītera (κιθάρα), Probi App. 197. 26 K.), Ital. cetera and cetra, but Span. guitarrar from cītāra (κιθάρα) (as from κάμμαρος Ital. gambero, but Span. gambaro), carry out the vowel-reduction which was omitted in the classical forms of these words. The analogy too of native words may often have interfered with the normal development of these unaccented vowels; the ō of ancōra (ἀγκόρα) and the e of plācenta (πλακοῦντα, Acc. Sg.), for example, may have arisen in this way, just as πρόβυρον became prōtulum (Lōwe, Prodr. p. 376) by the analogy of diminutives, or Περσε-φόνη, Prōserpina (Proserpina, Dative, on an old mirror of Cosa, C. I. L. i. 57) by the analogy of prōserpo.

Under the early law of accentuation, when the accent fell on the first syllable of every word, pretonic change could take place only in proclitic or subordinate words like prepositions preceding their nouns. Whether Menerua of early inscriptions (e.g. C. I. L. i. 191 Meneruai; cf. Quint. i. 4. 17), a quadrisyllable in Plautus (ch. iv. § 148), became Minerva through loss of accent in the first syllable or by analogy of mīnor is uncertain. But the pretonic change of au to ū in Ital. udire (Lat. audīre), uccello (Vulg. Lat. *aucellus from ēvis), and of ae to i in Ital. cimento (Lat. caementum), cisello, our ‘chisel’ (Lat. caesellum), may have already occurred in Vulgar Latin. The pretonic syllable is often assimilated to the accented, e.g. momordi for earlier memordi, and the same tendency in the post-tonic syllable
§ 19. Other Examples. I. Syllables long by position. Anteclassical exercerent from sarcio, Ter. Heaut. 143 (e in all the MSS.; cf. Paul. Fest. 57. 12 Th. exercerent : sarcirent); ommantans, from manto, Frequentative of mīnco, quoted by Fest. (218. 14 Th.) from Livius Andronicus (cf. Gl. Plac. ommentat : expectat, &c.); inpetritum : inpetratum (Paul. Fest. 77. 3 Th.); inermat: armis spoliat (id. 78. 28 Th.); inēx : inductor, ab incliendo (id. 80. 29 Th., with quotation of Plaut. Asin. 221) from O. Lat. viciō (id. 83. 36 Th., lacit : induct in fraudem. Inde est ‘alicie re’ et ‘inecessere’; inde ‘lactat,’ ‘illectat,’ ‘oblecat,’ ‘delectat.’ Cf. 83. 14 Th. lacit : deci piendo induceit. ‘Lax’ etenim fror ex est); procœstitia (id. 282. 6 Th.), apparently from castra, seems to be the word equated with Gk. ποιάτεσσα in the ‘Philoxenus’ and ‘Cyrillus’ Glossaries; compectus is in Plautus the Participle of the compound of πίς κοσπ, compacter (ch. ii. § 1.44) of compingo. We have e before a labial with a consonant in incepist, the old ‘Perf. Subj.’ of incipio (Paul. Fest. 76. 23 Th.); peremne dicitur auspicari, qui annem, aut aquam, quae ex sacro oritur, auspicato transit (Fest. 376. 32 Th.); indeptare : consequi (Paul. Fest. 75. 27 Th.). The gloss indepisci : adsequi, adipisci, on the same page, l. 31 (cf. Gloss. Plac.) is perhaps given more correctly in the ‘Philoxenus’ Glossary, indepti : ἀνασταρ- τες; proceptat: saepe praecepit Carm. Sal. (Fest. 244. 10 Th.); inbracæ aves: quae in auguriiis aliquid fieri prohibit (id. 78. 7 Th.). But enubro : inhibenti (id. 54. 7 Th.). Cf. the questionable spellings in the ‘Philoxenus’ Glossary, eniber, enibra, enibrum (for enub-?). On the Falisco-Latin inscription of the Faliscan ‘collegium coorum’ in Sardinia (Zv. I. I. I. 72), an inscription with bad spelling and worse metre, we have aciptum for acceptum in the first line: Gonlegium quod est aepctum aetatei agedai.

Classical examples are gēnetrēx beside genitus; obstētrix beside stator, constitīv; (but prōdītrēx, &c., influenced by prōdītor); fulgērum (all these Neuters in -trum
and Fems. in -tra have ε except a few with à, e.g. verītrum, mulātrīa, arātrum. But tonītra: see A. L. L. i. 111); id-ent-idem from ante; expers from pars; pīrennis from annus, and imberbis from barba, with the usual I-stem of Compound Adjectives; inaeōs from australis; forōs from formosus, ‘warm,’ and cūpio; compasco from *pācisco (cf. pāciscor). So in Reduplicated Perfects, e.g. pāperci from parco; fēdelī from fēdō. And in Final Syllables like miles for *mīles, *mīlīs (in Plaut. the last syllable of such words is long by position, ch. ii. § 137); cornicen for *cornicem, *cornu-cans. An original ν becomes e(i) in triginta for *triginta (Gk. τράκνατα) (on i for e before nt, cf. ch. ii. § 147), illē from unaccented orte (ch. vii. § 13), and perhaps pēren-dīē (cf. Osc. perum) (on -undo- and -endo in the Gerund, -und- and -ent in the Pres. Part., see chap. viii.). An original u becomes e in con-sterne (cf. Gk. πτύρωμα, O. H. G. stornem); an original i perhaps in O. Lat. magister Quint. i. 4. 17. Other examples of the variation of weakened and unweakened forms are: comparo and comparco, contrecto and contracto, aspvero and aspvero, amāno and amendo, disperto better than dispartio, bipartitus and bipartitum, quinquepartitus and quinqupartitus, rettracto better than retrecto, consperso and conspersyo, caliandrum and caliendrum, attracto and attracto (so perhaps Sarepta and Sarapto), on which see Georges, Lex. Worf. s. v.; cf. abarct Paul. Fest. i. 11. 36, abarct id. 19. 26 Th. On Greek inscriptions we have πανταφ, μακαφ, βιάλλαφς, ὄνταρας, &c., from the end of the first cent. A. D.; see Eckinger; πρασφαιιι is usually derived from fuscīnum, but neither exitorobo beside exentero, nor bipinnis beside bipennis are certain cases of the change of e to i, nor yet Antistius beside Antestius (§ 39). (On i for e in infringo, triginta, see ch. iv. § 11.)§ 20. II. Short Syllables (1) in -r. The compound of lex and rumpo has in Plautus the spelling lērīpa (e.g. Pers. 68, corrupted to lege rampam), cf. vicertādix, Cat., R. R. xxxiiii. 3, though at a later time the usual ‘Composition-Vowel’ i was used, e.g. pinnirīps, Juvenal (see Rev. Phil. 1892, p. 199); from paro come aequīpero, impero, pasper, but ūpi-parus; juniperus (and junīpīrus) (see Brambach, Lat. Orth. p. 142), derived by Verrius Flaccus from jūvēnis and pīrus (‘Serv.’ ad Ext. vii. 53); sicer, socer may be the direct development of *swēkūros, Gk. ἑκύς, Skt. śvāsuras, but see § 15, K. Z. xxxiiii. 564); cīneris, cīneri, but ciās, cinisculus (cf. Georges, Lex. Worf s. v. sīlerus, mataris, Samiraminis, and for plebeian spellings like Caeserem, see Schuchardt, Vok. i. 195, ii. 214). [The late spelling facīnerus is capable of being explained, like temperi Adv. beside temporī Dat., by the variation of the suffix -os- and -es- in the Declension of these Neuter stems (ch. v. § 71); cf. pīgnera for pignora (see Georges)].§ 21. (2) in -l or Labial. Anteclassical: consolverunt and cosoleretur on the S. C. de Bacchanalia of 186 B. C. (C. I. L. i. 196. But consuluerunt i. 185 beside consoluerunt i. 186 on two old inscriptions of Venusia); the MSS. of Plautus show exsdatum, Merc. 593 (B), exsolatum, Most. 597 (A), &c. (see Brix ad Trin. 535); consol on two inscriptions of 211 B. C. (i. 530–1) on another of 200 B. C. (Not. Scau. 1887, p. 195), and so normally till the third Punic War, even in one of 71 B. C., consolibus beside consolibus (C. I. L. i. 204); exsole is the Old Latin form (Cornutus ap. Cassiod. p. 152. 7 K.); Caesellius ap. eund. p. 204. 2 K.), while Velius Longus says, ‘consl’ scribebatur per o, cum legeretur per u (p. 49. 14 K.); incolonis is the spelling of the best MSS. (B, C) in Plaut. Truc. 168 (cf. columnas C. I. L. i. 1307). O remains in the classical period in vinoledentus (perhaps by analogy of cīnus lentus), somnoledentus, and sanguinolentus. For the Superlative suffix we have the oldest spelling ο in the proper name Maxomo in an inscription in the Faliscan dialect (Zv. I. I. 60 Maxomo Iuneo he cupat, ‘Maximus Junius hic
The spelling of Plautus has in words like magnus, Pseud. 702 (A.); pullufagis, Most. 526 (A.); sociusfraude, Pseud. 362 (A.); sacruficem, Pseud. 327 (both A, the Ambrosian Falimpsest, and the Palatine family of MSS.); carnufex, &c. (see Index to Studemund's Apograph of A, p. 522). So Oinunama for Uninamama, an Amazon, on an old Praenesteine cista (C. I. L. i. 1501); testumonum on the Lex Bantiina of 133-118 B. C. (i. 197); Cornuficia on an inscription (i. 1087), which Ritschl dates 'not long after Caesar' (cf. Gk. Kópro̱vikos, e.g. C. I. G. 6948), tubulustrium (Varro), but accifandam 108 B. C. (C. I. L. i. 565 and Eph. Epigr. viii. 460), epiparum on the old Falisco-Latin inscription with accipito (Zv. I. I. 72), vadimionum and adedicium on the Lex Agraria of 111 B. C. (C. I. L. i. 200); testimionum on the Lex Repetundarum of 121 B. C. (i. 198), &c. Monufestus is the anteclass., manifustus the classical spelling (Georges, Lex. Worff. s. v.). [For other examples see Georges s. vV. Hadrumetum, quadrupes, septu(m)ennis, septu(m)aginta, crassypes (Gk. Κρασόσπυρος, Bull. vi. p. 280, of the Republican period), manupretium, marabius, incolanum, cohuber, marsyphium, monumentum, cornupeta, sacrufex, existimo, lacruma, muculados, recupero, ustulo, acupenser, sterulinum, intubus, sessyfex, victuna, pontufex]. The influence of a following syllable with i (especially in hiatus) is shown in familia (O. Lat. famelia, § 18) beside famitus; subrimiti haedi, from munis, mamma (Paul. Fest. 369, 8 Th.) beside subbrunari (Fest. 442, 32 Th.); mo̱nicipies beside mancipium on the Lex Agraria of 111 B. C. (C. I. L. i. 200); manibies, Eph. Epigr. i. p. 215 (but manubies, ib. viii. 476, on a Capua inscription c. 135 B. C.); surripias is the spelling of both families of MSS. of Plautus in Pseud. 876, surripere in Pseud. 290, 675, surripitur in Mil. 602, but with u in the next syllable surrupui, surrupisse seem to be the Plautine forms (also surrupus); we have recept on a Scipio Epitaph of c. 180 B. C. (C. I. L. i. 33), accipito and concilium on i. 197 of 133-118 B. C., accipito, conciliatum, concilioboles on i. 198 of 123-122 B. C.; acipiant on i. 199 of 117 B. C.; only the i-form is quoted of inipitus: implicatus vel inretitus (Gl. Plac.), from root ap- (cf. aptus). [For ini̱pico: inpetum facite (Paul. Fest. 78, 5 Th.), see below]. In Gk. inscriptions Σετρυμοσ is very rare; we find almost always Σετρυμος. (See also Georges on Lanuvium).

Classical: u remains in contaminum (but adtibernalis, Paul. Fest. 9, 9 Th.) from taberna; manucyo, occupo from capio, occulto, &c., and was retained in the spelling of Dat. and Abl. Plur. of some U-stems to distinguish them from similar I- or Cons.-stems, e.g. artubus, but according to the second-cent. grammarian in the spelling only (Ter. Scaur. p. 25. 11 K. nemo autem tam insulse per u 'artubus' dixerit) (trebites on an old inscription in the British Museum, Eph. Epigr. ii. 299); dissypo is the anteclassical, dissipio the classical spelling (Georges, Lex. Worff. s. v.); so victuna and victima (ib. s. v.); monumentum and monimentum were both used, e.g. monimentu (C. I. L. i. 1258, 'not after 130 B. C.' Ritschl), while monimentum and monimentum are incorrect spellings (Georg. s. v.). Documentum, &c. but specimen, &c. by Assimilation.

The Parasitic Vowel. Anteclassical: piacolum, the old spelling according to Mar. Victorinus (p. II. 14 K. ut apparent ex libris antiquis foederum et legum, qui etiamsi frequenti transcriptione aliquid mutarunt, tamen retinent antiquitatem... pro 'piaculum' ubi 'piacolum'), is on a law of 56 B. C. (C. I. L. i. 603), piacul- (piacum) on the Spoletium inscription, xl. 4766), but the ancient o
remains in Plautine spellings like _aemolos_, Acc. Pl., _Pseud._ 196 (A.); _epolones_ dicebant antiqui quo nunc _epulones_ dicimus (Paul. Fest. 55. 15 Th.); _agolum_: pastorale _baculum_, quo pecudes aguntur (Paul. Fest. 21. 37 Th.); _Tuscolana_, _I. L._ i. 1200; _tabolam_ on S. C. Bacch. of 186 B.C. (i. 196); _tableis, popolum_ (beside _popul(o)_') on Lex Bantina of 133–118 B.C. (i. 197); _singolos, tableis_ (and _tabula_), conciliaboleis on the Lex Repetundarum of 123–122 B.C. (i. 198); _singolos_ (but _vinculaeis_) on the Sententia Minuciorum of 117 B.C. (i. 199); _tabolam, singolis_ on i. 208, an inscription referred by Ritschl to about the time of the Lex Agraria (i. 200, which however has only _tabula, tableis, singula, truentabule(is)_, viz. i. i B.C.; _angolaria_ (but _opercula_), on the (restored) Lex Parieti Faciendo of 105 B.C. (i. 577), so that the old spelling does not seem to have died out till the end of the second cent. B.C. (On Greek inscriptions we have _Δευτέρος_ (first cent. B.C.), _Δευτέρος_ (c. 140 B.C.), _Δευτέρος_ (first cent. A.D.), but usually _Δευτέρος_ (cf. ch. ii. § 102); the Gk. loanword _drachma_ is in the earlier writers _drachma_ for spellings like _vixium_, _vixulo_, _vigelio_, _tibulio_, _sibelo_, _sempulvita_, see Georges.)

§ 22. in other short syllables. Anticlassical: _accēdo_ (for _accido_) is preserved by the MSS. in _Enn. Trag._ 77. 206 R.; _Luct._ ii. 1025, v. 609 and elsewhere (see Ribbeck, _Prologom._ Vrg. p. 416); _sōtimus_ in _Naev._ Com. 35 R.; _acetare_ dicebant, quod nunc dicimus agere (Paul. Fest. 17. 30 Th.). Similarly _e_ is retained without weakening in spellings of the oldest MSS. of Plautus like _detenēt_, Pers. 505, _contenētum_, Stich. 214, _contenētum_ 623, &c. (so the corruption _ad te alienēt_, Pers. 497, points to _alienēt_ not _attīent_); in the MSS. of _Poen._ 266 _prosedē_ (cf. Paul. Fest. 282. 16 Th. _prosedas_ meretrices Plautus appellat), _optēnē_ on a Scipio Epitaph of c. 190 B.C. (C.I.L. i. 38) _conregione_ in the augur's formula (Varro, _L. M._ vii. 8; Paul. 46. 24 Th.); _promerēnum_, _promonet_, Carm. _Sal._ (Fest. 244. 12 Th.); _merētō(d)_ on a Scipio Epitaph of c. 215 B.C. (C.I.L. i. 32) _merētō_ i. 190, 'early part of the sixth cent. A. v. c.'), and even on a recent inscription (i. 1012). This _e_ in Old Latin spellings often appears for _I.-Eur._ i in syllables unaccented under the Old or the Paenuilima _Lēw_, e.g. _aëtēsis_ Nom., on a Scipio Epitaph of c. 250 B.C. (i. 31); _Fabrecio_ (i. 106); _Tempestētabēs_ on a Scipio Epitaph of c. 215 B.C. (i. 32); _Lēporeses_ for _Liparenenses_ (Gk. _Δέποια_), _Λετεῖδος_ (in Rep., but _Λετεῖδος_ in Empire), _Λεμέτιος_ and _Δομέτιος_. But the weakening to _i_ is old, as is seen from _dimidiūs_, which must have changed to _et i_ at a time when the accent rested on the first syllable; _conicēs_ on an old Praenestine _cisa_ of third cent. B.C. (Mll._Arch._ 1890, p. 303); _subigail_ and _opsēdes_ on a Scipio Epitaph of c. 200 B.C. (i. 30); _habitārent_ oppidum, _possidēre_ on the Decree of L. Aemilius Paulus, 189 B.C. (ii. 5041) _obstīnet_, dicebant antiqui, quod nunc est ostendīt, ut in veteribus carminibus, &c. (Fest. 228. 6 Th.); _prospēscē_, _prospicē_, Carm. _Sal._ (Fest. 244. 13 Th.); _ēnīco_ is the old spelling, later _enēco_ (Georgios, _Lex._ Worf. s.v.); _prosīcūm_, quod praesecatum projecitur (Paul. Fest. 282. 13 Th., cf. _prosīciōne_, _Gl._ Philox.); _esicēs_ from _ex_ and _secō_, _Plaut._ _Rud._ 122; _obigatē_ antiqui dicebant pro ante agitāt (Fest. 214. 2 Th.); _jīrige_, _jīrige_ (cf. _жиргем_); _gallīcērum_ from _canus_, by analogy of which was formed _conticēnum_ (cf. _Gl._ _Plac._ p. 58. 24 _G._ _conticēn_: temporē noctēs post _galli_ _cantum_ quando _cēnīt_ et _conticēt_ (see Goetz, _praef._ in _Plaut._ _Asin._ _xxv_). Classical: _Jupiter_ _fētrum_; _sītīste_ (cf. _Gl._ _postāre_); _conticēm_, explained by Varro, _'ubi viae competēnt'_ (L. L. 6. 25) (cf. _propītius_; _dimico_ from _maco_
§§ 22, 23.] ACCENTUATION. VOWEL-WEAKENING. 195

(cf. maesto); of the rare weakening of o we have examples in Compounds like 
hypercysta, armiger, &c. for the Composition-Vowel, which is o in other languages,  
is in Latin (see ch. v. § 83); inquitius beside incola? Of û, examples are cornicen  
(Gk. κορνικαρός, κορνουκαρός and κορνικαρός); supercilium (cf. Gk. κύκλι,  
Plur.); both inquitus (indeut in all the MSS. of Plaut. Pers. 251) and inquitus are  
attested spellings; (cf. arbita, not arbita, in the MSS. of Lucretius, v. 941 and  
965). For other examples of e-i, see Georges, Lex. Wortf., s. vv. digo, compitum,  
tremebundus, caeremonia, fenicium, ceresia, plozenem, subsicium, quatenus, internecto,  
protinus, senexa, querimonia, intellegentia, neglege, interimo, also for late and plebeian  
spellings like segitis, patena, tredecem, decim. (On late adjectivum see Schurardt,  
Vok. i. 193.) The change of e to i in syllables long by position is claimed for  
preficini génista, &c. (on these see ch. ii. § 12), certainly with right in in-  
fringo, &c. (see ch. iv. § 11), before a consonant-group like ny (so tingo for  
*tengo, Gk. τέγω). Assimilation saves the vowel in segetem, teretem, &c.

§ 23. (3) Diphthongs, ai, ae. Anteclassical: distisum and pertisum diebant,  
quad none 'distaesum' et 'pertaeasum' (Paul. Fest. 51. 25 Th., cf. 271. 2 Th.).  
Festus, 372. 7 Th. tells us that Scipio Africanus Minor was twitted for his  
use of pertisus by Lucilius:

Quo facetior videare, et scire plus quam caeteri  
'Pertisus' hominem, non pertaeasum, dices.

Lucilius was right, for compounds with intensive per are Separable Compounds  
like bene-facio, sat-ago (see below); pertaeasum is the spelling on the Claudius tablet  
at Lyons; consiptus was used by Ennius, according to Paul. Fest. 43. 37 Th. (cf.  
45. 15), and an example is quoted by Non. 183. 14 M. s. v. venor: tenor consipta,  
undique uenor (Enn. Trag. 254 R.); adspire and praessipere diebant antiqui, siue  
nos quoque modo dicimus abaequo 'iniquum,' ab quaerendo 'inquirere' (Paul.  
Fest. 16. 9 Th.); obsipiam, quoted from Caecilius by Diomedes (p. 383. 10 K.  
quad vulgo 'obsipio' dicimus veteres 'obsipio' dixerunt. Caecilius, &c.)  
(Com. 65 R.); praecondanem poream diebant, quam immolare erant soliti  
antiquam novam frugem praeciderent (Paul. Fest. 273. 5 Th.). (Gellius, iv. 6  
discusses this word and its cognate succedaneae, which, he says, was sometimes  
misspronounced in his time succidaneae: succidaneae nominatae, littera i silicet  
tractim pronuntiata; audio enim quosdam eam litteram in haec voce corripere);  
occisit is quoted from the Laws of Numa by Festus (194. 21 Th.); so decidito in  
XII Tab., incideretis on S. C. Bacch. of 186 n. c. (C. L. i. 196, 27). But exquaere  
is quoted by Priscian (i. p. 38 H.) from Plaut. Aul. 800, and the MSS. of Plautus  
often show this spelling of the word (see Ritschl, Opusc. iv. p. 141) (so defaecato,  
Aul. 79, but defecatam, Most. 158 are the likely spellings); conquaeri, conquaesierit,  
exaestumaverit occur on the Lex Repetundarum of 123-122 n. c. (C. I. L.  
i. 198), while on the Edictum Popillianum of 123 n. c. (i. 551) we have the  
curious spelling conquaesivei [cf. i. 547, an inscription of 141 or 116 n. c., with  
Caecilius (and consulto), while a similar inscription, i. 548, has the older spelling  
Caecilius (and consulto, § 26)]. Later, the retention of ae became the rule, e. g.  
iii. p. 166); we have usually fabri subaeidiani on inscriptions (C. I. L. x. 6699. 3;  
vi. 9559. 8, &c.), or subaeidiani (vi. 9558. 7; viii. 10523. 5) (of which last, subaeidiani  
on ii. 2211. 7, seems to be a misspelling). The weakened forms are used in  
the classical period in the compounds of quaero, in existimo (cf. Mar. Victor.  
O 2
p. 22. 6 K. quid enim facietis in his quae, velitis nolitis, et scribenda sunt et legenda ut scripta sunt, ut exempli gratia 'existimo' non 'exaestimo'), in fastiānum for *fasti-tilium* (§ 13; p. 176), &c. 

au; affincare aquam: in fauces obsorbendam dare (Paul. Fest. 223. 8 Th.); defrudo seems to be the spelling of Plautus and Terence (Ritschl, Parerg. Plaut. p. 540); accusō, incusō, &c. from causa are classical forms. The ā of the compounds of claudō was in time adopted in the simple verb too, clado by analogy of redudo, &c. (of Ital. chiudo) (see Seelmann in Gött. Gel. Anz. Aug. 15, 1890) (cf. sed frūde § 64, beside sed fraude § 69, on the Lex Repetundarum, C. I. L. i. 198). The ō of explōdo, &c. is not due to the loss of accent, but is a by-form of au found in the simple verb. (Diom. p. 382. 26 K. plaudo frequens est; then after quoting the form ploderent from Cicero, he adds, secundum eam consuetudinem qua 'au 'syllaba cum o' littora commercium habet, ut cum dicimus 'claustra' et 'clostra', item 'caudam' et 'codam' et similia), just as oe (older ōi) and ā are byforms, e. g. commūnis, immūnis, semine in S. C. Bacch. (C. I. L. i. 196), immoēnis (Plaut.). Oboedio from audio is difficult to explain. (See also Georges, Lex. Worfl. s. v. dissēptum, exquiro, existimo, and Brahmbach, Orth. on pertaesus, lapicidinae.)

§ 24. (4) Diphthongs in Χιατό. (On these see also ch. iv.) The u-diphthong is retained in dō-urus, dū-urus (O. Lat. strīt-urus) but becomes ū in duo beside lavo, ervum (eruvum) from *erēgūs* (Gk. ἐπιβάυθος), δέμου for de novo, &c. The Greek ἄχαν(φ) of became Lat. Achēvi (through *Acheiv-*); Gk. ἀχαυ(φ) or, olivo-, older oleivo-, which became when -om was weakened to -on *olei(v)um Nom., *oleivi Gen. &c. (see ch. ii. § 53), whence olemum (for ey before a vowel loses y, e. g. ίο, 'I go,' for *εγό, ch. iv. § 63), and olimum, olei and olei, &c. (like dei(v)us, deivi, whence deus and divus, dei and divi, ch. iv. § 70); Gk. ἀμφαία, a Thracian claymore, became rumpia (Enn. Ann. xiv. fr. 8 M.; Liv. xxxi. 39. 11). Incloaca for clōcaca, the v has been dropped, as usual, before the accented vowel (ch. ii. § 53), while νεκτός and νοεζός are different formations (ch. v. § 7).

§ 25. (5) Je and ve. On i, ū as a weak or unaccented form of yē, wē in Indo-European see ch. iv. § 51. Whether the i of abiicio, &c. should be explained as a similar Latin weakening, or as a modification of *ji-*, is an open question. The ū of concitō may also be compared with the use of Greek κυ for Lat. -qui- (especially unaccented), e. g. Greek ἀκόλος for Lat. Aquila, Greek Kopeivos for Lat. Quirinus, see ch. ii. § 28. Cf. ancūmēnta 'unclean,' (Paul. Fest. 8. 29 Th.), and inquinare; bigae is the reduction of bi-jugae (see Georges, Lex. Worfl. s. v. bijugae), quadrīgae of quadri-jugae; abicio has the first syllable short in the old dramatic poets (cf. ch. ii. § 48, p. 45).

§ 26. (6) Later change of o to u, u to ū, i. In syllables long by position this is the usual development of original o, for cases like trī-gintā with e(i) for unaccented o (cf. Greek τρακόντα) are rare, e. g. vētūnus from L.-Eur. *wetos (Greek ἔτος, 'a year') and similar derivative TO-stems from Neuter S-stems, férundus and similar Gerundial DO-stems from third Conjugation Verbs, vētūnus and the like formations [that fīnestus, ferenđus, ferenťarius (cf. Osc. Herentat-, the Ocean Venus), &c. show a weakening of o to e, and not rather a system fenes-, ferenđ-, feren- cannot be proved; cf. ch. viii. §§ 89, 94, and see above, § 20; cf. lugubreī (-os) and funebreī (-os)]. Similarly in final syllables long by position we have -unt in 3 Pl. of Verbs for O. Lat. -ont, e. g. nequantōn (Liv. Andron.), cosentōnt (Scipio Epitaph) (ch. viii. § 73). The change of o to u
in unaccented syllables is further discussed in ch. iv. § 20. Didymundus (and dupondius; see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v.), promunturium, are not good examples, for before nd, nt we find even accented o becoming a-u-sound, e.g. O. Lat. frondes, Acheruntem (ch. ii. § 22). For examples of the change in syllables not long by position, see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. vv. formalibus, adolescentes, lemures, fulgurio, bajulus, lautumiae, and cf. Brambach, Orth. on the misspellings palenta, annulum, Aequiculi and Georges on subules, eburis Gen., rigura Plur., vindulentus, sanguinulentus, somnulentus, tripudo. But œvilium (Greek οὐ) and caraulum (Greek καὐ) are not examples, nor mamphur (leg. manfar) the 'thong' round a turner's wheel (Paul. Fest. 101. 1 Th.). (see Meyer-Lübke, Comm. Schweizer-Sidler, p. 24), and O. Lat. colina is a doubtful form. Examples of u-i are includus, later includus, défutrum and défritum (see Georges), arbitum and arbitum (Lucr.), sótara and satira.

§ 27. (7) Greek words with Vowel-change. a. Aleria (Ἀλερία in Herodotus), a town in Corsica (cf. the Scipio Epitaph, c. 215 B.C. C. I. L. i. 32 hec eepit Corsica Aleriaque urbe); tessera (τεσσάρα); Agrigentum (Ἀγριγέντα Λεκες, now Girgenti; Tarentum (Τάραντα Λεκες), now Táranto or Taránto; Alixeutrom (Ἀλιξέαυρος) on a Praenestine cista of third cent. B.C. (i. 59), and on another (i. 1501) Alixente(r) (Ἀλιξέαυρος), Caserter(a) (Κασσάνδρα), Ailetta (Ἀιπαλάτη); Hecula, O. Lat. Hecuba (Quint. i. 4. 16) (Ἐξάβην); camera (καμάρα), also camara, (the spelling approved by Verrius Flaccus, Charis. 58. 23 K.), which was specially used in the sense of a decked boat (see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v.); Camerina and Camarina (Καμάρινα), σφηνολά (see Meyer, Rom. Gram., i. pp. 32, 36); machina (μηχανή, μαχανά); Catina (Κάτινα); scultula (σκυταλή); stranguló (στραγγαλάνω).

1. catapula (καταπλήττω); scopyalus (κασπάλεος); tarpesita Plaut. (τραπεζίτης); pharetra (φαρέτρα); Acheron Plaut. (Ἀχέρων); enecilis (Löwe, Prodr. p. 376) (ἐγχείλεσ). 2. dipsilis (διψιλή); cupressus (κυπάρισσος).

3. amara (ἀμάρη); cethurnus (κόθυρος); epistula (ἐπιστολή); also epistola (see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v.); paenula (φανόλη); tribulus (τριβόλος); Patricoles (Πάτροκλος), the old form, used by Ennius (Trag. 314 R.); a line of Livius Andronicus is quoted by Gellius, vi. 7. 11, with this name in the form Patroclus, without any divergence in the MSS.; lautumiae. Axerum, popularly connected with ὄρφος, and late Lat. averta (Greek ἀφορτή) admit of other explanations. (See Solmsen, Stud. Lat. Lat. Gesch. p. 23). On the spelling numisma (Gk. νομίσμα) see Keller ad Hor. Epit. ii. 1. 234, and on late Lat. zedulus for diabolus, Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v.

4. arteana; but artaena (artena) in Lucilius (ἄρτανα); inciceta (ἰγγυθήσα). (Paul. Fest. 76. 3 Th. inciceta: machinula, in qua constitutatur in convivio vini amphora, de qua subinde deferentur vina); mattea, 'mince meat' (Varro, L. L. v. 112) (ματυγ). (The word appears in a curious military term matoiosbarbaleis, used by Vegetius for a leaden bullet, or a soldier armed with these, apparently for ματυγ-πάρβολος, lit. 'mince meat-scattering.' See A. I. L. v. 135); serpillion, (if from Greek ἑρπυλλος), with s by analogy of serpo.

5. au, av. Achiol (Ἀχιόλ); olivum and oleum (ἄλεον); ocella and olea (άλεια); Centurum, Centaurum (GL. Plac. p. 54. 7 G.) (Κένταυρον).

Parasitic Vowel. Ἠρακλῆς is on Praenestine cistae and mirrors Hercle... (C.I.L. xiv. 4105), Herodes (? Forcides) (C.I.L. i. 1500), Herculee Acc. (i. 56), and on old Praenestine inscriptions (xiv. 2891-2) Hercolei Dat. On a Roman inscription of 217 B.C. (i. 1503) Hercolei Dat. So Hercolei (i. 1175), Hercolis (i. 815), but Herculeis Gen. on an inscr. of 146 B.C. (i. 541), classical Hercules,
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meoerle (cf. Prisc. i. p. 27. 13 H. Romanorum vetustissimi in multis dictionibus loco ejus (u) o posuisse inveniuntur . . . Hercules pro 'Herculem'); 'Asclepiōs is Aisclapiaio Dat. on an old inscr. (Ann. Epigr. 1890, no. 85, but Aisclapi, Eph. Epigr. i. 5), classical Aesculapius; 'Alekmērν is in Plautus Alcumena; on techina, &c., musino, see ch. ii. § 72.

§ 28. (8) Vowel unchanged. i. in Latin words. Anteclassical: incaantassit and excontassit of XII Tab. (ap. Plin. xxviii. 18), but 'oecentassit' antiqui diecbant, quod nunc convicium fecerint (Fest. 196. 12 Th.); ancessa, dicta sunt ab antiquis visa, quae caelata appellamus (Paul. Fest. 15. 10 Th.), but Prisc. i. p. 29. 20 H. cites as instances of am-, 'anfractus,' 'ancisus,' 'anquiro,' and Varro, L.L. vii. 43 explains 'ancel/a': quod ea arma ut utraque parte, ut Thracum, incisa; perfacul antiqui, et per se 'facul' diecbant, quod nunc facile diximus (Fest. 266. 20 Th.) is normal, for compounds with per- 'very' seem not to change the vowel, e.g. persulsus (beside insulsus), persapiens (beside insipiens): perfacelis (beside difficlis), being what are called 'Separable' Compounds, cf. per pol supe peccus, Plaut. Cas. 370, per àpus est, Ter. Andr. 265 (so that Lucilius was right in his objection to pertisum, see above); procopis progenies: quae ab uno capite procedit (Paul. Fest. 281. 22 Th.); concepit tignum XII Tab. (ap. Fest. 556. 27 Th. tignum inuentum aedibus uneaue et concepit ne soluto); respersum vinum (Paul. Fest. 353. 6 Th.): concapsit, comprehenderit (C. G. L. v. 182. 22). occamure (3 Pl. Fft.) is quoted from Sallust's Histories by Priscian, i. p. 529. 5 K.

Classical: redarguo, but 'rederguo,' was used by Scipio Africanus Minor (Fest. 372. 7 Th. redarguissse per e litteram Scipio Africanus Pauli flius dicitur unentiasse, ut idem etiam 'pertisum'); dilacris, but Vulg. Lat. alecor (so in a glossary in MS. Vind. 482) (Ital. allegro, &c.); auguratus, augur were formerly 'augeratus,' 'auger' according to Priscian, i. p. 27. 17 H.; impetus, but 'inipite,' inpetum facie (Paul. Fest. 78. 5 Th., apparently a corruption for 'impite,' impetum faci), 'compitum'; undecim, duodecim weaken the e of the final syllable but not of the paenultima; incola, but O. Lat. 'inquilinus' (ch. vi. § 10); inaequilis, but 'iniquus,' &c. U remains in tituli (see ch. viii. § 39), pœculum, comuus, &c. (See also Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. vv. instauro, con-quaestor, comparo, sepelio, &c.)

§ 29. ii. in Greek loanwords: amygdalai (ἄμυγδαλη) (but Vulg. amigdaula, Probi Appendix 198.26 K.); artemo Lucil. (ἀρτέμων); astrabla, the title of a play ascribed to Plautus (αστράβην); ballena or balena, Plaut. &c. (φάλανα); balanus, Plaut. &c. (βάλανος); barathrum, Plaut. &c. (βάραθρον); calamus, Plaut. &c. (κάλαμος), apparently Vulg. Lat. *calmus (Ital. calmo and calamo, Fr. chaume); cantharus, Plaut. &c. (κάνθαρος); cinaedus, Plaut. &c. (κινάδος); cottabos, Plaut. &c. (κότταβος); cymbalum, Lucer. &c. (κύμβαλον); daedalus, Enn. &c. (δαίδαλος); dapheta, Plaut. (δάφητα); gauvaceum, Varro (καυνάκη); gausoge, Lucil. &c. (γαυσόζης, γαύσαρος); Hecula, Plaut. &c. ('Εκάρη) hílarus, Plaut. &c., later hílaris (hároś); Hílúria, Plaut., later Ilíria ('Ilíría); lapathus, Lucil. (λαπάθος); machaera, Plaut. &c. (μάχαιρα); malaxis, Naev., Plaut. &c. (μάλακος); margvia, Varro, &c. (μαργαρίτης); metálum, Varro, &c. (μετάλλον); nurena, Plaut. &c. (νυρωναι); narcissus (νάρκης); obrussa, 'touchstone,' Cie. (δρυμῆς, ὀμβρος); onager (ἄναγρος); palasstra, Plaut. &c. (παλαίστρα); petaus, Plaut. &c. (πεταος); phalangia, Varro, &c.; pitàcium (πίτακον); ptisana, Varro, &c. (πτισάνη); raphanus, Cato, &c. (ράφανος); sessamum, Plaut. (σήσαμον), but sesumam, Plaut.
Poem. 326, sessimu (see Georges s. v.); stomachus, stomachor, Terr. &c. (στόμαχος); Tartarus, Tartarivos, Eun. &c. (Σαρπατος), sometimes mispronounced 'Tarterus' (Consent. 392. 17 K.); thalamus (θάλαμος); thesaurus, thesaurè, Plaut. &c. (θησαυρος); tropaeum, Accius, &c. (τρόφαιον); tympanum, Plaut. &c. (τύμπανον); tympanus, Plaut. &c. (τύμπανον); paedagogus, Plaut. &c. (παιδαγωγός).

§ 30. (9) Long vowels. None of the examples adduced to prove that long unaccented vowels were sometimes changed are conclusive: delero from līra, 'afurrow,' root le⇔- (O.Sl. leba, Lith. lysis, 'a garden-bed, 'O. H. wagan-leisa, &c.), is the correct form, while delero, as Varro (ap. Vel. Long. 73. 2 K.) pointed out, is due to confusion with Greek λήφω. Delinio (so spelt in all the MSS. apparently of Plaut. Stich. 457), beside delenio, subtilis (but probēm, &c.), suspicio, convicium, all with i in the following syllable, show the change to which even accented i is liable, e. g. Plēnus (ch. iv. § 7). Occedamus, attributed to Plautus, as an example of ob in composition, by the MSS. of Festus (196. 10 Th. occedamus Plautus ponit pro contra cedamus, cum plurimae aliae praepositiones familiariores huic verbo sint; cf. Paul. 197. 1 Th.) is clearly a corruption for occedāmus. For not only does Placidus' Glossary of Plautus (p. 89. 4 G.) give occedere: occurrere vel obviam cedere, but the MSS. (the Palatine family) of Plautus read in the passage referred to by Festus, viz. Pseud. 250, Accedamus hac obviam, where the corruption accedamus points to an original occedamus. Consiĕo, an epithet of the goddess Ops (Fest. 210. 26 Th., Varro, L. L. vi. 11) has been connected with consiĕo, consiēvi. The examples of unchanged i are numerous, such as the compounds of cēdo, rēpo, cēdo, crédo, crētus, spēro, iřrētio from rēte, &c. For the change of ā to ē through want of accent (for a similar change through influence of palatal j (y) in Vulg. Lat. Jēnwartus, &c., see ch. ii. § 3) the examples usually adduced are anhelus (cf. hālo), and subīl (cf. tālus). But anhelus (spelt anelus in MSS. of Virgil; see Ribbeck's Index) has probably come from *an-ēnēlos, the o of hālo, from *ānōso (root an augmented by s), having been changed to e while its quantity was still short. The word subēl quoted by Priscian (i. p. 147. 9 H.) as an instance of -ēl, and explained as tō koalov tō νόσος (what does he mean by hostis hostilis, subēl subtilis, i. p. 131. 21 H. ?) may similarly be due to a change of the short vowel in the original form *sub-laε-lous (cf. taxilus) (or from tallus ?). None of the Compounds of clāmnō, fāmnō, fātūlō, clārīus, pārex, plācto, prācēs, rādo, vādō, gnārīs, grātus, lābor, mānō, nātus, gnārīs, &c. ever change the vowel. Prouetus is a compound of festus (cf. fērīae for *fēsiaæ), not of fastus, fās (cf. nūfastus). Nor do ā, ē change; witness the Compounds of plōrō, dōnō, flōs, &c. Praeotor and praestālor come, the one from praestā, the other from praestā (§ 15. 3). Pējēro and ejēro (cf. conierat, coniurat, C. G. L. iv. 322. 33) have not yet been thoroughly explained.

§ 31. (10) Recomposition and Analogy. In Vulgar Latin, as was mentioned before (§ 11), the accent seems to have rested on the first syllable of the verb in Compound Verbs, e. g. renēgat, Ital. riniega, O. Fr. renie; dimōrat, Ital. dimora (with close o), Fr. demeure. The vowel of the simple verb usually appears unchanged in the Compound, e. g. redōdēlit, Ital. rendiede, O. Fr. rendet. From the inscriptions of the Empire and the remarks of grammarians we see that the same 'etymological' treatment of Compound Verbs was a feature of Imperial Latin. On the Latin Papyri of Herculaneum (first cent. a. d.) the preposition of a Compound Verb, &c. is usually retained in its simple form and not assimilated to the initial of the verb, or noun, e. g.
ad-siduo, ad-fini (Class. Rev. iv. 443), by a similar 're-composition'; and Velius Longus (p. 62. 16 K.) mentions adlunc, adlignor, adlabbor as the forms in use at his time, though Assimilation was the custom with other verbs, e. g. alligo (see ch. iv. § 159). The same grammarian, in another passage, while he approves of the pronunciation commendo, adds that the popular pronunciation was commendado (73. 10 K. quamvis 'commendando dicamus, tamen 'commando' in consuetudine est.) (So amendo and amando. See Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v.). And his remark on the word comprimo shows the tendency of his time (first cent. A.D.) to follow in these Compound Verbs the analogy of the Simple Verb, or of the Perfect Participle Passive (76. 9 K. 'comprimo' quoque per i malo scribi, quamvis 'compressus' dicatur). (Cf. Mar. Vict. 10. 6 K. sacratum autem in compositione 'consecratum' facit per s et e, non per s et a, sic et castus facit 'incestum' non 'incestum'; Caper 110. 7 K. 'insipiens' non 'insapiens'; Diom. 378. 30 K.; Prisc. i. p. 437. 25 H.) The analogy of the Perf. Part. Pass. (or was it Assimilation?) brought e instead of i into the second syllable of perputi, depercesei, &c., while the analogy of the simple verb is seen in spellings on Imperial inscriptions like consacratii (C.I. L. vi. 3716, of 182 A.D.), consacravi on the Mon. Ancyr. ii. 30; iv. 25) (for other examples see Seelmann, Ausspr. p. 60). Often the two forms, the old with changed vowel and the new popular form, are retained side by side, and are used by the grammarians to express different shades of meaning. Thus Velius Longus (75. 6 K.) differentiates aspergo the Verb, from aspargo the Noun; Caper (100. 5 K.) protimus the Adverb of time, from protermus the local Adverb. The i of the Oblique Cases of levir, *laecir, 'brother-in-law' (cf. Greek ἱαῖρ, L.-Eur. *daiwer-) and indeed of the Nom. Sg. too, is due to the analogy of vir (cf. Non. 557. 6 M. levir dicitur frater mariti, quasi laevus vir); of the inferior spelling genitriz, for genetrix (see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v.) to the analogy of genitor. Sometimes the Analogy of the Compound affects the Simple Verb, when the Compound is more frequently in use than the other. The Analogy of conspicio, aspicio, despicio, &c. changed the spelling of the little used simple verb from specio (e. g. Varr. L. L. vi. 82, Plaut. Cas. 516) to spicio; complico, explico, &c. have effected the change of *plicio (Gk. πλίκω) to pilico. (For other ex. of 'Re-composition,' see Seelmann, Ausspr. p. 60, and Georges, Lex. Wortf. s.vv. dispando, infasciatus, praecanto, infaricio, peremo, indaminis beside indemnis; see also above, § 28).

§ 32. (11) Pretonic. Miniscitum pro reminiscitur antiquitus dicebatur (Paul. Fest. 88. 12 Th.) (or by Analogy of Compound ?); the Preposition en of O. Lat. became in from its position before the accented syllable in phrases like in-aède esse, in-témpłum ire, &c. Caper (p. 93. 3 K.) corrects the mispronunciation pinaria colla for 'penaria,' and (p. 106. 4 K.) vulenta for 'polenta,' and (p. 100. 23 K.), vidato for 'pedato' in the phrase 'primo pedato'; Probi Append. 198. 5 K. sinatus (C.I. L. i. 206. l. 135; viii. 10525, &c.). We may similarly explain the u of Ullices, from 'Oλυσωσίς, the 'Aeolic' form of Οδυσσεύς (Quint. i. 4. 16, who also quotes the spelling Puluxena for Poluxena); cf. 'ουδείς on a Gk. inscription of Syracuse, L. I. S. 125; Βουλομνος on a Cyzicus inscription of the Republican period, Mith. vi. 124. (See also Georges, Lex. Wortf. for the spellings rutundus, pulligo, cimínum, Sigambri, Lundinum, &c.) In Italian the influence of the following labial is shown in somiglia (Lat. *similiat), domanda (Lat. demandat), dovere (Lat. debere), of a following r in smeraldo (Lat. smaragdus). But examples in Republican Latin of the weakening of initial syllables are doubtful (cf. § 7).
§ 33. (12) Assimilation, Dissimilation, and False Analogy. In Italian the unaccented vowel is often assimilated to the vowel of the neighbouring syllable. Thus Latin aequālis has become uguale; cronaca (Lat. chronicā) owes its penultimate a to Assimilation. The same tendency is seen in Vulgar Latin *aramen for aēramen (Span. arambre, Port. arame, Prov. aram, &c.), *salvaticus for silecticus (Fr. sauvage, our ‘savage,’ Span. salvaje), &c., and in classical Latin in Perfeces like memordi, peposei, eccecurri, of which the older forms were memordi, peposei, eccecurri (Gell. vi. 9). So strong is the tendency in Latin to assimilate completely an initial syllable which has some resemblance to a following syllable that we find this Assimilation even in the accented syllable of Perfeces like pupāgi, older pepugi (Gell. ib.) [cecini reflects the older spelling *ce-cen-ei, but when the Stem-syllable had originally i, we have i in the Reduplication-syllable, e.g. di-dic-i (see ch. viii. § 22) from *dic-sko]. (On the Assimilation of Syllables in Latin, see ch. iv. § 163). Mispronunciations of this kind censured in the Appendix Probi (197-9 K.) are: toloneum, tonotru, passar, ansar, parentalia, butumen, and on late inscriptions we have misspellings like monumentum (C. I. L. vi. 2888, 11131, 24481, xiv. 416 and 523 and 864; Bull. Comm. Rom. 1880, p. 137, 1887, p. 43), optono (C. I. L. ii. 2491) (cf. oppudum as early as the Lex Agraria of 111 b. c., i. 200, 81), passar (I. R. N. 7160 ; C. I. L. vi. 2698), ansare (v. 7066), patarir (vi. 2063. 12, the Act. Arval. of 81 a. d.), carcareres (vi. 2065, 2066, 2067, the Act. Arval. of 87-90 a. d.), cucurri (C. I. L. vi. 6262, 8766), figiliinae (xv. preaf. p. 8). See also Georges, Lex. Wortf. on the spellings lucuna, lucusta, tubarres, Berenice, carcar, passar [e. g. Itala (Ash.) Lex. xi. 5, (Taur.) Matth. x. 29 and 31, (Cantab.) Luc. xi. 150], Platonais, Doboberta, tugurium, and cf. Romance forms like Span. pajaro, Ital. passaretta (from Vulg. Lat. passar). The opposite tendency, viz. Dissimilation, perhaps appears in Vulgar Latin in a word like vicinus, where the first i (close i) has been changed to open i (Span. vecino, Prov. vezins, &c.). To the false analogy of lācus has been referred the a of Vulg. Lat. *lacusta (Roum. lacișă), while forms like Prov. langosta, O. Fr. longoste point to an original l'angusta (illé angusta). The tendency of plant-, bird-, and beast-names to be changed by all sorts of false analogies is well seen in the dialectal Italian descendants of Lat. vespertilio, 'a bat' (Tosc. pipistrello, and vipistrello Caserta sportiglione, Pisa pilistrello, Parma pîlîstre, &c.). (For exx. of vowel retained by Assimilation, see §§ 22, 29).

§ 34. (13) Shortening of Syllables long by Position. In the dramatists of the Republic a syllable long by nature or by position is occasionally scanned as a short syllable when a short syllable precedes, a law of Prosody which is usually called the Law of Breves Breviantes. Of final syllables, syllables whether long by nature or by ‘position’ are shortened by this law especially in iambic words like cavē, putā, feriunt, logiunt, the liability of a final unaccented syllable to be shortened being increased by the precedence of a short accented syllable (see next section). Putting final syllables aside for the present, the usual case of syllable-shortening is in a word of four or more syllables, where a syllable long by position is preceded by a short syllable, and followed by the accented syllable. Thus volūptātis, volūptatem, volūptarius, &c. are common asciptions in the early dramatists, and volūnātis, juvenūtis, gubernāre and gubernator, egūstatis, venūstatis, supperclicitis come next in order of frequency. The normal asciption of all these second syllables is that of Classical poetry; but the position of the syllable between a short syllable on the one hand and the
accented syllable on the other, made it especially liable to be slurred in pronunciation, so that the dramatic poets, who followed more closely the pronunciation of everyday life than others, felt themselves at liberty, when exigencies of metre demanded, to treat it as a short syllable. In the word ministerium this pronunciation was carried so far as to syncopate the second syllable, ministerium, minsterium (Ital. mostierio, Fr. métier, Chaucer’s ‘mystery,’ ed. Morris, iii. 348); and this form seems to occur as early as Plautus, Pseud. 732:

paruis magnisque misteriis praefulcior,

where the MSS. offer miseris. Less frequently we find the preposition shortened in a Compound when preceded by a short monosyllable (or elided disyllable), e.g. Capt. 83 in occulto, Most. 896 tibi òptemperem, phrases which may be considered as word-groups in-occulto, tib(í)-óptemperem, and so fall under the same category as the polysyllables voluptatis, voluptarius just mentioned, but also, e.g. Trin. 318 quid exporbas? Capt. 70 quia inuocatus, where the accent does not fall on the syllable immediately following the preposition. The tendency of a preposition in a Compound to be weakened (ch. ii. § 130) (cf. é-mitto for *om-mitto, *obmittó; récito, rē-latus, rē-duco, earlier recido,rellatus, redduco, but see ch. ix. § 49), is here increased by the precedence of a short syllable; or perhaps the truer explanation is that the Preposition was regarded as separable from the other member of the Compound, and quid ëx-, qui(a) in- show the same shortening as in the final syllable of iambic words. Similarly in Greek and other loanwords a long syllable by position may be shortened when the preceding short syllable has the accent, as in Plautus always Philippus (Φιλίππος) in the sense of a ‘Philip,’ a gold coin, and in the Christian poets ἀβύσσος (ἀβυσσος) (Paul. Nol. 19. 651; 35. 228; Cypr. Gall. Gen. 288 P.). In Vulgar and Late Latin we have syllables long by nature shortened in this way, e.g. ɛrèmeus (ἐρήμος) in the Christian poets (e.g. Prud. Psych. 372; Cath. v. 89), whence the Romance forms, Ital. erémo and erme, O. Fr. erme, Span. yermo, &c.; mérèbatur, a mispronunciation censured by Consentius 393. 23 K. (also érvor 392. 11 K.); verècundus in the Christian poets (e.g. Fort. vii. 6. 10) (cf. vericundus C. I. L. x. 1870), whence the Romance syncopated forms of ver(e)cundia, Ital. vergogna, Fr. vergogne, Span. verguenza, &c.; but the instances which can be quoted from the early dramatists are so few and so uncertain as not to warrant us in ascribing this pronunciation to an earlier time (see Journ. Phil. xxi. 198; xxii. 1). In Ter. Phorm. 902 an uredëbaminí; some MSS. have an uredemení; and Chutomestra or Claudiomesta [Κλαυδιαμέστρα], a better spelling than Κλαυταμέστρα, in Livius Andronicus, Trag. 11 R., may be a case of false analogy, like orichalcum (ὀρείχαλκος), which is in Plautus aurichalecum, by confusion with aurum, and owes its short i to this earlier form (cf. aqueductus non ‘aquiductus’ Prob. App. 197. 26 K., like terrae motus non ‘terrimotum’ ib. 198. 32). Ancora (Ἄνκρα), where the shortened vowel follows a syllable which is not short but long by position, seems, with its o for u before r, not to be a direct development of the Greek word. The early dramatists do not shorten by the law of Breves Breviantes the prepositions in, con in Compounds when the letter following the preposition is s or f (see Journ. Phil. ii. cc.) and we know from Cicero (Or. xlviii. § 159) that the ɛ, o were long in these cases. Calèfacio, &c. (in Quintilian’s time apparently calfacio, i. 6. 21), are really separable compounds, calce facio (cf. fæcō lātē, Lucr. vi. 962), so that the ɛ is properly regarded as a final vowel; and the same is true of disquinta (cf. Gell. x. 24. 1).
§ 35. Change and Shortening of Vowel in Unaccented Final Syllable. The final syllable in Latin requires a separate treatment, for besides the want of accent, there are other weakening influences to which a final syllable is always liable. Phoneticians tell us (Sweet, Primer, § 105) that 'the general tendency of language is to pronounce with diminishing force,' so that in English, for example, the e of 'cat' is pronounced with more force than the i, and the final consonants of 'obliged' are 'whispered'; and in Portuguese the final o of a word like campo (Lat. campus) is similarly uttered with what is known as 'whisper,' not with 'voice.' When a vowel actually ended a word, it would also be liable to elision, more or less complete, before a word which began with a vowel or the letter h.

I. Loss or Syncope of Short Vowel. i. Final vowel. The weakness of a final short vowel in Latin is seen in Plautine versification. Plautus (according to Langen, in Philologus, xlvi. p. 419) shows a preference to elide a final short vowel rather than allow it to constitute by itself a thesis, so that endings of iambic lines like expectare vis, where the final e of expectare forms the thesis of the last iambus, are not common. The weakness of final e in particular, the vowel to which, as we shall see, every short final vowel was changed, is shown still more by its occasional suppression in words like quippe, unde, inde, and perhaps ille, iste, before an initial consonant in Plautus and the early dramatists. Nempe is always scanned nemp in this position by Plautus and Terence, while proinde, deinde, have developed the byforms proin and dein, and neque, atque, the monosyllables nec, ac (for *ate). All these are words which would naturally be closely joined in utterance with a following word, so that we may compare the Italian suppression of -e, -o, after n, l, r in word-groups, such as of the final vowel of bello, buono, signore, &c., in phrases like bel tempo, buon giorno, signor padre, tal cosa, &c. Similarly the subordinate or auxiliary verbs facio, dico, duco, lose their -e in the 2 Sg. Imper. fac, die, duc (see ch. viii. § 28). The same loss of -e, whether due to syncope in a word-group, or to elision before an initial vowel, or to both causes, has produced -l from -le, -r from -re, in forms like bacchānal for earlier *bacchanāle, calcar for *calcāre (Neut. of
calcaris, for calcare ferrum, 'the iron attached to the heel'), &c., and has reduced the particles -ce, -ne, to -c, -n, in hic, hunc, viden, audin, &c. The loss of final -um in nihil for nihilum, sed for sedum (Ter. Scaur. 12. 8 K.), &c., can have been due to elision, but not to syncope (see ch. x. § 18).

ii. In final syllable. The syncope of a short vowel in a final syllable ending in a consonant has been already discussed in § 16. We there saw that this syncope, a prominent feature of the Oscan and Umbrian languages, e.g. Osc. húrz (Lat. hortus), Umbr. empš (Lat. emptus), is difficult to establish with certainty for Latin, since viólenz beside violentus, mansueó beside manuëtus, rémex beside pródígus, &c., may be instances of parallel stem-formations like penu-, peno-, penos-, of penus, Gen. penus, penum, Gen. pení, penus, Gen. penóris; and even stronger examples, such as Arpinas, older Arpinátis, præceps, older præcipes, may have arisen otherwise than by syncope.

§ 36. Loss of -e. For other examples in Plautus such as Pseud. 239 mitt(e) mé sis, and for a list of instances of quiept(e), nemp(e), &c., see Skutsch, Forsch. i. Plautus' use of -ne and -n seems to depend, not on whether the initial of the following word is a vowel or a consonant, but on whether the preceding syllable is short or long (Schrader, De part. 'ne' ... quod Plautum) (for Terence's use of -ne, -n, see Dziatko ad Phorm. 210 Anh.); while he employs the forms hisse, illise, &c., before an initial vowel, hi, illi, before an initial consonant (Studemund in Fleckelsen's Jahrh. 1876, p. 73). Parallel forms like atque, and ac (for *atc), Ital. tale and tal, which have arisen from the same original form according to its position in the sentence, are called 'doubles.' (German 'Satzdoubletten') (ch. ii. § 136). The Latin mágis has thus become in Italian mai, when used independently as an Adverb; but ma, with loss of the final vowel, when used as a Conjunction, and so joined to a following word. In Oscan, avt, in the sense of Latin autem or at, and avti, in the sense of Lat. aut, may be similar doublets. The synecopated form of the L-Eur. preposition *ápö (Greek ávo, Sanscr. ápá) has become universal in Latin, e.g. ap-tírio, ab-dúco (cf. sub, Greek úro), almost the only trace of the final vowel being po-situs, póno for *po-s(i)no; L-Eur. *pérí (Greek πέρι, Sanscr. pári) is Lat. per- in permagwus, persacepe, &c.; L-Eur. *ótí (Greek érí, Sanscr. áti) is Lat. et (Umbr. et); L-Eur. *óphi (Greek ón-ódev) is Lat. ob (Oscan op); L-Eur. *amhí (Greek ámuí) is Lat. amb-ustus, an-clusus), whether the Syncope of these words took place in the Latin period (ab from *aþ, earlier *apo), or at a much more remote period (cf. Goth. af, English 'of,' 'off'). Neo, seu, seu, which are not used in Latin poets before a vowel, are cases of Syncope in the Latin period o sicve &c.; also quíñ (see ch. x. § 16) for qui-ne [cf. Ter. Ancr. 334, if *ně]:
effíce qui détár tibi;
égó id agam mihi qui ne detur);
sín for si-ne; quot, tot (cf. bót-dém, Sanscr. káti, táti). (On for and vel, see ch. viii.)
§ 58, and on em, originally *ome, the Imper. of *ema, 'to take,' ch. x. § 19). As late as the time of Terence we find abduc used before a vowel, abduc before a consonant, while fac is the form employed at the end of a line (Engelbrecht, Studia Terentiana, p. 63); but in the classical period, owing to the prevalent use of these imperative forms dix, duc, fac in word-groups, i.e. in close connection with a following word, the synecopated 'doublet' has ousted the other form, just as in post-Augustan poetry we find nec more and more supplanting neque, and usurping the position before vowel- as well as before consonant-initials. Other Imperatives occasionally appear without final -e, e.g. inger mi Catull. xxvii. 2 (see ch. viii. § 58). So with -e of the Infinitive. Biber dari is quoted by Charisius (124. 1 K.) from Fannius (cf. Capre 108. 10 K. bibere non 'biber'); and a plausible etymology of insto, a word first used in Cic. Verr. ii. 5. § 44, and literally meaning 'weight' (cf. Cic. Off. iii. 3. 11 ut omnia ex altera parte collocata vix minimi momenti instar habeant), makes it the Infinitive, used, like biber, as a Substantive, of insto, 'to be of equal weight,' 'to show equipoise of the balance,' like Swiss-German 'die Stimmen stehen ein,' 'the votes are equal.' (Wölfflin in A. L. L. ii. 58.) Buster or bostar, glossed by βουστάραν in the 'Cyrillus' and 'Philoxenus' Glossaries, may be for stare, as instar for instare. We find -al, -ar for -ale, -are in trisyllabic or longer Nouns like animal, but from sedile, &c. we do not find *sedil, &c., nor from icle, &c. ul, though subbel (τὸ ηδὲ τὸν ποδός, Prisc. i. p. 147. 11 H.) is said to stand for *subbèle. Neut. of *subbélis from ilus. Sirempse, an old legal word, found in the phrase sirempse lex esto, 'let the same law apply,' e.g. Plaut. Amph. prol. 73:

sirempse legem iussit esse Iuppiter,

is found without the final -e in the Tabula Bantina of 133-118 B. C. (C. I. L. i. 197. 13 sirempse lex esto), and other early laws. Lacte, the Plautine form (though lact is the reading of the MSS. in Amph. 601, perhaps a corruption of lact) is lact in Varro, L. L. v. 104 (lacte Cato ap. Char. 102. 9 K.), and in classical Latin lac (cf. Charisius, 102. 4 K. lactis nominativum alií volunt lac, alií lact, alií lacte 'e' postrema). Vatican, 'pleasingly,' seems to be for *volupe, Adverbial Neut. of an Adj. *volupis; and Ritschl (Opusc. ii. 450) would analyze the volupest of Plautus, Mil. 277, &c. into volupe est, a form which the phrase seems actually to bear in late Latin writers, like Arnobius, Prudentius and others (see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v.). We have similarly facul for facilé, e.g. Lucilius vi. 3 M. nobilis facul propellere iinquit, and difficul for difficile (see Nonius, p. 111. 21 M.; Paul. Fest. 61. 32 Th.; Fest. 266. 20 Th. 'perfacul' antiqui et per se facul diebant, quod nune facile dieimus). The O. Lat. Adverb poste (e.g. Enn. A. 244 M. poste recumbite, nustraque pectora pellite tonsis) is in classical Latin post; ante does not appear without the final -e in Latin, but we have in Oscan ant, as well as pust, post, Umbr. post. The suppression of a final short vowel was a common feature of Oscan and Umbrian, e.g. Oscan nep, Umbrian nep (Lat. neque), &c. (See also ch. x. §§ 9 and 12, on ut and ulla-nam, duone and donique, and cf. Georges, Lex Wortf. s. v. altare(e), animal(e), autumnal(e), boletar(e), cervical(e), cocklebar(e), lacquer(e), paleinar(e), virginal(e), locar, specular, toral, torcular, vestibul, &c. Quint. i. 6. 17 speaks of tribunale as out of use in his time).

§ 37. II. Change of Vowel. i. Short Vowel. We have already seen (§ 18) that, in the syllable immediately following the
early accent, every short vowel was changed to \( \varepsilon \), unless diverted by a following labial to \( \partial \). It is probable that short final vowels took the same course, and were one and all changed to \( \varepsilon \). This \( \varepsilon \) might be dropped (§ 36) or retained, but did not become \( \partial \), as unaccented \( \varepsilon \) in the middle of a word did (§ 18), so that \( \varepsilon \) is preeminently the final vowel of the Latin language. A final \( \varepsilon \) becomes \( \varepsilon \) in \( \textit{m}{a}r\)e for \( *\textit{mari} \), \( \textit{\~a}n\v{e}m\v{a}l\v{e} \) (later \( \textit{animal} \)) for \( *\textit{animali} \), &c., while in the middle of the word it remains, e.g. \( \textit{milia} \), \( \textit{animalia} \). Similarly final -\( \varepsilon \), when, by the addition of a particle, it ceases to be a final vowel, becomes \( \partial \), e.g. \( \textit{b\~e}n\v{e}f\v{e}c\v{u}s \) beside \( \textit{bene} \), \( \textit{quippe} \) beside \( \textit{quippe} \), \( \textit{sicine} \) beside \( \textit{sic(e)} \), \( \textit{hoccine} \) beside \( \textit{hoc-ce} \) from \( *\textit{hod-ce} \) (ch. vii. § 16).

ii. Diphthong. A diphthong in the final syllable was treated like a diphthong in the posttonic syllable. As we have \( \varepsilon i \), class. \( i \), for posttonic \( ai \) in \( \textit{inceido} \) (S. C. Bacch.), class. \( \textit{incido} \) from O. Lat. \( \textit{caido} \), class. \( \textit{caedo} \), so we find final \( ei \), class. \( i \) representing I.-Eur. \( ai \) (or \( a\~i \)? ch. viii. § 66) in the 1 Sing. of the Perfect Active, &c., e.g. \( \textit{t\~e}t\~\v{u}\~\v{d}-i \) (older -\( e\~i \)). And while an example of the weakening of \( o\~i \) to \( ei \), \( i \) in the posttonic syllable is difficult to find (§ 18), it is regular when final, e.g. \( \textit{foiderati} \) (S. C. Bacch.), class. \( \textit{foederati} \), from an original ending -\( oi \). On the treatment of the final long diphthongs -\( ai \), -\( ei \), &c., see ch. iv. §§ 45 sqq.

iii. Long Vowel. In the post-tonic syllable, as we saw (§ 30), a long vowel was not changed through the influence of the preceding accent. Nor was it changed in quality in the final syllable, though its quantity suffered. Long final \( a \) became -\( \ddot{a} \) in \( \textit{terr\~\ddot{a}} \), \( \textit{arv\ddot{a}} \), &c., but did not pass into another vowel, such as \( \varepsilon \). The shortening of long final vowels is discussed below (§ 40).

§ 38. Change of final short vowel to \( \varepsilon \). An example of \( \varepsilon \)- for an original -\( \ddot{o} \) is the ending of the 2 Sg. Imperat. Pass. and Depon., e.g. \( \textit{sequere} \) for \( *\textit{sequeso} \) (Gk. \( \varepsilon \pi\varepsilon(\sigma) \o \), ch. viii. § 77), of -\( d \)- for -\( \ddot{a} \), perhaps sat from an older *\( \textit{sat}(\ddot{\varepsilon}) \), if this was a \( u \)-stem *\( \textit{satu}-( \) cf. \( \textit{saturo} \) (but see ch. ix. § 4). An -\( \ddot{o} \) which has escaped this weakening (e.g. \( \textit{endo} \), on which see ch. ix. § 27) became -\( \ddot{u} \) (as in the posttonic syllable, § 26), e.g. \( \textit{ind\ddot{a}} \). (On \( \textit{noen\~\ddot{u}} \), a byform of \( \textit{noenum} \), see ch. x. § 18).

§ 39. Alternation of final \( e \) with internal \( i \). Other examples are \( \textit{istic}, \textit{illic} \) from \( \textit{iste}, \textit{ille} \), increased by -\( ce \); \( \textit{isticine}, \textit{illicine} \), further increased by -\( ne \); \( \textit{hicine}, \textit{nuncine}, \textit{tuncine} \); \( \textit{tutin} \), for \( \textit{tute} \) with \( ne \), is the spelling of the MSS. in Plaut. \( \textit{Mil.} \) 290; \( \textit{undique} \) from \( \textit{unde} \), \( \textit{indidem} \) from \( \textit{inde} \); \( \textit{ante} \) is \( \textit{anti} \)- in compounds like \( \textit{antici-} \).
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pare, antistes, antistita, antigerio (O. Lat. for valde), and antisto (a better spelling than antesto: see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v.) ; facile in facile with ne, servirin for servire with ne, is the spelling of the MSS. in Plaut. Mon. 928 and 795; benivolus, benificus, malivolus, malificus (beside benevolus, malerolus, &c., a spelling much discussed by the grammarians, e.g. Vel. Long. 76–77 K.; Alcuin 298. 14 K.; Prob. 179. 2 K. See Brambach, Lat. Orth. and Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. vv.) (For additional examples see Ritschl, Opusc. ii. 556).

§ 40. III. Shortening of Long Syllable. i. Final long vowel or diphthong. A long vowel or diphthong in the middle of a Latin word may be shortened in hiatus, e.g. ānus (cf. Oscan ānho-), baluēum (βαλαύειον), dēamo, prēhendo (see ch. ii. § 143). The same thing happened apparently to a final long vowel or diphthong when the next word began with a vowel or ā, so that scanions like Plautus, Aul. 463 méō honoris, Asin. 706 dē hōrdico (cf. class. méōricle), Enn. Ann. 45 M. Scipio invictō, need not have been imitations of Greek poetry, but rather expressed the actual Latin pronunciation. How far the shortening proper to this position may have attached itself to the vowel, even when a consonant initial followed, is not easy to say. From the earliest period of Latin literature we find a tendency to shorten every final long vowel. Some offer more resistance than others; -ē and -ā than -ā and -ō. The final ā of Nom. Sg. of A-stems and of Nom. Acc. Pl. of Neuter O-stems seems never to occur even in the earliest poetry in any but a shortened form, while in the Oscan and Umbrian dialects it has been reduced to some sound which is written o, and which is treated by Lucilius as a short vowel (Lucil. inc. 106 M.), if we may trust the quotation by Festus (426. 7 Th.) Lucilius: ‘uasa quoque omnino dirimit non solo dupundi,’ id est, non tota). Final ō of verbs and nouns is, on the other hand, always long in the earlier poetry, except when the precedence of a short vowel, especially an accented short vowel, allows it to be scanned as a short syllable, e.g. legō, modō, less frequently pellegō, dicitō. But by the time of grammarians like Charisius and Diomedes (fourth century A.D.), this -ō was universally shortened in pronunciation, so that a fifth-century grammarian (Pompeius, p. 232 K.), cannot explain Virgilian scanions like cantō, except on the theory that they are imitations of the Greek -ω of ποιω, &c. ! The course of development taken by -ō in the literary period, viz. its shortening first in iambic
words like *legō*, then in cretic words like *pellegō*, finally in all words, e.g. *cantō*, we may suppose to have been taken in the pre-literary age by final *-ā*. From *ferā*, &c. the shortening would spread to *efferā*, &c., and would in time be extended over every Nom. Sg. Fem. of Ā-stems and Nom. Acc. Pl. Neut. of O-stems. That the shortening was mainly the work of analogy we see from *trīgintā*, *quadrāgintā*, &c., which, though really Neuters Plural, were regarded as mere numerals and so escaped the shortening which was enforced on every Neuter Plural Noun. But it must have been aided, partly by the inherent weakness of every final syllable, partly by the shortening of a final long vowel in pronunciation when the next word began with a vowel. The former presence of a final consonant does not seem to have made much difference. Ovid scans *estō* (earlier *estōd*) as he scans *Sulmō*; and Plautus allows the shortening by the Brevis Brevians law of *datō*, *dicītō*, *probē*, *maxūmē*, *manū* and other Ablatives (earlier *datōd*, &c.).

ii. **Long vowel followed by consonant.** The quantity of a vowel in a final syllable is often influenced by a following consonant. In English the long vowel-sound of *node* becomes a half-long sound before the dental *tenuis*, *note.* Similarly in Latin a long vowel tended to be shortened by a following final *t*, *r*, &c. Under the shortening influence of a preceding short accented syllable, the final syllable (with naturally long vowel) is readily shortened by Plautus in words like *tenet*, *amat*, and, to a less extent, *soror*, *moror*, but seldom in words like *tēnes*, *amas*, *moras* (for the statistics, see Leppermann, *De correctione*, &c. p. 78); and in classical poetry every originally long vowel is scanned as a short vowel before final *-t*, *-r*, &c., but not before final *-s*. Final *-l* also shortens a preceding long vowel; thus *bacchānāl* (for *bacchanāle*) became, when the accent shifted to the second syllable, *bacchanāl*, as *calcār* (for *calcāre*) became, under similar circumstances, *calcār*. And, though we cannot trace the effect of final *-m* in poetry, seeing that a syllable so ending is elided before an initial vowel, we are told by Priscian that it had the same power of shortening a long vowel (even in monosyllables), e.g. *spēm*, *rēm*, *diēm*, *meridiēm* (Prisc. i. 23. 13; 366. 21 H.).

iii. **Final syllable long by position.** In Plautus *legunt*, *dixerunt*
are admitted as well as legō, dixerō. But in the hexameters of Ennius, Lucilius, &c., these shortenings of final syllables long by position are avoided, as they were in the poetry of the classical period. They were apparently regarded as vulgarisms, much as the change of final -ng to -n is with us.

§ 41. Final long vowel in Hiatus. In Greek poetry (daedalic, anaepaetic, &c.) besides the shortening of final diphthongs like au, ov before an initial vowel (a scanion due to the consonantal character of u, anbpa μοι ἐνερε being pronounced anbpa μονενερε, G. Meyer, Griech. Gram.2 § 154), we sometimes find shortening of final ā, ə, η in similar circumstances. This shortening seems to have reflected the ordinary pronunciation, as we can see from inscriptions in the Cretan dialect, a dialect in which the nuances of sound taken by a word in its various positions in the sentence were more regularly expressed in the orthography than in other dialects. On the Tablet of Gortyn, for example, μη is written με when the next word begins with a vowel (K. Z. xxxiii. 133). In the native metre of the Romans, the Saturnian, a final long vowel or diphthong (or syllable in -m), seems similarly to be left in Prosodical Hiatus, i.e. shortened, not wholly elided, before an initial vowel or h- (see ch. ii. § 143); and this Prosodical Hiatus, as well as Hiatus proper, such as the non-elision of a final short vowel, is much more common in Plautus than in Terence, as it was in Naevius, according to Cic. Or. xlv. § 152, than in Ennius. Plautus employs it in dialogue metres with (1) (accented ?) monosyllables preceding a short initial syllable, e.g. quēcam? (2) iambic words with verse ictus on the first syllable, e.g. mēl honoris; (3) monosyllables following a short final syllable which has the verse ictus, e.g. omniā quaē isti dēdi; (4) iambic words or word-endings, when the final syllable has the verse ictus and the following initial syllable is short and has the natural accent, e.g. virī habitat, una operād ebur, obsequē animo. In Anaepaetic Metres also with (5) Cretic words, and in other cases. (For a list of examples, see Klotz, Altrōm, Metrik, p. 119. They include not merely instances of dissimilar vowels, but also of similar, e.g. i-i in éri imagēne, Pseud. 1202). Terence, and apparently Lucilius, restrict it to the first of these cases; but Virgil has not only examples like quī amant (Ed. viii. 108), but also like vale valeō inquit (Ed. iii. 79), and sub Ilīō alto (A. v. 26r). Virgil thus employs it (1) to prevent the entire suppression by elision of a monosyllable (accented ?), ending in a long vowel or -m; (2) in cases where a long final vowel would be shortened by the law of Breves Breviantes in the dramatists. That a vowel shortened in Hiatus was not so long as an ordinary short vowel, we may infer not only from the fact that it is normally elided, but also from the disinclination shown by Plautus to allow a vowel so shortened to constitute by itself the thesis of a metrical foot. It is allowed to go with another short syllable to form a resolved thesis, e.g. quō dām, but is never allowed to dispense with the proximity of another short syllable, except in a few phrases which may be considered as word-groups or compound words, e.g. dē hōrdōe, Asin. 706, which might be written de-hordeo like de-horturi, Poen. 674. The difference in this respect between Plautine and Saturnian versification (see ch. ii. § 143) need not imply a change in the pronunciation of these final long vowels in Hiatus; but may be due merely to the different character of the verse. The Saturnian poetry was of a more
solemn and dignified tone than the conversational verse of the dramatists, and would naturally be uttered with a greater pause between the words. Imitation of the Greek dactylic and anapaestic prosody is inconceivable in the Saturnian poetry, and unlikely in the trochaic and iambic verse of Plautus; so that we can hardly be wrong in supposing this Prosodical Hiatus to reflect the ordinary pronunciation in Latin, as it did in Greek.

§ 42. Breves Breviantes. The syllables most affected by this law are those ending in a long vowel in words which were in ordinary talk closely joined with a following word. Forms like mihī, tībī, sībī, modū, cīsū, &c. have forced their way even into classical poetry; and in Plautus we find this shortening chiefly in verb-forms, which go closely with a following word, e. g. vulē-scire, abi-rus, cavē-dicas, while the examples of nouns are mostly confined to adverbial forms, e. g. domi-restat, domō-prodīt, or subordinate words like homō (see statistics in Leppermann, De correptione, p. 78). Ennius in his Epic restricts this usage to words ending in a vowel, and subsequent Hexameter poets follow him, e. g. putō but not legiunt, dixerō (Hor. S. i. 4. 194) but not dixerunt. That this shortening was not a mere metrical licence, but reflected the actual pronunciation, we see from Quintilian's remark (i. 6. 21) that ave, not avē, was the normal form in his time, as well as from Phaedrus' fable of the man who mistook this word for the caw of a crow (App. 21), and Cicero's story (Div. ii. 40) of Crassus having mispronounced jurat's cry, Cænas (sc. fìcus vendo), for cave ne eas. The spelling causis for cave sis in Juvenal ix. 120 points to the same thing; and Servius (ad Aen. vi. 780) says that vidēn was the pronunciation of his day. (Should we read rogōn for rogās in Pers. v. 134?) Plautus in his dialogue allows the scansion of a cretic word as a dactyl in the first foot only of the line or hemistich; Terence not at all; but Horace in his Satires and Epistles has Polliō, dixerō, mentiō, &c.; commodā Catull. x. 26 is probably Neut. Plur. (see Owen ad loc.). (On the operation of the Breves Breviantes Law in Plautus, see Journ. Phil. xxi. 198 and xxii. 1.) Plautus requires that the preceding short syllable shall be perfectly short; he does not allow a short vowel preceding a mute and liquid to act as a Brevis Brevis, e. g. not pātrē like pātē, nor even a short vowel preceding qu, except under particular circumstances. But in classical poetry we find putrīfacta, liquifuentes, &c.

§ 43. Shortening of final -ā. We have -ā in Greek words in the early poets (Enn. A. 567 M. agoēa longa repletur is very uncertain; cf. Gk. ēγήμα), just as we have in later poetry, e. g. Stat. Theb. vi. 515 Nemaŭ (cf. Prisc. i. p. 202. 16 H.). But the instances quoted of -ā in Nom. Sg. of Α-stems or Nom. Acc. Pl. of O-stems seem to be illusory. They are really cases of (1) metrical lengthening, e. g. Enn. A. 149 M. et densis aquītā pinnis obniixat volatā, a lengthening of a short syllable before the penthemimeral Caesura, like the lengthenings before the heptameterimal in A. 85 M. sic expectabat populās atque ora tenebat, Virg. A. iii. 464 dona dehinc auro graviā sectoque elephanto, where we have an originally short syllable (e. g. populās, L.-Eur. -ōs) lengthened, by a metrical licence borrowed from Greek poetry, before the two chief caesuras of the hexameter; (2) syllaba aniceps, e. g. Plaut. Mil. 1226 namque ēdēpol uix fuit cópiā ad cuiūndī atque impetrándī (at the end of the first hemistich of an Iambic Septenarius, like -ūs in Truc. 149 non ārōus hic sed pāscuēs | ager ēst | si aratiōnes); Plaut. Rud. 1086 TR. Et crepuntādī (Ē). GR. Quid, si ea sunt aūrea? TR. Quid istūc tua? (at change of speaker,
like *e of Voc. Sg., I-Eur. *ę, in Pers. 482 TO. Quid agis? DO. Credo. TO. Ünde agis te, Đérdfalē. DO. Credó tibi). Or they are cases of wrong scansion, e.g. Trin. 251 nox datur: ducitur familia tota (where the metre is Anapaestic with fāmilīa, not Cretic with fāmilīa), Mil. 1314 Quid sis? Quin tu iūbes eceferri ómnia quae isti dedi [where we should scan ómnīa quae īstī, not ómnīa qu(ae), īstī], or of wrong reading, e.g. Asin. 762 Ne epistula quidem úlla sit in aēdibus (where we might insert usquam before usša, as in Rusd. 529, and scan epístulā, not epístulō). A few apparent instances of -ā in Plautus have not yet been explained, viz. Bacch. 1128; Epid. 498; Mon. 974 a. (For a list of examples in Plautus, see C. F. Müller, Plaut. Prosodie, p. 1; in Ennius, see Reichardt in Fleck. Jahrb. 1889, p. 777.) In the Saturnian fragments there is no reason for scanning -ā in Nom. Sg. or Neut. Pl. (see ch. ii § 141). Final -ā for -ād is long in Early Latin, as in Classical poetry, e.g. Abl. mensā, erā, Adv. extrā, suprā (exstrad, suprad on S. C. Bacch. of 186 e. c., C. I. L. i. 196), so that Early Latin contrā, frustrā (e.g. Plaut. Rud. 1255 ne tu frustrā sis, at the end of an iambic line; Naev. praed. 6 R. contrā redhostis, at the beginning of the second hemistich of a Trochaic Septenarius; Enn. ap. Varr. L. L vii. 12 quis pater aut cognatu' uoleat nos contrā tueri?) cannot have been originally contrād, frustrād. But it may be shortened by the influence of a preceding short syllable, like any other long vowel, e.g. venustissimā, Poen. 1177, gratiā, Stich. 327, rustiā, Pers. 169. Similarly with -ā of Imperatives of the first Conjugation. We have in the dramatists amā, putā beside amā, putā, and so even e.g. Persius iv. 9. hoc putā non justum est. But this shortening was not extended by analogy to all Imperatives in -ā. We never find *plantā for plantā, *mandā for mandā in Early or in Classical poetry. This is perhaps due to the influence of the other Persons of the imperative plantātō, plantātē, while for nouns like mensa the length of the final -ā would not be impressed on the memory by other cases like mensae, mensam, &c. The -ā of Numerals like quadraginta, &c. is not scanned as a short syllable till late times, e.g. C. I. L. vi. 2847 (=Meyr, Anth. 1326) quadraginta per annos; vi. 29426 (=Mey. 1389) septuaginta, when Abl. -ā is similarly treated, e.g. C. I. L. xiv. 3723 hic situs Amphion ereptus primā juventa (see ch. ii. § 141).

§ 44. Shortening of final -e. Final -e of the Imperatives of the second Conjugation is scanned short by Plautus under the same conditions as final -ā of first Conjugation Imperatives, e.g. monē and monē, cavi (almost always short). That this scansion corresponded with the pronunciation we see from the remark of Quintilian (i. 6. 21) that hāvē, not hāvē, was the universal pronunciation of his time (multum enim litteratus, qui sine aspirazione et producet secunda syllaba salutarit—‘avere’ est enim—et ‘calefacere’ dixerit potius quam quod dicimus, et ‘conservavisse,’ his adicait ‘face’ et ‘dice’ et similia. recta est haec via: quis negat? sed adiacet et mollior et magis trita) (cf. § 42). This shortening was not extended to Imperatives with long penult, e.g. splendē, never*splendē. Similarly the -ē of calē, frigē, &c. in the compounds calefacio, frigefacio is in all Latin poetry scanned short only when the first syllable is short, calefacio (but never *frigefacio), which in Quintilian’s time was apparently pronounced calfecto (Quint. i. 6. 21 quoted above; for this spelling see Georges, Lex. Worlf. s.v.). Cato’s aefacit, so spelt in MSS. of the Res Rustica 69; 125; 157. 12, seems to follow the analogy of calefacit. These Compounds were Separable Compounds (cf. facit for aefacit, Lucer. vi. 962), so that their -ē is properly regarded as final -ē. This -ē already
shortened to some extent under the influence of the preceding accented short syllable in cale, madē, &c., is in the Compounds cale-facio, made-facio (cf. Prisc. i. p. 402. 10 H.) subjected to the additional weakening influence of a following accented syllable, and so is scanned by the dramatists invariably as a short syllable, although other writers sometimes make it long, e. g. Enn. Ann. 573 M. patēfecit; Catull. lxiv. 360 tepēfaciet beside tepēfaciet of lxviii. 29 (see Ritschl, Opusc. ii. p. 618). A short vowel before a mute and liquid (and to some extent before gu) (see ch. ii. § 93) was not so short as a short vowel before a single consonant, and was not so capable of acting as a Brevis Brevians in the dramatists’ versification. Hence Ritschl was wrong in scanning putē-facit, Plaut. Most. 112, though Ovid has putē-factus, liquefuit. Similarly in the compound of dies and quintus, &c. the ę of the second syllable, properly regarded as a final -ę, was shortened in the Republican forms diēquint, &c. (Gell. x. 24. i ‘die quarto’ et ‘die quinto’ . . . ab eruditis nunc quoque dici audio, et qui alter dicit pro rudi atque indocto despicitur. Sed Marci Tullii actas ac supra eam non, opinor, ita dixerunt; ‘diequinte’ enim et ‘diequinti’ pro adverbio copulare dictum est, secunda in eo syllaba correpta. Divus etiam Augustus, linguae Latinae non nescitus, munditiarumque patris sui in sermonibus sectator, in epistulis plurifariam significatione ista dierum non alter usus est.) Final -ę in the Abl. of the fifth Declension is treated by Plautus exactly as final -ā of first-Declension Ablatives, that is to say, it is occasionally scanned short when preceded by a short, especially an accented short, syllable, but not otherwise, e.g. āūtē, āūtē. This shortening was not extended to Ablatives with long penult. So with Adverbs in -ē (originally -ēā, e. g. faciūmēā on S. C. Bacch. of 186 n. c., C. I. L. i. 196). Plautus scans prōbē, maxūmē, though an instance of the shortening of this -ę is wanting in Terence.

§ 45. Shortening of final -ō. In Plautus and the other dramatists final -ō is shortened under exactly the same conditions as final -ę, that is to say, only under the influence of a Brevis Brevians, e. g. vēlō, which normally has this scansion when joined closely as an auxiliary verb with an infinitive, vōlō-scire, &c. This shortening of -ō in some iambic and cretic words had so established itself in pronunciation that even the later Republican and Augustan poets admit scansion of iambic words like homō (Lucr. vi. 652), vōlō (Catull. vi. 16), datō (Catull. xiii. 11), vētō (Hor. S. i. 1. 104), and even of cretic words like Pollio (Hor. S. i. 10. 42, 85; and even in the Odes, ii. 1. 14), mēntō (Hor. S. i. 4. 93), dēxerō (Hor. S. i. 4. 104), quōmōdō (Hor. S. i. 9. 43). The shortening of final -ō, like that of final -ā, and unlike that of final -ě, rapidly extended itself to all instances, even when a long syllable preceded. In Ovid we have ergō (Hor. v. 59, and elsewhere), estō, Trist. iv. 3. 72, Submō, Nāsō, &c.; and even Cicero uses vetō, if his epigram is rightly quoted by Quint. (viii. 6. 73) fundum vetō vocat, quem possit mittere funda, &c. (On endō, see ch. ix. § 27.) But -ō of the Dat. and Abl. is not shortened till very late times. The fourth-century grammarians speak of the final -ō of Nouns (Nom. Sing.), Verbs (i Pers. Sing. Pres. Ind.), Adverbs and Conjunctions, as universally shortened in the pronunciation of their time, except in monosyllables and foreign words. [Charis. p. 16. 5 K. etiam illud magna cura videndum est quod veteres omnia vel verba vel nomina quae o littera finiuntur, item adverbia vel conjunctiones producta extrema syllaba proferebant, adeo ut Vergilius quoque idem servaverit, in alis autem refugerit vetustatis horrorem, et carmen]
contra morem veterum levigaverit... paulatim autem usus inverterit, ut in sermone nostro 'scribo' 'dico' et item talibus, ubi o non solum correpta ponitur, sed etiam ridiculus sit qui eam producturit... sane monosyllaba fere quae cuque sunt verba πρωτότυρα o littera finita tam versu quam etiam prosa similiter productam habent: necesse non corripi, ut 'sto' 'do.' quibus si conferatur 'dico' 'curro' 'disco' item producta o littera, dijudicari poterit quam sit aliud absurdum, aliud per euphoniam gratum; cf. p. 63. 17 K. nullum autem nomen o producta finitur nisi peregrinum, veluti 'Ino' 'Sappho' 'Dido' (cf. Diom. p. 435. 22 K.; 'Prob.' de ult. syll. p. 220. 15 K.); Mar. Victorinus (p. 28. 23 K.) distinguishes the Verbs monstrō, ostentō, &c. from monstrō, ostentō, the Dat. and Abl. cases of the Nouns monstrum, ostentum. Servius (ad A. iv. 291) attests quandō. Priscian (i. p. 409. 16 H.) excuses vigilandō of Juv. iii. 232, &c. on the ground that it is part of a verb (: nos in 'do' utimur terminatio, quae simulis est dativo vel ablative nominis, nisi quod verbum hoe existimantes quidam etiam corripiunt o finalem ejus.)

§ 46. Shortening of final -i. The shortening of -i by the Brevis Brevians Law is common in Plautus in Imperatives like abi, vei, and Perfects like dedi; while in nouns we have doni (very frequent), eri, viri, seni, &c., with the Ablatives avi sinistra, Pseud. 762, pari fortuna, Bacch. 1108 (cf. Ter. levi sententia, Hec. 312).

§ 47. Shortening of final -ū. By the Brevis Brevians Law we have manū in Plaut. Trin. 288, but owing to the few words with short paenultima ending in -ū, the examples are not frequent. Terence has always diū, never diū, but Plautus has diū (or djū?) very frequently.

§ 48. Shortening of final diphthong. A final diphthong is almost never shortened by the Brevis Brevians Law in Plautus (e.g. novaē nuptae, Cas. 118), and never in Terence. This is rather to be referred to the infrequency of words so ending (Noms. Plur. and Dats. Sing. in -ae), than to be quoted as a proof of the difference in sound between a diphthong and a long vowel.

49. Shortening of long vowel before final Consonant. -l. In Plautus we have still the long quantity, e.g. Aquil. 413 apertur Bacchanāl: adest, but in Classical poetry -āl, e.g. tribānāl, Ovid (cf. Mar. Victorinus de Finalibus p. 231. 11 K.). Subtel (apparently for *subtelē, Neut. of *subtelis, a Compound of sub and tētus) (but see § 30), is quoted as an instance of -āl by Priscian, i. p. 147. 11 H., and explained as τὸ κοίλον τοῦ ποδός.

-m. Whether the different treatment of -m after o of the Gen. Plur. and o of the Acc. Sg. Mase. and Nom. Acc. Sg. Neut. of O-stems on the earliest inscriptions (e.g. C. I. L. i. 16 Sussanā probōm, 'Sussanorum probōm') is a proof that a long vowel was at the end of the third cent. n.c. not yet shortened before final -m is uncertain (see ch. ii. § 137). If Lat. -m sounded like -w owing to the lips not being closed in pronouncing it (ch. ii. § 61), the shortening spēm may be compared with nēam (ch. ii. § 34). Osc. paam 'quam' Acc. Sg. Fem., Umbr. praetarum Gen. Pl. Fem. (with u the equivalent of Lat. o) indicate a retention of the long quantity in Umbro-Oscan.

- r. (1) Nouns like calculus. The final syllable was without doubt long in Plautus, though there is no certain evidence of its quantity, or of its loss of final -e. It is short in Classical poetry, e.g. exemplār, Hor. (but exemplāre, Lucr. ii. 124), though the grammarians recognize that it ought to be long by

(2) Nouns and Adjectives like sōrōr, maerōr, mīnor, major, have the long quantity invariably in Plautus, unless in cases of shortening by the Brevis Brevians Law, e. g. sōrōr, Poen. 364; amōr, Cist. i. r. 69, and probably always patēr. Iambič nouns often retain the old Nominative ending -os, e. g. odōs, Pseud. 841; honōs, Trin. 697. Ennius in his Annals has -ōr. Whether he ever (A. 455 M. sūdōr) uses -ōr is doubtful; but Lucilius has normally -ūr (e. g. stridōr, inc. 90 M.), and the two probable examples of -ōr in Lucilius, (dōtōr v. 55 M.; pūdōr xxx. 70 M.) are perhaps metrical lengthenings before the chief Caesuras, like Virgil's làbōr (6. iii. 118), dōmītor (A. xii. 550), &c.

There is a lack of decisive instances in the plays of Terence (see Boemer, De correctione, p. 25).

(3) Verbs like mōrōr, ādōr Ind., morer, utar Subj., in Plautus always have a long final, unless shortened by the Brevis Brevians Law, e. g. Red. 1448 nil morōr ullaem lucrum; Aul. 232 utār; Bacch. 153 nil mōrōr. By Lucilius' time it is invariably short, e. g. frunitōr xviii. 3 M.; obliōnār xxx. 25 M. In the Comedies of Terence the evidence is defective (e. g. sēpūrār, Andr. 819). In Tibullus, i. 10. 13 trāhōr is of course a case of metrical shortening before the penthemimeral Caesura. Oscan patiār 'pater,' keenzztur 'censor' apparently retain the long vowel.

-t. The shortening of a long vowel before final -t was perhaps slightly earlier than before final -r. It is indeed not found in Plautus, except where the Brevis Brevians Law interposes (and here the shortening is much more frequent than with -r), e. g. cubāt, Amph. 290; timēt, Amph. 295; vēnīt, Aul. 226; arāt, Asin. 874; solēt, Merc. 696; ail, Cas. 693; but in Ennius' hexameters, though the long quantity is usual, we find shortening occasionally even after a long syllable, e. g. mandebāt, A. 138 M. (but ponebāt, A. 288); splendēt, Sat. 14 (but jubēt, A. 465); potessēt, A. 235 (but essēt, A. 81). In Lucilius the short quantity is normal, though we have crissavit ix. 70 M. But Terence, to judge from the slender evidence at our disposal, seems to follow rather the usage of Ennius' hexameter poems, for we have more long scansion, e. g. stelli, Phorm. prol. 9; augētāt, Adelph. prol. 25, &c. beside audirēt, Adelph. 453. On a Scipio epitaph of c. 130 B.C. written in elegiac metre (C. I. L. i. 38) we have nobilitāvit, though the spelling -ēt in the Perfect is found much later (e. g. probavēt beside coeverit, in C. I. L. i. 600, of 62 B.C.) (see ch. viii. § 70). Ovid repeatedly lengthens the -it of interiēt, abīt, rēdīt, &c. and of petīt (see Munro ad Lucr. iii. 1042). On attēt in the Dramatists see § 10. p. 164.

Before final -s the long quantity persisted to classical times. It is occasionally shortened by the Brevis Brevians Law in Plautus, e. g. Mīl. 325 sunt manīs; Aul. 187 habēs; and the same is true of the plays of Terence (e. g. bonīs, Enn. prol. 8), which however do not offer any example of a verbal form in -s being shortened (potēs, adēs are for *potēs, *adēs, not *potēs, *adēs). But this shortening is very rare in both dramatists, and not at all so frequent as the shortening by the same Brevis Brevians Law before -i, -r (see the statistics in Leppermann, De correctione . . . apud Plautum, and in Boemer, De correctione . . . Terentiana). Horace's paīris aptaque remis (A. P. 65) is a unique scansion in Augustan poetry (cf. vidēn, rogān § 42). Ennius has in his Annals (l. 102 M.) virginiēs (cf. Plaut. Pers. 845) before a consonant initial (see below).

§ 50. Shortening of Final Syllable long by position. Abēt in Lucilius
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(ix. 29 M.), which seems to be the right reading, stands perhaps alone as an instance in non-dramatic poetry of the shortening by the Brevis Brevians Law of a final syllable long by position. Horace allows dixerò, but not e. g. dixeruint. Ennius' virginès in Ann. 102 M.:

uirgines nam sibi quisque domi Romanus habet sas,
shows shortening of a final syllable long both by nature (-ès for -ens, ch. vi. § 2), and by position. In the dramatists the shortening by the Brevis Brevians Law of final syllables long both by nature and by position, or by position only, is freely allowed in the case of disyllables in the dialogue metres (e. g. Nil pótést (?) supra, Ter.; ex Graécis bónis Latinas fecit nón bonas, Ter.), in the case of trisyllables, &c. only (as a rule) in Anapaestic and other lyric metres (e. g. vénérant húc, Plaut.; odio énicäs miseram, Plaut.; qui hic liberäs virginès meritâtur, Plaut.).

Final syllables which had originally a double consonant are long in Plautus, e. g. miles for *miless, Aul. 528 milés impransus ástat, aes censét dari, though they may, of course, be shortened by the influence of a Brevis Brevians, e. g. potès, Stich. 325. But after Plautus' time they appear to be short syllables. Ennius has not only équès (Ann. 484. 249 M.), but also mítès (Ann. 277); Terence has always adès, potès; Lucilius has miles (xi. 8 M.), pròdès (inc. 128 M.); Lucretius (iii. 721) exès, and so on. But final -s for -ss never fails before an initial consonant to make 'position' in Early Latin versification as original -s usually fails; mítès vult could not end an Iambic Senarius like occidístis me, Plaut. Bacch. 313. Perhaps the reduction of the final double consonant was proper to a position before an initial consonant, so that the actual pronunciation would be originally, e. g. miless impransus, miles pransus (see below § 51, on hoc(e)).

§ 51. Shortening of Monosyllables. The connexion of all these cases of shortening with the absence of accent is seen from the fact that monosyllabic words are as a rule not shortened, unless they are subordinate or enclitic words. Thus a long vowel is shortened before final -r, -l, in Classical poetry in unaccented syllables, e. g. candór, majór, fundór, calcăr, tribúnál, but not in the monosyllables für, söl, where the natural length of the vowel is retained. The monosyllable cor, however, which represents *cord, with vowel naturally short, but long by position, is scanned short in classical poetry, though it is long in Plautus, Poen. 388:

húius cór, huiús studium, huius sáuium, mastígia,

the pronunciation of his time having probably been cord huius, cord ardet, when the next word began with a vowel, but cor calet (like cor(d)culum, ch. iv. § 157), when the next word began with a consonant. Similarly the more or less subordinate word ter,
older *terr (cf. terr-uncius) for *tōrs (I.-Eur. *tri's, ch. vi. § 61), is a long syllable before an initial vowel in Plautus, Bacch. 1127 (a bacchiac line):

rerīn tōr in ānno posse hās tonsitāri,

while in subsequent poetry the ‘doublet’ used before an initial consonant, e.g. ter(r) durus, like hor(r)deum (from *horsdeum, ch. iv. § 158), established itself before initial vowels too. Hoc Neut. for hoc (*hōd-ce, ch. vii. § 16 ; cf. hocei-ne) retained its antevocalic ‘doublet’ form in classical poetry, e.g. Virg. (A. ii. 664):

hoc erat, alma paren,

and Velius Longus, commenting on this line, tells us that the actual pronunciation of his time was ‘hoc erat’ (54. 6 K. ergo scribendum per duo c, ‘hoc-erat alama paren,’ aut confitendum quaedam aliter scribi, aliter pronuntiari). Plautus uses the proper ‘doublet’ of all these monosyllables which have a vowel naturally short followed by a consonant that represents two consonants; thus he invariably makes es, ‘thou art’ (I.-Eur. *es-s(i), ch. viii. § 2), a long syllable before a word beginning with a vowel (unless under the operation of the Brevis Brevians Law, just as we find hōc in a line like Men. 522 quid hōc est negoti?). But in Terence es is a short syllable, and so in Lucilius (e.g. iv. 4 M.) (On the reduction of a final double consonant, see ch. ii. § 133).

The shortening of sī in sī-quitem, and (in the older poetry only) of tū, tē, mē, &c. before quitem (e.g. tāquitem, Lucil. xiv. 26 M., Plaut. Epid. 99), is due to accentuation, and should be understood in connexion with the rule that antepenultimate syllables could not be circumflexed in Latin (ch. iii. § 2, p.153), and with the modern Italian practice of diphthongizing a proparoxytone vowel, e.g. buono (Lat. bōnus), but not a proparoxytone, e.g. popolo (Lat. pōpūlus). The shortening of English sheep, know in shep-herd, shepherdess, know-ledge, is similarly due to accentual conditions, and of Welsh brawd, ‘a brother,’ in brod-yr, ‘brothers,’ &c.

§ 52. Loss of Final Syllable with -m. This could hardly take place except in the case of words closely joined in ordinary talk with a following word [e.g. noen(um) est, noen(um) habet, nihil(um) est, nihil(um) habet, would be the ‘doublet’ forms
before initial vowels, *noenunm dat, nihilum dat*, the ante-consonantal doublets], so that the theory which explains adverbs in -ter, e.g. *breviter*, as Accusatives Sing. Neut. of adjectives with the 'comparative' suffix -tero (ch. v. § 18), for *breviter(um)*, &c., is unlikely to be correct (see ch. ix. § 2). The Preposition *circum*, when compounded with a verb beginning with a vowel, has its final syllable not entirely elided but left in prosodical hiatus, e.g. *cir-cū(m)*it (a trisyllable); (cf. *sublatuirī* for *sublatum irī*, ch. viii. § 89), and it is possible that *non,ni(hi)*l, should not be referred to *noen(um)*, *nihil(um)*, but should receive another explanation, such as *non* for *noe-ne* (on *noenū*, see ch. x. § 18), *nihil* for *ni-hile*, Neut. of I-stem (cf. *imbellis* and *imbellus*, *subtēl* from *sub-tēle*, Neut. of an I-stem compound of *tālus* (?), and see § 49). But *vēnīre* seems to represent *venum ire*, though *pessum ire* did not become *pessire*. The grammarians defend the spelling *sed* against *set* by a reference to an older *sedum* (Charisius, 112. 5 K.; Mar. Vict. 10. 13 K.) (see ch. x. § 5). (On *donec* and O. Lat. *donicum*, see ch. x. § 12).
By comparing the various Romance words for, let us say, 'horse,' Ital. cavallo, Span. caballo, Port. cavallo, Prov. cavals, Fr. cheval, Roum. cal, &c., it is possible to conjecture the form of the Latin prototype from which they all have descended, caballus. In the same way we can guess at the early form, what is called the 'Indo-European' form, underlying any cognate group of words in the various Indo-European languages; e.g. Lat. māter, Dor. Gk. μάτηρ, O. Ind. mātār-, O. Ir. māthir, O. Slav. mater-, Arm. mair, O. Eng. mōdor, point to something like *mātēr as their prototype. We may similarly trace back inflexions to an 'Indo-European' form, and may out of these conjectured words and inflexions construct an 'Indo-European' alphabet.

In the last two chapters we have discussed the pronunciation and accentuation of Latin, and the phonetic changes of the language produced under the influence of the accent, or due to peculiarities (often local and temporal merely) of pronunciation. In the next chapter we shall compare Latin with the other languages of the Indo-European family; we shall investigate the form in which the various sounds of our imaginary 'Indo-European' alphabet appear on Latin soil, and how that form differs from the forms assumed in the various languages of Asia and Europe, which are classed under the name 'Indo-European.' These languages are: (1) the Aryan, including i. Indian, ii. Iranian (Zend, Persian, &c.); (2) the Armenian; (3) the Greek; (4) the Albanian; (5) the Italic, including i. Latin, ii. the Umbro-Oscan dialects; (6) the Celtic, including i. Gaulish, ii. Goidelic (Irish, Gaelic of Scotland, &c.), iii. Brythonic (Welsh, Breton, &c.); (7) the Balto-Slavic, including i. Baltic (Lithuanian, &c.), ii. Slavonic; (8) the Teutonic, including i. Gothic, ii. Scandinavian, iii. W. Teutonic (German, English, &c.), (see Introduction to Brugmann's Comparative Grammar).
CHAPTER IV.

THE LATIN REPRESENTATIVES OF THE INDO-EUROPEAN SOUNDS.

Ä, Á.

§ 1. Ä. I.-Eur. ä is Latin ā. Thus in the declension of A-stems we have Latin fāmilias (the old genitive preserved in legal language, pāter familias), terrō (later terrāi, terrae), praeda (O. Lat. praidā), filiārum, filiābus (another legal form, required for distinction from filiis, Dat. Abl. Plur. of filius); the word for ‘mother,’ I.-Eur. *māter- (O. Ind. mātār-, Arm. mair, Dor. Gk. μάτη, O. Ir. māthir, O. Slav. mati, with o as the equivalent of I.-Eur. ā in Lithuanian and in the Teutonic languages, Lith. motë, ‘wife,’ O. Eng. mōdor, O. H. Germ. muuter, now Mutter, with short vowel and double consonant instead of long vowel and single consonant) is in Latin māter.

I.-Eur. ā, Lat. ā, is often found in developments from simple roots like ġēn-, ‘to beget,’ e.g. Lat. gnātus, later nātus, beside inā-gēna, ġēn-us: tel-, ‘to carry,’ Lat. lātus for *tātus, P. P. P. of tollo; stel- (O. Slav. stelja, ‘I spread’), Lat. lātus, wide, earlier stlātus, stlāta, sc. nāvis, whence the adj. stlātarius, or with -ātt- for earlier -āt- (ch. ii. § 127), stlatta, stlattarius (Paul. Fest. 455. 1 Th. stlatta, genus navigii, latum magis quam altum, et a latitudine sic appellatum, sub ea consuetudine, qua ‘stlocum’ pro locum, et ‘stlitem’ pro litem dicebant; Gl. Philox. stlata: πειρατικοῦ σκάφους εἶδος: Juv. vii. 134 stlattaria purpura); ster-(Lat. sterno), Lat. strā-tus, strā-men; ġer-, ‘to rub,’ ‘wear away,’ ‘make old’ (Gk. γέρων), Lat. grā-num; keld-, ‘to strike’ (Lat. per-cello), Lat. clādes; kert-, ‘to bind,’ ‘weave together’ (O. Ind. cṛtáti, ‘he binds,’ kṛnáttī, ‘he spins’), Lat. crātes; āker-
(Gk. képas, horn), Lat. crābro for *crās-ro (§ 152), a hornet. The lā, rā, nā has been variously explained in some or all of these instances, as (1) long sonant or syllabic l, r, n (§§ 81, 92), (so Brugmann, Grundr. 1. §§ 253, 306), so that, for example, Lat. grānus would represent I.-Eur. *gēno-, while Goth. kaurn, Eng. corn, represent I.-Eur. *gēno- (cf. Lat. rād-ix, I.-Eur. *wīd-, but Goth. vaurs, Eng. wort), I.-Eur, *wīd-): (2) due to the fusion of an e-sound with an a-sound in a grade of a disyllabic root of the form ēna-, &c., so that e.g. Lat. gnātus would come from ēna-, the root ēn- with the addition of an a-sound, while Gk. (Att. and Dor.) -γνητος would come from ēne-, the root ēn- with the addition of an e-sound (so Bechtel, Hauptprobleme, p. 203); the *crās- of Lat. crābro for *crās-ro will thus be a grade of I.-Eur. *kēras- (Greek képas-): (3) a secondary root, formed by the addition of a stem-suffix ā to the weak grade of the simple root (see Brugmann, Morph. Unt. i. p. 1; Persson, Wurzelerweiterung, p. 91), so that e.g. Lat. gnārus would show a root formed from ēn-, the weak grade of the root ēn-, ‘to know,’ by the addition of the suffix ā, as gnōtus, gnōsco would show a root similarly formed from ēn- by the addition of the suffix ō; Lat. lātus, ‘carried,’ for *tlātus, will thus be like Dor. Gk. ἐ-τάλαν from root tel-, ‘to carry,’ ἐ-πτᾶν from root pet-, ‘to fly.’

Latin ā is often ā lengthened by ‘compensation’ (§ 162), e.g. quālus for *quās-lus (cf. quāsillus); hālo for *āns-lo, from the root an-, ‘to breathe,’ with the addition of s, ans-, ‘to be fragrant’ (O. Sl. ąchati, ‘to be fragrant’), with compound ān-hēlo from *an-enslo, with change of ā to ē before the vowel became lengthened by ‘compensation’ (ch. iv. § 162). The older spelling was with Ĺ (cf. quallus, anhellus, and anhellitus in Virgil MSS.), so that the ā is due to the shifting of the long quantity from the consonant to the vowel. In octāvus from octō we seem to have before v an ā developed from an ō, just as in cāvus we have āv for ēv (§ 19).

Unaccented ā remains unchanged, e.g. immānis, from an old word, mānus, good; but when final, or when preceding final m, t, r, l, it was, like other long vowels, shortened in course of time. When final, perhaps only in iambic words, originally (ch. iii. § 43), fērā, noun, pūtā, imper.; but this shortening was extended to all Noms. Sing. of Ā-stems and Noms. Aces. Plur. Neut. (see ch. vi. §§ 3
and 45). Thus in the declension of ā-stems, the ‘First Declension,’ final -ā of the Nom. Sg. is even in the earliest poetry a short vowel; the Acc. Sg. has -ām; the final syllable of the 3 Sg. Pres. Subj. Act., e.g. mittāt, and Pass. mittar was shortened in the second cent. B.C.; -al (older -āle) was also shortened (see ch. iii. § 49).

In Umbro-Oscan I.-Eur. ā was likewise retained (von Planta, i. p. 77), e.g. Osc. maatreis, Umbr. matrer ‘matris’; Osc. fratrūm ‘fratrum,’ Umbr. frater ‘fratres.’ But final -ā became an O-sound, written in Oscan ú (in Lat. alph. o, in Gk. alph. o), in Umbr. u (in Lat. alph. o) and a, e.g. Osc. motto, Umbr. mutu and muta, ‘multa’ (‘a fine’), Osc. víú ‘via.’ It is scanned (in the Neut. Pl. of an O-stem) as a short syllable by Lucilius (sollō, Lucil. inc. 106 M.; cf. ch. ii. § 1), so that I.-Eur. final -ā may have been modified at a very early period in the Italic languages (Latin as well as Umbro-Osc.), and the Latin shortening may not have been confined originally to iambic words (but see ch. iii. § 43).

§ 2. Latin ā for I.-Eur. ā. Other examples are (1) in suffixes, &c.: I.-Eur. ā of the Subjunctive, Lat. fārumus, fāritis, &c.; I.-Eur. noun-suffix -tāt- (e.g. O. Ind. dēvā-tāt-, ‘divinity,’ Dor. Gk. νεῦ-tāt-), Lat. multiĕtāt-, vōlūtāt-; I.-Eur. adjective-suffix -ako- [e.g. Ir. buadhach, ‘victorious’ (from buaid, ‘victory’); cf. Boudicca, wrongly called by us Boudica], Gaulish Teuto-bōdiācē, Bēn-ácus, Lith. šaidokas, ‘sweetish,’ O. Sl. novakū; cf. Gk. νεᾶτ-, Lat. māricus, vīrāc-; (2) in individual words: I.-Eur. *bhrātor-, ‘brother’ (O. Ind. bhrātār, Gk. φράτωρ, the member of a φράτρια, O. Ir. brāthir, W. brawd, Goth. brōfar, O. Eng. brōjor, Lith. brotė-ēlī-s), Lat. frāter; I.-Eur. *bhāgo-, ‘beech-tree’ (Dor. Gk. φάγυς, O. Engl. bō-trīw, ‘beech tree,’ bōc, ‘a book,’ lit. the runes scratched on a piece of beech-wood), Lat. fāgus; I.-Eur. *swādu-, ‘sweet’ (O. Ind. svādū-, Dor. Gk. ὅβους, O. Sax. swōti), Lat. suādīs for *swādīs; similarly Lat. clāvīs (Dor. Gk. κλάι(f)s), nāvem Acc. (O. Ind. nāv-am, Hom. Gk. νῆ(ο)ς, O. Ir. nau), fāri, fāma, fāvula (Dor. Gk. φα-μι, O. Sl. ba-jāti, ‘to converse’), vātes (O. Ir. fáith, the i being due to ‘Infection,’ that is, to the influence of an i, which was suppressed in pronunciation in a following syllable, from stem fātī-, I.-Eur. *wāti-).

§ 3. Ā. I.-Eur. ā is Latin ā. Thus I.-Eur. *āgo, ‘I drive’ (O. Ind. ājāmi, Gk. ἄγω, Ir. again, O. Isl. aka înf.), is in Latin āgo; its derivative, I.-Eur. *āgros, ‘a field’ (O. Ind. ājra-s, Gk. ἄγρος, Goth. akrs, Engl. acre), is in Latin āger, stem āgro-.

I.-Eur. ā varies with ā, and similarly Latin ā with ā, in this root āg-, to drive’ (Lat. amb-āges, Sanser. ājī-, ‘a race, contest,’ Ir. āg, ‘a contest’), and in others, some of which are enumerated in § 56. The P. P. P. of stō, from root stā-, ‘to stand,’ is stātus (Gk.
σταγός), with ἀ for the weak grade of Ἄ. Latin ā (probably Eur. ā) is also the vowel of a weak grade of ō, e.g. in a root like dō-, 'to give' (Gk. δῶος, δῶρος), Latin dā-tus beside dō-num. Like Lat. dā-tus from root dō- is Lat. sā-tus from root sē-, 'to sow'; and this ā seems to be an Eur. ā, a weak grade of ę, e.g. in root kēd- (Gr. έκέκοδει and κεκάδωντο, Lat. cēdo). This I.-Eur. vowel, found in a weak grade of roots with ā, ō, ē, whether it was in each case ā, or in some or all cases was an indeterminate vowel (written ə by Brugmann), appears in Latin as ā, stātus, dātus, sētus, but in O. Ind. we have ĭ in sthitās, ā-di-ta 3 Sg. Aor., -dhitas P. P. P. of dhā- (I.-Eur. dhē-), 'to place.' The same O. Ind. ĭ is seen in words like I.-Eur. *pater-, O. Ind. pitār-, where in the other languages we have ā, Gk. πατήρ, O. Ir. athir, Goth. fadar, O. Engl. fæder, as ā in Latin pater, probably a derivative from the root pā-, 'to protect,' with this weak-grade vowel. In other words, like Latin pāteo, ā seems to vary with ē (Gk. πετάνωμι); and in Latin we have a few instances of ā, where other languages, or kindred Latin forms, offer ę, frango fragilis (Goth. brikan, Engl. break), flagro (Gk. φλέγω), gradus (Goth. gripþ), aper (O. Engl. eorfo, Germ. Eber). They are mostly cases of ā with a liquid or nasal, and so admit of the explanation that they are a form of the sonant or syllabic l, r, m, n (so Osthoff, Morph. Unt. vol. v. pref.), while aper has been explained as 'a contamination' of I.-Eur. *kapro- (Gk. κάρπος) and I.-Eur. *epror; they have also been explained by the theory that I.-Eur. ē and ō when pretonic became ā in Latin (Wharton, Etyma Latina, p. 128). The more or less complete fusion of I.-Eur. ā and ē in other languages makes it impossible to be sure that this use of ā in words connected with ē-roots is not a peculiarity of Latin, or rather of the Italic languages generally (cf. Osc. patensínus, Umb. abro-), depending, it may be, on the pronunciation of Latin or Italic ā (see ch. ii. § 1). For Latin ā for ō, under influence of v, e.g. cāvus, older covus, see § 19, and for ar, al, an, from sonant r, l, n, §§ 81, 92.

Unaccented Latin ā in the posttonic syllable became at first ē, except before l and labials, where it became ę. This ē became, perhaps about the end of the third century B.C., ī in syllables not long by position (except when it preceded r), and before ng;
while this o became u or the ǔ-sound, which in most cases passed into ë at the close of the Republican period. Thus the compound of ab and cado became accēdo (so spelt by Ennius), then accīdo; from in and arma we have the compound inermis; from sub and rapio first *surroppio probably, then surrūpio (Plaut.), then surrīpio; from ex and frango, effingo (see ch. iii. § 18). Final Latin ë probably became ë, and might be dropped (see ch. iii. § 37).

In Umbro-Oscan I.-Eur. ë remains, as in Latin, e.g. Umbr. ager, 'a field;' Osc. actuòd 'agito' third Sg. Imperat., also I.-Eur. a, e.g. Osc. paterei 'patri,' Umbr. Iupater 'Juppiter' (von Plant, p. 1, p. 75).

§ 4. I.-Eur. ë. The I.-Eur. preposition *āpō (O. Ind. āpa, Gk. ἀπό, Goth. af, Germ. ab, Engl. of) is Latin āp- of ap-ērio, usually written ab, with suppression of the final vowel; but the form pō- of po-stūsus, from póno for *pō-īnō, shows suppression of the initial vowel; *ād (O. Ir. ad, Goth. at, Engl. at) is Latin ād.

Similarly mādeo (Gk. μαδω); sālio (Gk. ἀλλωμα); sālix (Ir. sail, a C-stem, Bret. haleg-en, O. H. Germ. salahā, O. Engl. sealh, Engl. sallow) (but see §§ 92–94); *dācīrma, later lacrūma and lacrīma (Gk. βλάχυ, O. Ir. dēr, W. dagr, Goth. tagr, O. Engl. tēr, Germ. Zähre); āngo, angor, angustus (O. Ind. āhas, 'need,' Gk. ἀγγα, Ir. t-achtaim, W. t-agu, Lith. aūksztas, 'narrow,' O. Sl. азүкū, Goth. aggvis, Germ. enge); arceo (Gk. ἀρέω, Arm. arsel, 'hindrance'); mācer, 'thin' (Gk. μακρός, long, Av. masah-, 'size,' O. H. Germ. magar, 'thin'); albus (Gk. ἀλφός, white leprosy); ānimus, ānima, 'soul' (O. Ir. anim, annam Gen., 'soul,' Gk. ἀνεμός, wind, from root an-, 'to breathe'); cánō (O. Ir. canim, W. canu, Goth. hanu, 'a cock,' Engl. hen); ādo (Ir. alaim, W. alu, Goth. alta, 'I grow up,' Gk. ἀυξάνω, insatiate); āqua (Goth. ahva); sābo (Gk. σάστρο, Lith. skabū, 'I cut,' Goth. skaba, 'I shave,' O. Engl. sçafe, Engl. shave); ὀρο (Arm. avar, 'a plough,' Gk. ἀρόω, O. Ir. arathar, 'a plough,' W. ar, 'tilth,' Lith. ariū, 'I plough,' O. Sl. orjā, Goth. arja, Engl. to ear); sal- (Arm. aļ, Gk. ἁλς, O. Ir. salān, W. halen, O. Sl. sośi, Goth. salt, Engl. salt).

I.-Eur. ë or o (see § 51).

ā—ë (see § 55) e.g. atrox and odium, a cuer-bus and ocris.

ā—ë (see § 61) e.g. a ser blood (Gk. ἕαρ), sacena a priest's knife (cf. seco).

Ε, Ε.

§ 5. Ε. I.-Eur. ë is Latin ë. Thus the optative-suffix, I.-Eur. -iē (-iē-) (O. Ind. syās, siyās, Gk. εῦς for *eiες) is -iē- of O. Lat. siēs. From the root plē-, 'to fill' (O. Ind. prā-tā- Part., 'full,' Arm. lī, Gk. πλη-πνης, O. Ir. lim, 'number,' O. Isl. fleire, 'more') comes Latin plē-nus, im-plē-lus, plērī-que, O. Lat. ex-plē-nunt; from
sē-, 'to throw, throw seed' (Gk. ἵμι for *τι-σή-μι, ἱ-μα for *sē-mn, O. Ir. sil, 'seed,' W. hil, Goth. mana-sēps, 'mankind,' Engl. seed, Lith. sēju, 'I sow,' O. Sl. séja, sē-mč, 'seed') Latin sē-vē, sē-men. This I.-Eur. ē is often found in developments from simple roots with ē, as, for instance, plē-, from the simple root pēl-, 'to fill' (Goth. filu, 'much,' O. Ir. il), or psē- (O. Ind. psā-, 'to devour,' Gk. ἕψυ, to rub) from the simple root bhēs-, (O. Ind. bhas-, 'to devour'), the ē being either due to the fusion of ē with an e-sound, in a grade of a dissyllabic root (thus plē- would be a grade of pele-), or a stem-suffix added to the weak grade of the simple root (thus psē- is ps-, the weak grade of bhēs-, with the addition of the suffix ē). The same doubt we found to exist about roots with ā, like ēna (Lat. gnā-tus) from ēna- or ēn-ā (§ 1). Occasionally ē became ī in Latin through the influence of an ī-(y) followed by a vowel in the next syllable, e.g. filius for *fēlius. Latin ē is often ē, lengthened by 'compensation,' e.g. anhelus for *an-ēnsto from *an-ānsto- (cf. ēla), written in the older orthography (in Virgil MSS.) anhellus, a spelling which indicates the lengthening of the e to have been a transference of the long quantity from the consonant to the vowel. Sometimes Latin ē is due to the fusion of two vowels, e.g. prēndo fromprehendo, très from *trēyēs (ch. vi. § 61).

In the unaccented syllable, Latin ē remained unchanged, e.g. concēdo, accēdo (see ch. iii. § 30). But when final, it was shortened in iambic words in course of time, so that while Plautus scans cāvē and occasionally cāvē, the ordinary pronunciation in Cicero's time was cāvē only. When preceding final m, it was shortened like other long vowels; hence the first Pers. Sg. of the optative would be siēm in Latin, unlike Gk. εἶνυ for *ε(σ)νυ; and before final -t, -r, -l it became (like ā, &c.) a short vowel in the second century B.C. (For this shortening, see ch. iii. § 40.)

In Oscan I.-Eur ē is ī (the symbol also of I.-Eur. ī, § 13), ī (Lat. alph. ī), e.g. ligatūs 'legatis,' ligūd 'lege'; in Umbr. e, sometimes i, e.g. plēner 'plenis,' habētu and habētus 'habeto' (von Planta, i. p. 89).

§ 6. Lat. ē for I.-Eur. ē. Other examples are: I.-Eur. dhē-, 'to suck,' 'suckle' (O. Ind. dhā-, dhā-rū-, 'suckling,' dhā-trī, 'nurse,' Arm. diem, 'I suck,
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Gk. ἰβδομα, ἱβ-λυς, ἰβ-λή, O. Ir. dith, 'he sucked,' dīnu, Pres.-Part., 'a lamb,' Goth. daddja, 'I suckle,' O. H. Germ. tāu, Lith. dė-tė, 'a leech,' pirm-dėlė, 'young mother,' O. Sl. dě-te, 'infant'), Latin fē-mīna, fēlo (vulgar form of fēlo), fō-lius for fēlius; I.-Eur. nē-, 'to sew, spin' (Gk. νηῦ, νη-θο, νη-μα, νη-τορ, Goth. nē-pla, 'needle,' O. H. Germ. nādela, näen, Germ. nähen), Lat. nē-re, nē-lus, nē-men; I.-Eur. *sēmi-, 'half' (O. Ind. sāmi-, Gk. ἵμω, O. H. Germ. sāmi, O. Engl. sām-, Engl. sand-blind), Lat. sēmi-. Similarly Lat. rēs (O. Ind. rā-s, 'property'); Lat. rēverus (O. Ir. fīr, W. gwir, Goth. tuz-vērjan, 'to doubt,' O. Sl. vēra, 'belief'); Lat. rē-ri (Goth. rēdan, 'to advise,' O. Engl. rēdan, Engl. rede, Germ. rathen); Lat. spēs (Lith. spētī, 'to have leisure,' O. Sl. spěti, 'to advance,' Goth. spēdīza, 'later,' Germ. spät). This I.-Eur. ē is often a 'doublet' of ē (see §47); rē-, for example, of Lat. rēs, O. Ind. rā-s, is a byform of rē-, rēy- (O. Ind. rāy-as Gen.); and some refer the fī- of Lat. fīlius to an I.-Eur. dē-, a grade of a root dēi-, dēiy, 'to suckle.' That the Romans of Plautus' day regarded fīlius as a cognate of fēlo (fēlo) appears from a line preserved only in the Ambrosian MS., Pseud. 422 iam ille felat fīlius, and in Umbrian the word seems to have had the sense of 'suckling,' e. g. sīf fīlu trif, tref sif felluf, 'tres sues lactentes' Acc., as well as that of 'son,' e. g. fel. for fēli. fīlius 'on an Umbrian epitaph. (Büh. Umbr. p. 174.) (On Praenestine filo(i)a, a nurse (?), see A.L.L. ii. 482.)

§ 7. I for Ė. Dēnmiō, a byform of dēnmiō; Pīnius (dialectal ?) apparently from pēnus; convicium from root wēq-, 'to speak' (?); suspicium from root spēk-, 'to look,' all seem to be examples of this change of ē to Ė, produced by a y-sound in the next syllable. Fīlius is spelt fēlius on an inscription (C. I. L. xiv. 1011), and seems in Umbrian to have the Ė-sound, spēt ē or ī. On the spellings Cornilius, Aurelius, which prove the affinity of Latin Ė with an Ė-sound before a syllable with y, see ch. ii. § 11 [Aurelius occurs on an inscr. of 200 B.C. (C. I. L. xiv. 4268, with cisidim)]; and on the spelling stūlio, for stēlio, a newt, see Georges, Lex Wortf. s. v. (Parodi in Stud. Ital. i. 385 gives other exx., and adds tīlia, &c.)


Latin em, en may represent I.-Eur. m, n, the sonant or syllabic nasal, e. g. I.-Eur. *kmontom (or *kmontom), O. Ind. šātām, Gk. κατόν, O. Ir. cēt, W. cant, Goth. hund, Lith. sziimtas, O. Sl. sūto), Lat. centum (see § 81). I.-Eur. ēw became ōw in Latin, which in the unaccented syllable passed into u, e. g. nōvus (Gk. νέος) and dē-nuo, and similarly I.-Eur. we became ū, e. g. sōvor for I.-Eur. swēsor-, in certain circumstances (see below), and I.-Eur. el became ūl (ūl) except before e, i or in the group ell, e. g. vōlo, but vēlim, velle. Latin Ė became i before ng, e. g. tingo (Gk. τέγγω). Q.
before *gn, e.g. *dignus from *decet (I see § 119), just as in the Teutonic languages ē has become ī before a nasal and a consonant, e.g. Engl. ‘wind.’ It became i also in open unaccented syllables, except when final, or when preceding r, but passed into a u-sound before l or a labial. Thus the compound of *nēco was ē-nīco (later spelt eneco), the ordinal of dēcem was dēcīmus, class. decimus (ch. iii. § 18).

Latin ē sometimes represents ei (ēy) before a vowel, e.g. *ēo from the I.-Eur. root ei-, ‘to go,’ on which see § 63. Final Latin ē may represent any I.-Eur. short vowel, as may also e in unaccented syllables before r or a consonant-group, e.g. pē-pēr-i from pārio, au-ceps from cāput (see ch. iii. § 18). Final -ē was often dropped, e.g. nēc for nēquē, exemplār, older exemplāre, as ē (and i) in the middle of a word might be suppressed by syncope, e.g. surgo for sub-rēgo (see ch. iii. § 13). On the substitution of -ēr- for -rē- in ter, older terr (cf. terr-uncius) for *ters, I.-Eur. *trīs, &c., see ch. iii. § 15. 8. I.-Eur. ē remains in Umbro-Oscan, though before some consonants it appears as ī, e.g. Osc. estud ‘esto,’ Umbr. fertu ‘ferto.’ The change to ā before l is apparently unknown. (For particulars, see von Planta, i. p. 83.)

§ 9. Latin ē for I.-Eur. ē. I.-Eur. -ē in the Voc. Sg. of O-stems (O. Ind. vīka, Gk. λῶς, Lith. vikė, O. Sl. vlūče) is Latin -ē of lupē, &c., as in the Imperative 2 Sg. Act., e.g. *agē (O. Ind. āja, Gk. ἄγε) Lat. āgē, dropped in ācē, duēc, fāc (ch. iii. § 36); the conjunction ‘and,’ I.-Eur. *qē (O. Ind. ca, Gk. τέ) is Latin quē, with ē dropped in nīc for nēquē, &c.; the first personal pronoun (O. Ind. ahām, Arm. es, Gk. ἐγώ, Goth. ik, O. Eng. ic, Lith. ăs, O. Sl. azū) is in Latin ego. Other examples are Lat. mūha (Gk. μῆθα, O. Ir. nēl from *nēblo-, W. nifwl, O. H. Germ. nebul, Germ. Nebel); Lat. sēquor (O. Ind. sāc-, Gk. ἔσομαι, O. Ir. sechur, Lith. sekū); Lat. ēt (Gk. ἔτη); Lat. mēdius (O. Ind. mādhya-, Gk. μέσος, μεσός, Goth. midjís, O. Ir. medón, ‘the middle,’ O. Sl. međa; Lat. ēquus (O. Ind. āśva-, O. Ir. ech, Gaul. Epo-rēdia, W. ebol, ‘a colt,’ Goth. aivva-tundí, ‘a bush,’ lit. ‘horse-tooth,’ O. Engl. eoh, Lith. asvā ‘a mare’); Lat. vīho (O. Ind. vah-, Pamphyl. Gk. φίχω, Ir. fēn from *wegno-, ‘a waggon,’ Goth. ga-viga, ‘I move,’ Germ. be-wege, Lith. vežū, O. Sl. vezā).

§ 10. For ē with w and l. I.-Eur. *nēw (O. Ind. nāva, Gk. ἐνεώ for *en-refa, Ir. nōi, W. naw, Goth. niun) is in Latin nōem; I.-Eur. *nēwo- (O. Ind. nāva, Gk. νέος, O. Ir. nē from *nowio-, Gaul. Novio-dūnum, W. newyd) is Lat. nōemus, Novimus, while in the unaccented syllable we see ǝ for I.-Eur. ew in ēnemī. (For other examples of this ǝ, see ch. iii. § 24.) The change of ē to ǝ before w, which is shared by the Celtic languages (e.g. Gaul. Novio-dūnum, O. Ir. nē for *nowio-, W. newyd from *nawyd for *nowio- from I.-Eur. *nèwio-, cf. Gk. νέος, Goth. niujis; O.-Ir. nōi, W. naw from I.-Eur. *nèw), and by the Balto-Slavic (e.g. Lith. tāvas for I.-Eur. *tēvo-, Gk. τοῦ (f)ός; O. Sl. novū for I.-Eur. *nēwō, Gk. νῆω, does not affect the ev (Latin ev, but not I.-Eur. -ew-) of words like lēvis (Gk. ἱ-λαχύς), sēvérus,
apparently from root *sōgh-, brētis (Gk. βρήθις), so that the law of change must have ceased to operate before these words assumed in Latin this form. It is like the change of the diphthong eu to ou in the Italic, Celtic, and Balto-Slavic languages, e.g. O. Lat. *douco for I.-Eur. *deukō (Goth. tiuha) (see § 35).

I.-Eur. swē- appears as sō- in Latin, e.g. I.-Eur. *swésor- (O. Ind. svásar-, Gk. ἱππε-, O. Ir. siur, and after a vowel fiur, W. chw aer, Goth. svistar, Lith. sosū, O. Sl. sestra) is in Latin sōr; I.-Eur. *swēkūro- (O. Ind. švāśu-, Gk. ἱππε-), W. chwegrwn, O. H. Germ. swehur, Germ. Schwäher, Lith. szeszaras, O. Sl. svekrū) is Lat. sōcr; I.-Eur. *swēpno- (O. Ind. svāpna-, O. Scand. svefn, O. Engl. svefén) is Lat. sūminus for *sępno-; cf. sēpor. I.-Eur. kwē is said to appear as cō- in Latin in conbr-ētum, a bulrush (Lith. szvėdrai Plur.) from a stem kwėndhro-, though this may stand for *guombr-ētum with the O-grade of stem (see § 137); fōrem seems to represent dissyllabic *fēcrem. But cō of dwē-remains, e.g. bellum, older duellum, bènè (cf. older Duemos). Quē from I.-Eur. qēw, kwē, &c. remains, and does not become co, e. g. -quē (I.-Eur. quē), quēr from kwē-ēs- (cf. Gk. κωβος), though quo became co in course of time, e.g. cōlo, the O. Lat. form of which was *quolo, as in the old inscription of the Faliscan 'collegium cocorum,' written in rude Saturnians, and with equally rude spelling (Zvetaieff, Inscr. Ital. Inf. 72 a):

gonlegium quod est aequum aetati aged[ai],
opiparam ad uicitam quolundam festosque dies,
quæi soueis astatieis opidque Uolgani

gondecorant saipisum comuiia loidosque,
quæquel huac dederunt inperatoribus summeis (i. e. Jupiter, Juno
and Minerva)
ut ei seised lubentes beneiouent optantis,

where also coqui is written ququei (so qholunt for colunt in the Plautus Palimpsest in Pseud. 822). The compound inquñimus, with -quil- for quil- in the unaccented syllable, was formed before the change from quo to co, and being a legal term kept its old spelling, unlike inculta, (but see p. 229). That quo had come to sound like cō as early as the beginning of the second cent. B. c., we may infer from the spelling in equoitd, for in occulta, on the S. C. de Bacehanalibus (C. I. L. i. 156) of 186 B. C.; for occulta must be connected with cēlo, which has not the qē- guttural (cf. Ir. célum, W. cēu with the é-grade of the same root). The analogy of quam, quem, &c. would preserve the spelling quom till a late date, though the word was probably pronounced *com, for the preposition, L.-Eur. *kōm or *kōm, is usually spelt quom till the time of the Gracchi (Bersu, Guttural, p. 42); and similarly loquantur, &c. would be written after the fashion of loquentur, loquentur, with quo; so that it is not until the fifth cent. A. D. that every quō has assumed the spelling co, e. g. cot, cómm, coque (the conjunction), condam (the adverb), locor (Bersu, p. 90). The form quotidie is censured by Quintilian (i. 7. 6 frigidiora his alia ut . . . 'quotidie,' non cotidie, ut sit quot diebus; verum haec jam etiam inter ipsas ineptias evanuerunt), by Velius Longus (79. 16 K. illos vitiose et dicere et scribere [qui potius] per 'quo' 'quotidie' dicent quam per 'co' cotidie, cum et dicatur melius et scribatur. non enim est a quöte die 'quotidie' dictum, sed a continenti die cotidie tractum), and by Marius Victorinus [13. 27 K. nam concussus quamvis a quatio habeat originem, et coccus a coquendo (v. l. quo-
quendo), et cotidie a quo die, et incola ab inquilino, attamen per e quam per qu scribuntur]. Cotidie and cotidie are the spellings of the best MSS., and are found on inscriptions (see Georges, Lex. Worff. s. v.), though no doubt the older spelling would have quo-.

Lat. ve- became ve- (see Solmsen, Stud. Lat. Lautg. p. 1) in the middle of the second cent. B. C. Quintilian tells us that Scipio Africanus (Minor) was credited by tradition with this change of orthography (i. 7. 25 quid dicam 'vortices' et 'vorsus,' ceteraque in eundem modum, quae primus Scipio Africanus in e litteram secundam vertisse dicitur?). (On these spellings in inscriptions, see Brambach, Orth. p. 101.) The MSS. of Plautus show the older spellings vorto, vorsus, and compounds, vos'ester, volo (I-Eur. g?), -vorto; and invorto, divorsii, vortex are found even in the MSS. of Augustan poets, like Virgil. The grammarians of the Empire sometimes adviser the retention of these forms for the sake of distinctions, e. g. Caper, 99. II. K. vortex fluminis est, vertex capitis; 97. 15 vorsus paginae dicitur, versus participium est a verbo vetor. One of the o-forms indeed, voster, was retained to the last (perhaps by analogy of vos, or of nostër) in Vulgar Latin (cf. Roumanian vostru, Ita]). vostro, Fr. vôtre), as o was retained in classical vo e (by analogy of vo ?), vomo, voro (I-Eur. g%). O was retained before single l and l before another consonant, e. g. volo, to wish, volo, to fly, vulnus, hollow of hand, volo, velnos, later vulnus, &c., and before e, e. g. vovo; though Cassiodorus, a doubtful authority, makes convulare the old spelling of convellere (149. 17 K.). Viâtterae for Etruscan Velafrî, Vômannus for Etruscan Velimyna cannot be quoted to prove that Latin ve- was ever pronounced vë-. They exemplify the phonetic law that ã became ãl in Latin (see below). There is no evidence that vëho was ever *voleo, or *Venus *Vonus, or *vntus, or vëru *voro, &c. The old spelling vorto (I-Eur. *vërtho, Goth. wairja) probably belongs to a period when ve- had come to take the sound of ve- and was occasionally used as a symbol of this sound (ch. viii. § 8); it has also been referred to the analogy of the P. P. P. vorsus (I-Eur. *vrt-to-), where Lat. or represents I-Eur. r.

Oî may similarly have become ei after e, so that vidi may represent an I-Eur. *woidai (O. Sl. vëde; cf. Gk. o§a, ch. viii. § 39) ; but the appearance of e beside o in Latin in words like amplior, O. Lat. amplior (Prisc. i. p. 25. 15 H.; cf. below ch. viii. § 33) is better referred to the same 'variation' (Ablaut) as that seen in tego beside toga, procus beside precor, &c., on which see § 51.

El is found in the group ell, e. g. velle, vellem (that ël had a more 'exilis' sound than l, in technical language was 'front-modified,' is attested by the grammarians, ch. ii. § 96), and before e, i (y) ; but in other circumstances it seems that the character of Latin l so asserted itself as to change e to o, e. g. vole, though there are a few exceptions to the rule, and not very many instances 1. Thus the Greek xalai(f)â, when adopted by the Romans (in the period of the Tarquins, Plin. Nat. Hist. xv. 1), became *aîâva, then *oleva (§ 27), olva. A following e- or i-vowel prevents the change, e. g. velim, mîlîor. The older type of declension holus, *hëleris (from *helës) has left traces of itself in holus, holeris and O. Lat. helus (Paul. Fest. 71. 13 Th. 'helus' et 'helusa' antiqui

1 Pliny contrasts the l of lectus, lectum with the 'exilis' l-sound of Metellus, so that we cannot suppose Latin l to have been pronounced exactly as Russian or Gaelic l, viz. a 'deep' l before a, o, u, a 'palatal' l before e, i.
diecebant, quod nunc nolus et holera; cf. the gloss 'helitores' hortodani Lôwe, Prodtr. p. 339), but *scelus has not survived beside sceloris. Before a consonant el became ol (ul § 17) (on the pronunciation of l before a cons., see ch. ii. § 96), e.g. vult, older volt. (On gelu, helus, sêmel, celsus, and for other instances of the change to ol, see Osthoff, Banckes u. helles 'l' im Lat.). Inquelinus may thus represent an older *enquelinus, incédia an older *enquólês, both from an early qêlê.-

§ 11. I for (accented) e. Other examples are: before ng, Lat. lingua, older ãngua from I.-Eur. ãnghâ- (O. Ir. tenge, W. tafod, Goth. tuggô); Lat. ingen from I.-Eur. ñgâ- (Gk. ἀδφύ'); Lat. stringo, I bind, draw tight (O. Ir. srêgim, 'I draw'); Lat. septingenti, conferingo, attingo, &c. for septengenti, *confrengo, *attengo, &c.; before gn, ignis from I.-Eur. *ugni (O. Ind. agni-, Lith. ugnis, O. Sl. ogni); Ignatius, a late spelling of Egnatius (see Schuchardt, Vok. i. 334); ilignus and iligneus from ilex, but abigánsus (with ñ, according to Priscian, i. p. 82. 8 H.) from abies; the old religious term for a sheep, brought with its two lambs to the sacrifice, is given by Paul. Fest. as ambegna (4. 7 Th. 'ambegni 'bos et verte excipella, cum ad corpus utraque lateri agnus in sacrificium ducbantur), but in Glossaries as ambigna (Mai, vi. p. 506 b. 'ambignae,' ovês ex utraque parte agnos habentes; and 'ambignae,' ovês quas Junonii offerebant, quia geminos parerent); while the MSS. of Varro give abigænuma, which may indicate a correction of abigna to ambigna (L. L. vii. 31 'ambigna' bos apud augures, quam circum aliae hostiae constituuntur). We have sim- for sem- (I.-Eur. sm-, Gk. ἁπλός, &c.), in simplicis, simplex, simpulieares funera (quibus adhibentur duntaxat ludi coribotesque, Fest. 498. 24 Th.) as well as singuli, sincereus, sincinia (canto solitaria, Paul. Fest. 500. 23 Th.) and in simul, older semul (see Georges, Lex. Worf. s. v.), similis, similî, but e does not become i before mpl of templum, nor before ne in iüvenecus, and Umbrian sumel, Gk. șmâlos, &c. suggest that the sim- of similis and its cognates is I.-Eur. som-, and has the õ-sound of sîminus, written also simus, libet later lcronym (see ch. ii. § 16); simicpût is derived from õmicapût by Velius Longus (78. 18 K.), &c. On the quantity and quality of the vowel i before gn in dignus, &c., see ch. ii. § 144. The I.-Eur. word for 'five' õpeniske (O. Ind. pânca, Arm. hing, Gk. πενῆ, O. Ir. cîc, Gaul. πεμφούα, cinqfoil, O. W. pîmp, Goth. fimf, Lith. penkî, O. Sl. petî) is in Latin quînque [with long i indicated both by inscriptions and by the Romance forms, a quantity which has been referred to the influence of quîn(e)bus (K. Z. xxx. 501) (see ch. ii. § 144)]. In rustic and dialectal Latin ì before rc became i, e.g. Mircuruos, Mirurios (C. I. L. i. 1500 and 59, both from Praeneste), stircus (C. I. L. ix. 782, from Luceria, in Apulia on the borders of Samnium), commircium, mentioned as an older form by Velius Longus (77. 12 K. 'mium' et 'commireum' quoque per í antiquis reliquisquam, apud quos aequo et 'Mircurius' per i dicebatur, quod mirandarum rerum esset inventor, ut Varro dixit. nostris jam auribus placent per e, ut et Mercurius et commercia dicantur). The i of country-terms like hircutus, hirtus, &c. (apparently from root glers- 'to be rough,' whence Lat. horreus, hordeum, &c.) may be explained by this dialectal pronunciation of stircus for sterucus, &c. (Of. Ose, amiricatus 'immerecato'). In other positions than before rc, &c. the 'rustic' pronunciation seems to have substituted e for i (ut tota litteram tollasse plenissimum dicat. Cîc. de Orat. iii. 12. 46) (cf. above, ch. ii. § 17). To this confusion is perhaps due the uncertainty in the spelling of country-terms like filix or filîx, a fern (the latter approved by Caper, p. 106. 1 K.; see Georges s. v.), fîber and fîber, a beaver, from I.-Eur. bhêbhur- (see Georges); but the byforms pînna and penna, vîges and vîgeo, vîlus
§ 12. I. I.-Eur. i has been faithfully retained by the various languages in almost all circumstances, and is in Latin ī, though often written in O. Lat. ei, after the I.-Eur. ei-diphthong had come to take the sound of ī (ch. i. § 9). The diphthong ei in Greek developed to the same sound (thus ēρείωσα, the proper spelling, became ερίωσα), so that in Greek also ei was in course of time often written for ī, e.g. πολείτης, and Ulfilas adopted this symbol ei for the long ī-sound of Gothic. For examples of I.-Eur. ī we may take the adjective-suffix in -ίνο- (O. Ind. nav-ίνα-, 'new,' Gk. ἀγάριστ-ίνος, often with names of animals, e.g. κοράκ-ίνος, δελφακ-ίνη, χοιρ-ίνη, Goth. gulp-eins, O. H. G. guld-im, Engl. gold-en, Goth. sv-ein, O. Engl. sw-im, Engl. swine, O. Sl. mater-ini, 'motherly,' sv-ini), in Latin su-ίνus, diu-ίνus, &c.; the optative-suffix ī (varying with yē, ch. viii. § 55) (O. Ind. dviṣi-mahi, Gk. εἰδείμεν from εἰδε(σ)-ί-μεν, Goth. vil-ei-ma) in Lat. s-ī-mus; the adjective *g疣ίω-, 'alive,' (O. Ind. jīvā-, Lith. gūvas, O. Sl. živū, O. Ir. biu, W. byw) in Lat. vívus, in old spelling veivos; Lat. viis (Gk. χίς, ἵ-φι); Lat. vírus (Gk. ἴος for *Φίος), Lat. vitex (Gk. ἴτεα and εἰρέα, Engl. withy, Lith. vytis). I.-Eur. ī is usually a grade of an ei-root, and it is often difficult to say whether Lat. ī represents the ī-grade or the ei-grade.

After ī, Latin ī appears as ē in lōni-ēna for *lānī-īna, &c. (cf. tonstr-īna), as we have ē in sōciētas, anxiētas, but ī in castītas, nōvītas, &c. (see ch. v. § 83). Latin ī represents I.-Eur. ei in dīco (O. Lat. dīco, Gk. διέκ-νῦ-μι), ad-dīco, &c., fīdō (Gk. πείδω for *φείδω), con-fīdō, &c. (see ch. viii. § 6), and has come from ī lengthened by compensation in words like nīdus for *nīsdo- (*nizdo-) (Arm. nist, 'situation,' Engl. nest). In the unaccented syllable it may represent older ei (Latin ei, not I.-Eur. ei), viz. an I-diphthong whose first element has been weakened; as in con-cīdo, older con-ceīdo, from caedo, older caīdo, and in the final syllable of Perfects like tū-tūd-ī (older -ei) (O. Ind. tu-tud-ē), which have the
I.-Eur. i Sg. Perf. Middle ending -ai (-ai) (ch. viii. § 66); oi in the final syllable of Noms. Plur. of O-stems like populi (oldest Lat. poploc, then populei, ch. vi. § 40). Vidi, older videi, from I.-Eur. *woidai (O. Sl. vėdė) shows vei-, a development of an older voi-, as versus (I.-Eur. *wrt-to-) shows ver-, a development of an older vor- (§ 10). On the use of e for Lat. i (perhaps properly only I.-Eur. ei) in rustic Latin, e.g. speca, vella, see ch. ii. § 17, and cf. below, § 32; on i for e in filians, § 7. I.-Eur. i remains in Umbro-Osc. and is written in the Oscan alphabet iů or i (in Lat. alph. i), in Umbr. i (in Lat. alph. i and ei), e.g. Ose. liūmitū[m 'limitum,' Umbr. si, sir, sei, 'sit' (see von Planta, i. p. 102).

§ 13. Į. I.-Eur. į is Latin ĵ, sometimes written in Old Latin e (e.g. Tempestatebus on a Scipio epitaph), after unaccented ĵ had come to take the ū-sound (see also ch. iii. § 18). The I.-Eur. pronoun *jī- (O. Ind. i-d-ām Neut., Goth. is Māsc., ita Neut., Engl. it) is Lat. īs M., īd N.; the pronoun *ķī-, 'this' (Goth hi-mma Dat., hi-drē Adv., Engl. him, hither, Lith. szis, O. S. si) appears in Latin cēs, citra; the interrogative and indefinite pronoun *qūy- (O. Ind. ci-d, Gk. τῆ(ὁ), O. Sl. ĉī-to) is Latin quiēs M., quīd N. (cf. Umbr. pis); from the root mūn-,'to lessen,' from the primary root mei- (O. Ind. minōmi, Gk. μυύ-θω, Goth. mins Adv., O. Sl. mënjiįį Adj.) we have Lat. mīnūno, minor.

I.-Eur. ĭ is generally the weak grade of the diphthong ei (as mūn- from mei-, 'to lessen'), and so in Latin, e.g. in-dico beside dico (older deico), fēdes (cf. Gk. ἐπιθ-ov) beside fido, older feido (cf. Gk. πειθω for *φειθω). For ĭ varying with ĭ, e.g. I.-Eur. *wiuro, 'a man,' see § 58. Latin ĭ may represent any short vowel in an unaccented syllable, not long by position, e.g. concīno for con-canō, dīlīco for dilego, inquīlinus for *inquōlinus, quīllībet for quīdīlubet (whence libet for lubet, ch. ii. § 16). In an unaccented syllable long by position ĭ became ĵ, e.g. ĵūlēxi beside indicō, ĵūlēx beside jūdico (cf. jūrī-dicus), comēs, properly *comēs, Gen. comē-it-is, and in an open unaccented syllable before r, e.g. cin-er-is from cinis, and also when final, e.g. mārē but mari, mariānus; lēvē, Neut. of levis (contrast Gk. ἱππ, Neut. of ἵππος), rurē, Loc. of rūs, in which case it may be dropped, e.g. animūl for animāle, Neut. of animālis. Latin -rī- in the unaccented syllable, when preceded by a con-
sonant, became ēr, e.g. ācērus for *acēr-bus from *acēr-dho-
(Lith. asptrūs, O. Sl. ostrū), incertus for *incrētus (Gk. ἀ-κρως); and apparently this may occur in the accented syllable too, e.g. ter, properly tērs (cf. terr-uncius) for *tērs from *tēs (Gk. τῆς), testis for *trē-stis (cf. Oscan tristamentud, in Lat. testamentō Abl.) (but see ch. iii. § 15. 8). Similarly for -lē-, when, through syncope, the l has to play the part of a vowel (sonant or syllabic l), as is seen in our ‘able,’ and more clearly in French able, we find āl (older ōl) in Latin, e.g. fācūlās for *facēl(i)ās beside facilītas, sūmultās for *simm(ī)ās beside sūmlītas.

After i we find e not ē in sōcietas, anxietas, &c., beside prōbitas, castītas, &c. (cf. Engl. yē- for yē- in ‘yet,’ ‘yes’), as we find lūnienā beside tonstrīna (§ 12). In Oscan I.-Eur. ē is i (in Lat. alph. ē, in Gr. ι); in Umbr. it is i (Lat. alph. ĕ), but in O. Umbr. often e; e.g. Osc. pīs, Umbr. pis ‘quis’ (von Planta, i. p. 96).

§ 14. Other examples of Lat. ī for I.-Eur. ē. The -is- of the I.-Eur. Superlative suffix is-to- (O. Ind. svād-ištā-, Gk. ἱσταρός, Goth. sūt-ista, ‘sweetest’) appears in Latin māg-is-ter (in O. Lat. written magēster according to Quintilian, i. 4. 17 quid? non e quoque iloco fuit? ‘Meneruma’ et ‘leber’ et ‘magester’ et ‘Diwē Victore,’ non Diwē Victorī), mīn-is-ter. The weak grade of an ei-root is seen in I.-Eur. trī- from root trei-, ‘three’ (O. Ind. tri-śū Loc., Gk. τρι-αί, Goth. þrī-m Dat., Lith. tri-sē Loc., O. Sl. trī-chū) and Latin tri-bus, though in ter, terni, &c. there is the usual change of -ri- to -er-; Lat. pǐcis (Goth. fisks), while O. Ir. iasg from *peisco-shows the ei-grade; Lat. videō (O. Ind. vid-mā, 1 Pl., Hom. Gk. φίδ-μεν, W. gwedd, ‘aspect,’ Goth. vit-um, 1 Pl., Engl. wit, Germ. wissen) from root weid-, ‘to see, know,’ with Perfect-stem woid- (Gk. ὁθα); Lat. fīd-i, findo (O. Ind. bhīd-), ‘to split,’ Goth. bitum, 1 Pl. Pret., Engl. bit, Germ. bissen), from root bheid- (Goth. beitan, Engl. to bite, Germ. beissen).

ī in the unaccented syllable. See ch. iii. § 18 for other instances.

§ 15. Ī, not ēī. Other examples are pīdas, sātiētas, ምירietas and other derivatives in -ta- from io-adjective stems,  onFinish, .AbsoluteConstraints, &c., vārīga, &c. beside ies, &c., hietarē, and the earlier spellings conieicant, proiectat, iniectātis, trāiēcere, &c. (see ch. iii. § 18, p. 188).

O, Ō.

§ 16. Ō. I.-Eur. ō is Latin ō. Thus the I.-Eur. root pō-, ‘to drink’ (O. Ind. pā-, pā-νa-, Noun, Gk. πέ-πω-κα, ᾧμ-πω-τισ, the ebb, Aeol. πῶ-νω, Lith. pū-ta) is Latin pō- of pō-to, pō-tus, pō-culum; dō-, ‘to give’ (O. Ind. dá-na- and dá-ti-, ‘a gift,’ Arm. tur, Gk. δῶ-
por and δωτίνη, Lith. dū-tis, O. Sl. da-rū, dan-ū, P.P.P.; in Celtic, the I.-Eur. word for ‘gift’ has taken the sense of ‘an accomplishment,’ O. Ir. dān, W. dawn) is in Latin dō-num, dō-s. On
the other hand, I.-Eur. Ṽ is often a grade of ė or ē (e.g. Gk. ποτάμος from root πέτ-, κλάψ, a thief, from κλέπτω, θεμός from τίθημι) (see §§ 51, 53). A root like ḡnō- (Gk. γνωτός, Lat. nōnas, older gnōtas, gnōsco) beside ġn-, admits of being explained either as an addition of the suffix -ō- to the weak grade ġn-, or as a grade of a dissyllabic root ġněo-, so that gnōtas from ġněo- would be like gnārus from ġnena- &c. (§ 1).

Latin Ṽ sometimes represents an ō lengthened by ‘compensation,’ e.g. pōno from *pō-s(i)no (cf. pō-situs); sometimes it is due to crasis, e.g. cōpula for *co-apula, cómburo for co-am-buro (see ch. ii. § 149); sometimes it is the ‘rustic’ development of Latin ou, which in standard Latin became ū, e.g. rōbus for *rubus (cf. rubidus) from I.-Eur. reudh- (Goth. rauþs) (see § 41); sometimes it is the ‘rustic’ form of au, e.g. plōstrum, a byform of planstrum, from plau.do (ch. ii. § 37). But ū is also found to vary with au in Latin, when both are sprung from an original ōu, e.g. ĵesulum, ausculus (ib.).

In unaccented syllables ō remained unaltered, e.g. con-dōno and co-gnōso, but final -ō became shortened in course of time (see ch. iii. § 45). Octāvus from octō (I.-Eur. *oktō, *oktōu) appears to show Ṽv for ōw, as cavus shows ľv for ľw (§ 19). Für, ĵür (O. Lat. quōr) seem to represent an I.-Eur. *bhōr (Gk. φόρ, p. 254), *q[v]ō-r (Lith. kur, ‘where,’ for *kūr, ch. x. § 10), and nōn to stand for *mūn, a development of noen(um) (ch. x. § 18).

I.-Eur. ū is in Osc. u, uu (in Lat.alph. u), but the endings -ūs, -ūd appear in Osc. as -ús, -ūd (with ū, the symbol of I.-Eur. ō); e.g. djuunated ‘dōnavit,’ dūnum ‘dōnum,’ Abellanús ‘Abellani’ Nom. Plur., Búvaianúd ‘Boviano’ Abl. Sg. In Umbr. it is usually o (in Lat. alph., for the native alphabet writes u for both the U-sound and the O-sound, ch. i. § 1), but -ōn appears as -nr, e.g. nome ‘nōmen,’ postro ‘retrō,’ arsferture ‘adfertōri’ (see von Planta, i. p. 116).

I.-Eur. ów seems to have become áv in the beginning of the second century B.C., e.g. cónus, older covus (Gk. κόοι, cavities, Hesych., κοῖλος for *κοῖλος). Latin vē- became vē- in the middle of the second century B.C. in versus, older vorsus, &c. (§ 10); but vūco was the older form of vūco, as we see from Plautus' pun in Cas. 527:

fāc habeant linguām tuae aedes. Quid ita? Quom ueniam, uocent.

Latin -ōv- may represent I.-Eur. -ēw-, as in nōvem, nōvus (see § 10); Latin sw-, I.-Eur. swē-, as in sōror, sōcer, somnus (see § 10); Latin āl, ōr, the I.-Eur. sonant or syllabic l, r, as in fors, cor (see § 92). In the accented, as well as the unaccented syllable, Latin õ became û, before l with a consonant (not ll), before m with a labial, before ngu, e.g. vult (volt) from volo, lumbus, unquis. Before certain other consonant-groups it tended to the close o- or to the u-sound (see ch. ii. § 22). In the unaccented syllable, Latin õ offered more resistance than, for example, Latin ù, to the rule that a short vowel became ẽ, then í, in open syllables; e.g. adnōto, arrōgo have not changed their vowel like aŭigo (from ãgo). In syllables long by position, õ became ù about the end of the third century B.C.; and any õ which had escaped weakening to ẽ, ì took the same course (see ch. iii. § 18). The terminations -os, -om became -us, -um towards the end of the third century B.C. [Luciom, filios, on one Scipio epitaph (C. I. L. i. 32), Lucius, pronogatus on another (ib. i. 30), -us, -um invariably in the S. C. Bacch. of 186 B.C., (ib. i. 196), and on the decree of L. Aem. Paulus Macedonicus of 189 B.C. (ib. ii. 5041)]. But after v, u, gu, gu we find the spelling -os, -om down to the end of the Republic. There are similar traces in Osc. of unaccented õ becoming ù, e.g. dolom and dolum (von Planta, i. p. 111). Final õ became ẽ, like final ā, ĕ, &c., e.g. sēquēre imper. for I.-Eur. *sequēso (Gk. ἑπέο) (see ch viii. § 77).

§ 18. Latin õ for I.-Eur. ō. Other examples: from the I.-Eur. root ǭh, ‘to see’ (varying with ǭh-) (O. Ind. ākṣi-, ‘the eye,’ Arm. akn, Gk. ἄμα, ἄμα, Lith. akiš, O. Sl. oko) comes Lat. oculus; the I.-Eur. preposition *prüf, ‘forth’ (O. Ind. prā, Gk. πρό, O. Ir. ro, used like the Augment to indicate past time, e.g. ro chan ‘I sang’ from canim ‘I sing,’ O. Bret. ro-, Goth. fra-, Lith. pra-, O. Sl. pro-) is Lat. prō- of prō-ficisor, &c.; another preposition, I.-Eur. *kom ‘with’ (Gk. κοινός from *κούν-γος, O. Ir. com-, Osc. com-) is Lat. com, which when unaccented, or when preceding b, p, gu, &c., became cum, its usual form in classical Latin; I.-Eur. *nokti-, ‘night’ (O. Ind. nakti-, Gk. νίκ, O. Ir. in-nocht, ‘to-night,’ W. henoeth, nos, Goth. nahts, O. Engl. neaht, niht, Lith. naktis, O. Sl. noštis) is
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Lat. *vōc* Gen. ; I.-Eur. root *dō-*, ‘to smell’ (varying with *ōd-*) Gk. ὀὖμη, ὀ, ὁ, Arm. hot) appears in Lat. *ōd-or, *ōeo* for *od-ō* (§ 111).

§ 19. Lat. ő for I.-Eur. ŏ, under influence of v. Other examples are Lat. *cōveo* for *kōveo* (Gk. κου(ή)ω, to perceive, κ-νοω), Lat. *autōno* for *aŭt-i-nō* from *ōt-i-nō* (Gk. ὀτείνω), Lat. őčū for *ōt-i-no* (Gk. λοῖω). Lat. *fāvīla* for *fōvīla* from I.-Eur. root धोघ-‘ to burn’ (O. Ind. dāh-, Gk. τέφ-πα, ashes, Lith. degū, ‘I burn’). The example previously quoted, Lat. *cāvus* for *cōvus*, enables us to assign a date to this change of I.-Eur. ow, Lat. ő to av. The Spanish and Portuguese words (Span. cueva, Port. cova) show that cova-, not cavo-, was the Vulgar Latin stem at the time when Spain was made a province. The country-term cōum, (cohum), the hollow in the plough, used by Ennius of the innermost part of the heavenly sphere, retained the ő, as did oris (Gk. ὄ(ῆ)ς), though whether the aui- of aŭvābulicus ‘pastor ovium’ (Lōwe, Prodr. p. 348), avūlīs ‘agnus recentis partus’ (Paul. Fest. 10. 32 Th.) is better referred to this root or to Agās- the root of agnus (Gk. ἄγνος for *άγ-νος*) is not clear. (Varro, L. L. v. 135 explains cōum as ‘sub jugo medio cavum, quod bura extrema addita oppilatur,’ and adds ‘vocatur cōum a cova’; cf. Paul. Fest. 28. 1 Th.; Isid. Nat. Rer. 12 cōus (v. l. chous) est quo caelem continetur, unde Ennius,

vix solum complere cōum (MSS. choum, cous) terroribus caeli.

Partes ejus sunt, cous (v. l. chous), axis, clima, cardines, convexa, poli, hemisphaeria ; Diomedes (365. 17 K.) says that Verrius Flaccus spelt incōho, not inčōhe, for he derived the word from cōhum, the Old Latin word for mundus. We have already found that I.-Eur. ēw became ŏ in Latin (e. g. Lat. norus for I.-Eur. *nevos*), and that probably at a very early date, seeing that the change is shared by other Italic languages (e. g. Osc. Nūvellum). If then it be the case that I.-Eur. ow became av in Latin in the third or second cent. n. c. we must suppose that Latin ov from I.-Eur. ew had a different sound from Latin ov from I.-Eur. ow ; for the former ov does not undergo change to av (e. g. novus, not *nareus; norem, not *narem*). Latin ov from I.-Eur. oghā shares the change to av, e. g. fāvīla from I.-Eur. dōghā, the o-grade of the root dōghā- ‘to burn’ ; but nōdus for *nōv(e)dus* from I.-Eur. *nōg-, ‘naked,’ shows that the change of ov to av was later than the syncope of ő in the post-tonic syllable.

Lat. viō (Plaut. Cas. 527) for vāco (Umbr. vaĉeto- P. P. P., vakaze, for *vakaz se, Lat. vacatio sūlit?), is probably nothing but an indication of the o-sound assumed by a when preceded by v (see ch. ii. § 4). This o-sound in *vēctus*, the Vulg. Lat. word for ‘empty,’ must have persisted till late times, for Italian voto, as well as O. Fr. voit, reflect this form.

§ 20. ŭ for ŏ. (1) in close syllables, unaccented (according to the early Accent-law) : *vītītus* for *vētūs*- (Gk. (F)éros), and other derivatives from Neuters in -os (class. Lat. -us), such as augūstus, vēnūstus, ēnūstus; hōmūlīs for *hōmūdīs* from *hōmōn*-lo-, and other lo- Diminutives from on-stems, like lemūlus, whereas Diminutives from on- have -oll-, e. g. persūlā, cōrūlā; so also Diminutives in -co-lo- from on-stems, like hōmīnīcūtus, latruncūtus; āūmūs (cf. Gk. ἄρηφ-ἀμαν) and similar formations, Vertumnūs, Autumnūs, cūlūmna, &c.

(2) before l with consonant (not ll) : cūlīmen (contrasted with colīmen); stūlīus (contrasted with stōlīdus); pūlīs (contrasted with pollen); fulūs (contrasted with solīo for *solū*). In Old Latin we have o, e. g. on inscriptions, Fœlinus (C. I. L. vi. 1307, of 187 B. C.; Eph. Epigr. viii. 476, c. 135 B. C.; C. I. L. i. 534 and
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555, both of 130–129 B. C. &c.) Polec[er] (ib. i 552 of 132–131 B. C.). Priscian (i. p. 27. 33 H.) tells us that *volva was the O. Lat. form of *volva; and in the lines of Ennius about Servius Tullius (Ann. 337 M.) the corrupt reading of the MSS. *optimus for ultimus, probably indicates the spelling *ultimus (cf. Osc. *ultiamum):

mortalem summum Fortuna repente
redidit, ut summo regno famul ultimam esset.

On the spellings *volva and *volva, Fem. of adj. *volvus from *volvo, see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v. Vulnus is the pronunciation of Varro (L. L. iii. fr. p. 148 Wilm. vafer, velum, vinum, vomis, vulnus, where he gives examples of initial v followed by the various vowels of the alphabet). This of may be I. Eur. ἐλ, e. g. volt, vult (§ 10).

(3) before m with labial: *umbo for *ombo, like *umbītīcus for *ombī (Gk. ὀμψάλων); the Greek (Thrācian?) ὀμβαία is runopia in Ennius (A. xiv. fr. 8 M.) and Livy (xxx. 39. 11). Perhaps also before ms, e. g. īnērus from omōs (O. Ind. ās-, Arm. us, Goth. ans, Umbr. onso-).

(4) before nūg: nūngo, nūgn, nūnungum for *nōng- (O. Ind. anāj, *to anoint*); nūnula, like nūnus (Gk. ὀμύς); but longus, where the g is not velar (gw), retains the o (we find however lun[gum] beside lon[gum] in neighbouring inscr., C. I. L. i. 1072). We have also unēus for *ōnēus (Gk. ὁγανός), (but sesconiam C. I. L. i. 1430, in a Cremona inscription), &c. On the occasional use of u for o, often for Greek o, before other consonant-groups, e. g. turnus beside tornus, from Greek θόρος, O. Lat. frūndus (see ch. ii. § 22). Some isolated cases of ū for accented ṽ have various explanations; hūimus, for *honos (cf. Gk. χθόν), may take its  ṽ from the analogy of *hūmeo, for the word (not common in the oldest writers; humi, for example, not occurring till Terence, Andr. 726) seems to have been first used in the sense of moist ground, clay, e. g. Laevius ap. Prisc. i. p. 269. 7 H. humum humidum pedibus fodit; Varr. Men. 531 B. in pavimento non audes facere laconam, at in humi calceos facis elixos; Enn. Trag. 396 R. cubitis pinsibant humum; Pac. Trag. 351 R. tractate per aspera saxa et humum; cf. Gracch. Trag. 3 mersit sequentium humidum plantas (MS. plantis) humum; Priscian’s *old Latin huminem’ (i. p. 27. 1 H.) may be an etymological spelling to suit a derivation from *humus, like the spelling colina, adapted to the derivation from *culo (Varro ap. Non. 55. 20 M.; *Serv.’ad Aen. iii. 134); *ōlica, if for *ōlica, either follows the analogy of *ōlīgo, or shows the vowel of *ōlica, the form used by Furius Antias ap. Gell. xviii. 11. 1. 4.

(5) in syllables unaccented under the later Accent-law: the 3 Plur. suffix -ont became -unt at the end of the third cent. B. C., though the old spelling was sometimes retained even later. On old inscriptions we have e. g. dederont (C. I. L. i. 181, from Picenum), convenedt on a Scipio epitaph (i. 32) (so on the restored Columna Rostrata, exficient, i. 195). Festus (244. 13 Th.) quotes praed-opiant (MS. praedotiont), in the sense of praepiant, from the Carmen Saliiare, and nequānont, an old 3 Pl. form of nequeo, from the Odysseia of Livius Andronicus (ap. Fest. 162. 24 Th.; cf. Paul. Fest. 163. 14 Th.):

pārtem errant, nequānont Graeciam redire;

the Nom. Sg. termination of Neuter ES-stems is *os on an old inscription, opos (C. I. L. i. 52, probably from Orvieto) (cf. Cenōs on old mirrors, i. 57 and 58); the Acc. Sg. termination of O-stems is *om in the older period, e. g. donom, the Nom. Sg. is *os (see Index to C. I. L. i.), and this spelling remained after u, v,
e. g. *equōs, arvōn, till the time of Quintilian, though the pronunciation may have been the \( \tilde{u} \)-sound (see § 70). (On this reduction of \( o \) to \( \tilde{u} \) in unaccented syllables, see ch. iii. §§ 18, 26; another example is the verb *sum, for *som, with \( u \) for \( o \), because of its usual unaccented character.) In late Latin, when \( u \) and \( o \) had come to have nearly, or altogether, the same sound, \( o \) is often written for \( u \), so that the older spelling seems to be revived (see ch. ii. § 29).

\( \tilde{u}, \tilde{u} \).

§ 21. \( \tilde{u} \). I.-Eur. \( \tilde{u} \) is Latin \( \tilde{u} \), I.-Eur. *dhūmo-, ‘smoke,’ from root *dheu-, ‘to move violently’ (O. Ind. dhūmā-, Gk. ὑψός, passion, Lith. dūmai Pl., O. Sl. dymū), Lat. fūmus; I.-Eur. *mūs-, ‘a mouse’ (O. Ind. mūš-, Gk. μῦς, O. Engl. mūs, O. Sl. myš), Lat. mūs. It is generally a grade of a eu-root as \( i \) of an ei-root (§ 12). Latin \( \tilde{u} \), older ou, may represent also I.-Eur. eu or ou, e.g. dūco, older duuco (see §§ 35, 41), Latin \( \tilde{u} \), older o\( i \), oe, I.-Eur. o\( i \), e.g. cura (§ 38), and sometimes has arisen from \( \tilde{u} \) by ‘compensation,’ e.g. dūmus, older dūsmo- (Paul. Fest. 47. 20 Th.), a spelling retained in the proper name Dūmius; dūmetum for dūsm-, in Virgil MSS. spelt dummetum, shows that -\( \tilde{u}m- \) is equivalent to -\( \tilde{u}mm- \). In the unaccented syllable \( \tilde{u} \) may represent au, e.g. dēfrūdō from fraundo, includō from clando (ch. iii. § 18). On for, cur for *fōr, quōr, see § 16. I.-Eur. \( \tilde{u} \) is in Umbr. and perhaps in some other dialects i, e.g. Umbr. frij ‘fruges’ Acc. Pl. (see von Planta, i. 129).

§ 22. Other examples of Lat. \( \tilde{u} \), I.-Eur. \( \tilde{u} \). Lat. frāniscī (Goth. brūkjan, ‘to use,’ Germ. brauchen, O. Engl. brūcan, Engl. to brook); jās, broth (O. Ind. yūja-, Gk. οὐ-μη for *οὐ-μη, leaven, Lith. jūszē); sātus (O. Ind. syūtā-, Gk. νεοκάττυτος); so-lūtus (Hom. θολωττω-δε).

§ 23. \( \tilde{u} \). I.-Eur. \( \tilde{u} \), Lat. \( \tilde{u} \), appears often in the weak grade of an eu-root, e.g. I.-Eur. *yūgo-, ‘a yoke,’ weak grade of yeug-, ‘to join’ (O. Ind. yūgā-, Gk. ὑγόν, Goth. jūk, O. Sl. igo for jūgo), Lat. jūgum; I.-Eur. lūk-, weak grade of leuk-, ‘to shine’ (O. Ind. rūc-, Gk. ἀμφι-λόκη, twilight), Lat. lūcēna. I.-Eur. \( \tilde{u} \) (Lat. \( \tilde{u} \)) is also the weak grade of a wē-root, e.g. I.-Eur. *pēruti, ‘last year’ (Gk. πέρυρι), from *wētes-, ‘year,’ and similarly in the unaccented syllable Latin \( \tilde{u} \) often appears for wē, e.g. concutio for *conquetio from quātio (see ch. iii. § 25). Lat. w often represents I.-Eur. (and older Latin) \( o \); for an \( o \) passed at the end of the third cent. b.c. into the sound \( \tilde{u} \), when in the unaccented syllable (unless saved by a preceding \( v \), \( u \)), e.g. donum from earlier donom,
but *equom* till the time of Quintilian; and even in the accented syllable #error! at 47 chars. omitted* came to assume a ⟨u⟩-sound before certain consonant-groups, e.g. *culpa*, older *colpa*; *Fulvius*, older *Folvius* (see § 20). (On *equom*, *divom*, &c., see §§ 70, 135).

Lat. ̄ offered more resistance than ̄ to the usual transition of a short vowel in the open unaccented syllable to ̄ (earlier ̄, and always before r), e.g. *sōver* (Gk. ἐκυπόσ) (ch. iii. § 18). Before ⟨l⟩ and labials it passed in open unaccented syllables (especially when the next syllable contained an i in hiatus) into the ⟨u⟩-sound, which ultimately was written and pronounced ̄, e.g. *mānubiae*, *manubiae*, *manibus*, *dissupo*, *dissipo*. That it ever had the ⟨u⟩-sound, the sound of Greek υ, in the accented syllable of native Latin words is doubtful. [On (quid)lubet and (quid)-libet, &c. see ch. ii. § 16]. Before a vowel in the unaccented syllable Latin ʌ may represent I.-Eur. ʌw, ow, Lat. ov, e.g. *dēnuo* for *dē nōvo*, *ēluo* for *ē-lavo* (I.-Eur. *ēlōvō*) (ch. iii. § 24); before ⟨l⟩ and labials any short vowel, e.g. *occupo* from *cap-* to take (ch. iii. § 18), and before any consonant-group Latin ɔ, e.g. *hōmulus* for *homōn-ło-* (see § 20). Final ʌ̄, like other short vowels, normally became ɔ̄, and might be elided (ch. iii. §§ 37, 38).

A close relation exists in Latin, as in I.-Eur., between ʌ and w, vocalic and consonantal u. After ⟨l⟩ and ⟨r⟩ the vowel ʌ̄ became a consonant in the second cent. B.C. in Latin, e.g. *lārva* (lärva, Plaut.), *arvum* (ārunos, -a, -om Plaut.), *milvus* (mīlunos, Plaut.), *pelvis*, &c. (see ch. iii. § 48). For Latin ʌ (earlier ɔ̄), the parasitic, or svarabhaktic vowel, in *occulus* from *ōc-ło-* from *spēc-ło-*, *ōr accolum* from *orā-clo-* see ch. ii. § 154.

I.-Eur. ʌ is Umbro-Osc. u, e.g. Umbr. *subra* ‘supra’, though sometimes we find o written in Umbr. [i.e. in the Lat. alph., for the native alphabet did not distinguish the O- and the U-sound (see ch. i. § 1)]. In Oscan we find iu after t, d, n (s?), e.g. *tiurri* ‘turrim’, *Diumpais* ‘Lumpis’ (‘to the Nymphs’), *Niumsieis* ‘Numerii’ Gen. Sg., an affection of u which resembles Boeot. *τιόχα* (Att. τύχη), or Engl. ‘pure,’ &c. (pronounced pju-), (see von Planta, i. p. 122).

§ 24. Lat. ʌ for I.-Eur. ʌ. I.-Eur. ʌ- in the U-stem suffix is Latin ʌ of *fructus*, *mānūs*, &c.; the I.-Eur. preposition *u pó* (O. Ind. ūpa, Gk. ὑπο, O. Ir. *fo* for *wo*, with p dropped between vowels, and u turned into w, Goth. uf,
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Engr. of ten) is Latin suid (see ch. ix. § 52); the preposition *üpēr, *upērī (O. Ind. upārī, Gk. ὑπέρ), &c. is Latin super, oxy, which is the preposition *uperā in Latin, from the root reudh-. 'To be red' (O. Ind. rudhirā, Gk. ἐυρέσ, O. Sl. rūdrū) is Latin rūder; Lat. müscu (the Romance forms prove ṻ), Gk. νυψα for *μυψα, Lith. musė; Lat. jüvenis (O. Ind. yuvan-), jüvenecus from I.-Eur. *yuvāko- (O. Ind. juvaś-, Gk. Τάκ-υβος, O. Ir. oc, Welsh ieuanc, Gaul. Jovincillus, Goth. juggs for *juvunga-, O. Engl. geong); Lat. fugga (Gk. φῦγα) from root bheug-, 'to flee' (Gk. φεῦγα); Lat. urgeo from urg-, the weak grade of the root verge-, 'to confine, press' (Gk. ἐ-φῇγα, Lat. verge.)

§ 25. Latin û and Latin ë. We have seen that Latin û became â when unaccented, and even in the accented syllable before certain consonant-groups, and that in late Latin û and ë came to have the same sound and were often exchanged in spelling (see § 17 and ch. ii. § 29). Some doubtful cases may be discussed here. As turbo and turba (Gk. τύβη, τύπβαια) come from I.-Eur. turb-, from turr-, the weak grade of twelve- 'to twirl,' so I.-Eur. gur-, gühr-, the weak grades of qüër-, qühr-, seem to appear in Latin as cur-, fur, e. g. furnus, an oven, from I.-Eur. gührno- (O. Sl. grůnů, 'a kettle'), but furnus, warm, from I.-Eur. gührorno- (O. H. G. warm, Engl. warm). Whether Nonius, who derives furnus from formus, has any justification in spelling the word formus (531. 24 M.) is uncertain; but formax has ω, and Plautus Epid. 119 puns on furno (so the MSS.), and foro. Curro may then stand for *quereso- from the root qüër- (cf. Lat. querquērus); curitus cannot be the same as Gk. καρπός, from the root ker- of Gk. κείπα, but must stand for *qüertos-, from a root qüer-; corpus must represent *q̣orpes-, not *q̣orpes- (cf. O. Ind. khp-); ursus may be a loanword (Lucianian, according to Varro, L. L. v. 100), or may owe its u to a velar guttural -q̣̄-; ɨrceus cannot be connected with ɨrça; the spelling foreclīs in MSS. of Catullus (v. 2) must be late, if the word is connected with Hesychius' φορκορ, φυρκος, which point to u (Cyprian forkas = χύρ’ακες shows dialectal o for u); urbus (cf. Mars. en urbid 'in urbe') cannot be connected with orbis, so that there is no etymological appropriateness in the play on these words which is often found in the later poets (e. g. Rutil. i. 66).

§ 26. The Diphthongs. In its treatment of the diphthongs ai, au, ei, [(1) I.-Eur. ei and in Latin also, (2) I.-Eur. ai (oi?) in the post-tonic syllable, (3) I.-Eur. ai, oi in the final syllable], oi, ou, [(1) I.-Eur. eu, (2) I.-Eur. ou], Latin stands halfway between Oscan and Umbrian. In Oscan they are all retained intact, except that the i-element has sunk to an e-sound. In Umbrian they are all reduced to simple sounds, e. g. Umbr.

1 Perhaps both in Oscan and Latin a sound between open i and e, just the second element of ai, &c. was as in German and English.
dēvo-, Osc. deīvo-, 'god'; Umbrian tōro-, Osc. ŭavpo-, bull; Umbr. tōto, Osc. ŭo//ro, people, community [I.-Eur. *teutā-, Goth. įiuda, whence some derive 'Teuton,' O. Ir. tuath, Gaul. Teuto-bōdiāci, W. tud (in Gaelic tuath is used for 'the country-people,' 'the tenantry'), Lith. tauta], (see von Planta, i. p. 137). In the Latin of Cicero's time ae (from ai) and au are the only survivors; and even they tend in rustic or colloquial speech to single sounds, ē, ā, e.g. pretor, plostrum. Diphthongs whose two elements had affinity of sound, such as ei, ou, are naturally the first to be simplified; ei, for example, both in Greek and in the Teutonic languages, passed early into a long ē-sound. The oldest Latin inscriptions offer with great fidelity ei for I.-Eur. ei, as also for the ei to which I.-Eur, ai, oi, when unaccented, were reduced. Thus on the S. C. de Bacchanalibus of 186 B.C. (C. I. L. i. 196) we have deicerent (I.-Eur. ei), inceideretis (I.-Eur. post-tonic ai), foideratei (I.-Eur. final -oi). But this diphthong soon became identical in pronunciation with the long i-vowel, so that spelling-reformers like Accius and Lucilius used i and ei for this long i-sound without sufficient regard to the past history of the sound (see ch. i. § 9), and the practice grew up of using ei to indicate the long vowel-sound, i to indicate the short. Ou is also sometimes used for Latin ū (I.-Eur. oi), e.g. couraverunt (C. I. L. i. 1419, from Picenum), though not at all to the same extent as ei for i. Ou seems to have been reduced to a simple sound at the end of the third century B.C. Ai became ae a little later. Towards the end of the second cent. B.C. we find the spelling ae established in use, with an occasional resort at the transition period to a spelling aei; but the original spelling (not pronunciation) was again brought into fashion in the reign of Claudius and is found occasionally on epitaphs even of the late Empire. On the diphthongal sound of ae (Germ. Kaiser is evidence of this sound in Lat. Caesar), au, see ch. ii. § 32. 

Oi passed (through oe) into ū at the beginning of the second cent. B.C., though oi, and afterwards oe, were long retained on official inscriptions in phrases like faciundum coiraverunt (coeraverunt), e.g. C. I. L. i. 567 (Capua) of 106 B.C.: murum et pluteum faciund. coeravere, where the spelling murum (older morum, moirom) shows that the pronunciation was ū,
not *oe*, and in some words of the official or legal style like *poena*, *foedus*.

The long diphthongs are not common in I.-Eur., so that we have hardly sufficient material from which to discover their history in Latin. In the Veda, the oldest literature of India, we see a tendency to use final -ā (I.-Eur. -ō) before a consonant initial, final -āu (I.-Eur. -ōu) before a vowel initial (e.g. dēvā and dēvāu in Dual of devā-, I.-Eur. *deivo-,* 'god'); and the development of ēi and ōu in roots and suffixes in the various I.-Eur. languages suggests that doublets of this sort, ēi and ē, ōu and ō, already existed in the case of these two diphthongs of kindred elements in what is called 'the Indo-European period.' Long diphthongs, composed of sounds not so nearly allied as ē and i, ō and u, may have taken on Latin soil a different course of development, according as they were final or not. When final, the second element may have been suppressed (probably after passing through the doublet-stage), just as in later times a short final vowel has been suppressed after a long syllable in words like exemplār(e), nēv(e). When followed by a consonant the long element must have been shortened, by the rule that any long vowel is shortened before y, w, n, m, l, r, &c. followed by a consonant, so that āi (āy) would pass to the ordinary diphthong-sound ai, āu (aw) to au, ēu to eu, ōi to oi; just as we have vēntus from *wēnt- (root wē-, *to blow,' Gk. ἄνειμι) (see below, § 45).

§ 27. AI. I.-Eur. ai is Lat. ae (older ai), e.g. the I.-Eur. root aiwē-,* time, life* (Gk. αἰών, αἰ for *αἰϝ(σ)ρ*, with Ion. Att. ā for alf-, as in ἔλαια for *ἐλαισα, O. Ir. ais, aes, Goth. aivos, O. Engl. ā), appears in Latin aevum; I.-Eur. aidh-,* to burn,* (O. Ind. ēdhas-,* firewood,* Gk. αἴθω, O. Ir. aid, aed, *fire,* O. H. G. eit, *pyre,* O. Engl. ād), in Latin aedēs, lit. 'where the fire is kept up,' aestus. In the last root I.-Eur. ai is the weak grade of ayē, thus aidh- of ayēd̆- (ayē- is seen in I.-Eur. *ayēs-,* 'metal, gleaming metal'), and in the first of āi (§ 45) (cf. O. Ind. áyu-). In the unaccented syllable ae became ā, e.g. inquīro, occido from quaerō, caedo (see ch.iii. § 18), or rather ai became ī, e.g. inceideretis on the S. C. de Bacch.; and in the final syllable, e.g. τυτιδ (O. Ind. tutudē) with the 1 Sg. Perf. Middle ending -ai or -ai
(ch. viii. § 76). On rustic and colloquial e for ae, and on the late Latin confusion of ae, e, oe (that is, oe which had been restored, § 38), see ch. ii. §§ 41, 44. A spurious diphthong ai is found in the verb aio for *ahio, § 116, aiu (for *aisne), aibat (dissyllabic), &c.

§ 28. I.-Eur. ai, Lat. ae (ai). Lat. caedo from I.-Eur. root skaidh- (Goth. skaidan, O. Engl. scâdan, Engl. water-shed, Lith. skêdžiû, 'I separate'); Lat. scaevus (Gk. σκαυ(F)os); Lat. laevus (Gk. λευ(F)os, O. Sl. lëvi); Lat. caerus from I.-Eur. *kaiko-, 'blind' (O. Ir. caech, with another sense, 'empty,' cf. Gael. caoch-ag, 'a nut without a kernel,' Goth. hâihs; in Gk. κοινόλω, 'to gape about,' the a has become o, through the assimilating influence of the accented v); Lat. haero from I.-Eur. root ghais- (Lith. gaîstî, 'to tarry'; Goth. us-gaisjan, 'to frighten,' lit. 'cause to hesitate,' Engl. gaze); Lat. haedus (Goth. gaits, Engl. goat); Lat. lévir from I.-Eur. *daiver-, O. Ind. dévâr-, Arm. taigr, Gk. δάφνη, O. H. G. zeihhur, O. Eng. tâcor, Lith. dêveris, O. Sl. dêveri) is a late Latin spelling for láevir, the i being due to the analogy of vîr.

§ 29. AI, AE on Inscriptions. We have ae on the S. C. Bacch. (C. I. L. i. 196) of 186 B. C. in aedem (along with aequum, tabellae, datai, &c.); Aemilius on three inscriptions of 187 B. C. (i. 535-7), but Aemilius (C. I. L. ii. 5041) of 189 B. C.; aetate on a Scipio epitaph of C. 130 B. C. (i. 34), (along with quairatis); quaestor, quaero, praetor are established spellings in the Lex Bantina of 133-118 B. C. (i. 197), the Lex Repetundarum of 123-122 B. C. (i. 198), &c. The spelling ai, which we find once or twice towards the end of the second cent. B. C., conquaesivei (in the post-tonic syllable under the older Accent Law) (i. 551, of 132 B. C.), Caecilius (i. 547 b., of 141 or 116 B. C.,) Memms., and i. 1487, from Majorca), Caecician[148] [i. 378, on a coin with an alphabet A-X, so older than the introduction of Y, Z (ch. i. § 2)], Caedia (ix. 3087, from Sulmo), seems to mark the transition stage. Often ai and ae are found side by side, e. g. praetores aere Martio emeru (i. 1148, from Cora); aetati and soipisjume on the dedicatory inscription of the Faliscan 'collegium cocorum' (Zvet. I. I. I. 72 a). The spelling Caisar, &c. is frequent on inscriptions of Claudius' reign, when anti-quarian lore was in fashion (e. g. C. I. L. vi. 353), and we find on epitaphs of the late Empire Valerai (Rossi, i. i13, of 352 A.D.), quai and filiiai (Rossi, i. 410, of 393 A.D.), &c. E is not regularly exchanged with æ till the fourth cent. A.D. on inscriptions (Seelmann, Aussepr. Lat. p. 225), but in dialectal inscr. it is of course much earlier, e. g. cedere for caedere on an old inscr. of the Umbrian territory (C. I. L. xi. 4766), and in plebeian from the first cent. A.D. (Hammer, Loc. Verbr. p. 11). The use of ai, ae for ã is a feature of inscriptions of the Etruscan country (see Mem. Int. Lombard. 1892), e. g. Painssos on a Praenestine mirror (C. I. L. xiv. 4998) [cf. Saeturni] on a Praenestine vase (i. 48), and perhaps Lat. Asculaðius for Ἀσκληπιός; we have ei in quesitores (i. 183, Marsei).

§ 30. AU. I.-Eur. au is Latin au, which in the unaccented syllable became ã (see ch. iii. § 18), and in the accented syllable was in dialectal Latin ò (e. g. Plautus' Umbrian name was Plotus ' splay-foot,' Paul. Fest. 305. 7 Th.). Thus the I.-Eur. root aug-, indicating 'growth' or 'strength,' a weak grade of the root awg- of Gk. ἀ(F)εξω (O. Ind. ājas-, Goth. aukan, 'to multiply,' Engl.
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Eke vb., Lith. āugu, 'I grow,' Gk. aŭξω, aŭξάω (O.) appears in Latin aug-eo, augus-tus; the I.-Eur. particle *au [Gk. aŭ, aŭ-re, aŭ-tis, Goth. au-k, 'also' (with -k like Gr. γε), O. Engl. ēac, Eng. eke advb.], in Latin au-t (Osc. avi, Umbr. aye), au-tem (Osc. ayt). This I.-Eur. *au is perhaps similarly the weak grade of *a-we, (see ch. x. § 4). Lat. au represents the weak grade of an I.-Eur. ōu-root in auscultum (Plaut.) beside ὅς from I.-Eur. *ōus (cf. cātus beside cōs, § 54).

§ 31. Other examples. Lat. paucus (Goth. favai Pl., Engl. few); Lat. auro for *aurōsa (Gk. αὐρων for *αὐρων, ἀγχ-αυρος νύξ Apoll. Rhod., 'nearing the dawn,' Lith. ausz-rā, O. Scand. austr; O. H. G. östar, Engl. east) from I.-Eur. aus-, a weak grade of ἀψε-, 'to gleam' (cf. Gk. ἡως for *ἂνως), whence *auso-, 'gold' (Lat. aurum, Lith. ākusas); Lat. auris for *ausis, aus-culto (O. Ir. au, a Neuter S-stem, Goth. ausō, an N-stem, Lith. ausis) from I.-Eur. *aus-, a weak grade of *awi-s [cf. Gk. αὐς (ἀ), I perceive; but ou is a Greek development of the high grade ὀus; cf. O. Ind. ए, 'openly'). Lat. au-, away, as in au-fero, au-fugio (Pruss. au- of au-mū-sna-n Acc., 'washing off'; O. Sl. u- of u-myti, 'to wash off') from I.-Eur. *au, a weak grade of *awe (*awo ?) (O. Ind. āva, 'away,' ava-bhr-, 'aufero'). It is often difficult to distinguish this Lat. au, representing I.-Eur. au (a reduction of I.-Eur. ἀψε) from Lat. au, a reduction of Lat. āve, āvet, e. g. audeo from avidus. (Other examples in ch. iii. § 16. 9.) On the occasional appearance of ὃ for au in the accented syllable, e. g. sed frude 'sine fraude' in the Lex Repetundarum, post-class. cludo, and on the plebeian and dialectal reduction of au to ē, e. g. plostrum, Clodius, see ch. ii. §§ 36-37.

§ 32. EI. I.-Eur. ei was in Old Latin ei; but this diphthong became identical with the sound of long i, so that in inscriptions from the latter part of the second century B.C. the symbol ei is used not only for I.-Eur. ei, but also for I.-Eur. i, and some spelling reformers proposed to reserve the letter I for short i, and the diphthong-symbol EI for long i (see ch. i. § 9). In Ocean, however, the diphthong is preserved. In Latin it is used in the interjection heī, ei, from which comes the verb ejūlo. Instances of I.-Eur. ei, Latin ei or i, are: I.-Eur. deīk-, 'to show, say' (Gk. δεῖκ-νῦμα, Goth. ga-teiha, 'I declare'), Lat. dīco, O. Lat. dieco, Osc. diecūm Inf.; I.-Eur. heidh-, 'to believe, trust' (Gr. πείθωμαι). Lat. fūlo, O. Lat. feido. Before a vowel ei, ej became e in Latin, e. g. eo from I.-Eur. ei, 'to go,' both in the accented (§ 63), and in the unaccented syllable (ch. iii. § 24). O. Lat. ei, class. i, may represent other I-diphthongs in the final or unaccented syllables, e. g. in tūtūdi Perf. (O. Ind. tutudē), I.-Eur. -ai or -āi (ch. viii. § 76); in popūlī Nom. Pl. (oldest Lat. poplōe),
I.-Eur.-oi; in con-cido from caedo, older caido, I.-Eur. ai. The older spelling of all these words shows -ei, tutudei, pop(u)lei, conceido, sometimes e, e.g. ploirume 'plurimi,' Nom. Pl., on a Scipio epitaph (C. I. L. i. 32). Greek ei before a vowel was written ē, e.g. Alexandrēa, Dārēus (shortened to ē, e.g. balnēum), later ē, e.g. Alexandrēia (shortened to ē) (cf. ch. ii. § 143).

§ 33. Other examples of I.-Eur. ei. I.-Eur. *ei-ti, 3 Sg. Pres. Ind. of ei-, 'to go' (O. Ind. ētī, Gk. ἑτί, Lith. ėtī, ėtī), Lat. it (with ē in Old Latin, but class. ē, a shortening produced in the course of the second cent. b.c. by the influence of the final -e, ch. iii. § 49); I.-Eur. *deiwo-, 'god' (O. Ind. devā-, Lith. dēvas, Br. dia, Gaul. Δευοβά, W. dwy-fol, 'divine,' O. Engl. Twes-deg, 'Tuesday'; but Gk. ἥσος is for *δῆός, like O. Ind. divya-), Lat. divus, on the Denvos inscription deiwo-. When ē of the final syllable was weakened to ē, deiwo became *deivus (for *deiwos, the v being absorbed by the following u, § 70), deivum became *deiwm, which passed into de(y)ums, de(y)um as *ei-um, Acc. M. of is, into e(y)-um, *ei-o 1 Sg. into e(y)o, so that the word would be declined deus, deivei, deivā, deivum, &c.; from this variation arose the 'doublets' divus, divi, divē, divūm, &c., and deus, dei, dem, &c. (cf. C. I. L. i. 632 seī deo sei deiave); some grammarians of Varro's time proposed to restrict divus to the sense of a mortal made a god (so later divus Augustus), but Varro contested the accuracy of this usage, showing that in old times divus was the word for any god (Varro, L. L. iv. fr., p. 150 Wilm.; cf. Serv. ad Aen. xii. 139 diva deam, &c.). Reus (cf. rivālis, older reiv-), seu (cf. steū, older seive) are to be similarly explained, though some prefer to suppose that the prior stages of all three words were *dēus, *rēus, *sēu (like Alexandrēa, Dārēus, &c.), and quote lēvis as an example of the passage of ei before v into e (cf. Gk. λιχ(φ)ος) (von Planta, Obs.-Umbr. Dial. i. p. 145). Nēv, ceu are most naturally explained as shortenings from *nēu (cf. nēve), *ēv (cf. Gk. κή, Lat. cē-tēri, B. B. xv. 313), though they also admit of being referred to *nei-u (from O. Lat. nei, nī, used in the sense of class. nē), and from a Locative, either Demonstr. *ei (ch. vii. § 15) or Relative quem, qui (ch. viii. § 23). On meio see ch. viii. § 6, ejus ch. vii. § 13, peior below § 116.

§ 34. EI and I in Inscriptions, &c. On the S. C. de Bacchanalibus of 186 b.c. (C. I. L. i. 196) we have deicerent (L.-Eur. ei), incederetis (L.-Eur. post-tonic ai), foideratei (I.-Eur. final -oi). But we have ei employed merely to indicate long ē in audire of the Lex Repetundarum of 123-122 b.c. (i. 198); ameicitiam of the Lex Agraria of 111 b.c. (i. 200); amecorum, vēneire (i. 203, of 78 b.c.); erceiscanda deiuidanda and feient of the Lex Rubria of 49 b.c. (i. 205); esuereis on a leaden bullet used at the siege of Perusia with the cruel message carved on it, esuereis et me celos (i. 692); veives (i. 1256), &c.; and this seems to be the function of ei in the Plautine text represented by the Codex Ambrosianus (see Index to Studemund's Apophag. p. 504). Even as early as the end of the third cent. b.c. we have openid devincam tel on a Praenestine mirror with a representation of a gaming-table (Rendic. Accad. Lincei, v. p. 253, 1889). The transition stage from ei to ē is perhaps marked by the spelling e in ploirume (Nom. Pl.) on a Scipio epitaph of the end of the third cent. b.c. (C. I. L. i. 32), compromesise on the S. C.
Bacch. of 186 B.C. (i. 196; cf. ameiserunt, i. 204), though this spelling is often nothing but a dialectal variety, e. g. uecos (Lat. vei-, vicus) on an inscription from the Marsic territory (i. 183) (cf. Umbr. devo-, ‘god,’ Lat. divo-). Now and then we find ei written for a short vowel, as in ineiprator on the inscription of Aem, Paulus Macedonicus, from Spain (C. I. L. ii. 5041, of 189 B.C.), leteras (see ch. ii. § 130), and seine on the Lex Repetundarum (i. 198); so in the Ambrosian Palimpsest of Plautus, ibis, Cas. 92; curabeis, Merc. 526. And ei appears occasionally even for the ë-sound, as in pleib-, in an old inscription found between Rome and Ostia (Eph. Epigr. i. 3), in leigibus on a Praenestine cippus of erratic orthography (pro sed suex for pro se suisque, &c.) (C. I. L. xiv. 2892), and in deceruit on the Spanish inscription of 189 B.C., just mentioned (C. I. L. ii. 5041) (see ch. ii. § 11). The Dative forms in -e on old inscriptions (e. g. C. I. L. i. 1110 Iunone Seispitei Matri) are best explained as graphical varieties of the Dat. in -ei, class. -i (see ch. vi. § 28), and similarly the 3 sg. Perf. Act. forms in -eit, -et, e. g. fijicet on the Praenestine fibula, deit (beside cepit) on a Seipio epitaph (C. I. L. i. 32), as graphical varieties of -eit (e. g. probaxit beside coeravit, i. 600) (see ch. viii. § 70). The Plautine spelling must have been mendic-, eira to judge from the remarks in Rud. 1305 that mendicus has ‘one letter more’ than medicus, and in Truc. 262 that comprime sain eiram becomes comprime sis eiram by ‘taking away a single letter.’ (Cf. Early Greek E for EI).

§ 35. EU. This diphthong has been merged in ou in most languages; but Greek, with eu and ov, and Gothic, with ia and au, will serve as criteria. We find eu in Latin in the interjections heu (cf. Gk. φεῦ), eheu, heus; the pronoun neuter [a trisyllable (ch. ii. § 32)] from ne and uter, with accent on the ne, whereas in neuitquam, pronounced nuiquam (or nyntiquam, ch. ii. § 149), ne being unaccented, was elided]; the conjunction nev, a byform of nēvē, seu, a byform of syve (older seive), ceu from *cē-ve or *cei-ve (§ 33). (On the pronunciation of eu in these words and in Latinized Greek words, like Orpheus, see ch. ii. §§ 32, 46.) Eu is assigned to the Cahlen Salire on the strength of the quotations Leucesie (Ter. Scaur. 28. 11 K.), and cozeulodorieso of Varro, L. L. vii. 26 (perhaps O Zeu, &c., ch. ii. § 5), but whether rightly or not is a matter of doubt. (See Rhein, Mus. xxxiv. 1 on Latin eu.) Examples of I.-EUR. eu, Latin ū (O. Lat. ou) are: Lat. dūcere (Goth. tiuhan, O. Engl. tēon, Germ. ziehen); Lat. jügeribus Abl. Pl. from *jūgers (Gk. ξύγος); Lat. ēro (Gk. εῦοω for *εὔω). The Greek Πολυδεύκης is in O. Lat. *Pollouces, written in the orthography of the early Praenestine inscriptions Poloces (C. I. L. i. 55), and Poloces (xiv. 4094), then Pollucēs (so the MSS. in Plaut. Bacch. 894; cf. Varro, L. L. v. 73, in Latinis litteris veteribus nomen quod est, inscribitur ut Πολυδεύκης, ‘Pollucēs,’ non ut nunc, Pollux).
Before a vowel *eu* (*ev*) from I.-Eur. *ew* similarly became *ov* in the accented syllable, e. g. *novus* from I.-Eur. *nēwo-* (see § 10), and in the unaccented was reduced to *u*, e. g. *dēnūo* (see ch. iii. § 24, and for other examples Solmsen, *Stud. Lat. Lantg.* p. 128); in *cloāca*, &c. *v* has been dropped before the accent (ch. ii. § 53), leaving *o*.

§ 36. Other examples of I.-Eur. *eu*. *Jūpiter*, in the usual Latin spelling *Jūppiter* (ch. ii. § 130), may have been originally a vocative like Gk. Ζεὺς πάτερ. (Can the fragment of the Carmen Saliare quoted above from Varro have *OZeü* with *Z* for the sound *dy*,-, as in Oscan inscriptions written in Roman characters we find *sicolo*- as the Diminutive of the word for 'day,' like Latin *diēcula*?)

§ 37. **OU, U** in Inscriptions. The diphthong was reduced very early to a so close affinity as *o* and *u*. We have *ū* for *ou* (I.-Eur. *eu*) in the name *Lucius* in two of the oldest Scipio epitaphs (C. I. L. i. 32 *Luciom*; i. 30 *Lucius* with *Loucanam*, and *ablolucit*), not later than 200 B. C.; *deducundae*, 181 B. C. (i. 558); *Lucius* in a dedicatory inscription of the consul Mummius, 146 B. C. (i. 542); *luctu* and *iurariunt* (with *iurante*, *iudicetur*, *iudex*, &c.) in the Lex Bantina of 133-118 B. C. (i. 197); *iurato*, *iudicibus*, *duco* (with *iudicium*, *iudicatio*, *ious*) on the Lex Repetundarum of 123-122 B. C. (i. 198), while the spelling with *ou* is entirely discarded in the Lex Cornelia of 81 B. C. (i. 202, with *invs*, *tuba*, &c.).

Now and then *ou* occurs for a short vowel, e. g. *ioubatantis* (beside *iousant*) in the S. C. Bacch. (i. 196) (but see ch. viii. § 29), *probonum* on old coins (i. 16), *Lauumelia* on an old Praenestine vase (xiv. 4108, or *Lad-*)?, possibly to represent the transition-sound between *a* and *ū*, or in imitation of the Greek orthography, in which *ov* represented the u-sound, *v* the ū-sound. *Ou* is sometimes used for *ū* (I.-Eur. *oi*), e. g. *curoverunt* (i. 1419, from Picenum), *piourumae* (with *Cloul[i]o*) for *Cloelius*, i. 1297, from near Amicternum), though not all at the same extent as *ei* for *i*. (On *ou* for I.-Eur. *ou*, see § 41.) The spelling *o* for *ou* (I.-Eur. *eu*) is dialectal, e. g. *Poloces* and *Losna* on a Praenestine mirror (i. 55) (cf. Umbr. *toro-* for Latin *tavo-*, bull). On Latin inscriptions *o* occurs for I.-Eur. *ou*, and for the new *ou*-diphthong, which arose by syncope in words like *nov(ā)nibus*, *cov(ā)nios*, but not for I.-Eur. *eu* or *ū*. The spellings *pohtico-, puiplo-*, &c. (see index to C. I. L. i.), are due to confusion of the two radically different words *pābes* and *pēp(u)lus*.

§ 38. **OI**. I.-Eur. *oi* was *oi* till the second century, then came to be written *oe*, and finally passed into the sound *ū*, though *oe* was still written in some words which belonged to legal or official diction, e. g. *foedus*, a treaty, *poena* (but *punio*), *Poenus*, *moenia* (but *munio*), *θοεδιο*, in the poetic words *foedus*, foul, *āmoenus*, and in the family name *Cloelius*. Thus I.-Eur. **oino-, 'one' (cf. **iwo-*, Gk. *oios*, 'alone') (Gk. *ōmē*, the ace. O. Ir. *een*, W. un, Goth. *ains*, O. Engl. *ān*, Engl. *an*, a, Pruss. *ains*, Lith. *vēnas*, O. Sl. *inù*; in Greek the numeral-root used was I.-Eur. *sem-* of Lat. *sēmel*, &c., *ēs* for *sem-s*, *μία* for *σμια*, *ēv
for *sem), Lat. ōnus, older oenus, oino-. I.-Eur. oi is a grade of an ei-root, often seen in the Perfect Tense or in a derivative noun, e.g. woid- in the Perfect of weid- , 'to know' (Gk. οἶδα and πέποιθα from πεἰθό, I.-Eur. bheidh-, Lat. fīdo, feido), *q̥oinā-, 'an assessment, fine,' from q̥eï- , 'to value, care for' (Gk. ποινή, from τείω, often written τίω, borrowed by the Romans, poena, Zend. kaēnā-, O. Sl. čena, the k and c in these two examples indicating oi not ei) and similarly in Latin, e.g. foëdus, a treaty, from feido, fīdo, just as Ὠ appears in the similar grade of e-roots, in pondus from pendo. After initial v- Latin oi became ei, as Ὠ became ĕ in versus, versus, &c. (§ 10), e.g. vidi in older spelling veidei, from I.-Eur. *woidai (-ai), Perf. Mid. (O. Sl. vědě; cf. Gk. οἶδα, Goth. wait, O. Engl. wät, Engl. wot).

In the unaccented syllable oi became ei, class. ĕ in the nautical term anquīna, a truss, a loanword from the Greek (ἀγκώνη), perhaps adapted to Latin nouns in -ēna (Non. 536, 5 M. anquinae vincla quibus antennae tenentur), but in most cases was as resistive of weakening as o (ch. iii. § 18), e.g. sē-curus from cura, older coira, impunis (impone Cato frag. p. 37. 21 Jord.) from poena (cf. punio); in the final syllable ei, ĕ is regular, e.g. Nom. Pl. populi, earlier pop(u)lei, from a still earlier poplo(e). (Fest. 244. 24 Th. quotes from the Carmen Saliare pilumnoe poploeo, a designation of the Romans 'velut pilis uti assueti.') A spurious diphthong oi, oe, class. ĕ, has arisen through composition in coeipi (older oēperi), coetus for co-itus, and through loss of v before the accent in Julius, older Iūti-o- from *Iō(v)illius (§ 43) (cf. Cloelius, older Cluilius, from the root *klew-, 'to be heard, famous'). On cui from quoi, see ch. vii. § 25, and on nōn from noen(u)m, ch. x. § 18.

§ 39. Other examples of I.-Eur. oi. Lat. mānus, Pl. mānera, *māne, Pl. moenia, mānia, mūnia, munīciēmum, com-mūnis, im-mūnis, O. Lat. mōni-cēpio-, conōnim (C. I. L. i. 196, of 186 b. c.) (Goth. ga-mains, Germ. ge-mein, 'common,' Lith. maunās, 'exchange,' O. Ir. moini, maini, 'gifts,'), and from the same root mūto, to exchange, mūnus, lent (Sicil. Gk. μοῖρος, requital, Goth. maipms, 'a gift,' Lett. meetūt, 'to exchange'); Lat. ātōr, O. Lat. oit-üle (C. I. L. i. 201. 9), oeti (i. 603. 6. 8), &c. (cf. Mart. Cap. iii. 236 'oisus' etiam dicietur; sic enim veteres usum dixeret) seem to show, like Gk. ὀθρός, fate, 'portion,' the o-grade of a root eit-, seen perhaps in Osc. eitùvā-, 'money,' for *eitou-; cūnae shows the o-grade of the root kei-, 'to lie' (Gk. κεῖ-μα; cf. koitn).

§ 40. OE, O, U on Inscriptions. Oi is reduced to ū in a Scipio epitaph of the beginning of the second cent. b. c. (C. I. L. i. 33) with utier; so umra in one of Mummius' tithe-dedications to Hercules (i. 542) of 146 b. c.; muru Acc. on
a Capua inscription of c. 135 B.C. (Eph. Epigr. viii. 476); procurandae (with aīnā and moinīcipiēs) on the Lex Agraria of 111 B.C. (C. I. L. i. 200). But the spelling oi, and after it the spelling oe, long continued to be used, especially in such phrases as faciūndum coiraverunt (coeraverunt) in magisterial inscriptions (e.g. i. 566, of 169 B.C. coiraver and loid[as]; i. 600, of 62 B.C. coeravit; i. 617, of 51 B.C. coeraver.)

and Cicero in the laws which he draws up for his ideal state seems to think that the official style demands the spelling oe (e.g. phœres, Legg. iii. 3. 6; oenus, ib. iii. 3. 9; coerari and oesus, ib. iii. 4. 10), though in the Lex Julia Municipalis of 45 B.C. (C. I. L. i. 206) we have regularly euro, utor, municipalis (once foiderc), and similarly on the Lex Rubria of 49 B.C. (i. 205), ludus (not loedus), the form used in the Comm. Lud. Saec. and the Mon. Anc., both of Augustus' reign, though Virgil MSS. often show moerus for murus (see Ribbeck's Index). The traditional nature of this spelling, even in the second cent. B.C., is seen from the occurrence of spellings like murus side by side with coeraverunt, &c., e.g. i. 567, of 169 B.C., murum... coiravere... loedos; i. 568, of 104 B.C., murum... coiravere...; Eph. Epigr. viii. 460, of 108 B.C., murum... coiraverunt. Examples from the older literature are, oenigenos 'unigenitos' Paul. Fest. 225, 2 Th.; oenus Plaut. Truc. 104 (B.); prōlīcio Men. 186 (P.); moenis, obliging, quoted by Nonius 23. 9 M. from Paeuvius; moerus Accius Trag. 347 R.; moenio in the Ambrosian Palimpsest of Plautus (see Index to Studemund's Apographe); 'loebesum' et 'loebertatem' antiqui dicebant liberum et libertatem Paul. Fest. 86. 30 Th. (Loebasius is given as the Sabine name for Liber by Serv. ad Georg. i. 7 quamvis Sabini Cererem Pandam appellant, Liberum Loebasium; cf. Gl. Plac. 80. 22 G.). This oe seems to have represented to the Romans a long ū-sound, the sound, in fact, of Greek υ; and the earlier instances of u for I.-Eur. oi probably indicate this sound. Plautus (Bacch. 129) puns on Lydus (Gk. Λῦδος) and ludus:

non ómnis aetas, Lýde, ludo cónuenit;

and oe is often used to express Gk. υ, e.g. goerus, coloephia (ch. ii. § 28).

§ 41. OU. I.-Eur. ou before a vowel (ow) became, as we saw (§ 19), first ov in Latin, then in the second century B.C. av, which in the unaccented syll. fell to u, e.g. ēlvo (ch. iii. § 24). For I.-Eur. ou before a consonant we find sometimes ō, sometimes ū. Occasionally both these spellings occur for the same word. Thus I.-Eur. *rōduho-, 'red' (Goth. raubs), is Latin rōbus, rōdīgo [the form rubigo (with ū like Rufus, or with ū like ruber?) is rejected in the Probi Appendix, 199. 5 K.; cf. the gloss robigo non 'rubigo' C. G. L. v. 144. 32, and see ch. ii. § 24], and rūfus, the last being shown by its f, instead of d or b (§ 114), to be dialectal. Rūbī-dus comes from a verb in -eo (cf. hūmīdus from hūmeo, cūlīdus from căleo, &c.), *rūdeo, with I.-Eur. eu of Gk. ἐρεύθεω, while the ordinary form of the verb, rūdeo, shows, like rūder (Gk. ἐρυθρός), the ū of the weak grade of the root, I.-Eur. rūdh-. The same variety of spelling is seen in a word indicating unshaped metal, &c., rōdus and rūdus, though the normal spelling
is perhaps raudus (see Georges, *Lex. Wortf.* s.v.), the weak grade of this stem (perhaps connected with the stem of rōbus, rūfus) being apparently seen in ēūdis, which means rough, literally, e. g. aēs rude, or rough, metaphorically, e. g. arte rudis, in Ovid’s criticism of Ennius: Ennius ingenio maximus, arte rudis. [Varro, *L. L.* v. 163 deinde (porta) Rauduscula, quod aerata fuit. Aes ‘raudus’ dictum: ex eo veteribus in mancipiis scriptum ‘raudusculo libram ferito’; Festus 356. 4 Th. rodus, vel raudus significat rem rudem et imperfectam, nam saxum quoque raudus appellant poetae, ut Accius . . . hinc manibus rapere raudus (so the MS.) saxeum; Paul. Festus. 377. 1 Th. Rodusculana porta appellata, quod rudis et impolita sit reicta, vel quia raudo, id est aere, fuerit vincita]. This variety of spelling suggests that I.-Eur. ou became in Latin an *au*-sound, which was sometimes written, like Lat. au from I.-Eur. au (§ 30), as ō, sometimes, like Lat. ou from I.-Eur. eu (§ 35), as ū; though, owing to the scarcity of reliable instances, it is impossible to determine how far these spellings corresponded to the pronunciation of the diphthong at various periods, or how far they were influenced by the analogy of other grades of the same root. For the higher grade with I.-Eur. ōu, ō would have in Latin ō (§ 50), and the weak grade of an eu-root with I.-Eur. ā would have in Latin ā (§ 23), while a ū-grade (I.-Eur. ū, Lat. ū) was also not unknown (§ 51). The Latin diphthong corresponding to I.-Eur. eu had thus a different sound from the representative of I.-Eur. ou. An *ou*-diphthong arose in Latin also from I.-Eur. -ōg(h)ʷ, for the velar g(h)ʷ took in Roman lips the sound of v (u). Thus I.-Eur. *nōg(h)edo- became in Latin *novedo-, *nudo-, whence *nūdus, an example which suggests that the ou from I.-Eur. og(h)ʷ had the same sound as the ou from I.-Eur. eu, and was developed in the same way to long ū. Also by syncope in words like O. Lat. noventius (as in the prophecy of Cn. Marcius: quamuis nometium duonum negumate, ap. Fest. 164. 28 Th.) with Lat. ūn, I.-Eur. ēw, O. Lat. *novendīnae, from nōvem (I.-Eur. *nēwn) and dīn-, a stem for ‘day,’ seen in O. Sl. dīnǐ, ‘a day,’ O. Ind. dīna-, &c. For this spurious ou we have first ō, later ū.

§ 43. Other examples of I.-Eur. ou. From the root neud-, ‘to use, enjoy’ (Goth. niutan, ‘to enjoy’) comes the Latin nātrīa, nātrix (in Old Latin nōtrix,
(Quint. i. 4. 16), perhaps showing the o-grade, I.-Eur. noun- (Goth. naufs, O. Engl. nêad, Engl. need, Germ. Noth. Cf. Latin unus est, there is need) ; Lat. clânis seems to represent L.-Eur. kloun- (O. Scand. hlamaun, 'haunch,' but Gr. κλάνος), though the word occurs so seldom in the older writers that we cannot say whether *clowinis, *clônis were earlier spellings; Lat. lâesus is L.-Eur. *louko- (O.H.G. lôh, 'copse, brushwood,' the -lôo of Water-loo, O. Engl. leâh, Engl. lea), properly an open space in a wood, like the German Lichtung (cf. colldäare, to make a clearing in a wood), showing the o-grade of the L.-Eur. root-leuk- of Lat. læco, &c., so that the old etymology 'luecus a non lucendo' had a grain of truth after all. The O. Lat. spelling shows -ou-, e.g. in hoc locuœriad on the inscription of Luceria (C. I. L. ix. 782); hence loucom... quod locui sit on the inscription of Spoletium (C. I. L. xi. 4766); the Perfect Part. Pass. of lâeu, to wash, L.-Eur. lôw- (Gk. λοῦω) is lautus, later lôsus (see Georges, Lex. Worfl. s. v.); the Dat. (Abr.) Plur. of bôs, bôcis (I.-Eur. *gôw-u-s, *gôw-es) is bôsus and bâbus; formed from the same stem *bou- after the fashion of instar (ch. iii. § 36), comes the word spelt bustar in the Glossary of Philoxenus, and bostar in the Glossary of Cyrilrus, and stated in both glossaries to be the equivalent of the Greek βοστάρασσαι, a word which must have belonged to the older period only, for Spanish and Portuguese alone preserve it [Span. bostar, Port. bostal, indicating a Latin original bôstar; bustar, a place for burning a dead body, (Charisius 38. 19 K.), is a quite different word, connected with bûstum]; Lat. über appears to show the û-grade of the root, like O. Ind. údhar, O. Engl. óder, Lith. ūdrūtėi, 'to give milk,' but the ou-grade of Gk. òðâos, Gen. -atôs for -ntos, meaning (1) udder, (2) fertility of soil, may appear in the (dialectal) name of a river in Latium, òfêns (modern Uffente) [cf. the Apulian river, Aufidus (modern Ofanto)], from which comes the name of one of the Roman tribes òfentina, in Old Latin Ofentina (see Index to C. I. L. i.), also Vefentina, and Ofentina (C. I. L. xi. 5702), in Greek inscriptions 'Ωφ., Õβωφ (Eckinger, p. 44).

§ 43. û for older ovî, ovê. By the composition of com-, co- with vir we get the word *côvîria (cf. Volsc. covehrîa-), which became by syncope *côvî(f)ria, cûria-. The name Julius (written Iulio on a lamp found in one of the oldest graves in the Esquiline burying-place, Ann. Inst. 1880, p. 260) seems to come from an earlier *Jovîlîo, from a word found in Oscan in the form diûvilîa-, later iûvilîa-, meaning apparently a gift presented yearly to its corporation or clan to its tutelary god. Here the older spelling Iulî suggests that the û represents not ov(i) but o(v), the v having been suppressed before the accent (see ch. ii. § 53). Jullus is the original form of the substantival name, of which Julius is an adjectival derivative. The trisyllabic Jûlîus is an invention of Virgil's (Herm. xxiv. 155). Similarly Clûlîus, the older form of Cloelius (written on an old inscription Clôlîus, C. I. L. i. 1297), shows its derivation from the name Cluvius, a name evidently connected with the root klev-, 'to be famous' (Gk. κλέφ-ος) [compare the gloss ducîor: nobilior, Lôwe, Prod. p. 364; Paul. Fest. 39. 2 Th. refers the word to Cluvîus; Cloelia familia a Clonio Æneae comite, est appellata. The family name retained, as often happens, the older spelling with ō, Cloelius, not Clûlîus]. Similarly O. Lat. conventio (conventiôdû on the S. C. Bacch. of 186 b. c., C. I. L. i. 196), lost its v before the accent, and the two vowels o and e were fused into ô; conventio (but see ch. ii. § 147, and below on munîtus).

§ 44. The spurious diphthong ou. Nontio, the older spelling (denontiâri on
§§ 43–45. REPRESENTATIVES OF I.-EUR. SOUNDS. ĀI, &c. 251

the Lex Bantina of 133–118 B. c., C. I. L. i. 197; pronontiato on the Lex Repetundarum of 123–122 B. c., i. 198; nontiata on the Epistula ad Tiburtes of 100 B. c., i. 201; pronontiato and pronontium on fragments of old Laws, i. 207 and 208) became nontio at the close of the Republican period (renontio is the spelling throughout the Lex Julia Municipalis of 45 B. c., i. 206; so nuntiationem on the Lex Rubria of 49 B. c., i. 205), though Cicero in his Laws (ii. 21) uses nontius. Marius Victorinus (12. 18 K.) says the old spelling had ou. For mundinae the oldest spelling is with ou, nondinum on the S. C. Bach. of 186 B. c. (C. I. L. i. 196, then with o, nondinum on the Lex Bantina) (i. 197).

§ 45. The I.-Eur. root, referred to in § 27, as aiwē-, 'time, life,' is perhaps more correctly aiwē- (cf. O. Ind. áyu-, 'life'), with the diphthong originally long, but shortened in Latin avum, according to the rule that a long diphthong (including combinations with a nasal or liquid as second element) shortened in Latin its first element when a consonant followed. Final I.-Eur. -āi, the ending of the Dat. Sg. of Ā-stems, shows traces in Latin of 'doublet' forms, (1) ā (with suppression of the second element, by a similar syncope as produced exemplar from exemplāre), a form which seems to occur on a few old inscriptions, e. g. Invonei Loucina (C. I. L. i. 189), Invone Loucina Tuscolana sacra (i. 1200); (2) -ai (one syllable), class. -ae (presumably āe; cf. Osc. -āi, Umbr. -e, Rustic and Late Latin e, ch. ii. § 41) (with a shortening of the first element, which properly took place only before a consonant). Similar doublets -ā and -ōi seem to show themselves for I.-Eur. -ōi in O-stem Datives [(1) class. ēqūō, dōminō, (2) O. Lat. populoi Romanoii, Numasioii; cf. Osc. -ūi, Umbr. -ē], though in O-stems the first (not the second doublet as in the Ā-stems) established itself in the classical usage. (On these Datives, see ch. vi. § 23.) In Greek this I.-Eur. -āi became -ī, e. g. χάρη, later -ā, but in dialects also -ai (presumably āi), while this I.-Eur. ōi became -φ, e. g. ἰππφ, later -ω, in dialects -ou.

Shortening of long 'diphthong' before consonant. It seems to have been a law very widely spread through the I.-Eur. languages that a long vowel became shortened before any y (in 1-diphthongs), w (in u-diphthongs), m, n, r, or l, when this was followed by a consonant. Thus I.-Eur. *wēnt- from the root wē-, 'to blow' (Gk. ἤνυ) has become in Gk. ἤνα, in Goth. vind, our 'wind,' as in Latin vēntus (Span. viento); the I.-Eur. word for the heel or the ham (O. Ind. pāṣṇi-) is in Gk. πηνα, in Goth. fairzna, and in Latin pierna (Span. pierna) [curiously enough Mar. Sacerdos (vi. 451. 5 K.) cites a derivative of this word, perntz, swift (lit. 'strong in the ham,' and properly used of horses and other animals, A. L. L. viii. 453) as an illustration of a short
e, the long pronunciation of which is a barbarism: barbarismus... fit... si
dicas pernix et 'per' producas, quae correta est]: the Dat. (Abl. Loc. Instr.)
Plur. Suffix of O-stems, I.-Eur. -ēis has become in Greek -ōς, as in Latin -ēis,
-is (ch. vi. § 48); ēnitus is a cognate of ēnīs. (Cf. Engl. 'kept,' 'wept' from
'keep,' 'weep').

§ 46. ĀU. The I.-Eur. long diphthong āu is seen in the stem
nāu-; 'ship' (O. Ind. nāūs, nāvās, Gen.; Hom. Gk. νηός, νηός Gen.,
Arm. nav, O. Ir. nau, naue or nōe, Gen., W. noe, 'a dish,' like our
'butter-boat,' O. Scand. nōr), which is in Latin an i-stem nāvis,
like clāvis (Gk. κλη(ς)). The -au- of nau-frāgium, nau-stībulum
'vas alvei simile' (Fest. 172. 23 Th.), claudio shortens the first
element owing to the fact that a consonant follows (see above,
§ 45). [That claudio had the same au, as the equivalent of I.-Eur.
au (e.g. fraus), we see from its sinking to ā in the unaccented
syllable, e.g. exclūdere, like defrūdare.] For Latin āv from
I.-Eur. ōw, e.g. octāvus, and perhaps flāvus (beside flōrus, Gk.
χαρύδος), see § 50. Gāvius (a trisyllable till late Latin, Harvard
Studies, 1891) is the class. form of older Gāvius (Osc. Gavviis),
with suppression of intervocalic v (§ 70), a name apparently
derived from the root of gaudeo, gāvius sum (Gk. γάθεω for
*γαθεω) (cf. Rainus and Rāvius) On the curious remark of Teren-
tianus Maurus about the pronunciation of Lat. au, see ch. ii. § 34.

§ 47. ĖI. I.-Eur. ēi appears e.g. in *réi-, 'property' (O. Ind.
rās, Gen. rāyās), Lat. rēs, Gen. rēi for *réyēi, a root in which the
diphthong had apparently in the 'Indo-European period' the
doublets ēi (ēy) and ē. The Loc. Sing; ending of Ė-stems shows the
second of these doublets in Latin, e.g. diē crastinī, postādiē, &c.

§ 48. ĖU. The I.-Eur. Nom. *dyēus, 'the sky,' shows the long
diphthong ēu (O. Ind. dyāūs, Acc. dīvam and dyām, dyām; Gk.
Zeus for *Znus, Lat. diēs like Acc. diem; on Jōvis, &c., from the
stem dyēw-, see ch. vi. § 9). A final ēu-diphthong arose in Latin
by the suppression of the final -ē of nēve, and produced the form
nev; ceu is probably to be referred to an older *ceve (ch. x. § 11).
The Loc. Sg. ending of U-stems, if this was I.-Eur. -ēu, appears
in noctū, where the ū represents an earlier -ēu with shortening
of the first element of -ēu (see § 26), so that I.-Eur. *dyēus
should be Lat. *diūs (nū-diūs-tertius?).

§ 49. ŌI. An example of final -ōi has been already mentioned,
the ending of the Dat. Sg. of O-stems. This in Latin shows the doublets, (1) -ō, the classical ending, e.g. ēquō, dúmnā, (2) -ōi (presumably -ōī), an ending found in very old inscriptions, e.g. Numasioi (Osc. -ū́, Umbr. -ē) (ch. vi. § 26).

§ 50. ŌU. I.-Eur. ōu- is seen in the numeral *ōktōu, a dual form, in the sense apparently of ‘two sets of four’ (O. Ind. aṁtau, astā, Gk. ὀκτώ, Goth. ahtau, O. Engl. ehta, Lith. asztū-ni), in Latin octō. Duals in the Veda show generally -āu (I.-Eur. -ōu) before an initial vowel, -ā (I.-Eur. -ō) before an initial consonant, e.g. dēvāu and dēvā, ‘twin-gods; ’ and it is probable that these doublets existed even in what is called the I.-Eur. period, so that the -ō of Latin octō (cf. ambo, duo) will represent an I.-Eur. -ō, and not -ōu. As I.-Eur. ōw became āv in Latin (§ 19), so I.-Eur. ōw is said to have become āv in the corresponding ordinal number, octāvus for *octōvus (Gk. ὀκτάο[θ]ος). The long diphthong seems to have occurred in the I.-Eur. declension of the word for ‘ox,’ stem *grep- (O. Ind. gāus, Loc. gāvi, Acc. gām, Nom. Pl. gāvas, &c., Arm. kov, Gk. βοῦς, Dor. βῶς, according to the grammarians, O. Ir. bou, bō, W. bu, buw, O. Engl. cū, Lett. gūws); but the Latin bōs is a doubtful example, for its b- instead of the normal v- (§ 139) suggests that it is a dialectal (or rustic) form like ōvis (I.-Eur. *ōwi-, § 19), and not a genuine Latin development.

§ 51. Variation (Ablaut) of Vowels. A root like pet- of Gk. πετέσθαι, to fly, O. Ind. pātati, ‘he flies,’ appears in the form pt- in Gk. πέσθαι, O. Ind. ā-pa-pta-t, ‘he flew,’ the shorter form being a syncopated form of the other, due to loss of accent. Similarly the root ei-, ‘to go’ (Gk. εἰ-σι, 3 Sg., Lith. eį-ti, Lat. it, older e-i-t, ch. viii. § 2), loses the ę of the diphthong in the P. P. P. *y-tō- (O. Ind. -iṭā-, Gk. -ιτός, Lat. -ītus), where the accent falls on the suffix; and eu becomes ū, through loss of accent, in I.-Eur. *bhug- ē, ‘flight’ (Gk. φυγῆ, Lat. fūga) from *bhēugō, ‘I flee’ (Gk. φεῦγω); while en, em, er, el, similarly reduced, appear before a vowel as n, m, r, l, e.g. Gk. γλ-γυ-μαί, Lat. gi-gn-o, beside Gk. γέν-ος, Lat. gēn-us, but before a consonant assumed in Greek the forms a, pa, la, e.g. φαρός from φεῦ-, to kill, I.-Eur. ghom-, ῥπακός (O. Ind. ῥπαν-) from ῥπακ-, to glance, I.-Eur. derk-, in Latin en, em, or, ol, e.g. ten-tus (O. Ind. ta-tā-, Gk. τα-τός) from
ten-, ‘to stretch,’ _fors_ (O. Ind. _bhṛ-ṭī-_, O. Ir. _brith_, Goth. _gabaurpṣ_) from _bhṛ-_, ‘to bear’ (see §§ 81, 92). We may call these reduced forms _pt-, bhūg-, bhṛ-, _&c._, the ‘weak grade’ of the roots, and _pet-, bheug-, bhṛ-_, the normal or _E_-grade. We find these roots also with their _e_ replaced by _ő_ in such words as Gk. _γέ-γον-α_ Pft., _oīros_, a Derivative Noun from the root _ei-, ‘to go,’ _γόνος_ from the root _γέν-, φόνος_ from _gh̲e̲n-_; and _γόν-, oī-, gh̲e̲n-_ may be called the _O_-grade of these roots. There are also occasionally forms with _ė_, _ō_, e.g. Gk. _πωτάομαι_ from _pet-, ‘to fly.’ This variation, or gradation, called by the Germans ‘Ablaut,’ of _I.-Eur._ vowels has not yet been thoroughly explained or systematized; the relation for example of _u_, _i_ to the ordinary weak grade _ū_, _ī_ in words like _I.-Eur._ *klū-tō-_ (O. H. G. _hlūt_, ‘loud,’ Zend. _srū-ta_) beside _I.-Eur._ *klū-tō-_ (O. Ind. _srū-tā-, Gk. _κλῦ-τός_) is not quite clear, nor yet that of the _E_- and _O_-forms to the _E_- and _O_-forms, e.g. Gk. _πωτάομαι_ beside _ποτέομαι_. They are generally called ‘lengthenings’ of the weak grade (of diphthongal roots), of the _E_-grade and of the _O_-grade, and are by German philologists classed under the term ‘Dehnstufe’ (‘lengthened grade’). [On these see Streitberg in _Indog. Forsch._ iii. 306, who explains them as produced by syncope of a following short vowel in *bhōr (Gk. _φόρ_)* for *bhōr(o)s, _&c.,* reks- (Lat. _rēx-i_)* for *rēg-ēs-, _&c._]. Nor have the grades of other than _E_-roots been properly equated to grades like _pēt-, pt-, pōt-_; the variation of the root _dō-, ‘to give,’ for example, which has _o_ in Gk. _d̲ì-b̲o-μ̲u_, Lat. _dō-num_, but a short vowel in Gk. _d̲o-τ̲ός_, Lat. _dā-tus_, of the root _sē-, ‘to throw,’ or _‘to throw seed,’ with _ē_ in Gk. _i-η-μ̲u_ for *σι-ση-μ̲u_, Lat. _sē-men_, but with a short vowel in Gk. _ē-τ̲ός_, Lat. _sā-tus_, of the root _stā-, ‘to stand,’ with _ā_ in Gk. _i-σημ̲u_ for *σι-στā-μ̲u_, Lat. _stā-re_, but with a short vowel in Gk. _στā-τ̲ός_, Lat. _stā-tus_; similarly the variation of _ā_ and _ā_, e.g. in the _I.-Eur._ root meaning ‘to drive,’ _āg- in O. Ind._ _ājā-mi_, Gk. _ἀγω_, Ir. _agaim_, Lat. _āgo_, _āg-_ in O. Ind. _āj-, ‘a contest,’ O. Ir. _āg_, ‘a contest,’ Lat. _amb-āges_; and the variation of _ō_ and _ō_, e.g. in Lat. _fōdio_ beside _fōdi_, Gk. _dō-μ̲η_ beside _eī-άδης_; not to mention the variation of _ā_ and _ō_ in Lat. _scābo_ beside _scōbis_, _ācies_ (Gk. _ἀκρος_, Hom. _ἀκρις_, a hill-top) beside O. Lat. _ōris_, a rugged hill (Gk. _ἀκρις_, a point), from the root _ak-, ōk-, ‘sharp.’
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Examples of this variation of vowels in Latin are I. in E-roots:
(a) Weak grade in (1) Derivative Nouns with ā-suffix, O-suffix, TI-suffix, &c., (ch. v. §§ 2, 42), e.g. fīga (Gk. φυγ-η) from the root bheug-, 'to flee,' jāg-um (O. Ind. yāg-ām, Gk. ζύγ-όν) from the root yeug-, 'to join'), for (O. Ind. bhr-ti-), mens (O. Ind. ma-ti-), mors (O. Ind. mṛ-ti); (2) in P. P. P. with TO-suffix, e.g. dūc-us from dūco for *deuco, ûs-tus (A. L. L. ii. 607) from úro for *euso (Gk. ευω for εύω), per-culsus for *kld-to- (cf. clādes); (3) in Reduplicated Present-stem, e.g. gi-gu-o from the root ēn-, sīdo for *sī-sd-o from the root sed-; (4) in Nasalized Present-stems, e.g., jū-n-g-o from the root yeug-, ùl-n-quo from the root leïq3- (Gk. λείπω), fūl-n-d-o from the root bheidh- (Goth. beita, 'I bite'); (5) in some Present-stems with the YO-suffix, e.g. fūg-i-o from the root bheug-.

(b) Normal or E-grade in (1) Neuter ES-stems, e.g. gen-us from the root ēn- (Gk. γεν-ος), decus from the root dek-, nemus from the root nem-; (2) Present-stems formed with the Thematic Vowel, e.g. veho from the root wegh- (O. Ind. vah-, Lith. vēžû, O. Sl. vezq), sequor from the root seq3- (O. Ind. sac-, Gk. ἑπομαι, O. Ir. secur), fīdo, O. Lat. feido, from the root bheidh- (Gk. πειθω for *φειθω), dīco, O. Lat. deico, from the root deik- (Gk. δείκνυμι), dūco, O. Lat. douco for *deuco (§ 35), from the root deukh- (Goth. tiuha), ûro for *euso from the root eus- (Gk. ευω for εύω), pluo, O. Lat. plivo for *plewo, from the root pleu-(Gk. πλέω) (On the u of pluo see ch. viii. § 6).

(c) O-grade in (1) Derivative Nouns with ā-suffix, O-suffix, &c., e.g. procus from the root prēk-, 'to ask' (Lat. precor), domus (Gk. δόμος) from the root dem-, 'to build' (Gk. δέμω), toga from the root (s)teg-, 'to cover, thatch' (Gk. στέγω, Lat. tego); (2) Causative Verbs, e.g. moneo, lit. 'cause to remember,' from the root menh- (Lat. me-min-i), torreo, lit. 'cause to dry up,' from the root tersh- (Gk. τέρσμαι).

II. in E-suffixes. (1) Nouns of the Second Declension with Voc. Sg. in -ē, e.g. equē, Nom. Acc., &c. in -ōs, -om, e.g. eqnos, equom; (2) N-stems, R-stems, S-stems, &c., e.g. temp-ūs (O. Lat. temp-ūs), temp-ōr-is for *temp-ōs-es Gen., temp-ōr-i Adv., aug-us-tus for *aug-ōs-to-, auxilium for *aug-s-ilio-, plēb-ēs, dēc-or (O. Lat. dec-ōs); nō-mēn, car-n-īs, rāti-ōn-i. In the I.-Eur. declension
of these stems the suffix may have shown in the Nom. Sg. ἔ when accented, ὀ when unaccented, e.g. Gk. ὃ-τῆρ, ὃ-τον, in the other ‘strong’ cases ἔ when accented, ὀ when unaccented, e.g. Gk. πα-τερ-α, φρά-τορ-α, and in the ‘weak’ cases the weak grade, e.g. Gk. πα-τρ-ός, πα-τρά-σι (O. Ind. pi-tf-ṣu), but the divergences of the suffix-form have been to a great extent removed in the various I.-Eur. languages, e.g. Gk. μετέρος as well as μετρός, πατέρων instead of πατρῶν. The alternation of strong and weak stems in Declension, depending on the accentuation of the stem or the suffix, has left its mark in the divergent form of words like Gk. ποὺς, ποδός (cf. Lat. tvī-pōd-are) and Lat. pes, pēd-is (cf. Gk. πέςα, τρά-πεςα, lit. ‘four-footed,’ πεζός, &c., for *ped-ya-, *ped-yo-), Lat. pecten and Gk. κτεῖς for *πικτεῖς, &c.

The combination yē, we was treated somewhat similarly to ei, eu, being reduced by the loss of accent to i, ü, e.g. Gk. ὢ-ν-νός for *sûp-nos (O. Sl. sinii) from the root swep (O. Engl. swefn, ‘a dream’), Gk. περυσι, last year, for πέρυτι (O. Ind. par-ut) from the root wet- (Gk. ὥ-τοσ, a year, Lat. vētus). This root seems to have lost by procope an initial ā, and the reduced form of ἄωτ- appears in Gk. ἄν-αυτ-ός, just as the reduced form of ὄων (Gr. ἄ(f)έξω) in the aug- of Lat. aug-er, Gk. αὐξόω, O. Ind. ὁξα-, ‘strength,’ while ὀγ- the reduced form of ὄγω (with procope of initial ā) appears in O. Ind. ukṣ-, ‘to grow strong,’ Gk. ὤγις for *ὠγις, &c. And as we sometimes find ī, ū beside i, ü the weak grades of ei, eu, so we find the same long vowels in forms of yē- and wē-roots, e.g. ἱ (O. Ind. śuṇa-, ‘want, emptiness’) from the root ἱκε- (Gk. κ(έ)vós, empty). On the variation of i with yē (īye) in I.-Eur. YO-stems, see ch. v. § 4, of i with yē in the I.-Eur. Athematic Optative (O. Lat. siēs and sīmus, &c.), see ch. viii. § 55. Latin con-ciēt-io for *con-quel-io from quaētio, ab-ic-io (with the first syllable short in the older poetry), for *ab-yēc-io from jācio, shows that the Latin language had the same tendency as the I.-Eur. to reduce unaccented yē to i, wē to u, and in many cases it is impossible to say whether the reduction belongs to the ‘Indo-European’ period or is a Latin development.

III. in other roots. I.-Eur. č (Lat. ĉ) varies with Lat. ā in Lat. sē-men (Gk. ἂ-μα, a casting) and sē-lus (Gk. ἂ-ρός) from the
root sē-, fēc-i (Gk. ἑ-θηκ-α) and fāc-io, an extension of the root dhē- (Gk. θή-θη-μι); I.-Eur. o (Lat. ó) varies with Lat. ā in Lat. dō-num (Gk. δοῦν), and dō-tus (Gk. δοῦς, δότις) from the root dō-, cōs (O. Ind. śā-, ‘to sharpen’) and cātus, which in O. Lat. meant ‘sharp,’ ‘shrink’ from the root kō-; I.-Eur. ā (Lat. ă) varies with Latin ā in Lat. fā-ma (Gk. φά-μη) and fāt-eor (ch. viii. § 32) (Gk. φάρος), stā-re (Gk. ιστημι for *στα-μι) and stā-lus (Gk. στα-τός).

In all these cases the Latin weak-grade vowel is ā, while in Greek we have ε for Ε-roots, o for Ο-roots, ā for A-roots, but in Sanscrit ṭ for all roots (e.g. हिता�- from root धित-, dī-ti- from root dō, sthī-tā- from root stā-), just as we have Lat. ā of pater, which is also ā in Greek and other languages (Gk. πατήρ, O. Ir. athir, Goth. fadar) represented by Sanscrit ṭ (pītār-). We find even in Greek occasionally ā in the weak form of Ε-, Ο-roots (e.g. κεκάδωντο beside ἐκεκάδεπ, δάνος beside δῶρον), so that we are perhaps justified in supposing a short a-sound (ā) to have been the form of the weak grade of ē, ō, as well as of ā, in European languages (see § 3).

The Latin tendency to weaken every unaccented vowel has greatly obscured the traces of the I.-Eur. variation of vowels; prosperus, for example, has spā- (cf. O. Ind. sphrā-, ‘wealthy’) the weak grade of spē- of spēs, spēro (O. Ind. sphā-, O. Sl. spē-ti), with ā weakened before r in the unaccented syllable to ē, and crēditus (O. Ind. śrād-dhīta-) has the same vowel weakened to ē.

Words like frāngo (ā is shown by con-fringo for con-frengo, &c.), with the weak grade frāg- in the Nasalized Present-stem of the I.-Eur. root bhreg- (Goth. brikan, ‘to break’), grādus, grādior, with a weak form grād- from the I.-Eur. root ghredh- ‘to step’ (Goth. grips, ‘a step’), suggest that in Latin (as perhaps in other languages, M. U. v. pref.) rā, mā, &c. were the weak grades of rē, lē, mē, nē, although we have seen Lat. ēr, ĕl, ĕm, ēn to be the weak grades of ēr, ēl, ēm, ēn where the liquid or nasal follows the ē. But we occasionally find in Latin (and perhaps in the other Italic languages) a in forms of ē-roots where ē is not preceded by a liquid or nasal, e.g. pateo (Osc. pate-) from the root pet- (Gk. πάτανωμι); its relation to the obscure or indeterminate vowel (like the Hebrew shēva), written ā, ə, &c., is not clear (see §§ 3, 83, 94).

As an I.-Eur. ā is the weak grade of ō, so āu may be the weak
grade of ōu; the Plautine aus-culrum, for example, may then exhibit the weak grade of the stem *ōus- (O. Ind. ās-, Lat. ōs-). It may also be the weak grade of ēu (Caurus or Corus, Lith. sziurė, beside O. Sl. sēverū, is quoted as an example), and of āu; and similarly āi of ōi, ēi, āi. It is also possible that as ā varies with ō, so ai may vary with oi (e. g. Lat. aemidus and Gk. oǐdōw), and au with ou (e. g. Gk. kaulōs, a stalk, and κούλος for *κούλος, hollow); and some explain in this way Latin forms like lāvo beside Gk. λῶο (on which see § 19).


§ 53. ë and ō. This ō is best seen in the Noun Suffixes -òn-, -ōr- which vary with -ēn-, -ēr- and -ēn-, -ēr-, as well as with -ōn-, -ōr-, e. g. Lat. hōmö Nom., hominis for *homēnis Gen., Lat. dōtor, dātoris beside Gk. δώτωρ, δωτορ, δοτήρ (see ch. v. § 57); in Greek it is seen also in the Perf. of verbs with ē, e. g. τίθωνται from ἔγγος, ἀφέωνα from ἀφήμα, &c. The root of Lat. flōs, Flora is bhlō- (Ir. bláth, Goth. blō-ma, Engl. bloom; O. Engl. blō-tn, Engl. blossom; O. Engl. blō-wan, Engl. to blow, of flowers), which is connected with the root bhlē- of Lat. flēma, congestion of blood (Goth. uf-blēsan, Germ. auf-bläsen), just as the root plē-, ‘to be full’ (Latin plēmus, Gk. πλήρης; Lat. plēbes, Gk. πλῆθος) seems to be connected with the root plō- of Ir. lār, Engl. floor, &c.; but these are rather to be explained like ġnō- and ġnā- of Lat. gnōtus, and gnārus (§ 1).

§ 54. ë-ā, ā-ā. From root lēd-, ‘to leave, to let’ (Goth. lētan, O. Engl. lētan, Engl. let), with ō-grade in Goth. lai-lēt Perf., we have in the weak grade Lat. lāssus (Goth. lats, Germ. lass); Lat. catus, which Varro makes the equivalent of acētus, used in Old Latin and in the Sabine dialect of sounds, i. e. sharp, shrill (L. L. vii. 46 apud Ennium):

iam cata signa fere sonitum dare voce parabant.

Cata acuta; hoc enim verbo dicunt Sabini: quare:

catus Aelius Sextus

non, ut aiunt, sapiens, sed acutus) is in O. Ind. śítā-, ‘sharp,’ from śā-, ‘to
sharpen,' and is connected with Lat. cōs, a whetstone (like dōs from root dō-).
Similarly we have vā-tus beside vēri, fāc-io beside fēc-i (ch. viii. § 41), and from I.-Eur. ōk-, 'swift' (connected with āk-, 'sharp?') (O. Ind. āś-, Gk. ἄκαρ, Lat. scabo, acuo, (0. alii the 129), accipiter (unc- Ter. Maur. 1267) is probably a corruption of *ācu-peter (cf. O. Ind. āśu-pitvan- for *ōkū-, 'swift-flying,' and Gk. ὀκύ-πτης, the epithet of a hawk in Hesiod, ὄπ. 210), due to a popular etymology from accipio; the form acceptor, the original of O. Span. acetore, is used by Lucilius (inc. 123 M.) extra acceptoris et unguis, but is censured by the grammarian Caper (p. 107. 8 K. acceptor non 'acceptor'); āmārus shows the root ām- (O. Ind. am-lā-, 'sour'), which is usually regarded as the weak form of ōm-, 'raw' (O. Ind. āmā-, Gk. ὑμός).

§ 55. ā-ō. Examples of this interchange are Lat. atrox for *atōrox (Arm. ateam, 'I hate') and odium; scabo, to scrape (Gk. σακάς, to dig) and scobis, sawdust; acuo, acus, acies, acer-bus (Gk. ἄκρος, Hom. ἄκρα, a hill-top) and ocris (Gk. ὄκρα, a point, ὄκριτος, an epithet of unhewn stone in Homer), an Old Latin word for a rugged hill. [Fest. 196. 17 Th. ocrem antiqui, ut Aetius Philologus in libro Glossatorum referit, montem confragosum vocabant, ut apud Livium:

sed qui sunt hi, qui ascendunt altum ocrim?

... unde fortasse etiam ocreae sint dialectae inaequalitae tuberatae; in Umbrian, and Marrucinian the stem ocri- (Nom. Sg. ocrar, in Umbrian) seems to bear the sense of citadel); ancus, an Old Latin word for a person with a crook-elbow (Paul. Fest. 15. 3 Th. ances appellatur, qui aduncum brachium habet, et exporrigi non potest), which went out of use c. 200 B.C., to judge from the fact that the word survives only in Portuguese anco, 'the elbow' (Gk. ἄγων and ἄγωλη, O. Ir. eath, 'a hook,' from root ank-), and ancus, a hook, reduncum brachium, aduncus unguis (Gk. ἄγος, a hook); doco and Gk. δίδακσα for *dī-dak-κοκ. We have Oscar a, Latin o in tongere, a word used by Ennius, declared by Aelius Stilo to be equivalent to nosocere, and to be still employed in the Praenestine dialect (Paul. Fest. 539. 5 Th. tongere nosse est, nam Praenestini 'tongitionem' dicent notionem. Ennius: alli rhetorica tongent. Cf. Fest. 538. 9 Th. [tongere Aelius Stilo ait noscere esse], appearing in Oscar in the noun tangion- with the sense of sententia, e.g. senatēs tanginūd, 'senatus sententia,' the cognate of our word 'think,' probably from a root tenq-. [Cf. the (dialectal?) variation of names like Glossius, Glossius; Fabius, Fabius.]

§ 56. ā and a. I. Eur. pāg-, 'to fasten' (cf. pāk-) (Sanser. pāśa-, 'cord,' Dor. Gk. πάγγμα and ἐπάγγμα, Mid. High. Germ. vuoge, 'deftness in fastening,' &c., Mod. Germ. Fuge, and Goth. fagrs, 'suitable'),' Lat. pāngo (with ā; cf. com-pāngo), pepīgi (from *pe-pāg-i) and com-pāges, pāciscor and pāc-em Ac.; I.-Eur. swāf-, 'to make pleasant' (O. Ind. svādāti and svādātē, Dor. Gk. ἱδόμαυ and Hom. Gk. εὐδόκω, Dōn Aor.), Lat. nūdē; I.-Eur. *nās-; 'the nose,' probably Nom. nās(s), Gen. nās-os (O. Ind. nās- and nās-, Lith. nōsis and O. Sl. nosu), O. Lat. nāssum, class. Lat. nāsus (ch. ii. § 129), nāris; similarly Lat. sāgō, sāgus and sūgax (Dor. Gk. ἀγάμαυ, Ir. saigim, 'I seek,' Goth. sōkja, Germ. suche, O. Engl. see). The Latin words sāgō and sūgō were used of hounds on the track,
whence prassāgiō, to 'scent out' the future (Cic. Div. i. 65: cf. Ennius, A. 375 M. nare sagaeī Sensit; voce sua nictit ululatque ibi acuta); params was applied to an old match-maker, like Gyllis in the first Idyll of Herondas (Non. 22. 34 M. sagae mulieres dicuntur feminarum ad libidinem virorum indagatrices; cf. Lucil. vii. 6 M. saga et bona conciliaetrix). So Latin ācer, stem acri-, and āceo (Gk. ἀκρος, Lith. asatri-s, &c.; show I.-Eur. ā); Lat. ācri- beside Gk. ἀκρο- reminds us of Latin sācri- (sācrēs porci, pigs for sacrifice, Plaut.) beside sācro-.

§ 57. ē and e. I.-Eur. ēd-, 'to eat' (O. Ind. ad-, 'to eat' and ādyā-, 'eatable,' Gk. ἔφομαι and ἔφανεν, Goth. itan and ētan, Lith. ėd-ēs Part., O. Sl. jad-ū), Lat. ēde and ēdi Perf.; Lat. ēx, lēx, lēg-is and lēgo, &c.; I.-Eur. rēg- 'to stretch, rule' (O. Ind. rāj-, 'a row,' rāj-, 'a king,' O. Ir. rígim, 'I stretch,' rī, 'a king'), Lat. rēgo, I rule, rēg-, a king. This lengthening appears chiefly in Preterites, e.g. O. Sl. nēsū, 'I carried' (beside nesq, 'I carry'), Goth. sētum, 'we sat' (beside sitam, 'we sit'), O. Ir. ro midar, 'I judged' (beside midiar, 'I judge, think,' from the root med- of Gk. μιδαω), and in the nouns derived from Verb-stems like lēx, rēx. The occurrence of the long vowel in some Present-forms like Lith. ėd-mi, 'I eat,' is probably due to the use of a Perfect-stem as a Present (like Gk. ἀφύω Pres. from ἀφύω Perf.).

§ 58. Ī and ī. I.-Eur. *wīro-, 'a man' (O. Ind. vīrā-, Lith. vyras have ī; O. Ir. fer from *wīro-, Goth. vair from *wīro-, O. H. G. wer, Germ. Wer-wolf, Engl. were-wolf and Lat. īre have ī); I.-Eur. *gīro-, 'lively' (O. Ind. jirā-, Lat. vīreo). But most examples of Latin ī-i are really cases of ī-ei, e.g. fides and idi, older feido (see § 13).

§ 59. ō and ŏ. The I.-Eur. root ŏū-, 'to see' (Gk. ὄψομαι and ὤψ) appears in Lat. o-ū-; the root ōd-, 'to smell' (Gk. ὄδηγ, Arm. hot, and Gk. θυσ-όβηθ, Lith. ŭduziu) in Lat. ōdor; ōgū-, 'naked' (O. Ind. nagā-, Ir. nocht, Goth. naqās), and Lith. nūgas, in Lat. nūdus for *nūw(i)du; ēlen-, 'the elbow' (Gk. ἔλενη, Goth. aleina, 'a cubit,' 'ell,' O. Ir. uile, uileann ēn, W. elin, O. Engl. eln, Engl. ell, el-bow) is Lat. ūna for rī(ī)na. As with ē (varying with ē) we find ŏ (varying with ŏ) in the Perfect-stem, in nouns derived from Verb-stems, &c., e. g. Gk. ὀν-tω-α, ὤψ.

§ 60. ū and ū. I.-Eur. *nū, 'now,' from the root neu- of *newo-, 'new' (O. Ind. nū, Adv. and Particle, nūmām, Gk. νῦ, νῦ, O. Ir. nō and nū, a Verbal Part, often used with the Present Tense, e. g. nō chanim, 'I am singing,' Goth. nū, O. Engl. nū, Germ. nun and sometimes nu, Lith. nū-gi, O. Sl. ny-ně), Lat. nu-duis tertius the day before yesterday, lit. 'now the third day,' 'now the third day,' -num in etiam-num, &c. (Gk. τρι-μν, nūm-; I.-Eur. īū- from the root leu-, 'to lose' [Gk. θυάλωνδε, about the time of loosing the oxen from the plough, towards midday (Class. Rev. ii. 260; Schulze, Quaest. Ep. p. 321), and λέτος], Lat. so-lētus ; I.-Eur. sū-, 'a sow' (O. Ind. sū-karā-, Gk. δί, O. Engl. sū), Lat. sūs and sū-ercēdae, 'stercus suillum' (Fest. 432. 8 Th.; cf. Paul. Fest. 433. 2 Th.; Non. 175. 14 M.) (W. hw-ch, Goth. sw-ein, O. Engl. sw-in; I.-Eur. tū, the accented and the unaccented form of the 2nd Personal Pronoun (Gk. το-νη and σο, &c.), Lat. tū (on tū-quitem, see ch. iii. § 51); I.-Eur. pū, 'to rot' (Gk. πυόω, Goth. fūls ist, 'he stinketh,' O. Fr. pou, O. Fr. foul, Lith. pūtis; Gk. πυός for *πυος), Lat. pūteo and pūter; I.-Eur. ἀττι-, 'skin' (Gk. ἄγ-ωρρίν and O. Engl. hyd, Engl. hide, O. H. G. hūt, Germ. Haut), Lat. cūlis. But usually the alternation of ā with ū in Latin is the alternation of I.-Eur. ou, ou with ū, e. g. dūce and dūx, fūgi and
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fugio (see § 23). The ü-grade of eu-roots and the i-grade of ei-roots are frequent before certain suffixes, especially the TO-suffix (ch. v. § 28), e.g. I.-Eur. *ľū-to- (Lat. so-tūtus, Hom. bou-lītūv-δε), though the ü-grade and i-grade are most common in the P. P., e.g. Gk. Λή-τάς (δή) (cf. defrätum, must boiled down, Plaut. Pseud. 744, Mar. Vict. 24. 15 K. in defruto apieceh secundae syllabae imponere debitis, nam a defervendo et decoquendo fit tale; but defrätum Virg. G. iv. 262). [See Osthoff's list of forms with i, ü in Morph. Unters. vol. iv., such as Lat. fī-mus (I.-Eur. *dhu-mo-, O. Ind. dhu-má-), sītus (Gk. νεο-κάττωρος, O. Ind. syū-tá-), pū-rus, &c.]

§ 61. ē and à. Cognate with O. Ind. asān-, Lettish asins, 'blood,' is an O. Lat. word aser, blood, with a derivative aseratum, a mixture of wine and blood (Paul. Fest. 12. 19 Th. assaratum apud antiquos diecubatur genus quoddam potionis ex vino et sanguine tempore, quod Latini prisci sanguinem 'assyr' vocarent; Gl. Philox. 23. 56 G. aser: āmu) which appears with an e-sound in Greek (ἐὰπ in the Cretan dialect, μέκαν ἐἀπ Callimachus). Another Old Latin word sacena, a priest's knife or axe, whose byform sacena recalls the Irish word for a knife, scian (stem scēnā-) (Fest. 466. 16 Th. scena ab alis; a quibusdam 'sacena' appellatur, dolabra pontificalis; id. 488. 33 Th. scenam genus [fuisse ferri] manifestum est, sed utrum securing an dolabra sit, ambiguitur, quam Cincius in libro qui est de verbis priscis, dolaram ait esse pontificiam. Livius in Lydō:

corruit quasi ictus scēna, haut multō seceus)

may be, like another word for a priest's knife, secespita (Fest. 522. 4 Th.; Paul. Fest. 523. 3 Th. dicta autem est secespita a secano; 'Serv.' ad Aen. iv. 262) derived from seco, to cut. O. H. Germ. sahs, O. Engl. seoxt Neut., 'a knife,' suggest connexion with Lat. sacum. Lat. aries, Gk. ἐρ-φος, is in Lithuanian ėras, 'a lamb,' with ē, and has in Umbrian some e-sound, eretu Acc., so that it has been suggested that Lat. ā, Gk. ē (but see § 51 on κεκάδωντο with ē from root κή-), may be weak grades of an ē-root; and the same explanation might be given of aser and sacena. In several cases of Lat. ā, Gk. ē we have a Gk. byform with ὅ, e.g. Lat. pacte, πανδο, Gk. πετάνυμι and πετήμα; Lat. quattuor (Osc. petora, Umbr. petur-), Dor. Gk. τέτορες, Αεολ. πέυσπες and Hom. πέυσπες; Lat. legis, Gk. λέμαρ, and in Hesych λέφ... πέρα. Other examples are: Lat. gradior, and pressus (O. Sl. gréqda, 'I come,' O. Ir. ingrennm, 'I pursue,' from root grend-, Goth. grip, 'a step'); Lat. magnus (cf. mägis, mäjor, ch. ii. § 55), Gk. μέγας (Goth. mikils, Arm. mec); Lat. nancis-cop, nactus, Gk. ἕνεκαν (Lith. nėštzi, 'to carry,' O. Sl. nesti, O. Ir. conicim, 'I am able'); Lat. labrum, labrum (by analogy of lambda ?), O. Engl. lippa from root leb- (?); Lat. glacies and gelu; Lat. almus, Lith. ėlsnis, O. Sl. jellicha, O. H. G. elira and erila, Germ. Erle). Paricio (cf. frequens) shows ār (cf. confer(č)tas), perhaps by metathesis (like Gk. φαρτός beside φακτός) (but see § 92).

§ 62. ōu-āu. Another example of *āus-, the weak grade of the I.-Eur. stem *ous-, 'mouth,' is aureae, whence, by composition with ago, auriga (Paul. Fest. 6. 27 Th. 'aureax' : auriga, 'aureas' enim diecebant fremum, quod ad aures equorum religabatur; 'ōrias' quò ore cohorscebatur, with an absurd reference to auris, ear), a byform of āreae (Fest. 202. 23 Th. ' oreae': freni quod ori inseruntur... Naevius in Hariolo:

deprándi autem leóni si obdas āreas,
like our proverb ‘to beard a lion’); *austium (C. I. L. i. 1463) (O. Pruss. austin, ‘mouth,’ O. Ind. ñrtha, ‘lip’), a byform of õstium (Lith. õsta, ‘mouth of river,’ Lett. õsta, ‘harbour’). (Schmidt, Pharalb. p. 221.)

Y, W.

§ 63. Y. I.-Eur. initial y is represented in Greek sometimes by the rough breathing, e.g. ῥάκ-ωθος, from I.-Eur. *yũwûk-, sometimes by ζ, e.g. ζυγόν (I.-Eur. *yũgo-), the same letter as we find used for an initial y- or yy-sound which has developed from an original dy-, e.g. Zêbs (I.-Eur. *Dyẽ-.). But in Latin both these kinds of I.-Eur. y are represented by j, as we write the letter, but, as the Romans wrote it, i, e.g. jũvene-us, jũgum. The question whether this j was pronounced like a consonantal spirant (γ), or like the half-vowel iy, is discussed in ch. ii. § 48. In the middle of a word it is often difficult to say whether the original form of the sound, the ‘Indo-European form,’ as we call it, is more correctly expressed by the spirant y, or by the vowel i (or iy, ii, øy, &c.). This would no doubt often depend upon the preceding consonant or consonant-group. The I.-Eur. word for ‘middle,’ for example, we write *mēdhyo- (cf. O. Ind. médhya-, Gk. μέδσ(σ)ος, Goth. midgis, O. Sl. mežda, ‘the middle’); the word for ‘paternal,’ *patryo- or *patriyo- (*patrîyo-, *patrayo-) (cf. O. Ind. píтриya-, Gk. πατριός). In Latin, this suffix -yo-, -io- appears as -io-, mēdius, pātrius, though a word like sócius gives us a clue that -yo- may often have been the original form. For in this word the qu of the root seq², ‘to follow, accompany’ (Lat. sequor), has become c in the derivative with this suffix, and with the o-grade of the root; and this would not have happened unless q² (Lat. qu) had preceded a consonant (§ 116) (cf. Gk. ἄ-οσητηρ from *óσσο- for *soq²yo-); so that the word originally socyo- has become in time a trisyllable, *socio-.

At a later period, owing to that wave of Syncope which, as we saw, passed over Late and Vulgar Latin, this Adjectiv-ending -ius, and similar dissyllabic endings, were reduced to single syllables, the i (now become y) merging itself in the preceding consonant and giving it a palatal character, e.g. Titius became *Tityns, and then something like *Titis; the i ‘lost
itself in a sibilant sound,' as a fifth-century grammarian puts it (perdit sonum sumum et accipit sibilum; see ch. ii. § 90; also § 151).

It is this palatalization of a consonant before an i, reduced to y, which has made many Romance words, especially French, so unlike their Latin originals, e.g. Fr. bras from Lat. braccium, through *braccy-; nièce from neptia, through *netty-; ache from ἀπίωµ, through *apīy-; rage from rābies, rābia, through *raby-; singe from simia, through *simy- (see ch. iii. § 13). The history of the suffix -yo- in Latin is very like that of the suffix -lo-. After a consonant both developed a parasitic vowel; *soc-yo- became *soc-īyo-, socius, as *oc-lo- (from root oqii-) became *oc-olo-, oculus; and this vowel was in both cases absorbed by syncope at a later period, *soc-yus, *octus (whence the Romance forms, e.g. Ital. occhio). Between vowels y was dropped in Latin, e.g. I.-Eur. *eyā-, the Fem. of the Demonstrative (Goth. ija Acc.) is Latin ea (so in Umbro-Osc., Umbr. eo, ea, Osc. ù, io; von Planta, i. p. 175). Causative Verbs, which ended in I.-Eur. in -eyō (e.g. O. Ind. mānāyā-mi from root man-, the I.-Eur. root men-; Gk. φοβεω from root φεβ-, end in Latin in -eō, e.g. moneo, I remind, 'cause to remember,' from root men-of mēmīni for *me-men-i, I remember. On the weakening of -yē- to y in I.-Eur. and in Latin (e.g. ab-icio), see § 51, p. 256.

The intervocalic ĵ (y) which we find in major, aio, &c. (pronounced 'māyyor,' 'āyyo,' ch. ii. § 55), has arisen through suppression (or assimilation) of h (for I.-Eur. ĥh) before y. In the first syllable y is not found after any consonant in Latin, except d, and that only in the older period, e.g. O. Lat. Diovem, classical Jovem (from dyēu-, O. Ind. Dyāús, Gk. Ζύς, while Lat. diēs shows a system *diēu-, O. Ind. Diyāús), though how far this ĵ (y) of Jovem (for yy-, I.-Eur. dy-, Gk. ζ-) differed at any time in pronunciation from the j of juvenis (I.-Eur. y-: Gk. '--) and from the j of jugum (I.-Eur. y-, Gk. ζ-), we cannot say. All these have developed to the same sound in the Romance languages, e.g. Ital. Giove, giovane, giogo (with the sound of our j or -dge in 'judge').

The Oscan orthography shows both ii and i for intervocalic i (y), though the paucity of the remains of the language makes it impossible to determine how far this was arbitrary or reflected
the actual pronunciation, e.g. diuviá *diviae, mefiai *mediae; heriaid is 3 Sg. Pres. Subj. of the verb and heriam Acc. Sg. of the noun derived from her-, ‘to wish’ (I.-Eur. ἕχερ-). The presence of the y-sound is indicated by the doubling of a preceding consonant after the accentuated vowel, e.g. medikkaí *med- diciae’ Dat. Sg., Στατιτις ‘Statii’ Gen. Sg., Petitio-, &c. In the Ocean dialect of Bantia this y-sound is merged in the preceding consonant, e.g. Bausae ‘Bantiae,’ allo ‘alia’ (see von Planta, i. p. 165). [Cf. Pel. ἃ (ch. ii. § 51), written s in Musea.]

§ 64. I.-Eur. initial y. I.-Eur. *yūwŋko- (O. Ind. yuvaśá-, Gk. ῥάκ-ϑος, O. Ir. ōc, Welsh ieuanc, Gaul. Jovineillus, Goth. juggs for *juvunga-, O. Engl. geeng), Lat. jūvencus, with its cognates jūvēnis (O. Ind. yuvān-), jūvēnta (Goth. junda, Engl. youth), &c.; I.-Eur. *yūgo-, (O. Ind. yugām, Gk. ἱὐγόν, Goth. yug, Engl. yoke, O. Sl. igo for *yīgo, *yūgo), Lat. jūgum, from the root yug-, ‘to join’ (O. Ind. yuj, Gk. κυγμυ, Lith. jūgiu, *I yoke’), Lat. jōgo; I.-Eur. *yūs- (O. Ind. yūśa-, Gk. ζύ-μη for *ζο-μη, leaven, Lith. jūsē), Lat. jus, broth, while Lat. jīs, law, other jŏs, is I.-Eur. *yēus- (O. Ind. yōs, ‘welfare’); I.-Eur. yā-, ‘to go,’ formed by adding the suffix ā to i-, the weak grade of the root ei-, ‘to go’ (O. Ind. yā-, ‘to go,’ Lith. jētē, ‘to ride,’ O. Sl. jad) appears in Lat. ē-ncus, a door, Jānovius. (On the tendency to give Latin a after initial j the open e-sound, whence Vulg. Lat. *Jēnovius, see ch. ii. § 1.)

Similarly Lat. jēus with I.-Eur. yō- (cf. Lith. jūkas, ‘ridicule,’ with I.-Eur. yō-, B. B. xviii. 255) (cf. § 59 above). On rēn (Plaut.; cf. rēn) and rēn, see Prisc. i. 149. 7 H. On Vulg. Lat. qu(i)ēmus, ch. ii. § 151, and cf. ch. iii. § 11 on par(i)ēs.

§ 65. I.-Eur. y preceded by a consonant. (1) In the first syllable:—This y has been dropped in the Latin derivatives from I.-Eur. roots like syū-, ‘to sew’ (O. Ind. syū-, Gk. κα-σύν-, a compound with καρ(ά), Goth. sijukan, O. Engl. seowian, Lith. siūti, O. Sl. šiti), Lat. suō; *gyhēs-, ‘yesterday’ (O. Ind. hyās, Gk. χήθες; cf. Goth. gistra-dagis), Lat. hērē, with Adj. hēster-nus; though it is possible that there were sometimes I.-Eur. byforms without y (cf. O. Ind. sū-tra-, ‘thread,’ also used, in the sense of ‘clue,’ for ritual and grammatical text-books, the Sutras). So Lat. sūno (Gk. πτῆς, Lith. spiuju, O. Sl. pljuju, &c.). There is a similar doubt about dy-. It may have lost the dental at a very early period, for we have Iōves (‘Jovios’?) on the ancient Dvenos inscription, and it is not possible to prove that the form Diovem had gone out of use by the time that the form Dīvem came in (cf. Dionem, C. I. L. i. 57, Iouei, i. 56, both on old Prænestine mirrors). Diovem may quite well have come from a byform *diyēw-, as O. Lat. sīs from *sīyēs (O. Ind. sīyās), a byform of *syēs (O. Ind. syās) and have been discarded in course of time for the other ‘doublet’ *dyēw- Dīvem.

(2) In other syllables:—Y after a consonant in other syllables than the first became vocalic in Latin. Thus after p we find y becoming τ in Greek in verbs formed with the suffix -yo- (-iyo-), e.g. τιν-τῳ for *τυν-γω, χαλεν-τῳ for *χαλεν-γω; but in Latin these verbs appear with -pio, e.g. capio, sīpio; after n we find y producing epenthesis in Greek, e.g. βαύνω for *γαύν-γω, root γαυ-, but not in Latin, e.g. vēnīo. But -ghy-, as has been mentioned, became hy.
then y or rather yy, e.g. āio, pronounced *ayyo, and often written aiiio (ch. i. § 7), from āgh-, 'to say.'

§ 66. I.-Eur. y between vowels. The Nom. Pl. of I-stems shows I.-Eur. *ēyes, e.g. I.-Eur. *treyes from the stem *trī-, *three' (O. Ind. trāyas), *ghosteyes from the stem *ghostī, 'a stranger' (O. Sl. gostije), in Latin -ēs for *ē-es, e.g. trēs, hostēs. In the words āhēmus, ahēneus the letter ĕ indicates the hiatus caused by the dropping of y of I.-Eur. *ēyes-, *metal,' *ayes-no-, 'made of metal' (O. Ind. āyas-), like h in the Umbrian stahā for *stā-yo, 'I stand' (Lat. stō). Like Lat. stō for *stā-yo (Lith. pa-stō-ju), are fleo for *fe-ro (O. Sl. blē-ja), neo for *mē-yo, &c., where the similar vowels e and o are blended into one sound, but the dissimilar, e and o, remain in hiatus. Similarly Lat. forma for *formā-ye, from forma (stem *formā-), and other 1st Conj. verbs from 1st Decl. nouns, like Gk. τιμάω, for τιμά-ω, *tumā-yo, from τύμη, Dor. τιμά (stem τιμά-).

§ 67. Latin j. Any j which has been developed by the phonetic changes of the language is treated in much the same way as I.-Eur. y. Thus the group sj- (sy-) has been produced by the union under one accent of the two words si audēs. The j (y) is dropped, like I.-Eur. y in suo, in the form sīdēs, a form which seems to have come into use in the period between Plautus and Terence. For Plautus has the full sī audēs, e.g. Pnon. 757 mitte ād me, si audēs, hōdie Adelphāsiūm tuam, but Terence the shortened form, e.g. Andr. 85 die, sodes. Internal j (y) after a consonant becomes vocalic in nunca-tam (3 syll. Plaut.), and between two vowels disappears in bīgae for *bi-jīgae from bi- and jugum. On abjicio, abjicio, abicio see ch. iii. § 18, ch. ii. § 48, ch. i. § 7.

§ 68. W. I.-Eur. initial w is represented in Latin by the sound which we write v, and which the Romans wrote u. (On the spelling and on the pronunciation of the letter, see ch. ii. § 48), e.g. I.-Eur. *weghō, 'I carry' (O. Ind. vāhā-mi, Gk. ἐχω, Pamph. ἐχω, O. Ir. fēn for *fegn, 'a waggon,' W. gwain, Goth. ga-viga, Germ. be-wege), Lat. vēhō. The suffix wo- after a consonant was perhaps, like the suffix yo- (§ 63), vocalic in early Latin, e.g. furvus for early *fusuros (§ 148; cf. fus-cus), Minerva, a quadrisyllable in Plautus (Bacch. 893); though Syncope, like that which reduced Titius, &c. to *Tityus, reduced ārum, lārna, mīlēus (all trisyllabic in Plautus) to arvum, larva, milvus. Between vowels v remains, e.g. āvis, āvis; but in the unaccented syllable we find u for āv, ēv, ĝv, e.g. dēnuo for de novo (see ch. iii. § 24), and before the accent v is often dropped, e.g. seorsum (and sorsum) for sévorsum, especially between similar vowels, e.g. O. Lat. dī(v)īnus, lā(v)ābrum (see ch. ii. § 53). After a consonant in the initial syllable, w is dropped in pīus for *pw-įyo- (?) from the same root as pūrūs, but remains (like y) after d, e.g. O. Lat. duōnus, Duēnos, duellum; though at the beginning of the literary period this dv- passed into b-, e.g. bōnus, bēnē, bellum. Side by side with dissyllabic duōnus, duellum
we find trisyllabic duonnes, duellum, just as in I.-Eur. we have duw- and dw- in the words for ‘two’ (O. Ind. důvá, and dvá, Gk. δύω and *δ(ϝ)Increase, Lat. duo and bīs), ‘dog’ (O. Ind. śuván- and śván-, Gk. κύων and Lith. szū). And side by side with I.-Eur. *twoi, the Locative case of the 2nd Pers. Pron. Sg. we have the unaccented form *toī (O. Ind. tvé and tē, Gk. σοί and τοι), so that it is often difficult to say when the I.-Eur. form has dropped w, when it has w, and when it has uw (ow), and to determine when the w has been dropped in the ‘I.-Eur. period’ and when in the ‘Latin period.’ An é has been turned into ō through the influence of a preceding w in the group swē-, e. g. sōror (I.-Eur. *swēsor-), sōcer (I.-Eur. *swēkūro-), &c. (see § 10). Before a consonant (l, r) I.-Eur. w is dropped in Latin, e. g. rālix for *wrād- (cf. Goth. vaurs, Engl. wort). On the weakening of unaccented wē to ō in I.-Eur., e. g. *pērūt(i) (O. Ind. parut, Gk. πέρυσι) from the root wēt- (Gk. Féros, a year, Lat. vētus), and in Latin, e. g. con-cūtio for *-quotio, see § 51, and on ferbui for fervui, ch. ii. § 52.

Latin v often represents I.-Eur. g̩, ḡ̱ (see §§ 139, 143), both initial, e. g. ṭēnio for *g̩em̱yō from the root g̩em- (Gk. χαινω, O. Ind. gam-, Goth. gima, Engl. come), and between vowels, e. g. niv-em Acc. for *nighm (Gk. νίφα Acc., W. nyf) from the root sneig̩- (e. g. O. Ir. snecha, Goth. snaivs, Lith. snaigytį, ‘to snow,’ O. Sl. snēgǔ, ‘snow’).

In Umbro-Osc. there are separate symbols in the native alphabets for the consonantal and for the vocalic U-sound (written in our transcription v and u respectively). The rules for the use of uv and v in Umbr. have not yet been determined; we have arvia and (once) aruvia, vatua (never *vatva), &c. (see von Planta, i. p. 180).

§ 69. I.-Eur. initial w. The I.-Eur. root weid-, ‘to know, to see’ (O. Ind. vēda, Arm. gitem, Gk. ἑοῖς, O. Ir. sādam, Goth vait, O. Engl. wēt, Engl. wot, O. Sl. viděti, ‘to see,’ vēděti, ‘to know’) appears in Lat. video; the I.-Eur. *weīk- (O. Ind. viš-, vēš-, Gk. ἕκος, Goth. veis, O. Sl. vīš), in Latin vicus; the conjunction *wē, ‘or’ (O. Ind. vā, Gk. ἕ-(F)ē), Lat. -ē; the root wert-, ‘to turn’ (O. Ind. vart-, Goth. vairja, Engl. ‘woe worth the day,’ W. gwerthyd, ‘a spindle,’ Lith. varta, O. Sl. vratiti Inf.) in Lat. verbo. Similarly Lat. vīcō, vītis (O. Ind. vi-, Lith. vytī, O. Sl. viti, Ir. feith, ‘woodbine,’ W. gwydd-fid); Lat. vēlīs, with u for in (§ 73), (Goth. valla, Engl. wool, Lith. vilnos, O. Sl. věna); Lat. vērus (O. Ir. fr, W. gwir, Goth. tuz-vērjan, ‘to doubt,’ O. Eng. wēr, ‘true,’ Germ. wahr; cf. Lith. vērā, ‘faith,’ O. Sl. věra); Lat. vespa (O. Eng. wesp and
§ 70. L.-Eur. w (and Latin v) between vowels. L.-Eur. *gwiwo-, ‘alive’ (O. Ind. jiva-, W. byw, O. Ir. biu, Goth. qius, O. Engl. cwicu- (with -c-developed before u'), Engl. quick, Lith. gyvas, O. Sl. živu) is Lat. virus; L.-Eur. *něwo-, ‘new’ (O. Ind. náva-, Gk. νέος (O. Sl. noví)) is Lat. něvus; L.-Eur. *něvnu, ‘nine’ (O. Ind. náva, Gk. ἐννεά, O. Ir. nóí, W. naw, Goth. niun) is Lat. něvum; L.-Eur. *ywũk̂-o-, (O. Ind. yuvaša-, Gk. ὑπαντα,) Lat. stātuanc is Lat. stātus. Similarly Lat. clāvis (Gk. κλῆς) and Lat. dēvir, better vocēir, brother-in-law (O. Ind. dēvār-, Arm. taigr, Gk. δαήψ from *dāufes; Lat. dēvum (Gk. αἰις, Goth. aïvs, O. Engl. in); Lat. laevus (Gk. λαύς, O. Sl. lai). The question of the change of the ending -vos to -vus and -us is a difficult one. The most natural explanation of the change of deiros to deus (the form in ordinary use as early as Plautus) is that given in § 33 (through *de(f)us), which takes for granted that -vos became -vus when -os became -us (§ 17) [cf. Flaus on a coin of 300-150 B.C (C. I. L. i. 277), Graecus, bowm, cown and cohun (§ 19),], and seems to conflict with the fact that the spelling -vo- (with -quo-, -guo-) is retained to the end of the Republic. But it is by no means clear that the spelling vo did not represent the sound vu, the spelling vo being preferred to vv, because this last might be confused with the sound u (ch. i. § 9) or ur. Velius Longus (first cent. A. D.) expressly asserts this (58. 4 K.): a plerisque superiorum ‘primitivus’ et ‘adoptivus’ et ‘nominativus’ per v et o scripta sunt, scilicet quia seabeant vocales inter se ita confundì non posse ut unam syllabam [non] faciant, apparetque eos hoc genus nominum aliter scripsisse, aliter enuntiasse. Nam cum per o scriberent, per u tamen enuntiabant. The tendency to re-insert the v from other cases and cognate words, divo, diēros, dīva, &c., would interfere from time to time with the natural development of the sound. (Cf. § 67 on abjicio, abjiicio and abijicio.) On Republican inscr. we find v in iuentia (C. I. L. i. 1202), &c., where vv (uv) is the orthography of the Augustan age, but that this always represents the pronunciation (as in fācu(v)us also written fāquius; vēsu(v)us, cf. Galen x. 364) is unlikely. [For examples of the spellings vo, vv, v (vo, vu, uv, u), and for a fuller discussion of the treatment of intervocalic v in Latin, see Solmsen, Stud. Lant. sect. iii.] The process of Syncope affected at various periods intervocalic v in different ways. Under the early Augustan Law *āvī-spex was reduced to anuspe (cf. au-ceps), *ēvīta (Lith. gywatà; cf. Gk. βιτί) to viat, &c.; under the Paenultima Law *āvidēre became audere, &c.; in the period of the Early Literature aeītus became aeōs, ēvidus became ēdus, praeclēs became praeda, &c.; while four-syllabled words with the first, second, and third syllables short, which were in the second cent. B.C. still accented on the first syllable (ch. iii. § 8), may have suffered Syncope within the literary period or at a much earlier time, e.g. Autius from Autiōs (C. I. L. i. 83, Præneste). (On the loss of -v-through Syncope see ch. iii. § 16. 9.)

§ 71. L.-Eur. w after a consonant. (1) In the first syllable:—Latin stĕrĭus (Goth. swērs, ‘honourable’; Germ. schwer, ‘heavy’) is from the root swe-, ‘to weigh’ (Lith. svefti); for Latin si we have in Oscan saí, in Umbr. sve; Latin stātus is connected with Lith. svideti, ‘to shine’; Lat. stātūbro, to fumigate, with Gk. βδο, from L.-Eur. *thw-iyê. But swā- is Lat. swā- in suavis (a trisyllabic in Vulg. Lat., cf. Ital. soave; Servius ad Aen. i. 357 says that many persons in his day made suādet a trisyllable). Lat. ās-, apart, asunder, seems
to be I.-Eur. *dīs-, a byform of *dwis (Lat. bis, O. Lat. duis), as I.-Eur. *toi (unaccented) was a byform of *towi (accented), though some regard Lat. dīs as the direct descendant of I.-Eur. *dwis, and O. Lat. duis (class. bis) as the descendant of I.-Eur. *dūwis. Sātvium, a kiss, seems to represent *s(u)ātivium.

On sos, &c. for suos, &c., see ch. vii. § 12.

(2) In other syllables:—Internal -dio- becomes -v- in suavis for *suad-vis; *derciosus, later deriviosus (see ch. ii. § 52), for *der-dercios-so- (O. Ind. dardū; cf. Engl. etter). Vītūus does not show I.-Eur. -dhw-, but -dhēw-, for it represents I.-Eur. *wīdhēwo- (O. Ind. vidhāva-, Gk. ἴ(F)ιδέ(Γ)ος, O. Sl. vidova, 'widow.') Postconsonantal u, later v, is in Vulgar and Late Latin dropped before the accent in Jan(v)arius, Febr(v)arius, balt(v)ere, cons(v)ere, quatt(v)ordecim, continv(ari), whence Ital. Gennajo, Febbrajo, quattordici, &c. (see ch. ii. § 54), like v between vowels before the accent (see above). The suffix -uo remains dissyllabic in the classical form of words like mortuos (O. Sl. mritvū). So quattuor (O. Ind. catvāras, Lith. ketveri, O. Sl. četvero); tēnvis (O. Ind. tanvī F.), gēnua (Zend. zanva, Lsb. Gk. γέννα for *γορφα\), though tenvia, genova are found in classical poetry, and in the first cent. A.D. tenvis is declared to have wavered between a dissyllable and a trisyllable (Caesellius ap. Cassiod. vii. 205 K.). Late-Lat. mortus, &c. (ch. ii. § 48) became mortus, &c. (Ital. morto), as rīvus, &c., rīus.

dw-, duw-. Duellius (Duell-?), consul of 260 B.C., was the first to change his name to Bellius (Cic. Orat. lv. 153; cf. Quint. i. 4. 15); duonos seems to be a trisyllable in the Saturnian fragments (cf. ch. ii. § 141 n), viz. C.I.L. i. 32; duonōro ēptum ro floe uiro, and Naevius (?) ap. Fest. 532. 22 Th.: simul dūona córum pōrant ad nāuis, duellum to be a dissyllable (Aem. Lepidus' inscr. ap. Caes. Bass. 265. 25 K.: duelio magnō dirimēndo, régibus subigēndīs), as it always is in Plautus (e. g. Amph. 189; extincto duello máxumo), whereas Ennius has (A. 168 M.): pars occidit illa duellis, a scansion imitated by later poets. (On O. Lat. duis, duī- for bis, bi- see ch. vi. § 59; on duī- in glosses, see Löwe, Prodr. p. 363, and add Duellona, C. G. L. ii. 56. 34.)

§ 72. I.-Eur. w before a consonant. Lat. lūquo, lūquor stand for *wliq- (O. Ir. liuch, 'wet'); Lat. répens may be a Pres. Part. of I.-Eur. wrōp- (Gk. ἰπναω, to fall; cf. Lith. virpēti, 'to tremble') (but see ch. viii. § 18).

§ 73. M, N. In Sanscrit various kinds of nasals are distinguished in writing. The palatal n (made palatal by the preceding j) of yajñā-, 'worship' (Gk. ἀγνός, holy) is written differently from the cerebral n (made cerebral by the preceding p) of mṛṇāmi, 'I crush, annihilate' (Gk. μάρναμαί, Mid.). And in Greek, owing to the fact that γ before v of γάνομαι, &c. had come to take the sound of the Agma (see ch. ii. § 63), *γνυνομαι (cf. Dor. γίνομαι), γ was used to express the guttural nasal, e.g. ἀγκυρα, ἔγγυς, though in inscriptions we often find ἀνκυρα, ἐγγύς. But in Latin we have only the symbols m, n (see ch. ii. § 63, and on their pronunciation, ch. ii. § 61). Before a consonant, though sometimes omitted on inscriptions, they were not dropped in correct speech. Līgūla, spoon (cf. O. Ir. liag, W. llwy), is not the
same word as lingüla, strap; *nēpe in Plautus should be corrected to nemp(e). (For other instances, see Skutsch, Forsch. i. § 2.)

M. I.-Eur. m is Latin m, whether initial, e.g. I.-Eur. *mätter-(O. Ind. mätár-, Arm. mair, Dor. Gk. ματήρ, O. Ind. māthir, O. H. G. muoter, O. Engl. mōðor, Lith. motė, 'wife,' O. Sl. mati), Lat. māter, or internal, e.g. from I.-Eur. root wem- (O. Ind. vām-, Gk. (ὄ)ματον, Lith. vemałai, Pl.), Lat. vômo; I.-Eur. *termen- (O. Ind. tárman-, Gk. ταρμόν), Lat. termō, terminus; I.-Eur. rump-, 'to break' (O. Ind. lumpāmī), Lat. rumpo, or final, e.g. I.-Eur. -m of the Acc. Sg., as in I.-Eur. *tōm (O. Ind. tām, Gk. τῶν, Goth. ūan-a, Lith. tā, O. Sl. tū), O. Lat. is-tom, class. Lat. is-tum. Before y (i), t, s, d, c we find n in quōniam (for quom jam, and originally used in a temporal sense 'when now,' 'now that,' ch. x. § 13), quam-sei, C. I. L. i. 200. 27 (on quāsi, see ch. x. § II), altrin-secus, centum from I.-Eur. *kmtom (Lith. szūnitas), septen-triōnes (lit. 'the seven oxen,' according to Aelius Stilo and Varro, who regarded the -trio not as a mere termination, but as a rustic word for an ox, Gell. ii. 21), septen-décim, nunc (from num, now, which survives in etiamnam in a temporal sense, but usually has the interrogative sense of 'now,' as in our 'now is this the case?' 'now is that true?,' where 'now' has something of the dubitative significance of Lat. num), princeps for *prim(i)-ceps; though a traditional spelling is often used, e.g. numcūbi, quamūs, O. Lat. quamde, than, &c. (see ch. ii. § 61). A p is inserted to facilitate the pronunciation of these groups in sumptus, sumpsi for sumtus, sumsi, exemplum for *exemplum, &c. I.-Eur. mr is Latin br in hibernus from *hibrēno- (§ 13), (Gk. χειμερέως), but initial mr probably became in Latin fr. On the loss of final -um by elision in sed from older sedum, nihil from nihilum, &c., see ch. iii. § 52.

Latin m represents an original n before a labial, &c., e.g. impello for iltello, an original labial before ṅ, e.g. scamnum from the root skabh-, 'to support,' with Diminutive scabellum. It is sometimes lost in a consonant-group, e.g. forceps for *form(i)-ceps, from formus, warm.

I.-Eur. m is Umbro-Osc. m, e.g. Umbr. matrer, Osc. maatreis 'matris.' Final -m is usually dropped in Umbrian (see von Planta, i. pp. 301, 570).
The Latin Language.

§ 74. I.-Eur. m; other examples. I.-Eur. *mēdhyo- (O. Ind. mādhya-, Gk. μέθυς), Ir. medón, 'the middle,' Goth. midjís, O. Sl. měţda, 'the middle') is Lat. mēdīus; I.-Eur. root men-, 'to think' (O. Ind. man-, máman-, 'thought,' O. Ir. men-me, 'thought,' O. H. G. minna, 'remembrance,' Lith. menų, 'I remember') appears in Lat. mēmīni for *me-men-i, mens, &c. Similarly Lat. mē (O. Ind. mām, Gk. μη, Ir. mi, Goth. mi-k); Lat. sēmi- (O. Ind. sāmi-, Gk. ἴμμ-); Lat. hēmo (Goth. guma, Engl. groom, bride-groom); Lat. cum, con-, with (O. Ir. com); Lat. mors, mortis (O. Ind. nūrti-, Lith. mirtis, O. Sl. sū-mriti; cf. Goth. maurýr, 'murder'); Lat. fāmus (O. Ind. dhūmā-, Lith. dūmai, Pl. O. Sl. dymū).

§ 75. n for m. Lat. con-tra from com; quon-dam from quom; vēnun-dō, class. vēndo, from vēno-, sale (cf. Gk. ἕρος), lit. 'to put or make sale,' like vēnum eo, class. vēnus, lit. 'to go to sale' (cf. pessum do, to ruin, and pessum eo, to be ruined). On the spellings damdum, damdam (C. I. L. i. 206. 17. 49) &c. see ch. ii. § 64.

§ 76. I.-Eur. ms. In Lat. tēmēbrae (Plur., like O. Ind. tāmāśi, Russ. sumerki) from the I.-Eur. root tem- (Lith. tümį, 'to grow dark,' Ir. tem, 'dark,' temel, 'darkness') the n seems to be due to the influence of s, for O. Ind. tāmisā, O. H. G. dinstar, Germ. finster, show that *temēsra- or *temsra- was the old form of the stem in Latin. The m remains in tēmēbra Loc., 'in the dark' (cf. ix. § 5) (cf. O. Ind. tāmas- from I.-Eur. *tēmes-, 'darkness,' and Germ. Dämmerung). Another example of I.-Eur. -ms- (mes-?) is Lat. āmērus (Umb. onso-, O. Ind. аša, Arm. us, Gk. ἀγός, Goth. ams), and perhaps Lat. numerus (cf. Numisius, O. Lat. Numasio-, Oscan Nimisio-); and another example of -msr- is Lat. membrum for *mens-ro- (cf. Goth. mīm, 'flesh,' O. Sl. mešo; also Gk. μῆρος for μερός, the thigh, O. Ind. māsā-, 'flesh,' Arm. mis.) The fiveness and the contrariety of these instances make it difficult to decide how I.-Eur. -ms- was treated in Latin. Latin -ms- became ns, e. g. con-sentio, con-silīo, &c., from com-, where the m might be regarded as the final letter of a separate word, but mps, e. g. sumpsi, dempsi, where the m could not be so regarded. (On the spellings sumpsi, sumsi, &c., hiems, hiemps, see Brabach, Lat. Orth. p. 248; the Roman grammarians approve of sumpsi, &c., but not of hiemps.)

§ 77. I.-Eur. mr, ml are equally difficult to trace in Latin. They are represented by ἑρ, βλ in Greek when initial, e. g. βρότος, βλάσκο, βλήττω (from μλήτ), by μμρ, μβλ when medial, e. g. ἅμμρος, μμβλακα. In Irish we find initial mr- to be an early spelling, which was changed later to br-, e. g. mraic, 'malt,' later brach, from a stem *mráici-, and similarly ml-, later bl-, e. g. mlchicht, blicht, 'milk.' The Latin fracies, olivesea, seems to be the same as this Irish word mraic, in which case fr- will be the Latin equivalent of I.-Eur. mr- (for other examples, see Osthoff, Morph. Unters. v. 85), and the b of hibernus, täber, a swelling, a truffle (from tūnec, to swell), will be like the b of ruber, &c. (§ 114), for which f is found in other dialects, e. g. Umbr. rufr.- [Ital. tartufo, 'truffle,' lit. 'earth-mushroom,' from terra and tāber, a name borrowed by the Germans in the eighteenth cent. for the potato, Kartoffel, shows that the dialectal form of tāber had f (ch. ii. § 83)]. The long vowel in hibernus, täber might then be explained like the long i of inféro, infringo, &c., (ch. ii. § 144), and the original forms would be *himfrīno-, tūmfro-. On the other hand the analogy of other languages and the connexion of m and b in
Latin would make us expect to find Latin *br* as the equivalent of I.-Eur. initial *mr*. A further difficulty is caused by *génér*, a word which it is hard to dissociate from Gk. γαύμβρός, with *n(e)r* for -*mr*. I.-Eur. medial -*ml-* appears in *exemplum* for *ex-em-lo-*, lit. ‘something taken out,’ with a euphonic *p* inserted, while a vowel seems to have intervened between *m* and *l* in *trénu-lus, tímnlus*, &c. (ch. v. § 21).

§ 78. N. I.-Eur. *n* is in Latin *n*, whether (1) initial, e.g. I.-Eur. *nëwō-, *newio-, ‘new’ (O. Ind. vàva-, návia-, Arm. nor, Gk. νεός, O. Ir. nüe, Gaul. Novios, W. newydd from *noviyo-, Goth. niujis, O. Engl. nöowe, Lith. naūjas, O. Sl. novú), Lat. nōvus, Nóvius, or (2) internal; e.g. the I.-Eur. root *sēn-, ‘old’ (O. Ind. sána-, Arm. hin, Gk. ἑὼν kaí vea, O. Ir. sen, W. hen, Goth. sineigs, sinista Superl., Lith. sēnas) appears in Lat. sēnex, senior, the root *anh-, ‘to choke’ (O. Ind. ãhas-, ‘need,’ Arm. anjuk, ‘narrow,’ Gk. ἁγχω, O. Ir. cum-ung, ‘narrow,’ Goth. aggvus, ‘narrow,’ Engl. anger, Lith. aūksztas, ‘narrow,’ O. Sl. ãzúkú) in Lat. ango, angor, angustus, or (3) final; e.g. the I.-Eur. preposition *ēn* (Gk. ἐν, O. Ir. in, Goth. in, Lith. ė) Lat. ėn, O. Lat. en. Before a labial we find *m*, e.g. impello, immūto. But *nm* seems to have become in Latin *rm*, if *carmen* stands for *can-men, germen* for *gen-men, just as the *nm* which arose at a later time from the syncope of *i* in *ānīma* has become in some Romance languages *rm* (e.g. Prov. anma, alma, and arma, O. Fr. anme, alme, and amne, Catal. arma and alma, Sicil. arma, Milanese armella). Before *l* it was assimilated, e.g. córōlla for *corōn-la, hōnūllus* for *homōn-lus, iliūgo, illex, malluviæ, water for washing the hands, from *man-luvïae* (so before *r* in *irritus*, &c.), and also after *l*, e.g. collis for *col-ni-s* (Lith. kūnas; cf. Gk. κολωνός), vellus (Lith. vilna, O. Sl. vilňa), as in Greek we have λλ for λν in *ελλός*, a fawn (Lith. ėlnis, O. Sl. jelen), &c. In *ulna, &c.* a vowel originally came between *l* and *n* (cf. Gk. ἀλένη). On the pronunciation of *ns* as *ss*, or *s*, with lengthening of the preceding vowel, e.g. *vicerimus* and *vicēsimus* from *vicënsim-ums*, see ch. ii. § 64. So with *uf* (ib.).

I.-Eur. *n* is in Umbro-Osc. *n*, e.g. Umbr. *nerus*, Dat. Pl., Osc. *nerum*, Gen. Pl., from the same root as Gk. ἀνήρ (cf. Nēro). Before mutes and spirants we find *n* often dropped, especially in O. Umbr., e.g. iveka ‘juvencas’ (N. Umbr. ivenga), but in Umbr. of all periods before *s*, e.g. aseriatu and *aseriato, anserianto*; in Oscen before a mute in an unaccented final syllable, e.g. *-et* for...
§ 79. I.-Eur. n; other examples. I.-Eur. *nēw̄n, 'nine' (O. Ind. náva, Gk. ēn-vēa, O. Ir. nōi, W. naw, Goth. niun, O. Engl. nigon, Lith. dewyni, O. Sl. devētī with d- by analogy of the words for ten, just as Vulg. Engl. 'thuppence' takes its u from 'tuppence,' 'two-pence.') Lat. nōvem [for nōven (§ 81): a similar substitution of -m for -n has been found in Subj. faram, (O. Ind. bhārāṇi)]; I.-Eur. *no-, *noū, 'we' (O. Ind. nāu, Gk. νάυ, O. Sl. na; cf. O. Ir. ni), Lat. nō-s; I.-Eur. *nās-, 'the nose' (O. Ind. nāsā Du., Lith. nōsis; cf. O. Engl. nosu), Lat. nāris for *nās-is; I.-Eur. *nāu-, 'ship' (O. Ind. nāu-, Arm. nav, Gk. ναῦς, O. Ir. nau, W. noć, 'a dish, vessel'), Lat. nāvis; I.-Eur. *nēpōt-, 'grandson' (O. Ind. nāpāt-, M. Ir. niaē, niath Gen., W. nai), Lat. nēpōtis, Gen. nepōtis; I.-Eur. nēcīgh-, 'to snow' (Zend. snēzaiti, Gk. νίφα Acc., ἀνθόφορος for *āya-avīfo, O. Ir. snecht, W. nyf, Goth. snaivas, Lith. snaig, Vb., O. Sl. snēgū), Lat. nīx, ningūt; I.-Eur. *gņō-to-, 'known' (O. Ind. jāntā-, Gk. γνωτός, O. Ir. gnāth, 'acustomed'), Lat. nōtus, O. Lat. gnōtis; the I.-Eur. root bhendh-, 'to bind' (O. Ind. bāndhana-, 'binding,' bāndhu, 'a relation,' Gk. πενθέρας, stepfather, πείζαμα, a rope, for *penn-th-ama, Goth. bindan, 'to bind') survives in the religious term, of-fendixces, the knots with which the priest's apex was tied on, an old word wrongly connected by some Roman antiquaries with offendō [Festus 244. 2 Th. offencides ait esse Titius nodus, quibus apex retineatur et remittatur. At Veranius coriola existimat, quae sint in loris apicis, quibus apex retineatur et remittatur, quae ab offendendo dicantur. nam quom ad mentum perventum sit, offendit mentum. Paulus Diaconus, the epitomator of Festus, has been misled by the corruption offendimium for offendit mentum (Paul. 245. 1 Th.): offencides dicebant ligature ae nodus, quibus apex retinebatur. Id cum pervenisset ad mentum, dicebatur 'offendimium;' whence the 'ghost-word' offendimentum has come into our Latin dictionaries; cf. C. C. L. iv. 132. 3 offendix nodus proprius quo apex flaminum retinetur (MS. restinguitur) et remittitur]; I.-Eur. *għans-, 'a goose' (O. Ind. hāṣā-, Lith. žāsis, O. Engl. gōs; cf. Gk. ἥγαν; in Irish the word means a swan, gēis from stem *gēs-, originally *għansi-), Lat. anser, properly hanser.

The instances of a nasal (n or m) being dropped before a consonant in Latin without 'compensation' are illusory: ligula, a spoon, from *lig-ūn, a strap, lit. 'a little tongue,' though the two were sometimes confused, as we learn from Martial's lines on a silver spoon (xiv. 120):

quamvis me ligulam diecant equitesque patresque,
dicor ab indeoctis 'lingula' grammaticis,
(see Friedländer ad loc.); lanterna (from Gk. λαμπτήρ) is the correct spelling (see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s.v.), laterna being probably a corruption due to a fanciful connexion of the word with lātus; tūpānum is Gk. τύπανος, tympa-num, Gk. τύμπανος, &c.

§ 80. nm. How far the theory that *carmen became carmen is supported by the comparison of cancer with O. Ind. karkara-, 'hard,' Gk. καρκίνος, and of crēpus-culum with Gk. κρέφας is doubtful. For the change of r to n in the first of these examples is due to Dissimilation, like the change of l to r in the first syllable of caerules (§ 84), and the second example, if correct, would exhibit
the same change of initial cn- to cr- for facility of pronunciation, as is seen in dialects of Gaelic, e.g. cnu, ‘a nut’ (pronounced cru with nasalized vowel), cno, ‘a hill’ pronounced similarly cr-; in Manx, cronk; gnath (I-Eur. *gnôto-) (pronounced grã with nasalized ã). In Latin, however, I-Eur. cn- and gn- seem to have become n- (§ 119), so that crepus-culum, creper, ‘dark,’ if they represent an earlier cn-, must be dialectal. Varro makes them Sabine words (L. L. vi. 5 secondum hoc dicitur ‘crepusculum’ a crepero. id vocabulum sumperunt a Sabinis, unde veniunt ‘Crepusci’ nominati Amiterno, qui eo tempore erant nati, ut ‘Lucii’ prima luce in Retatino; ‘crepusculum’ significat dubium; ab eo res dictae dubiae ‘creperae,’ quod crepusculum dies etiam nunc sit an jam nox multis dubium). The Probi Appendix censures the pronunciation ‘parcarpus’ instead of paceparus (Gk. παρκάπος) (197. 32 K.); the reading is doubtful, and ‘parcarpus’ has been proposed.

The evidence for the change of n to r in carmen, germen (cf. § 91 on n for r) is thus not very strong, and a good deal may be said for the view which refers germen to *gēs-imen from gēro for *geso, cf. gesi, ges-tum) and gemma to *gen-ma. Carmen may be connected with O. Ind. kāru-, ‘a singer,’ or with cāro (in Lat. a portion of meat, flesh, but in Osc. any portion, e.g. maîmâs car-neis senaeis tanginâd ‘maximae partis senatus sentientia’), as O. Ir. drecht means (1) part, portion, (2) song. (O. Ind. ās-man- Neut., ‘praise,’ a word which occurs only once in the Rig Veda, comes from the O. Ind. root sâs-, ‘to praise,’ which is usually connected with Lat. census). In Compounds with in-, con-, &c. -mn- became mn, e.g. in-mitto, com-mitto, so that gema seems a natural development of gen-ma.

The connexion of n with l seen in Provençal alma for Lat. an(ê)ma, &c. receives an equally doubtful support from the mispronunciation censured in the Probi Appendix (197. 24 K.) ‘cuntellum’ for culpellum, and in the curious form of the word neptis mentioned in glossaries, ‘leptis’ (Löwe, Prodr. p. 340); musceolo explained as ‘caecitudo nocturna’ (Fest. 180. 23 Th.; cf. nusciosus, ib., nusciosus in glossaries (Löwe, Prodr. p. 17 ‘qui plus vespere videt’)] seems to be a popular adaptation of luscito (-cio ?) (Paul. Fest. 86. 21 Th., derived from luscus, to the word nos. Conceola, the Diminutive of õits (C. G. L. iii. 322. 9) (cf. Ital. conocchia, ‘a distall,’ from Lat. *conceola, Fr. quenouille, &c.), may be influenced by õitus. N appears as l in dialectal Greek, e.g. lápráç for vápròç. (K. Z. xxxiii. 226). On the affinity of the n-, l-, and r-sounds, see ch. ii. §§ 61, 96, 105, 106. (Cf. Germ. Himmel, Goth. himins, Engl. heaven?).

§ 81. The M- and N-Sonants. For the sounds to which ēm, ēn (mê, nê) are reduced in the unaccented syllable of such a word as I-Eur. *tntô- (O. Ind. tatá-., Gk. τατός, Lat. tentus) from the root ten-, ‘to stretch,’ some write, m, n, others am, an (ma, na), the o indicating an obscure vowel sound, or else e(m, e(n (mê, nê). In Latin these sounds became ēm, ēn, e.g. dēcēm (Gk. δίκα, Goth. taihun), tentus, the ē being subject to all the changes of ē for I-Eur. ē (e.g. incertus, Gk. ἵκριτος, undēcim, decemus, decimus, &c.); in Greek they became a before a consonant [but am, av before vocalic i(y)]; in Teutonic un, un, and so on; so that it is only
by reference to another I.-Eur. language that we can tell whether Lat. ēm, ēn are I.-Eur. ēm, ēn, or I.-Eur. m, n. We occasionally find mā, nā in Latin words from roots in mé, nē, which are probably to be explained similarly by the weakening influence of the accent, e.g. nactus from the root nēk-, nenk-, 'to obtain' (O. Ind. naś-, Gk. ένέγκει-έν, Mid. Ir. eo-emnacar, 'potui,' Lith. nèstzi, 'to carry,' O. Sl. nesti). (See Osthoff, Morph. Unt. v. Pref., and cf. above, § 61.) Whether Gk. vā, Lat. nā of Gk. νήσα (Lat. ãnas) for *vā-ya, a duck, Lat. gnātus, and Lat. an, O. Ind. ā of Lat. antae, O. Ind. ātā-, 'born,' are rightly called the long sonant nasals from roots like ģen- &c. is a point which has not yet been settled (see § 1). I.-Eur. initial m, n have been also referred to a weakening of an original initial am-, an-, e.g. *mbhī beside *ambhī (Gk. ἀμμύς), like *po beside *apo (Gk. ἀπό) (ch. ix. § 12).

I.-Eur. m, n are in Umbro-Osc. treated as in Latin, e.g. Umbr. desen- 'deem,' ivenga 'juvenca,' Osc. tristaamentud 'testamento' Abl. Sg. Why an- should appear for Lat. in- (en-), in Umbr. antakres 'integrīs,' Osc. ampruʃid 'improve,' Umbro-Osc. anter 'inter,' is not quite clear (see von Planta, i. p. 315).

§ 82. Other examples of the Nasal Sonants. I.-Eur. -mns of the Nom. Sg. Neut. of men-stems (e.g. Gk. ἥμα) is Lat. -men, e.g. sēmen; the weak form of the root ten-, 'to stretch,' appears also in I.-Eur. *tanū-, 'thin' (O. Ind. tanū; cf. Gk. ταυ-, stretched, of ταυ-γλωσσος, ταυ-πτερος, ταυ-πηλος), Lat. tenus from the Fem. form (O. Ind. tanvī) (ch. v. § 47); I.-Eur. *kptōn, 'hundred' (O. Ind. ἱκτάμ, Gk. ἵκταοι, O. Ir. cēt, W. cant, Goth. hund, Engl. hund-red, lit. '100-number,' Lith. šūfntas, O. Sl. sūto) is Lat. centum; I.-Eur. *gañtī-, the Verbal Noun from the root gēnam-, 'to go' (O. Ind. gātī-, Gk. Βάσης, Goth. ga-jumīs, 'assembly,' Germ. Her-kunft, &c.), Lat. inventi-o; I.-Eur. *sm-, the weak grade of the root sem-, 'one' (O. Ind. sa-kīt, 'once,' Gk. ἅ-παξ, ἅ-πλος), Lat. simplex; I.-Eur. *mktō-, mntī-, the P. P. P. and Verbal Noun of men-, 'to think' (O. Ind. matā-, matī- Gk. αἰτῶ-παρος, O. Ir. dēr-met, 'forgetting,' Goth. ga-munds, 'remembrance,' O. Engl. gmynd, Engl. mind, Lith. miūtas, O. Sl. mētī, pa-mēti, 'memory') appear in Lat. com-mentus, mens, ĝen. mentīs. Similarly Lat. ensis (O. Ind. asi-); Lat. ingens, lit. 'unknown,' 'uncouth' (O. Eng. un-cēd) from the root ģen-, 'to know'; Lat. jīvēnus (see § 64); Lat. lingua, older dingua (Goth. tuggō, O. Engl. tongue,) (On nōem for *noren, see § 79). The late retention of the m-, n-sounds (as of the ṭ-, ṭ-sounds, § 92) has been inferred from patrēm (beside patriis), nēmēn (not -i) (but see p. 186).

§ 83. Other examples of am, an, mā, nā. Lat. gnārus from root ģen-, 'to know' (O. Ind. jānāmī); antae, pillars at door of a temple (O. Ind. ātā-, Arm. dr-and); Lat. janītrices, sisters-in-law (O. Ind. yātar-, cf. Gk. εἰβάρτες, O. Sl. jětry). Lat. āmāre is explained by some as derived from ēmo, 'I take,' with
a reduction of the \( \text{em} \)-, as \( \text{ātērāre} \) shows reduction of the \( \text{deic} \)- of \( \text{ātēco} \) (O. Lat. \text{deeco}). (Cf. § 94 on \( \text{al} \), \( \text{ar} \), and § 3 on \( \text{pāteo} \) (Gk. \( \piετο \)), \( \text{āper} \).

§ 84. L, R. These two sounds are often interchanged in Latin by ‘Dissimilation’ of \( \text{l-l} \), e.g. \( \text{caerūlevus} \) from \( \text{caelum} \), \( \text{pōpūlā-ris} \) and \( \text{anstrā-lis} \) (ch. ii. § 101). The same thing is found in other languages, e.g. O. H. G. \( \text{turtula-tūbā} \), our ‘turtle-dove’ from Lat. \( \text{turtur} \) (Gk. \( \kappaεφαλαργία \) and \( \kappaεφαλαλγία \)) and perhaps occurred in what is called the I.-Eur. period, e.g. I.-Eur. \( \text{gēr-gēr} \)-el-in in the reduplicated root (Lat. \( \text{gur-gul-io} \), O. H. G. querechela, Lith. gargaliū). On the parasitic vowel often found between a consonant and \( \text{l} \) (\( \text{r} \)), see ch. ii. § 103, and on the avoidance of \( \text{r-r} \), e.g. \( \text{praest\( \text{r} \)-giae} \) (like Gk. \( \deltaρυ-\text{φακτος} \) for \( \deltaρυ-\text{φρακτος} \) ib.

§ 85. L. I.-Eur. \( \text{l} \) is Lat. \( \text{l} \), e.g. the I.-Eur. root \( \text{leiq} \), ‘to leave’ (O. Ind. \( \text{ric} \)-, Arm. \( \text{lkānem} \), Gk. \( \lambdaελ\piω \), O. Ir. \( \text{lēcim} \), Goth. \( \text{leihvan} \), ‘to lend,’ O. Engl. \( \text{lēcon} \), Lith. \( \text{lēkū} \), ‘I leave,’ O. Sl. \( \text{otū-lēkū} \), ‘remainder’) appears in Latin \( \text{linguo} \), Pft. \( \text{liqui} \); the root \( \text{klei-} \), ‘to lean’ (O. Ind. \( \text{śri-} \), Gk. \( \kappaλίνω \), O. Ir. \( \text{cloen} \), ‘awry,’ Goth. \( \text{hlains} \), ‘a hill,’ Lith. \( \text{szłaitsa} \), \( \text{szłēt} \), ‘to lean’), appears in Lat. \( \text{clīnus} \), \( \text{ac-clinis} \); suffixal -\( \text{lo} \), -\( \text{lā} \), as in derivatives from the root \( \text{dhē-} \), ‘to suck’ (O. Ind. \( \text{dhārū-} \), Arm. \( \text{dal} \), ‘beestings,’ Gk. \( \thetaηλην \), \( \δηλων \), O. Ir. \( \text{dēl} \), ‘teat,’ Gael. \( \text{dēl} \), ‘leech,’ O. H. G. \( \text{tīlā} \), ‘teat,’ Lith. \( \text{dēlė} \), ‘leech’), in Lat. \( \text{fellare} \) for \( \text{fē-lare} \), &c. (ch. ii. § 130).

We find \( \text{l} \) in Latin for original \( \text{ld} \), e.g. \( \text{per-cello} \) (cf. Gk. \( \kappaλαλαρόπος \), brittle, Lat. \( \text{clādes} \)), \( \text{ln} \), e.g. \( \text{collis} \) (Lith. \( \kāl纳斯 \); cf. Gk. \( \kappaλωνός \) (\( \text{tna} \) had I.-Eur. \( \text{-lēn} \)-; cf. Gk. \( \κλέκνη \)), \( \text{ls} \), e.g. \( \text{collum} \), O. Lat. \( \text{collus} \) (O. Engl. heals, Germ. Hals M.), \( \text{velle} \) for \( \text{*vel-se} \) (cf. \( \text{es-se} \)), \( \text{rl} \), e.g. \( \text{stēlla} \) for \( \text{*stēr-la} \), \( \text{āgēllus} \) for \( \text{*ager-lus} \). So \( \text{dl} \) in compound verbs, e.g. \( \text{allīgo} \) for \( \text{ad-līgo} \). But usually a parasitic vowel was inserted to facilitate pronunciation, when \( \text{l} \) was preceded by a consonant, e.g. \( \text{piāculum} \) for \( \text{pia-clum} \) (see ch. ii. § 154).

I.-Eur. \( \text{d} \) became \( \text{l} \) in the Sabine dialect (see I. F. ii. 157), and this form was sanctioned in a few words in Latin, e.g. \( \text{lingua} \), older \( \text{dingua} \), from I.-Eur. \( \text{*lin̩uj̩a} \)- (Goth. tuggō) (§ 111). On \( \text{fācul} \), &c. for \( \text{*fæclī} \), \( \text{fæc(i)lē} \), &c., see § 13; on \( \text{leptis} \), a byform of \( \text{neptis} \), ch. ii. § 106; on the change of \( \text{ē} \) to \( \text{ō (ū)} \) before Latin \( \text{l} \) [except before \( \text{l} \) followed by \( \text{e}, \text{i (y)} \) or before the group \( \text{ɫ} \)], § 10, and on the various pronunciations of Latin \( \text{l} \) when alone, when double, and when preceding a consonant, ch. ii. § 96.
I.-Eur. 1 is Oscan 1, e.g. līgatūīs 'lēgātīs.' Similarly we have Umbr. plener 'plenis,' veltu 'vulto' Imperat.; but initial l does not occur in the Eugubine Tables, the chief record of the language, and it is not impossible that at the beginning of a word I.-Eur. 1 is Umbrian v in words like vapef (Lat. lāpides? Acc. Pl.), Vuvgis (Lat. Lūcīus? cf. Osc. Luvkis), vutu (Lat. lāvīto?); between vowels l became (like d) r (vs) in karetu, carītīu 'let him call' (Gk. καλέω, Lat. cālāre), famēriās 'familiae,' &c.; before it was dropped in muta 'multa' ('a fine,' Osc. múlta-), &c., while the Umbrian name Voisierno- (Lat. Volsiēno-)¹ suggests that it became i before s (see von Planta, i. p. 285).

§ 86. I.-Eur. 1; other examples. The I.-Eur. root leuk-, 'to shine' (O. Ind. rue-, Gk. λευκός, O. Ir. lēche, lēchet Gen., 'lightning,' Gaul. Leuceetios, W. lluched, Goth. liuchath, O. Engl. leocht, O. Sl. lúči) appears in Lat. lūceo, luceo; the root ĝhel-, 'green, yellow' (O. Ind. hárí-, Gk. χαλαρός, χάλη, O. Ir. gel, 'white,' O. H. G. gelc, O. Engl. geolo, 'yellow,' Lith. žėlti, 'to grow green,' O. Sl. zelijē, 'vegetables,' zelenē, 'green'), in Lat. helvus, hēlus, and hēlūs. Similarly Lat. sal (Arm. սա, Gk. ἅλς, O. Ir. salann, W. halen, Goth. salt, O. Sl. soli, Lith. salunka, 'salt-box'); Lat. flūs (O. Ir. bláth, 'bloom,' W. blodau, 'flowers,' Goth. bōma, O. H. G. blōmo); Lat. plēnis (O. Ind. śruti-, W. elun, O. Scand. hlaun, Lith. slauonis); Lat. plēnus, pērī-que, pētus (O. Ind. prātā-, Arm. բ, Gk. πλήρης, O. Ir. linaim, 'I fill,' lin, 'a number,' Lith. plūnas, 'full,' O. Sl. plūnū); Lat. in-cluius (O. Ind. śrutā-, 'heard,' Gk. κλυτός, in Hom. 'heard, loud,' e.g. ὁμομε κλυτόν, λιμῷ κλυτόν, O. Ir. cloth, 'famous'; cf. O. Engl. hlūd, 'loud').

§ 87. R. I.-Eur. r is Lat. r. Thus the I.-Eur. *rēg-, 'a king' (O. Ind. ráj-an-, O. Ir. rí, rig Gen., W. rhi, Gaul. Catu-rīges, lit. 'kings in fight') is Lat. rēx, stem rēg-; I.-Eur. *bherō, 'I carry' (O. Ind. bhārā-mi, Arm. berem, Gk. φέρω, O. Ir. berim, W. ad-feru Inf., Goth. baira, O. Engl. bere, O. Sl. bera) is Lat. fērō; I.-Eur. wert-, 'to turn' (O. Ind. vṛ-, Goth. vairban, Engl. worth, in 'woe worth the day,' Lith. veštį and vartįti, O. Sl. vratiti) is Lat. vēltīre; I.-Eur. *kēpro- (Gk. καπρός, boar, O. Engl. hæfer, 'goat') is Lat. cāper, stem *cēpro-, I.-Eur. rs before a vowel became rr in Latin, e.g. torreo for *torseo (O. Ind. trē-, Goth. þarsjan, 'to thirst'; cf. Gk. τέρσωμαι). But r was assimilated to a following s in pronunciation, e.g. Persa pronounced *Pessa (see ch. ii. § 96).

¹ On inserr. of Asissium the Umbr.

Voisiener Gen. Sing. (C. I. L. xi. 5389 = Bücheler, Umbriaca Inser. Min. i., p. 172) corresponds to Lat. Volsiensus (xi. 5390 = i. 1412). The Volsiensis of no. 5390 seems to be the son of the Volsiensus of no. 5389.
and I.-Eur. rs before a consonant became ss, e.g. *tostus for *tostus, *tostus from torreo. R was also assimilated to l in Latin, e.g. stella, ãgellus for *stella, *agãllus. The Campanian town of which the Latin name was Aetella has on its coins Aderl. so that its Oscan name must have been *Aderlo, a name apparently meaning 'the little black town.' On the metathesis by which rã became ãr, e.g. ter, terr- (*ters) for *trães, see § 13. Sometimes the cacophony of a repetition of r (§ 84) seems to be avoided by using n for one r, e.g. cancer for *carc- (Gk. karâ-ivos; cf. O. Ind. kar-kar-a, 'hard') (but see ch. ii. § 105). On carmen, possibly for *can-men, see § 78, and on r for d before f, v, ã, e.g. arfuerunt, arvorsum, arger, § 112. Between vowels I.-Eur. s became r in Latin, e.g. gãneris from the stem gãnãs- [cf. Gk. γενε(σ)ος], on which see § 148). I.-Eur. r is Umbro-Osc. r, e.g. Umbr. rehte 'recte,' Osc. Regaturei *\text{\textquotesingle}Regãtori' (see von Planta, i. p. 285). In UMBrian, as in Latin, intervocalic s became r, but not in Oscan (cf. infr. § 146).

§ 88. I.-Eur. r; other examples. Lat. rida (O. Ind. rãtha-, 'chariot,' O. Ir. roth, 'wheel,' Gaulo-Lat. petor-ritum, 'a four-wheeled vehicle,' O. H. G. rad, 'wheel,' Lith. rãtas); Lat. porcus (Gk. πόκος, O. Ir. ore, O. H. G. farb, Engl. farrow, Lith. pañas, O. Sl. prase); Lat. vir (O. Ir. fãr, Goth. vair; cf. O. Ind. virã-, Lith. vyrãs); Lat. inter (O. Ind. antãr, O. Ir. eter); Lat. serpo (O. Ind. srãp, Gk. ζπων); Lat. rãber (O. Ind. rudhirã-, Gk. ιρουχς, O. Sl. rãdri; cf. O. Ir. ruad, Goth. raupj); Lat. rumpo, (O. Ind. rup- and lup-, O. Engl. bereoan, 'to bereave,' Lith. rãpãtãi, 'to trouble'); Lat. prã-, O. Ind. prã, Gk. ποθ, O. Ir. ro, used like the augment to indicate a past tense, e.g. ro alt, 'he nourished,' ro char, 'he loved,' O. Bret. ro, Lith. pru-, O. Sl. pro-.

§ 89. ss for rs before consonant. Other examples are: Lat. testãmentum for *testis-, *terst- from *trist- (Osc. tristaementum Abl. Sg.); cëna for *cesna, *cessna from *cerdna (Osc. kersna-, Umbr. šesna-). The spelling coena, due to the analogy of Gk. κοινός, is very old. It appears on an early Praenestine cista of the third cent. B. C. with the representation of a kitchen where cooking operations are going on. One servant is saying feri porol (= feri porm) another replies cofect (= confect); a third orders made mirece (= made mi regic or made mirce, cie); a fourth misc sanc (= miscane) a fifth says assumeter (= assumam fero) a sixth confect piscin. The title is coenalia or coena piia (see Med. Arch. 1890, p. 303). Similarly Lat. fastigium for *farst- (O. Ind. brãšti, 'a point'); posco for *porcelco (O. Ind. prãchãmi, O. H. G. forscõn, Germ. forskën).

§ 90. rr for rs before vowel. Other examples: Lat. farreus (Umbr. farsico- and fasio-; cf. O. Sl. brašino, 'food'); gaëro (Lith. gañas, 'noise'); horreo (O. Ind. hrê-); porrum (Gk. πάρον); terreo [O. Ind. tras, Gk. τρε(σ)α, Umbr. tursitu tremitu]; verres (Lith. veršszis, 'calf'; cf. O. Ind. veš̄ni, 'ram'); verrãca, 'a rising-ground' in O. Lat. (Lith. viršzûs; cf. O. Ind. vâršman-); Massãler,
a byform of Marspiter; Tuscus (Umbr. Tursco- and Tusco-). Lat. fers has probably re-appended -s to an older *fer, *ferr for *fer-s [so ul-s has appended -s a second time to *ul, *ult for *ol-s (ch. ix. § 56)]. In Umbrian inscriptions written in the Latin alphabet, the Umbrian ð-sound (see ch. ii. § 88) is written rs, e.g. capire (in the native alph. kapirē), (Lat. capīdī), Dat. Sing. of cāpīd-, a bowl.

§ 91. n for r. Lat. crēpuscōlum, if it has cr- for cn- (compare Gk. κρήφας), with that change of cn- to cr- which we find in some languages, e.g. Gael, enu (pronounced cru with nasal vowel), Bret. kraoun, 'a nut,' must be like our 'gloaming,' a dialectal word: Varro (L. L. vi. 5) makes it Sabine (see § 80). On the spellings menetris for meretrix, &c., see ch. ii. § 105.

§ 92. The L- and R-Sonants. For the sounds to which ħl, ħr (lē, rē) are reduced in the unaccented syllable of such a word as I.-Eur. *dr̩tō-, *dr̩ti (O. Ind. dr̩ti-, Gk. ὀφρός and ὀφρός, ὀφός, Lith. nu-dirtas, Goth. ga-taurj) from the root der-, 'to flay,' some write l, r, others ɔl, ɔr (la, ra), the ə indicating an obscure vowel sound (also ər, əl, &c.). In Latin these sounds became ɔl, ɔr, e.g. mors, Gen. mortis (O. Ind. mṛti-, Goth. maurpr, O. H. G. mord, Lith. mirtūs, O. Sl. sū-mrīti), fors, stem *forti- (O. Ind. bhr̩ti-, O. Ir. brith, Goth. ga-baurj, 'birth,' O. Engl. ge-byrd, 'fate'), the ə being subject to all the changes of ɔ for I.-Eur. ɔ (e.g. pulsus, Gk. παρτός from the root pel-), while before a vowel we seem to find ɔl, ħr in sālāx (O. Ir. sail; cf. Gk. ἄληκη with E-grade), cāro (Umbr. karu, 'a portion '; cf. Gk. κελφω); in Greek they became ἄρ (pā, e.g. παράσιν), ᾶλ (λά), in Teutonic ār, āl; in Slavonic ūr, āl, and so on; so that it is only by reference to another I.-Eur. language that we can tell whether Lat. ħl, ħr are I.-Eur. ħl, ħr, or I.-Eur. l, r. (Lat. ħl may also be I.-Eur. ħl, § 10.) We occasionally find lā, rā in Latin words from roots in lē, rē, which are probably to be explained similarly by the weakening influence of the accent, e.g. frāngo, frāgilis from the root bhreg-, 'to break' (Goth. brīkan, O. Engl. brēcan) (see Osthoff, Morph. Untl. v. Pref., and above § 3). Whether Gk. ρω, pā, Lat. rā, of Gk. στρωτός, πεπρωταί, κράτος, Lat. strātus, clādes, and Gk. ὀρ (aρ), Lat. ār of Gk. ἀτόφυμωμ, Lat. pars, pārtior, quàrtus, are rightly called the long-sonant vowels from roots ster-, per-, &c. is a point which has not yet been settled (see § 1). There are some indications that vocalic l and r were sounds not unknown to the Italic languages down to a fairly late period, e.g. Marrucinian pacrisi 'pacar (pacris) sit,' 'may she be propitious' (Zv. I. I. I. 8) (cf.
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Umbr. pacer, Lat. aecr, aeris Fem.), Sabine Atruo (Zv. 10), Osc. Tantrnaium Gen. Pl., though how far these are merely graphic is hard to decide (cf. ch. iii. § 14); corresponding to Gk. ἀγρός we have in Lat. ager, in Umbr. ager, and so on (see ch. vi. § 4). On Lat. ter(r) for *trís, facul for fae(i)lī, see § 13. I.-Eur. 1, r receive the same treatment in Umbro-Osc. as in Latin, e.g. Umbr. ortus (Lat. ortus), Osc. molto (Lat. multa, a fine) (see von Plantha, i. p. 314).

§ 93. Other examples of the liquid Sonants. I.-Eur. *phk-skō (O. Ind. přehámi, přehā-, ‘enquiry,’ Arm. harcanem, hārō, O. H. G. forscōn, forse) Lat. posco for *porce-so; I.-Eur. *krd-. O. Ind. hifā, Gk. καρφα and κραδιγ, O. Ir. crīde, Lith. szirdis, O. Sl. sridice, Lat. cor for *cord; I.-Eur. *phk-kā-, ‘the ridge of a furrow’ (W. ryhch F., O. Engl. furth F.). Lat. porca (Varro, R. R. i. 29) qua aratrum vomere laeunam striam fecit, ‘suleus’ vocatur. quod est inter duos sulcos terra dicitur ‘poreca’; Paul. Fest. 77. i Th. explains the name Imporcitor as ‘qui porcas in agro facit arando,’ the name of a deity invoked by the flames in the sacrifice to Tellus and Ceres, with a number of other agricultural divinities: Vervactor, Reparator, Imporcitor, Insitor, Obarator, Occator, Saritor, Subrelinator, Messor, Convector, Conditor, Promitor, whose names are given by Fabius Pictor ap. Serv. ad Virg. G. i. 21. The word poreca occurs also in a line of Accius ap. Non. 61. 19 M. bene prosectas cossi- gerare ordine porcas; I.-Eur. ķīn (Gk. κάρπος Hesych., Goth. haurn), Lat. cornu (cf. Lat. cornus, cornel, Gk. κράνος, κράνον); I.-Eur. *pło- (Gk. πόσον); Lat. porrum for *porsum. Certain examples of I.-Eur. 1 in Latin are not numerous. Ulmus may stand for *limo- (Ir. lem, Russ. ilemû); or for *elmio- (O. Engl. elm); or for *omlo- (O. Seand. almr) umelus, milked, for *mkktlo- (Lith. mitszas, O. Ir. mlcht or blicht, ‘milk’); oc-cultus for *kalo- from the root kel-, ‘to hide’; cf. sepultus from sēpēlio.

§ 94. Other examples of al, ar, là, rā. Lat. palma, palm of hand (O. Ir. lām F.; cf. Gk. παλαμ ‘scalpo (cf. scalpo); elādes (cf. Gk. κασαθόπος, pereisus, from the root keld- of per-cello); clāmo (cf. calo, cālendae); fitāus (cf. fītus, O. Lat. Fōtris); lātus, carried (cf. tōlo); lātus, wide, earlier stātus, from the root stel-, ‘to extend’ (O. Sl. stelj); arida (cf. Gk. ἄραδος); armus (O. Ind. irmās, Goth. armis, O. Sl. ramę; cf. Pruss. irmo); cārpo from the root kerp-, ‘to cut’ (Lith. kerpā) (cf. Gk. καρπός, Engl. harvest); fasĭgūnum for *farst- (cf. O. Ind. bhṛṣṭi-, ‘point,’ O. Engl. byrst, ‘bristle’), or *frast- (see ch. viii. § 18, on farcio for *fracio); crābro for crā-sro (cf. Lith. szirsz, O. Sl. srūseni); crātis and cartīlago (cf. Gk. κάρπαλος, basket, O. H. G. hurt, Engl. hurdle); frazīnus and farmus (O. Ind. bhūra-, ‘a birch-tree’) from the root bherg-, (O. Engl. becor, Lith. bėržas, O. Sl. běrča); grūmum (O. Ind. jīrnā-, ‘worn out’; cf. Goth. kaurn, ‘corn,’ Lith. ėrnis, ‘pea,’ O. Sl. zrūno, ‘a grain’); grātus (O. Ind. gūrtā-, ‘welcome’); rādīx for *verd- (cf. Goth. vauerts, Engl. wart); stramen (Gk. στράμα) from sterno; lūna for *vlāna (O. Ind. ėrṇā, Gk. οὐλος for *foivos). On Lat. āl, ār for al, or before a vowel, see M. S. L. viii. 279, Osthoff. Dunsles v. helles l, p. 52, (palea, paren, parīx, &c.), and cf. § 3 on pātō (Gk. πέτω), &c.

§ 95. Tenues, Mediae, and Aspirates. In Sanscrit we have four varieties of each class of mutes or stopped consonants,
(1) tenues, or unvoiced, (2) mediae, or voiced, (3) tenues aspiratae, or tenues followed by ḥ (like our th in 'ant-hill'), (4) mediae aspiratae, or mediae followed by ḥ (like our dh in 'sandhill'). But these varieties are not kept distinct in other I.-Eur. languages. In Greek tenues aspiratae take the place of the Sanscrit mediae aspiratae (e.g. ḍvṃs, O. Ind. dhūmās); in the Celtic and Slavonic families the mediae and mediae aspiratae of Sanscrit are merged in mediae (e.g. Lith. dū-ți, 'to give,' O. Ind. dā-, O. Ir. dān, 'a gift, an accomplishment'; Lith. délė 'a leech,' O. Ind. dhā-, 'to suck,' O. Ir. dél, 'teat'). The tenues aspiratae of Sanscrit are especially difficult to trace in the other languages; nor is it always easy to say whether they are due to some phonetic law peculiar to Sanscrit, or represent I.-Eur. tenues aspiratae. In the O. Ind. root sthā-, 'to stand,' where the dental tenuis is found in all other languages (Gk. ἱστήμι, Lat. stō, &c.), it seems probable that the I.-Eur. form of the root was stā-, whereas in O. Ind. nakhā-, 'a nail, claw,' for which we have an aspirate in Gk. ἵκχ- the tenuis aspirata may be original. Tenues aspiratae have been with more or less probability conjectured for such words as I.-Eur. *konkho-, 'a shell' (O. Ind. ṣarakhā-, Gk. κόγχος, Lat. conchus, a quart); I.-Eur. skhi(n)d-, 'to split' (O. Ind. chid-, Gk. ἕχω, ἐχθαλμός, a splinter, Lat. scindō, O. H. G. scintan, Germ. schinden); the suffix of the 2 Sg. Pft. Ind. (O. Ind. vēt-tha, Gk. οὖθ-θα, Lat. vér-is-ti, Goth. las-t, &c.); and the same hypothesis has been used to explain the anomalous correspondence of Latin ḥ- and Goth. h- in the verb, 'to have,' Lat. hābet, Goth. habaiþ (I.-Eur. khabhē-?), &c.

These I.-Eur. tenues, mediae, and aspiratae were liable to change their character under the influence of an adjoining consonant. A media became a tenue before an unvoiced consonant, e.g. I.-Eur. *yukto-, P. P. P. from the root yeug-, 'to join' (O. Ind. yuktā-, Lat. junctus). A tenuis similarly became a media before a voiced consonant, [cf. I.-Eur. *si-zd-o, the reduplicated form of the root sed-, 'to sit' (Lat. sīdo)]. A media aspirata before t or s is in Latin and other languages treated like a tenuis, e.g. vectus, vexi (veesi), from Lat. vēho (I.-Eur. root wegō-), but whether this was the case in what is called 'the Indo-European period' is not certain. More plausible is the
theory that t before t or th, and perhaps d before d, dh, produced already at this period some sibilant sound; for a trace of this appears in every branch of the I.-Eur. family, e. g. from the root sed-, with the P. P. P. suffix -to-, we have Zend ni-shasta-, Lat. sessus, Lith. setas, O. Scand. sess) (for other examples in Latin, see § 108). The occasional confusion, too, which we find between tenues and mediae (e. g. Gk. σκαπάνη beside Lat. seabo), mediae and aspiratae (e. g. Gk. στεμβω beside ἀστεμφύς; O. Ind. ahám beside Gk. εγό, Lat. ego, &c.) may in many instances date from the same early time.

In Umbrian a tenuis becomes a media before r in subra 'supra,' podruhpei 'utroque,' regularly after n, e.g. ivenga 'juvencas,' ander 'inter' (Osc. anter) (von Planta, i. p. 547); and we have both in Oscan and Umbrian many instances of a tenuis appearing for a media, which are by some explained as miswritings, due to the earlier use of the tenuis-symbol only in the native alphabets (derived from Etruscan, ch. i. § 1), but are by others considered as a proof that the Italic mediae were not voiced (ch. ii. § 77). (For instances, see von Planta, i. p. 555.)

§ 96. Media or aspirata assimilated to unvoiced consonant in Latin. Other examples are cet-le for *cē-dātē, the plural of cēdē, give, lit. 'give here' (ch. vii. § 15), hoc(c) for *hod-ce (ch. vii. § 16); toppar for *tod-per (ch. ix. § 7); ac-tus from ãgo; scribus from scribo; rec-tus from veho, &c. On spellings like optenui (Scip. Ep., opscide, urps, see ch. ii. § 80.

§ 97. Tenuis assimilated to voiced consonant in Latin. On ob-duco beside op-tenui, see ch. ii. § 73. I.-Eur. d becomes t before r (unvoiced?) in Latin, e.g. ātrax, from ad-, a byform of the root od- of ōdium (§ 113).

Interchange of tenuis and media in Latin. (See ch. ii. §§ 73-77.

Interchange of tenuis and aspirata in Latin. On g occasionally appearing for I.-Eur. gh, see § 116.

P, B, BH, PH.

§ 98. P. I.-Eur. p is Lat. p, e. g. I.-Eur. *pēku- N. (O. Ind. pāsu, Goth. faihu, Germ. Vieh, Engl. fee), Lat. pēcu, I.-Eur. *sēptm (O. Ind. saptá, Arm. eftin, Gk. ἐπτά, O. Ir. secht, W. saith, Goth. sibun; cf. Lith. septyni). P becomes m before n, e. g. sommus for *sop-nus; it is assimilated before labials, e. g. summus for *summās, suffio for *suffio.
The Labial Tenuis receives a similar treatment in Umbro-Oscan, e.g. Umbr. patre, Osc. paterei ‘patri'; but pt is in Osc. ft, in Umbr. ht, e.g. Osc. scritfo-, Umbr. sreihlo- ‘scripto’ (see von Planta, i. p. 424).


§ 100. B. I.-Eur. b is Lat. b, e.g. I.-Eur. *pibō, ‘I drink’ (O. Ind. pibāmi, O. Ir. ibim), Lat. bibō for *pibō (§ 163). Lat. b, whether from I.-Eur. b or bh, becomes m before n, e.g. scannum beside scabellum. Latin b may represent I.-Eur. -bh-, e.g. scribo (cf. Gk. σκαβεῖομαι, scratch) (§ 103), -dh-, e.g. rüber (Gk. ἐρυθός (§ 114), m before r, e.g. hibernus (Gk. χειμερινός) (§ 77), s before r, e.g. cērel-rum for *cerēs-rum (§ 152), dw-, e.g. bis for *īvīs (Gk. δίς) (§ 68). On the confusion of b and v in late spellings, see ch. ii. § 52, and on the substitution of -b for -p in sub, ab, ch. ii. § 73.

§ 101. Other examples of I.-Eur. b. Lat. balbus (O. Ind. balbalā-, Gk. βάλβας); Lat. lombo (O. H. G. laffan, O. Sl. lobůži; cf. Gk. λάπτω); Lat. lābricus (Goth. sluipan, ‘to slip’); Lat. lābium (O. H. G. lefs, O. Engl. lippa).

§ 102. mn for bn. annmis from abh- (O. Ind. ámbhas-, ‘water,' Ir. abann, ‘river’). On the spellings annuere in glosses, see Lōwe, Prodr. p. 421; cf. annmegaverit (C. I. L. vi. 14672). Similarly bm of *glib-ma (root gleubh-, Gk. γλῶφα) became mn, and was reduced to m (ch. ii. § 127), glōma.

brawd, Goth. brōpar, Lith. broter-ēlis, O. Sl. bratrǔ), Lat. frūter. A good example of the different treatment of initial and medial bh in Latin is the word for a beaver, I.-Eur. *bhēbhru- (O. H. G. bībar, Lith. bēbrus, O. Sl. bebrǔ; O. Ind. babhrū-, ‘brown’), Lat. fīber. On mn for bn (with b from I.-Eur. b or bh), e.g. scamnum from skabh- ‘to support,’ with Dim. scabbellum (-illum) (also scamillum Ter. Scaur. 14. 6 K.), see § 102, and on dialectal f for b (e.g. Albus, a byform of Albīnis), see ch. ii. § 83. I.-Eur. bh is Umbro-Osc. f, whether initial or internal, e.g. Umbr.-Osc. fust ‘erit,’ Umbr. aflō-, Osc. Alafaternum ‘albo-.’ On Faliscan haba for Lat. fūba, see § 121, ch. ii. § 57.

§ 104. I.-Eur bh; other examples. Lat. nēbula (Gk. νεφέλη, O. Ir. nēl for *neblo-, O. H. G. nebul, Germ. Nebel), Lat. fītore, sīma (Gk. φήμι) ; Lat. sorbeo (Gk. ἱρόφω, Arm. ārb-enam, Lith. srebiūt) ; Lat. umbo, umbilicus (O. Ind. nāhhi-, nābhi-, Gk. ὀμφαλός, O. Ir. imbliu, O. H. G. naba, nabolo, Pruss. nabis, Lett. naba); Lat. ḫōs (O. Ir. bīath, ‘bloom,’ Goth. blōma’ ; Lat. albus (Gk. ἀλφός, white leprosy) ; Lat. ambī- (O. Ind. abhī, Gk. ἀμφι, O. Ir. imme for imbe, Gaulish Ambi-gatus’ O. Engl. ymb, Engl. ember-days, from O. Engl. ymb-ryne ‘running round, circuit,’ Germ. um für umb) ; Lat. ambō (O. Ind. u-bhā-, Gk. ἄμφω, Goth. bai, baj-ōps, Engl. b-oth, Lith. abū, O. Sl. oba ; Lat. findo from I.-Eur. root bheid- (O. Ind. bhid-, Goth. beita, Engl. I. bide ; Lat. fāgus (Dor. Gk. φαγός, O. Engl. bōc). Barba for *farba (I.-Eur. bhardh-, O. Sl. brada, Lith. barzdā, Engl. beard) is due to assimilation (see § 163).

T, D, DH, TH.

§ 105. T. I.-Eur. t is Lat. t ; e. g. the I.-Eur. root ten-, ‘to stretch’ (O. Ind. tan-, Gk. τείνω, O. Ir. tennaim, Goth. uf-panja, Germ. dehnen ; O. Ind. tanū-, ‘thin,’ Gk. ταρύν-πτερος, O. Ir. tana, W. teneu, O. H. G. dunnī, O. Engl. pynne, Lith. dial. tenvas, O. Sl. tīnīkũ) appears in Latin ten-do, tēnīnis ; I.-Eur. *wert-,” to turn” (O. Ind. vārtātē 3 Sg., Goth. vairpan, Germ. werden, Lith. veīszti, vartěti, O. Sl. vratiti, W. gwerthyd, ‘spindle’) is Lat. vertēre. Before l it is dropped when initial, e.g. lātus for *llātus, P. P. P. of fēro, tūlī, but becomes c when medial; thus the suffix -clo-, which indicates the instrument with which an action is performed, or the place of its performance, appears in Latin as -clo-, e.g. vēhīclum or vehīcīlum, ‘that by which one is carried’; pocclum or pocclīlum, ‘that out of which one drinks,’ cūbīclum or cubīclīlum, ‘the place where one lies down,’ &c., by the same change as is seen in later Latin vēclīs for vēt(ū)līs, in the
English mispronunciation ‘a least’ for ‘at least’ in Mod. Gk. σεύκλα from Gk. σευτλανον, &c. Before c it is assimilated, e.g. ac for *acc from *atc, atqu(e), while tt became ss, after a consonant s, e.g. passus for *pattus from patior, salns for *saltus from sallo, *salilo, versus from verio, &c.

Final -nt seems to have become -ns in the Umbro-Ocean languages, for the 3 Plur. Act. ending of Secondary Tenses (I.-Eur. -nt) appears in them as -ns, e.g. Osc. fufans ‘erant,’ quasi ‘fubant’ (ch. viii. § 73). The same may hold of Latin, for quōtions, lōtiens suggest the O. Ind. suffix -yant of ki-yant, ‘how large,’ &c. (See A. L. L. v. 575). Latin t represents an original d before r, e.g. dtr ox beside òdiun (see § 113). On the loss of t in consonant-groups, e.g. vax for *nocr(t)s, vermina for *ver(t)mina, see § 157, and on nn for tn, e.g. annus, § 161.

In Umbro-Ocean. I.-Eur. t remains, e.g. Umbr. tota-, Osc. τω&τo, a community, but tl became (as in Latin) kl, e.g. Umbr. pihaklu, Osc. sakaraklúm (cf. Pelignian sacaracirix ‘sacratrices,’ pristafalacirix ‘praestabulatrices’).


§ 107. I.-Eur. tl. Lat. locōr is I.-Eur. lloq- (O. Ir. atluchur for adtluchur in the phrase atluchur bude, ‘I thank,’ ‘ad-loquor gratias’). On the spellings stlēs, sēlis, sīlis for class. lis, see § 150.

§ 108. I.-Eur. tt. Verbs whose stem ends in a dental show ss (after a diphthong, &c. reduced to s, ch. ii. § 127) in their P. P. P., formed with the suffix -to (e. g. fissus from fiúo, ausus from avo, fissus from fiido, &c. (see § 155 and ch. v. § 28). So in formations with the suffix -tūmo-, e. g. vicentūnum for *vicieni-tūmo- (ch. v. § 14), Adjectives in -osus (ch. v. § 65), &c.

The combination tt in Latin appears to have been dropped by syncopé, e. g. cettē for *cē-dāte 2 Plur. Imper., egret(t)i, adgret(t)i (§ 109).

"ten" (O. Ind. dāṣa, Arm. tasn, Gk. δέκα, O. Ir. deich, W. deg, Goth. taɪhun, O. H. G. zehan, Lith. dėzimt, dėszimtis, O. Sl. dešeti?), Lat. dēcem; I.-Eur. root weird-, 'to see, know' (O. Ind. vēda, Arm. git-em, Gk. οἶδα, O. Ir. ad-fiadaim, 'I narrate,' Goth. vait, Engl. wot, O. Sl. věděti Inf.), Lat. vidēo, vidi. In the Sabine dialect d became l (I. F. ii. 157); and we find the spelling l sanctioned in a few Latin words at the beginning of the literary period, e.g. lācrīma, older dācrīma, dācruma (Gk. δάκρυ, Welsh dagr, Goth. dagr), (Paul. Fest. 48. 15 Th. 'dacrimas' pro lacrimas Livius saepe posuit). D became r before g in mergo, mergus (O. Ind. madgū-, 'a waterfowl'), &c., and before v and f, though the old forms arger, avrorsus, arfuernut, had their d restored from ad at the beginning of the second cent. B.C. Initial dw- became b, e.g. bēllum (older duellum, always a dissyllable in Plautus), bīs for *dwīs (Gk. δίς), (see § 68), and initial dy- became j- (y), e.g. Jōvis, O. Lat. Divōs (see § 63), but internal -dw- leaves v in suvīs (§ 71). D is assimilated to a following m in rāmentum from rūdo, caementām from caedo, c in O. Lat. reccido, hoc for *hōd-ce, l in relligio, pelluviae, water for washing the feet, grallae, stilts, from grādior, but assimilates a preceding l in percello for *cello (cf. clādes), &c. (see ch. viii. § 33), sallo for *salido (Goth. salta). It became t before r, e.g. ātrox (cf. ādlīm), and before t, this it becoming ss (see § 108), e.g. egressus, adgressus. The forms egrettus, adgrettus (Paul. Fest. 55. 3 Th. quotes egretus, adgretus, apparently from some early writer, earlier than the practice of writing the double consonant) seem to stand for *egred(i)to-, adgred(i)to- (§ 108).

I.-Eur. d remains in Umbro-Osc., e.g. Umbr. devo-, Osc. deīvō- 'divus,' but between vowels became in Umbrian a sound (u? ch. ii. § 88) which is expressed in the native alphabet by a sign conventionally written by us ū and in the Latin alphabet by rs, e.g. tēra, dersa 'det' (quasi *dēdat) (Pel. dida; cf. Osc. didest). For nd we have in Umbro-Osc. nn as in -nno- the Gerundive ending, e.g. Umbr. pihano- 'piandus,' Osc. ñpansano- 'operandus.'

THE LATIN LANGUAGE.

(0. Ind. chind-, Gk. σχίνδ-αλμύς, a splinter); Lat. dīvus (O. Ind. dēvā-, Lith. dēva); Lat. pes, Gen. pēdis (O. Ind. pād-, Gk. πός, πόδος Gen., πηχα, Goth. fōtus, Lith. pėdā, 'footprint'); Lat. suādeo (O. Ind. svādū-, 'sweet,' Gk. θέσος, Goth. suts); Lat. ēdo (O. Ind. ēd, Arm. ut-em, Gk. ἔδω, Goth. ita, Lith. ėdu, O. Sl. ėdā, 'food').

§ 111. Lat. 1 for d. Lautia, which usually occurs in an alliterative formula, e.g. Liv. xxx. 17. 14 aedes libere, loca, lautia legatis decreta; xxviii. 39. 19 locus inde lantiaque legatis praeberti jussa) was in Old Latin lāutia, a form quoted from Livius Andronicus by Paul. Fest. 48. 16 Th. 'lautia' (Livius saepae posuit), quae lautia dieimus, et dantur legatis hospitii gratia; līngua, for l.-Eur. *dunghwā- or *dunghwā-, Goth. tuggō; cf. O. Ir. tenge) was in Old Latin āingua [nos nunc . . . līnguam per l potius quam per d (scribamus), Mar. Vict. 9. 17 K.; communionem enim habuit littera (1 eum d) apud antiquos, ut 'dinguam' et āinguam, et 'daerimis' et lacrimis, et 'Kapitodium' et Kapitolium, id. 26. 1 K.). (Was Aquilonia the Ocean Akudunnia-, now Codogna? cf. O. Umbr. akeftunia-).

Pompey, according to Mar. Vict. 8. 15 K., affected the old spelling and pronunciation kādamitas for cādamītus (perhaps from the same root as Ocean cādeis ammod, 'with intent to injure,' 'out of malice,' Gk. κέκαδησα, explained by Hesychius as βδάψα, κακώσα, στερήσα), the di Novensiles appear on an old inscription from Picenum as Déiv. NOVESEDE (C. I. L. i. 178) (cf. the Marsic esos novesede, Zv. I. L. L. 39). In many or all of these words the preference of the byform with l can be explained by false analogy; in līngua by the analogy of līngo (cf. O. Ir. ligur, 'the tongue,' Arm. lezu, Lith. ležūvis); in cādamītus by the analogy of cālānum; in lāutia by the analogy of lavo, &c. Similarly O. Lat. délícāre with the sense of indicāre (e.g. Plant. Mil. 844) may owe its l to the influence of délīgue, to clarify. Perhaps Lat. līmpha, a Graecized form (cf. Gen. Pl. lynnphon, Varro, Sat. Men. 50 B.) of *dumpa, (Osc. Dümpe-), with Lat. Úlysses, does not exhibit a Latin change of d to l, but a change which had already been made in Greek; for Quintilian, i. 4. 16, quotes dialectal Gk. ὅλονσεΐς; and on Gk. vases (see Kretschmer, Gr. Vas. p. 146) we have Ὠλουσεύς (C. I. G. 7697), frequently Ὠλυτεύς (C. I. G. 7383, 7699, 8185, 8208), while Varro, L. L. vii. 87, quotes ψυφηλήγετος (cf. O. Lat. Thélis for Θέης, Varro, L. L. vii. 87). The exact relation of simīla, simīlāgo, fine wheaten flour (cf. Germ. Semmel), to Gk. σκίφαλα is doubtful, as also that of casīa (Paul. Fest. 33. 22 Th.; for cassīa?) to cassīs, cassida (an Etruscan word according to Isidore, Orig. xvii. 14. 1) The form redivium mentioned by Festus (370. 17 Th. redivivam quidam, alii 'reliquium' appellant, cum circa unguis cutis se resolvit, quia luere est solever) never ousted the form redivia. It does not appear to have been a phonetic variety of redivia, but rather a separate word, perhaps a grammarian's coinage, derived from luo, as redivia, re-d-ūxra was derived from *ūo of īnd-ūo, ex-ūo, exūvīae. Some of the forms with l mentioned above, e.g. cādamītas, 'injury to crops,' may similarly have been different words from the d-forms. [So consilium, &c. beside præsidium, &c.; cf. Mar. Vict. 9. 18 K. præsidium per d potius (scribamus) quam per l; consilium Plant. Cas. 966 (see below on solium)]. Some appear to be dialectal; e.g. lepēsta or lepīsta [Gk. δέπεστα (but cf. λεπαστή), according to Varro, L. L. v. 123] was Sabine (Varro, l. c.), and perhaps Novensiles (id. v. 74) (cf. Paul. Fest. 77. 7 Th. 'inpelimenta' 'inpedimenta dicebant); so probably lārix for *darix (O. Ir. dair for *darix, 'an oak'), and possibly laurus for *daurus (O. Ir. daur for *daruas, 'an oak'); Melica (gallina) for Medica (Varro, R. R. iii. 9. 19) (cf.}
Paul. Fest. 89. 27 Th.) ; and the few modern Italian words which show this change of d to l may be dialectal too, e.g. cicala from Lat. cicāla, ellera from Lat. hēdēra, trespolo from Lat. trēs and pēdes, as tiepolo is a dialectal variety of tepido (Lat. tēpīdu) (cf. the Pygentia, now Licensa, in the Sabine district). It is possible, but unlikely, that Lat. pōbbicus (Umbr. pupītiko-), Pōbbius from gūbes, a name whose spelling was often altered after Poplicola and other names derived from pōpūlus (cf. Umbr. Puplicio-), may stand for *pābī- and exhibit that change of d to l after a labial which is seen in these Italian forms tiepolo and trespolo (cf. the byform impellentum). The town-name Telēsia shows d on Oscar coins with Tedis (Zv. I. I. 1. 262). Other examples of l for d are levir, better laevir, a brother-in-law for *dauver (O. Ind. devir-), Gk. δαυρ for *δαυριν, Lith. dėveris, O. Sl. děveri), which Nonius (557. 6 M.) explains: quasi laesus vir; ὅθος, which stands in puzzling contrast to σῶτος from the root od-, 'to smell' (Arm. hot, Gk. ὀδή, Lith. ūžū) (odefacit of Paul. Fest. 193. 21 Th. 'odefacit' diecubant pro officio, may be a grammarians's coinage). But the other instances usually quoted are doubtful: ἀλίγο may come from *πενιθ as well as from ἀρίδος; σόλουm and O. Lat. solūm (e. g. Ens. Ann. 93. 6 M. scannnemolun) may be from a root swell- (Gk. σέλαια, Lith. sūlas, 'a bench'), and not represent *sodīnum (O. Ir. suide) from the root sed-, as solūm, the ground, the sole of the foot (cf. solēa, a slipper) stands for *swolo-, (O. Ir. fol, 'the base, foundation'); melus might be from *maz-lo-, as Engl. mast is from *maz-do-. The interchange of d and l in lacrūma, lingua, &c. was well known to the native Latin grammarians, and was often appealed to by them to support theoretical etymologies of words with l. Thus they explained sella (really for *sed-la;) by Laco. Gk. ἡ ζώλα; cf. Goth. sitius, Engl. a settle, O. Sl. sedlo, 'a saddle') by this interchange (Mar. Vict. 26. 3 K.); similarly ancūla from ambe-cūdo (Varro, L. L. vii. 43); sēlīquastra from sēdeo (Fest. 508. 10 Th.); médivo from μεσερός (Serv. ad Ed. i. 2); delicactus from dedicatus [Paul. Fest. 49. 17 Th. ; who quotes a (suppositions) dedicare, 51. 35 Th. 'delicare' ponebant pro dedicare; cf. Gl. Plac. 1 11 G. delicare: deferre, quod et 'dedicare' diecubant pro commercio litterarum). This delicare for dedicare is either an etymological coinage to explain delicatus, or the Old Latin dedicare, to explain, inform, which was mentioned above. Modern etymologists have adopted a similar course to explain some difficult words like mutier, miēs, silvecrum, lēdus (for other examples, see Wharton: On Latin Consonant Laws, in the Phil. Soc. Trans. 1889 ; and Conway, Indogerm. Forsch. ii. 157). But the evidence rather points to this l-like pronunciation of d having asserted itself at the beginning of the literary period, but not having gained admission into the literary language, except in the case of a few words where the l was supported by analogy or other causes. (Latin balīolus, from bâdius, is a 'ghost-word,' the true reading in Plaut. Poen. 1301 is baiolus, the old spelling of baulus). Whether an original l is ever represented by d in Latin is doubtful. The mispronunciation alipes for ādipes (Prob. App. 199. 3 K.) was probably influenced by the Gk. ἀείφα, but is no argument that the Greek and Latin words are connected; the O. Lat. sedla for sella, quoted by Ter. Scatrin. 13. 14 K., seems to be a grammarians's coinage to illustrate the etymology from sēdeo, though it might possibly be the same dialectal sedēta, with a peculiar form of d, which is still heard in S. Italy and Sardinia, where every Italian l is replaced by this dē-sound (see ch. ii. § 85). (On melīpontus and melīpontus, see Keil on Cato R. R. iii. 5.)

§ 112. Lat. r for d. Priscian (i. p. 35. 2 H.) tells us that the 'antiquissimi'
used arenae, arcentores, arvocati, arfines, arvolare, arfari, also asper; and other grammarians mention arventum (Mar. Vict. 9. 17 K.), arverse, arvorsarius. Vel. Long. 71. 22 K.), areniet, Gl. Plae., arferia: Paul. Fest. 8. 32 Th.; Gloss. ap. Lœwe Prodr. p. 13 vs vinarium quo vinum ad aras ferabant; cf. adferial, Gl. Cyrt.). In Cato we find arevho (e.g. R. R. 135. 7; 138); and on inscriptions arsferunt, arfiuse and arvorsum (C. I. L. i. 196) in the S. C. de Bacchanalibus of 186 B. C., arvorsario beside advorsarium (1. 198), in the Lex Repetundarum of 123-2 B. C., arversu (ix. 782). Apur (Mar. Vict. 9. 17 K.), apor (Paul. Fest. 19. 34 Th.), the old form of apud, was probably a 'doublet' used before a word beginning with g, v, f. cf. apur finem in an old inscription from the Marsic territory, Zv. I. I. I. 45; but quäquir in the augur's formula for marking out a templum (Varro, L. L. vii. 8) is a doubtful example; and arvorsus (Legg. XII Tabb. 10. 7 Br.), ar me Lucil. ix. 30 M. unlikely readings. The affinity of the sounds is seen in the (dialectal) mispronunciation 'in usu cotidie loquentium' (Consent. 392. 15 K.) peres for pédes (cf. arrenire Diam. 452. 29 K.); and r (or else d, the th-sound of our 'this,' 'then') takes the place of Italian d in the dialects of S. Italy and Sicily, e.g. dicere and ricere for Ital. dieere in the Abruzzi; Napolitain ruece for Ital. dodici, and (like Consentiius' peres) pere for Ital. pedie, &. Arger persisted in Vulgar Latin (Ital. argine, 'a dam,' Span. arcen, 'a parapet.') Arbitur, from the root q̣̄ēt- of Lat. vēo (O. Scand. at-kvædêa, 'a decision') seems to be dialectal. O. Umbr. adpurati, in Lat. arbitratu) (cf. minërêula, the form used by Plantus, classical minëdêula with the termination of acriâula, fícêula, quærâela, nîtêula, alêÇêa; and the glosses mareus for müdûus, solerare for sådâure, marcerat for marçêat (Lôwe, Prodr. 352 ; Opusc. 142). The change of d to r in O. Lat. arsferunt (preserved in the formula scr. arf. scribendo arsferunt), &c. was often mentioned by the native grammarians, who regarded a reference of any r to an original d as a legitimate device in framing etymologies. Thus Velius Longus (71. 23 K.) derives auricûla from auâio, and merîdes (older meridies Adv.) from médios and dies. This explanation of meridies is probably right, the r being due to dissimilation (cf. Cic. Orat. xlvii. 157 jam videtur nescire dulcius, ipsum meridiem eur non 'mediem'; Varro, L. L. vi. 4, says that metidies was the old form, and that he had seen it on a Praenestine sundial: meridies ab eo quod medius dies. d antiqui, non r, in hoe dicebat, ut Praeneste incisum in solario vidit), though a good deal may be said for the derivation from merus (cf. mero meridie, Petr. 37. p. 25. 1 B.), and the Praenestine D seen by Varro may have been merely an old form of the letter R, as lâdinop, lâdenel on all coins c. 250 B. C.) of Latinum (modern Larino) (C. I. L. i. 24) may show the Oscan D, the symbol of r, as R was of d. Isidore (Orig. xii. 7. 69) similarly explains mëëâla: merula antiquitut 'medula' vocábatur, eo quod moduletur; and Varro (L. L. v. 110) derives perua 'a pede.'

Modern etymologists explain in the same way glârea (Gk. χάρως), possibly a dialectal form, simìtur (ch. ix. § 8) beside simìtu, and other words of doubtful origin (see Wharton, Latin Consonant Laws, in Phil. Soc. Trans. 1869, on córes, plôra, &c.). But the available evidence hardly allows us to ascribe any r to an original d in a Latin word except before g, v, f. Cidìcìus, a loanword from Gk κηρύκων (Dor. κάρ-') may owe its d to a fanciful connexion of the word with cidìcìus. In Umbrian ar- is found for the Preposition ad in compounds perhaps only before f, v-, e.g. arvefitu 'advêhito,' arferutu (and arsferutu) 'arfeitur' (von Planta, i. p. 408). (On Lat. arcesso and other doubtful exx. of ar- for ad-, see Schoell, xii Tabb., p. 81.)
§ 113. TR for dr. Lat. *citrus* was the old form of Gk. κήδος, for Naevius has *citrosa vestis*, while *Casternar, Alexanier* were the old forms of *Casavérpa, Akēdrós*, according to Quint. i. 4. 16 [we find *Ailexentrum (C. L. I. i. 50), Alizente(r), Casenter(a) (i. 1501), on old inscriptions from Praeneste]. So Gk. *Thēdras, ovivos, Lat. *Hydrantum, is modern Otranto, Lat. *nūtris is for *noud-río (§ 42) (Lith. maudā, ‘use,’ Goth. niutan, ‘to enjoy,’ Germ. geniessen) : *taeter for *taed-río (cf. *taedet) ; so *ter. Gen. *träis (Gk. *δπία) ; *lūtra, an otter, may be a malformation of *utra (O. Ind. *ṭrā-, Lith. *ūdra, Engl. *otter). The group *dr* is not found in Latin, except in *quadra-, quadra, * &c. (but cf. *triquetus*). The name *Drusus* (cf. Gloss ap. Löwe, Prodr. p. 398 *drusus* : *patiens, rigidus, contumax*) is declared by Suetonius (Tib. iii.) to be a Gaulish name: *Drusus, hostium duce Drauso comminus trucidato, sibi posterisque cognomen invenit ; andraure and anua* (Paul. Fest. 7. 15 Th.) are very doubtful spellings of *antraure (antroare) and *traua (ib. 1. 17).

§ 114. DH. I.-Eur. *dh* became *f* in Latin, which in proximity to *r* became *b* ; but in the middle of a word between vowels *d* is found ; e.g. I.-Eur. *dhámö- (O. Ind. dháma-, Gk. θύμος, Lith. dūmāi Pl., O. Sl. dymū), Lat. fāmūs ; I.-Eur. rūdhro- (Gk. ἐρῆθρος, O. Sl. rūdrū ; cf. O. Ind. rudhirā-), Lat. rūber, stem *rubro- ; I.-Eur. root bheidh- (Gk. πείθω for *ϕείω, Lat. fito). This *f, b, d* may have all three developed from an older *d*-sound, the sound of our *th* in ‘this,’ ‘that,’ ‘then ;’ but whether Sicilian *λρπα* (for Lat. *libra*) is a survival of the *d*-stage is uncertain. The change of *dr* to *fr, br* may be compared with the change of *sr* to *fr, br* in *tenebrae* for *tenes-rae*, &c. (§ 152).

I.-Eur. *dh* is in *Umbro-Osco. f*, whether initial or internal, e.g. | Umbr. *fācia, Osc. fākiiad *fāciat*, Umbr. *rufra *rubra*, Osc. *mesia *mediae* (von Planta, i. p. 451). This *f* for Lat. (internal) *d, b* is found in some dialectal words, e.g. *crefrare* for *cribrare*, like dialectal *f* for Lat. (internal) *b* from I.-Eur. *bh* (see ch. ii. § 83).


(2) Medial : from I.-Eur. root *reudh-, ‘to be red’ (O. Ind. *rāhita-, ‘red,’ lōhā-, U
The corresponding vdes 79) 104) fulius (3) grddus I.-Eur. cf. Goth. *farba languages, (O. koka-, (3) Goth, *medhyo- (O. Ind. madhya-, Gk. μέδις, Goth. midjís), Lat. mèdus; I.-Eur. root aidh-, ‘to burn’ (O. Ind. ādha-, ‘firewood,’ Gk. αἵθω, O. Ir. aid, ‘fire,’ O. Engl. ād, ‘pyre’), Lat. aedes, house, lit. ‘hearth.’ Similarly Lat. vídua (O. Ind. vidhávā, O. Ir. fedb, Goth. viduvō, O. Sl. vídova); fīdīlia (Gk. φίδος); ērūdus (Goth. griþs); vādes (Goth. vadi, Germ. Wette, Lith. vadūti, ‘to redeem’); āber (O. Ind. údhar, Gk. ἀδαφ, O. Engl. üder); conblētron, a bulrush (cf. Lith. sveindrai Pl.); barba for *farba (§ 104) (Engl. beard, O. Sl. brada, Lith. barz-dā); arbas (O. Ind. ardha-, ‘to grow, thrive’); ēlēber (O. H. G. glat, ‘smooth,’ Engl. glad, Lith. gladus, ‘smooth,’ O. Sl. gladûkû); verbūm (Goth. vauð, Neut., Lith. vaðas, ‘a name’).

§ 116. The Gutturals. There are three series of Gutturals, viz. (1) Palatals (in some languages Sibilants, e.g. O. Ind. śatam, Lith. sziimtas, O. Sl. sîto, ‘hundred’ corresponding to Lat. centum); (2) Velars, better called Gutturals proper (Gutturals in all languages, e.g. the onomatopoetic name of the cuckoo, O. Ind. kōka-, Gk. κόκκυξ, Lat. cucûlus; cf. Lith. kukûti, ‘to cry cuckoo’); (3) Velars with Labialisation, i.e. followed by a w-sound (in some languages Labials, e.g. Hom. Gk. πισυρες, W. pedwar, Ose. petora, ‘four,’ corresponding to Lat. quattuor). They are most conveniently written, (1) k, ẑ, &c., (2) g, &c., (3) qu, gu, &c., while the symbols k, g, &c. may be reserved for Gutturals whose exact nature is doubtful. So far as Latin is concerned, we might write (1) and (2) as k, g, &c., and (3) as kw, gw, &c., for the same letter c represents the k of centum and the k of carpo (O. Ind. kṛpa-), nor does the kw of equus, &c. (O. Ind. ásava-) present a different appearance from the q\textsuperscript{2} of quattuor, sequor (O. Ind. sac-). I.-Eur. k and k became Lat. c (k), ẑ and g Lat. g, ẑh and gh became a guttural spirant, which was written g with a consonant, elsewhere h; I.-Eur. qu is Lat. gu (which we might write kv, kw), q\textsuperscript{2} is Latin gu, gv (gw), which became g before a consonant, but lost its g when initial just as dʒ- (dʒ-) when initial became j- (y-), or as Teut. gw from I.-Eur. gh\textsuperscript{1} became w in ‘warm,’ ‘snow,’ &c. It lost its g also when medial between vowels. I.-Eur. gh\textsuperscript{1} became a guttural spirant
followed by a \( \nu \)-sound, which was written with a consonant \( \text{gu} \) or \( g \), but elsewhere became \( \text{hw} \), this \( \text{hw} \) developing at the beginning of a word into \( f \) [just as the Greek \( \text{hw} \)-sound from I.-Eur. initial \( sw \)- seems to have developed into some \( f \)-sound (ch. i. \( \S \) 3)], but in the middle of a word into \( v \) (\( w \)). (For examples see below.)

The I.-Eur. Gutturals offer considerable difficulty. It is not only that we find occasionally the confusion, found with every species of Mute, between Tenuis and Media (ch. ii. \( \S \) 75), Media and Aspirate, &c.; e.g. the guttural Media seems to replace the Aspirate in Lat. \( \text{dëgurrio} \) (cf. lingo), from the root \( \text{leigh-} \), 'to lick' (Gk. \( \lambda \varepsilon \chi \omega \)), Lat. \( \text{adagio, prödígium} \), from the root \( \text{agh-} \), 'to say' (O. Ind. \( \text{ah-} \)), Lat. \( \text{fëgëra} \) (cf. fingo) from the root \( \text{dheigh-} \), 'to mould', (O. Ind. \( \text{dih-} \), 'to smear') just as we find the labial Media replacing the Aspirate in Gk. \( \sigma\tau\epsilon\mu\beta\omega \) beside \( \omega\sigma\tau\epsilon\mu\phi\phi\). We find also apparent confusion of one series of Gutturals with another; thus in Greek (and perhaps in other languages) the proximity of the vowel \( u \) seems to change a Guttural of the third into a Guttural of the second series, e.g. \( \gamma\nu\nu\gamma \) (Boeot. \( \beta\alpha\nu\dot{a}, \text{O. Ir. } \text{ban} \), \( \lambda\kappa\kappa\sigma\) (dial. Lat. \( \text{lopus} \)) ; and very often the want of a cognate word in a language which treats one series differently from another, prevents us from ascertaining to which series a Guttural properly belongs, e.g. whether the \( c \) of \( \text{collum} \) is a palatal or a true guttural. We are also confronted with an apparently I.-Eur. dialectal change of \( q^\text{u} \) to \( p \), perhaps made in order to avoid that similarity between two successive syllables which was so sought after in Latin (\( \S \) 163). Thus the I.-Eur. word for 'five' may have been \( *q\text{e}q\text{nq}^\text{u} \text{c} \) in one dialect (O. Ind. \( \text{páncac} \), Gk. \( \pi\varepsilon\nu\tau\varepsilon, &c.) \), \( *q\text{e}q\text{nq}^\text{u} \text{c} \) in another (Lat. \( \text{quinque, O. Ir. } \text{còic} \); the root meaning 'to cook,' \( \text{peq}^\text{u} \) - (O. Ind. \( \text{pac-} \), Gk. \( \pi\varepsilon\sigma\sigma\omega \)), \( q^\text{u} \text{eq}^\text{u} \) - (W. pobi, with \( p \)- from I.-Eur. \( q^\text{u} \), Lat. \( \text{coqus} \)), and even \( q^\text{u} \text{ep} \) - (Lith. kepù. What of Gk. \( \dot{\alpha}\rho\tau\omega-\kappa\dot{\omega}\tau\sigma\sigma\text{os} \) ?). The same explanation has been suggested for the \( q^\text{u} \) of Lat. \( \text{quercus} \) beside the \( p \)- of O. Engl. \( \text{furh} \), Engl. \( \text{fir} \), and for the \( p \)- of Goth. \( \text{fidvör} \), Engl. \( \text{four} \), beside the \( q^\text{u} \) of other languages, e.g. Lat. \( \text{quattuor} \).

A Latin Guttural, to whatever series it belongs, combines with a following \( s \) into \( x \), e.g. \( \text{vezi} \) from \( \text{vëho} \) (I.-Eur. \( \text{gh} \)), before \( l \) becomes the group \( cl \), e.g. \( \text{vectus, actus} \), which in late Latin

---

1 So \( w \) is dropped before the \( \nu \)-sound in Engl. 'two.'
came to be pronounced tt (Ital. atto), before n, m becomes the group gn, jn, e.g. j from il, e. the word cygnus from kókko. Initial gn- became n- at the beginning of the second cent. B.C., e.g. nátus. But lúna does not stand for *lucna, but for *lucsa (Zend raoxšna-, 'shining,' Pruss. lauxnos, 'stars'), as we see from the old form on a Praenestine mirror, Losna (C. I. L. i. 55), just as vélum, a sail, stands for *vex-ulum (O. Sl. veslo, 'a rudder'), as we see from the Diminutive form vexillum, so that Gk. λύκνος has been declared to represent *λυκσνος (M. S. L. vii. 91). Another instance of Greek χυ appearing in Latin as n with long vowel is the (loanword?) aránea (Gk. ἀράχνη). Exágmen beside agmen, amb-ages (on exagmen see Class. Rev. v. 294), contámino beside contágium; [contrast propagmen (Enn. Ann. 587 M.) beside propágο, and cf. subtegmen from texo beside subtegmen, e.g. Virg. Aen. iii. 483], have been variously explained by hypotheses that have as yet failed to establish themselves, such as (1) that the Guttural is assimilated (like d in caementum from caedo) after a long vowel, *exág-men becoming *exámnen, exámen, while ág-men remains agmen; (2) that the Guttural is assimilated in the unaccented syllable (under the earlier Accent Law), whence exámen but ágmen; (3) that the unassimilated forms had originally a connecting vowel, e.g. āg(i)men (cf. jugumentum, a joining, Cato, R. R. xiv. 1 and 4). Another theory, that these forms add an s to the final Guttural of the root, exámen for *ex-ax-men from *aɣs-men- (cf. *ax-la, ax-is), connects the forms with a known law of Latin phonetics, and is preferable on that account.

The cognates of major, aio show g in Latin, e.g. magnus, mágis, adagio, pródígium, but the guttural Aspirate in other I.-Eur. languages (O. Ind. mah-, ah-); so it is better to refer them to the ordinary law that Latin k may be dropped between vowels, than to posit a new law that the guttural Media was dropped before y. Major will thus come from an older *máhior (cf. O. Ind. máhīyas-); púlèium, fleabane, apparently from púlex, a flea, may be dialectal, like Umbr. muiento P. P. P., with i for palatalized g, beside mugatu Imperat.; brévis (Gk. βραχύς) will represent an older trisyllable bréhuis, and lèvis (Gk. λαχύς: what of ἀλαφρός?) an older *lehuis, while pinguis (Gk. παχύς),
where the Aspirate is preceded by the consonant *n, will represent an older trisyllabic form *pinguǐs (see § 127).

Aspirate Tenues, which are difficult to trace (see § 95), have been found in unguis (cf. O. Ind. nakhá-, Gk. ὄνυχ-, O. Ir. inge, Lith. nāgas, O. Engl. nagel) (see B. B. xvi. 133), congius (O. Ind. šanská-, ‘a shell,’ Gk. κόγχη, Lett. sence). On dat. el for I.-Eur. -tl-, e.g. pōc(w)lum see § 105; on ce for le, e.g. ac for *ato, atque, hoc for *hod-c(e), § 109; on the mispronunciations ss, sc for s, e.g. coxim, ascella, ch. ii. § 117.

In Umbrian the combination kt, when due to Syncope, seems to be differently developed according as the k represents on the one hand an I.-Eur. q² or on the other an I.-Eur. k (or k); in the former case it becomes kt, e.g. fiktu (Lat. fūgitò for fīvītō, ch. viii. § 7), in the latter, it, e.g. deitu (Lat. dīcitō). In Osc. both are kt, e.g. fruktatiu̱f fru(v)itationes, factu̱d facītō, while I.-Eur. q²t (not due to Syncope) is Umbro-Osc. kt, and I.-Eur. kt, kt (not due to Syncope) is Umbro-Osc. ht (for examples see Buck, Vocalismus Osk. Sprache, p. 145).

§ 117. x for Guttural with s. Vexi from vihō (I.-Eur. root wegʰ-, ‘to carry’); pανξι (cf. Gk. πάγγους); fυξί from fingu (I.-Eur. dheigẖ-); nιx for *s(n)igẖs; cξί from cōquo; ᾱξια, prō-lixus, e-lixius from oliquor for *vliquor (O. Ir. fliech, ‘wet,’ W. gwylb). Before most consonants x became s, e.g. sece̱ni for *sex-ceṉi, (as after r in mers for merx, sparsi, tersi, &c., § 158), but not before t in dexter, dextra, sectus, &c. (but lustro, to illuminate, illustris, &c. from *lucus, tr.; on Sestius, mishtus, see ch. ii. § 125), while before m, n, l it was (like s for I.-Eur. s, e.g. quāḻhus for *quas-ḻhus, cf. qua̱ssiḻlus, § 151; dropped with ‘Compensation,’ e.g. pāḻhus for *pax-ḻhus (Dim. paxxiḻlus); ἀυλα, wing, shoulder, for *ex-la (Dim. ax̱iḻla), like axis, an axle, from the root aɣ- of ἄγγο (O. H. G. ahsala, ‘shoulder,’ W. echel, ‘an axle,’ Engl. axle); τεύλιον, for *texus-ḻnum, from texo, to shape (O. H. G. dehsala, ‘an axe,’ O. Sl. tesla; tīla, for *texus-ḻna, from texo, to weave (Ter. Hœn. 285 texentem telam); τάξις, for *texus-ḻsus (Dim. tax̱iḻlus); σε̱μι for *sex-i; aula, Dim. auxilla.

§ 118. c̱t for Guttural with t. Vεκτ̱us, with seeḵos, a lever, from vihō (gh); pαντ̱um and pαντ̱um from pαγγ̱o (g̱?). Fεκτ̱um from fingu (gh); lucṯus, grief, from lūg̱o (g̱); cœcṯum from cōquo (q²); nιc̱o, to wink; cf. co-nive̱o (gh³). After a consonant c was dropped in course of time (§ 157), e.g. foṟtis, in O. Lat. fortĕs [in the XII Tables foṟetes was the name given to the loyal neighbours of Rome, sanates to those who had swerved from their loyalty, but had returned to it, Fest. 524. 15 Th.; cf. Paul. Fest. 59. 26 ‘foṟetes’ (leg. ‘foṟetis’) frugi et bonus, sive validus]; quīnṯus, in the older spelling quīnṯus, the older form being long retained in the names Quīnṯitiḻus, Quīnṯi̱cius, Quīṉteḻi̱us, &c. (see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v.). On Vulg. and Late-Lat. tt for c̱t, e.g. brate̱a, see ch. ii. § 95, and cf. Rhein. Mus. xlv. p. 493.

§ 119. gn, gm for en, cm. Like i̱ḏg̱num from i̱lex are tarīg̱num from lāṟix, salīg̱num from sīḻix; similarly segmentum from sēco; dīg̱num, usually explained as *dec-nu̱s
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from *deect*, but better as *dic-nus* (O. Scand. tiginn, ‘high-born,’ tign, ‘rank’) a P. P. P. NO-stem from the root deik- of dicere, indicare, &c. *Aprinus* is a late spelling of *aprumus*; *aprinus* is an entirely different formation (see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v.). After a consonant the Guttural is dropped, e. g. *quernus* for *querc-nus* from *quercus*; *farnus* for *fiarg-nus*, a byform of *fraxinus*, though not in Compounds with ad, &c., e. g. *agmosco*. When the consonant is a Nasal, it seems to combine with the following Nasal, e. g. *quini* for *quinc-ni*, so that *contāminu* might stand for *con-tang-nino* as well as for *con-tags-mino*. Compounds with in, con show different spellings; in- with *gnosco* gives *ignosco*, con- with *gnosco* both *cognosco* and *cōnosco*, as con- with *necto* gives *cōnecdto*, &c. (cf. ch. ii. § 130).

Initial Latin *gn* became at the beginning of the second cent. b. c. *n* (as in Engl. ‘gnat’), e. g. *nōso, old gnōso (γν-), nātus, older gnātus (γν-*) (gnatate παυδονύμα, C. G. L. ii. 35. 10), *nixus*, older gnixus (kn-); cf. O. H. G. *hnīgan*, Germ. *neigen*, *nārus*, older gnarius (gnàruit ympfèra, C. G. L. ii. 35. 12), *nātus, older gnātus, Naeusus* (cf. Gk. *Naos* on the Mon. Anc.) beside *Gnaeus* (cf. *Gnaivod, Abk., on a Scipio epitaph, C. L. L. i. 30). For instances of the older forms, see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v., and Lōwe, Prod. 354: e. g. *gnosier* on the S. C. Bacch. of 186 b. c., C. L. L. i. 196. 27, but *nationum, noverit* (beside *gnatus Part.*) on the Lex Repetundarum of 123–122 b. c., i. 198; *natus Part.* on the Sent. Minuciorum of 117 b. c., i. 199. Plautus and Terence use, as a rule, *natus* for the Participle, *gnatus* for the Substantive; the *gn* of these forms appears in the Compounds agnosco, agnatus, ignarius, ignaves, &c., and strangely also in *agnomen*, cognomen; for *nōmen* (so in S. C. Bacch.) was not originally *gnomen* (cf. O. Ind. nāma-, and for the various forms of the root, see B. B. xvii. 132). On *cρυπνολυμ* and Gk. *καφα*, see § 80.

§ 120. Lat. *h* dropped between vowels. *Bimus* for *bi-himus*, lit. ‘two winters old,’ like Eng. twiner, a two-year old beast (cf. *χυμapos, gast, lit. ‘a winter old,’ Scotch gimmer, a yearling lamb); *nil* (so always in Plautus), for *nihil*, *nihītum* from *nē* and *hisum* (cf. Erm. A. 8 M. nec dispendi facit hilum; Lucil. xiv. 11 M. hilo non sectius vivas; Lucr. iii. 830 nil igitur mors est ad nos neque pertinent hilum), *hilum* being explained as ‘quod grano fabae adhaeret’ (Paul. Fest. 72. 10 Th.); *praebes* for *praehibes*; *cor* for *cohors*. On the *h* of *Ætnus* (*auemus*) for *ayēs-no*, and on the question whether *h* was used in *vehemens*, &c. to indicate a long vowel (as in Umbrian, e. g. *comohota* ‘commōta’), see ch. ii. § 56.

§ 121. Dialectal *f* for *h*. In Spanish, Latin *f* has become *h*, e. g. hablar, ‘to speak’ (Lat. *fabulari*, O. Lat. *fabulare*), and an interchange of *h* and *f* shows traces of itself in the dialects of Italy. We find the form *fusena* for *hāsena* inscribed to the Sabine dialect by the grammarians (Vel. Long. 69. 8 K.), along with *ficus* (cf. the name of a citizen of Reate mentioned by Varro, *Ficellius*) and *fēsus*. Similar forms roughly classed by the grammarians as ‘Old Latin’ we may believe to have been dialectal, e. g. *fordem* for *hordeum, folus* for *hōsus, hostis* for *hostis, hostia* for *hostia*, &c., though some of them may be mere coinages to strengthen the argument for the spelling with *h* (see Quint. i. 4. 14; Ter. Scaur. pp. 11, 13 K. ; Vel. Long. p. 81 K. ; Paul. Fest. 59. 21 Th. &c.). A Faliscan inscription has foiled for *hodie* (Not. Scav. 1887, pp. 262, 307): foiled uino pipafo kra karefo ‘hodie vinum bibam, cras carebo,’ but a Sabine inscription has *hirietum*, apparently from the root *ğer- (ʔğer-)* (Osc. *heriiad, Gk. *χαιρω, &c.*), and Ter. Scaurus (13. 9 K.) quotes *haba* (Lat. *faba*, O. Sl. *bobu,*
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I.-EUR. bh- as Faliscan. (See von Planta, i. p. 442; Löwe, Prodr. p. 426; and on the interchange of f and h in Etruscan inscriptions, Pauli, Attitalische Forschungen, iii. p. 114). Lat. fel has been explained as a dialectal form for *hel (cf. Gk. χῖνος), and fovea for *hovea (Gk. χῖνος) (cf. the gloss 'fuma' terra, C. G. L. v. 296. 50).

§ 122. The Palatal Gutturals: Ř, Ĝ, ĠH, ŹH. These were in Latin, as in Greek, Celtic, and Teutonic, guttural sounds, while in the Asiatic languages and Slavonic they were sibilants.

Ř. I.-EUR. Ř, Lat. c, is seen in I.-EUR. *k̞mto-, 'hundred' (O. Ind. šātām, Gk. ε-κατόν, O. Ir. cēt, W. cant, Goth. hund, Lith. šūmītas), Lat. centum; *swēkūro-, 'step-father' (O. Ind. śvāśura-, Arm. skesur F., Gk. κεφός, O. Corn. hwigeren, hwege F., Goth. svaihra, Germ. Schwäher, Lith. szeszuras), Lat. sōcer; *ökō(u), 'eight' (O. Ind. aśṭāu, aśṭā, Gk. ἕκτο, O. Ir. ocht, W. wyth, Goth. altau, O. Engl. eahta, Lith. asztūnī, O. Sl. osmī), Lat. oktō. I.-EUR. řw was merged in qu, the representative of I.-EUR. q; thus I.-EUR. *k̞kwo-, 'horse' (O. Ind. āśva-; cf. Lith. aszvā, 'mare,' &c.) is Lat. ėquus.

I.-EUR. Ř is Umbro-Osc. ř, e.g. Umbr. kletram Acc., 'a litter' (Gk. κλίνω, &c.), Kluvīer, Osc. Kluvatium from the root klew- (Lat. cluēo, Gk. κλέω, &c.), (von Planta, i. p. 326). In Umbrian ř (whether from I.-EUR. Ř or ř) was palatalized before e, i, and was written in the native alphabet by a sign which we conventionally express by č, in the Latin alphabet by ś (sometimes š), e.g. čeršnatur, čišna (Lat. cēna, Osc. kersna-) (ib. p. 359).

§ 123. Other examples of I.-EUR. Ř. From I.-EUR. root weik-, 'to enter' (O. Ind. viś-, vēṣā- M., 'a tent,' Gk. φῶς, Alb. vis M., 'a place,' Goth. vīhs, 'a village,' Lith. vęsėti, 'to be lodged,' O. Sl. viši, 'a farm'), Lat. vicus; I.-EUR. *yūwenkō- (O. Ind. yuvāś-, Gk. ὑπόβασις, O. Ir. ōac, W. ieuance, Goth. jugs), Lat. ĵwences, I.-EUR. ĵrd-, 'heart' (O. Ind. śrad-dhā-, 'confidence,' Arm. sirt, Gk. καρδία, O. Ir. eride, Goth. haitō, Lith. širdis, O. Sl. srđice), Lat. cor, crēdo; I.-EUR. root kłę-, 'to hear' (O. Ind. śrū-, Gk. κλῶ, O. Ir. cloor, cluinim, W. clymed Inf., Goth. hlīu-ma, 'hearing,' O. Sl. slūti, 'to be famous'), Lat. clīeo; I.-EUR. *pōrkō- (Gk. πόρος, O. Ir. orc, O. Engl. ear, Engl. farrow, Lith. pašzas, O. Sl. prasė), Lat. porcos; I.-EUR. Ř-, a Demonstrative Pronoun-stem (Arm. -s, Gk. κα, Alb. si-, O. Ir. cē, Goth. hi-mma, Lith. szis, O. Sl. si), Lat. čis, čiter, čitra; I.-EUR. klēi-, 'to lean' (O. Ind. šri-, Gk. κάθω, O. Ir. cloen, 'awry,' Goth. hlains, 'a hill,' Lith. šzialt̥as), Lat. ac-lēnis, čarious; I.-EUR. *dēk̞p̞-, 'ten' (O. Ind. dāśa, Arm. tasn, Gk. δέκα, O. Ir. deich, W. deg, Goth. tailbun, Lith. dēšimt, O. Sl. děšet̥i), Lat. décem; I.-EUR. root deik-, 'to point, say' (O. Ind. diš-, Gk. δείκνυμι, Goth. gateihan, 'to proclaim'), Lat. dicere, indicare; I.-EUR. root prék-, 'to ask' (O. Ind. praš-ná-, 'a question,' O. Ir. imm-chom-arcim, 'I ask,' O. W. di-er-
chim, Goth. fraih-na, Germ. frage, Lith. praszaũ, O. Sl. prošq, Lat. précor. Similarly Lat. crāblo for *crūbro (cf. Lith. szirsũ, O. Sl. srūšen, Engl. hornet); ācus, ācer, &c. from the root āk-, 'to be sharp' (O. Ind. āšr-, 'edge,' Arm. ašæn, 'a needle,' Lith. aštrim, 'sharp,' O. Sl. ostru, &c.); cērērum for *cerēs-rum (cf. O. Ind. śiras-, N., 'head,' Gk. κάρα, &c.).

§ 124. I.-Eur. ĺw. Lat. combrērum, bulrush, from the stem ĺwēndhr-, seen in Lith. szvȩndrāi Pl., has been compared to sōr for *swēsor- (§ 68) but it more probably shows the O-grade of the stem, *swombr-ērum (cf. O. Scand. hvōnā 'angelica'), with reduction of quo- to co- as in cōlo for older quolo (cf. § 137).

§ 125. ĺ. Of I.-Eur. ĺ, Lat. g, we have examples in the I.-Eur. roots ĺen-, ľen-, 'to know, learn' (O. Ind. jā-nā-mi, jātā-, Arm. can-eay Aor., Gk. γινο-σκω, γνωρός, O. Įr. gnāth, 'accustomed,' W. gnawd, O. Engl. enåw, Engl. to know, Lith. žin-òti, O. Sl. zna-ti), Lat. gnō-sec, gnō-tus; melg-, 'to milk' (O. Ind. mrj-, 'to wipe off,' Gk. ἀμέλυω, O. Ir. bligim, O. Engl. melce, Lith. mēžu, O. Sl. mltzq), Lat. mulgeo.

I.-Eur. ĺw would be indistinguishable in Latin from I.-Eur. ı²; thus uvulūs (cf. Gk. υψός), if connected with the root weg-, 'to be strong' (cf. Gk. υγνύς), shows v between vowels for ıw.

In Umbro-Osc. I.-Eur. ĺ is g, e.g. Umbr. ager 'ager,' Osc. aragetud 'argento' Abl. (von Planta, i. p. 329). In Umbrian g, whether I.-Eur. ĺ or g suffers before e, i palatalization, and is written i, e.g. muieco, P. P. P. of a verb whose Imperat. 3 sg. is mugatu (von Planta, i. p. 372).

§ 126. Other examples of I.-Eur. ĺ. I.-Eur. ĺeus-, 'to taste' (O. Ind. jüm-, Gk. γεύω for *γεύω, O. Ir. to-gnu, 'I choose,' Goth. kiusa), Lat. gustus; I.-Eur. rēg-, 'to stretch, rule' (O. Ind. rj-, rāj- or rāj-an-, 'king,' *rēj̣aw, O. Ir. rigim, rīg Gen., Gaul. Catu-rīgēs, W. rhi, Goth. uf-rākja, Lith. rākē, Lat. végo, rēgis Gen.; I.-Eur. ĺen-, 'to beget' (O. Ind. jan-, jánas-, Arm. cim, Gk. γεγομα, γέρας, O. Ir. gēnā Pft., gēin, W. geni, genid, Goth. kuni, 'race,' Engl. kin), Lat. gi-gna, gēnus. Similarly Lat. argentum (Zend eṛzata-, Arm. arcat); cf. O. Ind. ĺājuna-, 'white,' Gk. ἄργυρος); Lat. glōs (Gk. γάλας, O. Sl. zlūva); Lat. āgo (O. Ind. aj-, Arm. asem, Gk. ἀγω, O. Ir. ag-, O. Scand. aka), Lat. grānum (O. Ind. ĵrā-, 'crushed,' Goth. kaurm, Lith. ĺrūnis, 'a pea,' O. Sl. žrîno); Lat. ĺenu (O. Ind. jānu, Arm. cunr, Gk. γόνυ, Goth. knuu N., O. Engl. eneō N.); Lat. végeo, vigētus (O. Ind. va-j-, 'to be strong,' Zend va-, Gk. ἐγεῖς, Engl. I wake, Germ. wacker); Lat. gēlo (O. Sl. žlêdica) (on ĺ instead of ĺl, see § 10).

§ 127. ğH. I.-Eur. ğh is in Latin h, but g before or after a consonant, e.g. I.-Eur. *ighet- (Gk. χόρτος, O. Ir. gort, Lith. žardis), Lat. hortus; I.-Eur. root wegh- (O. Ind. vah-, Gk. ἄχος, Goth. ga-viga, Engl. waggon, Lith. wežu,
\\[\text{**§ 124-129.**] REPRESENTATIVES OF I.-EUR. SOUNDS. K, G, GH, 297\\]

O. Sl. vezá), Lat. *vēho*; I.-Eur. root angh- (O. Ind. áhas-,'need,' Arm. anjuk, 'narrow;' Gk. ἀγχω, O. Ir. cum-ung, 'narrow,' Goth. aggvus, O. Engl. ange, Germ. eng, O. Sl. æzuki), Lat. *ango, angor, angustus*; Lat. *grando* (O. Ind. hrádúni-). A good example of the rule for *g* and *h* is *mingo* beside *meiho* from the root mediß- (O. Ind. mih-, Lith. mįzaių, Gk. ἁμε). 

I.-Eur. *gh* was in Latin merged in I.-Eur. *ghü,* e.g. I.-Eur. *ǵhwēr-,* a wild animal' (Gk. θύρ, Thess. φύρ, Lith. žviris, O. Sl. zvērį), with which is connected Lat. *fērus,* Fem. *fēra,* a wild animal. (But Engl. deer, Germ. Thier, Goth. dius point to some I.-Eur. original like *dheusó-,* cf. Lat. *fāro* for *fīusó?*).


\[\text{§ 128. Other examples of I.-Eur. *gh.*} \]

Lat. *hiems* (O. Ind. himá-, Arm. jin, Gk. χεώ, χεών, O. Ir. gam, O. W. gaem, Lith. žemà, O. Sl. zima); Lat. *hūnus* (O. Ind. jmá-, F., Gk. χωμά, Lith. žemė, O. Sl. zemlja); Lat. *helus,* older *helus,* *helcws* (§ 10) (O. Ind. hári-, 'yellow,' O. Ir. gel, 'white,' O. Engl. geolo, Engl. yellow, Lith. želù, 'I grow green,' O. Sl. zelije, 'vegetables'); Lat. *tingo* (O. Ind. lih-, Arm. lizum, Gk. λείχω, Goth. bilaigō, Lith. lėžių, O. Sl. ližą); Lat. (h)anser (O. Ind. ūsí, Gk. χύρ, O. Ir. geis, 'a swan,' Engl. goose, Lith. žisí); Lat. *fingo* (O. Ind. dhi-, 'to smear,' dehì, 'a wall,' Arm. dzem, Gk. τεχως, O. Ir. dengaim, 'I fasten,' Goth. deigan, 'I mould,' daigs, 'dough,' Germ. Teig); Lat. *hiare* (O. H. G. gīm, Engl. to yawn, Lith. -žioti, O. Sl. zijati).

\[\text{§ 129. The Gutturals Proper: K, G, GH, KH.} \]

These appear as Gutturals in all the I.-Eur. languages. The fact that the I.-Eur. onomatopoetic name for the cuckoo shows this form of Guttural (O. Ind. kóka-, Gk. κόκκυς, Lat. cuculus, O. Ir. coach, W. cog; cf. Lith. kukūti, 'to cry cuckoo') indicates what sort of Guttural it was.

**K.** I.-Eur. *k* is Lat. *c,* e.g. I.-Eur. root kert-, 'to plait' (O. Ind. *crt-,* káta-, 'mat,' Gk. κάρταλος, basket, Goth. haurs F, 'door,' Engl. hurdle), Lat. *cráles,* *cartilago*; I.-Eur. kerp-, 'to cut, reap' (O. Ind. krāna-, 'a sword,' Gk. καρπός, fruit, Engl. harvest, Lith. kerpù, 'I cut'), Lat. *carpō* (on ar, see § 3).

In Umbro-Osc. I.-Eur. *k* remains as in Latin, e.g. Umbr. kanetu 'canito' (von Planta, i. p. 327), though in Umbrian *k* suffers palatalization before e, i (see above § 122).
§ 130. I.-Eur. k; other examples. Lat. cruvor, crásus (O. Ind. kravị- N., 'raw meat'), Gk. κρέας, O. Ir. crū, ' gore,' W. crau, Lith. kraūjąas, O. Sl. krůví, O. Engl. hrēaw, 'raw'); Lat. collis (Goth. hallus M., Lith. kālnas; cf. Gk. κολώνυς); Lat. clēvis, clāvus (Gk. κλῆς, O. Ir. clō M., 'a nail,' Germ. schliesien, O. Sl. kljući, 'a hook, a key'); Lat. ancus, uncus (O. Ind. auśkā-, Gk. ἀγκός, ἀγκος, O. Ir. ćeath); Lat. cāpio (Arm. kap, 'a fetter,' Gk. κάτη, O. Engl. haft, 'captive, Lett. kampu, 'I seize'); Lat. coxa (O. Ind. kákṣa-, O. Ir. coss, 'the foot,' W. coes, 'the leg,' M. H. G. hahsc, 'bend of knee, hough'); Lat. eāva (O. Ind. kūpa-, 'a pit,' Gk. κύπη); Lat. sēco (O. Scand. sigdr, 'a sickle,' O. Engl. sage, 'a saw,' O. Sl. sēka, 'I cut'), O. Lat. cēfo (Gk. κέφαλη, Goth. hlifa, Eng. shop-lifter, Pruss. au-klīpts, 'hidden'); Lat. vinco (O. Ir. fìchim, 'I fight,' Goth. veiha, Engl. wight, Lith. vėka, 'strength,' ap-veikų, 'I compel'); Lat. sceando (O. Ind. skādā-mi, 'I spring,' Gk. σκανδάληθον, a springe, O. Ir. ro-sescaind, 'he sprang').

§ 131. G. Of I.-Eur. g; Lat. g, examples are: I.-Eur. root gar-, 'to shout' (O. Ind. gr-, Gk. γγεων, O. Ir. gāir, 'a shout,' W. gawr, O. H. G. chirru, 'I shout,' Lith. garsas, 'noise'), Lat. garrio; I.-Eur. *yūgo-, 'a yoke' (O. Ind. yugā-, Gk. χυγόν, Goth. juk, O. Sl. igo), Lat. jūgum.

I.-Eur. g is g also in Umbro-Osc. (von Planta, p. 330); but an Umbrian g, as we have seen, is palatalized (written i) before the vowels i, e, &c. (§ 125).

§ 132. Other examples of I.-Eur. g. Lat. grās (Arm. krūn, Gk. γέρανος, Gaul. Tri-garanus, W. garan, O. Engl. cran, Lith. gérvė, O. Sl. žerně); Lat. te-go (O. Ind. sthāgā-mi, Gk. στήγας, στέγος, and τέγο, O. Ir. teg, O. W. tig, Engl. thatch, Germ. Dach, Lith. stōgās); Lat. augo (O. Ind. ōjas, 'strength,' Gk. αὐξάω, O. Ir. ǧ, 'entire,' Goth. auka, 'I multiply,' Engl. eke, Lith. āug, 'I grow'), O. Lat. erūgo, of which e-recto is the Iterative form (Paul. Fest. 58. 30 Th.), used by Ennius, Ann. 593 M.:

contempsit fontes quibus ex erugit aquae uis,
comes from the I.-Eur. root reug- (Gk. ἐρήγωμα, Lith. rāgiu, O. Sl. rygaja).

§ 133. GH. I.-Eur. gh, like I.-Eur. ãgh, became k in Latin, except before or after a consonant, when it became g. Examples are: I.-Eur. *ghōsti- (Goth. gasts, Engl. guest, O. Sl. gosti), Lat. hostis, hostis (O. Lat. hostis, 'stranger,' Varro L. L. v. 3); I.-Eur. root ghred- (O. Ir. ingrennim, 'I pursue,' Goth. gripts, 'a step,' O. Sl. grēda, 'I come'), Lat. grādior (on a, see § 3), gradus.

In Umbro-Osc. also I.-Eur. gh is h (von Planta, p. 438). On f for h in some dialects, such as the Sabine, see above, § 121.

§ 134. I.-Eur. gh: other examples. Lat. prē-hendo (Gk. πρέ-ένω, Alb. ğen, 'I find,' ġèndem, 'I am found,' Goth. bi-gita, Engl. I get); Lat. hordeum (Arm. gari, Germ. Gerste); Lat. haerevo (Goth. us-gaisja, 'I frighten,' Engl. gaze, Lith. gaisztu, 'I tarry').
§ 135. Velar Gutturals with Labialisation. These appear as Gutturals in some languages, and as Labials in others, and show this divergence even on Italian soil, e. g. Umbr., Osc. pis, Lat. quis. (On the Italic treatment of the Gutturals of this series, see von Plant., i. pp. 331 sqq.). Q\textsuperscript{3}. I.-Eur. q\textsuperscript{3} is Lat. qu (but qoi for classical qui on the Dvenos inscription). Before \textit{u} we find \textit{c}, e. g. \textit{sēcūlus} from \textit{sequor}, a change which may have been very ancient (see § 116). Before \textit{o} this \textit{qu}, though often retained in writing, seems to have come to sound like \textit{e}; hence \textit{quōquo-}, a cook, was written \textit{coquo-} as well as \textit{quoquo-}, and on the other hand the Preposition \textit{cum}, older \textit{cōm} [for \textit{kum} or \textit{kom} (Osc. kūm, Umbr. -kum)], was written \textit{quom} till the time of the Grachii, and the P. P. P. of \textit{occūlo}, from a root \textit{kel}- or \textit{kel-} (W. celu), appears with the spelling \textit{oquoltod} on the S. C. de Bacc. of 186 B. C. (C. I. L. i. 196). When in the eighth cent. A. U. C. \textit{o} before a final consonant, came to be universally changed in spelling (see § 20) to \textit{u}, we find the spelling \textit{quo} (\textit{guo}) replaced by \textit{cu} (\textit{gu}), so that \textit{ēquus} became \textit{ecus} (Gen. \textit{equi}), \textit{quoquos} or \textit{coquos} became \textit{cocus} (Gen. \textit{coqui}). The grammarians of the first cent. A. D. were puzzled by the want of analogy between \textit{ecus} Nom., and \textit{equi} Gen., &c., and reconstituted the Nom. as \textit{equus}, &c. Instances of I.-Eur. q\textsuperscript{3} in Latin are: I.-Eur. root seq\textsuperscript{3} (O. Ind. sac-, Gk. επομαι, O. Ir. sechur, Lith. sekū), Lat. \textit{sequor} ; I.-Eur. root leiq\textsuperscript{3}-(O. Ind. ric-, Arm. e-lik', 'he left,' Gk. λεῖπω, O. Ir. lécin, Goth. leihva, 'I lend,' Germ. leihe, Lith. lékū), Lat. \textit{linguo} ; I.-Eur. *q\textsuperscript{3}i- (O. Ind. -eid Neut., Gk. τί for *τίδ, O. Sl. či-to 'what?'), Lat. \textit{quīd} Indef. ; I.-Eur. *q\textsuperscript{3}ē (O. Ind. ca, Gk. τε, O. Ir. -ch, W. -p, Goth. -h), Latin -quē. Before a consonant this \textit{qu} became \textit{c}, e. g. sēcius, older *socyō- from the o-grade of the root seq\textsuperscript{3}, with the adjectival suffix -yo- (O. Ind. sāciya-, Gk. ὁ-οσσο-ητήρ, with \textit{σσ} for \textit{κύ}); òcūlus, older *ösčỌ- from the root og\textsuperscript{3}-, 'to see' (Gk. ὅσσε, with \textit{σσ} for \textit{κύ}, ὑμε for *ŏs-μα, Lith. akis, O. Sl. oko) with the suffix -lo.

I.-Eur. q\textsuperscript{3}w has been postulated for the initial \textit{u} (v) of \textit{ūbi} (Osc. puf, Umbr. pufe), \textit{ūt}, \textit{ūtī} (šf. Osc. puz, Umbr. puze) (with \textit{cu} in the middle of a word, e. g. si-čūbi), vāpor (Lith. kvāpas), \textit{in-vilus} and \textit{in-vīto} (Pruss. quāits, 'will'; Lith. kvēčziū, 'I invite'), &c. (see K. Z. xxxii. 405).
In Umbro-Osc. I.-Eur. qu² is p. (On the date of the change, see von Planta, i. p. 331). Latin pōpina, lūpus, &c. are dialectal, just as Pontius and Pompeius are the dialectal names corresponding to Lat. Quintius, and Petreius to Lat. Quartius. (A full list of examples in von Planta, l. c.);

§ 136. I.-Eur. q², Lat. qu: other examples. Lat. quattuor (O. Ind. catvāras, Arm. ցոկ', Ion. Gk. τέσσερας, Aeol. Gk. πέντε, O. Ir. cethir, W. pedwar, Gaulo-Lat. petor-ritum, Lith. keturi, O. Sl. četyrije); Lat. quānque (O. Ind. pāica, Arm. hing, Gk. πίνετε, O. Ir. cōic, W. pump, Lith. penki); Lat. quà, quàm, &c. (O. Ind. kā, Gk. πόδεν, πῆ, O. Ir. cia, W. pwy, Goth. hvas, hvē, Lith. kās, O. Sl. kū-to).

§ 137. c for qu. (1) Before u; arcus (Goth. arhv-azna, 'an arrow,' O. Engl. earh), beside arquitēmens, arquitēs, the old word for sagittārii (Paul. Fest. 15. 32 Th.) the change to -cu appears to be Italic and not merely Latin, if Umbr. aršlāta- (cf. Paul. Fest. 12. 15 'arculāta' dicebantur circuli, qui ex farina in sacrificiis fiebant) comes from arcus; from quānque come quīncūx, quīncūpes; from sesque comes sescipulus (but cf. Löwe, Prodr. p. 403).

(2) Before a consonant: Lat. nēc for nēquē, ac from *ate for atque, with Syncope of -ē before an initial consonant (ch. iii. § 36); torculus from torquēo; cōālum from cōquo. On ct for qšt-t, x for qšt-s, see § 116.

(3) Before o: cōdo (older quoło: we have golun in the Ambrosian Palimpsest of Plautus, Pseuð. 822, and quolundam on the inscription of the Faliscan 'collegium coquorum,' which also has quœquei for coqui, Zv. I. I. I. 72) beside inquītīnis; cōla, a distaff (Gk. πνὸς, an axile). The fact that quō (I.-Eur. qò or kwò) had come to be pronounced like co (I.-Eur. kò or kwò) explains why qu seems not to offer the same resistance to the Brevis Brevians law in the Early Poets when it precedes o, as when it precedes other vowels, e.g. coquō but only locūi (ch. iii. § 42). But the indiscriminate spelling of every quō as co is not found till the fifth cent. a. d., e.g. cot, corum, condam, locor (see Bersu, die Gutturalen, p. 90) and the analogy of the other cases and persons kept quō as the spelling in the Nom. Sg. of equōs, &c., and the 3rd Pl., sequuntur, &c., until the o, hitherto preserved in spelling by the preceding u, became in the eighth cent. a. u. c. u (ch. iii. § 17), when eus, secundur were adopted as the proper spelling. In words where the analogy of other forms played no part (e.g. sesconciam, C. I. L. i. 1430) the spelling co is found much earlier. Similarly the first syllable of the stem coquo- shows co earlier than the second syllable; we have qu- however in the older period (e.g. in all the MSS. of Plaut. Pseuð. 382; cf. quœquei on the inscription of the Faliscan 'collegium coquorum,' Zv. I. I. I. 72). Puns are unsafe evidence of pronunciation; but the punning reply may be quoted of Cicero to the cook's son who asked for his vote: ego 'quoque' tibi favo (Quint. vi. 3. 47). The spelling equōs, &c., was instituted by Velius Longus in Trajan's time. (On this transition of orthography -quo-, -cu-, -qu-, see Bersu, die Gutturalen, who quotes a large number of instances of these spellings, as also of the use in the time of the Gracchi of q for c before u, e.g. oguāre, pequinia, &c., and has collected those passages of the grammarians which bear on the subject. A list of the instances of the spelling quon in the MSS. of Plautus is given by Probst, Gebrauch von 'ut' bei Terenz, p. 178 n.) I.-Eur. quà did not, as is often stated, become quà, cō in Latin (as
it did in Celtic, e.g. Ir. cōic, W. pump, but Lat. *quinque*; and though -wē after other initial consonants appears as ṭ in Latin sōcer (swēk-), sōror (swēs-), &c., it probably did not after a palatal; for the evidence points to kw, gw, &c. having been merged in qā, qā in Latin. Combrētum, bulrash, may show the O-grade of the stem ñwendhr- of Lith. szvėndrai Pl. (cf. O. Scand. hvōnn *'angelica').

§ 138. Lat. qu of other origin. We have already seen that I.-Eur. kw became qu in Latin, e.g. I.-Eur. *kwo-, 'horse' (O. Ind. āśva-, cf. Lith. ašvā, *mare*), Lat. vēnus. The guttural of lācesus (Gk. λάκησς, *a tank,* O. Ir. loch), lacūnar, is not I.-Eur. qā, but when followed by a consonantal u we find qu in ñagnear. The occasional spelling sterquilinium (see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v.) may be like that usage of Late Latin orthography, whereby qui is written for Greek κυ, e.g. quincus, helquisticon, liquiritia (see ch. ii. § 28), the ui being meant to express the ū-sound of Greek υ, or possibly the qu being meant to indicate the hard unpalatalized guttural. In Italian, Latin qu before e, i has this hard sound (written ch), e.g. chi, che, retaining the labial affecion (the following w-sound) before a, e.g. quale (see ch. ii. § 91), though in cinque, *five,* where two Latin labialized velars stood in successive syllables, the first seems to have lost its labialization in Vulgar Latin.

§ 139. Gu. I.-Eur. gū is in Latin v, but after a consonant gu, and before a consonant g. Thus I.-Eur. *gūwo-, 'alive' (O. Ind. jīvā-, O. Ir. biu, Lith. gyvās) is Lat. vīvus; I.-Eur. root ongū-, 'to anoint' (O. Ind. anj-, O. H. G. ancho, 'butter'; cf. O. Ir. imb, 'butter,' W. ymen-yn) is Lat. ungūv; Lat. gravis is cognate with O. Ind. gurū-, Gk. βαρός, Goth. kaurus. Before u I.-Eur. gū was replaced by g in Latin, a change probably of a very early date, e.g. gurges (Gk. ἐπό-βρυγα, ἐπο-βρύχιος), though the u may be often regarded as a weak form of the ṭ of gwē (see § 51). Before o, Latin gu (gv) seems to have come in time to sound like Latin g, as quo came to sound like co (§ 137). After o in terminations had come to be written u, even when preceded by v, u, we find spellings like distingunt, extingunt, for which distinguunt, extinguunt, &c. were afterwards restored by the analogy of the other persons, distinguimus, &c. The grammarians of the Empire have difficulty in determining the proper spelling of verbs in -quo and -go, and generally follow the rule of writing -go when the Perfect ended in -xi, e.g. extingo, ungo.

§ 140. I.-Eur. gū, Lat. v: other examples. Lat. vīnīo (O. Ind. gam-, gach-, Arm. e-kn, *hecama,* Gk. βαίνω, βάκω, Goth. qima, Engl. I come, Germ. kommen; Lat. vēro (O. Ind. gr-, Arm. kor, *food,* Gk. βορᾶ, νεβράς, Lith. geriū, *I drink,* O. Sl. šīru, *I swallow*); Lat. vēru (O. Ir. bir N., a U-stem, W. ber); Lat. nūdus for nūdes (Goth. naqās); cf. O. Ind. nag-nā-, Lith. nūgas, O. Sl. nagū.)
An intervocalic *gw* of later origin is similarly treated in māvolo (*mavo-lo*) from "mag(e)-volo."


(2) Before *u*. (On the spellings *distinguent*, &c., see Bersu, *die Gutturalen*).  
(3) Before *o*. (On the spellings *distingo*, &c., see Bersu, *die Gutturalen*). Similarly *gu* from I.-Eur. *gh* is written *g* before *o* in *ningo*.

I.-Eur. *gh* is *f* in Umbro-Osc. whether initial or intervocalic, &c. (see von Planta, p. 447, for examples).

§ 144. I.-Eur. *gh* in Latin: other examples. Lat. *cō-nīceo* from the root *kneigh*² (Goth. *hneivan*, Germ. *neigen*); *tergus* (Gk. *στέφος, tēφos*); Lat. *fürco*, the original meaning of which is 'to warm' (e.g. Plaut. *Capt.* 847; *foueri* foculis ferentibus) from the root *dhegh*², 'to burn' (Lith. *degû*), and from the same root, Lat. *fāxīla* (Gk. *θέφρα* for *θέφρα*).

§ 145. The Sibilants: S, Z. In Sanscrit, besides the *ś* (I.-Eur. *k*), which corresponds to a guttural in Greek, Latin, &c. (e.g. O. Ind. *sātām*, Gk. *κατόφ*, Lat. *centum*) we have *s* (I.-Eur. *s*) which corresponds to *s* in other languages (e.g. O. Ind. *saptā*, Lat. *septem*, O. Ir. *secht*, Goth. *sibun*, Lith. *septyni*), and *ś* (like our *sh*) which appears after *i-*, *u-*, *r-*, and *k*-sounds, e.g. *uśta-, Lat. ʻastus*. Sanscrit *kš* is the equivalent of Greek *κθ* in *ıkša-, Gk. *ἀρκτος*, &c., of Greek *ξ* in *akaša-, Gk. *ξονο*, &c., and even of Greek *χθ* in *kšam-, Gk. *χθων*. The exact number and nature of the I.-Eur. sibilants have not yet been determined, but we can at least discriminate an unvoiced and a voiced sibilant, which we may call *S* and *Z* (cf. Engl. *use*).
Noun and 'use' Verb), without precluding the possibility of this S and Z representing more than one variety of sibilant.

§ 146. S, Z. Latin s was, as we have seen (ch. ii. § 117), unvoiced or hard. The voiced or soft sibilant, for which the symbol Z may have been used in early times (ch. i. § 5) passed in the fourth cent. B.C. into r between vowels (cf. Engl. 'forlorn,' Mid. Engl. forlorn, beside 'lost'). Before a consonant the voiced sibilant was dropped with lengthening of the preceding vowel, e.g. I.-Eur. *ₙίzdo (O. Ind. nīḍā-, Arm. nist, 'situation,' O. Ir. net M., 'a nest,' Engl. nest), Lat. nīdus. An initial sibilant was often dropped in I.-Eur.; thus we have a root teg-, 'to cover, roof' (Lat. tēgo, Gk. τῆγος, O. Ir. teg, 'house,' Engl. thatch), as well as a root steg- (O. Ind. sthag-, Gk. στέγω), the roots without initial s- being perhaps those used after words ending in -s (cf. ταυστεγαίος for ταῖς στεγαίοις on the Gortyn inscr., ὅστηγος for *ὅστηγος, &c.) and it is not always easy to say whether Latin words, which lack an initial sibilant that is found in cognate words of other languages, have lost it through the phonetic laws peculiar to Latin, or represent an I.-Eur. 'doublet.' Lātus, broad, from the I.-Eur. root stel-, 'to extend' (O. Sl. stelja), appears in Old Latin in the form sīlātus, sīlātaria or sīlattaria navis (ch. ii. § 130); and we have silo-cus, silis (slis) as the old forms of lōcus, līs, just as in Greek σμικρός, &c. are the older forms of μικρός, &c. An initial sibilant is not found in Latin before m, e.g. mordeo from the root smerd- (Gk. σμερδαλέως, O. H. G. smerzan, 'to feel pain,' Engl. to smart), before n, e.g. nārus from I.-Eur. *snūso- (O. Ind. smuṣā, Arm. nu, Gk. νυ(ς)ός, O. H. G. snur), before l, e.g. lābo for *slabo (O. H. G. slaf, 'loose,' Lith. slābmas, 'weak'). Before r in the middle of a word a sibilant becomes b, e.g. sobrīnus for *swesrinus (Lith. seserynai, Pl.), from I.-Eur. *swēsor-, 'a sister,' probably from an earlier f (§ 114); whether it becomes f at the beginning of a word, e.g. frīgus (Gk. φῦς), or is dropped, e.g. rēpo for *srēpo (cf. serpo), or becomes str-, e.g. stringo (O. Ir. srēgim, 'to draw'), is uncertain. After r and l it is assimilated, e.g. verres for *verses (Lith. vešūs; cf. O. Ind. viša-), collum, O. Lat. collus, for *kolo- (O. Engl. heals, Germ. Hals). Initial ps-, ks- appear to have become s-,
e.g. sābūlum, sand (Gk. ψάμμος for *ψαφ-μος), dis-stro (O. Ind. kṣip-, 'to throw').

Latin s often represents an original dental sound, e.g. adjersus formed from the stem of adgrēdior with the participial termination -to-. This change was probably very old, so that the form adjrettus (written in the earlier orthography adgretus), quoted from Ennius by Paul. Fest. 5. 6 Th., probably represents *ad-gred(i)tus (like cēdīte, §108). A double ss (generally arisen from tt, ts; cf. our 'gossip' for god-sip) was after a diphthong or long vowel (see ch. ii. §129) reduced in the Early Empire to single s, e.g. fūsus, older fussus, ʊsus, older ʊssus. In sescēni, from sex, the second s represents an original x (i.e. c-s) (see §158); and x reduced to s is first assimilated, then dropped with lengthening of the vowel, in words like telūm, older tellum, for *teslum, *texlum (§117). On initial s- for sy-, e.g. sso, see §65; for sw-, e.g. südor, §71. On us, see ch. ii. §66, on I.-Eur. ms, above, §76.

In Umbro-Oscan I.-Eur. s remains when initial, e.g. Umbr. sent, Osc. set 'sunt,' but when intervocalic became first voiced s (written in Oscan in the native alphabet s, in the Lat. alph. z, e.g. Fluusaī 'Florae,' egmažum 'rerum'), which in Umbr. passed into r, e.g. kuratu 'curato' (Pel. coisatens 'curaverunt'). I.-Eur. ss became tt if the Perfect ending -attēs 3 Sg., -attens 3 Pl. (e.g. Osc. prūfattē 'probavit,' prūfattens 'probaverunt') is rightly compared with the Lat. Future in -ssēo, e.g. amasseo (ch. viii. §3); sr probably became fr (Lat. br) (cf. mod. Neapolitan Uttrafe for Ital. Ottobre, 'October'); sn, sm, sl remain, e.g. Umbr. snata P. P. P. (Lat. nāre), Osc. Slabiis 'Labius' (cf. Lat. Stlabōrīus); rs appears in Osc. sometimes as r with 'compensatory' lengthening, e.g. teerūm 'terram,' sometimes as rr, e.g. Kerri, in Umbrian sometimes as rs (r), e.g. tursitu, tusetu (cf. Lat. terreō), sometimes as rf, e.g. Čerfu-; ns in the middle of a word became nts, e.g. Umbr. menzne 'mense'; when final it is in Osc. -ss, in Umbr. -f, e.g. Osc. viass 'vias,' Umbr. turuf 'tauros'; final -nts is in Umbr. (and Osc.?) -f, e.g. Umbr. zēref 'sedens.' (On the treatment of I.-Eur. s in Umbro-Oscan, see von Planta, i. p. 472.)

§ 148. Lat. r for intervocalic sibilant. Intervocalic s became h in Greek, e.g. εἶναι for eἰνάω (L.-Eur. *eusāo), and was dropped, e.g. γίνεσθαι, γίνων Gen. (L.-Eur. *γένεσ-ος), but in Latin it appears as r, e.g. ἀρο, γένεσις, having probably passed through the stage of voiced s (z), a stage at which the sibilant remained in Ocean, e.g. εἰςum ‘esse,’ while it suffered rhotacism in Umbrian, as in Latin, e.g. erom. The grammarians often quote Old Latin forms with intervocalic s, e.g. lasses, Valesii, Fusii (Quint. i. 4. 13; cf. Ter. Scaur. 13. 13 K. Fusius, asa, lasses); dasi, arbus, robosum, helusa ‘holera,’ loesbus ‘liberum’ (Paul. Fest. 48. 19; 11. 20; 71. 12; 86. 30 Th.); r pro s littera saepe antiqui posuerunt, ut maioisibus, meliosibus, lasibus, fesisis (id. 359. 1 Th.); τιγνοσα (id. 260. 11 Th.) (for other passages see Müller ad Paul. Fest. p. 15), and often refer similar forms to the Sabine dialect (e.g. Paul. Fest. 6. 36 Th. aurum . . . alli a Sabinis translatum putant, quod illi ‘ausum’ dicebant; id. 18. 3 Th. Aureliam familiam ex Sabinis oriundam a Sole dictam putant, quod ei publice a populo Romano datus sit locus, in quo sacra faceret Soli, qui ex hoc ‘Auseli’ dicebantur, ut ‘Valesii,’ ‘Papisii’ pro eo quod est Valerii, Papiri; Varro, ap. Vel. Long. 69. 8 K. (cf. L. L. vii. 27) gave fasena as Sabine for Lat. harena. Varro (L. L. vii. 26) quotes examples of this older spelling from the Carmen Saliae; Livy speaking of Sp. Furius Fusus, the consul of 464 B.C., says that some of his authorities spelt the name Fusio- (iii. 4. 1 Furius ‘Fusios’ scriptere quidam); on the inscription with the Carmen Arvale (C. I. L. i. 28 we have Lases ‘Lares’: enos, Lases, iuuanet; in the most ancient piece of Latin preserved for us, the Praenestine fibula, Numasii ‘Numerio’ (xiv. 4123 Manios med fefaked Numasii), and in the Dvenos inser. Toitesiai ‘Tuterei.’ But words of the literary period with intervocalic s are either (1) dialectal, e.g. ἀνασίς, a gallant (Sabine ? , see Nettleship, Contributions, s. v.), or (2) foreign loanwords, e.g. ἀγνημ (Gaulish; cf. gaesati, Gaulish mercenaries, C. G. L. v. 71. 23. O. Ir. gai) (so ἄσινος, λέσαρ, ῥοάς, σίσερ, &c.), or (3) had originally ss, whether derived from I.-Eur. tt, e.g. caesus for *cat-tus from caedo, from ss (I.-Eur. ntt, &c.), e.g. vicēsis older vicennus (ch. ii. § 66), formōsus, older formonius (ib.), from I.-Eur. ss, e.g. quaeso, older quaes-so, a different word from quaero (ch. viii. § 33), nāsus, older nassum, or from some other consonant-group. This older ss was after a long vowel or diphthong written s after the close of the Republic, but Quintilian tells us that causae, causus, divisiones, &c. was the spelling of Cicero and Virgil (i. 7. 20 quid quod Ciceronis temporibus paulumque infra, fere quotiens s littera media vocalium longarum vel subjecta longis esset, geminabatur? ut ‘caussae, causus, divisiones’: quemodo et ipsum et Vergilium quoque seripisse manus eorum docent), and this spelling is by no means uncommon in the MSS. of Plautus, Virgil, &c. (see ch. ii. § 129). After a short vowel ss remained, e.g. fissus. Quāsillus, pūsillus (cf. pisus) are said to show the same reduction in the pretonic syllable as ἡφίλα (beside offa), māmilla (beside mamma) (ch. ii. § 130); rather the Dim. quasillus was formed from *quas-los X
after Rhotacism had ceased to operate; *miser* (on the spelling *myser* see ch. ii. § 16, p. 29) has been explained as a loanword from the Greek (*μυσαρός*), like other adjectives expressive of nuances of feeling, e.g. *hilāris* older *hilarus* (Gk. *λαπός*). An initial s is not rhotacized when it comes after the final vowel of a preposition, &c., in a compound, e.g. *pŏ-sītus* from *po-,* a byform of *ab* (I.-Eur. *ā♣ō* and the P. P. P. of *āno,* but the final s of a preposition, &c., in a compound is rhotacized before an initial vowel, e.g. *dir-imo* from *dis-* and *ēmo,* *dirībeo* from *dis-* and *hābeo.* Favarus points to an earlier trisyllabic *fus-uo-* (cf. *arvum* from trisyllabic *arum,* § 68), a byformation of *fus-cus,* and Minerva to *Menes-uā* (the word is a quadrisyllable in Plaut. *Bacch.* 893, Attius, *Trag.* 127 R.), but before consonantal *r* we have *s* dropped with *Compensation* in *di-vello,* *di-xendo,* &c. Other examples of forms with *r* beside forms with *s* are *maeere* (*maesia,*) *grēr* (*gesi, ges-tum,* *haurio* (*haus-s*)'i, *haus-tum,* *quaero* (*quaes-tus;* but *quaes(s)i*vi, *quaes(s)i*tum come from *quaes(s)o,* ch. viii. § 33), *Etrūria* (*Etrusci,*) *auris* (*aus-culdo,*) *nāres* (*nās-s*)'um,* and oblique cases of S-stems, e. g. *fāneris* (*funes-tus,*) *ōneris* (*onus-s*)'um,* and *verberis* (*subverbustum* Plaut. ap. Fest. 444. 15 Th.), *hīmōris* (*honestus;* but analogy of these oblique cases *r* has found its way into the Nominative of *honor* (older *honas,* *arbor* (older *ardos,* cf. *arbustum* and *arbōtum,* *üdor* (older *odos,* &c. (ch. vi. § 7). (For a fuller list of examples of the Latin and Umbro-Oscan treatment of I.-Eur. intervocalic *s,* see Conway, *Verner's Law in Italy.* The change of intervocalic *s* to *r* is a common occurrence in language. English *r* corresponds to Gothic *z* in words like *ore* (Goth. *aiz,-* I.-Eur. *aifes,-* Lat. *aes, aeris Gen.*), and in Polish a word like *może,* *can,* 'has a trilled sound of the voiced sibilant that is hardly to be distinguished from *r* (see B. B. xx. pp. 270 sqq. ).


(3) Before *r.* The use of *t* for I.-Eur. *d* with *r* in Latin, e. g. *āter,* stem *ātro-* for *ādāro-,* suggests that Latin *r* was not voiced, so that it is better to consider separately the treatment of an initial sibilant before *r.* The instances are unfortunately few and uncertain. Lat. *frīgus* goes naturally with Gk. *φρύγος,* but it has also been connected with Gk. *φλόσωσε,* while Lat. *nīgor, rigidus* has been assigned to *φύργος;* Lat. *frīga,* strawberries, has been referred by some to
Gk. *páξ*, a grape, by others to *fragro*, and certainly Lat. *rācum* goes more naturally with *páξ* than *frāga*. Whether Greek *phros*, *páξ* originally began with *s* or *f* is a moot point. Lat. *rēpo* goes naturally with *serpo*, but Lith. *rēpliotis*, Zend *rāp-*, ‘to go,’ suggest an L.-Eur. ‘doublet’ without the initial sibilant. The L.-Eur. root *srune-*, ‘to flow’ (O. Ind. *sr-,* Gk *phef-*, Lith. *sraviu*, Ir. *srualain*, ‘a stream,’ O. H. G. *strum*), has been sought in the Latin words *rūmen, rīmena, rūmon*, the old name of the Tiber (Serv. ad Aen. viii. 63, 90) and in the name *Romana* itself; Lat. *rātis* has been connected with *sir*o, Lat. *rātus* with Germ. Ge-strüpp, and so on (for other examples see Osthoff, *M. U.* v. 62). On the other hand Latin forms with initial *r* which have in other languages a sibilant before the *r*, may come from an L.-Eur. ‘doublet’ which lacked the sibilant, as *tēgo* comes from L.-Eur. *tēg-, a byform of the root *teg-*, ‘to cover,’ roof. Another possibility is that *sr-* may be the Latin equivalent, as in our ‘stream,’ &c. It is not always easy to decide where Lat. *str- *and *sr-,* *sr-* in other languages, represent an original *sr-* or an original *sr-;* and similarly O. Lat. *stl-*, of *stlocus, stlis* and *slis* may have been originally *sl-* and not *stl-*.  

§ 150. O. Lat. *stl, sl, scl*. Quintilian (i. 4. 16) quotes *stlocus* and *stlītes* as O. Lat. forms. The old form *stlis* was retained in the legal phrase *decemviri stiltībus justicandīs in Cicero’s time (Cic. Or. xlvi. 156); on the Lex Repetundarum of 123–122 B.C. (C. I. L. i. 198) we have once *slis* but usually *lis* and sl. *stlīk* on a Scipio epigraph of c. 130 B.C. (i. 38), *sclīth* ... (x. 1249); cf. *slōc[us]* (v. 7381). *Stlēmbus,* slow, is quoted from Lucilius (Paul. Fest. 455. 4 Th.); *slōppus* (v. i. *stlōppus*), is used by Persius (v. 13) to indicate the sound of slapping the cheek when distended (cf. Ital. *schiooppo*):  

*nec sceloppo tumidas intendis rumpere buceas.*

In dialectal names these combinations are preserved, e. g. *Stlaccius* (C. I. L. vi. 26863, &c.) (cf. Lat. *laccus, a swelling on the leg*?), *Stlaborius* (Wilm. 1913, Pompeii) (cf. Lat. *lābar?*, Oscan Slabio-). In Latin the *t* of *stl-* (or *c, for *fl* became *cl*, § 105) would be dropped, as it is in the name *Foslus* (cf. *Fostlus, Faustlus*), C. I. L. ii. p. 130 (cf. *for(c)itus*, § 157), leaving *sl-*, which would become *sl-*(see above), then *l-*.  

\[\text{THE LATIN LANGUAGE.} \quad \text{[Chap. IV.]}\]

\[\text{pōne for } *\text{pos}(f)-\text{ne}; \text{ Lat. } pōnō \text{ for } *\text{po(o)(e)no}, \text{ a compound of } pō-, \text{ a byform of } ab, \text{ ap- \text{ of } aperīō (cf. O. Ind. āpā, Gk. ārō), and } sīno [\text{cf. the P. P. P. } po-stūs, \text{ and Ppt. Ind. originally } po-śvī, \text{ then by false analogy of } pos-ītus, \text{ posi (ch. viii. § 39)}]; \text{ oēnus, aēnus for } *\text{ayes-no}, \text{ Umbr. ahesno-}, \text{ and so with many stems in } -\text{ino-}, \text{ -iwō-, -ēo-, } &c. \text{ In some of these examples the sibilant is a development from an earlier group of sounds, e.g. } \text{from } *\text{sl in } \text{pāntrērum, pōne, from } s(i) \text{ in } pōnō; \text{ similarly from } (1) \text{ os, } x \text{ in } lūna, \text{ written } \text{Losna} \text{ on an old Praenestine mirror (C. I. L. i. 55), for } *\text{hux-na} (\text{Zend raoxšā, 'shining,' Pruss. lauxnos, 'stars'}); \text{ sēni, sēmenstris (cf. } \text{ses-ceni} \text{ for } *\text{sexni}, *\text{sex-menstris}; \text{ tēla from } tēxō, &c. \text{ (other examples in § 162). } (2) \text{ ns in } (h)\text{ālo for } *\text{anslo} (\text{O. Sl. } \text{ačati}, ' \text{to be fragrant'}); \text{ pītum from } pīnō. \text{ The older spelling showed a double consonant in these cases. Thus velātura, } \text{the carrying trade, for } *\text{rex-latura, } \text{from } \text{rebo}, \text{ was probably spelt velātura by Varro in a passage (R. R. i. 2. 14) where he connects the word with } \text{vīla}, \text{ the rustic form of } \text{vīlla}; \text{ a sibilant which came at a later time to stand before a voiced consonant was similarly treated, e.g. } \text{divelō for } \text{dis-rello, dīmote for } \text{dīsmote} \text{ (S. C. Bach. C. I. L. i. 196), } \text{dīmitte ('dīsmitte' } \text{non dicās, Caper, 97. 7 K.), } \text{dī-numero, dī-luo. \text{ In the same way the form } \text{ē arōse from } \text{ex} \text{ in collocations like } \text{ē-rello, ē-moro, ē-mitto, ē-numero, ē-luo (sec ch. ix. § 29)}; \text{ vīden for } \text{vidēs-ne was shortened to } \text{vidēn} \text{ (ch. iii. § 42). } \text{Cāmillus (Camelio on old Praenesteine epitaphs, C. I. L. i. 74; } \text{1501 a) was derived by the Romans from a Greek (or Etruscan?) } \text{καῦμως, meaning a servant of the gods (see Varro, L. L. vii. 34; Macr. iii. 8. 5; Paul. Fest. 44. 33 Th.; cf. Virg. Aen. xi. 542). Varro refers } \text{Cīmena to an earlier } \text{Cosmena, } \text{which he connects with } \text{carmen (L. L. vii. 26). \text{How Cāmillus and Cosmena (if the word ever existed in this form) failed to become } *\text{Cāmillus, } *\text{Cīmena is not clear. The group } \text{rēd became } \text{rēd (through } *\text{rrēd, for } \text{rs becomes } \text{rr}, \text{ e.g. } \text{horēdum (cf. O. H. G. } \text{gerstā, Germ. Gerste); tardus (Lith. strādzas, O. Ir. truit, Engl. throstle). The I.-Eur. prototype of } \text{custos (Goth. huzid, Engl. hoard), hāsta (Goth. gazds, 'a sting'), Germ. Gerte, Engl. yard, O. Ir. gat) may have had } \text{sth-, not } *\text{-zdh-.}}\]

\[\text{Quāsimillus from } *\text{quis-slos (class. } \text{quaēbus) shows that } \text{sl remained later than the change of intervocalic } \text{s to } \text{r (§ 148). } \text{Dusmus Adj. occurs in Liv. Andronicus (end of third cent. B.C.) (Trag. 39 R.) dusmo in loco. Plautus' } \text{vidēn for } \text{videœne, ain for } \text{aisne, } &c. \text{ show that the law was operative in his time.}}\]

\[\text{§ 152. Sibilant before } \text{r in middle of word. Lat. } \text{cērēbrum for } *\text{cerērum} \text{ (O. Ind. } \text{šīras, 'the head'}); \text{ Lat. } \text{cribrō for } *\text{crēsro} \text{ (Lith. širszū, O. Sl. šršen); } \text{fibra for } *\text{sīra (cf. } \text{fibum for } *\text{fīṣum, Lith. } \text{gýsla, 'a sinew'); } \text{Lat. } \text{tēnēbrae for } *\text{tenēsrae} \text{ (O. Ind. } \text{tāmisrā, from } \text{tāmas, 'darkness,' Germ. Dāmmernung); } \text{fūnēbris for } *\text{fūnēs-ris.}}\]

\[\text{§ 153. Assimilation of sibilant to preceding } \text{r, l. Lat. } \text{farreus for } *\text{farreus} \text{ (Umbr. } \text{farsio}, \text{ O. Sl. } \text{brašino, 'food'; Goth. barzēins, 'made of barley'); Lat. } \text{torreō for } *\text{torseō (O. Ind. } \text{trē-, Gk. } \text{tēprosai); Lat. } \text{ferre for } *\text{fer-se}; \text{ Lat. } \text{velle for } *\text{velse}; \text{ Lat. } \text{erro for } *\text{ero (Goth. airtjan, 'to mislead,' Germ. irren); Lat. } \text{garrio for } *\text{garsio (Lith. garsas, 'noise'); Lat. } \text{porrōn from } \text{L.-Eur. } *\text{prrso- (Gk. } \text{pākōv); Lat. } \text{terruncius for } *\text{ters-, older } *\text{tris- (Gk. } \text{trēs). This } \text{r from } \text{rs was final reduced to } \text{r, e.g. } *\text{ter (scanned as long by position in Plautus) (eh. ii. § 133), fār, Gen. } \text{farris. Before } *\text{t the } \text{s kept its place, and the } \text{r was dropped, e.g. } *\text{tēsta- from older } *\text{trista- (Osc. tristaentamen); } \text{tostus for } *\text{tortus.}}\]

\[\text{An } *\text{s (ss), arisen out of an earlier } *\text{t}, &c. \text{ was not assimilated, e.g. } *\text{versus for } *\text{vērtus, rurus and } \text{reversus for } *\text{revertus, } \text{ars beside } *\text{ar. Latin } *\text{r was}}\]
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pronounced like ss, as we see from the pun in Plautus, Pers. 740 Persa me pessum dedit, and often came to be written ss, and after a long vowel, s; hence russus and rusus, introsum, prosa, &c. (see ch. ii. § 129).

§ 154. Assimilation of preceding dental to the sibilant. Lat. suāsi for *suāssī from suādeo; conciissi from conciītio, &c.; pōssum for *pōt(e)sum. Similarly in the final syllable, hospes for *hostpes, müles for *miles; this -es is short in classical poetry, but probably long by position in Plautus (ch. ii. § 133).

§ 155. Lat. ss for tt. Before r we find st for tt, e.g. pedestrīs for *pedet-trīs from pedes, Gen. pedētis, assestrīx Fem. of assestor, and perhaps at the end of a word, e.g. est, 3 Sg. Pres. of ēdo. But in other cases tt became ss, e.g. ēsus, older issus, from utor (older otor, octor) for *ut-tus, ēsio for *ut-tio, *oit-tio (Osc. oittiuī ‘usio,’ beside Pel. oisa ‘usa’ is best explained as *oit(i)tions); so fassus from fāter, ēssus) from sēdeo, morsus from mordeo, perculsus from per-cello, *per-celdo, &c., all formed by adding the participial TO-suffix (see ch. v. § 27) to the root of the verb. In the second cent. n. c. some verbs whose root ended in a guttural followed the analogy of these verbs, owing to the similarity of their Perfect Indicative Active, e.g. sargo, sparsi made sparsus, as ardeo, arsi-made arsus; tergo, tersi made tersus, as mordeo, morsi made morsus. But in the period of the older literature these false forms in -sus had not established themselves; Paul. Fest. quotes merrat for mersat (57. 16 Th.; cf. 89. 26); Quintilian (i. 4. 14) says: ‘mertare’ atque ‘pultare’ dicebant; and Nonius (179. 4 M.) quotes from Varro tertus for tersus, and from Accius mertare for mersare. Exfutī, explained by Paul. Fest. 57. 16 Th. as exfusi (cf. con-futī, fulūlis, fātilis) has been referred to *fūtus, P. P. P. of a verb *fuo, to shake (O. Ind. dhā-); if it comes from fundo it must represent an older *fud(i)lus, a byform of *fud-tus as all(i)lus of al-tus; so mattsus, drunk (the Romance forms attest tt) for *mad(i)tus, like adgrettus (§ 109). Estis, estē, &c. from edo, to eat, must be due to the analogy of ānā-tis, ama-te, &c.; so con-estus beside conesus. Fēranto, &c. for *feront-ōd (ch. viii. § 57), echemeneter, if for *echement-er (ch. ix. § 2) retain t in the same way.

§ 156. Other groups with a sibilant. When a sibilant came between two labials or gutturals, the first was dropped, e.g. asporto for *abs-porto, disco for *dico-so (cf. dī-dico-i), sesēnī for *sex-ceni, *secso-ceni. Similarly pst becomes st in ostendo (but O. Lat. obstruent) beside obstriūdo, obstīno.

As rs became rr, and ls became ll, so rs, ls before a consonant become r, l, e.g. hordēvum for *horsēvum, ānisus for *alsnisus (Lith. ėiksnis), perna, the ham. from I.-Eur. *pērsnā-, ‘the heel’ (Gk. πέρπα, Goth. fairzna, O. Engl. fyrsn, Germ. Ferse; cf. O. Ind. pēršnī-), but an unvoiced consonant preserves the s at the expense of the r, l, e.g. tostus for *torstus, posco for *posco (O. H. G. forscōn, Germ. forschen), properly for *pēkško from the root prek- of precor, &c. (On these groups see the next paragraph.)

§ 157. Loss of Consonant in Group. It is convenient here to bring together the various examples of the loss of consonants, when they occur between two other consonants, or in some unpronounceable combination (cf. Engl. ‘hal(f)penny,’ ‘Satur(n)-day,’ ‘be(t)st,’ ‘cas(t)le,’ ‘go(d)spe’). It is not always possible to decide whether the consonant was already ejected in what we
call the 'Indo-European period,' e.g. mīšk-, 'to mix' (Lat. miscēo, O. Ir. mescæm, W. mysgu Inf., O. H. G. miscu), for *mīš-sk-, from the root meīk-, 'to mix' (O. Ind. mīš-rā-, 'mixed,' Lith. sumšzti, 'to get mixed'), with the addition of the Inceptive suffix (ch. viii. § 21), or whether its ejection is due to the phonetic laws of Latin, e.g. lūna (on an early Praenestine mirror Losna) for *lun(c)su, (Zend raoxšna-, 'shining,' Pruss. lauxnos, 'stars').

A consonant between two others is dropped in such groups as:

(1) l(e)t, l(e)s, r(e)t, r(e)s, r(t)e, s(t)e, s(e)t, e(t)s, r(t)s or r(d)s, e.g. ultus for *ulctus, multis for *mulesi, fortis, O. Lat. fortis (§ 118), tortus for *torctus, torsi for *torcsi, corculum for *cor-culum from cor(d), pastum for *pasctum, O. Lat. stilis, liss, class. lis for stlis (scitis) (§ 150), nox for *nocts, ars for *arts, arsi for *ardsi.

(2) r(g)n, r(g)m, r(d)n, r(d)m, r(b)m, e.g. urna for *uragna (cf. urceus), tormentum for *tormentum, from torqueo, onro for *ordno (cf. ordin), vermina, gripes (Gk. στροφος, Paul. Fest. 571. 12 Th.) for *verdmina from verto, sarmentum for *sarbmentum from sarpo.

The first consonant is dropped in groups like:

(3) (t)sc, (c)sc, (p)s(p), (p)st, (p)sc, (s)ps, (n)gn, (r)st, (r)sc, e.g. esca for *etsca from ēdo, disco for *dicsco (§ 156) (cf. lī-dic-i), asporto for *apsporto from abs (ch. ix. § 12) and porto, ostendo for *opstendo from obs and tendo (but obstānātus, O. Lat. obstinet, &c.), Oscus, older Opuscus (Obscus) (see Fest. 212. 24 and 234. 29 Th.), ipsē for *ispē, ignis for *engnis (I.-Eur. *agnī-, O. Ind. agni-, Lith. ugnis, O. Sl. ognī. See M. S. L. vii. 236), fastigium for *farstigium (cf. O. Ind. bhṛṣṭi-, 'a point,' Engl. bristle), Tuscan (Umbr. Tursco- and Tusco-).

(4) (c)s(n) or (g)s(n), (c)s(l) or (g)s(l), (c)s(m) or (g)s(m), e.g. lūna for *lusna (Praen. Losna) for *lucnsa, tēlum for *tecsulum, āla for *asla, subtēmen for *subtecmen for *subtecmen.

The group nct is preserved in junctus, defunctus, anteclasc, quinctus, but drops the c in class. quintus, late Lat. defuntus (C. I. L. iii. 2137), santus (v. 8136), nantus (iii. 1635. 4), &c. (see ch. ii. §§ 70, 95), and cf. conctione miswritten for contione on the Lex Repetundarum, i. 198. 18. The group ncs remains, e.g. planxi, lanx.

§ 158. Other examples. On the forms cal(c)s, calx, and mers for *mer(c)s, mers, see ch. ii. § 125; they are like farsi for *farsī, fulsi for *fulsi, multis for *mulesi. Like for(c)tis is fertum, O. Lat. fertum, a sacrificial cake, from a lost
verb *fergo, to bake (cf. O. Ir. bairgen ‘bread’); also fartus from *farctio, O. Lat. tertus (§ 155) from tergo, sartus from servio. Cf. fulmentum for fulcmentum, quernus, for *quernus. The b of *ambe, around, is dropped in am-termini, am-caesa, am-sigites, &c. (see ch. ix. § 16), and the loss of the d in indu- in similar circumstances probably led to its being ousted by in, e.g. imperator, ingredi (O. Lat. induinator, indugredi, ch. iii. § 15). The sibilant is dropped in hordum for horseum (O. H. G. gersta), taurus for *tursitus (Engl. throstle; cf. Lith. strzdas), perna (Goth. fairzna, ‘the heel’); O. Ind. paṛṣṇi-), alnus (cf. Lith. elksnis for *elsnis) (see § 156); also in inquam, coinguo if these stand for *ind-squam, co-ind-squa, but remains in exta if this stands for enexta (Lith. inktas, ‘kidney’). Like asporto, &c. are suscipio for *sup-s-cipio, astūlit (Charis. 237. 2 K.) for apstūdit (obstūlit). Porco represents *por-aco (O. H. G. forsçon, Germ. forschen), I.-Eur. pr(ķ)-sko-like *mi(ķ)-sko-. The group rst remains in monstrum, &c. but becomes st between vowels, e.g. mostellum. Like fastigium is testāmentum for *terstamentum (Osc. tristaamentud Abl.).

The weakening of a root often produces an unpleasing consonant-group which has to be changed and often becomes unrecognizable. Thus the I.-Eur. weak-grade of dék- (of the numeral ‘ten’, I.-Eur. *dékm) appears in the word for hundred as dē-, which is changed to ķ- (I.-Eur. *kntom for *dĩkntom, ch. vi. § 76; Lat. centum beside dēcem); the weak-grade of the root ūen- ‘to be born,’ appears in Lat. gnātus, which in class. Lat. lost its initial g (§ 119). Similarly *lātus from the root tel- of tollo, &c., became lātus, ‘carried’ (§ 105), and stlātus, from the root stel- of O. Sl. stelja, ‘I extend,’ was reduced to the same form lātus, ‘extended, broad’ (§ 146). Other initial consonant-groups avoided in Latin are cr-, cn-, dl-, sm-, vel-, wr-, &c. (see this chapter passim).

§ 159. Assimilation of Consonants. The loss of a consonant in a group is often really due to assimilation. Thus the loss of s in hordum for horseum can hardly be separated from the assimilation of s to r in the group rs, e.g. horreo for *horseo. In the case of Assimilation, as of Ecthipsis, it is often difficult to say whether the Assimilation already existed in ‘the I.-Eur. period’ or not. Assimilation plays a great part in the compounding of Prepositions with verbs, e.g. accurrere for ad-cur- rere, O. Lat. ommentans for ob-mentans, pellége (Plaut.) for per- legé, al-ligare for ad-ligare (the assimilated form had so established itself by the time of Pliny that he treats it as a simple verb and re-compounds it with ad, ad-alligare), but the unmodified forms of the preposition were often restored in spelling at least (thus Servius ad Aen. i. 616 says that applicat was the spelling formerly in vogue, adplicat the spelling of his own day), a restoration which went hand in hand with the restoration of the weakened form of the vowel in verbs like ē-neco (older enico), intel-lego, &c. (see ch. iii. § 31). Examples of Assimilation are:
pc, e.g. oc-caeco, suc-curro; pf, e.g. of-ficina (O. Lat. ὕψι-ficina), sufficio; bg, e.g. og-géro, sug-gero; bm, e.g. ommentans (quoted from Liv. Andron. from Festus 218.14 Th., and explained by obmũ-nens, 'waiting'; cf. C. G. L. v. 37.3 ommentat: expectat), summitto, āmitto (for ammitto, ch. ii. § 127) (but āmitto), glũma for *glũb-ma from glũbo. B is assimilated to r in Prepositional Compounds like surripio, and before n becomes m in scannum (cf. scabellum), amnegaverit (C. I. L. vi. 14672), &c. (§ 102), though in Prepositional Compounds the spelling with b is usually retained, e.g. ab-nẽgo; cf (rather c(s)f, § 157), e.g. estĭro from ex-fĕro; tc, e.g. ac-curro, hoc for *hod-ce; tf, e.g. affero; dg, e.g. ag-géro; dl, e.g. al-luo, pel-luviae, water for washing the feet, lăpillus for *lapid-lus; dm, e.g. āmentum from rādo; dn, e.g. an-nuo, mercenarius from mercēd-; tp, e.g. ap-pāreo; tq, e.g. quicquam; dr (tr), e.g. ar-rīdeo; ds (ts), e.g. as-śideo; ln, e.g. collis (Lith. kānas), but ulna had originally a short vowel between l and n (Gk. ὄλεν), ld, e.g. per-cello (cf. clădes), but valdē from vălide, calda from călida; ls, e.g. colūm, O. Lat. collus (Goth. hals Masc.), velle for *cel-se (cf. es-se); m and n are assimilated in Compounds of the Prepositions com-, in, and the Negative Prefix in-, e.g. col-laudo, il-lăbor, illaudabilis, cor-ruo, ir-ruo, ir-rītus, con-necto or cōnecto, im-mitto, im-mēmor, and similarly the final -m of ētiam, tam, &c. was often written n (ch. ii. § 65) before an initial n, e.g. etian-num tan-ne (ch. ii. § 135); nl (as in Engl. 'eleven,' Mid. Engl. enleven), e.g. cōrolla for *corōn-lu, hōmullus for *homōn-lus; rl, e.g. Ātella (Osc. Aderl-), āgellus for *agerlus (cf. supellex non 'superlex,' Probi IV. 198. 14 K.); rs, e.g. torreo for *torreo (cf. Gk. τῆρομαι), ferre for *fer-se (cf. es-se). On the Assimilation of s to a following voiced consonant, and the consequent lengthening of the preceding vowel by 'Compensation,' e.g. quālus (older quāllus) for *quās-lus (cf. quāsillus), see § 151, on a like treatment of n before s or f, ib., and on the Assimilation of Mediae to Tenues (e.g. scriptus for *scriptus), cēt-le for *cēd(i)te), Tenues to Mediae, e.g. ab-duco from ap- (I.-Eur. *āpō), see § 95. In dialectal Latin nd became mn as in Osc. ūpsanno - 'operando,-' whence dispennīte and distennīte (Plaut.) (see ch. ii. § 71); on the pronunciation ss for rs (cf. russus for rursus), see ch. ii. § 104.
§ 180. Assimilation in Preposition compounded with Verb. The passages of the Roman grammarians dealing with this subject are enumerated by Brambach, *Lat. Orth.* pp. 294 sqq. Lucilius declared it to be immaterial whether one wrote *d* or *c* in *adcurrere, accurrere* (ix. 25 M.):

\[\text{"adcurrere" scribas}\]
\n\[\text{d ne an c, non est quod quaeras equae labores,}\]

but seems (though the reading is doubtful) to have insisted on the necessity of distinguishing *ad-bitere* (from *ad* and *baeco*) and *ab-bitere* (from *ab* and *baeco*) (ix. 27 M.):

\[\text{"abbitere" multum est}\]
\n\[\text{d siet an b;}\]

(absimilis seems to have been discarded in Latin for dissimilis, through fear of confusion with *adsimilis*); he pronounces in favour of *pellicio* (ix. 32 M.):

\[\text{in praeposito per}\]
\n\[\text{"pelliciendo," hoc est inducendo, geminato l.}\]

Similarly Priscian (i. 50, 7 H.) quotes *pellige, pellocet* from Plautus.

The MSS. of Plautus and Terence show great prevalence of Assimilation; Plautus puns on *adsum* and *assum*, *Poen.* 279:

Milphio, heus ubi tu es? Assum apud te ececum. At ego oxilius sis uolo,

where however the MSS. read *adsum*, and Stilo (end of second cent. B.C.) derived *as-sidus* "ab asse dando" (Cic. *Top.* ii. 10). It is quite a mistake to suppose the unassimilated forms to be the older, and the assimilated the more recent (see Dorsch in the *Pragar philol. Studien*, 1887). In the Herculanean papyri the proposition is generally not assimilated, e.g. *'adsiduo,' 'inridens,' 'inilita,' 'affinum,' but 'imminet,' 'imperiis* (Class. Rev. iv. 442). The byform *ā* of *ab* originated in an assimilated form, e.g. before *f-* in the verb *ā-fluo*, to be abundant (cf. *ab-undo*), often confused in MSS. with *af-fluo*, to flow to (see Nettleship, *Contributions*, s. v. *affluo*), and before *m-*, *v-*, e.g. *ā-mitto, ā-vello*, the forms *ammitto, &c.* being avoided apparently through fear of confusion with compounds of *ad*; in classical spelling *ad* is assimilated usually before *c-*, e.g. *ac-cipio* (sometimes before *q-*, e.g. *ac-guīro*), before *g-*, e.g. *aggredior* and *ad-gredior*, before *l-*, e.g. *alligare* but *adluere, adloqui* (Velius Longus, p. 61 K.), before *p-*, e.g. *op-pōno*, rarely *ad-pōno*, before *r-*, e.g. *arrīpio* and *ad-ripio*, before *s-*, e.g. *as-sideo* and *ad-sideo, ad-sum*, before *t-*, e.g. *at-trībuo*; *con-* is assimilated before *l-*, e.g. *col-lūgium, col-loco* and *con-loco*, before *r-*, e.g. *cor-rigo*, and becomes *con-* before *c-, d-, f-, g-, j-, n-, q-, s-, t-, v-; on ex see ch. ix. § 29; *in-* is assimilated before *m-*, e.g. *im-mitto* (becoming *im-* also before *b-, p-*), occasionally before *r-*, e.g. *fr-rua* and *in-rua*, not so often before *l-, e.g. *in-lūda* and *il-lujo*; *ob-* is assimilated before *c-, e.g. o-c-curro, before *f-, e.g. *of-fendo*, before *g-, e.g. o-guīro*, before *p-, e.g. *op-pōrior*, and occasionally before *m-*, e.g. *ob-māneo*, O. Lat. *om-mentare*; *per-* is assimilated before *t-, e.g. pel-līcio, pel-lēgo and *per-lego*; *sub* is assimilated before *c-, e.g. *sus-curro* before *f-, e.g. *suf-fendo*, before *g-, e.g. sug-guīro*, before *p-, e.g. *sup-pōno*, and optionally before *m-*, e.g. *sum-mitto* and *sub-mitto*, and *r-*, e.g. *sur-rīpui* (contracted *surripui*) and *sub-rīpui*; *trans-* often becomes *trā-* before *j-, d-, l-, m-, n-, e.g. *trā-do* (trans-dere attested by Donatus for Terence, *Phorm.* 2, where all our MSS. have *trudere*); before *j-* we find *co-* in *coēcio, &c.*, *pe-* in *pejērare*, a later spelling of *perjērare* (see Georges, *Lex. Wortf.* s. v.) (cf. *pelēuri* Plaut. *Truc.* 612 (B)).

§ 161. Other examples of Assimilation. If Festus (252. 7 Th.) is right in saying that both *petna and *pesna were O. Lat. words for ‘a wing,’ we must suppose *penna to be the development of the former, while the latter (from *petna-) would become *pēna (cf. tūna for *tuesna); annus is most naturally derived from *at-no- (Goth. aþn Neut., ‘a year’). The assimilation of c to a following t was a feature of dialectal (e.g. *blatta for *blacta, Lett. blakts, ‘a bug’) and Late Latin (see ch. ii. § 95). Like gūma from giōbo is rumentum (glossed by ‘abruptio’ Paul. Fest. 369. 12 Th.) from rumpo; like rāmentum from rādo is caementum from caedo. (On the reduction of mm after a long vowel or diphthong to m, e.g. caementum to caemen tum, see ch. ii. § 127). For dp we have O. Lat. topper (see ch. ix. § 7) for tod-per (on quippe, quippiam, see ch. x. § 7). Idcirco is sometimes spelt idcirco (see Brambach, Hiltfibichlein, s. v.). Whether mm became mm, e.g. gemma, or rm, e.g. germen, is discussed in § 80, and whether exāmen represents *exāgen or *ex-a-gen-men in § 116. In the Probi App. (198. 26 K.) we have: amygdala non ‘amiddula’; the ġa of frīg(i) dus (frīgda Probi App. 198. 3 K.) became ġā (cf. frīdam, C. I. L. iv. 291; Ital. freddo, &c.).

§ 162. Lengthening by Compensation. Closely connected with the Assimilation of Consonants is what is called the ‘Compensatory’ Lengthening of Vowels, where the assimilated consonant lends itself rather to increase the length of the preceding vowel, so that the loss of the consonant is, as it were, compensated by the additional quantity of the vowel. (English examples are ‘lady,’ ‘maid,’ ‘rain,’ ‘thane.’) Quālus, for *quās-lus (cf. quās-illus, § 148), is in the older spelling quällus, anhēlus for *anhebus, rētum for *vebllum (cf. ve lulium) is vellum, anīla, a pot (later olla), for *auxlā (cf. auxilla) is anūlla, &c.; the Adjective ending -ōsus for *o-went-to- (ch. v. § 65) is in the older spelling -ōssus, -ossus (see Brambach, Orth. p. 268, and the Indices to Ribbeck’s Virgil and Studemund’s Apograph of the Ambrosian Palimpsest of Plautus); dūmetum for *dusmetum is in Virgil MSS. dummetum, as dimino is in Plautus MSS. diminuo [cf. dirrumpo, Bacch. 441 (C D), but dirr- (B)], and so on. (On the spellings with double consonant in the MSS. of Plautus, Virgil, &c., see ch. ii. §§ 127–133, where the question is discussed how far a long vowel with a single consonant might be substituted for a short vowel with a double consonant in Latin. On the lengthening of a vowel before ns, see ch. ii. § 144, and for additional examples of the loss of s, x with ‘compensatory’ lengthening, § 151 above.)
§ 163. Assimilation of Syllables. The change of the older Perfect-forms cēcurri, mēmordi, pēposci, pēpūgi, &c. to cēcurri, mēmordi, pēposci, pēpūgi, &c. (see ch. viii. § 43) shows the partiality of Latin for the complete assimilation of two neighbouring syllables. The I.-Eur. dissimilation of *qʷenqʷe, ‘five,’ to *penqʷe (§ 116) (O. Ind. pāṇca, Lith. penkš, &c.) is not seen in Lat. quinque; quercus (for *querquuns), querquētum may be another example, for O. Engl. furh, our ‘fir,’ points to I.-Eur. *perqʷ- (cf. bībo from I.-Eur. pib-, O. Ind. pībāmi, O. Ir. ibim). The same similarity of initial and following syllable, whether an original similarity preserved in Latin or first produced by the Latin partiality for a repetition of the same sound, is seen in words like cincinnus, a curl (Gk. κίκων), quisquiliae, shreds (Gk. κοσκυλματία), barba for *farba (Engl. beard, O. Sl. brada), querquēra, ague, murmur (Gk. μορμόρω), ἄρπα (Gk. ἔποψ), furfur, tintinnio, cūcūmis, turτur, &c. But in Vulgar Latin we find qu becoming c when a following syllable has qu, e.g. cinque for quinque, cesquo for quiesco (Bersu, die Gutturalen, p. 98).
CHAPTER V.

FORMATION OF NOUN AND ADJECTIVE STEMS.

§ 1. I. STEM-SUFFIXES. We have seen how the several sounds of the Latin language were written (ch. i.), and pronounced (ch. ii.), and what original or 'Indo-European' sounds they represent (ch. iv.). We have now to see how Latin words were formed, and how the Latin process of formation was related to the 'Indo-European.'

For the forming of words we find sounds combined into roots, and these developed into stems; thus the sounds t, e, and g, are combined into the root teg-, 'to cover' (Lat. teg-o, teg-men, lectus for *teg-tus, têg-a with O-grade of root), which is further developed into the stems tōgā- (Lat. Nom. Sg. togā, earlier *tegā, Gen. Pl. tōgā-rum, &c.), tegmen- (Lat. Nom. Sg. tegmen, Gen. tegmēnis, earlier *tegmen-es, &c.) by the addition to the root of the stem-suffixes -ā-, -men-. It is these stem-suffixes, used in the making of Nouns and Adjectives, which will be the subject of this section.

§ 2. Suffixes ending in -ō, -ā (Nouns and Adjectives of the First and Second Declension). -ō-, -Ā-. -Ō-, which should rather be called the ē-ō-suffix, since it alternates with ē (e.g. I.-Eur. Voc. Sg. of Masc. o-stems ended in -ē, *ēkwē, 'O horse,' Gk. ἐπεύτης, Lat. equē, &c.), is associated with the Masc. and Neut. Gender. -Ā-, which should rather be called the ā-suffix, since it alternates with ā (e.g. I.-Eur. Voc. Sg. of Fem. ā-stems ended in -ā, *ēkwā, 'O mare'; cf. Hom. Gk. νῦμφα), is associated with the Fem. Gender. Hence the ō- and ā-suffixes were used
in Adjectives, e.g. I.-Eur. νεώ-, Masc. and Neut., *νευά-, Fem. (Gk. νέ(φ)ος, νέ(φ)ον, νέ(φ)α, Lat. nōvos, novum, nova, &c.). Special circumstances have however produced a few instances of Fem. o-stems and Masc. ā-stems. Thus Lat. fāgus, Gk. φυάζω are Fem., being names of trees; and Lat. agricola, when it passed from its original abstract sense of 'field-tillage' into the concrete sense of a 'field-tiller,' became Masc. (cf. Gk. *νευά-, youth, νευάς, a youth). (See ch. vi. § 1.)

Of the many uses of the o-suffix, two may be selected for particular notice: (1) in Abstract Nouns (Nomina Actionis), these having the accent on the root, e.g. I.-Eur. *γόνο-, 'production' (O. Ind. jānam, Gk. γωνὸς), from root ḡen-, 'to produce'; (2) in Nomina Agentis, these having the accent on the suffix, e.g. I.-Eur. *τόρο-, 'a piercer' (Gk. τοπός), from root terr-, 'to pierce'; I.-Eur. *πρόκο-, 'an asker' (Lat. prōcus, a suitor), from root prek-, 'to ask.' The root in all these examples shows the o-grade (ch. iv. § 51).

The ā-suffix is similarly used in Abstract Nouns (Nomina Actionis), e.g. I.-Eur. *bhūgā, 'the action of fleeing' (Gk. φυγή, Lat. fuga), from the weak grade of the root bheug-, 'to flee.'

How far these simple suffixes -ō- and -ā- have been combined with others to form the large number of suffixes which end in the letter ō, or the letter á, e.g. -io-, -iā-, -to-, -tā-, -tuo-, -tuā-, -tro-, -trā, &c. need not be discussed here. In Latin we find them more used in the older stages of the language, while fuller suffixes seem to be required in the classical period; thus per-vicus (from the root wek-, 'to fight,' Lat. vinco) is O. Lat. for per-vicāx, and squālus, Enn., became squālīdus. The Verbal Noun used as Infinitive by the Umbro-Samnite nations was probably a Neuter ō-stem, e.g. Osc. ezun, Umbr. erom from root ēs-, 'to be,' Lat. esse; Osc. deicem corresponds to Lat. dicere, Osc. moltaum to Lat. multam); and at all periods of Latin we see a tendency to make rough-and-ready coinages of words with the help of these simple suffixes, e.g. Carna, from *cār(o)n-, flesh, the goddess of the vital organs, to whom a temple was dedicated by Junius Brutus in 510 B.C., Cārda (or Cardea), from *cardon-, a hinge, the goddess of hinges, nola, 'a say-no' from nōlo, in Caelius' punning description of Clodia (Quint. viii. 6. 53).
THE LATIN LANGUAGE.

§ 3. Latin -e- and -e-suffixes; other examples. - Lat. uncus from *oneos (O. Ind. ankās; Gk. ἄνσω) from the root ank-, 'to bend'; Lat. dēsus (Gk. δελος), perhaps the O-grade of a root del-; Lat. jāgum (O. Ind. yugam, Gk. θυγόν, Goth. juk Neut., O. Sl. igo Neut.) from the root yeug-, 'to join'; Lat. plāga (Gk. πληγή) from the root plāg-, 'to beat'; con-viva from viva, to enjoy oneself (e.g. Catull. v. 1; Plaut. Pers. 30 uiues mecum; so vita Plaut. Trin. 477; cf. Non. 14. 16 M. sicuti qui nunc est in summa laetitiae, 'vivere' eum dicimus); parcus from parco; with lengthened root col-lēga (cf. lēg-ō, rēg-ō, and cēlēre, if from *lēga, *rēga, *cēla, Verbal Nouns from the roots tēg-, rēg-, kēl-; cf. § 23). Of early forms, and occasional coinages, may be mentioned: condus and prōmus from con-do, promo, e.g. Plaut. Pseud. 608 condus promus sum, procurator peni; trāha, a harrow, for which Virgil substituted (invented?) the form trāhea (cf. the note of Servius or G. i. 164 traheseque: Epenthesin fecit causa metri, ut 'navita.' traha autem vehiculum est a trahendo dictum; nam non habet rotas), from traho, like sūra, the bolt of a door, from servō, to join; from atō was formed Aius Locadius, the god to whom a temple was dedicated in gratitude for the supernatural warning against the attack of the Gauls, 350 B.C.; from pando, Panda, the goddess of opening, after whom was named the Pandāna porta (Varro, L. L. v. 42), the Oscar name of the goddess being Patana.-Nonius quotes perrivcus, stubborn, persistent, from Accius (Trag. 158 R.):

sed pérú conco Aiax ánimo atque aduorsábili,
derived from *perivco, to be stubborn, persistent, as we may see from the assonance of Ennius (Trag. 408 R.):

peruince pertinácì peruciacia;

coa and nola, from coeo and nolo are quoted from Caelius by Quintilian (viii. 6. 53): quadrantarium Clytemestrat, et in triclinio coam, in cubiculo nolam; so perhaps confata sus, for sus cum fētu, explained by Paul. Fest. (49. 28 Th.): quae cum omni fētu adhibebatur ad sacrificium; Domī-diucca, Prū-nūba (an epithet of Juno), Juga (another epithet of Juno), Lua, Vica Pola, nocti-lioca, sangui-sīga. Scrība was the early word for 'a poet' (Fest. 492. 19 Th.).

§ 4. -Iō-, -Iā- (-Yō-, -Yā-). It is difficult to distinguish in Latin the I.-Eur. suffixes (1) -yō-, -yā-, (2) -iyō-, -iyā- (by some written -āyo-, -āyā-), for as we have seen (ch. iv. § 65), y after a consonant in the middle of a word became vocalic i in Latin, so that Lat. mēdīus from I.-Eur. *mēdh-
yo- (O. Ind. mádhya-, Gk. μέθρσ, is, unlike the O. Ind. and Greek forms of the word, a trisyllable. The weak grade of I.-Eur. -yō-, -iyō- (or -yē-, -iyē-, § 2) seems to have been -ī-, -i-; e.g. Goth. brūks, 'useful,' for *brükis, I.-Eur. *bhrūg"i-, *bhrūg"yō- (-yē-), from the root bhreug"-, 'to use, enjoy' (Lat. fruor); Goth. hairdis, 'a herd, shepherd,' for *hairdis; and this opened the way to a confusion of io-stems with i-stems. Another byword seems to have been -iyō-, -iyā-, e.g. O. Ind. trī-īya-, 'third,'
Hom. Gk. προθύμ-ιή, a form which would in Latin shorten the i before the following vowel, and become identical with I.-Eur.-ίο-.

These IO- suffixes have three chief uses in I.-Eur.: (1) to form Verbal Adjectives, especially Gerundives, the Neuter and Fem. being often employed as Verbal Nouns, e.g. I.-Eur. *sōq"-yo-, 'requiring help or company' (Lat. sōcins; cf. O. Ind. sāciya-, Gk. ἀ-οσπηρό from *όσσο-) from the root sēq"-, 'to accompany' (O. Ind. sac-, Gk. ἐσομα, Lat. sēquor). Similarly Latin exīnĭus in the sense of eximendus (e.g. Ter. Hec. 66 utin eximium neminem habeam? 'am I to make no exception?'); Lat. studium from studeo, Lat. exīviae from exuo; plūvia from pluo; (2) as a secondary suffix of Adjectives, the Neuter and Fem. being often used as Abstract Nouns; often too in Compound Adjectives; e.g. I.-Eur. *pātrīyo- (O. Ind. pītriya-, Gk. πάτρος, Lat. patris) from the noun *pāter- (I.-Eur. pītār-, Gk. πατήρ, Lat. pāter); Lat. somni(m) (O. Ind. svāpnyam, O. Sl. sūnije, sūnije) from somnus, stem *somno- (O. Ind. svāpna, O. Sl. sūnů); Lat. falsi-jārius from falsus and jus, discordia from discors; (3) in Adjectives which have a sense of comparison or distinction, indicating a special locality, direction, &c., e.g. I.-Eur. *mēdhyo- (O. Ind. mādhya-, Gk. με(σ)ρος, Lat. mēdius); I.-Eur. *ālyo- (Arm. ail, Gk. ἄλλος, Lat. ēlius, Goth. aljís); Gk. ἄξιος has this suffix, while Lat. dexter (Gk. ἄξιτερός) has the -tero- suffix, which has the same force (§ 16). So in some Ordinal Numbers, e.g. Lat. tertius (cf. O. Ind. trīfy-, Goth. bridja, O. Sl. tretiý, ch. vi. § 61).

A notable use of this suffix in the Italic languages is in the formation of Proper Names. While in all, or most, of the other I.-Eur. languages Compounds were used for Proper Names, the son taking a Compound slightly varied from the father's (e.g. Gk. Δίο-κράτης, son of Δίο-κλῆς, Teut. Walt-bert, son of Wald-ram), the Italian stocks employed simple stems with this IO- suffix, e.g. Lat. Lūcius, Stātius, &c., which correspond to some contracted or 'pet'-names in the other I.-Eur. nations, e.g. Gaul. Toutius, a familiar shortened form of Toutio-rix, Gk. Zeuvlaas, for the more ceremonious Zeuξ-ιππος, &c., Λευκίς beside Λεύκ-ιππος, &c. (see Fick, Personennamen).

The Oscan inscriptions enable us to distinguish two varieties
of this suffix in Patronymics (or family names), which cannot so easily be distinguished in Latin: (1) -yo-, in Patronymics derived from praenomina (what we call ‘Christian names’) in -o, e.g. Osc. Úhtavis, Lat. Octávius, the patronymic derived from Lat. Octavus; Osc. Statis from a praenomen *Stato-.

The Oscan suffix is in native characters written -is (i.e. -ïs), in Latin characters -is, in Gk. -is; (2) -ïyo-, in Patronymics derived from praenomina in -yo-, e.g. Statiiis, a patronymic from the praenomen Statis (stem *Statyo-). This suffix is in Oscan characters -ïis, in Latin characters -ïes, in Gk. -ïes. To these we may add a third variety, -ïyo-, apparently the unshortened form of -ïyo-. This is used in ceremonious language on inscriptions bearing the names of magistrates, &c., and is written -ïis, Gk. -ïëis, e.g. Vínikiís, Λφδεïes, both quaestors. How far Latin spellings like Clodeius, Publeius, Vareius, if they are genuine Latin forms and not dialectal, may be distinguished from the normal forms Clodius, Publius, Varius is hard to determine. The diphthong ei in O. Latin may, as we have seen, represent the weakening of an original -ai- (-oi-) in the unaccented syllable, e.g. occeido, as well as an original -ei-, e.g. deico; it may also be a graphic expression of the long simple vowel i, for this -ei- came to be pronounced, and in time spelt, in the same way as i; and before another vowel ĩ would be shortened to ķ. Thus Osc. Bovaiano- was in Latin Bovianum through *Bovianum from *Boveianum; Osc. Pümpanians is Lat. Pompéianus; Osc. Maraio-, Falisc. Mareio-, is Lat. Marcius (cf. Umbr. pernaio-, ‘in front,’ postraio-, ‘behind,’ in Lat. anticus, posticus). Analogous to the Oscan -ïyo- as opposed to -ïyo- is perhaps the Latin use of the full ending -ius, as opposed to the shorter -is or -i (with -ĩ- like Osc. -is?), in names of magistrates; for example, on the S. C. de Bacchanalibus (C. I. L. i. 196) the consuls’ names are Marcius and Postumius, but the names of the clerks who ‘scribendo arfuerunt’ are Claudi, Valeri, Minuci.

As the IO-suffix is often added as a secondary suffix to Verb-stems (e.g. pinsio and pinso, ch. viii. § 15), so it is added to Nouns. O-stems either drop their final vowel before it, e.g. somn-iun, or show -ëyo- which became -ëo- (ch. iv. § 66), e.g. aureus. (On rustic -eo- for -io-, see ch. ii. § 10). This ending
was often assigned to other stems, e.g. *flammaeus* (Ā-stem), *cornu*s (U-stem), *vīleus* (I-stem), to denote material. The TER-stems augmented by -io- produce in Latin a numerous class of Neuter Nouns indicating the place or instrument of an action, with the ending -tōrio- corresponding to Greek -τηριο-, e.g. *audī-torium*, ‘the place of hearing;’ *deversorium* for *devert-torium*, ‘a lodging-place,’ *sculp-torium*, ‘an instrument for scratching’ (Martial xiv. 83). (Cf. Gk. βονλεν-τήριον, ἐργασ-τήριον, both indicating place, καυσ-τήριον, ‘instrument for burning;’ κρυ-τήριον, ‘means of deciding’). (On Fem. -toria in Late Lat. see Rönsch, *Collectanea*, p. 197.) Similarly we have -mōnium, -mōnia from MEN-stems, e.g. *āūtomonia and āūtomonium* (cf. *āūtmentum*), *flāmonium* (on the spelling, see Nettleship, *Contributions*, s.v.) from *flamen*, an ending extended to *trīstī-monia, sanctī-monia, &c.* The Adj. ending -ārius (from āsios, ch. iv. § 160) was to some extent supplanted by -āris in later Latin (ch. iii. § 16), though the popular speech retained the older forms (e.g. *vinarius*), forms which should perhaps be restored to various lines of Plautus (see Langen, *Beiträge*, p. 324; e.g. *militariis*, Pseud. 1049). The same may be true of -ālius and -ālis, &c., e.g. *mānualium: ēγχειριβιον* (Gl. Cyrill.), *ōvīlium* (ib.) A common ending of Abstract Nouns is -itia (often -itiae), e.g. *laetitia* from *laetus*, like *militia* from *miles* (see also YΕ-stems, § 51), *sītium, e.g. servitiurium, flāgitiurium, lānitiurium*. From N-stems we have, e.g. *cōlōnicia*, in O. Lat., ‘a dwelling-place’ (Plaut. *Anul*.* 576 : ut communetur coloniam*).

-ārio- and -āri-, -ālio- and -āli-. Caper (p. 103. 9 K.) approves the old form *vinarius*:

Vasa istaeae vinaria sunt, vinaria cella: Vulgus adhuc retinet de prīsae verba loquella;

and similarly atramentarium (p. 108. 3 K.); but Probi Appendix (p. 198. 7 K.) primipilaris, non ‘primipilarius.’ (For other examples of -arius, -alius, see Rönsch, *Collectanea*, pp. 196, 208; Neue ii3. p. 158.)

**Other examples of IO-stem Compounds.** From *jūs* and *āgo* was formed *jūr(i)-gium; so litīgium; from dīco, jūdicium, indicium; from co, cīmitium, exītium (cf. § 77); similarly praemium from ēmo, incendium, suspīrium, discīdium, cōmūdiā, substādiā, acci-ficium, lecti-sterniūm, stilli-cīdium, obsēquium [wrongly declared ( Cicero ap. Quint. viii. 3. 35; but cf. Lael. xxiv. 89) to be a coinage of Terence, for it is used by Plautus (*Bacch. 1082*) and Naevius (Don. ad Ter. *Andr. i. i. 40*)] and *exśqueia, excūbiae, suspētīae, vindēmia* from *vinum* and *āmo, *incitāria from *cāra, &c.
§ 5. -UŌ-, -UĀ-. Here again the two I.-Eur. forms of the suffix, (1) -wō-, -wā-, (2) -ūwō-, -ūwā-, (or -owo-, &c.) are difficult to distinguish in Latin, where w after a consonant in the middle of a word became vocalic u at first, though it might afterwards become a consonant by the process of Syncope described in ch. iii. § 13, e.g. *furvus, which must have been trisyllabic, *fusnos (cf. *fus-cus), at the time when s between vowels became r in Latin. An original -ūwō-, -wō-, -ūwō- would also become -ūō-, and in time -vō- in Latin (ch. iii. § 24, p. 174), so that the exact origin of the Latin suffix -ō-, -vō- is often doubtful. Another element of confusion is that the weak grade of the I.-Eur. suffixes -wō-, -ūwō- (-wō-, -wō-, see § 2) was ā, which opened the way to these stems coalescing with ā-stems.

The UO-suffix is much used in Latin and in Teutonic in adjectives denoting colour, e.g. Lat. helvus (O. H. G. gelo, Engl. yellow, from *ghēl-wo-), furvus, flāvus, rāvus, &c. Greek Verbal Adjectives in -τεός for *-teōs, with Gerundive force, e.g. δωκτέος, requiring to be pursued, capable of being pursued (cf. O. Ind. kārtva-, kārtuva-, 'requiring to be done'), are in Latin represented by formations in -ēvus, e.g. cadēvus, excēvus, prae-ēvus, conspēvus, while another class of Verbal Adjectives, denoting state or condition, end in -īvus, e.g. nātīvus, captīvus, vōtīvus. These Adjectives in -īvus seem to be derived from Verbal Nouns with a TIO-suffix or a TI-suffix (cf. *furīvus from *furī-, a stem seen in Adv. furītum, ch. ix. § 4; sēmentīvus from sementis, Late Lat. sementīvum, Rönsch, Collect. p. 209), though some have tried to connect them with Sanskrit Gerundives in -tāvā-, e.g. O. Ind. kartāvā-, 'requiring to be done.' (See Thurneysen, Verba anf -io, p. 41; von Planta, Gramm. Osk.-Umbr. i. p. 169), while Verbal Adjectives of the same sense in -īvus, e.g. rēcūdīvus [cf. cadīvus (morbus), 'the falling sickness,' in Gaulish Latin, e.g. Marc. Emp. xx. 93], sub-sēcīvus, O. Lat. vocīvus from vocare (classical vācare), may come from Verbal Nouns with an IO-suffix. The forms ilō-ōdīvus, vācūvus are not phonetic developments of these, but follow the analogy of Gerundive Adjectives like cadēvus, excēvus, &c.

§ 5–7.] 

**NOUN AND ADJECTIVE STEMS.**  
-ÜÖ-, -ÜÀ-.  

*laiwo-, 'left' (Gk. λαο(φ)ός, O. Sl. lëwù), Lat. laevo, probably connected with Engl. slow, from Teut. *sliwa-. Similarly Lat. calcus (O. Ind. kulva-); Lat. scaevus (Gk. σκαεφός); Lat. clevus (Goth. hlaiv Neut. 'tomb,' O. Engl. hlàw, hläw, 'hill,' esp. 'grave-hill,' Sc. law) from the root *klei-, 'to lean, slope.'

The thematic vowel is inserted in I.-Eur. *widh-ë-wo-, 'unmarried, widowed' [O. Ind. widhàva-, Gk. ὑδεως; cf. Goth. viduvō (n-stem), O. Sl. vidova, 'a widow,' O. Ir. fedb, W. gweddw]. Lat. vidus, from the root weidh-. 'to separate,' of Lat. di-vido, &c.

§ 7. Latin Verbal Adjectives in -uus, -ivus, -tivus. *Relicus (rather relicus) is a word of four syllables in Plautus, and indeed in all the Republican literature, though it afterwards became reliquus and finally relicus; similarly delicus, &c. (see Bersu, *die Guthwulst*, p. 59). This ending -uus (-ivos), indicating state or condition, is seen in continuus, ingénus, assiduus (whence the Adverb assiduo, for the sake of a pun with which Plautus coins the form acciduo, Truc. 422), exigium, ambiguum [though we find other Compounds like prodigus from āgo (prodigivus in the Comm. Lud. Saec.), indignus from āgeo with the O-suffix]; from first conj. verbs we have ōnus, irrigus (irrigivus Cato), vulcus (roculus Plaut.) from ineo we have Iunos. Derivative IO-stems from these are e.g. reliquiae, deliquium. Examples of Adjectives, &c. in -uus, derived from nouns, are: annus from annus (O-stem), Minerva for *menes-ùul* (cf. O. Ind. manas-vin-, 'intelligent') from *menes-, 'intelligence' (O. Ind. mánas-, Gk. μένεσ-), a quadrissyllable in Plautus (ch. iv. § 148), strēnus (cf. Gk. στριφός, health, Engl. stern, Pruss. sternawiskan, 'earnest'), patrunus from pater (R-stem). Another example of a Gerundive Verbal Adjective in -uus is pascus, fit for pasture, intended for pasture, with which Plautus contrasts ōrus, fit for ploughing (Truc. 149):

non aruo hic, sed pasceus ager est;

(cf. Cic. *de Rep.* v. 2. 3 agi arvi et arbusti et pascui), whence arum, with O. Lat. auras Plur., a field for ploughing. Of Nouns and Adjectives in -ivus, -tiva, which some would make Derivative IO-stems of Adjectives in -uus (recidivus from recipuus; but cf. deliquium, reliquiae from delicus, relicus), examples are: internicivus (cf. internecio and internecuum) from vicere, subsicivus [cf. i(n)i-sicium, ferni-sicium] from sicere. (Subsicivus denotes what remains over and above a division of land, &c., hence subsicivus ager, spare land, subsicium tempus, spare time, whence the proverb subsicivus operis, Cic. *de Orat.* ii. 89, 364). Another word often confused with this last, viz. succisivus, from succio, shows the more usual mode of derivation, from a Verbal Noun TI- or TIO-stem (cf. succisio), like passivus, fügitivus. Lixivus, whence the derivative IO-stem liquivus, comes from lixivus, derived from lixa, water, lye, *lixara* (Ital. lessare), to boil, words connected with the root wleiw of Lat. *vignor*, O. Ir. fluich, 'wet' (see *Class. Rev.* v. 10). The O. Lat. word sonicius (Paul. Fest. 409. 6 Th. 'soniov,' sonanti) used in the augur's phrase sonicium tripulatum (Serv. ad A. iii. 90; cf. Fest. 422. 19 Th.), will, if the second syllable is long, be similarly related to *sonare*, as lixivus to *lixara*, subsicivus to subsicare, &c. [Nöcivus, Plin. Phaedr., &c. from nóceo, I.-Eur. *nökeyo* (ch. viii. § 23), has been compared to O. Sl. chodi-vû, 'wandering,' from chodi-ti, 'to go,' ljubi-vû, 'loving,' from ljubi-ti, 'to love'.]
§ 8. -NŌ-, -NĀ-. The I.-Eur. suffix -nō-, Fem. -nā-, seems to vary with the higher grades -ṃnō-, -śnā-, and -ōnā-, -ōnā-; sometimes a vowel-sound seems to precede the nasal, representing some such variation as -enō-, -enā- (ch. iv. § 81). Its chief use is in the formation of Verbal Adjectives, usually with the force of a Perfect Participle Passive; thus in Sanscrit a certain number of Verbs have P. P. P. in -nā-, the others in -tā- (I.-Eur. -to-, § 27), and likewise in Teutonic and Balto-Slavic, e. g. O. Ind. pūrnā-, ‘filled,’ O. Engl. bunden, ‘bound,’ O. Sl. danū, ‘given.’ In Latin, as in Greek, the P. P. P. suffix is -to-, but traces of a similar use of -no- are found in words like plēnus, full (cf. im-plēitus); while of Verbal Nouns formed with this suffix we have, e. g. dōnun (O. Ind. dāna- N., O. Ir. dān), somnus from the root swep- (to sleep) (O. Ind. svāpna- M., Arm. k’un, O. Ir. suan, O. Engl. swefen, Lith. sāpnas; cf. Gk. ὀνυς, O. Sl. sūnū). An N-stem which passes into the O-declension shows this suffix; thus rēgnun (ch. ii. § 144) may be from stem *rēgen- (cf. O. Ind. rājān-, ‘rule’). The suffix is preceded by s in lūna for *lunna (cf. losna on an old Praenestine mirror, C. I. L. i. 55) (Zend raoxšna-, ‘shining,’ Pruss. lauxnos Pl., ‘stars’). In Greek we find some Adjectives of Time in -ivos, derived from a Locative Case ending in ὄ, e. g. χειμερ-ivos (Lat. hibernus for *himērī-no-, ch. iv. § 77), ἐπι-ivos (Lat. verus), ἐσπερ-ivos (cf. Lat. vespére), &c. Adjectives in -inus in Latin like jāginus, įuncius show an I.-Eur. suffix -inō-, denoting material or origin, e. g. Gk. φύτ-ivos, made of beechnwood, βύβλαinos, made of papyrus, &c. In Latin, owing to the weakening of vowels in unaccented syllables, -īnus may represent an older -ānō-, -ānō-, -ānō-, &c., as well as -ānō-; and, owing to the syncope of such vowels, -īnus may represent the same formations. It is however often possible to distinguish between original -no- and original -ino-, &c.; thus pōmulīnus, made of poplar-wood, must have had originally a vowel between the l and the n, for original ln becomes ll in Latin (e. g. collis for
The suffix -ίνος in Greek, denoting species, occurs frequently with names of animals, e.g. δελφακ-ινη from δελφαξ, κορακ-ίνος from κόραξ; and similarly in Latin we have bōvinus, vīnus, suīnus (Goth. sv-ein, Engl. swine, O. Sl. sv-inū), fībrīnus (O. H. G. bibir-in; cf. Zend bawr-aeniš, Lith. bebr-īnis), &c., the feminine often being employed with ellipse of cūro, as vītūlīna, veal, suīna, pork, &c. Latin -ίνος is often due to the addition of the NO-suffix to IO-stems, e.g. Lātīnus from Latinum (though, when the suffix -īno-, and not -no-, is added, we have -iēnus, e.g. ãliēnus from alius, lāniēnus from lānius, with the same dissimilation of the i- and e-vowels, as in piētas instead of *piētās, médiētas instead of *medīitas, &c., Engl. 'yet,' 'yes,' for 'yit,' 'yis'), or to I-stems, e.g. mārinus from mare, piscīna from piscis, ominō from omnīs. It is often seen in the transference of an ION-stem into the Ō- or Α-declension (cf. § 55 on òπόλουν beside επολο), e.g. in names of gods like Δικατίνου s, 'qui conjuges jungit,' from jūgātīo, Potīna, the goddess worshipped when a child first took milk (Non. 108. 17 M.), from pōtio, &c. Lat. -īnō may also represent an earlier -aino-, &c., for ai in the unaccented syllable, became ei, which passed into i, but Ose. deīv-īnō-, &c. proves an original -ino- for deīvinus, &c. The suffix -tānus of divū-tānus, cras-tānus, pris-tānus, &c., corresponding to the O. Ind. suffix -tna-, -tana- used to form Adjectives from Adverbs of Time, e.g. divā-tana- and divā-tāna-, 'daily,' nú-tana-, nú-tāna-, 'of the present time,' pra-tnā-, 'former,' &c., may be connected with O. Ir. tan, 'time,' and so be more strictly the second element of a compound than a mere suffix, just as -gnus in privi-gnus, bignae, twins (Paul. Fest. 24. 25 Th.), represents the root ġen-, of gēnus, gignu, &c. The -gnus of ili-gnus, sālignus, lārignus on the other hand shows the suffix -no-, the g being the development before n (ch. iv. § 119) of the final c of the stems ille-is, salīc-is, larīc-is, and was by their analogy extended to other tree-adjectives like abīgnus from abīōs, Gen. abīōt-is [ferrīgīnus (cf. aurīgīnus, fūlīgīnus) adds the O-suffix to the stem of ferrīgin-is]. Similarly -ānus, the ending of Adjectives formed with the NO-suffix from Ā-stems, e.g. silvānus, arcānus, is extended to Adjectives from other stems, e.g. urbānus. By the addition of this NO-suffix to Nomina Agentis in -or we get
-urnus, e.g. tāciturnus (and -urnius, e.g. Plauturnius); while ES-stems give -ēnus; e.g. ahēnus, Umbr. ahesno- from aes, I.-Eur. *āyes-; vēnēnum, lit. 'philtre,' 'love-potion,' for *vēnēs-no- (cf. Vēnus); ēgēnus (cf. ēges-tas), &c.; we have -ūna from a U-stem in rūcīna. A common use of the NO-suffix in Latin is to form Distributive Numerals, e.g. quāternī, bīnī, trīnī, tertiī (see ch. vi. §§ 59, 61, 63).

§ 9. I.-Eur. NO-suffix. I.-Eur. *oi-no-, 'one' (Gk. ὁίνη, the ace on dice, (though oίνος, Cypr. olfoς, alone, has the WO-suffix, like Zend āqvā-, āvā-), O. Ir. oen, W. un, Goth. ains, Lith. vēnas, O. Sl. inū), Lat. ānus. Similarly Lat. ānis for *casnus (cf. caucus), Osc. casnair, an old man; Lat. urna for *urcna (cf. urcus); Lat. quernus for *quercus; Lat. aegus (Gk. ὄεγος for *άβɵ-νος, O. Ir. uan, W. oen; cf. O. Sl. jagnè); Lat. grānum from root ēr-, 'to rub down, wear out' (O. Ind. jirnā-, 'rubbed down,' Goth. kaurn, 'corn,' O. Sl. zrino).

§ 10. Latin -nus. From Ā-stems, names of animals, we have āquilinus, formācicus, noctūnicus, mustēnicus, ĉūminus, vipērinus, &c., and from names of persons, Agrippina, Jāgurthius, Messētina, Sībīllinus, &c. Other examples are: from O-stems, die-īnicus, vicīnus; from an R-stem, sobr-īnus (for *sōbr-īnus from sōbror, I.-Eur *swēsor-); from U-stems, ĝēminus dens, from ĝenus, the jaw (Gk. ἥριος), verūna from vērō; from Verbs in -io, officina, fōtina. (For a list of Nouns in -īna, see Rönsch, Collectanea, p. 199.)

§ 11. Latin -ānus. (See A. L. L. i. 177.) From town-names of the first declension we have Rōmanus, Čāpuanus, &c. Names of persons in -ānus are usually derived from place-names, and often preserve the names of lost towns; e.g. Apscelλanus points to a town *Apscēlla (Eph. Epigr. ii. pp. 25-92). Derivative Adjectives from the fem. of ordinal numbers show -ānus, e.g. undecīmani from undecima, sc. vīgīo, cohors. So decimānus from decīma, sc. pars, the tenth part, tithe, e.g. a āger decimānus, land paying tithes, an adjective which somehow acquired the sense of large, huge, e.g. decimāna secula, decimānus flūctus, decimāna ora, all quoted by Paul. Fest. (3. 31; 50. 27 Th.), decimānus acipenser, Lucil. iv. 6 M. The same ending appears in some names of gods which are derived from Verbs of the first conjugation, e.g. Levana from lēvāre, to lift, the goddess who protected the newly-born child when first lifted from the ground, Tutana from tātāri, Praestana from praestāre, &c. The ending -ānus, properly affixed to ā-stems, e.g. Odāevenanus from Odāvia, sc. gens (the cognomen of a person who had passed by adoption from the gens Octavia to another
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gens), was much affected with N-stems, e.g. Cicerónianus, Pisónianus, which seem to have pleased the Roman ear more than *Ciceron-anus, *Pisón-anus, and was in time extended to other Proper Name-stems, e.g. Caesaríanus (but Caesaríanus in Cicero, &c.). The ending -iánus, e.g. Abdéritanus, was produced by adding the Roman termination to the Greek -íyνος, e.g. 'Αβδόρθυνος; so Nápolítanus, Pínomítanus, &c. The ending -íanus often denotes a resident alien as opposed to a native, e.g. Africanus, an Africander, opposed to Afer, Gallicanu, to Gallus. (Varro, L. L. i. 32. 2: legumina Gallicani quidam 'legarica' appellant.)

The Romance languages point to a great extension of the -ánus endings in Vulgar and Late Latin, e.g. Fr. certain from *certánus, moyen from *mediánus.

§ 13. -MÉNÔ-, -MÉNÄ-. Other grades of this suffix were -mônô-, -mônä-, and -mnô-, -mnä-, &c. In Latin -mëno- and -môno- would both become -mëno- or (by Syncope) -mono- (cf. lamna, earlier lammina). The suffix was used in the Middle or Passive Participles of Thematic Tenses of the I.-Eur. Verb (e.g. O. Ind. bhára-mána-, Gk. φερό-μενος); and although the Pres. Part. Passive was lost in Latin, traces of this formation remain in the 2 Pl. Pres. Ind., e.g. legimíni for legimíni estis (while legímíni, 2 Pl. Pres. Imper., may equally stand for the Inf., Gk. λέγεμεναι, used in Imperatival sense; see ch. viii. § 81), álumnu, ó τρεφόμενος (sometimes a nurse, as in the Cirís, 441: commu-nis alumna omnibus, of the earth), jë-mína from the root dhé(y)-, ‘to give suck,’ Vertumnus, the god of the changing seasons, from vero, Volumnu, the deity who guarded new-born children, from vólo, *calumnu (cf. cálumnia) from calu-or, culvor, to deceive. Analogous, but irregular, formations seem to be O. Lat. pilumnoe poploæ, from pilum, a javelin, used of the Romans in the Carmen Saliare (Fest. 244. 24 Th.), like classical pilâni, and the names of deities, Pilumnu, from pilum, a pestle, Vitumnu, ‘per quem vivescat infans,’ from víla, &c. We find -mo- (from an earlier -mno-?) in Umbro-Oscan Imperative forms like Umbr. persni-himu ‘ supplicato,’ Osc. censamur ‘ censeror ’; cf. Lat. praefá-minô, antestáminô (see ch. viii. § 60). Sometimes the suffix is used in the transference of a MEN- or MON-stem into the -o- or -a-declension, e.g. cólumnua, beside cólùmen (cf. columnella for *colum-men-la), terminus, beside termen and termo (quoted by Festus, 550. 22 Th., from Ennius, e.g. A. 591 M.: qua redditus termo est).

The ending -ánus in Latin often arises from the addition of the suffix -no- to a stem ending in a labial consonant, e.g. som-
nus for *sopnus (cf. sōpor), damnum (cf. Gk. ἰατάρη), scramnum (cf. scabellum), &c.

§ 14 -MÔ-, -MÄ-. This suffix was used to form Adjectives (e.g. Gk. φύξιμος, from φυξίς, λύσιμος from λύσις) and Nouns, especially Masculine nouns, but sometimes Fem. (e.g. Gk. Abstracts in -μός like λη-μός, λυο-μός). Examples are I.-Eur. *dūmōs (O. Ind. dhūmās, Gk. θημός, Lith. dūmai Pl., O. Sl. dymū), Lat. finitus, from the root dheu-; I.-Eur. *gh₃ormōs, *gh₃ermus, (O. Ind. gharmás, 'warmth,' Arm. jerm, 'warm,' Gk. θερμός, Engl. warm), Lat. formus, from the root gh₃-er-.

It was also used to form Superlatives (with Comparative in -tēro-, ch. vi. § 52), e.g. Lat. summus for *s-yp-mo, with Comp. s-ypyero- (O. Ind. upamā-, with Comp. āpara-; cf. O. Engl. yf(e)m-est). In Latin pulcerimus for *pulcersimus, *pulcrēsimus, it is affixed to the Comparative suffix -is- of magis, &c. The more usual Superlative suffix however was -temo- (-t₃mo-) (with 'Comparative' in -tēro-, ch. vi. § 52), e.g. Lat. in-timus, with 'Comp.' intero- (O. Ind. ān-tama-, with 'Comp.' ān-tara-). (On the Lat. Superlative see ch. vi. § 54.) But originally this suffix, like the Comparative -tero- (ch. vi. § 52), had the sense rather of likeness (O. Ind. gō-tama-, lit. 'like an ox'), or position (Lat. mārēlimus, older mari-tumus, lit. 'placed by the sea'). The Ordinal Numeral ending -mus of dēcimus, &c. may owe its -m to the final of the Cardinal Numeral stem; but -t₃mo- appears in vicēsimus, &c. (ch. vi § 74).

§ 15. Other Examples: (1) of the Noun- or Adjective-suffix. Lat. ānimus (Gk. ἀνε-μος); Lat. fāma (Gk. φή-μη); Lat. palma (Gk. παλά-μη, O. Ir. lá-m Fem., O. Engl. fol-m Fem.); Lat. culmus (Gk. κάλα-μος, O. Engl. healm, Lett. sal-ms, O. Sl. sla-ma Fem.); Lat. dāmus, O. Lat. dūmus Adj. (Liv. Andr. dūsmo in loco) (cf. O. Ir. doss, 'a bush'); Lat. timus (O. H. G. lim, Engl. lime).

(2) Of the Superlative suffix, (a) alone: Lat. mīnīmus, brāma from brēvis for *breghu- (cf. Gk. βραχύς); Lat. infimus beside infūrus. (b) With -is-: cēlerrimus, facillimus, simillimus, &c. The suffix -temo- (-t₃mo-) has its original sense in finī-timus, legī-timus, aedi-tumus, a temple attendant, which was changed in Varro's time to aedi-tus, through a false reference of the word to tueor (Varro R. R. i. 2. 1) ab aeditio, ut dicere didicimus a patribus nortris, ut corrígimur a recentibus urbanis, ab 'aeditu'; cf. Gell. xii. 10). Ultimus (Osc. últiemo-) is Superl. of ulterior, citimus of citerior, &c.

§ 16. -RÔ-, -RĀ-. This suffix in its various forms was used to form Adjectives and Concrete Nouns, e.g. I.-Eur. *rūdhrō-,
'red,' from the root reudh- (O. Ind. rudh-irá-, Gk. ἐ-πυθόσ, O. Sl. rüdrů; cf. O. Scan. rōdra Fem., ‘blood’), Lat. rōber; I.-Eur. * getResource, 'a field,' from the root ag-, 'to drive' (O. Ind. ájra-, Gk. ἀγρός, Goth. aksrs), Lat. āger. In Latin the ending -rōs (and -rēs, § 40) became -er, as is seen in these two examples [cf. ch. iii. § 15 (8)]. The suffixes -érō- and -tērō-, which in Latin might through Syncope lose the ę and appear as -ro-, -tro- have already been mentioned as Comparative Suffixes, corresponding to Superlatives in -mo- (-mmo-), -tmmo- (-tmo-). Their original sense however was rather that of likeness, of equal than of greater degree, e. g. O. Ind. vatsa-tarā-, lit. 'like a calf' (cf. Lat. māterterā), and similarly O. Ind. -tama in gō-tama-, lit. 'like an ox;' &c.; and in O. Ir. the suffix -tero- retains this sense, e. g. demnithir, 'equally certain' (not 'more certain'), from demin, 'certain,' while in O. Ind. and Greek it has developed into a regular Comparative suffix (but cf. Hom. θηλύτερος, ἀγρότερος). Latin nouns like fāliaster, matraster, patraster have this suffix with a prefixed -as- (see Ascoli, Suppl. Arch. Glotl. i), while in māg-is-ter, mīn-is-ter, the Comparative sense belongs to the suffix -is-, not to the suffix -ter; cīter, exter, &c. are not Comparatives; ci-ter-ior, ex-ter-ior, &c. are. (On the Latin Comparative, see ch. vi. § 53). Latin Adverbs in -iter have probably this suffix, e. g. breviter (see ch. ix. § 2); though some have explained -iter as the noun ēter, a way, so that brev-īter would correspond to the German adverb kurz-weg. It is used in Possessive Pronouns in Latin, e. g. vester, as in Gk., e. g. ὑμέτερος, and in various pronominal and locative Adjectives, with the sense of 'like,' 'in the direction of,' e. g. al-ter, i-terum, sūp-erūs, to which Adverbs with -(t)ro-correspond, e. g. intrō (ch. iii. § 15). This suffix -tero-, in Lat. -tero- or -tro-, must be distinguished from the I.-Eur. suffix -TRO-, which was used to form Neuter nouns indicating an instrument, &c., e. g. ārā-trum, ' an instrument for ploughing,' a plough, and from the Latin suffix -cro- which represents the stem cēro-, making, from the root ker-, 'to make' (cf. Lat. Cerus, creare, &c.), e. g. lūdī-er, or stands by assimilation for -clo- (I.-Eur. -tlo-) when an l precedes, e. g. involū-crum for *involu-clum (ch. ii. § 101). This -clo- (I.-Eur. -tlo-) is a suffix closely associated with -tro-, forming Neuter Nouns which indicate a tool or instrument. Another
suffix, -dhro-, is used in the same way, though in Latin it affects also the Feminine gender, -bra for *-frā, *-dhrrā (ch. iv. § 114), e.g. tērēbra, a gimlet, borer, from tēro, to bore; cēribrum, a sieve, from cerno, to sift. Latin -ōrus, of honōrus, dēcōrus, cānōrus, ōdōrus, &c. stands for -ōso- (§ 74); we have -crēsus in e. g. sēvērus, prōcērus.

§ 17. Other examples of the RO-suffix. Lat. pro-sper, stem pro-spēro- for *pro-spēro-, with the weak grade (ch. iv. § 51) of the root of spēs (O. Ind. sphirā-, O. Sl. sporū); Lat. vēr (O. Ir. fer, Goth. vair, Eng. wer-wolf; cf. O. Ind. virā-, Lith. vyras); Lat. tēnēbrae for *tenes-rae (O. Ind. tamis-ram, tāmis-ra, O. H. G. dinstar); Lat. cāper (Gk. kāp-pos, O. Eng. hæser); Lat. mācer (Gk. mēk-pós); Lat. plē-rus, gnā-rus, in-lēger, glāber for *gladhro- (cf. O. Sl. gladuķī, 'smooth'), cēribrum for *ceres-rum (cf. O. Ind. āiras-, 'head'), mātā-rus (cf. pēnāria). (On Fut. Part. in-ārūs, see ch. viii. § 86.)

§ 18. Examples of I.-Eur. -tēro- and -ēro- in Latin: (1) attached to Nouns. Adjectives formed with this suffix from Nouns seem to have passed into i-stems in Latin (cf. § 34); they have often a locative sense and correspond to Adjectives in -dimus like māritimus, finītimus: e.g. cāmp-i-s-ter, sīve-s-ter, &c., which take -es by the Analogy of Neuter ES-stems (cf. Gk. ṭepos-epos, &c.); ὕπωσ-ter for *hupit-tri-, pēdaster for *pedītri-; pāluster for *palūd-tri-, tellūs-ter. The ending -aster of Nouns or Adjectives, especially in Vulgar or colloquial Latin (cf. Ital. giovinastro, poetastro), derived from Nouns or Adjectives, implies likeness, and is often used contemptuously in the sense of 'a poor imitation of,' e.g. pēditaster, of which Plautus uses the Diminutive in the sense of 'tag-rag and bob-tail soldiery' in Mēl. 54:

at pēditastellī quīa erant, sīi uiuērent,

Antōnīaster (Cic. fragm. ord. pro Vareno, 10); ōleaster, wild olive, and similarly ὕπιοστραμ, wild parsley, &c.; fīliusaster, a stepson, māstrastra, a stepmother, pāstrastra, a stepfather; auraster, another Adjective indicating bodily defects, such as calvaster, subaster, and the diminutive rāvastelestrum from rāvus, grey (v. l. grāvastelestrum; cf. Gk. γαυρ?) in Plaut. Epid. 620. Derivative Adjectives show -ast(r)imus, e.g. mediōstimus and mediōstrinus, oloastmus, fīliusanīmus. (On these formations in -aster, see A. L. L. 1. 390.)

(2) Attatched to Prepositions, &c.: Lat. sūpero- (O. Ind. īpara-, Gk. ὑπερόσ, O. Engl. ufer-ra with -ra for Goth. īza), sūper and sub-ter; Lat. inter-ter (O. Ind. āntara-, Gk. ἵπερόσ, the entrails, O. Sl. ėtraro, 'the liver'); Lat. extr (O. Ir. echtar), postero-, postrā-dēr, contrā, prāter (ch. ix. § 2). Other locative words are ci-ter (Goth. hi-drē, 'hither'), āec-ter (Gk. ἄει-τερόσ), sin-is-ter.

(3) Forming Pronouns: Lat. īl-ter, Osc. potro- (cf. O. Ind. kata śa-, Gk. πότρόσ, Goth. hvjař, Lith. katras); īterum, for another time, again, from ītero-, other (O. Ind. ītaro-, 'other'). The suffix often expresses that a pair of persons or things is spoken of, e.g. al-ter, the other (of a pair), but īlīus, another (of many). The Possessives 'our,' 'your' take -tero- in Latin, nos-ter, ves-ter, and Greek ἤμε-τεροσ, ἤμε-τέροσ, but -ero- in Teutonic, e. g. Goth. unsar, Germ. unser.

§ 19. I.-Eur. -tro-. Lat. ārā-trum (cf. Gk. ἄρο-τρον, Arm. arăr, Ir. aratham, W. arad(r) from aro (aratus); spectrum from spēcio (spectus)); rītūm from rūo
§ 20. I.-Eur. d-hro-. The Greek and O. Ir. cognates of Lat. cerebra show the suffix -tro- (Gk. τέρπτρον, O. Ir. tarathar Neut.); so O. Ir. criathar, 'a sieve,' for *kreitron (cf. Lat. palpebra and palpēra). Other examples of Lat. -bra are dolā-bra, from dolāre, whence the name (originally a nickname) Dōlā-bella, lit. 'a place for hiding,' from lateo, verē-bra from verēre, pel-lōcē-bra from locio, to allure (cf. ἀγλη-θρον from ἀγλέω). Examples of Lat. -brum are flā-brum from flāre, O. Lat. polābrum (quod Graeci χέρνιβο, nos trullum vocamus, Nom. 544. 30 M.) from *phō-luo in the sense of ab-luo (cf. ch. ix. § 12), délābrum, ventīlā-brum from ventīlā-re. (On the possibility of referring all these forms to the suffix -dhlo-, see § 26). Latin -bro-, -braw also represent an original *s-ro-, *s-rā- (ch. iv. § 152), e.g. tēnēbrem (O. Ind. tāmisrā-) from *temis, *temus darkness (cf. tēmēra), cērebrem (cf. O. Ind. śiras-, 'the head'); and some would explain terebra, &c. as *teres-rā, from the Verbal Noun-stem teresen in Inf. terere (§ 71).

§ 21. -LŌ-, -LĀ-. This suffix in its various forms was used for Nomina Agentis (Nouns and Adjectives), and often came to denote an instrument, while as a secondary suffix it was specially used to form Diminutives. Thus Engl. shovel, literally 'an instrument with which one shoves,' meant originally 'the shover'; Engl. throstle, is a Diminutive. Latin examples are lēgūlās, a picker, from legō, pendūlūs, hanging, from pendō, pendeo, vincūlum, a bond, 'an instrument for binding;' from vincio, mensūla, a little table, from mensa. In Latin, since every short vowel in a syllable which had not the accent under the early Accent Law (ch. iii. § 5) became before l the short u-vowel, it is impossible to distinguish -ēlo- (e.g. Gk. νεφέλη, Lat. nībūla), from -ūlo- (e.g. Gk. παχύλος, O. Ind. bahulā-), &c. Further, owing to the tendency to insert a short u-vowel between a consonant and l to facilitate pronunciation (ch. ii. § 102), it is not always possible to decide whether the original suffix was -lo- or -ēlo-, -ūlo-, &c., though in words like exemplum, &c. (as contrasted with words like trēmulus, &c.) it is clear that no vowel intervened between the final consonant of the root and the LO-suffix. The wave of Syncope which passed over the Latin language reduced all these formations in Late and Vulgar Latin to -lus, -la-, -lum (e.g. aurī-cō-la, formed by adding the
Diminutive Suffix -la to the Diminutive Suffix -co- (§ 31), in classical Latin *auricula*, became *auricla*, *oricla*, whence Ital. *orecchia* and orechio, Fr. oreille, &c. (ch. iii. § 13). From these formations with the two Diminutive Suffixes -co- and -lo- we must distinguish Neuter nouns formed by the suffix -tlo-, denoting the instrument with which an action is performed, or the place of its performance. This took in Latin the form -clum, or with parasitic vowel -culum, e.g. *vēhī-clum* (*vēhīculum*), 'that by which one is carried,' *pō-clum* (*pōculum*), 'that out of which one drinks,' *cūbī-clum* (*cūbiculum*), 'the place where one lies down'; and we have seen (ch. ii. § 154) that Plautus generally makes this suffix monosyllabic, and the Diminutive -co-lo- dissyllabic, e.g. *vēhīclum*, *pērīclum*, but *corcīlum*, *uxorcīlā*. The suffix -dhlo- (in Latin *-būlum*) had much the same function as -tlo-, e.g. *stābulum*, 'a place for standing.' The presence of an *l* in the stem of the word causes a dissimilation of -clum to -crum, -blum to -brum in *ambūlā-crum*, 'a place for walking,' &c. (ch. iv. § 84). Beside Neuters in *-būlum* we have Passive Adjectives in -bilis, with much the same sense as the Passive Adjectives in -lis, e.g. *āgī-bilis*, that can or ought to be driven, from *āgo*, like *āgilis*, 'that can easily be driven,' nimble.

§ 22. Adjectives formed by the *lo*-suffix. Other examples of Adjectives expressing the action of a Verb are Lat. *bībīlus* from *bībo*, *crēdīlus* from *credī*, *trīmīlus* from *trēmo*, *garrīlus* from *garrīo*, *ēmīnīlus* from *ēmīnēa*, *pātīlus* from *pātēo*. With a passive sense they become I-stems in Latin, and indicate capacity, suitability, &c., e.g. *āgilis* (O. Ind. *aḍrī-)*, 'easily driven,' nimble, from *āgo*, to drive, *dōcilis* from *dōceo*, *frāgilis* from *frango*, *bībilīs* from *bībo*. This *-i*-suffix is often added with the same sense to P. P. P. stems, e.g. *coctīlis* from *coctus*, *fissīlis* from *fissus*, *flexīlis* from *flexus*.

In Adjectives derived from Nouns, &c., we find *-lī-, e.g. *hūmilīs* (Gk. ἡμομόλογος) from *hūmus*, *herbīlis* from *herba*, *simīlis* (Gk. ἱμαλός) (on these see § 40).

Active Verbal Adjectives in -lo- are used in O. Sl. in the periphrastic perfect tense, e.g. zna-lū jesmi, 'I have known,' lit. 'I am acquainted,' from znati, 'to know.'

§ 23. Nouns denoting the Agent or the Instrument, e.g. Lat. *figīlus*, a potter, from *fingo*; *tīgūla* from *tīgo*; *rīgūla* from *rīgo* (unless these are Diminutives of *ēga*, *ēga*; cf. col-*ēga*; cf. § 3); *ōpīlus* from *ōpio*; *sπīcūla*, a place of outlook, and *spēclum*, a looking-glass, from *spēcio*, to look; *torclūm* (with Adj. *toreclus*), a wine-press (later *torclar*), from *torqueo*; *cīngūlum* and *cingūlus*, a girdle, from *cingo*; *jācīlum*, (x) a javelin, (z) a throw-net (*rete iaculum*, Plaut. *Truc. 35*), and *jaculās*, a kind of snake, from *jācio*; *sella* for *sed-la* (Lac. Gk. ἱλιάδα) from *sēdeo*; *graltēs* from *grādiōr*; *pīlum* for *pinsīlum*, a pestle, from *pīnso.*
Often we have the terminations -slo-, -slâ-, e.g. -âlum for *ans-lum, from ans-(cf. O. Sl. âch-ati, ‘to be fragrant’), a byform of the root an-, ‘to breathe’; pâlus for *pax-lus (cf. Diminutive pâxilus), from pângu; véllum, a sail, for *vexillum (cf. exulum), from vého (cf. O. Sl. veslo, ‘a rudder’). Nouns in -îla may be derived from Neuter es-stems (e.g. quêrêla for *queres-la, séqêla for *seques-la) or may have had originally ē (e.g. ci-ândêla, a glow-worm, from candeo, candê-re, like Gk. μουσκός from μουσμά). These nouns, in -îla were in Late and Vulgar Latin confused with Diminutives and became quêrêla, séqêla, &c. (see ch. ii. § 130), just as camêlus became camêllus, cucilus became cucilus, angûla (A. L. L. viii. 442) became angûllus. We have -rum for -lum by dissimilation of l in scalp-rum from scalpe, &c.

§ 24. Diminutives. Lat. cistula; auxilla from aula (olla) for *aux-la; porculus (Germ. Ferkel); servulus; fitilus; tineola; lactacula from lactica; bœgnâ-ulas; miellus (occasionally mielîlus); Æplea (Ose. Aderla-); asellus from ânîmus; gemellus from gâminus; lapillus from lâpidâ-. Sometimes this termination is added a second time, e.g. cistella from cistula; ollula from olla; porcellus from porculus; asellus from asellus; gemellus from gemellus. Sometimes it is added to the Diminutive suffix -co-, e.g. olli-cu-la, serci-cu-lus, cor-cu-lum, légîan-cu-la, aïni-cu-la (cf. febrî-cubìsus, métâ-cubìsus), ãpi-cu-la, valî-cu-la, diê-cu-la, corpus-cu-lum, artî-cu-lus. The Diminutive retains the Gender of the simple Noun, unlike Greek Diminutives in -en, which are Neuter (A. L. L. iv. 169). This suffix -culus gives to Adjectives the sense of ‘somewhat,’ e.g. melînus-culus, ‘somewhat better,’ and other Comparatives like plus-culus, majorius-culus, &c.; also grandius-cus, dulcius-cus, lécius-cus, &c. With the Diminutive suffix -lor, familiar or pet names are often formed in I.-Eur. languages, e.g. Gk. Θασι-λος, the familiar form of Θασι-μαχος, Goth. Vulfl-la. The gradual weakening of the diminutive force of these suffixes, which is to some extent accountable for the doubling of the suffix in puellula, cistella, &c. (cf. anellus from ânus, Dim. of ânus, a large ring, e.g. Plaut. Men. 85 anum lima præterunt) is seen in words like ancilla (Fem. of servus), which had ceased to be a Diminutive as early as the time of Plautus. Adulescentulus always differs from âdulâsecens in Plautus, but in Terence is hardly distinguishable. Diminutives were a feature of Vulgar Latin, as we see from the forms censured in the Probi Appendix: juveneus non ‘juvenculus’ (197. 29 K.); catulus non ‘catellus’ (198. 2), auris non ‘oricula’ (198. 11; cf. Ital. orecchio, Fr. oreille); fax non ‘facla’ (198. 23); neptis non ‘neptica,’ anus non ‘anula’ (199. 1); mergus non ‘mergulus’ (199. 7). The ending -llus, as we have seen, may denote a Diminutive of a LO-Diminutive, e.g. ânellus (on -ell-, see ch. iv. § 10), Dim. of ânus, or the Diminutive of a Noun with a RO-suffix, e.g. ãgellus from âgro for *âgrîo-lo- (ch. iii. § 15. 8), or of a Noun with ē in the penult, e.g. fémllea from fémina (earlier -mena). Similarly we have âllus for â-lus in lapillus, âlla for â-la in catella, âlurn for â-lurn in âllum, âllus (older âllus) for ân-lus in homellus, âlla for ân-la in córilla, âllus for ân-lus in âllus, âllus for ân-lus in Hispállus, &c. (cf. nîdulâ and nîtella).

§ 25. Neuters formed with the Suffix -tlo- Lat. discerrnîcum (‘acu quae capillos mulierum ante frontem dividit: dictum a discernendo,’ Non. 35. 20 M.); pâculum (pâculum), ‘a means of appeasing the gods,’ a victim, then ‘a sin for which the gods must be appeased,’ from pâtre; récepculum from receptâre; pávcula, a mallet, from pávre; sediculum from sîdeo (‘sediculum’
sedile, Paul. Fest. 500. 9 Th.) ; *operculum* from *operio* (*opertus*); *sepulcrum*, from *sepelio* (*sepultus*). We have -*crum* by dissimilation of *t-l* in *laxa-crumin*, 'a place for bathing,' from *lavare* ; *involutum* from *involvo*, &c.

§ 26. The suffix -*dhol*. Lat. *ludibulum*, 'a place for hiding,' from *lateo*; *vindabulum, 'an instrument for hunting,' a hunting-spear, from *venari*; *victabulum* (quod nunc vehiculium dicitur; Non. 54. 26 M.) ; *concellabulum* (locus ubi in concellium convenit, Paul. Fest. 27. 9 Th.) ; cf. *fabula, sibylla*. We may have -*brum* by dissimilation of *t-l* in *laxbrum* ; and it is possible that some, or all, of the examples of Lat. -*brum* (I.-Eur. -*dhro*), quoted in § 20, had originally -*blo* and not -*bro*, e. g. *po-lubrum*. Just as I-stem adjectives with a Passive sense like *aigailis*, 'easily driven,' are connected with Neuter In-286strumentals in -*lo* like *aigulum* ('agulum,' pastorale baculum, quo pecudes aguntur, Paul. Fest. 21. 37 Th.), so we have Passive I-stem Adjectives connected with the suffix -*dhol*, e. g. *anobilis, horribilis, flo-bilis, volubilis, mo-bilis, intelligibilis*, &c. (cf. Umbr. *facefele* 'facibile'), sometimes derived from the P. P. P. stem, e. g. *persuasibilis, flexibilis, sensibilis, and sometimes showing -*bris* (-*ber* for -*bilis, when an *l* precedes, e. g. *ailibris* (and *ailitilis*), *auclibris*. For a list of Adj. in-*bilis* in early authors (e. g. *nobilis*, known, Plaut. *Pseud. 1112* neque illis nobilis fui; cf. Paeuv. *Trag. 227 R*), see Hanssen in *Philol. xlvii. 274*, who denies that they ever have a transitive sense, e. g. *incogilubis, 'thoughtless,' Plaut.

§ 27. -*TÔ*, -*TÂ*. This I.-Eur. suffix was used to form (1) Verbal Adjectives, which in Latin and some other languages have the function of perfect participles passive, e. g. *genu-lous* from the root *gen-*, while with the negative particle prefixed they may express incapacity, e. g. I.-Eur. *nûmto-, 'incapable of being killed,' immortal (O. Ind. *amîta-, Gk. *μπρο*) ; (2) Ordinal Numbers, and when added to the Comparative suffix -*is* (§ 52), Superlatives ; e. g. I.-Eur. *sekasto- (O. Ind. *aś-țhâ-, Gk. *ἐκ-τος*, Goth. saiks-ta, an N-stem), Lat. *sextus* ; I.-Eur. *ökis-to- (O. Ind. *aś-iśtha-, Gk. *ἐκιςτος*). In Latin this formation of Superlatives is not found, but another, e. g. *ocissûmus* (ch. vi. § 54). Abstract Nouns in -*tâ-* are found beside Verbal Adjectives in -*to-*, e. g. Gk. *γενετή*, birth, Goth. junda 'juventa' , which occasionally pass into a concrete sense and become Masculine. e. g. *γενέτης, ἱππότης* (cf. Lat. *eques* from an earlier Abstract Fem. **aequilla*), though the suffix in Latin was ousted by -*las*, -*tudo*, &c. (§ 67). I.-Eur. -*to-* is often seen added to the MEN-

---

1 Lat. *jventa* seems to be a formation on the analogy of *sineceta* (sc. *aelas*), for *jventas* is the form used by the oldest writers, both in the sense of 'period of youth' and 'a number of young men,' (Fleck. *Jahrb. Suppl. 1891*). We have *actate iuveta* on an inscription (C. I. L. i. 1202).
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suffixed (§ 54) in neuter nouns, e.g. Lat. cogō-men-tum beside cogno-men, such forms being apparently the Neuter of Participles or Verbal Adjectives, formed not from verbs but from nouns, e.g. *cogno-mentus beside cogno-mīnātus, like scelērātus beside scelērātus (cf. Engl. compounds like ‘bare-footed,’ ‘black-headed,’ where the participial suffix is added to the nouns ‘foot,’ ‘head’). The forms with -mentum are, as a rule, those used by prose writers, the forms with -men being relegated to poetry. With -mentum, Plur. -menta has been compared Gk. Plur. -mata, e.g. στρῶματα (Lat. strāmenta), καστρύματα (cf. Lat. assūmenta).

§ 28. Participles in -tus. The weak grade of the root is used with I.-Eur. verbal adjectives in -to-, and the suffix is accented, e.g. I.-Eur. *klu-tō-, ‘heard, heard of, famous,’ from the root *klu-, ‘to hear,’ [O. Ind. śrutā-, Gk. ναύτης, which perhaps retains the old sense of ‘heard,’ ‘loud’] in such Homeric phrases as κλύτα μήλα, O. Ir. cloth, from *elūto-, O. H. G. Hit-hari (from O. H. G. hari, Germ. Heer), the name Lothair, corresponding to Greek Καυτό-στρατος; cf. Zend srūta-, O. Eng. hlūd, ‘loud’]. Lat. in-clītus; though with the noun we often find the high-grade and the accent on the root, e.g. Gk. κοινή from κείμαι, οὕτος from ἄμμος, &c. In Latin -sus replaced -tus when the verbal stem ended d or t (ch. iv. § 155), e.g. salus from sullō for *saldō; occasionally the P. P. P. took -sus when the Perfect Ind. had -st, e.g. tersus from tergo (Perf. Indic. tersi), though the older spelling appears in the earlier literature, e.g. tertus (Varro) (see ch. viii. § 92; ch. iv. § 155).

Examples of Latin participles in -tus are strātus (from the root ster, O. Ind. stṛta-, Gk. στρατός, O. Sl. -střitů); mulētus from the root mēl- (Lith. mišitas); com-mentus from the root men- (O. Ind. matī-, Gk. αὐτό-παρος, Goth. munds, Lith. mištās, O. Sl. mětů); Lat. gnātus from the root ġen-, *gnā- (O. Ind. jātā-, Goth. -kunds); Lat. sūtus for *sūtō- (O. Ind. sūtā-, Gk. νεο-κάτττς, Lith. sūtās, O. Sl. šītī; Lat. gnōtus (O. Ind. jātā-, Gk. γνωρός, O. Ir. gnāth); Lat. junctus (cf. O. Ind. yūktā-, Gk. ἐνεκτός). The different treatment of the stem vowel before the suffix is exemplified by āmātus, dōmātus from first conj. Verbs; viētus, viētōs, exercitus (but ar(e)citus), mōnētus (but Monēta), mulēctus from second conj.; ālītus and alītus, cultūs, factūs (but fāctus) from third conj.; fīnītus and ēpertus from fourth conj. (On these Verb-stems see ch. viii.); aegrī-tus, argī-tus, inclā-tus, cītus and cītus. Words like plātī, ‘armed with the plēnum,’ barbātus (O. Sl. bradatū), aurītus, cāntītus, do not of course imply the existence of verbs, *pĭlēre, *barbare, *aurire, &c. Of similar formations from Noun- or Adjective-stems examples are: Lat. libertus beside libērātus; mōnētus beside onērātus; sēnectūs from senex; and the words indicating a place planted with trees, &c., e.g. arbūs-tum, sālīc-tum, the Neuters of arbūstus, ‘provided with trees’ (arbustus sive silvestris, Columella), &c. (Arbōretum is a quasi-participle from *arboreo, arborēscō, like āctum from acetō; so nīcē-tum, pīnē-tum, tīcē-tum. The -ōtum of ilīcētum, &c. and the -ētum of salīcētum, &c. were extended by false analogy, e.g. bācētum, viætēm). For a list of Adjectives in -estus, -uestus, -ātus with this sense of ‘provided with,’ see Rösch, Collect. p. 217, and cf. Plaut. Capt. 392: qui me honore honiostorem semper
THE LATIN LANGUAGE.

§ 29. Abstract Nouns in -ta (-sa). The Fem. of the Participle repulsa, deprensus, &c. is used in an abstract sense: repulsa, 'defeat at an election,' deprensus, 'genus militaris animadversionis, castigatione major, ignominia minor' (Paul. Fest. 50. 30 Th.). These Abstracts must be distinguished from Concretes like torta (sc. plica, a roll, expensa (sc. vicinia), a sum expended (for a fuller list, see Rönsch, Cōbet, p. 193). The Fem. Abstract *equita, 'horsemanship,' seems to have been made a Mase. Concrete in O. Lat. with the sense also of 'a horse'; thus Ennius (A. 249 M.), describing a charge of cavalry and elephants, says:

denique ui magna quadrupes eques atque elephanti proieciunt se,

a usage imitated by Virgil (G. iii. 116):

equitem docuere sub armis
insultare solo et gressum glomerare superbos,

and commented on by Aulus Gellius (xviii. 5; cf. Non. 106. 24 M.).

§ 30. Neuters in -mentum. Other examples are augmentum beside augmen (poet.): fundamentum beside fundamentum (poet.); intignamentum beside tegumen, tegimen, tegmen; cognomen beside cognomen; termentum and trimentum beside vérimen; argumentum, from arguo, 'a making clear,' a proof, then 'the subject of a story, picture, &c.,' e.g. Virg. A. vii. 791 argumentum ingens; Prop. iii. 9. 13: argumenta magis sunt Mentoris addita formae; vestimentum, from vestio; caementum for *caed-mentum (ch. iv. § 161) from caedo; jugamentum (et paries, C. I. L. vi. 24710), and jugamentum (Cato); jumentum from javo, according to Augustine, Quæst. in Heptat. iii. 2 and v. 38; mōmentum beside mōmen (poet.) from mōco. Nāmen, crīmen, culmen (cf. cōlōmen), &c. have no byforms in -mentum; implementum, increvimentum, nómentum, &c. have no byforms in -men.

§ 31. -KÖ-, -KĀ-. I.-Eur. -ko-, the -y of Engl. 'stony,' 'angry,' &c., is rarely -ko- (with palatal k), e.g. I.-Eur. *yūwnkō-(O. Ind. yuvašā-, O. Ir. ὁκ, W. iauane, Goth. juggs), Lat. jūvencus, but usually -ko- or -qko-. It is used as a primary suffix, e.g. cascus (cf. cānus for *casnus, Osc. casnar) fuscus (cf. furcus for *fusnus), but mainly as a secondary suffix employed in the formation of Adjectives from Adverbs, e.g. antiquus (of place), antiquus (of time) from ante (cf. O. Ind. antikā-), Nouns, e.g. bellicus, civicus, and Adjectives, e.g. O. Ind. nágnaka-, 'naked,' beside magná-, having often a diminutive significance, which is in Latin denoted by -cūlus (§ 24), the addition to -co- of the other diminutive suffix -lo- (§ 21), e.g. nigrīculus beside
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niger, óvicula (O. Sl. ovíca), [àllicare and nigrícare are Verbs with the Diminutive KO-suffix (ch. viii. § 33 (7))], (cf. hómun-cio and homun-cu-bus, séneca, Non. 17. 18 M., senecio and senicus), as in Gk. by -σκο- of παιδόκος, &c. We also find it preceded by i, e. g. εἰρων-εκός, Lat. histrión-icus (without the vowel we should have had *histriuncus), often -tico-, e. g. rus-ticus, herbà-ticus, errà-ticus after the analogy of Participle-stems in -to- (§ 28); by i, e. g. Goth. máltëgis, 'mighty,' Lat. ãticus, púdicus (i not ei is attested for mendíicus by Plaut. Rud. 1305; see ch. iv. § 34); by â, e. g. mórâcus. Adjectives in -áko- had the sense of English adjectives in -ish, e. g. Lith. saldókas, 'sweetish,' and came in some languages to acquire the force of Comparatives, e. g. Lett. saldáks, 'sweeter,' W. glanach, 'fairer.'

In Latin the -ko- and -qâo- suffixes seem often to have been confused, e. g. anteicus and antiquus, tесca or tесqua, lit. 'dry places,' for *tersce-, from the root ters-, 'to dry' (cf. torreо, Gk. τέρσομαι), and, as in Greek, &c. there are often byforms of the Consonantal declension, e. g. lâbax, &c. beside merâcus, fêlix, &c. beside pudícus, &c., like Greek θαλες and θάλος, μεθάς (O. Ind. maryakâ-). For -icus we have -leicus in aedíli-cius, tribúnicius, patricius, adventícius, communáticius, &c.; for -æcus we have -âceus in herbâceus, gallânicus, ärundânicus, &c.

§ 32. Adjectives with the KÖ-suffix. From the adverbs rē- and prē- we have vé-dí-péreus, while prœcés adds the lo- (li-) suffix to *préces (O. Sl. prokù) (Rhein. Mus. xliii. 402); posticus is the opposite of anteicus; prís-cus (cf. prīnus for *prís-mus). From the numeral únus we have unicus (Goth. ainahs, O. Sl. ínokú; cf. O. Ind. dvíka-, Gk. διασός for δίφως). From nouns: patricus (cf. patricius); hosticus, used in Plautus like hostílis (hostíca manus, Capt. 246); hostílis manus, Capt. 311; cívicus (beside cívís). (Cf. Porph. ad Hor. C. ii. 1. 1 adtenè autem non 'civile' sed 'civicum' dixisse antiqua figura, illi enim 'civica' et 'hostica' deinde 'civilia' et 'hostilia' dicebant. denominationes autem hæ fere liberæ sunt apud doctos). Other noticeable forms are cládicas, mandácus (cf. fídic-ia from *fídicus, and pantácia); língúlicus, verburnácus; hiáeucus, pélicus from hiare and petere with the (diminutive?) LO-suffix. [For a list of Nouns in -ica, e. g. verrúca, a wart, in O. Lat. a hill (Cato ap. Gell. iii. 7. 6; Quint. viii. 3. 48 and viii. 6. 14), from the root wers- of Lith. virszus, 'the top,' O. Ind. várśman, 'a height,' see Stolz, Beiträge, p. 6, who points out the connexion of this ending with the ending -ego, e. g. Verrúgo, a Volscian town in Latium.] A gloss has: manubrium, quod rustici 'manicum' dicent (C. G. L. v. 115. 17; manico- in Romance, e. g. Ital. manico, Span. mango, Fr. manche); Paul. Fest. quotes olentica 'mal odoris loca' (223. 4 Th.).

§ 33. Adjectives in -leius. Denominatives (i. e. derivatives from Nouns Z
or Adjectives) have -i-, e.g. patrīcius from pāter, natāliarius from nātālis; Derivatives from P. P. P. in -to (Vb. Nouns in -tio-, -ti-) have -i-, e.g. dētīcius from dētītus, insitīcius (cf. insitītus) (also nūscius). (For a full list, see A. L. L.v. 415.)

§ 34. Suffixes ending in ĕ (Nouns and Adjectives of third Declension). -ī-. In the declension of these stems ĕ varies with ei and oi (see ch. vi.). The ĕ-stems are often confused with IO-stems (§ 4), with Ĩ-stems (§ 51), and with YĒ-stems (§ 51). Examples of the primary suffix -ī- are Lat. anguis (Lith. angis, O. Sl. aži, Arm. auj), and another I.-Eur. word for a snake, *čghi- (O. Ind. āhi-, Zend aži-, Arm. iž, Gk ἢχις).

Neuter ĕ-stems in I.-Eur. (like Neuter R-stems, &c., see § 56) seem occasionally to show a heteroclite declension, a nasal replacing the vowel in oblique cases, e.g. O. Ind. ākśi, aḵšāṇas Gen., 'the eye,' āsthi, asthṇās Gen., 'a bone,' which may have led to a confusion of I- and N-stems in such words as I.-Eur.*āksi-, 'an axle' (Lat. axis, Lith. aszis, O. Sl. osť; but Gk. ἀξον). As a secondary suffix -i- is used in many languages to give an adjectival sense, especially in the formation of Compound Adjectives from Nouns, e.g. Lat. exsomnis from somnis, O. Ir. essamin for *exomni-, from omun (*omno-), 'fear,' though we often find in the early Latin literature the O-stem, e.g. Ĭnermus, class. inermis (so Gaulish Exobnus, Exomnus for O. Ir. essamin).

In Latin the I-declension has been greatly extended; thus consonantal stems of the third declension often take the ĕ-stem case-suffixes, e.g. pūd-ĕ-lus, fērēnt-iūm, &c.; and a stem-suffix ending in ō or ū passes readily, if it be an adjective, into an I-stem, e.g. simōlis (Gk. ὅμολος), hūmōlis (Gk. χθαμαλός), nāvis (I.-Eur.*nānu-, O. Ind. nāús, Gk. ναῦς), brōvis (cf. Gk. βραχύς), lēvis (cf. O. Ind. rāghus, Gk. ἐ-λαχύς, Lith. lenguris). The Greek loanword hĭlĭrus (ἵλαρός) is also hiliaris by the time of Terence.

§ 35. Other examples of I-stems. Lat. ensis (O. Ind. asi-); Lat. trādis from trādo (root treud-, Goth. us-trutan, 'to trouble,' Engl. thrust, threat, O. Sl. trudū, 'toil'); Lat. rūdis, unworked, rude, originally of metal, from the root reudh-, 'to be red' (cf. raudūs, unworked metal, ch. iv. § 41); fāgis, continual, from jungo; Lat. scōbis from scōba; Lat. māre (O. Ir. muir Neut., for *morī, O. H. G. meri Neut., Germ. Meer Neut., Engl. mere).

§ 36. Adjective I-stems from O-stems. Other examples are: O. Lat. substīnum, e.g. Enn. Trag. 2 R. deum substībus subies, Lucr. i. 340 sublimaque caeli (see Munro's note); O. Lat. sterīlus, e.g. Lucr. ii. 845 sonitu sterila (cf. Paul. Fest. 463. 1 Th. 'sterilam' sterilem). Greek αὐτρόνδα had the same tendency to the I-declension in Latin as Greek ἵλαρος, for Caper gives
a caution against the form austeris (p. 108. 4 K.). Nonius (494. 26 M.) quotes prōnis from Varro (Men. 391 B.). On O. Lat. foretus, see ch. viii. § 92. The Noun torris from the root ters- (Gk. τέρσαμαι; cf. Lat. torreo for 'torseo, ch. viii. § 29) was in O. Lat. torras (Non. 15. 22 M.; Serv. ad Aen. xii. 298 'hic torris'... ita nunc diecimus: nam illud Ennii et Pacuvii penitus de usu recessit ut 'hic torrus, hujus torri' diecamus), but is rather to be explained as an E-stem become an I-stem (like sordes, § 51). The form torres F., a burning, read by Lachmann in Lucretius iii. 917 (MSS. torret) is doubtful (A.L. L. viii. 587). On hilaris beside hilaris, see Neeve, ii2., p. 149.

§ 37. -NI-. This suffix, varying with -čni-, -čni-, &c. is more common in those languages which have extended the use of the P. P. P. in -no- (§ 8) than in Latin. Examples are: Lat. ignis (cf. O. Ind. agni-, Lith. ugnis F., O. Sl. ogní M.), Lat. clūnas (O. Ind. śrōni-, O. Scand. hlaunn, Lith. szlaunis). Adjectives in -nis may have been originally NO-stems (§ 36), e.g. immānis from O. Lat. mānus, good (with a system in -ni-, Mānēs, lit. 'the good deities'); cf. Janis, a byform of Janus, in Carm. Sal. (Tert. Apol. 10).

§ 38. Other examples of Latin -nis. Lat. amnis for *ab-nis (cf. O. Ir. abann), Lat. crinis for *crinis (cf. Lat. crista), pānis for *pasnis (cf. Lat. pastillus).

§ 39. -MI- is a still rarer suffix than -ni-. An example is Lat. vermis (O. H. G. wurm), a word the relation of which to I.-Eur. *qūrmi- (O. Ind. kēmi-, O. Ir. cruím, W. pyrf, Lith. kirmis) is not quite clear. Latin Adjectives in -nis like inermis, sublimis were originally -MO-stems (cf. § 36); thus Nonius 489. 7 M. gives some examples of sublimus from the older literature (cf. Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v.).

§ 40. -RI-, -LI-. These are not nearly so common I.-Eur. suffixes as -ro-, -lo-, e.g. O. Lat. ēris, a hill (in Umbrian, &c. used of the citadel) (Gk. ἄρης, a point, ἄρης, a hill; cf. O. Ind. āśri-, but also Gk. ἄρης), Lat. tālis, quālis (O. Sl. tolǐ Adv., kolǐ Adv.; cf. Gk. τῆλι-κος, τῆλι-κος); but -li- is fairly frequent in the Slavonic languages, where the P. P. P. in -lo- is much in vogue. In Latin, Adjective -RO- and -LO- stems often show -ris, -lis, e.g. O. Lat. sācres, used of animals for sacrifice (e.g. Plaut. Rud. 1208 sunt domi agni et porci sācres) beside sācer (cf. Mānes beside O. Lat. mānus, good), similis (Gk. ἱμαλός), hūmilis (Gk. χθαμαλός). And the use of -li- and -ri- for Adjectives derived from Nouns is very widely extended in Latin, far more widely...
than in any other I.-Eur. language, e.g. *vītālis from vīta, ālāris for *alālis(?) from āla, so that the Greek Adj. ὀψιλύς, when borrowed by Latin, assumed the form dāpsīlīs. Dialectal examples are Osc. luisarifs, *lusaribus; Sab. Flusare 'Florali,' while Osc. Fiuusasiasiais ‘Florariis’ has -āsio- (Lat. -ārio-, § 4).

§ 41. Other examples of Latin -li-, -ri-. āter, a skin, for *ūd-ri-, beside uērīs (O. Lat. uterum); ōer, sharp (cf. Gk. ὀσος). Verbal Adjectives in -īs are, as we have seen (§ 22), byforms with Passive sense of Active Verbal Adjectives in -lus, e.g. ὀψίλις, ‘easily driven,’ βιβλίς, ‘easily drunk’ (beside διόβλυς, ‘easily drinking,’ inclined to drink), δοκίλις (like δοκιβλύς); sometimes formed from the Perf. Part. Pass., e.g. ἱστιλίς, ἤστιλις, ἡστιλίς (and ἡστίλις), ἀματίλίς et saxātīlīs (Plaut. Rud. 299), missīlis. The ending -īlīs of actīlīs has I.-Eur. i, not ei, to judge from old inscriptions, e.g. C. I. L. i. 61 aidīlīs (cf. ib. 91). This -īlīs (proper to I- and IO-stems) as well as -ālīs (proper to Ā-stems) is often extended by analogy; e.g. ὀναλίς (for *αναλίς) by analogy of σένιλις; vernālīs is from verna, vernālīs from ver; from libra, a pound, we have librālīs and librālīs; from scurr, scurrīlīs; from manu not *manulīs, but manuālīs (so dorouslīs from doro-). Examples of -ālīs are fidēlīs from fidē-, crādēlīs (cf. ūmē-fāmus, contāmē-līa) as well as patrulīs and matrulīs. Like tribulīs (from tribu-), idulīs (from ibu-), is ēdulīs. From O-stems we have puērulīs, virulīs, hūrulīs, servulīs, &c.; annulīs, fātulīs, &c.; from Cons.-stems cōpitulīs, virgūn-ulis, hospulīs, jāvēnulīs and jāvēnulīs, &c.

§ 42. -TI-. As -to- was the I.-Eur. suffix of Verbal Adjectives, especially of the Perfect Participle Passive, so -ti- was the suffix of Verbal Nouns (Nomina Actionis), e.g. Gk. πιστὸς and πλωτίς. These nouns were of the feminine gender, had the weak form of the root, and are accented sometimes on the suffix, and sometimes on the root, e.g. O. Ind. mati- and māti- for I.-Eur. *mn-ti- (Lat. mens) from the root men-,' to think.' In Latin, as in Celtic, we find this suffix enlarged by an EN-suffix, e.g. Lat. mentio, Acc. mentionem, O. Ir. -mitiu-,-mitin Acc., and this compound suffix, which in Latin supplanted almost entirely the older -ti-, appears also in other languages, e.g. Goth. rapjō (Lat. rātīo), Gk. δωρίη (cf. Lat. dātio, Acc. dationem). The supplanting may be accounted for, wholly or partly, by the change which the phonetic laws of the Latin language would produce in the TI-suffix, a change which would often make the suffix unrecognizable. From the root men-, the Verbal Noun *mnēti-became mens in Latin and from the root bher-, the Noun *bhrēti-became foris, while from mēto we have messis for *met-tiś, from the root wes-, vestis, from sātiāre, sātiās, &c., forms whose common formation has been obscured past recognition. A similar
explana-tion has been offered for the fact that in Teutonic also the same suffix -ti- ceased to be a living suffix, namely that under the working of the Teutonic phonetic laws it would assume the various forms -pi, -di, -ti, -si, &c. The older suffix remains in Adverbs like rap-ti, fur-ti, &c. (see ch. ix. § 4).

Occasionally the feminine abstract passed into a concrete noun and might change its gender. Thus Lat. hostis (Goth. gasts, 'a guest,' O. Sl. gosti) may have been originally abstract, just as Lat. agri-cola, a field-tiller, meant originally 'field-tillage' (§ 2).

The secondary suffix -tāti- (or -tāt-), used to form feminine Abstract Nouns, derived from Adjectives and Nouns, and the similar suffix -tūti- (or -tūt-) exhibit this suffix -ti- added to the suffixes -tā- and -tu-, e.g. Lat. jūvenās beside jūventa (see § 27). The suffix -tāti- (-tāt-) is found in O. Ind., Greek, and Latin, while -tūti- (-tūt-) is found in Latin, Celtic, and Teutonic, e.g. Lat. nōritās (Gk. νεόρης), Lat. unītās (O. Ir. oentu), Lat. jūvenūtās (O. Ir. őitiu). In Latin, in addition to -tūti- (-tūt-), which is much less in use than -tāti- (-tāt-), we find a form augmented by an N-suffix, -tūdo, Gen. -tūdinis, e.g. servītūdo beside servītūs, hīlāritūdo (so in Plaut., not hilaritas), beatītūdo, which (with beatītās) was a coinage of Cicero (Quint. viii. 3. 32).

§ 43. Other examples of the suffix -ti- in Latin. Latin vectīs, a lever (cf. vectīo), from vēho; Lat. vitīs from the root weid-,' to plait, weave'; Lat. messīs (cf. messio) from mēto; Lat. forīs (O. Ind. bhrīti, O. Ir. brith, Goth. gau-burfs, O. H. G. giburt, O. Engl. gebyrd, 'fate') from fōro; Lat. mens (O. Ind. māti- and mātī-, Goth. gamunds, ana-minds, Lith. at-mintis, O. Sl. pamēti) from the root men-, 'to think' (cf. mentio); Lat. gens, from gigno (cf. nātio for *ignatio); Lat. mors (O. Ind. mṛtī-, O. Lith. mirtis, O. Sl. stī-mriti) from mūrīor; Lat. dōs (O. Ind. dōtī-, Lith. dūtīs, O. Sl. datī) from root dō- (cf. dātīo, Gk. δοτή); so Lat. cōs beside cūtus (ch. iv. § 54); Lat. ars (O. Ind. rīt- means 'attack'); Lat. pars (cf. portio); Lat. grātīs beside grātūs; Lat. quītōbeside quiētūs (inquiēs for inquiētus is due to the tendency to turn Compound Adjectives into I-stems); Lat. vestīs from the root wes-, 'to clothe,' meant originally, like our word 'clothing,' the act of arranging oneself, then the raiment itself.

§ 44. Examples of Lat. -tiōn-. Lat. visio (cf. O. Ind. vītī-, O. Sl. -vistī and věštī) from the root weid-, 'to see, know'; Lat. ven-tio (cf. O. Ind. gati-, Gk. Βάτιας O. H. G. culfī, Lith. -gimtīs) from the root qem-,' to come'; Lat. sētīo (cf. Gk. σέ-σις, Goth. -sēfs, 'seed,' Lith. sēti) from the root sē-, 'to throw, throw seed'; Lat. con-dātīo for *con-dātīo (cf. O. Ind. -hītī-, Gk. δένεις, Goth. -dejīs, 'a deed,' O. Sl. -dētī) from the root dhē-, 'to put, place'; Lat. ad-ĕptīo for *ad-ĕptīo (cf. O. Ind. ľptī-) beside aptūs; Lat. ex-ĕptūs (cf. O. Ind. prātī-, Gk. πάγος) beside ex-plētūs; Lat. nōtīo for *gnōtīo (cf. O. Ind. -jnātī-, 'the act of knowing,'
§ 45. Adjectival -ti- for -to- in Latin. The same tendency to turn O-stem Adjectives into I-stems, which we have seen in similis (Gk. ἱμιμίλος), hūmīlis (Gk. χθαμαλότ), appears in an adjective like fortis, in O. Lat. fortus (Paul. Fest. 73. 9 Th. horcketum et forctum pro bono dicebant), originally a P. P. P. from the root dhergh-,' to establish' (O. Ind. ḍṛghá-, 'established, firm '). The older spelling forctis occurs in the clause of the XII Tables quoted by Festus (524. 15 Th.), which provided: ut idem juris esset Sanatibus quod Fortibus, the Sanates being allies who had revolted but had returned to their allegiance, 'quasi sanata mente,' the Forctes being those who had never broken faith [cf. Paul. Fest. 59. 26 Th. forctis (MSS. forctes), frugi et bonus, sive validus]. The word Sanates shows a similar transference to the I-declension of the P. P. P. of sānāre, and throws light on the termination, -ās O. Lat. -ātis (see ch. iii. § 16), which indicates the country or the party to which one belongs, e. g. opίnιατεs, ínfιmιtιs (Plaut. Stich. 493), Arpιnιтеs.

§ 46. Other examples of Lat. -tāt(i)-, -tūt(i)-, -tūdīn-. The tendency of the I-stems to encroach on the Consonant-stems in Latin (mentioned above, § 34) makes it difficult to decide when -tāt-, -tūt-, and when -tāti-, -tūti- were the suffixes used, e. g. Gen. Pl. cιvitātum and cιvitātium. In O. Ind. -tāti- e. g. svartātī-,' completeness') is rarer than -tātī- (e. g. svartātī-), while in Greek only -tāt- is found. Other Latin examples of -tās (see A. L. L. viii. 321) are savvuitus (Gk. σουωορνθ), commānītus (Goth. guainindūs), bōnītus from bōnus, līberitas from līber, cιviitas from cιvīs, līberitas from līber, cαsiliitas and fαciliitas from fαcilīs, vōluptas from vōlīp(ε), tempestas from tempestus (cf. tempērī), vōluntas from vīlēns. Examples of -tās: sēnectus from sēnex, virtus from vir; O. Lat. tempestus (Varro L. L. vii. 51 libri augurum pro tempestate 'tempestutem' dieunt supremum augurii tempus). Examples of -tūdō: altitūdō from altus, lāditūdō from lātus, sollicitūdō from sollicitūs.

§ 47. Suffixes ending in -ū (Nouns of fourth Decl.). -Ū-. In the declension of these stems ū varies with eu and ou (see ch. vi.). I.-Eur. Adjectives in -u- usually show the weak form of the root, and are accented on the suffix, e. g. *phū-, 'broad' (O. Ind. prāthū-, Gk. πλαρός, Gaul. litu-). They formed their Nom. Sing. Fem. in -wī, e. g. *swādu-, 'sweet,' with Nom. Sg. Masc. *swādūs (O. Ind. svādūs, Gk. ᾳδος), Nom. Sg. Fem. *swādvī (O. Ind. svādvī). In Latin these Adjectives, aided by the analogy of the Fem., have followed the tendency of O-stem Adjectives, and have passed into the I-declension (as in Teutonic *tīnu- 'thin' became ānni- by influence of the fem. *tīnwī); thus sūnis for *sūnīvis, bēnīvis (O. Ind. tanū-, Gk. τανύ-γλωσσος,
O. Sl. tūně-kñú), *nēvis (cf. O. Ind. raghú-, Gk. ἡ-λαχύς, O. Sl. ligū-kñú), *brēvis (Gk. βραχύς), gurāvis (O. Ind. gurú-, Gk. βαπός, Goth. kaurus). Of nouns with the U-suffix examples are I.-Eur. *pēku- (O. Ind. paśu- M., Goth. faihu N., 'property,' O. H. G. fihu, O. Engl. feoh, Germ. Vieh, Engl. fee), Lat. pēcu and pecus; Lat. lūcus (O. Ir. loch, a Neut U-stem); with the rarer NU-suffix, Lat. cornu and cornus, mānus, pīnus. The -ru- of Gk. ὀδύρα is augmented by the suffix -mā- in Lat. dacrīma, lacrīma. The Romance languages show us that U-stems had come in Vulg. Lat. to be merged in the O-declension; and even as early as Plautus Noun-stems in -u retained little of a distinctive declension in ordinary speech.

-TU-. As we have seen -ti- used to form feminine Verbal Nouns (Nomina Actionis), connected with the P. P. P. in -to-, similarly -tu- was used for masc. nouns of the same kind, sometimes with accent on the root (strong grade), sometimes with weak grade of root and the root unaccented, e.g. O. Ind. ētum but ētvā, from the I.-Eur. root ei-, 'to go.' The Latin first Supine is the Accusative of a TU-stem, used with a verb of motion, e.g. vīsum it (cf. O. Ind. vēttum ēti, O. Sl. vidētā īdetī), and the second Supine is another case (ch. viii. §88) of a similar stem. Occasionally these Abstract Verbal Nouns become concrete, e.g. Lat. māgristrātus, a magistrate. In Greek (they are mostly confined to the Ionic dialect) they are feminine, e.g. ἀπρός, a fitting; a connexion (Lat. artus, M., a limb) (cf. O. Lat. metus F.).

§ 48. Other examples of U-stems in Latin. Lat. genu (cf. O. Ind. jānu, N. Gk. γάνο N., Goth. kniu N.); vēru (O. Ir. bir, a Neut. U-Stem, W. ber).

§ 49. Interchange of U- with O-stems. This interchange is found also in Umbro-Osc. Thus Osc. senatēis shows the same Gen. Sg. suffix as an O-stem (e.g. sakarakleis 'sacraclis'), Umbr. maronato 'magistratu,' the O-stem Abl. In Plautus the U-stems appear mostly in the Nom. Acc. Abl. Sg., and so are hardly to be distinguished from O-stems; the Dat. Sg. is usually in -ui (ch. vi. §27), but the Gen. Sg. is normally in -i (ch. vi. §21); in the Plural instances are comparatively seldom and almost only in the Nom. Acc. and Abl.; the only certain instance of a Gen. Pl. is mille passum. On the S. C. Bacch. of 186 B.C. we have Gen. Sg. senatūs, but at the end of the same century senati (C. I. L. i. 199, 200, 547), and Quintilian (i. 6. 27) states that it is impossible to say whether senati or senatus is the Genitive form. Nūra for nūrīus, socra for socrus, forms censured in the Probi Appendix (198. 34 and 199. 1 K.) occur on late inscriptions (nūra, C. I. L. viii. 2604. 4293, &c.; nūra, v. 2452; socra, ii. 530, 2936; iii. 655; viii. 2906, 3994; xiv. 526, &c.; socra, iii. 3895, vii. 229, &c.) and nūra, sūcra or socra are the prototypes of Ital. nuora,
suocera, Span. nuera, suegra, &c. On Greek inscriptions the only fourth Decl. Nouns found are ἰδιος, tribus, and the forms used are Nom. Pl. εἰδοι (ἰδοι), Gen. Pl. εἰδον (second cent. B. C., but later εἰδών) Abl. Sg. τριβόν (see Eckinger, p. 134).

Δώμας is declined only according to the second Decl. in Plautus and till Sulla (see Langen, Anal. Plant. ii. p. 5). Quintilian (1.6.5) mentions it as a word about whose declension there might be doubt. We find in the older writers ἰμενός (Varro, Mon. 422, 531 B.; the gender of ἰμενός is Masc. in O. Lat., see Georges, Lex. Worft. s. v.), lectus (fourth Decl., Georges s. v.), sōnus (fourth Decl., Georges s. v.), and in a quotation from a Law of Numa (ap. Fest. 212. 17 M.) occurs the form Jōmi Dat. Sg.: Janui Quirino agnum marem caedito. Priscian, discussing the interchange of second and fourth Decl. forms (i. p. 256 H.), mentions the variants fastos and fastus in Hor. C. iii. 17. 4, cibus Gen. Sg. (doubtful), arcī Gen. Sg. (Cic. Deor. Nat. iii. 20. 51; arcus is Fem. in O. Lat.), as well as the parallel forms spēsus and spectum, pēnus and pēnum, fico and ficu, &c. For statistics of the O- and U-declension of such words see Neue, I. pp. 509 sqq. Names of trees like laurus, fagus, &c. show this uncertainty (Varro L. L. ix. 80 ali di cult cupressus, ali cupressi, item de fies platanis et plerisque arboribus), an uncertainty perhaps due to the rarity of fem. O-stems (e. g. fagus, Gk. φυγός F.) in I.-Eur. (see ch. vi. § 1. p. 369).

§ 50. Other examples of -tu-stems. Lat. ēsus from ēdo (O. Ind. ātu-, Lith. ėštē, O. Sl. jastū); Lat. vitus, the felly of a wheel (Gk. ἱφές F.); Lat. actus, (1) a driving, (2) a road for driving (Paul. Fest. 13. 17 Th. inter inter vicinos quattuor pedum latum), (3) the space over which something is driven, a measure of land, like our 'plough-gate,' (Plin. xviii. 9 in quo boves agerentur cum aratro uno impetu justo); Lat. fētus, a brood (cf. Gk. τροφή, e. g. Soph. O. T. 1); O. Lat. metus F., e. g. Ënn. A. 526 M. nec metus ulla tenet.

§ 51. The Suffixes -YE- (Nouns of fifth Decl.) and -Ī-. The Stems in -Ē. As the feminines of O-stems were formed with the suffix -ā- (§ 2), so the feminines of other stems appear with the suffix -ye-, e. g. Lat. tempēriēs from the ES-stem tempus, or -ī-, e. g. O. Ind. dātrī, fem. of dātār- (in Latin with c added, e. g. dātrī-ā, stem dātric-; cf. Gk. αἰλητρίδα- with added dental and short i), or -yā-, e. g. Lat. temperia (cf. Gk. ἀληθεια for *ἀληθεὐ- γά, ὀφεπά for *ὀφεπ-γά). How far these differences are due to a variation of -ye- with -ī-, as in the Optative, e. g. Lat. sīēs, sēlis (ch. viii. § 55), or to a confusion of -ī-stems (thus O. Ind. naptī-, Lat. neutīs, may be an Ī-stem corresponding to the Ú-stem, O. Ind. švaśrū-, Lat. soerus, O. Sl. svekry), has not yet been satisfactorily determined. It is possible that the ę-vowel of Latin and the Balto-Slavic languages (e. g. Lith. žem-ę for *zem-įę-, 'land,' O. Sl. zėm(l)-ja- for *zem(l)jė-, whence the name Nova Zembla, connected with Lat. hēmus and Gk. χθών) may be a modification
of an original á under the influence of the preceding y-sound (cf. Vulg. Lat. Iunarius for Januarius, ch. ii. § 3), so that O. Lat. heriem Acc., a word occurring in the liturgical formula heriem Junonis (Gell. xiii. 23. 2), will exactly correspond to Osc. heriam [on an execration-tablet, Zvet. I. I. 129. 1; the i (not ii) of the Oscan word probably indicates a y-sound (ch. iv. § 63)]. Verbal Nouns with -yē- are a feature of Latin, e.g. pro-gēnies, rābies, scābies, perrnicies, and permīties [in fācies, spēcies the i (y) appears also in the Pres. stem].

Other examples of these suffixes are: of U-stems, O. Ind. svādvī, Gk. ἱδεῖα for *sφάδεφ𝘆ά (cf. Lat. suāvis M. and F., § 47), fem. of I.-Eur. *swādu-; of N-stems, O. Ind. yūnī, fem. of yūvan-, 'young' (the Plautine inuenīx, Mil. 304 points to Lat. jūnīr being rather a contraction of a stem *yūwenī- than a direct development of the stem yūnī-), O. Ind. rājī (mod. Ranee), fem. of rājan-, 'a king'; of NT-stems, O. Ind. bhārantī, fem. of the Pres. Part. bhārant- (Gk. φεροῦσα for *φερούτυα; cf. Lat. praeveniā, &c.).

Other fifth Decl. stems are suffixless, e.g. rō-s (O. Ind. rā-s, rāy-ás Gen. from the root rēi- (ch. iv. § 47); diēs from a stem d(i)yēw- (O. Ind. dyāus Nom. Sg.), a byform of d(i)yēw-, 'sky, day' (ch. iv. § 48). Some seem to have the same Verbal E-suffix as is seen in verbs like cālē-facio, candī-facio [ch. viii. § 33 (9)], e.g. fām-ē-s (cf. Gk. ἐ-χάω-ν-ν from χαῦω for *χαὐφω, which is really a fifth Decl. noun like fūl-ē-s (cf. Gk. ἐ-πίθ-ν-ν). Another noun declined according to the fifth Decl. is sordēs, Abl. sordē, Lucr. vi. 1271, Gen. Pl. sordōrum, Plaut. Poen. 314 (cf. sordeo). So from *ōleo, to grow, prōles for *pro-ōles, sub-ōles, ind-ōles (cf. ol(e)-facio from ēleo, to smell); from luo lues, from struo strues from ruo ruses ['rues' ruina, C. G. L. iv. 281. 5; cf. lue rue, 'luem ruem' (?) on the Carmen Arvalae]. Against the association of lābes with lābe-facio is the different quantity of the root-vowel. A long vowel is seen also in mōles (mōles-lus), sēdes (sēdeo), amb-āges (āgo),

---

1 spēs may be of similar formation (cf. O. Ind. sphañatē, 'he extends himself, increases'); it is used by Plautus only in Nom. Acc. Abl. Sg. and in Nom. Acc. Pl. (spes). But Ennius treats it as an S-stem in Ann. 448 M.: spero, si spēres quiequam prodesse potis sunt (cf. 119 M.). With the variants spēs and spēres, compare vis (Nom. Pl.) and vires.
contāges (lāngo), propāges and compāges (pāngo), rūpes (rūmpo). The cognates múles-tus, Gk. ἄδος, νέφος have suggested the reference of múles, sēdēs, nūbēs (though the ā is difficult to explain) to ES-stems (§71), with the same -ēs that we see in Gk. ἀλήθης from λήθος, Dor. λάθος (cf. ἐλαθου). But perhaps a better explanation of sēdēs is to regard it as a Plural of an I-stem sēdēs, used as a Singular (cf. O. Ind. vāyas, 'a bird,' properly 'birds,' and for the long vowel Gk. μῦνας, &c.); for a good many of these nouns in -ēs were more used in the Plural than the Singular, e.g. ambāgēs (O. Ind. ājī-, 'contest,' Ir. āg, 'contest'), aedes, vepres, and byforms of the Nom. Sg. occur with -ēs, e.g. nubis, Plaut. Merc. 880 (cf. unbs, Liv. Andr.), saeps, Cie. (cf. prae-saepe Neut.), vātīs (cf. O. Ir. ēath for *wāti-), vēhis, clādis, aedīs (O. I. L. i. 2c6. 3o), caēdis, molis, sedīs. Many of them belong to poetical diction; e.g. neither Plautus nor Terence use sedes (the usual word for a seat being sōlium or sella), rupes, tābes, caedes, &c.; and they must have been liable on that account to confusion of Number. A certain amount again of Nouns in -ēs are fem.1 names of animals, e.g. cānēs (F., beside cānēs M., in O. Lat.), fēlēs, mēlēs, vulpēs (cf. vulpēcula), pālumbēs. The last two, perhaps all, are dialectal, so that this -ēs may be the dialectal expression of -eis, a byform of the Nom. Sg. suffix of I-stems. Plēbēs has been called an ES-stem like πλήθος, but it is more persistently declined after the fifth Decl. (cf. plēbeins), than any of the others, whose Abl. is often the only Singular case found in use (e.g. ambage, vepre, Ovid, &c.); pūbēs (cf. pūber-tus, im-pūbēr-es Nom. Pl.) has a better claim, although the Abl. pūbē, Plaut. Pseud. 126, would have to be explained as due to a false analogy of the Nom. Sg., such as has produced requīē Abl., requiem Acc. from requīēs, -ētis.

The declension of a good many of these Nouns with Nom. Sg. in -ēs wavers between the third and fifth Decl. Plautus makes the Gen. Pl. of sordēs sordērum (Poen. 314), like rērum, but we find sordiūm in late Lat. Cicero (Top. vii. 3o) says that speciērum, speciebus are impossible forms (nolim enim, ne si Latine quidem

1 Priscian (i. pp. 168. 15, 169, 9, and 321. 19 H.) seems to think that adip- F. implies a Nom. Sg. adipēs.
§ 52. Other examples of Latin Fems. in -ī, -ic, &c. Latin cornīx (cf. Gk. κοπῶν), gēnētrix (O. Lat. jānītrī, Gk. γενετῆρα); from mēctor comes mētrīx, but from mētor the name of the deity Mētrīna, whose festival, the Meditrinalia, is mentioned by Varro (L. L. vi. 21) and Paul. Fest. (88. 36 Th.) in connexion with the curious Roman custom of hallowing the first taste of new wine with the words: novum vetus vinum bibo; novo veteri morbo medeor; cānīcula (cf. O. Ind. śunī); cāvis, -im Acc., -ī Abl. (cf. Gk. κανή, stem καν-δ-).

§ 53. -yē- and -ī-. Aciscus, a small pickaxe (there was a Roman family name Valerius Acisculus), has been referred (with supposed i) to ăcīes (Rhein. Mus. 1891, p. 236); the Probi Appendix (p. 198. 12 K.) censures a large number of forms in -is beside forms in -es, e.g. vātis beside vates, and among them facis for facies (cf. faciērgium Isid. beside faciērgium Greg. Tur.).
§ 54. Suffixes ending in -n (Nouns of third Decl.). -EN-, -YEN-, -WEN-, -MEN-. Beside I.-Eur. Masc. stems in -o- (-e-), -yo- (-ye-), -wo- (-we-) (§§ 2, 4, 5), we find masc. stems in -en- (-on-), -yen- (-yon-), -wen- (-won-). The relation between the two seems to be that the O-stem is the Adjective, but becomes an N-stem when a Substantive, e.g. Lat. multi-bus Adj., but bitū Subst. An adjective which is restricted to denote one individual, in other words which becomes definite from indefinite, takes this suffix, e.g. Lat. rūfus, red, but Rūfō, ‘the Red’ (cf. Gk. στραβός and Στράβων); and this process, which has been more consistently carried out in the Teutonic languages than in any other, is still seen in the German ‘weak declension’ of the Adjective, e.g. rothe Nom. Pl. indef. (strong decl.), die rothen Nom. Pl. def. (weak decl.) (Goth. raudai and pai raudans). This early connexion between O- and N-stems explains why an N-stem in a Compound is often replaced by an O-stem, e.g. Gk. ἄκμο-θετον, stithy, compounded of ἄκμων and τίθημι, and why an N-stem in one language often corresponds to an O-stem in another, e.g. Gk. αἰ(φ)ων to Lat. aevum (also explained as *aiswēn), Goth. ga-juk-a (N-stem) to Lat. con-jūg-us (O-stem), or in the same language, e.g. Lat. lānio to Lat. lānius, incūbo to incūbus. In the declension of these Masc. N-stems, n varies with en, on, ēn, ōn, &c., yen also with ēn, and wen also with ūn. They are sometimes transferred by the addition of -o- or -ā- into the O- and Ā-declension, e.g. Lat. ēpūlōnus beside ēpūlō, terminus beside termō (§ 13). Neuters in -n are connected with neuters in -r, &c., the n apparently being proper to the Oblique Cases, e.g. Lat. femur, Gen. feminis (§ 56). They are therefore better considered in the paragraph which deals with the R-suffix § (56).

Neuters in -men are Verbal Nouns (Nomina Actionis), and are used in various languages as Infinitives (like -sen-, e.g. O. Ind. nēśāni from nī-), e.g. O. Ind. vid-mān-ē, Hom. Gk. τὸ-μεν-αί (perhaps Lat. 2 Pl. Imper. Pass., e.g. lägiṃīni, is a similar Infinitive form with Imperative sense; see ch. viii. § 81). They have usually the E-grade of root, e.g. teg-men, but the Latin law of Syncope seldom allows us to decide when there was a connecting vowel, when an s preceded, &c. (cf. regimen, integumen-tum,
jugumen-tum and jugumen-tum, angumen-tum, rūmen from sūgo, and see ch. iv. § 116 on agmen and exāmen). Their byforms with -mentum in Latin, e.g. ālimentum, have been mentioned in § 30, and the extension of MEN-stems by the YO-, YĀ- suffixes, e.g. alimōnia, alimonium, in § 4.

Fem. Verbal Abstracts in -yen-, -tyen- (-tien-) in Lat., Celt., Teut., e.g. Lat. āsū-cāpio, captio have become fem. by the analogy of other abstract nouns. They sometimes appear as Ā-stems with the ending -īna, -īna, e.g. Potīna, the goddess worshipped when a child first drank (Non. 108. 15 M.) from pōlio, Statīna, 'statuendi infantis,' officīna (ōpī-fīcīna Plaut.), rūpīna, ruīna (cf. § 8).

§ 55. Masc. en-stems in Latin. Lat. ściē, Gen. ściēs shows -ēn, and poeën, Gen. pectīnis (Gk. στενε ὑπάρχει for *παρατείνει) shows -ēn, but the usual form is -ō in the Nom. Sg., -ōn- or -ōn- (with i for older o or e) in the oblique cases, e.g. ębō, Gen. ębōnis from the verbal root ed-, 'to eat,' ębōn, Gen. hominis from the noun-stem humo-, the ground. The Fem. cōro, Gen. carrīnis, is exceptional in reducing the stem-suffix in the oblique cases to n. In Umbr.-Osc. the word has the same declension and gender, but retains the older sense of 'a part,' a 'share,' e.g. Osc. māinās carrīnis sententiās, which would be in Latin, 'maximae partis sententiae'; and originally the word seems to have been a Verbal (Nomen Actionis), 'the act of cutting or dividing,' whence the feminine gender. (On the variation of gender in cardo, margo, cāpīdo, grando, aērigo, farrāgo, see Neue, i. p. 654; Abstracts in -go, like ārigo, are fem., and Nouns indicating defects or ailments like ferrāgo, aerāgo, cāligo, prārigo).

Nouns in -ō, -ōnis Gen., used of persons, belong as a rule to plebeian or colloquial Latin and express contempt, e.g. ālea, bibo, Cāpīdo, Nāso; in the earliest period they are derived only from Adjectives, e.g. strābo, but later from Nouns and Verbs, e.g. communīto from nōles, lānio from lānus, erro from errare, sāturīo from sāturīre. The more respectful formation was in -ānus, e.g. patronus (but patrōn always on Greek inscriptions, as early as 150 B. C., Eckinger, p. 135); Paul. Fest. quotes O. Lat. epolōn for ēpīlo (55. 15 Th.), centōrionus, cūrionus and dēcūrionus (34. 36 Th.); so Dor. Gk. Λατη became Lātoma. (On these nicknames, &c. in -ō, -ōnis, see Fisch, Lat. Nomina Pers. auf -ō, -ōnis, 1890.)

§ 56. Suffixes ending in -r (Nouns of third Decl.). -R-. I.-Eur. Neuters in -r (-r) seem to have substituted n for r in the oblique cases, e.g. Lat. fēmur, Gen. fēminis, O. Ind. údhar, 'the udder,' údhnas Gen., which has led to confusions of R- and N-stems, e.g. Lat. jēcūr, but O. Ind. yakān-, and to such curious declensions in Latin as ści-in-ēr-is, jēc-in-ēr-is, and jōc-in-ēr-is, &c.

§ 57. Neuter R-stems. Many of these are names for parts of the body, e.g. fēmur, jēcūr, āber. (Amer. Journ. Phil. xii. 1). On O. Lat. aser, blood (O. Ind. āsr-k Nom., asn-ās Gen.) and on other Neut. R-stems, see ch. vi. § 15.
§ 58. -ER- and -TER-. As the Comparative suffix is sometimes -ero-, sometimes -tero- (§ 16), so we find -er and -ter as the suffix for forming words of relationship, and masculine Nomina Agentis [with fem. in -(t)rī, -(t)ria, &c., § 51]. This -(t)er-varies with -(t)or-, -(t)or-, -(t)or-, -(t)or-, &c., e.g. Gk. πατήρ, Acc. πατέρα, and φράτωρ, Acc. φράτορα, Gk. δοτήρ beside δώτωρ, δοτήρ beside βοτωρ, &c. The Nomina Agentis in Latin show -tōr-, e.g. actor, Gen. actōris (Gk. ἀκτωρ, -όρος and εἷ-ακτήρ, -ήρος). Abstracts in -or-, -ōris Gen., often connected with Verbs in -eo and Adjectives in -ulus (e.g. cūlor, beside calco, calidus), are not R-stems but S-stems, and had in O. Lat. -ōs in the Nom. Sg., e.g. cūlos, though in the classical period the r, into which intervocalic s in the oblique cases had passed by the phonetic law of Latin (ch. iv. § 148), forced its way into the Nom. Sing. also (see ch. vi. § 7).

§ 59. Nouns of relationship. Lat. pāter [O. Ind. pitār-, Arm. hair, Gk. πατήρ, O. Ir. athir, Goth. (rare) fáder]; Lat. māter [O. Ind. mātār-, Arm. mair, Gk. μήτηρ, O. Ir. māthir, O. Engl. mōder (in Goth. aīpei, 'mother,' atta, 'father') O. Sl. mater-]; Lat. frater (O. Ind. brātār-, Arm. eβαιρ, Gk. φράτωρ and φράτηρ, a clansman, O. Ir. brāthir, 'a brother,' W. brawdr(r), Goth. brōjar; cf. O. Sl. bratrů); Lat. svōr (O. Ind. svāsār-, Arm. k'oīr, O. Ir. siur and fiur, Lith. sesā; cf. Goth. svistar, O. Sl. svestra); Lat. lexīr better *laevir, for *laevēr by Anal. of vir (L-Eur. *daiwer, O. Ind. dēvār-, Arm. tairg with g for w, Gk. δήρ for *δαύερ, O. Engl. tācor, O. H. G. zeihhar; cf. Lith. dēver-īs, O. Sl. dēver-i).

§ 60. Latin Nomina Agentis. Lat. praecōtor for *praec-itor (O. Ind. pura-ctar-, 'he who goes before,' 'a guide'); junctor (O. Ind. yōktār-, Gk. ἰοκτῆρ) (cf. junctus); con-ātor for *con-ātor from the root dhē-, 'to put, place' (O. Ind. dhātār- and dhātār-, Gk. θέτηρ) (cf. conditus); pōtor (O. Ind. pātār- and pātār-, Gk. ποτήρ) (cf. pōitus); génitor (O. Ind. janitār-, Gk. γενετήρ and γενέτωρ) (cf. génitus) with Fem. gēnēitrīa (O. Ind. jānitrī, Gk. γενετειρία) (on ἐπ see ch. iii. § 19); textōr (O. Ind. tāstār-, 'carpenter') (cf. textus); ësor (O. Ind. attār-, Gk. ἔμπαιστήρ) (cf. ēsus).

§ 61. Suffixes ending in -t (Nouns and Adjectives of third Decl.). -T-. Latin stems in -t are probably of various origins. A compound like com-es (stem *cōm-*it-) from cum and ire, which has the sense of a Participle Active, 'going along with,' reminds us of the use of this suffix in O. Ind. with verbal roots ending in vowels, &c., when these roots form the second part of a compound, e.g. O. Ind. viśva-jīt-, 'all-conquering,' from ji-, 'to conquer.' To this category belong Latin t-stems like anti-stes
from the root stā-, 'to stand,' sācer-dōs from the root dō-, 'to give.'

On the other hand adjectives of passive meaning like man-suēs, Gen. mansuētis, 'accustomed to the hand,' tame (beside mansuētus), in-gens, Gen. ingentis, 'not known,' huge (cf. Engl. uncouth), may be for *mansuētis, *ingentis with that transference of the Adjective to an I-stem which we have seen in O. Lat. Sanates, beside sanati, forctis (class. fortis) beside forctus (§ 45). It has further been suggested (§ 29) that nouns like ēques, Gen. equītis, may be connected with Greek formations like ἵππος, the fem. Abstract *equīta, horsemanship, becoming masc. ēques, a horseman, just as antistila fem, is related to antistes masc.

Again Feminine I-stems like tēges, Gen. tegētis, a mat, lit. 'a covering,' sēges, Gen. secētis, a crop, lit. 'a sowing' (W. hau for *sog-, 'to sow'), merges, a sheaf, lit. 'a dipping' (if merga, a pitchfork, be rightly explained by Paul. Fest. 89. 13 Th.: quia ... messores eas in fruges demergunt, ut elevare possint manipulos, or 'a plucking' (cf. Gk. ἀ-μέργω), may have been originally Fem. TI-stems (Nomina Actionis), like messis for *met-tis, 'a reaping;' harvest (§ 42), and may show that confusion of the TI- and the T-suffix which is shown by words formed with -tūt(i)-, -tāt(i)-, (§ 46), and systems like Gk. ναυτ-, Lat. nōcti-.. But Greek nouns like κέλνς, -ητος, a horse, lit. 'runner,' from the root kel-, 'to run, go quickly' (O. Ind. car-; cf. Lat. celer), and adjectives like ἀργῆ- and ἀργήτ-, bright, from the root arg-, 'to shine' (O. Ind. arj-; cf. Lat. argēntum), rather point to by-forms in -t, beside the usual Pres. Part. stems in -nt, just as Greek compounds like ἄγνως, -ώνως, (1) unknowing, (2) unknown, beside ἄγνωςς and ἄγνωστος, πρόβλης, -ῆτος, a headland, beside πρόβληςς, thrown forth, suggest that Latin mansuēs, &c. may be quite separate forms from mansuētus, &c., and not sprung from *mansuētis, still less produced by Syncope of the last syllable of mansuētus (cf. ch. iii. § 16).

§ 62. Other examples of Lat. T-stems. Lat. tēres, Gen. terrētis, from tero; hēbes, Gen. hebētis; āles, Gen. allēs, with the sense of alētus; tādes (cf. tādūtare), an old word for a hammer (Fest. 530. 30 Th.; Paul. Fest. 53r. 12. Th.), from tūnā, is a rather doubtful form; and the origin of I.-Eur. *nēpt- (O. Ind. nāpt-, M. Ir. niae, Gen. niath, W. nai; cf. Hom. Gk. nēpōdes), Lat. nēptōs, with its cognate *nēptī (O. Ind. nāpt-, Goth. niðjēs, 'kinsman,' O. Sl. ne)p'ti, 'nephew,' &c.), Lat. neptis is not clear. The termination -es was much in vogue.
in the earlier period, e.g. cæles, -itis, circes, -itis. From it were formed Abstract Nouns in -ilia, -iles, &c. (see §§ 4, 51) (cf. axitiosi, Paul. Fest. 2. 34 Th. a. factionis dicebantur, cum plures una quid agerent facerentque, from axites id. 3. 1 Th. a. mulieres sive viri dicebantur una agentes. The adj. axitiosus is quoted by Varro, L. L. vii. 66 from the Astraba of Plautus:

axitiosae annónam caram e uili concinánti uiris).

§ 63. -NT-. The suffix -ent-, -ont-, -nt-, &c. plays an important part in the I.-Eur. languages, being used in the formation of all Active Participles, except the Perfect (ch. viii. § 89). In the thematic conjugation we have -ont- in all the cases in Greek (φέροντ-οσ, φέροντι for *φεροντι, &c.) and other languages; and O. Lat. forms like flexuntes (?), as well as the classical euntes where e precedes, have been quoted as proof that Lat. ferent-is, ferent-em, &c. represent an older *feront-; with change of the short vowel before double consonant in the syllable unaccented under the early Accent-law (ch. iii. § 5) into ə (but see ch. viii. § 90). These Participles have often become adjectives and nouns, e.g. Engl. friend (Goth. frijonds, lit. ‘loving ’), fiend (Goth. fijands, lit. ‘hating,’ Germ. Feind), Gk. ἄρχω, Lat. rudens, sometimes with transference to the O-declension, e.g. Lat. vénus (Goth. vind) beside the Participle, O. Ind. vánt-, Gk. ἄεις for *ἄφερτα.

§ 64. Other examples of Lat. -ent. Lat. ãgens (O. Ind. ãjant-, Gk. ἀγω); fẽrens (O. Ind. bhárant-, Gk. φέρω, Goth. bairands, O. Sl. bery); rudens (O. Ind. rudánt-), (r) ‘roaring,’ (2) ‘a rope’; vēhens (O. Ind. váhant-, Goth. ga-vigands, Lith. vēšas, O. Sl. vezý) ; bēnēvolentens is often a Noun (cf. bēnēmērens) in the Comedians, and is closely connected with the Adjective benevolent, so that benevolent and benevolent have taken the place of the Comparative and Adverb of the latter, as magnificēntior, magnificentissimus supply a Comparative and Superlative to magnificus. Other Nouns are pârens (beside the verb pârio), serpens, ádulēcens; other Adjectives, òuquens, sâpiens, inācens. The addition of the ya-suffix, which forms the fem. of these participles in Greek (e.g. φέρονα for *φεροντα) forms Abstract derivatives in Latin. e.g. benevolentia, praesentia, eloquentia (all of these first used by Terence), confidentia, matīvolentia, pātientia, sāpientia, polentiā, &c. (all used by Plautus), sentiēntia (beside the verb sentio). On the rare ending -entium, e.g. silentium, see Rönsch, Collect. p. 208. Fluentum and cruentus probably originated in Neut. Pl. fluenta, cruenta (cf. silenta loca Laev.), a formation like Gk. φλορτα, &c. The ending -lentus of openlentus (beside opulens), viâlentus (and viâens), tricîlentus, esculentus, virulentus, &c. comes from an Adj.-stem in -io (-li § 21); cf. grâcîlentus (the o of vinîcentus, somnîlentus has been explained by ‘popular etymology’ from vinî lentus, somnî lentus; see ch. iii. § 21).

§ 65. -WENT-. This suffix, like our ‘-ful,’ added to Noun-
§§ 63–67.] NOUN AND ADJECTIVE STEMS. -WENT-, -D-.

stems to form Adjectives, with the sense ‘possessed of,’ ‘abounding in,’ and occasionally ‘resembling,’ e.g. O. Ind. agni-vánt-, ‘provided with fire,’ χαριέις for *χαριέντις, possessed of grace, graceful, στουόεις (Corey. στουοέσαν, Acc. Sg. Fem.), woeful, is in Latin augmented by the TO-suffix, e.g. ἀδόλοεις (Gk. ἀδόλεις) for *ἄδολο-εννεσσις from *ἄδολο-went-to- or *ἄδολο-went-to-, πίνοεις (Gk. ντφοεις). In O. Ind. it was often added to the P. P. P. TO-stem, e.g. κράτα- to κράτα-, P. P. P. of κρ-, ‘to do,’ and came to be used in the sense of a Perfect Indicative (with omission of the Substantive Verb), e.g. sa tad κράταν, ‘he has done this.’

§ 66. Other examples of Lat. -όσς. Lat. vίρος (cf. O. Ind. viša-vánt-); vίνος (cf. Gk. ϋβος), (1) full of wine, (2) like wine; ϑιάθερος, like a dead body. From U-stems, -όσς, e.g. aestuōs (but fastuōs, and from the stem mont-, montuōsos), but from I-stems -όσς, e.g. pisoos (Virgil’s rendering of Homer’s ἵθυεις), (but biloos). Incīrióos (from incīria) produced vīrōs (instead of *κτίρος) ; καλαμιτούς stands for *καλαμιτός (cf. iii. § 13, p. r76). On the change of *κονεςσις to -όσς (cf. retrōsum, retrōsum from retroversum, &c.), see ch. ii. § 53. The older spelling is -ονςσ, -ονςσ (see Brambach, Orth. p. 268, and the Indices to Ribbeck’s Virgil and to Studemund’s Apograph of the Ambrosian Palimpsest of Plautus). Gellius (ix. 12) comments on the Active and Passive sense of these Adjectives: ut ‘formidulosus’ dici potest et qui formidat et qui formidatur, ut ‘invidiosus’ et qui invidet et cui invidetur, ut ‘suspeiosus’ et qui suscipatur et qui suspectus est, ut ‘ambitiosus’ et qui ambit et qui ambitur, ut item ‘gratiosus’ et qui adhibet gratias et qui admirat, ut ‘laboriosus’ et qui laborat et qui labori est, &c.

§ 67. Suffixes ending in -d (Nouns of third Declension). D-suffixes are not frequent enough in the I.-Eur. languages to enable us to determine the formation of Latin d-stems like lápis (cf. Gk. λέπας ?), mercēs, hērēs, nor to trace the passage of original D-stems into other stems. The -aō- of Gk. χορός, a reef, ‘like a hog’s back,’ πέλειας, a wild dove, has been declared to be the first part of the Latin -astro- (for *-ad-tro-) of poēlaster, ‘like a poet,’ ὀλεαστερ, ‘a wild olive,’ &c. Lat. -έλαλα occurs in names of birds, &c., e.g. ficēlula (and ficēlλα?), a beecafico, acreōula, querquēlula, nītēlula and nītēlla (cf. alcēdo); Lat. -edo in names of ailments like frīyēdo, ἵβεδο, grāvēdo and gravēdo resembles the -ηδῶν of Gk. ἄχθηδῶν, χαρηδῶν. Lat. -dus of Adjectives beside Verbs in -eo and Abstract Nouns in -or, e.g. pallidus (beside palleo and pallor), splendīdus (beside splendo and
splendor), squātīdus (O. Lat. squalus) (beside squāleo and squalor), has been referred to the root dō-, 'to give' (cf. O. Ind. jala-das, lit. 'giving moisture,' like Lat. imbrī-dus, artha-das, 'giving benefit,' but see ch. iii. § 15. (8)); and the termination of Gerundives like laudandus, &c. has been similarly explained (*lanudam-dus, 'praise-giving') with the Acc. Sg. of a Verbal Noun as the first part (cf. vin-dex) of the compound (see ch. viii. § 94), as well as Verbal Adjectives in -bundus, e.g. errūbundus, pūdībundus, fūrd-bundus, gēmēbundus, mōribundus, lasciāvibundus (-ūb- probably) and -cundus, e.g. jācundus, rūbicundus, vērēcundus, fēcundus, irācundus, fācundus. (On these also, see ch. viii. § 94.) The termination -tūdo, Gen.-tūdinis, has been called the amplification of the stem -tūt- by an N-stem, *tūt-n- producing *tūd-n- (but see ch. iv. § 161), but it may also be derived from a tu-stem, as rūbēdo from an ē-stem.

§ 68. Other examples. Lat. pōcussus, -ūdis beside pecus, -ōris; Lat. cassis, an Etruscan word, according to Isidore (Orig. xviii. 14. 1), with transference to the ā-declension in the byform cassida.

§ 69. Suffixes ending in a Guttural (Nouns and Adjectives of third Declension). These also are infrequent in I.-Eur. languages, and often have, as we have seen (§ 31), byforms with added -o-, e.g. Gk. αλόωνης (O. Ind. lōpaśu-), Gk. μεºραζ (O. Ind. maryakā-), Gk. νεάζ (O. Sl. novakū), Lat. sēnex (O. Ind. sanakā-, cf. Goth. sineigs; perhaps with the Diminutive suffix -ko-, so that Lat. senex may be for *sēnēcis, 'oldish,' with that transference to the I-declension so frequent in Adjectives; cf. seni- from I.-Eur. *sēno-, O. Ind. sāna-, Gk. ἑρως, O. Ir. sen, Lith. sēnas, &c.). Latin Adjectives in -āx express tendency or character, e.g. bibāx, divāx, rāpāx, pervicāx (O. Lat. pervicus); of adjectives in -īx we have fēlīx from *fēla, Gk. θηλη, the breast, pernīx (properly of horses, &c. A. L. L. viii. 453) from perna; -trīx is the fem. ending (O. Ind -trī, Gk. -τριά) of Masc. Nomina Agentis in -tor, e.g. gēνētīrīx (O. Ind. jānitīrī, Gk. γενετείρα, § 51); -ōx appears in the derivatives from Adjectives, fērōx (from fērōs), sollīōx (from sollīs), ūtrōx (from *ūtro-; cf. ὀλίωμ), and in vēlōx, cēlōx, which suggest connexion with ωκόρ. We have O-stem Adjectives with -ātus, e.g. mērātus, and -ātus, e.g. mendātus, ōmicus (§ 31), and Ā-stem Nouns with -ica, e.g.
lectīca, and -ūca, e.g. lactūca (§ 32). The Latin termination -ūgo, in names of ailments, e.g. vertīgo, dēpētīgo, impētīgo, cāligo, may be due to the addition of an N-suffix to Adjectives in -ēx, *verētī-n-, *calūc-n-, &c., and the somewhat similar -ūgo of ferrūgo (cf. rōbīgo), aerūgo, lānūgo, and in names of plants, e.g. mollūgo (-igo), aspērūgo may similarly represent -ūc-n-, the c becoming g before n by the phonetic law of Latin (ch. iv. § 119).

§ 70. Other examples. Lat. pālix, -īcis, a flea, but pulexiun, fleabane; Lat. lālix, Pl. latīces (but Gk. λάταγες; cf. Gk. ὑφύ- but O. Ind. vartakā-); Lat. verēx from verto; Lat. verēx, a wether; Lat. nātrix, -īcis, a watersnake (O. Ir. nathir, nathrac Genn.).

Words like aurreax (a. auriga, Paul. Fest. 6. 27 Th.), aurīfex, &c. do not show the Guttural suffix, but are Compounds of ago, ficio (§ 78).

The number of words ending with -x that indicate parts of the body is noticeable, e.g. calix, fūnx, cœrōnx, cœrīx (or rather cœritxes Plur., for the Sing. was a poetical usage; cf. Varro, L. L. viii. 14 and Quint. viii. 3. 35), mātrix, pantex, pōdex, also bodily marks, e.g. varix, ribīx, famex, &c.; bird-names in -ix are, e.g. cornīx, coterīx, spinuntīx. Adjectives in -āx from second Conj. Verbs are audax, tēnax (cf. vītīnāculum), mordax, &c.; from 10-Verbs cēpax, effīcax, perspīcax. With fallax cf. fallō, O. Lat. for fallācia; with dīcax cf. dīcā-re beside dīcēre; with cēpax, oc-cēpā-re.

§ 71. Suffixes ending in -s (Nouns and Adjectives of third Declension). -ES-. The suffix -es-, varying with -os-, -s-, &c. was used to form Neuter Abstract Nouns, with E-grade of root and accent on the root, e.g. I.-Eur. *γένος Nom. Sg., *γενές- in Oblique Cases, from the root γεν- (O. Ind. jānas, Gk. γένος Nom., γένε(σ)-os Gen.), Lat. gēnus Nom., gener-īs for *genes-es Gen. These Neuter-stems became adjectives by transferring the accent to the suffix and substituting -ēs for -ōs in Nom. Sg. Masc., -ēs in Nom. Sg. Neut., e.g. Gk. εὖ-γερῆς Masc., -vēs Neut. Beside them we find occasionally Masc. or Fem. Nouns with -ōs in Nom. Sg., a formation which came into great favour in Latin, e.g. tēnor Masc. for *tenōs, beside tenus Neut. (Gk. τένος, a string), from the root ten-, ‘to stretch’; tēpor Masc. for *tepōs (cf. O. Ind. tápas Neut. for *tēpos), from the root tep-, ‘to be warm.’ A case of these Neuters is used as the Infinitive in various languages, e.g.: Lat. vīvēre Loc., O. Ind. jīvāsē Dat., ‘to live’ (see ch. viii. § 83).

§ 72. Neuter ES-stems in Latin. The original declension with -os Nom., -es- in Oblique Cases and Derivatives, is sometimes departed from, e.g. tempus,
THE LATIN LANGUAGE.

§ 73. Adjective ES-stems. Of the transference of a Neut. S-stem into an Adjective a good example is Lat. vētus, which is nothing but I.-Eur. *wētōs (Gk. Φίτως, a year) used in apposition as a predicate (cf. Hom. Gk. πάπα, Lat. über, &c.). The ordinary way of making an Adjective from a Neuter S-stem was by adding the suffix -o- to (§ 27), e.g. vētustus, to which however, owing to the cacophony of the two similar syllables, vētus was preferred in the Positive and veterrimus in the Superlative, though vētustor was the Comparative in vogue (cf. Varro, L. L. vi. 59 a vetere vētustius ac veterrimum), vēnītus, scūtētus, fūnītus, jītus. Perhaps another way was to add the suffix -ō, e.g. O. Lat. scōlīrus, and perhaps fūnīrus (beside funerēus) (see Fieck. Jahrb. 1881, p. 676; both forms are doubtful) (cf. tēcrūs from tēcr, § 74). The verb used by Ennius (Ann. 16 M. cum ueter occubuit Prīmus sub Marte Pelasgo) and Accius (Trag. 48 R.) may be of this formation, or of the third Decl. like pūber (beside pubēs Adj.) and the Compounds degerē, bicorpor, &c.

§ 74. Masc. (and Fem.) ES-stems. The usual termination is -or Nom., -ōris Gen. (older -ōs, -ōsis), e.g. dēcor (beside decus ; with Adj. decōrus, O. Lat. deōrem Accus. ; cf. indeōrem beside indeōrum) ; anōr (O. Ind. āsas Neut. ; with Adj. anugustus) ; hōnor (with Adj. honestus) ; arbor F. (with Adj. *arbustus, cf. arbustum, § 28) ; paedōra is Vulg. Lat. for paedolor (C. G. L. iv. 270. 4 ' paedora' aurium sordes). The -s remains in flōs [like Flōra F. beside flūs M. is aurōra beside I.-Eur. *ausōs (Gk. ἀυρός F.) ;] while some have found -ās in the Fem. nouns sēdēs, beside L.-Eur. *sēdōs (O. Ind. sādas, Gk. ἀδώ) ; pādēs (Gk. παλάδος), and perhaps ādēs beside ādēs (see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v.) (O. Ind. ēdhas, Gk. ἀδός) (but see § 51). These Masc. Nouns in -or are widely used as Verbal Abstracts, connected with Verbs in -ō and Adjectives in -ōdus, e.g. pallor (paleo, pallidus), timor (time, timidus) (see § 67 ; and for a list of examples

1 Plaut. Curt. 300 immodestis tuis modereris moribus.
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A. L. L. viii. 313). The Verb in -eo is not found with flor, fluidus, cruor, crūdis (cf. O. Ind. kravi, 'raw flesh,' Gk. κρέας); the Adj. in -itus is not found with flor (fīceo), a coinage of Cicero’s time (Quint. viii. 3. 34).

§ 75. Other S-stems. Lat. cēbrum for *cēsrum points to an S-stem like O. Ind. śīrās, 'the head,' Gk. κέπας, a horn; Lat. tēmēre for *teinesræ (cf. O. Ind. tāmis-ra beside tāmas, 'darkness'; cf. Lat. tēmēre, lit. 'in the dark'); Lat. cinis M., sometimes F., resembles Gk. κόνις F. in its termination; Lat. fār, farris Gen. for *fars, *faris has a derivative farīna for *farīsa, Fem. of an Adj. *farīnus (cf. Goth. bariz-eins, 'made of barley').

§ 76. -YES-. This suffix, used to form Comparatives (cf. the 'Comparative' use of -yo-, § 4), appears in Latin as -ior Nom. M., F., -īōris Gen., -ius Nom. N. (older -īōs, -īōsis, -īōs), e.g. suāvior, suāvīōris, suāvius. The variations of the suffix are not easy to determine among the variety of forms in the various languages (e.g. O. Ind. svād-iyas-, with Nom. svād-īyān, Gk. ἕδων, Acc. ἕδω for *ἕδωσα, Goth. sutīza for *sut-izen-, Lith. sāld-ēs-nis, &c.), but it is certain that the weak grade -īs- was prefixed to the suffix -tō- (-thō-) to form Superlatives in various languages (O. Ind. svād-ištīha-, Gk. ἕδωσος, Goth. sutists), though in Latin this formation was ousted by -issimus (cf. however māgis, magis-ter, &c.). These suffixes were originally affixed to the root without the suffix of the Positive stem (so Lat. ōc-ior, O. Ind. ās-iyas-. Gk. ὀκ-ίων from a Positive stem *ōku-), but we have also in Latin, e.g. tēnu-ior, suāvior for *suadv-ior, aspir-ior, &c.

For other details of the formation of Comparatives and Superlatives in Latin, see ch. vi. section 2.

§ 77. Suffixless Forms. Nouns formed directly from the root, without any suffix except those of the cases, are especially frequent as the second element of a Compound, and take in this position the function of a Nomen Agentis, e.g. Lat. au-spex, 'seer of birds,' from the root spek-; 'to see,' partī-ceps, 'taking a share.' They are also found independently, e.g. O. Ind. spās-, 'a spy,' often with a high grade of vowel, e.g. Gk. σκόξβ, an owl (cf. ch. iii. § 51, p. 254), both from the same root spek- (skep-). The passage of such forms into the vowel declension is a very near one, so that we find systems with and without a suffix in the same language, e.g. Lat. auspex beside exti-spīcus (a late
form of *exti-spez*, or in different languages, e.g. O. Ind. náú-, Gk. νάυς beside Lat. nāv-īs, O. Ind. úd-añc- beside Gk. ποδ-αξ-ός, Lat. prōp-ingu-o-s. The Latin Inf. Pass., e. g. ṣāgi, seems to be a case of a suffixless Verbal Noun (cf. O. Ind. nir-ájē, drśē, Inf. of drś-, ‘to look’), just as the Inf. Act., e. g. ḍāgērē, seems to be the Locative case of a Verbal Stem in -es- (see ch. viii. § 83).

§ 78. Suffixless stems at end of Compounds in Latin. From jungo, con-jux (cf. O. Ind. sq-yuj-, Gk. σύ-μύξ) and con-junx (O. Ind. yunj- beside yuj-); from fūcō, artifex, carnifex, ṣūpīfex, &c.; from cāpia, mancores, aucores, forcores for *formi-ceps, princeps, &c.; from dicō, judex, vindīx; from sādeo, ñēses, ēses; from cēno, cornicen, fidicen; from ṣāgo, rēmen, auvecex, &c. Beside these we have often O-stems, &c., e. g. jārī-dīcōs beside jā-ī-tex, pūrō-gaùs beside rēm-es, O. Lat. hostī-capas (hostium captor, Paul. Fest. 73. 10 Th.). urbī-cūpe Voc. (Plant. Mīl. 1055) beside aucores, &c. The presence of suffixless stems in the second part of Compounds in other L-Eur. languages forbids us to regard the third Decl. forms as due to Latin syncope of the O-suffix in the Nom. Case, *ævi-cap(o)s, &c. (see ch. iii. § 16). But in some adjectives original O-stems may have become I-stems (cf. § 34), and the Nominative form may be due to syncope or to the analogy of consonant-stems (just as pars Nom. for *parti-s, with Gen. partis, is due to syncope or to the analogy of rēx Nom. with Gen. rēgis, &c.), e. g. praceox beside praeocioquus and praeocioquus, colors for *cohortis from hortus. The Feminines add a, e. g. exti-spic-a, fūdī-cin-a.

§ 79. Latin Independent suffixless stems. Lat. vēx (O. Ind. ráj-, O. Ir. rig Gen.) from the root rēg-, of régo; lēx from lēgo; pēs Nom., pēl-is Gen. (cf. O. Ind. pad-, pād-am Acc., Dor. Gk. πός Nom., ποδ-όs Gen., &c.); fur for *for (ch. iv. § 16) (Gk. φυρ) from the root bher-; vēs (O. Ind. rās); hiems (Zend zyā, Gk. χίων); ós, the mouth (O. Ind. áś-); mūs (O. Ind. mūs-, Gk. μῦς, O. H. G. mūs); dīc-is Gen., in the phrase dīcis causa, for form’s sake (O. Ind. dīs-, ‘direction’) from the root deik-, of dīco; nīx (Gk. νήp-a Acc.); sal (Gk. ἑλάρ); sūs, sūuhs Dat. Pl. (Gk. ῥυ, O. H. G. sū); dīx from dīco; prē-cus Plur. from root prēk-, ‘to ask’; vōx (O. Ind. vāc-F.) beside vōcō. (On the long vowel, see ch. iv. § 51, p. 254.)

§ 80. II. COMPOSITION. Compounds are seldom resolvable into two intact words like Gk. Διός-κουρος, ἄρηλ-φαρος, slain in battle, Lat. sēnātūs-consilium, patres-fāmiliārum, jūris-jurandī, res-publica, O. Engl. Tiwes-dæg, ‘Tuesday.’ Sometimes, as in reduplicated words, one element is reduced almost beyond recognition, either the second element (in ‘broken’ or curtailed Reduplication), e. g. Lat. bal-b-us (cf. O. Ind. bal-balā-karōmi), gur-g-es, a whirlpool (cf. O. Ind. gār-gara-), or more usually the first, e. g. ci-čiNdē-la, a glow-worm, while Lat. gur-gūl-iō, the throat, guer-quër-us, mur-mur, &c. give equal prominence to both elements. But generally the full stem without the case suffixes
is used in the first part of the Compound, e.g. *patrī-cūda (contrasted with *patres-familiorum), *jurī-dicus (contrasted with *juris-jurandī). The treatment of these stems which begin the Compound is the special subject of this section.

Owing to the weakening of unaccented vowels in Latin, every vowel in the final syllable of such a stem was liable to change under the early accentuation of the first syllable of each word (ch. iii. § 5). It is therefore often necessary to call in the aid of other I.-Eur. languages before one can determine the original vowel in a Latin Compound, e.g. *ālī-ger from *āla may be shown to have been originally *ulī-ger by Greek ἀλο-τόπος, &c. from ἄλη (§ 82), though, so far as the Latin form goes, it might equally well have been *alī-ger, *alē-ger, &c., while in *formī-ceps for *formi-ceps the vowel has been suppressed altogether by Syncope (ch. iii. § 13), in arcībīi for arcī-cūbīi by Dissimilation (ib. p. 176). Ὄ is the I.-Eur. 'Composition-Vowel' par excellence. Not only does it appear in O-stems, but it is often added to Consonant-stems, and sometimes takes the place of the -ā of Ā-stems. In Latin post-tonic ὂ (like ā and other short vowels) became, as was shown in ch. iii. § 18, ā before labials (later ć), and ć before other single consonants (except r), so that ć is the 'Composition-Vowel' of Latin as Ὄ of I.-Eur. (cf. Unomammia Plaut., Oinn-mama on a Praenestine inscription, ūnī-mamma, an Amazon).

The second part of a Compound is often scarcely to be distinguished from a suffix. Thus the second part of *imbri-duš (cf. O. Ind. jala-da-, lit. 'moisture-giving,' § 67) is often called the 'suffix' do-; and the form taken by the final vowel of the stem before a suffix is often determined by the same laws as before the second element of a Compound (cf. *fābā-ginnus with fābā-ceus, fābā-tus, fābā-rīus, fābā-līs; *imbri-duš with *imbri-ceus). For these laws with suffixes, laws often disturbed by the influence of analogy, e.g. *ānīlis (from *ānu-) for *anūlis by analogy of sēnūlis (from *senī-), see the preceding section.

Composition does not play so great a part in Latin as in Greek (cf. Liv. xxvii. ii. 4 quos 'androgynos' vulgus, ut pleraque, faciliore ad duplicanda verba Graeco sermone, appellat). The early dramatists and other imitators of Greek poetry incurred
the censure of Quintilian for their attempts to reproduce Greek compounds like κυπταφχην in Latin (Quint. i. 5. 76 sed res tota magis Graecos decet, nobis minus succedit: nec id fieri natura puto, sed alienis favemus, idoeque cum κυπταφχεβα mirati simus, ‘incurvicervicum’ vix a risu defendimus, alluding to Pacuvius’ line:

Nérei repándirostrum incurvicervicúm pecus);

and Virgil uses a periphrasis like (Averna) sonantia silvis (A. iii. 442) where an earlier poet might have employed a compound like silvisōnus (cf. silvijrāgus, used by Lucretius, who however complains that the ‘patrii sermonis egestas’ prevented him from reproducing the Greek compound όμοιωμεία, i. 832). The compound Proper Names of other I.-Eur. languages are, as we have seen (§ 4), replaced in Latin (and Umbro-Oscan) by Adjective IO-stems, such as Lūcius [on the compound Opiter, see ch. iii. § 16 (9)]. The Latin language does not therefore give the same occasion as the Greek for a study of the I.-Eur. types of Compounds, or the various irregularities which disturbed the normal course of Composition; and a brief account of these types and irregularities will suffice.

I.-Eur. Compounds, Nouns and Adjectives, are sometimes classified according to the scheme of the Sanscrit grammarians [Dvandva or Collectives, Bahuvrihi or Possessives, Tatpurusha or Determinatives (including Karmadhārāya formed of Adj. and Noun, and Dvigū formed of Numeral and Noun), Ayayībhāva or Adverbial Compounds], sometimes by the more rational criterion of the change or retention of the meaning of the second element (thus the Possessive longi-mānus, ‘possessing long hands,’ ‘long-handed,’ changes its second element from a Noun to an Adjective, while the Determinative pereūnī-servus, ‘a constant slave,’ retains the Noun-meaning of servus), these two main classes being subdivided according to the nature of the first element [a Noun or Adj. stem as in longi-manus, a Particle as in in-certus, vē-sānus, a Preposition as in con-servus, a Noun or Adj. Case as in vin-dex, législator, jurīdictio (contrast jūri-dicus), the last being, as we have seen, rather Word-groups than Compounds; cf. parcē-prōnus Plaut., lēnū-vōlus, paen-insula (contrast
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Um-densis, solU-citu$), &c. Of Possessive Compounds (Sanser. Bahuvihi) examples are angui-pes, 'possessing a foot which is a snake,' 'snake-footed'; pūdōrī-cōlor, 'possessing the colour of shame,' 'shame-coloured,' sicc-ōcīlus, 'possessing dry eyes,' 'dry-eyed.' Of Determinatives with first element consisting of (1) a governed Noun (Sanser. Tatpurusha): vīlī-sātōr, 'planter of the vine;' artī-fer, āqui-lex; (2) Adjective qualifying a Noun (Sanser. Karmadhāraya): O. Lat. allō-gātōrns, the white cap of the Flamen Dialis, svāvī-sāviātio Plaut., vīvē-rādix Cato, laūt-

cūnus (the Adj. contrary to rule follows the Noun in Pliny's equifer, a wild horse; cf. ovifer, a wild sheep); (3) Numeral, tri-

nummus. (For other examples of Numeral Compounds, see ch. vi. sect. iii.) Coordinate Compounds (Sanser. Dvandva, e.g. agni-
dhumau, 'fire and smoke') are not found in Latin, except in Derivatives, e.g. su-ōvī-taurūlīa (but not *su-ovi-taurūrs), a sacri-
fice of a swine, a sheep, and a bull, stru-fer(c)tarīi, those who offered 'struem et fertum.' Scaliger's rule that a Noun is never compounded with a Verb was a law of I.-Eur. Noun-

compounds, and is not broken in good Latin, though Tertullian coins vincī-pes by false analogy of nudi-pes, whose first element he conceives as a verb, 'qui pedes nudat' (de Pall. 5 quem enim non expedit in algore et ardore rigere nudi pedem?), and Verti-cordm was a name under which Venus was worshipped. As we have seen in the chapter on the Latin Accent (ch. iii.), the line is often hard to draw between a Word-group (united under a single accent) and a Compound, e.g. aṣṭatim (from ad fatim), denuo (from de novo), Juppiter (from *Jū- pater, Voc., ch. vi. § 32). From the group per noctem has been formed the Compound Adj. pernox, much as mērī-die [a single word like O. Lat. diequinte or diequinti, ch. iii. § 129 (9)], which is only found in this form in the earlier writers, gave rise to the Compound Noun merūdies; from Sacra Via we have the derivat-

ive Sacravienses, from quarta dēcīma (sc. legio) the derivative quartadecimānī (cf our 'get-at-able,' &c. formed from the

1 These Possessives were originally retained in the Fem. of Compounds used in Apposition, e.g. angui-pes, 'Snake-foot.' Hence in Greek -ος is like ἤόδο-δάκτυλος ('Hät), 'Rose-finger.'
phrase ‘to get at’). *Holusatrum* differs from a word-group by the fact that the first element remains undeclined in *holusatris* Gen., &c. (§ 85); *vin-dex*, by the fact that -*dex* (-*dix*) is not used as a separate word, though the first element shows the Noun in its proper Case (for a similar explanation of *laudan-dus*, &c., see ch. viii. § 95). Similarly the Case instead of the Stem appears in the first element of *centum-pēda* (cf. Gk. ἐκάτωμ-πέδος), beside *centi-pēda* (but see ch. vi. § 76), while the reverse is seen in the forms *multi-mōdis* (for *multis modis*), *omni-mōdis* (for *omnibus modis*), which are used by Plautus. Plautus is especially fond of whimsical compounds coined on the Greek type, and often half-Greek, half-Latin, e.g. *Pers. 702–5*:

Unniloquidorus Uīrginesuendónides
Nugiepiloquides Ārgentumextenbrónides
Tegigniloquides Nūmmosexlabelpónides
Quodsēmēlarrippides Nūmquameripides: ém tibi.

*Cāraedium* may stand for *cav(um) aedīnum*, *domnaedium* Accus. for *dōmīn(um) aedīnum*, as *ānīmaadverto* for *anim(um) adverto* (ch. iii. § 52) (*ānīmaēquitās* has similarly been referred to *anim(i) aequitās*); Lucr. uses *ordia prima* for *primordia*; and *summodere*, *magnōpere*, &c. represent *summo opere*, *magnō opere*, and the like. Greek compounds like *ἀριστο-χεῖρ* (with a Superlative as first element), *αὐτό-χεῖρ* (with a Pronoun) are alien to the spirit of the Latin language.

These Noun and Adjective Compounds sometimes retain the stem of their second element unchanged, e.g. *sicc-ōculōs*, sometimes add a suffix (on *ōpīficīus*, &c. beside *ōpīfex*, &c., see § 77). Compound O-stem Adjectives, as we have seen (§ 34), tended to become I-stems, e.g. O. Lat. *inerminus*, class. *inermis*; and Compound Nouns (and Adjectives) affected the IO-suffix, e.g. *lāti-clāvium* beside *lāticlāvus* (so the Vulgar Compound formed from the Word-group *terrae mōtus* assumed the form *terrimōtium*, Prob. App. 198. 32 K.). Often the selection of a suffix for a Compound is determined by the usage in Derivatives from the simple word, e.g. *transmārinus* from *trans mare*, like *marinus* from *mare*, *dūbingienōsus* from *dubius* and *ingenium*, like *ingeniosus* from *ingenium*, *simplūdiārius* (cf. *ludiarius*).

Compound Verbs have normally as their first element a Prepo-
sition (see ch. ix.). Whether the Negative Particle in might be used, e.g. *ig-nosco, 'not to notice,' to overlook or pardon, is doubtful (see ch. x, § 18; cf. *ne-scio, *ne-gueo, &c.). But Compounds like *aedificare from aedes and facio are really Derivatives from Compound Adjectives or Nouns, *aedificus or *aedifex; so that Scaliger’s law (see above) is not violated (cf. Gk. *ai·ko·do·pē·o·w, &c. from *oi·ko·dō·mō·wos); so navegare from *navegus, ἄπιτιλαri from *opitulus (like philosophari from philosophus). (On these Deriv. Verbs, see ch. viii. §§ 21, 33.) Bēnē/focio, μαλά/ficio, &c. are really word-groups, and so are caele/facio, areficio, &c. (cf. facit ārē Lucr.). Crēðo comes from an L.-Eur. word-group (O. Ind. śrād dadāhāmi, ‘I set the heart to,’ see ch. viii. § 27). Compound Adverbs like dērē/pentē, dēsī/bitō are discussed in ch. ix., and also Compound Prepositions like Vulg. Lat. ābante (Fr. avant). (For a fuller treatment of Latin Compounds than can be permitted within the limits of this book, see Skutsch, Nom. Lat. Comp.).

§ 81. Reduplicated Nouns and Adjectives in Latin. Lat. gur-g·es, whirlpool, gur·gi·lo·io, throat (O. Ind. gār-gar·a-, ‘whirlpool,’ Gk. γαρ·γαρ·εῦρ, uvula, γέ·ρε·πο·σ, throat, O. H. G. quer·ch·a·la and quer·ch·a, Germ. Gurgel); bal·b·us (O. Ind. bal·bal·ā·karōmi, ‘I stammer,’ Gk. βάρ·βαρ·ο·σ); quer·quē·r·us, cold, shivering (frigidus cum tremore, Paul. Fest. 343. 5 Th., who quotes from Lucilius febris querquera, the ague) (cf. Hom. Gk. καρκάπω), has reduplicated form like other words for trembling, shivering, such as Germ. zittere from *ti·trō·mi; can·er (cf. O. Ind. kar·ka·t·a, Gk. καρ·κιν·ο·σ); murr·mur (O. Ind. mar·mar·a-, Gk. μορ·μιρ·o·σ, Lith. mūr·m·i·u·v) tu·tu, like mamma, children’s words mentioned in Martial’s witty epitaph (i. 100):

‘mamma·s’ atque ‘tata·s’ habet Afra; sed ipsa tatarum
dici et mammam maxima mamma potest,

and found on children’s epitaphs, e.g. C. I. L. vi. 25868 destituiti. Vitilla mea, miseram mammam tuam (cf. ch. ii. p. 118 n.), qua·squīla· Sic, shreds of leather, &c. (Gk. κα·σκυλ·μάτα) (Cæc. Com. 251 R. quisquisiá usolantis, uenti spolia); fib·er (the L.-Eur. name was *bhe·bhr·u·w, O. Ind. ba·bhr·u·w, ‘brown,’ O. H. G. bi·bar, ‘a beaver,’ Lith. bē·br·u·w, O. Sl. be·br·u·u. Reduplication is common in onomatopoetic words, e.g. cī·cī·lus (cf. Gr. κόκκυς, Lith. ku·kū·ti, ‘to ery cuckoo,’ &c.), īp·īp·a (cf. Gk. īπ·σφ), īl·īl·a (cf. O. Ind. ul·ul·i·w, Gk. δι·αλ·i·γ), tur·tur. The Latin tendency is to assimilate the first to the subsequent syllable, e.g. cin·cin·nus (Gk. κί·κυν·νος) (cf. mō·mord·i for earlier mē·mord·i, &c. see ch. iv. § 163). Often a reduplicated Noun is a derivative from a reduplicated Verb-form, e.g. cī·cīn·dē·la from *cē·cīn·dē·o, a reduplicated form of candae, like Gk. δι·δάγγ·ή from δι·δᾶγγα, κε·κράγ·μός from κί·κράγ·γ. (On these reduplicated Verb-forms, see ch. viii. § 9.)

§ 82. Ā-stems show sometimes ā, but usually ē in L.-Eur. compounds,
(e. g. Gk. νικη-φόρος and Νική-μαχος, O. Ind. urvarā-jit- and ukhā-chid-, Lith. sziksznō-sparnis and galvā-raistslis, Gaul. Toutō-bōdiāci, Goth. airjā-kunds), so that Lat. i of tibi-chen, ali-ger, &c. must have been originally o. The long a is probably seen in fābā-ginuś, olean-ginuś, as before suffixes like Ἐκαμ-νος, ἀλα-ρίς. Stems in -ia seem to show a similar divergence of forms, tibi-chen with i for iō (§ 4), and before a suffix viā-icus.

§ 83. O-stems appear with -ō in Gk. ἴππο-δαμος, Gaul. Dēvo-gnāta, Epoređia, Teut. Austro-valdus, &c., so that Lat. i of belli-ger, magnī-icus, earlier ü before a labial, e. g. magnū-icus, is probably a weakening in the unaccented syllable of original ō. O. Lat. spellings (mostly before a labial), likeUna-mammia (Plaut. Curc. 445; cf. Oinu-mama, an Amazon, on an old Prænestine cista, C. I. L. i. 1501), sescento-plāgus (Plaut. Capt. 726), albo-gālērus (Paul. Fest. 8. 6 Th.), Ἀλένο-barbus may thus be genuine relics of the oldest spelling, though late compounds like mālō-grānūtum must be imitations of the Greek. Before a vowel this -ō is elided in Latin (as in Greek, &c., e. g. ἰμπ-αγρός), e. g. magnū-ānīnum, acqua-ānīmitus, forms like multi-angūlus being late. Lat. -IO-stems show -iē- for -ii- by Dissimilation (ch. iv. § 13) before a suffix in sicīt-us, anxiatōs, &c., but -i- in Lucilius, &c. (cf. hosti-is from the I-stem hosti-). Like sescento-plāgus, &c. is O. Lat. sīciō-fraudus or sociu-fraudus in Plaut. Pseud. 362. (The Palatine MSS. have o, the Ambrosian Palimpsest u.) Latin ro-stems show -ér- by rule [ch. iii. § 15 (8)], e. g. sacer-dōs, but sometimes -ri-, e. g. sacri-fex, after the law by which -ri- became -ér- had been forgotten.

§ 84. I-stems had i in I-Eur. compounds (e. g. O. Ind. tri-pād-, Gk. τρίπος, Gaul. tri-garanus, O. Engl. þri-fēte, Lith. tri-kōjis, O. Sl. tri-zab), and so Lat. tri-ennium, tri-ēnīnum, though by rule -ri- [at least unaccented -ri-, ch. iii. § 15 (8)], became -ēr- in Latin, e. g. terr-ēnīnum, and before a labial i was by the older spelling properly u, e. g. ácrīfōlius Cato (R. R. xxxii. 1), as before r it was ē, e. g. legērīpa Plaut. Before a vowel this i (now become y) might be dropped, e. g. fun-ambulus (coined by Messalla to express Gk. σκύουβατης, Porph. ad Hor. S. i. 10. 28), from *funy-ambulus, sēm-ermus for *semyermis.

§ 85. U-stems had originally ü (e. g. O. Ind. svādu-rāṭi-, Gk. ἱψο-(F)επός, Gaul. Catu-rīges; O. H. G. Hadu-mar, Lith. virsū-kalnis), so that the older spelling mānū-festus preserves the earliest form (class. mānū-festus). From diphthongal U-stems we have nau-frūgus (see ch. iv. § 49), bā-caedu beside bōv-cādium, bu-star and bo-star, an ox-stall (ch. iv. § 42), jū-glana (Gk. Δώσ Βάλανος) (Macr. iii. 18. 3). Dies-pitris (C. L. L. xi. 3259), Dies-pitri Arnob. ii. 70 (cf. Dies-pitrum, Macrobr. i. 15. 14 'ut diei patrem') may be a case of the declension only of the second part of a word-group, like holus-atri for holēris atri (§ 80), or pronouns like alter-uter, alter-utrius Gen. (ch. vii. § 29). On Juppiter, see ch. vi. § 32.

§ 86. N-stems show, as we have seen (§ 54), their close connexion with O-stems, by substituting -ō for -n whether in the first half of a compound, e. g. Gk. ἄξυ-βέτορ, stithy, from ἄκυμορ, Lat. hōnī-tāda, from homo (cf. Goth. guma-kunds, 'of male sex'), or in the second, e. g. Gk. ῥαμιμος beside ῥαμιμων. We find also ñ in Gk. ἰνομ-κλωτος, so that the en of Lat. nomen-clātor, &c. was originally ñ; also the 'Composition vowel' -ō-added to the stem, e. g. Gk. φεν-ο-βλαβή, Lat. imāgin-ī-fer.
§ 87. R-stems, like N-stems, take the weak grade of the stem suffix before a consonant, r (e.g. O. Ind. pitr-srāvāra-, Gk. τετρά-γρος, Goth. brōbru-lūbo), before a vowel, r (e.g. O. Ind. pitr-arthaṃ, Gk. πατρ-ονύμος) and often add the ‘Composition vowel’ ò (e.g. Gk. πατρο-φάρος). Since Latin -ir- (for L-Eur. -ō-) would generally become in the unaccented syllable -ir-, it is not easy to decide on the origin of -ēr- in each case. For patri-ēda, patri-ēs, &c. we should expect *paterēda, *paterēs; cf. acertas on the Aes Italicense. (C.I.L. ii. 6278, l. 36, of 175-180 A.D.)

§ 88. Dental and Guttural Stems. The frequent interchange of consonantal with I-stems in Latin (§ 34), suggests that the -i of dent-i-frangōdulus, piēl-i-sēquus, vēg-i-fūgium, has been original i. It may also have been the o, which is often used as ‘Composition vowel,’ with these stems, in other languages [e.g. Gk. δρακοντ-ὁ-μαλλος, νυφ-ὁ-βολος, Gaul. Carant-o-magus, Cinget-o-rix (lit. ‘king of warriors’); cf. O. Ir. cine, ’a warrior,’ from cingim, ’I march’]. Before r we should have ë, e.g. tēgōripa (Plaut.), and before a labial û (û) in the older spelling (see ch. iii. § 18).

§ 89. S-stems. The S-stems, like other consonantal-stems in Latin, often show ë, e.g. mār-i-cādis, īār-i-ālicos, whether the i of I-stems or the ‘Composition vowel’ ò it is not easy to decide. But we find also the normal stem, e.g. mās-cīpita (cf. Gk. μισ-φώς). The ES-stems took -ēs in L-Eur., compounds [e.g. Gk. σακκοσ-φώς (the poetical form), Goth. sigis-laum], and so before suffixes in Latin tempes-ficus, hōnes-tus, &c., though -ēs-, by Analogy of the Nom. Sing., is found in ēnus-tus, &c. In Latin compounds the stem suffix is either displaced by i [the ô of Gk. ἵππο-πώς (the prose form), ἀληθ-ματιν, &c. O. Sl. ėtodore-točinû], e.g. foeld-frīgus, or augmented by it, e.g. foeldēr-i-frīgus, hōnūr-i-ficus (cf. O. Sl. ětoder-o-točinû, Goth. aiz-a-smīja).

§ 90. Stem-suffixes and Composition in Romance. The Latin suffixes have for the most part remained productive in Romance (e.g. Ital. cannonata with the TO-suffix), though their meaning has sometimes undergone a change. Thus -ino-, which has ousted -e(y)o-, the suffix denoting material (§ 4), e.g. Fr. ferrin, ivoirin, has acquired in Italian and Portuguese a Diminutive sense, e.g. Ital. tavolino, Port. filinho; -iaco- has taken the sense of large size or inferior quality, e.g. Ital. corpaccio, acquaccia. And new suffixes have been gained from other languages, such as -issa (from the Greek), a fem. suffix used especially in titles, e.g. Ital. duchessa, Fr. duchesse; -itto- with Diminutive sense, e.g. Ital. biglietto, Fr. amourette; -ià (from the Greek), denoting Abstracts, e.g. Ital. villania, Span. villanía, cortesia, and so on. (For a full account of the Romance suffixes, see Meyer-Lübke, Rom. Gram. ii. pp.448 sqq.) Of Composition these varieties are noteworthy: Word-groups like Fr. pourboire; Bahuvrihi Compounds like Fr. rouge-gorge; Dvandva Compounds like Ital. acqui-vento, ‘wind and rain’; Verb with Noun (violating Scaliger’s rule), e.g. Fr. garde-robe, Ital. guarda-boschi, becca-fico, lit. ‘peck-fig,’ with the Verb apparently in the 2 Sg. Imperat. (see Meyer-Lübke, ib. pp.577 sqq.).
CHAPTER VI.

DECLENSION OF NOUNS AND ADJECTIVES.

COMPARISON OF ADJECTIVES. NUMERALS.

§ 1. I. DECLENSION OF NOUNS AND ADJECTIVES.
The I.-Eur. Noun had three Genders, Masc., Fem., and Neut., three Numbers, Sing., Dual, and Plur., and at least eight Cases, Nom., Gen., Dat., Acc., Voc. (if the Voc. may be called a Case), Abl., Instrumental, and Locative (the Dat., Abl., Instr., Loc. are not always easy to discriminate in the Plural). The three Genders are retained in Latin, but of the Numbers the Dual has disappeared, though traces of it remain in the Numeral forms duō (§ 59), octō (lit. 'two sets of four' ?), and in the Pronoun form ambō (ch. vii. § 29) 1. (On vi-gintī, see § 74.) Of the Cases the Voc. hardly survives except in O-stems (§ 31), and the Instr. has left only doubtful traces of itself in some Adverb forms (§ 36); the Locative became by the operation of the phonetic laws of the language indistinguishable in Ā-stems from the Gen. Sg., while in O-stems it seems to have ousted the Genitive (§ 17), and in Cons.-stems the Ablative (§ 33).

The I.-Eur. Cases were indicated sometimes by the addition of suffixes, e.g. -s for Nom. Sg. Masc., -m for Acc. Sg., sometimes by modification of the stem, e.g. *pātēr Nom. Sg. of stem *pātēr-, 'a father,' sometimes by both, e.g. *patr-ōs, *patr-ōm Gen. Sg., Pl. of the same stem. This modification (called by the Germans

---

1 With the gradual loss of these peculiar suffixes (in Plautus ambōs has begun to oust ambō Acc., and in Late Latin ambis ousts ambōbus) we may compare our plural 'shoes,' with disuse of the older suffix of 'shoon,' a suffix still retained in 'oxen,' &c. The Dual is rapidly disappearing at the present time in the Prussian dialect of Lithuanian, though in the other dialects it is better preserved.
Declension of Nouns, Etc.

Abstufung of the stem is due to the different accentuation of the different cases; and the I.-Eur. cases have been divided into (1) 'Strong' Cases, viz. the Nom., Voc. M. and F. of all Numbers, and the Acc. M. and F. of the Sing. and Dual, along with the Loc. Sing.; (2) 'Weak' Cases, where the accentuation of the suffix weakened the stem, e.g. *patr-ós (Gk. πατρός). This alternation of unweakened and weakened stem is a feature of the Sanscrit declension, but has been effaced in most other languages by the natural tendency to make one Case like another in everything but the suffix (cf. Hom. Gk. πατέρας on the analogy of πατέρας), Lat. patr-em on the analogy of patr-īs), and often the only trace left of it is the existence of varieties of the same stem; e.g. the varieties pōlen- (Lat. pōlen-ta) and poll- for *poln- (Lat. poll-em) may be due to a former declension with the stem polen- in the strong, and the stem poln- in the weak cases. [The variations homēn-, e.g. hōminis, homōn-, e.g. O. Lat. hēmōnem (Paul. Fest. 71. 18 Th.), and homō(n) have been similarly explained.] The appropriation of different stems to different cases leads to what is called Heteroclite declension; thus itēr- is the stem appropriated to the Nom. Sing., ītinēr- the stem appropriated to the other cases in Latin [so sēnēc- (ch. v. § 69) Nom. Sg., but sēni(i)- in the other cases, sīpelleg-, for super-leg-, a suffixless stem (ch. v. § 77) in the Nom. Sg., supellectili- for super-lectili- (an Adjectival LI-stem, ch. v. § 40) in the oblique cases]. Lat. fēmūr Nom., fēminis Gen., &c. retain a very ancient type of heteroclite declension of Neuter Nouns, in which the consonant R was the mark of the Nom., Acc., the consonant N of the Gen., Dat., &c. (see ch. v. § 56). In discussing the declension of the Latin Noun it will be better to put aside the conventional division made by the native grammarians, and to class nouns rather according to the final letter of their stems as Ā-stems, Ō-stems, &c. The heterogeneous composition of the fifth declension (rēs stem rēt-, fūdēs stem fidō-, tristitiēs stem tristitiā- (?)) has been already pointed out (ch. v. § 51); also the close connexion of Consonant and I-stems (ch. v. § 34; cf. below, § 46, on cīvitātium, fērentium, audācium, &c.), and the absorption of the U- into the O-declension (ch. v. § 49). O-stems had, as we saw (ch. v. § 34), a tendency, when used as Adjectives, to become I-stems, e.g. inermis, O. Lat. inermus,
from the stem *armo*; and in Vulg. Lat. we find a similar confusion of I-stem Adjs. with O-stems, e.g. *tristis* non *tristus,* Prob. App. 198. 3K. (cf. *trista* N., Rossi, i. 842, of 472 A.D., Ital. *tristo*).

In the Romance languages the Latin Declensions have been ‘levelled’ to a much greater extent than the Latin Conjugations, owing to the fact that the distinction of the Cases came to be expressed rather by Prepositions than by Case-suffixes. The sign of the Genitive was the Preposition *de,* of the Dative *ad,* and so on; and these Prepositions ceased to retain their classical construction [as early as the first cent. A.D. we have on a Pompeian graffito (C. I. L. iv. 275) Saturninus cum discentes]. Thus the Cases have been reduced in most languages to one, though O. Fr. and O. Prov. retain the distinction of the Nom. and Acc. (e.g. O. Fr. chars Nom., char Acc. of Lat. *cārus*; suer Nom., serour Acc. of Lat. *sōrīr*), and in Roumanian we see the Dat. Fem. in roase Dat. (Lat. *rōnae*) beside roasă Nom. (Lat. *rōsa*), &c. More important was the distinction of Singular and Plural; and so the two Numbers are always distinguished, except (in pronunciation) in French, though a Latin Plural has often become a Romance Singular, e.g. *ligna,* Ital. *legna,* *biblia,* Ital. *bibbia.* The fourth Declension has been merged in the second, a process which shows itself very strongly even in the conversational Latin of Plautus (ch. v § 49), the fifth in the third or first; and forms like Span. polvo (Vulg. Lat. *pulventus* for *pulvis*), Ital. *serpe* (Vulg. Lat. *serpī*– for *serpens*) illustrate how the ‘levelling’ influence of Analogy gradually removed the distinctions of declension. (For particulars of the Romance declension, see Meyer-Lübke, *Gram. Rom. Sprach.* ii. pp. 1 sqq.).

As regards Gender, the laws according to which one Noun was Masculine, another Feminine, and a third Neuter in I.-Eur. have not yet been determined. The Neuter Gender seems to have been restricted to things without life. Thus while names of trees were masc. (in O. Ind., e.g. bhūrjas, ‘a birch’) or fem. (in Greek and Latin, e.g. *φυγός,* *fūgus,* ‘a beech ’), names of fruits were Neuter (e.g. O. Ind. āmrām, ‘mango-fruit,’ beside āmrās, ‘mango-tree,’ Lat. *mārum* beside *mālus*) (see Delbrück in Brugmann’s *Grundriss,* iii. ch. i.); the difference between the gender of names of rivers in O. Ind. (fem.) and in Gk. and Lat. (masc.)
may be due to the different gender of the word for 'river' in these languages (O. Ind. nadi F., Gk. ποταμός M.), just as the names of the months, winds, &c. in Latin are really Adjectives agreeing with mensis, ventus (e.g. Jānnārius, Februārius, Martiōns; Auster, Caurus, Favōnius). But the proneness of nouns to take a new gender by analogy of a noun which had a similar termination, or a kindred meaning, or with which they were often joined in speech¹, makes it impossible to trace the original gender of each and every noun. The feminine gender seems to have been associated with Abstract Nouns, e.g. Lat. optio, 'choice.' But if an Abstract Noun came to be used as a Concrete, it might change its gender; and so optio in the sense of 'a centurion's assistant' was masculine. Similarly agricōla, lit. 'field-tillage,' became masc. in the sense of 'a field-tiller'; and this is probably the reason why Ā-stems, which were associated with the feminine gender in I.-Eur., are often masc. in the various I.-Eur. languages (ch. v. § 2). O-stems were similarly associated with the masculine (with Nom. Sg. in -ōs) and the neuter gender (Nom., Acc. Sg. in -ōm); but we have feminine O-stems in the various languages, e.g. Gk. ὄδος, κέλευθος, λίθος, ψῆφος, and names of trees like φῆγος, &c. In Latin (as we have seen, ch. iv. § 49) we seem to detect a tendency of these feminine O-stems to pass into the fourth declension. Thus fūgnus is treated like a U-stem (fourth Declension) in the Culex, I. 139: umbrosaeque patent fagus (cf. Varro ap. Charis. p. 130. 5 K.); and the declension of dōmus (an O-stem in the earlier literature, ch. v. § 49; cf. Gk. δῶμος²), cōlus (Gk. πόλος), nārus (Gk. νῦς for νυσός) has been so explained.

The confusion of masculine and neuter O-stems may be illustrated by the words collum, which in Plautus is cōllus (I.-Eur. kolso-, Germ. Hals M.), and uteurus, which in Plautus is uterum (cf. O. Ind. udáram). (Other exx. in Neue, i², p. 529.) (On lōcus, loca Plur., &c., see § 45.) In Late and Vulgar Latin the masculine seems to oust the neuter in these stems, as we see from

¹ Thus the fem. gender of dius has been ascribed to the analogy of nov.
² O. Slav. domů is a U-stem, but in Slavonic the O- and U-declensions have been mixed up, as in Latin.
the precepts of the grammarians [e.g. Caper (first cent.) censures pratus 105. 6 K., solius 94. 19 K., and expresses himself forcibly about cereber 103. 6 K.: hoc cerebrum est nam ‘cereber’ qui dicunt sine cerebro vivunt], and from the ‘sermo plebeius’ of Petronius (e.g. fatus, 42, p. 28. 13 B.). On plebeian epitaphs we find collegius (e.g. C. I. L. xi. 4579. 4749), monimentus (e.g. ib. vi. 19319), and especially fatus in the stock-epitaph of the lower classes (like our ‘Affliction sore long time he bore’):

noli dolere mater eventum meum,
properavit aetas: hoc voluit fatus mihi.

(On the disuse of the Neuter in later Latin, see Appel, De genere neutro intereunte in lingua Latina, Erlangen, 1883).

In the Romance languages the Neuter has disappeared, though it has influenced the formation of the Plural. Thus O. Prov. pratz points to pratus for prátum, but Ital. temporata Plur. (tempo Sg.), braccia Plur. (braccio Sg.), retain the Neut. Plur. formation tempora, bracchia. (On change of gender see Meyer-Lübke, ii. 416.)

The Adjective Declension took advantage of the connexion of O-stems with the masculine and neuter, and of A-stems with the feminine gender, e.g. I.-Eur. *nēwōs M., *nēwā F., *nēwōm N. (Lat. nōvus, -a, -um) (see ch. v. § 2). Consonant-stems formed their feminine with the I-suffix, e.g. I.-Eur. *nēptī F. beside népot- M. (Lat. neptis beside nēpōs.) (On the I-suffix, see ch. v. § 51, and on other feminine formative suffixes, as in Lat. gallīna beside gallus, rēgīna beside rēx, consult the same chapter.) The Greek extension to the Feminine of the masculine suffix -os in Compound Adjectives, which were originally Nouns in Apposition, is not found in Latin, e.g. ῥόδοδάκτυλος ‘Hώ’s, lit. ‘Dawn Rose-finger’ (ch. v. § 80), though we have in O. Lat. lupus femina, agnus femina, &c. (e.g. Ennius, A. 59 M., in the story of the nursing of Romulus and Remus, has:

indotuetur ibi lupus femina).

But a usage peculiar to Latin is the extension to the Neuter of the S-suffix of the Masc. and Fem., not merely in Present Participles like fērens, where fērens Neut. may represent an older *ferent (ch. iv. § 105), and in vētus, which was probably originally
§ 2. Nom. Sing. I. Masc., Fem. Ā-stems took -ā in I.-Eur. (e.g. O. Ind. āśvä, 'a mare,' Gk. χῶπα). By the time of the oldest Latin poetry this ā has in every Nom. of an Ā-stem been shortened to ā, a shortening which may have begun in disyllables with short first syllable, e.g. hera, where the working of the Law of Breves Breviantes would shorten the final syllable, hērā like cāvē, hāvē (ch. iii. § 40); though an early reduction of this -ā, as well as of the -ā of Nom. Pl. Neut. of O-stems (§ 45), on Italian soil is indicated by the fact that in Oscan both have been replaced by an o-sound (in Oscan alph. ú, in Lat. o, in Gk. o), and in Umbrian are written sometimes -a, sometimes -o (in Umbr. alph. -u), e.g. Osc. vίο 'via,' Umbr. mutu and muta 'mulcta' (see ch. ii. § 1). O. Lat. hosticapas (hostium captor, Paul. Fest. 73. 10 Th.), paricidas quoted from the Laws of Numa (Paul. Fest. 278. 10 sibi hominem liberum dolo sciens morti duit, paricidas esto) may be analogous to the Greek usage of

1 Many were originally RO-stems (ch. v. § 40; cf. O. Lat. hidārus). They are often RO-stems in Late and Vulgar Latin, e.g. Vulg. Lat. alēcer, Ital. allegro; cf. Ital. campestro, &c.

2 For the Umbro-Oscan forms of these and the other case-suffixes, see Class. Rev. ii. pp. 129, 202, 273.
adding -s to a fem. Abstract á-stem when used as a masc. Concrete, e.g. *veavlā, a youth, from *veavlā, youth, though the usual practice in Latin is to retain the ordinary Nom. form, e.g. *agri-cōla, a field-tiller, originally 'field-tillage.'

YA-stems, the fem. of consonant-stems, &c. (ch. v. § 51), which in O. Ind. take -ī, e.g. bhūrantī, Pres. Part of bhṛ-, 'to carry,' napā, Fem. of nāpāt-, 'grandson,' in Greek -iā, e.g. φέρουσα for *φερουτιά, show in Latin -ia, e.g. praesentia, possibly also -īs, e.g. *ferentīs which became ferens, neptīs (older Lat. -īs?). Beside -ia (first Decl.) we find -īs (fifth Decl.), e.g. mātēr-īes beside materia. The exact relation between O. Ind. -ī, Gk. -iā, Lat. -ia and -īs has not yet been determined (see ch. v. § 51).

Ó-stems took -os in I.-Eur. (e.g. O. Ind. vṛkas, 'a wolf,' Gk. λύκος, Gaul. tarvos, 'a bull'), and in Latin, e.g. lupus, taurus, older *lus, *tauros (ch. iv. § 19). In RŌ-stems the final -ros, when preceded by a consonant, was changed by a phonetic process common to Latin with other Italic languages to -er, e.g. Lat. āger for *agros (Gk. ἄγρος), Umbr. aeger; even when a short vowel precedes, we find, e.g. Lat. sōcer (in Plautus socerus) for *socīros, *socēros (I.-Eur. *swēkūros), vér for *viros, sātur for *satūros.

YO-stems, whose suffix in I.-Eur. seems to have varied with i (e.g. Goth. hairdeis, 'a herdsman;' Lith. gaidys, 'a cock,' beside svēczias, 'a guest') show in Latin usually -ius, but in familiar language also -is, e.g. Cornēlis and other proper names.

All other stems took -s in I.-Eur. and in Latin, e.g. āvi-s (O. Ind. ávi-s, Gk. ἄβις, Lith. avis), mānūs (O. Ind. svādūs, 'sweet,' Gk. ἱώς, Lith. sūnūs, 'a son'), vīs (Gk. ἴς), sūs (Gk. ἱς), rēs (O. Ind. rās), mileś for *miles (the last syllable is scanned long by Plautus, *mileas, ch. ii. § 133), mūs for *mūs-s, rēx, &c. S-stems have -ēs (e.g. I.-Eur. *dus-menēs, O. Ind. dur-manās, Gk. ὅσ-μενής) or -ōs (e.g. I.-Eur. *vūsōs, Hom. Gk. ἴως; cf. O. Ind. uṣās), and so in Latin, e.g. pūbēs, ἱνός M., later honor, tēnōr M. (beside tenus N.). But N-stems, which in I.-Eur. showed (1) -ōn, -ēn, (2) -ō (cf. e.g. (1) Gk. κυόν, νομίβων, (2) O. Ind. śvā, 'dog,' O. Ir. cē, Lith. szū], show -ō in Latin, e.g. hōmō, rātiō, virgo 'virgo' on the very ancient Dvenos inscr. I.-Eur. R-stems had similarly (1) -ōr, -ēr, (2) -ō, -ē [e.g. (1) Gk. μήτηρ, δώτωρ,
§ 3. Nom. Sing. of Ā-stems in Lat. We have seen in ch. iii. § 43 that all supposed instances of -ā Nom. Sg. in early poetry are illusory [e.g. *aquā, Enn. A. 149 M. is a case of metrical lengthening of a short syllable before the pentameter caesura; *cōpīā, Plaut. Mil. 1226 shows ‘syllaba anceps’ at the end of the hemistich; *fāmilīa, Trin. 251 is a procelematic (*fāmilīa) representing an anapaest, and so on]. The only genuine instances are Greek words with -ā, which are long in later poetry too, e.g. *Nemeā (Stat. Theb. vi. 516). Greek Nominatives in -ās, -ēs were especially in the older literature changed to the ordinary Latin Nom., e.g. *Anchisā (Enn. A. 19 M.), *Aenea (Qunt. i. 5. 61) ne in a quidem atque s litteras exire temere masculina Graecae nomina recto easu patiebantur, ideoque et apud Caelium legimus ‘Pellā cincinnatus’ et apud Messalam ‘bene fecit Euthia,’ et apud Ciceronem ‘Hermagora,’ ne miremur, quod ab antiquorum plerisque ‘Aenea’ ut ‘Anchisa’ sīt dictus, and similarly in classical Latin poētā, nautā, biblīōpōtā, &c. (cf. Atrādā, Propert. ii. 14. 1; Marsyā, Hor. S. i. 6. 120; and for other instances see Neue, Forsch. ii. pp. 31 sqq.) though they usually in the classical literature retain -ās, -ēs, just as Greek Noms. in -ē retain ē, e. g. *Andrōmāchā, or take the Latin suffix, e. g. *ēpīstālā. Hosticapas, quoted by Paul. Fest., is a strange form. Compounds of ophiō usually show -cēps, e. g. *mūnī-cēps, while Plautus has urbi-cēps Voc. (Mil. 1055). Parricidās (i. e. *parricidās, for the double consonant was not written double till Ennius’ time, ch. i. § 8) is indeed in the Republican and Classical period an Ā-stem (e. g. *parricidā Voc., Plaut. Pseud. 362; but adjectively mūri-cidle homō Voc., ‘you coward,’ Epi. 333); however, if these Masc. Ā-stems originally took -ās in Latin, they had conformed to the ordinary usage of Fem. Ā-stems as early as the beginning of the second cent. b. c., for Plautus, Rud. 652, has *vāigūpā (better *legerupā, ch. iii. § 20) Nom. Sing. with its last syllable elided:

legerupā, in pudēns, in purpur, inurucundissimus,

where *legerupā, originally ‘the act of law-breaking,’ a fem. Abstract, then masc. and Concreets, ‘a law-breaker,’ cannot have been written by Plautus legerupas (ch. ii. § 137). The names on Oscan inscriptions (Map)as (Zv. I. I. I. 1)

1 *agoēā in Enn. A. 567 M.: multa foro ponet et agoēōa longa repletur, is not a certain example. The Greek word seems to have been *ōγυνά, and one MS. reads ponens agoēacu.
253 from Messana), Maras (I. F. ii. p. 437 from Puteoli or Cumae), whence the derivative Osc. Maraiio-, Falisc. Mareio-, Lat. Mārius (ch. v. § 4), and Tanas (Zvet. 102 from Samnium) suggest that Noms. in -ās (for -ās would probably be syncopated in Oscan) were used in Oscan like Noms. in -ēs, -ηs in Greek. But they may belong to some un-Italic dialect. Ξενιας is Osc. Santia (Zvet. 228).

§ 4. RO-stems. The substitution of -er for -ros is extended even to Gk. loanwords, e.g. Alexander, though the usage varied, e.g. Euandrus and Euander in Virgil (see Neue, Formenl. i. p. 77). It is not found in Latin words when a long syllable precedes -ros, e.g. seēr-us, sēsur-rus, mētā-rus, nor in these trisyllabic words hūmērus, nūmērus, ʊltērus. Plautus has the trisyllabic stem sōcēro-(I.-Eur. *svēkūro-, O. Ind. śvāśūr-, Gk. ἱκύρω, Lith. szesziūras) with Nom. socerus (Men. 957), and Priscian (i. 231. 13 H.) says that puerus was used by the older writers, though he is perhaps referring to Voc. puerē, probably the invariable form of the Voc. Sg. of puer in Plautus, for puerus is not found in any extant literature. It is not however certain that puerus was originally an O-stem, for the cognate Greek word is πα(μ)/ιβ-, and the old Saturnian poets used puer as fem. as well as masc. (see Charis. 84. 5 K.; Prisc. i. p. 232 H.), e. g. Naevius, Bell. Pun. ii. :

prima incédit Cé reris Proserpina puer,
while the curious compound slave-names Marcipor, Gai por, Quintipor, &c. are I-stems, Plur. Marcipores (e.g. Plin. xxi.ii. 26). Infērus, with ἅλπερος, is used in Livius Andronicus' translation of the Odyssey (at least in the later dactylic version of it):

infērus an superus tibi fert deus funera, Ulixes ?,
but infer and super by Cato (R. R. exil. i. ubi super inferque uelcinus permittet), like cīter (Cato, Ort. fr. ixiii. p. 65 J.). Of compounds ending in Verbal Adjective in -rus we have always mēri-gērōs (e.g. Plaut. Capt. 966), prī-pērōs, (jāni-pērōs is by some explained as jun(on)i-pērōs, 'Juno's pear,' like jā-glans, 'Jove's acorn,' by others is derived from *jūnus, cf. jun-ūs, and pārio), but the normal usage favoured -er, -er, &c. (for details, see Kühner, Lat. Gram. ii. pp. 278 sqq.). All this points to -er having originally been substituted for -ros only when a consonant preceded, e. g. äger for *ag-ros. After the vowel ɪ we find -ros curtailed to -r in viv (but pūrus beside pūrum); after the vowel u, in sātūr (as early as Plautus; see A. L. L. v. 34), although volūrus (class. cultūr, -ūris Gen.) is used by Ennius, A. 138 M. The tendency to curtail -rus to -r increased in Vulgar Latin, as we see from the Probi Appendix 197. 30 K.: barbarus non 'barbar,' although the opposite tendency (due to Greek influence of S. Italy?) is also mentioned (ib. 198. 26) : teter non 'tetur,' aper non 'aprus.' In the Umbro-Oscan dialects -los was similarly changed to -el, e. g. Osc. famel, apparently for fām-lo- 'a dweller' (cf. Osc. faamat, 'he dwells') with the same formation as Lat. figūtus, stem fig-lo- from figo, &c. (ch. iv. § 51). But this was not the Latin usage, e. g. famūlus, bibūlus, masculūs, &c. (cf. ch. iv. § 10), though Ennius borrows from his native Oscan the form famul in his reference to Servius Tullius (A. 336 M.):

mortalem summum fortuna repente
reiddit, ut summō regno famul othimūs esset,
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in which he is imitated by Luceretius, who echoes the rhythm of this passage (iii. 1035):

Scipiadas, belli fulmen, Carthaginis horror,
ossa dedit terrae proinde ac famul infimus esset.

The S. Italian forms figel, mascel found their way into plebeian Latin under the Empire (Prob. App. 197. 28 K. figulus non 'figel,' mascelus non 'mascel'); but the usual Vulgar Latin form masculus is mentioned in the same treatise (197. 20 K. speculum non 'specelum,' mascelus non 'mascels,
vetus non 'veclus,' vernaculus non 'vernacels,' articulus non 'articels,'
baelus non 'baelus,' angulus non 'angulz,' jugulus non 'jugulz.') (On the
curtailment of -ris and -lis, see ch. iv. § 13; the restriction of -er to Masc.,
-ris to Fem. Nom. Sing. is not observed in the older literature; e.g. Ennius
has somnus acris and acer hiems; cf. § 1, p. 371).

§ 5. YO-stems. The -is of the Nom. Sing. of Oscan YO-stems, e.g. Pakis,
Lat. Pætis (-is would be syncopated in Oscan, e.g. cers, Lat. ciris), is perhaps
indicated for Latin by the occasional spellings with -es on Greek inscriptions,
e.g. 'Eles (Lat. Aelius) (I. I. S. 928, Ostia, very late), Perpovcias (Lat. Petronius);
the usual Greek transcription, however, is -es. (Neither -es nor
-es is found till the beginning of the first century A.D.; see Eckinger,
Orthographie p. 56). Alis (if we may infer this quantity from ald, Lucer. i.
263, &c.) may have its final syllable shortened by the Law of Breves Brevi-
antes, like vacé, hacé, &c. (ch. iii. § 42). In the S. C. de Bacchanalibus (C. I. L.
i. 196) the consuls' names are written in what we may suppose to be the
ceremonial form, Marcus, Postiumius, while the secretaries' names have the
is-ending, Claudii, Valerii, Minuchi. Ritschl in a paper entitled 'De declinatore
quadam latina reconditore' (Opusc. iv. 446) has collected a large number of
these proper names with -isor -i Nom. (less certainly -is Gen., -i Dat., -im Acc.)
from Latin inscr. The form alis, quoted from the older writers (e.g. Catull. lxvi.
28) by the grammarians (see the passages mentioned by Ritschl, ib. p. 452),
may have been specially used in collocations like alis alias (so in the Vulgar
receperunt), alis aliBi (e.g. Sallust fragt. ap. Charis. p. 159. 31 K.), where
the two words formed a single word-group like our 'one another.' This byform
of the Nom. (Acc. &c.) must have led to confusion with I-stems, of which we
have perhaps a trace in the gradual ousting of the second Decl. suffix -arius
by the third Decl. -aris (ch. v. § 4), and in the remark of Capir (112. 2 K.) that
vates (an I-stem, like O. Ir. faith for *wáti-, Gaul. édáres Plur.) was in O. Lat.
vatius.

§ 6. I-stems. The -is of the Nom. Sing. of I-stems is syncopated in the
Umbro-Oscan dialects, e.g. Osc. cers (Lat. ciris), like the -ös of the Nom. Sing.
of O-stems, e.g. Umbr. emps (Lat. emptus), Ikurins (Lat. Igurinus), Osc. hürz
(Lat. hortus), Bantius (Lat. Bantuinus), and the -ös of the Nom. Plur. of Consonant-
stems, e.g. Osc. μδίς for *med-dik-ös Nom. Plur. of meddix, censur for *cen-
sor-ös, Lat. consóris. We have seen (ch. iii. § 16) that it is very difficult to
prove a similar treatment of -is in Latin; for Noms. like pars (for partis), Gen.
partis, may have dropped i not by Syncope, but by the Analogy of Cons.-stems
like rēx, Gen. régis, lēc, Gen. légis, &c. Like -rōs, however, -ris was reduced to
-er in Latin as in Umbro-Oscan, e.g. Lat. áer for áris, Umbr. paer for *pac-
ris, 'propitious,' connected with Lat. pāx. Ennius, who coined fāmil after the type of the Oscan famel (§ 4), used dēbil (Voc. Sing. ?) for dēbilis (A. 341 M. debil homo), perhaps after Osc. aidīl (Lat. aidīlis), &c. Nouns with Nom. Sing. in -t (consul, praesul, excul, pugīl, vigil, mūgīl, &c.) are declined as Consosnt-stems in Latin (Gen. Plur. consul-um, pugīl-um, vigil-um, mūgīl-um) (see Neue, Formenl. p. 153), though the line between Nouns in -t and Adjectives in -lis, e.g. dēbīlis, is, as might be expected, often passed over. Thus Juvenal, (x. 317) has mūgīlis (but Mart. Cap. iii. 294 sī 'mūgilis' esset . . . 'mugilium' faceret.) For vigil, pugīl we should expect *vīgulus, *pugulus, like bībīlus, figūlūs (ch.v. § 22), or with adjectival i (ch. v. § 34) *vīgūlis, *pugūlis, although -lis has properly a passive sense, e.g. bībīlus, 'drinkable, easily drunk,' āgūlis, 'easily moved,' hābīlis (whence dēbīlis for *de-hūbilis), 'easily handled' (ch. v. § 41). Beside -is, the usual Nom. Sing. of Masc. and Fem. I-stems in Latin, we find occasionally -ts, e.g. čānēs F., the O. Lat. form which had been replaced by canēs by the time of Varro (L. L. viii. 32). The -ts of ambūgēs, &c., we have seen to be really the -es of the Nom. Plur. of I-stems, viz. -ēyes (e.g. Lat. trēs for *tréyēs, O. Ind. trāyas, Cret. Gk. τρίες for *τρείες, O. Sl. trīje, &c.) (§ 40); it must not be confounded with an early spelling like aīdīles for aedīlies on a Scipio epigraph (C. I. L. i. 31, but aēdīlis on another Scipio epigraph, i. 32), where the e (pronounced ē) is merely an expression of the i-sound in an unaccented syllable, like the third e of Tempeslabebus for Tempestātibus (C. I. L. i. 32) (see ch. iii. § 22). This use of -ēs in the Nom. Sing. of I-stems led to the diversion of other stems, which took -ēs in the Nom. Sing., into the I-declension. Thus plebeīs, if an ÉS-stem by origin like Gk. πελεβής (beside πλήφος) (ch. v. § 74), should have made its Gen. Sing. *plebēris, but was led by the analogy of canēs, &c. into taking a Gen. pleb-ēs, as on the other hand the analogy of stems like rēs, Gen. rēt, rē supplied the Gen. plebēi, plebēi; and the tendency of Vulgar Latin to replace every Nom. Sing. -ēs by the more familiar -is was perhaps the cause of the forms cauēs, plebēs, vātis, tabés, nubēs, subēs, vulpēs, palumbēs, laūs, vēprīs, famēs, cladēs, proēs, censured in Prob. App. pp. 198-9 K. For the late byform motēs (an ES-stem, cf. mōēs-tus), see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s.v., and for other examples, Ritschl, Opp. ii. 654. Beside plebēs, nubēs, cauēs, saepe, we have plebēs, nubēs (used by Liv. Andronicus, according to Servius ad A. x. 636, and frequent in the Itala), oēs, saepe; also trābes for older trābes (Varro, L. L. vii. 33 sic dictam a quibusdam unam 'canēs,' unam 'trābes' . . . cujus verbi singularis casus rectus corripit ac facit trābes.) (On these Noms. in -ēs, see ch. v. § 51.) O. Lat. sortis (class. Lat. sors) and the like are discussed in ch. iii. § 16; messēs of Plaut. Rud. 763 (AP) is changed by editors to messēs.

§ 7. S-stems. Masc. and Fem. ES-stems, connected with Neuter ES-stems (Nom. -ēs, ch. v. § 71), took -ēs M. (class. -or), -ēs F. in Latin, e.g. hōnōs, class. honor (cf. honōs-tus), plebēs (cf. Gk. πλήφος). As Adjectives (cf. Gk. πελεβής beside πλήφος, ψευδής beside ψευδός) they show -er in pūber (also pubēs, -ēris Gen., impērēs, -ēris Gen.), ērē-gēneri; -er in con-color, bi-corpor (ch. v. § 73). The -os of honōs, lābōs, cōdōs, vīpos, &c. was not quite ousted by -or (taken from the oblique cases, honōris, honōrem, &c., where s came between two vowels, ch. iv. § 148) till the Augustan period (for details, see Neue, Formenl. p. 167). Sallust, according to Servius ad A. i. 253, almost always used the form labōs; and -os was persistently retained in monosyllables, e.g. fōs, rōs.

§ 8. N-stems. We find -en in pecten M. (Gk. κτεῖς M. for *πατεῖς, Gen.
§ 9. Diphthong Stems. I.-Eur. *nāu-s (O. Ind. nāū-s, Gk. ναῦς) is Latin nāvis; I.-Eur. *gāūs (O. Ind. gāū-s, Gk. βάος) is Lat. bōs, but the b- points to the form being dialectal; the stem rēy- (O. Ind. rās Nom., rāy-ās Gen.) probably formed its I.-Eur. Nom. Sing. as *rē-s, and so in Lat., rēs. I.-Eur. *d(i)yēu-s, ‘the sky, day’ (O. Ind. d(i)yāūs, Gk. Ζεύς) has in Latin in the sense of ‘day’ the Nom. dīē-s, while for the name of the sky-god a compound is used, Juppiter (the correct spelling, ch. ii. § 130. p. 116) for *Jeu-pater, probably in the Voc. case, unless Jeu- be the stem (ch. v. § 85; cf. Jani-patri, C. I. L. xi. 5374). The grammarians point out the incongruity of a declension like Juppiter Nom., Jovis Gen. (*as absurd as Phoebus Nom., Apollinis Gen.) Mar. Sacerd. 473. 1 K.), and tell us that in the old liturgical books the word was declined Juppiter Nom., Juppitis Gen., &c. (Pompeius 172. 25; 187. 9 K.), or Jovis Nom., Jovis Gen., Prisc. i. 229. 10 H.). We have tovos Nom. on an old Praenestine cista (C. I. L. xiv. 4105), also [Dios]pater (Bull. 1887, p. 232), Diespiter (C. I. L. i. 1500); and in Plautus, &c. Diespiter is not unknown (see Georges, Lex. Worff. s.v. Juppiter). Dies is like the Aecus. diem. For the Nom. we should expect *dieus (Gk. Ζεύς), with eti from et, which would become in Latin diēs (cf. nā-dius-tertius?).

§ 10. Nom., Acc. Sing. II. Neut. Neuter O-stems in I.-Eur. have their Nom. Sing. in -ōm, the suffix of the Acc. Sg. Masc.; all others use the bare stem, ES-stem Nouns taking however -ōs, N-stems -ṇ, NT-stems -nant, &c. So in Latin, e.g. jūgum (older jūgōm). (I.-Eur. *yūgōm, O. Ind. yugām, Gk. γυών), mīte (older *mītī; see ch. iii. § 37) (cf. O. Ind. śūci, ‘pure,’ Gk ῥόπο; nōmen with -en for I.-Eur. -ṇ (O. Ind nāma; cf. Gk. ὄνομα); fērens from *ferent (ch. iv. § 105) with -ent for I.-Eur. -nt (O. Ind. bhārat), gēnus (older genōs) (I.-Eur. *gēnōs, Gk. γένος), cor for *cord (O. Ind. hṝ; cf. Gk. κόρ for *κόρδ). U-stems have in I.-Eur. -u, e.g. *mēdhā, ‘mead,’ *swādū, ‘sweet’ (O. Ind. mādhā, svādū, Gk. μεθή, ηδό); and similarly Latin Neuter Nouns have -u, e.g. pēcu, cornū (U-Stem Adjectives passed into the I-declension in Latin, e.g. suave; see ch. v. § 47). But there is a doubt with regard to the quantity of the -u. Most grammarians declare it to be short, while Priscian (i. 362. 11 H.) controverts their opinion, and proves by quotations from the poets that it is long. (For
details, see Neue, *Forment.* ii. p. 345). The existence of byforms like *pecus, cornum,* &c. obscures the question, but there seems to be little doubt that with the Augustan poets *cornū,* &c. was the recognized seansion. The long vowel has not yet been satisfactorily explained (see Brugmann, *Grundr.* ii. § 223 for the various theories, and cf. below, § 45). The Neuter Nom. of consonant-stem adjectives has been assimilated to the Masc. and Fem, form, e. g. *fēlix* for *fēlic* (cf. *allēc N., allēx F.)*, *du-plex* for *dū-plēc* (Umbr. tu-plak) (cf. above, § 1, p. 370).

§ 11. O-stems. We find -um lost in *nihīl, nīl,* from *nihīlum,* a compound of *nē* and *hīlam* (quod grano fabae adhaeret, Paul. Fest. 72. 10 Th.), a loss which seems due to elision before a vowel (ch. iii. § 52). From phrases like *nihīl(um)* hoc est on the one hand, and *nihīlum dicit* on the other, the ‘doublets’ *nihīl* and *nihīlum* would come into use, and no doubt existed for a long time side by side till the less cumbersome *nihīl,* nīl ousted its rival. Similarly nōn for *ne-oenum,* like our ‘nought’ for ‘ne-aught,’ ō being substituted for ŏ (older oe) because of the monosyllabic form or the unaccented character of the Conjunction (but see ch. x. § 18). The Umbro-Oscan neuters have -ōm, Osc. saka-raklūm ‘sacraeulum’ (‘a shrine’), dunum ‘dōnum,’ Umbr. *esonom,* a sacrifice.

§ 12. I-stems. Final ō is dropped by Syncope (cf. ch. iii. § 36) in Neuters like *facul,* an O. Lat. form of *facile,* e. g. *Accius, Trag.* 460 R.:

> έρat istuc uirile, ferre aduórsam fortunām facul,


§ 13. U-stems. The uncertainty of the grammarians of the Empire about the quantity of -u of fourth Decl. Neuters may be due to the fact that in later Latin the fourth Decl. was being supplanted by the second Decl. (ch. v. § 49). Priscian elsewhere (i. 161. 26 H., &c.) corrects the extraordinary statement of Charisius (fourth cont.) (22. 15 K.) and others, that the -u of -us in fourth Decl. Noms. masculine was pronounced long, a quantity indicated neither by poetry nor by the orthography of inscriptions.

§ 14. S-stems. The I.-Eur. Nom. Sg. -ōs of Neut. ES-stems, and -ōs of Masc. ES-stems, remained distinct in Latin, e. g. O. Lat. *opūs* (C. I. L. i. 52), *honōs.* In course of time Neut. -ōs sank to -ūs, *opus* (see ch. iv. § 20), Masc. -ōs became by Analogy of the oblique cases (hōnōr-ēs, hōnōr-em, &c.) -ōr, then -ōr, owing to the difficulty of sounding a long vowel before a final -r (ch. iii. § 49). There are a few indications of a temporary formation of Neuter Noms. in -or, e. g. *calor* (Plaut. *Merc.* 860 nec calor nec frigus metuo), *prior bellum* (Claudius Quadrigarius ap. Prisc. i. p. 347. 7 H.), *bellum Punicum posterior* (Cassius Hemina
ap. eund.) (cf. § 53 below). Priscian (l. c.), who quotes some instances of Neut. Comparatives in -or from the old historians, says: vetutissimi etiam neutrum in or finiebat, et erat eadem terminatio communis trium generum, thus hinting that the justification of this usage was the Analogy of Adjectives of one termination for Masc., Fem., Neut., like and, felix. And it is possible that a Neuter in -ūr (older -ōr like robūr (robor Acc., Varro, R. R. iii. 7. 9) took -r for -s in the Nom. from the oblique cases robōr-is, robōr-i, &c., for Cato (R. R. xvii. i) uses the form robus, or from an Early Latin Masc. byform [if we may trust Paul. Fest. ii. 20 Th. 'robosem' pro robore (dicebant antiqui)]. But in spite of these occasional deviations, Latin writers hold with great persistence to the rule that a Neuter ES-stem has a Nom. in -ās (older -ōs), a Masc. ES-stem in -ūr (older -ōr, -ōs), e. g. timus N., timor M., dicus N., dicor M., frigus N., frigor M. The -us, not only of Neut. Nouns, but also of Neut. Comparatives, is invariably short in Plautus and the older poetry (Müller, Plaut. Pros. p. 55).


§ 16. S in Nom. Sg. Neut. of Adjectives. This, if we may believe the MSS., is as old as Plautus, e. g. facius au Felix, Aul. 460 (so Ter. Phorm. 233, &c.), duplex (sc. aurum), Men. 546, sogas nasum, Curr. 110, and occurs in the ancient phrase quod bonum faustum felix fortunatunque sit. (For examples, e. g. dīves opus, Ovid, pondus iners, Cic., see Neue, ii. p. 22). Similar is the extension of the suffix -īc-, properly fem., to neuter Adjectives, e. g. victīcia arma, Virg. A. iii. 54 (though victīx Sg. is not used as neut. till Late Latin). [Does concepit of the XII Tables (ap. Fest. 556. 27 Th. tignum inactum aedibus uineane et concepit ne soluto) point to an earlier use of the bare stem for the Neuter?]

§ 17. Gen. Sing. Ā-stems took in I.-Eur. -ās (e. g. Gk. χώρας, Goth. gibōs, Lith. raikos), and similarly in the Umbro-Oscan languages, e. g. Umbr. tutas, later totar 'civitatis,' Osc. cīnas 'pecuniae,' and in O. Lat., e. g. escas, Liv. Andr. But a rival formation, of doubtful origin, which appears in the oldest literature as ēi (dissyllabic) ultimately established itself in exclusive use in the form -ae. In Greek we find Masc. Ā-stems taking the O-stem suffix, e. g. Hom. 'Αρπείδαο like Αἰώνου, and it has been suggested that Lat. -āi began in Masc. Nouns such as agrīcūla, advēna, &c. (§ 2), and took its -i from the Gen. of the second Decl. Similarly fifth Decl. stems show -ēi, later -ei, -i, e. g. fēdēi O. Lat., fēdere class., rēi, rēi, and rēi in the Dramatists, diēi, Virg. A. i. 636, also (like -ās from Ā-stems), O. Lat. faciēs, diēs.
O-stems, which in Umbro-Oscan show the I-stem suffix, have in Latin, as in Celtic, a long *-i* sound, e.g. Lat. nātī, vivī, Gaul. Ate-gnati, O. Ir. eich for *ēci, 'of a horse,' which one would have no difficulty in regarding as the Locative suffix of O-stems, -ei (§ 37), were it not that it is written *-i* and not *-ei* in the oldest Latin inscriptions. For IO-stems indeed a Gen. *-ī* would naturally go with a Nom. *-īs* (§ 5); and it is possible that the suffix, or at any rate the spelling of the suffix, has been extended from these over all O-stems.

I-stems have *-eis, -ois* in various languages (e.g. Goth. anstais for I.-Eur. *-ois*); and in Umbro-Oscan we have *-eis*, e.g. Umbr. ocrer, of the citadel (Lat. *ōcrēs*), a suffix extended to consonant-stems and even to O-stems, e.g. Osc. carneis, of a part (Lat. *carn-ius*), sakarakleis, 'of a shrine' (Lat. *sacrūcūlī*). But in Latin the consonant-stem suffix has enforced itself on the I-stems too, e.g. *partīs* like *reg-īs* (cf. *partus* like *Castorius, C. I. L. i. 197*).

U-stems seem similarly to have had *-eus, -ous* (e.g. Goth. sunaus, 'of a son,' for I. Eur. *-ous*), and so in Umbro-Oscan, e.g. Umbr. trīfor 'tribus,' Osc. castroes 'fundi,' Lat. mānūs, all probably with *-ous* from I. Eur. *-eus* (ch. iv. § 35). Whether the Gen. form of *dōmus* affected by Augustus, viz. domos, points to the coexistence in Latin of I.-Eur. *-ous* is uncertain (cf. ch. iv. § 41, on Lat. *ō* for I.-Eur. *ous*). A common formation, perhaps the usual one in the careless talk of every-day life, in which the fourth Decl. seems to have been greatly merged in the second (ch. v. § 49), was *-i*, the O-stem genitive. This is the normal genitive in the Dramatists of the Republic; and even Quintilian in the first cent. A. D. declares it impossible to decide whether *senati* or *senatīs* is the proper Gen. of *sēnātus*. Occasionally the Dramatists have *-uis*, the suffix proper to *i*-stems like *sūs, socrūs*, as *-iius*, *-īs* to *i*-stems like *vis* (O. Lat. Gen. *vīs*).

Consonant-stems show *-ēs* in some languages (e.g. O. Sl. dīn-e, 'of a day,' with *-e* from *-ēs*), *-ōs* in others (e.g. Gk. πομέν-ος). Latin *-ēs*, on old inscriptions *-es*, shows the former suffix, while the *-us* occasionally written on inscriptions seems to be a relic of the latter. To make *-īs* a weakening of earlier *-us* (-*os*) is an unlikely theory, seeing that *-us* (-*os*) of the Nom.
§ 18. Ā-stems. (1) In -ās. This form is proper to the Saturnian and earliest Epic poetry. Thus escæs, Mōnētas, Lātōnas are quoted by Priscian (i. p. 198 H.) from Livius Andronicus, Terras and fortānas from Naevius, vias from Ennius. (For other passages of the grammarians treating of this Genitive, see Neue, Forment. I. p. 5.) Servius favours the reading auræ for avaræ in Virg. A. xi. 801, and in his note on the passage mentions that some interpreted custōdias as a Gen. Sg. in a passage of Sallust: castella custodias thensaurorum in deditionem acciperentur. A relic of the old usage survived in legal phraseology, so conservative always of old words and ceremonies, in the terms pater famūlis, mater famūlis, filius (-a) famūlis. But this form is unknown to the conversational language of the Dramatists [Alcēmēnas in the Argument (post Plautine) of the Amphitricho, l. 1, is an imitation of the antique], and must have been in their time out of use. (A contrary view is stated in Studen. Stud. ii. p. 21.)

(2) In -ā, class.-ae. Dissyllabic -āi is not infrequent in Plautus, and is perhaps found in Terence (Rhein. Mus. 1893, p. 305), while in Lucilius it is allowed in hexameters only (e. g. Tirēsiaï, v. 43 M.), not in the dramatic metres. Lucretius is especially fond of this early form; and it is used occasionally by Cicero, Virgil, and other Epic writers (for instances, see Neue, i. p. 12). To Martial it seems typical of the uncouth early Latin poetry (xi. 90.5):

atonitusque legis ‘terrai frugiferai,’
Accius et quicquid Pacuviusque vomunt.

The rarity of the elision of the final -i of -āi, as of -ēi [Plaut. Bacch. 307 Diana(i) Ephesiae; Pers. 409 pecunia(i) accipiter, are more or less doubtful instances], may be an indication that the ending had already at the beginning of the second cent. B.C. ceased to be quite two distinct syllables, though it is scanned as a spondee. The change to -ae would probably begin by the shortening of the ā before the following vowel, so that āi (classical -ae) would differ from -āi in Plautus very much as his pronunciation Chius (Adj. pius from Chius, pius (ch. ii. § 143). Though written -ai on early inscriptions (for example on the old Praenestine vases and mirrors) it need not have been pronounced otherwise than the diphthong ai of aidīlis, &c. (ch. iv. § 29), precisely as the archaistic spelling of a later metrical inscription (C. I. L. vi. 555) offers as a spondee ripai. Another inscription of no early date (i. 1202),

Sg. of Neuter ES-stems, &c., e.g. genus, opus, was not weakened to -ēs, -īs.

The Ā-stem Gen. -aes (pronounced -ēs with the open E-sound, ch. ii. § 32) is probably a feature of the Italian-Greek patois, for it is practically confined to epitaphs of the uneducated classes (from the last century of the Republic). It is merely an expression in Roman letters of the Greek Genitive-ending -ης (with open E). Hedonēi (C. I. L xi. 3316 Forum Clodi), may be an example of a Greek name in -η taking a Genitive after the analogy of Latin fifth Decl. stems (or for Hedonii ?)
seems to show -ai with -i elided: non aevo exsacto vitai es traditus morti). [For passages of the grammarians referring to this Genitive in -ai, see Neue, ii, p. 9, e.g. Quint. i. 7. 18 unde ‘pictai vestis’ et ‘aqua’ Vergilius amanttissimus vetustatis carminibus inseruit. Servius on A. vii. 464 says that Virgil ended the line with ‘aqua amnis’ (leg. vis?), which was changed by Tucca and Varius to aquai].

A list of ‘Greek’ genitives in -aes from plebeian epitaphs is given by Neue, ii, p. 13. On two bricks of the same year (125 A.D.) from the manufactory of Flavia Procule we have (C. I. L. xv. i. 1157-8) Flaviæa Procolæ and Flaviæa Procule. [Cf. no. 1425 Seiae Isauricae (123-141 A.D.), but usually Seiae Isauricae.]

Some would connect Lat. -āī, -ae with O. Ind. Gen. -āyas, Dat. -āyāi (used in the Brāhmanas for the Gen.) of Ā-stems, the yo f which forms is of doubtful origin. The derivation of Lat. -āī from an earlier *-ais is impossible. The supposed ‘Prosepnai’ of a Praenestine mirror (C. I. L. i. 57) is really Prosepnai, and is a Dative, not a Genitive (see Rhein. Mus. 1887, p. 486).

§ 19. Fifth Decl. Stems. The Genitive of these stems is discussed by Aulus Gellius in the fourteenth chapter of Book ix of the Noetes Atticae. In old copies (aliquot veteribus libris) of the History of Claudius Quadravigarius he found facies Gen., sometimes with facii added in the margin: miniminus enim in Tiburti bibliotheca invenire nos in eodem Claudii libro scriptum utrumque ‘facies’ et ‘facii.’ Sed ‘facies’ in ordinem (in the text) scriptum fuit, et contra (in the margin) per i geminum ‘facii.’ He quotes dies from Ennius (Ann. 433 M.) and from Cicero, pro Sest. xii. 28: equites vero daturos illius dies poenas (where our MSS. read diei, but where Gellius found dies in the older copies: inpsensa opera conquisitis veteribus libris plusculis), and mentions a report that in a ‘liber idiographus’ of Virgil the line (G. i. 208) was written:

Libra dies somnique pares ubi fecerit horas.

He adds examples of -ii (Nom. -īvī), -i (Nom. -ēs) from early literature, famī from Cato and Lucilius, perricīī from Sisenna and Cicero, progenīī from Pacuvius, acīi and specīi from Matius, luxurīi from C. Gracchus, and supports the reading diī in Virgil, A. i. 636: munera laetitiamque diī (quod inperitiores ‘dei’ legunt, ab insolentia silicet voeis istius abhorrentes). Finally he summons the authority of the great Dictator for die, specie, &c.: sed C. Caesar in libro de Analogia secundo ‘hujus die’ et ‘hujus specie’ dicendum putat, and supports this form from an old MS. of Sallust: ego quoque in Jugurtha Sallustii summae fīdeli et reverendae vetustatis libro ‘die’ casu patrio scriptum inveni. (The passage is Jug. xviii. 3, where two of our MSS. have die, the rest diēi.) (For the remarks of other grammarians on this point, see Neue, ii, p. 375.)

From his account we gather that forms like diēi, specēi, were grammarians’ coinages designed to restore the actual forms diī, specīi to the proper e-type of stem. At the same time the tendency to Dissimilation, which in the middle of a word turned ī to ī in ālēnus, &c., may have been to some extent operative in certain collocations of these words, e.g. diī-festī, diī-natalīs, &c. [see ch. iii. § 12 a (9)]. The spelling diēi, specēi, &c., in early literature and inscriptions, may often have represented diīi, speciī, the -ei being diphthongal as

1 The form dies would, however, produce cacophony with its repetition of -s in the Cicero and Virgil passages.
in the old spellings deico, feido (ch. iv. § 34). Gallius mentions (l. c.) the theory
of some grammarians that die, specie were Ablative forms used as Genitivae,
and modern philologists have made them Locatives, like die crestdi, &c. (§ 37).
The rule of the grammarians of the Empire is that in the approved Gen.
form, disyllabic -ei, the e is short after a consonant, long after a vowel,
E. g. fidei, di(ei). In Plautus and Terence we rarely find rei (E. g. Plaut. Men.
494), but usually monosyllabic re, hardly ever the ceremonious form rei,
E. g. Mil. (prol.) 103 magnai re publicai gratia (post-Plautine ?); similarly
fidei is always dissyllabic in Terence and usually in Plautus (but twice fide) ;
rei is never a dissyllable. (Seyffert, Stud. Pl. p. 25.) (Compare the usage of
the dramatists with regard to the Pronoun Dat. Sg. e, e, and e, ch. vii. § 19.)
The normal shortening of e in hiatus (ch. ii. § 143) would be hindered when
preceded, e. g. diei. Of the elision of the final -i of dissyllabic -ei examples
(more or less doubtful) are: Plaut. Aud. 68 Malaé rei euénisse, Poen. 479 Quoi
rei ? Ad fundas uiscus ne adhaerésceret, &c. (Other examples of all these
forms of the Gen. of fifth Decl. stems, e. g. nálês in Lucre. iv. 1083:
quodcumque est, rabies unde illaece germina surgunt,
die in Varro, Ep. ad Fufiun : meridiem die natalis, fidei in Hor. C. iii. 7. 4 con-
stantis juvenem fide, see in Neue, l. c.)

§ 20. O-stems and IO-stems. The grammarians tell us that Váleri, Vergili,
&c. were accented on the second syllable, that is to say they were accented as
if they were contractions of Volerii, &c. (ch. iii. § 10. 4), though whether this
accentuation was due to tradition or to grammarians' rules is open to question.
Lucilius' rule for the use of the single symbol i for a Singular case, e. g. quóri
Gen. Sg., and of the double symbol ei for a Plural, e. g. quórei Nom. Pl. has
been mentioned in ch. i. § 9.
The earliest form of the O-stem Gen. Sg. suffix is -i, E. g. Saeturni pocolom
C. I. L. i. 48; from the time of Lucilius to the end of the Republic -ei, which
had come to be an expression of the long i-sound (ch. i. § 9) is also found.
E. g. populi Romani on the Lex Agraria of 111 B. C. In Faliscan we have -oi in
the one instance of the Gen. Sg. of an O-stem, Zextoi ' Sexti' on a rude inser.
on a tile (Zvet. I. I. 73); IO-stems (with Nom. in -io or -es) have -i, E. g.
Acrecelini (ib. 62), Caui (ib. 49) (also -es ?). On the use in the Gen. Sg. of
IO-stems of -i (the older form) and -ii (Propertius, Ovid, &c.), see Neue,
Forment. P. pp. 85-94. The passages which he quotes from the grammarians
make it clear that -ii was a grammarian's restoration 1 on the Analogy of

1 The suggestion of -ii seems to have been made as early as Lucilius,
who proposed to distinguish in this way the Gen. of Numerius from the
Gen. of numerus. The phrase servandi numeri should, he said, mean ' for the
purpose of keeping tune' (Inc. 66 M.):
'servandi numeri':—numerus ut
seruemus modumque.
This use of the Gen. of the Gerundive
to indicate purpose (cf. Aegyptum
proficiscitur cognoscendae antiquitatis, Tac.) is a genuine Latin con-
struction (see Weisweiler, Der finale
Gen. Gerund. 1890), and is found in
Umbrian, E. g. essono... ocer pihaner
'sacrificium arecis piandae' (Tab.
Ig. vi. A. 18), verfale pje aosfortur
trebeit ocer pihaner 'templum (? ) ubi
flamen versatur arecis piandae' (ib.
vi. A. 8).
O-stems, -i the actual historical development. Adjective IO-stems have -ii, e.g. patrii sermonis, Lucr. [See Neue, ii, p. 44; fluvi of Virg. A. iii. 702 (Gela fluvi cognome dicta) has been explained as an Adj.]

§ 21. U-stems. On the S. C. de Bacchanalibus of 186 B.C. (C. I. L. i. 196) we have sēnātus, but in inscriptions of the latter part of the second cent. B.C. senati (i. 199, of 17 B.C.; i. 200, of 111 B.C.; i. 547, of 141 or 116 B.C.), (cf. lāci i. 584, of 82–79 B.C., and see Mommsen’s note); and in the Comedians and Tragedians -i is the usual form (cf. Prisc. i. 257, 18 H.), occasionally -uis (dissyll.), e.g. Ter. Heaut. 287 eius anuis causa. Gellius (iv. 16. 1) tells us that Varro and Nigidius (first cent. B.C.) approved -uis, e.g. senatīs, dōminus, a form which sticklers for Analogy defended by the Dat. Sg. senatui, since patrī, dācī, caełī had as Genitives pātris, ducīs, caeādis. According to Mar. Victorinus (9. 4 K.), Augustus used domos for domus Gen. (divus Augustus genetivo casu hujus ‘domos’ meae per o, non ut nos per u litteram scripsit. Cf. Suet. Aug. 87). (For other passages of the grammarians dealing with the Genitive of u-stems, see Neue, ii, p. 332). The -uos of senatuos must be the u-stem Gen. with the L.-Eur. Gen. suffix -ōs (see below), as the -uis of anuis is the u-stem Gen. with the L.-Eur. Gen. suffix -ēs. But the -uis of senatus, ānūs can hardly be derived by the ordinary processes of phonetic change from either; for -uos, -uis would naturally become -ūs (‘nūs), -ūs (cf. millōs, Plaut., milēs in class. Lat., mort(v)ūs in Late Lat., ch. iv. § 71). In Faliscan we have (Zvet. I. I. I. 70): de zenateuo sententiad, where the final -s of zenateuos (Lat. senatūs) has been dropped before the following initial s. Oscan senateus shows the same Gen. suffix as the O-stems.

§ 22. Consonant-stems. The frequency of the Gen. -us in S. Italian inscriptions, e.g. Pēnērus, C. I. L. i. 565 (Capua, 108 B.C.), Eph. Epigr. viii. 460 (Capua, 108 B.C.), C. I. L. i. 1183 (Casinum), i. 1495 (on a tile, now at Naples), Cērērus, i. 566 (Capua, 106 B.C.), i. 568 (Capua, 104 B.C.), Hōnōrus on the Lex Pariet. Fac. i. 577 (Puteoli, 105 B.C., a copy), may be due to the influence of the Greek Gen. in -os [so régus (with sociētās) on a bilingual Greek and Latin inscr. of 81 B.C., Not. Scav. 1887, p. 110], but this Latin suffix cannot have been merely a usage of Italian-Greek patois, like -oes in Gen. of Ā-stems. It is found on so early inscriptions as the S. C. de Bacch. (i. 196) with nōminus, and the old Praenestine cippos (xiv. 2892) with Sēlēthūs, and on various official inscriptions, e.g. the Epistula ad Tiburtas (i. 201, of c. 100 B.C.) with Kastorūs, the Lex Agraria of 111 B.C. (i. 200) with hūminis, praevāriōtīnōus, the Lex Bantina (i. 197, of 133–118 B.C.) with Castorūs and even partus (an I-stem), and may be the correct reading in Lucil. ix. 28 M.: foris subteminus panust. (Other examples in Neue, ii, p. 191, such as the soldier’s message of defiance cut on a glans used at the siege of Perusia: L. Antoni calve, peristi C. Caesarius victoria, C. I. L. i. 685). The Genitive in -es on old inscriptions may sometimes be dialectal with -ēs for -i (the I-stem Gen., extended in the Umbro-Oscan languages to Consonant-stems), e.g. Umbr. matrer, nonmer (cf. Ose. mātreis ‘mātris’), but is more naturally regarded as -ēs, the older spelling of classical -ēs (as early as c. 180 B.C., flāminis, C. I. L. i. 33) (cf. ch. iii. § 18). Examples are C. I. L. i. 49 (Orte) Salutes pocolum, i. 187 (Praeneste) Apollones dederit, i. 811 (Rome?) [C]ereres.

On a possible byform -s, of the Gen. Sg. suffix, seen in the O. Lat. Adverb nox, ‘by night’ (Gk. νυκτός), see ch. ix. § 3.
§ 23. Dat. Sing. The Dat. Sing. of Ā-stems had in I.-Eur. the long diphthong -āi (e.g. Gk. χώρα). In Latin and the Umbro-Oscan languages we find the ordinary diphthong -ai (Osc. -āi, Umbr. -e, Lat. -ae, older -ai). Whether in O. Lat. -ā existed beside -ai is not quite certain. If it did, we must suppose -ā and -ai to have been doublets, both sprung from original -āi, just as atque and ac (for *atc) were doublets, the one representing the sound which at with the enclitic que took before a word beginning with a vowel, the other its sound before a consonant (ch. ii. § 136; ch. iv. § 45).

O-stems had similarly in I.-Eur. the long diphthong -ōi (e.g. Gk. ἐπίσκηπτος). In the most ancient Latin inscriptions we have -ōi with the quantity of the o unascertainable (Umbro-Oscan seem to have had the ordinary diphthong -oi, in Oscan -ūi, in Umbrian -e), but in all other inscriptions and in classical Latin, -ō. This -ōi and -ō are generally regarded as doublets, like -ā and -ai of Ā-stems, the long vowel having survived the struggle for existence in the one declension, the diphthong in the other.

As regards Fifth Decl. Stems, we have seen (ch. iv. § 47) that the doublets -ēi (the long diphthong) and -ē probably existed in I.-Eur. times. If Gellius is right in saying that fācie, &c. were regarded as the correct forms by the older writers, this may indicate that the latter gained the day in Latin. The alternative Dative which he mentions, facīi, may then be the Genitive form (fāciē for older fāciēi from fāciēī), which was adapted to the dative use on the Analogy of third Decl. datives in -ī (just as the classical fāciēī seems to be a Genitive form), though some prefer to regard it as a relic of the I.-Eur. 'doublet -suffix ēi-

I-stems have in Latin -ī, older -ei, probably (like the Genitive in -ēs, older -es, also -us, § 22) a loan from Consonant-stems, and so originally -ai. The Umbro-Oscan termination was -ei (Osc. -eī, Umbr. -e), as in Consonant-stems.

U-stems have -ūī in Latin, which is equally traceable to either of the I.-Eur. suffixes, -ēwai and -wai (e.g. O. Ind. sūnāvē, 'to a son,' and śīv, 'to a child.' The occasional Latin forms in -ū are (cf. Umbrian trīfo 'tribui') really Locatives (§ 37), according to some, Instrumentals (§ 36).

Consonant-stems had -ai (-ai? ch. iv. § 3) in I.-Eur. (e.g. O. Ind. c e
§ 24. Æ-stems. Dissyllabic -āi is not found in the Dat. of Æ-stems, but only in the Gen. (terrai frugiferai, Enn. A. 505 M.) like Virgil's autai medio, with which Charisius couples it, a Genitive, so correct 'dativo' in Char. 19. 1 K.; uiā sternendāi, Lucil. xi. 5 M., even if the reading is right (MSS. vim sternenda et), is anything but a certain example (see L. Mueller's note), so that Priscian's remark that the Nom. and Voc. Plur. ending of the first declension did not admit of 'divisio,' as the Gen. and Dat. Sg. did, cannot be quite accurate (Prisc. i. p. 291. 17 H. nominativus et vocativus pluralis primae declinationis similis est genetivo et dativo singulari. Nam in ae diphthongum profertur, ut 'hi' et 'o poetae'; sed in his non potest divisio fieri, sicut in illis). Gellius (xiii. 26. 4) tells us that Nigidius (first cent. B.C.) approved -ai (presumably the diphthong) in the Gen., -ae in the Dative. (On Lucilius' practice see L. Mueller's note on Lucil. ix. 6.) The -e found on some inscriptions is dialectal (cf. Umbr. -e) and rustic, e.g. Diane (C. I. L. i. 168, Pisaureum), Fortune (i. 64, Tusculum), Vertic (i. 183, Marsi). Of the 'Datives in -a,' only found on very old inscriptions, most of the apparent examples come from Pisaureum (C. I. L. i. 167-180), where -e (Diane just quoted) was the Dat. suffix of Æ-stems, and may be Genitives in -ae with omission of the final s (cf. Nom. Pl. matrona Pisaurese for matronas Pisaurenses, i. 173; so Gen. Sg. Coira poculo, Eph. Epigr. i. 6), or else a mere dialectal variety, which would prove nothing for the Latin dative. Others, viz. Fortuna (i. 1333, Praeneste); Fortuna (Bull. 1885, p. 62, Signina); Fortuna Diovo fileia primogenia (xiv. 2863, Praeneste); Diana (xiv. 4182 a and 4184 a, Nemi) are open to similar doubts. The strongest instances are: [Me]nerva dono d. . . . (Not. Scow. 1887, p. 179, Rome); Iunonia Loucina (C. I. L. i. 189, loc. inc.); Iunonia Lucina Tuscolana sacra and [Pa]le [Tusculana sacra (i. 1200-1, Capua) [cf. Faliscan Menerua sacra (Zvet. I. i. 70)].

Examples of -ai are Dianai donum dedit (C. I. L. xiv. 4270, beg. of second cent. B.C.), Menervai donum port- (C. I. L. i. 191), [Iunon]e Loucina (i. 813). We have -ai even on inscr. of the Emperor Claudius, e.g. Antoniā Augustai matri (Orelli 650).

§ 25. Fifth Decl. Stems. Gellius (ix. 14): in casu autem dandi qui purissime locuti sunt non 'faciei,' uti nunc dicitur, sed 'facie' dixerunt. He then quotes two examples of facie from Lucilius (vii. 9 and viii. 7 M.), and adds: sunt tamen non pauci, qui utroque 'facii' legant. In Plautus the treatment of the Dative Sg. of these stems is the same as that of the Genitive (see § 19). In Umbr. ri 'rei' the i may correspond to Lat. -i, as in pru-sikurent 'pronuntiaverint' with the ō-grade of root seen in Lat. sēdē, &c. (ch. viii. § 39).

§ 27. U-stems. Senatuei (C. I. L. i. 201, of c. 100 B.C.). Gellius (iv. 16) informs us that Varro and Nigidius used senatui, domuti, fluctui, &c. in the Dat. and senatuis, domuis, fluctuis in the Genitive, but gives examples of -u from Lucilius (iv. 8 M. ; ãnu, iv. 9, cf. vii. 21) and Virgil, and clinches them with the authority of Caesar: C. etiam Caesar, gravis auctor linguae Latinae, ... in libris Analogicae omnia istiummodi sine i littera dicenda censet. In Plautus -ui is the usual form, e.g. quaestiui habere, exterusi, usui esse, and with the force of a second supine, Bacc. 62 quia istaecc lepida sunt membraturi; but -u is also found, e.g. Ruel. 294 sunt nobis quaestu et cultu.

§ 28. Consonant-stems. The so-called 'Datives in -e' in Latin poets (cf. Servius ad A. x. 653 conjuncta crepidine saxi, A. x. 361 haeret pede pes, and L. Mueller's note on Ennius, Ann. 395) are really Locatives or Instrumentals (see Neue, ii. p. 195). The -e which we find (along with -el) on old inscriptions is -ê, possibly in some cases (e.g. C. I. L. i. 1170, Ioue, Marsic), a dialectal form (cf. Umbr. patre), but certainly in others a mere graphic variety of -ei, later -i, just as the e of ploirume on the Scipio epitaph (C. I. L. i. 32 hone oino ploirume cosentiont) represents no different sound from the usual -ei, later -i of the Nom. Pl. of O-stems. Instances of Dat. -ei and -e are: Hercoloi (i. 1503, Rome, 217 n.c.); Martei (i. 531, Rome, 211 B.C.); Hercule (Ann. Epigr. 1890, no. 84, Rome); Hercule (C. I. L. xiv. 2891-2, Praeneste). We have the three spellings of the suffix side by side on a freedom's inscription from the Roman district (i. 1110): Iuvene Sepsitei Matri, and the two older in i. 638: [D]iouei Uictore (Rome, c. 180 n.c.); [Quintilian (i. 4. 17) mentions Diove Uictore as an old form], and in xi. 4766 Ioue ... Iouei (Spoletium in Umbria). (For other instances of these old spellings, see Index to C. I. L. i.)

§ 29. Acc. Sing. To form the Acc. Sing. Masc. and Fem. the suffix -m was added, which in the case of Consonant-stems took the form -m (e.g. O. Ind. mātār-am, Gk. μητέρ-α, Lat. matr-em). The Acc. Neut. was the same as the Nom. (§ 10).

Thus Ā-stems had -ām (e.g. O. Ind. āśvām, Gk. χατραν), which in Latin would become -ām (ch. iii. § 49), equām. The long vowel is indicated by Osc. paam (Lat. quam), the Acc. Sg. Fem. of the Relative Pronoun, but the usual spelling is e.g. Osc. tovtam, Umbr. totam, the community. O-stems had -ôm, in O. Lat. -om, class. -um (ch. iv. § 20); IO-stems, -îom, -ium, perhaps also in the
familiar' declension (§ 5), -im; I-stems, -im, which is found in the older literature and in many examples, *turrim, &c., in the classical period, though -em, the Consonant-stem ending, has usually supplanted it; U-stems, -äm; Í-stems, -im (also -iym, e.g. O. Ind. dhíyam, 'thought'), which in Latin would become -im; Û-stems, -uṃ, Lat. -uem, e.g. suem, also -ūm, Lat. -ām, e.g. socrum. Consonant-stems take in Umbro-Oscan -om, the O-stem Accusative, e.g. Osc. medicatin-om (Lat. *medicatiōnem from med-dix, a magistrate). Of Latin ES-stems some are regular, e.g. dēgēnērem from *degenes-em; others follow the analogy of Ê-stems, as in the Gen. and other cases, e.g. plēbem (ch. v. § 51).

§ 30. The endings -im and -em. We can hardly say that -ēm arose from -im by ordinary phonetic change, seeing that final -im remains in so many words, e.g. Adverbs in -im like ēlim, as well as Accusatives like clāvim. The change is rather due to that intermixture of I- and Consonant-stems which was the despair of grammarians as early as Varro (L. L. viii. 66), and which led to the substitution of iê for i in the 'Ablative' (see below, § 33). A list of Accusatives in -im, with references to the Latin grammarians who discuss this question, is given by Neue, ii, p. 196, to which may be added piēcin on an old Praenestine cista (Māl. Arch. 1890, p. 393), and the instances from the Ambrosian Palimpsest of Plautus given in Studemund's Index, e.g. imbrīm, Pseud. 102. Sometimes the use of -im indicates an Ê-stem, e.g. vim, sometimes a Greek loanword, e.g. turrīm (?); it is retained in Accusatives used adverbially, e.g. partīm (ch. ix. § 4). [Claudi, &c. (C. I. L. iv. Ind.), if for Claudi(n)im, may be dialectal. On Gk. Ἀπφεῖν for Ἀππον Nom. Sg. (I. I. S. 1411), &c., see Eckinger, Orth. p. 56.]

§ 31. Voc. Sing. In the Plural and Dual, and in the Neut. Sing., the Nom. form was used also for the Voc. in I.-Eur., and even in the Masc., Fem. Sing. the same thing is often found (e.g. in the Veda, Vāyav Índraś ca, 'O Vāyu and Indra'; in Hom., Ze β pāτηρ, . . . Ἡλιὸς τε; in Plautus meus ocellus, . . . μι anime). The rule however was that in the Singular the bare stem was used (accented on the first syllable, e.g. O. Ind. pītar, Gk. πάτηρ, unlike the Nom., O. Ind. pitā, Gk. πατήρ). Ā-stems had a short A-vowel (Gk. δέσποτα, &c.), O-stems -ē (O. Ind. vīkē, Gk. λύκε, Lat. lūpe) and so on. In Latin I., U- and N-stems substitute the Nom. form for the Voc., e.g. cīvis, mānes, hōmo (contrast Gk. φίλος, πήχυς, κόνος); and the same was done in R-stems even earlier than the shortening of long vowels before final -r in the second cent. B.C. removed the distinction between I.-Eur. -r and -r, -or and -ōr, to judge from seclusions in
Plautus like *Merc. 800 Uxor, heus uxor; probably also in S-stems. Final ā was shortened in Nouns of the first declension still earlier, before the literary period (ch. iii. § 43), so that it is impossible to say whether *equā Voc. is the Nom. form (originally *equā), or is a special Voc. form. It cannot be the I.-Eur. Vocative, if final I.-Eur. -ā became -ē in Latin (ch. iii. § 37), so that I.-Eur. *ekwā would become *equē, and would be indistinguishable from the Voc. of O-stems, I.-Eur. *ekwē, Voc. of *ekwos. The levelling process to which the other Latin Vocatives have submitted makes it likely that the Nom. was used for the Voc. in the Ā-declension too; and that the Umbrian language, in which a distinction between the Nom. (in -o, § 2), and the Voc. (only in -a, e.g. Šēria), of Ā-stems is clearly apparent, has retained the I.-Eur. -ā of the Voc. (cf. ch. iii. § 18, p. 191). Latin IO-stems show in the Voc. -ī, e.g. Vālēri; but this form is hardly found except in proper names [which, as we saw before, (§ 5), admitted the 'familiar' declension,-is Nom., -im Acc. (?), &c.], and the word of everyday life, fīli, so that the -ī need not be a contraction of an older -iē, but may be the Voc. byform corresponding to the Nom. byform -is (cf. Lith. gaidī́ Voc. from gaidī́s Nom., 'a cock'; see § 5). RO-stems which took -er in the Nom. retain this in the Voc. too, though puer, and not puer, seems to be the form always used by Plautus.

§ 32. Other examples. Jū-piter (better Juppiter, ch. ii. § 130, p. 116) corresponds exactly with Gk. Zeus πάτɛρ, and might be a Vocative used as a Nominative, just as Homer’s νεφεληγερέτα Zeús, μπυετέρα Zeús, have been explained as obsolete Vocative forms, preserved only in certain liturgies, and treated by the poet as Nominatives through a similar mistake to ours in using 'cherubim' as a Singular. But Jū-piter may also be a correctly formed Nominative with the stem *Dyeu-, Lat. Jov- (cf. O. Lat. Jovis Nom.) as the first part of the Compound (cf. jā-glana, ch. v. § 85). The same double explanation is possible for Dīte pater Voc. (C. I. L. i. 818). Dīte Voc. (Eph. Epigr. viii. 529) reminds us of Gk. ὑπό, &c.

The Vocative formation for IO-stems is discussed by Gellius (Noct. Att. xiv. 5), who describes a battle royal waged in his presence between two grammarians about the proper Voc. of egregius, without satisfactory result (non arbitratus ego opera pretilum esse, eadem istaec diutius audire, clamantes compugnantesque illos reliqui). Priscian (i. p. 301. 19 H.) says that the early writers used -ie as well as -i in the Voc. of proper names: haec tamen eadem etiam in e proferebant antiquissimi, 'O Virgillie,' 'Mercurie' dicentes, though all that he quotes is a couple of instances of Laertie, which is a Greek word, and as much an Adjective as a Noun. He adds that the classical form -i must be
a contraction of this older -ie (as Arpinás, &c., of older Arpinátis, &c.) because Voces. in -i were accented on the paenultima, e.g. Valéri Voc. (like Valéri Gen.). Gellius (xiii. 26) tells us that Nigidius Figulus (first cent. B.C.) wished to distinguish Valéri Voc. from Valéri Gen., but says that in his time both Voc. and Gen. of IO-stems were invariably accented on the paenultima (cf. ch. iii. § 10. 4). (For other passages of the grammarians, see Neue, Formenl. ii. p. 82.) Priscian elsewhere (i. p. 305. 9 H.) quotes filie (apparently the more ceremonious form) from Livius Andronicus:

páter nóster, Satúrni filie,

but almost the only instance of the Voc. Sg. of a masc. IO-stem to be found in Plantus and the older writers is volturi (for which some would read volture), 'you vulturo' (Capt. 844). Publíi Cornelii occurs on a Scipio epitaph of c. 180 B.C. (C. I. L. i. 33). Adjective IO-stems take at all periods -ie, though there is evidently a reluctance on the part of good writers to use these forms (see Neue, Formenl. ii. p. 42).

§ 33. Abl. Sing. The Ablative suffix, ending in -d, appears to have been used in I.-Eur. only in O-stems, which formed their Abl. Sg. in -ôd and -êd (the latter suffix being reserved in the Italic languages for Adverbs, ch. ix. § 1), [O. Ind. yugát, 'from a yoke,' O. Lat. jugod, Falisc. rected, class. Lat. júgô, rectē, final ù being dropped after a long vowel at the close of the third cent. B.C. (ch. ii. § 137)]. In other stems the Genitive ending -ês or -ôs was used (O. Ind. návás, 'from a ship,' Hom. Gk. m(Ô)s); and in the Greek language this Ablativus use of the Genitive was extended to O-stems too. In the Italic languages on the other hand the Ā-, Ī-, Ū- and Ê-stems acquired Ablatives in -d on the Analogy of the O-stems; and the Consonant-stems availed themselves in Latin of the I-stem Abl., in Umbro-Oscan of the O-stem Abl. (e.g. O. Lat. air-ûd, Osc. lígud, 'by law'). The Locative Case in -ê (possibly Instrumental, § 36) of these Consonant-stems competed with this I-stem Abl. not only in Consonant-stems (e.g. aerê and aerî), but also in I-stems (e.g. cîvē and cîvi), so that Varro declares that ove was heard in his time as often as ovi, ave as avî. The confusion of cases was increased by the circumstance that when -d of the Abl. was dropped, nothing remained to distinguish Abl. -ô(d) of Ê-stems, -ô(d) of I-stems, -û(d) of U-stems from Loc. -ê, -î, -û (see § 37), so that the ôvî, âvî of Varro's time have as much right to be called Locatives as Ablatives. (On the question whether these forms can have been Instrumentals, see § 36.)
The use of -ē in the 'Abl.' Sg. of I-stems was certainly not so far advanced in the time of Plautus as in the classical period. He uses only sortī, bīli, cīvi, fūsti, nāvi, &c., not sortē, &c. Priscian however attests rete (presumably rētē, like fortē, Most. 694) in Rud. 1020, and remarks (i. p. 331. 16 H.): vetustissimi solement hujusce-modi ablativeum etiam in -ē proferre. Of Consonant-stems with -ī we have, e.g. pāriētī (MSS. -e), Cas. 140, pūrīciī (MSS. -e), Pers. 41, obiēcīi, Pers. 203. (For details of the use of -i and -ē forms by the Latin authors, and the rules laid down by the native grammarians, see Neue, i. pp. 212 sqq.). An early example of the Ablativeal use of -e (presumably -ē) is the line of the Saturnian Scipio epitaph (C. I. L. i. 30, c. 200 B. C.?):

Gnahōd pātre prognátus fōritis vir sapiēnsque.

(Cf. aire moltaticōd i. 181, Picenum); somewhat later are i. 198 (Lex Repet.) maiore parte diei; i. 199 (Sent. Minuc.) de maiore parte; i. 603 (Lex Furf.) mensē Flusare (dial. Cf. Sab. mesene Flusare). We have -ei, apparently a graphic variety of i (ch. i. § 9), in the Scipio epitaph of c. 130 B. C. (i. 34, along with aetāte):

is hic situs quei nūnquam uietus est uirūtei

(cf. ab fontei on the Sent. Minuc., i. 199. 7); -i in the Lex Agr. (i. 200. 23 ab eo herediue eius . . . testamento hereditati dediti∞nue obuenit, and again: curatore herediue), in the Lex Jul. Municipp. (i. 206 ubi continentis habitabilitur), the Lex Rep. (i. 198. 56 de sanctioni, but also adessint for adessent). These are clearly the forms of the older -īd of i. 61 airid, i. 186 (S. C. Bacch.) conventiād, xī. 4766 bonid.

§ 34. O. Lat. Abl. with -d. Ablatives with -d seem to be unknown in Plautus and the earliest Dramatic literature, so that the final dental must have dropped out of the spoken language before the end of the third cent. B. C., though it is found in the Saturnian poetry (e.g. Naevius, Bell. Pan. 7 M. nōctu Troadi exiunt captibus opértis; C. I. L. i. 30, one of the oldest Saturnian Scipio epitaphs: Gnahōd pātre (probably -ī) prognátus fōritis vir sapiēnsque (but SamnicioAbl. on the same epitaph), and is persistently written in the S. C. de Bacchanalibus (i. 196) of 186 B. C. (sententiaid, conventiād, exstricta, suprad, opoldtod, prēvatod, populiōd, fāciunmed, &c.). It is as persistently omitted in a nearly contemporary inscription (C. I. L. ii. 5041, Spain, of 189 B. C.). [For other examples of Abl. -d on inscriptions, and for passages of the Latin grammarians referring to this form, see Neue, i. p. 2, Ritschl, Neue Excurs., i., and add porod (for class. porro) on a Praenestine cista, Mel. Arch. 1890, p. 303.] In Oscan the -d remains, e.g. tristamamentud 'testamentō,' akrīd 'acri,' egmad 're' (cf.
Faliscan sententiad), but in Umbrian it has been dropped as in Latin, e.g. populu 'populó,' re-per 'pro re,' ocri-per, vea 'viā' (cf. Pelignian oisa 'usā'); similarly with Adverbs in -ēd, e.g. Osc. amprufid 'improve,' Umb. rehte 'recte;' Cons. stems show the O-stem Abl., e.g. Osc. liguit 'lege,' or the Loc. in -i, e.g. Pelign aetate, Umbr. nomne.

§ 35. I-stem and Cons.-stem 'Abl.' in -i and -e. There is no evidence of an old Cons.-stem -ēd, later -ē, corresponding to I-stem -ēd, later -i. The dictatored (also navaled, but marid) of the Columna Rostrata (C. I. L. i. 195) is probably a mistake, for the inscription is not the actual inscription of 260 B.C., but a copy made in the time of the Empire; and the instances in MSS. of Plautus and the old poets with final -ē may be due to that 'imperitia' on the part of scribes which Priscian (i. p. 345. 1 H.) blames for the change of civi, &c., to cīcē in MSS. of Cicero. The reading of the best Palatine MS. (B) in Plaut. Pseud. 616 is militē, which points to a correction in the archetype of militē to militē (the Ambrosian Palimpsest seems to have militē); and the MSS. often vary between -i and -e, e.g. Naev. Bell. Pan. 14 M. pieleti (v. l. -te), Enn. A. 486 M. monti (MSS. montis and monde).

§ 36. Instr. Sing. The Latin grammarians knew nothing of an Instrumental Case. Quintilian indeed (i. 4. 26) suggests that a seventh case is required in Latin for such a phrase as hastā percussi, where hastā is not a real Ablative; though of the previous existence of an Instrumental Case in the Latin language he has no conception. But in various I.-Eur. languages we find an Instrumental, and also a Locative Case; Sanscrit, for example, has, in addition to the Abl. dēvāt, 'from a god,' the Instrumental 1 dēvēna, 'with a god' (in Vedic also *dēvā), and the Locative dēvē, 'in a god.' And the suffixes used in these languages to form their Instrumentals and Locatives it is possible to find also in Latin, though the weakening process which attacked every Latin final syllable has made them indistinguishable from other Case suffixes. To form the Instrumental Singular there seem to have been originally two methods used in the Indo-European language: (1) the addition of -ē [according to some -ā, which would in Latin become -ē (ch. iii. § 37)]; in Cons.-stems this -ē is found unchanged, in Ā-stems we have -ā, in O-stems -ō or -ē and so on; (2) the addition of -bhi (e.g. Hom. Gk. ἰ-ψί), or -mi (e.g. Lith. sūmu-mi, 'with a son'); and various modifications of these suffixes are found in the different languages. Of Ā-stem

1 The Instrumental, it may be remarked, is the case used after the phrase ārthō bhavati (Lat. opus est).
Instrumentals with I.-Eur. -ā (and -ām?) (e.g. Gk. λάθρα ?) there are no certain examples in Latin, for the Adverbs suprā, extrā, &c. are written in the S. C. de Bacechanalibus suprad, exstrāl, and are therefore Ablatives. Some make O. Lat. contrā (the invariable scansion in O. Lat. poetry, Skutsch, Forschungen, i. p. 3) an Instrumental, with the same shortening of -ā as is seen in the Nom. Sing. of Â-stems, e.g. terrā (ch. iii. § 43), contrā, the classical form being adapted to the type of suprā, extrā, &c. But contrā may be an Acc. Pl. Neut. form, and frustrā (the O. Lat. quantity, e.g. ne frustrā sis, Plaut.) need not be an Instrumental either. The Oscan preposition contrud (i.e. *contrō; cf. Lat. contrō-versia) is an Ablative.

The O-stem suffix -ō would by the second cent. B.C., when -d was dropped after a long vowel, be identical with the Abl., so that modo, cito (usually with -ō by the Law of Breves Breviantes, ch. iii. § 42) may be either Instrumentals or Ablatives. Porro is shown to be an Abl. by the old spelling porod, mentioned above (§ 34). The other O-stem suffix -ē may indeed appear in bēnē, mālē, since the shortening of their final syllable by the Breves Breviantes Law (e.g. Plaut. dātō for *datōd) has advanced more rapidly than in the case of -ōd; but on the other hand this might be referred to their greater use in everyday life (cf. hāvē but monē in Quintilian's time, ch. iii. § 42), and their more frequent occurrence in word-groups, e.g. bene-rem-geras, male-ficio (cf. dieōquinte but fidiē, ch. iii. § 44). (The scansion bene, mālē in Plaut. is doubtful.) Superlative Adverbs in -ē have lost a final d, as is shown by facēto oned on the S. C. de Bacechanalibus. Similarly -ē of Fifth Decl. stems, e.g. fūciē, rē, may be Instrumental -ē or Ablative -ōd; -ī of I-stems may be Instr. -ī or Abl. -īd; -ū of U-stems may be Instr. -ū or Abl. -ūd; they may also be Locative -ē (e.g. postrī-die), -ēyī (Lat. -ei, class. -ē, e.g. Neāpōli), -eu- (Lat. -ū. e.g. noctū) (see § 37). The -ē of Consonant-stems, e.g. patriē, cannot be an Abl. suffix, but either Instrumental -ē (-ā?) or Locative -ī (Lat. -ē, e.g. Tibārē), used ablatively and instrumentally, as Loc. -ī in Gk. Cons.-stems was used to express all the meanings of the Greek Dative case, e.g. πατρ-ī.

It thus appears how difficult it is to establish by certain proof the presence of Instrumental forms in the Latin declension, owing
to the lack of a sufficient number of examples from the earlier inscriptions in which Abl. forms have not yet lost their final d (e.g. C. I. L. xi. 4766 bouid piaculum datod; i. 61 airid [coir]aui-
it]; i. 181 aire moltaticod; Zvet. I. I. I. 72 opidque Uolgani)\(^1\), and Loc. -i would be distinguished from Instrumental -e (-ā?). Yet the evidence of cognate languages shows that Instrumental case-forms must have been a living part of Latin at some period, however remote; and when we come to examine the formation of Latin Adverbs we shall find that some of them are believed with a fair amount of probability to be Instrumentals. The evidence that we can draw from forms on Oscan inscriptions (they are not very numerous), is all in favour of the supposition that in the declension of the Noun the Instrumental forms had quite dropped out of use. The Oscan language, unlike the Um- brian, does not drop final d; and indubitable Ablative forms with -d are used in all the senses of the Latin 'Ablative,' to express our prepositions 'from,' 'with,' 'by,' &c., e.g. kúmbe-nieī's tanginud, 'by decree of the assembly,' ētiuvad, 'with money,' ūp ēisūd sakaraklūd (Lat. apud id sacellum). (The doubt-ful ētīe of Zv. I. I. I. 89; suvad ētīe upsed (Lat. sua pecunia opera-tus est), requires confirmation before it can be used as evidence that IE-stems used an Instr. or Loc. -iē instead of Abl. -iēd. The absence of an Abl. in -iēd from the early Latin inscriptions can be explained by the comparative paucity of Fifth Decl. stems.) In the Pelignian dialect, a variety of Oscan, we have in the few inscriptions preserved an 'Ablative Absolute,' oisa acetate (Lat. usū aetate, with passive sense of the Deponent, 'his life having been exhausted') (cf. forte, of doubtful meaning; on the same inscription), and an Ablative of uncertain construction, suad (?) acetatu firata fertlid (Lat. suā aetate . . . fertili), with apparent dropping of -d before initial f; and this evidence, so far as it goes, points to an Abl. of Cons.-stems in -ud (i. e. -ōd, the O-stem Abl. suffix), beside another case in -e (presumably -ē). If however this -e represents an original -i (cf. Pel. ae for ai, Osc. Bansae Loc.) the case will be a Locative, not an Instrumental; and this view is favoured by the fact that other stems have in

\(^1\) The (Adverb ?) mērītō is spelt meretōd or meritōd on the oldest inscriptions.
Oscan a Locative as well as an Ablative Case, e.g. Ā-stems: "víaí medzial Loc., beside eítuuvad Abl. (and vítuas Gen.); O-stems: Ladinei Loc., beside trístaamentud Abl. (and sakaraleis Gen.). An isolated example of an Adverb formed apparently by the Instr. suffix in Osc. is suluh ‘omnino’ (Zvet. I. I. I. 129), though this stands on a carelessly written inscription, a leaden excretion tablet, and is not free from the suspicion of being meant for sullud, a form which seems to occur (the last letter is unfortunately not quite legible) on another tablet of the same kind (I. F. ii. 435; cf. von Planta, i. pp. 577–80). The conclusion therefore which the scanty evidence at our disposal entitles us to draw is that Instrumental formations, though they may be found in some Latin Adverbs, are not found in the declension of Latin Nouns, the case-forms which competed with the Latin Ablative (especially in Cons.-stems) being Locatives and not Instrumentals.

§ 37. Locative Singular. Locatives in I.-Eur. seem sometimes to have had a final -ī (e.g. O. Ind. mürdhán-ī and mürdhn-ī, ‘on the head’), sometimes not (e.g. O. Ind. mürdhán, Gk. domév Inf., a Loc. as dómevai is a Dat.). Of Locatives without -ī in Latin there are only uncertain traces, such as Prepositions like pénēs (Loc. of penus, with -es not sunk to -is, possibly because the accent rested on it in collocations like penēs me, penēs te, ch. iii. § 12 a. 3), and Adverbs like noctū. The predominant formation is with -ī. Of these ï-forms, Ā-stem locatives show I.-Eur. -āi in O. Ind. ásvāy-ām, Lith. rāńkoj-e, with Postpositions -ām and -e, but in Greek the ordinary diphthong -ai (a ‘doublet’ of āi, ch. iv. § 45), e.g. Θηβαί-γετός; and this is also the Italian form (O. Lat. -āi, class. Lat. -ae, Ose. -ái, Umbr. -e). O-stems took -oi and -ei (e.g. Gk. óxou and ókei). By the phonetic laws of Latin both these suffixes would become -ei, class. -ī (ch. iii. § 18); so the origin of the suffix of Córinthī, &c. is, so far as Latin is concerned, doubtful. But in Oscan we have -ëi, which must be I.-Eur. -ei (e.g. múðnikéi tereí, ‘on common ground’) (Umbr. -e, e.g. destre onse, ‘on the right shoulder,’ may be -oi or -ei). Fifth Decl. stems took -ëi, which already in the ‘I.-Eur. period’ had a ‘doublet’ -ë. It is this latter form which appears in Latin, e.g. die in the phrase postrī-die, die cīstūnī, &c. (unless die has lost
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a final d; cf. Faliscan foied 'hodie'). I-stems had -ëyi (e.g. Hom. Gk. πτόλει), which in Latin would become -ei, class. -i, and would be merged in the Dative (§ 23) [possibly Instrumental! (§ 36)] suffixes. U-stems had -ëyi (e.g. Hom. Gk. ἀστεί), but Latin U-stem Locatives show -ūi, the i-less formation, e.g. uoctū, mentioned above. Ī-stems showed -īyī, Lat. -ī, as Ī-stance -ūwī, Lat. -ue, e.g. sue. Consonant-stems had -ī (used in Greek as Dative suffix, as well as Locative), which in Latin became -ē, e.g. Carthāgniū, rūrē, and Infs. Act. like āgēre, ēverē (contrast O. Ind. jīvās-ō, Lat. agī, which are Datives), though by false analogy of O-stems (or I-stems?) we sometimes find -ī, e.g. rurī, perhaps introduced to discriminate the locative from the ablative use, e.g. rurī esse, from rurē venire.

§ 38. Locatives in -ī and -ē in Latin. Herī is by modern editors written with -ē when the last vowel has been scanned short, otherwise with -ī. The scansion herī (by the Brevis Brevians Law, ch. iii. § 42) is common enough in the early Dramatists (e.g. Caecil. Com. 197 R. herī uero, where herī has abundant MS. authority), while the spelling here is established for passages like Plaut. Mil. 59 (quantity of final vowel doubtful), where the Ambrosian Palimpsest has here and the Palatine MS. hercle (cf. Pers. 108). Quintilian (i. 7. 22) says: 'here' nunc e littera terminatus: at veterum comicorum adhuc libris invenio: 'heri ad me uenit,' quod idem in epistulis Augusti, quas sua manu scripsit aut emendavit, deprehenditur. [On his remark (i. 4. 8), in 'here' neque e plane neque e auditor, see ch. ii. § 16.] The spelling of these forms, especially in the early writers, is often doubtful, and so it is difficult to prove with certainty such a theory as that only rurī is used for 'in the country,' and usually rure for 'in the country' in Plautus (Langen, Beitragge, p. 308). Charsius (p. 200. 12 K.) attests heri for Afranius Com. 71 R., peregrī for Naev. Com. 93 R., but peregrē for Naev. Com. 84 R., as prac-fischeine for Afranius Com. 36 R. The long quantity of the final vowel of peregrē (so both the Ambrosian Palimpsest and the Palatine family) is required by the metre in Plaut. Truc. 127, an anaepastic line, and peregrē has been explained as the suffixless Locative of an I-stem peregrī- (ch. v. § 34) with the I.-Eur. ending -ē, a doublet of -ēi (cf. O. Ind. agni, Loc. of agni, -īre). Vespēri, the form always used by the early writers, is naturally referred to the O-Stem vespēro-. Tempēri -ōri, see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v.) may be related to temporē as fænōrī to fænōre, maiorō to maiorō (§ 33), and so with rurī (e.g. Ter. Phrm. 363, Plaut. Cist. 226), Carthagini (e.g. Plaut. Poen. 1056 AP), Accherunti Plaut., while māne (if not an Adverbial Accusative) may show conversely a Cons.-stem 'Ablative' suffix applied to an I-stem māni-, Manes Pl. (ch. v. § 37). The close connexion of the Ablative and Locative, already mentioned in § 33, is seen in phrases like māne same septimī, Plaut. Men. 1157; lucī clāro, Plaut. Aul. 748 (the use of clāro for clārō or clārae is due to the fact that lucī being an Adverb does not have the fem. gender of lux). (For fuller details about these Locatives, see Bell on the Latin Locative; Neue, Formenlehre, ii3. p. 640, ii2. p. 242).
§ 39. **A-stems, &c.** O. Lat. -ai is never disyllabic, like -ā of the Genitive. In Plautus a common A-stem Loc. is *viciinæ, as in the phrase proxunæ viciinæ,* 'next door.' We have Romæ on a very early inscription, C. I. L. i. 54: maed Romæ fecid. *Die quinti occurs in Cato's account of Mahabal's boast to Hannibal: mitte mecum Romanum equitatum; die quinti in Capitolio tibi cena cocta erit (ap. Gell. x. 24. 7).

§ 40. **Nom. Plur. I. Masc., Fem.** The I.-Eur. -ēs, which appears in Cons.-stems as -ēs (e. g. O. Ind. mātār-as, Gk. μνημέ-ες), in Ā-stems as -ās, in O-stems as -ōs, and so on, is the suffix in use among the Umbro-Oscan dialects (e. g. Umbr. frater for *fratr-ēs, Osc. censtur for -rēs, aasas ' arae'), but in Latin is hardly found except in I-stems whose -ēs represents I.-Eur. -ēyēs (e. g. from the I.-Eur. stem tri-, 'three,' O. Ind. trāyas, Cret. Gk. τρήσες for *τρήσες, Att. τρεῖς) Lat. trēs. In O-stems this I.-Eur. suffix -ōs is replaced in many of the I.-Eur. languages by -oi, the Nom. Pl. suffix of the Pronominal Declension (e. g. I.-Eur. *toi, O. Ind. té, Hom. Gk. τοί, Lat. īs-li from -lei from original -toi). Thus in Greek we find -oi (e. g. λόκοι), in Celtic -oi (e. g. Gaul. Tano-taliknōi; O. Ir. fir Nom. Pl., 'men,' points to an original *wiroi, as does Lat. vīrī, while firu Voc. Pl. is either the I.-Eur. Nom. Pl. in -ōs or the Acc. Pl.), Teutonic -ai (used in Adjectives, I.-Eur. -ōs being used in Nouns), Balto-Slav. -ai (e. g. Lith. viškai, O. Sl. vlūci, 'wolves'). Similarly in Latin we find -ī from -ei from still earlier -oe or -oi, e. g. O. Lat. poploe (Carm. Saliare), poplei, class. pōpūlī, which is thus distinguished from Acc. Pl. populōs as Nom. Pl. istī (originally -toi) from Acc. Pl. istōs. The prevalence of this Pronominal oi-suffix among the European languages suggests the possibility that Umbro-Osc. -ōs (e. g. Umbr. Atiersiur 'Attiedii,' Osc. Núvlanús 'Nolani') may have had at one period a struggle for existence with -oi, and may have owed its acceptance into use to the analogy of Ā-stem Noms. Plur. in -ās. The Latin Ā-stem suffix -ae, e. g. äræ (O. Lat. -ai, never disyllabic, according to Prisc. i. p. 221 H.), is an example of the contrary change from a prehistoric -ās, of which no traces remain, to a new formation made on the model of the -oi of O-stems. It resembles Greek -āi (e. g. χόραι), but must have been originally -āi, since the ordinary diphthong -āi would become -i in the unaccented syllable in Latin (cf. occidī for òc-caido, ch. iii. § 18). Lat. iē-stems with Nom. Pl. -iēs may
have the I.-Eur. suffix, but U-stems with -זכ show the Acc. Pl. suffix, instead of the I.-Eur. Nom. Pl. -זכ, which would be in Latin -秾, -秾. (This would hardly contract into -秾, as we saw before, § 21). The -秾 which is occasionally found for -秾 in I-stems is also an Acc. Pl. suffix (§ 51); and the I-stem Nom. Pl. v秾 (so in O. Lat., but in class. Lat. v秾-秾 for *v秾-秾, an S-stem) is probably an Accusative form. The -秾 of Cons.-stems, e.g. mattr-秾, censör-秾 may either be the I-stem Nom. Pl. ending, since there is so much interchange of Cons.- and I-stems in Latin (§ 30), or the Acc. Pl.; and the same is true of the U-stem -ע秾, e.g. snע秾.

§ 41. A-stems. Ritschel (Neue Excursae, i. p. 118) proposed to avoid hiatus in some passages of Plautus by the change of Nom. Pl. -א to -ע, reading e.g. alternas in Trin. 539:

nam fulguritae sunt alternae illaque,

where all the MSS., the Palatine family as well as the Ambrosian Palimpsest, read alternae (which may be right, the hiatus being palliated by the alliteration, though editors prefer alternis, or alternas, an Adverb like illas, illæras). He quoted in support of this change a line from one of the Atellanæ of Pomponius, c. 90 b. c. (Com. 141 R.):

quôt laetitias insperatae modo mi inrepsere in simum,

where laetitias insperatae is now usually explained as Acc., governed by inrepsere, though it may quite well be a dialectal form, for the Atellanæ in imitating the manners of country life may also have imitated its language. Dialectal -ע_nom Pl. is found in the old inscriptions of Pisaurum with the s dropped (C. L. L. i. 173 matrona Pisaurese dono dedrot ; 177 dono dedro matrona), along with Gen. Sg. -ע(s) [or Dat. Sg. -ע(i)], § 24]. In early inscriptions we have -א for class -ע, e.g. tabelai, datai on the S. C. de Bacch.

§ 42. O-stems. Pilammoe poplœ was a phrase used of the Romans in the Carmen Saliare (Fest. 244. 25 Th. velut pilis uti assueti); cf. fescennœ (qui depellere fasinum eredebantur, Paul. Fest. 61. 10 Th.; should we read Fescenniœ, class. Fescennini ?). On early inscriptions we have -א, e.g. folderatei, uireti, oinuorsei on the S. C. de Bacch., sometimes written -א (cf. ch. iv. § 34), e.g. ploirume (C. L. L. i. 32). A Nom. Pl. of an IO-stem with -א occurs on an inscription of the first cent. A. D. (C. L. L. i. 1541 b), filis. It is impossible to say whether fleï (i. 1272), fellëi (i. 1284) (cf. socii, i. 1041) is meant for this form (cf. Choli for Clodis Nom. Sg.), or is a misspelling of fellëi (i. 1275) or a contraction of it (like gratiœ for older gratiœ). O-stems show -א, also written -אא, -אא, in some inscriptions of the end of the second or beginning of the first cent. B.C., e.g. magistreïs (C. L. L. i. 565, Capua, 108 B. C.: heise magistreïs Uenerus Louiae muru aedificandum coirauerunt), lanies (vi. 168, Rome), violaries rosaries coronarius (vi. 169, Rome). (For other examples, see Ritschel, Opusc. ii. 646, and add heise magistreïs, Not. Sacr. 1893, p. 164, from Capua, mustae pleis, C. L. L. iii. Suppl. 12316, from Samothrace.) This form is attested for the pronoun hic by Priscian (i. p. 593. 5 H. inveniuntur tamen etiam nominativum ‘hicide’ proferentes antiqui), and is found in the Nom. Pl. Mase. of hic, ille, iste in the Dramatists
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before a word beginning with a vowel, when the particle -ce is added, e. g. Plaut. Mil. 374:

non possunt mihi minaciis tuis hisce oculi exfodiri,

(similarly illisce and istisque are the forms used in Plautus before a word beginning with a vowel, never illis, istic; Studemund in Fleck. Jahrb. 1876, p. 57), though probably never in the Nom. Pl. of O-stem nouns. In the pronouns it seems to be due to the addition of the plural suffix -s to the already formed plural in -i (older -ei); in the Noun O-stems it may have the same origin, though it is not unlikely that the IO-stem formation mentioned above had at least some share in bringing it into use.

Deus has two Nom. Pl. forms, dei, a dissyllable (probably the more ceremonial form), and di, also written dīi, a monosyllable. (Dii and deī are compared to iī and ei by Prisc. i. p. 298 H.).

§ 43. Ì-stems. Varro (L. L. viii. 66) says that puippis and puppices, restis and rests were rival forms in his time, like Abl. əvi and ore, əvī and are. On early inscriptions we have usually -es, e. g. aidiles, C. I. L. i. 187, Eph. Epigr. viii. 676, but ceveis on the Lex Repetund. of 123-122 B. C. (C. I. L. i. 198. 77), fineis and finis in the Sent. Minuciorum of 117 B. C. (ib. i. 199), and pelleis on the Lex Furf. (i. 603) (cf. coques atriensis on a Praenestine inscr., i. 1540). (See Neue, i. p. 246.) The O. Lat. Plur. of vis was vis (Prisc. i. p. 249. 9 H.).

§ 44. Cons.-stems. Lat. quattuor appears to be a relic of the -ès formation, for *quattuor-ès (§ 63), I.-Eur. *qwestwōrēs (O. Ind. catvāras, Dor. Gk. τέμπος, O. Ir. eothir), though some make it represent I.-Eur. *qwestwör, supposing this to be a byform of the ordinary Neuter, which would be in Latin *quatuor (Osc. petora or *petoro). Plautine scansiones like cānis, turbinēs (Trin. 835) are of course mere examples of the Law of Breves Breviantes, like the Imperatives cāvi, pūti, &c. (ch. iii. § 42) (cf. Acc. Pl. überōs virōnēs, Pers. 845) and are no evidence of the use of the suffix -ès.

§ 45. Nom., Acc. Plur. II. Neut. In the Italic, Balto-Slavic, and Teutonic languages all Neuter stems form their Nom. and Acc. Plur. in -ā, while in Greek we have -ā. This ā seems to have been originally peculiar to O-stems, and to be in reality the same as the Nom. Sg. Fem. suffix. Prof. Johannes Schmidt, in his book on the Indo-European formation of Neuter Plurals (Die Pluralbildungen der Indogermanischen Neutra, Weimar, 1889) has mustered an array of facts from the various I.-Eur. languages, which point to the Neut. Plur. having been originally a Collective Fem. Sg. like Lat. fāmīlia in the sense of fānūli, so that, e.g. Lat. jūga originally meant what the Germans would express by 'das Gejöche,' the yoke-material. The use of a Singular Verb with a Neut. Plur. subject in
Greek, O. Ind. (Vedic) and Zend may be explained by this hypothesis, e.g. μῆρα in Hom. Il. i. 464 ἐπεὶ κατὰ μῆρ’ ἐκάη differs from μηρ’ of 1. 460 μηρώς τ' ἐχέταμον in signifying the mass of meat as opposed to the thighs separately. And the change of Gender in Lat. caementum N., caementa F., mendum N., menda F. may be due to the fact that a Collective Sing. Fem. caementa, menda, being treated as a Plural (a ‘Nom. Plur. Neut.’), developed a new Singular, caementum, mendum (Nom. Sing. Neut.). Other illustrations of the connexion between a Collective Sing. Fem. and a Plur. Neut. may be seen in Prof. Schmidt’s book, e.g. Lat. ὀπέρα Sg. Fem. and ὀπέρα Plur. Neut., Hom. Gk. τὰ ἱβία, Att. ἵ ἱβία, with plur. αἱ ἱβίαι. (The Latin examples of change of Gender like locus Sg., loca Pl. are to be found in Neue, i. 2, p. 540.)

The suffix -ā appears, as we have seen, in the Nom. Plur. of all Neuter-stems in the European languages. But in the oldest Indian and Zend literature we have relics of an earlier state of things, viz. -ā for O-stems, -ī for I-stems (a Latin relic of ē is trī-ginta, lit. ‘three tens,’ § 74), -ū for U-stems (perhaps the long vowel of Lat. pēvum, gēnu, cornu, &c. may be due to their having been originally Neut. Plur.; another suggestion is, that genū, cornū, &c. were Duals, like I.-Eur. *sūni, Nom. Dual of the stem *sūnū-, ‘a son’); while Cons.-stems lengthened the vowel of their final syllable [e.g. Vedic nāmā, ‘names,’ for *nōmō(u)?; Prof. Schmidt compares Lat. quattuor from I.-Eur. *qʷetwōr, but see § 63]. All these formations Prof. Schmidt identifies with Fem. Sing. Collectives.

Like the -ā of the Nom. Sing. of Ā-stems, Neut. Plur. -ā appears in Latin as -ā in the earliest literature, and in Umbro-Oscan becomes an o-sound, Oscan ú, Umbr. u, (a), both written in the Latin alphabet o, which is scanned by Lucilius as a short syllable in the Oscan loanword sollo (Lat. tota Neut. Pl.) (inc. 160 M.):

uasa quoque omnino dirimit, non sollo dupundi,

and is written -a by Festus in the Oscan numeral petora, four (250. 30 Th. petoritum et Gallicium vehiculum esse, et nomen ejus dictum esse existimant a numero quattuor rotarum. alii Osce, quod hi quoque ‘petora’ quattuor vocent). In Umbrian
it appears that the Nom, and Acc. Pl. of Neuter-stems were distinguished by the addition to this -o of the -r (-s) and the -f, which are the final letters of the Masc. Nom. and Acc. Plur., though it is possible that this -r and -f were not pronounced, but were used merely as graphic criteria of the two cases, e.g. luderor Nom., verof Acc. Whether it is merely accidental, or not, that the ordinary forms in -a, -o are found in the Acc. along with forms in -of, but not in the Nom. along with forms in -or, the limited material does not allow us to decide.

With that interchange of the Cons.- with the I-declension mentioned in § 50, we have e.g. plüría (cf. compluria) and plura, forms discussed by Gellius (v. 21), who tells us of a letter written by Sinnius Capito to Pacuvius Labeo to prove the thesis: ‘pluria non plura dici debere.’ We have -ia in the Neut. Plur. of Adjective Stems like tērētia, audācia, victīcia, fērentia, &c. (see Neue, ii3. p. 121), but always vētēra from vetus, which was originally a Noun (Gk. (F)étos, a year) (§ 55). In O. Lat. we have silentia, for silentia, quoted by Gellius from Laevius (Gell. xix. 7. 7 ab eo quod est sileo ‘silentia loca’ dixit et ‘pulverulenta’ et ‘pestilentia’) (see ch. v. § 64).

§ 46. Gen. Plur. The suffix -ōm is indicated by most of the I.-Eur. languages (e.g. Gk. ἱσταμ, μιτέρ-ων), which would in Latin become in time -ōm (ch. iii. § 49), then -ām (e.g. socium on the S. C. de Bacch.) (cf. Osc. Nūlvanūm, Mαμερπνουμ, Λουκανομ, Umbr. Atiersio). Ā-stems took in Greek and in the Italic languages -āsōm, e.g. (Hom Gk. ὑδάων, Att. θεῶν, Lat. deārum, Osc. egmazum ‘rerum,’ which was the Gen. Plur. Fem. suffix of Pronouns (e.g. O. Ind. tāsām, Hom. Gk. τάων, Lat. is-tarum, &c.), and after this model a Gen. Pl. of O-stems was formed in Latin with the suffix -ōrum (O. Lat. -orum), a suffix not found in Umbro-Oscan, which by Cicero’s time drove the older -om, -um off the field. On the same model the Fifth Decl. stems formed their Gen. Pl., e.g. fāciērum. The use of -iūm in Gen. Plur. of Adjectives like fērentiūm, audāciūm, and of -um in Gen. Pl. ērum, vōlūcrum, vālum, &c. (see instances in Neue, ii. pp. 258 sqq., e.g. civitātūm and civitatiūm), is due to that confusion of Cons.-stems with I-stems, which played so great a part in the Latin dā
declension, and which occupied a great deal of the attention of the native grammarians.

§ 47. -um and -orum in O-stems. Cicero's remarks on these suffixes are worth quoting (Orat. xlvi. 153): atque etiam a quibusdam sero jam emendatur antiquitas, qui haec reprehendunt; nam pro deum atque hominum fidem 'deorum' aiunt. Ita credo. Hoc illi nesciebant? an dabat hanc licentiam consuetudo? Itaque idem poeta (Ennius) qui inusitatius contraxerat: Patris mei, meum factum pudet, pro 'meorum factorum,' et: Texturit, exitium examen rapit, pro 'exitiorum,' non dicit 'liberum,' ut plerique loquimur, cum 'cupidos liberum' aut 'in liberum loco' dicimus, sed ut isti volunt: Neque tuum unquam in gremium extollas liberorum ex te genuis. Et idem: Namque Aessculapi liberorum. At ille alter (Pacuvius) in Chryse non solum: Cites, anti quos aici maiorum meum, quod erat usitatun, sed durius etiam: Consilium socii, augurium atque extum interpretus; idemque pergit: Postquam prodigium horriferum, portentum pavor. Quae non sane sunt in omnibus neutris usitata. Nec enim dixerim tam libenter 'armum judicium,' etsi est apud eundem: Nihilne ad te de iudicio arnum accidit? quam centuriam, ut censoria tabulae loquntur, fabrum et procum audeo dicere, non 'fabrorum' et 'procorum.' Planeque 'duorum virorum judicium' aut 'triumvirorum capitalium' aut 'decemvирorum stilitibus judicandis' dico nunquam. Atqui dixit Attius: Uideo sepulera duo duorum corporum; idemque: Mulier una duum uirum, Quid verum sit intellego, sed alas ita loquor, ut concessum est, ut hoc vel pro deum dico vel pro deorum, alias, ut necesse est, cum triumvirum, non 'virorum,' cum sestertium, numnum, non 'nummorum,' quod in his consuetudo varia non est. Similarly Varro (L.L. viii. 71): quaerunt, si sit analogia, cur appellant omnes aedem Deum Consentium et non 'Deorum Consentium'? Item quor dicatur mille denarium, non 'mille denariorum'; est enim hoc vocabulum figura ut Vatinius, Manilius, denarius; debet igitur dico ut Vatiniorum, Maniliorum, denariorum; et non equum puplicum mille assarium esse, sed mille 'assariorum'; ab uno enim assario multi assarii, ab eo assariorum. (A list of Genitives Plur. of O-stems in -on is given by Neue, P. 103.) Nastrum and vestrum, Gen. Plur. of noster, vester, established themselves in class. Lat. as Gen. Pl. of nos, vos (ch. vii. § 9). A-stem Genitives like agricolum (Luccr. iv. 586. follow the analogy of O-stems, as do vectigaliorum, anciliorum, &c., and perhaps currum, &c.; amphirom and drachnum follow the Greek. On the (restored) Columna Rostrata (C. I. L. i. 195. 10) we have the Pronoun ohotom 'illorum'; on a Scipio epitaph of perhaps the end of the third cent. B. C. (i. 32), the Adj. duonum 'bonorum,' but -o(m) on the earliest coins, e. g. C. I. L. i. 15 Caleno (with Neopolitans), i. 16 Suesano (with Neopolitans). (See ch. iii. § 49.) In i. 24, of end of third cent. B. C., Ladinod is usually read Larinor, a Gen. Pl.

§ 48. Dat., Abl., Loc., Instr. Plural. These four cases must be considered together; they are so intermingled in Latin and in other I.-Eur. languages. Latin A-stems show -is, older -eis, which has come from an earlier -ais (cf. Oscan -ais, Greek -ais), a suffix apparently formed in imitation of the -ois of O-stems.
This O-stem suffix, in Latin -īs, earlier -eis, and still earlier -oēs or -oēs (Osc. -ūis, -ōis) is regarded by some as a Locative, by others as an Instrumental (see Brugmann, Grundriss, ii. §§ 357, 380). The suffix -ēs, O. Lat. -ēs, shown by other stems (e.g. civē-bus, légū-bus with the i of I-stems, lācī-bus or lācī-bus, sī-bus or sē-bus), comes from an original -bhōs. In Umbro-Oscan, as usual, the short vowel of the final syllable is syncopated, e.g. O. Osc. luisari-fs (in Lat. *lūsāribus), Osc. teremn-īss (in Lat. terminēbus), lig-i-s (in Lat. légī-bus), Umbr. fratr-ŭ-s, with s for ss and so not changed to r, and preceded by a vowel which may be the I.-Eur. 'Composition Vowel' o (ch. v. § 80), though this is quite uncertain. This suffix was in O. Lat. employed in the Dat., Abl. Plur. of Ā-stems, e.g. dextra-bus (cf. Gaul. Mārpēβo Namawikāβo), but in the classical period this form was retained only in legal language, for the purpose of distinguishing Ā- from O-stems, e.g. filiis et filiabus, just as we retain the old Plural suffix in 'oxen' but have dropped it in 'shoes' (earlier 'shoon'). Adverbs like āliās, O. Lat. alteras, forēs may show the I.-Eur. Locative of Ā-stems (Gk. -āστι, e.g. θυρāσι; O. Ind. -āsū, e.g. āśvāsu) (but see ch. ix. § 4).

§ 49. Ā- and O-stems. The old form privicloes (privis, id est singulis), the Dat., Abl. Plur. of a diminutive of priēus, is quoted from the Carmen Saliare by Festus (244. 21 Th.), and Paul. Fest. 14. 17 Th. has: ab 'oloēs' dicebant pro ab illis, but -eis, sometimes written -ēs (ch. iv. § 34), is the spelling of the older inscriptions: e.g. viēis, leibereis, populeis, aedificiēs, aereis, locēis, on the Lex Agraria of III b. c. (C. I. L. i. 200); souēs nuges on an old epitaph of a minum (i. 1297):

plouruma que fecit populō souēs gaudia nuges,

which has ē for ei also in the Nom. Sing. Masc. of the Relative, que for queī (class. qui); de manubies (Eph. Epigr. viii. 476, Capua, 135 b. c.). We find -īs contracted in course of time into -is; thus gratīs (always with -is, and similarly ingratīs, in Plautus and Terence; cf. gratīs in a line of Pomponius, e. 90 b. c., Com. 110 R.) became gratīs in classical Latin; provincīs, &c. beside judicīs (the long i being indicated by the tall form of the letter), occur on the Mon. Aneyranum; and of IO-stems we have, e.g. Januarīs (C. I. L. vi. 543, of 115 a. d.), Junīs (vi. 213, of 131 a. d.). (For other examples, see Neu i. p. 31.) An example of -ibus in O. Lat. is quoted by Nonius (493. 16 M.) from Livius Andronicus' translation of the Odyssey: dēque mānibus dextra-bus. The passages of the grammarians bearing on this form, and details of the use of deabūs, filiabūs, and libertabūs, the most frequent words of the kind, are given by Neu, i. pp. 22 sqq. We have Masc. -ibus with Fem. -ibus in the Duals duabūs, ambabūs, though the rarity of the formation led to the latter being
replaced in Vulg. Lat. by ambis Masc. and Fem. (Caper 107. 14 K. ambobus, non 'ambis' et ambabus'. O-stems sometimes take the I-stem and Consonantal -ibus in Late and Vulgar Latin, e.g. C. L. vi. 224 ditus omnibus deabuque (197 A. D.); 15267 amictibus; 17633 alumnibus. Pomponius, the writer of Atellanae, uses pannis (Com. 70 R.) for pannis in imitation of the rustic mode of speech; and in the Sermo Plebeius of Petronius we have dibus (Sat. 44. p. 29, 35 B. ita meos fruniscar, ut ego puto omnia illa a dibus fieri). In the O. Lat. inscription (C. L. i. 814) devas Corniscas sacrum, found in the 'Corniscarum divarum locus trans Tiberim' (Paul. Fest. 45. 16 Th.), the two first words may be Gen. Sing. If Plural, they are Locatives like alias. The instances of dialectal and Lat. -os are all doubtful (Class. Rev. ii. p. 204).

§ 50. Other stems. O. Lat. -bos of trebibos on a bronze vase in the British Museum (Eph. Epigr. ii. 299 Q. Lainio Q. f. praefectos protebibos fecit), corresponding to class. -bus, indicates a short vowel, for -bos would have retained ॐ (ch. iii. § 18). The few apparent examples of its being scanned as a long syllable by the Dramatists (collected by C. F. Müller in his Plaut. Prosodie, p. 53; add Naev. Trag. 57 R.) must be illusory (many of them are cases of syllaba anees at a pause in the line, e.g. Plaut. Merc. 900, Rud. 975).

§ 51. Acc. Plur. The I.-Eur. suffix was -ns, after a consonant -ns. Thus A-stems ended in -âns, which became -âs, O-stems in -âns, which became -âns, I-stems in -ins, R-stems in -îns, S-stems in -îns, and so on. Latin examples are viâns, lupôs, fratrês [with -ês from -îns (ch. ii. § 64) from I.-Eur. -îns], honôrês for -ôsêns. I.-Eur. -ns, -ns becomes in Oscan -ss, in Umbr. -f, e.g. Osc. viass 'vias,' felîuss, walls (cf. Gk. τέχω), Umbr. vitlaf 'vitulas,' or with loss of -f villa, toru for *toruf 'tauros,' avif, avif, and aveif 'aves.'

I-stems in Latin should show -îs (from -îns, ch. ii. § 64); and this is the usual form in the best MSS., though we often find -ês, the Nom. Pl. ending or the Cons.-stem ending. Thus urbis is attested for Virg. G. i. 25: urbisne inviserë, Caesar, &c., but urbes for A. iii. 106: centum urbes habitant magnas, tres for A. x. 350, but tris for the following line (Gell. xiii. 21); so on the (restored) Columna Rostrata (C. I. L. i. 195) [é]lasesque nauales... classeis Poenicas... copias Cartacimienseis... naeuis. (For statistics of the use of -îs and -ês, see Neue, i2. p. 245.)

§ 52. II. THE COMPARISON OF ADJECTIVES. The I.-Eur. suffixes used to form the Comparative and Superlative of Adjectives have been already mentioned in chap. iv. For the Comparative, (1) -yês-, with weak grade -is- (e.g. O. Ind. svâdîyas-, Gk. ἱδω Acc. for *ências, Goth. sutiza, Lith. sâdîs-).
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Lat. suāvior, older *suaviōs, māgis Adv.; (2) -tēro- and -ēro-, the original sense of which was rather that of likeness, of equal, than of greater degree (e. g. O. Ind. vatsa-tarā-, lit. ‘like a calf’; Lat. māter-tera, lit. ‘like a mother,’ Ir. demnithir, ‘equally certain,’ from demin, ‘certain’); for the Superlative, (1) -is-to- (-is-tho-?), (e. g. O. Ind. āś-īṣṭha-, Gk. ὅκιτος; O. Ind. svād-īṣṭha-, Gk. ηὔ-

-στος, Goth. sut-ists, Engl. sweet-est), apparently composed of the weak Comparative suffix -is- and the TO-suffix (ch. v. § 27); (2) -temo- or -tēmo- (-tēmo-) and -emo- or -emo- (-emo-)(ch. v. § 14) (e. g. O. Ind. ān-tama-, Lat. in-timus; O. Ind. upamā-, Lat. summus for *sup-mus). This last Superlative suffix was, like the Comparative -tero-, -ero- (Ascoli, Suppl. Arch. Glott. Ital. i. 53), originally a suffix denoting likeness (e. g. O. Ind. gō-tama-, lit. ‘like an ox’) or position, and it has this force in Latin words like aedī-timus, lit. ‘living in a temple’ (later corrupted to aedī-tums, as if from tēcor, ‘guarding a temple,’ Gell. xii. 10 ; Varro, R. R. i. 2. 1); finī-timus, mārī-timus, &c., so that e. g. cī-timus probably meant originally ‘near in position’ (cf. dex-timus, ‘on the right, not ‘most on the right’), and is not properly a Superlative. To give Superlative sense, the weak Comparative suffix was added, -is-emo- (-is-e-mo-), e. g. maximus for *māgis-imus, sācerrimus for *sacris-imus, fācillimus for *fācilis-imus (on the change of -ris-

to -ers-, -err-, &c., see ch. iv. § 13). The origin of the usual Latin Superlative ending -issimus, older -issimus, has been matter of much discussion. One theory makes the I.-Eur. suffix of O. Ind. āś-īṣṭha-, Gk. ὅκ-στος -istho-, not -isto-, and explains Lat. -issimus as this suffix augmented by -emo- (-mo-). But the change of I.-Eur. sth into Latin ss is not satisfactorily proved by Lat. ossi-, bone (O. Ind. asthān-, Gk ὀστέον; see ch. iv. § 95), and it seems safer to analyze -issimus into the suffixes -isto- and -temo- (on ss for (s)tt, see ch. iv. § 108)1. The -is- of -issimus, like the -is of magis, had short i, a fact attested not only by grammarians [Mar. Victor., p. 242. 24 K.; Vergilius, p. 189.

17 H. (Suppl.)], but by late spellings like merentessesmo, karessemo

1 Or -issimo-, an ending peculiar, so far as is known, to Latin, may contain the suffix -is- twice. The change of *oci-s-imus) to oxime (*oc-
sime) obscured the presence of this suffix, and may have led to a re-
formation from ocius (*oci), viz. ocis-
sime.
(C. I. L. ii. 2997). (The tall form of I in some late inscriptions, e. g. carissimo C. I. L. vi 5325, does not prove that the vowel was long; see ch. i. § 9).

The irregular Comparison of simple Adjectives like 'good,' 'bad' (e. g. bonus, melior, optimus; Gk. ἀγαθός, ἀκέλειυς; Engl. good, better) is a relic of a very early time when different roots were used to express a Positive, a Comparative, and a Superlative notion,—bonus (older duonus) from dwen- (cf. O. Ind. dūvas-, 'honour'), melior, optimus (C. I. L. i. 1016 has opituma, an archaism) from the root op- of optō, ὑπες, &c. On the Comparison of Adverbs, see ch. ix. § 1.

In the Romance languages Comparison is expressed by the use of the descendants of Lat. plus (Ital., French, &c.), magis (Span., Port., &c.), e. g. Ital. più riceo, 'richer;' il più riceo, 'the richest,' except in these simple Adjectives like 'good,' 'bad,' which retain their old irregular Comparison, e. g. Ital. migliore and ottimo, 'very good' (il migliore, 'the best'), peggio and pessimo, 'very bad' (il peggiore, 'the worst'), &c. Ital. -issimo (e. g. ricchissimo, 'very rich,' not 'richest') shows itself by its -is- instead of -es- (for Lat. -is-, ch. ii. § 14) to be a late innovation, and no transmission from ancient times. (See Meyer-Lübke, Rom. Gram. ii. p. 83.)

§ 53. The Comparative Suffixes. The suffix -yes appears in Latin as -ior Nom. Sg., M., F., -iōris Gen. Sg., -ius Nom. Sg. Neut., of which the older forms were -iōs, -iōsēs, -iōs. (On the change of s to r, see ch. iv. § 148.) Varro (L. L. vii. 27) quotes from early Latin (from the Carm. Sal.?) meliosen, and Paul. Fest. (359. 1 Th.) maiosibus, meliosibus (his 'meltom meliorem dicebant, 87. 25 Th., may be a corruption of a gloss like 'melior meliori; see Class. Rev. v. 10; so in a Glossary 'meliosa meliora, Löwe, Opusc. p. 170). Priscian (i. p. 347. 2 H.) quotes from the earlier historians Neuter forms like prior, posterior; thus from Valerius Antias: hoc senatusconsultum prior factum est; from Cassius Hemina: bellum Punicum posterior; from Claudius Quadrigarius: prior bellum quod cum his gestum erat; and: foedus prior Pompeianum (on calor Neut. in O. Lat., see § 14); though it is conceivable that the actual forms used may have been priōs, posterōs, which must have been the predecessors of priōs, posteriōs (ch. iii. § 18).1

The yes-suffix was originally affixed to the root without the suffix of the Positive stem, as in Lat. āc-iōr, O. Ind. ās-iyas-, Gk. ἄξ-ιαυ from a Positive

1 The supposed examples of -iōs in Plautus are illusory; see Müller, Plaut. Pros. p. 55.
stem *ōk-, but Lat. suātior for *swāt-ior, tēnior, aspērior, &c. start from the Positive stem *swādū-, &c. On the other hand the suffix -tero-, when added to an Adjective, was affixed to the Positive stem, e.g. ākū-repos. This -tero- is often added to Prepositions, e.g. ex-ter, ci-ter, postero- (similarly -ero- in supero-). In Latin it has not Comparative sense unless augmented by the YES-suffix, e.g. ex-ter-ior, ci-ter-ior, dex-ter-ior, sinis-ter-ior; xēter, &c. being apparently the Latin equivalent of the Gk. ākū-repos-, &c. (ch. ix. § 1).

§ 54. The Superlative Suffixes. The suffix -tomo- or -tomo- (-tomo-) with -emo- or -mo (-momo-) is closely associated with Comparative -tero-, -ero-, e.g. ci-timus goes with ci-tero-, in-timus with in-tero-. (O. Ind. án-tama- with án-țama-), summus from *sup-i-mus with supero-, infimus (imus seems not to occur in Plautus) with infero-. The old augural term solstiumum triumulum may combine it with the Comparative -is-. Its original form is difficult to ascertain. The spelling on Republican inscriptions is timus, umus (ch. iii. § 18). Umbr. hondomu suggests an older -tomo-, -omo-, while Osc. ultimumum (Lat. ultimum) shows an affection of t that is usual before a u-sound (cf. Osc. tiurri-, Lat. torris). The form without t is seen in mínimus, bráma from brēvis for *breghu- (Gk. θραχύς), (cf. Osc. maimo- 'maximus'), and apparently attached to a case-form, in suprē-mus, extrē-mus, postrē-mus (cf. postumus Virg. A. vi. 763), but it is usually combined with the Comparative -is-, e.g. maximus for mag-is-timus (Falisc. Maxomo-), O. Lat. oximé (Paul. Fest. 225. 1 Th.) for *te-is-īme, medioñimus from the stem medio- seen in médioeris. This was the formation adopted by Adjective-stems ending in -i-, -ri-, -ro-, e.g. faciīs, facti-īmus for *faci-ī-simus; ācer (acer), accerrimus for *acri-simius; mīsero-, miser- rimus1, &c., though we have sīcīrissimus, māturissimus and maturissime, but usually maturīme, &c. (see Neue, ii2, pp. 187 sqq.). With the last we should probably compare O. Lat. piurīme in the phrase purīme tetnoero, explained in Paul. Fest. 335. 7 Th. as purissime tenuero. Ennius (according to Charisius 83. 22 K.) wrote equitatus celerissimus, and mīnerrimus is quoted by Paul. Fest. 88. 11 Th.: 'minerrimus' pro minimo dixerunt.

§ 55. Some irregular Comparatives and Superlatives. Vetustior appears as the Comparative of vētus, because vētus with its ill-sounding repetition of the syllable -us- was discarded in the Positive for vētus, apparently the L-Eur. Noun *wētōs, *wētēs- (Gk. ἐτός, a year); in the Superlative vētērīmus and vētēstīssimus (in Livy and later writers) are both found. Mīnus, with -is not -ius, has been similarly explained to have originated in a Neuter Noun, meaning 'the less quantity,' and to have produced the declension minor M., minor F., minus N.; the Ocean equivalent of minor is minstro- (Lat. minister), e.g. ampert mindreis acēcis eliusa mollas mollavum ticioţa 'dumtaxat minoris partis pecuniae multas multare liceto' on the Law of Bantia (cf. Umbr. mestro- 'major,' Lat. mágister). The coexistence of such forms as bēnévōlās and benevolens (ch. viii. § 90) produced a type of Comparison like magnificēs, magnificentior, magnificentissimus; while frugī, which was a Dative Case of a noun [frugi (bonae) se.

1 It is a mistake to suppose that the antepenultimate of -issimus is ever shortened (Class. Rev. vi. 342).
faciendae aptus; cf. Plaut. *Pseud.* 468 tamen ero frugi bona; *Poen.* 892 erus si tuos nol facere frugem) had recourse for its Comparative and Superlative to the Adj. *frugi-tis.* The retention of *v* in the Positive with its suppression in the other degrees, causes the anomaly in the Comparison of *dives,* (but cf. *Ter.* *Adelph.* 770 dis quidem esses, Demea), *diti-or,* *ditissimus*; *jüvénis,* *junior.* From plē-, a development of the root pel-, 'to fill' (Lat. plē-nus, reple-tus, plē-ri-que, Gk. πλήνη), &c.; were formed Greek *πλείων, πλείστος*; from plō-, another grade of plē- (ch. iv. § 53), the Latin *plūs* for *plo-eris* (*ple-eris* Cic. *Legg.* iii. 3, 6), *plūrimum* for *plo-eris-*omo- (*ple-ruma* Nom. Pl. *Masc.* on a Scipio epitaph of the end of the third cent. B.C., *C. I. L.* i. 32:

hoc oino ploirume cosentiant R[ōmaï]

diōnóro óptumo fuise uiro,

' humane umnum plurimi consentiunt Romae bonorum optimum fuisset virum'); the *plous* of the S. C. Bach. (*C. I. L.* i. 156, 196 and 20) may with its *ou* merely represent the *u*-sound which the diphthong *oi* had by this time assumed (ch. iv. §§ 37, 38), and is hardly sufficient evidence of a formation *plo-us* like *minus*; similarly *ploiruma* on the epitaph of a mime (*C. I. L.* i. 1297, in dactylic hexameters:

ploiruma que fecit populo soueis gaudia nugas,

' plurima qui fecit populo suis gaudia nugis') is a misspelling of *ploiruma* or *plo-eruma.* The *ploeris* of the Carmen Arvalae (*C. I. L.* i. 28), a hymn preserved in a late and wretchedly spelt inscription:

neve luæ rue, Marma, sins incurrere in dlores,
neve luæ rue, Marmar, sins incurrere in ploeris,
neve luæ rue, Marmar, sers incurrere in ploeris,

' neve luem rueem, Marmar, sinas (*siveris ?*) incurrere in plures,' may be a mistake for *ploeris,* and the *ploisima* quoted from the Carmen Saliiare by Festus [244. 17 Th. 'ploisma' plurima; but in Varro's account of the same Carmen (*L. L.* vii. 27) *ploisma* is the reading of the MS.] should perhaps be corrected to *ploisima* (*ploisoma*), though some regard these forms as evidence of Latin derivatives from the root plē-, like Greek Πλείων (Πλείων) and Πλείστος. *Major* is by far the best referred to an older *mahior* (cf. O. Ind. *máhiyas*) with *h* for the Guttural Aspirate, while magis, maximus show another form of root with the Guttural Alveolar (*C. I. L.* i. 117), (but cf. Ose, *mais* for *mahis, maimas* for *mahimas*, Umbr. *mestru* for *mahistro*); the relation, however, of the Italic forms to Goth. maiza, 'more' Adj. (I.-Eur. *ma-ias*), O. Ir. *māa*, mō, O. W. *moi,* all of which point to a root ending in a long vowel, mā- or mō-, is not perfectly clear.

§ 56. III. NUMERALS. Of the Latin Cardinal Numbers only 1–3 are inflected, *únus* -a -um, *duō* -ae -ō, *trēs* -ēs -ia, not 4 (O. Ind. catvāras, cástrasas, catvāri, Gk. τεσσαρεῖς -es -a), nor 5 (O. Ind. pānca Nom., pānčañám Gen., Gk. πέντε, Lesb. πέπνων Gen.). The Numeral Adverbs from 5 upwards end in -iens or -iēs (on the spelling, see Brambach, *Lat. Orth.* p. 269; Neue, ii3. p. 335; the Mon. Ancyranum has -iens), an ending which is also found
in totie(n)₄, quotie(n)₄, and which has been connected with the ending of O. Ind. kiyant- (Adj.), ‘how great?’ iyant- (Adj.), ‘so great,’ probably I.-Eur. -yěnt. Umbr. nuvis ‘novies,’ Ose. pomis ‘quinquies’ seem to show the same ending, with i as weak grade of yě (ch. iv. § 51). [On the change of I.-Eur. -nt to -ns in Lat. and Umbro-Oscean, see ch. iv. § 105; in late Lat. inscriptions we often find -is (cf. ch. ii. § 6), e.g. quinquis, Rossi, I. Chr. i. 508, of 402 A. D., sexis, ib. i. 530, of 404 A. D., decis C. I. L. xii. 2087, of 559 A. D., also -es (cf. quetus for quiētus, ch. ii. § 149), e.g. quinques, Rossi, i. 510, of 402 A. D., deces C. I. L. xii. 2086, of 558 A. D., vices xii. 2187, of 564 A. D.]

Fractions are expressed by divisions of the ad (=12 unciæ), e.g. uncia, ‘one-twelfth,’ quincunx, ‘five-twelfths;’ septunx, ‘seven-twelfths;’ duenx, ‘eleven-twelfths,’ lit. ‘minus an ounce.’ The I.-Eur. word for ‘half,’ *sēmi- (O. Ind. sāmi-, Gk. ἑμα-, O. Engl. sām-, whence our ‘sand-blind’), is in Latin sēmi-, the declinable form sēmis, Gen. semissis, &c., being apparently a compound of sēmi- and as with the -ye- of *semyēsis weakened to å (ch. iii. § 18, p. 188); similarly the -wē- of *centu(m)-essi-, *dēcu(m)-essi- is weakened to ã in centussi-, decussi-. The origin of the -ns (for -nts) of triens, ‘one-third,’ sextaus, ‘one-sixth,’ quadraus, ‘one-fourth,’ dodecaus, ‘three-fourths,’ dextaus, ‘five-sixths,’ for *dē-sextaus, lit. ‘minus one-sixth,’ is not clear; bessi- is usually explained as *dē-sexsi- (on b- from dvs-, see ch. iv. § 71), but it means not ‘two asses’ but ‘two-thirds of an ass.’ The Adjective for ‘half’ is dī-midius from dis- and medius (ch. iii. § 18). ‘One and a half’ is sesqui-,...usually explained as *sēmis-que, with the same syncope as is seen in sesertiuaus, ‘two and a half,’ for sēmis-tertius (cf. Germ. drittehalb).

§ 57. One. I.-Eur. *oi-no- (Gk. ὄνη, an ace, O. Ir. oen, W. un, Goth. ains, Lith. včnas, O. Sl. i-nů; cf. O. Ind. ēka- for *oi-ko-, Cypr. Gk. ol-Fos, Att. oios, alone, for *oi-wo-), Lat. ūnus (-a-um), O. Lat. oinos. Another I.-Eur. word for ‘one’ was

1 The Oscan word, often compared with bessi-, viz. diasis (Zv. I. I. I. . . . jasis. 154), has scant claims to existence.
*sēm-, which is used in Gk., εἰς for *sem-s, μᾶ for σμ-ia, ἐν for *sem, and in Arm., mi for *sm-i; and in Derivatives and Compounds in all languages, e.g. *sem-, *sm- in O. Ind. sa-kīt, *once, Gk. ἀ-παξ, ἀ-πλός, ἀ-πλῶς, Lat. sin-gūli, simplus, sim-plex, sēmēl, sem-pēr, sincinia: cantio solitaria, Paul. Fest. 500. 23 Th., simpludiaearea funera: quibus adhibentur duntaxat ludi, Fest. 498. 24 Th., Goth. similē, 'once.' For the Ordinal was used a derivative from the I.-Eur. root per- (cf. Lat. prō, prae, &c.; Gk. πέρυς: for πέρ-ντι, 'in the previous year,' O. Ind. par-ut, from pēr and the root of *wētōs, 'a year,' Gk. ἔτος), in Latin *prīs- (cf. prius) with the suffix -mo, prīmus for *prīs-mus (Pelign. Prisma-; cf. Lat. prīs-cus, prīs-tinus), in O. Ind. a derivative with one Superlative suffix, pra-thamā-, in Teutonic with another, O. H. G. fur-ist (cf. Germ. Fürst), Engl. first.

The Adverb is in Latin sēmēl from the root sem-, just mentioned, a byform of which furnished the Indefinite Pronoun 'any,' 'some,' in various languages (O. Ind. sama-, Gk. ἄμο-, Goth. sums, Engl. some; K. Z. xxxii. 373); the Adjective, sim-plus (Gk. ἀ-πλός) or sim-plex (from *sem-plax, cf. du-plex § 59); the Distributive sin-gūli.

§ 58. Unus. O. Lat. oinos appears on the proud epitaph of L. Cornelius Scipio (C.I.L. i. 32), written in Saturnian metre:

hónc oino ploirume cosēntiont R[ōma]
dūōnōro ὅptumo fuise uiro,

'hunc unum plurimi consentiunt Romae bonorum optimum fuisset virum'; cf. oinūrseī 'universi' on the S. C. de Bacch. (i. 196), and Oinumama 'Unimamma' (an Amazon) on an old Praenestine cista (i. 1501), oinā Adv. in the Lex Agraria of 111 B.C. (i. 200. 21); oenus in Plaut. Truc. 103. Cic. Legg. iii. 3. 9. But we have unus in the Lex Repetundarum of 123-122 B.C. (i. 198). The Neuter, with the Negative particle nē prefixed, was used as the ordinary Negative, noenom (for *ne-oīnom), later nōn (ch. iv. § 16), like our 'not' and 'nought,' Germ. nicht and Nichts, from Goth. ni waihts (see ch. x. § 18), while to express 'nothing' the Romans used a compound of ne and nihil (quod grano fabae adhaeret, Paul. Fest. 72. 10 Th.), nihilum, later nihil, nīt (ch. iii. § 52). The plural of unus is found with Nouns whose Plural is used in a Singular (Collective) sense, e. g. una castra, and in the sense of 'only,' 'alone' (cf. Gk. ὀλος), e. g. tres unos passus Plaut. In the Romance languages the Indefinite Article is formed from Lat. unus, as the Definite from Lat. īle; and we see traces of this use in colloquial Latin, e. g. una aduliscuntula, Ter. Andr. 118.

§ 59 Two. I.-Eur. *dūwo- and *dwo- with Dual declension,
§§ 58–60.] DECLENSION OF NOUNS, ETC. NUMERALS. 411

*duwó(u) M., *duwai F., *duwou or *duwei N. (O. Ind. dváu and dvá, older dváu and dvá M., dvé, older dvé F., N., Gk. δώ and δό, also δ(θ)ω–, O. Ir. dau and dā M., dī F., W. dau M., dvy F., Goth. tvai M., tvós F., tva N., Lith. dū M., for *dvū, dū F. for *dvē, O. Sl. dva and dāva M., dvě and dāvě F., N.), Latin duo M., N., duae F., with Dual declension, which however became intermixed with Plural forms, e.g. dvōs Acc. M. beside duo. In Derivatives and Compounds the I.-Eur. stem dvi- appears (O. Ind. dvi-pád-, Gk. δ(θ)τ-πος, O. Engl. twi-fête), Lat. bī-pes, bī-dens (O. Lat. duo-dens, Paul. Fest. 47. 8 Th., cf. duicensus : cum aliter, id est cum filio, census, id. 47. 5; duicensus . . . δεύτερον ἀπογεγραμμένος Gl. Philox.), while in the Italic languages we have also dū- (Lat. du-plus, du-plex, du-centi, Umbr. du-pursus ‘bipedibus’), apparently the weak grade of an I.-Eur. *dvē- (Lat. du-livs has the same root ; cf. Hom. δοῖν, doubt, Germ. Zwei-fel, Zend dvai-dī). For the Ordinal the Romans used secundus, lit. ‘following,’ from séquor, or alter, ‘the other of two,’ from the same root as ăl-ins, ‘the other of many’ (O. Ir. aile, W. ail, which have also this sense of ‘second’; in O. Engl. ōfer had this numerical sense); for the Adverb I.-Eur. *dwi's or *dūwīs (O. Ind. dvis, Vedic dveś, Gk. δ(θ)ς, M. H. G. zwis, Goth. tvis-, ‘apart’; Engl. twis-t), bīs (O. Lat. dvis, Paul. Fest. 47. 6 Th.; cf. duidens ‘hostia bidens,’ and duicensus ‘cum aliter, id est cum filio census’ quoted above); for the Adjective dū-plus (Gk. δ-πλος, Umbr. du-plo-) or dū-plex (Gk. δ-πλεξ; cf. Umbr. tu-plak N.); for the Distributive bī-ni from *dwiž-no- (O. Scand. tvenner) or from *dwī-no- (Lith. dvynū Du., ‘twins’).

§ 60. Duo. The original quantity of the final vowel of duo in Latin is difficult to establish from poetry. We cannot assign much weight to the precept of the grammarians (e.g. Charisius 35. 25 K.) which distinguishes duō M. from dú N., nor to the scansion duō in the Christian poets (Neue, ii. 277; similarly ego for ἐγό). In classical poetry the scansion is invariably duō (cf. duōdēnt), but in the old Republican poets we find duo Acc. distinguished from duō, not by the quantity of its final syllable, but in being treated as a monosyllable or the equivalent of a long syllable; for example, duo Acc. is never allowed to end an iambic line, which points to *dūo rather than to *dūō (A. L. L. iii. 551). The shortening of the final vowel can be easily explained by the Law of Breves Breviantes, which reduced hāve to hāve (ch. iii. § 42); for a similar doubt with reference to the pronunciation of scio as scē or *scē, see
ch. ii. § 151). The Fem. duae may retain the old suffix of the Nom. Dual of A-stems, -ai (e.g. O. Ind. āśvē for I.-Eur. *ēkwai, 'two mares'), which would be retained in monosyllabic *dva in without sinking, as in the unaccented syllable, to -i (e.g. occia from oc-caio, ch. iii. § 18). The termination -ibus of duabus M., N. is shared only by the other Dual-form ambo, though -ibus F. was a common (Dat., Abl. or Instr.) Plural ending of A-stems, retained in legal language especially in the words deabus, filiabus, libertabus (§ 48). But the Plural declension encroached more and more on these Dual forms; diūs Acc. M. competes, as we have seen, in the older literature with duō, while duas F. is a Plural, as are also the Genitive forms duorum M., N. (older duam, e.g. duumvirum used by Cicero, § 47), duarum F. A Nom., Acc. Neuter duā appears on inscriptions (e.g. C. I. L. v. 1102; other instances in Neue, ii. p. 277), though it is called a barbarism by Quintilian (i. 5. 15 nam 'dua' et 'tre' diversorum generum sunt barbarismi, at 'duapono' et 'trepondo' usque ad nostram aetatem ab omnibus dictum est, et recte dici Messala confirmat), which seems to have been supplemented by a Nom. Masc. *dva in Vulgar Latin, to judge from the Romance forms (e.g. Ital. due, older duī, O. Fr. duī, doi, &c.). In Umbrian the word shows Plural declension, duu Nom., tua Nom. Acc. Neut. (On the declension of Lat. duo, see Neue, ii. pp. 276 sqq.). Late compounds like diloris, dimmimum are hybrid formations with Greek ἀμ- instead of Latin bi-. The relation of I.-Eur. *dwi- to the Latin preposition dis-, apart, has not been established, nor yet to I.-Eur. *wi- of Dor. Gk. ἤπασσι, Lat. vi-ginti, &c., perhaps connected with O. Ind. vi, 'apart.'

§ 61. Three. I.-Eur. *tri-, Nom. Masc. *trēyēs (O. Ind. trāyas, Gk. τρεῖς, Cret. Gk. τρēς, O. Ir. tri, Goth. preis, Lith. trys, O. Sl. trýje), Lat. trēs M., F., tría N. (cf. Umbr. trif or tref Acc., tria Neut.). The stem tri- appears in Gk. τρί-τος, τρί-νος, Lat. tri-pes, &c., but a stem trē- in Lat. trē-centi, tre-pondo, Lith. trē-czias, 'third,' O. Sl. tre-tij, &c. The Ordinal tērtius (Umbr. tertio-) probably shows this stem trē- with metathesis of r; the Adverb tēr, for terr (in Plautus scanned as a long syllable, cf. terr-uncius) from *ter-s, comes from the same stem, or, like O. Ind. tris, Gk. τρῖς, from the stem trī- (ch. iii. § 15. 8); the Adjective is trī-plus (Gk. τρι-πλός), trī-plex; the Distributive trīus (see on bīnus above), and ter-nus. We find trē- and ter-interchanged in Compounds like tri-gēminus and ter-geminus, tri-vincius and ter-vincius, tri-vincius and ter-vincius (C. I. L. ix. 2476), Terventum now Trivento; trē- and trē- in tri-modia and tre-modia (Varro, Men. 310 B.).

§ 62. Tres. The grammarians prescribe tres in the Nominative and tris in the Accusative (Neue, ii. p. 284), as is the rule in all I-stems (§§ 40, 51), though Virgil, as Gellius (xiii. 27. 10) points out, uses tres Acc. for the sake of variety in A. x. 350:
tres quoque Threicios Boreae de gente suprema et tris, quos Idas pater et patria Ismara mittit, per varios sternit causas,
as he uses elsewhere urbes Acc. in a context where the Roman critics found that this form gave greater melody to the line (A. iii. 106): centum urbes habitant magnas (Gellius l. c. quotes the remarks of Probus on this form: hic item muta ut 'urbis' deicas, nimiis exilis vox erit et exsanguis, and his reply to a caviller: noliigitur laborare, utrum istorum debeat diecere 'urbis' an 'urbes.' Nam cum id genus sis, quod video, ut sine jactura tua pecces, nihil perdes, utrum dixeris!). Tris Nom. is found on late inscriptions, e.g. Eph. Epigr. iv. 420 (other examples in A. L. L. vii. 65).

§ 63. Four. The L.-Eur. stem q"etw-or- had various grades, q"etw-or-, q"etw-, &c. Its Nom. Masc. *q"etw-ôres (O. Ind. catvâras, Dor. Gk. τέταρτος, Att. τέταρτος, Lesb. πέπυρος, O. Ir. cethir, W. pedwar, Goth. fidvôr, O. Engl. ñower; cf. Lith. keturi, O. Sl. četyre) probably appears in Lat. quattuor (some make this an I.-Eur. Neuter *q"etwôr, §§ 44, 45), apparently for *quotвор(č)s, with t doubled before the v-sound (ch. ii. § 130) and -av- for -otv- like -av- for -ov- in căvus, &c. (ch. iv. § 19). The Oscan word was petora (so spelt by Festus 250. 33 Th., but probably better *petoro). In Compounds and Derivatives we find a stem q"etw-ro- (Zend caþru-, Gaul. Petru-corius; cf. Umbr. petur- persu- 'quadripedibus'), which in Latin is quadru- (with á for č by analogy of quattuor, quartus?), where the d is puzzling, for -dr- seems to become -tr- in Latin, e.g. átro- for *ādro-, nîtrix for *nîdrix (ch. iv. § 113), so that -tr- should not change to -dr- [Wharton, Etym. Lat. p. 83 suggests that quadra, a square, means literally 'pointed' and comes, not from quattuor, but from a root q"ad-, 'to point, sharpen,' Engl. whet, the usual change of -dr- to -tr- being seen in tri-quetrus, triangular. Quadra, which retained d (by analogy of other words from the same root?), may have been the cause of *q"etru- taking the form quadru-; cf. K. Z. xxxii. 565]. The Ordinal quârtus with its long a (indicated by an apex over the letter on inscriptions; see Christiansen, de Apicibus, p. 52) has not yet been satisfactorily explained. On an inscription of Praeneste we have Quorta (cf. ch. ii. § 4); the Oscan word truto- is interpreted variously as 'quartus' for *ptru-to-, and as 'certus.' The Adverb quâtôr stands for *q"etru-s (Zend caþruš; cf. O. Ind. catûr), as ager for *agrôs, úcer- for *ācríš (ch. iii. § 16); the
Adjectives *quadri-*plus, *quadri-*plex show the curious change of -tr- to -dr-, remarked on above, from which *quater* is free; the Distributive *quaternus* for *quatri-*nus (like *sacerdos* for *sacrīdōs*, ch. iii. § 16) from *quetrū-*no- (ch. iii. § 18), or from the Adverb *quater* with the suffix -no (see above on *bīnus*, § 59).

§ 64. Quattuor with double t is the spelling of the best MSS. and inscriptions, such as the Monumentum Ancyranum (see Georges, Lex. Worlf. s.v.). The form *quattor*, found on late inscriptions (e.g. C.I.L. viii. 5843; other examples in A. L. L. vii. 65) has been already explained from *quatt(u)rdecim*, where the w-sound would be dropped before the accent, as in *Jan(u)rarius, Feb-ruarius*, &c. (ch. ii. § 54). Vulg. Lat. *quatordecim* is indicated by the Romance words for 'fourteen,' e.g. Ital. quattordici, Fr. quatorze, but Vulg. Lat. *quatro* by the words for 'four,' e.g. Ital. quattro, Fr. quatre (Sic. battor, however, from *quattor*). This Late and Vulg. Latin *quattuor* can hardly be assigned to early Latin authors; so retain *quattuor* in Plaut. Most. 630 and scan *quattuor*, like *eniciēs, Rud. 944* as a dactyl at the beginning of an iambic line; in Enn. A. 90 M. *quattuor* like *virginēs* A. 102; in Enn. A. 609 read *ferē quattuor partum* (?). Petreius, Petronius are dialectal Proper Names derived from this numeral, as Pompeius, Pontius (Lat. Quintius) from the numeral 'five.'

§ 65. Five. I.-Eur. *pēnqūē* (O. Ind. *pānca, Arm. hing, Gk. *pēnte, peµp-ōβολον, Lith. penki*) shows in Teutonic assimilation of the second syllable to the first, *pempe* (Goth. *fimf*), in Lat. and Celtic of the first to the second *quēnqūe* (Gaul. *peµpe-ðowna, quinquefoil, O. W. pimp*; in O. Ir. with o for e in the first syllable, cōic; cf. Umbro-Osc. *pump-, Pompeius*), Lat. *quinque* with e changed to i before a nasal and gutturial (like *tingo* for *tengo*, ch. iv. § 11), and the i lengthened (by analogy of *quīntus*?). The Ordinal *quīntus*, older *quīnetus*, follows the rules of Latin phonetics that *qu* becomes *e* before a consonant (ch. iv. § 137), and that in this group of three consonants the middle one is dropped (ch. iv. § 157). On the lengthening of the i, see ch. ii. § 144. The original form was *quēnqē-to- in Italic for I.-Eur. *penqū-to* (or *penqū-to-?) (Gk. *µπτος, Lith. peiktas, O. Sl. *pėtu*; Osc. Pūnti, also *Pompties* with -mp- from the Cardinal form). The Adverb is *quinquies*, older *quinquīens*, on which see § 56, the Adjective *quinquē-*plex [or with -*eu- for -*quu- (ch. iv. § 137) quinquē-*plex], rarely *quinqueplus* or *quinquiplus*; the Distributive *quīnus* for *quinque-nus* (ch. iv. § 157).

§ 66. Quinque. The long quantity of the i of *quinque* is attested by the use of the tall form of the letter on inscriptions (for instances, see Christiansen, de *Apsicibus*, pp. 45–46. On Vulg. Lat. *cinque* (Ital. *cinque, Fr. cinq, &c.*), see ch. iv. § 163).
§ 67. Six. Lat. sex points to I.-Eur. *sēks or *ksēks (M. S. L. vii. 73), as Greek ἕξ, ἕξ to *sweks or *ksweks (cf. Zend xšvaš, O. Ir. sē and *fē, W. chwech). The Ordinal sextus has -st- in Umbro-Oscan, e.g. Umbr. sestentariu; Sextius is a dialectal byform of Sextus. The Adverb is sexicēs, older sexicēns (see § 56); the Distributive sēnus for *sēx-nus (as lūna for lūx-na, ch. iv. § 162).

§ 68. Seven. I.-Eur. *sēptm (O. Ind. saptā, Arm. evt'n, Gk. ἑπτά, O. Ir. secht, Goth. sibun; cf. Lith. septyn-i), Lat. septem, with Ordinal *septmo- (O. Ind. septamā-, Gk. ἑβδομος, Pruss. septmas and sepmas), Lat. septimus, older septu-, mus. The Distributive septenus stands for *septen-no- (ch. ii. § 130).

In later Latin we find tt for pt, e.g. Setembres (C. I. L. xi. 2885, Setebres 4075); cf. Ital. sette, Settembre. In Compounds we find the stem septem-, e.g. septempēdilis Plaut., septemplex Virg., septemgēminus Catull., but Septi-montium, and on the restored Columna Rostrata septe-resmos (C. I. L. i. 195); septu-ennis Plaut., &c. (cf. septuā-gintō, below), for *septum-ennis, shows the usual weakening of unaccented ē before m to n, and the same loss between vowels of final m of the first member of a compound as is seen in circu(m)ire, &c. (ch. iii. §§ 18 and 52).

§ 69. Eight. The O.-Ind. Dual form *ōktō(u), cleverly explained by Fick as ‘the two sets of pointed’ (i.e. the fingers, without the thumbs, of both hands), from the root āk-, ōk-, ‘to be sharp, pointed’ (O. Ind. aštā and aštāū, Arm. ut', Gk. ὀκρό, O. Ir. ocht, W. wyth, Goth. ahtau, Lith. astū-n-į) is in Latin octō, with Ordinal octavus (cf. Osc. Úhtavis ‘Octavius’) for *octōvus (ch. iv. § 16), and Distributive octō-nus. In later Latin ct became tt, Ottobres C. I. L. xi. 2537 (cf. Ital. otto, Ottobre), and the final -ō is shortened, like every final -ō in the poetry of the Empire, e.g. octō Mart. vii. 53. 10. In Compounds it is treated as an O-stem, e.g. octō-plus, octō-plex, octō-pes, octō-ennis.

§ 70. Nine. I.-Eur. *nēwn (O. Ind. nāva, Gk. ἐννέα for *en-neFα (?), O. Ir. nóí, W. naw, Goth. niun; cf. Lith. devyn-i with d- instead of n-) in Latin novem with ov regularly enough for -ew- as in Celtic (ch. iv. § 10), but with -em instead of the
normal *-en. The proper Nasal appears in the Ordinal novēns, older noīno- (if the Dvenos inscription is rightly read dieinoine, on the ninth day), from *novēno-, where the ō is difficult to explain, though it seems to have a parallel in nōn for noen(um). Failing this explanation, we may suppose that *nouno- or *nownno- was the I.-Eur. form, with the O-grade of the root, and understand Lat. ō as an expression of I.-Eur. ou as in rōbus, &c. (ch. iv. § 41). (On nōndium and noundium, old spellings of nūndium, for *no(v)endium, from novem and the root dīn-, seen in O. Sl. dīnī, 'a day,' see ch. iv. § 44.) Umbr. nuvimo-shows the form rather to be expected in Latin, *novimō- (O. Ind. navamá-), but in Pelign. we have Novnis ‘Nonius.’ The Adverb is novīēs (Umbr. nuvīs); the Distributive novēnis from *novēn(no- (ch. ii. § 130).

§ 71. Ten. I.-Eur. *dēkm (O. Ind. dāśa, Arm. tasn, Gk. δέκα, O. Ir. deich, W. deg, Goth. tainhun; cf. Lith. dėszim-t, O. Sl. desėt-ti), Lat. décem, with Ordinal dēcinus (O. Ind. dašamá-) (cf. the proper name Decius), Adverb deciēs, and Distributive dēnus for which we should expect *decēnus like septēnus (cf. § 74).

§ 72. Eleven to Nineteen. These Numerals were denoted in I.-Eur. by Compounds, expressive of the addition of the smaller unit to ten. These Compounds consist of the two Numerals themselves (not their stems) placed together, the smaller unit preceding the ten, e.g. I.-Eur. *trēyōs-dēkm, ‘thirteen’ (O. Ind. trāyō-daśa). The Latin Compounds (in which the final -em of decem sinks to -im, ch. iii. § 18) are, un-decim for *un(i)-decim (on Vulg. Lat. *undecim, see ch. ii. § 147), duo-decim, trē-decim for *tres-decim (like uādus for *nis-dus, ch. iv. § 151), quattuor-decim, quīn-decim for *quin(que)-decim (ch. iii. § 13), sé-decim (the correct spelling) for sex-decim (like lūna for *lux-na, ch. iv. § 162), septem-decim. Octō-decim and novem-decim were replaced by duo-dē-viginti, un-dē-viginti for *un(i)-de-viginti, or by octo et decem, decem novem, a mode of expression which is found in the other numerals too, e.g. decem duo (Umbr. desen-duf Acc.), and which is used in Greek exclusively for the numbers above twelve, e.g. ῥεῖς καὶ δέκα and δέκα τρεῖς, and optionally for
twelve, δώδεκα or δέκα δύο. In I.-Eur. it was used for numbers above twenty, and so in Lat. quattuor et viginti or viginti quattuor, &c. The Ordinals are undecimus, duodecimus (O. Ind. dvádašama-), &c.; the Adverbs undecies, duodecies, the Distributives undénsus, duódénsus, and so on.

§ 73. O. Lat. duovicesimus for class. duo et vésimus, twenty-second, is attested by an interesting chapter of the Noctes Atticae (v. 4), which illustrates the pains taken in the Imperial period to secure correct texts of early authors. Gellius there tells us of a MS. of the Annals of Fabius: bonae atque sincereae vetustatis libri, quos venditor sine mendis esse contendebat. A grammaticus who was asked to inspect the MS., on the absolute correctness of which the bookseller was willing to stake any amount of money (grammaticus quispiam de nobiliioribus, ab emptore ad spectandos libros adhibitus, repperisse se unum in libro mendum dicebat; sed contra librarius in quodvis pignus vocabat, si in una uspiam littera delictum esset), declared that duovicesimo anno in Book iv. was a mistake of the copyist for duo et vésimo anno, but was finally forced to admit, on being referred to other passages of ancient authors, that duovicesimus was a genuine Old Latin form.

§ 74. Twenty to Ninety. These Numerals are denoted in I.-Eur. by Neuter Compounds, ‘two decades,’ ‘three decades,’ &c., the word for ‘decade’ being *dekm-t-, changed in Composition into *(d)kmt- [or *(d)komt- ?; cf. Greek -κοντ- in 30–90, τριά-κοντα, τεσσαρά-κοντα, or τέτρω-κοντα, &c., which suggests that this is the plural stem, the other the dual]. In Lat. vi-ginti vi- is probably Neut. Dual Nom. of I.-Eur. *wi-; the -ginti, with i for e owing to the popular accentuation *vigeni, *trigenta, *quadragenta, &c., which takes its γ apparently through influence of the d of I.-Eur. *(d)kmt- (but vicesimus; so Alb. -zet, ‘a gross,’ points to ŋ not ķ), is also Neut. Dual Nom. In tri-gintā the tri- is Neut. Plur. Nom. of the I.-Eur. stem *tri-, the -gintā shows the original quantity of the Neut. Plur. suffix, which has by the time of the earliest literature been shortened in Nouns, &c. to -ā (ch. iii. § 43). In quadrā-gintā the quadrā- (on the form of the stem, see § 63) may correspond to Gk. τετρώ- of τετρω-κοντα (see ch. iv. § 92), or may have the Neut. Plur. ending -ā, an ending assumed by quinque, sex, septem, novem in a somewhat haphazard way in the Compounds quinquā-ginta, sexā-ginta, septuā-ginta (for *sept(m)āginta; see above on septuennis, § 68), nonā-ginta, while octō in octōginta retains its ordinary form. The Ordinals are formed with the suffix -tmo- or -tmo- (ch. v. § 14),
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e.g. vicēsimius, older vicenius (this spelling is more frequent than vigesimius) for *vi-cent-lumun, tricēsimus and trigēsimus, older -enius for *tri-cent-lumus (O. Ind. tri-sat-tamâ-) ; the Adverbs are vicēsēs, older -ens, tricēsēs, older -ens (sometimes trigīes), like decies, older -ens (§ 56) ; the Distributives vicēnus (with byform vigēnus), tricēnus (with byform trigēnus), &c., not like the abnormal dénus, but like *decēnus (§ 71).

§ 75. Viginti, &c. Viginti is spelt viginti (C. I. L. i. 1194; x. 6009), but the ei may merely indicate i, for the inscriptions are not of great antiquity (ch. i. § 9). The late spelling viginti (C. I. L. v. 1645 &c.) points to viginti (cf. quinquaginta xii. 482, and other examples of -genta quoted in A. L. L. vii. 69-70). In Late and Vulgar Latin the g was dropped (ch. ii. § 94), whence the form vinti ; e.g. Wilm. 569:

et menses septem diebus cum vinti duobus;

cf. Sard. vinti, Ital. venti, &c. The same thing happened to triginta, producing the form trienta (C. I. L. xii. 5399, &c.), and in Romance, Sard. trinta, Ital. trenta, &c.; also to quadraginta (a hexameter line on a late epitaph ends, quadraginta per annos, vi. 28047), which had become quar(t)aqinta (Fabretti, iv. 134), whence Ital. quaranta, Fr. quarante. On the accentuation of these three numerals, see ch. iii. § 11. 4. Septuaginta is the scansion required in metrical epitaphs (C. I. L. vi. 22251. 29426). Its analogy produced in Mediaeval Latin the form octuaginta, which found its way into some early editions of Latin authors (Skutsch, Forsch. i. 24). Octuaginta occurs sometimes in the Edict of Diocletian (C. I. L. iii. pp. 810, 811) and elsewhere (see A. L. L. vii. 70). (For other examples of the scansion -ginti in late poetry, see Neele, ii. p. 290.)

§ 76. The Hundreds. The I.-Eur. expression for 100 was apparently 'a decade of decades' (like the Compound later evolved in Gothic, taithunte-hund (?) ), viz. *(d)kmtom, probably an old Gen. Plur. of the stem *dekmt (§ 46), treated as a Nom., like sestertium, -i Gen. for mille sestertium, 'a thousand of sesterces,' in Latin. This explains why the full form, and not the mere stem, is used in Compounds in Greek and Latin (e.g. ἐκατόμ-βη, ἐκατόγ-χειρος, centum-plex, centum-geminus, centum-pondium); though some prefer to regard *(d)kmtom as Nom. Sg. of a Neut. O-stem, 'a decade,' just as O. Ind. daśati- means, (1) a decade, (2) a hundred, i.e. 'a decade (of decades'). The d of *(d)kmtom shows its influence in Latin in the presence of g, instead of, or along with c, in the expressions for the various hundreds. In O. Lat. we find Neuter Compounds, dūcentum (with dū- the weak stem of I.-Eur. dwē-, a byform of dwē-, § 59), trē-centum (with I.-Eur. trē-, a byform of trē-, § 61),
nongentum, &c., used with the Genitive of the thing specified, e.g. argenti sescentum, Lucil. xxx. 22 M.; but these Neuter Compounds, when referring not to a mass, but to a number of individual things, became in course of time declined as Adjectives, du-centi -ae a, trë-centi -ae -a, e.g. trecentae causae Plaut. (cf. nongentus, Plin. xxxiii. 2. 31). (So in Greek YO-stem Adjectives were formed, in Att. -κόριον (with -σι- for -τι-), in Dor. -κάτων.) They formed their Numeral Adverbs, Adjectives, and Distributives by analogy of the tens, e.g. trë-cent-i-ies (like trëcies), trë-cent-i-simus (like trëcensus), trë-cent-ëni (like trëceni). The forms quin-genti (for *quinë-genti, ch. iv. § 157), septin-genti (for *septem-genti, *septen-genti like tingo for *tengo, ch. iv. § 11), apparently influenced quadrin-genti (for earlier quadri-genti), octin-genti, and even nonin-genti (beside the usual non-genti). Ses-centi for *se(c)s-centi obeys the same phonetic law as disco for *di(c)-seo (cf. di-dic-i; see ch. iv. § 157. 3).

§ 77. Centum, &c. The stem *centi- (-e) appears in centi-cepä Hor., centi-minus Hor., centi-peda (and centum-peda) Plin., &c., but centom- in centumperium Plaut., Cato, centumplex Plaut. Pers. 566, centum-gëminus Virg., &c., so that the latter is the older formation. For examples of ducentum, &c., with Gen., from the older writers and in legal phraseology, see Neue, ii2. p. 298. The usage is confined to phrases like ducentum aurí, argenti, vini, &c.; Plautus has duente -ae -a, &c., as in classical Latin. A transitional construction is seen in C. I. L. iv. 1136 nongentum tabernac, nine hundred shops. As to the form of the several numerals; ducenti is found in the late Latin of the Itala; quadrí-genti is the Plautine form, though the MSS. have usually (not, however, universally in Bacch. 1183) changed it to quadríngenti; for the second syllable is always short, and the Breves Breviantes Law is inoperative when a Mute and Liquid follow the short vowel, so that -drí- not -drin- must have been the second syllable of the word used in Plautus' day; quadrí-genti, quadrí-genes, &c. are probably also the classical forms (Neue, ii2. p. 297), but on Mon. Ancyr. iii. 8 quadrígenos; of quingentum Festus tells us that the pronunciation before his time was quingentum. Fest. 338. 19 Th. 'quincentum' et producta prima syllaba, et per e litteram usurpant antiqui, quod postea levius visum est, ita ut nunc dicimus, pronunciari; ses-centi is the correct spelling, not sescenti (see Neue, ii2. p. 297); septí-genti for septingenti occurs on the Edict of Diocletian; noningenti is a late and rare form (see Neue, l. c.); Caper censures the form noncenti (104, 1 K. nongentos non 'noncentos' dicendum est), and it seems to be the rule that after n the voiced (g), and not the unvoiced (c) guttural is used in these words.

§ 78. The Thousands. The Latin mille, in O. Lat. a declinable Neuter Noun taking a Genitive of the things specified, e.g. mille hominum occiditur, milli (Abl.) passum vicerit, is probably
unconnected with the Gk. χίλιοι, Lesb. χελλιοι, from *ghēsiolo- Adj., and the O. Ind. sa-hāśram from *sm-ghēslom, a Neuter Noun-compound, of which the first part is the root sem-, ‘one,’ literally ‘one thousand,’ as Gk. ἐ-κατόν for *α-κατόν (?), ‘one hundred,’ ‘one (decade) of decades (?).’ [Some suppose that it represents an original *sm-hesli, ‘one thousand,’ and that this became *melle, *mèle, as *quaslius (cf. quāsillus) became quālus (older quallus, ch. iv. § 162); the Plural *mēlia becoming mīlia as *Plénius became Plénius (ch. iv. § 7). O. Ir. mile would then be a loanword from Latin, for I.-Eur. sm- would remain in Irish.] It is cognate with the Celtic word for ‘thousand’ (O. Ir. mile, W. mil), just as the Teutonic and Slavonic numerals are cognate, Goth. þusundi F., Lith. tūkstantis, O. Sl. tyṣěšta or tyṣěšta F.

For the thousands, the units duo, tria, &c. are prefixed in Latin as separate words, duo mīlia (on the spelling mīlia beside mille, see ch. ii. § 127), tria mīlia, &c. The Ordinals and Adverbs are formed like those of the hundreds, mill-ēsimus, milleēs, &c., like cent-ēsimus, cent-ēsēs.

§ 79. Mille. Gellius (i. 16) quotes a number of passages to show that Cicero, as well as the older writers of the Republic, used mille as a Neuter Singular Noun, e. g. Cic. Mil. 53 mille hominum versabatur. So mille passuum (earlier passum), a mile. [Other examples are given by Neue, ii. p. 303, to which add Plaut. Bacch. 928 millī (MSS. mille) cum numero nāuium. In the spelling mēlia (probably for meillia, for double consonants are written single on this inscription, e. g. redidei, tabelarios) of C. I. L. i. 551 (Lucania, 132 B.C.), the ei may indicate merely the long i-sound. Lucretius (ix. 21 M.) seems also to recommend ei in both singular and plural (cf. ch. i. § 9) (so mēlle in the Ambrosian Palimpsest, Plaut. Stich. 587).

§ 80. The Numerals in Romance. The Cardinals are mostly retained, though dīcenti, &c. have become Fr. deux cents, Span, doscientos, &c. But only Italian keeps the Ordinals unchanged, primo, secondo, terzo, quarto, &c. French has premier for prīmus, and for the others uses the suffix -ième. Spanish has primero (like French) for prīmus, tercero (with the same suffix) for tertius, and uses for nōmus noveno (the Lat. Distributive nōcēmus), and similarly for dēcimus deceno. (For a fuller account see Meyer-Lübke, Rom. Gram. ii. pp. 590 sqq.)
CHAPTER VII.

THE PRONOUNS.

§ 1. I. THE PERSONAL PRONOUNS AND THE REFLEXIVE. 1. Sing. Latin *ego*, O. Lat. *ego* represents I.-Eur. *eγό* (Gk. *eγω*), of which byforms were *egό* (Goth. *ik*, Lith. *esz* and *asz*), *eγόm* (Gk. *eγόv*), *egόm* (O. Sl. *azи*; cf. O. Ind. *ahάm* with Aspirate instead of Media). It is strengthened by the addition of the particle -*mɛt*, e. g. *egomet*, *mihimet*, *miheipte*, while in the Accusative we find the Pronoun doubled for emphasis, *mɛmɛ*. For the Genitive, *mei* is used, apparently the Gen. Sg. Neut. of the Possessive, 'of mine,' but in O. Lat. we have *mīs* (with the Gen. *ɪs*-suffix?); for the Dative *mihī* (*mī*) for *mehei* or *mehoi*, with the I.-Eur. Locative ending (Umbr. *mehe*; cf. O. Ind. *māhy-am*) and with *mī* instead of *mē* because of the Pronoun's want of accent (ch. iii. § 18); for the Accusative O. Lat. *mēd*, by the time of Terence always *mē*, owing to the Latin phonetic law that final *d* was lost after a long vowel (ch. ii. § 137); this *d* is either the Ablative *d*, with a strange confusion between Acc. and Abl. functions (so in Engl. 'him' Dat. has become Acc.), or the I.-Eur. particle -*id*, often used in the Veda to strengthen Pronouns, *mē-**id* (cf. Dor. Gk. *έμει* Acc. for *έμε-**id*?), just as the particle *γε* is used to distinguish the Acc. in Teutonic (Goth. *mi-k*, Germ. *mich*; cf. Gk. *έμε-γε*); for the Ablative, O. Lat. *mēd* from I.-Eur. *mēd* (cf. O. Ind. *mād* from I.-Eur. *mēd*), which with *mēd* Acc., became *mē* in the second cent. B.C.; the Locative [I.-Eur. *mei* or *moi*, O. Ind. (Vedic) *mē Loc.*, used also as Gen. and Dat., Gk. *μοι* Dat.] and Instrumental (perhaps I.-Eur. *mē* or *mō*) cannot be identified in Latin. On the affix -*gh*- of *mihī*, see ch. x. § 1.
§ 2. Ego is the invariable scansion of classical poetry, and the almost invariable scansion of Plautus and the early Dramatists; ego is found occasionally in late poetry (Neue, ii2, p. 346), where it may possibly be influenced by Gk. ἐγώ, and in Plautus (e.g. Poem. 1185), &c., where it must be a relic of the older quantity (Klotz, Altröm. Metrik, p. 51; Müller, Plaut. Pros, p. 30), not yet shortened by the Breves Breviantes Law (ch. iii, § 42). The preponderance of the shortened form is due to the enclitic character of the word (even ego met), for Lat. ego cannot represent I.-Eur. *ḛg̊ō, if final ō became ē in Latin (ch. iii. § 37). Mihipte is quoted from Cato by Fest. 144. 11 Th.; Paul. Fest. 145. 5; mepte occurs in Plaut. Men. 1059:

quin certissumumst
mēpte potius fieri scerum, quam te unquam emittām manu.

For examples of meme (a somewhat doubtful form), see Neue, ii2, p. 355. Mis Gen. is quoted by Priscian from Ennius (A. 145 M.):

ingens cura mis eum concordibus aequiperare,

and probably occurs in Plaut. in Poem. 1188, beginning: rebus mis agūndis (anapaestic), and in other passages, though the MSS. have usually changed it to the more familiar me. It is often mentioned as an O. Lat. form by the grammarians (see the references in Neue, ii2, p. 347), and may represent an original *mēs, as Salutis is in O. Lat. Salutes (ch. vi. § 17). For the Dative, we have on old inscriptions mihei (C. I. L. i. 1016. 1277), and with e to express the et-diphthong (cf. ch. iv. § 32) mihe (i. 1049). A still older form mehe (cf. mehi Plaut. Men. 925 (P.)) seems to be mentioned by Quintilian (i. 5. 21 nam 'mehe' pro mā apud antiquos tragœdiarum praecepique scripторes in veteribus libris invenimus), though, if we retain the MSS. reading 'pro me,' we must suppose mehe to be a mere graphic expression of mē, as in Umbrian a long vowel is indicated by repeating it and inserting h, e.g. comohota 'commóta' (whether this was a Latin practice is doubtful, see ch. ii. § 56). The final vowel of mēhi, &c., had quite become a short vowel in Quintilian's time, and is described by him in the phrase commonly applied to i, as 'a sound between e and i' (see ch. ii. § 16); and even in Plautus and the early Dramatists mēhi is the usual scansion (Leppermann, De correcptione, p. 9). Mihi is often contracted to mī, as mihēl to nil (ch. ii. § 58), so that we have side by side in Plautus divergent treatments of this Dative, such as (r) dissyllabic mīhī, e.g. Truc. 77 Nam mēhi haec mēretrix, &c., (2) the same with elision, e.g. Stich. 427 mih(i) expedi, (3) monosyllabic mī, e.g. (elided) Truc. 173 Sunt m(i) étiam. (For instances of mī, see Neue, ii2, 349, and on Nigidius' distinction of Gen. and Dat., Gell. xiii. 26.)

The remark of Festus (156. 6 Th.) 'me' pro mē dicebant antiqui, illustrated by a quotation from Luellius (inc. 98 M.): quae res me impendet, means, of course, merely that in O. Lat. another case was used (in this example, the Accusative; cf. Lucr. i. 326 mare quae impendunt saxa), where the classical construction had the Dative; and similarly vae te Plaut. Asin. 481 (cf. vae me Seneca, Apoc. 4) is probably nothing but an unusual employment of the Accusative. The Vocative of the Possessive Pronoun mī, e.g. mī filī, mī vir, has been regarded as a Locative-Dative by some and compared with Homer's μητρέα μοι, the Tragedians' ἄ γένων μοι, Vedice mē giras, 'my hymns.' But it is more likely to be a byform of *mии (with unaccented e sunk to i, ch. iii. § 18),
as fili may be of filie (but see ch. vi. § 31), for it is always joined with a Voc., and is used in good writers only with a masculine noun (with a Fem. after Apuleius. Neue, ii. p. 368); and this is the explanation given by the native grammarians [see below, § 12; there is no *tī (Gk. το, σοι) nor *si (Gk. οἱ)]. The Accusative medi is found on the very earliest Latin inscriptions which we possess, the Praenestine fibula (C. I. L. xiv. 4123), with Manilius medi ferudi Numa-sioi, and the Dvenos inscription (Zvet. I. I. I. 285, Rome), with Dvenos medi ferud (or feced); and in Plautus mēd and mē are doublets, in the Acc. as in the Abl., mē often being shortened by prosodical hiatus to mē before an initial vowel, while in Terence mē, &c. Acc., Abl. has ousted mēd, &c. Whether Plautine mēd Abl. is ever an Instrumental form, and has not lost a final -ă, it is impossible to say; but there is no indication of its being anything but a phonetic variation of an original mēd (cf. ch. ii. § 137). On mē-quadem Plaut., see ch. iii. § 51.

§ 3. 2 Sing. Lat. tū is from I.-Eur. *tū (Hom. Gk. τῶ-νη, O. Ir. tū, O. H. G. dü, O. Sl. ty), as Dor. Gk. τύ from I.-Eur. *tū. In the oblique cases the I.-Eur. stem was *twē (or *twō) and *tē (or *tō), &c. [e.g. Gk. σέ for Cret. τέ, O. Ind. (Ved.) tvā Instr., tvē Loc., tē Dat., Gen.], often enlarged by an affix -bh-, like the -gh- of the i Sing. Pron. (e.g. O. Ind. tū-bhyam Dat.). For the Genitive in Latin the Gen. Sg. Neut. of the Possessive is used, būh, of thine (see above, on me), and a Gen. tis (? tis) appears in O. Lat.; for the Dative, tibē, older tibeī, for *tebhei (Umbr. tefi; cf. Pruss. tebbei), with tē for te- owing to its unaccented character; for the Acc., as for the Abl., O. Lat. tēl; in the earliest literature tēl and tē appear as 'doublets' (like mēd and mē, § 2), but by the middle of the second cent. B.C. tēl is out of use; the Locative and Instrumental cannot be identified in Latin. A strengthened form of the Nom. is tū-lē, of the Acc. and Abl. tē-lē; and with addition of the particle -mēt we find tū-lē-mēt (cf. ch. iii. § 39), tibē-met, tē-met.

§ 4. Tis (like mis, § 2) is attested for O. Lat. by the grammarians (see Neue, ii. p. 347), and occurs in Plaut. MIL. 1033 (an anapaestic line):

quia tis eget, quia tē careat: ob eām rem huc ad te missat,

where, if we keep the reading of the MSS. (the evidence of the Palimpsest is wanting), we must scan tis, unlike mis. (Shall we read quia tis ea eget ?) ; Trin. 343 nē tis digō ministrat (so in the Palimpsest, but the other MSS. have changed the unfamiliar form to tuō), and possibly elsewhere (see Neue, l. c. and add Plaut. Cit. 457). The Dative is spelt tibē, C. I. L. i. 542. 1453, but tibē in all the MSS. of Varro R. R. iii. 11, and in C. I. L. i. 33 (one of the Scipio epitaphs in Saturnian metre, c. 180 B.C.). The Acc. is spelt ts (probably with elision) on the same epitaph:

quae lūbens t(e) in-grūmium, Scipio, récipit.
Tu-met is not allowed by Priscian (i. p. 591. 5 H.). An example of tute is the famous alliterative line of Ennius (A. 108 M.):

O Tite tute Tati tibi tanta tyrannus tulisti.

(For other examples of tute, tutimet, tibimet, &c., see Neue, ii2. pp. 361 sqq.; on tiquidem, tiquidem, see above, ch. iii. § 51.)

The Umbro-Oscan forms for the Accusative (and Nom.?) point to an original tôm (from *twiom as fio from *fiow; or with i for I.-Eur. ü?), Umbr. tîom and tio, Osc. tiium (usually taken as Nom.).

§ 5. Reflexive. The I.-Eur. stem was *swê (or *swô) and *sê (or *sô), &c. (e. g. O. Ind. svâ-, 'own,' Goth. svēs, O. Sl. svojî; Goth. si-k Acc., O. Sl. sebê Dat.), often with the same affix as 2 Sg. *twê, *tê (see above), viz. -bh-. The Latin Gen. is swî, the Gen. Sg. Neut. of the Possessive (like mei, tui; see above), the Dat. sibê for *sebhei (Pelign. sfeî, Osc. sîfeî; cf. Pruss. sebbei), with sî- for sê- owing to the unaccented use of the Reflexive; the Acc. and Abl. sê (O. Lat. sed, which went out of use with med, ted, § 2), often doubled for emphasis, sêvê. The particle -met is added for the same purpose to se, sibi, viz. semet, sibimet. Se-pse is read in Cic. Rep. iii. 8. 12 : quae omnis magis quam sepse diligat.

§ 6. The spelling sibei is found on C. I. L. i. 38 (an Elegiae Scipio epistep, c. 130 B.C.) ut sibei me esse creatum Laetentur; i. 196 (the S. C. Bacch. of 186 B.C.); i. 198 (the Lex Repetundarum of 123-122 B.C.); i. 200 (the Lex Agraria of 133 B.C.); i. 205 (the Lex Rubria of 49 B.C.), &c.; the spelling sibei was found (with quase) by Quint. (i. 7. 24) in several MSS. (sed an hoc voluerint auctores nescio), and was affected by Livy (T. Livium ita his usum ex Pediano comperi, qui et ipse eum sequabatur). Livy's spelling was probably designed to express short unaccented i, the sound which the grammarians describe as being 'between an e and an i' (see ch. ii. § 16). Sibê (like mihi, tibi) is the usual scansion in Plautus and the early Dramatists, but sibi is by no means rare, and is normal in the phrase suus sibi, 'his very own' (so mens mihi), e. g. suo sibi gladio hunc jugulo; cf. O. Sl. pisachâ svojâ si rëče, 'scribebant suam sibi linguam.' There is no Genitive form in O. Lat., *sis, corresponding to mis, tis (Priscian ii. p. 2. 29 H.). Sed, Acc., occurs on the S. C. Bacch., of 186 B.C. (C. I. L. i. 196 inter sed), and on the Lex Bantina of 133-118 B.C. (i. 197 apud sed; along with sese, sesse); sesed on the inscr. of the Faliscan cooks (Zvet. I. I. I. 72 a). Sese is much more frequent than même and têtê. (For examples of its use, see Neue, ii5. p. 355.) The Oscan Acc. is siom (cf. above, § 4, on Umbro-Osc. tôm 'te'), the Umbrian Dat. sesse.

§ 7. 1 Plur. Of the two I.-Eur. stems, *wê- (or *wô-) (e. g. O. Ind. vay-âm Nom., Goth. veis, Engl. we, Lith. vë-du Dual, O. Sl. vë) and *nê- (or *nô-) (e. g. O. Ind. nas, the enclitic Gen.,
Dat., Acc., O. Ir. ní, Goth. uns for *ns, Engl. us, O. Sl. nasū; Gk. νῶι Dual, O. Sl. na; with weak grade ns- and an affix
-smē- in O. Ind. oblique cases, asmān Acc., asmābhīs Instr., &c., Lesb. Gk. ήμες, Att. ἰμεῖσ), the latter appears in Latin nōs Acc.
(Zend nā Acc.). Nōs is also the Nominative form. The Gen. is
nostrum (O. Lat. nostrorum, -arum) and nostri, the Gen. Plur. and
the Gen. Sg. Neut. of the Possessive, 'of ours,' the Gen. Pl.
being used when the idea of plurality was specially prominent,
e.g. omnium nostrum, pars nostrum, but amicus nostri; the Dat.,
Abl. is nōbis (earlier nō-bei-s), apparently with the plural suffix s
added to a case suffix like that of Dat. Sg. tībeī, sībeī; in O. Lat.
nīs seems also to have been used (Paul. Fest. 33, 6 Th.), with the
ordinary Dat., Abl. Plur. suffix (see ch. vi. § 48). To strengthen
the pronoun, the particle -met is added; nosmet (always Nom. in
Plautus), nobismet.

§ 8. Enos Acc. is found in the ancient Hymn of the Arval Brothers, preserved
in a carelessly written inscription, containing the minutes of the Priesthood
for the year 218 a. d. (C. I. L. i. 28): enos, Losses, iuuate, and enos, Marmor, iuato.
If the lines have Saturnian rhythm, the accent must fall on the first syllable
of enos (see ch. ii. § 141, p. 128 n.) :

énos, Lāses, iuāte ...  
enos, Mármor, iuāto;  

but this, and indeed every fact about the lines, is doubtful. The form enos is
generally explained as having a particle *e prefixed to nos (cf. *e-μι). Nosmet
is, like nosmet, always Subject in Plautus, but also Acc. in Terence, Phorm. 172,
and the classical writers. The use of nostrum (Partitive Gen. and with omnium)
and nostri is discussed by Gellius (xx. 6). For instances of nostrorum, -arum for
nostrum in Plautus, &c., see Neu, ii. p. 359. The spelling nobēis is frequent
in the Ambrosian Palimpsest of Plautus (see Studemund's Index, p. 505).

§ 9. 2 Plur. There are two L.-Eur, stems, *yu- (O. Ind. yu-
yām, Goth. jūs, Engl. you, Lith. jūs; O. Ind. yuvām Dual, Lith. jū-du) and *wō- (or *wō-.) (O. Ind. vas, the enclitic Gen.,
Dat., Acc., Pruss. wans, O. Sl. vy vasū; O. Ind. vām Dual, O. Sl.
va). The former, with the affix -smē- is found in Gk. ήμεῖς,
O. Ind. yuśmān Acc., yuśmābhīs Instr., &c.; the latter is
the stem used in Latin vōs Acc. (Zend và Acc.). Vōs is also the
Nominative form; vestrum (O. Lat. vostrorum, -arum) and vestri
(O. Lat. vestri) the Gen., with the same usage and origin as
nostrum and nostri (see above); vōbis is the Dat., Abl., older vōbeis
(see above on nobis). The strengthening particle used is -met:
vosmet (only Nom. in Plautus, but afterwards Acc. as well),
obismet; and -pte in O. Lat. vopte (Paul. Fest. 578. 21 Th.
' vopte ' pro vos ipsi Cato posuit).

§ 10. For examples of Gen. vestrum (costorum) and vestri, see Neue, ii?,
p. 359; and cf. nostrum, nostrorum, nostri, above. The spelling vobeis is extremely
frequent in the Ambrosian Palimpsest of Plautus, and occurs in the S. C.
Bacch. (c. I. L. i. 196. 29), the Epistula ad Tiburties of c. 100 B. c. (i. 201), &c.

§ 11. II. THE POSSESSIVE PRONOUNS. In the I.-Eur.
languages there is a close connexion between the Possessives and
the Gen. of the Personal Pronouns. Thus O. Ind. (Vedic) tvā-s is
Possessive 'thy,' táva is Gen., 'of thee' (I.-Eur. *tēwē); Dor.
Gk. τέος is Possessive, τέο (I.-Eur. *tē-syō) is Gen. Latin tuus,
O. Lat. tovo- (I.-Eur. *tewo-) must be similarly derived from
from a corresponding Gen. *sēwē, while mens (*meyo-) may come
from the Locative-Genitive *mei (O. Ind. mē Gen., Dat.). The
same connexion is seen between cujus, the Gen. of the Interrogative
§ 13), and cujus -a -um the Possessive (§ 23). Some
purists objected to this Possessive, and parodied Virgil's line
(E. iii. 1) by:

dic mihi, Damoeta, 'cujum' pecus, anne Latinum?

under the idea that cujus -a -um was merely a vulgar inflexion
of a Gen. suffix -us, treated as if it had been -us of the Nom.
Sing.

Beside the Reflexive Possessive stem *sēwō- (Gk. εώς), there
was another I.-Eur. form, *swō- (O. Ind. svās, Gk. Ὀς for *σφός).
The latter would be in Latin so- (ch. iv. § 68), and appears in
the O. Lat. forms sam for suam, sas for suas, sos for suos, sis for
swis, which must not be confounded with the Demonstrative stem
so- on the one hand (O. Lat. sos for eōs, sum for eum, &c.), nor
on the other with the monosyllabic suas, suos, suis (pronounced
swas, swos, swis), where, through the unaccented use of the Poss.,
the ā has been turned into a consonant (w) before a long vowel
(see ch. ii. § 149), just as the č (č) of unaccented mens has been
turned into y in monosyllabic meas, meos, meis, meā, meō. Mieis
was the older spelling of meis (ch. ii. § 9), and in the Voc. Sing.
Masc. we have, besides meus, the form mi, e.g. mi fili, mi homo, mi vir.

For the Plural Pronouns the suffix -tēro- (ch. v. § 16) was used (cf. Gk. ἴματ-τερος, ἴμκ-τερος), 1 Pl. nōster, 2 Pl. O. Lat. vōster, which by the phonetic laws of Latin (cf. vōto from older vōto, ch. iv. § 10) became vēster about the middle of the second cent. b.c. [Osc. nestro- (?), Umbr. vestro-]

The Gen. Sg. Neut. of these Possessives was in classical Latin used for the Gen. of the Personal Pronouns, mei, tui, sui, nostri, vestrī, and, where the notion of plurality was involved (as in the Partitive Genitive or with omnīnum), the Gen. Pl. nostrum, vestrīnum (in O. Lat. nostrorum, -arum, vōstrorum, -arum) (see § 8).

The strengthening particles -mēt, -ptē are added to the Possessives, e.g. meamet, snismet, meapte, snopte, nostrapte.

§ 12. The grammarians speak of an O. Lat. spelling mīus, from which they derive Voc. mi (as Lādi Voc., Lādius Nom.) (e.g. Charis. p. 159. 17 K., Vel. Long. p. 77. 12 K.; other references in Neu.e, ii, p. 366), though the only instance which they quote is mīis in Ter. Haed. 699 (probably a dissyllable):

at enim istoc nihil est māgis, Syre, mīs nūptīs aduērum,

where mīis (a spelling retained in the MSS. of Terence), like mīcis (probably a monosyllable) on a Scipio epitaph of c. 130 B.C. (C. I. L. i. 38):

uirtutes generis mīcis morībus accumulavi,

and mīcis (probably a monosyllable) in Plaut. Men. 202 : una uiuis mīcis morīgera mōrībus (probably mīcis, Truc. 709, where the MSS. read mīles), shows that spelling of i for e (I.-Eur. eý) which was the rule in Republican Latin in an unaccented syllable before -is (-nis), e.g. abiġnieis (but abiżnea Acc.), aṣcui̇nivis on the Lex Parieti Faciundo of 105 B.C. (C. I. L. i. 577) (see ch. ii. § 9). [For other passages in Plautus where mīis is indicated by the MSS., see Neu.e, l. c.; in Trūn. 822 mīis may be Gen. Sg. of the Personal Pronoun, mīs (§ 2), or Abl. Pl. of the Possessive: bonis mīs quid foret aut meā utīae (anapaestic)]. For the Vocative Sg. Masc., meus was used with an O-stem Noun in the Nominative form, e.g. Plaut. Asin. 664:

da, mēus occellus, mēa rosa, mi ānīme, mea uolūptas,

Cos. 137:

sine, amābo, ted amāri, meus festūs dies,
meus pūllus passer, mēa columba, mi lepus.

(Notice mi lepus in Plaut., where the Noun is not an O-stem. But Virg. has mēus sanguīs.) On the theory that mi is I.-Eur. *moi or *mei Loc., see § 2 above. Mi is not found with a Voc. Fem. Sg. or Masc. Pl. till Late and Vulgar Latin, e.g. mi parente, my mother, Apul. Met. iv. 26; o mi, inquit, hospites, Petron.
116, p. 82. 25 B.; (mi homines, mi spectatores, Plaut. Cist. 678, should probably be mei, as in Mil. 1330 O mei oculi, O mi anime). (See Neue, ii. pp. 368—9.)

We find tou[am] for tuam on an old inscription (C. I. L. i. 1290 quei tou[am] pacem petit adjicata); soueis for suis on the Lex Repetundarum of 123-122 B.C. (i. 198. 50, beside mei, sua, suae, sua Abl.,) and on i. 1258, i. 1297 (where it is a monosyllable:)

plouruma que fecit populo soueis gaudia nubes),

somo i. 1007 (beside suom, both dissyllabie:)

suom mareitum cōrdē dilexit souo),

soumo Gen. Pl. Masc. i. 588, of c. 81 B.C.

The unemphatic Possessive is a monosyllable in the early Dramatists (by Synizesis), in iambic forms, e.g. mēos, sūis, which should probably not be scanned according to the Breves Breviantes Law *mēos, *sūis (see ch. iii. § 49). (Instances from Plaut. and Ter. in Neue, ii. p. 371.) How far the Vulgar Latin unemphatic Possessive *mus, *num, *ma (seen in Fr. mon, ma, and in Vulg. Ital. ma-donna, padre-mo, &c.) should be referred to O. Lat. so- (I.-Eur. *swo-), &c., or to these colloquial forms, is a doubtful point. (Cf. tis for tuis on a late metrical inscription, Orelli 4847:)

cum vita functus jungar tis umbra figuris.)

O. Lat. so- Possess. is attested by Festus and distinguished from O. Lat. so-Demonstr. (sas Fest. 476. 17 Th. ‘sas’ Verrius putat significare eas, teste Ennio, qui diecat in lib. i.;

uirginēs nam sibi quisque domi Romanus habet sas,

cum suas magis videatur significare, siciuti ejusdem lib. vii. fatendum est eam significari, cum ait:

nee quisquam sapientia quae perhibetur
in somnis uidit prius quam sam discere coepit,

idem cum ait ‘sapsam,’ pro ipsa nec alia ponit in lib. xvi. :

quo res sapsa loco sese ostentatque iubetque,

et Paevius in Teucre:

nam Teůcrum regi sápsa res restibiliet ;

sis Fest. 428. 11 Th. ‘ sos ’ pro eos antiqui dieebant, ut Ennius, lib. i. :

constitit inde loci propter sos dia dearum,

et lib. iii. :

circum sos quae sunt magnae gentes opulentae,

lib. vii. :

dum censent terrere minis, hortantur ibe sos,

lib xi. :

contendunt Graios, Graecos memorare solent sos,

interdum pro suos ponebant, ut cum per dativum casum idem Ennius effert:

postquam lumina sis oculis bonus Ancus reliquit;
§ 13. III. DEMONSTRATIVES. There were several Demonstrative Pronoun-stems in I.-Eur., some of which appear in some languages as Adverbs and Particles only, but as Pronouns in others. Thus the stem ļke-, (ċo-) appears in Latin in the Adverb ce- of cēdō, 'give here,' and in the Particle -ce of hujus-ce, illis-ce, &c., but in Oscan eko- is the Pronoun in common use, which corresponds to the Latin hic; and on the other hand the

sam Paul. Fest. 33. 6 Th. antiqui dicebant . . . 'sam' pro suam). On the other hand Festus quotes in illustration of O. Lat. puellus part of a line of Ennius with monosyllabic suos (so spelt in the MSS. of Festus 324. 17 Th. and Paulus 325. 6):

Poei soliti suos sacrificare puellos,

and the MSS. of Lucretius spell suo (monosyll.) in i. 1022, v. 420:

ordine se suo quaeque sagaci mente locarunt,

but sis in his quotation of Ennius' line, just mentioned, iii. 1025:

lumina sis oculis etiam bonus Ancus reliquit,

so that monosyllabic sīōs, &c. of everyday speech, a scansion discarded by the Augustan poets as unsuitable to the dignity of poetry, were different forms from O. Lat. sos, &c. We have monosyllabic suo, tua (see ch. ii. § 65) on the dedicatory inscription of Mummius, the conqueror of Corinth (C.I.L. i. 542, of 146 B. c.):

uisum animo suo perfect, tua pace rogans tce.

Gen. Pl. meum, tuum, nostrum are attested by Priscian (i. p. 308. 23 H.), and occur along with suum (cf. soom, C. I. L. i. 588, of 81 B. c.) in the Republican Dramatists, &c. (see instances in Neue), though an instance of vosstrum (vestrum) is difficult to find. It occurs in the elegiae epitaph of Ennius quoted by Cicero, Tusc. i. 15. 34:

hic nestrum panxit maxima facta patrum.

The particle -met is not found with the Possessives in Cicero or Caesar, and is not common in other authors. We have meāmet culpā, Plaut. Poen. 446, suāmet, suāmet, suāmet, suāmet in Sallust. It was thus more a particle for personal than for Possessive Pronouns. But -pte is very common, though almost exclusively with the Abl. of the Possessive, which precedes its noun, e. g. suapte manu, Cic.; meapte ingenio, Plaut.; nosstrapte culpā, Ter. Phorm. 766. (See examples and references to the native grammarians, in Neue, ii. p. 373). Still the usual method of emphatic expression was suā ipsius manu, meo ipsius ingenio, nostra ἵσορων culpa in literary Latin, and in colloquial speech suus sibi, meus mihi, &c. (§ 6). Examples of Possessives from the Umbro-Oscan dialects are, Osc. tuvač 'tuač,' suvam 'sam,' suvadm 'sam,' suveis 'sui' (perhaps Pel. svad 'sā,' Osc. nistrus 'nostros'); Umbr. tua and tuva 'tua,' tuver and tuver 'tui,' restra 'vestrā.'
stems ģho-, ģhe- (cf. ģhi-) of Lat. hi-c (O. Lat. hé-c), ho-c appear as particles in O. Ind. ha, hí, Gk. oβ-χί, val-χί.

The Latin Demonstrative stems are:

(1) I.-Eur. sō-, (sē-), which seems to have been originally confined to Nom. Sg. Masc. and Fem., a stem tō- being used elsewhere (O. Ind. sā and sás M., sā F., tād N., Gk. ὁ and ὥ M., ῳ F., τό, for *roδ, N.) So- is the stem of O. Lat. sam ‘eam,’ sos ‘eos,’ sum ‘cum’; to- of the second element of the compound is-te for *is-tō M. (ch. iii. § 37), is-la F., is-lul N., from the stem *i-, *ei- (see below), though some regard the first part as the stem es- (Umbr. es-to-?), a byform of the stem so- (se-), with i for e owing to the unaccented use of the Pronoun (ch. iii. § 18). By a further reduction of the vowel is-te became in course of time ste.

(2) I.-Eur. ģhō- (ģhē-) supplies Lat. hi-c from O. Lat. hé-c M., haece for *hai-ce, hoc for hocce for *hod-c, ‘this,’ all augmented by the particle *ke. The i of hie is due to its unaccented nature (see ch. iii. § 18).

(3) I.-Eur. ol- (Lat. ăl-tra, ăl-timus; see ch. ix. § 56), a grade of the root ăl- (ăl-) of Gk. ἀλλος, Lat. alius, &c. (§ 29), with I.-Eur. sō- appended. The Nom. Sg. Masc. was *ol-sō, O. Lat. olle, or *ol-sōs, O. Lat. ollus, Fem. *ol-sā, O. Lat. olla, with ll by the Latin phonetic law for original ls (cf. velle for *vel-se), Neut. *ol-tōd, which should have been in Latin *ollud, *ultud, but which was adapted to the Masem. and Fem. forms and became ollud. In class. Lat. owing to the unaccented use of the Pronoun apparently, though the change is a curious one, the ō became i, ille (illus being dropped), illa, illud.

(4) From I.-Eur. ī- (ei-) and eyo- (O. Ind. îd-âm N., im-âm Acc. M., Lith. įs M., O. Sl. -jì, &c.) comes the Latin ‘anaphoric’ pronoun (i.e. the pronoun which refers to something previously mentioned), īs M., ea for *eyā F., îd N. Augmented by a combination of the particle pē (ch. x. § 1) with the Pronoun-stem so-, a combination which expresses ‘self,’ it forms the Latin Pronoun of Identity, ipse M. for *i-p(e)-sō (ch. iii. § 37), ipsa F., ipsum N., in the O. Lat. also eaipse with flexion of the first element of the Compound only, and eaipsa with flexion of both elements. Augmented by the particle -dem (ch. x. § 1) it
expresses 'the same,' *i-dem for is-dem M. (like audio for *aus-dio, ch. iv. § 151), ea-dem F. (For a fuller list of the I.-Eur, demonstrative stems which appear in Latin, see the chapters on the Adverb and the Conjunction.)

The Declension of these stems differed originally from that of Noun-stems, though it became more and more assimilated in course of time, and in Greek had come to be almost identical. The Nom., Acc. Sg. Neut. was formed, not like O-stem Nouns in -m, e.g. dōnum, but in -l (often written -t, ch. ii. § 73), e.g. illud, istud (but ipsum instead of *i-plud), id; the Dat. Sg. of all Genders has -ī, older -ei (-oi), like the Locative -ei (-oi) suffix which appears in O-stem nouns such as Corinthi, e.g. illī, istī, ipsis, huic for O. Lat. hoi-ce, ēi, and cī for *ey-ei; the Gen. Sg. of all Genders is formed by the addition to this Dative-Locative form of the Gen. suffix -ōs, -us, as in O. Lat. nomin-us, e.g. illī-us, istī-us, ipsis-us (with shortening of vowel before vowel, illius, &c. ch. ii. § 143), hujus (pronounced *hūyyus) for hoi-us, ejus (pronounced *eyyus) which when unaccented became in the rapid utterance of ordinary speech *illīs, *istīs, *ipsīs, *hūīs, *eīs, e.g. illī(us)st modi Ter. Ad. 441, or in one word, illismodi, with s dropped before m as in primus for *prismus (ch. iv. § 151). The Nom. Plur. Masc. suffix of O-stem pronouns, viz. -oi, was in Latin (as in Greek) borrowed by O-stem nouns (see ch. vi. § 40), and so is not distinctive of the Pronoun in Latin, but the Nom. Sing. Fem. (and Nom. Acc. Pl. Neut.) in -ai is a feature of the pronominal declension which remains in Latin haec for O. Lat. hai-ce, illaec for *illai-ce, istaec for *istai-ce, though without the particle -ce the two last take the -a of Noun-stems, illa, ista (and so ipsa). Before the Dat., Abl. Plur. suffix the stem appears with an appended i (O. Ind. þi-bhyas, Goth. þai-m, Lith. þe-ms, O. Sl. tē-mu), e.g. Lat. hī-bus; cf. ī-bus for *ei-bus (O. Ind. ē-bhyās), but quī-bus, not *quī-bus. There is the same difficulty with Latin Pronouns as there is with Nouns (ch. vi. § 36), in assigning any 'Ablative' forms to an original Instrumental. Thus Osc. svai puh, 'si quo' (cf. Umbr. pu-e 'quo'), in the sense of 'sive' (but see ch. ix. § 5), suggests that Lat. quō in some of its uses may be an Instrumental case form and represent an original *qūō not *qūōd. But
Adverbial *ea* in *praeter-ea* is shown to be an Ablative by *arvorum ea* on the S. C. Bacch. (*C. I. L. i. 196. 24*); cf. *eod die*, xi. 4766. The Locative had also the Dat. and Gen. functions, which we found to belong to the Loc. of the Personal Pronouns, e.g. Gk. *μητέρι μοι* (§ 2). Its suffix in O-stems was -ei or -oi, e.g. Gk. *τοί, Dor. πεί, ἐκεῖ*; the former is the suffix used in Oscan, e.g. *eisai*, which uses in the Fem. the *A*-stem Loc. suffix, e.g. *eisai*.

§ 14. O. Lat. so-. Festus (428. 11 Th.) quotes *sos* for *eos* from three lines of Ennius (see § 12); elsewhere (476. 17 Th.) he cites *sum* for *eum*, *sopsa* for *ipsa* from the same author, and (426. 2 Th.) *sum* for *eum*: *sum*’ pro eum usus est Ennius lib. i.:

`astu, non ui, sum summam seruare decet rem,`

et lib. ii.:

`ad sese sum quae dederat in luminis oras.`

[The gloss (Löwe, *Prodr.* p. 350 ‘soc’: *ita* is doubtful; cf. Umbr. *e-soc* ‘sic.’] But neither the Demonstrative *so*—nor the byform of the Reflexive Possessive *so*—(I.-Eur. *swvo*) are found in the conversational language of Plautus and Terence. The Neuter *tod* is preserved in an O. Lat. Adverb *topper* for *toder-, on which see ch. ix. § 7.

§ 15. The particle -ce. This particle belongs to the stems kō-(kē-), (also *ki- and *kö-*) [Gk. *kē* Loc. Advb., *kēvos*, Osc. *eko-* (often with this particle added, e.g. ekask, *'hae*’), Lat. *ci-ter, ci-tru*, O. Ir. *cē*, ‘on this side,’ Engl. he, him, Germ. heut-te, Lith. szis, ‘this,’ O. Sl. *sí*], and appears as an Adverb or Preposition in Lat. *cé-do*, ‘give here’ (more frequent in Terence than in Plautus), (O. Ir. *cit ‘da’ (‘?)), and probably in Osc. *ce-bnust, ‘huc venerit.’ It is said to be employed as an enclitic in other languages too, e.g. Arm. *ter-s, ‘this person,’ Goth. *tau-h, Engl. though (‘?. Its widespread use with Demonstratives in Lat. and Umbro-Oscan (Lat. *hī-c, īle, O. Lat. illicit, iste, O. Lat. istie, Osc. *eisa* and Umbr. *ekak, *'eá, Osc. ekask, *'hae, exc, *'hac, *'ūk, *'eār, and so on) may be compared with the Romance forms which have prefixed Lat. *ece* to certain Pronouns and Adverbs, e.g. Fr. *ça, ‘there,’ from *ece-hac; Fr. ci, Ital. *ci, ‘here,’* from *ece-hic; Fr. ce-, Ital. *ci, *‘this,’* from *ece-hoc*; Fr. celle from *ece-illa, Fr. *cette* from *ecce-ista, &c.,* (cf. *eccillum video and eccistem video* Plaut.). It is the same tendency of expression which has reasserted itself; and it has its equivalents in vulgar English ‘this here’ for ‘this,’ ‘that there’ for ‘that,’ and so on. The usage with these forms with -ce differed in early and in classical Latin; for while in early Latin they are more or less arbitrarily used, in classical Latin their use is stereotyped in most pronouns. Thus class. Lat. illicit is the Adverb (Locative), while *ili* is the Dative (so *istic and *isti); *hae* is the Nom. Pl. Fem., *haec* the Nom. Pl. Neut.; but in Plautus *illi* and *illic, isti* and *istic* are equally Adv. and Dat. Pron., *hae* and *haec* (*illae and *illaec, *istae and *istae*) are both used for the Nom. Pl. Fem., *illa* and *illae* (but only *haec, *ista* for the Neut., while *illic, istic*, forms not found in class. Lat., are equivalents of *ille, iste, illuc of illud (but only *istue* in Terence, and perhaps also in Plautus). Still there are rules observed even so early as
Plautus' time; for example, the Nom. Pl. Masc. of hic, ille, is before a word beginning with a vowel hisce, illsce, but before a consonant hi, illi, and in general the forms with -ce are found in use before an initial vowel, hasece, hasce, hisce Dat.-Abl., illsce, istsce Dat.-Abl., though before a consonant horinc, harinc are employed when the verse-ictus has to fall on the final syllable. In the Latin of ordinary conversation, as represented by the language of Plautus' plays, the particle -ce has not in these pronouns the worth of a syllable, a disyllabic hasece, &c. being proper to a more elevated style of poetry, e.g. Ennius, A. 294 M. haecce locutus vocat, at the beginning of a hexameter line, so that hacutenus and hocalie, quoted as O. Lat. forms by Mar. Victorinus (9. 19 K.), must come from an Epic poem, or else from some official inscription or legal document. When the interrogative particle -ne is added, the -ce is preserved as a full syllable, e.g. hoc-ci-ne, si-ci-ne with i not e, because the vowel has now become medial and not final (ch. iii. § 39). The full form only is used in Plautus and Terence, but in later authors we find also, e.g. hiec (Stat. Theb. i. 189; other examples in Neue, ii* p. 422). The Interjection em seems always to take the forms with -c, e.g. em illic, en istoc, but not the Interjection ecce, e.g. ecce-illam, ecce-istam, ecce-am (for ecce *ham ?, § 16). Prefixed to quidem the c is not used in hiquidem, &c. of the Dramatists (but istucquidem, not istudquidem, in Plautus, as istuc not istud in the simple Pronoun).

§ 16. Hic. The old form hoc (for *ghē-ke) appears on the earliest Scipio epitaph in Saturnian metre (C. I. L. i. 32):

hic cépit Córsica Alériaque urbe,

which has, however, e for original i in Tempestatebus, and in the previous line shows the spelling hic (probably not the Adverb, for this would naturally be spelt heic in so early an inscription):

cónsol, cónsor, aidiilis hic fuet a[pud uos].

The spelling hoc seems to be a retention of the old form, due to the emphatic position of the Pronoun at the beginning of the line, if it is not merely an example of the early interchange of e and i in the unaccented syllable (e.g. aidiilis for aeiilis on the still older Scipio epitaph, i. 31; see ch. iii. § 22). The Neuter Nom.-Acc. hoc should be *hocc (for *ghōd-ke), but though we are expressly told that it was so pronounced before an initial vowel, as in Virgil's line: hoc erat, alma parens, &c., there is no evidence that it was ever written with -ce, for Priscian's statement (i. 592. 22 H.): in antiquissimis codicibus inventur bis e scriptum, is illustrated only by the form hoccine. Hoc is always long by position in Latin poetry, as hōc Abl. is long both by nature and by position (for *hōd-ce), and hīc M. is distinguished from hēc Adv. in Plautus and the early Dramatists (spelt heic in Plautine MSS., Merc. 307, Men. 375, &c.), though, like other long syllables, hēc, (hēc) may be shortened, when unaccented, after a short syllable by the Law of Breves Breviantes (ch. iii. § 42), e.g. quid hēc est ?, what is here ?, (quid hēc est ?, what is this ?). But in classical poetry hic M. is more often scanned as a long than as a short syllable; and the grammarians assert of hic in a line like Virg. A. xi. 16: manibusque meis Moenzenti hic est, that it was pronounced *hīce (Mar. Victor. 22. 17 K.; other references in Neue, ii* p. 411), just as they declare hoc erat to have been pronounced hocce erat; so that it is probable that hīc M. came to be pronounced *hīce by theAnalogy of hoc (for *hōc) N. -r, which was pronounced *hōcc. (One
theory supposes hic with long i to have been a byform of hic, Rev. Philologie, 1892.)

In the Genitive we have, e.g. hoiusue on the Lex Repetundarum of 123–122 B.C. (C.I.L. i. 198. 56), hoiusque (i. 603, of 58 B.C. hoiusque aedis ergo), hoius Plaut. Pseud. 271 (hoius A, huius P), huivius Most. 664 (A, huius P). Plautus is said not to admit the form with -ce (Poem. 1237) into the colloquial language of his plays. It occurs, however, in Terence (Andr. 439, Phorm. 827), and the phrase huiusce modi is very common in Cicero and Sallust.

In the Dative hoic occurs in the Lex Bantina of 133–118 B.C. (C.I.L. i. 197. 26 hoice leego). Mar. Victorinus (12. 2 K.) quotes 'ex libris antiquis foederum et legum, qui etiamsi frequenti transcriptione aliquid mutarunt, tamen retinent antiquitatem,' the form hoic, a form affected in pronunciation by a few in the time of Velius Longus (first cent. A.D.) (p. 76. 3 K.). In later poetry haic (like cii in the poetry of the first cent. A.D., § 25) is scanned as a dissyllable (twice in Statius, Silv. i. i. 107; i. 2. 135; and even haico in Ter. Maurus, l. 1375. For other examples, see Neue, ii*, p. 415). In the Accusative the oldest spelling hon-ce appears in the Lex Spoletina (C.I.L. xi. 4766 honce loucom nequis uliolatol), hance in the Lex Bantina (i. 197), hoce for *hoccce on the S. C. Bach. of 186 B.C., where double consonants are written single, (i. 196. 26 atque utci hoce in tabolam ahem inceideritis) (cf. i. 1291 itus actuque est in hocce delubrum Feroniai). We have hoxce on the Scipio epitaph (i. 32), in the Saturnian line:

hoxe oino ploirume coséntient R[omae],
‘h unc unum plurimi consentiunt R[omae].’ Like hunc from hone M. is huced(c) from hoc(c) N., a spelling found in an inscription of somewhat irregular orthography (i. 603, of 58 B.C., ad huc templum), and in the Falisco-Lat. huc dederunt (Zvet. I.I.I. 72 a’), but in classical Latin reserved to discriminate the Adverb from the Pronoun (see ch. ix. § 10). In the Abl. we have the full form hoce, e.g. in the magisterial proclamation cited above for hoce Neut. Acc. (C.I.L. i. 1201 ex hoce loco; cf. Orell. 5857), hoce in the Lex Bantina (i. 197. 7) and throughout the Lex Repetundarum (i. 198) [cf. hocedie and hactenus, mentioned as O. Lat. forms by Mar. Vict. (9. 18 K.)]. (For the Locative, see the Adverb hice, heic, ch. ix. § 10). Nom.-Acc. Phur. Neut. haie is found in the S. C. Bach. (C.I.L. i. 196. 22 haice utci in couentionid exdeicatis, ‘haec uti in contione edecatis’; haecce has been already cited from Ennius, A. 294 M. haecce locatus; hice or heise, the Nom. Pl. Masc. form used by Plautus before a word beginning with a vowel, occurs without the particle in two inscriptions of no great antiquity (C.I.L. i. 1059 haic soint horti; i. 1071 haic soint duo concordes), and, according to the grammarians, in Virg. E. iii. 102:

his certe, neque amor causa est, vix ossibus haeren;

we have heise further in some Capua inscriptions of 108-71 B.C. (C.I.L. i. 565 heisce magistreis Ueneris Iouiae; i. 566 heisce magistreis Cererus; i. 567 heisce magistrei; i. 569 heisce mag.; i. 573 heise magistr.; Not. Scar. 1893. p. 164 heisece magistris); cf. C.I.L. i. 1478 (Cartagena), heisece magistris.

For examples of haece F., see Neue, ii*, p. 417; e. g. Virg. G. iii. 305:

haece quoque non cura nobis leviore tuendae.

The form seems to have been used both by Caesar and Cicero. In the Genitive the full form is found in Cato, e.g. harumce (R. R. 139 harumce rerum ergo), and in the old oath administered to soldiers taking furlough (ap. Gell.)
xvi. 4. 4 nisi harunce quae causa erit, funus familiare, feriaeae denicales, &c.). In the Dat.-ABL. *hisc* is used by Plaut. and Ter. before vowels, by Cicero, &c. before consonants too (examples in Neue, ii. p. 419; cf. *heisc* in the Lex Repetundarum, C. I. L. i. 198. 8 de heisce, dum, &c.), and the same holds of Acc. *hosc* and *hosc* (cf. *hosc* sedes, C. I. L. iii. 7239).


* eodem hércele uto pono ét paro: parissumi estis hibus,
like *ibus* (for *eibus*) in Plaut. *Mil.* 74 (see § 19); it follows the analogy of Noun *Ā*-stems in Dat. Sg. *F*. *hæ* in Cato (*R. R.* 14. 3 hæ rei materiem ... dominus praebetit).

* The Nom. Pl. M. *heisc*, already mentioned, is, like Nom. Pl. *eis* of the stem *i* (§ 19), due to the addition of the Plural suffix -s to the already formed plural *heī, hī*. (On the declension of *hīc* in Plautus, see Studemund in Fleckeisen’s *Jahrbücher*, 1876, p. 57, and on its use, Bach in Studem. *Stud.* ii.) *Hicc* always refers to the first Personal Pronoun in Old Latin, and means ‘this that is near me, that belongs to me,’ &c.; *so hic homo for ego* in the Comedians. It is sometimes used for *is*, to refer to something already mentioned, in the classical historians and Epic poets, but rarely earlier, e. g. Ter. *Phrm.* 866-9 has *hıc* where *ibi* would be used by Plautus:

* ad fores
sūspenso gradu placide ire pérrexī, accessī, āstītī,

* hic pulcherrumum
fācīnum audīui.

The Adverb *hī-dīc* (Falisc. *foied*) seems to show the bare stem (cf. ch. ix. § 5). A form without the enclitic has been claimed for O. Lat. *eccum*, e. g. sed *eccum* Falaestrione, ‘but see, here comes P.’, Plaut., though the word may be analyzed into *eccum eum* as well as into *eccc* *eicum* (§ 15). On Faliscan he eupat, ‘here lie,’ ‘here lies’ (for *heī* or for *heic* ?), and on Late Lat. *hi jact*, see ch. ix. § 10. We have Dat. *hi* in late inscriptions (Henz. 7339, Rome; perhaps also in C. I. L. x. 7297, Palermo).

§ 18. Ille. Nom. ollus M., olla F. are the words used in two ancient formulae preserved by Varro (L. L. vii. 42), the announcement made at a ‘funus indicivum,’ viz. ollus leo datus est, and the proclamation by the herald at the comitia, in which olla centuria and not ‘illa c.’ was used, just as we keep up the old Norman French ‘oyez, oyez’ in Royal proclamations. The same Nom. Fem. seems to occur in the formula, also preserved by Varro (L. L. vii. 8), which the augur used on the citadel in marking off a ‘templum,’ though the reading of the MSS. is corrupt: ullam per arbus quiriquir est... ollaner arbus quiruir est. The immediate precursor of ille, the Nom. Masc. ollar, is found in the Law of Servius Tullius, quoted by Festus (290. 15 Th.): si parentem per verberet (M. -it), ast olla plorasit, per divus parentum sacer esto. A very old form of the Abl. Plur. oloses, is cited by Paul. Fest. 14. 17 Th.: ‘ab oloses’ dicebat pro ab illis; antiqui enim litteram non geminabant; and in the inscription on the Columna Rostrata (a restoration made in the Imperial period) we have the Gen. Pl. olorum (C. L. L. i. 195 prae sente[d Hanibaled]) dictated o|lor[on]m (cf. ollarum on an early inscr., Marini, Act. Arr. p. 233). Macrobius (iii. 9. 10) quotes an old ritual with ollis legibus, and on the Lex Furfensis of 58 b. c. (C. I. L. i. 603) the same phrase occurs, ollis legibus (followed immediately by illeis regionibus), similarly on the Lex Cornelia of 81 b. c. [i. 302. (1), 6 olleis hominibus]. Cicero in his De Legibus employs in the archaic language of his laws olli Dat. Sg., ollis Dat. Pl., ollar Nom. Pl., ollar Neut. Pl., ollar Acc. Pl. In the early Dramatists the form is not found, so that it must have been already relegated to the legal style by the beginning of the second cent. n. c. Ennius in his Annales knows only olli Dat. Sg. and Nom. Pl., and ollis Dat.-Abl. Plur. (illi and illis are apparently not used by him), and these are the only forms of olla found in his imitator, Virgil, and the later Epic poets, while Lucretius confines himself to ollis. Quintilian mentions olli among the happy archaism of Virgil (viii. 3. 25 ‘ollo’ enim et ‘quianam’ et ‘moerus’ et ‘pone’ et ‘porricerent’ adspergunt illam, quae etiam in picturis est gratissima, vetustatis inimitabilem arti auctoritatem). The old spelling may have lingered longest in these forms through the analogy of the Adverb olim, which comes from the stem ol- (Umbr. ulo ‘illuc’) a byform of ol- (ch. iv. §§ 45, 59), and does not exhibit a substitution of ol- for oll- (cf. ch. ii. § 127). Servius (ad A. i. 254 and v. 10) mentions a theory that oll in these two lines of Virgil was not the Dat. Sg. of the Pronoun, but an Adverb with the sense ‘tune’ (cf. the glosses ollis ‘illi ... aut tune’; olli ‘ibi, interdum, illi, vel illine,’ C. G. L. v. 229. 4–5), and olli-c is quoted by Paul. Fest. 231. 2 Th. as an O. Lat. form of illis (cf. Lucil. inc. 152 M.: uelut olim Auceps ille facit, where the MSS. offer ollis). The mispronunciation, ‘oll’ for olim, censured in Prob. App. 199. 16 K., is merely an example of the tendency of Vulg. Lat. to omit final -m, like the mispronunciations ‘pride,’ ‘passi,’ ‘numqua,’ ‘ida,’ censured on the same page. From olim was formed Late Lat. olitanus, ‘of former time,’ and the curious phrase, found in Petron. 433 p. 29. 2 B. olim ollorum, ‘long long ago.’ [Another theory connects O. Lat. olli, ‘then,’ with O. Sl. lani, ‘last summer,’ and analyzes olotius into *ol-no,-, not *ol-so- (I. F. iii. 264).] For instances of the addition of the particle -ce to ille in its various forms in Plautus, see (ille Nom. Sg. M., illaece F., illaece N., illaece Dat., illaece Acc. M., illaece F., illaece Abl., illaece F., illaece Nom. Pl. M. (before a vowel), illaece F., illaece Neut., illaece Dat.-Abl. (before a vowel), see Neue, ii. i. 427. In old rituals mentioned by Cato in the Res Rustica we find illaece (139 illaece sacri coecendii ergo), illaece
(132. 101 rei ergo macte hac illace dape pollucenda esto), *illace (141. 4 Mars pater, squid tibi in illise suoutaurilibus lactentibus neque satisfactum est, te hisce suouitaurilibus piaculo); and in legal formulae in Varro’s *Res Rustica, *illace (ii. 5. 11 illosec bores sanos esse noxisque praestari, ... illosec iuuences sanos recte deque pecore sano esse noxisque praestari spondesne?*), *illace (ii. 4. 5 illace sus sanas esse). The Analog of O-stem Adjectives has produced *illum Neut. in Late and Vulgar Latin (e. g. in the Vulgate, S. Marc. iv. 35), *ille Dat. in Cato (R. R. 153 and 154 iliae rei) and Plaut. *Stich. 560 (illae iilae; so the MSS.), *illo Dat. in late authors (e.g. Apuleius); to the Analog of I-stems is due *illibus, if it be a genuine form, ascribed to O. Lat. by Serg. in *Donat. p. 547. 37 K.

Lucilius seems to have proposed the spelling *illi Dat. Sg., *illee Nom. Pl. (ix. 15 M.):

‘hoc illi factumst uni’: tenue hoc facies i.

‘haec illeil fecere’: adde e, ut pinguius fiat,

on which see ch. i. § 9. According to Diomedes (332. 11 K.) the strengthening particle -met is added to ille, and produces illemet.

In colloquial Latin ecc- was prefixed to the Acc. case of ille and formed a compound, e. g. eccilium video, Plaut. By prefixing em [the old deictic interjection, for which in was substituted in class. Latin (ch. x. § 19)], was formed *illum, *ellam of the Comedians, which survives in the exclamation used in the dialect of the Abruzzi at the present day, elle (with open e).

On the pronunciations *illius and *illius, see Neue, ii². 518, and cf. below, § 22.

§ 19. Is. The stem -i- appears clearly in *is Nom. Sg. M., *id N. But the encroachment of the O-declension shows itself in the numerous cases formed from a stem eyo- (e. g. *vom for *eyom Acc. Sg. M., which ousted the old Acc. *im; *eis for *eyois Dat.-Abl. Pl., which ousted the old *ibus for *ei-bus (O. Ind. *-bhyás), with stem augmented before the Dat. Plur. suffix as in *hibus (§ 16). Another old I-stem form may be Abr. *i in *i-loco, which is used in O. Lat. in the sense of ‘in loco’ [‘in eo loco,’ Nom. 325. 6 M., who quotes Accius (Trag. 373 R.):

*ilico, inquam, habitáto, nusquam própius],

while the class. Abl. Sg. M. is *ei for *eyóod. *Iúo is however better explained as *in loco, O. Lat. for in loco (see ch. ix. § 7).

It may be owing to this stem eyo- that we find the natural Fem. *iá replaced by ea. The Acc. form *iam preserved in the MSS. of Varro, L. L. v. 166 and viii. 44 (cf. *jam, the Adverb, ch. ix. § 10. 8; *iam on a Laceria inser., C. I. L. ix. 782), may be a relic of the old and correct spelling, for there is no indication that there ever existed a spelling *etam, of which some have supposed it to be a corruption (cf. ch. ii. § 9). (In Umbr. we find *eam Acc. Sg. *F., eaf Acc. Pl. F.)

The particle -ce is not added to this Pronoun-stem until Late Latin, e. g. *ejuscemodi (Jerome, Epist. 82. 6) by Analogy of *hujuscemodi. [Postoac in Claudius’ edict on the Anauni (Hermes, iv. 99, l. 13) is an isolated form.] But in Oscan we have iiz-ie ‘is,’ iú-k ‘ea,’ id-ik ‘id,’ and in Umbrian (with intervocalic s become r) er-ee ‘is,’ ed-ek ‘id,’ &c., as well as forms like Osc. id-ad ‘ad id,’ Umbr. *ae Acc. Pl. M., eu Acc. Pl. N., &c.

The various case-forms that call for notice are these. Nom. Sg. M. *eis appears three times beside the usual is on the Lex Repetundarum. It may be
a Nom. formed from the strong stem ei- (cf. Dat. Pl. i-bus), but is as likely to
be a mere mistaken use of ei for ë in seine and leiternas on the same inscription,
an inscription not older than the last quarter of the second cent. B.C.
(On eisterem, see § 21.) In the Dat. Sg. iei is written in the Lex Rubria (C. I. L.
i. 205) of 49 B.C. (beside ei), by the same orthography as mieis, abiegnieis, aesculnieis
(see ch. ii. § 9, and cf. iei Nom. Pl., ieis Dat. Pl. below). (So Umbr. ie-pru,
io-pl). The Acc. Sg. M. was in O. Lat. im [Charis. 133. 1 K. 'im' pro eum,
nam ita Scaurus in arte grammatica disputavit, antiquos 'im', 'ques'... et
declinari ita: is, ejus, ei, eum vel im; Paul. Fest. 73. 29 Th. 'im' pronoun
pro eum, a nominativo is; ib. 33. 7 antiqui dicebant... 'im' pro eum; Gl.
Philoex. im: aïtov, eis aïtov; Gl. Cyrill. aïtov, toïtov im (MS. eim)]. Macro-
bius (i. 4. 19) quotes a law of the XII Tables: si nox furtum factum sit, si im
occisit, iure caesus esto, and Cicero (Legg. ii. 24. 60) another: cui auro dentes
inuncti essent, as im eum illo sepelirei uraeae se fraudae esto (cf. Fest. 322.
13 Th.).

This form is often given as em, instead of im, perhaps by analogy of Noun
I-stems which substituted the Acc. suffix of Consontant-stems for that of
I-stems, e.g. turrem for turrem (see ch. vi. § 29); so Paul. Fest. 54. 20 Th. 'em'
pro eum, ab eo quod est is. Another law of the XII Tables is cited by Porphyrio
in his note on the 'licet antestari?' of Hor. S. i. 9. 76: si in ius uocet, ni it,
antestanimo, igitur em (MSS. en) capito; and Festus (298. 15 Th.) quotes, from
a speech of Cato, si em perceussi. Similarly the Adverb im (ch. ix. § 10) (cf.
O. Ind. im, originally an Acc. of the 'anaphoric' pronoun, then a mere
particle), so written in Gl. Philoex. im: λοιπων, ἡγη, is mentioned by Paul. Fest.
as em (53. 37 Th. 'em,' tum); the Acc. of an O. Lat. derivative of is in the
sense of idem is imeum in the Philoxenus Glossary (imeum: τῶν ἀιτων), but
emem in Paul. Fest. (54. 2 Th. 'emem,' eundem) [cf. the form in the Glossary
of Placidus, eundem (MSS. hendem): aequ, similitur, C. G. L. v. 73. 19].

The Dat.-Loc. Sg. *eyei, written eiei1 (along with ei) in the Lex Repetundarum
of 123-122 B.C. (C. I. L. i. 198), has in Plautus and the older poetry three
scansion, ēi, ei and ēi, in Ovid and later poets one, ei (cf. vē and vē Plaut.,
vei class., ch. vi. § 19). This *eyei is thought to have become ēi much as
-eye became -ēs (e.g. Lat. trēs for I.-Eur. *trēyes, ch. iv. § 66), which in
what we may call 'ceremonious' speech would preserve its full sound, and
for a time resist the Latin tendency to shorten every long vowel before
another vowel (ch. ii. § 143), while after the shortening set in, ēi, through its
unaccented character, would in the rapid utterance of everyday life become
a mere monosyllable ēi, as tiā became tiā, &c. (§ 12). (Priscian, ii. p. 10. 2 H.
speaks as if ei were as much a monosyllable as huic, cui in the ordinary
pronunciation of his time). To suppose that eiei was pronounced *ey-yei as
*Trōia was pronounced *Troy-ya, pējor, *pey-yor (ch. ii. § 55), does not account
for the fact that these words are always scanned with the first syllable long
in poetry, while eum for *eyom is never scanned with its first syllable long.
(See below, however, on the doubt attaching to the antiquity of the scansion
ēi.) But the Genitive ejus, formed by the addition of the Gen. suffix -us to

1 This would most naturally be explained as a Reduplication of ei,
and some explain ἔι, éi as produced in this way. But the reduplicated
form of the i-stem had in Latin the

NOTION
the already formed Locative had this pronunciation *ēy-yus [Caesell. ap. Cassiod. 266. 6 K. ‘Pompeius,’ ‘Tarpeius’ et ‘eiuis’ per duo i scribenda sunt, et propter suum (plenius enim sonant), et propter metrum. Numquam enim longa iet syllaba nisi per i geminum scribatur]. This pronunciation is indicated by the spelling ziiVs on inscriptions (Neue, ii2, p. 375) and MSS. (Index to Studemund’s Apograph of the Ambrosian Palimpsest of Plautus). The treatment of Nom. Pl. *eiyei for *eyeoi and Dat.-AbL Pl. *eyeais for *eyeois is not the same as that of Dat.-Loc. Sg. *eyei; for we have in Plautus and the older poetry no instance of *ēi, eiēs, but only ēi or ēi, and ēis or ēis, is.

Where ē is followed by a long syllable it passed in unaccented usage into y by Synizesis, e.g. ős, ős, őrum Plaut. (not ős, &c., by Law of Breves Breviantes; see ch. iii. § 49).

The old Abl. Sg. -ā is seen in eōd die of the Lex Spoletina (C. I. L. xi. 4766), and in Adverbial ead of the S. C. Bacch. (i. 196. 25 quei aruworm ead fiesent, ‘qui adversum eā fecissent’).

In the Nom. Pl. the spelling ēiē is, in accordance with the orthography of the first cent. b. c. (ch. ii. § 9), found on the Lex Cornelia of 81 b. c. [i. 202. (1). 7, along with ei], on the Lex Antonio de Termessibus of 71 b. c. (i. 204, passim, never ei], on the Lex Rubria of 49 b. c. [i. 205. (1). 4], on the Lex Julia Municipalis of 45 b. c. (i. 206. 24, usually ei], and in Varro (L. L. ix. 2 and 35). We have also i in MSS. (often confused with hi), and inscriptions (examples in Neue, ii2, p. 382); and the ei of Republican inscriptions (ibid. p. 383) admits of being taken to denote the simple long i-sound. Priscian (i. 298. 9 H.) seems to distinguish monosyllabic ī (for i) from disyllabic ēi, and similarly ēis (is) from ēis, dīi (di) from dīi, dīis (dis) from dīis (see Neue, l. c.). The Nom. Pl. Masc. form used in the Lex Bantina of 133–118 b. c. (i. 197) and the Lex Repetundae of 123–122 b. c. (i. 198) is ēis (cf. i. 199. 29 ?), a form which appears in the earlier spelling eis in the S. C. Bacch. of 186 b. c. (i. 196. 5, the only occurrence of a Nom. Pl. of ēs on this inscr.) (possibly in i. 185 ēis), and which should be compared with his (older heis) and hisce for hi, illis (ilveis) and illisce for ǐli (§§ 16, 18). (The reading is in Pacuv. Trag. 221 R. ap. Charis. 132. 4 K. is very doubtful). In the Gen. Pl. the form eum, mentioned by Paul. Fest. (54. 20 Th. ‘eum’ antiqui dicebant pro eorum), is found once (usually eorum) on the Lex Julia Municipalis of 45 b. c. [C. I. L. i. 206. 52 eum h(ac) l(ege) n(ihil) r(ogatur)]. The orthography of the Dat.-AbL Pl. resembles that of the Nom. Pl. We have ēis on the Lex Antonia de Termessibus, the Lex Rubria, the Lex Julia Municipalis, and other inscriptions of the first cent. b. c. (see Index to C. I. L. i.), but ēis in the early spelling of the S. C. Bacch. of 186 b. c. (i. 196), while the earliest form of ēis, ēis, reappears on an inscr. of circ. 100 b. c., the Epistula Praetoris ad Tiburtin (i. 201 de eisibus ab uobis pecatam non esse. Quonque de eisibus rebus senatuei purgati estis, &c.). We have also ēs in MSS. (often confused with his) and inscriptions (Neue, ii2, p. 383), and the ēis of Republican inscriptions (see Index to C. I. L. i.) admits of being taken as an expression of the sound ēs. Priscian, as we have just seen, appears to distinguish ēis (pronounced ēs) from ēis, as ēis (pronounced ēis) from disyllabic ēis.

The O. Lat. I-stem Dat.-AbL ibus is mentioned by Nonius (486. 11 M. ‘ibus’ pro is minus latinum putat consuetudo, eum veterum auctoritate plurimum valeat), who quotes Plautus, Mil. 74:

latrōnes, ibus dīnumere m stipéndium,
(the MSS. of Plautus have *latronibus* and *latronibus*), and other instances from the Comedians. The Placidus Glossary (C. G. L. v. 75. 9) has *ibus,* *iis,* *illis,* with quotation of the same line of Plautus. For other lines of Plautus where some editors read *ibus,* and for Lachmann’s proposal to read *ibus* (though only *ibus,* *ibus* are known in Plautus, &c.) in certain lines of Lucretius, see Neue, ii*, p. 386.

The analogy of the Á-declension has produced *aeae* Dat. Sg. F., a form found in Cato (*R. R.* 142 quo modo uilicam uti oportet, et quo modo eae imperari oportet) and probably in Plaut. *Mil.* 348: hic eae proxxmust, but not in use in Varro’s time (L. L. viii. 51); so in Late Latin *eum* for *iē* (see Georges, Lex. Worff. s. v.). Cato also uses *eabus* (*R. R.* 152 facito scopas urgeras ulmeas aridas... *eabus* latera dolis intrinsecus usque bene perficito), which is quoted from Cassius Hemina (pro eiusmodia causa in feminino) by Priscian (i. 294. 4 H.).

The obscure form *necrim* mentioned by Festus (160. 21 Th.) and Paul. Fest. (161. 11 Th.), and explained by them as ‘nee eum,’ has been supposed by some to be a wrong reading for *nee im* (nee *eim*?), by others to contain the Pronoun-stem es- of *iste* for *este* (*§ 13*).

The scansion *ei* is allowed by most editors of Plautus in the Dat. Sg., but a certain example is very difficult to find, except in the Prologues; and these cannot be quoted as Plautine. Thus in *Rud.* 392 where editors end the line with: ne cōpia esset *ei,* the MSS. have *iēus*; in *Bacch.* 545: mendáciunm ei dixit, only the Ambrosian Palimpsest has *ei,* the Palatine MSS. have *illī* [editors similarly prefer *illī* the (probable) reading of the Palimpsest] to *iīs* of the other MSS. in *Rud.* 219: neque quicquām umquam illīs prófuit; in *Curc.* 544, for which we have only the testimony of the Palatine family of MSS.: is Summanum sé uocari dixit; ei rēddidī,

*ei* might be easily emended to *ei* *ego,* and so on (e. g. *Cist.* 138). But the scansion *ei* in the Dat. Sg. is certain for Terence, e. g. *Andr.* 443:

*dum licitum*est ei dumque actās tulit,

and is very common in Lucretius, e. g. vi. 674:

scilicet et fluvius quivis est maxīmus ei
qui non ante aliquem majorem vidit;

so that *ei* (like *supera* for *supra*, ch. iii. § 15) may be a form that is not genuinely antique. The Dat. Sg. is avoided by the Augustan poets, Horace for example in his Satires and Epistles using *eius,* *eum,* *eo* but not *ei*; but in Ovid, *Halieut.* 33, we have *ei* (see Neue, ii*, p. 378, who, however, quotes as examples of *ei* from Plautus lines where it can be scanned *ei* in prosodical hiatus, e. g. *Curc.* 603 māter *ei* utēndum dederat, like mēt honoris, *Aul.* 463).

§ 20. *Ipse.* We have already seen the particles *-pte* and *-pse* added to various pronouns to give the sense of ‘self,’ *own,* e. g. *meopte* ingenio like *meo* *ipius* ingenio, *sepse* like *se ipsum.* These particles seem to be composed of a particle *pe-* (pl.), seen in *quis-piam,* *quippe,* &c., and the Pronoun-stems so- and to-, which alternate in the L.-Eur. Demonstrative with its Nom. *sō* M., *sā* F., *tōd* N., and its oblique cases formed from the stem to- (*te-*). [Lat. *-pte* should therefore not be compared with Lith. *pats,* ‘self,’ from *patis* (Lat. *patis,* Gk. *pās,* &c.).] Similarly we find the Pronoun-stem *i-* augmented by *pse* in the Latin pronoun of identity, *i-pse,* which is further strengthened in the O. Lat.
form, or forms, given by Paul. Fest. as *ipsippe (74. 37 Th. 'ipsippe,' ipsi, neque alii), in the Glossary of Philoxenus as *ipsipte ('ipsipi' : abrói, C. G. L. ii. 87, 26 and 44) and *ipsipse ('ipsipse': abróis, ib. 91, 35), and augmented by -pte in eotp (Paul. Fest. 78. 16 Th. 'in eotp., co ispo').

The original declension of *ipsipse we may suppose to have been: Nom. Sg. *ips-ipse (i-psé) M., ea-ipsa F., *id-pod (*i-pod) N., Acc. Sg. *im-padm M., &c., until the inconvenience of the alternation of -p-so and -p-to brought about a 'levelling' process. (Ipsud is not found till late Latin, see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v.) The declension of both elements of the Compound may still appear in isolated forms indicated by the MSS. of Plautus, e.g. eapsa, Cas. 602 [so the Ambrosian Palimpsest (A), but ea ipsa in the Palatine MSS. (P), as in v. 604 for eapsa of A]; eapsae, Pers. 833 (eapsa A, eae ipsae P); eapsam non eampsam, Truc. 133 (eum ipsum non eam ipsam A, eum ipsum non ea ase P); eapsam, Truc. 114 (eum ipsum A, umsum P), which have been, perhaps unnecessarily, changed by editors to eapsae, eapsae. eapsa, eapsae.

The declension of the first element appears in eapsae, mentioned by Paul. Fest. (54. 28 Th. 'eapsae, e apsa), and this and similar forms are sometimes preserved in the MSS. of Plautus (e. g. eapsa, Trin. 974, Truc. 24, Curc. 161, 534), though usually *ipsipse is written for the unfamiliar -p-se and is sometimes declined, e.g. eapsae, Pers. 603 (eum ipse P); eapsae, Poen. 272 (eum ipse P); eapsae, Cas. 604 (so A, but ea ipsa P). (On sivemsepse, see ch. ix. § 8.)

In the Nom. Sg. Masc. we have a byform ipsus in O. Lat. (ipsos in a Law of Numa quoted by Paul. Fest. 4. 29 Th.: si quisquam aliutta favit, ipsos Ioui sacer esto), which is the form used by the Comedians before a Reflexive Pronoun, e.g. ipsus sibi, ipsus sumum rem, &c. *Ipsipse is not a development of ipsus. The two are separate forms, *ipsipse for -sö, ipsus for -sos, corresponding to the I.-Eur. by-forms *sö and sös (O. Ind. sá and sás, Gk. ó and ós) (§ 13). The influence of O-stem Adjectives produced in Late Latin ipso Dat. Sg. (Apul.) and *ipsa (Apul.), of I-stems ipsibis Dat. Pl., ascribed to O. Latin by Segr. in Don. (547. 37 K.). The Plautine ipsissimus (Trin. 988), like Aristophanes' abróaros, seems to have been, in the form ipsu or ipsima, actually used in the colloquial Latin of the Empire in the sense of *domina (Petron. 69. p. 46. 16 B.; 75. p. 51. 23 B., &c.). (On the colloquial pronunciation isse, issa, for ipse, ipsa, see ch. ii. § 81.) Ipsamet is found occasionally (see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v.).

§ 21. *Idem. The affix -dem of *ideum, O. Lat. is-dem, tanthi-dem, tantum-dem, expressing the idea of 'precisely,' 'exactly,' is thought by some to have been originally *ideum, for the Ocean equivalent of Latin *ideum is is-udum. This *ideum, formed by adding the affix -em to the Neut. Demonstr. *id, is used in Latin as the Neut. of the Pronoun expressing 'the same,' but in O. Ind. id-ám is the Neut. of the Demonstr. 'this,' much as the Acc. Masc. with the same affix, *im-em, is used in O. Ind. (imám) as the Acc. Masc. 'this,' but was in O. Lat. the equivalent of eumdem [Paul. Fest. 54. 2 Th. emem, 'eundem'; Gl. Philox. imeum: τoν aytóv; cf. Gl. Plac. (h)emdem, 'aeque, similiter'; these readings leave it doubtful whether the word was formed by adding the affix -em to the Acc. im, or, as seems more likely, by doubling the Acc.]. Priscian (i. 589. 14 H.) derives i-dem from is and *deman.

The Nom. Masc. is discussed by Cicero in a passage of somewhat uncertain text (Orat. xlvii. 157): 'ideum campus habet ' inquit Ennius, et in templis *ideum probavit; at 'isdem' erat verius, nec tamen 'eisdem' ut optimius: male
sonabat 'isdem'; impetratum est a consuetudine, ut peccare suavitas causa liceret. He seems to say that idem [also written with ei for the long i-sound (ch. i. § 9) idem] was the form in use, with s dropped with compensatory lengthening before ei (ch. iv. § 151), but that some purists insisted on the spelling with s, isdem or even eisdem. (For examples of these spellings, e.g. eisdem C.I.L. i. 576; 577. (2). 9, 11, 13; 1468; 1470, &c., see Neue, ii². p. 390.)

In the Dat. Sg. we have eisdem and eodem (like ei and ei, § 19), but eisdem is not found. On later inscriptions idem is very frequent (examples in Neue, ii². p. 390), and even isdem (Neue, l. c.), a confusion with the Nom. Sg., which had the (archaic) spelling isdem, but the pronunciation idem. In the Nom. and Dat.-Abl. Pl., Priscian (i. 589, 29 H.) seems to distinguish ei-dem, eis-dem from eisdem (pronounced and usually spelt i-dem), isdem (pronounced and usually spelt is-dem). (For instances of the spelling i-dem and is-dem, the usual forms, see Neue, l. c.) The eisdem of Republican Inscriptions (Neue, l. c.; e.g. C. I. I. i. 197. 17 and i. 202) may represent the pronunciation idem. Like eis, older eis, as Nom. Plur. of is (§ 19), we find eisdem Nom. Pl. (C.I.L. i. 198. 27 eisdem ioudices; often in the phrase eisdem probuavert, &c., e.g. i. 1149; i. 1187; i. 1192; cf. i. 1143), and in later inscriptions sometimes isdem (Neue, p. 394). In the Dramatists, &c., with a second word we find the word pronounced with Synizesis, e.g. eodem, eisdem, &c., like ei, eis (§ 19). The influence of O-stem Adjectives is seen in the Late Latin forms eodem Dat., eodem Dat. (very rare; see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v.).

§ 22. The Pronominal Gen. and Dat. Sg. In the early Dramatists we find two scansiones of illius, istius, ipius, &c., (1) illiius, istiisus, ipsius, alterius, &c., (2) illi(u)s, isti(u)s, ipsi(u)s, but not illius, istius, ipsius, &c., as in classical poetry. Examples of the second scansion are: is(i(u)s modi (4 syll.) in Plaut. Most. 746; Rud. 321; Ter. Heaut. 387, &c. Another O. Lat. form of the Gen., fully attested by Priscian (i. 196. 22 H.; i. 226. 16 H.; i. 266. 3 H.; i. 303. 21 H.; ii. 8 H.) is with -i, illii, istii, ipsii, e.g. illi modi and isti modi (Cato), istii modi Plaut. Truc. 930 (so the MSS.). This cannot be explained as an O-stem Adjective formation, for it is found with Fem. Nouns, e.g. toti familiae (Afranius), isti formae (Terence), and a Dat. Masc. like illo, isto is not found till Late Latin. It may be a relic of the Locative form which, as we have seen, was augmented by the Gen. suffix -us (-os) to form these Pronoun Genitives in -ius; but it is also conceivable that it is a doublet which has arisen out of the contracted form illii(u)s, isti(u)s, &c. in certain combinations. A word-group like isti(u)s modi would be pronounced istimodi, as naturally as O. Lat. dasmus became damus, or primum became primus, or is dem, idem; and a large number of Priscian’s examples of this Gen. in -i show the Pronoun in combination withodus. Similarly alli(u)s-rei would become ali-rei, as dis-rumpo became dirumpo; cf. Priscian’s examples, alii rei causa (Caelius), nulli rei (Cato). The byforms illi, nulli, &c. having been produced in such combinations would push their way into other combinations too, e.g. tam nulli consili (Ter. Andr. 608). They do not however seem to be found before a vowel initial.

The Dative in -i is, as we have seen, undisturbed by the influence of the O-stem Noun declension till Late Latin, e.g. illo, isto, ipso (Apuleius). But a Dat. Fem. in-ae, attested for O. Lat. by Priscian (i. 197. 12 H.; i. 226. 18 H.), is not unknown in early authors, e.g. illae rei, Cato (R. R. 153 and 154). (For a list of examples of these Gen. and Dat. forms, with references to the passages of
grammarians dealing with them, and for a fuller discussion of the whole subject, see Luchs in Studemund's Studien, i. pp. 319 sqq.)

§ 23. IV. RELATIVE, INDEFINITE, AND INTERROGATIVE PRONOUNS. The I.-Eur. Relative-stem *yo- (O. Ind. yás, Gk. ὅς) does not supply the Latin Relative, which shows the stem *qʰo-, a stem originally proper (with *qʰi-, *qʰu-) to the Interrogative and Indefinite Pronouns (O. Ind. kās, kū-tra, 'where ?', Gk. τίς, ποῦ, O. Ir. eia, W. pwy, Goth. hvas, Engl. who ?, Lith. kās, O. Sl. kū-to ; O. Ind. cit Neut., Gk. τίς, &c.), but used also as a Relative (Engl. who, &c.). I.-Eur. *qʰo-, *qʰi-, *qʰu- appear in the Latin quis ?, sī-quis, qui ? , ali-œbi, &c. (Umbr-Oscan pis, Osc. píd Neut.). We may roughly distinguish qui as the Relative, quis as the Interrogative and Indefinite Pronoun, though the stems frequently overlap, e. g. in the Latin of Cato and the earliest inscriptions ques is the Nom. Pl. of the Indefinite, qui (quei) of the Relative; but in class, Lat. both are qui. In the Italic languages (as in Celtic and elsewhere) a curious declension of the Relative (and Interrogative) was in vogue, a case-form of the Relative-stem being prefixed to a Demonstrative, like modern Gk. ποῦ τόν for ὅν in such a sentence as αὐτῶς εἰσε ὁ ἀνδράς ποῦ τόν εἶδα, that is the man whom I saw. Thus an Abl. Sg. Fem. of the Relative is in Oscan pullad, which is compounded of the Relative-stem po- (Lat. quo-) (either the bare stem or a case-form) and *ullad (Lat. *ollād), the Abl. Sg. Fem. of the Demonstrative ollo-; another is poizad, a similar compound with the Abl. Sg. Fem. of the Demonstrative eiso-. The old spelling of the Dat. Sg. of Lat. qui, viz. quoiei, shows it to be a compound of this kind, having for its second element the Dat. Sg. of is (O. Lat. eiie), *quo-eiei ; and Gen. Sg. quoius (class. eijus) will consequently represent *quo-eign. Whether this method of declension was used in other cases in Latin does not appear. Another feature of the Italic Relative is its tendency to append the Pronominal particle i (cf. Gk. ὁντο-ε), e. g. Umbr. poi Nom. Sg. M., porsi (*podi) N.; Lat. qui for *qʰo-i (O. Lat. quoi).

The Latin Interrogative-Relative has a Possessive eijus -a -um, older quoius -a -um, which is very frequent in Plautus and Terence, and is found in Republican inscriptions (e. g. in the
Lex Repetundarum, i. 198. 5, 10, 29 quoium nomen and quoiaue in fide), in Cicero (e.g. Verr. II. i. 54. 142 cuja res), and Virgil (b. iii. i cujum pecus). Virgil’s use of the word was objected to by purists, apparently through an idea that cujus -a -um was a vulgar inflexion of the Gen. Sg. of the Pronoun, an idea which the occurrence of the word in Cicero and in State inscriptions disproves (§ 11). It is rather formed by means of the Adjectival suffix -yo- (ch. v. § 4) from the stem *qyo-, *qyo-yo-, as meus (stem *me-yo-) from the stem *me- (§ 1). It is not till Late Latin that we find the particle -ce added to the Relative-Interrogative Pronoun in cujuscemodi (Apuleius, &c.), a word coined after the type of hvujuscemodi.

§ 24. Stems qyi- and qyo-. In O. Lat. there is a usage of quis, possibly as a Relative, but rather in the sense of siquis or quicumque; e.g. in an old treaty quoted by Festus to illustrate O. Lat. nancitor for nanciscitor (170. 25 Th.): pecunium quis nancitor, habeto; in an old plebiscitum (Fest. 332. 11 Th.): eum quis uolet magistrianus multare, dum minore parti familias taxat, liceto; on a public notice affixed to a grove at Luceria (C. I. L. ix. 782): quis uolet (other examples from Cato and from Cicero’s laws are given by Neue, ii2. p. 430, e.g. Cato, R. R. 147 dominus uino quid uolet faciet’. Cf. O. Lat. necumquem explained by ‘nee umquam quemquam’ (Fest. 162. 22 Th.; Paul. Fest. 163. 12 Th.). (So Umbr. piæst totar Tarsinatiss quisquis est civitatis Tadinatis,’ Osc. pis hæst ‘qui habebit’). In the Dramatists quis is the Fem. of the Interrogative, quae of the Relative (cf. Prisc. ii. 8. 21 H. quis etiam communis esse generis putaverunt vetustissimi, sicut apud Graecos τίς, e.g. Plaut. Pers. 200 quis haec est, quae me aduorum incedit? (other examples in Neue, p. 447.), but the distinction of qui Adj., and quis Pron. in questions, e.g. qui homo venit? and quis venit? is hardly observed, the habit of Plautus being rather to use quis before a vowel, qui before a cons. (see Neue, p. 431, and B. P. W. xiii. 278; similarly Cornificius seems to write siquī before an initial s, otherwise siquis, e.g. siqui suadebit, iii. 5. 8). The I-declension form of the ‘Abl.’ Sg. qui, e.g. quicum, is Relative as well as Interrogative and Indefinite; e.g. Ter. Ad. 477 psaltriam paravit, quicum uiauut; C. I. L. i. 200 quine ab eorum quae emit (see Neue, pp. 455 sqq.). But the Nom. Plur. ques, attested by Charisius (91. 16 K. ut duces, ducibus, mores, moribus, et ‘ques,’ quibus; 158. 21 veteres nominativum pluralem ‘ques’ dixerunt regulam sequi, unde etiam dativus mansit in consuetudine), Festus (348. 23 Th.), Priscian (ii. 9. 13 H.) &c., seems to have been confined to the Interrogative and Indefinite use. Thus Cato began his Origines with the words: siquē homines sunt, quos delectat populi Romani gesta describere; on the S. C. Bacch. (C. I. L. i. 196) we have: sei ques esent, qui sibi deicerent necesus esse Bacanal habere, ‘siquī essent, qui sibi dicerent necesse esse Bacchanal habere’; and a line of Pacuvius (Trag. 231 R.) runs:

ques sunt? ignoti, nescioqes ignōbiles;

(other examples in Neue, p. 466).
The I-declension Neuter quia survives only as an Adverb or Conjunction, e.g. O. Lat. quinam, 'why?,' like quidnam; the Gen. quium can hardly be ascribed to Cato on the mere testimony of Servius (ad A. i. 95: denique Cato in Originibus ait: si quae sunt populi. Et declaravit 'quae,' 'quium' ut 'puppies,' 'puppium'), for this remark only implies that Cato's quae was an I-stem formation. The I-stem Dat. quiudus supplanted the O-stem quaeis (older quaeis) in the Relative, though the O-stem form is by no means uncommon (see a long list of instances in Neue, ii3 p. 469, e.g. Plaut. Most. 1040:

quis méd exemplis hódie eludificátus est).

§ 25. Case-forms. The original Nom. Sg. Masc. of the Relative qui-i (stem quia- with affix -i of Gk. olóros-i, &c.) [Osc. púi(?), Umbr. poi; the Umbr. shows this affix also in Nom. Pl. Masc. pur-i, Acc. Pl. Fem. poíae, &c.] is probably intended by the spelling qui of the very ancient Dvenos inscription [Zvet. I. I. I. 285 qui med mitat, 'qui me mittat (mitten)!'] The weakened form qui, due to the unaccented use of the Relative (ch. iii. § 18), is common on inscriptions of the Republic, from the Scipio epitaph (in Saturnians) of c. 200 B. C. (C. I. L. i. 30):

cónsol censor aidólis qui fuit apúd uos,

to the Lex Julia Municipalis of 45 B. C. i. 206', which has qui more frequently than qui; also in the MSS. of Plautus, &c. (see instances in Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v.). The Fem. of the Indefinite Pronoun in its Adjectival use followed the Adjective Declension in taking usually the suffix -a in class. Latin, e.g. siquà causa est (but seíquà causa erit on the Lex Repetundarum, C. I. L. i. 198. 37; si quæ lex on the Lex Agraria, i. 200. 41; and in Plautus nuequé causa est qui, &c.; see Neue, ii3 p. 445). Gen. Sg. quoius appears in the Saturnian Scipio epitaph of c. 200 B. C. (C. I. L. i. 30):

quoius fórma uiirtútei parísumá fuit,

in the Lex Repetundarum (i. 198), and other inscriptions, and in the MSS. of Plautus, Varro, &c. (see Georges, s. v.; Neue, p. 450). When the oi sank to ui, the qu by a law of Latin phonetics became c (ch. iv. § 137); hence cuius (pronounced cuy-yus, ch. ii. § 55), a pronunciation indicated by spellings like cuius, cuíus (Neue, p. 451). (On monosyllabic quoi(u)'s in quoi(u)smodi, &c., in the Dramatists, and qui in quoquoímodi, cuiquoímodi in Cic., &c., see § 22). The oldest form preserved of the Dative is quoìei of a Scipio epitaph of c. 130 B. C. (C. I. L. 1. 34) in a Saturnian line referring to the short life of the deceased :

quoìei uíta défécit nón honos honóre,

in the Lex Repetundarum of 123-122 B. C. (i. 198. 10, usually qui), and in the Lex Agraria of 111 B. C. (i. 200. 68, usually qui; cf. quiéique, ll. 3. 6. 32. 45. 99); though the disyllabic Dative seems not to occur in Plautus (it is read by some editors in Trin. 338. 558, &c.; see Brix ad loc.), and so cannot have been used in the ordinary conversation of his time. The common form in use on Republican inscriptions is qui (see Index to C. I. L. i.); the Lex Julia Municipalis, for example, of 45 B. C. (i. 206) has always quió, never cui, as it has always quióus, never cuius, and always, except in two instances, qui for qui (so quió in the Comm. Lud. Saecl. of Augustus' reign). And Quintilian (i. 7.
27 tells us that in his youth quoi was the spelling. [Cf. Velius Longus (first cent. A. D.), p. 76. 3 K. itaque audimus quodam plena oï syllaba dicere ‘quoi’ et ‘hoic’ pro cui et huic.] In late poetry cui is a dissyllable, cui, a scansion which is found as early as Seneca, Juvenal, and Martial, e.g. Mart. i. 104. 22 sed norunt cui serviant leones (examples in Neue, p. 454). Acc. quem has *em for *im (Osc. pim) by analogy of Noun I-stems which usually substituted the Cons.-stem -em for the I-stem -im, e.g. terrem (ch. vi. § 29). As to the Abl. Sg., we have not sufficient means of deciding, owing to the absence of sufficiently old inscriptions, whether and in what uses qui, O. Lat. for quo, was an Abl. (from *quâi), a Locative (from *quiei), or even an Instrumental (from *qui). But the spelling quium (‘in any way’) on the S. C. Bacch. (L. 12), an inser. on which original i and original ei seem to be kept distinct, goes against the Locative theory, unless indeed it is a mere mistake for quium (see § 28). The spelling quiei on the Lex Agraria of 111 B. C. (C. I. L. i. 200. 17 queer ab eorum quei emit) merely expresses the sound qui (see ch. i. § 9). This qui, byform of quô, quâ, occurs in Virgil (A. xi. 822):

Accam ex aequalibus unam, quicem partiri curas.

It was not in living use in the time of Servius (fourth cent. A. D.) (in Donat. p. 411. i K. nam dicimus ‘a quo’ venisti et ‘a qui’ venisti; sed ‘a qui’ in usu esse desit). Already in Terence quiem is not so frequent as in Plautus. In the early authors qui is used: (1) as an ordinary Abl., e.g. Plaut. Capt. 828 qui hómine nemo uiuit fortunátor; Bacch. 335 sed qui praesente id aërum Theotimó datumst?; but especially (2) as an Abl. of the instrument, e.g. Plaut Men. 391 quis istést Puniculus? qui extérgentur báxeae?, ‘what Mr. Brush do you mean? one to clean shoes with? ’; Varro, R. R. ii. preæf. 3 frumentum qui satíri fíamus. In this capacity it passes into a mere Adverb like ut, and is used even with a plural noun, e.g. Plaut. Stich. 392 quadrigas qui uheâr; Pseud. 487 (uiquant minas) quas meo gnato des, qui amicam liberet; (3) as an Adverb with the sense of quomodo; e.g. qui fit ut?, a phrase in common use in classical Latin; Ter. Adelph. 215 qui potuit melius?; (4) as an enelitic Particle, e.g. hercle qui, edgoi qui, utinam qui (Plaut.), a usage surviving in classical at-qui. (For a fuller list of examples, see Neue, ii. pp. 455 sqq.; cf. below, ch. x. § 5) The Nom. Pl. Masc. is written quiéi on Republican inscriptions (see Index to C. I. L. i.), this being the weakening of an original *quoi, due to the unaccented nature of the Relative (ch. iii. § 12 a. 5), e.g. i. 196 sei ques esent, quei sibi deicerent necesus esse Bcaenal habere. (On ques Nom. Pl. of qui in O. Lat., and on quei and quiis, Dat.-Abl. Plur., from *quoiis, see above, § 24.)

§ 26. The stem qu-*.

Corresponding to Umbr. pu-fe, Osc. pu-f, ‘where’ (O. Ind. kùha, O. Sl. kúde, from L.-Eur. *q*udh-), is Lat. -cubi of âii-cubi, ‘somewhere,’ si-cubi, ‘if anywhere,’ ne-cubi, num-cubi, &c., with cu- instead of qu- by the same phonetic law of the Latin language that has made quinca-pex out of quinquaque-plex (ch. iv. § 137) (cf. Vulg. Lat. nescio-cube, Probi App. 199. 16 K.), and clearly connected with the Interrogative, Indefinite, and Relative Pronoun-root (see ch. x. § 1, on the existence of parallel stems of Pronouns in -o, -i, -u). But apart from compounds the Latin Adverb is ubi. Similarly the -cunte of âii-cunte (aliquonde) is written in Plaut. Pseud. 317 in the Ambr. Palimps.; so Caesellius ap. Cassiod. 202. 28 K. aliquonde per quon debet scribi), si-
§ 27. The Possessive cujus. The case most frequently in use in Plautus and Terence is the Nom. Sg. Fem., e.g. Plaut. Trin. 45 quoia hic uox prope me sonat?; cf. Cic. Verr. II. iii. 7. 16 ne is redimeret, cuja res esset; ib. 27. 68 Apronius sertorem facit istum, cuja res erat. The Plural is very rare, Plaut. Rud. 745:

argentum ego pro istisce ambabas quoiae erant dominó dedi,

Trin. 533, with quoium for cujorum, Gen. Pl. (?)(cuium A, quoium B; some read quorum):

neceunquam quisquamst, quoius ille ager fuit,
quín pessume ei res uorterit, quoium fuit,
alli exolatum abierunt, aliis emortui.

With the suffix -ati-, denoting the country of one's birth (cf. v. § 45), we have cujás, O. Lat. quojatis, 'what countryman? ' 'belonging to what country? '

§ 28. Other derivatives. Alli-quis, some one, is a compound of the stem ali-, some (connected with álto-, other) and the Indefinite Pronoun, like ali-cubi, somewhere, ali-cuné, &c. An O. Lat. Nom. Pl. aliqves is mentioned by Charisius (159. 7 K.). Ec-quis has been explained as nothing else than et quis, with e for t by the same phonetic law as reduced *sit-cus (cf. sitis) to sic-cus (ch. iv. § 159), but it is more likely to come from the pronominal stem e- (used as a prefix in e-nos, Umbro-Osec. e-tanto, &c.) with the appended particle -ce (without this appendage in e-quidem, ch. x. § 6, and in e-quis, a byform of ec-quis, in Plaut.). The Neut. ecquid in Plautus often sinks into a mere conjunction, e.g. ecquid placent? Most. 906, &c.

Quidam for *quis-dam (like idem for is-dam, § 21) appends the particle -dam to the Indefinite Pronoun. The Nom. Plur. Masc. is not found in Plautus, and scarcely indeed in any of the older authors. We have quesdam Acc. Pl. in Accius, Trag. 477 R. Quaises (cf. Umbr. pis-hor from the verb heri-, 'to wish') may stand for *quis-vis, 'any you please,' 'whosoever you please' (cf. O. Lat. quis nancit, 'whosoever obtains,' § 24), with the same loss of s before initial v in a Compound as divello for *dilis-vello (ch. iv. § 151), and quilibet, for *quis-libet, like áligo for *ádis-hor (ib.), as well as for quí-vis, quí-libet. The I-declension Abr. quinis appears in Plaut. Stich. 627: quicumuis depúgnno mulito fácilius

1 aliquis alius is not found in Plautus, though it occurs in Terence.
quam cùm fame. Quí-cum-que, O. Lat. qui-quam-que (C. I. L. i. 197. 5; 200. 50; 202, &c.), had probably a byform *quis-qui-om-que, to judge from Nom. Pl. ques- 

qui-caque n Cato (Orig. ii. fr. 34 J. quescunque Romae regnauissent). The latter part of the word is probably the Adverb quaum (O. Lat. quom), when, with the enclitic particle -que, so that -cumque means literally 'whenever' (see ch. ix. § 10. 7). In O. Lat. quique is used in the sense of qui-caque, e.g. quemque offendoro, Plaut. Capt. 798, the particle -que (O. Ind. ca in ka-ca, 'whoever,' &c., Hom. Gk. ð in ðh, Goth. -h in hv-h) giving to a word the sense of our 'ever' in 'whoever,' 'whenever,' &c. (see ch. x. § 2); but has in classical Latin the sense of 'each.' It is fem. as well as masc. in O. Lat., e.g. Ter. Hec. 216 quisque uostarum; so quemque Acc. Sg. F. in Plaut. Pseud. 185. Another expression for 'whosoever' is quisquis (Osc. pispis, of which the Neut. pîpî is mentioned by Paul. Fest. 263. 8 Th.), (risus occurs in an Old Gk. inscr., Mon. Antichi i. 3. p. 594), a doubling of the Indefinite Pronoun 1. We have quisquis Fem. in O. Latin, e.g. Plaut. Cist. 610 mulier quisquis es (cf. Nonius, 197. 30 M.). The Neuter qui-cauid, a byform of quietuid, shows the same assimilation of d (t) before a guttural as occurs for adverbo (ch. iv. § 160). The shortened form of the Gen. Sg. of quiis, current in ordinary pronunciation when not specially emphasized, viz. qui(u)s, cui(u)s, (§ 22), appears without its final s in Cicero's cuivinimoti; and the I-stem Ablative quiis occurs more than once in Plautus in the phrase cum co, cum quiis, anyhow, at any cost, lit. 'with that thing or with whatsoever thing' (Poen. 536. 588). A curious passage, Cas. 523:

séd facito dum, mérula per uorsús quod cantat, tú colas:

'cùm cibo, cùm quiis' facito ut uéniant,

suggests that Roman children interpreted the alarm-note of the blackbird into the words: cum cibo, cum quiis, se veni, 'come along! food or no food.' (Class. Rev. vi. 124.) Quis prefixed to the Adverb quaum, quiu-quaum had the sense of 'any,' and was used especially in negative sentences. Examples of its use as Fem. in O. Lat. are Ter. Eun. 678 nostrarum numquam quiu- 

quaum uidit; Plaut. Rud. 406:

neque digniorem cénseo uidisse anum me quiuquam,

and of the I-declension Abl. Plaut. Pers. 477 nec satis quia quiu homine accepì [see § 25 on quiu-quaum Adv., 'anyhow' (?), of S. C. Bacch.: neue pro magistratud neque uirum neque mulierem quiuam feice uelate, like nêqui-quaum, in vain, lit. 'not anyhow,' always so spelt in the Ambrosian Palimpsest of Plautus'. Another compound of the Indefinite Pronoun, quiu-piâm, some, the formation of which was obscure to the Roman grammarians (Festus 338. 28 Th. 'quiu-quiuiam' quin significat aliquis, et 'quaei- 
pium' aliueae, similiterque alia ejusdem generis, ut dubium non est, ita unde sequens pars ejus coeperit, inveniri non posset), may be a compound of *quiu-pe, of which quiupe for *quiuipe is an Adverbial case-form (ch. x. § 7), with jam, as municia in nunc with jam (ch. iv. § 67). Corresponding to -quaum, -piâm of Lat. quiuquaum, quiu-quiuiam is Oscan -um of pid-um 'quidquam,' pieis-um 'cjuujuiam.'

1 So quantum quantui's, 'every inch of you,' Ter. Adelph. 394; quantum quantum, Plaut. Poen. 738; quaequalis in a poetical inser., C. I. L. vi. 6314.
§ 29. V. THE PRONOMINAL ADJECTIVES. These are:

(1) *ullus, I.-Eur. *al- (Arm. ail, Gk. ἄλλος, O. Ir. aile, Goth. aljis, Engl. else), Osc. allo- (on the Bantine Tablet), with a byform *alis in the Nom. Sg. Masc. (e.g. Catull. lxvi. 28), *alid in the Nom. Sg. Neut. (e.g. Lucr. i. 263). These byforms, which are to be compared with Cornelis, &c. for *Cornélius (see ch. vi. § 5), come into special use in the phrase *alis alium (e.g. *ad alis alium and *cum alis alio in the Vulgate, alis alium, C. I. L. ii. 2633. 7), probably owing to the fact that the stress of the voice in this word-group fell on the antepenultimate syllable (see ch. iii. § 12). The deriv. Adj. *aliēnus is for *al-īno- (ch. iv. § 12).

(2) alter is formed from the root al- (al-?), seen in *alypo-, by the addition of the suffix -tero- (ch. v. § 18), (Osc. alttro-), while other I.-Eur. languages show a similar formation from the root an-, seen in O. Ind. anyā- ‘alius’ (O. Ind. āntara-, Goth. an-jar, O. Engl. āper, Germ. ander, Lith. ān-tras). It is often used as an Ordinal Numeral, ‘second.’ A stem alttro- appears in altrin-secus, alttro-vorsum (Plaut. Cäs. 555) and other words (cf. Gk. ἄλλοτροσ), but in lines like Plant. Bacch. 1184 alterum, &c. need not be changed into *altrum, &c., but may be scanned as dactyls, altérūm, &c. (see Klotz, Altrom. Metrik, p. 59); even in Pers. 226 altra is not certain.

(3) *ullus is formed by the LO-suffix (ch. v. § 21) from *ānus (see ch. iii. § 15. 5), which also belongs to the Pronominal Declension, Gen. unius, Dat. uni. (With quisque appended we have the word-group or compound unius-quisque.) The opposite of *ullus is nullus with the negative prefix uē- of n-usquam, u(e)-utiam (pronounced with both first and second syllable short) and the like (ch. ii. § 149); and *ne-ullus, ‘not a little one,’ ‘not even one,’ was probably anterior in formation to ulla, in which the force of the Diminutive suffix is not so apparent. Like nullus, but used properly of persons, while nullus was used normally of things, is nēmo from uē-hemō. (On hemō, a byform of homo, see ch. vi. § 1.) Nullus is hardly used as a substantive till Late Latin, but nullius and nullo take the place of neminis and nemine in class. Latin. As the Neuter of nullus, nihil is used, a compound of the negative uē- and hītum (see ch. iii. § 52; ch. vi. § 11).

(4) sólus may be connected with the Adverb sē-, sēl-, apart...
(e.g. sōl-itio, lit. 'a going apart') (ch. ix. § 51), and be formed of sō-, a grade of sē- (ch. iv. § 53), with the suffix -lo. Some refer the word to the stem sōllo- of Osc. sōllo-, 'whole;' Lat. sōl-ers, soll-emnis, but the connexion of the ideas 'alone' and 'whole' or 'all' is not apparent.

(5) totus is another word of uncertain etymology. Some connect it with the Umbro-Ocean word for a community, state or people, *teutā- (Osc. tovtā-, Umbr. totā-), and suppose the Latin word to exhibit another grade of the root, perhaps *touto- (see ch. iv. § 41). The word encroached on the sphere of omnis, and finally supplanted omnis in Vulgar Latin. Of the Romance languages Italian is the only one which preserves Lat. omnis (Ital. ogni) beside Lat. totus (Ital. tutto; on this form, see ch. ii. § 130. p. 116).

(6) üter is one of those Latin Relative (Interrog., Indef.) forms beginning with u- like übi, üt which are discussed in § 26. With the addition of -que, 'ever' (see on quis-que, § 28), it becomes üter-que. The Umbro-Ocean stem is *potro- (Osc. pātūrās-pīd Nom. Pl. 'utrique,' puterei-pīd Loc. Sg.; Umbr. sci-potrunh-peī 'utroque' Adv. is a formation like sed-utroque Nom. Sg. Fem., 'each separately,' Plaut. Stich. 106). The opposite of üter is neuter, a trisyllable (ch. ii. § 32), with the negative prefix. Alter-uter is a compound of alter and üter, sometimes with both elements declined, sometimes with the second only (cf. § 20 on ipse, Fem. ea-psa, ea-psae and i-psae). A form altertra for alterutra is mentioned by Paul. Fest. 6. 2 Th.

All of these take the pronominal Gen. and Dat. Sg. in -ius, and -i, but only alius takes the Neut. Sg. (Nom.-Acc.) in -d. Still they admitted more readily than ille, ister and the other Demonstrative Pronouns the Noun Declension forms in these cases; e.g. unae rei (Gen.), Cic. Tull. xv. 36; tam nulli consili, Ter. Andr. 608; coloris ulli, Plaut. Truc. 293; alterae legioni, Caes. Bell. Gall. v. 27. 5 (see Priscian, i. 196. 18 H. and Neue, ii3, pp. 516 sqq.). For the Gen. Sing. of alius the Romans discarded albus, which was liable to confusion with the Nom., and used the Gen. Sing. of alter instead, alterius (in dactylic poetry, of course, only alterius is admissible, but alterius occurs in other metres, e.g. Ter. Andr. 628, Seneca, Herc. Fur. 212).

There are other Adjectives called 'Pronominal' Adjectives, which are derived from Pronoun-stems, but which do not share
the Pronominal Declension. From the stem to- (te-) comes Lat. *tālis (I.-Eur. *tāli- of Gk τῆλι-κοσ; cf. O. Sl. toli Adv., 'so very,' toli-kū Adj., 'so great'); *tan-tus (Osc. e-tanto-, e. g. molto etanto estud 'multa tanta esto'; Umbr. e-tanto-, e. g. etantu mutu adfferture si 'tanta multa affertori sit') (tantisce pro tantis C. G. L. v. 155. 36), tōt, older toli-, preserved in tōtī-dem (I.-Eur. *tōtī, O. Ind. tātī; cf. Gk. τῶσ(σ)ο for *τοτοσ), and (with O-suffix) *tōtus (e. g. Manil. iii. 420 detrahitur summae tota pars, quota demitur). From the Relative (Interrog., Indef.) stem comes Lat. quālis (Gk. πῆλι-κοσ; cf. O. Sl. kōlī, koli-kū), quantus (Umbr. panto-), quōtī, older quōtī (I.-Eur. *quōtī, O. Ind. kātī; cf. Gk. τῶσ(σ)ο for *τοτοσ), and (with O-suffix) quōtus (e. g. Hor. tu quotus esse velis rescribe). (On cōtī-die, see ch. ix. § 5.) The Late Latin use of lanti, quanti for tot, quot (e. g. Tertull. nec tamen tantos inveniunt verba discipulos, quantos Christiani factis docendo), survives in Romance, e. g. Ital. quanti anni ha?, 'quantos annos habet?,' 'how old is he?' (On cē-teri, see ch. iv. § 33.)

A Dual, like the Numeral duo (ch. vi. § 59), is ambō -ae -ō (I.-Eur. *ambhō(u), Gk. ἀμφω), Gen. ambōrum, &c., Dat. ambōbus, &c., Acc. ambōs and ambō -as -ō; in the Acc. the older ambō was being ousted by ambōs even in Plautus' time, for he uses ambōs always before an initial consonant, and ambō with ambōs before an initial vowel as the metre requires, while in Late Lat. we have ambīs for the Dat.-Abl. Plur. e. g. Eph. Epigr. iv. p. 491 (cf. Caper 107. 14 K. ambobus, non 'ambis,' et ambabus; and see Neue, ii3. p. 279).

The Pronominal Declension has in some languages (e. g. Lithuanian and the Teutonic languages) extended itself from these Pronominal Adjectives to all Adjectives 1. What is called in Teutonic the 'Strong Declension of Adjectives, in Lithuanian the 'Indefinite' is really the Pronominal, e. g. Goth. blinds with Neut. blindata, 'blind,' like Neut. pata, 'that.' In Greek, on the other hand, the Pronominal Declension has lost ground, and that is why in Greek the declension of the Pronouns does not appear so unlike the declension of the Nouns as in Latin.

---

1 We have seen (ch. vi. § 46) that in Latin the Gen. Pl. suffix of O-stems, -ōrum, then -ōrom, class. -ōrum, was extended from Pronouns (e. g. duōrum 'illorum' on the Columna Rostrata) to Adjectives (e. g. duōnoro on a Scipio Epitaph of perhaps the end of the third cent. B. C.), and in time to Nouns (e. g. deōrum competed with deōm in Cicero's time, ch. vi. § 47).
§ 30. The Pronouns in Romance. The development in the Romance languages of two series of the Personal and Possessive Pronouns, \(\text{(a)}\) the enclitic, e.g. Fr. me, te, mon, ton, \(\text{(b)}\) the accented, e.g. Fr. moi, toi, mien, tien, has been already mentioned (ch. iii. § 12 a, 3, and above, § 12). In Vulgar Latin *ego* became *eo*, whence the Romance forms, e.g. Ital. io, Span. yo, Sard. eo, O. Fr. eo, io, eu, jo, now je. Spanish nosotros `we,' vosotros `you' represent *vos alleros, vos alleros* (cf. Fr. nous autres, &c.). The 2 Pl. Possessive remained *voster* in Vulg. Lat., whence Ital. vostro, Fr. vôtre, Span. vuestro, &c., while two rival forms competed for the 3 Pl. Possessive, *nus* (Span., Port.) and *illorum* (Ital. loro, Fr. leur).

The Demonstratives *ille, ipse* (which takes the place of *ille* in Sard. as 3 Sg. Pron. and Article, isse and issu, `he'), *iste* had in Vulg. Lat. *i* in Nom. Sg., *ni* in Dat. Sg. Masc., *aei* in Dat. Sg. Fem., e.g. *illi* (Ital. egli, Fr. il), *illui* (C. I. L. x. 2654; Ital. lui, Fr. lui), *illaei* (Ital. lei, O. Fr. li). Their extension by the prefix *ecce* has been noticed in § 15, e.g. Fr. celle from *ecce-illa*. Used enclitically, *ille* has lost its first syllable in Romance, e.g. Ital. gli (from *illi*), lo (from *illum*), Span. le, Sard. li. The Definite Article in most Romance countries was supplied by *ille* (but by *ipse* in Sardinia and elsewhere), which in Roumanian is postfixed (e.g. domnu-1 for *dominus ille*), and in all languages is united with a Preposition into one word, e.g. with the Preposition *ad* in Ital. al, Fr. au, &c. *Hic* survived only in word-groups, e.g. Ital. ciò from *ecce hoc*.

Of the Indefinite, Interrogative and Relative Pronouns *quae* and *quis* seem to have been ousted in Vulg. Lat. by *qui*; *quid* is Ital. che, and (accented) Fr. quoi, (unaccented) Fr. que.

For the Pronoun of Identity (*ipse* had become a Demonstrative) various phrases were used; e.g. Ital. medesimo, Prov. medesme, Fr. même, Span. mismo are from *met ipsimus*; Ital. desso from *id ipsum* (or *ad ipsum*?); Ital. stesso is a compound of *iste* and *ipse*.

*Alius* survived in a Neuter form **alum*, whence O. Fr. el and al, O. Span. al, *alter* having taken its place (Ital. altro, Fr. autre, Span. otro). *Certus* (and *certanes*?) replaced *quidam*. *Aliquis* was joined with *inus* into a Compound *alicunus*, whence Ital. alcuno, Fr. aucun, Span. algoño. (See Meyer-Lübke *Rom. Gram.* ii. pp. 89 sqq., 595 sqq.).
CHAPTER VIII.

THE VERB.

§ 1. I. THE CONJUGATIONS. The I.-Eur. Verb had two Conjugations, (1) the Thematic, in which the Person-suffixes were attached to the verb-root augmented by -ē- or -ō-, e. g. Gk. ἰστᾶ-μεν, ἰστᾶ-τε; (2) the Athematic, in which this vowel, the Thematic Vowel, as it is called, was absent, e. g. Gk. ἰστᾶ-μεν, ἰστᾶ-τε. In the Thematic Conjugation the 1 Sg. Pres. Ind. Act had -ō, e. g. φέρ-ω, Lat. leg-ō; the Subjunctive changed the Thematic Vowel of the Indicative to -ē- (and -ō-), e. g. Gk. φέρ-η-τε (φέρ-ω-μεν); the Optative changed it to -οι-, e. g. Gk. φέρ-οι-μεν, φέρ-οι-τε. In the Athematic Conjugation the 1 Sg. Pres. Ind. Act. had -mī, e. g. Gk. ἴστη-μι; the verb-stem was weakened in the Dual and Plural Act. and in all Numbers of the Middle, e. g. Gk. ἵστα-τον, ἵστα-μεν, ἵστα-μαῖ beside Sg. ἴστη-; the Subjunctive (with strong stem) showed -ē- or -ō- between the root and the Person-suffixes, and the Optative (with weak stem) -γε- in Sg. Act., -ῆ- elsewhere, e. g. Gk. ἵστα-ίην, ἵστα-ί-μεν (ἵσταί-μεν).

We find early Derivative Verbs like I.-Eur. trā- from the root ter-, plē- from the root pel- (Lat. in-trā-re, im-plē-re), and later Derivatives from Nouns, e. g. Lat. curā-re from the Noun-stem curā-, forming the persons of their Present Tense sometimes thematically with the suffix -yō- (§ 15), sometimes athematically, e. g. O. Ind. trā-yā-tē and trā-ti 3 Sg. The long vowel, with which these derivative verb-stems end, is not weakened in the Dual and Plur. Act., nor in the Middle, e. g. O. Ind. trā-sva 2 Sg. Imperat. Mid.
In Latin almost every athematic verb becomes thematic in 1 Sg. Pres. Ind., and usually in 3 Pl.; and the declension of the Pres. Ind. often shows thematic and athematic forms side by side. Thus L.-Eur, *ei-mī, 'I go' (O. Ind. ē-mi 1 Sg., ē-mās 1 Pl., Gk. ει-μυ 1 Sg., εμευ 1 Pl., Lith. ei-mi) is in Latin eo for *ēy-o, a thematic form, though other Persons, e.g. 2 Sg. i-s, older ei-s (*ei-s(i)), are athematic; I.-Eur. *wēl-mī, 'I wish' (Lith. pa-velmi 1 Sg., pa-velt 3 Sg.) is in Latin thematic in 1 Sg. vōl-ū, but athematic in 3 Sg. vul-t. The Latin Substantive Verb sum has best retained the features of the Athematic Conjugation, with its 1 Sg. Ind. in -m, its Opt. originally declined s-iē-m, s-iē-s, s-iē-t, *s-i-mos, *sē-tēs, and so on.

The four Conjugations of our Latin Grammars, (1) amā-re, &c., (2) vidē-re, &c., (3) legē-re, &c., (4) audi-re, &c. are, like the five Declensions (ch. vi. § 1), an unscientific classification, often bringing forms together which were of dissimilar origin, just as Modern Italian with its three Conjugations brings together in the Second forms like vendēre (Lat. venulēre), potēre (Lat. posse), solēre (Lat. sōlēre), and in the Third dire (Lat. dicēre), empire (Lat. implēre), apparire (Lat. apparēre), seguire (Lat. séqui), and venire (Lat. vēnire). We must substitute for them an enumeration of the various ways in which the Tense-stems are formed, especially the Present Tense-stem.

Of the Latin Present (i. e. Thematic Present) Tense-stems, the usual type is that which was also the most prevalent in L.-Eur., that namely in which the Present-stem shows the ordinary unweakened root (E-grade) of the Verb, e. g. Gk. πεῦδ-ο-μαι from the root bheedh-, πείδ-ω from the root bheidh-, πετ-ο-μαί from the root pet-, while the weak grade of the root is proper to the Preterite (Aorist) tense, e. g. Gk. ἐ-πεῦδ-ό-μην, ἐ-πείδ-ο-ν, ἐ-πετ-ό-μην. Latin examples (part of the 'Third Conjugation') are: dōcō, O. Lat. docō, for *deucō (Goth. tiuha) from the root duuk-; dice, O. Lat. decō (Goth. ga-teiha, 'I indicate') from the root dei-k-; veho for *wegh-ō (O. Ind. vā-hā-mi, Lith. vezh-u, Goth. ga-vig-a, 'I move'). Another type shows a Nasal in the Present-stem (with weak grade of root) which is omitted in the other tense-stems, this Nasal being either (1) a nasal infix, e. g. Lat. rū-m-po (O. Ind. lū-m-pāmi) from the root reup-, fī-n-do
(O. Ind. bhī-na-dmi) from the root bheid-, or (2) a nasal affix, e.g. Lat. lī-n-o (O. Ind. lī-nā-mi, O. Scand. lī-na) from the root lei-. Latin meio for *meigh-ō, beside mingo for *mī-n-gh-ō, is a good example of these two modes of forming the Pres.-stem; and similarly we seem to have O. Lat. nīvo for *(s)neighu-ō (or (s)nīghu-ō? M. U. iv. 8), beside nīnguo for *(s)nī-n-ghhu-ō, in a line of Pacuvius (Praet. 4 R.):

sagittis nīuit, plūmo et saxis grāndinat.

Another affixes -yō- (-yē-) or -iyō- (-Iyē-), an affix which often varied with i (cf. ch. iv. § 51); e.g. in Latin (part of the Third and of the Fourth Conjugations), fārcio (Gk. φράσω for *φρακ-υω, with 2 Sg. fārci-s, from the root bhrequ- (cf. frequens), Lat. morior (O. Ind. mr-iyā-tē 3 Sg.) from the root mer-. We have also a suffix -skō- (-skē-) used to form what are wrongly called 'Inceptives' (Third Conj.), with weak grade of root, e.g. pōscio for *porec-sco, from pōk-, the weak grade of the root prek-, 'to ask'; a suffix -cyō- (with O-grade of root) used to form Causatives (Second Conjugation), e.g. Lat. mōnēo for *mon-eyō. 'I remind,' lit. 'cause to remember,' from the root men- (cf. Lat. me-min-i), and so on. A very important class is the class of Verb-stems ending in a vowel (Vowel-stems), which form their 1 Sg. Pres. Ind. usually with the help of the suffix -yō-, e.g. in Latin (First and Second Conjugations) no for *(s)nā-yō (O. Ind. snā-ya-tē), neo for *(s)nē-yō (O. H. G. nāu), but other Persons athematically, e.g. 2 Sg. nū-s, nē-s, many of these Vowel-stems being Derivatives from Nouns and Adjectives (First, Second, and Fourth Conjugations), e.g. cūro from cura (stem *curē-), like Gk. τιμά-ω from τιμά (-y), albeo from albus (stem *albo-, *albe-), finio from finis (stem fini-, finei-). These various modes of forming the Present Tense-stem will be considered in later sections (§§ 6–33).

§ 2. Traces of the Athematic Conjugation in Latin. Of I.-Eur. verbs the Athematic Conjugation, which retain more or less of their athematic character in Latin, the most important are the roots es-, 'to be,' ei-, 'to go,' ed-, 'to eat,' wel-, 'to wish.' ES- has in 1 Sg. sum (Osc. sum) with the root in weak form s, instead of es- of I.-Eur. *ēs-mi (O. Ind. ās-mi, Arm. em, Gk. el-μί for *ēs-μί, Lesb. ἐμ, Alb. ja, Goth. im, Lith. es-mi, O. Sl. jes-mi), though, if we may believe Varro (L. L. ix. 10), the older form was esum (sum quod nunc dicitur olim dicebatur 'esum'); 2 Sg. es [older es(es)], scanned long by 'position' in Plautus, I.-Eur. *ēs-si (Arm. es, Hom. εϊ-�示); 3 Sg. est (Osc.
ist), I.-Eur. *ēs-ti [O. Ind. ās-ti, Gk. ἔσ-τιν, O. Ir. is for *ēs-t, Goth. ist-t, Lith. ėš-ti and ėš-t, O. Sl. (Russ.) ėš-ti]; 1 Pl. sīnus and sīnus (ch. ii. § 16), I.-Eur. *s-nes, *s-mos (O. Ind. s-mās); 2 Pl. es-ti should be *es-tis, I.-Eur. *s-tē (O. Ind. s-thā), but cf. Gk. ἐς-τί, Lith. ėš-tē; 3 Pl. sunt (older sōnt) from *son(i) beside I.-Eur. *sentī (Goth. s-ind), as Umbr. senti, Osc. set; the I.-Eur. Optative *s-yē-m (*s-iē-m) 1 Sg., *s-yēs (*s-iē-s) 2 Sg., *s-i-mos 1 Pl., &c., is reproduced with some fidelity in O. Lat. sē-s, s-i-mus, though the vowel i extended itself in time over Sg. as well as Plur., class. Lat. sim, sīs, sit (§ 55), as in Umbr. sir 'sis,' si 'sit,' sins 'sint'; in the Imperative we should expect *es, the bare stem, in 2 Sg. (and ēs is probably the only actual Latin form, on which see § 58), *s-tōd in 3 Sg., but we have es-tōd (cf. Gk. ἔσ-τω) the Inf. is es-se, the Loc. Sg. of an S-stem, as the Umbro-Oscan *es-om (Osc. ezum, Umbr. erom) is the Acc. Sg. of an 0-stem (ch. v. § 2); El is thematic in 1 Sg. in Lat. eo from *ēy-o instead of I.-Eur. *ei-mi, but athematic in the other persons of the Pres. Ind., 2 Sg. ēs, older e-is, 3 Sg. ēt, older et, 1 Pl. ē-mus, older e-mus, with strong stem ei- as in Lith. ei-me, ei-te, instead of weak stem i- (possibly with a bygrade i like 0. Ind. i-mahē 1 Pl. Mīd.; but Pel. ei-te 2 Pl. Imper. points to an original ei- for Latin also), 2 Pl. e-tis older ei-tis (with ei- again for i-), except the 3 Plural sunt from *ey-o-nt(i), unless -enti was an I.-Eur. byform of -enti in the Athematic Conjugation (cf. sunt from *sont(i)); the form int of the Philoxenus Glossary (ch. 146); int, ποπενοῦρα is too doubtful to quote as an athematic 3 Pl., for it may be a wrong reading for iunt (cf. prēd-iunt, reēd-iunt, ob-iunt), although indeed the common theory of the origin of these forms presupposes an old. 3 Pl. in-t (see § 73); athematic too are the Inf. ūre older ei-re from *ei-si, Imper. ē re older ei (Lith. ėš-k), ē to older ei-ū(d) (with ei-, as in Umbr. ee-tu, for i- of Gk. ἐς-τιν, § 57); ED is thematic in 1 Sg. ed-ō (Gk. ἐδ-ός), is thematic in the other persons, which often show a byform ed- (Lith. ēd-ė and ēd-u 1 Sg., ēs-t 3 Sg.) (thus Donatus ad Ter. Andr. i. 1. 54 distinguishes ut uva ēsent, Subj. of edo, from ut uva ēsent, Subj. of sum); 1 Pl. edimus, 3 Pl. edunt are like sumus, sunt; the Imper. es-tō is athematic, and the Inf. es-se. (On -st-instead of -ss-from I.-Eur. -st- in est 3 Sg. &c., see ch. iv. § 155; on Imperat. es, § 58, below). The byforms edit, eītis, &c. need not be new Latin types, for there are indications that in the I.-Eur. period this root waved between the Thematic and Athematic Conjugations (cf. Lith. ēd-u for *ēd-ō beside ēd-mi; Goth. ita for *ēd-ō); WEL was probably declined ; 1 Sg. *wēl-mi, 2 Sg. *wēl-si, 3 Sg. *wēl-ti, 1 Pl. *wl-mōs or -mōs, &c.; Lat. vūlō, vult (volt) are the normal equivalents of *wēlō, *welt(l) (see ch. iv. § 10 on ōtēra from Gk. ὀτάρα, &c.), so that the 1 Sg. is thematic, as are possibly also the 1 Pl.1 and 3 Pl. (cf. sumus, sunt), while the 3 Sg. and 2 Pl. are athematic; for the 2 Sg. *wels, which would become *wel(l) (ch. iv. § 146), and would be probably scanned as a long syllable in Plautus [see ch. ii. § 133 on Plautine ter(r) for *ters from I.-Eur. *tri-s], the Romans substituted the

1 The -u- in 1 Pl. of these Athematic Verbs, sumus, volumus, is noticeable. Volimus, the reading of the Ambrosian Palimpsest in Plaut. Pseud. 233, Truc 192 is a Late Lat. form (see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v.), due either to the Analogy of the Thematic Conj. (so Late Lat. feris, auffere, on which see Georges), or to the ordinary weakening of unaccented ē (so possimus, § 97, sinus, ch. ii. § 16). On the spelling quessumus see below, § 33. 4.
2 Sg. of a different Verb-root weí-, 'to wish' (O. Ind. vi-, with 2 Sg. vi-ți, Gk ἔμα) [I.-Eur. wel-, wei-, wek- (Gk. ἔδω) all mean 'to wish,' and are probably connected] the athematic Imper. ἐδὲ (ἐδὲ in Plautus too) has become a Conjunction (ch. x. § 4), while the Imper. non of the Compound, has been variously referred to a system of the Fourth Conjugation (I.-Eur. *weł-yō, Goth. vilja; O. Sl. velği), with Imper. *wełi, like ἐφῄ, § 57, and to the Optative (cf. 2 Pl. Opt. nōdēs with 2 Pl. Imper. nōdē; also 1 Pl. nōdīmus, used both in an optative and an imperative sense). The root BHER- belonged to the Thematic Conjugation (Gk. φέρ-μι, O. Ir. -biur from *ber-ē, Goth. bair-æ; cf. 3 Sg. O. Ind. bhar-a-ti for *bher-e-ti, Arm. ber-ē, O. Sl. ber-e-tu; athematic forms however appear, O. Ind. bhar-ti 3 Sg., bhār-tām 2 Du.; cf. Gk. φέρ-τε 2 Pl., O. Ind. bhar-tam 2 Du.', but in Latin to the Athematic (with the usual exceptions of the 1 Sg. and probably 1 Pl. and 3 Pl. Pres. Ind.), e.g. for-ī 3 Sg. Pres. Ind., fer-tis 2 Pl. (with strong stem fer- instead of weak stem fer-), I.-Eur. bhār.; cf. Gk. φέρ-τε), fer Imper., fer-re (for *fer-se from *fer-si, ch. iv. § 146; ch. iii. § 37) Inf., while 2 Sg. *fer-rē [this is what an original *fer-si] would become in Latin; cf. ter(r) for ters, ch. ii. § 133] has been brought into line with other 2 Sg. forms by the fresh addition of the 2 Sg. suffix, fer-s. An Optative *ferim like velim and the other optatives of athematic Verbs is not found and probably never existed. (On the Pres. Part.-stems sent- and sunt-, lent- and lent-, volent- and volunt-, see § 90; and on the Optatives sim, O. Lat. sim, velim, velim, § 56; the Compounds possum, mālo, nālo, &c. are discussed in § 97, ambio in § 46).

Of 1.-Eur. athematic Verbs of the type of O. Ind. dā-ti 3 Sg. (Gk. διδώ-μι, ἵττ-μι, &c.) with root dō- (varying with the weak grade), Latin examples are: DO-, to give, of which 1 Pl., 2 Pl. Pres. Ind. dā-mus, dā-tis are the normal athematic forms with the weak root dā- (cf. dātus and dōs, ch. iv. § 54), while 2 Sg. dās, 3 Sg. dat (O. Lat. dāt, probably so scanned in Plautus, e. g. Most. 601, Mon. 101), show d instead of d, *dō-s, *dō-t; the old athem. 2 Sg. Imper. *dō (Lith. dū-k) remains only in cē-dō (shortened under the influence of the preceding short syllable, like hāvē, sībī, ch. iii. § 42), for the ordinary form dē is coined on the type of the 1st Conjugation; the 2, 3 Sg. dō- to is the correct athematic form, also 2 Pl. dā-te, and Inf. dā-re, older dā-sī. 1 Sg. Pres. Ind. dō is probably *dō-yō (cf. O. Sl. da-ją), and the reduplicated Present-stem of Gk. ἵττ-μι, Pelignian dida 'det' &c. (§ 9) may appear in redda, if this stands for re-d(i)-dō. DHE-, to put, appears in the Latin compounds con-dō, crē-dō (O. Ind. srd-dhā, lit. 'to put the heart to,' O. Ir. cētim), which are usually reckoned as ordinary thematic verbs of the 3rd Conj., like lēgo, though a great many of their forms may be explained as athematic, with the weak root, Lat. dā- (which at the beginning of the word would be fār, ch. iv. § 114; cf. fācio, I.-Eur. *dhāk-yō, from DHE-K-, Gk. ἐ-θηκ-α, an extension of the root by addition of k); thus, though condīs, condīt should have *dēs, *det (O. Lat. *det, class. *dēt, ch. iii. § 49), con-dīmus may represent *dēmus, con-dītis, *dētīs, and though 2 Sg. Imper. con-dē should be *dē (Lith. dē k), 3 Sg. con-dīto, 2 Pl. con-dīte may represent *dē-bō, *dē-te, and Inf. con-dīre, *dē-sī. (On Opt. dūm from the stem *dū, a system both of DŌ- and of DHE-, see § 56.) The roots STA- and BHA- (Gk. ἵττ-μι 1 Sg., ἵττ-μέν 1 Pl.; φη-μί 1 Sg., φή-μέν 1 Pl.) are treated like the type trā- (a development of the root ter-; see below) and retain t throughout, stā-s, stā-mus, stā-re, &c., fā-ter, fā-mur, fā-rī, &c. (cf. Gk. ἰ-στημέν, ἰ-στήρε) forming the 1 Sg. Pres. Ind. with the suffix -yo, sīō from
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*stā-yō (Umb. stahu, Lith. stō-ju̯s, ‘I station myself,’ O. Sl. sta-ja; cf. Zend ā-stāya, but see Buck, Ósk. Spr. p. 24), fo(r) from *bhā-yō (Lith. bō-ju, ‘I enquire,’ O. Sl. ba-ja, ‘I converse’; cf. O. Ind. bhā-ya-tē Pass., if this be a genuine form). The weak grade of the two roots appears in stātus (O. Lat. also stātus), fātōr (cf. Osc. fatium Inf.) the reduplicated Present-stem of the former (Gk. ὅρη- for *av-α-στρ-μ), in Lat. si-st-o, which usurped the transitive sense that had in O. Lat. to be, e.g. med Mano statōd, ‘set me as an offering to Manus,’ on the Dvenos inscription, ‘astasent’ (leg. -int?) statuerunt (leg. -int?) Paul. Fest. 19. 32 Th. On these Reduplicated Presents of athematic roots in Latin, si-sti-mus from the root STĀ-, se-rī-mus from the root SĒ- (Gk. ἕνα for *av-α-στρα-μ) and perhaps re-d(i)-di-mus, see § 9. An athematic a Sg. Imper. from the root BHEU- (of Lat. fū) occurs in the Carmen Arvalb. fū (Lith. bū-k, Umbr. fū-tu), if rightly understood in the sense of ‘be’ : satur fū, fere Mars.

Of I.-Eur. athematic verbs of the type of O. Ind. pra-mi (Gk. πι(μ)ξανη-μ) with root plē-, a development of root pel- (the strong grade plē- never varying with any weak grade), the Latin examples are: PLE- (cf. PĒL-), in-plē-re, ex-plē-re; TRĀ- (cf. TĒR-), in-trāre, &c. These form the 1 Sg. Pres. Ind. thematically with the thematic suffix -yo-, e.g. in-plōo for *plē-yō, in-trō for *trā-yō (athematic byforms with this suffix perhaps existing in the L-Eur. period, e.g. O. Ind. trā-ya-tē beside trā-ti), but the other persons athematically, in-plē-s, in-trā-s, im-plē-t (O. Lat. -tā), in-trā-t (O. Lat. -āt), im-plē-mus, in-trā-mus, &c., as also the other parts of the verb, Imper. im-plē, im-plē-to, in-trā, in-trā-to, Inf. im-plē-re, in-trā-re.

Like them were declared other verbs whose stems ended in long vowels or diphthongs, e.g. I.-Eur. *wid-e- (a stem perhaps originally confined to Secondary Tenses, *wid-yō- being the stem used in the Present Tense; see § 15), Derivative Verbs from A-stems, e.g. curā from the Noun cura (stem curā-, ch. v. § 2), from I-stems, e.g. finei- from the Noun finis (stem fini-, fini, ch. v. § 34), but not from U-stems (e.g. stātus from status, § 15), nor possibly (1) those from O-stems (e.g. flaévo from flāvus). (2) Causatives and Intensives with i Sg. Pres. Ind. in-ēyō (e.g. mōneō, Causative of root men- ; f. mēmīni; see § 29) though these two last types have a declension which, by reason of the phonetic changes of Latin, can hardly be discriminated from the athematic declension (thus monēs may represent *monē, as well as *monē-ēs (cf. trē for *trē-ēs, ch. iv. § 66), monē Imper. may come from *monē, a stem in -ē, or *mon-ēyō. In the P. P. P. however the two types are distinct, monē-tus, with I.-Eur. weak stem moni-, in-plē-tus with stem plē-, as in the Perfect Ind. Act. mon-uī, in-plē-vī; see § 39. 4). Farciō (Gk. φάσσω for φασσυω) and fācio both belong to the same I.-Eur. thematic type, a type in which the root has the suffix -yō-, varying on the one hand with -yō-, on the other with -i- and -i̯-; the divergent roads which they have taken in Latin are perhaps due to the fact that in the declension of fācio the weak suffix -i̯- asserted itself (Imper. O. Lat. face for *facci, cōpe for *capī), in the other the weak suffix -i (Imper. farciō), and this assertion of the long vowel brought with it a transference to the Athematic type, fācē-re beside facer-e from *facci-se, though the original difference between farciō and a Derivative like fīnō, is still maintained in the Perf. Ind. Act. far-si, for *farc-si; beside fin-ē-tī, and P. P. P. far-tus, older fārc-tus, beside fin-tūs. (On these stems with suffix -yō-, and on the Derivative Verbs and stems ending in vowels which form their 1 Sing. Pres. Ind. with the help of this suffix, see §§ 15, 21.)
§ 3. THE VERB. AORIST AND S-STEMS.

The form cante for canite quoted from the Carmen Saliare by Varro (L. L. vii. 27) can hardly be called an Athematic 2 Pl. (Imper.). It is rather an example of the Latin tendency to syncopate every short unaccented vowel before a single consonant, which would have destroyed most traces of the thematic vowel in the Latin Verb, if it had been allowed free play (see ch. iii. § 131).

§ 3. II. THE TENSE-STEMS (STRONG AORIST AND S-FORMATIONS). The Tense-stems are formed by various modifications of the root. From the root ągen- for example is formed by Reduplication (with ą as Reduplication-vowel and with weak grade of root) the Present-stem ģi-ągn- (Lat. ģignō, Gk. ģίγνειν-μαι), expressive of continued action in Present time, 'I am producing,' and by another species of Reduplication [with ą as Reduplication-vowel and in the Singular (see § 39) with the O-grade of the root] the Perfect-stem ģe-ągon- (Gk. ģέγονα) expressive of completed action, 'I have produced.' The Aorist-stem, expressive of action merely, unlimited by the idea of continuance or the idea of completeness, is in this Verb formed from the root itself ģen- (Gk. ģ-γευ-δ-μαι), and so the O. Lat. form genunt (Varro, Sat. Menipp. 35 B. sed quod haec loca aliquid genunt; cf. Luer. iii. 797 durare genique) might be called an Aorist (i.e. unlimited) tense-form. But the distinction between a Present-stem and an Aorist-stem is by no means so clearly marked as between a Present-stem and a Perfect-stem, and what is an Aorist-stem in one language may be used as a Present-stem in another. The stem ģen- (with the thematic vowel ģeno-, ģene- as in Gk. ģ-γευ-δ-μαι, ģ-γευ-το) is in O. Ind. used as a Present, jána-ti 3 Sg., and the exact equivalent of Gk. ģ-γευ- (with the Augment prefixed) is in O. Ind. not an Aorist, but the past tense of a Present-stem, in other words an Imperfect, á-jana-m, 'I was producing,' while the aorist sense is assigned to the weak grade of root, ģn- (ģn-), a-jía-ta 3 Pl. Thus in this verb it would be more correct to say that the Present-stem was both ģi-ągn- and ģen-, than to restrict the first of these to the Present, the second to the Aorist signification.

1 Or is cante, like the other strange syncopated form quoted from the Carm. Sal. prīnīōes ʹprīvīulis' (p. 175), merely a trace of the older syllabic writing (ch. iii. § 14)?
Some find more exact counterparts of the Greek Strong Aorist (2nd Aorist) in Latin Perfects like scidit (O. Ind. á-chûdâ-t), scid- being the weak grade of the root sceid-, a root which forms its Present-stem in Latin by Nasalization, scind-. But, as is pointed out in § 41, scidit is more likely to be a Reduplicated Perfect (O. Lat. scî-cidî, O. Ind. cî-chûdî), and to have lost its Reduplication syllable in Compounds like dissclidit (O. Lat. -vit, -eit) for *dis-scî-cidit, like re-pûlit for *re-pe-pûlit), the Perfect having in Latin come to assume Aorist functions, e.g. dêdî (1) I have given, (2) I gave. Where the Aorist-usage most shows traces of itself in Latin is in phrases like nê attîgas (Subjunctive of an Aorist-stem tâg- beside the Present-stem tâng-), which suggest comparison with the Greek use of the Aor. Subj. in prohibitions, &c.

The Present-stem, as it is on the one hand occasionally indistinguishable from the Aorist-stem, so it is on the other from the Verb-stem. In a verb like Lat. sinô the Nasal is clearly part of the Present-stem, and connected with the idea of continued action in present time, for it is not found in other parts of the verb (e.g. sî-vî, sî-tum) (cf. tango Pres., têlîgi Perf., tac-tus Verbal Noun). But in a verb like Lat. jungo the Nasal is extended throughout the Verb (e.g. junxî, junctum, § 10). Similarly the 'Inceptive' suffix of cre-sco is properly dropped in crê-vî, crê-tum, but the same suffix is in posco (for *porc-sco, I.-Eur. *prk-sko-) extended to Perf. pûporci, &c. Some of the stems which are included in this section in the list of Present-stems are probably rather to be called Verb-stems, i.e. extensions of the root by means of a suffix to denote action, whether continued action, completed action, or momentary action; for example, the stems trêm-, trêς-, formed from the root ter- (O. Ind. tar-alâ-, 'trembling') by means of an M-suffix (Gk. τρέμ-ω, Lat. trêm-o) and an S-suffix (Gk. τρεί-ω, Lat. terreo for *ter-eo) are rather Verb-stems than Present-stems, although, for practical purposes, it is best with a view to completeness to include them in the list of Present-stem formations.

We have already spoken of the so-called Aorist (i.e. Strong Aorist) forms of the Latin Verb. Another series of forms is better considered here than assigned to any definite Tense, viz.
the S-formations, which receive further treatment in the sections dealing with the Perfect, Future, Imperfect and Pluperfect Tenses. A large number of Verb-forms, whose exact relation to each other has not yet been clearly explained, show the sibilant s in some shape or other (-ss-, -s-, -es-, &c.). We find an S-suffix in the Verb-stem just mentioned, tres-, 'to be afraid, tremble' (O. Ind. trás-a-ti and tar-á-sa-ti, Gk. τρεί(σ)ώ; cf. Lat. terreo for *ter-s-); and in a stem like auk-s- of Gk. αὐξόω (cf. αὐξάνω) from the root aug- (Lat. augéo), this S-suffix is clearly connected with the S-suffix (-ss-, -os-, -s-) of the Noun *augos, *auges-os Gen. (O. Ind. ójas, 'strength'; cf. Lat. augus-tus like róbus-tus, ūnus-tus, ch. v. § 71), precisely as in Derivative Verbs like Gk. τελέω-σ-ω, Pft. Pass. τετέλεσ-ται, from the Noun τέλος, Gen. τέλει(σ)-os; and this Noun S-suffix we shall find to be the suffix used in Infinitives like Lat. āgéré for *aγ-es-ī Loc. Sg., jère for *bher-s-ī Loc. Sg., jérī for *bher-s-ai Dat. Sg., Gk. δέξαι, &c., which are nothing but cases of Verbal Nouns. Side by side with Verb-stems with an S-suffix stand Verb-stems with a suffix -sy-o-, e.g. O. Ind. tra-sya-ti, exactly as Present-stems in -yo- like Lat. fūg- io (stem bhūg-yo-) stand side by side with Present-stems like Gk. φέγγω (stem bheug-o-). This suffix -sy-o- is however usually the suffix of the Future-stem (e.g. O. Ind. dēk-šyā-mi from I.-Eur. deīk-, Lith. bū-siu from I.-Eur, bheu-), but not of the ordinary Greek Futures, e.g. δείξω, φύςω, τιμήσω, which are now generally regarded as Subjunctives (the I.-Eur. Subjunctive had Future, as well as Subjunctive, force, § 55) of the S-Aorist, the difference between τιμήσωμεν Fut., τιμήσωμεν Aor. Subj., δείξωμεν Fut., δείξωμεν Aor. Subj. being explained by the fact that originally the Subjunctive of the S-Aorist was Athematic (§ 1), τιμήσ-ο-μεν, δείξ-ο-μεν (cf. τέλομεν Hom.), but afterwards took by analogy of Thematic Subjunctives the long vowels ω, η, and retained its proper athematic forms only in their Future Indicative usage. Gk. τιμήσω, ετίμησα, &c. must have had at the first double s, *τιμήσω (−άσω), ετίμησα (−άσα), for s between vowels in Greek disappeared when single (e. g. γένε(σ)-os), and was reduced when double (e. g. εύσα from the root eus-, for *εύσα, cf. Lat. us-si, ch. ii. § 129), as in Latin it became r when single (e. g. γένερ-īs, quaero), and was reduced in the classical
period after a long vowel or diphthong (iū.) when double (e.g. quaeso, older quaessus, haesii, older haesissi). Gk. τιμήσω, older -ἀσως, will then correspond to O. Lat. amasso, Gk. σελξω to O. Lat. dixo and similar forms. We have also Latin forms in ss used as Presents, but always with a peculiar sense (§ 33. 5), e.g. *lācessus (cf. lacio, lacto), fortunassint (cf. facio), ἕλπεσσο (cf. capio), incipissus Plaut. (cf. incipio), petessus (cf. peto); in O. Lat. petissere, ‘saepius petere’ 7r.; cf. petevis), quaeso (cf. quaero), vixo (cf. video); they have sometimes been called Latin Intensives, and compared with another S-formation in which the root is reduplicated, namely, the Desideratives (sometimes with Intensive force) of Sanscrit, e.g. pī-pā-s-āmi, ‘I wish to drink,’ jī-jivā-s-āmi, ‘I wish to live,’ īp-sāmi, ‘I wish to acquire,’ and the Reduplicated Futures of Celtic, such as O. Ir. gigius ‘rogabo,’ gigeste ‘orabitis’; their Perfects in -ivi, lacesvī, quaessvī (used as Pft. of quaero), arcessvī, perhaps point to parallel stems in -ss-yo-, *læcessio, *quaessio, *arcessio (cf. the I.-Eur. Fut. in -syo-, Lith. bū-siu beside Gk. φῦ-σω) (on visi, see § 41). Other O. Lat. s-forms (Subjunctive or rather Optative, § 55), like averruncassis, servassis, faxis, used in prayers, wishes, deprecations, &c. (e.g. deos ut fortunassint precor; Juppiter, prohibessis scelus; di mactassint), have been called Latin Precatives, and compared with Sanscrit Precatives (more usual in the older literature than in classical ‘Sanscrit’) such as bhū-yā-s-am from bhū-, ‘to be.’ These O. Lat. Fut. and Opt. forms with ss (corresponding to s after a consonant, fako, faxim, dixo, dieim) are mostly found in Verbs of the first Conjugation, -asso, -assim, Inf. -assere, but sometimes in Verbs of the second, e.g. prohibessis, prohibessint. They do not occur in the Aorist (Preterite) Indicative usage of Gk. εἴσασα (-άσσα), ἐφίλησα (-ησσα) in Latin; but, if Umbro-Oscian it is rightly interpreted as the equivalent of I.-Eur. ss (cf. Att. πράτω for πράσσω, this σσ being a Greek development of κυ), they do occur in this usage in the other Italic languages, Osc. teremnattens ‘terminaverunt,’ quasi *terminassunt, prōfattē ‘probavit,’ quasi *probassit, duunated ‘donavit’ quasi *donassit, Pel. coisatens ‘curaverunt’ and so on (all the examples preserved belong to the first Conjugation).
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So far we have found evidence of Verb-forms with ss after a vowel, s after a consonant, used as Aorists, Futures [in the Future use often with -(s)syo- for -(s)so-], Precatives, &c., as well as of Verb-stems with a suffix consisting of a single s (e.g. *tres-: the stem of Gk. τρέω), a suffix perhaps identical with the S-suffix of Verbal Nouns. It is therefore a natural inference to explain the formations with double s as due to the addition of some S-suffix to a Verb-stem already composed by means of an S-suffix, so that Latin ama\(\text{-}\)sso would be resolved into ama\(\text{-}\)s\(\text{-}\)so, and possibly dixo into deic-s-so. (On dixo however, see § 55; Greek Locatives Plural also like θύρασι offer an original -ss-, which after a consonant appears as -s-, e.g. φύλαξι).

This additional S-suffix may be the same as that which seems to show the form -es- in Latin Future Perfects like vid-ero, amav-ero, dix-ero, and Pluperfects like vid-eram, amav-eram, dix-eram, and which has been identified, plausibly enough, with the Substantive verb, es-,'to be' (it appears in the form s in ama\(\text{-}\)rem, fer-rem, age-rem, &c.), though some regard it as the suffix -es- of Noun-stems, comparing vid-ero to Gk. εἶδες(σ)ω, viderimus Subj. to Gk. εϊδε(σ)μεν Opt., and these to Gk. εϊδός, -ε(σ)-ος (similarly ferrem, agerem, &c. to ferre, agere). Others make it not only -es- but -is- or -as- (ch. iv. § 3), comparing vid-eram to O. Ind. ā-vēd-išam, dixeram to O. Ind. Aorists with -siś- such as ākśisur 3 Pl., and identify this -is- or -as-, as well as -es-, with the suffix of Noun S-stems (e.g. O. Ind. rōcēś- N., Gk. γηρας, θεμις-, Lat. cēnis), and further with Latin -is- of amav-is-tis, amav-is-sem, amav-is-se, although the i in these Latin Perfect-forms may be merely an example of the continuation of the vowel of the 1 Sg. Ind., &c. of the Perfect throughout the declension of this Tense, as Gk. δειξαμι, δειξάτω, &c. continue the a of δειξα (see §§ 67, 52, 39). The Umbro-Oscan Future forms, e.g. Osc. didest 'dabit,' Umbr. ferest 'feret' point to the vowel having been originally e, for the Latin weakening of unaccented vowels is almost unknown in Umbro-Oscan.

Another moot point in the analysis of the Latin Verb is the explanation of what the Roman grammarians regarded as contracted forms, such as amassem beside amavissem, amastis beside amavistis, amarunt, amaro, and amarim beside amavērunt, amavero,
and *amaverim*, and also such as *invassem* beside *invāsissem*, *dixem* beside *dixissem*, *dixti* and *dixχi* beside *dixisti* and *dixistis*. There is nothing in the laws of Latin Phonetics to prevent the Contraction Theory from being right; *audivisse* would become *audisse* as naturally as *si vis* became *sis*, *oblivisci* became *oblīsci* (Plaut.), *divinus*, *dīnus* (Plaut.) (see ch. iv. § 70); *invasisse* would become *invasse* by that Roman practice of discarding one of two similar neighbouring syllables which reduced *arcicubii* to *arcūbii*, *Restitutus* to *Restūnus* (see ch. iii. § 13. p. 176). Thus although the comparison of *amassem* (É-Subj. like *amem*) with *amassim* (Opt. like *sim*, O. Lat. *siem*), *dixem* with *dixo* and *dixim*, *amarim* with *amaem* is a very natural one, it cannot be said that the evidence is at present strong enough to warrant us in relinquishing the old explanation.

Indeed the evidence to be derived from the usage of Plautus and the other Dramatists is all the other way, for we find that Plautus and Terence treat these shorter forms exactly as they treat forms that are indubitably contracted, like *jurgo* from *jūrigo* (ch. iii. § 13); in the older poet the two are used side by side, in the later the contracted have ousted the uncontracted, the latter being used only at the end of a line, i.e. only through metrical necessity. (For statistics, see §§ 48, 49.)

§ 4. *Strong Aorist* forms in Latin. Besides the Nasalized Present-stem *tọ̄ngo* of *tango*, *attīgo* we find a stem *tōg-* in O. Lat. In the Dramatists *attīgas* (only in prohibitions) are not uncommon, e.g. Plaut. *Bacch.* 445 ne *attīgas* puerum istac causa (cf. *Non.* 75. 26 M.). A lamp discovered in the very ancient Esquiline burying-ground bears the inscription: ne *stīg*as, non sum tua. *M. sum* (*Ann.* *Inst.* 1880, p. 260). In the simple verb we have, e.g. *si tagit*, *nisi tagam* in *Pacuvius* (*Trag.* 344 and 165 K.) (forms compared to *con-tigit*, *at-tigit* by *Festus* 540. 27 M.), and probably *tōg-* in Plaut. *Mil.* 192:


Similarly beside the Nasalized Present-stem *tọ̄m-* of *tolo*, *attōlō* (cf. *affero*), *abstōlō* (cf. *aufero*) we have *attulas*, *abstulas*, &c. (or in the older spelling *attolos*, *abstolos*) in prohibitions in the Dramatists, e.g. *Novius*, *Com.* 87 R. *dotem ad nos nullam attulas*; *Pacuv. Trag.* 228 R.:

cūstodite istūne uos: ne uim qui āttolat, nui qui āttigat,

and in the simple verb * nisi tulat* (Accius, *Trag.* 102 R.).

Beside the Present-stem formed with the suffix *-yo* (§ 15), *vēnio*, we find a stem *vēn-* without this suffix in the compounds *evenat*, *advenat*, *pervenat*, &c. (e.g. Plaut. *metuo ne ađuenat*, priusquam peruenat, utinam euenat, quomodo
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euenat, &c.) These Aor. forms seem to occur only at the end of a line (the same indeed is generally, but not always, true of attugas, attulas, &c.), and so are licenees of which the Dramatic Poets availed themselves under metrical necessity. They have been also referred to a suppression of the i (y) of eveniat, &c., like that of i (y) in ãbicio (the scansion of the Dramatists) and possibly augur(i)α of Accius (see ch. ii. § 50), on the plea that the Aor. stem would be vem-, for the n is produced from m under the influence of the following consonantal i (y), *ven-yo (L.-Eur. *g3m-yo-, Gk. ἕνα for *βαμυα) becoming ven-yo, vēnio, as quom-jam became quōniam (ch. iv. § 72). The root is g3em- (cf. Goth. qiman, ‘to come’). Similarly beside pārio, to give birth to, we have parentes. Beside the Reduplicated Present gi-gn-o from the root gēn-, we have an O. Lat. Present geno (cf. Priscian, i. 528. 25 H.) of the common type of fero (root bhe-r-), veho (root wegh-), segnor (root seq-2) (see § 6). This form of the Present is frequent in Varro (e.g. R. R. ii. 2. 19 nam et pingues facit facilli et genit lacte; ib. i. 31. 4 antequam genat; Men. 35 B. quod genuit), and occurs in the testamentary formula ‘si mihi filius genitur’ (Cic. De Orat. ii. 42. 141) (see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v. for examples of the word). It was a moot point among Latin grammarians whether in the phrase of the XII Tables nē in pacevint, the last word was 3 Plur. of a verb *pace (whence pācio; but cf. § 28), or with the old usage of writing c both for c and for g, of a verb pago (an unnasalized form of pango; cf. pēpīgī) (see ch. i. § 6). (On rūdentes, the ropes of a ship, see below, § 6.)

§ 5. O. Lat. forms with -ss- (-s-). The forms in -s'so in Sg. may be called Future-Perfects; thus faxo corresponds to feciero in Plaut. fr. 62 W.:

peribo si non fecero, si fixo uapulābo.

Capt. 695 pol si istue faxis, haud sine poena feceris; but they are often used in the Dramatists, as the ordinary Fut. Perf. is also used, in the sense of a Future, e.g. Plaut. Poen. 888 nisi ero uni meo indicasso, ‘I will tell my master only’ (see Neue, ii, p. 548). They have an Inf. in -ssere, e.g. hoc credo me impetrassere, illum confido me reconciliassere, and occur sometimes in the Passive Voice in laws, e.g. mercassitur (C. I. L. i. 200. 71); faxitur in an old Rogatio mentioned by Livy, xxii. 10. 6: si antidea senatus populusque iussisset fieri, ac faxitur; turbassitur in a law in Cicero, De Legg. iii. 4. i., cf. uti iussit, ‘as shall be ordered’, Cato R. R. xiv. 1.

The forms in -(ss)im 1 Sg. have never a reference to past time like the ordinary Perfect Subjunctive; contrast, for example, Plaut. Capt. 127 uisam ne nocte hac (‘last night’) quippiam turbauerint, with Paevius, Trag. 297 R. precor ueniam petens Ut quae ēgi, ago, vel āxim uerruncēt bene (see A. L. L. ii. 223); they are frequent in Plautus, who normally uses cave dixis, cave faxis, &c., and not (except at the end of a line, i.e. for metrical convenience) cave dixeris, cave feceris, &c. (after ne only dixeris, &c.), but are much less frequent in Terence. They are generally used by Plautus in the protasis of a conditional sentence (except auisim, faxim, which are found in the main clause), e.g. Aul. 228 si locassim, and similarly in old laws, e.g. the Lex Numae (ap. Fest. 194. 21 Th.): si hominem fulminibus occasit; we find them also in wishes, e.g. Plaut. Aul. 50 utinām me diui adāxint ad suspēndium, in prayers, as in the Augural Prayer (quoted by Festus, 526. 11 Th.): bene sponsis beneque volueris, and with ne in deprecations, e.g. Plaut. Most. 1097 ne occupassis opsecor aram, and expressions of anxiety, e.g. Plaut. Bacch. 598:

H h...
mihi caútios
ne núciefangibula excüssit ex malis meis.

These usages mark the forms in *-silm as the Optative Mood of the forms in *-so. This *-s formation appears in Vowel Verbs almost only in the first Conjugation, though we find in the second prohibessit, prohibessint and prohibessis occasionally, cohibessit (Lecr. iii. 444), ücüssit (Plaut. Asin. 603), &c., while for the fourth ambissit (MSS. ambisset) in the (un-Plautine?) prologue of the Amphi
treo of Plautus, l. 71, is quoted. In Terence these forms of Vowel Verbs are very rare, e. g. appellassit, Phorm. 742. In Consonant-stems of the third Conjugation they are found in poetry of all periods (faxim and ausim even in prose); examples are (Labials) capso, accesso, incessit, (Gutturals) axim, taxim, insexit, norit, (Dentals) baesis (C.G.L. ii. 27. 55), incessit, (Nasals) empsim, surempsit (Fest.). [For other instances, see Neu, ii. 539 sqq.; essis of the MSS. of Nonius (200. 30 M.) in a line of Accius [Trag. (Proet.) 16 R.], quoted as an example of castra F.: castra haec uestra est: óptime essis méritus a nobis, seems a miswriting of escis (cf. below, § 33. 5); adessint of the Lex Repctundarum (C. I. L. i. 198. l. 63) may stand for ad-essent (cf. ch. vi. § 33); niolasit (C. I. L. xi. 4766, with annua) and similar forms with s for ss belong to the period when double consonants were written single (ch. i. § 8)].

§ 6. A. Present. 1. (1) With Æ-grade of root and Thematic Vowel. Examples are of E-roots: I.-Eur. *sêq²ô-, *sêq²e-, Mid., 'to be following' (O. Ind. sāca-tē 3 Sg., Gk. ἐπο-μαυ, O. Ir. sechur, Lith. sekū Act.), Lat. sequor; I.-Eur. *we̩ghô-, *wêghé-, 'to be carrying' (O. Ind. váhâ-mi, Pamphyl. Gk. ἐξω(?), Lith. vežû, O. Sl. vezµ, Goth. ga-viga, 'I move'), Lat. veho. Of EI-roots: I.-Eur. *bheidhô-, *bheidhê-, 'to be trusting' (Gk. πείθο-μαυ, Goth. beida, 'I abide'), Lat. fido from O. Lat. feido; I.-Eur. *deikô-, *deikê-, 'to be showing, indicating' (Goth. ga-teiha, Germ. zeige), Lat. dico from O. Lat. deico; I.-Eur. *meighô-, *meighê- (O. Ind. méhā-mi, O. Engl. muge), Lat. meio. Of EU-roots: I.-Eur. *deukô-, *deukê-, 'to be leading, drawing' (O. Tiulu, Germ. ziehe), Lat. dico, O. Lat. duco for *deukô (ch. iv. § 37); I.-Eur. *eðos-, *esê-, 'to be burning, singeing' (O. Ind. ḍê-së-mi, Gk. εὐω for *eũω), Lat. ēro, O. Lat.oron from *eðos; I.-Eur. *plewô-, *plewê-, 'to be flowing, sailing, swimming' (O. Ind. plava-tē 3 Sg. Mid., Gk. πλέ(f)ω, O. Sl. plovâ for *plew-), Lat. plvuo from O. Lat. plove (cf. Fest. 330. 29 Th. 'pateram perplovere' in sacris coll. dicitur, significat pertusam esse; so plovebat, Petron. 44. p. 30. 1 B.). (The form pluo is proper to Compounds, e. g. perpluo, ch. iii. § 24.)

1 For a fuller list of examples of the various Present-stem formations, see Job, le Présent et ses dérivés dans la conjugaiso latine, Paris, 1893.
The weak grade of the root, which in Greek appears with the accent on the suffix, and with the Aorist sense (e.g. τραπεῖν Aor. but τρέπειν Pres., πιθέσθαι Aor. but πεθέσθαι Pres., πυθέσθαι Aor. but πυθέσθαι Pres.), has sometimes encroached on the Pres.-stem, e.g. Dor. Gk. τράπω beside Att. τρέπω, Gk. γλύφω beside I.-Eur. *γλευβῆ- (Lat. glūbo, O. H. G. chliubu, Engl. cleave). Similarly Lat. vālō (O. Ind. vūdā-mi) beside vāda (O. H. G. riuzu) seems to show *vādō- beside *vēdō-, so that vādentēs, the ropes of a ship, lit. ‘the rattlers,’ ‘roarers,’ might be called an ‘Aorist’ participle (§ 4). [In Plautus we have vūdentēs, Rud. 1015 mūtē rūdentēm, seeleste, as vāda in Persius, iii. 9 Arcadiae pecuaria rūdere eredas. The Pft. rudivi (Apuleius) and Verbal Noun ru-ditis point to a Pres.-stem *vēd-yō-, like fūgīo, § 15.]

Examples of Verbs which have not an E-root are: vāda, I am going (the weak grade vād- is seen in vādam, a ford); cāedo, from older cāido, I.-Eur. (s)kaidh- (Goth. skaida, cf. Engl. watershed); ἄγο, I.-Eur. *ἀγό (O. Ind. ājā-mi, Gk. ἄγω, M. Ir. again, &c.; the strong stem ἄγ- is seen in Lat. amb-āges, &c.); scābo, to scrape, I.-Eur. skabh- (Goth. skaba, ‘I shave’; the strong stem ἱκάβh- perhaps appears in Perf. scābī; see § 39).

§ 7. Other examples. Lat. tego (Gk. στέγω); vego (Gk. ὤ-πέγω); lego (Gk. λέγω). Like O. Lat. nīxī, beside ninguit, for *s/neighhō- (Zend snaclzaiti, Gk. νῆψε, Lith. dial, snēga) is O. Lat. fixo for *dheighhō- (? ) (Lith. dēgīa Intr.), for which fizō was afterwards substituted by Analogy of fixī, &c. The form with r which, we are told, was used by Cato [Paul. Fest. 65. 19 Th. ‘fivere’ (apud Catonem for figere), reappears in the derivative fibula for *fēi-balā (cf. scut-ae, Paul. Fest. 64. 7 Th. ‘fixulas,’ fibulas). (Lith. dygūs however points to *dhīghhō-, and we have figer, not fēi- on the S. C. Bacch.)

O. Lat. amplōctor (veteres immutaverunt ‘amplōctor’ crebro dictitantes, Diom. 384. 8 K.), e.g. Liv. Andr. Odysy.: utrum gēna amplōctens uirginem orāret, may take its o from a Derivative Noun (cf. toga from tego, ch. iv. § 52, and see below, § 33. 3). The o of oǐgū for *guīō-ōd (O. Ind. pac-, Gk. πάσαω, O. Sl. pekš) has been similarly referred to the influence of oǐquis.

§ 8. Weak grade of root. Verto is in O. Lat. vorto (Plaut., &c.), so that instead of showing the vowel e of I.-Eur. *wērt-ē (O. Ind. vārtatē 3 Sg. Mid., Goth. vairja, ‘I become’), it seems to show the o of the Perfect, O. Lat. vorti (with weak-grade of stem, wēt-, as in O. Ind. va-vēt-ē Perf. Mid.) and the P. P. P., O. Lat. vortus for *wēt-to (O. Ind. vēt-tā-). But in Umbr. we find wērt- in the Present, vortī in the Perfect and Verbal Noun, ku-vertu, co-vertu ‘convertīto,’ ku-vurtus, ‘converteīris,’ co-vortus, vorsum Acc. ἐπίθυνον. The O. Lat. spelling vorto is in all probability a mere matter of spelling; the Present
was always pronounced with e, *verbo, but at the time when *vo- had come to be pronounced *ve- (see ch. iv. § 10), it was occasionally spelt (not pronounced) *verbo. O. Lat. *verro for *verbo (O. H. G. wirru, ‘verwirre’) may be similarly explained. In Gk. γιγνομαι Pres., ε-πεφνο-ν Aor. we find the E-root relegated to the Preterite, while a modification of the root by Reduplication is assigned to the Present (see next paragraph). In O. Lat. and O. Ind., however, the E-form, *gen-, appears also as a Present-stem (O. Lat. genunt, O. Ind. ján-a-ti 3 Sg.) (see §§ 3-4). Similarly, Lat. peto is regarded by some as originally an Aorist-stem, the Present-stem being formed with the -YO-suffix (§ 15), *peto 1 Sg., whence the Perfect petivi.

Examples of the unaccented verbal-form of a Latin Compound asserting itself in the uncompounded verb are: ēndo for clando (see ch. ii. § 36) ; lux for lavo (Sil. Ital. xi. 22); specio, seco for specio, seco (see ch. ii. § 12). (For additional instances, e. g. pico, see Solmsen, Stud. Lantg. p. 130.)

§ 9. (2) With reduplicated root. Latin examples are: gigno [I.-Eur. *gī-gnō-, *gī-gnē from root *gnē-, which also occurs with Them. Vow. as a Pres.-stem in O. Ind. and O. Lat. (§§ 3-4), Gk. γίγνομαι], bibo for *pibo (ch. iv. § 163) (I.-Eur. *pī-bo-, *pī-bē-, O. Ind. pī-ba-ti 3 Sg., O. Ir. ibi-d; cf. Faliscan pipa-fo Fut.), siasto (I.-Eur. *si-stō-, *si-stē- from root stā-, O. Ind. tiṣṭha-ti 3 Sg.), sūdo for *sī-sūdo (ch. iv. § 151) (I.-Eur. *sī-zdō-, *sī-zdē- from root sed-, O. Ind. sīda-ti 3 Sg. for *sīsd-, Umbr. ander-sistu ‘intersidito’ Imper., for *sīsd(e)-tōd). Often these Reduplicated Present-stems belong to the Athematic Conjugation, e. g. Gk. ἵστη-μι for *si-stā-mī (O. H. G. sestō-m), beside Lat. siesto, O. Ind. tiṣṭhā-mi; and Latin sistīmus, sistītis correspond as well with the Greek ἵστα-μεν, ἵστα-τε, as with the thematic forms. Similarly Gk. ἵμι (I.-Eur. *si-sē-, athematic) is in Latin thematic in siquo for *si-so, though serē-mus, serē-tis may be equally referred to athematic *sisa- as to thematic *sisō-, *sisē- ; I.-Eur. *dī-dō-, athematic (Gk. δίω-μι, O. Ind. dádā-mi) has in Latin lost its reduplication, except in reddo, if this stands for re-d(ī)dō as repuli, repperi for re-p(e)puli, re-p(e)peri, but not in Umbro-Oscan (Pelig. dida ‘det,’ Umbr. divsa pronounced *dīda ?). All these Latin examples reduplicate with the vowel ī, and most belong to roots ending in a long vowel. Some Greek Aorist-stems show this reduplication with the vowel ē, e. g. è-πεφνο-ν from root φεν-, è-kékle-to from root κελ-, πεποθ-όν from root πεθ-, πεποθ-οίτο from root πενθ-, by analogy of which the spurious Presents πεφνο, kékloμαι have been formed. Short e is also the Reduplication-vowel of the Perfect-stem (see § 39).
§ 10. (3) With root nasalized. Of the ten conjugations under which the Hindu grammarians have classified the Sanscrit verb, three are assigned to these nasalized Present-stems, one (the seventh conjugation) showing a nasal infix, I.-Eur. -nē-, varying with -n-, e.g. yū-nā-j-mī 1 Sg., yū-n-j-mās 1 Pl., yuṇāk-tē 3 Sg. Mid. (Lat. jū-n-go), from the root yuj- (I.-Eur. yeug-), the other two showing a nasal affix, viz. the ninth conjugation with -nā- varying with a weak grade (O. Ind. -nī-), e.g. str-nā-mī 1 Sg., str-nā-mās 1 Pl., str-nā-tē 3 Sg. Mid. (Lat. stēr-no), and the fifth conjugation with I.-Eur. -neu- (O. Ind. -nō-) varying with -nū-, e.g. r-nū-mī 1 Sg., r-nū-mās 1 Pl., r-nū-tē 3 Sg. Mid. (Gk. ὅρ-νū-μι). In Greek the type of Present corresponding to the Sanscrit seventh conjugation has only -n-, never -ne-, and has been usually modified by the addition either of a nasal affix, e.g. not *λικ-μ-πω (Lat. lī-n-quo) but λιμ-π-άω (so τυ-γ-χ-άω, λαυ-θ-άω, &c.), or of the -YŌ-, -YĒ- suffix, e.g. κλάζω for *κλαγγ-γω (cf. ἐ-κλαγγέα) (Lat. clango); the Sanscrit ninth conjugation is represented by σκιδ-νη-μι 1 Sg., σκιδ-να-μεν 1 Pl., σκιδ-να-μαι Mid., πίτ-νη-μι 1 Sg., πίτ-να-μεν 1 Pl., πίτ-να-μαι Mid., &c.; the Sanscrit fifth conjugation by ἁγ-νῳ-μι 1 Sg., ἁγ-νῳ μεν 1 Pl., ἁγ-νῳ-μαι Mid., σκεδάννυμι, πετάννυμι, &c. In Sanscrit all these nasalized stems belong to the Athematic Conjugation, though we have thematic byforms like 3 Sg. yuṇjāti, ῥνβάτι; but in Greek the first type mentioned is always thematic, e.g. λυμπάω, the others occasionally, e.g. πυτνάω, δαμνάω (by forms of πυτνημι, δάμνημι), ἵσχανάω, &c., ἰτρωννῦω, ἐρωννῦω, ὄρνω for ὄρνιγω, &c., while we have another type with -νω, e.g. ἰκνέωμαι, ὑπωσχέομαι, κινέω. The discrepancy between Greek and Sanscrit, the two languages in which these nasalized stems have been most fully preserved, makes it difficult to determine the original I.-Eur. types of nasalization (see I. F. ii. pp. 285 sqq.). In default of a better classification, we may arrange the Latin nasalized Presents in two classes, according as the nasal presents the appearance of a nasal infix or a nasal affix.

i. With nasal infix, e.g. lī-n-quo (O. Ind. rī-ṇā-c-mi 1 Sg., rī-ṇ-c-mās 1 Pl., Pruss. po-linka, ‘he remains’; cf. Gk. λυμπάω), from root leiq¬ (Gk. λείπω, Lith. likū, Goth. leihva, ‘I lend,’ Germ. leihe); fī-n-do (O. Ind. bhī-ṇā-d-mi) from root bheid-
(Goth. beita, ‘I bite’). The variation of -nē- and -n- seen in O. Ind. rī-ṅa-c-mi 1 Sg., rī-ṅ-e-mās 1 Pl., is not seen in other languages, where the weak grade -n- is used throughout. The Latin Presents conquiniscor (Perf. conqneus), to stoop, and possibly frūniscor (cf. fructus), to enjoy, do however perhaps show the fuller suffix -nē- combined with the Inceptive suffix -sko- (§ 22), if -niscor stands for -nēc-scor, with loss of c (g) in the group -csc- as in disco for *dic-sco (ch. iv. § 157), and with i by analogy of other Inceptives (see § 28); and Gk. ku-vé-(g)-ω, Λορ. ὦ-kvο-α, may do the same. These forms with nasal infix are often augmented by the YŌ-suffix (§ 15), e.g. Gk. πτίσσω for *πτίνω-γω, πλάζω, to beat, for *πλαγγ-γω (cf. ἔ-πλαγγζα), κλάζω for *κλαγγ-γω (cf. ἔ-κλαγγζα), Lith. jung-iu, beside Lat. pinso, plango, clango, and jungo; and so in Lat. pinseio, sancio (cf. sāc-er), vincio (from the root vyek-). English examples of nasal infix are: ‘I spring,’ from *spr-ṅ-ḡō, from the root sperṅh- (Gk. σπέρχομαι); ‘I wring,’ from the root werṅh- (Lith. verž-iu, ‘I squeeze’). (‘I stand’ belongs to a rare type of I.-Eur. Present-stem in -NT, on which see Osthoff in Versamml. Philolog. xxi. p. 300.)

ii. With nasal affix. I.-Eur. lī-nā- (O. Ind. lī-nā-mi, Gk. λί-να-μαι τρέπομαι Hesych., O. Ir. lēnim, ‘I cling to, follow,’ O. Scand. līna, ‘I grow weak’) is Lat. lī-no, from a root lei-, so that the I.-Eur. affix -nā- has been lost in Latin (unless līno represents *lī-nā-ō), and only its weak grade (O. Ind. -nī-, Gk. -vā-) remains, e.g. lī-nī-nus (Gk. *λί-να-μεν). The -nā- of aspernāri (beside sperno), consternāre, to terrify (beside consterno, to strew) (but cf. ch. iii. § 19), declināre and inclināre (beside Gk. κλίνω), destināre (beside Gk. στάνω and στανύω) cannot quite be identified with I.-Eur. -nā- (O. H. G. spor-nō-n, O. Ind. stre-ṅ-ti 3 Sg., O. Sax. hli-nō-n; cf. O. H. G. stornēn, ‘to be astonished,’ hlinēn), for the same ā appears in compounds of other than nasal-stems, e.g. occupāre (beside cāpere), profligāre (beside fligere) (see § 32), and the -ṅa- of la-u-c-ṅa-re (cf. lāc-er), coqu-ṅa-re (cf. cōquo), which indeed suggests comparison rather with Gk. -āνω- of λι-μ-π-ἀνω, ἀμαρτ-ἀνω, &c., than with Gk. -vā- of σκλη-νη-μι, πῦ-νη-μι, seems to show the -ā- (I.-Eur. -āyō-) of Derivative Verbs (§ 32), like sarcastānus from sarcastā (a Derivative with nasal suffix from sarcio, as facīnus from facio), runcināre from runcīna, pāguṇare from pāguṇa,
or nominare from nomen (cf. destina, a prop). The I.-Eur. affix -neu-, -nū- has left very few traces in Latin: sler-wn-o (Gk. πτάφ-vū-μαι), mī-wn-o (O. Ind. mū-nūmi; cf. Gk. μῦ-vū-θω), probably for *mī-new-ō, &c. (cf. ἄνυω for de *newō, ch. iii. § 24). English examples of nasal affix are ‘I spurn, ‘I shine’ (Goth. skei-na), ‘I fill’ (with ll for ln).

By rule the Nasalization should be confined to the Present Tense, and not extended to other than Present forms: e.g. li-u-guo, re-līgni, re-līc-tus; ēl-n-o, ēl-vi, ēl-tus. But it pervades the whole verb in some cases, e.g. jungo, junxi, junctus.

The weak grade of the root is proper to all these Nasalized Present-stems, e.g. jungo from root yeug-, līuo from root lei-, mī-wn-o from root mēi.

§ 11. Other examples of nasal infix. Lat. rū-m-go (O. Ind. rū-m-pamī), from root reup- (O. Engl. berēofe, Engl. I bereave); pi-n-so (O. Ind. pi-nā-s-mi; cf. Gk. πίσωσα for *πισῶσα, Lat. pisiso); sci-n-do (O. Ind. chi-nā-d-mi); fungor (O. Ind. bhu-nā-j-mi); tu-n-go, from root leigh- (Gk. λείχω) (cf. O. H. G. leechōm, from *līgh-nā-mi); vi-n-co, from root weik- (Goth. veiha, ‘I fight’); cla-n-go (O. Scand. hlakka; cf. Gk. κλαγγάω, κλαδουμα), from root klag- (Lith. klagėti, ‘to cackle’); pre-he-n-do (Alb. ģędem, ‘I am found,’ Lett. gidu, ‘I apprehend, perceive,’ for *gendu; cf. Gk. χανδάω, χείσομα For. for *χενδ-σομα), from root ghed- (Engl. get, Lat. praeda for *praed-hed-a); di-sti-n-guo (Goth. stigqa, ‘I thrust’; cf. Lith. stėngiu), from the root steiga- (O. Ind. tējate, ‘is sharp’; cf. Lat. in-stigare); e-mu-n-go (O. Ind. muńcāti, ‘he releases,’ Lett. mūku, ‘I escape,’ for *munku); fi-n-go (O. Ir. dengaim, ‘I fasten’), from root dheigh- (Goth. déga) ; tū-n-do (Pft. tū-tū-di); pi-n-go (Pft. pi-pīg-i); ac-cā-m-bo (cf. cābar, Pft. ac-cūt-mi); tū-n-go (Pft. te-tūg-i, for *te-tūg-i, Gk. τεταγώ); tū-m-bo (cf. lū-tūan); ri-n-gor (O. Sl. řen-m, augmented by -nō), beside victus.

§ 12. Retention of Nasal throughout the Tenses. Like jungo, junxi, junctum (with possibly a Neuter Noun jungus, -eris, ‘a team,’ like Gk. κέφος, in Plaut. Men. 913: nōn postet haec rēs ellebori ūngere optimēri), we have pungo, punctum (but pāngī; Priscian says the Perf. of repungo is repunxi, like expunxi, or repupugi, i. 524. 13 H.): distinguo, distinxi, distinctum; fingo, finxi (but fictum; fictum, Ter. Enn. 104); planco, planxi, planetum; emungo, emunxi, emunctum; lingo, linxi, linctum; fungor, functus [but on plebeian inscriptions delectas (C. I. L. ii. 4173), like sactus, e. g. sactissimae (vi. 15511, v. 6580), whereas the Welsh loanword saith besides sant; nactus and nactus are equally good spellings, see Georges, Lex. Wortif. s. v.]. Spellings in MSS. like corruptus (Neue, ii. 560), velingu, Perf., are due to the same confusion. When the stem is extended by the YO-suffix, the n is retained, e. g. vincio, vinxi, victum, from root vyek-, beside vinco, vici, victum from root weik-, sanctus from sanctio. Of roots ending in a dental we have e. g. from tundo, tunsus and (post-Aug.) tussus, and the grammarians speak of a Perf. tunti (Georges, s. v.); but the dropping of n before s in pronunciation makes it doubtful how far the nasal was really present in such forms (see ch. ii. § 66 on thensaurus for θησαυρός; cf. mensus from mētor).
§ 13. Other examples of nasal affix. Lat. sperno (O. H. G. fir-spirni-t 3 Sg., spurnu), with Perf. sprê-ti, as cerno Perf. cvê-ti (cf. Gk. τῆκ-ων, ἐ-τια-θην); O. Lat. degunere (degustare, Paul. Fest. 50. 36 Th.; cf. Gl. Philox. degunere: ἀνογείεσθε καὶ συγγωναί) for *de-gus-ner-e from root genus- (Gk. γενός(ός), Goth. kiusa, Engl. I choose); ap-pellâre and com-pellâre for *pel-nâ-re (Gk. πικ-να-μα, I approach, O. Ir. ad-ellaim), beside pellere, to strike; the Compound-stem with -nâ- has a peculiar sense also in de-sti-nâ-re, prae-sti-nâ-re, which in Plautus are used for ‘to buy,’ e. g. Most. 646 quid, eas quanti destinat?; Capt. 848 alium piscis praestinatum abire (cf. Arm. sta-na-m, ‘I possess, buy’), ob-sti-nâ-re, to stickle for, Plaut. Aud. 267:

id inhiat, ea affinitatem hanc obstinauit grátia,
whence obstinatus; there is a gloss, gredinunda baēk'ôvôsa, C. G. L. ii. 36. 10.

§ 14. Other Verb-stems with n. From Nasalized Present-stems we must distinguish (1) O. Lat. forms of the 3 Plur. Pres. Ind. like dûnunt, exemplunt, prodîunt, on which see § 73; (2) Derivative A-Verbs from Noun and Adjective Nasal-stems: e. g. opinor, -âri from a Noun *opînîon-, connected with praed-optimît (MSS. praeodotînt) ‘praecoptant’ of the Carmen Saliare (Fest. 244. 13 Th.), aûdâ, opîure, &c.; fesîino, -âre; vulûnîor, -âri, to use the wiles of a fox (Varro, Men. 327 B.); auctînîor, -âri; contînîor, -âri; sarcîno, -âre; nomînîo, -âre (see above); (3) Verbs in which the nasal belongs to the root, e. g. tendo, formed from the root ten- by means of the suffix d (§ 33); fremdo similarly for frem-dô; offendô, defendô from the root ghusen, ‘to strike’ (Gk. têinô for *thegôw).

The verb pando is of doubtful origin. Some make it a nasalized form like unda (cf. Lith. vandû beside Goth. vâtnô, Engl. water; O. Ind. udân- beside Gk. ὕδωρ); others make it a word-group, *patem-do, lit. ‘I make opening,’ like vendo and vendûm do [Osc. patensins ‘apercire?’ (?)] has also been variously explained]. Mando, to chew, if connected with Gk. μασάÔμαι for *μαïaÔμαι (?), will be a parallel formation.

§ 15. With suffix -YÖ-, -ÝÝÖ-. Like the Noun-suffix -yô-, -yô- (ch. v. § 4) this varies with -yê-, -îyê- or with -î-. Owing to the weakening of vowels in unaccented syllables in Latin, it is difficult to ascertain the exact form of the suffix in the various persons of the Present Tense; but the analogy of other languages points to a declension like this of those Presents in which -yô- varied with -î-: 1 Sg. *cup-yô, 2 Sg. cup-i-s, 3 Sg. cup-i-t, 1 Pl. *cup-yô-mos, 2 Pl. *cup-i-tes, 3 Pl. *cup-yô-nt (see Brugmann, Grundriß, ii. § 702).

Two classes of Present-stems with the YÔ-suffix stand out very clearly, though they occasionally overlap:

i. With E-grade of root and accent on the root, e. g. Lat. spêc-îo (O. Ind. pâś-ya-ti, Zend spas-yê-iti, Gk. σκεπτομαί for *skêp-yo-mai).
ii. With weak grade of root and accent on the suffix, e.g. Lat. mîr-ior for *mr-yôr (O. Ind. mr-iyá-tê 3 Sg.), vînio for *gîm-yô (O. Ind. gam-ýá-tê, Gk. βαλνω for *βm-yo). To the second belong intransitive verbs (e.g. O. Sl. sto-ja, 'I stand'); and so intimately connected is this type of the suffix with intransitive sense, that in Sanscrit its Middle is used as the Passive of all verbs, e.g. kriyê, ' I am made,' kriyûtê, ' he is made,' the Passive of karômi, ' I make,' karôti, ' he makes.' In the Balto-Slavic family of languages these verbs show in the other tenses an Ê-suffix, clearly the same as the Greek Passive -η of ē-μάν-η-v beside μαυρωάτι for *μn-yo-ma, a suffix likewise identified with the intransitive or passive sense. This conjugation of intransitive verbs is not found in Latin, but it has perhaps left its mark in the coexistence of Presents in -io and -eo, e.g. jácio and jácio, pâvio and pâveo. In most cases however the Ê-suffix ousted the YO-suffix altogether, e.g. sêdeo, sed-ē-s, sed-ē-mnâ, &c. from an I.-Eur. Present-stem *sed-yô-(Gk. ἐκοµατιον for *τρεδ-γο-ματιον, O. H. G. sizzu for *sed-yô), video, vid-ē-s, vid-ē-mnâ, &c. from an I.-Eur. Present-stem *wid-yô-(O. Ind. vid-yâ-tê. ' he is perceived,' Lith. pa-výdžiu 1 Sg. Pres.) with another (originally not a Present) stem in -ē- (Lith. pa-vydėti Inf.). [In Goth. vitais for *wid-ē-yâ-s, vitaiþ for *wid-ē-yâ-t, and in other Teutonic verbs, the same intrusion of -ē- (-yô-) into the Pres.-stem is seen as in Latin.] These Intransitive Verbs with Inf. -ère constitute an important part of the second Conjugation in Latin, e.g. cālère, rōdère, pâtère; they acquire a Transitive sense by appending fâcio to a Verb-stem in -v (ch. v. § 51), e.g. cālē-fâcio, and often take as their Present-stem an 'Inceptive' formation in -seô, e.g. incâlesco, érûbėscô (see § 28). The association of this type with the Intransitive functions is seen in pedéco Intrans. beside pedô Trans., mûdo (Gk. μαθάω), vëcreor (Gk. ὁραω, ch. iv. § 10), clûeo and cluô (Gk. κλûω).

Another class of Presents which show the YO-suffix is—

iii. With -ā, -ē, -ô after the root. Beside the root pel-, for example, we have the root plê-, ' to fill,' with a Present-stem *plê-yô-, *to be filling' (Lat. im-plœ); beside the root ter- we have the root trê-, ' to penetrate,' (cf. Gk. τρπ-μα) with a Present-stem *trê-yô- (O. H. G. drâu, Germ. drehe), as well as the root trâ-,
with a Present-stem *trä-yō- (O. Ind. trā-ya-tē, Lat. in-tro for *trāyō) (see ch. iv. § 66). Unlike the second Conj. verbs just mentioned, vīdeo, sēdeo, &c. with Perfects vidi, sedi, Supines visum, sessum, and cāleo, rībeco, &c. with Perfects cālui, rūbi and with Supines wanting, these ē-verbs retain their ē throughout the con-
jugation, -plēvi, -plētum, &c. In addition to monosyllabic Verb-
stalks we have such dissyllabic stems as Lat. *ulmā-yō, dōmo (O.
Ind. damā-yā-ti), and a group of onomatopoetic words, e. g. Lat.
*ul-ulā-yō, ūlūlo (Lith. ul-ūlō-ju, and unreduplicated ūlō-ju, Gk.
ūlāw for *ūlā-yō). Beside the Present-stems with the YO-suffix we
find athematic Presents from these roots with -ā, -ē, -ō (e. g.
O. Ind. trā-ti beside trā-ya-tē, Gk. πίμ-πλη-μι, τί-τρη-μι, κι-χυ-μι)
which seem to have originally retained the long vowel throughout,
and not to have variation with the weak grade (e. g. O. Ind. trā-sva
2 Sg. Imper. Mid., Gk. κί-κυ-μετ Pl.); and in Latin this athematic
formation appears to be used in all persons but the first, in-trā-s,
in-trā-mus, &c., though this cannot be proved, seeing that, e. g.
in-plēs is equally derivable from thematic *-plē-yō-s (cf. trēs for
*trē-yēs, ch. iv. § 66) as from athematic *-plē-s (O. Ind. prā-si).

The YO-suffix played a great part in the I.-Eur. languages as
a secondary suffix, added to Verb-stems, e. g. Lat. pinsio beside
pinsō (an already-formed Pres.-stem, § 10), Gk. ἔσθω beside
ἐσθω, or to Noun-stems, &c. to form derivative verbs, e. g. Lat.
cūro, for *curā-yō (Umbr. kuraia, ‘curet’) from the Noun-stem
*curā-, claudeo for *claudē-yō from the Adjective-stem *claudē,-
*claudō,-, finio for *fini-yō from the Noun-stem *fini-, statufo for
*statiu-yō from the Noun-stem *stati-, custōdiio for *custōl-yō
from the Noun-stem *custōl-, and so on. But since the suffix is
in these derivatives usually maintained throughout the Latin
conjugation, pinsītus, custodīvi, custodītus, &c., they are better
reserved for discussion among the Verb-suffixes in § 26 (cf. Gk.
δαλ-σω, δαλ-νυ-μι beside δαλω for *δα-νω). Derivatives from
A-stems follow the analogy of roots with -ā (e. g. Lat. in-tro,
in-trās, in-trāmus, see above) in using the YO-suffix only to form
the thematic 1st Pers. Sg. of the Present Tense, while those
from U-stems use it in all persons, e. g. statuvo, statuis, statuimus.
For Latin athematic forms like curā-mus derived from stem
curā-, &c. we may compare the athematic flexion of similar
Derivative Verbs in the Lesbian dialect, e.g. τίμαι-μεν, derived from stem τιμαι-, φίλη-μι, derived from stem φιλε-, στεφάνωμι, derived from stem στεφανο-. English examples of Present-stems with the YÔ-suffix are 'I lie' [O. H. G. ligge(i)u, but Pret. lag, 'I lay'], and the two Pres. Participles which have become Nouns, 'a fiend' (Goth. fijands, lit. 'hating'), 'a friend' (Goth. frijonds, lit. 'loving').

§ 16. I in the third Conj. Presents with YÔ-suffix. We have i often in O. Lat.; capīs, Plaut. Curc. 364:

laūdo. Laudatō, quando illud, quōd cupis, effēcero,
facīs, Amph. 555 (so the MSS.); facēt, Curc. 238 (?); inīcitē is the scansion required by the metre in a line of Naevius (Trag. 30 R.):

sublimen altos sīltus inīcitē, ubi
bipēdēs volantes (MSS, uolucre) līno linquant lūmina;

in 1 Pers. Plur., morīmus is attested by Priscian (i. p. 501. 16 H.) in a couplet of Ennius (Ann. 415 M.):

nunc est ille dies, cum gloria maxima sese
nobis ostendat, si uiuimus siue morīmus;

we have adgredīmus, Plaut. Asin. 680, Rud. 299; and in 3 Sa. Dep. adorītur is attested by Prisc. (l. c.) in a line of Lucilius (or Lucretius iii. 515 ?). The long vowel is especially common in the Inf. of the Deponent in Plautus, e.g. adgredīrī, morīrī, effōdīrī (cf. parīrē). (For other examples, see Neu, ii. p. 415.) These forms can hardly be due to the false Analogy of verbs like finīo, -īri, -ītum, -īre, such as is seen in Late Lat. fācētūs (coined on the type of finā-tus), for they are a feature of the older language. They rather indicate that in the period of the early literature the suffix might appear as ī or as i, whereas in the classical period the usage became restricted to one or other of these forms. The best explanation then of Verbs in -io 1 Sa. Pers. Ind., which belong to the third Conjugation is that they are YÔ-stems in which -i- asserted itself, rather than -i-, as the weak grade of -iō- (iō-) ; capēre will then stand for *capēsi, cape for *capī. This does not however preclude the possibility of other explanations being right in particular cases, such as that a system without -iō- existed, say *fācē beside *fāc-iō (cf. bene-ficent-iō beside faciens), *rapē beside *rap-iō (cf. rapē, 'a robber'; Varro, Mon. 378 b.), that -i- belongs to a stem in -iō-, -ī to a stem in -iō-, e.g. spēcio from stem *spēck-iō (cf. Gk. σκέπτω) with the YÔ-suffix immediately following on a consonant.

§ 17. Other examples of E-grade roots. Lat. *cērīo, 'to close,' seen in op-(w)erio, ap-(w)erio (Lith. už-eriu, 'I shut,' at-veriu, 'I open') (on the loss of w, see ch. iv. § 71); ĭnd-iō for *ĭndove from *ēw-iō, to judge from Umbr. an-ovīhi-mu for *and-ov-i-mu, 'indivino' (ch. iii. § 24) from the root ĭw-, 'to put on.' Similarly haurio for aurio (exaurio is the almost invariable spelling

§ 18. Of weak grade roots. i. With -io. Lat. cīp-īō (O. Ind. kup-yā-tī, 'is in agitation'); fūgio (cf. Hom. ἑρ-φεῦτες for ἑρφυγό-) from root bheug-(Gk. φεῦγε;) grādār from the root ghreidi-(Goth. grīdī-), 'a step,' O. Sl. grēdā, 'I come,' O. Ir. ingreimm, 'I pursue, attack,' the last two with Nasalized stem) shows the weakening of -rē- to -rē- mentioned in ch. iv. § 51; similarly farcio for *farcio (Gk. φάρσω) from the root bhrēq'- of frequens (and for the connection of cramming' and 'frequency,' cf. sāpe and O. Lat. saepissimus, 'closely packed,' ch. ix. § 4); likewise rāpīō, if connected with rēpens, 'sudden.'

ii. Intransitive with -eō. Lat. rūbeō from an I.-Eur. *rūdh-yō (O. Sl. rūždq, with the e-suffix in Inf. rūdē-tī); torpeo with tēp- the weak grade of the root terp-; stādeo (cf. Gk. σταθεῖα) ; mēneō (cf. Gk. μένω), and pāteō (cf. Gk. πατ-άνωμι), both seem to show Lat. ā as a weak grade of ē (ch. iv. § 3). Like rūbeō with Noun rūber, torpeo with Noun torpor and Adj. torpēdus are a large number of Intransitive Verbs, cādeo (color, calidus, plaecō (placidus; but Transitive plaeco, liquēō (liquor, liquidus); cf. liquor, third Conj.), and so on (ch. v. § 74). The tīneō of per-tīneō, lit. 'to reach through,' trans-tīneō, 'to reach across' (Plaut. Mil. 468 commenatus transtinet trans pari etem) is the Neuter of tendō.

§ 19. Alternative forms in -eō and -eō. Lat. tēor and tūtor, 'to look'; fulgeo and fulgo; ferreo and ferro; scitēo and scito; abunō and O. Lat. abunō (Diom. 382. 11 K.). In all these of the form -eō is the older (e. g. connor, intor Plaut., scito Plaut., Enn., Luer.; fer vit and ferēre are common in the early Dramatists, the latter often in Virgil, but to Quintilian a third Conjugation form of this verb is 'inaudītum,' Quint. i. 6. 8), while the form in -eō is a new formation on the Analogy of the numerous Intransitives in -eō (cf. Caper 109. 16 K. fidō non 'fīdeo'). We have sordēre in Plaut. Poen. 1179. (See also below, § 33.)

§ 20. Of roots with -ā, -ē, -ō. Latin no for *snā-yō (O. Ind. snā-ya-tē, and athem. snā-ti, Lat. nat); neo for *(s)nā-yō (Gk. νέω, O. H. G. nēu, Germ. nāhē), tīceo for *tāce-yō (Goth. thainj 3 Sg. from *takē-yē-ti, and athem. O. H. G. dagē-s, Lat. tacēs); flu for *filā-yō (cf. O. H. G. flau from *filē-yō, perhaps the same word as Lat. fleo for *filā-yō, Gk. φλαεω, to overflow); hīo for *hiā-yō (Lith. žio-ju) from the root gheīi; jūreo for *jūnā-yō, I.-Eur. *dryūgā-yō, from the root dyēngā- (cf. Lith. džiung-ū-s, 'I rejoice,' a nasalized Present) (but cf. ch. iv. § 64); cēbō for *cub-ā-yō from the root kenb- (cf. cmbō, a nasalized Present). Of onomatopoetic words with 1 Sg. Pres. in -āyō, we have māmurō, tintimō, unco, to bray (Gk. ὄγκαμα).

§ 21. Inceptive, and other Verb-stems. Though Inceptive verbs by virtue of their meaning restrict, as a rule, the inceptive suffix -skō- (skō-) to the Present sense, e. g. cresceō, Pft. crēvi; they differ from Present-stem formations like sīno, Pft. sīvi, cāpio, Pft. cēpi, in this respect, that the meaning, which they express, is something more than the mere sense of action in present time, e. g. sēnesco means, not 'I am old' (sēneō), but 'I become old.' They are therefore better considered in a separate
section, along with some verb-formations which are more than mere Tense-stems, such as Causatives, Intensives, Desideratives, and the like.

§ 22. Inceptives in -skō- (-skō-). The root shows, as a rule, the weak grade, e.g. I.-Eur. *prk-skō- (O. Ind. pr-chá-mi, with *-skh- for *-sk-), Lat. *poseo for *pore-sko, from the root prek-. It is sometimes reduplicated in Greek, e.g. διδάσκω for δι-δακ-σκω, but not in Latin unless diisco, from root deik-, stands for *di-de-sco, (cf. di-dic-i) and not for *di-sc-o. An English Inceptive is 'I wash' (O. Engl. wasce, from a Teut. *wat-skō 1st Sg., derived from the same root as 'wet,' 'water,' Lat. unda, &c.).

§ 23. Causatives and Intensives in -eyo-. The root has the O-grade, and the accent rests on the first syllable of the suffix. Causatives of this type are a regular feature of the Sanscrit conjugation, and may be formed from any verb, e.g. mān-āyā-mi (Lat. mōneo for *mon-éyo) from the root man- (I. Eur. men-; cf. Lat. mēnuī for *me-men-i); tarś-āyā-mi (Lat. torreo, O. H. G. derr(i)u, for *trs-éyo) from the root trś- (I.-Eur. ters-), so that Lat. moneo was literally 'to cause to remember' [cf. Plaut. Mil. 49 Edepol memoria's óptima. Offae monent; Paul. Fest. 115. 6 Th. 'monitores' qui in scaena monent histriones (our 'prompters')], torreo 'to cause to be dry.' These Causatives of Sanscrit have a different accent from Derivatives in -eyo- from O-stems, in which the accent falls on the suffix -eyo-, e.g. dēvaya-mi, 'I honour the gods,' from dēvā-, 'a god' (an O-stem, *deiwō-). The same formation often has the Intensive or the Iterative sense, e.g. Gk. φορέω from I.-Eur. *bhor-éyo, 'I carry frequently,' from the I.-Eur. root bher-, 'to carry' (Gk. φέρω, Lat. fero); Gk. ποθέω for *phothēw from I.-Eur. *gh3odh-éyo (O. Ir. guidiu), 'I ask or desire earnestly,' from the I.-Eur. root gh3edh-, 'to ask' (Gk. θέσωσθαί). The P. P. P. of these verbs shows -i- in some languages (O. Ind. varṭi-tā-, Goth fra-vardis), -i- in others (cf. Lith., vartý-ti Inf., O. Sl. vrati-ti); in Lat. ē.g. monitus, uocitus; and there are indications that the I.-Eur. declension of the Present Ind. was *wortéyō 1 Sg., *wortīmōs 1 Pl., &c. (P. B. Beitr. xviii. p. 519). An English example is 'I lay' (Pres.), in Goth. lagja, from I.-Eur. *loghēyō; 'I lay' is the Causative of 'I lie.'
§ 24. Latin Desideratives in -tūrio. These are formed with the YŌ-suffix (§ 15), probably from Verbal Noun-stems in -tor-, e.g. parturio from partor, scripturio from scriptor, with the same change of unaccented ō to ū as in fulgūro, O. Lat. fulgōrio (ch. iii. § 26).

§ 25. Latin Iteratives or Frequentatives in -*tāyō- are formed from Perf. Part. Pass.-stems, or rather from the Fem. of these used as a Noun (cf. offensa beside offensus, repulsa beside repulsus), with the help of the YŌ-suffix, e.g. pulso, older pulto, for *pultā-yō, from pulsus, older pullus, P. P. P. of pello. Sometimes the TO-suffix is doubled, e.g. facēto, ventēto.

§ 26. Other Derivative Verbs with the YŌ-suffix. The ending -āyō-, which properly belongs to Derivatives from Ā-stem Nouns (e.g. from planta, a plant, a shoot, plantare, to plant, lit. ‘to make or turn something into a plant’), acquired a transitive sense, and was used in Latin, as in other I.-Eur. languages, with any Noun- or Adj.-stem, e.g. clārare, ‘to make clear,’ from the Adj.-stem clavo-, pulverare, ‘to turn something into dust,’ or ‘to cover with dust,’ from the Noun pulvis, a Consonant-stem. The ending -ēyō-, which properly belongs partly to Derivatives from O-stem Nouns or Adjectives (e.g. claudeo, ‘to be lame,’ from claudus, albeo, ‘to be white,’ from albus), partly, as a Primary suffix, to Intransitive Verbs like rubeo, sedeo (see § 32), is the corresponding intransitive formation, e.g. clarere, ‘to be clear.’ Latin Verbs in -io include Derivative Verbs from Consonant-stems, e.g. custōd-ō from the stem custōd-, and from I-stems, e.g. īnānio from the Adj. I-stem īnani-. This ending acquired to some extent an intransitive sense, expressing a state of body or of mind, and was in this capacity applied to other stems too, e.g. īnānio from the Adj. O-stem īnānus, to be mad, saevio from the Adj. O-stem saevus, to be fierce.

§ 27. Other suffixes commonly used in forming Verb-stems, primitive suffixes, the sense conveyed by which cannot now be detected, were (1) -dh-, e.g. Gk. κυρί-θ-ω beside krōo, (2) -d-, e.g. Gk. ἐλ-δω-μαι from root wel- (Lat. volo), which may be nothing
but the Verb-stems dhō-, 'to put,' and dō-, 'to give' (cf. Lat. creō, O. Ir. cretim with O. Ind. śrád dadhāmi, lit. 'I set heart to'), as the common Latin ending -igō, -āre, e. g. nāvigo, seems to be nothing else than the Verb āgo (from *navigus; cf. ch. v. § 80); (3) -t-, e. g. Gk. πέκ-τ-ω (Lat. pecto) and πεκτέω, beside πέκω, which seems connected with the P. P. P. suffix -to- (ch. v. § 27); (4) -s-, e. g. Gk. δέψω beside δέφω, τρέ-(σ)-ω beside τρέ-μ-ω, which seems the same as the ES-suffix of Nouns, e. g. Gk. τέλος, stem τελεο- (Gk. τελε(σ)-ω, τε-τέλεο-ταί) (§ 3). Latin examples are: gau-d-eo (Gk. γάυθομαι and γνθεό) for *gāvē-il-ēo (cf. gāvisus), sallo for *sal-do (Goth. salta), plecto (O. H. G. fill-tu, Germ. flechte) beside plīco, -āre (Gk. πλέκω), viso, older visso, veisso for *weid-so (Goth. ga-veisō; cf. the O. Ind. Desiderative vi-vit-sāmi), quaeso, older quaes-so for *quaes-so, beside quaero for *quaiso, in-cesso for *in-ced-so (cf. cēdo). Other Latin endings are: (5) -sso, e. g. cápresso, incipissso (Plaut.), pētasso, O. Lat. petissso (Fest. 250. 19 Th.) from cúpio, pēto (or a system *petio, whence petivi, § 47); on these see § 3; (6) -lo and -illo of Diminutive Verbs, e. g. conscribillo Catull.; (7) -co of albico, fōdico, &c. ; the last two are like Derivative Ā-verbs and belong to the first Conjugation, conscriballe, fōdicare, albicare, like mēdicari from medicus. Similarly, (8) -ro of lamb-evo (§ 41) is like -ro of the Derivative tempēvare from tempus.

§ 28. Other examples of Latin Inceptive. Misc-co has added the Causative ending to a lost *misco [cf. misc sane for miscē same on an old Praenestine cista (§ 58)] for *mīk-skō [the shortness of the i is seen in the Romance forms, such as Ital. (Tusc.) mesci, 'give me a drink,' the Latin miscē mi] with the weak grade of the root meik-. But the E-grade is retained in O. Lat. esco for *es-SCO, the Inceptive of the root es-, 'to be,' used for ero (or rather for sum) in the Laws of the XII Tables: si morbus aeuitumus ultium uscit, and aut ei custos nec escit, &c. ; and even by Lucri. i. 619:

ergo rerum inter summam minimamvne quid escit ?

as by Ennius, A. 322 M. :

dum quidēm unus homo Romanus toga superesceit.

Roots extended by -ā, -ē, -ō like ġnō- from ġn-, keep this vowel long, as is their custom in such cases (§ 2); hence (g)nō-SCO (Gk. γ-γνῶσκω, Epir. γνώκω), (g)nāvē-SCO, crī-SCO, viē-SCO, há-SCO ; and similarly Latin Intransitives in -eo (§ 32) and Derivatives in -o (for *śvō), -ēo, -īo (ib.), e. g. vībē-SCO, con-līcē-SCO, vā-SCO, fāvē-SCO, ob-dōrnī-SCO, crī-SCO [ereiscunda on the Lex Rubria, C. I. L. i. 205. (2). 55], desēSCO (with tall form of I on Mon. Anc. v. 28, which also offers
nascer with an apex over the a); though at a later time, when the difference of quantity between vowels had become less marked, we find some uncertainty about the e of quiesco (see Gellius, vii. 15, who decides in favour of quiesco, on the strength of câlesco, nîtesco, stîpèsco and other Inceptives; cf. ch. ii. § 144).

The name ‘Inceptive’ is unsuitable. It is only verbs of the second Conjugation uncompounded with a Preposition, such as câlesco, lîquesco, to which a notion of ‘beginning’ can be attached, and even there the notion conveyed by the suffix is rather that of passing into a state or condition, of ‘becoming’ than of ‘beginning,’ e. g. lîquesco, ‘to pass into a liquid state,’ ‘to become liquid.’ The suffix is closely associated with Intransitive Verbs of the second Conjugation, so closely indeed that these, when compounded with the Prepositions cum, ex, in (Prepositions which convey the idea of ‘becoming’), always form their Present-stem with this suffix in good authors, e. g. erubesco (not erubeo), conrâlesco (not conralaeo), inaridesco (not inardeo), unless the Preposition retains its separate force, e. g. ã-lîceo, ‘to shine out,’ co-haerêo, ‘to be united with,’ which have the force of lîceo ex, haerêo cum. Intransitive Derivatives from stems like dulci-, igni-, gravî-, &c. are formed on this type, and take -esco instead of -isco, dulcesco, ignesco, gravesco, nîtesco, pinguesco, &c.; and -asco of Intransitive Derivatives from A-stems, &c., is in Late Latin often changed to -esco, e. g. gemmasco for gemmasco. The spelling -isco for -esco in Late Latin, e. g. erubesco, may often be a mere interchange of the similarly sounding vowels i and ë (see ch. ii. § 14), but it may also be referred to the Late Latin importation of Verbs of the second Conjugation into the fourth (e. g. floriât, florient in the Itâl), which has left its mark on the Romance languages, e. g. Ital. apparrire (apparisco Pres.) from Lat. apprâire (§ 33 a). The -iscor of âpîscor, nancîscor, may be referred to the old forms âpîo, nancio (whence coepiam, Paul. Fest. 41. 34 Th., nanciam, Prisc. i. 513. 17 H.), as the -isco of O. Lat. pélîsso to a lost *petio (whence petivi, § 47). ‘Inceptives’ from fourth Conjugation Verbs are for the most part ante-classical, e. g. condormîsco (Plaut.), ãdormîsco (Plaut., Ter.), perprûrisco (Plaut. Stich. 761), permentisico (Plaut., Ter.), but obdormîsco, ‘to fall asleep,’ is used by Cicero (Tusc. i. 49. 117). They are mostly Compounds (except scîsco), and the same is true of the ‘Inceptives’ from third Conjugation Verbs in the Republican writers, e. g. vîstîpsco (Plaut., &c.), prôfîscor (cf. fâcessere, ‘to take oneself off,’ and Late Lat. se fàcere, ‘to betake oneself,’ e. g. intra limen sese facit, Apul., concîpîsco (Cic., Sall., &c.), impîlicîsceir, to become affected (by a disease), Plaut. Amph. 729:

ubi primum tibi sensisti, mulier, impliciscier ?

though in the poets and later prose writers we have trèmesco, gêmesco, &c. ‘Inceptives’ from first Conjugation Verbs found in the early writers are ânasco (Naev.), ânasco (Cat.), ãbasco (Plaut., Ter., Lucr.), çollabasco, permânasco, dêsîdasco, and a few others; but this formation was not continued in the classical period, though we find Derivatives in -asco, derived from Noun- and Adj.-stems, e. g. veterasco, vesperasco, gemmasco, in which the suffix -asco seems to be added to change the transitive sense attaching to these Derivative Â-verbs (e. g. clarare, to make clear, to clarify, § 32) into an intransitive.

It thus appears that an intransitive sense attached to the suffix -asco in Latin, and that this was the reason of its close association with the Intransitive Second Conjugation. Its sense of ‘passing into a state or condition’ suited it for acting as the Present Tense-stem of Intransitive Verbs. A
verb with this suffix did not govern an Accusative, unless the simple verb from which it was formed governed an Accusative, e. g. perhorrescere aliguid, Cie., like horeere aliquid (a construction of horeeo, pīceo, &c., not found before Cicero's time). But in the fifth cent. a. d. the termination acquired a causative sense, e. g. innotescere, to make known, inform; mollescere, to make soft, not 'to become soft,' a sense which was properly expressed by the Auxiliary facio, e. g. calē-facio, rubē-facio. Assusesco, inssuseso, mansusesco, and other compounds of suesco had at an earlier period assumed the sense of assus-facio, mansus-facio, and perhaps supplied the type for this new formation, which was widely extended in the Romance languages (cf. § 33 a).

Of individual 'Inceptive' Verbs may be noticed: callesco, in whose Perfect Cato retained the Inceptive suffix, callescrunt 3 Pl. [Nonius 89. 26 M. quotes this form (MSS. callesserunt from Cato's speech on the Punic War: aures nobis callescrunt ad inuiuras]; obolesesco and exolesco from sileo with P. P. P. obsīturus, exōturus; adolesco and coalesco (col-) from the root al- (ol-), 'to grow, nourish' (whence indicēs, subōles, prōtēs), with P. P. P. aduītus, coāturus.

For a list of Latin 'Injectives,' and full details of their history, see A. L. L. i. 465 sqq. Umbro-Ocean examples are Umbr. pepurkurent 'rogaverint,' Osc. comparavaecri 'consulta erit.'

§ 29. Of Latin Causatives, &c. O. Lat. lūceso, 'to cause to shine,' to light or kindle (e. g. Enn. A. 153 M.; prodimum famuli, tum candida lumina lucent; Plaut. Curc. 9 tutē tibi puér es: laūtus luces cēreum; Cos. 118 primum omnium huic lucēbis nouae nuptae facem) may be a Causative form, L-Eur. *louk-ēyō (O. Ind. rōcāyā-mī), and different from lūceso, to shine, which seems to be an intransitive form like sēdeo, with -eo instead of -io, L-Eur. *leuk-yō (Gk. λευσαω); nīceso, L-Eur. *nok-ēyō (O. Ind. nāsāyā-mī) is the Causative of the root nēk- (Lat. nēx), and has in Late and Vulgar Latin the construction which we should expect, viz. with the Accusative case; its use with the Dat. in class. Latin must be due to the analogy of obesse, officere, &c. The rivalry between Transitive ā-stems and these Causative-stems, best seen in Lithuanian, where the Causatives (e. g. vartī-tī Inf.) form their Present-stems with -ā- (e. g. vartō- for I-Eur. *wortā-), appears in Lat. nēcāre beside nīscē; dōmāre may be I-Eur. *dōma- (O. H. G. zamō-, 'to tame'), a byform of I-Eur. *dōmēyō- (Goth. tamja, O. H. G. zemm(1)u). In O. Ind. we have examples of verbs with this suffix which have not the O-grade of root, but the weak grade, e. g. grīh-āya-ti, 'he seized.' Perhaps Latin ci-vo (beside cēo) belongs to this type. But the ending -eo is sometimes added to other Verb-stems which have a Causative sense. Thus in Lat. misc-eco it is added to a stem formed already with the inceptive suffix, so that miscēo for *mīsc-sc-eyo has really two suffixes (cf. O. Ind. dhūnaya-ti, 'he shakes, shatters,' beside dhūnā-ti and dhā-nō-ti, Gk. ἀλαλέσει beside ἀλαλέσει for *aλαλ-ω). And this may be the true explanation of cēo also. Jūdeo for *yā-dh-eyo [from the root yeu- with the formative suffix -dh- (see § 27), cf. O. Ind. yō-dha-ti, 'is set in motion,' Lith. j-u-n-dū, 'I am set in motion' ] is spelt in the S. C. Bach. with -ow-, the diphthong always found in the perfect (C. L. L. i. 196. 1. 27 iouvbeīs, l. 9. l. 18 iouissit; cf. iouissit 547 a, 1166, iouicent 199. 1. 4, iouicent 198. l. 12); this, if not a misspelling (ch. iv. § 37), will exactly correspond with the O. Ind. causative yōdhāyā-mī (I-Eur. *youdhēyō). Terreo, for which we should expect *torreo, has in Umbrian the O-grade of root (Umbr. tersitu, O. Umbr. tusetu, 'terreto').

I i
Other Causatives, or Transitive Verbs with the Causative -so appended, are vígeo (older vígeo?), to rouse to life, e.g. Pomponius, Com. 78 R. animos Venus veget voluptatibus, dōceo, suādeo, vígeo, tandeo, turgaeo, mordeo, spondeo, augeo, &c.

§ 30. Of Latin Desideratives. These were called by the Latin grammarians 'Meditativa.' They were avoided in the higher literature and went out of use in Late Latin. They are not found in the Romance languages. Examples of Desiderative Verbs are ēsūrio, partūrio, emptūrio, cēnūrio (see A. L. L. i. 408). Verbs in -urrio (-ūrio), e.g. ligurrio, scūtario, are a quite distinct class, being apparently Derivatives from Verbal Nouns in -ūris (e.g. sēcuris) or -āra (e.g. figura).

§ 31. Of Latin Iteratives. The distinction of (1) 'Iteratives' in -ítlo, (2) 'Intensives' in -ito, -so is untenable. The suffix in all its forms denotes repeated action; the usual type is that of a Derivative A-Verb from a Perfect Participle Passive, e.g. dūtare, dormitare, though from Verbs of the first Conjugation we have sometimes forms in -ito like dūmito, vicītō, virtō, pointing to P. P. vocitūs like crīpitūs (§ 92). As the to-suffix of the P. P. P. became in time so- (ch. iv. § 155), we have Iteratives in an older form, mero, pullo ('mertare' atque 'pultare' diecubant Quint. i. 4. 14; Plautus puns on pullem Subj. and pallem Acc. of pulēs in Poen. 729), and in the class, form merso, pulso. Iteratives which add the suffix to a Present-stem, e.g. sciscto Plaut., noscto Plaut., ãgīto, are especially frequent in Late Latin, e.g. mergīto Tertull., miscto Script. Grōmat., while to the class of Iteratives with double suffix belong actīto, lectīto, cantīto, dicitīto, hauktīto, jactīto, ventīto, vicītō, cursīto, factīto, Vulg.-Lat. *lūxtīto, *lūxtare, Fr. tätter, 'to taste, try.'

Iteratives are especially used in anticlass. and postclass. Latin. They are avoided by Terence, and not much used by Cicero and Caesar, hardly at all by the Augustan writers; in fact they seem to have been regarded as a part of the uncultured speech. In the Romance languages they have often taken the place of the parent verb, e.g. Fr. jeter (Lat. factare), to throw (Lat. jácere), mériter (Lat. méritare), to deserve (Lat. mére), chanter (Lat. cante), to sing (Lat. canto). (See A. L. L. iv. 197.) Dūbitare is the Iterative of an O. Lat. verb dūbare (Paul. Fest. 47, 18 Th. 'dubat', 'dubitat'); horītare of an O. Lat. *horītor [attested in 3 Sg. horītor by Diomedes (p. 382. 23 K.) for Ennius (A. 465 M.): prandere īūbat horīturque], which seems to be a Deponent of L.-Eur. *gēr-yō (Gk. ηύφω), a byform of *gēr-yō (O. Ind. hār-yā-mi, 'I delight in'); *herin, the Umbro-Oscan word corresponding to Lat. vēlo, e.g. Umbr. heris, 'vis,' Osc. heriād, 'velit,' whence Herentas, (the Oscan name of Venus) from the root *gēr-; *gūstare is apparently an L.-Eur. Iterative of this type (O. H. G. kostōn) from *gūs-to, P. P. P. of ēgus-, 'to taste' (Gk. γεύσεως, Goth. kiusan, to approve,' Engl. choose: cf. Germ. Kur-fürst); īāo, *are (Gk. ἴητρέω) from *ithus P. P. P. of eo, for *ītāyo (Umbr. etiuans, 'intent'); *pute-, *are, to prune, to think, lit. 'to sift or cleanse often' (in Romance 'to prune,' e.g. Ital. potare), from a P. P. P. stem *pūto-, 'cleansed' (Lat. pūtus, clean, in the phrase pūrūs pūtus, e.g. Plaut. Pseud. 1200), from the root of Lat. pūt-rus, for *pūtāyo (cf. O. Sl. pytāja, 'I investigate'), with ū; dūmito from domitus; crīpitō from crēpitus; habilo for habitūs, which monopolized in class. Lat. the sense of 'to dwell,' 'inhabit' (cf. archaic Engl. 'to keep,' as in the Merchant of Venice, iii. 3: it is the most impenetrable ear That ever kept with man), a sense which it shared

§ 32. Of Latin Derivative verbs with YO-suffix. The onomatopoeic verbs tinnitus (also tinnio and tinnitus), gingiriō, to cackle, of geese (whence gingrina, the name of a small size of fīf: genus quoddam tibiariam exiguarum, Paul. Fest. 67. 23 Th.; cf. Gl. Philox.) have a formation analogous to the Sanscrit Intensives (e. g. nan-nam-ya-tē from the root nam-, 'to bend') and to Greek πυμφαίνω for *πυν-φαν-υω, μαρμαίρω for *μαρ-μαρ-ω, &c., that is to say with the suffix -yō- appended to the fully reduplicated root.

The suffix -yō-, as was remarked before (§ 10), is often added to nasalized Present-stems, especially in Greek, e. g. κλάω for *κλι-ν-ω from the root klei-, and so we have: λίνω, a Late Lat. derivative from līno, the Present tense of the root lei-; pūsio (Gk. πτύσσω for *-αν-ω) beside pūsio; vīncio from *viz-ν-ω, the nasalized Present of the root yvēk- (O. Ind. vi-yu-k-ti, 'he encompasses'); sancio beside sēcēr. These derivatives naturally retain the nasal throughout the verb, e. g. P. P. P. pīnītus (but from pīsio, pīstus), santūs (in Vulg. Lat. sanctus, ch. ii. § 70).

Examples of Verbs in -yō- from Noun Ā-stems are: scintīlō, -are from scintīlla; lācīrīnā, -are from lācīrīna; mūla, -are (Osc. multāven Inf.) from multa; insidūrō; -ari, insidiae; mācīlō, -are from mācula; prāedūrō, -ari from prāeda; mōnūrī from mora [in O. Lat. always transitive, 'to cause delay,' 'to detain,' whence nihil moror (hane rem), I do not care for, lit. 'I do not (care to) detain']. Lat. peōnīa, pūnīa, from poena, may exhibit an alternative method of forming derivative verbs from the Noun-ā-stems, viz. with the mere suffix -yō-, the final vowel of the Noun-stem being suppressed, as in derivative Adjectives like Gk. τιμ-ιος from τιμή; or may follow the analogy of derivatives from I-stems, or derivatives from Consonant-stems.

Of Transitive Verbs from O-stems: amplant, 'pro amplificant,' Paeuv. Trag. 339 R. (ap. Non. 506. 30 M.); nōtō, -are from nōrus; sāno, -are from sanus; narrō, -are from guānus (? ch. ii. § 132); armō, -are from armā Pl.; spūtior, -ari from spūtium; numerō, -are from numerus; lūco, -are from locus; dōno, -are from donum; cūntūlo, -are from cantūlum; ānnō, -are from ānnuān. This use of the -AYO- suffix for Derivative Verbs from O-stem Nouns and Adjectives is common in all I.-Eur. languages, e. g. Goth. frijō, 'I love' (of which Engl. 'friend' is a Pres. Part.), O. Sl. prija-ja, O. Ind. priyā-yā-tē 3 Sg., all from an I.-Eur. O-stem, *priyō- (O.-Ind. priyā-, 'dear'), O. Ir. caraíd, 'he loves,' from I.-Eur. karō-, 'dear' (Lat. cārōs). On the use of -āb- as a Participle Adjective suffix, meaning 'provided with,' 'clothed in,' &c., e. g. armātus, dentātus, pūlātus, from pūlum, cardūtus in Ennius' egrec ordiatur homō (cf. re-cordāri), see ch. v. § 28.

It is probably seen in Gaulish γαςατα [gaesati, 'Gaulish mercenaries,' C. G. L. v. 71. 23 (?)], from Gaulo-Latin gassum, a spear.

The natural formation from the O-stems is sometimes in -ēyō-, e. g. Gk. φίλεω, to love, for *φιλε-υω, from φίλος, dear (stem φίλω- or φιλε- , ch. v. § 2), dūnayōtēō, to be unable, from dūnayōtēs, sometimes in -yō- merely, e. g. Gk. μελίσσω for *μελιη-υω from μεληχης, Without the latter Lat. nīo from nīus, bland-ior from blandūs may be compared, as in Noun derivative YO-stems we have somn-iam from somnus, Octārius from Octārum, &c. (ch. v. § 4); with the former, intransitive Verbs from second Decension Adjectives, like claudō from claudus, albeō from albus, clāvēō from clāres, flāvēō from flāres [as in Adjective derivative YO-stems like aures from aurum (ib.)], unless these follow the
analogy of Intransitives like sēde for L.-Eur. *sed-yō (see above, § 15), in which case their ending will be not -ēyō but -ēyō. (The corresponding verbs in Balto-Slavic have -ēyō, e.g. Lith. kēt-ju, 'I grow hard,' from kētas, 'hard'). The same distinction between transitive -o, -āre and intransitive -eo, -āre is seen in primary verbs like lūquare and līquire. (On the pronomens of Intransitive Verbs to take -eo, e.g. fēr- eo, fulg-eo, O. Lat. fērvo, fid-go, see § 19.)

We have also Participle Adjectives in -ātus, e.g. aegrotātus from aeger (stem aegro-), like Gk. μασθω-τά from μασθω, Lith. rasė-tas from ῥάςας, 'a horn,' with corresponding Verb-stems in Greek and Lithuanian, e.g. Gk. μασθω, Lith. jūkū-ju, but no *aegro- or *aegrā, -o, -āmus in Latin. Derivatives from I-stems have -iū-, e.g. O. Ind. kavīyā-tē, 'he acts like a seer,' from kavi-, 'a seer,' janīyā-ti, 'he desires a wife,' from jānī-, 'a wife'; Gk. μνείουα (ι') from μνεία, μνείω (ι'), from μνεύω, κονοίω (ι') from κόνος; Latin examples are: finio from finis, lenio from lenis; they show -i in the Perfect Participle Pass., &c., e.g. Gk. ἀπιπή- τος, Lat. finē-tus, lenī-tus, multī-tus, insignī-tus, vestī-tus, miṃnī-tus, stāltī-tus, ērīdī-tus; from srcs, O. Lat. sortīs, comes sortīor; from pars, stem partīr-, comes partīrior; from pēlis (O. Ind. pāti-, 'lord,' Gk. πόσι) comes pōtior, 'to become master of,' with an Active patō (e. g. Plaut. Rud. 911 piscātu nouō me uberi compoitūit), which was used in Oscan as the equivalent of the Latin possess (Osc. puti- iād 'possit,' puti- ians 'possint'); (§ 97). U-stem derivatives have -āyo-, e.g. O. Ind. šatrā-yā-ti, 'acts like an enemy,' from šatrā-, 'an enemy,' Gk. ὀκρυω (β) from ὀκρυ (from U-stems, e.g. ὀξέω in the Dramatists), Lat. stātūs from status, inētu (from mehtus, with -ē) in the Perf. Part. Pass., e.g. Gk. ἀ-δάκρυ-τος, Lat. statā-tus, argā-tus (from the stem argu- of O. Ind. ärju-na-, 'white,' Gk. ἀργυρος), accā-tus (cf. aces, a needle). 1 From the analogy of a number of verbs of similar meaning, which happened to be formed with one or other of these types of YO-suffix, a definite meaning came to attach itself in the various languages to certain suffixes. Thus in Sanscrit the ending -āyō- came to acquire a desiderative sense and was used to convey this notion, not merely in derivatives from I-stems, e.g. janīyā-ti, 'he desires a wife,' from jānī-, 'a wife,' but in derivatives from other stems too, e.g. putrīyā-ti, 'he desires a son,' from putrī-, 'a son' (an O-stem). In Latin, as we have seen, the desiderative ending is -āturā, e.g. partūrā, but it is possible that the ending -īō conveys this sense in cūtīīio from the O-stem cūtātus, ēpīō from epinus.

A fact of more certainty is that Latin -ā for *-ayō was used to give a transitive sense, e.g. clārō, -ārē, to make clear, from the O-stem clarus, nīdo, -āre from normas (and so in other languages, § 29, e.g. O. H. G. niuōn, though in Greek the ending -ow ousted -aw from this usage, e.g. νεω, to make new, from νέος, ἄγω, to make healthy, from ἄγης), and Latin -eo, to give an intransitive sense, e.g. clārō, -āre, to be clear, from the same stem, clāro-, while -áo possibly had attached to it the notion of a state of body or mind, e.g. forēcīo, -īre, to be

---

1 These Derivatives in -uyō- must be distinguished from Presents ending in -nuo, like minuo (O. Ind. miṃnō-mi, from I-Eur. *mi-neu-mi, § 10), as well as from a Present like pūvo (O. Lat. pūvo, from I-Eur. *plewō, § 6), and from fluo, fruor, &c., whose root has a Gutural (cf. flāxi, fructus, § 39. 3). Sūo represents an I-Eur. *syū-yō (Goth. siuja, Lett. schujo, Gk. κασσω). 2 On First Conjugation Deponents with intransitive sense, e.g. aemīlāri, fluccuari (and fluccuare), see §§ 62, 64.
haughty (Cato, &c.), saevio, -ire, to be fierce, insānio, -ire, to be insane, dentio, -ire, to be teething, as -ow, -aw were used in bodily ailments in Greek, e.g. ὅθαλμου, ὀδοντῶν, or desideratively, e.g. τομᾶω.

The -YÖ- suffix was the L-Eur, suffix by which verbs were formed from Nouns and Adjectives, e.g. O. Ind. apas-ýá-ti from ἄπας-, ἄπας- (Lat. opus), Gk. ὄρομαίρω for *θορυμ-ya from θορύμα (Lat. nomen). But in Latin, denominative -yō has been to a great extent supplanted by -ā-yō (see below). Thus the Latin equivalents of the Sanscrit and Greek verbs, just quoted, are ēpérami and nōmīnare. This process of extending the ĀYO-suffix at the expense of the YÖ-suffix went on as late as the literary period. Many O. Lat. verbs of the fourth Conj. are in class. Lat. verbs of the first Conj.; e.g. O. Lat. fulgorio (fulgur-io), from fulgur, used by Naevius (Trag. 15 R.):

suo sōnitu claro fūlgiōriuít Iūppiért.

is in class Lat. fulgiōra, -āre; imptērīvī is the old form of imptērāre, consecrated to religious usage, like parvīcere the old form of prōjīcere (ch. ix. § 44); artīvē, Cato, &c. is in class. Lat. artāre; cf. dolītus, Varro, Men. 7 B. for dolītus; atrītor, Compar. of atrībus, Plaut. Ponz. 1290 (if this is the right reading); gnarīvīsse quoted (apparently from Livius Andronicus) by Paul. Fest. 68. 5 Th., for narrasse (cf. Gl. Philox. gnāritur: γνωρίζεται; C. G. L. v. 72. 9 gnāritur: cognitum sive compertum est).

The old formation remains in custādio from custus; dentio, to grow teeth (used by Plautus for ‘to suffer through lack of food’ in Mil. 34, where the parasite apologizes to the audience for his complaisance in listening to the soldier’s bragging: àūribus Perāudienda sīnt, ne dentes dentiānt), though dentātus, and not dentitūs, is the Participle Adjective. In dentio we have the same -YO- or -IYO-suffix as in the Verbs indicating disease, state of body, &c. (see below), like insānio from insanus.

When a Verb is compounded with anything but a Preposition the Compound assumes the form of an Ā-Derivative, e.g. acūdīfēcare from acēdes and facio, sacrificāre from sacrificium and facio (cf. sacrificus), as in Greek we have -ow of oikōdojwós, &c. Mandāre seems to be a similar formation, as if a Derivative Verb from *manā-ōus, ‘giving into the hand’; and the Derivative Verbs in -ago, -are, e.g. nāvīgo, -are, pārī-go, -are, jārī-go, -are (on O. Lat. purīgo, jūrīgo, see ch. iii. § 13) point to *navigus, &c. from nāvīs and ago. Mōrīgērāri, to humour, devote oneself to (also nōrem gerere), comes from the Adj. mōrigerō (Plaut. Amph. 1904 meo me aequo: mōrīgerum patri esse); InBackgroundari from a stem *opportulo-,-c. (cf. ch. v. § 80, p. 363). (On the predominance of the Ā-type of Verb in Latin, see § 33 a.)

Examples of these endings are: (1) -o, -āre: nōmīno, -are from nōmen; cūlō, -are from color; īnōro, -are from omar; scēlō, -are from scēlus; exāmīno, -are from examen; privō, -are from privus; ignōro, -are to make unrecognizable, Plaut. Men. 468: pūo, -are from pūs; prōbo, -are from probus; sācro, -are from sacer; grāve, -are, to make heavy, from gravis; cūro, -are from cūr (not i, Rev. Philologie, xv. 64); levo, -are, to make light, or to lift, from levis; pāvo, -are, to make equal, from par, Plaut. Curr. 506:

eodem hérce lus pono ét paro; parissumī estis hibus.

Ampliāre, to adjourn a case, is a rough-and-ready Derivative from amplius, the judge’s phrase in giving notice of adjournment; similarly compōrendināre, to remand for two days, from (com) perendinās (dies), Vulg. Lat. *hūcāre, to call
hither (Fr. hucher), from huc; some explain négere as a Derivative of this sort from nec (cf. Germ. verneinen from nein), or rather from its byform neg- (ch. x. § 18), the byform being chosen to avoid confusion with nècare, to kill.

Whether the a so often seen in Verbs compounded with a Preposition, e.g. profi gare (from fligó), occi pare (from cópio), aspernæri (from sperno) is due to the transitive sense of the Compound, or to derivation from lost Adjective-stems *profi gare, *occi pare, *aspernæri, is not clear. (On ampio see K. Z. xxxiii. 55.)

(2) -io, -ià : raucio, to be hoarse, from raucus; singultio from singultus (U-stem), blandior from blandus, largior from largus, praes-sagio from ságus (an Adj. especially found in the Fem. saga, a go-between, e. g. Lucil. vii. 6 M. saga et bona conciliatrix).

(3) -eo, -ià : ardeo from àridus [O. Lat. ardeus, e. g. C. I. L. i. 577. (2). 21; see ch. iii. § 13], which is the Adjective corresponding to àdeo, as cálidus to caléo, nitidus to nitæo, &c. (ch. v. § 74); audéo, from àridus, the Adj. corresponding to àdeo, had originally the sense of 'to be eager,' 'to have a mind to,' e. g. Plaut. Mil. 232 auden participare me quad commentu's, whence the colloquial sàdes (Terence, &c.), 'if you please,' for si audes (Plaut., e. g. Trin. 244 dá mihi hoc, mel meum, si me amas, si àduces) (ch. iv. § 67). These two classes of verbs in -eo must be kept distinct, the Derivatives from O-stem Adjectives like flàdeo, ardeo, audéo, and the Intransitives with Nouns in -ar and Adjectives in -idus, e. g. caléo, (ad color, calidus), arco (àridus), areo (àridus), nitæo (nitor, nitidus) (see ch. v. §§ 67, 74).

§ 33. Of other Verb-suffixes:—(1) -dh: on jùbeo with jùb-, for *dyu-dh-, lit. 'to set in motion,' 'rouse to action,' see § 29.

(2) -d: tændo seems to be Causative of a lost *tendo (Gk. τενδω, to gnaw), for *tem-do from the root tem-, 'to cut' (Gk. τενω, pecco for *cel-do (cf. chál-oes, Gk. κλαδ-ίας σίσας, Hesych.) from a root kel- (cf. Gk. ἀκαλαλ-έ-εις); trúdo (Goth. us-þrutu, 'I trouble').

Since -dh- would become d in Latin (ch. iv. § 114), it is impossible to determine whether the suffix -dh- or -d- appears in cæ-do (cf. Lith. kàut-ju), fæn-do (and fændeo) 1 for *fæm-do (cf. fremo), ten-do from the root ten-, 'to stretch' (cf. Gk. τενω for τενω, τενεω, τενενω; cf. Gk. βίνω for *βινω). On vando, mandò (third Conj.), vendo, see §§ 14, 95, and on mando ('first Conj.') § 32, above.

(3) -t: mé-ta (cf. Med. Ir. methel, 'a reaper'); so some explained the name Metellus, Lüwe, Prodr. s. v.) cannot be dissociated from Gk. αὔω; nor fle-ta from fætæ. But this formation is not so common in Latin as in Greek, though all of the numerous Gk. Verbs in -ται, e. g. τοῦτω, χαλεπτω may be formations with the YO-suffix, for -py- seems to have become -πτ- in Greek, *τυπ-ω, *χαλεπ-ω, &c. (ch. iv. § 65). The E-grade of root seems to be used with the T- as with the D-suffix, so that plècto (from root plék-), Gk. πλέκω is the correct form, O. Lat. *plæcto being due to false Analogy (cf. pondus with o by Analogy of pondo-, ch. v. § 72, and see above, § 7).

(4) -s: præ-r-s shows the ending -io of verbs indicating bodily ailments, &c. (§ 32) attached to a lost *prærdo for *preu-so (O. H. G. friusu, Engl. I freeze) from

---

1 The two forms frendeo and frenndo have been explained by a supposed original declension like fren-dues (I.-Eur. *-dhês) α σγ, fren-dités (I.-Eur. *-dhâtes) 2 Pl.
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the root *proû*; with Gk. αὐτῆς, a development of *aûγω (cf. Lat. aug-ēo, a Causative formation,§ 29) with the suffix -ss- (cf. L. -Eur. *auges-, *augos-, a neuter noun, O. Ind. जस, 'strength'; cf. Lat. augus-tus), we may compare Lat. aux-ilium, and the Umbrian formula in invocations of deities over *ose, if this means 'his (sc. donis) macte,' *ose being Voc. of a stem *auke-o- with the sense of Lat. auctus.

If *arcesso* is connected with accēdo as incesso with incēdo, the suffix must in this Verb have Causative force (cf. Lib. Gloss. 'acesserat,' advenire compulerat; Porphyr. ad Hor. Epp. i. 17. 50 corvus cum accedit ad ebum, strepitu vocis alias aves arcessit), but the use of r for d before e is peculiar (ch. iv. § 112. *Acceso* is a metathesis of *arcesso* and belongs to colloquial Latin (e. g. Terence, Petronius), as arcesso to legal phraseology (see A. L. L. viii. 279). *Quaeso*, in older spelling quaessu (ch. ii. § 129), from *quaiss-o-s-a, is in the earlier writers used along with quaero (older quairo, C. I. L. i. 34, from *quaiss-o-), e. g. Plaut. *Bacch. 178*:

mirumst me, ut redeam, te opere tanto quaéscere,
Enn. *Ann. 143 M.* (a description of Ostia):

Ostia munitast. idem loca naibus celsis
manda facit nautisque mari quaesentibus uitam,

and Trag. 97 R. liberum quaescendum causa 1; in classical Latin it is found in 1 Sg. *quaeso, 1 Pl. quaesumus*. (On the spelling quaesimus in MSS. of Cic., see Neue, ii. p. 437. The spelling with *u* seems to be an affectation due to the archaic character of the word.)

(5 -ss-). These bear the same relation to the stems just mentioned as Lat. *amasso, &c. to dicco, capso*. They are called 'Desiderativa' by Priscian (i. 431. 18 H.), who explains capesso as 'desidero capere' (i. 535. 10 H.). In MSS. they are often confused with 'Inceptive' forms, e. g. laeessentem for *laeessentem, capessit for capessit* (for a number of examples, see A. L. L. i. 515).

(6) Verbs in -illo. These are hardly to be separated from Ā-Derivatives from Diminutive Nouns in -illa-, Adjectives in -illo-, &c., such as scintillare from scintilla, stillare from stilla (cf. stria), tranquillo from tranquil·lus. They are evidently Diminutive Verbs derived in the same style from Verbs instead of Nouns. Examples are: *conscribillare from conscribo, e. g. Catull. xxv. 11*:

ne lāneum latúsculum manúsque mollicellas
inústa turpítēr tibī flagella conscribíllent;
occíllare from occo, Plaut. *Amph. 183*; sorbillo from sorbeo; obstringillare from obstringo, e. g. Enn. *Sat. ii. 1 M.:

... restitánt, occurrunt, óbstringillant, óbagitant.

(See A. L. L. iv. 68. 223.)

We have -lo in vápílo, vertíl-bundus, ventílo, ustílo, &c.

(7) -co in albíco, fólico, velíco seems to have the same Diminutive force as the preceding suffix. As the Adj. suffix -co is often combined with -lo in Diminu-

1 quaescere, quaesentibus, quaesendum, cannot be the O. Lat. forms of quaerere, quaerentibus, quaerendarum, as (ch. iv. § 148).

Valesius of Valerius, &c., for inter-
vocalic s had become r long before the time of Plautus and Ennius.

(33)
tives, e. g. *puer-ca-lus* (ch. v. § 31), so we have in Verbs *pandiculans*, stretching oneself (in yawning) Plant. *Men.* 834 (cf. *gesticulati* from *gesticulus*, *Dim. of gestus*).

(8) *-o*. Considero can hardly come from *sidus*, a star, but must with *desidero* be an extension of a Verb-stem -sid-. Other examples of this formation are *maêu*, *recipéro*, *lĕre*.

(9) Other formations. Verbs in *-ypo*, *-are*, e. g. O. Lat. *gnarigavit*, used by *Liv. Andr. for narravit* (Paul. Fest. 68. 5 Th.), with an Auxiliary *ago* giving a Causative force, have been already mentioned (§ 27), and verbs in *-ico*, *-are* (§ 32), e. g. *amplifico*, *-are*, in which an Auxiliary *facio* plays the same part. *Facio* does not enter into so close composition with the Verb in *bēnē facio*, *āre facio* (Laeu. vi. 962 sol excoquit et facit are), *cāle facio* later *cāle facio* with the same shortening of a final long vowel as in *havē* (ch. iii. § 42), *consuē facio* (Varro, *R. R.* ii. 9. 13 consue quoque faciunt) (on this *-e* see § 34), *compendi facio*, to cut short (Plant, *orationis operam compendia.fice*) ; and we have an Accusative case-form as the first element of *vēnum-do* (*vendo*), *venum eo* (*veneo*), *pessum-do*, *pessum eo* (on *critio*, see § 27; on *mando*, *-are*, § 32; on *pando*, *pando*, *-are*, § 14). Other Latin Verb-suffixes are *ut(tio) of balditio*, to stammer, *frigittio*, to chirp; *avrio* (-*ariō* of *tigurio*, *sæturio* (on which see above, § 30); *-einar, -ari* of *patrōnin*, *leōnin* (cf. *patercium*, *lénocium*), *vātitōnin*, *alēcinor*, *tubārcinor*, &c.; *-issō, -āre*, which is borrowed from Gk. *-τω, e. g. attēceso* (*ἀτετικ(.τω)*, *graeccisco*, *patriasso* (cf. § 33 a).

§ 33 a. The Conjugations in Romance. In the Romance languages the Latin Conjugations are much better preserved than the Latin Declensions (ch. vi. § 1). The first Conjugation is the prevailing type. Its encroachment on the others even in the Latin period is shown by Vulg. Lat. forms like *fulāre* (Fr. fier, Span. fiar), a Derivative from *fulus*, which supplanted class. *fīlēre*, as the Derivative *peclīnare* supplanted *pectere* (Caper 93. 1 K. pecto caput non ‘pectino,’ et pexum non ‘pectinatum’), as well as from the fact that Greek loanverbs appear naturally to drift into it, *ὄψωνείν* becoming *obsōnare*, *ποπίνειν* *propīnare*, &c., just as loanwords in French take -er (Lat. *-āre*), e. g. *trinquer*, and in German, -ieren, e. g. *marschieren*, *amusieren*. The freaks of false Analogy appear in Vulg. Lat. *fugīre*, *cupīre*, &c. (Ital. *fuggire*, Fr. *fuir*, Span. *huir*; Sard. *kubire*, Prov. *cobir*), with transference to the fourth Conjugation by the analogy of their 1 Sing. Pres. Ind., *fungio*, *cupio*; in Vulg. Lat. *florīre*, *complīre* (Ital. *fiorire*, Fr. *fleurir*; Ital. *compire*; cf. Fr. *emplir*), with a similar transference, due to the identity in Vulg. Lat. of *-eo* and *-io* (both pronounced *-yo*, ch. ii. § 149); and the confusion

---

1 The same tendency appears at an early period. *Cēare*, a Derivative from *cēla*, concealment, has sup- planted *cēlo* (cf. *occēlo*), and the same explanation should perhaps be given of *sōnare* (Perf. *sonui*), &c. (See § 32.)
of second and third Conjugation Verbs, which we have already remarked in the Latin of Plautus in the case of *ferveo, sordeo, &c.* (§ 19), is intensified in Romance through the approximation of the *-e* and *-è*-sounds (ch. ii. § 141), so that we have Vulg. Lat. forms like *respondēre* (Ital. rispondere, Fr. répondre), *tondēre* (Ital. tondere, Fr. tondre), and (by Analogy of the Perfect tense *sapuī* *sapēre* (Ital. sapere, Fr. savoir); so Anal. of *potui, posse* became Vulg. Lat. *potere* (Ital. potere, Span. poder), and by Anal. of *volui, velle* became Vulg. Lat. *vole-re* (Ital. volere, Fr. vouloir). The Perfects *struxi, truxi, prostrāvi, contrivi* have similarly produced the Vulg. Latin forms *tragere* (Ital. trarre, Fr. traire), *strugere* (Ital. struggere, Fr. dé-truire), *prostrare* (Span., Port. prostrar), *contrare* (Span., Port. curtir). Verbs of the fourth Conjugation often show the *'Inceptive'* suffix in their Present, e.g. Ital. unisco Pres. Ind., unire Inf., on which see § 28. (For a fuller account of the Romance Conjugations, consult Meyer-Lübke, *Rom. Gram.* ii. pp. 137 sqq.).

Of Derivative Verb endings may be noticed (1) *-icare*, a frequent formation in Vulg. Lat., e.g. *nuvicare*, to snow (Ital. nevicare, Fr. neiger), (2) *-idiare* (Gk. *-iēv*), which appears in Ital. as *-eggiare*, in Fr. as *oyer*, in Span. as *-ear*, e.g. Ital. biancheggiare, O. Fr. blanchoyer, Span. blanquear, (3) *-antare, -entare* (cf. Lat. præsentare), used for Factitive Verbs, e.g. *expaventare*, to terrify (Ital. spaventare, Fr. épouvanter, Span. espantar) (ib. ii. pp. 604 sqq.).

§ 34. B. Imperfect. In Slavonic the Imperfect is formed by appending a Preterite of the Substantive Verb (1 Sg. *jachū* from original *čes-o-m, *I was*) to a case form (usually called an Instrumental) of a Verbal Noun. Thus of the verb *'to see,'* of which the Inf. is *vidē-ti* (Lat. *vidē-re*), the Imperfect (1 Sg.) is *vidē-achū*, lit. *'I was a-seeing';* of the verb *'to carry,'* Inf. *nes-ti* (from the I.-Eur. root nek- of Gk. ἐνεκέω, &c.), the Imperfect (1 Sg.) is *nesē-achū*; of glagola-ti, *'to speak,'* the Impf. (1 Sg.) is *glagola-achū*. The same method of forming an Imperfect was followed in Latin, only the Auxiliary verb chosen was not I.-Eur. es-. Lat. *vidē-bam, ferē-bam, amā-bam*, are formations consisting of a Verbal Noun-stem (probably in
some case form such as the Instrumental) followed by the Preterite of an Auxiliary verb. The b of the Latin Imperfect is in Umbro-Oscan f (Osc. in-fans, 'they were'), and must represent an I.-Eur. bh or dh (e.g. Lat. ฤि, Umbr. puf, Osc. puf, O. Sl. kũde, O. Ind. kũha from an I.-Eur. DH-suffix) (ch. iv. § 114). It can hardly be separated from the b of the Latin Future vidē-bo, ama-bo, &c. (see § 36), which is similarly in the Italic languages f, e.g. Fal. kare-to 'carebo,' but whose equivalent in O. Ir., b, e.g. no charub, 'amabo' [quasi *nu (nunc) carabo] (cf. Lat. cûrus), shows it to represent I.-Eur. bh, not dh (which would be d in O.-Ir.). The Auxiliary verb used must then have been the I.-Eur. root bh eu-, whence Lat. fui, O. Lat. Subj. fuum, &c.; and Lat. -bam, -bós, -bat, 3 Pl. -bant (Osc. -fans) may represent an I.-Eur. Preterite *bhvám, -ás, &c. (on the loss of postconsonantal w, see ch. iv. § 71), seen in O. Ir. ba (from *bám), and corresponding to the Lat. Preterite of the verb es-, erau (from *esám). The Verbal Noun-stem employed recurs in such formations as the Fut. vidē-bo, arcē-bo, sci-bo, as well as in Verbs compounded with fācio, e.g. arcē-fācio (§ 33. 9), and in Adverbs compounded with licet, e.g. vidē-licet, sci-licet, i-licet (ch. ix. § 7). It appears in the Acc. case in O. Ind. Perfects like vidā-cakāra, compounded of vidām, the Acc. Sg. of a Verbal Noun (cf. Lat. vidē-) and cakāra, the Perfect of kr-, 'to make' (I.-Eur. ker-, Gk. κρ-αίνω, Lat. creo). Lat. vidē-, ama-, fũí- might be regarded as the bare stem of the Verb without any Case-suffix, but this explanation does not suit with legē-bam, for the Verb-stem would here be legē- (legō-), and the only way of avoiding this difficulty ¹ would be to suppose that Verbs of the third Conjugation followed the analogy of Verbs of the second Conjugation, *legets-bam becoming legē-bam after the fashion of vidē-bam, as in the third Declension of Nouns Consonant-stems followed the analogy of I-stems in their Nom. Pl., *milit-ēs becoming milit-ēs like part-ēs (originally -ěyēs, ch. vi. § 40). A similar change of their Imperfect formation was made by Verbs of the fourth Conjugation in the second century B. C., for

¹ Some prefer to regard the Latin Imperfect as formed of a Verbal Noun in -ēs with an Auxiliary. In that case legēbam will represent *legēs-bam (cf. ch. iv. § 151).
while these have -ibam (or -iebam) in Plautus and the earlier writers, e.g. audī-bam (and audīe-bam), they follow exclusively in classical Latin the analogy of Verbs like facio in their Imperfect audīe-bam like faciē-bam, as in their Future audiam (O. Lat. audībo and audīam) like faciam. The Romance languages point to a Vulgar Latin Imperfect of the second and third Conjugations in -ēam, of the fourth in -iam (e.g. Sard. timia, finia, Span. vendia, Port. dormia, O. Fr. diseie ‘disais,’ senteie ‘sentais ’), while the first Conj. Impft. had -ībam (e.g. Sard. istava from Lat. stābam), but whether this may be taken as evidence that byforms *timē-am, *fini-am, &c. formed like er-am, *bhw-am, existed in Latin from the earliest times is doubtful (see Meyer-Lübke, Rom. Gram. ii. p. 282; and cp. below, § 37).

The Imperfect Subjunctive is formed with an S-suffix which is usually referred to the Substantive Verb es-, appended as an auxiliary, though some explain it as a Noun-stem suffix, comparing ãger-em (on Subjunctive e, see § 55) to agere for *āges-i, Loc. Sg. of a Neuter S-stem *āgos, *āges-os Gen., ferr-em for *ferr-ēm to ferre for *ferrē, āmarem, mērērem, audirem to amare, merere, audire (see § 83).

§ 35. Fourth Conj. Impft. in -ibam. These forms are very common indeed in the Dramatists, e.g. Plaut. Aud. 178:

praesagibat mi animus frustra me ire, quom exibam domo.

and the Republican poets, e.g. Lucret. v. 934:

nec seibat ferro molirier arva,

and are often used by the Augustan poets and their followers, where the ordinary form would not come into a dactylic line, e.g. lenibat in Virg. A. vi. 468:

lenibat dictis animum lacrimasque ciebat.

From eo, the classical Imperfect remained ibam, pēr-ibam, vēn-ibam, and from queu, quiābam, nē-quiābam.

Aībam, a dissyllable, is the usual form in Plautus, but we have also aiebam, e.g. Ruf. 108a quam esse aiebas (MSS. aiebas).

The question whether -ibam or -iebam was the correct ending for these fourth Conjugation Imperfects was a matter of discussion among Roman grammarians. We hear of a certain Augustius who wrote a treatise, dedicated to Asinius Pollio, to show that veniebam and similar forms were preferable to venibam, &c.

§ 36. C. Future. (1) In -bō. (I.-Eur. *bhwō). This formation is shared by the Celtic languages [e.g. O. Ir. no charub
'amabo,' quasi *nu (nune) carabo' (cf. Lat. *cārus)], and appears in Faliscan, karefo 'carebo,' pipafo 'bibam' in the inscription on a drinking bowl: foied vino pipafo, kra karefo 'hodie vinum bibam, eras carebo' (Not. Scav. 1887, p. 262). In class. Lat, it is confined to the first and second Conjugations, āmābo, vīdē-bo, but in the early Dramatists the fourth Conjugation Verbs show -ībo as well as -iam in the Future, and in the plebeian Latin of Novius' Atellanae, or rustic farces, we find vivebo, for vivam, dicebo for dicam (as in the Atellanae of Pomponius paribis for pāries, Com. 20 R.). These last forms are doubtless due to the influence of the Imperfect in -bam (see the preceding section), a formation shared by the third Conjugation, as well as the first, second, and fourth; vivēbam, dicebām called into existence vivebo, dicebō, on the analogy of vīdēbam, càrēbam, which had Future forms vidēbo, càrēbo. This -bō of the Future Tense, Falisc. -fo, O. Ir. -b(ō) is clearly some part of the Verb bheu- (Lat. fui, &c.), of which we have seen -bam of the Imperfect Tense to be a Preterite. The Future of Latin sum, ero, is a Subjunctive form, *es-ō, with Future meaning; a meaning which seems to have attached itself to the I.-Eur. Subjunctive (see § 55).  

(2) In -am. For verbs of the third and fourth Conjugations in Latin the 1 Sg. of the Ā-Subjunctive (see § 55) is used for the 1 Sg. Future, though, as we have seen, in the case of Verb-stems of the fourth Conjugation, this Subjunctive did not succeed in entirely ousting the formation in -bo till the classical period, e.g. lig-am 1 Sg. Fut. and 1 Sg. Subj., audi-am 1 Sg. Fut. and 1 Sg. Subj. (but in the older literature, also audi-bo). For the other Persons of the Future the Ē-Subjunctive forms (see § 55) are used, legēs, leget, legēmus, &c., audīēs, audīet, audīēmus, &c. The reason of this distinction between the 1 Sg. and the other Persons of the Future Tense is not clear. It may be that the 1 Sg. Subj. had already for a long time played the part of the 1 Sg. Fut. of these verbs, as it played the part of the 1 Sg. Imperative at all periods of Latin, and still retained its place when the new Future forms, which supplanted an older dixō, &c. (see below), were introduced. The spellings affected by Cato dicae, faciae for dicam, faciam seem to have had nothing to do with this variation of ā and ē.
in the Future of these verbs, but to be merely an attempt to express by a written symbol the weak sound of final \( m \) in Latin (see ch. ii. § 61).\(^1\)

(3) In -\( \text{so} \). This formation belongs to O. Lat., e.g. \( \text{dixo}, \text{faxo} \). It is discussed in §§ 3 and 5. The similarity in use between \( \text{dixo}, \text{faxo}, \text{capso} \) on the one hand, and \( \text{amasso}, \&c. \) on the other, suggests that \( \text{dixo} \) stands for \( *\text{die-so}, \text{faxo} \) for \( *\text{fac-so}, \text{capso} \) for \( *\text{cap-so} \). But the Umbro-Ocean Future, e.g. Ose. \( \text{deivast} \) 'jurabit,' \( \text{censazet} \) 'censebunt,' Umbr. \( \text{fust} \) 'erit,' \( \text{furent} \) 'erunt' had only one s. In Romance the Future has been lost (but O. Fr. ier from \( \text{ero} \)), its place being supplied by periphrastic formations with \( \text{habeo} \) (the usual type), \( \text{volo}, \&c. \). Thus Ital. \( \text{anterò}, \text{Fr. chanterai} \) represent \( \text{cantare habeo} \) (reduced to \( \text{hayo} \)) (see Meyer-Lübke, Rom. Gram. ii, pp. 138 and 354 sqq.).

§ 37. Fourth Conj. Fut. in -\( \text{ibo} \). This formation is extremely common in the Dramatists, e.g. Plaut. Asin. 28 ut ipse seibo, te faciam ut seias, but was not adopted (as the Impft. in -\( \text{ibam} \) was) by the Augustan poets, though Propertius ventures on \( \text{entibunt} \), iii. 21, 32. In Late Latin poetry it reappears, e.g. \( \text{larigibor} \), Juvenec. ii. 562. The existence of \( \text{audiam} \) beside \( \text{audibo} \), and of \( \text{diebo} \) beside \( \text{dieam} \) may have led in Vulgar Latin to the coinage of an Imperfect without \( b \), whence Romance Imperfects like Sard. \( \text{timia}, \text{finia} \) (but \( \text{istava}, \text{Lat. stabam} \) (see § 34). \( \text{Red-dibo}, \) an O. Lat. Fut. of \( \text{redibo} \), shows the Fut. of \( \text{do}, \text{dio} \), e.g. Plaut. Men. 1038 (perhaps \( \text{redibo} \) is the spelling indicated here and elsewhere by the MSS.):

\[
\text{sáluom tibi ita, ut mihi dedisti, réddibo : hie me máne modo.}
\]

The Fut. of \( \text{eo} \) and its Compounds, as of \( \text{něqueo}, \) has -\( \text{ibo} \) in class. Latin as well as in the earlier period; and it is not till Late Latin that forms like \( \text{reddibo} \), \( \text{transient} \) came into use \( \text{(exist in Hor. C. iv. 4. 65: merses profundo, pulcherius evit, is the reading of inferior MSS., and like \( \text{mübbih} \) of C. iii. 23. 19 has no probability)}.\)

Whether third Conjugation YO-stems took this form of Future (and the Imperfect in -\( \text{ibam} \)) is very doubtful. \( \text{Paribis for pàries}, \) quoted from an Anteliana of Pomponius (Com. 20 R.) may be a vulgarism. \( \text{Adgrédiibor} \) is the reading of the Palimpsest in Plaut. Pers. 15, as against \( \text{adgrelior} \) (\( \text{agreglior} \)) of the other MSS., and seems to be required by the metre; \( \text{congregiar} \) of all the MSS. (AP) in Plaut. Most. 783 is changed by editors to \( \text{congregibor} \).

§ 38. Third Conj. Fut. in -\( \text{ibo} \). \( \text{Virebo} \) is quoted by Nonius (509.3 M.) from Novius (Com. 10 R.):

\[
\text{tibi dum uiuebó, fidelis éro,}
\]

\(^1\) Still all the instances of this spelling of Cato's seem to be 1 Sg. Fut. In MSS. of Plautus we find -\( \text{en} \) occasionally in 1 Sg. Fut. of Verbs in -\( \text{io} \) (for the references, see Neue, ii).
and *dicebo* by Nonius (507, 1 M.) from the same play of the same author Com. 8 R.) *primum quod dicebo*. Plautus (Epid. 188) uses the phrase *exsugebo sanguinem*:

iam ego me convortam in hirudinem atque eorum exsugebo sanguinem,

though in another passage he has the usual *exsugam* in this phrase, *Poen. 614*:

iam nunc ego illic egredienti sanguinem exsugam

(in *Rud. 1009* the correct reading is: exurgebo quidquid umoris tibist). (On Late Latin *inferebis, tremebit*, see Georges, *Lex. Wortf.* s. vv.)

§ 39. D. Perfect. The I.-Eur. Perfect-stem, denoting completed action, was either (a) Reduplicated, with O-grade of an E-root in the Singular Active, and elsewhere the weak grade, e. being the usual Reduplication-vowel: e. g. from the root *gen-* (Lat. *gi-gn-o*) the Perfect-stem was *ge-gon-*, *ge-gn-* (Gk. *γε-γον-, γε-γν-*; cf. O. Ind. *ja-jan-a*, *ja-jn-ur*), or (b) Unreduplicated, usually with a high grade of the Stem, and that either confined to the Singular Active, or extended over all the declension: e. g. from the root *weid-* (Lat. *vid-eo*) the Perfect-stem was *woid-*, *wid-* (Gk. *οτί-ε*, *τι-μευν*, O. Ind. *vid-a*, *vid-ma*); from the root *sed-* (Lat. *sed-eo*), the Perfect-stem was *sed-* (Goth. *set-um*, Lith. *séd-ęs*, Partic.). Verbs beginning with vowels, e. g. root *ed-* (Perfect-stem *ęd-*, O. Ind. *äd-a*, Goth. *fr-čt*), may have been the stepping-stone between these two formations. Other Unreduplicated Perfects occur in various languages side by side with Reduplicated forms, and show the same vocalism, e. g. O. Ind. *sarpa* (and sa-sarpa), from the I.-Eur. root *serp-*, 'to creep,' Hom. *δέχ-αται* (beside *δέ-δεκ-ται*) from *δέχομαι*, O. Ind. *skambh-ur* (and ca-skambh-a) from the root *ska(m)bh-* (to support) (cf. Lat. *scamnum*). In Latin both the Reduplicated and the Unreduplicated type of Perfect are found, and it is not always easy to decide whether on the one hand the Reduplication has been lost in what we may call the 'Latin period' (e. g. *tūli*, which is in the time of Plautus *tē-tūl-i*; cf. Gk. *τέ-τλαμευ*), either by that Latin habit of discarding one of two neighbouring syllables with similar form [ar(ei)-cābīi, &c.; see ch. iii. § 13. p. 176] *re-t(e)-tuli* (so *dē-tondi*, O. Lat. *de-tō-tondi* beside *to-tonādi*), or by adaptation to other Unreduplicated forms, or whether on the
other the want of Reduplication dates from what we may call the 'Indo-European period.'

The Latin Perfect had usurped the functions of the Aorist or Preterite, and denoted action in past time, as well as completed action in present time, e.g. dēdi (1) I gave, (2) I have given. It thus drew within its sphere Aorist or Preterite formations, such as what is called the S-aorist, e.g. Gk. εὐδεξ-α, O. Ind. ā-dikš-am, and gave to these its own peculiar person-endings (1 Sg. -i from I.-Eur. -ai or -ai, O Ind. -e, the I.-Eur. Middle 1 Sg. suffix, so that Lat. ded-i corresponds to O. Ind. da-dē, a Middle, not an Active; 2 Sg. -isti, and so on; see §§ 65 sqq.). Thus Lat. dix-i from the S-Aorist stem *deik-s- (Gk. εὐδεξ-α) is in Latin called a Perfect, not an Aorist, and is declined like a true Perfect, dix-i (O. Lat. deixeis, *deik-s-ai), 3 Sg. dixit (O. Lat. -i, -eit) like meminī, 3 Sg. meminit (O. Lat. -i, -eit).

Strong Aorists, both Reduplicated (e.g. Gk. ἐπιφανε-ν from ἐπιφαν-, 'to kill') and Unreduplicated (e.g. Gk. ἔγνω-μιν from ἔγνω-), may have been absorbed into the Latin Perfect with the others, but decisive evidence that will prove their existence separate from true Perfects (Reduplicated and Unre duplicated) is hard to find. Thus Lat. fuldī of dif-fild-i from jīn-d-o, root bheid-?, may perfectly well be a true Perfect, with Reduplication lost in the 'Latin period,' the weak grade of the stem being appropriate to the whole of the I.-Eur Middle (e.g. O. Ind. bī-bhind-ē, 1 Sg.) as well as to the Plural (and Dual) Persons of the Active Perfect (e.g. O. Ind. bī-bhind-ur, 3 Pl.). It may however be claimed for the Strong Aorist class, like O. Ind. ā-bhind-ā, Aor.; and similarly sciūd-i has been called a Strong Aorist (O. Ind. ā-chūdā-m) with the Latin Perfect-ending, while sci-vid-i is the true Perfect-form; even sci-vid-i might be itself ascribed to a Reduplicated Aorist-class, as tētīsī has been identified with Gk. τε-παγ-ων, πεπαγέ with Gk. τε-παγο-λυ. It seems best to class these Latin forms merely as 'Reduplicated' and 'Unre duplicated,' without the more definite title of 'Reduplicated Perfect,' 'Unre duplicated Perfect.' To attempt a further subdivision into Reduplicated Aorist (or Preterite), Unre duplicated Aorist (or Preterite) would be to go beyond the evidence at our disposal.
There is still another formation which in Latin has the name and
the person-endings of the Perfect-stem, viz. the formation
adopted for Vowel-verbs (first, second, fourth Conjugations),
which appends v (after a Consonant u), e.g. āmā-v-i, re-plē-v-i,
audī-v-i, mōn-u-i. This formation has not yet been satisfactorily
explained (see below). The v disappears in audīit (pronounced
audīt in ordinary speech, audīt in Poetry), audīt, abīt, as in
dītor from dīvītor, O. Lat. dīnus from dīvīnus (ch. ii. § 53), sīs
for sī vis.

Examples of the various types of Latin Perfect are:

1 Reduplicated: dē-dē-i (O. Ind. dā-dē, Perf. Mid.; cf.
O. Ind. ā-da-da-m, Impf.), Osc. de-d-ed ‘dedit,’ Umbr. dēde (on
the Umbro-Oscan 3 Sg. Person-ending, see § 69), crē-dē-d-i
(O. Ind. dā-dhē, Perf. Mid. On crēdo, O. Ind. ērād-dhā,–,
I believe,’ lit. ‘put the heart to,’ O. Ir. cērim, see § 27). The
I.-Eur. Reduplication Vowel ē (in O. Ind. the vowel of the
stem is often substituted) remains in class. Latin in forms like
mē-mūn-i (older *me-men-i), pe-pēr-i, but came
to be assimilated in Latin fashion (see ch. iv. § 163) to the vowel of the second
syllable in mō-nōrd-i, tū-tūd-i (cf. O. Ind. tu-tūd-ē), &c., although
in O. Lat. to the end of the Republic forms like mē-nōrd-i were
in use.

What the Latin Stem-vowel originally was is not always to be
discovered, owing to the Latin habit of weakening every
vowel in a short second syllable to u (ē) (ch. iii. § 18). Tu-tūd-i,
which has retained the u-vowel unweakened (ch. iii. § 28),
shows the weak stem tād- of the I.-Eur. Middle and Plural
Active (O. Ind. tū-tūd-ē 1 Sg. Mid., tū-tūd-ūr 3 Pl. Act.),
while con-tūd-it, quoted by Priscian (i. p. 518. 13 H.) along with
con-tūd-it from the Annals of Ennius (ll. 515 and 418 M.), may
be the trace of a Latin *tū-tūd-, *te-taud- (O. Ind. tū-tād-a
1 Sg. Act., Goth. stai-staunt 1 Sg. Act., stai-staunt-un 3 Pl.
Act., apparently from a root (s)taud-), like ce-cād-i from *ce-cāid-,
root (s)kāidh-.

But to-tōnd-i, spo-(s)pōnd-i (O. Latin spe-pōnd-i),
from the roots tend- (Gk. ῥέπω), spend- (Gk. σπέρμω), are not
necessarily derived from that form of the Reduplicated Perfect-
stem which was reserved for the Singular Active in I.-Eur., the
form namely with O-grade of an E-stem vowel, *te-tond-,
for their o may be due to the Causative Present-stems (§ 29) with which they were associated, tondeo (I.-Eur. *tondēyo-), spondeo (I.-Eur. *spondēyo-). The or of mo-mord-i (O. Lat. me-mord-i) is most naturally explained as the Latin equivalent of I.-Eur. r, so that me-mord- is the weak stem, *me-mrd-, from root (s)merd-, and me-mord-i is exactly O. Ind. ma-mrd-ē i Sg. Mid.; similarly the ul (older ol) of tetuli will be I.-Eur. l (9) (cf. Lat. te-tul-i-mus, Gk. τέ-τα-α-μέν) from the root tel-.

(2) Unreduplicated: vild-i, I saw, have seen, if vild- represents I.-Eur. *woid- (ch. iv. § 10, p. 228), exactly corresponds to O. Sl. věd-ě, ‘I know,’ a Middle form, and perhaps the only trace of the Perfect Tense to be found in the Balto-Slavic family of languages, with the exception of the Participle, while in Latin, Celtic, and Teutonic it is the Perfect Participle which has been lost, and the other parts of the Tense retained; the Active form, I.-Eur. *woid-ā, appears in O. Ind. věd-a, ‘I know,’ Gk. ὁδ-α, Goth. vait; sěd-i, unless it stands for *sě-sld-i, as sūlo for *si-sld-o (§ 9) 1, shows the I.-Eur. Perfect-stem sěd- of Goth. sēt-um i Pl., Lith. sėd-ės Partic.; ēd-i shows I.-Eur. ēd- of O. Ind. ēd-a Act., Goth. fr-ćt; ēgi, the Perfect of ēgo, does not show I.-Eur. ēg- (O. Ind. āj-α, Gk. ἕγγαμ, O. Scand. ók; cf. Lat. amb-āges), but adopts a Latin raising of ā to ē, seen in other verbs whose root-vowel is a, e.g. pēgi from root pāg- (Lat. pango) [cf. ch. iv. § 51, where it is shown that I.-Eur. ā, Lat. ā, is the weak grade of I.-Eur. ē, Lat. ē, e.g. I.-Eur. *sāto- from root sē-, Lat. sātus beside sē-men, fāc-io beside fēc-i (Gk. έθηκα) from root dhē-].

A similar absence of Reduplication appears in Umbro-Oscan, e.g. Osc. dicust ‘dixerit’ (beside Umbr. dersicust), Umbr. fakust ‘fecerit’ (beside Osc. fefacust), Umbr. vurtus ‘verterit’ and ku-vurtus ‘converteris.’

(3) S-Aorist (Preterite): dīx-i, older dēx-ci (Gk. έ-δειξ-α; cf. O. Ind. á-dīkša-m) from the root deϊ-, a Reduplicated Perfect (Aorist?) of which appears in Umbr. de-reic-ust ‘dixerit’ (Umbr. rs expresses an intervocalic d-sound, ch. ii. § 88), and apparently an Unreduplicated in Osc. dic-ust ‘dixerit’; ussi (Gk.

1 Umbr. pru-sik-urent ‘pronuntiaverint’ has certainly I.-Eur. ę (Umbr. i).
ẹ̣a for *ẹ̣a) has a short vowel according to Priscian, i. 466. 7 H., like us-tus which has the weak grade ûs- of the root eus-
(cf. Late Lat. ostile for ûstile, &c., A. L. L. ii. 607). The S-Aorist forms show sometimes the weak stem, sometimes the E-grade in
I.-Eur. languages, e.g. O. Ind. á-dîkṣam just mentioned, Gk. ω-ρεκξ-α, sometimes a still higher grade; e.g. from the root
l-eq²-. O. Ind. á-rāikṣam Act. [Gk. ε-λευψ-α may represent
-lēiq²- or -lēiq²- (ch. iv. § 45), O. Ind. á-rîkš-i Mid. has
the weak grade]; and the same variety appears in Latin
S-Perfects, e.g. di-vādlo, di-vi-si, but ūro, ūssî. But it is not
always possible to ascertain the quantity of the vowel in Latin,
for the grammarians of the Empire are uncertain guides about
the natural quantity of any vowels long by position, for which
they could get no clue from the classical poets. One requires
further evidence before one can fully believe Priscian (sixth cent.)
(i. p. 466. 17 H.), when he posits a naturally long penult for all Per-
fests in -xi which have the vowel e before this ending, e.g. il-lexi
from lâcio, and for no others, e.g. dus-i from dūco (so perlûctus,
Audacié exc. 359. 15 K., but dedûxerunt in the Mon. Anc. iii. 26).
The use of the apex, or accent-mark, to indicate a long vowel, on
inscriptions, especially on inscriptions later than 150 A.D., is also
evidence of a more or less doubtful character; and even when the
length of a vowel seems fairly established, e.g. réxi (with apex
over the e on an inser. of 105 A.D., C. I. L. v. 875; also declared
to have long e by Priscian, l.c.; contrast Gk. ω-ρεξα), there
remains a further question whether the long vowel is not due to
a similar phonetic law for the group g-s, as that which gramma-
rians mention for the group g-t (in rectus, lectus, sectus, &c.), viz.
that a naturally short vowel is lengthened before this Consonant-
group. (On the question of the quantity of the Stem-vowel in
these S-Perfects, see ch. ii. § 144, and cf. ch. iv. § 51, p. 254,
where the high grade of the root is accounted for by the syncope
of a short vowel, réx- for rēko-.) The vocalism of the Perfect
of jūdeo may have been altered before the end of the Republic,
for the spelling jous- on old inscriptions (see C. I. L. i. Index,
s.v.) proves an original diphthong ou (probably I.-Eur. eu;
the root is yeudh-, O. Ind. yodhati), and O. Lat. joussei (with s
for ss before the practice of writing a double consonant came in,
ch. i. § 8) would become naturally in classical Latin jūsi, as in
the Perfect of milto O. Lat. meissei became class. Lat. mīsī (see
ch. ii. § 129). Cōdo has cēsī (Prisc. i. 466. 6 H.). Perfects
in -ssī often come from Verb-stems ending in -s, e.g. from
the root eus-, us-sī; thus prēmo probably takes its Perfect
vres-sī from a lost Present *preso [cf. Gk. τρέ(σ)ω and τρέμω;
Lat. ter(s)-eo and trēm-o, § 3]. Fluxi comes from the stem
*bhluy3- (Gk. οἰώ-φαυξ), the guttural becoming v in fluvo, class.
jluo; co-nixi from the root ḱneigh3- (cf. nicto); fiξi from the stem
dheig3-, the O. Lat. Present being fivo (§ 7); vexi from the
root wegh-, Pres. veho, and so on.

The S-Aorist is not found with Vowel Verbs in Latin as it is
in Greek, e. g. ἕ-τιμη-σα (Dor. -ἀσα), ἕ-φιλη-σα (with σ apparently
for σσ as in εἴσα for *εῴσ-σα, quoted above); at least it is not
found in the Indicative. But in Umbro-Oscan, if tt in these
languages represents an original ss (as Att. πράττω for πράσσω),
we have this formation in Perfects like Pelignian coisatens
'curaverunt' quasi *curassunt, Oec. dunatted 'donavit' quasi
*donasit, dadikatted 'dedicavit,' prūfatted, prūfattens 'probavit,
probaverunt,' teremmnattens 'terminaverunt' [all the examples
preserved belong to the first Conj., and so do almost all of the
Latin examples of -ss- forms, e. g. amasso, amassim, amassere (see
§ 5)].

(4) With v (v). This is the Perfect-stem formation of Vowel-
Verbs, as of the first Conjugation, āmāvi, nēcā-vi, and with the
v (v) added to a stem not ending in -ā, nēc-ūi (so orēpavi and
creplui, cūbavi and cūbui, dimicavi and dimicui, &c.), of the second
replēvi, monnui, of the third strā-vi, sē-vi, cre-vi, sē-vi, of the fourth
audīvi, dēsīlīvi, and dēsilīvi. It is also found with some Consonant
Verb-stems, e. g. cōlui, ālui, gēmui, and is sometimes added to
a Perfect-stem already formed; e. g. mess-ūi (but see § 51).
When the stem ends in v (v), two v's are not written, but the
preceding vowel is lengthened, e. g. cāvi, lāvi (see § 47 on fōvi).
Statui, fui, &c. were in O. Lat. statuī (statūvi), fūvi. Pōsui
is a form introduced by the false apprehension of pō-sitūs [from
the Preposition pō- (Gk. ἀπό, Lat. ab, ch. ix. § 12) and situs
P. P. P. of sīno (pōnō for pō-s(ī)no, ch. iv. § 151)], as if it were
posi-tus like mōnī-tus. The true Perfect, used by the older
writers, is *po-stivi*, but this could not become *posui* (*imposui*, Lucil. xxviii. 26 M.) by ordinary phonetic development.

Both the Perfect with *v* and the S-Perfect occasionally present shortened forms, e.g. *amasti, misiti*, which are best regarded as phonetic developments of the full forms *amāristi, misistī*, due in the one case to the Roman tendency to drop intervocalic *v* (see ch. ii. § 53), and in the other to the practice of discarding one of two neighbouring similar syllables (see ch. iii. § 13, p. 176). The same shortening occurs in various parts of the Perfect-stem conjugation, e.g. *amāro* Fut. Pft., *amassem* Pluperf. Subj., and so on (see § 3).

The Perfect-stem was formed in I.-Eur. from the root of the verb, not from the Present-stem. This is the reason why a Latin Perfect often presents so different an appearance from a Latin Present. Thus *sē-vi* is formed from the root *sē-* (cf. *sē-men*), but *sēro* is a Reduplicated Present, for *sē-ś-s-ō* (cf. Gk. ἵηα for *śη-ς-μη, § 9); *crē-vi*, I determined, *si-vi, strū-vi* and others exhibit Nasalized Present-stems, *cer-no, sē-no, ster-no* (see § 10); *crē-vi*, I grew, *nō-vi, abōlē-vi* and *abol-un* have as Presents 'Inceptive' stems *cre-sco, no-sco, abole-sco* (see § 28). But it often happened that the Perfect was influenced by the form of the Present-stem. Thus *vēni* from root *g"em-* (Goth. qēmum I Pl.) should be *vēmi*, but takes its *n* from the Present, a YO-stem, which by the Latin Phonetic law changes its *m* to *n* before *i* (*y*), *vēnio*.

In Oscan the Perfect Subjunctive differs from the Perf. Ind. only in its use of the Subjunctive vowel ē (§ 55), e. g. Osc. *tefacid* 'fecerit.' But in Latin the Perfect Subjunctive adds to the Perfect-stem *-ērim, -ēris, -ērit, &c*. (*3 Pl. -erint*), which is generally regarded as an Optative form from the root es- (cf. *sim*) used as an Auxiliary. Others explain *vidērim*, with *vidēro*, &c., as containing a Noun-stem *vidis-* (cf. *cīnis-*), which is seen in its proper form in *vidīs-sem* (see § 52). In the Perfect Subjunctive person-endings ū, not ē, is correct; scansion with ū are due to confusion with the Fut. Perf. (see Neue, ii2, p. 510). In its Potential use, e. g. *dixerim*, I would say, *affirmaverim, &c* the first Pers. Plur. is rare (e. g. *dixerimus*, Cic. Tusc. iii. 4. 7; *Nat. Deor*. i. 20. 52), and in the Deponent Conjugation this use is rare.
even in the Singular (e.g. passus sim, Ter. Andr. 203; cf. sit passus, Virg. G. iii. 141) (see A. L. L. i. 347).

§ 40. Other examples of Reduplicated forms: stē-ti (O. Ind. ta-sth-ē), ste-li-mus, older ste-lē-mos (Gk. ἱστηκ-, ἵστηκ-) ; pe-pēd-i from pēdo for *pezdio (O. Engl. feast); ce-clīn-i, older *ce-cen-eī (O. Ir. ce-chan); but with the Reduplication-vowel changed, di-dic-i, Pres. disco for *dic-sco; pō-poss-i, O. Lat. pe-poss-i for *pe-prik (root prek-) with 'Inceptive' stem suffix -sk- (§ 22) (cf. O. Ind. prapra-, lat. plenturum) ; peculiar to O. Lat. are: te-tin-i (O. Ind. ta-tan-e from tan-, L.-Eur. ten-,'to stretch'), which was used as a Perfect of eneo (apud veteres 'tetini' dictur Dion. 372. 18 K.); Nonius (178. 7 M.) quotes tetinisse and telinerrin from Paeuvius, telinerit from Acetius; in Plaut. Amph. 926 we should probably read abstinerei for abstines of the MSS.:

nunc quâmodo factis me inpudicis ãbßtineï.,
ab inpudicis dietis auorti uolo,

and tetini, -tini should perhaps be read for tenni, -linni in other passages of Plautus (Studem. Stud. ii. 122 n.) ; Paul. Fest. (335. 7 Th.) has preserved for us an old augural phrase, discussed by Messala in his Treatise on Augury, purine tetinero 'purissimo tenuero'; scicidi (scicidi?), illustrated by Priscian (i. 517. 3 H.) with several passages from the Dramatists.

§ 41. Unreduplicated. The following, with short vowel, which are often referred to L.-Eur. strong (unreduplicated) Aorists, are more probably reduplicated forms which have lost their Reduplication, first in Compounds, then in the Simple Verb: tāli (see below); sci-di (cf. O. Ind. ei-chid-e Perf. Mid., ā-chida-m Aor.), in O. Lat. sci-clīn-i (see above), cf. ab-scidi, di-scidi, re-scidi, &c.; fidī (cf. O. Ind. bi-bhid-e Perf. Mid., ā-bhida-m Aor.), rare in the Simple Verb, but more frequent in the Compound dif-fidī (e.g. Virg. A. ix. 588 tempora plumbō diffidit; Hor. C. iii. 16. 13 diffidit urbium Portas vir Macedo); -uli only occurs in the Compound per-culi, just as -pili (in the Simple Verb pe-pūli) is only found in Compounds, dispuli, impuli, &c. (cf. rep(e)puli).

And a large number of the forms usually quoted as Unreduplicated Perfects with stem-vowel unchanged rest on very insecure foundation: -cendi occurs only in Compounds ac-cendi, in-cendi, &c.; the same is true of -fendi of de-fendi, of-sendi, and -hendi of pre-hendi, nor can we be certain whether the e in these Perfects was short or long; *lambri is attested by Priscian (i. 506. 25 H.) with the single example of a line of Lucilius (xiii. 11 M.):

iucundasque puer qui lamberat ore placentas,

where lamberat is evidently Pres. of lambero (Plaut. Pseud. 743: euægepae: lepidë, Charine, meo me ludo làmberns),

and is probably the very word which is quoted by Paul. Fest. 81. 30 Th. 'lamberat' scindit ac laniat; for *psali Priscian quotes only a line of Caesius Bassus, the friend of Persius, with psallerat; of mandó he says (i. 419. 13 H.) ejus praeteritum perfectum quidem alii mandui, alii mandidi esse voluerunt; Livius tamen in Odyssey (a later hexameter version):

cum socios nostros mandisset impius Cyclops;
-vērī (cf. Prisc. i. 532. 22 H.) is easily attested for Compounds, but not for the Simple Verb, and the same is true of -cādī (Prisc. i. 515. 16 H.), and to a great extent of velli (Virg. Ecl. vi. 4 vellīt et admonuīt).

Of the remaining examples of Unreduplicated Perfect with Stem-vowel unchanged, ici (Ppt. of īo? see Wharton, Elyn. Lat. s. v.), strīdī, visī (an S-Aorist?); the usual Perfect of these Present S-stems is in -iē, e.g. access-īē, quae-īē, from access, quae(ś)ō, § 3), and better attested than these, pāndī, praundī, scāndī, vērtī (on sīdī, bīdī, see below); the Verbs with Present in -nō are sometimes credited with a Perfect in -dīdī instead of -dī (cf. condīdī, but in composition abscondī, though abscondīdī is quoted from the Republican Dramatists by Nonius, 75. 22 M.), e.g. descendīdī, quoted from Valerius Antias and Laberius by Gell. vi. 9. 17, mandādī, a byform of mandī (Prisc. i. 419. 13 H., just cited), praundādī, censed by Diomedes, 267. 17 K. This -dīdī is proper to verbs compounded with do (1) to give, (2) to put, so is applied by false analogy to de-secondo, from the I.-Eur. root skand-, skandī, skandādrīnów, O. Ir. ra-sescaind); the formation of pāndō (cf. Osc. patensins 'aparent’ (¿)), mandō, prāndō is not clear (see § 14). Vertī, O. Lat. vortī (vo) became ve- in the course of the second cent. n. c., ch. iv. § 10), has probably the weak stem *wṛt-, with which we may compare either the O. Ind. Reduplicated Perf. Md. va-vītē or the O. Ind. Unreduplicated Aorist ā-vīt-am); but while the Umbrian forms ku-vurtus, co-vurtus, curt-vust (or curt-vust?, 'converteris’ ‘convertēritis’, ku-vurtu, co-vurtu 'convertito', point to a different stem for the Present (wrt-); cf. O. Ind. vārtatō) and the Perfect (wṛt-), the O. Lat. spelling shows vort- (wṛt-) both in the Present and in the Perfect, as well as in the Perfect Participle Passive versus (s-wṛt-to-, O. Ind. vṛttā-), so that the weak stem has the appearance of having forced its way in Latin into the Present Tense-system, leaving an identity of Stem-vowel between the Present and the Perfect. The spelling vorto may, however, have represented the pronunciation verto (see ch. iv. § 10).

The alternation of ā in Present- with ē in Perfect-stem is seen in fāc-īo (Umbr. fācia, Osc. fākiad ‘faciat’) and fēc-ī (I.-Eur. dhē-k- of Gk. ἔθηκ-α), frāngō (root bhreg-, Goth. brikān; see ch. iv. § 51), and frēg-ī, jēcio and jēci, coāpio and cēpi, pango and pēgi, ēgo and ēgī, cēphi (Lucr.) and apere (ch. ii. § 150), it is seen also in Oscan ĕpīd ‘habuerit’ (Osc. ē is I.-Eur. ē), though *hēbi is unknown in Latin; that of ā with ē in fōd-īo and fōd-ī [the I.-Eur. root is bhedh-], Lith. bēdu, ‘I dig,’ W. bēdd, ‘a grave,’ varying with b-hole-; Gk. bōkōs (with B for ść), Lith. bāda, ‘I prick,’ O. Sl. bodq]; of ā with ē there is one doubtful example, scībo (with ā in scāberet, Hor. S. i. 10. 71) and scāberat, quoted as a Plupft. (with lamberat, on which see above) by Priscian from Lucell. ix. 77 M. scabērāt ut porcos contritus arbore costis; that of ē with ē is seen in ēdo and ēdi, ēmo and ēmi, ēgo and ēgī, scēdo and scēlī, vēno (en for ęm, m, like Gk. baīva) and vēnī for *vēnī (Goth. gēmum, I Pl.); the weak stem with short vowel is seen in the Present, but not in the Perfect, in fūgio and fūgi (root bheug-), lāmpo and lāpu (root leiq-), rūmpo and rūpi (root reup-), vēdeo and vādi (root weid-), vīnīo and vīci (root weik-), fāndo and fādi.

§ 42. Form of Reduplication. When the root of the Verb began with a group of consonants the practice in I.-Eur. languages is to use only the first consonant of the group in the Reduplication-syllable, e.g. I.-Eur. *ke-klow-, *ke-klu-, the Perfect-stems from the root kleu-, ‘to hear’ (Gk. κλουε; cf.
§ 42–44. THE VERB. PERFECT.

O. Ind. šu-šráva, O. Ir. ru chualo from *cu-clowa, both of these last having the weak stem vowel ū instead of the Reduplication-vowel e. This form of Reduplication appears in Latin Reduplicated Presents (see § 9) like si-śt-o (L-Eur. *si-st-, Zend hi-śtaiti, Gk. ἵ-στημι, Umbr. se-stu). But in Latin Perfects the whole group appears in the Reduplication-syllable when the group consists of s followed by a mute, while in the stem-syllable the s is dropped (possibly sometimes retained, as in Teutonic), whereas in other I.-Eur. languages (e. g. O.-Ind., Gk.) only the mute appears in the Reduplication-syllable, e. g. Lat. spō-pont-i (spō-sponditi is occasionally found in MSS.), sci-clid-i (v. l. sciscidī), Goth. stai-staut, O. Ind. sthāū (from O. Ind. sthā-, ‘to stand’). Bībi shows the i of bi-b-o, the Reduplication-vowel of Present-stems, as e of Perfect-stems. Similarly di-dic-i may owe its i to the fact that disco is a Reduplicated Present for *di-de-scō (cf. Gk. δι-δάκω for *δι-δάκα) (but see § 22). The Roman grammarians were in doubt whether the correct Perfect of sisto was stē-t-i or stē-t-i (see Georges, s. v.), Gallius (ii. 14) speaks of an old MS. of Cato’s speeches which had the reading vadimonium stitisisses, a reading changed by ‘emendatores’ to vadimonium stetisses; the same doubt existed whether stīdi or stēdi was the Perfect of sīdo (‘*si-sa-o’).

§ 43. Assimilation of Reduplication-vowel to Stem-vowel. Aulus Gallius, in a chapter dealing with peculiar forms of the Latin Perfect (N. A. vi. 9; cf. Nonius 140. 19 M.), says that although poposci, monordi, papugi, ecurri were the forms used in his time by almost all educated men (omnes ferme doctores), the older writers used ē in the Reduplication-syllable. He quotes memordi from Ennius (from his poem to Scipio, and referring to the rivals of his hero?) (Sat. 20 M.):

meum nón est, ut (v. l. at) si mé canis memőderit,
from Laberius, Nigidius, Atta, and Plautus (Aul. fr. 2 ut admemordit hominem), remarking that the last author used also prae-morsisset (the S-Aorist form), peposci from Valerius Antias, pepugero from Atta, oecucurit from Aelius Tubero, speponderant from Valerius Antias. He even assigns similar forms to Cicero and Caesar (sic M. Tullius et C. Caesar mordeo ‘memordi,’ pungo ‘pepugi,’ spondeo ‘spepondi’ dixerunt), although our MSS. of these authors, as of Plautus and the older writers, hardly preserve a trace of them [see Neue, ii. 465. In Plaut. Poen. 1074 one of the Palatine MSS. has memordit (D), another me mordit (C), another monordit (B)].

§ 44. Loss of Reduplication. This assimilation may have in some cases facilitated the loss of the Reduplication-syllable in Compounds, which was ascribed above (§ 39) to the Latin practice of discarding one of two neighbouring and similar syllables [e. g. ar(cf)-cibii, ch. iii. § 13. p. 176]. This practice of Latin [cf. Gk. ἄμφιν-δοπέν], along with the liability of every short second syllable to Syncope under the older law of Accentuation (ch. iii. § 13), must have operated most powerfully to the detriment of the Reduplication-syllable in Compounds, so that it is wrong to refer all Latin Unreduplicated Perfects to L-Eur. Unreduplicated Perfect and Aorist forms. A Perfect like tūli, which has in Plautus the form étūli, in Terence usually the Unreduplicated form, tūli, as always in classical Latin, is most naturally explained as a Reduplicated form which lost its Reduplication in the second cent. n. c. The Compound retūli (not retuli, see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v.) has a double t, which
is clearly not due to the Preposition having had the form red, but like the double p of repèrè (beside répèrèo), repùtli (beside répetlu), to the Syncope of the Reduplication-vowel, re-(e)-tuli, like re-(p(e))-peri, re-(p(e))-puli. Other compounds, like con-tuli, at-tuli, sus-tuli have precisely the form which they would have had if they, like rettuli, had suffered Syncope of their second syllable; only, while Syncope has left a trace of its operation in the double t of rettuli, this trace has been obliterated by the phonetic conditions of these other Com-

powers. *Conttuli, *obtuli, *attuli, *sustuli are impossible forms; they must in Latin orthography be written contuli, obtuli, attuli, sustuli, so as to afford no criterion of whether the Preposition was originally compounded with tetuli or tuli. The one Compound however which does afford such a criterion pron-
nounces for the first of these alternatives, and warrants us in asserting that an original tetuli has been reduced to tuli in the Perfect of all the Compounds of fero (tollo), and in denying the theory that they show an original tuli, an Aorist formation like Subj. attulás, &c. (see § 4). The shortened form tuli having thus established itself in the numerous Compounds of fero, words in constant use in the speech of every-day life, it may well have spread from them to the simple verb. The habitual use of con-tuli, at-tuli, ob-tuli, &c. would naturally lead to the preference of tuli for the more cumbersome tetuli, although by a freak of language, by the caprice of that 'ustus,

quem penes arbitrium est et jus et norma loquendi,' the shortened form -puli of the Compounds re-p(e)puli, com-(pe)puli, im-(pe)puli, &c. did not supplant the full form pepuli at the same time. It is the Compound Verbs which as a rule in Latin show the short form, the Simple Verbs which are most retentive of the full Reduplicated form; e.g. ac-tondi (detotondi) is quoted from Varro by Priscian, i. 482. 7 H., but is declared impermissible by Servius, who lays down the law that no Compound can have a Reduplicated Perfect: 'verba quae in praeterito perfecto primam syllabam geminatum, cum composita fuerint, geminare non possunt,' attondi (in Plaut. &c.), despondi (Plaut., Ter., Cic.), praecondi (Plaut., Cic.) beside rotondi, sopondi, eccidi; and this fact is additional evidence of Latin Unreduplicated forms having lost the Reduplication-syllable in Composition.

§ 45. Co-existent Reduplicated and Unreduplicated forms. A more certain example of an Unreduplicated form existing side by side with a Reduplicated, and not a phonetic development from the latter due to the loss of the Reduplication-syllable, is the Perfect of pango, pēgi beside pēpīgi. Both forms survived in classical Latin, the Reduplicated pēpīgi being reserved for the sense 'I have agreed,' 'stipulated,' so that it is often called by the Roman grammarians the Perfect of prēcissor; and in addition a third Perfect is men-
tioned by the grammarians for the Simple Verb (not the Compounds), an S-Aorist form pānxi, e.g. in the elegiac epitaph of Ennius (ap. Cic. Tusc. i. 15. 34):

hic uestrum panxit maxima facta patrum.

In the same way O. Lat. fefaked of the very ancient inscription on a Praenest-
tine brooch (C. I. L. xiv. 4123): Manios med fefaked Numasioi, seems to be from a Perfect-stem *fe-fécē (and similarly Osc. fefavest 'feecerit' Fut. Ptf., and fefaciti 'feecerit' Ptf. Subj., will have a not a), anterior to the weakening of unaccented vowels (see ch. iii. § 18). It would have been in class. Latin, had the form survived, *fēcei, related to fēci as pēpīgi to pēgi.

§ 46. S-Preterite. Examples of parallel Latin and Greek forms are dīxi,
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O. Lat. dei- (Gk. ἔθεγα) (both Lat. dei- and Gk. ἔθα- may before a consonant represent I.-Eur. dei-; ch. iv. § 45), rexi (Gk. ἔθεξα), texi (Gk. ἔστεξα), cleps (Gk. ἔκλεψα), manai (Gk. ἐμάνα for *ἐμενα), isai (Gk. ἔσσα for *ἔσσα), pexi (Gk. ἐπεζάμυν). The substitution of -si for -zi (of sōxai, tīnxi, &c.) in mulsi from (1) nūtceo, (2) mulgeo, fusli from (1) fulceo, (2) fulgeo, parsi (and perepec) from parco, sparsi from spargo, &c. is due to the preceding consonants l, r (see ch. iv. § 157). The same Verb may use as its Perfect both the S-formation and the Reduplicated Perfect: thus parco has parsi and perepec; praemordeo has praemordi and praemorsi (Plaut. fr. 120 G.): surgo has surrexi, but in Livius Andronicus often surregi (in the old spelling surregi; Paul. Fest. 423. 1 Th. 'surregit' et 'sortus' pro surrexit, et quasi fieri surrecutus, frequenter posuit Livius); the difference between de-lexi, neg-lexi (cf. intel-lexi) and ex-igi, e-igi, &c. has been explained by referring the Perfects with x to a lost Present *lege (Gk. ἔλγε, to care for); ëmo, to buy (cf. redimo, coëmo), in O. Lat. to take (Paul. Fest. 53. 26 Th. emere, quod nunc est mercari, antiqui accipiebant pro accipere) as in ad-imo, to take away, O. Lat. ab-emo with the same sense (Paul. Fest. 4. 11 Th. 'abemito' signifies de-temi vel auferito. 'emere' enim antiqui diebant pro accipere), dir-imo, intér-imo, ex-imo (cf. M. Ir. fo-emaim, 'I take,' Lith. imū, O. Sl. imaj, retains in these Compounds the Perfect-formation of the Simple Verb emi, redëmi, coëmi, adëmi, &c., but in the Compounds como, démo, vivō, sōno, in which its connexion with emo is obscured, it takes an S-Preterite, compsi, dempsi, prompsi, sumpsi (O. Lat. surunit however for sumput is quoted by Paul. Fest. 425. 3 Th.); similarly amicio, a Compound of jacio, is conjugated inconsistently with its forgotten origin amici and amixi, amictem, amicere (cf. ambívam Supine of ambio, a Compound of ao, but amb-itus, a going round, cauvasing, &c.) why elicio should have as Perfect eliciui, but allicio, allexi is not clear.

§ 47. Origin of the Perfect in -vi (ui). The v (u) of Perfects like amá-vi, mún-vi has variously been explained as a case-ending of a Verbal Noun U-stem followed by the Auxiliary Verb ei-, 'to go,' as a formation on the analogy of Verb-stems which end in v (u) such as for-ω (ch. iv. § 144) from the root dheghs-fivéi being regarded as a Perfect formed in the same way as fádi from fádio, and not in the manner stated in § 39. 4) and other even less satisfactory hypotheses. A very plausible theory supposes I.-Eur. -wi to have been the ending of the first and third persons singular of the Perfect of roots ending in a long vowel and compares O. Ind. ja-jinā (with final unaccented i dropped) with Lat. (g)nùn (with the middle 1 Sg. ending -ai), O. Ind. pa-prāū with Lat. plēri. These O. Ind. forms are confined to the 1 and 3 Sg. of the Perfect of roots ending in a long vowel, e. g. da-dāu, 'I have given,' he has given,' but da-dā, 'thou hast given,' &c., so that the original Latin paradigm may have been plei, plēsi, plērit, &c. There is also an explanation possible which connects these Latin Perfects with Oscan (and probably Umbrian) Perfects in -f (-ff), such as Ose. a-ma-mana-fēd 'amanadavit' 'facienda curavit,' aikda-fed *aequidavit' 'fines ad normam derogavit,' prūf-fed 'probavit,' fufens 'fuerunt.' This Oscan f has been naturally explained, like f of Oscan fu-fans 'erant,' Falisc. kare-fó 'carebo,' as representing I.-Eur. bh, seen in O. Ir. charub 'amabo' (quasi i 'carabo'). But Italic f may also represent I.-Eur. dh (see ch. iv. § 114), so that these Oscan Perfects, if separable from the Impf. fufans, may contain an Auxiliary Verb connected with the root dhe-, 'to put' (Gk. ἔθημα, Lat. crē-do, § 27 and p. 363). Latin v (u) in the middle of a word
may represent *dv (I.-Eur. dw, as in suācis, 1.-Eur. *swādu-, and probably also I.-Eur. dhw), while at the beginning of a word I.-Eur. dw- is represented by Latin b, e.g. *bis from I.-Eur. *dwis (Gk. δήνιον), so that the *v of the Latin Perfect and the f. ff) of the Oscan may both represent the dhw- of a weak stem from the root dhē-, 'to put, place,' a stem which appears in a fuller form (the E-grade? ch. iv. § 51) in Lat. crē-duas, as the numeral duo (see ch. vi. § 59) appears beside bis. If this explanation, which requires a good many possibilities, be right, Oscan-manaffed will correspond to Latin cubāvit, &c., Oscan prūfused to Latin cubauit, &c., and the -ss- of messuë, &c. will be due to the combination of the final dental of the Verb-stem with the initial dental of the Auxiliary (see below § 51).

In cabae beside cabae, crequī beside crepavi, the u-forms may be referred to the parallel Consonant-stems of cumbere, *crepere (percrepis, Varro, Men. 124 B.), and similarly lāci (for *laucci) to O. Lat. lātere, sōnīi to O. Lat. sōnere (cf. § 92). But Perfects in -ui may also come from forms in which a short vowel preceded the Auxiliary *dhwai, just as elus (so elu from elāvā, dēnuvo from dē nūvo (*nūvō), ecreum from *ēgro[20]- (cf. Gk. ὑποθέτω, ἐπιθέωθος) (see ch. iii. § 24). Perfects in -vi from Consonantal Verbs, such as petivī from pēto, rudivī from ruido, lacessivī from lācessō, arcessivī from arcessō (and similarly quaessivī for *quaessivī from quaeso, older quaessus, used as Perf. of quaero), probably come from parallel YO-stems, *petiō, *rudio, *laessivī, &c. (cf. sallo and sallio, Perf. saltīci, līno and līnīo, Perf. limitīri, &c., § 15).

§ 48. Shortened forms of the Perfect in -vi. Latin v was often dropped when it stood between two vowels, oftentimes between two ē's, e.g. O. Lat. dēnūs for dīnīus, oblīcī for oblīcisī, ētenī for ēvitēn (so dis for dīvēs) (see ch. ii. § 53), but the dropping of u after a consonant is not practised in the same way (ch. iv. § 71). The only Latin Perfect form without u is the curious monerīm of Pacuvius, quoted as an irregular formation by Nonius (507. 23 M.)

Trag. 30 R.: .. die quid fāciam; quod me mōneris effectūm dabo,
and Trag. 112 R. di mōnerint meliōrā atque amentiōm āuerruncassīnt tuam (parodied by Lucil. xxvi. 35 M.), which seems to be a formation from a stem mon- (cf. Gk. μῦ-μωνα?) instead of the ordinary Perfect-stem monēre-, unless it indicates a pronunciation mōn(ε)reīm like dūb(y)icio of the Old Dramatists (ch. ii. § 50), and possibly augūr(y)a in a line of Accius (Trag. 624 R.) (quoted by Nonius 488. 2 M., who makes the word augūrum, by some regarded as a Neut. Pl. like rōbūra; cf. O. Ind. ḍjas- N., 'strength'): prō certo arbitrábor sortīs, ērācla, adytus, āugūra,
and prōgen(y)em (? prōgēnēm) in a pentameter line of a Scipio epitaph of this period (C. I. L. i. 38, c. 130 B.C.):
prohē geni mi genuī: facē patris petieī
(probably a graver's mistake for prohēgenn genuī). (Pēssisse, sāpūsse are shortened forms, not of postūsse, sāpūsse, but of postūsīs, sāpūsīs, § 39.4). But Perfect-forms

1 Dōmnus, which is usually explained in as Perf. of *dōmēyo-, a Causative by-form of *domāyo- (§ 29), is by some referred to an I.-Eur. stem ending in a or -ā (cf. Gk. Æ-β-μαρτος with Lat. domitus). An example of a stem in I.-Eur. -ā is O. Ind. vāmīmi (3 Sg. vāmī-ti, but also with the Thematic Vowel, vāmā-ti), the equivalent of Lat. vīma, -ēre.
without *v* were extremely common; in Cicero's time *nossē, jūdicasse, &c.* were usual (*Orat.* xlvi. 157 quid quod sic loqui, *nossē, jūdicasse* vetant, *novisse* jubent et *jūdicavisse*? quasi vero nesciamus in hoc genere et plenum verbum recte dici et imminutum usitate); and in Quintilian's time the forms *audīvisse, scīvisse, conservāvisse* were scarcely heard even in public speaking (*Quin.* i. 6. 17–21 inhaerent tamen ei (*sc.* analogiae) quidam molestissima diligentiae perversitate ut *audaciter* potius dicant quam *audacter,* licet omnes oratores aliiud sequantur . . . his permittamus et *audīvisse* et *scīvisse* et *tribunāle* et *faciliter* dicere . . . sed abolita atque abrogata retinere insolentiae cujusdam est et frivolae in parvis jactantiae. multum enim litteraturus, qui sine aspiratione et produta secunda syllaba salutarit (*avere* est enim), et *calefacere* dixerit potius quam quod dicimus et *conservāvisse,* his adiacit *face* et *dice* et similia. recta est haec via: quis negat? sed adjacet et mollior et magis trita? Servius, in a note on the form *lenītt* in Virg. *Aen.* i. 451, tells us that the pronunciation of every-day life was *lenītt,* the form with the short penult being confined to poetry (*sed* hoc in metro ubi necessitas cogit: nam in prosa et naturam suam et accentum retentat.

Varro (*L.* L. iii. fr. p. 148 W.) mentions *anastī, nostī, abiīt* as the favourite forms of his time; and in Terence the usual forms of Perfects in *-ēvi, -ēvi* and of *nōvi* are the contracted (in Plautus the uncontracted, though in the middle, not the end, of a line *sīris,* not *śiōris,* is used), while the uncontracted forms of Perfects in *-āevi* are used only at the end of a line (in Plautus equally with the contracted). *Eo* and its compounds have even in Plautus usually the form *-ēvī* in Perfect forms, except *āvi,* *exāvi,* *ambāvi,* &c. All this indicates the forms without *v* to have been phonetic developments of the others, and to have gradually established themselves in exclusive use, the *v* being dropped earliest and most persistently in forms where it came between two *v*’s. The shortened form of *-ēvit,* if it did not push itself into literary usage, must however have become, sooner or later, a part of every-day pronunciation, for the Romance forms point to a Vulgar Latin *-aut* for *-ēvit,* e.g. Ital. *comprò* from a Vulg. Lat. *comp(ā)vunt.* (*On* *audīt,* &c. for *audīvīt,* see *ch.* iii. § 10. 2.)

The *v* of the Perfect of verbs whose stem ends in *v* (*u*) was not dropped to the same extent; a fact which may be explained by the different sound of *āvī* for *-āvī* in *cāveram* (pronounced *cāveram?*) and *-āvī* in *anāveram.* But even these Perfects when *o, u* precede *v,* are contracted almost as readily as the others: e.g. *dēvōro* for *dēvōrō* in the Praeextatā of Accius called *Deciuς* (referring to Decius Mus) [*Trag. (Praet.)* 15 R.]:

pātrio exemplo et me dicabo atque animam deorō hōstibus;

*commōrat,* Ter. *Phorm.* 101; *commōrant,* *remosae,* Lucr.; *adjūro* (or *adjūvō?*), in a passage of the eleventh book of Ennius’ *Annales* (l. 386 M.) describing the Macedonian campaign of Flamininus (the words are addressed by a shepherd-guide to the Roman general):

O Tite, siquid ego adiuro curamue leuasso, quae nunc te coquit et uersat in pectore fixà, ecquid erit praemī?

and the same form (3 Sg.) in Plaut. *Rud.* 305 and Ter. *Phorm.* 537, &c. *Mōrunt,* *mōram,* *commōrant,* *commōram,* *commosam,* &c. are not uncommon in the Augustan poets, e.g. *Hort.* S. l. 9. 48:

disperea am ni

summosse omnis,
and *jüerint occurs in Catullus, lxvi. 18:

non, ita me diui, uera gemunt, iucrint

(for other examples, see Neue, ii 533). The usage on inscriptions of the 3 Pl. Pft. forms of cōra, prōba similarly points to the forms with v being the older [e.g. coerenterant, C. I. L. i. 73, coerenterant 1419, coerenterunt 565, &c. (once coererunt), but coerenterant and coererunt, curarunt].

§ 49. Shortened forms of the Perfect in -si. A better case might be presented for the theory that the shorter forms of Perfects in -si (-xi) are really ancient forms of different origin from the full forms, for dixit, dixer, dixem, &c. are most found in the early Dramatists, though they are by no means uncommon in Virgil and later poets. But the explanation of this fact is rather that they were felt to belong more or less to colloquial Latin, and so were freely admitted into Comedy and Tragedy (in both of which the every-day language of cultured society was employed), but not so freely into other literature. (Quintilian ix. 3. 22 remarks on Cicero's use of dixit 'excussa syllaba' in the pro Cæcina, 29. 82.) A thing that is almost conclusive proof that dixer &c. are not parallel forms to dixim, dixo, &c. is that these shortened forms are only found with Verbs which form the Perfect in -si (-xi); we have no *caspem, answering to capsem, no *axem answering to axim. [On the wrongness of the readings subaxet (for subaxii) in Faen. Trag. 161 B, facet in Plaut. Capt. 712, accepti, Trin. 420, 964, &c. see Neue, ii. p. 539, and for examples of the shortened forms of Perfects in -si (-xi), e.g. rix and vixem in Varro (Mon. 321 B, non eos optime vixi qui diutissime vixent sed qui modestissime, misti, misce, scripti, rescripti (Cic. ad Att. v. 9. 2), -sumpti, -sumpse, -cessi, -cessem, -cisse, -dixi, -duxi, -spexi, -spexa, -truxi, -curuxi, &c. see Neue, ii. pp. 536 sqq.]

§ 50. O. Lat. Perfects in -u(v)i. Varro declares that in the correct pronunciation of his time the u of verbs like pluo, luuo was short in the Present but long in the Perfect Indicative, as in the Perfect Participle Passive of similar verbs (L. L. ix. 104 quidam reprehendunt, quod 'pluit' et 'luit' dicimus in praeterito et praesenti tempore, cum analogiae sui cujusque temporis verba debent discrimenari. falluntur; nam est ac putant aliis, quod in praeterito u dicimus longum 'pluit,' 'luit,' in praesenti breve 'pluit,' 'luit'; ideoque in venditionibus legi fundi 'nita caesa' ita dicimus ut u producamus) (but cf. diritus). Priscian (i. 504. 22 H.) makes this pronunciation, -üi, in the Perfects of Verbs in -uo, a feature of Old Latin, and quotes Ennius (Ann. 135 M):

adnüt sese mecum decernere ferro,

while in another passage (i. 503. 14 H.) he quotes pluavisse, pluvit with v (the quantity of the u is not mentioned) from Livy.

Institūit is the reading of the MSS. in Plaut. Most. 86 (in baccheiniac metre, a metre in which the long quantity of a vowel preceding another vowel is often retained):

argumentaque inpectus múltà instituí.

The commonest instance of -üi or -avi is in the Perfect of the old verb fluo, viz. füi, used as the Perfect of sum, as füimus in the boast of Ennius on being made a Roman citizen (Ann. 431 M.):

nos sumus Romani qui füimus ante Rudini,

füit (along with profüit) in Plaut. Capt. 555:

quibus inspicious saluti fluit atque est profüit;
§ 51. Some Irregular Perfects. Besides the byforms in s of the Perfect of parco, -ego, &c. which are found in the older as well as the later literature (§ 46), we have some which are more recent coinages on the type of other verbs. Velius Longus (74. 4 K.) speaking of sorpsi, a byform of sorbu, says: verb recens haec declinatio a sordidi sermonis viris coeperit (cf. Caper 94. 14 K. non est...sorbsi, sed sorbui), and similarly describes terni for *trivi as a constiutudo novu (absorpsi is used by Lucan, iv. 100). The Perfect velsi, for veli, seems also to belong to this class of later coinages (aculit in Lucan, v. 594; cf. Neue, ii 2. 503), and -cinui of concinui (Ov., Tibull.), ocacnui (Sall.), incinui (Varro), &c. may be a remodelling of a Perfect with lost Reduplication -cin (con-cinui, oc-cinui, in-cinui) after the pattern of io-mui, consonui, &c. Messui (found in the older writers) is generally regarded as due to a similar addition of the ending -mi to an already existing Perfect *messi, and also nexui (with nexi), pexui (with peri), although, if the theory of the origin of the V-perfect stated in § 47 be correct, the sibilant might be referred to the influence of the dental in the auxiliary *dhwai (cf. *aus us for *ut-tus, *ot-tu-, fäsus for *fud-tus, &c., ch. iv. § 93 p. 281). In late inscriptions we have e.g. reguit (C. I. L. v. 923, from Aquileia: septimae qui cohortis centuriam reguit, a pentameter line), convertuit (viii. 2532 D b 1) ; Apuleius uses conterui (see Georges Lex Wortf. s. v.). On Heteroclite Perfects like fu, Perfect of sum, esti; older têlii) of fero, see § 97.

In Vulgar Latin, as reflected in the Romance languages, the ending -ni encroached still more. Cognovit became cognovuit (Ital. conobbe'), moxvit became movuit (Ital. move'), ceedit was replaced by caduit (Ital. cadde), stetit by stetuit (Ital. stette), venit by venuit (Ital. venne), &c. (cf. § 92 on the Vulg. Lat. P. P. P. in -tuus, e.g. cadat', fallen (Ital. caduto)). The ending -si also extended its sphere, responsiit passing to responsit (Ital. rispose), prenuit to pr(n)stit (Ital. prese), cucurrit to cursit (Ital. corse), &c. (See Moyer-Lübke, Rom. Gramm. ii. pp. 297 sqq.)

§ 52. E. Pluperfect. The Pluperfect-stem is formed by adding to the Perfect-stem an S-suffix, probably a Preterite of the Substantive Verb es-, as the Imperfect in -bam, e.g. amā-bam, uses a Preterite of the Verb bheu-. The -eram, -erās, -erat of amāv-eram, mēru-eram, replēv-eram, diē-eram, vid-eram, pēpig-eram, audīv-eram is most naturally referred to the Imperfect of sum, though āderam has been, with the O. Ind. ā-vēdiš-am, analyzed into a Noun-stem in -is (cf. vidēs-sem) as Gk. ἀδεa into a Noun-stem in -es (see § 3). The -is- of the Pluperfect Subjunctive amāvissem, mēnvissem, vidēssem, audīssem must, if the old view be correct which sees in these forms an
Auxiliary *esse* appended to the Perfect-stem, be a change of *-er* to the I-vocalism of the Perfect, just as the *a* of Gk. ἔσεσαντο, &c. is due to the apprehension of *a* as the appropriate vowel of the Aorist Tense.

§ 53. F. Future-Perfect. The Future-Perfect adds to the Perfect-stem *-erō, -erīs, -erēt, &c.* (3 Pl. *-erunt*), which seems to be nothing else than the Future (in form a Subjunctive, § 55) of *sum*, appended as an Auxiliary Verb, though those who explain the *-er* of *vidēram* as I.-Eur. *-is*, the suffix of a Noun-stem, see the same *-is* in *vidēro* (cf. O. Ind. vēdēṣam) (see 3).

Scansions like *fecerīmus* (Catull. v. 10), 1 Pl. of *feco*, are due to the confusion of the Future-Perfect forms with Perfect Subjunctive forms (see Neue, ii, p. 510); *aderint* is similarly used for *ēdērunt* throughout the Lex Col. Jul. Genetivae Urbanorum of 44 B.C. (*Eph. Epigr.* ii. p. 122). The use of the Fut. Perf. in the Republican Dramatists in sentences like *mox ivero*, where it hardly differs from the Future, suggests that in its original usage the Tense was more of a Future than of a Future Perfect (see *A. L. L.* iv. 594).

In the Umbro-Oscan languages we have a suffix *-us* (Umbro-Oscan *u* may represent I.-Eur. *ō* as well as I.-Eur. *ā*), which is supposed to be the termination of the Perfect Participle. Thus Osc. *fecacust* ‘fecerit’ will be like Gk. ἔδρακός ἔσομαι, Umbr. fakurent like ἔδρακότες ἔσονται. (On the Umbro-Ocean Perfect Participle in *-us*, see § 89.)

§ 54. G. Tenses formed with Auxiliary Verbs. We have seen that the suffix used to form the Imperfect Tense of all Verbs, *-bā-,* and the suffix used for the Future of Vowel Verbs, *-bō- (-bē-)*, are nothing but parts of the Auxiliary Verb bheu- (Lat. *fui*), that the S-suffixes of the Pluperfect and Future-Perfect Indicative, and of the Imperfect, Perfect and Pluperfect Subjunctive are probably to be referred to the Auxiliary *es*- (Lat. *sum*), and we have seen the possibility of a similar explanation of the V-suffix of the Perfect Tense as a form of the root *dhē-*, ‘to set, put,’ used as an Auxiliary Verb. These theories receive a sanction from the proneness of the Latin and other Italic languages for Periphrastic Tense-forms. Not only was the
Italic Perfect Indicative Passive a form of this kind [Lat. amātus sum, (1) I was loved, (2) I am in a state of being loved, amatus fui, I was in a state of being loved, Osc. prūftī-set 'probata sunt,' teremnαtus 'terminatus est,' Umbr. scrēltō est 'scriptum est' (the Auxiliary is joined in writing with the Participle in froselomest)], and other Tenses of the Passive (Pluperfect, Lat. amatus ēram, amatus fuēram, Future-Perfect amatus ēro, amatus fuēro, Perfect Subjunctive amatus sim, amatus fuērim, Pluperfect Subjunctive amatus essēm, amatus fuīssēm), but we have many other examples of Periphrastic formation. The 2 Pl. Pass. ending -mini, e.g. fūrīmini, is explained (§ 81) as the ending of a Pres. Part. Pass. (Gk. φερόμενοι) with suppression of esse, just as esse is commonly suppressed in the Fut. Inf. dictūrus, -a, -um (esse) (§ 86). Osc. manafum 'mando,' if it correspond to 'mandans sum,' is another example, showing a Pres. Part. with the Substantive Verb (cf. C.I.L. i. 196 senatusisque sententiam utei scientes estis). The Auxiliary eo appears in the Latin Fut. Inf. Pass., e.g. dātum (i Sup.) ivi (§ 87), the Auxiliary hábeo in such phrases as missum hábeo for mīsi or dimīsi (e.g. Plaut. Pseud. 602 illa omnia missa hábeo, quae ante agere ocepi), the Auxiliary DHĒ- (reddo, do, fācio, &c.) in phrases like missum fācio for mittō or dimittō (e.g. Plaut. Amph. 1145), perfectum reddo for perficio (e.g. Plaut. Asin. 122), factum dabo for facium (e.g. Ter. Enn. 212). In the Romance languages these expressions have supplanted many of the Latin tenses; e.g. cantare habeo (Fr. chanter-ai, Ital. canter-ò, with habeo, habes, &c., reduced to hayo, has, hat, haunt, &c.) has supplanted cantabo, &c. so that the Latin Future survives in Romance only in a few isolated forms, Ital. fia, O. Fr. ier from Lat. fiam, ero; we find a Periphrastic Perfect consisting of the Perf. Part. Pass. with sum, sto (Intrans.) or with habeo, teneo (Trans.); and for the Passive the same Participle with sum, fio, venio, &c. (See Meyer-Lübke, Rom. Gram. ii. pp. 138 sqq.)

§ 55. III. THE MOODS. A. Subjunctive. (Relics of the I.-Eur. Optative Mood in Latin.) The I.-Eur. Subjunctive had the functions of a Future (cf. Hom. II. i. 262 oū γάρ τω τοιού τόου ἀνέφας οὐδὲ τομαί), as well as of a true Subjunctive; it had
also Imperatival functions, and in O. Ind. while Subjunctive forms are frequent in the oldest literature, the Vedas, they survive in classical 'Sanscrit' only in Imperatival use, e.g. 1 Sg. Imper. bhar-ā-ni, 'let me carry.' To the unweakened stem (E-grade) was appended in the Athematic Conjugation the short vowels ę and ō, followed by either the Primary or the Secondary Person-endings (§ 65): e.g. from the Athematic Verb es-, 'to be,' we have 3 Sg. Subj. *es-e-t(i) (O. Ind. āsat(i)). In Greek these athematic Subjunctive forms are still seen in Homer (e.g. βήσομεν, τείσετε), and later in a few so-called Futures like ēd-o-μαι from the Athematic Verb ed-, 'to eat,' as in Latin we have ēro, ērit 3 Sg. similarly retained as a Future Tense. But in Greek, as in Latin, the athematic forms have been almost wholly supplanted by the thematic forms, which show a long vowel, sometimes ā, as in the Italic, Celtic and other languages, sometimes ę (which in Greek varies with ō, e.g. φέρ-η-τε, φέρ-ω-μεν, like athematic ε-o in τείσετε, βήσ-ο-μεν), as in the Italic and Greek languages; and this process must have begun very early, for thematic Subjunctive forms of verbs belonging to the Athematic Conjugation appear in many instances to have been I.-Eur. forms. Thus *ed-ā-, *ed-ę- must have been an I.-Eur. Subjunctive stem of ed-, 'to eat,' for we find in Lat. vidā-mus, vidā-tiā, in Greek ēdω-μεν, ēδη-τε, and in O. Ind. ādā-n 3 Pl. (O. Ind. ā may represent I.-Eur. ā, ē, ō); *es-ę- from es-, 'to be,' appears in Gk. ēη-τε, ēω-μεν (cf. O. Ind. āsā-t 3 Sg., asā-tha 2 Pl.); and ey-ā- from ei-, 'to go, in Lat. ēā-s, ēā-tiā (cf. O. Ind. ayā-s 2 Sg., ayā-t 3 Sg.). The discarded athematic forms are supposed to have been utilized in Greek as Futures [the Future in -σο- (-σε-)]; thus Αττ. τείσομεν, τείσετε, δείξομεν, δείχσετε, τυμήσομεν, τυμήσετε, &c. will not be of the same class as the ordinary I.-Eur. Future in -σο-, e.g. O. Ind. đek-σγā-mi corresponding to Gk. δείγω, Lith. bū-siu to Gk. φύσω, but will be Subjunctives of S-Aorists; and Latin Futures in -so-, like dīxīo, fāxīo, &c., have been referred to the same source. (On this theory, see § 3.)

In Latin the ā-forms were not used for the first Conjugation, probably because a Subjunctive like *amāy-ā-s(i) 2 Sg. must have become amās, and so been merged in the Indicative
2 Sg. amās. The Ė-forms only were used for this Conjugation in Latin, e.g. amās from *amāy-ō-s(i) (cf. Osc. devāid ‘juret,’ tadāit ‘censeat,’ sakahíter ‘sacetur’; Oscan ľ, in the Latin alphabet ľ, represents I.-Eur. ľ, e.g. ligato- ‘legatus,’ zico- M. ‘diēcula’), but in Umbrian we have Ā-forms in kurāia ‘curet,’ etaians ‘itent.’ Similarly the Ė-forms were not used for the second Conjugation in Latin, to avoid confusion between *widēy-ō-s(i), *vidēs 2 Sg. Subj., and vidēs 2 Sg. Ind., only the Ā-forms being allowed, e.g. *widēy-ā-s(i), videās. But in the other Conjugations the Ā- and Ė-forms probably existed side by side, until the latter were appropriated for the Future functions (see § 36), e.g. ferās 2 Sg. Subj. from *bher-ā-s(i), ferēs 2 Sg. Fut. from *bher-ē-s(i), faciat 3 Sg. Subj. (Osc. fakiaudad, Volsc. fačia, Umbr. fačia), faciet 3 Sg. Fut. These Ā- and Ė-Subjunctives show in Umbro-Oscan the Secondary Person-endings (-d in 3 Sg., -ns in 3 Pl.).

The Optative must have entered into competition with the Subjunctive at an early time, for it has almost entirely ousted the Subjunctive forms in the Teutonic and Balto-Slavic families of languages, and in Latin we see the struggle still going on between the Optative-forms ēdā-mus, ēdā-tis, and the Subjunctive-forms edā-mus, edā-tis from the root ed-, ‘to eat,’ while in the case of the root es-, ‘to be,’ the Optative sī-mus, sī-tis have driven out of the field the proper athematic Subjunctive forms evē-mus, evē-tis (from *eso-, *eso-), which have been relegated to the Future function, as an *(es)e-mus, *(es)e-tis may lurk in the Imperfect Subjunctive ending (see § 34).

The I.-Eur. Optative had in the Athematic Conjugation the weak grade of stem, with a suffix which was in the Singular Active -yē- (-iyē-) and elsewhere -i-, and with the Secondary person-endings. Thus from the root es-, the I.-Eur. Optative forms were: 2 Sg. *syē-s (O. Ind. syā-s) or sīyē-s (O. Ind. s-iyā-s, O. Lat. sīēs), 2 Pl. *s-i-tē (cf. Lat. s-i-tīs). In the Thematic Conjugation the suffix was -oi- in Singular and Plural alike, e.g. from the root bher-, to carry, 2 Sg. *bher-oi-s (Gk. φήρ-οι-s), 2 Pl. *bher-oi-te (Gk. φήρ-οι-τε). I.-Eur. oi of the Thematic Optative would in the unaccented syllable in Latin become -ei-, then -i- (ch. iii. § 18), and I.-Eur. -yē- (-iyē-)
of the Singular Active of the Athematic Optative has been mostly replaced by -i, the weak form of the suffix (e.g. class. *sim for O. Lat. *siem, like *simus, *sitis), so that a Latin Optative form-like *edis might equally well represent an I.-Eur. athematic *edi-o-s (with E-grade of stem and with i transferred to the Singular from the Plural, as -ye is transferred to the Plural from the Singular in Gk. *sta-η-μευ, a byform of *staipnευ), and an I.-Eur. thematic *edi-o-s. The probability however is that the Optative was confined to the Athematic Conjugation in Latin, and represents in every case I.-Eur. -ye-, -i-. Again, it would be possible to argue that *sīes, *sēmus, &c. were representatives of I.-Eur. *sta-ye- (Gk. *sta-ης, *sta-η-μευ), and not examples of E-Subjunctives. The resolution of these doubts must come from the Umbro-Oscan languages, of which the remains hitherto discovered offer too scanty material to enable us to separate with certainty Latin thematic and athematic Optatives, and Latin Subjunctives in -e-. The use of the weak grade of the suffix -ye- in the Singular of the Optative of es appears in these languages too, e.g. Umbr. si 'sis,' si 'sit,' like *sinus 'sint,' Marruc. -si 'sis' or 'sit,' and has been referred to an Italic weakening of unaccented ye to i. How far it is possible to assign an Optative force to forms like *credum in the older literature, and a Subjunctive force to forms like *crednam is doubtful. The Optative origin of the old forms in -(s)sim comes out clearly in their use in prayers (e.g. Juppiter prohibessis scelus, di mactassint, and the formula of the ancient Augural prayer: bene sponsis beneque volueris; see § 5), but in process of time all distinctions between Optatives in -im Subjunctives in -am and Subjunctives (possibly Optatives) in -em came to be effaced.

§ 56. Some O. Lat. Subj. and Opt. forms. In one of the oldest Latin inscriptions preserved, the Dvenos inscription, we have an A-Subjunctive mitat 'mittat' used as a Future, with the Optative of the root es-, sied 'sit,' used in the true Optative sense: qoi med mitat, nei ted endo cosmos uireo sied 'qui me mittet, ne erga te comis Virgo sit' (asest on the same inscr. is variously interpreted as 'adstet' and as 'ast'); see ch. x. § 5). Sien, sies, siet (on sient, see § 73; *siemus, *sietis have not found their way into Latin as syama, syata have into O. Ind.), possiam, &c. are by Terence used almost only at the end of a line or hemistich, i.e. through metrical necessity, but
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siem, siet are almost invariably used in old laws (e. g. C. I. L. i. 196. 30; 197. 21; 198 passim; 199. 6; 200 passim), and Cicero (Orat. xlvii. 157) says, 'siet' plenum est, 'sit' inminutum: licet utare utroque. [For statistics, see Zander, Vers. Ital. p. cxx, who makes -i- of sit, &c. not the L.-Eur. 1 of the Plural, but a Latin weakening of -ie- as in Cornellii Voc. for Cornellie (cf. ch. vi. § 31)]. Besides the class, Lat. 'Subjunctives' (Optatives) in -im, sim, edim, velit (in Plaut. velit and vis are used as the metre requires, without difference of meaning), with its Compounds nótim and málit (on nóli, see § 58), we find an O. Lat. Optative duiam. It comes from duo, a system both of do, to give (root dō-) and of -do, to put (root dhē- of τι-θη-μ, &c.), e. g. duitur (v. l. adru-uitur) XII Tab. x. 7, interduam, Plaut. Jr. inc. 2 G. cecum non interduo, acceduo, Adul. 585, concredui, Porf. Cas. 479. We have in Plautus the Optative forms duiam, perduim, especially in prayers and excommunications (e. g. Most. 668 di istum perduint), interduum (e. g. Ru. 580 cecum non interduim), creduim (in phrases like Amph. 672 si situlam cēpero, Nünquam mihi duiuni quiequam créduis post häum diem, 'may you never trust me again'), as also the Á-Subjunctive forms creduam e. g. Buæch. 524 nam mihi duiuni nünquam quisquam créduant, Ni ego, &c.), and acrereduum (Asin. 854 néque diuni néque mi humani pósthae quiequam aderéduas . . . si, &c.), while an É-Subjunctive form (in Future sense ?) is quoted by Paul. Fest. 20. 22. Th. adües, adiüderis (cf. ib. 47. 6 Th. dui . . . pro dederes). We have in Conditional use, e. g. duit in a Law of Numa (ap. Paul. Fest. 278. 9 Th.) si qui hominem liberum dolo sciens morti duct, parcidas esto; adduit in a Plebiscium de Ponderibus Publicis (ap. Fest. 322. 11 Th.) siquis . . . facit iussitne . . . dolumue adduit, &c. Festus also quotes an old form produit which he explains by 'porro dederit' (284. 16 Th.). Duiam was the form appropriate to Early Latin prayers, as in the prayer at the 'agri iustratio', preserved by Cato (R. R. exii. 3): pastores pecuœaque salua seruassis duique bonam salutem ualudinemque mihi domo familiaque nostræ; it is used even in Tiberius' letter to the Senate (Tac. Ann. iv. 38). There are also uncertain traces of Optative forms from other verbs, such as coguint, the reading of the Palatine MSS. in Plaut. Pseud. 819 (but cocunt in the Ambrosian Palimpsest), temperint, the reading of the same family of MSS. in Truc. 60, a line for which the evidence of the Palimpsest is not available (other examples, see in Neue, ii°. 442: carint of the Palatine MSS. in Most. 858 is carent in the Palimpsest, and the corrupt reading of the Palatine MSS. in Men. 984 a, where this line of the Mostellaria is wrongly inserted, culpant for culpa carent, shows carent to be the right form; verberit of the law of the XII Tables, ap. Fest. 290. 15 Th.: si parentem puér uerberit, ast olle plorassit, is a corruption due to the fact that the words were wrongly divided in the archetype verberas tolle, and the first word, being mistaken for a frequentive Verb, was changed to verberitus).

An O. Lat. Á-Subjunctive is fiam used in the sense of fiam, e. g. Bacch. 156, in the amusing conversation between young Pistoclerus and his 'paedagogus' Lydus:

Psir. fiam, út ego opinor Hércules, tu autém Linus.
Lyd. pol métuo magis, ne Phoénix tuis factis fiam, teque ád patrem esse mótuam renúntiem, 

sometimes merely in the sense of sim, e. g. Virg. A. x. 108:

Tros Rutulusve fuet nullo discrimine habebo.
The equivalent of *forsitan* (which is not used by Plautus, and only seldom, if ever, by Terence, ch. ix. § 5) is in Plautus *fors fuat an*, e.g. Pseud. 432:

> fors fuat an istaece dicta sint mendacia.

(Cf. Ter. *Hec. 610* fors fuat pol! ‘heaven grant it may!’)

Nonius (478. 26 M.) quotes *volum* for *velim* from Lucil. (xxviii. 15 M.):

> eidola atque atomus uince cere Epicuri uolam,

and Plaut, *Asin. 109* siquid té uolam, Ubi eris?; but in the second at least of these passages it seems to be used in the Future sense.

§ 57. B. Imperative. In the 2 Sg. Act. of the Present Imperative the bare stem of the Verb is used, e.g. Athematic *ei*, from the root ei-, ‘to go’ (Gk. *e-ει*, Lat. *ex-i* from *ex-ei*), Thematic *bhere*, from the root bher-., ‘to carry’ (O. Ind. bhāra. Arm. ber, Gk. ἐπές, O. Ir. beir, Goth. bair; Lat. age). But a particle was often added: the particle -dhi to the 2 Sg. in the Athematic Conjugation (e.g. O. Ind. i-hí, Gk. *i-θτι*; O. Ind. vid-dhi, Gk. *ιορθι* for *θυο-θτι*, O. Lith. veiz-di, O. Sl. viž-dí); the particle -ki or -ke in Lithuanian, e.g. eí-k, ‘go’, dú-k, ‘give’, bů-k, ‘be’; the particle -u (cf. O. Ind. sō for *sou*, Gk. *οὐ-τός* for *σου-τος*) in Sanscrit to the 3 Sg. and Pl., e.g. bhāratu, bhārantu; the particle -tōd to various persons both in the Athematic and Thematic Conjugations [e.g. O. Ind. vit-tāt 2 Sg.; Gk. *ιττω* for *θυι-τῶ* 3 Sg.; Gk. *εσ-τῶθ* (δ), Lat. *ex-tōd*]. In Latin the 2 Sg. Imper. in -tōd(ī) is called the Future Imperative, because it expresses a command, not for immediate performance, but for performance after something shall have happened (e.g. Plaut. *Merc. 770* cras petito, dabitur; nunc abi; Hor. C. iii. 14. 23 si per invisum mora janitorem Fiet, abito), and the same sense is attached to the O. Ind. 2 Sg. Imper. in -tāt (see Delbrück, *Altind. Syntax*, p. 363), so that it is not unlikely that this particle -tōd is nothing but the Abl. Sg. of the Demonstrative Pronoun-stem to- (ch. vii. § 13. 1), and means ‘from this,’ ‘thereupon.’ It is also found with the 3 Sg. Dual and Plur., and perhaps took with it originally the weak grade of the Verb-stem (e.g. Gk. *ταρ* 3 Sg., *δυς-τω* 3 Sg., O. Ind. kr-ṇū-tāt 2 Sg., ‘do thou’; but not in Latin *uó*, Umbr. etu, *eetn*, for *ei-tōd*). In the 3 Pl. it is added to what is called the ‘Injunctive’ 3 Pl., viz. a form resembling an augmentless Imperfect
(I.-Eur. *bheront like Impft. *e-bheront), e.g. Gk. φερόντεν for *φεροντ-τωδ, Lat. ferunto for *feront-tōd. For the 1 Sg. and Plur. the Subjunctive was used, e.g. Lat. feram, ferāmus. In the 2 Pl. we have the 'Injunctive' form (e.g. *bherētē, O. Ind. bhārata, Gk. φέρητε, O. Ir. berid, Goth. bairīp; Lat. āgīte from *agete), beside which we find in Latin a 'Future' form with -tōte, e.g. estote, apparently the addition of the 2 Plur. suffix -tē (§ 72) to the 2 Sg. 'Future' Imperative (e.g. estō.)

In the Latin Passive, the Injunctive form in -sō (e.g. I.-Eur. *bhere-sō, Zend bara-sāha, Gk. φέρεο, contr. φέρου, καθέρεο, contr. ε-φέροv) is used, e.g. āgē-rē for *āgē-so (see ch. iii. § 38), in the 2 Sg., and in the 2 Pl. the old Passive Infinitive1 (Dat. Sg. of a MEN-stem), e.g. āgū-menī for *āgē-menai (Hom. Gk. āγέ-μεναι), da-menī (O. Ind. dá-manē Inf., Hom. Gk. δό-μεναι); in the 2 Sg. 'Future' Imper. and in the other persons the final d of -tōd is changed to -r, e.g. āgītor, dūtor, aguntor (cf. Umbr. emantur, emantu, turšíandu). A byform for the 2, 3 Sg. is in -mēnō, e.g. prae-fámino, formed apparently by Anal. of 2 Pl. -mēnī. There is no Perfect Imper. in Latin, though mēnīni, a Perfect used for a Present, has mēmento for *memento-tōd (Gk. μεμάτω for *μεματ-τωδ). Memento, like other 2 Sg. Imperatives in -tō, expresses a command that usually has reference to the future, a reference naturally suggested by the command 'remember.'

§ 58. Other examples of 2 Sg. Imper. with bare stem. (1) Athematic: like athematic Ind. im-plē-s, vidē-s, curā-s, finā-s are Imper. im-plē, vidē (Lith. pa-vydė-k), curā, finā, &c. Fer, vel, es (from sum) are then likely to be athematic too, since their Ind. is athematic (e.g. 3 Sg. fer-t, vid-t, est-t; see § 2). Fer cannot be an Injunctive form *fer-s (like ter for *ter-s from L.-Eur. *trī-s, ch. vi. § 61), if, as is probable, it is in Plautus a thoroughly short syllable, capable of acting as a brevis brevians (see ch. iii. § 42), in Curc. 245 aufer istace quaeo, whereas ter is a long syllable in Plautus, e.g. Bacch. 1127. In Mīt. 1343 however one family of MSS. reads: fer aequo animo, the evidence of the Ambrosian Palimpsest being unfortunately wanting, a reading which may easily be changed to fer animo aequo (as Curc. 245, for which there is similar Ms. evidence, is changed by some editors to aufer quaeso istace). The

1 Or the Plural of the old Pres. Part. Passive, agimīni for *āgō-menoi (Gk. ἀγό-μενοι), with ellipse of estē, as 2 Pl. Ind. agimīni for the same, with ellipse of estis (§ 8a). The Inf. is used for the Imper. in Italian &c. in phrases like non pūrāre 'do not speak.'
small number of lines with decisive evidence on the quantity of *fer in Plautus makes it difficult to speak with certainty. *Fer is short in *Asin. 672 *fer amantii ero salutem. *Vel is a short syllable, capable of acting as a brevis brevians in Plautus, e. g. *Amph. 917 *vel hunc rogato; es, *be,’ cannot be shown (like es, ‘art’) to be long by position in Plautus (see Solmsen, *Stud. Latint. p. 185); es, *eat,’ for which we should expect *ed, beside 3 Sg. *esto, may be coined on the type of es, *be,’ beside 3 Sg. *esto, although both es, *be,’ and es, *eat,’ can also be explained as Injunctive forms (like Gk. *πι-σχ-σ, &c.) for *es-s and *ed-s.

*Če-dō (with Plur. *ce-tie for *ce-áltie?), ‘give me’ or ‘tell me,” seems to contain the Pronoun *Ke (perhaps Lith. sė, ‘hither’; see ch. vii. § 15), prefixed as an Adverb or Proposition, ‘here,’ ‘hither’ (cf. Osc. *ce-bnust ‘lue venerit,’ composed of *Ke and a tense of the L.-Eur. root *gēn-, ‘to come’) to an athematic Imperative *dō (Lith. dū-k; cf. Gk. *di-dō), the final vowel, shortened by the Law of Breves Breviantes after the short syllable *če, being invariably short owing to the rapid utterance of the word in every-day talk (so hācum for *oce in the pronunciation of Quintilian’s time, ch. iii. § 42).

*Dō for *dō shows the same transference to the Ā-Conjunctive as Pres. Ind. *dās, dat (O. Lat. *dāt) (see § 2).

Another example of an athematic Imperative may be *fu in the Carmen Arvale, if the words *satur fu, *fere Mars, are rightly interpreted *satur esto, *fere Mars.” *Fu will be Imper. of *fuus, like Lith. bū-k. *Nūsti may come from a system of the fourth Conjugation, L.-Eur. *wel-yo- (Goth. vilja, O. Sl. velja) (see § 2). (On Late Lat. *afere, see Georges, *Lex. Wortf. s. v.)

2) Thematic. The thematic Imperatives O. Lat. *dice, *díce, *fáce (for *facci, from stem *facc-yō-, § 16) drop their final -i in classical Latin owing to their frequent use in word-groups, i. e. in close connexion with a following word (like *at(que), *neg(que) before consonants; see ch. iii. § 35). *Díc *míhi, *fác *sciam are regularly used even in O. Latin authors, and in Plautus we find *díce in questions when the next word begins with a consonant, e. g. *dic quid est, but *dice is the form employed where there is anything of a pause after the word; cf. Mil. 256 *dice, monstra, praceipe, and especially *Rud. 124:

tu, siquid opus est *dice. *Dic quod té rogo.

*Abdicēce, *addicēce and other Compounds of *duce are still found in Terence before a vowel, *abdicē, &c. before a consonant, while *fáce is the form employed at the end of a line; *édice in Virgil (‘antiquitatis amans’ *Diom. p. 349. 30 K.) in *Aen. xi. 463:

tu, *Volusia, *armari *Volscorum edice maniplis.

The Compounds however of *facio, whose short penult was not so favourable to Syncope (ch. iii. § 13. p. 173) retain the -s, *conficē, *offer, *insicē, &c. Catullus has *ingermi (xxvii. 2): *inger mi calices amariores, from which we may perhaps explain *miscem same on the old Praenestine cista with a kitchen-scene (*Mil. *Arch. 1890, p. 393) as *misc(ī) same from *miscem, an earlier form of *miscem (see § 28). The Interjection *en (ch. x. § 19) [e. g. *en tibi, ‘take that’ (with a blow), *em ergo hoc tibi, &c., in the Comedians] may have been originally Imperative of *eno, which in O. Lat. (§ 46) meant ‘to take’ (thematic *enem, to judge from the Ind. *emis, *emit, &c.), just as the Conjunction *vel (ch. x. § 4) was the

1 *Sins of the Carmen Arvale (quoted in ch. vi. § 55) is a very doubtful form.
Imperative (athematic) of vēdō (I.-Eur. *wēl-mi) (cf. Umbr. heris . . . heris, ‘either . . . or,’ lit. ‘do you wish . . . do you wish’).

§ 59. Other examples of Imper. in -tōd. The final -d is retained in Oscan, e. g. 3 Sg. deixtād ‘jurato,’ estōd, likītād ‘licito,’ and in Early Latin inscriptions, e. g. 2 Sg. stātōd, ‘sīstitō’ on the Dvenos bowl [a Future Imperative if we are right in interpreting dieñoine meāl Manō stātōd] ‘on the ninth day set me (with an offering) for Manus’; 3 Sg. violātōd, licētōd, datōd with exuēhito, exerpto, cēditō ‘caedito,’ in the Spoonetium inscription (C. I. L. ii. 4766), estōd, licōtād with fundatid, proiectād, parentatid on the Luceria inser. (C. I. L. ix. 782); but in class. Latin, as in Umbrian, -d was by the phonetic laws of the language lost after a long vowel (see ch. ii. § 137), e. g. Lat. estō, licētō, fertō, habētō, Umbr. fertu, futu ‘esto,’ habētu. The curious forms in -tid and -tad on the Luceria inser. (in hooe loacardid stireus ne[qu]is fundatid nee cadauer-proiectid nee parentid) are dialectal (Subj., with i for ē in -tād?). A Third Pl. form with -d, sanctōd, occurs on the Spoonetium inscription. (On Umbrian *-tō-tā in 2, 3 Pl., see § 73.)

Deponents sometimes show -to for -tor, e. g. nītīto (Cic. ap. Diom. 340. i K.), utuntō [C. I. L. i. 204. (1). 8), and on the Lex Repetundarum we have the Passive censentō (i. 198. 77).

§ 60. Imper. Pass. 2, 3 Sg. in -mīnō. This is an O. Lat. form, found as 2 Sg. in Plautus (e. g. prōgreditīmino, Pseud. 859: tu spectatō simul, si quo hie gradīetur, pāritēr prōgreditīmino),

and Catō (praefamimino, R. R. exli. 2 Iamum Iouemque nino praefamino, sic diciō) (cf. Paul. Fest. 62. 10 Th. ‘famino’ diciō), and as 3 Sg. in early legal Latin; antestamīno in XII Tables: si in ius uocat, ni it, antestamino, igitur em capito; fruīmīno in the Sententia Minuciorum of 117 B.C. (C. I. L. i. 199. 32 quēl . . . non parebit, is eum agrum nei habeto niue fruimino); prōfīmīno in the Lex Julia Municipalis of 45 B.C. (i. 206. ll. 3, 5, 8, 11).

The corresponding suffix in Umbrian is -mu 3 Sg. (i. e. -mō, from *-mnōd?, ch. v. § 133), e. g. persēni-h-mu ‘precamino,’ with 3 Pl. persēni-h-muno. In Oscan the Passive ending -r appears in 3 Sg. censamur (i. e. -mōr) ‘censemino,’ but the so-called Latin 2 Pl. Imper. Pass. in -mīnor is a fiction of the grammarians (see Madvig, Opusc. p. 239). [Cicero in the archaic language of his laws employs appellamino (MSS. -minor) as 3 Pl. Pass. (Legg. iii. 3. 8), but that this is a genuine old usage may be doubted.]

§ 61. 3 Pl. Imperat. The grammarians occasionally offer curious forms, amento (Sacerdos); probundo, docunto (Probus; cf. 3 Pl. Ind. mercunt, Commod., neunt, Tibull.).

§ 62. IV. THE VOICES. Deponent Verbs. Passive. Since the Passive in Latin does not differ from the Active in the Tense-stems so much as in the Person-endings, it is best discussed here, immediately before we proceed to the consideration of the suffixes used to denote the different Persons of the Verb. In close connexion with it goes the Middle, which had originally a Reflexive force, e. g. Gk. τύπτομαι like τύπτω ἐμαυτόν, or
a Neuter force, e.g. Gk. ἀρομα, ἐρυχομαι. In Latin Middle Verbs are called 'Deponents,' e.g. cingor like cingo me. Thus the L.-Eur. Middle *seqverbs, 'to follow, accompany' (O. Ind. sāca-tē 3 Sg., Gk. ἐπε-ται) is in Lat. the Deponent sequor, sequitur 3 Sg. (O. Ir sechur, sechethar 3 Sg.). The R-endings of the Passive and Middle or 'Deponent' in the Italic and Celtic languages are discussed in §65, where it is suggested that the Passive R-forms may originally have been restricted to an Impersonal use in Latin, as in Umbro-Oscan and Celtic the Impersonal Passive with -r, e.g. Umbr. fera-r Subj., 'there may be carrying,' O. Ir. do-bera-r, 'there may be giving' (L.-Eur. *bhera-r), is by its absence of person-ending distinguished from the Deponent with -r, e.g. Osc. karanter 'vescuntur,' O. Ir. sechethar 'sequitur.' The Personal Passive of O. Ir. by its restriction to the Third Person indicates its Impersonal origin. A Latin phrase like itur in antiquam silvam, the peculiarity of which is commented on by Quintilian (i. 4. 28: jam itur in antiquam silvam 'nonne propriae cujusdam rationis est? nam quod initium ejus invenias? cui simile 'fletur') may then exemplify the oldest use of the R-Passive, except that the original form would be *ir (*ei-r) without the 3 Sg. Person-suffix of itur (*ei-tō-r); and the change from the Impersonal vitam vivitur of O. Lat. to the Personal vita vivitur of class. Lat. is parallel to Horace's use of invideo for invidetur mihi, or Cato's change of contumeliam factum itur to contumelia factum itur (§87).

The Latin Perfect, as we have seen (§ 39), represents the L.-Eur. Perfect Middle, its 1 Sg. -ē, older -ei, being L.-Eur. -ai or -ai (O. Ind. -ē), so that a Perfect like reverteri (older -vorti, -vortei; cf. O. Ind. va-vrte) goes naturally with a Present reverto. On the other hand, the Participle in -to- (§ 92), which properly belonged to the Preterite Passive, was often used in an Active (or Middle) sense, e.g. Lat. cēnātus, prānsus, pōtus, so that reversus (older -vornus; cf. O. Ind. vrttá-), reversus sum are also admissible. More questionable is vertens as the Pres. Part. of vertor in the phrase: intra 'finem anni vertentis, 'within the current year,' vehens of vehor, &c. In the older literary period we find Active and Middle forms of the same verb side by side, but by the time of the classical writers there is less freedom
of choice; assentior, for example, had almost wholly supplanted assentio in Varro's time, who tells us that Sisenna the historian still clung to the old-fashioned assentio in giving his vote in the senate [L. L. fr. ap. Gell. ii. 25, 9: 'sentior' nemo dicit, et id per se nihil est; assentior tamen fere omnes diceunt. Sisenna unus 'adsentio' in senatu dicebat, et eum postea multi securi, neque tamen vincere consuetudinem potuerunt; cf. Quint. i. 5, 13. Quintilian however (ix, 3, 7) allows both assentior and assentio, and the latter form is found in Cicero's Letters and in the De Inventione; see Georges, Lex. Wort. s. v.]. The Middle form of assentior (as distinguished from sentio) is justified by the use of the Middle in verbs which express a state of feeling, e.g. reor, vereor, irascor. For the Greek Verb-ending -εω (e.g. κολακ-εω), used in Derivative verbs indicating 'to play a part,' 'to act like,' we have in Latin an Ā-Middle, e.g. aemul-or,-āri from aemulus, angūror, from angur, dōminor from dominus, poētor of Ennius' frank confession (Sat. 1 M.):

nunquam poetor nisi sim podager,

from poēta and so on. Examples of Frequentative Middles are hortor from O. Lat. *hōrior (3 Sg. horitur Enn.), meditor from a lost *medor (Gk. μεδωμαι), imitor (cf. ιμαγω), nitor for *nivitor from a root with a Guttural (cf. nixus, and see ch. iv. § 116).

§ 63. Impersonal use of Latin Passive. An example of an Acc. governed by an Impers. Pass. is Ennius, Trag. 190 R.:

incerte errat ánimus, praeterpróptet uitantuiutur,

quoted by Gellius (xix, 10) in illustration of the word præterpróptet, 'inexactly,' 'so so,' a word which was in his time only used in plebeian Latin (nescioquid hoc praenimis plebeium est et in opificium sermonibus quam in hominum doctorum disputatiónibus notius); the same construction has been seen in Plaut. Mil. 24 (epityra estur), Pseud. 817 (teritur sinapis seculera), (but see edd. ad loc.), Pers. 577 (uēniri hanc uolo) (but cf. Plaut. fr. inc. l. 64 G. ego illi uenear). Without an Acc. the Impersonal Passive is very common in the older writers, e.g. Plaut. Pseud. 273:

Quid agitur, Calidōre? Amatur átque egetur ácriter;

Pers. 309 ut ualentur, 386 facte nubitur, 'marriage is easy' ; Trin. 586 ibitur ; Capit. 80 quom calētur, 'in hot weather' ; Rud. 1018, &c. The Latin for 'No admittance' is PRIVATVM. PRECARIO ADEITVR, a notice preserved in an inscription (C. I. L. i. 1215).

§ 64. Active and Middle. Gellius (xviii, 12) remarks on the O. Lat. use
of Active Verbs like *augeo*, *mālo* in a Neuter sense, instead of *augeor*, *mutor*, and similarly of *contemplo* for *contemplor*, &c., and the seventh book of Nonius contains a host of examples from the older writers, *aucupo* for *aucipitor*, *vaço* for *vāgor*, and so on. Quintilian (ix. 3. 6–7) remarks on the inconsistency of the Middle form of Transitive Verbs, *fabricor*, *pūnior*, *arbitror*, *suspičor* with the Active form of a Neuter or Passive Verb, *vāpūlo*, and mentions as parallel forms *luxāriatur* and *luxuriat*, *fluctuatur* and *fluctuat*, *adsentior* and *adsentio* (see § 62). The same uncertainty with Active and Middle forms is shown for a later period by the precepts of the grammarians, e. g. Caper (93.10 K. *ructo* et *nausio* dicendum, quamvis quidam veteres *ructor* et *nausior* dixerunt. non *'ego'* ... dicendum, non autem *'egoor'*; 93.21 K. *suffragor* non *'suffrago*; 95.1 K. *somnio* dicendum, non *'somnior'*). The Passive form of Deponents (e. g. *vereor* abs te) is discussed by Gellius (xv. 13) with examples from the older writers, and a fuller list is given by Priscian (i. pp. 379 sqq. H.). A curious instance of Attraction is seen in the use of *coepitus sum* instead of *coepi*, *desitus sum* instead of *desit*, with a Pass. Inf., e. g. *urbs* coepta est aedificari (cf. mitescere *discordiae ceoptae*, Liv.), and in O. Lat. we find *pōlestur*, *pōlatur*, *possetur* similarly used (instances in Nonius p. 508 M.), *nēquitur*, *nēquatun* (see Georges, s. v.). The Neuter sense of *fio* (cf. Osc. *fiect* *fiunt*'), and its use as Passive of *fācio* (on the occasional use of *facior*, apparently a vulgarism, see Georges), have changed its old Inf. *fīere* to *fīeri*. *Fīere* was used by Ennius (see *Gram. Lat.* v. p. 645. 9 K.), perhaps in the line in which the spirit of Homer related his experience of metempsychosis (*Ann.* 8 M.):

memini me *fīere* pauom (MSS. *fīeri*),

while Cato (ap. Prisc. i. p. 377. 11 H.) used *fītum* for *fit*, *fiebantur* for *fiebant*. (On Imperat. *fī*, e. g. Plaut. *Pers.* 38, *Curt.* 87, *Fite* *Curt.* 89, 150, &c., see Georges, *Ler. Wörfl.* s. v.); so *vēnīri* is used for *vēnire* (*vēnum irē*) in Plaut. Pers. 577 (cf. *perwenda*, * Epid.* 74, *pāenda*, *Trin.* 1159). As *coepitus sum* and *desitus sum* replaced *coepi* and *desit* (originally Middle formations), when these verbs were used intransitively, so Intransitive Verbs like *ādeo*, *gavo*, *audō* took a Perfect of Passive form *seditus sum*, *gravīsus sum*, *ausus sum*, in O. Lat. also *solvī*, *gavisī*, *ausī* (Prisc. i. pp. 420, 482 H.; Non. 508. 27 M.), e. g. Liv. *praei.*: *quoniam audīuī*, *paucis gavisī*. On the Deponent Imperatives *nilīto*, *utando*, &c., see § 59.

§ 65. V. THE PERSON-ENDINGS. The I.-Eur. person-endings were slightly different in Primary Tenses (the Present Ind., Future Ind., &c.) and in Secondary Tenses (the Preterites Ind., the Tenses of the Optative Mood, &c.), e. g. I.-Eur. *bhērē-tī, 'he is carrying,' *ē-bhērē-t, 'he was carrying,' 'he carried,' *bhēroi-t* 3 Sg. Opt. The Tenses of the Subjunctive Mood seem to have taken sometimes the Primary, sometimes (in Umbro-Oscan perhaps always) the Secondary person-endings. In the Perfect Tense an entirely different set of endings was in use, e. g. I.-Eur. 1 Sg. *woidā, 'I know,' 2 Sg. *woit-thā, 'thou knowest,' and so on; and in the Imperative the persons are often
distinguished by the addition of particles, e.g. I.-Eur. *bhērē-tōd, with the particle *tōd, Abl. Sg. of the Pronoun *to-, meaning "from this" or "thereupon" (§ 57).

In Passive and Deponent Verbs, Latin departs widely from the I.-Eur. scheme of Passive (or rather Middle) person-endings (contrast Lat. feror, sequor with Gk. φέρω-μαι, ἔπο-μαι, ferōmur, sequīmur with Gk. φερό-μεθα, ἔπο-μεθα, and with O. Ind. bhār-ē, bhārā-mahē). Latin, as well as the Umbro-Oscanian languages, and the Celtic family, uses as the characteristic mark of its passive and deponent flexion the letter r (cf. O. Ir. sechur 1 Sg., sechethar 3 Sg., sechēmar 1 Pl., sechētar 3 Pl., with Lat. sequor, sequītūr, sequīmur, sequuntur) [In Celtic r is used in all persons of Deponents (except 2 Pl.), but only in 3 Sg., Pl. of Passives.] This r cannot be connected with the Reflexive Pronoun *swē- (Lat. se Acc.), seeing that s between vowels does not become r in Osca or in the Celtic languages (e.g. Lat. sequor might conceivably stand for *seqʷo-sē, but O. Ir. sechur could not). Nor does it go well with the r of 3 Pl. suffixes in the Sanscrit Verb, and the -runt, -re of the 3 Pl. Ppt. Act. in Latin (e.g. O. Ind. ā-duh-ra, ā-vavṛt-ranta, Lat. dūlōrunt, dedērē), since the Sanscrit r is confined to 3 Pl. suffixes, and is used in Active as well as Passive Verbs. Its original sense may have been impersonal [cf. Lat. itur in antiquam silvam, "they go," "one goes"; originally without any person-ending, as in Umbro-Oscanian and Celtic, e.g. Umbr. pone esonōm-e ferar, "when there is carrying to the sacrifice," "when the carrying to the sacrifice takes place," which would be in Lat. feratur or feretur, with person-ending -tv- (-tō-); O. Ir. dober or doberar, "they give," "one gives," Bret. gweler, "they see," "one sees"]; and the original construction of these Impersonals Passive seems to have been with an Acc. of the object (e.g. O. Lat. vitam vivitur; Osc., iūvīlas . . . sakriiss sakraftīr avt ūltiumam kersnaiś, "let the jovilae be consecrated with victims, but the last with banquets"); Welsh, Etlym gledyf coch ym gelwir, "they call me Etlym of the red glaive," like Lat. me appellatur (see § 62).

This Impersonal (Passive?) governing an Acc. has been explained as the Verb-stem with the Locative suffix r (seen in Engl. "where," "there") used predicatively like the i-Locative of the
Verbal *S*-stem (the Latin Inf. Act.; see § 83) in such a phrase as *hostes apparere*, 'the enemy appeared' (Historical Inf.), lit. 'the enemy in the action of appearing.' On the change from, e.g. *amā-r amicos to amantur amici*, like Horace's *invideor for invidetur mihi*, see above, § 62.

§ 66. (1) Active. 1 Sing. I.-Eur. Athematic Verbs ended in Primary Tenses in -mi (e.g. I.-Eur. *es-mi, O. Ind. ás-mi, Arm. em, Gk. ἐμι for *ēσ-μι, Alb. jam, Goth. im, Lith. es-mi, O. Sl. jes-mi), Thematic in -ō (e.g. I.-Eur. *bhēr-ō, Gk. φέρω, O. Ir. -biur for *berō, Goth. baira for *berō; Lith. vežū, 'velo'), Thematic in -mi, Thematic in -ē (e.g. I.-Eur. *bher-ē, Gk. 4>epo>, O. Ir. -biur for *bero, Lith. vezu, 'veho').

In Secondary tenses the ending was -m (e.g. I.-Eur. *am-m, O. Ind. ámd-mi, Gk. ἀμε, Gk. ἑμ, Gk. ἐμ, O. Sl. es-mi, O. Ir. -biur for *bero, Gk. ἑμ, Gk. ἐμ, O. Sl. es-mi, O. Ir. -biur for *bero, Gk. ἑμ, Gk. ἐμ; Lth. vezu, 'veho'). In Secondary tenses the ending was -m (e.g. I.-Eur. *am-m, O. Ind. ámd-mi, Gk. ἀμε, Gk. ἑμ, Gk. ἐμ, O. Sl. es-mi, O. Ir. -biur for *bero, Gk. ἑμ, Gk. ἐμ; Lth. vezu, 'veho'). In Secondary tenses the ending was -m (e.g. I.-Eur. *am-m, O. Ind. ámd-mi, Gk. ἀμε, Gk. ἑμ, Gk. ἐμ, O. Sl. es-mi, O. Ir. -biur for *bero, Gk. ἑμ, Gk. ἐμ; Lth. vezu, 'veho').

The Perfect had -a (e.g. I.-Eur. *woid-a, O. Ind. vaid-a, Gk. oīδ-a, Goth. vait for *vaitā; O. Ir. ro cecchan 'ecceci').

In Latin, as we have seen, Athematic Verbs form the 1 Sg. according to the Thematic Conjugation, e.g. Lat. ed-ō for I.-Eur. *es-mi, vēl-ō for I.-Eur. *vel-mi (§ 2), just as in Sanscrit Thematic Verbs take the Athematic -mi, e.g. bhārā-mi for I.-Eur. *bher-ō. I.-Eur. *es-mi, however, is in Latin sum, whether originally *sōm* with Syncope of final ĭ (ch. iii. § 37) or merely *sōm*, it is impossible to determine (cf. Ose. sum). The curious 1 Sg. inquām 1, with the other Persons formed from a 1 Sg. inquio, and with Imper. inquiē, resembles a Subjunctive in form, 'I should say;' or 'I shall say;' or 'let me say;' (see § 55). The Secondary Tense-ending -m appears in Imperfects and Pluperfects, e.g. ēra-m (cf. O. Ind. á-yā-m, 'I went,' Gk. ἐ-δρα-ν, Goth. idja, 'I went'), āmā-ha-m (cf. O. Ir. ba for *bām, 'I was'), āmāv-ēra-m, in Optative forms, e.g. sī-m, O. Lat. sie-m (O. Ind. siyām, syā-m, Gk. εἰφ-ν, āmāv-ēri-m, āma-SSI-m, faksi-m, and in Subjunctive, e.g. āme-m, āmāvīsīe-m, videa-m, fēra-m (also used as Fut., § 36), fīnia-m (cf. O. Ir. do-ber for *-ram, O. Sl. ber, used as Pres. Ind.). But the 'Future-Subjunctives' (see § 53) take the Thematic ending, e.g. ēr-o for *ēs-ō (Zend. arāhā,

In the Perfect, the ending of the Active Voice has been replaced in Latin by the Middle ending -ai (-aī), which became in the unaccented syllable -ei, then -ē (ch. iii. § 18), tētūd-ēi (O. Ind. tutud-ē), dēd-lēi (O. Ind. dad-ē), vid-ē from *vidēdai, a Middle form which survives in the O. Sl. vědě, 'I know,' for *woidai (O. Lat. feci, posse ini, conquae si ne, vididai, all on the milestone of Popilius of 132 B.C., C. I. L. i. 551). Lat. reverti, assensi, &c. are thus really Middle forms, and go suitably with Pres. revertor, assentior.

§ 67. 2 Sg. The I.-Eur. endings are -sī (e. g. I.-Eur. *cē-si and *cēs-si, O. Ind. a-si, Gk. εῖ for *ei-στι, which with the addition again of the suffix -s became ei's, Hom. ei-στι; I.-Eur. *ei-si from the root ei-, ‘to go,’ O. Ind. ε-ς, Gk. εῖ for *ei-στι; O. Ind. bhāra-si, O. Ir. beri. Goth. bairi-s), -s (e. g. I.-Eur. *bē-hērē-s, O. Ind. a-bhara-s, Gk. ε-φερ-ς, O. Ir. do-bir; O. Sl. veze 'vexisti.' and in the Present Tense, Gk. τίθη-ς, Dor. φέρ-ς), in the Perfect -tha (e. g. I.-Eur. *woit-tha, O. Ind. vēt-tha, Gk. oίτ-θα; cf. O. H. G. gi-tars-t). In Latin we have -s in ēs, 'thou art,' for *cēs (scanned as a long syllable in Plautus), whether from older *cēsi (ch. iii. § 37) or not, it is impossible to say, āgē-s for *agē-s (if from an original *age-si, like O. Ir. beri from *bhere-si, the final -i must have been dropped before the fourth cent. B.C. when s between vowels became r; see ch. iv. § 146), sī-s (O. Lat. sic-s), agha-s, while in the 2 Sg. of the Perfect Tense we have -sī (e. g. dēd-sī, the final vowel of which (O. Lat. -ei, e. g. gesistei on a Scipio Epitaph of c. 180 B.C., C. I. L. i. 33), like the -i of 1 Sg. dēd-ī (O. Ind. dad-ē), must represent an original -ai (-aī), while the -s reminds us of that -s- which so often appears in the endings of the second Person (e. g. Gk. ἐφη-στα, τίθη-στα, ἐπηλη-στα, βαλλ-στα). (For another theory which regards vidistī as a Verbal Noun-stem, see § 52.)

In the Imperative, the bare stem is used, as the bare stem is used in Vocatives Sg. of Nouns, e. g. (Thematic) age from the Thematic Verb-stem *aγέ-, *aγο-, 'to lead,' as *aγέ is Voc. Sg. of the Thematic Noun-stem *aγέ-, *aγο-, Gk. ἀγός, a leader,
Lat. *prōl-īgus*; (Athematic) *ī* for *ei* from the Athematic Verb-stem *ei*—, ‘to go’ (see § 2). Sometimes the particle *tōd* (Abl. Sg. of the Pronoun-stem *tō*, ‘from this’, ‘thereupon’) is added, when the command refers not to immediate action, but to action after something shall have happened, e.g. *quam venerit, scribito, ‘when he comes, write,’ lit. ‘write thereupon.’ (So in O. Ind., e.g. 2 Sg. *vit-tāt* for I.-Eur. *wit-tōd* from the root *weid*—, ‘to know’; see § 57.) The final -ē of O. Lat. *dūce, dīce, fāce* [for *fācē* (ch. iii. § 37), from the stem *facy-, facỹ*, § 16] is dropped in classical Latin, through its frequent use in word-groups like *die(e) mihi*, &c. So in Catullus (xxvii. 2) *inger mi* for *ingere mi* (see § 58; ch. iii. § 36).

§ 68. The athematic Sg. of *fēro, vōlo* would be *fors*, *vels*, which would become *fer(r)*, *vel(l)* (ch. iv. § 153). The former word was changed to *for*s by the addition of the 2 Sg. suffix -s, as in Greek *ē* for *iō* was made *ē*, thou art; for the latter was substituted the word *ēs*, apparently 2 Sg. of a root *weī*—, ‘to wish’ (O. Ind. *vi*—, 2 Sg. *vē-si*, Gk. *iēma*).

Whether *dices* of the MSS. in Plaut. *Trin.* 606 non credibile dices, is a relic of the old spelling of *dīce* is doubtful. It may be *Futuro*.

§ 69. 3 Sg. The Primary Tense-ending in I.-Eur. was -tī (e.g. *ēs-ti*, O. Ind. *ās-ti*, Gk. *ēs-ti*, O. Ir. *is-t*, Lith. *ēs-ti* and *ēs-t*, O. Sl. (Russ.) *jes-tī*; Dor. Gk. *ēdō-ti*, Att. *ēdō-στι*, *tēdō-στι*, &c.), the Secondary Tense-ending was -t (e.g. *ēs-bhērē-t*, O. Ind. *ā-bhara-t*, Gk. *ē-φεπε* for *ē-φερε-τ*), and the ending of the Perfect -ē (e.g. *wōidē*, O. Ind. *vēd-a*, Gk. *ōd-ē*, Goth. *vait*; O. Ir. ro cēchūin *‘eceinit’*). In Latin all trace of the -ī of I.-Eur. -tī has been lost (e.g. Lat. *es-t, fer-t, ōgī-t* for *agē-t*), but in Oscan we find -t for I.-Eur. -tī, and -d for I.-Eur. -t.

On the very oldest Latin inscriptions we find -d for the Secondary ending, but certain instances of Primary endings are unfortunately wanting. Thus the Praenestine fibula has *fesfaced*, *‘feci,’* the Dvenos inscription has *fessed, sied* (but *mitat*, apparently 3 Sg. Subj. used as Fut.), and in Oscan we have deded *‘dedit,’* kūm-bened *‘con-vēnit,’* fusī-d *‘foret,’* deivaid *‘juret,’* heriiad *‘velit,’* while Primary Tenses show -t, e.g. *faamat* *‘habitat.’* These endings had been *‘levelled’* to *t* in Latin before the second century B.C.; for a Praenestine cista, not of the same antiquity as the fibula just mentioned, has *dedit* beside *fecīd* (*C. I. L.* i. 54 Dindia Macolnia fileai dedit. Nouios
Plautios med Romai fecid), and in all other old inscriptions we have invariably -t, e.g. ionsit (ii. 5041, of 189 B.C.), velet 'vellet.' eset, fuit, censuit (all on the S. C. Bacch. of 186 B.C., i. 196), cepet on the (restored) Columna Rostrata (i. 195), fuet, cepit, dedet on one of the oldest Scipio Epitaphs (i. 32.).

In the Latin Perfect the original ending seems to have been -eit, written in the very oldest inscriptions -ed (with that use of e to express the ei-sound which we have seen in Nom. Pl. ploirum on a Scipio Epitaph, Dat. Sg. Diove Victore, ap. Quint. i. 4. 17; see ch. iv. § 34), then -et, -eit, and in class. Lat. -it. Before a final -t a long vowel was shortened in the course of the second cent. B.C. (ch. iii. § 49), so that in class, poetry this -it of the Perfect is a short syllable. But in Plautus it is invariably scanned long, unless shortened in iambic words, &c. by the Law of Breves Breviantes (e.g. dēdīt may be scanned dedit, but only vidit, fōcit, &c.). The long quantity is found in every type of Perfect in Plautus (see § 39), in vixit, habuit, adnumeravit, as well as in Perfects proper like vicīt. This -eit can hardly have been anything else than the I.-Eur. ending of the 3 Sg. Mid. of the Perfect Tense (which was, like the 1 Sg. Mid. ending -ai, a diphthong weakened in the unaccented syllable in Latin to -ei, class. -i, ch. iii. § 18), augmented by the 3 Sg. Act. Secondary suffix -t. So that all trace of the I.-Eur. 3 Sg. Act. ending -ē is lost in Latin. In the Oscan Perfect, however, the ending -ed, e.g. deded 'dedit,' prūfattēd 'probavit' (quasi *probassīt, § 3), aamanaffed ' -mandavit' (cf. dedēt, awafakēt, Pel. afde 'abiit') is usually referred to the I.-Eur. Preterite ending -ēt, or to the Perfect Active -ē augmented by -t, though whether Umbrian-d (fēfur for *fēfurēd, dēde for *dedēd) was dropped after a short vowel, so readily as after a long vowel (like Latin -d) is doubtful.

In the Imperative the same form is used as the 2 Sg. 'Future' Imper. e.g. es-tō(d), on which see above, § 67.

§ 70. The 3 Sg. Pst. in Latin. We have found (ch. iii. § 49) that the shortening influence of final -t on a preceding long vowel is already seen in the poetry of Ennius (239-169 B.C.), who scans, e.g. mandēbat beside ponēbat, splendēt beside jūdēt, potessēt beside essēt, though it probably does not appear in Plautus (c. 254-184 B.C.), that Terence (195-159 B.C.) follows the same usage as Ennius, while Lucilius (148-103 B.C.) scarcely ever allows a vowel before final -t to retain its original length. It is thus the versification of Plautus
which must decide the original quantity of the vowel in the 3 Sg. Ptf. ending -it. Indubitable instances of -it in Plautus are emit, Poen. 1059:
emit, et is me sibi adoptauit filium;
vixit, Pseud. 311:
ilioc uixit amator, ubi lenoni sulplicat;
which are the readings of both families of MSS., while we have viciit, Amph. 643:
uiict et domum laudis compos reuénit (a bacchie line);

adrüméràit, Asin 501:

adrúmerauit et crididit mihi nèque deceptust in eo,
where the evidence of the Ambrosian Palimpsest is wanting. (For other examples, see Müller, Plaut. Pros. p. 71.) The instances of -it in Plautus, except where the Law of Breves Breviantes operates (e.g. dedit like dêit, âbi, abit, âbis, &c.), are very few and uncertain (e.g. dixit, Pers. 260); and even if it were true, as it almost certainly is not, that this seansion occurred now and then in Plautus, it would only prove that the shortening influence of final -i showed itself even earlier than Ennius, for there is no indication of one type of Perfect having had -it and another type -it. In other writers we have, e.g. cedidit Naev. Trag. 5 R., dedit Ter. Eun. 701, sedit, Phorm. prol. 9, crissitét Lucil. ix. 70 M., and the long quantity is found after i in the compounds of eo in Ovid, e.g. interit, abit, reuít (see Lachmann and Munro on Lucri. iii. 1042; and cf. interiécst, C. I. L. i. 1202).

The spelling in the very oldest inscriptions is -ed: fexed on the Praenestine fibula (C. I. L. xiv. 4123 Manios med fexed Numasioi, ‘Manius me fecit Numero’), fexed (or fexed?) on the Dvenos bowl (Zvet. I. I. 285 Duenos med fexed). This can hardly be equated with Osc. -ed, since the other spellings -eit, -it point to this early e being merely that symbol of the ei-sound which is often found in old inscriptions (eh. iv. § 34), derivable from an L-Eur. -ai, for which in Oscan we should expect to find a diphthong rather than the simple vowel e. Other old spellings are -et, -eit, -id, and -it. Examples of -et are fuet and dedet (beside cedit) on a Scipio Epitaph, perhaps of the end of the third cent. B.C. (C. I. L. i. 32), dedet in two old inscriptions with Ablative -d (i. 63 de praedid Mauret dedet; i. 64 de praedid Fortune dedet); and this is the spelling adopted in the (restored) Columna Rostrata (i. 195 exemet . . . cedet . . . ornauet). The classical spellings -it occurs as early as the Scipio Epitaph, just mentioned, with cedit; the dedicatory tablet of Minucius, 217 b. c., with vocit (i. 1503 Hercolei sacrom. M. Minuei C. f. Dictator ouuit); a Scipio Epitaph of c. 200 B.C. (i. 30) with fuit, cedit; the dedication of Aurelius, 200 B.C. (Not. Serv. 1887, p. 195), with dedit, probauit; the decree of Aemilius Paulus of 189 B.C. (C. I. L. ii. 5041) with decreviuit, iouisit; and the contemporary decree of Fulvius Nobilior 189 B.C. with cedit (i. 534 Aetolia cedit, ‘took from Aetolia’); the S. C. Bacch. 186 B.C. (i. 196) with consecuít; while we have both -it and -id on the old Praenestine cista (end of third cent.? quoted above, with dedet, fecid. But -eit is not common, e.g. probauit (with covauit) (i. 600, of 62 B.C.), fumuit (i. 1051), rediuit (i. 541, of 145 B.C.), veniuit (i. 200. 58, &c., of 111 B.C.), so that if we had only the spellings of inscriptions to guide us, and not the versification of the early poets, we should be inclined to suppose the original form of the 3 Sg. Ptf. suffix to have been -it, -éd, which, with the usual change of unaccented é to i, became about the end of the third cent. -i(-it). It has been suggested that in some types of Perfect, e.g. dixit (cf. Gk. ἐδειξε(ἡ)), fidit (cf. O. Ind. á-bhid-
§ 71. 1 Plur. In Lat. we have in all tenses the ending *-mōs (class. -mūs), while in the other I.-Eur. languages we have a variety of endings, e.g. Gk. φερο-μεν, ἐφερο-μεν, Dor. φερο-μεσ (this I.-Eur. *-mōs varied with *-mōs, the Latin person-suffix), O. Ind. ā-bhara-ma, Vedic vid-mā. The scansion -mūs in Plaut. is illusory (see Müller, Plaut. Pros. p. 57).

§ 72. 2 Plur. The ending -tē of Gk. φερε-τε, &c. appears in Latin only in the Imperative, e.g. fer-ter, agi-te for *agī-te, &c. Elsewhere it was replaced by -tēs (older *-tēs), an ending like the 2 Dual ending (with th- apparently) of O. Ind. baira-thas, Goth. baira-ts, the use of which discriminated agitis Ind. from agīte Imper., as agīs Ind. differed from age Imper. Corresponding to the 2 Sg. 'Future' Imperative in -tō (older -tōl), we have a 2 Pl. 'Future' Imperative in -tōle, apparently composed by adding to the Sg. form the 2 Pl. suffix -tē, -tōle (e.g. estōle), for -tōl-te (ch ii. § 127).

§ 73. 3 Plur. The I.-Eur. suffixes end with -i in Primary but not in Secondary Tenses. Thus -enti, -nī, -nti are Primary, -ent, -nt, -nt are Secondary, e.g. *s-enti (O. Ind. s-anti, Gk. εισί for Dor. ε-ντ, O. Ir. it, O. W. int, Goth. s-ind; so Umbr. s-ent, Osc. s-et for *s-ent), *bhērō-nti [O. Ind. bhārānti, Arm. beren, Dor. Gk. φέρο-ντι, O. Ir. berit, Goth. baira-nd, O. Sl. (Russ.) berat], *ē-bhērō-nt (O. Ind. ā-bhara-n, Gk. ē-φερο-ν). In class Lat. the ending both for Primary and Secondary Tenses is -nt, e.g. fern-nt (older *férno-nt, e.g. cœsientiont on a Scipio Epitaph, m m
C. I. L. i. 32), fereba-nt, fera-nt, si-nt [Umbr. sins; but O. Lat. sient, either by analogy of Sg. siem, sies, siet (see § 55), or with -ent for -nt, *siynt], s-unt (older sont, C. I. L. i. r166). But in Umbro-Oscan there is a distinction. We have -nt for I.-Eur. -nti, but -ns for I.-Eur. -nt, e.g. Umbr. sent, Osc. set for *sent in the Ind. of the Substantive Verb, but Umbr. sins, in the Opt., Osc. prufattens 'probaverunt,' so that it is likely that at some early period Latin, like the other languages of Italy, distinguished Primary -nti and Secondary -nt. The 3 Pl. tremonti in the fragment of the Carmen Saliare, ascribed to Numa's time, is a doubtful reading [Ter. Scaur. 28. 9 K. Cum ... quoniam antiqui pro hoc adverbio 'cuine' dicebant, ut Numa in Saliari Carmine:

cuine tonas (MSS. ponas), Leucesie, praet tet tremonti (MSS. praetexere monti)],

though it is confirmed by another corrupt passage of Festus (244. 17 Th.; he is quoting from the Carmen Saliare): 'praet tremonti' (MSS. pretet t.) praetremunt te (MSS. praetemunt pe). In Old Latin we have a curious form in -nunt (older -nont) in the Pres. Ind. only, e.g. dā-nunt, explē-nunt, prōdi-nunt, nēqui-nunt, which has been explained on the theory that the 3 Pl. of the Pres. Ind. had once ended in -u, *dān, *explēn, *prōdin, *nequin, and that these forms were expanded by the subsequent addition of the Thematic Secondary ending -ūnt, later -ūnt, much as Gk. εἰ for *ēs, 2 Sg. of εἰμι, was by the addition of the Secondary suffix -s expanded to εἰ-s, or O. Engl. sind, 'they are,' to sind-un. If it were a mere case of Nasalization like tu-n-do, vi-n-o, *stū-n-o in destīno (?), &c., Lith. einū, 'I go' (§ 10), it is difficult to see why it should be confined to this single person, the third person plural of the Present Indicative Active. But how *danti could become *dān, *ēks-plenti become *explen, has not yet been satisfactorily shown (see I. F. ii. 302).

I.-Eur. -nti, -nt (e.g. O. Ind. dād-ati, Gk. λαλόγχ-ς for -nti) does not appear in Latin, unless possibly in O. Lat. sient (see above). But in Umbro-Oscan -ent, -ens [I.-Eur. -ent(i) or -nt(i) ] is as universal as -unt [I.-Eur. -ont(i) ] in Latin, e.g. Osc. fiient 'fiunt,' prūfattens 'probaverunt,' Umbr. furent 'erunt,' Osc. censazet for -ent 'censebunt.'
The ending of the 3 Pl. of the Latin Perfect -erunt is to be compared with the O. Ind. 3 Pl. endings with -r- of various Tenses (e.g. á-duh-ra Pret., duh-raté Pres., bharē-rata Opt., duh-rám and duh-ratám Imper.; very rarely -ranta, in á-vavṛt-ṛanta). The O. Ind. Perfect has in 3 Pl. Act. -ur, e.g. dadúr. 'they have given,' and in 3 Pl. Mid. -rē, e.g. dadirē, representing probably I.-Eur. -r and -rai). The byform -ērē is in O. Lat. -erē (dederi, C. I. L. i. 187, probably from Praeneste: M. Mindios L. f. P. Condetios Úa. fī. aidiles uicesma partī Apolones dederi).

In the Imperative we have in Latin, as in Greek, the particle *tōd, 'from this,' 'thereupon,' added to a 3 Pl. form, e.g. Lat. ferunto for *feront-tōd, Gk. φερόντω for *φεροντ-τῶ. The final -d is seen in suntod on the Spoletium inscription (C. I. L. xi. 4766). The Umbrian ending appears to have been -tōtā, e.g. etuta and etuto 'unto.'

§ 74. 3 Pl. Pres. in -nnunt. Dimunt for dant is quoted from the older poets by Nonius, 97. 13 M., e. g. Caecilius, Com. 176 R. patière quod dant, quando optata nōn dunnunt (cf. Paul. Fest. 48. 18 Th. 'dunnunt' dant); it is often used by Plautus (the references are given in Neue, Forment. ii2. p. 412), and is found on a Saturnian dedicatory inscription of two brothers, money-lenders, called Vertuleius (C. I. L. i. 1175, Sora):

dōnu dānnunt Hércolei máxsume méreto);

prōdunnunt for prōdeunt is quoted by Festus (284. 22 Th.) from Ennius (A. 158 M.):

prōdunnunt famuli; tum candida lumina lucent;

so obdunnunt for obeunt (id. 214. 4 Th.), redunnunt for redeunt (id. 400. 12, a passage badly preserved in the MS.), quoted from Ennius [possibly with mention of inunt for eunt, so that the Philoxenus Gloss (p. 75. 23 G.), int: πορειόντα may be a corruption of inunt: πορειόντα (see § 2)]; nequīunt for nequeunt (Fest. 162. 24 Th.), quoted from the Odyssea of Livius Andronicus:

pārtim ērrant, nequīont Graeciam redire,

and paralleled with feriunt (MS. ferunt) for feriunt (MS. ferunt; cf. 400. 14 Th.), and soliunt for solent [rather for solunt, the obsolete verb of which consulo is a compound; cf. Fest. 536. 14 Th. 'solino' idem (Messala) ait esse consulo]; expleunt for explent by Paul. Fest. (56. 14 Th.); inserīuntur for inseruntur is used by Liv. Andr. (ap. Fest. 532. 24 Th.): millia ália in idem inserīuntur.

§ 75. 3 Pl. Perf. The isolated forms dedro on an old inscription of Pisaurum (C. I. L. i. 177 Matre Matuta dono dedro matrona; beside dedro on another inscription from the same place, i. 173 Iunone re, matrona Pisaurae dono dedrot) and emeru on an inscription of Cora (i. 1148 Q. Pomponius Q. f. L. Tullius Ser. f. praiōres aere Martio emeru) cannot be taken as a proof that -vrā
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was a byform of -ri in the Latin 3 Pl. Perfect. For the dropping of final consonants is a feature of the Latin of Pisaurum (see the inscriptions quoted above with -s, -r dropped; and cf. the loss of -i in dide, 1. 169, and apparently of -nt in i. 177 M'. Curia, Pola Liuia deda), and emeru on the Corona inscription may be a similar dialectal variety, or merely a graphic contraction for emer-

unt. Final -nt often loses the dental on late inscriptions and is written -n or -m; thus we have feceru and fecerum (also feceru, vi. 24649) in plebeian inscriptions of the Empire (see ch. ii. § 137). Some Roman grammarians called the form with -re the 'Dual' form, a theory which is rightly rejected by Quintilian, though his own explanation, that it is a weakening of -runt, cannot stand (i. 5. 43 quanquam fuerunt qui nobis quoque adicerent dualem 'scrip-

sere' 'legere': quod evitandae asperitatis gratia mollitum est, ut apud veteres pro male mereris 'male merere') (cf. Serv. ad A. ii. 1). In the older writers -runt and -re seem to be used at will, e.g. Plaut. Trin. 535 alii exolatum abierunt, alii emortui, Alii se suspendere, and Cicero (Orat. xlvii. 157), quoting a line of Ennius, says: nec vero reprehenderim 'scripseri alli rem'; 'scrip-

serunt' esse verius censeo, sed consuetudinari auribus indulgenti libenter obse-

quor. (Ennius, however, seems to prefer -erunt to -ere in his Annals; Terence prefers -ere.) The older spelling -ront, mentioned by Quintilian (i. 4. 16), who quotes dederont and probaveront, is found on early inscriptions (see Index to C. I. L. i.).

The ending -rē (older -ri) seems to come from an I.-Eur. -ri cognate with the I.-Eur. -rāi of the O. Ind. 3 Sg. Ppt. Mid. -re, e.g. dadirē, 'dedere'; the ending -runt (older -ront), either from an I.-Eur. -ront (cf. O. Ind. -ava-rranta), or from a subsequent addition of the usual 3 Pl. Thematic suffix -unt (-out) to a 3 Pl. Ppt. in -r. Thus *dēler (a 'doublet' of dēlēre?) would become dēlērunt by the same process as we have supposed an earlier *explēn to have become explēn-unt. In view of the presence of r in these O. Ind. third persons plural this is a more likely explanation than to suppose that r is the Latin substitute for intervocalic s.

With regard to the quantity of the e in -erunt, the short quantity, though it is in the classical and later period more prominent in Dactylic Poetry than in other verse, owing to its suitableness for the dactylic metre, is not by any means unknown in the older (and later) dramatists, e.g. in Plautus subegērunt, Plaut. Bucch. 928, fecerunt, Amph. 184 locaverunt, Pers. 160, cessaverunt, Mil. 1432, &c.; emerunt, Ter. Eun. prol. 20, conlocarunt, ib. 593). Plautus appears, how-

ever, to use it only at the end of a line or hemistich, so must have regarded its use as a licence to be resorted to under metrical necessity. It does not appear to have been used in Tragedy, nor by the earlier Epic writers, like Ennius, and not very frequently by Lucretius (e.g. instiērunt, i. 466; see Munro's note), which points to its having been a pronunciation of colloquial Latin that won its way only gradually into the higher literature. It is gener-

cally explained as a 3 Plur. of the Auxiliary stem es-, 'to be,' and is com-

pared with Gk. -eov of 3 Plur. Plupft., so that dēdērunt from *dedesunt would be a quite different formation from dēdērunt and dēlēr, with I.-Eur. r. An-

other theory makes it *dedis-ont, the first part being a Verbal Noun-stem *dedis- (see § 52). [On curarunt for curaverunt beside the older coirauerunt (cf.?) on inscriptions, see § 48.]

§ 76. (2) Passive (Deponent). 1 Sing. The Italo-Celtic
ending was -ōr in the Pres. Ind. [e. g. O. Lat. sequōr, class. sequōr (ch. iii. § 49), O. Ir. sechur], apparently an addition of Passive -r to the Active ending -ō. Those Tenses and Moods which in Latin formed their 1 Sg. Active in -m substitute in the Passive -r for -m, e. g. fēra-r Fut. and Subj., fereba-r Impft., except in the Perfect group, where a periphrastic form is used, e. g. lātus sim, latus essēm, not *tulerir, *tuliisser, also latus ero, not *tuleror (see § 54), though in Oscan we do find this adaptation of the Active forms in comparascuster, Fut. Pft. Pass. (pon ioc egmo comparascuster 'cum ea res consulta erit'), the Active of which would be *comparascust (§ 89); but in Umbr. we have pihaz fust 'piatus erit,' &c.

§ 77. 2 Sing. Since O. Ir. sechther 'sequeris' shows the I.-Eur. (athematic) ending -thēs (e. g. O. Ind. á-di-thās, Gk. ἓ-θέ-θης), which is retained in the O. Ir. Imperative (e. g. cluin- te, 'do thou hear,' Dep.), with the usual ending -r, we might expect to find in Latin the I.-Eur. (thematic) ending -sō (e. g. Zend bara-ṇa, Gk. φερεο for *-sō, ἑ-φερε-ο), which is retained in the Latin Imperative (e. g. sēquērē for *sequesō, § 57), with an appended -r, *sequesōr, in class. Lat. *sequerūr. But the forms actually found are (1) sequerē, the same as the Imperative 2 Sg. (this is the usual form in O. Lat., and even in Cicero); (2) sequeris, which adds to this the ending -s of the 2 Sg. Act., *sequerēs becoming sequerēs (ch. iii. § 18). The addition of this -s discriminates the Ind. from the Imper. form as āgis differs from āgē, āgitēs from āgitē. The 'Future' Imperative changes to -r the -d of its 2 Sg. Act., e. g. fer-tor 2 Sg. Pass., fertō from fer-tōd 2 Sg. Act. [On the O. Lat. ending for the 2, 3 Sg. Imper. -minō, formed apparently from 2 Pl. -minē on the type of 2, 3 Sg. Act. -tō(d), see § 60, and on forms like utīto for utitor, § 59.]

§ 78. For statistics of the use of -re and -ris, see Neue, ii2, pp. 393 sqq. Terence uses -re only, Plautus both -re and -ris, but -re far more frequently. (He puns on obloquere Ind. and obloquere Imperat. in Curt. 41.) Cicero prefers -re in all other tenses than the Pres. Ind., and in this tense too in Deponent Verbs. Quintilian is wrong in supposing -re to be a weakening of -ris (i. 5. 42 quod evitandae asperitatis gratia mollitum est, ut apud veteres pro male mereris 'male merere'), for -is did not become -e in Latin (ch. ii. § 137), nor can an isolated spelling like tribunos [militare]re for militāris on an old inscr. (C. I. L.
i. 64) be quoted as a proof of this change. The form -rus on a few inscriptions (spatarius, C. I. L. i. 1220, Beneventum; uturus, i. 1267, Venusia; figarus, iv. 2082, Pompeii), none of them old, may be a mere dialectal or vulgar variety, but it may also (like -us in the Gen. Sg. of the 3rd Decl., ch. vi. § 22) be a genuine tradition of an older form, which arose from the addition of -s to *sequo-, &c., at a stage prior to its weakening to sequēr. Thus *spatia-sō would be expanded to *spatia-sō-s, which would become *spatia-rōs, spatarius.

§ 79. 3 Sg. The Italo-Celtic ending is -tōr [e.g. Lat. sēquîl-tūr, O. Ir. sechethar; cf. Osc. sakarater ' sacra-tur,' with -ter from syncopated -t(ō)r as Umbr. ager from *agr(ōs)], formed by adding Passive -r to the I.-Eur. Secondary ending -tō (e.g. O. Ind. ā-di-ta, Gk. ἔ-do-ro; O. Ind. ā-bhara-ta, Gk. ἑ-φερε-το). The Imperative changes to -r the -d of the Particle -tōd which it appends to the bare stem in the Act., e.g. fer-tor Pass., fer-to(d) Act., ἀγί-τοr Pass., ἀγί-το(d) Act. (On O. Lat. -mīnō, e.g. antestamino, ' let him take to witness,' see § 60, and on -to for -tor in ulla, &c., § 59.)

§ 80. 1 Plur. The Italo-Celtic ending is -mōr (e.g. Lat. sēquīmār for *sequo-mōr, O. Ir. seche-mmar with a curious doubling of the m), formed by changing to r the s of the Active -mōs (Lat. fērī-mōs for *fere-mōs, O. Ir. do-beram for -mōs ?).

§ 81. 2 Plur. Both the Celtic and the Italic languages depart from the ordinary procedure in this person. In O. Ir. Deponents we have the Active ending; in Latin we have the Nom. Plur. of the old Pres. Part. Passive with ellipse of estis, e.g. fērimīnī from *fēro-menoī (Gk. φερόμενοι) in the Present Tense, and analogical formations in the others, e.g. fērēbā-mīnī, fērā-mīnī, fērrē-mīnī. The 2 Plur. Imper., though similar in form to the 2 Plur. Pres. Ind., e.g. ferimīnī, is usually explained as an old Infinitive (Dat. of a MEN-stem), for I.-Eur. *bhēremenai (Gk. φέρε-μεναι) (see § 57).

§ 82. 3 Plur. The Italo-Celtic ending is -ntōr (e.g. Lat. sēquuntūr from *sequo-ntūr, O. Ir. secheta; cf. Osc. karanter ' pascuntur' with -nter from syncopated -nt(ō)r, like 3 Sg. -ter for -t(ō)r; see above), formed by adding Passive -r to the I.-Eur. Secondary ending -ntō (e.g. O. Ind. ā-bhara-nta, Gk. ἑ-φερο-ντο. Cf. Gk. ἐμ-πλη-ντο with Lat. im-ple-ntur). In the Imperative the
§ 83. VI. THE INFINITIVE. The I.-Eur. Infinitive was merely a Case (usually Dat. or Loc. Sg.) of a Verbal Noun, and has best retained its character in the Celtic languages, where its object stands not in the Acc., as after a verb, but in the Gen., as after a Noun. The form of the Inf. varied not merely according to the case employed, but also according to the Noun-stem which was chosen. In O. Ind. we have a great variety of Infinitives, e.g. (1) Dat. of a Root-stem, a stem which was the same as the root of the Verb, e.g. -ájē, 'to drive;' lit. 'for driving' (Lat. ágō; cf. Gk. χαίνω); (2) Dat. of an S-stem, e.g. jišē, 'to conquer' [cf. Lat. da-rī, O. Lat. da-sei (§ 85), Gk. πει-σαι]; (3) Dat. of a MEN-stem, e.g. dá-manē, 'to give' (Gk. δώσεω; Lat. damini 2 Pl. Imper. Pass., see § 57), vid-mânē, 'to know' [Gk. (ἐ)δώ-σω]; (4) Loc. of a MEN-stem (without -i, see ch. vi. § 37), e.g. dhár-manē, 'to keep up' (cf. Gk. δό-σων); (5) Dat. of a TU-stem, e.g. dhá-tavē, 'to set' (cf. Pruss. dā-twei, 'to give'); (6) Acc. of a TU-stem, e.g. dhá-tum (this is the classical or Sanscrit form of the Infinitive of every verb) (Lat. con-dītūm 1st Sup., Lith. de-tū Sup., O. Sl. dě-tū Sup.; the Balto-Slavic Supine in -tum is fused with the auxiliary verb of the same root as Lat. fui to form a Compound Tense, e.g. Lith. de-tūm-bime, 1 Pl. Opt., as the Lat. 1st Supine is joined with impersonal iri to form the Fut. Inf. Pass., e.g. subhātum irī or sublatūri, see below); (7) Dat. of an I-stem, e.g. drā-ayē, 'to see,' and many others. The Teutonic Inf. is Acc. of an ONO-stem, e.g. Goth. itan, Germ. essen from *ōdōnōm (cf. O. Ind. ēdanan, a Neut. Noun). The form chosen for the Latin Inf. Act. was a Loc. Sg. of an S-stem, e.g. ágō-rē from *age-sī, amā-rē from *ama-sī, vidē-rē from *vide-sī, fini-rē from *fini-sī, es-sē from *es-sī, dēdis-sē (see § 52), fer-rē from *fer-sī, vel-lē from *vel-sī, the last two showing the regular change of rs to rr (cf. torreō from *torseyo, ch. iv. § 153), ls to ll (cf. collum from *colso-, Germ. Hals, ch. iv. § 146). For the Inf. Pass. a Dat. Sg. was chosen, either (1) of a Root-stem, e.g. āgāi (O. Lat. ag-ai) from *āg-ai, mōrāi (with the dipthong ai
weakened in the unaccented syllable, first to e\textipa{ i}, then to \textipa{\v{i}}, as in \textipa{ *\textit{oc-caido}, oc-ceido, oc-cido}, ch. iii. § 18), or (2) of an S-stem, e.g. \textipa{\textit{a\textipa{ m\textipa{ o\textipa{ r\textipa{ ri}}} \textipa{ (O. Lat. \textit{ama-rei}) from *ama-sai, vid\textipa{ e}\textipa{ ri} from *wide-sai, \textit{fim\textipa{ r\textipa{ ri}}, O. Lat. m\textipa{ o\textipa{ r\textipa{ ri}}, so that the Lat. Inf. Pass. differed from the Inf. Act. only conventionally, and had no distinctive Passive suffix. This however seems to be present in the byforms \textit{agier, am\textipa{ d\textipa{ r\textipa{ r\textipa{ i}}, moririer, though the exact origin of this -ier, -rier is doubtful. 1}} For the Perfect Inf. Passive the Perf. Part. Pass. was used with the auxiliary verb \textit{esse}, e.g. constat id factum esse, constat ea facta esse; for the Fut. Pass. the 1st Supine with \textipa{\textit{iri}, Inf. Pass. of \textit{eo}, 'to go,' e.g. constat id factum iri, constat ea factum iri. The Fut. Act., e.g. constat id eventurum (esse), is most naturally explained as a combination of the Fut. Part. Act. with \textit{esse}, though its Old Latin indeclinable use, e.g. credo inimicos meos dicturum (from a speech of C. Gracchus) has suggested the theory that it is a compound of the 2nd Supine in -\textipa{ tu} (e.g. even\textipa{ t\textipa{ u}, dict\textipa{ u}, Locs. of TU-stems, ch. vi. § 37) with an old byform of \textit{esse}, viz. *exom, later *erum (Umbr. erom, Osc. ezum, Acc. of O-stem), dicturum for *dict\textipa{ u}\textipa{ -erum} being in time made personal dicturum -a -um (the Fut. Part. Act.) in the same way as O. Lat. 'dicendum est orationem' changed to class. Lat. 'dicenda est oratio' (Postgate in Class. Rev. v. p. 301). The Umbro-Oscan Pres. Inf. Act. is the Acc. Sg. of a Verbal O-stem (e.g. Umbr. er-om, Osc. ez-um, deic-um, molt-aum 'multare') (ch. v. § 2).

On Lat. \textipa{\textit{ar\textipa{ v}}} in \textipa{\textit{ar\textipa{ v}-\textipa{ facio}} and similar Verb-stems, see § 34.

In Vulg. Lat., as reflected in the Romance languages, the Perf. Inf. has been lost; \textit{esse} has become \textit{essere} (Ital. essere, Span. ser, Fr. \textipa{\textit{\v{e}tre}}); \textit{vole}, \textit{volere} (Ital. volere, Fr. vouloir), this verb having been transferred (by the analogy of its Perf. volui like \textit{monui, habui}, &c.) to the second Conjugation, voleo 1 Sg. Pres. Ind. (Ital. voglio), voleat, 3 Sg. Pres. Subj. (Ital. voglia), as \textit{posse} became \textit{potere} (Ital. potere, Sp. poder) through the likeness of its Perf. \textit{potui} to the second Conjugation type. (cf. § 33 a).

1 Some make it an addition to \textipa{\textit{i}} of the Active Inf. ending, with Syncope of the final \textipa{\v{e}}, as in \textipa{\textit{bib\textipa{ r}}} for \textipa{\textit{bib\textipa{ r\textipa{ e}}} (A. L. L. vii. 132). Similarly in Vulg. Lat. \textit{esse-re} replaced \textit{esse} (see below).
§ 84. Pres. Inf. Act. Biber for biberé in the phrase biber dare (quoted by Charisius 124, i. K. from various early authors, and censured as a mispronunciation by Caper, 108, r. K. biberé non 'biber"), seems to be a case of syncope of final -ë (like nec for niqué, animal for ānimāle, colour for calcāre, ch. iii. § 36), though it has been also regarded as a veritably old form, a Locative without i (ch. vi. § 37), like Gk. ἔβαπτε Inf. (see above). Instar may be a similar syncopated Inf. (for instare) used as a Noun (cf. bustar, an oxstall; see ch. iii. § 36). On late inscriptions we have, e.g. haber (C. I. L. viii. 8369, of 128 A.D.) ; and on a lamp found in the oldest Esquiline cemetery (Ann. Inst. 1880, p. 260), Sotae sum. noli me tanger.

§ 85. Pres. Inf. Pass. The form in -ier, -rier belongs to O. Lat. and is employed as an archaism by the Augustan poets and their imitators (see statistics in Neue, ii, p. 409). Even in the time of Plautus it can hardly have been so current as the form in -i, -ri; for it is confined to the end of iambic and trochaic lines, e.g. percontarier, Most. 963 (see Lorenz, ad loc.), and is never found with a short antepaenultima (except deripier, Men. 1006), restrictions which indicate that it was a form used only for the sake of the metre. That the -r of -ri was originally s we see from the O. Lat. form dasi mentioned by Paul. Fest. [48. 19 Th. 'dasi' dari (should we read 'dasei' or else dare ?)].

The occasional scansion of the Pres. Inf. Act. with -ë in Plaut. (e.g. Pseud. 355. 1003) has been explained as a relic of the use of -ai (O. Lat. -ei or -i, ch. iv. § 34) as Active suffix (I. F. iv. 240). But it may be otherwise explained, as syllaba anceps before final dipody (see Müller, Plaut. Pros. p. 22). The theory that the i- and ai- suffixes were in the O. Lat. period used indifferently as Act. or Pass. is plausible enough but lacks proof.

§ 86. Fut. Inf. Act. Gallius in the seventh chapter of the first book of his Notus Atticae quotes several instances of the indeclinable use of the Fut. Inf. Act. from the older authors, in connexion with the reading: hane sibi rem praesidio sperant futurum (Cic. Verr. II. v. 65. 167), found in a copy of Tiro's edition (libro spectatae fidei, Tironiana cura atque disciplina facto). This reading was defended by such examples as: credo ego inimicos meos hoc dicturum (from a speech of G. Gracchus); hostium copias ibi occupatas futurum, and again: deos bonis bene facturum (from the Annals of Claudius Quadrigarius); omnia ex sententia processurum esse (from Valerius Antias; the use of esse is irregular); altero te oecisurum ait (sc. Casino) (from Plaut. Cas. 693, where our MSS. are almost unanimous for oecissuram !); non putavi hoc eam facturum (from Laberius, Com. 51 R.). Priscian (i. p. 475. 23 H.) quotes from Cato: illi polliceiit sese facturum omnia; from Lucilius (xvii. 8 M.) : nupturum te (sc. Penelope) nupta negas.

The existence of nouns like scriptūra, versāra, pictūra points to the Fut. Part. scriptūrus -a -um, versārus -a -um, pictūrus -a -um, &c. (formed from U-stems, as Gk. ἱοξύδε-, from a Û-stem; cf. ch. v. § 16, ch. iv. § 60) having been an old formation (cf. offensa beside offendus, répulsa beside repulsus), and makes it unlikely that the declinable Fut. Part. arose from this indeclinable Inf. So it may be better to regard O. Lat. dicturum as the Neut. sg. of this participle used (without esse) impersonally, just as the Impersonal constat, e.g. 'constat inter omnes haec ita esse,' becomes in the Fut. Inf. Pass.
constaturum, e.g. ‘spero constaturum inter omnes haec ita esse.’ Similarly the Gerundive in -ndus -a -um seems the older form and the Gerund in -ndum an Impersonal use, eundum est being analogous to itur (see § 62). On the other hand the preference shown by Plautus and Terence for the omission of esse (for statistics, see Postgate in I. F. iv. 252; cf. Plaut. Bacch. 592 negat se iturum, with Truc. 85 is nunc dicitur Uenturus peregre), and the rarity of the use of the Fut. Part. in apposition (e.g. Enn. Ann. 412 M. carbasus alta uolat pandam ductura carinam) are quoted in support of Prof. Postgate’s explanation.

§ 87. Fut. Inf. Pass. Iri is impersonal, like itur in Virgil’s itur in antiquam silvam, so that the line of Terence (Hec. prol.) : rumor uenit datum iri gladiatores, should be translated ‘that they are going to exhibit gladiators,’ ‘that there is going to be a gladiatorial show.’ Gellius (x. 14) quotes a curious extension of this usage from a speech of Cato, contumeliam mihi factum itur : atque euenit ita, Quirites, uti in hac contumelia, quae mihi per huiseue petulantiam factum itur, rei quoque publicae mediujus fidius miserear, Quirites. This throws some light on the development of the Italo-Celtic passive from an Impersonal R-form (§ 62). (Cf. Plaut. Rud. 1242 mihi istaece uidetur praeda praedatum ierit.) The word-group factum iri, &c. seems to have become a single word in ordinary language, for we often find the Fut. Inf. Pass. written with -turi in MSS., which is frequently corrupted in later copies to -turi as if Nom. Pl. Masc. of Fut. Part. Act. (e.g. sublatuiri in Cod. A of Bell. Alex. xix. 2, but in other MSS. sublatuiri ; for a list of examples from Lactantius, see A. L. L. ii. 349). The suppression of -m of sublatum, &c. is like the suppression of m of circum in circuit for circum it (see ch. ii. § 153).

§ 88. VII. THE SUPINES. The First Supine, used after a Verb of motion, is the Acc. Sg. of a Verbal Noun, a TU-stem (e.g. ire spectatuum, lit. ‘to go to the seeing,’ like ire domum, to go to the house, ire Romam, to go to Rome), the same form as is in Sanscrit the regular Infinitive of the verb (see § 83). An O. Ind. usage like draștum á gachanti, ‘they come to see,’ hótum eti, ‘he goes to sacrifice’ (cf. O. Sl. vidětě idetě, ‘he goes to see’) (Delbrück, Altil. Syntax, p. 428) is what the Latin First Supine has developed from.

The Second Supine, used after an Adjective, is the Loc. Sg. of the same Verbal Noun (e.g. ágilis cursu, nimble in running). The Loc. Sg. in -n of U-stems often played the part of a Dat. (e.g. currui for currui in Virgil, see ch. vi. §§ 37, 23, 27); and we find the Second Supine used not only as a Loc., but as a Dative, e.g. (fabula) lěpida měnòratu, pleasant for telling, where in the older language the Dative proper in -ni is used, e.g. lěpida memoratui (Plaut.), as well as the Locative, e.g. ridicula auditu
(Plaut.), (in Plaut. *Rud.* 294 sunt nobis quaestu et cultu, this Loc. plays the part of a Predicative Dative).

This TU-stem bulks largely in the language of Plautus and the older Dramatists, e.g. opsonatu redeo (Plaut. *Men.* 288), essum vocare, 'to invite to dinner' (*Men.* 458), nuptum dare, 'to give a girl in marriage' (*Pers.* 383). In *Aul.* 736 *perditum ire* is used almost like *perdere*:

        quam ób rem íta facerés méque meosque pérditum ires líberos,

(cf. *Bacch.* 565 mi ires consultum male), and the use of the Accusative without a Preposition is paralleled by phrases like

        *i mūlam crūcem* (Plaut.), *suppētias, infinitias, exsēquias ire, &c.* Like

        *nuptum dare* and *nuptum ire* are *vēnundāre* or *vēnundare* (vendere) and *vēnūm ire* (vēnire; but cf. O. Ind. *vasna-yá-ti, 3 Sg., Gk. ávēqua*); *pessūndāre* or *pessundare* and *pessum ire*. A similar

        Acc. of a Verbal Noun TU-stem is *asom* (class. *assum, 1st Supine of ardeo*) in the phrase *asom fero* on an old Praenestine cista with the representation of a kitchen scene (*Mél. Arch.* 1890, p. 303), a phrase which recurs on a Marrucine inscription, *asum ... feret* (*Zvet. I. I. I.* 8). The 1st Supine is also found in Umbrian, e.g. *aseriato etu 'observatum ito.* In the Romance languages the Supines have been lost.

§ 89. VIII. THE PARTICIPLES. The I.-Eur. Participles were merely Verbal Adjectives formed with the various suffixes already mentioned in the chapter on Noun- and Adjective-stems (chap. v). Thus for the Perf. Part. Pass. the TO-suffix was used (e. g. O. Ind. -dhi-tá-, Gk. ὶο-τός, Lat. *crū-di-tus*, Lith. dé-tas; Goth. vaurh-ts, 'wrought'), or the NO-suffix (e. g. O. Ind. pūr-ná-, 'filled, ' O. Engl. bund-en, ' bound-en,' O. Sl. nes-enū, ' carried'; cf. Lat. *plē-nus*); for the Gerundive, the YO-suffix (e. g. O. Ind. dFrançois, 'seeable, worth seeing;' O. Sax. un-fōd-i, 'insatiable'; cf. Gk. áγ-ιός, venerable, Lat. *extim-ius*), or -TWO-, -TÊWO- (e. g. O. Ind. kārtva-, ' worth doing;' Gk. δωκ-τίς(τ)ός, worth pursuing), and so on. With the LO-suffix is formed the second Past Participle Act. in O. Sl., e. g. nes-lū, used in the periphrastic *neslū jemšć, 'I have carried,* and the Aor. Part. Act. or Pass. in Armenian, e. g. *gereal kapiens, captus.*

The Pres. Part. Act. (and all Active Participles, except the
Perfect) took the suffix -ēnt-, -nt-, -ont- (see ch. v. § 63) (e.g. O. Ind. bhārant-, Gk. φέρων, -ορος, Goth. bairands, O. Sl. bery), Lat. fōr-ensis, -entis, sēdens (Umbr. zēdef). The Perf. Part. Act. took -wēs- (e.g. O. Ind. ririk-vās-, Gk. λελοω-(f)ōs, Lith. likēs; cf. O. Sl. mlūz-ū, 'having milked'); and this formation appears in Umbro-Ocean in the Compound Tense, which corresponds to the Lat. Fut. Perf. (e.g. Osc. fēfactus 'fecerit'), and probably in Osc. sipus, knowing, with full knowledge [from *sēp-wes- (?)]. That the u is long (I.-Eur. ū or ō) is inferred from the absence of Syncope, for *sipūs, *sipūs would become in Ocean *sipu; but see ch. iii. § 16]; but in Latin the Perf. Part. Act. is not used. Neither is the Pres. Part. Middle (or Pass.), which was formed in -mēno- (-mono-, -mno-) (e.g. O. Ind. bhāra-māna-, Gk. φερό-μενος; cf. Pruss. po-klausi-manas, 'being heard'), though it is found in the 2 Pl. Ind. Pass., e.g. fōrīmīn (sc. estis, see § 81), and in nouns like alumnus (cf. Gk. ὁ τρεφόμενος, see ch. v. § 13). The Perf. Part. shows the suffix -to-, e.g. scriptūs (Umbr. scriehto-, Osc. scrifto-); the Fut. Part. Act. in -sūrus is probably a formation with the suffix -ro- from a TU-stem Verbal Noun, e.g. scriptūrus, stem *scriptū-ro- from the stem *scriptu- of scriptus, -ūs, pictūrus from the stem *pictu- of pictus, -us, &c., like Gk. ἵπχο-πός from ἵπχός. [On its relation to the Fut. Inf. Act. in O. Lat. scriptūrum, in class. Lat. scriptūrus (-a -um) (esse), see § 86. For a Participle the Latin writers, especially the poets, often substituted an Adjective, e.g. lācēr for lācērātus (Virg. lacerum crudeliter ora), and these Adjectives or 'truncated Participles' have to some extent encroached on the Perf. Part. Pass. in the Romance languages, e.g. Ital trovo beside trovato. (Meyer-Lübke, Rom. Gram. ii. p. 375.)

§ 90. Pres. Part. Act. The Pres. Part. Act. was liable to become in all languages an ordinary Adjective or a Noun; e.g. Goth. frijōnd-s, lit. 'loving,' assumed the sense of 'friend'; Lat. rīdēns (see § 6), lit. 'rattling,' assumed the sense of 'a rope, tackling'; bēnēvelōns is a noun in Plautus, e.g. Trin. 46, 1148, &c. Very early examples of this seem to be Lat. dens (Osc. dont-?), a Pres. Part. of the L-Eur. root ed-, 'to eat,' sons a Pres. Part. of L-Eur. es-, 'to be' (cf. O. Scand. sanner, 'sooth, true,' which acquired the sense of 'truly charged,' 'guilty'). Of Pres. Parts. becoming Adjectives in Latin examples are congruens (beside congruus), benevolens (beside benevolus), bēnēmērens (cf. -mērus in Lucilius' mercēdimērēa lēpōnes); indigēns, not indīgus, and insicēns, not inscius (but nescius), are used by Plautus. The result of this close connexion of
Verbal Adjectives (especially Compounds) in -us with Participles in -ens, is a Comparison like benevolus, benevolentior, benevolentissimus, magnificus, -entior, -entissimus (see ch. vi. § 55).

The ο-γrade of the suffix which predominates in the Greek declension, φειν, -οντος, -οντι appears in Lat. sons (beside praec-sens, praec-sentia, ab-sens, &c.), euntis, -i, -em, -es, &c. (beside Nom. Sg. tens), viduntas (beside velons). It can hardly be due to a mere accident that all these traces of the suffix -ont- are found in verbs belonging to the Athematic Conjugation, I.-Eur. *es-mi, *ei-mi, *wel-mi (see § 2). It almost seems as if the declension of the Pres. Part. Athematic Verbs in Latin had originally exhibited the suffix -ont-, perhaps varying with -ent- (I.-Eur. -nt- or even -ent-), e.g. ab-iens Nom. Sg., euntis Gen., eunti Dat., *ientem Acc. (see ch. vi. § 1, p. 367), or sons Nom. Sg., sentis Gen. from an I.-Eur. *sonts Nom., *sintos Gen. (cf. O. Ind. sant-, satás Gen.), *sentia Fem. from sant- like Dor. Gk. ἡσσα for ἱσσα, the equivalent of Att. ὄσα (ch. iv. § 81). The use of euntis, eunti, &c. cannot well have been due to the dislike of the combination -i- (iens has -i-, the vowel being lengthened before ns, ch. ii. § 144), for this combination is not objected to in other Participles, facientis, copientis, &c. The survival of the suffix -ent- in the struggle for existence in the Latin Present Participle, athematic and thematic, was probably aided by the Latin tendency to turn every short unaccented vowel before a consonant-group to e (see ch. iii. § 18; and cf. below, § 94, on -undus and -undus in the Gerundive).

§ 91. Perf. Part. Act. This has been lost also in Celtic and Teutonic, but in Balto-Slavic is the only part of the Perfect Active retained. Some find traces of the formation in Lat. ċūdāver, pāpāver, others in O. Lat. gnābūres Plur., 'knowing,' e.g. Plaut. Most. 100:

simūl gnarurius uos uolo ésse hanc rem mēcum.

(Cf. Gloss. Placid. 'gnarurius' gnarus, sciens : Gloss. Philox. 'gnarurem' gnārēm; 'ignarures' ἀγνοούτες; 'ignarat' gnorίζει. Memoria seems to be not a Perfect Participle, but an Adjective derived from a Perfect Participle, as Gk. κεκαραγμός (Eurip.) is a Noun derived from κεκραγας.

§ 92. Perf. Part. Pass. This participle too became often an ordinary Adjective (Engl. 'cold,' 'dead,' &c. are TO-stem Participles), e.g. citus, swift, lit. 'bestirred' (O. Ind. ši-tā-); cūtus, sharp (this was the meaning of the word in the Sabine district, Varro's home, Varro, L. L. vii. 45), then (metaphorically) (i) piercing, of sounds, e.g. Eun. A. 538 M. cata signa, the shrill clarions; (2) shrewd, of persons, literally 'sharpened,' from I.-Eur. kō- (cf. Lat. ċōs, a whetstone) (ch. iv. § 54); lūtus, O. Lat. slūtus, broad, lit. 'extended' (cf. O. Sl. stel-ja, 'I spread, extend') 1, or a Noun, e.g. nātus, a son (in Plautus and Terence we have as a rule gnatos, a son, natis, born), legūtus, a lieutenant, deputy. When used as an Adj. it sometimes passes into the I-declension, the favourite Adjective declension (ch. v. § 34), e.g. fortis, O. Lat. forcutus, originally P. P. P. of the I.-Eur. root dhergh- 'to establish' (O. Ind. ḍṛghā-

1 Another example is euncītus 1168: fac istam cunctam gratiam. (for co-euncītus?), which has still its Accūtus is always a Participle in participial sense in Plaut. Most. O. Lat.
‘established, firm’), in- genu, lit. ‘unknown,’ from the root ĝen-, ‘to know’ (O. Engl. un-cûdt, ‘uncouth’). When used as a Noun the Neuter often appears, e.g. lectum (also Masc. lectus, of the fourth or second decl.), lectum, fìtium (the sense of ‘destiny’ probably originated in the phrase ‘fari fatum alieut,’ to lay a doom or spell on one, like the Welsh tyngdu tynged; see Rhŷs, Proc. of Internat. Folklore Congr. 1891, p. 150), and (especially in the case of Abstract Nouns) the Feminine, e.g. offensa, rēpulsa.

The Participle in -to- of Intransitive Verbs has the sense of a Perfect Part. Active, e.g. ērnātus, having a phrase as ‘a learned man,’ ‘a learned judge.’ Hence its use as the Perfect Participle of Deponent Verbs, e.g. aspernātus, secētus, and the coexistence of Deponent Perf. Part. and Act. Verb, e.g. fīsus beside fīdo, mæstus, sad, beside mæcro. These participial TO-stems from roots which have developed in Latin into Deponent Verbs often retain their true passive sense, e.g. ābūsa Pass. (Plaut. Asin. 196; cf. Pelign. oïsa actate ‘confecta actate’), so that there is a justification for Virgil’s obūta carmina, Horace’s dētestātā bella, and the like.

It seems to have taken in L.-Eur. the weak grade of the Verb-root, e.g. L.-Eur. *wid-to- from the root weid-, ‘to know’ (O. Ind. vittā-, Gk. ἄσατος, Goth. un-vis), klu- to- from kluē- [O. Ind. śrūtā-, Gk. κλαύρος, Lat. in-clūtus, O. Ir. cloth for *elūto-, O. H. G. Hlot-hari (the equivalent of Gk. ΛUρó-στρας, cf. Germ. Heer, an army), the name ‘Lothair’). In Latin this is also the rule, e.g. dāc-tus from dāca, ūs-tus from āro, tentus for *tn-tos (Gk. ταρός) from root ten-, pūtus (Plaut. Ps. 1200) used with its equivalent pū-ritus. See ch. ii. § 144, where it is suggested that the long vowel of rēctus, &c. may be due to a Latin tendency to lengthen a vowel before the group y-t.

The Perfect Ind. Act. too has often influenced its vocalism. The same influence caused the substitution of -sus for -tus, which spread from Dental Verb-stems, where it was due to a Latin phonetic law (ch. iv. § 155), e.g. tensus for *tend-tus, āsus older āssus, for āl-tus, *oil-to-, flexus for *fle*tus, sālsus for *sal-tus (cf. Goth. saltan), perculsus for *kld-to- (cf. ādēs), to others where the Perfect has s (x), e.g. farus (cf. farsi Perf.), fīxus (cf. fēxī; but fīctus from fingo, finxi), just as the analogy of hasī has produced the late form hāce-ārīs, and hausī (P. P. hausus), haus-ārīs beside hausārurs, or as the analogy of the Present Tense is followed in O. Lat. sortus (surtus?) with -rē for -ret-, ch. iv. § 157) for *surrectus (Paul. Fest. 423. i Th. ‘surgit’ et ‘sortus’ pro surrexit, et quasi possess fieri surrectus, frequenter posuit Līvius, expergītus for experrectus, Lucil. iii. 56 M.; Lucr. iii. 929, &c.).

On Oscan prūto- ‘probatus,’ Umbr. vašeto- (from stem vaka-), &c., which have been compared with Lat. crēpītus from crepāre, implicitus from implīcare, see von Plantura, i. p. 214. The difficulties which they offer have not yet been satisfactorily removed.

In Italian, French, and Roumanian the ending -ātus (like stātus, minātus, &c.) has become the normal ending of the P. P. P. of the third Conjugation; e.g. Ital. venduto, Fr. vendu, Roum. vindut, point to a Vulg. Lat. vēndātus for vendītus (see Meyer-Lübke, Rom. Gram. ii. p. 270). (Cf. § 51, above, on the encroachment of the Perfect in -ui in Vulg. Lat.) For the Past Part. of some the Italian and French languages use stātus (Ital. stato, Fr. été, &c.) (ib. p. 385). A Romance example of a P. P. P. which has become an Adj. is strictus with the sense of ‘narrow’ (Ital. stretto, Fr. étroit, Span. estrecho).
§ 93. 'Truncated' Particles. Priscian (i. 534. 6 H.) says: 'retus' pro retitus dicebant, quomodo 'saeclus' pro saeclatus, et 'lassus' pro lassatus, et 'lacerus' pro laceratus et 'potus' pro potatus; Gellius (xix. 7) quotes from Laevius 'oblitteram' gentem for oblitteratam, with other novelties such as 'aeceptitret' for lacseret, 'pudoricolorem' auroram, curis 'intoler-antibus' for intolerandis.

§ 94. IX. THE GERUND AND GERUNDIVE. The Gerundive (Adj.) in -ndo-, Umbro-Oscan -no- (e.g. Ose. tríubúm . . . úpsanam deded ' domum . . . operandam deduct,' Umbr. esonir . . . popler anferenur et ocer pihauer ' sacris . . . populi circumferendi et arcis piandae,' Gen. of 'Purpose') has beside it in Latin, but not, so far as we can tell, in Umbro-Oscan, a Gerund (Neut. Noun) in -ndo-, which seems to stand to the Gerundive in the same relation as an Impersonal to a Personal Verb, evundum est in antiquam silvam being Impersonal like itur in antiquam silvam. Until more Umbro-Oscan inscriptions with this formation have been discovered, it is rash to attempt a history of the Gerundive and Gerund on Italian soil. The evidence at present at our disposal points to the Adjectival use as having been the original one, shared by all the Italic languages, e.g. domus aedificanda, iter cognoscen- dae antiquitatis (ch. vi. § 20, p. 383 n.). In the older Latin writers when this formation is turned into finite form, i.e. when a state- ment is made by means of it, the usual method is to employ the Gerund with est governing an object, e.g. agitandum est vigilias, imperandum est servis, carendum est urbe; but in classical Latin the Gerundive is preferred if the Verb is one which governs the Accusative, e.g. agitandae sunt vigiliae, but still as before, imperandum est servis, carendum est urbe (see Roby, Lat. Gram. ii2. Pref. pp. lxi sqq.); and the transition from the impersonal to the personal mode of expression, marked by a construction like Plautus' nominandi istorum copia (a construction allowed by Cic. with a Gen. Pl. for the sake of euphony, e.g. facultas agrorum condonandi) is like the transition from 'factum itur contumeliam' to Cato's contumeliam factum itur (§ 87).

The origin of the Gerundive suffix still remains doubtful, after all the theories that have been started to account for it (see especially Brugmann, Grundriss, ii. §§ 69 and 1103; Thurneysen, K.Z. xxx. 493; Conway, Class. Rev. v. 296). In the third and fourth Conjugations the form -endo- cannot be a phonetic
development of -đudo- through weakening of the vowel ō in the unaccented syllable, for we have anferenno- for *ûmbhī-bhērēndō- in Umbrian, where a weakening of this kind would not be found. Although the form -enudō- became the approved form in classical Latin, while -ēnudo- (from an earlier -ēndo-) was relegated to the legal and archaic style, e.g. rēs rēpētundae, yet the classical form is found on the earliest inscriptions. On the Senatus Consultum de Bacchanalibus of 186 B.C. (C. I. L. i. 196) we have exdeicendum ‘edicendum’ and faciendum, and on the Lex Repetundarum of 122-123 B.C. (i. 198) tribuendi, fruendi, fruendum, &c. stand side by side with legundis, scrībundī, deferundō, quaeœrundāi, &c. The two are rather parallel endings like -ōnt- and -ēnt- in the Pres. Part. Act. (see §90), although the ultimate acceptance of the É-form in both these cases may have been helped by the Latin tendency to turn a short unaccented vowel before a consonant-group into ē (ch. iii. §18).

With the Gerundive suffix are evidently connected the suffixes of Adjectives in - bends-, cundo-, &c., e.g. errā-bundus, ĭrā-cundo-, rōbi-cundo-, rōtundus (cf. O. Ir. cruind, ‘round,’ alaind, ‘beautiful’?). The b of the first of these has been referred to the root bheu- of fvi, &c., the c of the second to the suffix seen in rōbi-care, albī-care, &c. (above § 27, ch. v. § 31).

§ 95. Origin of the suffix -ndo-. The suffix -do- of lūci-dus, &c. has been referred to the verb dare, so that lūci-dus would really mean ‘giving light’ (ch. v. § 67). In the Gerundive this same suffix (cf. Aius from aio, Panda from pdo, &c., ch. v. §§ 2-3) may perhaps be joined not with a stem, as in lūci-dus, but with an Accusative case, as -dex (from dīce) is in vin-dex (ch. v. § 80), or as the finite verb is joined in composition with an Accusative in venum-dō, veno, pessum-dō. These may be relics of a mode of expression that prevailed much more widely in the pre-literary period of Latin. The combination of Active and Passive sense, which is so peculiar a feature of the Latin Gerundive forms, e.g. ‘agitandum est vigilias’ Act., and ‘agitandae sunt vigiliae’ Pass., and ‘anulus in digito subtertonatur habendo’ Act.-Pass., may then be explained from the double sense that can be attached to an expression like rōbīren dure, (1) to blush, Neut., (2) to cause to blush, Act. The Accusatives will be Accusatives of Verbal Noun-stems *rotam-dus, *ludam-dus (ludándus, Audaces exc. 359. 15 K.), *rubem-dus, *habem-dus (Ital. provienda points to habēndus), *ferōm-dus (with *ferōm-dus; cf. ferō-bam, § 34) (see § 34 on rubē-saco, &c., i-īcēt, &c., and cf. the Zend Inf. dām, ‘to set, to give’). That -md- became -nā- in Latin, but -nm- (often written n) in Umbro-Oscan, we see from Lat. quon-dam, quan-do, Umbr. ponne and pone, Osc. pon from *q?<om-dē.

§ 96. Adjectives in -undo-, cundo-, &c. Examples of -undo- from Verbs
of the first Conjugation: erri-bundus, praesū-bundus (Sall., &c.), populā-bundus (Liv., &c.), vertītā-bundus (Varr. Men. 108 B.); of the second: pūdī-bundus (Aug. poets); of the third: fūrī-bundus, mūri-bundus, quērī-bundus, trempē-bundus (cf. treme-factio, treme-seo), fremē-bundus (Accius, with fremi-?, and Aug. poets); of the fourth: lascīri-bundus (Plaut. Stich. 288; the quantity of the third vowel is not decided by the metre, but must be long). Examples of -cundo- are from the first: fā-cundus (cf. fā-tus), irrā-cundus (cf. irrā-tus), jū-cundus (cf. jūtus); and from the second: fe-cundus (cf. fe-tus), vēr-e-cundus (from Plaut. onwards), rābi-cundus (Ter., &c.; cf. rubē-facio). Verōndus has -undo- (cf. Ital. rotondo, Span. redondo, &c.) from -ando- (on the spelling rotundus, see ch. iii. § 33). Socīennus, a Plautine word for sēcīus (Aug. 659), may be a dialectal form (Plautus was an Umbrian), of which the true Latin equivalent would be *sociemus.

§ 97. Some Irregular Verbs. The irregularity of many verbs consists in their use of different stems for different tenses. The Substantive Verb shows the root ES- in some tenses (§ 2), the root BHEU- in others, e.g. Pft. fūri1; and the heteroelite conjugation of verbs like 'to be,' 'to go' seems to date from the L.-Eur. period. Other Latin examples are fio (for *ficīo from bhw-., a weakened form of the root bheu-; cf. Osc. fiet, fiet 'fient') and factus sum; fērio and percussi; fēro and tūlī (O. Lat. tētūli, § 39), the Perfect being taken from the root of O. Ind. tul-, 'to lift,' Gk. τελάω, Ir. tallaim, 'I take away,' Goth. julan, 'to endure,' Scotch thole; tollo for tol-wō (Ir. tallaim), with the Nasal Present-stem and sustūli for sustētūli (§ 44), with Preposition and Aorist- or Weak stem (§ 3); vescor and pastus sum; argnor and convidius sum; vēminiscor and recordatus sum; medecor and midiacatus sum; surgo differs from surrexi and surrectus in being syncopated (cf. porgo and porrigo); a contracted form of the P. P. P., sortus, is said by Fest. 422. 5 Th. (cf. Paul. Fest. 423. 1) to have been frequently used by Livius Andronicus; Virgil (J. iv. 183) uses the full form sub-rīgo in an active sense: tot subrigit aures; on vis beside vōlo, see § 3. Other verbs, classed as Irregular, are the Defective Verbs: coeπi (the Present coeπio is found in O. Lat., see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v., e.g. Plaut. Men. 960 neque ego litis coeπio; Pers. 121 coeπēre Inf.; on coeπi dissyll. and coeπi trisyll., see ch. ii. § 150); inquam for

1 fūet beside esset seems to be a form -pucr; the Oscan equivalent is fusid, of *furet, *bhewēt, like soror- from cf. O.c. fust Fut. *swēsor (ch. iv. § 10), or Marci-por for
*ind-squam (ch. iv. § 158) from the root seqⁿ, ‘to speak’ (W. heb, O. W. hepp, ‘quoth he,’ &c.), the unweakened form of which appears in O. Lat. insēque Imperat., insequis, ‘narras, refers, et interdum pergis,’ C. G. L. v. 78. 10 [or *in(ī)-ve-
quam from the root weqⁿ-?]; inque, an Imperat. of *inquam, is used by Plaut., and the 2 Sg., &c. of Pres., inquiis, in-
quit, inquinunt and of Fut., inquies, inquiet are frequent, but inquio Pres. Ind. is not found till Late Lat. (cf. inquio ‘dico,’ C. G. L. iv. 250. 27). [On the parts in use of inquam, āio for
*āgh-īo (ch. iv. § 116), insit, see Neue ii². p. 612; infio is quoted from Varro by Priscian, i. p. 450. 17 H.; ai Imperat. (a dissyll.) is used by Naevius, Com. 125 R. uel āi uel nega (but aie ‘incepe, dic,’ C. G. L. v. 165. 7, like infe ‘inceipe, dic, narrar,’ ib. 211. 10, infens’dicens,’ ib. 211. 37); the two vowels of āio are sometimes united in a diphthong, e.g. aibam (dissyll.), ain (monosyll.) in a phrase like ain vero? ‘do you really mean that?’; on the spelling āio, see ch. i. § 7.]

Possum is found in the older writers in its uncompounded form pōtis and pōtē sum (examples in Georges, Lex. Wortf. s.v., Neue, ii². p. 600); pote is properly the Neuter of pōtis, e.g. pote est (class, potest), it is possible, but the Masc. (and Fem.) and Neut. forms are used of any gender and of any number, e.g. pōtis est, it is possible, Ter. Phorm. 379, credo equidem potis esse te, seelus, Plaut. Pseud. 1302; so with pōtis and pote, without sum, just as O. Ind. īśvarā-, ‘able,’ which is used with the sense of ‘can,’ though generally agreeing with the subject, sometimes appears in the stereotyped form īśvarās (Delbrück, Allind. Syntax, p. 88). In Ocean we have a derivative verb used in this sense, putiāni and putiānis ‘possint,’ putiānō and putiānīd ‘possit’ (cf. Lat. pōtui, like mōnuī from moneo), but the Latin derivative pōtio is used in the sense of ‘potē facere,’ pōtior (fourth and third Conj.) of ‘pōtis fieri’ [cf. potiōr fieri used in the sense of pōtiri, Plaut. Cas. 112 quam tu eius potiōn fias, like certior (and certus) fieri], e.g. eum nunc potiuit pater seruitutis, Plaut. Amph. 178; postquam mens rex est potitus hostium, Capt. 92; regni potiri, Cic. On possumus for possumus in MSS. of Virgil, Eccl. vii. 23 and perhaps viii. 63: non omnia possumus omnes, also in the Verona Palimpsest of Gaius (99, 14; 101, 2), &c., see ch. ii.
§ 16. Possem for potessem has been explained by the Analogy of possum (for pot(e)-sum) beside potis-sum, possim beside potis-sim.

Maolo, a contraction of māvolo, seems to come similarly from māgē (a byform of magis, ch. ix. § 4) united into a word-group with vēlo, and nōlo from the Negative nē- and vēlo, though the exact process of phonetic or analogical change by which the various parts of these verbs arose is not easy to trace. Perhaps māg(e)-vēlo became *māvvolo (written māvolo, as *cavvi was written cāvi, § 39. 4), much as I.-Eur. gō or gw became Lat. v (ch. iv. § 139). And nē-vēlo (for the word-group cf. ne-scio, nē-queo, Engl. cannot) may have become *nōvolo as I.-Eur. *nēvos became Lat. nōvus (ch. iv. § 10), and similarly *novis, *novōlt, *novōlumus, *novōlunt. By loss of intervocalic v (ch. ii. § 53) arose nōlo (the only form known to Plautus), nōlumus, nōltis (ap. Diom. 386. 19 K.), nōlunt, while O. Lat. nē-vis, nē-vōlt, as well as class. non-vis, non-vult, non-vōltis are re-formations. On Imperat. nōli see § 2, and on the spellings mallo, nollo, ch. ii. § 129. Another account of mā-vōlo makes its first element the Comparative Adverb *mā, *mō (see ch. x. § 6 on im-mo), and not mage.

§ 98. Irregular Verbs in Romance. Of Lat. sum the Vulg. Lat. Inf. esse (Ital. essere, Fr. être, Span. ser), and P. P. P. status (Ital. stato, Fr. être), have been already mentioned (§§ 83, 92); the Pres. Subj. seems to have been siam (Ital. sia, Span. sea, O. Fr. sole). For Lat.  eo various verbs were united in the Vulg. Lat. paradigm, e. g. Fr. je vais (from Lat. vādo), nous allons (from Lat. am-bulo ?). Lat. hābeo was, owing to its Auxiliary use, shortened to a declension like hāyo, hās, hāt . . . hāunt (Ital. ho, hai, ha . . . hanno; Fr. ai. as, a . . . ont; Span. he, has, ha . . . han). Vulg. Lat. voleo, volēre Inf. (Ital. voglio, volere; Fr. veux, vouloir) by Analogy of Pst. volui, as Vulg. Lat. potēre (Ital. potere, Span. poder) by analogy of potui, have been cited in §§ 33 a, 83.

1 Both mavolo and malo, mavelim and malim occur in Plautus, but malo, malim, &c. are predominant later, though we have mavolo once at the end of a line in Terence, Hec. 540. Mallem is not found in Plautus, only marellem (Sölmsen, Stud. Lautg. p. 55).
CHAPTER IX.

ADVERBS AND PREPOSITIONS.

§ 1. ADVERBS. Latin Adverbs are for the most part cases of Nouns, Adjectives (or Participles), and Pronouns, the cases most frequently found being the Accusative (cf. O. Ind. nāktam, 'by night,' satyām, 'truly,' Acc. Sg. Neut., pratarām Acc. Sg. Fem., Gk. πράτερον Acc. Sg. Neut., μακρῶν Acc. Sg. Fem., κρύφα Acc. Pl. Neut.), Ablative (cf. O. Ind. dūrāt, 'afar') [also Instrumental (?), cf. O. Ind. dīvā, 'by day,' Gk. ἄλλη]¹, and Locative (cf. O. Ind. dūrē, 'afar,' Gk. οἴκου, ἀναμωτεί, ἕκοντι), and often retain case-forms which have become obsolete in the ordinary declension. Thus, -im, the original form of the Acc. Sg. suffix of I-stems (ch. vi. § 29), which in classical Latin was replaced by the -em of Consonant-stems, e. g. partem from the stem parti-, like militem from the stem milit-, is retained in Adverbs like partim, and in the Adverbial Accusatives of Verbal Noun I-stems, e.g. raptim from the stem rapti- (class. raptiōn-, ch. v. § 42), sensim from the stem sensi- (class. sensiōn-), uni-versim (Osc. úni-veresím) &c.; nox, an old equivalent of noctu, seems to be an early byform of noctis Gen.; -ē (older -ōd), the suffix by which Adverbs derived from Adjective O-stems are formed in the Italic languages, is an Abl. Sg. suffix (parallel with -ō, older -ōd, ch. vi. § 33), which has been reserved for Adverbs alone. The Adverbial suffix -tus (I.-EUR. *-tōs) of fundū-tus, dīvīnī-tus, &c., is in O. Ind. occasionally used as an Ablative suffix (Sing. or Plur.) of Nouns, e. g. māṭ-tas, Abl. Sg. of māṭ-, 'a mother,'

¹ In O. Ind. the Instr. Case is in the sphere of motion, 'by the route of.' (Delb. Allind. Synt. p. 129.)
ADVERBS.

1.

An example of a purely Adverbial suffix is -ies (older -iens), by which most Numerals form their Adverbs, e.g. sex-ies (cf. tot-ies, quod-ies), or the *-mente of the Romance languages, e.g. Fr. facile-ment, Span. facil-mente, which is nothing but the Abl. Sg. of Latin mens, just as the -versus, -versum (older -vorsus, -vormum) of quaquaversus (-m), aliocorsum (contracted aliorsum), retraversorsum (contracted retrorsum, retrosum), rursus (-m) for reversus (-m), &c. are nothing but the Nom. Sg. Masc. (see below) and Acc. Sg. Neut. of the P. P. P. of vero, to turn, or as the -tēnus of hactenus, aequatemenus, &c. is the Acc. Sg., employed adverbially, of the old neuter noun tenus, a stretching, used by Plautus in the sense of a string or snare (§ 54). The Adverbs derived from Pronouns, e.g. ibi, inde, illinc, offer special difficulty, because of our ignorance of the full number of case-suffixes used in the I.-Eur. declension of the Pronoun. Thus -am of quam, tam, nam, jam is naturally taken as Acc. Sg. Fem., but it has also been referred to an Instrumental formation with the suffix -m, -mi, which appears in the Instrumental case of Nouns and Pronouns in Balto-Slavic (ch. vi. § 36); and various other Latin Adverbs in -m, usually called Accusatives, have been referred to the same source.

Adverbs in -ter, e.g. breviter, are best explained as Nominatives Singular Masc. of stems in -tēro-, a Stem-suffix which occurs in various pronominal and locative Adjectives, e.g. al-ter, dext-ter, &c. (ch. v. § 16) (b-terum is an Acc. Sg. Neut. of a similar formation), though they have been also referred to the noun iter, brev-iter corresponding to German kurz-weg. Other examples of a Nom. Sg. Masc. Adjective stereotyped as an Adverb are probably deinceps, which was declined in O. Lat. like princeps, though it might be regarded as Acc. Sg. Neut. (cf. exordium princeps), demus an O. Lat. byform of dénum; more certainly adversus, rursus, &c., the byforms of adversum, rursum, and other compounds of versus (-m), &c.

Examples of Acc. Sg. Neut. forms are, beside the Adverbs in
-tim (-sim) just mentioned, Adverbs in -um like -terum, another time (Acc. of *itero-, O. Ind. itara-, *other; from the Pronoun-stem i-, ch. vii. § 13, with the suffix -tero-, ch. v. § 16), ce-terum (ch. x. § 5), commōdum (beside commodo), multum, pārum (§ 7), plērum-que (p. 559), vērum, tantum, along with some Superlatives like minimum (usually minime), potissimum, insānum (not insane in Plaut.) 'very,' and occasional Adverbs from I-stem Adjectives, e.g. fācilē, difficile, sublīmē (though -iter is the usual suffix, e.g. breviter, fūdēlīter, the formation in -ē being reserved for poetry, e.g. dulce ridentem . . . dulce loquentem, Hor.). The comparative degree of the Adverb is always the Acc. Sg. Neut. of the Comparative Adjective, e.g. longius, facilius, brevius. Accusatives Sing. of Nouns used Adverbially are vicem, id gēnum, &c., to which we may add an Acc. Pl. fōrās, which is only used with verbs of motion towards (foras ire, like rus ire, domum ire), and seems to be Acc. Pl. of *fora (Gk. θόρα), a door. Of Acc. Pl. Neut. forms we have ceterā (Verg. A. ix. 656 cetera parce puer bello), omnia (Verg. A. iv. 558 omnia Mercurio similis; C. I. L. vi. 1144 omnia magno Constantino), possibly the O. Lat. forms contrā [for which contrā, an Abl. Sg. Fem., was used in class. Lat., and contrud, an Abl. Sg. Neut. (cf. Lat. contrō-versed), in Oscan], and frustrā (class. frustrā).

Of Ablatives we have for O-stems, beside the ēd-suffix already quoted (a suffix used to form the Superlative Degree of Adverbs, e.g. facilīme, O. Lat. faciliumed, brecessīme), the ordinary ēd-suffix (ch.vi. § 33), e.g. certo (beside certe), vero (beside vere), assidduo (usually assidue), explōrāto (and explorate), mērito and immērito (neither of these are Adverbs in Plautus, for they are used with meo, luo, &c.), festināto (also festinatim), fortūtō (also fortuitū; see ch. v. § 49). Examples of Ablatives Sg. Fem. are dextērā (scil. parte), rectā (scil. via), ēadem (scil. opēra), extrā, suprā. As was pointed out before (ch.vi. § 36), the loss of final d after a long vowel at the beginning of the 2nd cent. B. C. makes it impossible to be certain that some of these 'Ablatives' (e.g. ūna, omnīno) are not really Instrumentals (e.g. Gk. λάθρα, kouν?) for it is natural to suppose that the Instrumental suffix, whose existence in the Latin declension of Nouns is difficult to establish (ch. vi. § 36), may have survived in Latin as an Adverbial suffix. The
shortening of -ō (by the Law of Breves Breviantes, ch. iii. § 42) in cōlō, mōdō, and of -ē in bēnē, mīlē, is no proof that these words ended originally in -ō, -ē (Instr.) and not in -ōd, -ēd (Abl.), but should be referred to their greater use in every-day speech (cf. hāvē beside mōnē, &c. in Quintilian’s time, ch. iii. § 42), and their more frequent occurrence in word-groups, e. g. bene-rem-gēras, male-sānum (cf. diēquintī beside fīōdē, ch. iii. § 44). It is only rarely that the occurrence of an Adverb on an old Latin inscription, or on inscriptions written in Oscan, or some other dialect which retained -d, enables us to decide, e. g. O. Lat. meritor (meretod), porod, extrad, suprad, Osc. contrud, Falisc. rected, which are Abl. forms, Osc. suluh, ‘wholly,’ from the stem solo-, all, whole, which is called an Instrumental form (but see ch. vi. § 36). The third Declension ‘Abl.’ (originally a Consonant-stem Locative, ch.vi. § 37) appears in fortē, spontē, rēpentē (O. Lat. dērepente), &c., and the Plural Abl. (Instr. Loc.) in grātīs (older gratiis), ‘for more thanks’ (cf. Ter. si non pretio, at gratiis), ingratīs (ingratiis), fōris (used with verbs of rest, e. g. foris manere, occasionally with verbs of motion from, e. g. foris venire), alternis. Examples of Locatives of U-stems are hūmi (first found in Terence, Andr. 726), postrī-dīcē, die crastīnī, noctū (cf. O. Ind. aktāū) (see ch. vi. §§ 37–38).

Pronominal Adverbs show various suffixes: (1) -bē (older -bei) with locative sense, e. g. ĭlē, ĭlē, also ĭō, ĭbē, with final vowel either shortened by the Breves Breviantes Law (ch. iii. § 42), or originally short (cf. Osc. puf); (2) -ī (older -ei), the Locative O-stem suffix, e. g. O. Lat. ĭlī, ĭsti, there, which in classical Latin always have the particle -c(e) appended, illī-c, ĭstī-c; (3) -ā, to indicate motion to a place, e. g. ēō, quaō, ľstō, aliō, apparently Abl. forms like porrō (O. Lat. porod); O. Lat. hoc, istoc, illoc may represent *hōd-c(e), *istōd-c(e), *illōd-ce, Acc. Sg. Neut., for in class. Lat. we have huc, istuc, illuc; (4) -ā, to indicate direction, manner, &c., e. g. qua, ea, which like quo, eo are Abl. forms (O. Lat. avorsum ead), not Instrumental like Greek πῆ, ταῦτη, πάντη (afterwards confused with Dative -η); (5) -im, to indicate motion from a place, e. g. illīm, ľstīm, which in class. Lat. always append the particle -ce, illīne, ľstīne (cf. hinc, dehinc); (6) -nde, with similar sense, in unde, unde; this unde is shortened by syncope of the final vowel to -in in the Compounds prōin, dein,
exin, &c. (ch. iii. § 36). Other endings like -dam of quondam (cf. quidam), -dem of qui-dem, tanti-dem, with the sense of 'exactly,' 'precisely' in ibi-dem, tanti-dem (cf. idem, ch. vii. § 21), -tem of i-temp., -ta of ita, are apparently case-forms of pronominal stems, as -quam of un quam, usquam (cf. quis- quam), appears to be Acc. Sg. Fem. of the stem *quo-. (See ch. x. on the Conjunctions.)

Other Adverb formations are (1) in -fariam, indicating division, e.g. hi-fariam, quadrifariam (cf. Gk. -φάσις from -φαίνομαι, e.g. πρι-φάσις); (2) in -seucus, indicating motion from a place; this seucus is an Adverbial Noun, and is appended to Adverbial forms in -im, e.g. extrin-secus, intrin-secus, altrin-secus, as seculus to Abl. Sg. Fem. forms, e.g. qui-seculus, aliqui-seculus, eā-seculus; it is derived from the root sequ-, 'to follow,' and must be distinguished from (1) the Adverb seicus, otherwise (O. Ir. sech, 'beyond,' W. heb, 'without'); (2) the Adverbial Noun seucus, a Neuter byform of semi, used in phrases like: trecenti occisi sunt viriles, '300 were killed of the male sex' (see § 50 on the Proposition seculus). The Abl. fīnī (fīnē) occurs in O. Lat., like tenus, after an Abl., e.g. senem esse fini dedolabo, Plaut., oleas operi terrā radicibus fini, Cato; but came to take a Genitive, e.g. amphorās nolito implere nimium, ansarum inimicarum fini, Cato; fine inguinum ingrediuntur mare, Sall.

Instances of Adverbial word-groups are ad-fatim, sufficiently, lit. 'to weariness,' ad-modo, quem-ad-modum, quā-rē, quam-ob- rem, dē-unō for de nōvo, se- dulō for se dolo, i-licō perhaps for in sloco (old form of locō), i-licet, scī-licet, vide-licet, im-primis, dum-taxat, &c.

In the Romance languages Lat. mente (p. 549) is the favourite Adverbial suffix, though Lat. -o(-um) is not uncommon, e.g. Vulg. Lat. alto or allum (Ital. alto, Fr. haut, Span. alto) (-iter has been lost). Mente (Abl. of mens) retains a trace of its independence in usages like Span. temeraria y locamente, O. Fr. humle e dulcemente. So firmly has it established its footing as Adverbial suffix that it is even added to already formed Adverbs, e.g. Ital. quasimente, O. Fr. ausiment. (For fuller details of the formation of Adverbs in Romance, see Meyer-Lübke, Rom. Gram. ii. pp. 637 sqq.)
§ 2. Nomina-tive Adverb-forms. Breviter, &c., are better considered Nom. Sg. Masc. than Acc. Sg. Neut. for *brevis-terum, since the loss of -um seems only to occur in a few words of constant use, such as nonum, ni(hi)lum, which came to be employed exclusively in that doublet-form which the words assumed before a vowel, e. g. no(e)n(um) est, ni(hi)l(um) habeo (ch. iii. § 52). Iterum did not become *iter, nor ceterum, *ceter. The crystallizing of the Nom. Sg. Masc. of the Adjective as an Adverb, used with any number or gender, finds a parallel in the extension of potis, properly Nom. Sg. Masc., Fem. only, e. g. potis sum, potis es, potis est ille, potis est illa, to all persons and numbers of the Verb, e. g. qui istue potis est fieri ?, Plaut., with Neuter subject (see ch. viii. § 97). The Adverbs (Prepositions) propter, propret, &c. might be similarly explained; propter it ille, *prorecta it illa, *prorecteri eunt illi became praeterit, praetererant without distinction of gender or number (but see p. 554). Nuper (Superl. nuperrime) appears to be Nom. Sing. Masc. of the Adjective nupéro- (Plaut. Capt. 718 recéns captum hominem, nuperum, nouicium) for *nevi-péro-, *newly acquired,' unless it is Acc. Sg. Neut. of an I-stem Adj. (ch. v. § 34) for *nupere. Fócul (Paul. Fest. 61. 32 Th. 'facul' antiqui dicebant et 'faculter' probe facile; Fest. 266. 20 Th. 'per-facul' antiqui, et per se 'facul' dicebant, quod nunc facile dicimus; Nom. III. 27 M. 'facul' pro faciliter, huic contrarium est 'difficil'), a word used by Lucilius in his description of the Roman patricians (vi. 2 M.):

pecceae inpune rati sunt
posse, et nobilitate facul propellere iniquos.

is better regarded as Neut. Sg. for facile, with syncope of -e, as in velope, Neut. of *velupis (ch. iii. § 36), than as Nom. Sg. Masc. of an Adj.-stem faculo- (cf. sacri-faculius), since the reduction of -lós to -l seems to be dialectal only (e. g. Oscan jamel) (ch. vi. § 4), and not, like the reduction of -rós to -r (e. g. Lat., Umbr. ager, Gk. ἀγρός), shared by Latin. We have difficult Nom. Sg. Neut. in Varro Men. 46 B.:

quod utrum sit magnus an párvum, facile an difficil.

Simul (older semel, C. I. L. i. 1173, in MSS. of Plautus semel, e. g. Rud. 760, Mon. 405) (Umbr. sumel ?) may be Acc. Sg. Neut. of simulis, unless it rather shows the L-suffix of 0. Sl. ko-li, ko-lé, 'when,' 'to-li, to-lé, 'then,' &c.; simul and simulter (a form of similiter, used by Plaut. Pseud. 382) correspond to facul and faculter. Deinceps was declined like princeps in O. Lat. (Paul. Fest. 53. 1 Th. 'deincepem' antiqui dicebant proximo quemque captum, ut princepem primum captum; cf. ib. 50. 5), and may have been associated with princeps in a fragmentary line on the Lex Repetundarum (C. I. L. i. 198. 79); index deinceps faciat pri[incepem cessante]. Deimus (cf. Gk. τῆμος) was used by Livius Andronicus (Paul. Fest. 49. 27 Th.); it is the reading of the Palatine family of MSS. in Plaut. True. 245; qui dé then-sauris integris demús danant (demus oggerunt A), and is required by the metre in Trin. 781. In the Adverbial compounds of versus the terminations -us and -um compete in the early literature, e. g. rursum and rursus (also russus, russum, &c., ch. ii. § 104; rursum appears to be used in Plaut. after Compounds with re-, e. g. redeo rursum, and at the end of the line', prorsum (with local sense in Plaut. Pers. 677 simulato quasi eas prorsum in naven; Mil. 1193, &c.) and prorsus (cf. prosa oratio), sursum and sursum, but in the classical period one of the rival forms often has the monopoly, e. g. rursus, prorsus, sursum (for statistics, see Ritschl, Opusc. ii. 259; Neue, Forment, ii3. 743). These compounds show other
adverbial suffixes in ānūsīm (Osc. ānūversīsīm), ānūsī for *ānū-vorse (Paeuv. Trag. 213 R. őcēdistī, ut múlta pauceī uerba uno sebuntōm). On the Preposition versus, see § 58. Adverbs in -ter are in classical Latin almost confined to Adjectives of the third Decl. (Cicero in his earlier writings uses hūmāntēr, but finally discarded it for hūmāntē); but in the older literature are often formed from O-stem Adjectives [Priscian, ii. 70. 20 H. gives a list of these from the older writers, e. g. ānūcēter, maesēter, Plaut., and the eleventh book of Nonius is devoted to obsolete Adverb forms, especially (1) Adverbs in -ter from O-stem Adj., (2) in -tū from I-stem Adj., e. g. cētra, fitūla, (3) in -tus, e. g. médul·lī tus, largītus, commūnītus]. The NT-stems have -tēr, e. g. vehementēter, impūdentēter, instead of -nt-ter (cf. 3 Pl. Imper. fēruntē for fērunt-ād, ch. viii. § 57), by dissimilation, some say, for *nt-i-ter (ch. iii. § 13, p. 176). From audīxē we have audaecēter (less commonly audācēter; see Georges, Lex. Worff. s. v.), but from fallīxē, fallātēr, from lōpūxē lōquācēter, from prōxēx proactūlēter, &c. Difficultēter is more usual than difficēter (see Georges); fācūlēter is mentioned by Paul. Fest. (61. 32 Th. 'facūl' antiqui dicebant et 'faculēter', but facēlēter (see Georges) was the form that competed with facēlē (cf. Mart. Cap. iii. 325 cum difficēlē dicamus, cur 'faculēter' dīci non potest?); simūlēter is quoted from Plaut. Pseud. 382 by Nonius 170. 19 M. Quintilian condemns both audaecēter and facēlēter [i. 6. 17 inhaerent ei (s. analogiae) quidam molestissima diligentiae perversitate, ut 'audaecēter' potius dicant quam audaetēr, licet omnes oratores alīud sequantur, et 'emīcavit' non emicuit, et 'conicūr' non coire; his permittamus et 'audivisse' et 'scivisse' et 'tribunale' et 'facēlīter' dicere], regarding audaecēter and facēlē as the true Latin forms.

Other Adverbs that may be called Nominative forms are: ēmisīus and comīnus (the spelling co-minus is due to the analogy of ē-minus; see Georges s. v.), which may be Nom. Sg. of Compound Adjectives (cf. Gk. ἀερω-χειρ, e. g. Soph. Ant. 1175 ἄμων δωλην, αὐρώχειρ δ᾿ αλμάσσαντα); rēcēs (used with a Perfect Participle, e. g. Lucr. vi. 791 nocturnumque recēs extinctum lumen), which is equated with libēns by Charisius (114. 21 K.): utimur sic 'recēs venīt,' quod est ad verbīo nomen, ut 'libēs dixit.' (Similarly rēpens comes very near rēpente in phrases like Liv. xxii. 8. 1: repens alia nuntiatur clades); prō-tīnus (also prō-rēnus), 'stretching forward,' may be the Nom. Sg. of an O-stem, as the (somewhat doubtful) form prō-tēnis (Afran. Com. 107 R. cómis surrectī prōtēnis rectā domum Digēridīmūr) may be the Nom. Sg. of an I-stem (ch. v. § 34); sēcūs in intrin-secūs, &c., has been sometimes explained as Nom. Sg. of an Adj. *seco-, lit. 'following from within.' But these, and indeed all the Adverbs cited as Nominatives, are capable of other explanations; recēs (like deimēcōs) as Acc. Sg. Neut.; comīnus, emīnus [with the other Adverbs in -s, rūrsus and other compounds of versus (vōrsus)] as augmented with the same particle -s (p. 573) as appears in Greek μεχρί (s), ἀμφίς (and ἀμφί), εὐθύς (s), &c. (with dēnum cf. Gk. ἕπος, ἑπος, and for -tēnis, -secūs, see above); prātē, prōtēr, subēter are best explained as suffixless Locatives (ch. vi. § 37) like O. Ind. prā-tār, 'early,' sanu-tār, 'away,' Lat. super and Gk. ἑπ (cf. O. Ind. upār-i, with the Locative suffix), Lat. inter and O. Ind. antār (but antārī-kṣā-), though they are also capable of being referred to the O. Ind. ending of local Adverbs, -tra (L.-Eur. -trē ?), e. g. tátra, 'there,' yātra, 'where,' anyātra (Lat. dīter ?), 'elsewhere,' *prāt-trē, &c. becoming by syncope *prāt-ter, &c.; prīcūl has been similarly explained as *pro-te (ch. iv. § 105), by Dissimilation from *pro-tre (ch. iv. § 84), or as Acc. Neut. Sg. of a compound Adjective, whose second element
is from the same root, q&Ael-, as Gk. τάλή, πάλαυ, but it is more naturally referred to some extension of the Preposition πρό by a co-suffix (cf. rēci-prīcus from re-co- and pro-co-, O. Sl. pro-kū); nāpēr (Superl. nāperrime) may have as its second component the Preposition per of autō-per (§ 7), sem-per (?), Osc. pert in petīro-per 'quarter,' and as its first the adverbial particle nā (O. Ind. nā, 'now,' Gk. νῦ-ν, νῦ, Lat. nu-diū tertius, &c., ch. x. § 10). The existence of Adverbs in Latin derived from Nom. Sing. case-forms is thus at once natural to imagine and difficult to prove.

§ 3. Genitive Adverb-forms. Examples of nox, used for noctū, in O. Lat. are XII Tab. : si nox furtim facit ; Enn. Ann. 439 M.:

si luci, si nox, si mōx, si jam data sit frux ;

(cf. Plaut. Asin. 598, and see Gell. viii. lemm. 1). In Lucil. iii. 22 M. it is qualified by medīā, as if noctē:

hinc media remis Palinurum peruenio nox.

The parallel Adverbs in other I.-Eur. languages, e.g. Gk. νυΕτάς, O. Ind. aktōs, 'by night,' vāstōs, 'by day' (cf. Germ. nachts), suggest that it is a Genitive form (see however ch. iii. § 16). Diūs, in O. Lat. 'by day,' may then be likewise a Genitive form (I.-Eur. *diw-os was the Gen. of the word for 'day,' O.-Ind. divās Gen., Gk. ΔιήCr Gen.) and inter-diūs. They have also been explained as suffixless Locatives (ch. iv. § 37), like O. Ind. sa-divas, 'at once,' ārve-dyus, 'early in the morning' (so pēnēs may be a suffixless Loc. of pēnus Naut. § 37). Examples of diūs are, Plaut. Merc. 862 noctu neque diūs ; Titin. Com. 13 R. noctu diūsque. Interdiūs is more common, e.g. Plaut. Asin. 599 : nunc enim ēsse negotiosum interdiūs udiēlict Solonem ;

(other instances in Georges, Lex. Worfi. s. v.), just as interdiā became the usual word for 'by day,' while diā [formed on the analogy of noctā, a U-stem Loc. (ch. vi. § 37), according to one theory] is seldom found in this sense. It is found only in conjunction with noctu, at least in the older writers). Nonius (98. 20 M.) gives as examples Plaut. Cas. 823 (apparently anapastic):

noctūque et diū ut uire sūbdola sis ;

Aul. fr. 4 nec noctu nec diū; Titin. Com. 27 R. (in his play about the life of the fullones):

nec noctu nec diū lect fullonibus quiēscant.

[On diū, for a long time, see ch. x. § 12 ; we have quamdius for quamdiu in the epitaph of a litter-bearer (C. I. L. vi. 6308), quamdius (vi. 13101)]. Mox has been, like the Adverb nox, explained as an old Genitive-form, or a form with the Adverbial suffix -s (a variety of -sū, -si, the suffix of the Loc. Plur., cf. Gk. πέρις and μεραγυ); its cognates are O. Ind. māksū, 'soon, quickly,' an Adverb from the Adjective māksū, 'quick,' O. Ir. mos (e.g. mos-ricub, 'I will soon come'), moch, 'early.' Vīx (connected with vicem ?) must be of similar formation. Per-nox is an Adj. (e. g. lunā pernocte, Ov.), so in Late Lat. pernox et perdiūs, -a, -am.

§ 4. Accusative Adverb-forms. The Adverbial use of the Accusative Case was a feature of I.-Eur. syntax. In addition to the Latin examples already given (vicem, id génus, sēcum in virīde secus, &c.), may be mentioned partem (e.g. magnum partem, maximum partem), principium (e.g. Cato, R. R. 157. 1 de brassica pythagorea, quid in ca boni sit salubritatisque, principium te cognoscere
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oportet). When used alone as an Adverb, the Acc. Sg. partem retains its old form partim (see Gell. x. 13 on partim hominem venerunt and Cato's cum partim illorum era). If saltem is Acc. Sg. of *saliti-, a leap, lit. 'with a leap,' 'swiftly, easily, assuredly,' it has taken -tem by analogy of au-tem, i-tem, &c. [saliem, e.g. C. G. L. v. 146. 13. is, according to Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v., a late spelling, like decim for decem (ch. ii. § 8; cf. B. P. W. xii. 310), for the other Adverbial Accusatives of Verbal Nouns retain, in addition to the old Stem-suffix -ti-, class. -tōn-, ch. v. § 42), the old form of the Case-suffix, -im. Other examples of these Verbal Adverbs are dātatim from the. Frequentative dātāre, whence dādānus ludere, to play at ball (Plaut. Curc. 296), a phrase used in the famous description of the coquette ('Naev.' Com. 75 R.): quasi in choro

ludens datatim dāt se et communém facit.

alium tenet, alii ádrnietat, alibi manus
est occupata, alii peruellit pedem,
alii dat anulum æspectandum, á labris
alium inuocat, cum álio cantat, áttamen
aliiis dat digito litteras;

praesertim from sero, lit. 'in the front row' (cf. divertim O. Lat. for diserte);

stātim, at a trot (see Nonius, 4. i M.), connected with tollo; strictim (e.g. strictim tondere, as opposed to per pectinum tondere, Plaut. Capt. 268) from stringo, to graze, touch the surface; pedetempletim, cautiously, like sensim, lit. 'feeling.' (Nonius quotes a byform pedepressim, 29. 1 M.); passim from pando; cursim, hastily, for which Virgil and others use curræ [Abl. Sg. of the Verbal Noun-stem currus-, like the Comedians' currident fugere, abire, percurrerere, &c.], Abb. Sg. of currīcolum (cf. Plaut. Trin. 1103, Stich. 337)]; stātim, at once, lit. 'standing,'

'at the spot' like illō, § 7), is the Acc. Sg. of the Verbal Noun stātī- (class.
stātī-sanum), while O. Lat. stātin (for the ā, see Nonius, 393. 5 M.; Donat. in Phorm. v. 3. 7), comes from a system stātī- (cf. stātī- and stātī-) ; in Plautus the word has the sense of 'standing to one's ground,' e.g. Plaut. Amph. 239 nēc recedit loco quin statim rém gerat; *ib. 276 ita statim stant signa; it does not mean 'at once' till Afranius' time (Langen. Beitr. pp. 16 and 337). Parallel with the Adjectives in -ābs- derived from Nouns, e.g. togatus from bōga, and, like them, not postulating the existence of a verb in -arc (e.g. *tāgare) (ch. v. § 28), are Adverbs in -ātim like assulatim, from assutā, a splinter (e.g. Plaut. Capt. 832 āperite hasce ambas foris, Prius quam pulsando assulatim fūribus exiutum ádero), guttatim from gutta, ostiatim from ostium, vitiatim from vīcus, gradatim from grādus, &c. also paulatim, paucillatim, nostratim from noster; cf. nostrates), and from proper names, tongiatim (tongiatim loqui, ... a Tengilio parasito, qui . . . salutatus conviecio responderet; see Löwe, Prodr., zopyriatim, Lucil. ix. 74 M. Vir forms its Adverb with -ātim, virūtim (so propriūtim Lucir. ii. 975). Confestim comes from a stem *festi-, a byform of which, *festōn-, is indicated by the Verb festānus, from which Virgil (A. i. 488) coined the Adj. festānus. These Adverbs in -i- (sīm) were more frequent in early than in classical Latin (Gellius xii. 15 remarks on their frequency in the historian Sisenna), but returned into fashion at a later period (see A. L L. viii. 98). Vicissim (which some derive from *vic-essi, a Loc. Plur. of *vīx, Acc. vicem) is an abnormal form. In O. Lat. we have also vicissatim, with that substitution of -atim for -im, -m, which we see in two forms mentioned by Paul. Fest. 79. 12 Th., interatim for interīm and interatim (cf. Plaut. Truc. 382?) for interūm. Prō-tinus (also spelt prō-tenus; see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v.) meant (1) forward, onward (of
space or time), e.g. on ipse capellas Protenus aeger ago, Virg.; sic vives protinus, Hor.; (2) without interval of space, e.g. Virg. A. iii. 416 cum protinus utraque tellus Una foret, of the traditional connexion of Italy with Sicily; (3) without interval of time, forthwith (its usual sense); *qua-tenus (also spelt *qua-tinus; see Georges), whose earlier form *quatenos is quoted by Festus (346. 34 Th.) from a speech of Scipio Africanus, meant originally (1) 'as far as,' of space, then (2) 'as long as,' of time, then acquired a causal sense like our 'in so far as,' a usage found first in Lucr. ii. 927, &c., but avoided by the classical prose writers, as well as by Virgil; in later Latin it took also (4) the sense of 'quomodo,' 'qua ratione,' (5) the final sense of 'ut,' (6) the consecutive sense of 'ut,' (7) the force of an Acc. before an Inf., and was very widely used (see A. L. L. v. 399). (On the Prep. *tenus, see § 54.)

Adverbs in *-am are usually called Accusatives Sing. Fem., though a new theory makes them relics of the old A-stem Instr. Sg. in -ām, of which -ā was a byform, and explains Gk. Adverbs in -ā like τάχα, έως, κρύφα as Instrumentals in -m; see J. F. i. 17). Other examples quoted are: *perpērāvν, falsely, wrongly, said to be Acc. Sg. Fem. of *perperus (cf. C. G. L. iv. 141. 19 'perperum,' perversum), sc. *viam, an Adjective used by the Dramatist Accius in his poem on stage technique (Pragnaticon, fr. inc. i. M.), a precursor of Horace's Ars Poetica:

discirebore in theatro pérperos
pópularis,

along with the derivative noun perpetitūdo (fr. inc. ii. M.):

et eo plectuntur poetae quām suoi uitio saépius
dūctabilitate ānīmi nīmia néstra aut perpēritūdine;

protīnum, forth, forward, an O. Lat. Adverb, used always of motion forward from a place of rest (Langen, Beitr. p. 163), e. g. Plaut. fr. 16 G. dare pedibus protinam sēse ab his regiónibus, and sometimes wrongly written protinus in MSS. of Plautus and Terence (e. g. Ter. Phorm. 190), seems to be an Acc. Sg. Fem. of an Adjective-stem *protīno-, as continuō is Abl. Sg. Neut. of the Adjective-stem continuus; pró-miscam (e. g. Plaut. Pseud. 1062 ut mei laetitia laetūscam promisci siet; cf. Paul. Fest. 281. 1 Th.) is similarly related to the usual pró-miscus (also promiscus).

Of Accusative Plural, alēs (sc. vices), at other times, alērīs quoted (apparently from Catō) by Paul. Fest. 20. 8 Th., utrasque, on both occasions, used by the historian Cassius Hemina (ap. Non. 183. 25 M.: in Hispania pugnatum bis, utrasque nostrī loco motī), and by the comedian Caecilius Statius (Com. 225 R.):

atque hérce,

utrasque te, cum ad nóis uenis, subfārcinatam uidi),

have been called Locative Plural forms like Gk. thēpāsai, and the occasional use of ἄνος in the sense of ἄνος (better explained as a vulgarism, e. g. Petron. 30. p. 21. 10 B. . III et pridie Kalendae Januarias C. noster foras cenat, the entry on the engagement-tablets of the wealthy parvenu, Trimalchio; cf. ib. 47. p. 32.

4 B.) has been referred to the same source; *contra is an Adverb, not a Preposition (but Pers. 13 contra me astat; cf. Pseud. 156), in Plautus and Terence, e. g. tueri contra (cf. Liv. i. 16. 6 and ix. 6. 8 contra intueri), auro contra vendere, &c., and has the final vowel short like frustrā (for the quantity -ā, see Brix, Trin.3
introd. p. 20) [ne frustra sis, ‘don’t mistake,’ is frequent in Plaut. but frustra sum (cf. ita sum, bene sum, &c.) is avoided by classical writers (A. L. L. ii. 3), though frustra in Plautus usually occurs with this verb (with other verbs nequiquam)]. Contra can hardly be anything else than Acc. Plur. Neut. (cf. Gk. ἀντίστρε, ἀντίστροε) of *con-tra-* (ch. v. § 16) ; and frustra may be the same case of a stem *frustra-*, whence frustrari [cf. Liv. ii. 31. 9 neque frustrarib eves meos neque ipse frustra dictator ero; Ennius in one of his Saturae (inc. 84 M.) plays on the words frustra and frustrari for four lines consecutively: nām qui lepide pōstulat ālērum frustrāri. Quēm frustratur frūsta eum dīcit esse frustra, and so on, somewhat in the style of the Schoolmaster in the Merry Wives of Windsor]; torē tueri and similar adverbial Accusatives Pl. Neut. belong, like ducere ridentem, to the language of poetry. (Servius ad Aen. iii. 594 cetera Graius, &c., quotes from Sallust sanctus alia ; cf. Tac. Ann. xii. 3 juvenem et alia clarum, and see A. L. L. ii. 90).

The Comparative Degree of the Adverb is in Latin (as in Greek) expressed by the Acc. Sg. Neut. of the Adjective (the Superlative in Greek, but not in Latin, by the Acc. Pl. Neut., e. g. pejus (Superl. pessìme), longius (Superl. longìssìme). The Adverb corresponding to the Compar. Adj. major (pronounced ‘maj-jor,’ ch. ii. § 55) is not *majus but *maγis; this magis, properly *ma(h)is (Osc. maγis), takes its g from mag纳斯, as figūra for *fihurá (ch. iv. § 116) takes its g from fīgūra, and represents either L.-Eur. *mais (‘mais?’), (Goth. mais), from a stem mā-, seen in O. Ir. mār (mōr), ‘great,’ or more probably *maγhis from a stem maγh-, seen in O. Ind. māh-, ‘great’ (cf. the Greek name Mahîo-). In either case the suffix is -is, the weak grade of the Comparative suffix -ios, seen in Superlatives like Gk. πλε-iσ-τεις, Goth. ma-is-ts, &c. (ch. vi. § 52, just as the -v of Att. πλευρ, a byform of πλευρόν, and πλευρό, is the weak grade of -ion (see on these weak grades ch. iv. § 51; and on the Compar. suffix, ch. vi. § 53; and cf. magis-tro-, minis-tro-, Osc. mins-tro-). This -is seems to have been confused by the Romans with -is, the Nom. Sg. ending of I-stem Adjectives, like facilis, potis, so that from maγis, regarded as a Nom. Sg. Mace. or Fem., was formed maγē, a Nom. Sg. Neut., as pōē from pōēs (cf. Serv. ad Aen. x. 413 nune mage sit, &c.: ‘mage ... proper metrum dictum est pro magis, sicut etiam ‘pote’ pro potis, ... quod adeo in usum venit ut etiam in prosa inveniatur; Cicero in Frumentaria: mage condemnatum hominem in judicium adducere non posse), whence mēcādo (pronounced *mavvolō?, ch. viii. § 97) for mag(h)-ōlo; nīmis did not produce a parallel Neuter in -i, *nine, perhaps because there existed already a cognate Neuter in -īnum, nīmīnum (Neut. of the Adj. nīmus) with Comparative sense, ‘too much’; but sūtīs, a Noun meaning ‘sufficiency’ (cf. fātis, § 7), and properly used in sentences like satis est māhī dīcūtiam, then extended as an Adverb to sentences like satis dīcūtiam habeō, satis dīces sum, developed a Neuter *sate, curtailed to sat!); plus, if plos on the S. C. Bach. (C. I. L. i. 196, of 186 n. c.) be merely an expression of the sound pūs (as plo-rum, Clou[i] on the epitaph of the actor, i. 1297, seem to show ou for ū, 

1 Another explanation of sat makes it Neut. Sg. of a stem satu- (cf. Lith. sotis, ‘satisfying’), whence, with addition of the suffix -ro-, was formed the Latin Adj. sātūr (stem satu-ro-). Paene may similarly represent *paenū (cf. pōnāria). Satin (with the Interrog. Particle -nō) is used in questions, e.g. satīn aŭbit? ‘has he gone?’ Terence puts on satīn and satīs in Phorm. 683: Satin est id? Nescio hērele : tautum iüssus sum.
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ch. iv. § 37, will have, like magis and nimis, the comparative suffix -is, and will represent *plo-is [cf. plora, 'plura,' an archaism used by Cicero in his laws (Legg. iii. 3. 6), plo-ir-umé, 'plurimi,' on one of the oldest Scipio epitaphs (i. 32, end of the third cent. b. c. ?)], with root plo-, a variety of the root plo- of Greek πλεον, πλεόστος (ch. vi. § 55). That forms like magis, &c. are not mere expressions of a tendency to drop final s in pronunciation (ch. ii. § 137), we see from a line like Plaut. Poen. 461 : conténtiores máge crunt atque audí minus, where the final of the word is elided (cf. ch. viii. § 78 on -vē and -ris in 2 Sg. Pass.).

For plerum-que, plerum is used in a passage of the historian Sempr. Asellio (ap. Prisc. i. p. 182. 13 H. ut fieri solet plerum, ut in victoria mítor man- suetiorque fiat), an Acc. Sg. Neut. of the O. Lat. Adjective plerus, used for example by Paecevius, Trag. 320 R.:

periére Danai, pléra pars pessúm datast.

Other examples of the Adverbial Acc. Sg. Neut. of 1-stem Adjectives are:

vidicp for voldicp (ch. iii. § 36); impúni from impunis, a compound of in and poenú; vidié, an Adverb in common use in the time of Charisius (116. 7; 187. 7; 183. 14 and 18 K.); fidélé, quoted from Plaut. Capt. 439 (fac fidele sis fidélis) by Nonius, 512. 59 M.; sublimé, aloft. For this last we often find sublimen, as in the Plautine expressions sublimen rapere, ferre, auferre, which is nothing but an Adverbial word-group sub limen, 'under or up to the lintel' (on the confusion in MSS. between sublime, sublimen and sublimen, see Ritschl, Opusc. ii. 462); saepé, Neut. of an old Adj. *saepis (whence saepio) of which the Superl. is possibly to be read in Plaut. Pers. 633:

úbi rerum omnium bonarum cópiast saepíssuma,

'the most closely packed store,' 'the densest store' (fréquens seems to be connected with facio by a similar transference of meaning).

Gellius (x. 1) says that Pompey consulted various authorities, and finally Cicero, on the question whether he should write tertium or tertio consul in the dedicatory inser. on the temple of Victory, and by his advice wrote merely tert. The distinction between the two words is a slight one, 'during the third year' and 'in the third year.'

§ 5. Ablative (Instr.) and Locative Adverb-forms. The normal formation of Adverbs from O-stem Adjectives was in -ē, older -ād (e. g. faciūmed on the S. C. Baecch., C. I. L. i. 196; cf. Falisc. rected, Osc. amprúfād 'improve,' Umbr. rehte, totec 'publice'), a suffix which in classical Latin was distinctive of O-stems as -(i)ēr of I- and Consonant-stems. The ending -ā (the Abl. suffix, originally -ād; possibly in some words the Instrumental suffix, originally -ā, but see below) competes, as we have seen, with -e in some Adverbs formed from O-stem Adjectives, and is exclusively used by good writers in subito (cf. O. Lat. desubito), omnīma, mérīto (meritum, C. I. L. i. 190), the Abl. of meritum, desert (cf. Plaut. Asin. 737 meritissimo ejus), &c. Charisius seems to say that the use of -o for -e in Adverbs was a feature of some dialects of Latin (193. 16 K. non quia negem ultra Safinum interque Vestinos Teatinis et Marrucinis esse moris e litteram relegare, o videlicet pro eadem littera claudentibus dictionem). Adverbs formed from O-stem Nouns have -ā, e. g. modō, with Adverb or Preposition prefixed in postmodo, prōpēmodo [these
are not early forms; postmodo is indeed read in Ter. Hoc. 208, but propanum is the only form used in the old Drama. Asinius Pollio (Cic. Fam. x. 33. 1) seems to have introduced the form postmodo into prose, and Livy prefers it to postmodum (see Nee, ii. p. 600); O. Lat. antigerio (antiqui pro valide dixerunt, Paul. Fest. 6. 18 Th.; vel admodum vel imprimit, Gl. Placid.; cf. Gl. Philox.), a word described by Quintilian (viii. 3. 25; cf. i. 6. 40) as quite obsolete in his day, apparently AbL. Sg. of a Verbal Noun, an IO-stem (ch. v. § 4), anti-gerium from antē and gēra, a carrying in front; O. Lat. nūmōro, quickly, or too quickly, e.g. Plaut. Mon. 287 numero hue aduenis ad prandium, whence Varro (ap. Non. 352. 32 M.) derives the name Numerius, ‘prematurely born,’ a Beneventan name first introduced into the Roman aristocracy, according to the tradition, by a Fabius who married the daughter of a rich citizen of Beneventum (Fest. 178. 32 Th.); numero, probably used originally with Verbs of motion, may mean ‘with musical note or rhythm,’ like Germ. nach Noten; vulgo from vulgo; principio (rarely Acc. Sg. principium); impendio (Abl. of impendium, outlay), used as an Adverb (Gell. xix. 7. 10 translates it by impeno) by the Republican Dramatists, especially with magis, minus, e.g. Ter. Enn. 587 impendió magis ánimus gaudebat mihi. Instead of fortē, the Nom. fors is sometimes used (e.g. Virg. A. ii. 139) with an ellipse of sītān [cf. foresitan (first in Terence)] and forsān (first in Lucr.), often written foresitam and forsam (see Ritschel, Opusc. ii. 570) by Anal. of Advbs. in -ān? cf. p. 69], while forthāse and forthāsis in O. Lat. followed by Acc. and Inf., e.g. Plaut. Asin. 36 ubi fit polenta, té forthāse dicere, but also, e.g. RVol. 140 fortāsse tu huc nocātus es ad prandium] seem to be parts of a verb *fortāre, to assert, affirm, derived from O. Lat. fortēs, strong, as of-firmāre from firmus. Oπērī, ‘Abl.’ of opus, appears in a great many Adverbial expressions, e.g. magnōπere, tantōπere for magnum operē, tāntō operē (cf. Plaut. Mil. 75 me operē orāvit maxūmo). Rītē is a similar formation from *rīs, a by-form of rītus (cf. O. Ind. rūt-, ‘the fitting time,’ esp. for a sacrifice, ṛtā-, ‘fitting, suitable,’ P. P. P. ṛtōna, ‘fitly, duly,’ Adv. (Instr.).)

Temērī (on the quantity of the final e, see A. L. L. iv. 51) is either the Loc. Sg. of a lost Noun *temēns (cf. O. Ind. tāmās-, ‘darkness’), lit. ‘in the dark,’ or Acc. Sg. Neut. of a lost Adj. *temēris, lit. ‘darkly, blindly’ (cf. O. Lat. lēmērītē). On the adverbial Locative cases of Nouns in common use, hūīi, dūmi, millitiae, &c., see ch. vi. §§ 37-38. Dīe whether with original -ē (cf. eōd die, C. I. L. xi. 4766, an inser. where -ē is not invariably written after a long vowel; die noine or dīe noine, ‘on the ninth day,’ on the Dvenos inser., if this reading be the correct one) or with original -ēd (cf. Falisc foed, apparently ‘hodie’ (Not. Sacr. 1887, pp. 262 and 397): foedē vino pipāfo kra karefo ‘hodie vinum bibam, eras carebo’) occurs in a great many Adverbial word-groups, e.g. postrēdīe (cf. die crastīnī), prīdīe, cōtī-dīe and cōtī-dīe (spelt quōdīdīe only by precisians, Quint. i. 7. 6), pēren-dīe, hō-dīe, mērī-dīe (see ch. iv. § 112), from which was formed the Noun meridies. Ĉētī-dīe can hardly represent anything but a compound of ĉēs and the word quōd in some form or other (cf. quōt Kalendīs? Plaut. Stich. 60; quotannis, and in Late Latin quōt diebus and quōt dies) with co- written for quō, its equivalent in sound (ch. iv. § 137), but what that form was is not easy to say. Some make it quō-tūs, a correlative of rētus (cf. totos dies, Plaut. Avl. 73; totis homis, Mil. 212);
others postulate a *quot-tus (beside qui-tus from quo-) formed from quot-with that TO-suffix which is used in Ordinal Numerals, quar-tus, quin-tus, &c., just as quot-umus (Plaut. Pseud. 962. 1173) is formed on the type of septumus; others again suppose *quod(t)us (O. Ind. katithâ-) to have been a byform of qui-tus; peren-die, the day after to-morrow, is connected with Osc. peram, without (originally 'beyond'; cf. Gk. περά), of the phrase perum dolom mallon 'sine dolo malo,' and means literally 'on the beyond day'; hó-die seems to join to die the bare stem hó- (but see ch. iii. § 51 on sé-qui-dem). (For other Abl. and Loc. Adverb-forms, see ch. vi. § 38.)

Eadem, at the same time, always with the Fut. or Fut. Pft. in Plautus, e.g. Trin. 577:

i hac, Lésonice, mécum, ut coram núptiis
dies constitutar; eadem haec confirmábimus,
is occasionally found without ellipse of ὑπέρ, e.g. Capt. 449:

séquere me, uiátiicum ut dem á tarpezitá tibi :
êadem opera a praetóre sumam sýngraphum;
úna may, in some uses at least, have sprung from a similar phrase; cf. Pseud. 318:

quia pol quà opera credám tibi,
úna opera alligém canem fugitium aignis láctibus.

Of Adverbs in -è from O-stems may be noticed: valde [the full form valide is found in Plautus, Pseud. 145 (AP), &c.] from valditus; Cicero was the first to use it with an Adj.; férè and férnè are related as Positive and Superl. (cf. p. 185).

§ 6. Adverbs in -tus. The best established in classical usage were anti-quitus, díeinitus, providentially, funditus, lit. 'from the ground,' 'from the bottom' (derived from fundo-, O. Ir. bonn, Gael. bonn, 'the sole, the ground or base'; cf. O. Ind. budhna-, Gk. πυθάφ and πίθαξ, the bottom of a vessel, O. Engl. botm), pénitus, lit. 'from within' (see § 37 on pénés), rídicitus, intus. Intus is used not only of motion from within, e.g. Plaut. Men. 218 ecuate intus Culindrum, but also like Gk. ἱρός (cf. ἱερό), of rest within, e.g. Capt. 192 ibo intro atque intus súbducam ratiónculum; cf. Lucil. ix. 59 M., who explains the distinction between ad and apud as the same as that between intró and intus:

intro nos uocat ad sese, tenet intus apud se.

Quintilian declares the use of intus in the sense of intro (motion to within) to be a solecism (i. 5. 51). (The suffix -tus, when added to another preposition, sub, has the same variety of meaning; for subtus, like intus, denotes not merely motion from, but also rest in, e.g. uti subtus homo ambulare possit, Cato, R. R. xlviiii. 2). But in the older and the later literature many other of these Adverbs occur. Nonius in his eleventh book, which deals with the Adverb forms of the older writers, cites commónítus, publíctus, pugnítus, with the fist, húmánítus, immórtálítus, larótus, 'pro large'; and elsewhere mentions ánìmitus, germánítus, médúllítus [from the Saturae of Ennius (1. 7 M.)]:

Enni poeta, sáuex, qui mortálìbus
uersú propínas flámmeos medúllìtus],

O o...
§ 7. Adverbial word-groups and compounds. Antiper πρὸ τοῦτον, Gloss. Philox., seems, if the reading is right, to represent *antia [Acc. Pl. Neut. of *antio-, Gk. ἄριος : cf. antia (sc. comae), front curls], with the Preposition per (on o for u after i in the unaccented syllable, e. g. filiōs, see ch. iii. § 18), as παραμ-πέρ represents pārum (Acc. Sg. Neut. of *par-o-, little, a byform of par-uo-, pārurus) with the same Preposition (cf. the Umbro-Ocean Numeral Adverbs, Umbr. triu-per, 'three times.' Osc. petiro-per, four times; on the form pert, see § 38). Topper, a word quite obsolete in Quintilian’s day (i. 6. 40 ab ultimis et jam obliteratis repetita temporibus, qualia sunt ‘topper’ et ‘antigerio’ et ‘exanclare’ et ‘prosapia,’ et Saliiorum carmina vix sacerdotibus sui sat is intellecta) seems to be a similar word-group with an Acc. Sg. Neut. *tel (from the Pronominal-stem to-, ch. vii. § 13; cf. is-tul) governed by the Preposition per; according to the Roman grammarians (see Festus, p. 532 Th.) the word had two meanings, (1) 'cito, celeriter, temere,' e. g. Liv. Andronicus (a translation of Homer; Od. viii. 138 sq.) :

nānque nūllum pelis mācerat humānum
quaēde māre sæuoam, uis et eui sunt māgnae;

Topper confringent inportūnae undae.

and in his translation of Bk. xii. 17 :

topper citi ad aēdis uēnimus Circāi,

and of Bk. x. 395 :

topper fācit hōmines ut prius fuérunt ;

2 'fortasse,' a later sense, e. g. Pacuvius (Trag. 424 R. :

topper tecum sit potestas fāxit si necum uelit,

and the historian Caelius Antipater (cotemp. of C. Gracchus): eadem re gesta, topper nihilo minore negoti acto, gratia minor esset. Sem-per may likewise have as its first element an Acc. Sg. Neut. *sem (Gk. ἕως), and as its second the Preposition per (semipertimus¹ may then be a formation on the analogy of æxternus; but see Suppl. Arch. Glott. Ital. i. 58). These examples suggest that in paulis-per², lantis-per, atipliantis-per the first element may be a Neuter-stem in -is, possibly a weak grade of Comparative -ius (cf. magnis, p. 558), and not, as is usually thought, an Abl. (Loc. Instr.) Plural form, paulis, 'by littles,' 'little by little.' The -per of these words however may be the Greek -περ of ῥωπερ, καθάπερ, &c. (ch. x. § 1). (On nuper, see § 2.) Impræsentārur is more naturally analyzed into in praesentia rerum (a phrase which actually occurs in

---

¹ Explained as *sempe(r)termus with loss of r by Dissimilation (ch. ii. § 103)
² Paulisper, with the tall form of I
its full form; see A. L. L. iv. 11), with suppression of one of two similarly sounding syllables (see p. 176), than into in praesentia harum, with ellipse of rerum. Another adverbial word-group, consisting of a Preposition with its Noun, is affatim, for ad-fatim from a lost noun *fatis, weariness (cf. fatigo), e.g. Liv. Andr. Com. 5 R. affatim edi, bibi, lusi; Plaut. Poem. 534 bibas... usque affatim, where affatim (perhaps better written ad fatim, for an early affatim would have become *affatim) means 'abundantly'; it is also used with a Gen. in the sense of 'abundance,' e.g. Plaut. Men. 457 affatim hominumst. Paul. Fest. 8. 34 Th. says: Terentius 'affatim' dixit pro eo quod est ad lassitudinem, which shows that the grammarians of the Empire still realized that affatim was a combination of the Preposition ad with a Noun (like ad saturetatem, Plaut. Rud. 758; ad raviim, Aud. 336, Cist. 394; praemolis ad fastidium, Hor. Epod. 4. 12). Indeed from the words of Gallius (vi. 7) we gather that in the second century A.D. the Adverb was divided in spelling and pronunciation into two words ad fatim, for he speaks of the pronunciation affatim (like admodum) as unusual, only to be defended on the supposition that the phrase was one word and not two (quod 'affatim' non essent duae partes orationis, sed utraque pars in unam vocem coalesisset). It was possibly this pronunciation ad fatim that gave rise to the curtailed Adverb fatim, which was in use in the time of Servius (4th cent. A.D.) (Serv. ad Aen. i. 123 'fatim' enim abundanter dicimus). Amussim (Paul. Fest. 5. 3 Th.), Accusat. of amussis, a carpenter's rule, may be a similar late curtailment of ad amussim, though we find examussim as early as Plautus. Another word-group of the kind is sedulo, from se, a Preposition used in O. Lat. in the sense of its cognate sine (§ 51), and adus. From the Adverb sedulo (with a for o in the unaccented syllable, ch. iii. § 26) was formed the Adjective sedulus. That this is the true account of sedulo is clear from se dulo male of the Lex Agraria (C. I. L. i. 200. 40), and from the comparison of phrases like Plaut. Trin. 90 haud dicam dolo. 480 non tibi dicam dolo, Men. 228 non dicas dolo, with Capt. 886 quod ego dico sedulo, Ter. Phorm. 453 ego sedulo have dixisse credo (but sedulo is commoner with facio than with dico); though the confusion of sedulo with an Adverb from an Adjective-stem sedulo- must have been very early, for the byform sedulum is found in a line of 'Plautus' (fr. 41 G.) sedulum est, and in a plebisctium about weights and measures quoted by Festus (322. 3. Th.): ex ponderibus publicis, quibus haec tempestatas populus setier qui solet, uti coaequetur sedulum, uti quadrantal uini octoginta pondo siet, congius uini decem pondo siet, &c. (cf. later sedule). The Roman grammarians usually explained the word in this way: Acron however, in his commentary on Terence, derived the word from an Adjective-stem sedulo-, as falsa from the Adj. falsa (ap. Charis. 192. 30; 219. 5 K.). Another combination of Preposition and Noun is ob-viam, which has its literal sense in Plautus (usually with esse, ire, venire, &c.); thus in Capt. 791 the parasite Ergasilus, who is hurrying to give Hegio news of the arrival of his son, cries out:

émolor intérminorque néquis obstiterit óbium,
‘that no one stand in my way’; it has not the sense of praesto in Plautus nor in Terence. From obviam was formed the Adjective obvius (but cf. pervius, persius), as from sedulo, sedulus. Like obviam (and inter-vias with vias Acc. Pl.) is obiter, a word regarded with suspicion by purists, though Augustus gave it his sanction, and reproved Tiberius for using per viam instead. The Emperor Hadrian seems to have reversed his predecessor’s decision (Charis. 209. 12 K.)
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'obiter' divus Hadrianus Sermonum I quaeit an Latinum sit . . . quanquam divus Augustus reprehendens Ti. Claudium ita loquitur: scribis enim 'per viam' āvrī roō obiter). Ilīco is explained by Charisius (201. 17 K.) as in ilīco (the length of the initial i could be accounted for by the old form sloco, ch. iv. § 150), and has often this sense in Old Latin authors (for examples, see Charisius, l. c. and Nonius, 325. 6 M.) (in Plautus the local sense is not nearly so common as the temporal, and is found only with verbs of rest, e.g. Rud. 878 ibidem ilico manete; 836 ilico ostude ilico): Nonius (l. c.) makes it the equivalent of 'in eo loco,' but the sense of ivi is foreign to ilīco, a fact which tells against its derivation from *i, an old Abl. sg. of is, and locus. Ilīco has not the sense of 'on that spot,' but of 'on the spot' (e.g. ilico hic ante ostium, Plaut. Trin. 608), and its change from a local to a temporal meaning finds an exact counterpart in our phrase 'on the spot,' which may be used in the sense of 'immediately,' 'without delay.' Curiously enough the O. Lat. adverbial word-group ilīcet, which in the Comedians has the sense of tre līcet (e.g. Plaut. Capt. 469):

ilīcet parasiticae arti máximum malám crucem,

'the profession of diner-out may go hang itself on the highest possible gallows'), from which by an easy transition it acquired that of actum est [e.g. Plaut. Cist. 685 perii, opinor, actumst, ilīcet, was brought again into fashion by Virgil in the sense of ilīco, e.g. Aen. xi. 468:

ilīcet in muros tota discurritur urbe.

[Charisius quotes the note of a commentator on this line: (ilīcet) nune pro ilico, id est statim antiqui pro eas ilīcet,' and mentions somewhat similar use of the word in a line of Afranius (Com. 215 R.): an tu eloquens ilīcet?, 'have you become an orator all at once?'] By another freak of language the confusion of ilīcet with a word of similar sound was repeated some centuries later, when it was used (e.g. by Sidonius Apollinaris, fifth cent. A.D.) in the sense of scilīcet (cf. Paul. Fest. 74. 22 'ilīcet,' sine dubio). A verbal group like ilīcet is vidēlīcet, which in the earlier period occurs with the construction of vidēre līcet, e.g. Plaut. Asin. 599:

nunc enim esse negotiosum interdiius uidēlīcet Solōnom,

Lucret. i. 210:

esse videlīcet in terris primordia rerum,

also scilīcet, construed like scire līcet in such a line as Plaut. Pseud. 1179: scilīcet solutum esse, 'of course he used to' (on these verbal Noun stems i, vide-, sci-, see ch. viii. § 34). Sīs (for sī vis, ch. ii. § 53), sultis Plur., similarly takes an Inf. in Plaut. Asin. 309 sis amanti subuenire fāmilari filio.

The word mōdus enters into several adverbial word-groups. Besides admodum, propemodum (and later propemodum), postmodum (and postmodum), which have been already mentioned, we have quomadmodum, quōmodō [cf. cujusmodi, huicmodi, ejusmodi, ejusmodi, &c., which in Plautus are scanned as cretics or the equivalents of cretics (ch. vii. § 22), cuicuimodi (perhaps not in Plautus)], quōdammodo, tantummodo and (in late Latin) soluimmodo, &c. (cf. the compounds omnimodis, multimodis, on which see Neue, ii2. pp. 609 sq.). We find rēs in qua-rē, quam-ob-rēm, &c., dies in in-dies, propemodiem.

A Preposition with a Noun (or Adj.) appears also in de-mō, for de nīco (with
§ 8. Other Adverbs. One of the puzzles of Latin etymology is the O. Lat. Adverb simitā, the equivalent of simul, found as an archaism on some inscriptions of the Empire in the forms simitū (C. I. L. vi. 1758), and certainly once (possibly twice) simulītor (vi. 9290, a slave-girl’s epitaph of 13 B.C., and read by Ritschl in x. 174, an epitaph in illiterate verse). Nonius mentions simulītus (175. 16 M.) with three examples from Lucilius and Plautus; so that this form is well established. Plautus elides the last syllable in Stich. 249 mecum simulīt ut ires ad sesō domum. The later (plebeian) form simulītor can hardly be due to a change of -d to -t like that seen in O. Lat. apro, apur for apud (§ 19); it is more likely to be a corruption caused by confusion with the Impersonal itūr, 3 Sg. Pass. of eo, to go. Similītus has been explained as a Compound of the root sem- (ch. vi. § 57) in some form or other with illū, the Abl. Sg. of the Verbal Noun illus, a going.

Another puzzle is igiūtūr (the quantity of the final syllable cannot be determined in Plautus), the oldest sense of which is ‘then,’ ‘thereupon’ (cf. Non. 126. 14 ‘igiūtūr’ positum pro postea), e.g. the first clause of the XII Tables: si in ius uocat, ni it, antestamino: igiūtūr em capito, a clause well known to Roman schoolboys of the first cent. B.C. as the beginning of one of their most formidable lesson-books (cf. Cic. Legg. ii. 4. 9 a parvis... Quinto, didicimus ‘si in ius vocat’ atque alia ejus modi ‘leges’ nominare); Plaut. Cas. 215 mōx magis quom ōtium ét mihi et tibi erit, Ígiūtūr tecūm loquar: nūne uale; Mil. 772 quānō habebo, igiūtūr rationem meārum fabricārum dabo; igiūtūr tum (e.g. Most. 689), igiūtūr deinde, igiūtūr dēmōn are all frequent in Plautus. This makes unlikely the theory that igiūtūr is a curtailment of qviūd igiūtūr, a form of qviūd igiūtūr, with a weakened to i in the unaccented syllable of the word-group qviūd-agiūtūr? Another theory connects it with Lith. -ktu of tōktu, ‘so,’ kōktu, ‘as,’ or with O. Sl. -gda of toģda, ‘then,’ igda, ‘hitherto.’ It has also been resolved into the three Pronominal-stems i- (ch. vii. § 13), Êko- [ib.; digitūs is quoted as a parallel case of the change of -eīt- to -eīt-; others make the particle *gē (Gk. γῆ) the second element of igiūtūr,] and tō- (ib.); the last with the ending -r, seen in O. Ind. tār-hi, ‘then,’ kār-hi, ‘when,’ &c.). Its use varies in different authors; thus it is placed normally as first word of the sentence in Sallust and Tacitus, but almost never in Cicero’s speeches; and it is avoided by purists like Terence (except in his
earliest plays), Lucilius, Caesar, and the older and the younger Seneca (for statistics, see A. L. L. iii. 560). Its formation evidently seemed to the Romans to have something irregular about it (cf. Quint. i. 5. 39 ex quo genere an sit 'igitur' initio sermonis positum dubitari potest, quia maximos auctores in diversa fuisse opinione video, cum apud alios sit etiam frequent, apud alios nunquam reperiatur). Another Adverb (?) of uncertain etymology is *siremps* in the formula found on old laws, *siremps lex esto*, 'the same law shall hold' (C. I. L. i. 107. 12; 158. 73; 200. 27; 202. (1). 38, (2). 1, &c.; see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v.), and in the form *sirempse* (which Charisius calls the Ablative of *siremps*, 93. 24; 146. 1 K.) in the (un-Plautine ?) prologue of the *Amphitruo* of Plautus, l. 73:

*sirempse legem iussit esse Iuppiter.*

One theory declares it to be composed of *sis* (*si vis*) and *empse*, the old Acc. Sg. Masc. of *ipse* (ch. vii. § 20), and to have originally meant 'the aforesaid' (person), but to have been in course of time wrongly associated with *lex esto* (Wien. Stud. 1891, p. 296).

Setius, less (esp. non setius, nihil setius, also quo setius like quo minus), is the correct spelling, not *secius*, which is not found till the period when *ti* began to be confused with *ci* (see ch. ii. § 90, and Fleckisen, Fünfzig Artikel, p. 28), so that the word cannot be equated with Gk. *ησαυ* (for *εκραυ*; cf. *ησαυρος*). Though treated by the Roman grammarians as the Comparative of the Adverb (Preposition) *secius* and as a byform of the normal comparative *sequius* (e.g. Afranius 293 R. sin, id quod non spéro, ratio tális sequius céciderit) (from the root *seq*-, 'to follow,' Gk. *ἐρωμαι*; lit. 'following,' hence 'inferior'), it seems impossible to connect *setius* with *secvus* (see § 1) or with *sequius*. Gellius (xviii. 9. 4), describing a controversy he had heard over the spelling of the O. Lat. verb *insec* (*insequa*), to narrate (Gk. *ἐναρκον*), mentions as an argument adduced by one of the disputants, that the form *setius* was found in Plaut. Men. 1047 (our MSS. in this line of Plautus, a line unfortunately undecipherable in the Ambrosian Palimpsest, vary between *setius quam, sed usquam, and secus quam*):

haec nihiloe esse mihi uidentur setius quam sǒnnia,

and that this *sectius* was connected with the O. Lat. *insessiones* 'narrationes,' so that the line really meant 'nihilo magis narranda esse quam si ea essent somnia.' On the strength of this very questionable authority, it has been attempted to connect *setius* with the root *seq*-, 'to follow,' by the theory that *sectius* was the oldest form (from *secto*, a participial-stem from *sequo*; cf. secta, *sector*), which became *settius*, then *setius*. But even granting the existence of this form *sectius*, a form most probably due to an error in the copy of Plautus used, the change of *et* to *it* is a late one (ch. ii. § 95), and the substitution of *et* for *ett* too doubtful (ch. ii. § 130) to make this theory at all convincing. It is much more likely that *setius* and *sequius* were entirely different words (like *milites* and *bēnd, pejus* and *malē*), associated as Comparative and Positive owing to their similarity of meaning.

Oppidō is another of the problems of Latin etymology. The most likely theory is that *oppidum*, a town, meant originally the part on the plain (ob-*pedum*; cf. Gk. *πεδον*) as opposed to the *arx*. This distinction seems to be expressly made in the Titulus Aletrinas (C. I. L. i. 1166) in a passage referring to the water supply of a town: *aquam in opidum adqu[e] arduom. The
Adverbial Abl. oppido will then be exactly similar to plāvē. In Plautus it goes usually with a Verb, but in Terence only with an Adj.


§ 10. Pronominal Adverbs. (On the Relative Adverbs which show initial u- in the simple word, but as the second element of a compound -e-, e. g. ubi, si-cubi, unde, si-cunde, see ch. vii. § 26).

(1) With suffix -bi (Umbr. -fe, Osc. -f, e. g. Umbr. pufe, Osc. puf, 'ubi,' Umbr. ife). The Umbro-Oscan forms point to -fi as their original suffix, with f representing I.-Eur. bh (Gk. -φί), as in the Dat. Sg. of the Personal Pronouns (e. g. Osc. sifei 'sibi,' I.-Eur. *sebhei, ch. vii. § 5), or more probably dh (Gk. -θί; cf. O. Sl. küde, O. Ind. kūhā). Latin -bi is in O. Lat. -bei [e. g. ubei on the S. C. Baech. (C. I. L. i. 196)] ; other examples in Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v. ; on the spelling ube, e. g. Varro R. R. i. 4. 4, see ch. vii. § 6], and is in poetry scanned as a long or as a short syllable (similarly ibāden), a variation of quantity which is most naturally explained by supposing that the last syllable was originally long (representing I.-Eur. -ei), and was in time shortened through the influence of the short first syllable (avē from avē, &c., ch. iii. § 42). The Oscan form however suggests that the short final vowel may not be a late development (cf. uti- and utei, ch. x. § 11). Latin examples of this formation are u-bi, si-cubi, num-cubi, &c., ubi-que, iβi, ibāden (rarely ibādem in Plaut.), in-ibi [inibi esse like in eo esse (ut)], 'to be on the point of'), inter-ibi (often used by Plautus for interim, interim), post-ibi (used sometimes by Plautus for postea), aŭbi and the less usual aŭtibi (as early as the Lex Agraria of iii b. c., C. I. L. i. 200. 86 : aliaeubie alterne), utribi, utribique and utribique (on these spellings, see Georges s. v.), neutribi.

(2) With suffix -i (older -ei). In the language of Plautus illa or iļic (older ìlic, Paul. Fest. 231. 2 Th.), isti or istic may be Dat. Sg., 'to him,' or Adverb (Loc. Sg.), 'there.' The scribes of our MSS. however have gone on the principle of correcting illi, isti, 'there,' to illic, istic, usually (e. g. Capt. 278, where the metre requires illic), and almost always illic, istic, 'to him,' to illi, isti, so that the relative frequency of the two forms of the Adverb in Plautus, or other writers, cannot well be determined. The Adverb from the pronoun hic seems to have had the enclitic -e(e) at all periods of the literature, hic, older heic (C. I. L. i. 551. 590. 1007. 1009) ; heicei on the epitaph of an actor, i 1297:

Protagenes Clou[i] suauei heicei situs minimus, plouruma que fecit populœ soueis gaudia nugas,
may be a graver's error, for the orthography of the inscription is erratic; heicei (i. 1049 me heice situm immature). But on late inscriptions we occasionally find hi (e. g. ii. 3244 hi jacet). [Gallican he, hei in the formula he (hei) cupat 'hic cubat, -ant' may owe the suppression of its -e to the initial e- of the following word ; cf. Zvet. I. I. L. 66.] From the Pronominal-stem *so- (ch. vii. § 13) we have si, and with the enclitic -e(e), sic1 (cf. Umbr. i-sek

1 For an example of the older spelling seic we may take this touching epitaph of a girl called Flavia Amoena [Mitth. (röm.) viii. 150]:

ut rosa amoena homini est quom primo tempore florit, quei me viderunt, seic ego Amoena
fui
'item'); from the Relative (Interrog., Indef.) the Adverb qui (which is perhaps rightly regarded as an Instr. (cf. O. Engl. hwi, O. Sl. čiți) from a stem qui-, ch. vii. § 25), and with the suffix -v(e), quin (ch. x. § 16), as well as the compounds alio-qui and alio-quin, cetero-qui and cetero-quin, nō-qui-quam (ch. vii. § 28), and perhaps quippe (if for qui-pe) and quippiam (quipiam) (see ch. x. § 7; ch. vii. § 28).

(3) With suffix -ō, e.g. eo, eo-dem (id-eo has only the later sense of purpose, not the earlier of motion towards, 'that for that purpose,' 'and that indeed with that object'), quo, quo-cumque, alīquō, ilīo, utro, utroque, neutro. These have the same sense as Adverbs formed with -versum,-s (older -versum,-s), and often have this participle added, e.g. alīvorsum and aliorsum, Plaut. (for the suppression of v between the two vowels, see ch. ii. § 53), quorsus, -m. The Preposition ad is appended in quo-ad, and prefixed in ād-eo (used in a literal sense in the older literature, e.g. Cato, R. R. xii. 32 curulum artito usque adeo quae praeceperit; cf. adeo res reddi, 'things have reached such a pass,' in the Comedians), and ad-quo, a variety of quoad, 'so far as,' for which Nonius (76. 6 M.) cites two lines of Afranius, Com. 278 R.:

> ut scire possis ad quo te expediat loqui,

and 249 R.:

> irūtus essem adquō liceret.

We have the same suffix -ō in Adverbs indicating motion towards, formed from Prepositions by means of the tro- (ro-) suffix, rē-tro, ci-tro, ut-tro, por-tro; and that this -ō represents earlier -ōḏ, the Ablative case-ending of O-stems, we see from the spelling porod on an old Praenestine cista (Mêl. Arch. 1890, p. 303). Oscan ād-pūd in a Capua inscr. (Rhein. Mus. 1888, pp. 9 and 557. ād-pūd fīet) seems to be the equivalent of Latin quoad (cf. Afranius' adquō) and to have the sense of 'so long as,' Lat. quod fīet. In Umbrian, where, as in Latin, final -d is dropped after a long vowel, we find ar-ni-po with another sense of quoad, 'until,' followed by a Future Perfect, ser situ arrnipo ... pensis jūst 'sedeo quoad precatus erit' (the -ni- of arrnipo seems to be like the -ni- of Latin dō-ni-cum, ch. x. § 12, and -po may represent *pōm rather than *pōd); the Adverb corresponding to Latin quo is pu-e with that suffix i (7) (Gk. ὅτωσ-ι) written -i, -ei, -e, which is added not merely to the Nom. SG. Masc. of the Umbrian Relative, po-i, or po-ei, or po-e (Lat. quē for quo with i, ch. vii. § 25), but to other parts of its declension, e.g. Acc. PL Fem. pae-le; the Adverb from O. Lat. sēd-sō-que (Plaut.), 'each separately,' is in Umbrian sej-podrub-pei, with uh expressive of the long o-sound (a close o, nearly or altogether u; see ch. ii. § 20). The fact that the O-stem Abl. shows -u in Umbr. has been used as an argument that Umbr. ulo 'illuc,' podro 'retro,' &c. are Instrumentals. Similar formations from ille, iste are found at all periods of Latin, illō (cf. Umbr. ulo, ulō), istō (for examples, see Georges), but the Adverbs generally used are illuc, istuc, with final syllable scanned long in poetry, and similarly from hic we have huc, hither, ad-huc, hither-to (is *hō indicated by the form horsum for horsum?). In the earlier literature the forms with the enclitic -e(e) end in -ce, with final syllable again scanned long, e.g. hoe (as in Plaut. Capt. 480, where the parasite is touting for a dinner):

> quis ait. 'hoe?' aut quis profitetur?); an archaic form employed by Virgil, A. viii. 423 (see the note of Servius on the passage):

> hoe tune Ignipotes caelo descendit ab alto
[for other examples, see Georges, Lex. Worf. s. v.]; statistics of the spelling hoc and huc in Plaut., &c. are given in Fleck. Jahrb. (Suppl.) 1891, p. 293 n.]. This -ce has been referred to an earlier oni- with the Locative suffix -o, which is used in Adverbs of motion towards in Greek, ποι, ὅποι, &c., but it seems unnatural to regard it as anything but a phonetic development of the earlier -œ. If the vowel in these endings be naturally long, it must have been originally ou (ch. iv. § 41), and the parallel Adverbs in Greek will be not ποι, ὅποι but ποι, ὅποι, which mean in Greek 'where,' not 'whither.' But it may have been naturally short; for the metrical value of the syllable can be explained by the fact that  ε really represents ee, from an earlier de,

*hod-i-c(e), *is-tod-c(e) (ch. iii. § 51), so that the forms would be really Accusatives Sing. Neut. (cf. however O. Lat. illuc, istuc, and class. hoc, Acc. Sg. Neut.), and not Ablatives.

Quo, eo, &c. have also other senses in Latin, as with Comparatives eo major, eo minor (cf. Lith. ūa with Comparatives; Welsh po, 'by how much the'), quo major, quo minor, &c., from which comes the use of quo for ut in final sentences with a Comparative, e. g. quo facilius haece fieri possint, and the word-group qui minus, lost, e. g. quominus haece fieri possint; also quo, whereby, &c. These too are Ablative forms, originally *quād, *ēd, as we may see from Osc. pod . . . minus 'quominus' in the Tabula Bantina (Zvet. I. I. I. 231. 10): nep fecavit pod pius dat eisae egnav min[a] deivais dohul malud 'neve fecerit quo quis de ea re minus juret dolo malo'; Osc. svae pod . . . svae pod 'sive . . . sive,' Umbr. scep; Umbr. eso (io) from the stem *ek-so-, also esc (issoc) for 'ek-sok 'sive'; with the last, cf. the Latin gloss: sce, ita Löwe, Prodr. p. 350, a doubtful form. In a leaden execution tablet (Zvet. I. I. I. 129), written in Ocean (presumably not the best Ocean), we have svaepod (h indicates the length of a vowel in Umbrian), a spelling which, if found on a magisterial proclamation, or any carefully written inscription, might establish the existence of an Ocean pod (pū), an Instrumental form, beside pod (pūd), the Ablative form. But the character of this inscription diminishes the value of the evidence of this, as well as of the other 'Instrumental' Adverb, which occurs on the same tablet, suluh 'omnino' (from the stem sollo, 'all, whole'); besides it is doubtful whether h indicates vowel-length in Ocean. In another Ocean execution scroll (J. F. ii. 435), we have the form sullud (the last letter somewhat doubtful), but the fragmentary state of the inscription makes it impossible to determine satisfactorily that sullud is an Adverb.

(4) In -ā, e. g. qua, 'in which direction' (cf. qua . . . qua, 'both . . . and'), ne-qua-quam, haud-qua-quam, qua-propter (cf. Plant. Amphi. 815 qua istaeque propter dicta diantur mihi), ea (often appended to Adverbs, propter-ea, praeter-ea, post-ea, ante-ea, and on the S. C. Bacch. arcervum ead in the sentence: sei ques esent, quei arcrorum ead feciessent, quam suprad scriptum est), ea-eam, alia, alequa, hac (appended like ea to Adverbs, post-hac, ante-hac, praeter-hac, and in a plebiscitum ap. Fest. 322. 8 Th. adversus hac; cf. Osc. post eacse 'posthac'), illuc, istuc. With tenus appended these Adverbs indicate distance: quatenus, 'how far' (on the subsequent development of meanings, see § 4), haetenus, 'thus far' (cf. Hor. est quam prodire tenus). The formation is evidently the same as that of Adverbs derived from Prepositions with the suffix -tro (-ro), e. g. extra (extraad S. C. Bacch.), supra (suprad S. C. Bacch.) (cf. Ocean pullad 'qua,' an Adverbial Ablative Sg. Fem. of the Relative, formed by adding the Abl. Sg. Fem. of the Ocean Demonstr. stem ollo- (Lat. illo-, older ollo-, ch. vii.
§ 18) to the Relative stem po- (ch. vii. § 23); [p]úllad viú uruvú íst 'quà via flexa (c) est,' Zvet. I. I. 136. 56. Quo-adv is found for quo-adv on late inscriptions, and is a not uncommon variant in good MSS. (see Georges).

(5) In -im, utrin-que, ilitim (found in Cicero as well as in the older writers, whereas istim is doubtful; see Georges, Lex. Worff. s. vv.), but usually ilitim, as istim, hinc. The same suffix is found in the forms to which the Adverb sicus is appended, intrin-secus, utrin-secus, extrin-secus, and apparently in exim, interim, and ilitim, though in two at least of these three last words, it has not its usual sense of motion. Interim is equivalent to inter-adv, inter-ibi (Plaut.), while ilitim, from meaning 'at that time' (often answering to quam in Plautus, e. g. olim quom caletur maxime, Truc. 65), came to mean 'at a former time,' 'formerly,' 'once upon a time,' then 'at any time,' 'occasionally' (e. g. Lucil. iii. 4 M. Uianaque Degrumatus uti castris mensor facit olim), and to be used even of future time (e. g. Hor.: non si male nunc, et olim Sic erit). Olim can hardly come directly from the Pronoun-stem allo- of O. Lat. olus, olé (class. ilé), best analyzed into *ol-so- (ch. vii. § 13), for oll- would not become òl- (ch. ii. § 130); it is rather to be derived from the stem òl-, a grade of the OL-(AL-)stem, without the suffix so- (cf. Umbr. ubo 'illuc' with u the equivalent of Lat. ò).

The origin of the suffix -im has not yet been satisfactorily explained.

(6) In -nè. This suffix seems to be the suffix -m (hardly the Acc. Sg. suffix) augmented by the particle -è. As the Adverbs meaning 'thence,' ilit, iste added to -im the particle -c(e), the corresponding Adverbs from is, qui add to -m the particle -le (cf. Gk. ἅδε), which, like -e, was liable to be curtailed of its final short vowel in every-day pronunciation (ch. iii. § 36). Thus we have inè (which should not be derived from the Preposition in, but must go with unde), indi-dem, and with prefixed Adverb de-inde (curtained to dein), pro-inde and proin, extride (and exin, a different word from exim; see Georges, Lex. Worff. s. v.), &c., unde, si-cunnde, nè-cunnde, undi-que, aliunde, àlicunnde. For utrinde, quoted from a speech of Cato by Charisius (224. 14 K. utrinde factiones tibi pares) we should expect utrinnde.

(7) In -on (-om), the Acc. Sg. Neuter, e. g. tum and with the enelic -c(e), tune (cf. nunc and etiam-nunc), quon, older quom, with appended jam in quàmian (ch. x. § 13), and appended -dam in quàm-dam (cf. qui-dam, ch. vii. § 28), dum (ch. x. § 12), dò-dam (ib.), non-duñom. From the Pronominal-stem i- (Lat. is) an Adverb in -m was in use in O. Lat. in the sense of 'then,' variously written as ìn and en (ch. vii. § 19); and from the Relative-stem seen in u-bi, &c., we have the un- of un-quam (cf. O. Lat. *unquis of neeunquem 'nee unquem quamquam' Fest. 162. 22 Th.), and with negative nè- prefixed, nun-quam (neeunquam, the reading of the MSS. of Plaut. Most. 307); though some make this originally to have ended in n, not in m, and find the form with initial c (like si-cubi, si-cunnde) in the cum of qui-cun-que (ch. x. § 2), ne-cun-quem (so interpreting the O. Lat. word mentioned by Festus), which they compare with Goth. hun- of ni hvas-hun, 'none so ever.'

(8) In -am, apparently the Acc. Sg. Fem., though some make it an Instrumental case (suffix -m or -mi, ch. vi. § 36). If Festus is right in quoting tame as an O. Lat. form of tam from the Carmen Saliare (Fest. 546. 1 Th. 'tame' in Carmine positum est pro tam), all these Adverbs in -am may have originally ended in a short vowel. From the Relative Pronoun we have quam, the correlative of which is taken from the Pronoun to- (ch. vii. § 13), not from the Pronoun i-, tam. The two are united in tam-quam. Whether jam, now (cf.
ADVERBS.

§ 10.] Lith. jaū, 'already'), is the corresponding formation from the stem -i- is not certain. The indeclinable Adj. nē-quaquam may be a colloquial compound of quam, as the Adverb nē-quaquam is of quiquam, so that nequam would literally mean 'a no-how' (cf. O. Lat. negqualia 'detrimenta' Fest. 162. 23; Paul. Fest. 163. 13 Th.). Another compound is perquam, exceedingly (cf. admodum quam, Plaut.).

The addition of the Preposition dō (§ 27) to quam gives the Adverb quandō (ch. x. § 12), originally temporal, then causal (cf. quandōque, quài-quando), quandō-que (Umbr. panu-pei) (cf. O. Sl. kādu, 'qua, unde?'), while O. Lat. quam-dō is a byform of quam, than, as in a passage of Livius Andronicus (quoted in § 7): peius... quamde mare saecum, and Lucr. i. 640 quamde gravis inter Graios qui vera requirunt. Other derivatives are alīquam in aliquam-diu, &c., quam-vis (rarely with Subj. in Plautus, and always with an Adj. or Adv.; not in Terence), and quam-quam (cf. tam-quam), n(e)-ūti-quam, nē-quā-quam, &c.

From the pronominal-stem *no- (O. Ind. nā-nā, 'in various places or ways,' lit. 'there and there,' 'thus and thus'), connected with the stem *eno- (*ono-)

O. Ind. ana-, 'this,' Lith. anās, 'that,' O. Sl. onū; we have nam used in emphasizing a question, e.g. quid cerūsā opus nam? Plaut. hence quis-nam, who?, O. Lat. quiā-nam, why?, and in the sense of 'for'; from the stem *dio-, -dam of quon-dam (cf. qui-dam).

(9) With other suffixes: of t-suffixes we have (a) -ta in i-tā, so (Umbr. itek), i-tā-que, therefore (ch. x. § 8); *uta, as, may be inferred from O. Lat. ali-uta (cf. ali-ubi, p. 564), otherwise, quoted from the Laws of Numa by Paul Fest. [4. 27 Th. si quisquam aliuta faxit, ipsos Iutī saecer esto; cf. the gloss alia sae (leg. aliuata), aliud, amplius, Löwe, Prodr. 432]. The final a was no doubt originally long, if every final short vowel became i in Latin (ch. iii. § 37), but there are no traces of this quantity in ullaque in the older poetry (on ullaque in the Saturnian epigraph of Naevius, see ch. x. § 8), and probably none in ulla either. So that the shortening of the final vowel under the influence of the preceding short syllable must have established itself in this word of common use at a very early date.

(b) -tem in i-tem, an-tem (cf. O. Ind. -tham of ka-thām, 'how,' &c.?).

(c) -t (originally with a short final vowel, probably i; cf. O. Ind. i-ti, 'thus') in ītū, ītī-nam, ītī-que. The Umbro-Ocean equivalents of Latin ut show an s after the t, Umbr. pūze, pūsc, ending originally in -tsi or -tsē, Osc. pūz (pūsc on the Bantine tablet must surely have ou for u), which in Latin appears in the local Adverbs us-quaum, mus-quaum.

Us-que is a different word, derived from the L.-Eur. Preposition ud-, as ab-quo from ab (see § 57 for ullaque).

The suffix t appears also in aut, which probably ended originally in a short -i (Gk. αὖ-τε has τε for I.-Eur. *q*-q, ch. x. § 2), as we see from Umbr. ute, Osc. avti. The long -i of utī is probably Loc. -ei (§ 11).

Of ð-suffixes, besides (a) -dam of quon-dam (temporal Adv. of qui-dam) and (b) -dem, with idea of time in *dā-dam, non-dam, vix-dam, inter-dam already mentioned, we have (c) -dem in qui-dem (ch. x. § 6), and with the sense of 'exactly,' 'just' (cf. is demum, ibi demum) in a large number of Adverbs, such as kanti-dem, ibi-dem, indi-dem, ilti-dem, töti-dem (from *toti, the older form of tot, ch. vii. § 29), as well as in the Pronoun of Identity, i-dem (ch. vii. § 21), with its curious derivative identidem, repeatedly (explained as 'idem ante idem' or 'idem tum idem'), also with the idea of time (cf. dam in inter-dam, non-dam) in tan-dem (cf. demum), pri-dem.
§ 11. PREPOSITIONS. Prepositions are Adverbs, which came to be specially used in connexion with certain cases of the Noun, or in composition with a Verb. In the early stage of a language the cases alone were sufficient to indicate the sense, but as the force of the Case-suffixes became weakened, or as the necessity for clearer definition was more recognized, the Case-suffix was strengthened by the addition of an Adverb. Thus *ire monte might mean 'to go out of the mountain' or 'to go down from the mountain.' To indicate the first sense, the Adverb *ex was used, *ire monte *ex; to indicate the second, the Adverb de, *ire monte de; or ex-ire monte, *de-ire monte. These Adverbs which, owing to their meaning, are most frequently associated with particular cases of Nouns, or are used in composition with Verbs, are called Prepositions; and the process, by which Latin Adverbs became Prepositions, may be seen in operation at various periods of the language. Thus contra, which has hardly passed the Adverb stage with Plautus and Terence, is a Preposition in classical Latin and governs an Accusative Case; coram is not a Preposition till Cicero's time; simul in Augustan poetry and Silver Age prose; retro not till Late Latin (e.g. vade retro me, S. Marc. viii. 33, Vulgata). It is customary now in writing Latin to write the Preposition and the Verb in one word, e.g. exire, but not the Preposition and the Noun, e.g. ex monte; and this practice is justified by the fact that a Verb compounded with a Preposition had, so to speak, a separate life of its own in its compound form. *Exigo, for example, was a different word from *ago, and so suffered weakening of the vowel a in the unaccented syllable; *pōno ceased to be recognized as a compound of po- (see § 12) and *sīno, and changed its Perfect pō-sīvi to posui (ch. viii. § 39. 4); summitter shows that assimilation to which the internal consonants of a word were liable. On the other hand a Noun with a Preposition is as a rule not so treated (although there are not wanting examples like sedulo for se dolo, § 7), unless a Compound Adjective is formed of the Preposition and the Noun, e.g. *pērēgre, Loc. of *peregris compounded of per- and ager (ch. vi. § 38). Still it must be remembered that in the Roman pronunciation the Preposition and the Noun formed a word-group (e.g. circum-littora, ch. iii. § 12 a. 6), and in the Roman ortho-
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graphy they were usually written together (e.g. ingalliam, initiatiam, Mar. Victorin. 23. 12 K.), sometimes with consonant-assimilation, (e.g. summānus for sub manus, Plaut. Pers. 450). This close union of the Preposition with its Verb and Noun must have led at a very early time to the syncope of a final short syllable of Prepositions; and it is possible that byforms like Gk. ēvī and ēv may be doublets of very ancient date, representing the forms assumed by the word when used independently and in composition (cf. Engl. 'by' and 'be'-witch, Germ. 'bei' and 'be'-leben, similarly 'off' and 'of,' 'too' and 'to' are doublets, one of which is used as Adv., the other as Prep.). Tmesis, or the separation of the prepositional part of a Compound, from the other part, is a feature of the older stage of every language; and is common in O. Lat. (e.g. sub uos placo was the archaic phrase for supplīco retained in Latin prayers; transque dato and endoque plorato are legal archaisms for tradītoque and implōrātoque, Fest. 444. 30 Th.). An arrangement like sub uos placo, ob uos sacro (for obsercro vos) (cf. Vedic ví nō dhēhi, 'lend us') became the rule in the Celtic languages, thus in O. Ir. at-om-aig 'adigit me' the Pronoun is 'infixed' between the Preposition and the Verb, as if we had in Latin 'ad me agit.'

In the later stages of a language the use of Prepositions increases more and more. In Latin this culminated in the loss of Case-suffixes, and the use of Prepositions in their place, as we see in the Romance languages. As early as the first cent. A.D. a grammarian points out that in manus aqua is the phrase in vogue instead of the older aqua manibus (Caper 92. 8 K.). New distinctions of prepositional meaning were expressed by compounding Prepositions with one another, e.g. de-ex, de-sub, &c. [cf. abante, C. I. L. xi. 147, Fr. avant], a process which may have begun at a very early stage; for I.-Eu. Prepositions often show an appended particle (Pronoun and Adverb), such as (1) -s(ē), Gk. -σε, e.g. ἀψ, ἔς, Lat. abs, ex, sus-; (2) -d(ē), Gk. διμον-δε, e.g. Lat. postid, antid, prod- (cf. O. Sl. -dŭ of pré-dŭ-, 'before'); (3) -tī, e.g. O. Ind. prati, Zend pati, Gk. πορί, πορί, Osc. pert-; (4) -n(ē), e.g. Lat. pōne for *pos-ne (cf. Germ. von, O. H. G. fona and fon). These particles, whose original form is not always recognizable (thus a Latin -d from -dē might come from
an original *dē, *dī, *dō, *dū, &c., ch. iii. § 37), cannot be separated from the pronominal stems mentioned in § 10, ch. x. § 1 (e. g. the 'Adverbial' -ŏe of Gk. δόμονδε from the 'pronominal' -ŏe of Gk. ὁ-ŏe); and it is doubtful how far there was originally any real distinction between them. In Latin their original form is especially obscured by the Latin tendency to syncopate a short second syllable (ch. iii. § 13), a process which may have led to the confusion of the Preposition endō-, indu- with the different Preposition en-, in-, in such words as indu-grēdi, in-grēdi, indu-pērator, in-perator, and ultimately to the disuse of endo, indu, in favour of en, in. (In Terence inaudio alone is used for earlier indu-audio and in-audio. A similar confusion of I.-Eur. *endo and *en may have taken place in Celtic).

And the tendency of a Latin Preposition, because unaccented, to be obscured brought about that confusion of ob- and ab-, de- and di- (dis-) in Compounds which we see in Late Latin, and which even in the earlier centuries of the Empire attracted the notice of the grammarians (Vel. Long. 64. 19 K., &c., on de- and di-; in Romance *abdurare, *abaudire, *abtenere have supplanted obdurare, obaudire, obtinère). A much earlier opportunity of confusion was afforded by Prepositions which represented different developments, case-forms, &c. of the same root, e.g. Lat. per, through, and Umbro-Osc. per, 'on behalf of, before,' the equivalent of Lat. pro (both I.-Eur. *per and *pro being derived from the same root per-, on which see § 38); and this confusion is very hard to trace. The readiness too with which a Preposition changes its meaning is an obstacle in the way of identifying its cognates in other languages. Oscan úp, op governs the Abl. with the sense of Lat. apud, while Latin ob (governing the Acc.) has passed from that sense (§ 35) to its classical sense of 'on account of'; O. Ind. á with Abl. following has the sense of 'to,' but with Abl. preceding might be translated 'from'; examples which show that a difference of meaning between a Preposition in one language and in another is not a valid proof that the two words were not originally identical. Much less is the difference of case governed to be taken into account. In the earlier stage of every language the Prepositions must have been used with great elasticity, sometimes with one case, sometimes with another
(cf. O. Lat. in potestatem esse, &c.), the fixing down of Prepositions to a particular case being always a feature of an advanced stage of language. [Servius may thus be right in saying (ad Ecl. i. 29 longo post tempore) that post, ante, circum were used also with the Abl. in earlier times: antiqui enim ‘post’ ‘ante’ ‘circum’ etiam ablative junebant, quod homin diem possumus; Pompeius (278. 21 K.) attributes ante templo and propter homine to Pacuvius]. It should be noticed that in Umbro-Oscan local Prepositions, indicating rest in a place, &c., go with the Locative case, not the Abl. as in Latin. Their position too varied in course of time. In classical Latin a Preposition, especially a monosyllabic Preposition, precedes the noun (hence ‘Pre-position’), except in particular circumstances (e.g. metu in magno, &c.; see Neue, ii2, pp. 942 sqq. for statistics), but in the older literature often follows it; and in Umbro-Oscan postposition is common, e.g. Umbr. asam-ai, ‘ad aram,’ termnon-e ‘in terminum.’ (So our ‘in here’ was earlier ‘here in’). In I.-Eur. the Preposition seems to have preceded the Verb, but to have followed the Noun, while between the Prep. and the Verb a Particle or Enclitic Pronoun (ch. iii. § 12) might be inserted (cf. O. Lat. anti-□eo, § 18 ?, sub vos placio, p. 569).

On the Vulgar Latin treatment of Prepositions in composition with Verbs, as it is reflected in the Romance languages, see Meyer-Lübke Rom. Gram. ii, pp. 617 sqq. To the ordinary Prepositions were added foris, e.g. Vulg. Lat. foris-facere (Fr. forfaire, Ital. fuorfare), and other words.

§ 12. Ab, ap-, po-, abs, ā-, au-, af, absque. Āb, from, is I.-Eur. *ap (Goth. af, Engl. of, off), a curtailed form of *āpō (O. Ind. āpa, Gk. ἀπό, e.g. O. Ind. apa-i-, ‘to go away,’ Gk. ἀπε-εμι, Lat. ab-eo; cf. Lat. āpūd for *apo-d, see below), of which another curtailment was *po (O. Sl. po-, Lith. pa-), found in Lat. pō-sītus, pōno for *po-s(i)no (with Pft. pō-sīvi changed to pōs-ni owing to a false apprehension of po-sītus as if it were positi-tus like mōnē-tus). (Po-lubrum, a wash-basin, pō-lire, and Germ. vo-n, O. H. G. fo-na and fo-n, have also been referred to this I.-Eur. form, § 39). The form āp- appears in āp-ĕrio, and was no doubt the shape assumed by the word in such collections as ab temple; ab is due to the same
Latin preference for -b rather than -p, as substituted ob for op (Osc. op; cf. Lat. op-crio), sub for *sup (ch. ii. § 73). The form abs (pronounced and often written aps, see ch. ii. § 80), in which the Preposition is augmented by the particle *s(∅) (Gk. ἄψ), is used in Composition before Tenues, e.g. before t, c in abs-traho, abs-condo, while before p it is, by a law of Latin phonetics (ch. iv. § 157), reduced to as-, e.g. as-porto for *aps-porto, as-pello for *aps-pello; it appears also in the O. Lat. phrase absque me (te, &c.) esset (foret), equivalent to 'si sine me esset,' where que, like its O. Ind. equivalent ca in the Rg-Veda, seems almost to have the sense of 'if' (cf. O. Engl. an for and); at a later period absque me, &c. was used without the verb, and absque came to take the sense of sine, without (A. L. L. vi. 197). That ā (Osc. aa-manaffed 'amandavit,' Umbr. aha-, aa-, a-, e.g. aha-vendu beside pre-vendu) is another form of ab, as ē of ex (see below), is generally believed, though it is difficult to see why ob and sub did not develope corresponding forms *ō, *sū; it may be an entirely different word, associated with ab because of its resemblance in meaning, form, and usage.

Au- of auθεῖο, auθέρω, &c. is an example of an association of this kind. It has not been produced from ab by any phonetic process, but represents a different I.-Eur. preposition, *aw(∅) (O. Ind. āva, Pruss. au-, e.g. O. Ind. ava-bhr- 'au-fero'), which was brought into requisition in these Compounds before an initial f to avoid confusion with the compounds of ad, e.g. affero. (On the confusion between āfluo and afluo, see Nettleship, Contrib. Lat. Lex. s.v.). A curious Preposition af, used in Cicero's time occasionally in account-books, with the name of the person from whom money had been received, occurs on a few inscriptions, and in O. Lat. afvolant for āfōlant. Whether it is a dialectal form (cf. Pelign. af-ded 'abīt'?) with f representing some I.-Eur. aspirate (cf. O. Ind. ādhi, 'on,' used with Abl. in the sense of 'from'), or a Latin variety of ab (or au?) with f produced originally under the influence of some following consonant (most probably v), it is impossible to say. It may be a mere (Greek?) trick of writing, with the symbol F employed to denote the u- or v- sound, like the Greek digamma (cf. Prisc. i. 35. 17 H.).

1 Lat. ā and W. Teut. ō are referred to I.-Eur. *ā by Buck, Osk. Spr. p. 25.
§ 13. Ab, abs, a. In Plautus ab is used before vowels and j, s, r; ã before b, p, m, f, r, c, q, g (Labial and Guttural sounds); abs (and a) before tu, luus, &c.; ab and a before t, d, l, n; in class. Lat. ab is used before vowels and l, n, r, s, j; ã before b, p, f, v; abs before q, t (Cicero began with abs t, but discarded this expression for a te) in Late Latin ab is used before vowels, ã before consonants (see Langen, Beitr. 331; Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v.; A. L. L.iii. 148). The usage of ã in the older period allows of its being a mere phonetic development of ab, for ã bello may be simply an expression of the sound abbello (ch. ii. § 130), and so the shortening of ã by the Law of Breves Breviantes in Plautus, e. g. quid à bello portât?, will not be a case of the shortening of a naturally long vowel by this law (see ch. iii. § 34).

§ 14. Af. Cicero’s words are (Orat. xlvi. 158) : una praepositio est ‘af,’ enque nunc tantum in accepti tabulis manet, ne his quidem omnium, in reliquó sermone mutata est; nam ‘a-movit’ dicimus et ‘ab-egit’ et ‘abs-tulit,’ ut jam nescias ‘a’ ne verum sit an ‘ab,’ ‘abs.’ Quid si etiam ‘ab-fugit,’ quod ‘ab-fugit’ turpe visum est et ‘a-fer’ noluerunt, ‘aufugit’ et ‘afer’ maluerunt. Quae praepositio praeter hae duo verba nullo alio in verbo reperietur. Vellius Longus (60. 13 K.), who refers to this passage of Cicero, gives as an illustration of the now obsolete use of af in receipts, af Longo (his own name); Paul Festus (19. 31 Th.) mentions afvolant as an actual form used by an ancient writer. On an inscription of Amiteurnum (Not. Sacr. Oct. 1891) we have of vinvies, af villa (beside ab castello, ab seglete); on the Epistula ad Tiburtus (C. I. L. i. 201, of c. 100 b. c.) of nubes; on the milestone of Popillius (i. 551, of 152 b. c., from Lucania) of Cupina (besides ab Regio); on a bilingual (Greek and Latin) inscription ascribed to c. 81 b. c. (i. 587) of Lyco; on an inscription of Praeneste (i. 1143) af muro, and so on.

§ 15. Ad, at, to. I.-Eur. *ad (O. Ir. ad, e. g. at-om-aig ‘adigit me,’ lit. ‘ad me agit,’ Goth. at, Engl. at; cf. Goth. at-tiuha with Lat. ad-dăco, Goth. at-baira with Lat. ad-fēro) is a different word from the Conjunction at, I.-Eur. *at (Goth. ap- in ap-pan, ‘but’), though often confused with it in Roman spelling (ch. ii. § 76). On the old form ar, e. g. arquernunt, arvorsum, due to the phonetic change of d to an r-sound before f, v, see ch. iv. § 112. This Preposition, which governs the Acc. in Umbro-Oscan as in Latin, is found augmented with the particle *s(e) in Oscan, e. g. az húrtum ‘ad hortum’; but also ad, e. g. adpúd ‘adquo’ ‘quoad,’ idad ‘ad id.’ In Umbrian we have ad, e. g. ad-fertur ‘adfertor,’ adputrati ‘arbitratu’ (ch. iv. § 112), prefixed to Nouns, e. g. asam-ad ‘ad aram,’ written ar- in araipo ‘quoad’ (§ 10. 3).

THE LATIN LANGUAGE. [Chap. IX.

(Gr. ἀμφος, Lat. ambo; cf. O. Ind. ubhā-, Goth. bai, baj-ōps, Lith. abu, O. Sl. oba), appears in Latin compounds in the forms, (1) amb- before a vowel, e.g. amb-arrvole (sacrificium) ‘quod arva ambiat victima’ (Serv. ad Ecl. iii. 77), amb urbales (hostiae) ‘quae circum terminos urbis Romae ducabantur’ (Paul. Fest. 4. 15 Th.), amb ustus ‘circumustus’ (ib. 4. 17), whence by false analogy comb ustus, instead of *com ustus (unless this rather represents co amb ustus), amb ltus ‘circum’ (ib. 4. 18); (2) am- before a consonant, e.g. am ter mini (oratores), a phrase of Cato’s ‘qui circa terminos provinciae remanit’ (Paul. Fest. 13. 9 Th.; Macr. i. 14. 5; Gl. Philox.), am plector, am pendices ‘quod circumpendebant’ (Paul. Fest. 16. 3 Th.), am segetes ‘quod circum segetes’, am vietus ‘vicus’; Umbr. an ferener ‘circumferendi.’

§ 17. An-, a curtailment of I.-Eur. *āné, ‘on’ (Zend ana, Gr. āvā, Goth. ana, Engl. on, O. Sl. vü for *ōn) (cf. I.-Eur. *ānů), (O. Ind. ānu, Zend anu) may appear in ānu hēlbus (also derived from the root an-, ‘to breathe,’ whence ānimum, &c.), an quiro [by some explained as *amb(i) quiro], an tennae, an testari (or for *ante tennae, *ante testari, ch. iii. § 13, p. 176). Its presence is more certain in Umbro-Oscan, e.g. Osc. ava fāker ‘consecravit,’ an getuζet ‘proposuerunt,’ Umbr. an tentu ‘intendito,’ am pentu ‘impendito,’ unless indeed it is here some variety of Lat. in, as an the Umbro-Oscan negative prefix (ch. iv. § 81) is of Lat. in-.

§ 18. Antē, before, I.-Eur. *ánti (O. Ind. ánti, ‘opposite, near,’ Gr. ávri, opposite, instead of, Goth. and, ‘towards,’ Engl. an swer, Lith. aūt, ‘on’), a Locative Sing. of some stem connected with Lat. antes, rows, O. Ind. ánta-, ‘vicinity, end,’ Goth. and eis, ‘end,’ of which Gr. ávra, opposite (cf. ávην), is another case. In Oscan
the Preposition (governing the Acc. as in Latin) appears without the final short vowel (this loss of a final ū is common in Oscan), e.g. ant pūntram 'ante pontem;' but in Latin, though poste was reduced to post (see below), ant is not written for ante [in Plaut. Rud. 509, if the reading of the MSS. is right, we must pronounce ant(e)positast, a quadrisyllable:

quam quae Thyestae quondam antepositast Tēreo.

On antena and antestor, see above. With the particle *dē appended, as in posid, is the form antid- in O. Lat. antid-eo (e.g. Plaut. Trin. 545 sed Campans genus Multo Surorum iam antidit patientiā), antid-hac (used by Plantus when three syllables are required by the metre, antehac being a dissyllable; cf. antidit, &c. and anteit, &c.), antid-eā (Liv. xxii. 10. 6 in the Vow of the Ver Sacrum; antea is not found in Plautus, and only once in Terence, viz. Andr. 52). In antid- the -ī of I.-Eur. *anti, not being final, does not sink to ē (cf. anti-stes, &c., ch. iii. § 39).

§ 19. Apud, which is also spelt aput, seems to be the I.-Eur. Preposition *āpō (of which Lat. ab is a curtailment; see above), augmented by the particle *d(e), or *t(I), and must have been originally *apo-d, or *apo-t (cf. Dor. por). An old form apor, with that change of -d to an r-sound (before f, v) seen in arfu-runt, ar-vorsum, &c. (ch. iv. § 112), is quoted by Paul. Fest. 19. 34 Th. (cf. apur finem on a Marsic inscr., Zvet. I. I. 45; apur is quoted by Mar. Vict. 9. 17 K.). On the spelling aput, like at, set for ad, sed, see ch. ii. § 76. In Oscan úp, op (Lat. ob) is used with the Abl. in the sense of Lat. apud, e.g. op tovtad 'apud populum,' úp eisūd sakaraklūd 'apud id sacellum.'

§ 20. Circum, circā, circiter. Circum, around, is the Adverbial Acc. Sg. of circus (Gk. κρίκος, a ring; cf. O. Engl. hring, with nasalization), which had in O. Lat. the sense of class. circulus (Dub. Nom. 573. 4 K; cf. above, ch. v. § 24), and is used, for example, by Accius of the moon's orbit (Trag. 100 R.):

quot lūna circos annuo in cursu institiit.

In the early literature circum is the only form, whether Adverb or Preposition, but in class. Lat. a byform circā appears, first found in Cicero (who uses it in three passages of the Verrine orations, but afterwards seems to have discarded it), possibly never
in Caesar, but much affected by Livy. *Circā is a formation on the type of *suprā, *extrā, &c., perhaps originally employed with verbs like *esse (Cicero's three examples of the words are: *Ferr. II. i. 51. 133 canes esse circa se multos; i. 48. 126 canibus, quos circa se haberet; iv. 48. 107 Henna, quam circa lacus sunt plurimi), owing to a feeling that *circum was suitable only for verbs of motion, e.g. legatos circum civitates mittère, 'to send ambassadors a tour of the states,' ire circum urbem, 'to go a circuit of the city' (*A. L. L. v. 295). *Circiter, an adverbial formation like *breviter, O. Lat. *amiciter (see § 1), came to be restricted to the logical sense of 'about,' 'almost,' e.g. Plaut. *Cist. 677 loca hae circiter.

The form *circo appears in the Adverb *id-circo, as *circa in quö-circa, with the same logical sense (cf. Osc. *amnud, 'because of,' in *egm[as *tovti]cas *amnud 'rei publicae causa,' an adverbial Abl. Sg. Neut. of amno-, a formation with the suffix -no- from the Preposition am- [Lat. *am-, *ambi-], as commo- 'comitium' from the Prep. com-).

*Cis, *cirtrā, on this side (cf. Umb. *çimu, *simo, 'retro'?), are formed from the I.-Eur. pronominal root *ki-, 'this' (Gk. -κι of οὐκι, πολλάκι, Goth. hi-na, 'this,' Engl. he, Lith. szis, O. Sl. si), exactly as their opposites *uls, *ultra, on that side, from the I.-Eur. pronominal root *ol-, 'that' (ch. vii. § 13), the first by the addition of the particle *s(e) (p. 573; on *uls for *oll, see § 56), the second (an Abl. Sg. Fem.) by the suffix -tero- (ch. v. § 16). The Adverb *cirtrō (Abl. Sg. Neut. or Masc.) corresponds to *cirtrā as *ultrō (e.g. ultrō citroque) to *ultrā.

§ 21. *Clam, *clancūlum. *Clam, an Adverbial Acc. Sg. Fem. (?) from the root *kel-, 'to hide' (Lat. *celō, *ocēlo, &c.), had in O. Lat. a byform *clam-de, *claude (written clade in the MSS. of Placidus 15. 32 G.; but cf. *quamde from *quam, ch. x. § 11), whence was formed the Adj. *clandestinus. Another O. Lat. form written *callim in the MSS. of Paul. Fest. 33. 6 ('callim' antiqui dicebant pro *clam, ut *nis pro nobis, 'sam' pro suam, 'im' pro eum) is more difficult to explain. (Should we read *calam, and refer the form to the Analogy of *pālam? It may be merely the coinage of some grammarian to support his etymology of *clam). *Clam, which governs the Acc. always in Plaut. and Ter., and perhaps never the Abl. at any period of Latin (Langen, *Beitr. p. 230), has in the Comedians another, apparently a Diminutive form,
clanculum (but cf. procul, § 2), used as a Preposition by Terence, Adelph. 52 clanculum patres. Cf. the glosses: clanculae 'absconsae' (C. G. L. v. 277. 58); clanculum 'occultum' (ib. 278. 1).

§ 22. Cōm-, (eum), with, and co- (e.g. oōgo for oō-go), I.-Eur. *kōm and *kō (?) (with palatal or with guttural k?) (O. Ir. com-, co, W. eyf-, ey, Osc. com, con, co-, Umbr. con, -co, co-) is in early inscriptions written quom (Bersu, Gutturnale, p. 42), like the Relative Adverb quom, when, because quo- had the same sound as co- (ch. iv. § 137). The o of com became u in the unaccented use of the word (ch. iv. § 20), and before certain initial consonants (ch. ii. § 22), and cum became the recognized spelling of the simple Preposition, though in compounds, e.g. com-es, the o-form was retained. On the form co-, e.g. co-eo (Quint. i. 6. 17), O. Lat. co-ventionid, and the like, see ch. ii. §§ 61, 65. Its original difference from com- is not certain. Osc. com, with, governs the Abl., and is prefixed in compreivatud, compreivatud 'cum privato' on the Tabula Bantina (cf. Umbr. com privavir 'cum legatis'), but Umbr. kum, com is postfixed in the sense of 'apud,' 'juxta,' e.g. asa-ku, 'juxta aram,' veris-co (opposed to pre verir and post verir), at the gates.

§ 23. Contra (see §§ 1, 4). Osc. contrud in the phrase on the Bantine Law: svae pis contrud exeic fefacust 'si quis contra hoc fecerit,' is followed by the Adverb (Locative) exeic, as Lat. avorum in the S. C. Bacch. by the Adverb (Abl. Fem.) ead: sei ques esent, quei arvorum ead fecissent. It is Abl. of an O-stem (cf. Lat. contrō-versia), as contrō of an Ā-stem.

§ 24. Cōram, in presence of (not a Preposition till Cicero's time), seems to be connected with ōs, Gen. ōris, the face, perhaps being an Adverbial Acc. Sg. Fem. of a stem *cōso-* (*cōro-), compounded of the preposition com- (cum) and this noun (cf. O. Ind. sākṣiḍ). Incoram with a Gen., e.g. incoram omnium, is found in Apuleius.

§ 25. Dē, down from, concerning (Fal. de in the phrase: de zenatuo sententiad, Zvet. I.I.I. 70); O. Ir. di, O. W. di; cf. O. Ir. di-mōr, 'very great,' with Lat. de-magis, &c. corresponds to Osc. dat (e.g. dat senateis tanginud 'de senatus sententia').
which seems to have the particle -t(i) affixed, as per-t, Lat. per (§ 38), unless the -t stand for -d, in which case *dad may be an Ablative (Lat. dē for *dēd?). The Umbrian Preposition is da (with final -d or -t dropped in Umbrian fashion), if da-etom on the Eugubine Tables (vi. A 28) stands for Lat. demptum (cf. Osc. da-did ‘dedat,’ da-dikatted ‘dedicavit’).

§ 26. Dis-, apart, is most naturally referred to some byform of the root dwo-, dwi-, ‘two’ (Goth. tvis-, e.g. tvis-standan, ‘to separate’), wanting the w (see ch. iv. § 71). With the w the same formation expressed the Numerical Adverb *dwīs [O. Ind. dwīs, Gk. ὑδ, M. H. G. zwis], and is in Latin bis (ch. iv. § 68). Before a vowel dis- becomes, by the phonetic law of Latin, dir- (ch. iv. § 148), e.g. dir-buo, and before voiced consonants (see ch. iv. § 151) di-, e.g. di-mūveo (dis-mota) on the S. C. Bacch., C. I. L. i. 196.

§ 27. Endō. (Cf. O. Ir. ind-, e.g. ind-ruth, ‘I attack,’ Gaul. ande-?), also under the form indu, the i and u being apparently weakening of e and o due to the unaccented use of the Preposition. It corresponds in meaning to in (both with Abl. and Acc.), and was in classical Latin replaced by in, e.g. class. im-pērāto, O. Lat. indu-perator, class. in-grēdi, O. Lat. indu-grēdi. It seems to represent an I.-Eur. *en-dō (Gk. ἔνδο-θ, ἔνδο-θεν, ἔνδον), compounded of the Prep. *en (Lat. in) and the Prep. *dō (cf. Lat. dō-nece; O. Ir. do, Engl. to, Lith. do, O. Sl. do), the last element being connected with the Adverbial particle *d(e) (Gk. δομο-δε). The final -ō has been preserved from becoming -ē in Latin (ch. iii. § 37) by the frequent use of the word as the first element in a compound. (So *prō remains pro in Latin and does not in unaccented use become *prē, owing to compounds like prō-ficiscor, &c.). Traces of the same confusion of I.-Eur. *endo- and I.-Eur. *en- are seen in Celtic.

Endo and indu. The form endo occurs, e.g. in the epitaph of Ennius, quoted by Cicero, in his De Republica (ap. Sen. Epis. 106. 34):

si fas endo plagas caelestum ascendere cu quam est,
mi soli caeli maxima porta patet,
in a clause of the XII Tables (ap. Fest. 452. 6 Th.): si caluitur, pedemue struit, manum endo iacito, ‘if he deceives, or attempts to run away, the prosecutor may arrest him,’ a clause alluded to by Lucilius, xvii. 10 M.:

si non it, capito, inquit, eum, et si caluitur, endo fertō manum,
and in other laws (Legg. ii. 8. 19); it is employed too by Lucretius (vi. 890) endó mari [cf. the glosses: endoletus ἐγκεκλεισμένη; endo festabat; endo ríxum κατά βελθρόν; endoedicarit μνύσισ (C. G. L. ii. 61. 35); endogenia (via?) 'naturaliter amœna' ; endoriguum 'irriguum' (C. G. L. v. 193. 25)]. The form endo-appears in a line of Ennius, referring to Romulus and Remus (Ann. 59 M.):

indotueur ibi lupus famina, conspiciet omnis;

the form indú, e.g. in Ennius, Ann. 298 M. indu foro lato sanctoque senatu (cf. Lucil. inc. 17 indú foro); in Lucr. v. 102 nec Ŀaceere indu manus (cf. ii. 1096 indu manu), as well as in the compounds induceptor Enn., Lucr., indupedio Lucr., indugregitor Lucr., &c. By the time of Plautus the word seems to have dropped out of ordinary usage, for it occurs in his plays only in compounds like indú (Terence knows only in-audio), in-dípiscor (cf. class. indígeo, indí-géna, indí-íces, &c.); and though it occurs at the end of Varro's RéS Rusticae (iii. 17. 10): ille inde endo suam domum, nos nostram, the phrase is a quotation from Ennius' curious experiment in language, mentioned by Ausonius (Techn. 18) and others: endo suam do, with do, an apocopated form of dónum, after the type of Homer's Ἡς.

§ 28. Ergā, ergō. Ergā, originally local (e.g. Plaut. True. 405 tonstríceum SuraM Nouístin nostram quae erga aedem seséd habet?, if the MSS. reading be right), must be connected with ergō, on account of, in O. Lat. a preposition or rather postposition, governing the Genitive, e.g. funeris ergo, XII Tab. Whether the two words have been differentiated on the type of ultrō and niltrō, intrō and intrō, or whether they came originally from two different stems, it is impossible to say. Ergo has been explained as a compound of the Preposition é and the Abl. Sg. of a stem *rego- (from the root reg-, 'to stretch'), meaning 'direction,' so that its change of meaning would resemble that of German wegen (originally von wegen). Ergā might similarly represent e *régiā, like e régione, opposite. It is not restricted to the expression of friendly feeling in Plautus, e.g. Pseud. 1020 ne malus item erga mé sit, ut erga illúm fuit; Cas. 618 aut quód ego umquam erga Uénemer inique fécercim.

§ 29. Ex, ec-, ō, out of. L.-Eur. *éks (Gk. ἔξ, Gaul. ex-, O. Ir. ess-, W. es-; cf. Lith. isz?) appears to be a compound of a Preposition *ék and the particle *s(e), as Gk. ἤψ, Lat. abs, append the same particle to *ap, a curtailment of *apo (§ 12). In Latin compounds the Preposition often appears before the letter f in the form ec- in MSS. (cf. Ter. Scaur. 26. 14 K. effatus, non 'exfatus' nec 'ecfatus;' ut quidam putaverunt; Ter.
Maur. 1. 949 K. muto vel partem prioris, si fit hirtum, syllabae, 'ecer' ut dicam, vel illud, 'hoc tibi effectum dabo'), e.g. ecfōdio, ecfōro, ecfāri (for examples, see Neue, ii3, p. 870), often corrupted to haec and to et (see Class. Rev. v. 295; Fleck. Jahrb. 1890, p. 771). (Et is often a corruption also of ex, owing to the fact that the symbols for these words in minuscule writing were very similar.) This ec- may be merely a phonetic development of ex before f, as e of ex before it (e.g. e-dūco; cf. sē-dēcim), m (e. g. e-mitto; cf. sē-mestris), &c. (ch. iv. § 151). Corresponding to Lat. ę we find in Osc. ee-stint (apparently with a different sound from I.-Eur. ę, which is in Osc. i, i, e.g. liguă 'lege'), eehianasūm ' e(ve)hiandarum,' Umbr. ehiato- ' evehiaito-', easa ' ex ara,' &c. (see ch. ii. § 6).

Extra. (O. Lat. extrad; cf. the S. C. Bacch., C. I. L. 1. 196 extrad urben) is an Abl. Sg. Fem. of an extension of ex by the suffix -t(e)ro- (ch. v. § 16), like in-tra, eit-tra, ul-tra, &c. Oscan ehtrad (with āt for ct, as in Uhtavis, the Oscan form of Octavius), O. Ir. echtar may represent an original stem *ek(s)-tero- or *ek-tero-.

§ 30. In, in, the unaccented form of O. Lat. en [cf. ϐύγε, but inállod on the (restored) Col. Rostrata (C. I. L. i. 195)] is I.-Eur. *ēn (Gk. ēv, O. Ir. in, W. yn, Goth. in, Lith. ė). The same form is used in Latin and other languages with the two senses, (1) in, (2) into [whereas in Greek the second is distinguished by the addition of the particle *s(e), ĕs, Att. ēs], and appears to be a Locative case, formed without the case-suffix -i (ch. vi. § 37). (The Greek byform ēvī shows this case-suffix; but cf. above, § 11). Before labial consonants in became im by the Latin phonetic law (ch. iv. § 78), e.g. im-pleo, im-mitto, imbello (in war), C. I. L. iii. 4835, &c. On the derivative Prepositions endo, inter, see §§ 27, 32.

Osc. en (in), Umbr. en, have with Acc. and Loc. (not Abl.) the two senses of Lat. in, but are postfixed, e.g. Osc. exaiae-en ligis 'hisce in legibus,' Pel. eite uus pritrom-e, 'do ye go past or forward,' Umbr. arvam -en ' in arvum,' arven ' in arvo,' fesner-e ' in fans.' Osc. -en with the Abl. imad-en ' ab ima (parte),' cisne-en ziculud ' ab eo die (*dieulo),' which has the sense of Lat. ab, has been referred to Lat. inde (but see § 10. 6).
§ 31. *Infra* (*inf-era, C. I. L. i. 1166*), an Abl. Sg. Fem. like *supra, citra, intrar*, connected with the Adj. *infraus* (on which see ch. v. § 16).

§ 32. *Intar*, between (O. Ind. antar, O. Ir. ētar; e.g. O. Ind. antar-chid- ‘inter-scindo’), is formed from *in* by the addition of the suffix -tero- (see ch. v. § 16), like *interior* (cf. *intrar, intrar*), as *ex-tero-, &c. from *ex*. The Ocean form is anter (with Acc., but once with Abl.-Loc. Plur.), the Umbrian form is anter, ander (governing the Acc.), both with an- corresponding to Lat. *in-, the Preposition, as to Lat. *in*, the Negative, e.g. Umbr. an-takro- ‘in-tegro-’.

§ 33. *Intra, intus*. *Intra* is an Abl. Sg. Fem. like *extrar* class, *contrar* (while *intro* is an Abl. Sg. Neut. like Osc. *contrud*, Lat. *contrar-cersia* (cf. Osc. *Entra-, the name of a goddess). *Intus* (Gk. *év-tós* with the I.-Eur. affix -tós, implying usually motion from, § 1) wavers between an Adverb and a Preposition in such a phrase as Virgil’s *tali intus templo, ‘in such temple, within’ or ‘within such temple’ (cf. Lucr. vi. 798).

§ 34. *Juxta*, which is first used as a Preposition by Caesar, is Abl. Sg. Fem. of a stem *juxto-, whether this be P. P. P. of a verb *juno* formed from *jungo* as *viso* from *video, quaeso* from *quaero* (ch. viii. § 33. 4), or a Superlative with the I.-Eur. Superlative suffix -isto- (Gk. *πλε-ωτος, &c.*). The Adv. *juxtim* is found as early as Livius Andronicus (*Trag. 11 R.*).

§ 35. *Ob*, I.-Eur. *op(i)*, apparently a variety of *opi* (Gk. *επί, on, to, ὀπι-σθεν*, behind, O. Ind. *āpi, ‘by,’ Lith. *api-, ‘around’; cf. Lith. *ap-szvesti, ‘to make light,’ with Lat. *ob-caeco, to make dark*), is in Ocean *op* (with the sense of Lat. *āpud*, governing the Abl., e.g. *op tovtad ‘apud populum,’ ēp eisūd sakaraklūd ‘apud id sacellum’), and often retains its -p in Latin spelling in compounds like *op-loeneo* (e.g. *optenui* on a Scipio Epitaph, *C. I. L. i. 38*; cf. Quint. i. 7. 7), *op-ério*, though in the simple word the Latin usage substituted the Media for the Tenuis as the final consonant (cf. *ab for ap, sub for sup,* and see ch. ii. § 76). In classical Latin it has the sense of ‘before,’ e.g. *ob oculos ponere*, to describe, or ‘on account of’; but in the earlier literature it had other shades of meaning; cf. Paul. Fest. 193. 7 Th.
ob praepositio alias ponitur pro circum, ut cum dicimus urbem 'obsideri,' 'obvallari,' alias pro ad, ut Ennius:

ob Romam noctu legiones ducere coepit;

Servius tells us that many interpreted *ob Italiam* in Virgil, *Aen.* i. 233 as 'juxta Italiam,' with the old sense of *ob*: ob enim veteres pro juxta ponebant. (This variety of meanings has been explained by the theory that Lat. *ob* represents, not only I.-Eur. *epi, *opi, but also an *ebhi, seen in O. Ind. abhí.) By the addition of the particle *s(e), as ab became abs (e.g. abs te, abstineo), so *ob* became *obs,* a form occasionally found in compounds before *t*-, e.g. *obstinet* (Fest. 228. 6 Th. o. dicebant antiqui, quod nunc est ostendit), *obstrudant* (Paul. Fest. 221. 3 Th. 'avide trudant'; Fest. 220. 14) (so Umbr. *os-tendu* 'ostendito'). (On omitto, see ch. iii. § 34.)

§ 36. *Palam,* like its opposite, *alam,* an Acc. Sg. Fem. (but see § 1) of some stem, perhaps connected with the Plautine verb *dispalesco* (*Bacch.* 1046):

periisse suáust
quam illúd flagitium nólgo dispalésceere

(from the root of *pálari,* to wander, be dispersed abroad). Others connect it with *palma,* the hand, and make it mean literally 'in the hand.' Besides the Adv. *palam* we have *pró-palam,* as early as Plautus, but *palam* is not a Prep. till the Augustan Age.

§ 37. *Pénés* (governing the Acc., usually of a person), represents some case of *penus,* -*oris* N., or a kindred stem, from the root *pen-* of *pen-tus* (§ 1), *pené-tra,* &c., a suffixless Locative according to some (cf. Dor. *aiś*), a Loc. Pl. according to others, who offer a similar explanation of *vicissi-m* (ch. ix. § 4), *sémissi-, vix, móx* (cf. § 3). The final syllable may have been prevented from being weakened to *-is* by the fact that the stress of the voice fell on it in the common phrases *penés-me,* *penés-te,* *penés-nos,* *penés-vos,* &c. (ch. iii. § 12 a. 3). *Penes* is used only with Pronouns in Plautus.

apparently in the old sense of Lat. *perēmo* (Fest. 266. 31 Th. 'peremere' Cincius in libro de Verbis Priscis ait signifiacer idem, quod prohibere: at Cato in libro qui est de Re Militari pro vitiare usus est), though the commoner form of the Oscan Preposition is pert (with the suffix -t of Gk. πορτ, § 11), e.g. *comono* pertemest 'comitia peremet, *am-pert, 'not beyond' (used like Lat. *duntaxat*, § 7), *petiro-pert, 'four times' (cf. Lat. *sem-per*, § 7), and to Umbr. per, pert, e.g. *per-etom* 'peremptum,' *трио-per, 'three times,' which with the Abl. has the sense of Lat. *pro*, e.g. *noumne-per* 'pro nomine.' The intensive sense of *per-* in *per-magnus, per-quam,* &c. (often separated from the qualified word, e.g. per pol quam paucos reperias, Ter. *Hec.* 58; hence *per-taesus* did not become *per-tibus, ch. iii. § 23), is seen in Lith. *per-saldūs, 'very sweet'; cf. Gk. περφνιγιν, very long, &c. (cf. Engl. 'through' and 'thorough'). Again Lat. *per-* approaches the usual sense of Gk. πορί, about, around, in *pertingo, perungo, pertōītio.* The sense of 'past,' 'beyond' (cf. Osc. *am-pert, pert viam* 'trans viam,' Umbr. pert spinia 'trans spinam' (?)) appears in *per-go,* &c.; and with the implication of wrong or injury (cf. Gk. παρα-βαίνω, παρ-όμηνι), in *per-jurus* [from which *pejero, perjero* (see Georges, *Lex. Wortf.* s. v.), can hardly be separated, though the c is hard to explain], *per-do, per-fidus,* and of difference in *pergrō.* It thus appears that *per* represents a considerable variety of meanings, and this variety is increased if we take into account Umbro-Oscan *per, pert.* For besides the sense of Lat. *pro,* on behalf of, seen in Umbr. *noumne-per,* &c. in the Eugubine Liturgy: *(tio . . . ore-per Fisiu, tota-per Iovina, erer nomme-per, erer nomme-per . . . subocau* 'te pro are Fisia, pro populo Iguvino, pro ejus (M.) nomine, pro ejus (F.) nomine, subvoco, estu esunu fetu fratrus-per Atiiediie 'ista sacra facito pro fratibus Atiediis'), once written *pert* in the phrase: Petruniapert natine 'pro Petronia natione,' it has the local sense of Latin *pro-, forward, in front of, in the words, Umbr. *per-ne, per-naio-, opposed to *post-ne* (Lat. *pōne, behind*), *post-naio-, Osc. Perna-, the name of a goddess [cf. I.-Eur. *per-* in *per-üt(ǐ), from *wētos-, 'a year,' O. Ind. parat, 'in the former year,' Gk. πέρφνι, Dor. πέρνι]. The reason of this is that the I.-Eur. root *per-* produced a large number of Prepositions, representing different case-forms, &c., *pērī* Loc.
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(O. Ind. pári, ‘around,’ Gk. περι, *pérós Gen. (O. Ind. purás, ‘before,’ Gk. πάρος), *pérm (O. Ind. párá, ‘beyond’; cf. pára, Gk. περα; Lat. perem- of perem-die, Osc. perum dolom mallom (‘sine dolo malo’), and so on. The weak grades of the root, pr-, pr-, seen in Gk. napd, Goth, fara, far, Engl. be-fore, appear in Lat. por- of por-tentum, &c., Umbr. pur-titu, pur-ditom (unless this be merely a metathesis of pro], and in Lat. prö, Umbr. pro, pru, Osc. pro, pru, as well as in Lat. præ from *prai (Pel. prai-, Osc. prae, Umbr. pre), perhaps a Dative form (cf. Gk. παπά, O. Ind. paré).

§ 39. Pó-, retained only in a few Compounds, po-sítus, po-lubrum, porcoo, &c., as Teut. *mpö, ‘with’ (Goth. mpö, Germ. mit, like Gk. μετά) is in English retained only in the compound ‘mid-wife’ (see under ab, § 12).

§ 40. Post, pönē. Post, behind, from *postë, O. Lat. poste, posti-d (with the particle *d(e)), adds the suffix -tē (§ 11) to I.-Eur. *pos (Lith. pās, &c.), which seems to be derived from *pó-(Lith. pa-, ‘under,’ O. Sl. po, ‘about’), a curtailment of *apó (see § 12). In certain collocations the -t was dropped by the Latin phonetic law (ch. iv. § 157), e.g. C. I. L. i. 1454 postempsus; of Virg. Aen. iii. 1 Marius Victorinus says (22. 11 K.): posquam res Asiae, non ‘postquam’; and this pos might be further reduced (before m, &c., ch. iv. § 151) to pó-, e.g. pó-merium (so spelt, not pomoerium), quod erat post murum ‘post-moerium’ dictum, Varro L. L. v. 143.

Pone (Plaut., &c.) adds the suffix -nē (§ 11) to post (Umbr. postne, opposed to perne; cf. postnaio-, pusnao- Adj., opposed to pernaio-).

Umbr. post is joined with the same case as pre (Lat. præ), e.g. post verir Treblanir and pre verir Treblanir, in O. Umbr. pusveres Treplanes and preveres Treplanes, and similarly Osc. púst feihús ‘post fines,’ while Osc. post excad corresponds to Lat. postlac.

In Umbro-Oscan we find a Preposition postin governing the Acc. case with the sense of Lat. secundum, e.g. Umbr. pusti kastryuuf, ‘according to their lands,’ Osc. pùstin slagim, ‘according to the locality (?)’.
§ 41. Poste, posti-d, pos, pō-. *Poste, which shows the regular change of -i when final to ī (i not final is retained, e.g. posti-d, see ch. iii. § 39), is found in a fine line of Ennius, Ann. 244 M., an exhortation to rowers:

poste recumbite, uestraque. pectora pellite tonsis,

frequently in Plautus, e.g. Asin. 915 (see Ritschl, Opusc. ii. 541 sqq.), and probably in Terence, Eun. 493 (see A. L. L. ii. 140). Its reduction to post is like that of *animaīt* to *animal*, nequit to nec, &c. (ch. iii. § 36). The Adverb postīd is not unfrequent in Plautus (e.g. postīd locorum, Poen. 144, &c.), as also postīd-eā (cf. antid-eā, antid-hac), compounded with the Adverbial Abl. Sg. Fem. of is (§ 10. 4) (e.g. postīdea loci, Stich. 758, &c.), and has on account of its exclusively adverbial use been regarded as a compound of post(e) with id, the (adverbial) Acc. Sg. Neut. of is (cf. post-eā, ad id locorum, Sall., Liv.), though this explanation requires us to see in postīdea, antīdea, &c. a pleonastic repetition of the pronouns, post-id-eā, ant-id-eā. Cicero (Orat. xlvii. 157; cf. Vel. Long. 79. 3 K.) says that he preferred posmeridianas (quadrigas) to posmeridianas, while Quintilian (ix. 4. 39) seems to mention the form pomeridiem. (On the spelling pos for post in MSS. of Plautus, see Ritschl, Opusc. ii. 549; of Virgil, see Rübeck, Proleg. p. 442; of other authors, see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v.). The evidence points to Lat. pos-being not I.-Eur. *pos, but a syncopated form of I.-Eur. *pos-tī (see Stolz, Beitr. p. 21).

§ 42. Prae, before, I.-Eur. *prai (Lith. prai; cf. O. Ir. rē or ria, with a dropped final nasal). In O. Lat. also pri, according to Paul. Fest. 282. 27 Th. (cf. prīs-čus, prīs-lius, prīmus for *prīs-mo-), Pelign. Prisma-, pri-stafalacirix 'praestabulatrices'), probably I.-Eur. *prī (Lith. pri, O. Sl. pri, Goth. fri-), connected with I.-Eur. *prō, 'before,' and with Gk. πápos, O. Ind. purás, purā, Goth. faura, Engl. be-fore (B. B. xvii. 17), possibly a Dative formation from the root per- (see above, § 38). The Preposition is found with the same use as in Latin, but with prominence of the idea 'before' (often for Lat. ante), in the Umbro-Ocean languages; Pel. prai-cim, Osc. prai, praesentid 'praesente' (with the usual sense of Lat. praesens; in the Columna Rostrata we have praesens in its older sense: praesente[d] . . . dictated or[om, 'being in command,' C. I. L. i. 195), praecucus 'praec-fectus,' Umbr. pre verir Treblanir 'ante portas Treblanas,' pre-pa, priusquam, lit. 'praec-quam,' pre-habia 'praecbeat.'

§ 43. Praetēr, past, except, is formed from the preceding by means of the suffix -tero- like the Adverbs brēci-ter, &c. (§ 2), as from I.-Eur. *prā is formed Pelignian pritro- (in an epitaph, Zvet. I. I. 13 eite uus pritrome 'ite vos praeter' quasi 'praeterum in'). (Cf. Umbr. pretro- 'prior.')
§ 44. Pro, por-. Prō, before, forth, is I.-Eur. *prō (O. Ind. prá, Gk. πρά, O. Ir. ro-, used like the Greek augment with preterite tenses, Goth. fra-, Lith. pra-, O. Sl. pro). The long vowel seems to be the vowel of the Oscan preposition (or I.-Eur. *prū, Gk. προτάτος, &c.), e.g. pru-hipid 'prohibuerit,' pru-er-pan 'priusquam,' and may have been I.-Eur. (Gk. πρω-τι, early, O. H. G. fruo, Lett. prūjam, 'forth'). These Oscan forms suggest that Lat. prō was not originally *prōd, an Abl. form (which would be in Oscan *prud-, not prū-), so that the prōd- of prōd-est, prōd-ere, may be a form augmented by the particle *-d(e) like anti-d-, posti-d, red-, &c. In Late Latin the form prode (cf. Charis. 236. 29 K.) is common, especially with esse (cf. Charis. 237. 8 K., and see Neue, ii. p. 662) (prodius: ulterius, longius, a prodeundo, quoted by Nonius 47. 10 M. from Varro, is generally corrected by editors to propius). The por- of por-rigo or porgo, porrício for *por-jicio, por-rō (O. Lat. porod), &c. is either a metathesis of prō-, or represents an I.-Eur. by-form *pr (cf. Gk. παρά) (see ch. iv. § 92). In Umbrian we have pro- for Lat. prō, before, e.g. procanurent 'procinuerint,' affixed in ie-pru (cf. promo- 'primus'), and pur- in a verb corresponding in sense to Lat. porrício and in form apparently to Lat. prō-do, with P. P. pur-ditom, Imper. pur-dovitu.

§ 45. Prō- and prō-. The variety prō- and prō- in Compounds (the simple preposition has always the long vowel) is seen more in the early literature than in the stereotyped usage of the classical age: prōdhat abque prōpellat, Lucr. iv. 194 and vi. 1027; Lucr. prōportare; O. Lat. prōtinam. Prō- almost ousted prō- in class. Latin, but prō- is normal before f-, e.g. prō-ficiscor, prō-fundo, except in prō-ficio (for próde-ficio, as in Late Latin ?); but Catullus (iv. 202) has prōfādint; Plautus (Men. 643) and Ennius (Trag. 293 R.) prōfiteri; Plautus (Trin. 149) prōfecturus. The Greek πρόλογος is prólogus in the Comedians (cf. pródota, Lucil. v. 28 M.), própiva is própinae. Even in classical poetry we have próvora. O. Lat. prō-turus might be similarly explained, were it not for the fact that there are indications of an old form propōtervo- (so in the MSS. of Plaut. Bacch. 612, and in the Ambrosian Palimpsest in Truc. 256: see Löwe, Gloss. Nom. pp. 142, 184, who connects the form with Gk. πρώτηρ). Prōbous (cf. O. Ind. prabhū- 'preeminent ') apparently adds to prō the same formation (from the root bheu- 'to be' ?) as super-bus (cf. Gk. ὑπερβους) to super.

§ 46. Prōcēul is formed from *prō by the suffix -ko- [a suffix often attached to adverbs, e.g. Lat. posti-cus, antī-cus (ch. v. § 31), reciprocēus from *reco- and *proco-, § 49], and some L-suffix (see § 2). It is used as a Prep. as early as Ennius (Trag. 220 R.)
§ 47. Prōpē (e.g. Plaut. Curc. 97 prope me est) adds to L.-Eur. *prō the particle -pe (ch. x. § 1. 4). The sense ‘nearly’ is perhaps later than Plautus (A.L.L. ix. 165). For Superl. proxime we should expect *prop-(i)s-ime, ch. vi. § 54).

§ 48. Propērē, near, on account of (in Plautus this latter sense is always expressed by propter, not by ob, when a person is spoken of), is formed from the Adverb prope by means of the suffix -tero-, as praefer from prae (§ 43), circiter from circum (§ 20).

§ 49. Rē-, back, has in O. Lat. a byform rōd-, with the addition of the particle *d(e) (§ 11; cf. anti-d, posti-d), which in class. Lat. remains in red-co, red-do, &c. (redi-vivus is peculiar), but is before a consonant usually discarded for rē-, e.g. rē-duco (O. Lat. red-duco, but perhaps only re-dux), (before a vowel, not till Late Latin, e.g. reedifico; see A. L. L. viii. 278). From re- was formed the Adverb rē-trō (like in-trō, ci-trō, ul-trō), which in Late Lat. became a Preposition, e.g. vade retro me, S. Marc. viii. 33, Vulgata. An Adjective-stem *rōco- from this Preposition (ch. v. § 31) is seen compounded with a stem *prōco- from the Prep. prō-in the word reci-procus. In Umbrian this Prep. appears in two Compound Verbs, re-vestu ‘revisito’ and re-statitu ‘restituito.’

§ 50. Sēcundum, sēcūs. Secundum, according to, close behind, &c. is the Adverbial Acc. Sg. Neut. of secundus, following (§ 4). In plebeian Latin secus was used for secundum (Charis. 80. 18 K. id quod vulgus usurpat, secus illum sedi,’ hoc est secundum illum, et novum et sordidum est; cf. Caper. 103. 12 K.; so on plebeian inscriptions, secus merita ejus, secus viam, &c., but also in O. Lat. authors, for Charis. (220. 14 K.) quotes hoc secus, ‘soon after this,’ from the historian Sempr. Asellio), which may be Nom. Sg. Masc. of an Adj.-stem (cf. heres secus, ‘h. secundus,’ C. I. L. iii. 387), or Acc. Sg. of a Neuter S-stem *secus, like tenus (§ 54). Apparently connected with the Prep. secus are O. Ir. sech, ‘past,’ W. heb, ‘without,’ from a stem *sequo-; and the Latin Adv. secus appended to Adverbs in -im, e.g. extrin-secus (§ 10. 5), as well as the secus of phrases like secus accidit, non secus atque (Comp. sequius) has been also referred to our Preposition on the theory that this Adverb meant originally ‘following but coming short of,’ ‘less,’ as O. Ir. sech meant ‘following and going past,’ ‘more than’ (see § 8).
§ 50 a. Simūl, used as a Prep. in Augustan and later poetry, and in Silver Age prose, is perhaps Acc. Sg. Neut. of similis (see § 2).

§ 51. Sinō, sē. Sine, if connected with O. Ind. sanu-tár (cf. sani-tár), M. H. G. sun-der (which have the suffix -tero-), must represent L.-Eur. *sēnī (*sēnū), and must have been in O. Lat. *se-ne, the change from e to i being due to the unaccented use of the word, as in mihi for *mehi (ch. vii. § 1). The spelling seine on the Lex Repetundarum (C. I. L. i. 198. 54) is best explained, like leiteras on the same inscription, as a case of ei wrongly used for i (ch. ii. § 130).

In O. Lat. there is another Preposition of the same meaning, sē(d) (as an Adverb meaning ‘apart’), which became obsolete except in Compounds like sēd-ilio, lit. ‘a going apart,’ se-orsum (-s) (a dissyll. as early as Plautus), sē-dūlō from sē dolo (whence the Adj. sē dulvis, § 7), sē-cūrns, sē-cedo, sē-cerno; it is evidently connected with the Conjunction sēd (ch. x. § 5); the d of sēd-ilio, &c. need not be the Abl. Case-suffix, but may be the particle *d(e) (cf. re-d-, § 49). This Preposition occurs in the legal phrase se fraude, ‘without hurt,’ free from penalty, written sed fraude on the Lex Repetundarum of 123–122 B.C. (C. I. L. i. 198), and on the Lex Agraria of 111 B.C. (i. 200, ii. 29 and 42, but se dulo malo l. 40) (cf. Paul. Fest. 500. 6 Th. ‘sed ’ pro sine inveniuntur posuisse antiqui). The compound sed-ütærque (cf. Umbr. sei-podrukpe) occurs in the Nom. Sg. Fem. in Plaut. Stich. 106 sedutraque ut dicat mihi. This sē(d) has been plausibly connected with the L.-Eur. Reflexive Pronoun-stem *swe- (Lat. sē Acc.), and explained as originally meaning ‘by oneself.’ The Old Slavonic Prepositions svě-ně, svě-nī, svě-nje, ‘except, without,’ in which this root swe- appears with an N-suffix, suggests that Lat. *se-ne may also be connected with the Reflexive Pronoun. The first part of the Compound Verb sol-vo, and the Adj. sō-brius (cf. e-brius, according to Charis. 83. 16 K. from bria ’vas vinarium’), sō-cors (cf. secordis ‘stultus, fatuus,’ C. G. L. iv. 282. 52), is of kindred origin. Festus quotes nesi ‘pro sine positum’ from an inscription on the temple of Diana on the Aventine, but the fragmentary condition of the MS. of Festus for this passage (nesi pro sine positum ... Dianae Aventinens ..., 166. 26 Th.) makes it doubtful whether the word is
not really the conjunction nisi, used in a context which gave it the force of sine.

§ 52. Sūb, subtēr, subtūs. Sub, under, is I.-Eur. *ūpō (O. Ind. úpa, 'to,' Gk. ὑπό, under, for ὑπό, O. Ir. fo, W. gwo-, go-, Goth. uf). The initial s-, which is found also in the Umbrian Preposition su(b), e.g. subocau, 'subvoco,' su-tentu 'subtendito,' as well as in super (§ 53), is generally explained as a curtailment of prefixed ex (I.-Eur. *eks), so that sub would represent an I.-Eur. compound Preposition *eks-upo, but is as likely to be the particle -s(e) (§ 11). This particle -s(e) is postfixed in the form sus- for sub-s, e.g. sus-tineo, sus-que de-que (in the O. Lat. phrase susque deque fero, habeo (Plaut. Amph. 886), explained by Gell. xvi. 9 as meaning 'aequo animo sum'), apparently used by wrong analogy in old forms of sumpsit and sumpserit quoted by Paul. Fest. 425. 3 Th., suremit and surempsit. Sub-ter is a formation like prae-ter (§ 43), and sub-tus like in-tus (§ 33). The diminutive sense of Lat. sub in sub-absurdus, &c. is shared by Gk. ὑπό (e.g. ὑπόλευκος) and O. Ir. fo (e.g. fo-dord, 'a murmur').

§ 53. Sūpēr, sūprā, insuper, supernē. Super is I.-Eur. *ūpēr, *ūpērī (O. Ind. upāri, Gk. ὑπέρ for ὑπέρ, O. Ir. for, O. W. guor-, Goth. ufar) with a prefixed s- as in Lat. sub, just mentioned. Umbr. super governs the Loc., e.g. super cumne 'super comitio.' Sūprā is an Abl. Sg. Fem. (suprad on the S. C. Bacch.) like in-trā, ci-trā, &c. The form supera is quoted by Priscian (ii. 30. 3 and 55. 23 H.) from Cicero's poems, and is found in Lucretius as well as on C. I. L. i. 1011. (2). 11 (see p. 181). The Umbrian equivalent is sobra, governing the Acc., e.g. sobra tudevo 'supra fines.' Super-ne (also supernē, Adv. of supernus) is formed from super as pōnē from post (§ 40). It is not used as a Preposition in Latin, at least in classical Latin, but is so used (governing an Acc.) in Umbrian, superne adro 'super atra (vascula). Insuper is a Prep. as early as Cato (R. R. xviii. 5).

§ 54. Tēnūs, apparently the Adverbial Acc. Sg. of a Neuter S-stem *tenes-, from the root ten-, 'to stretch' (cf. tenus N., 'a cord,' in Plaut. Bacch. 793 pendébit hodie púlere; ita intendi tenus) is used as a Preposition as early as Ennius. It takes the Abl. Sg.,
e.g. Tauro tenus, Cie. (originally 'from T. in a line,' then used for 'usque ad'), and the Gen. Pl., e.g. erurum tenus, Virg., and in Late Latin the Acc., e.g. Tanain tenus, Val. Flacc. It is not found in prose till the Silver Age (see A. L. L. I. 415). Tenus is appended to Adverbs in -ā (older -ād Abl. Sg. Fem.) in the sense of 'as far as,' lit. 'stretching from,' e.g. aliqua-tenus, hac-tenus (on which see § 10. 4; cf. prō-tinus, § 4).

§ 55. Trans, across (Umbr. traf, trahaf), is either the Pres. Part. of *trāre, in-trare, pēnē-trare (probably the Nom. Sg. Masc. crystallized in Adverbial usage; cf. § 2), or is an extension of an obsolete Preposition *trans (an Acc. Sg. Fem. from the same root) by the same particle *s(e) as appears in the Prepositions of kindred meaning, ul-s, ci-s. It is clearly connected with O. Ir. trē or tria, trí, trem-, tar, W. trwy, trach, O. Ind. tirās, all from the root ter-, 'to go through, drive through' (O. Ind. tr-, 'to bore,' Gk. τείπω, Lat. ēro, &c.). The -ans, pronounced -as (ch. ii. § 66), of trans became before voiced consonants ā by the Latin phonetic law (ch. iv. § 151), e.g. trā-do (but transdo C. I. L. I. 198, 11. 54, 58, &c.), trā-mitto (and trans-mitto). Umbr. traf, trahaf (i.e. tràf), trà governs the Acc. with a verb of motion, e.g. traf sahatam etu 'trans Sanctam ito,' the Loc. with the idea of rest, e.g. trahaf sahate vitla trif feetu 'trans Sanctam vitulas tris facito.'

§ 56. Uls, ultrā, beyond, on the other side, came from the same root, I.-Eur. ol- (whence Lat. ille, O. Lat. olle for *ol-sō, ch. vii. § 13), the first being augmented by the particle *s(e) (§ 11), the second (an Abl. Sg. Fem.) by the suffix -tero- (ch. v. § 16). The ō has become ā before the combination l with a consonant by the Latin phonetic law (ch. iv. § 20), but the original vowel appears in oltimus (Osc. últiumo-) in Ennius' description of Servius Tullius (A. 337 M.):

mortalem summum fortuna repente
reddidit ut summo regno famul oltimus (MSS. optimus) esset.

(The ovis of the MS. of Varro L. L. v. 50 is a scribe's emendation of vis, the same mis-writing of uls as occurs later in v. 83, or is due to the correction of ols to uls, and should not be printed outs, which would imply ūls. The shortness of the vowel is proved by the Romance forms of ultra; cf. Gell. xii. 13. 8 on the extension
of in, cis, uls to intra, citra, ultra: quoniam parvo exiguoque sonitu obscuarius promebantur, addita est tribus omnibus eadem syllaba. It is a mistake to suppose that there is an accent to indicate length over the first vowel of ultra in Claudius' tablet at Lyons.) An original *ol-s(e) must have become *oll in Latin; the form uls is due to a later re-addition of s on the analogy of ci-s, &c. (cf. ch. viii. § 68 on fer-s).

§ 57. Usqué, with long u, to judge from Romance forms like O. Fr. usque, Fr. jusque for de usque (for Lat. ē would be represented by o, see ch. ii. § 26), is formed from the I.-Eur. Preposition *ud, 'out, up out' (O. Ind. úd, Goth. út, Engl. out) in the same way as asbusque from I.-Eur. *ap(o) (§ 12), so is not connected with usquam (§ 10. 9).

The Prepositional use of this Adverb (see § 11), e.g. usque quintum diem, Cels. (in Cic. only 'usque Romam,' &c.; so Ter. Ad. 655 Miletum usque, but Cato R.R. xlix. 2 usque radices persequito), is due to a curtailment of the proper phrase usque ad, much as in Attic Greek ὡς (for ὡς εἰς) came to be used as a Preposition, e.g. ὡς τὸν βασιλέα λέγει. The Latin grammarians point out that usque, unlike other Prepositions (cf. p. 573), can take a Preposition as prefix, e.g. abusque, adusque (Expl. in Donat. 517. 22 K. nemo enim dicit 'de post forum,' nemo enim 'ab ante'; at vero dicimus 'ab usque' et 'ad usque'); ab usque was a poetic inversion of Virgil's which found its way into Silver Age prose (A.L.L. vi. 80); ad usque (first in Catull. iv. 24) is likewise a phrase of Augustan poetry and Silver Age prose (A.L.L. vii. 107).

58. Versus, versum, adversus, adversum, exadversus, exadversum. Versus apparently a Nom. Sg. Masc., as versum is an Acc. Sg. Neut., of the P. P. P. versus, corresponds to the Celtic Preposition meaning 'towards,' 'against' (O. Ir. frith, fri, W. wrth, O. W. gurt). On its Adverbial use, see § 2.
CHAPTER X.

CONJUNCTIONS AND INTERJECTIONS.

§ 1. CONJUNCTIONS. As Prepositions are hardly separable from Adverbs of Locality, so Conjunctions are closely connected with pronominal Adverbs. These pronominal Adverbs, as we have seen (ch. ix. § 10), are not always capable of being referred to their proper case-form (e.g. ἄρ̄, ἄρα), owing to our imperfect knowledge of the declension of the I.-Eur. pronoun. Nor is it easy to find their cognates in the various I.-Eur. languages; so rapidly does the meaning of a Conjunction alter. Thus Latin enim, which in the older literature is a particle of asseveration, 'indeed,' had by the classical period appropriated the sense of 'for'; and in French, pas (Lat. passus) and point (Lat. punctum) have acquired a negative sense from their use in the phrases ne . . . pas, ne . . . point. A feature of I.-Eur. Conjunctions is their tendency to append other Conjunctions or conjunctive Particles (e.g. ὡς in Greek may append ὡς, ὡς, ὡς, &c., ὡς ὡς, ὡς ὡς); and this habit puts another obstacle in the way of identifying cognate Conjunctions in different languages, for in one language they may appear extended by one particle, in another language by another. The exact form of these conjunctive Particles is also a difficult thing to ascertain; we often see parallel stems in -o, -i, -u, &c. (e.g. *q̄o-, *q̄e-, *q̄i-, *q̄u- are all various forms of the Relative and Interrogative Pronoun-stem, ch. vii. § 23; -tē and -tī appear in O. Ind. u-tā, Gk. ā-tē, O. Ind. i-tī, Gk. ē-tu), and parallel forms with long and with short vowel (e.g. Negative *nē and *nē appear in O. Ind. nā and nā, Lat. nē- and nē-; I.-Eur. *wē, 'or,' O. Ind. vā, Lat. -vē); and the tendency was always
present to adapt the ending of one Conjunction to the ending of another Conjunction of similar meaning (e.g. Lat. saltem for saltim, adapted to an-tem, ǔ-tem?, ch. ix. § 4). It will therefore be best to designate these conjunctive Particles according to their consonants, as, for example, (1) the T-particle of Lat. tam, ǔ-tem, u-ţi(ć), Gk. aős-re, O. Ind. u-tú(-ā), i-ti, 'so,' O. Sl. te, 'and'; (2) the D-particle of O. Ind. i-dā, 'now' (Lat. ǔdō-neus ?); dum, ǔbic-dem, Gk. δή, δέ, δ-δε; (3) the DH-particle of Gk. ἐν-θα, O. Ind. kú-ha, 'where,' O. Sl. kū-de, 'where;' (4) the P-particle of Lat. quip-pe, nem-pe, Lith. kaĩ-p, 'how, as,' zėip . . . teip, 'so . . . so'; (5) the N-particle of Lat. nam, num, nem-pe, quis-nam, O. Ind. hi-nū, 'for,' O. Sl. tu-nū, 'then.' These particles are not easily distinguished on the one hand from the particles affixed to Prepositions (e.g. *-tī of O. Ind. prá-tī, Gk. προ-τί, Osc. per-t; *-nē of Lat. pō-ne, Umbr. post-ne, Germ. vo-n), as has been already mentioned (ch. ix. § 11), nor on the other are they always to be distinguished from Case-suffixes. Indeed the usage of the oldest Indian literature, where, for example, the particle kām is often added to a Dativus Commodi or to a Dative of Purpose (see Delbrück, Altind. Syntax, p. 150), and other particles are more or less allotted to special cases, suggests that the Case-suffixes may have at the first originated in this way, just as Gk. ἀν came in time to be a sign of a Mood of the Verb. Thus not only has the -s of the Nom. Sg. Masc. been with great probability referred to the pronominal-stem *so-(*se-)(ch. vii. § 13), but also the Abl. -d to the suffix *dē expressive of motion, joined with an Accusative, in the sense of motion towards, in Gk. δόμον-δε, Gen. -s (which in Greek and other languages has the function of an Abl.) to the similar *sē of Gk. ἀλλο-σε. The person-suffixes of Verbs may often have had a similar origin. The *-dhī of the 2 Sg. Imper. in O. Ind., Gk. &c., e.g. ἐ-θα, is the asseverative particle *dhî, joined to Imperatives, as Lat. dum in ągę dum; the *-tōd of the 2 Sg. Fut. Imper., e.g. quando uidebis, dato, Plaut., is the Adverbal Abl. Sg. Neut. of the Pronoun *to-, 'from this,' 'thereupon' (ch. viii. § 57). And in the declension of the Pronouns themselves we have clear instances of the progress of appended particles to case-suffixes in *gę (Gk. γε) used as the sign of the Acc. Sg. in Goth. mi-k, Germ. mi-ch, *gī (O. Ind. hi,
Gk. \( \text{val-\chi} \) as the sign of the Dat. Sg. in O. Ind. má-hy-am, ch.vii. § 1). The -\( d \) of the Acc. Sg. of the Personal Pronouns in Latin has been similarly explained as the particle *\( id \), so common in the oldest Indian literature, where it is used to emphasize a preceding word, so that Lat. tēd was originally *tē id (cf. tuām īd in the Rig-Veda) (see ch. vii. § 1).

§ 2. (1) Conjunctive.—Que, et, atque, ac, quoque, etiam. -Que, I.-Eur. *-q\( \_\_\_ \)e (O. Ind. ca, Gk. \( r\_\_\_ \), Goth. -h, e.g. ni-h 'ne-que'), apparently the bare stem of the Relative *q\( \_\_\_ \)o-(*q\( \_\_\_ \)e-) (ch. vii. § 23), is in Latin, as it was in I.-Eur., an enclitic appended to the first word of the sentence. Through Syncope, to which final -\( e \) was always liable in Latin (ch. iii. § 36), it has become -\( e \) in nec (neque), ac for *at-c (at-que), &c., and probably often had this sound before an initial consonant in the rapid utterance of every-day life. In some lines of Plautus (Stich. 696, Capt. 246, Poen. 419, &c.) we must, if the reading of the MSS. be right, scan: dúmq(ue) se exóratn; pérq(ue), cōnsércuitium commūne, &c. (Skutsch, Forschungen, i. p. 151). I.-Eur. *-q\( \_\_\_ \)e gave a relative and indefinite sense to pronouns, and so in O. Latin, though in the classical period the fuller ending -cunque (O. Lat. -quomque, e.g. queiquomque, C. I. L. i. 197. 5; 198, &c.; see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v.) is preferred, e.g. quem-que Plaut. for quem-cunque (O. Ind. kaš-ca, Hom. Gk. ὅς \( r\_\_\_ \), Goth. hvō-h F.); so quis-que, each (cf. O. Ir. cá-ch, W. pawb, O. W. paup, apparently from I.-Eur. *q\( \_\_\_ \)o-q\( \_\_\_ \)e or *q\( \_\_\_ \)a-q\( \_\_\_ \)e). This -cunque seems to be nothing but cum-que, 'whenever' (Hor. C. i. 32. 15), though some connect it with O. Ind. caná (with ka-, &c., 'whoever,' &c.), and others make the -cun- (-cum-) a byform of um- (-un-) of um-quam, &c. (ch. ix. § 10. 7). The corresponding particle in Ocean is -pîd (O. Ind. -cit), e.g. pokka-píd 'quandoque.' Lat. quō-que is composed of some part of the Pronoun-stem quo- (que-) and the enclitic -que (perhaps the bare Pronoun-stem; cf. O. Ind. kva-ca, 'anywhere, in any case,' from kva, 'where,' and ca, Lat. -que). Similarly, at-que, of the Preposition (Adverb) ad and the enclitic, lit. 'and to,' 'and further'; in O. Lat. it often signifies 'forthwith,' e.g. Plaut. Most. 1050:

quōniām conuocāui, atque illi me ēx senatu sēgregant.
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 Umbrian *ape, when, also spelt *api, appei, may be the same formation as Lat. *atque. The Umbro-Oscan equivalents of Lat. *nēque, Osc. *nep, *neip, *nip, Umbr. *neip, *nep, have -p for I.-Eur. *qē. *Et is the I.-Eur. Adverb *ēti (O. Ind. *āti, ‘over,’ Gk. étō, further), used in Latin, as in Gothic (ij, ‘and ’), for the copula. It may be that it gradually encroached on the sphere of the older -guē, for it is noticeable that only -gue, not ēt, is found in the (restored) inscription on the Columna Rostrata (C. I. L. i. 195). The Umbrian copula is also et, but in Oscan inīm, a word related to Lat. enim (see below).

 In ēt-iam, et is associated with the Adverb jam, now, the *i (y) becoming vocalic by the Latin phonetic law in the middle of a word, as in mēdis (I.-Eur. *mēdhyos, O. Ind. mādhyas, Gk. μέδας, &c.) (ch. iv. § 67).

 § 3. Atque, ac. On Republican Inscriptions the rule is that atque be used before an initial vowel, ac before an initial consonant, and so in the MSS. of Terence. But in the MSS. of Plautus atque is sometimes used before a consonant, where the metre requires the pronunciation ac (e. g. Epid. 522), and in the MSS. of Cato atque is the prevailing spelling (whatever Cato's pronunciation may have been) before initial consonants and vowels alike. The classical authors, as well as Plautus, seem to avoid ac not only before vowels, but also before c, g, q (see Georges, Lex. Worf. s. v.; Skutsch, Forsch. i. 52; B. P. W. xiii. 312). Atque is the spelling in Republican inscriptions; atque occurs in the Res Gestae of Augustus (onec), and is in later inscriptions very frequent, as well as in good MSS. (see Neue, ii. 953). Atque atque seems to mean ‘nearer and nearer’ in Ennius, Ann. 519 M.:

 atque atque accedit muros Romana iuuentus.

 § 4. (2) Disjunctive.—Ve, aut, vel, sive, seu. -Vē is I.-Eur. *-wē, (O. Ind. vá, e. g. nūktam vá dívá vá, ‘by night or by day,’ Hom. Gk. νυκτί-(F)έ, probably a curtailment of an I.-Eur. Adverb *āwē (O. Ind. áva, ‘away’). The I.-Eur. particle had also the sense of ‘as,’ ‘like,’ seen in Lat. ce-u, O. Ind. i-va, ‘as,’ e-vá, ‘thus,’ later e-vám.

 Aut is compounded of I.-Eur. *au [Gk. αὖ, again, Goth. au-k, ‘also’ (quasi *au-ye), Engl. eke], another curtailment of the same Adverb (cf. au-fūgō, auf-ēro, ch. ix. § 12), and the particle -tī (§ 1). Similar are Umbr. ote, Osc. avti and avt, though the latter Oscan form has generally the sense of Latin autem.

 Vēl is the old 2 Sg. Pres. Imperative of vīlo (ch. viii. § 58), lit.
The Latin Language.

Section 5. (3) Adversative.—At, ast, sed, autem, atqui, tamen, ceterum, verum, vero. *At* is the I.-Eur. Adverb *ät(i)* (O. Ir. aith-, 'back,' Lith. at-, O. Sl. otū, 'from'), used in Latin, as in Gothic (ap-)jan, 'but'), as a Conjunction. On its confusion in spelling with the Preposition *ad*, see ch. ii. § 76.

Ast is a Conjunction found in old laws in various senses (Charis. 229. 30 K. 'ast' apud antiquos variam vim contulit vocibus, pro atque, pro ac, pro ergo, pro sed, pro tamen, pro tum, pro cum, ut in glossis antiquitatum legimus scriptum), especially (1) 'if further,' 'and if moreover,' e.g. Lex Serv. Tull.: si parentem puer uerberet, ast olle plorasit, puer diuis parentem sacer esto; (2) 'if,' e.g. XII Tab. 10. 8 (in the curious law referring to the use of gold in dentistry): ... neue aurum addito, at cui auro dentes iuncti escunt, ast im cum illo sepeliet uretue, se fraude esto), and occasionally in the early writers, e.g. with the sense of 'if further,' Plaut. Capt. 683:

si ego hie peribo, ast ille ut dixit nón redit,

with the sense of 'further' or 'but,' Accius, Trag. 260 R.:

*idem* splendet sæpe, ast idem nimbis interdum nigret.

It may be a formation from *ad*, and stand for *ad-s-tī as post for
*po-s-tī (ch. ix. § 40), so that its original signification would be 'further,' 'moreover,' though, owing to the custom of using it in the added clause of the protasis in conditional sentences, it came to acquire the notion of 'if further,' and even of 'if.' It is one of the archeaisms used by Cicero in drawing up his code of laws (Legg. ii. 8. 19, &c.), who gives it the senses of (1) 'if further,' (2) 'if' (so on the law relating to the Ludi Saeculares of Augustus' reign, *ast quid est 'siquid est'), (3) 'further' (so in Cicero's translation of Aratus's Prognostica, l. 160). The Augustan poets revived the use of the word, as a substitute for *at, where the metre required a long syllable, and in the second cent. A.D. it passed into prose. If *astel on the Dvenos inscription (usually explained as adstel) be really *ast, it is a byform with the particle -d(e) like *postid (ch. ix. § 40).

*Séd, if we may believe the statement of some grammarians (Charis. 112. 5 K.; Mar. Victorin. 10. 13 K.; Ter. Scaur. 12. 8 K.; Isid. Orig. i. 26. 24), who argue against the spelling *set (ch. ii. § 76), was at some early period *sedum. The word can hardly be separated from the Preposition (Adverb) *sē, (sed), 'apart' (ch. ix. § 51), and may be a compound of *sē, a byform of *sē, with the Conjunctive particle *dum (see below).

Autem adds the particle -tem (cf. ḫ-tem) to the I.-Eur. Adverb *au [Gk. aŭ, again, Goth. au-k, 'also' (quasi *aŭ-γε), Engl. eke], which is probably identical with the Preposition *au- of Lat. aŭferō, au-fāgīo (ch. ix. § 12), and cognate with the I.-Eur. Conjunction *wē (see under Lat. -ve). The Ocean equivalent of autem is avt, apparently a 'doublet' of avti, the equivalent of aut (§ 4). The older usage of autem is seen in passages like Plaut. Merc. 118:

et cúrrendum et pugnándum et autem iūrīgandumst in uia,

(cf. *sed autem, Rud. 472; et autem, Poen. 841).

Atquit adds to the Conjunction *at the particle quī, which is much used by the early Dramatists as a mere particle of emphasis [e.g. Plaut. Herele qui (Pseud. 473), utinam qui, ut qui (Trin. 637)], and which is either the Abl., Loc. or Instr. Sg. of the Relative (ch. vii. § 25). Atquin (on this spelling, see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v.) has the particle -n(e) appended (§ 1, above).

Tamēn however, 'none the less,' is clearly related to tam (ch. ix.
§ 10. 8), so, ‘equally much,’ which was often used in the sense of *tamen* in O. Lat. (Fest. 548. 3 Th. antiqui ‘tam’ etiam pro tamen usi sunt, with examples from Naevius, Ennius, and Titinius; for examples in Plautus, see Seyffert, *Stud. Plaut.* p. 14) (cf. class. *tam-etē* and *tamen-etē*). Some see in *tam-en* a relic of the earlier usage, retained in Umbro-Oscan, of putting the Preposition *in* (older *en*) after the word it governs, e.g. Umbr. *arvam-en* ‘in arvum,’ Pel. pritrom-*e* ‘praeter’ quasi ‘praeterum-in’ (ch. ix. § 30); others suppose that the particle -*nē* (of *quando*-ne, &c., § 1), appended to *tam*, produced *tam-i-ne* or *tamen(e* and quote Plaut. *Mil.* 628, where the MSS. reading points to *tamine*, as a proof that interrogative -*ne* appended to *tam* produced this same form:

\[\text{tām capulares? tānne tibi diu uideor uitam uīuere.}\]

On the other hand *tanne* is mentioned by Festus 542. 26 Th. as the O. Lat. form of *tam* with interrogative -*ne*, and exemplified by Afranius, *Com.* 410 R.: *tanne ārcula Tūa plena est arānecurum?* Festus also quotes *tame*, as an old form of *tam*, on which see ch. ix. § 10. 8.

*Cētērum* is the adverbial Acc. Sg. Neut. of the stem *cētero*- (Nom. Pl. *cēteri*), as *cetera* in such a line as Virg. *A.* ix. 656: *cētera parce puer bello, ‘for the rest—you are a boy—deal sparingly with war,’ is an adverbial Acc. Pl. Neut. *Cētērum* of Plautus’ *Truc.* 847, &c. is exactly parallel to *unum* of Plautus, *Mil.* *Glor.* 24 nisi *unum epityra ei ēstur insanüm bene, ‘but—one thing,—&c.’ The root of the word is the I.-Eur. pronominal *ke*, which shows the short vowel in the Latin enclitic -*ce* of *hujus-ce*, &c. (ch. vii. § 15), the long vowel in Lat. *cē-teri*, &c. (see § 1 on the variation of quantity in pronominal *wē*, *nē*, &c., and cf. ch. iv. § 33).

*Vērum* is similarly an adverbial Acc. Sg. Neut. of the Adj.-stem *vero-*, true, and *verō* an adverbial Abl. (Instr.?) Sg. Neut. of the same stem.

§ 6. (4) Limitative and Corrective.—Quidem, *immo*. The formation of *quidem* has not yet been satisfactorily explained. The *qui*- may be the bare stem of the Pronoun (see § 2 on *quī*-
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qui); or if idem represents *禹-dem, quidem may be the Neuter Pronoun with the suffix -dem (§ 2) *quid-dem (but see ch. vii. § 21 on idem).

Equidem might be similarly explained as et-quidem [cf. Plaut. Pers. 187 et quidem (A), eq. (P)], but is better referred to the pronominal prefix e- of e-nos, Umbro-Osc. e-tanto-, &c., augmented by the particle -ce in ec-quis, and in ecce (see § 19). Its association with the first Personal Pronoun in Cicero and other good writers (see Neue, ii8. p. 963) shows that to a Roman the first syllable suggested a reference rather to ego than to et (cf. Prisc. ii. 103. 5 H.; ecce in Plautus very often refers to the person speaking, A. L. L. v. 18). The exact truth regarding its use in Plautus is not easy to ascertain, for the MSS. frequently write it for et quidem (e. g. Pers. 187), and editors often substitute it for quidem after tu, me, &c. to avoid the scansion tu qui-dem, me qui-dem (like siquidem, ch. iii. § 51), or the division of a dactyl between two words in iambic and trochaic metres, e. g. atque quidem.

Immo (not imo1, according to Brambach, Hülfsbüchlein, s. v.) has the scansion of a pyrrhic (w w) according to the MSS. in passages like Terence, Phorm. 936:

immo uero uxorem túdo. In ius ámbula,
a scansion which has not yet been accounted for. Nor is the derivation of the word at all clear. One theory makes it Adver- bial Abl. Sg. Neut. of imus, another analyzes it into in-mō, 'in magis,' supposing *mō to be an I.-Eur. Comparative 'more,' whence comes Gaul. -mā-rus of Virdo-mārus, O. Ir. már, mōr, 'great,' &c.

§ 7. (5) Explanatory.—Enim, nam, namque, quippe, nempe, nemut. Enim, in O. Lat. an asseverative particle merely (cf. class enim-vero), a usage imitated by Virgil, e. g. A. viii. 84:

quam pius Aeneas tibi enim, tibi, maxima Juno,
mae tat sacra ferens,
is most naturally referred to I.-Eur. *eno- (*ene-) (cf. O. Ind. anā, 'indeed,' 'for'), another form of I.-Eur. *no- (*ne-) (§ 1), (cf. illim from ille, istim from iste, ch. ix. § 10. 5). The weak point of this etymology is that it prevents us from connecting the word

1 Imo occurs in the Aes Italicense of 176-180 A.D. (C. I. L. ii. 6278, l. 20).
directly with *einem* 'igitur' of the Dvenos inscription, Pel. inom (?), 'et,' Ose. *inim,* 'et' Umbr. *enom* (enum-ek, inum-ek, with the particle -ce of Lat. *hujus-ce, &c.), also *enem* 'tum,' which all show the Pronominal root i- of Lat. *is* (ch. ix. § 19) prefixed to a form (-nim, -nom) of the root no- (ne-). Lat. *enim* (from *e-no-) will stand to O. Lat. *enom* of the Dvenos inscr. (from *ei-no- ; cf. O. Ind. *éna-,* 'he,' *éná,* 'so, here'), as O. Ind. *asä-ú,* 'this' (from *e-so-) to O. Ind. *éśá-,* 'this' (from *ei-so-).

_Nam_, often used in O. Lat. in questions, e.g. 'quid cerussa opus nam?' 'why, what is the use of paint?' Plaut. (cf. *quis-nam*), without that definite sense of 'for,' 'because' to which the word is restricted in classical literature (but cf. *uti-nam*), is the same case-form of the Pronominal-stem *no-* (§ 1) as quam of *qno-, lam of *to- (Acc. Sg. Fem. ?, ch. ix. § 10. 8).

_Namque_ adds to *nam* the enclitic -quē (§ 2). It is used only before an initial vowel in Plautus and Terence.

_Quippē_ appends the particle -pe (§ 1) to some case of the Relative or Interrogative or Indefinite Pronoun, either the Acc. Sg. Neut. *quippe* for *quid-pe* (cf. *quippīni* equivalent to *quidni*), or (if -ipp- can represent -ip- in Latin; cf. _ipsippe_ 'ipsi neque alii' Paul. Fest. 74. 37 Th., and see p. 116 n.), the Loc. Instr. Sg., *quippe* for *quip-pe*, or else the Abl. Sg. _quippe_ for *quid-pe._

_Nempē_ appends the same particle to a form *nem* (the same case-form of the Pronominal-stem *no-*, as -tem of _autem_ is of the stem *to-). This form *nem* appears also in O. Lat. nemut ' nisi etiam vel nempe' (Fest. 160. 28 ; Paul. Fest. 161. 13 Th.). On the pronunciation _nemp(e)_ before initial consonants, see ch. iii. § 35.

§ 8. (6) Conclusive.—_Ergo, itaque, igitur._ _Ergō_ has already been explained, in connexion with its use as a Preposition, e.g. _funeris ergo_ (ch. ix. § 28), as possibly standing for _ē *rögo_ (cf. _e rögione_), 'from the direction,' and has been compared with German wegen, M. H. G. vonwegen.

_Itaque_, compounded of *ūtā* (ch. ix. § 10. 9), and -quē (§ 2), seems, like _ita_, never to have _ā_ even in the earliest poetry. We should scan the Saturnian line of the epitaph of Naevius (ap. Gell. i. 24. 2):

_Itaque postquam est Orcho traditus thesauro_ (see p. 128 n.)
The grammarians of the Empire distinguish *itāque*, therefore, from *itāque*, and so, *et ita,* (e.g. Serv. in Don. 427. 13 K. tune corripitur media cum una pars fuerit orationis, tune vero producitur cum duas), but short *a* is invariably shown in the Dramatists in both senses of the word. The grammarians’ rule about *itāque* resembles their rule for the penultimate accentuation of *plerāque, utrāque*, Nom. Sg. Fem. (cf. ch. ii § 93 on Late Lat *āqua, aequa*).

*igitur* had in O. Lat. the sense of *tum* (Paul. Fest. 74. 29 Th. *igitur* nunc quidem pro completionis significatione valet, quae est ergo. Sed apud antiques ponebatur pro inde et postea et tum), as in Plaut. *Mil.* 772:

quándo habebo, *igitur* rationem meárum fabricárǐm dabo,

or in the first law of the XII Tab.: si in ius uocat, ni it, antestamino. *igitur* em capitō. The etymology of the word, one of the most puzzling in Latin, is discussed in ch. ix. § 8.

§ 9. (7) Optative.—*Ut, utinam*. *Ut*, in wishes, e.g. Jupiter ut Danaum omne genus pereat, is the Conjunction *ut*, that (older *ulti*, ch. iii. § 36), with suppression of the idea ‘I wish’ or ‘do thou grant.’

In *utinam* the final *i* of *ut(ī)* is retained, and *num* has its older sense of a strengthening particle, ‘indeed’ (§ 7).

§ 10. (8) Interrogative.—*Ne, nonne, num, utrum, an, anne, cur, quare, quianam*. In class. Latin *-nē* is the general interrogative particle, while *nonnē* is limited to questions which expect an affirmative, *num* to those which expect a negative, answer. This distinction is unknown to Plautus, who uses *nonne* hardly at all (e.g. *Trin.* 789), (-*ne* being used instead, e.g. *Trin.* 178, *Meu.* 284, or *nōn*, e.g. *Stich.* 606), and *num*, *numquis* without a negative sense occasionally, e.g. *Most.* 999. (A list of examples of the Interrogative Particles in Plautus and Terence is given in *Amer. Journ. Phil.* vol. xi. 1890.) It is easy to see how these meanings came to be attached to *non-ne, ‘is . . . not,’ and *num, ‘now’* [Gk. *vew*; cf. *nūne* for *num-e(e)*, ch. ix. § 10], e.g. *nonne haec ita sunt?*, ‘is not this the case?’; *num haec ita sunt?*, ‘now is this the case?’ (with emphasis on the word ‘is’).

*Ne* is probably I.-Eur. *nē* (Zend *-na*, appended to Interrogatives, e.g. *kas-nā, ‘who then?’*; cf. O. H. G. na weist tu na,
‘nescisne?’), though it might also represent I.-Eur. *nū (ch. iii. § 37) (O. Ind. nū, in the phrase: kathā nū, ‘how then?’; cf. Hom. τί νό μοι μήκοστα γένηται). On its reduction by Syncope to -n, e.g. vidēn, audēn, see ch. iii. § 36.

*Ultron* is the adverbial Acc. Sg. Neut. of *üler*, like Gk. πόρεπον.

*An* (Goth. an; cf. Gk. ἄν, in that case) belongs to the I.-Eur. pronominal root seen in Lith. aūn, ‘that,’ O. Sl. onū, &c.

*Cur* (O. Lat. quōr) is I.-Eur. *qū'r [Lith. kuŗ, ‘where,’ for *kūr (I. F. ii. 420); cf. O. H. G. hwār, ‘where?’], from I.-Eur, *q̞ū'r, and O. Ind. kār-hi, ‘when?’, from I.-Eur. *q̞ūr], with a change of ŏ to ū in a monosyllable before final -r (ch. iv. § 16) that has a parallel in *fūr* from *fōr* (Gk. φῶρ). It may also represent I.-Eur. *q̞ou* (Gk. ποῦ, where?) with the suffix -r. (On O. Lat. ā, class. ū for the I.-Eur. diphthong ou, see ch. iv. § 41.)

*Quīrē*, which must not be connected with *cur*, since the length of the final vowel makes the idea of Syncope impossible (calcarē becomes calcar, but avarē could not become *avar*) is the Ablative of Cause, just as *ei rei* Plaut. Truc. 394 (quo rei te adsimulare retulit?) is the Dative of Purpose, of the word-group *quae res?* (cf. *quamobrem?*). Plautus uses *cur* or *quamobrem*, *quoi rei*, but perhaps not quare. (Epid. 597 quare filiam Credidisti nostram? is bracketed by Goetz.)

*Quīōnam*, in O. Lat. poetry (Fest. 340. 25 Th.; ‘Servius’ ad Virg. A. x. 6) (not in Comedy, so not colloquial; Langen, Beitr. p. 326), and adopted as an archaism occasionally by Virgil (A. v. 13 and x. 6), is the adverbial (I-stem) Acc. Pl. Neut. of *quis-nam* (ch. vii. § 28), as *quid-nam* is the adverbial Acc. Sg. in such a phrase of Plautus as: *quid tu, malum, nam me retrahis?, ‘plague on you, why do you pull me back?’

§ 11. (9) Comparative.—*Ut*, uti, quasi, ceu, quam. *Ut*, of which the final short vowel is preserved in *ūtī-nam, ne-ūtī-quam*, [pronounced *u(e)nti*quam with first, as well as second, syllable short], *ūtī-que*, is one of those Relative Particles that appear in Latin with initial *u*, but in the Umbro-Oscan dialects with an initial *p*, which is their usual equivalent for an I.-Eur. labiovelar guttural (see ch. iv. § 135). The Umbro-Oscan forms are discussed in ch. ix. § 10. 9.


§ 11.

**CONJUNCTIONS.**

Ütī is in O. Lat. utei (e. g. on the S. C. Bacch. of 186 b.c., C. I. L. i. 196).

Quaśi. It is difficult to derive quasi from quam si, though the two expressions were undoubtedly equivalents: e. g. in the Republican Laws quasei is the usual form, as in the Bantine tablet of 133–118 b.c., C. I. L. i. 197. l. 12, in the Lex Repetundarum of 123–122 b.c., i. 198. l. 41 (cf. l. 73), but quanseis occurs in the Lex Agraria of 111 b.c., i. 200. l. 27; and in Plautus we have (1) quam sī in the sense of the usual quaśi in Poen. 241 item . . . quam si, (2) quaśi in the sense of ‘than if,’ (quam si) in Mil. 482, &c. (see Brix’s note on Trin. 265). For the first syllable of quasi was so thoroughly short that it acted as a ‘Brevis Brevians’ and made the normal quantity of the final vowel of -sī short as early as the time of Plautus, whereas the combination nas (ns) properly lengthens a preceding vowel in Latin (ch. ii. § 144). We are thus driven to suppose that quam (adverbial Acc. Sg. Fem.) and quasi (adverbial Acc. Pl. Neut.) were two equivalent Conjunctions which were joined with si to denote (1) as, (2) than if, and that the classical usage made a differentiation of them, assigning the sense of ‘as’ to the combination qua-si and the sense of ‘than if’ to the combination quam-si.

Ceu, which is restricted to the Epic and Lyric Poets and a few Silver Age prose writers (the elder Pliny, &c.), is compounded of the Pronominal-stem *kö- (kē-), ‘this’ (ch. vii. § 15) and the particle *wē, ‘as, like’ (§ 4). It has been supposed that as sen is a syncopated form of sive [*sei-w(e), § 4], ceu must come from a fuller form *kēi-w(e), the Locative Case of the Pronoun with the particle *wē. But of this fuller form there is no trace, so it is better explained as *cē-ve (cf. cē-teri) (ch. iv. § 33).

Quam is the Acc. Sg. Fem. of the Relative, as tam of the Demonstrative (ch. ix. § 10). The two words are combined in tanquam. Its Oscan equivalent is pan (Zvet. I. I. I. 231. 6 mais egn[as tovī]cas amnul pan pieium brateis ‘magis rei publicae causa quam cujuspiam gratiae’) or pam (ib. 231. 16 pruter pam medicatinom didest ‘prieusquam judicamentum debit’). In O. Lat. we have a form augmented by -dē, quamde, e. g. Liv. Andr. ap. Fest. 532. 8 Th.:

nāmque nullum pēius màcerat humānum quàmde màre saēuom nīs et eui sunt māgnae,
§ 12. (10) Temporal.—Quum, quando, dum, donec, ut, ubi. Quum, O. Lat. quom, is most simply explained as an Adverbial Acc. Sg. Neut. of the Relative, an I.-Eur. *qum. Terentius Scaurus (28. 9 K.) mentions an old form of the word (MSS. cuine, for which editors read quonne or cuime), and quotes a couplet from the Carmen Saliare; but unfortunately the passage in the MSS. is so corrupt that little certain has hitherto been made of the lines (see ch. viii. § 73). The Umbrian word ponne, pone and the Oscan pún, pon seem to be compounded of I.-Eur. *qum and a particle -dē [cf. O. Lat. quande for quam (Umbr. pane, Oosc. pan) § 11; and see below on quan-do].

Quandō seems to be the Acc. Sg. Fem. of the Relative with the I.-Eur. Preposition *dō, 'to,' or with some form of the particle -de of O. Lat. quande, than (§ 11). The Faliscean form quando (cu- or cv-) (Zvet. I. I. I. 70 quando datu) affords presumption that the word did not end originally in -d, so that -dō would not be an Abl. The 'Preposition' -do, 'to' (ch. ix. § 27) would give a suitable sense, 'to what' (sc. time), for in Plautus the Conjunction is mainly temporal, though in Terence it is mainly causal, as quandoquidem is at all periods of the literature (see Studienwuid's Studien, ii. pp. 85 sqq.). Varro mentions its use for quum, 'when,' as a feature of the dialects of Formiae and Fundi (ap. Charis. i11. 23 K.). In quandone (C. I. L. vi. 25048 nequa ei loci controversia quandone fieret; 25905 con qua reliquis meas quandone poni volo) we have the suffix further augmented by the particle -ne (cf. dō-nē-cum and see ch. ix. § 10; O. Sl. kū-da-no 'quando,' beside kū-da 'quando' shows another form of the N-suffix), and in quandō-quē, whenever, by the particle -quē, 'ever' (§ 2). Quandoe, quoted from the XII Tab. by Festus 346. 3 Th. (cf. Paul. Fest. 345. 4, 7 Th.) seems to be a syncopated form of quandoque as nēc of nēquē. The seansion quandoquidem, found as early as Plaut. (Trin. 991 saluos quandoquidem aduenis; some would scan quandōdem) seems to be like sīquidem (see ch. iii. § 51).
CONJUNCTIONS.

Dum, which is often a mere asseverative particle, e. g. *āgē dum (Gk. ἀγέ δῦ), quīdūm, how so? primūndum, first of all, is an Acc. Sg. Neut. from the Pronominal-stem *do-, as tum from *to-, quum from *q¬o- (Gk. δῦ is another case-form of the same stem). The phonetic laws of Latin hardly allow us to connect it with diū, diēs, which come from the root dyew-, diw-; but the first part of dū-dum, often referred to diū and dies, may come from a stem *du-, a byform of *do-, whence Gk. δῦν for δῦάν, O. Slt. dāvē, 'olim' (I. F. ii. 250). Similar parallel stems were *no- and *nu-; and as Latin num may stand for *no-m from the first or *nu-m from the second, so Lat. dum may stand for *do-m or *du-m. The temporal sense is clearly seen in the particle -dum in non-dum, etiam-dum, inter-dum, &c. On late plebeian inscriptions we find a form donec, while, e. g. C. I. L. vi. 2563:

ad tu ne propera simili qui sorte teneris,
dune annos titulo nomina ut ipse legas;

apparently an extension of dum by the particle -e(e), on the type of nume, tunc (ch. ix. § 10. 7). The connexion of the two meanings 'while' and 'until' is seen in archaic Engl., e.g. Macbeth, iii. 1. 143 while then, God be with you.

Dōnēc must be considered in connexion with the byforms dōnicum and dōnique. Dōnicum is mentioned as an O. Lat. form by Charisius (197. 15 K.), who quotes Livius Andronicus:

ibī māncens sedēto dōnicum nidebis
mé carpēnto uēhente mēam domum uēnisse,

as well as Plautus and Cato. It is naturally resolved into *do-ne (the Preposition *do, ch. ix. § 27, and the affix -ne, § 1), and cum the temporal Adverb, 'to when,' 'till when' (cf. Umbr. ar-ni-po and its Latin equivalent quo-ad. Some explain donec as a form of donicum with the last syllable dropped, but the loss of final -um in Latin is confined within strict limits [on nihil(um), no(e)n-(um), see ch. iii. § 52], and would hardly be allowed in donecum. Donec is more naturally explained as the syncopated form of doni-que (cf. nec and neque, § 18), and doni-que as *done augmented by the particle -que, 'ever' (cf. quando, when, quandoque, whenever; also dé-nique); but the weak point in this account is that donique is not found till Lucretius, and so is later than donec. Perhaps the true explanation is that donicum was appre-
hended as donec cum, and so with omission of cum became donec, while Lucretius coined a donique on the analogy of nec and neque. Whether Fr. done and the cognate Romance words come from donec is doubtful [see Körting, Lat.-rom. Wörterb. s.v.; donec in Petronius 40 (see Friedl. ad loc.) and 55 need not be translated 'then.']

Ut (see § 9). Ubi (see ch. ix. § 10. 1).

§ 13. (11) Causal.—Quum, quoniam, quod, quia, quippe. Quum (see ch. ix. § 10. 7).

Quoniam is a compound of quum (quom) and jam, the j (y) becoming vocalic by the law of Latin phonetics in the middle of a word (so I.-Eur. *mëðhyos, O. Ind. mëdhyas, Gk. μέδο(ν)ος, &c., became medius in Latin, ch.iv. § 63). Its oldest sense is temporal 'when now' (with Pres Ind., the Pres. tense being required by the jam), e.g. Plaut. Trin. 112:

quoniam hínec iturust ipsus in Seleúciam, mihi cómendauit uirginem;

and it is possible to trace its gradual development from a temporal to a causal sense in the course of Latin Literature (see Luebbert, Gramm. Stud. ii.).

Quod. I.-Eur. *q'òd (Lith. kad, 'that,' after verba declarandi, &c., also used in the sense of 'if') is the Acc. Sg. Neut. of the Relative O-stem, used like Homeríc ὅ in such a line as Od. i. 382:

τῇδεμαξῶν θαύμαζων ὥ θαρσαλὼς ἐγρανεν.

In Plautus it is always, or almost always, subject or object of a relative sentence, e.g. Capt. 586:

filium tuum quod redimere se àit, id ne utiquam mihi placet;

from the second cent. A.D. it is used with verba declarandi, &c. e.g. Apul. Met. x. 7 asserere incipit quod se vocasset.

Quíä is an Acc. Plur. Neut. of the Relative I-stem (Slov. či, 'if,' Bulg. в, 'that, because'), and has the same double meaning as quod, (1) that, (2) because. With appended -nam it had interrogative meaning 'why?' (see § 10) like quid? quidnam?

Quippe (see § 7). (On quatenus see ch. ix. § 4.)

§ 14. (12) Conditional.—Si, nisi, ni, sin, sive, seu, modo, dummodo. Si, O. Lat. sei, is a Loc. Sg. of the Pronoun *so-, seen
in Lat. *ip-se, ip-sa* (ch. vii. § 20), as Lith. *jéí, ‘if,’ of the Pronoun seen in Lat. *is, ea* (ch. vii. § 19). Greek έ has been connected by some with the Latin, by others with the Lith. conjunction. *Sic, so,* is the same word with the enclitic -e(c) appended (ch. vii. § 15). Osc. suai, Umbr. sve come from a stem *swo-* (whence Goth. sva, ‘so’), of which O. Lat. *suar *sic,* quoted from an augural prayer by Festus (526. i5 Th. suad ted ‘sic te’) is an Abl. Sg. Fem., as the Umbro-Oscan forms are Loc. Sg. Fem.; but Volscian se shows the same stem as Latin. The stems *so-*, *swo- were no doubt originally connected like the two stems of the second Sg. Personal Pronoun *twe- and *te- (ch. vii. § 3). (On sw- see ch. iv. § 68.)

*Nisi* is a compound of the negative *nē* (§ 18) with *si,* ‘not if.’ It is probably this word which is quoted in the form *nesi* (ch. ix. § 51) in a defective passage of Festus, who explains it as *sine* (166. 26 Th.); it is spelt *nisei* on the S. C. Bach, and the Lex Repetundarum, and *nise* (with *e* for the *ei-*diphthong, ch. iv. § 34) on the Lex Rubria. The change of *e* to *i* in the first syllable is due to the unaccented use of the word (as *sine* for *sē-ne, mihi* for *mehei*) (ch. iii. § 18).

The Umbro-Oscan forms have *swai* instead of *sei* (Lat. *si*), as their second component, the Negative being represented in Oscan by the Loc. Sg. form *nei* (Osc. *nei sveae*), in Umbrian by a form no (Umbr. *nose*). In that very old Latin inscription, known as the Dvenos inscription, we find the Negative in another Loc. form *noi* (is this a mere graphic variety of *nei*?), if *noisi* is rightly interpreted ‘unless.’ With the first part of *nisai* we may compare Osc. *ne pon ‘nisai quum’* (Zvet. *I. I. I.* 231. 14 *izic comono ni hipid ne pon,* &c., ‘is comitia ne habuerit nisi quum,’ &c.).

*Ni, I -Eur. *nei,* perhaps *nē* with the deictic particle -i of Gk. *óúrou-,* &c. (ch. vii. § 23), had originally the sense of *nōn* or *nē,* as in *quid-ni, quippi-ni* [Lith. *nei,* ‘not at all’; Osc. *sveae pis cens- stomen nei cebnust* ‘si quis in censum non venerit,’ *nei-p mai pomsis com pravorud actud ‘neve magis (quam) quiniques cum privato agito,’ nei *sveae ‘nisai,’ svaí nei-p *si non* ‘si nee’], and still retains this sense in some passages of O. Lat., e.g. Cato: *caueto ni quam materiem doles, and in Virg’s line: ni teneant cursus. It came however to acquire the sense of *nisai* from its
use in such phrases as si in ius uocat, ni it, XII Tab., 'if he summons him (and) he does not go,' id ni fit, pignus dato Plaut., 'lay me a wager in the event of that not happening,' lit. 'that does not happen, lay me a wager.' (See O. Brugmann, *Gebrauch des Cond. 'Ni,' 1887.)

*si* is usually said to represent *si-ne*, 'if not,' with the same syncope of the negative particle as in *quin*, lest (§ 16), or as of the interrogative particle in *audia* for *audis-ne*, &c. (§ 10); and this explanation exactly suits its use in sentences like Cic. *Epp. Pamm.* xii. 6. 2 qui si consecutus erit, victimus; *si*, —, quod di omen aver-tant, omnis omnium cursus est ad vos. But this negative sense of *si*, 'if not,' is hardly attached to the word in the 'time of Plautus. The Plautean use of *si* has been explained by the O. Lat. habit of attaching interrogative *-ne* to the first word of the relative clause, instead of to the first word of the main clause [e.g. Ter. *Phorm.* 923 quodne ego discrpsi? instead of: quod ego discrpsi, illudne rescrbam?], so that, e.g. Plaut. *Trin.* 309 si animus hominem pepulit, actumst... *si* ipse animum pepulit, uiuit, might more properly be written: *ipse* animum pepulit? *uiuit*. It is however unnecessary to regard the *n* of *si* as either the Interrogative or the Negative Particle *-ne*; for it may be merely that Demonstrative suffix *-ne* seen in *aliaquin*, &c. (§ 16) [*Quin* (see § 16) represents (1) *que* with Negative *-ne*, (2) *que* with Interrogative *-ne*, (3) *que* with Demonstrative *-ne*]. The older spelling *sein* occurs, for example, on an epitaph, much affected by the Romans 1 (Not. Scav. 1887, p. 180):

| mortua heic ego sum, et sum cinis, is cinis terrast; | seu est terra dea, ego sum dea, mortuam non sum. |
| Sine and *seu* (see ch. iv. § 33). |

*Modō* is the adverbial Abl. (Instr.? Sg. of *mādus*, measure, limit (cf. Hor. quis desiderio sit pudor aut modus?), 'only'; *dum-modo*, 'while only.' A common sense of the word is the temporal sense, 'only a little while ago' (cf. Caper 96. 15 K. *modo* praeteriti est temporis, et ideo dicendum 'modo scripsi,'

---

1 This is a translation of Epicharmus' epigram (ap. Schol. Hom. II. x. 144):

![](https://example.com/epigram.png)
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'modo feci' non 'modo scribo,' 'modo facio'; quamvis quidam veteres et praesentis putaverint), emphasized in the Praenestine dialect by the addition of tam (tam modo, inquit Praenestinus, Plaut. Trin. 609). The shortening of the final -o is due to the influence of the preceding short syllable (see ch. iii. § 42 on the Law of Breves Breviantes), like dūtō (originally *datōd) Plaut., hōvē, bēnē, mālē, &c.

§ 15. (13) Concessive.—Etsi, quamquam, quamvis, licet. The formation of all these words is evident: el-si, 'even if,' quam-quam (reduplicated), quam-vis, 'how you wish' (like quan-tum-vis, 'however much you wish' or quam-tībet, 'how you please'), līcet, 'it is allowed,' 'granted.'

§ 16. (14) Final.—Ut, quo, quominus, quin, ne, neve, neu, nedum. Ut (see § 11).

Quō is the Abl. (Instr.?) Sg. Neut. of the Relative, used with Comparatives, quo facilius like eo facilius. Quōmēnūs adds to quo the Comparative mēnis, 'less,' used in a negative sense (cf. mēnīmē, 'by no means'; pārum scīens, 'ignorant').

Quin is composed of qui, how (Abl.? Loc.? Instr.?), and the negative particle nē (§ 18), and is found with -ne (or perhaps nē, 'lest') in unsyncopated form in Ter. Andr. 334: efficitे qui detūr tibi; Ego id agam mihi quī ne detur, and in a fragment from some comedy (Com. inc. 47 R.):

haudad facile est defēnsu qui ne cómburantur próxumae.

In some instances it represents qui (Nom. Sg. Masc.) with -ne, e. g. nemo fuit quin scīret (qui nescīret); and a construction like nulla mulier fuit quin scīret, nil tam difficīle est quin exquirī possit, is best explained as a universalizing of qui Masc., as of potīs Masc. in potīs est (ch. ix. § 2), though some regard the qui of this usage as the Adv., and compare it to that Mod. Gk. use of ποῦ ῥῶ for ῥῶ mentioned in ch. vii. § 23 (I. F. iv. 226).

It is used also in other ways than as a Final Conjunction (the manifold uses of quīn were a favourite theme of Latin grammarians; see Gell. xvii. 13). Quīn in affirmations, e. g. hercle quīn recte dicīs, Plaut., may be merely the Adverb qui of
hereque qui, &c. with the Demonstrative suffix -ne (so alquìn and atqui, alioquin and alioqui, ceteroquin and ceteroqui; see on these forms Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. vv.) ; quin in commands, originally with Ind. (and so usually in Plautus), e.g. quin dicis?, then by 'constructio ad sensum' with Imper. (so usually in Ter.), e.g. quin die, is the Adverb qui with the Interrogative particle -ne, 'how not?' 'why not?'; quin in a sentence like Plaut. Trin. 360: quin comedit quod fuit, quod non fuit? (i.e. eumne dicis qui, &c.), is qui Nom. Sg. with the same particle (cf. Mil. 13 quemne ego servauï? 'you mean the man whose life I saved?' (see above, § 14 on sin).

Nē is I.-Eur. *nē, 'not' (O. Ind. nā, O. Ir. nī), a variety of I.-Eur. *nē, 'not' (Lat. nē, § 18). In O. Lat. ni (I.-Eur. *nei, Osc. nei) was used in the sense of nē (§ 14). In Umbro-Oscan i corresponds to I.-Eur. ē (Lat. e), so that Osc. ni in ni hipid 'ne habuerit,' ni fluid 'ne fuerit,' Marruc. nī in nīta[g]a 'ne tangat' exactly correspond to Lat. nē.

Nēvē adds to nō the enclitic -vē, or, which in neu is reduced by syncope (cf. sive and seu, § 14).

For nedum (especially used by Livy, also by Cicero, but rarely by the other authors) ne alone is occasionally found (Journ. Phil. xx. 177). An early instance of the word, which is not employed by Plautus, is Ter. Heaut. 454:

satrapa sī sīet
amātor, numquam sūfferre eius sumptūs queat;

lit. 'ne(dum) tu te posse credas dicò satrapam non posse,' 'satrapa non potest, nondum tu potes,' with which we may compare Plaut. Amph. 330:

uix incedo inānis, ne ire pōsse cum onerē existūmes.

Nedum is related to ne, as vixdum to vix, nondum to non; cf. Liv. xxiv. 4. 1 puerum vixdum libertatem, nendum dominationem modice laturum. On the construction and use of the word, see Harv. Stud. ii. pp. 103 sqq.

§ 17 (15) Asseverative Particles.—Ne (nae), -ne. Nē is the spelling indicated by the references to the word in the Roman grammarians, for they speak of it as the same in form with pro-
hibitive ne (Charis. 189. 2 K.; Diom. 394. 21 K.), and is also
the spelling of the best MSS. (Georges, Lex. Wortf. s.v.), though
there is no reason why there should not have been in Latin two
separate affirmative particles né and nae, as there were in Greek
vî and vât (cf. δή and δαί), representing an original *nē and *nai,
a Loc. Sg. Form (cf. Osc. svâi, ‘if,’ § 14). The form *nē corre-
sponds to *nē of the affirmative suffix -nē found in the
Dramatists with Personal and Demonstrative Pronouns; cf.
O. Scand. þēr-na ‘tibimet’ (e. g. Plaut. Mil. 565 :

ógone si post húnc diem
muttiuero, etiam quód egomet certó sciam,
dato exeruciandum mé ;

for other examples, see Amer. Journ. Phil. ii. 51), as *wē to *wē, ‘or,’
*dē to *dē, &c. (§ 1).

§ 18. (16) Negatives.—In-, ne-, nec, non, haud, ve-. Nē-
(I.-Eur. *nē, O. Ind. ná, &c.) is prefixed, not only to Verbs, e. g.
ne-scio, O. Lat. ne-vis, ne-parcunt, &c. (cf. O. Engl. nille, nolde ;
O. Sl. nēsmí, &c.), but also to other parts of speech, e. g. nē-fus,
n(e)-nliquam, neüter (nē-†I.-Eur. *nē, O. Ind. ná, &c., appears in
nēquiquam, &c.); in- (I.-Eur. *n̄, O. Ind. an-, a-, Gk. àn-, a-, &c.)
and vē- (I.-Eur. *wē, O. Ind. vá-; cf. O. Sl. u-bogú, ‘poor’),
a curtailment of I.-Eur. *awē-, O. Ind. ava-, ch. ix. § 12) only to
Adjectives, &c. (but see Langen, Beitr. p. 181 on imprébare,
infíleri, ignoscere, &c.). I.-Eur. *n̄- (Lat. in-, older en-, ch. iv. § 81),
the weak or unaccented grade of I.-Eur. *nē (ch. iv. § 51), is re-
presented in Umbro-Oscan by an-, e. g. Umbr. antakres ‘integris,’
Osc. am프rud ‘improve.’

Nōn is generally supposed to represent *noeu(um), the ‘doublet’
of noenum (usually explained as *nē-oïnom, ‘not one’) before an
initial vowel, as nihil, nihil was the similar doublet of nihilum
(ch. iii. § 52); though the absence of a satisfactory parallel for the
change of oe to õ (instead of the usual ü) has led many to see in
the first part of the word some other form of the Negative stem
(cf. Umbr. no-sve ‘ nisi,’ § 14), leaving the final n to be explained
as the particle (negative or demonstrative, § 1) *nē
(or *-nü ; cf. O. Ind. na-nú, Hom. ov vů, and see ch. iii. § 37).

Noenů (e. g. Lucr. iii. 199 noenu potest) should be written
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*noenus, and represents *ne-unus as noenum; *ne-unus (cf. dēnum and dēnum, ch. ix. § 2) with suppression of -s in pronunciation (ch. ii. § 126). The other theory makes it differ from noenum in appending *nū instead of num (§ 10).

Hand, which is confined within narrower limits than non in O. Lat., being used especially with Adjectives and Adverbs, usually immediately before the negated word, and never in questions, has been referred (along with Gk. οὐ) to I.-Eur. *aiwē- 'away' (see above on ve-), so that it would properly be spelt *and. The Roman grammarians preferred the spelling hant to hantt, e.g. Charis. 112. 8 K. haud ... d littera terminatur. ou enim Graeca vox d littera terminari apud antiques coepit), and were probably right in doing so; for the byform hau seems to be the 'doublet' (ch. ii. § 136) before an initial consonant [Mar. Vict. 15. 25 K. cum (sequens) verbum a consonanti incipit, d perdit, ut 'hau dudum' et 'hau multum' et 'hau placitura refer'], e.g. C. I. L. i. 1007 heic est sepulcrum hau pülerum pulerai fémnae. (On the spellings hand, hant, hant, see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v.) The initial h- must have been used as a distinguishing mark to differentiate the word from aut (cf. Prob. Inst. Art. 145. 9 K. 'aut' si sine aspiratione scribatur et in d litteram exeat, erit conjunctio; si vero 'haud' cum aspiratione scribatur et in d litteram exeat, erit adverbium).

Nēc in O. Lat. has the sense of non 1 [Festus 162. 14 Th. quotes XII Tab.: ast ei custos nec escit, and Plautus 'in Phasmate' (Most. 240) nec recte si illi dixeris], like Osc. neip (svai neip, dadit 'si nec dedat'), Umbr. neip (sve neip portust issoc pusei subra sverhoto est 'si nec portarit ita uti supra scriptum est'). The g of nēg-ōtium, neg-lēgo (often spelt neclego in MSS.; see Georges, Lex. Wortf. s. v.), &c. is variously explained as a phonetic change of the -c (*qē) of nec (see ch. ii. § 73), or as the particle *gē (Gk. γέ) of *nē-g(ē) (cf. Lith. nē-gi, ne-gu), a different formation from *nē-g(ē).

§ 19. INTERJECTIONS. Interjections, being for the most part onomatopoetic words, do not come under the phonetic laws

1 Catullus (lxiv. 83) uses the phrase funera nec funera to express the Greek τάφοι αταφοί.
of a language; their analysis and etymology offer little difficulty. The Latin interjections need not therefore detain us long. Oh! ah! st! are more or less the same sounds that we ourselves use to express astonishment and surprise, and to enforce silence; and they require no discussion. Many are borrowed from the Greek, especially the exclamations used at musical or other entertainments, e.g. 

&c. [in the Dramatists enge (engae) with a lengthening of the final syllable\(^1\) like our 'bravo,' 'hallo'], sophos, pala, as ours come from the Italian or French, e.g. bravo, da capo, encore. But some are peculiarly Latin and offer points of interest. Em (not to be confused with hem, an Interjection of terror, grief, &c.), which is used by the Republican Comedians, where en (Gk. \(\eta\varepsilon\)) is used by the classical writers (in the Comedians \(\epsilon\nu\) is used only in rhetorical questions, e.g. enunquam?, Plaut. Men. 142, 925), seems to be the Imperative of \(\epsilon\nu\), lit. 'take,' a sense which suits well in phrases like em tibi, 'take that!' 'there's for you!' (in giving a blow), e.g. Plaut. Asin. 431 (in ergo hoc tibi. Others make it Adverbal Acc. of is, O. Lat. \(\epsilon\nu\), 'tum' (Paul. Fest. 53, 37 Th.), which is also, perhaps properly, spelt im (ch. vii. § 19). Joined with ille (in the Acc. Case) it produces ellum [ello (with open e) is still heard in the Abruzzi], ellus, &c. So exe (O. Sl. ese and se) from the Pronominal stem *eke-(*eko-)(ch.vii.§ 15)either with appended -ce; [cf. Osc. eko-, 'this,' usually with appended -k (Lat. -ce), ekak 'hae,' ekkum 'item'], or else with doubling of consonant (as in att-at) produces eccillum, eccillos, &c., whence the Romance forms, Fr. celui, Ital. quello, &c. (see ch. vii. § 15). Eccum has been explained as exe *hun (the enclitic -ce not being appended to the Pronoun because it exists already in the Interjection, just as *ecceillunc, &c. is never found); and this analysis is preferred to exe enum, because the word is used by the Dramatists only when the person referred to is present on the stage, whereas is is the Pronoun used of persons who have been recently mentioned. Still *exe enum might be explained as a parenthesis, e.g. Amphitrudo eccum exit foras, 'A.—see him—has come out.' Eccum is the original of the Italian

---

\(^1\) Heia, the usual scansion, as in this refrain of a Late Lat. boating-song (Poet. Lat. Min. iii. p. 167 B.):

Heia, viri, nostrum reboans echo sonet heia!

appears as heia in Plaut. Merc. 998.
interjection ecco, and in Plautus often comes very near ecce, e.g. Mil. 25 ubi tu es? Eccum, Poen. 279 assum apud te eccum.

Prō (not proh, see Neue, ii3. p. 985) seems to be merely the Preposition (Adverb) prō, forth, lit. 'away with it!'

Vae, I.-Eur. *wai (Goth. vai, Lett. wai), borrowed in late Greek, vôai, is the same word as our Noun 'woe.'

Âgé is, like em, an Imperative used interjectionally, in Plautus and Terence often with the enclitic dum appended, agedum (like Gk. âye õŷ, § 1). The interjectional use of Imperatives is a feature of all languages; our 'lo' is the Imperative of 'to look,' and we have in modern Italian vie (for venî), tie or te (for tene), guar (for guardâ).

The names of deities occur in hercle, me-hercules (sc. juvet, Paul. Fest. 90. 11 Th.), me-hercle, me-castor, me-dius fidius ('the god of good faith,' with dīus for deus because the first syllable is unaccented?), pol (a curtailment of Pollux), ecastor (better eccastor, for the first syllable is long, but not long by nature, since it is shortened by the Law of Breves Breviantes in the Dramatists; see ch. iii. § 34). The last might represent et Castor, but âdêpol can hardly represent et deus Pollux, although the irregular forms assumed by many of the English interjections, 'zounds,' 'sblood,' 'marry' (for 'Mary'), show us the difficulty of tracing curtailed phrases of the kind back to their origin by the ordinary methods. Eccērē is either an invocation of Ceres or ece re, 'lo indeed.'
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A, pronunciation, 13 sqq.; phonetic changes, 219 sqq.; in weak grade of O-root, 258 sqq.; of É-root, 258 sqq.; of É-root, 261; varying with á, 259; with á, 259 sqq.; Lat. á for L.-Eur. á (ā), 221 sqq.; for ē, 222; for au in Augusťus, &c., 38, 41 sqq.; in là, râ, mà, mà, 222; for ó, 234 sqq.; Lat. á for á lengthened, 220; for ó, 220; in là, râ, mà, 219 sqq.; not weakened to ő, 199; aa written for á, 10.
-á, shortening of, 210 sqq.; in Nom. Sg., 210 sqq., 373; of qua, Adv., &c., 551.
A-Subjunctive, 512 sqq.
á, ab, abs, Prep., 573 sqq.; ab- confused with ób-, 574.
abante, 573, 595.
ábest, the scansion, 214 sqq.
ábicio, 45.
ábígnus, pronunc. of, 138.
Ablative (see Declension), Adv. use of (see Cases).
Ablaut (see Gradation).
abnuo and abnuo, 476.
abélevi and abólevi, 500.
absceðio and absceßio, 112.
abscondi and abscondidi, 502.
abside, 79.
absinthium, 79.
absque, 576.
abstinei (?), 501.

Abstufung, 367.
abstulas, 464.
abusque, 595.
abýssus, the scansion, 156.
ac (see abque).
Acca Larentia, 118 n.
accédó, 194.
accentus, meaning of, 152, 154.
accepti (?), 508.
acceptor for accipiter, 115.
accurso, 487.
Accheruns, Plaut., 58.
Achilles, Plaut., 58.
accipiter, 259.

1 If a word is not found in this Index, the ending or suffix of the word should be looked for. Thus the reference for furibundus, fremebundus, &c., will be found under -bundus, the reference for commencticius, &c., under -ticius.
Accius, doubling of vow., 8 sqq.; *y for *y, 10 sq.; *e for *i, 9 sq.
accidius, 275.
accurbus, 323.
accuratus, 541 n.
Accusative (see Declension), Adv. use of (see Cases).
acer, 260, F. 371; -ris, M., 371.
acerbis, 180.
acertas for aceritas, 365.
acctum, 335.
-acus (see Suffix -KO-).
Acchir, 196.
acies, acicatus, 347.
acredula, 353.
acrufulius, spelling, 364.
Ædito, pronunci. of, 134; of actum, 139.
Active, endings (see Verb).
actus, Noun, 344.
actulum, 565.
acu, 260.
acupedium, 259.
-acus (see Suffix -KO-).
Acute Accent, 153 sqq.
ad, Prep., 576; spelling of, 76 sq.; ar, 288, 99.
adagio, 291.
aditus, 515; -it, 515. (See ardumur.)
adex, Adv., 568; accent. of, 166.
adeps, alipes, 287.
adessint (?), 466.
adgredimur, the scansion, 475.
adgretus, 285.
Adjectives, dist. of Gender (see Gender); Decl. of (see Declension); Compar. of (see Comparison); form of (see Suffixes); Numeral (see Numerals); Pronom. (see Pronouns); used as Part., 540, 543; from Part., 540 sqq.
adjo (juo-), Fut. Pft., 507.
adnuit, Perf., 508.
adolesco, 481.
adverterat, the scansion, 475.
adpetisis, 462.
adquo, 568.
adsim, pronounced ass-, 313.
adenat, 464.
adventicicus, 337.
Adverbs, 548 sqq.; Nom. forms, 553 sqq.; in -ter, 553 sqq.; Gen. forms, 553; Acc. forms, 555 sqq.; Compar. of, 557 sq.; Abl., Instr., Loc. forms, 559 sqq.; in -tus, 561; in -tim, 548; in -e, 548; word-groups, 562 sqq.; -mente, 552; of doubtful origin, 565 sqq.; Num. (see Numerals); Pronom., 567 sqq.; Compound, 360 sqq.
adversus (-m), Prep., 595.
adulescens, spelling of, 197.
advenus, 259.
adusque, 595.
ae, pronunci. of, 37 sqq.; and e, 42, 242; for au, 42; for Gk. η, 42 sq.; for ã, 242 (see also AI).
Aceditai, 168.
aedes, 241, 346.
aeotilis, 340; aidinges, Nom. Sg. 376.
aeotimus (-tus), 405.
aeotrus, 484.
-aet- for -ai-, 242.
aenius, 258.
Aenea, Nom., 373.
aequaminus (-tus), 123, 364.
aequiper, 192.
aequis, pronunci. of, 42.
-aes in Gen. Sg., 381 sq.
aes, 157.
Aesculapius, 242; spelling, 198.
anus, 173.
aevum, 241, 251, 348.
af, Prep., 576 sq.
affatin, 563.
afluo and aflueo, 576.
age, 600, 618.
ager, 221.
agitis, 332.
Agra, 10 sq., 60, 65.
agmen, 292.
agmenum, 294.
agmus, 235; F., 370.
age, 221; ejus, 497; actum, pronunci.
-optum, 139; age, 600, 618; axim, 465 sq.
agoood (?), the scansion, 373 n.
agricola, 317.
Agregantium, 197.
agrum, 334.
Agustus for Aug-, 38, 41 sq.
Ahala and Ala, 54.
Ahenobarbus, 364.
ahenus, 265; spelling of, 55, 57.
AI, phon. changes of, 241 sq.; ÁI, 251 sq.; ai on inscr., 242.
-of Gen. Sg., 381 sq.; Dat., 386.
ai, 546, 265; pronunci., 53; spelling
INDEX.

aiio, 8; ai, aie, Imper., 546; aibam, aiebam, 491; pronounce of ai-, 43.

-ai- from I.-Eur. l, 279.

aia, 293.

alae, pronounce. of aie, 18; -ris, M., 371; -eier, 18, 198.

albus for aib-, 51.

albogulerus, 361, 364.

Albsi for Albensi, 177.

albogulerus, 361, 364.

Aleria, 197.

Alexander, -er, Aligentrom, Acc., 73.

Alfrus, dial. for Alb, 80.

ala, Adv., 569.

alii, and aliiubi, 567.

alica (hal-), 56.

alicunde, 570.

alicuni, 378.

a!a, Adv., 557.

alma, -w, 80.

alp?er, 554; cf. 553.

OZMs and al^ws, 335.

Cdium, all-, 115; -eum, 22. (See aZMs).

aliunde, 570.

aliius, 449; -is, 375.

aliqua, 571.

allexi, 505.

albus, 309.

alo, 223.

Alphabet, 1 sqq.; Gk. letters, 4; sqq.; Claudius' reforms (see Claudius).

alter, 449, 452; -ius, Gen., 450.

alteras, Adv., 569.

*alteras (?), Nom. Pl., 398.

alternis, Adv., 551.

alterius, 450; -utra, 450.

alucvor, 488; spelling of, 117.

alium, 333. (See allium.)

album, 327.

-al of quam, tam, &c., 549.

am-, Prep., 578.

amans, 259.

anamasius, 305.

ambages, 345 sq., 221.

ambeegna (-igna), 229.

ambi-, Prep., 577.

ambio, 505; -issum, 466.

ambus, 451.

ambulo, 547.

amendo (-ando), 200.

amico, 505, 578.

amicus, 337.

amitio (amn-), 109, 114.

amomentum, spelling of, 114.

ammeo for abn-, 80.

amnis, 282.

ammuo for abn-, 80.

amo, 274; -ento, 3 Pl., 519.

amoenus, 246.

ampendices, 578.

amplant, 483.

ampluctor 578; -oct- 467.

amplio, 485.

anmsegmentes, 578.

amtermini, 578.

amurca, 33, 75.

anussim, 503.

anypgula, -iddida, 198.

an, Conj., 606.

an-, Prep., 578.

Anaptyxis (see Parasitic Vowel).

ana?, 274.

ancaesus (-ISMS), 198.

ancaps, older, -capse, 178.

ancilia, 287.

ancubris, 334

ancora, 155, 190; -ch-, 59.

ancius, a servant, 178; -illa, 333.

ancus, 259.

angenla, 326.

ano, 271; -ustus, 223, 356.

anquila (-illa), 115.

anquis, 338.

anheiro, 199, 578; alct-, 98; -lt-, 112.

animalveto, 362.

animus, -ma, 223.

annus, 117, 314.

anquina, 247.

ankvo, 578.

anser, 272.

antae, 274.

ante, 578; ant(e)positus, 579; antea,

579, 569; antehac, 569; antld-, 579;

antidlae, 579.
antennae, 578.
antes, 578.
antestaminos, 519, 578.
antae, 562.
anticus, 337.
antides, 575, 579.
antigero, 560.
antiper, 562.
antigus, 337.
antistes, 350.
antus, 578.
"antennae", 578.
antes, 578.
antestaminos, 519, 578.
antae, 562.
anticus, 337.
antides, 575, 579.
antigero, 560.
antiper, 562.
antigus, 337.
antistes, 350.
antus, 578.
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Athematic, Conjug. (see Verb); Pres.
Part. Act, 541.
-adim of Adv., 556.
aque (ac), 598 sq., 122; spelling,
  599; aqve atque, 599.
atqi ('n), 601, 614.
atrius, 485
atrix, 259, 354.
atatt, 617; accent of, 164.
attingas, 464.
attilas, 464.
-atus, e.g. dentatus, P.P.P., 483.
A, phon. changes of, 242 sq.;
  pronounced, 37 sqq.; weak grade of
  O'l-root, 261; -au- for àvé, 243;
  À, 252.
au-, Prep., 576.
au, Interj., 38.
aububulus, 235.
aueps, 180.
audacter (-iter), 554.
audeo, 486; -si, 522; -sus sum, 522;
  -sim, 465; ausus, 112.
audio, 307.
are (see have).
Averus, 197.
acerruncosis, 462.
acerta, 197.
Aufitus, 250.
augoe, 482, 243.
augur, -ger, 198; -ra, Accius, 48.
avitus, 235.
avia (olla), 41; avilia, 112.
Auliüs, 267.
aureas, 261.
aureialcum, 41.
auriga, 261.
auris, 243.
aurora, 243, 356.
aurugo (-igo), 37.
aurum, 243.
aus- (os-) in osclar, &c., 41, 262.
aus for anus, 52.
ausculta, 243; asc-, 41.
auspea, 180.
ausus, 112.
austerae, -ris, 338.
austium, 262.
aut, 599.
aute, 601, 571.
autor for -cl-, 89, 119.
automo, 180, 235.
auandulus, aunc-, 49, 172; anc-, 172.

Auxiliary Vbs., 511; accent., 169.
auxilia, 333.
Ayyayibhava, Compd., 360 sq.
-a$x (see Suffix in Gutt. -KO-.
-ax, e. g. auweax, 355.
axim, 465 sq.
axis, 395, 338.
axites (-tiost), 352.
B, pronunci., 78 sqq.; for Gk. ò, 11;
  for v, 47, 49 sqq.; phon. changes
  of, 282; for dw-, 265, 268; for bh.
  282 sq.; for dh, 289 sq.; br for sr.
  303, 308.
baea, spelling of, 116 sq.
BahuVrhi, Compd., 360 sq.
baltus, 282, 358.
baltudia, 488.
balticus (?), 287.
baltaena, 48, 58; spelling, 117.
balmum, bain-, 173.
-bam of Impft., 489 sqq.
barba, 283.
barbactum for vev-?, 52.
barbar(us), 374.
barev, 184.
basitica, bas-, 115; basis, base-, 115
Basis of Articulation, 30.
battilum (see vev-).
battu, spelling of, 113.
battitudo (-tas), 341.
Belona (?), 48.
bellum, O. Lat. cheelum, 268.
bellus, 326.
bene, -è, 551; ben(e), 184; -merens, Adj.
  540; -merens, 332; and -lus, 540;
  -ficus for vev-?, 51.
benignus, pronunci. of, 138.
Bemutnot, 184.
*verbix for vev-?, 52.
bessi, 400.
BH, phon. changes of, 282 sq.
bhâa, 'to speak,' 457.
bher-, 'to carry,' 457.
bheu, 'to be, 458.
-bi of ibi, &c., 551, 567.
bi- of bitens, &c., 411.
bibo, Vb., 468; -i, Perf., 593; -er(e),
  Inf., 537.
bicorpor, 376.
bijag, 196.
-bûs (see Suffix -DHLO-.
bimus, 144, 294.
bini, 411.

bipinnis for -pen-, 23.

bis, 411.

bifrons, the scansion, 156.

blata, 314.

-bo of Fut., 491 sqq.

bonus, 326; Compar., 406.

bos, 253; bûnos, bu-, 250.

-br for mr, 269 sqq.

-bra (see Suffix -DHRO-).

braca, spelling of, 116.

braccium, 58; spelling of, 117.

Breathing, Gk. in Panhormus, &c., 57.

Breath-Seconds (see Tenses).

Breves Breviantes, 210, 126, 129 sq., 201 sq.

brevir, 227, 292

breviter, 553.

Britanni (Britt-}, 115.

Broken Reduplication, 358.

Bruit for Phryg-, 36, 58.

-brum (see Suffix -DHRO-).

bruma, 407.

Brittii (-ri-), 29.

-b-, -b-; pronunc. of, 79.

bucetum, 335.

bucina, spelling of, 117.

bulba for vulva, 50.

-bulba (see Suffix -DHLO-).

-bundus, e. g. errabundus, 545.

Burrus for Pyrrh-, 36, 75.

burrus, 75.

-bus, Dat. Pl., scansion of, 404.

bustar (bo-), 205, 250.

bustar (of bustum), 250.

butrum, the scansion, 156.

*butis (-fl), 116.

Butrio, 33.

buxus, 75.

c, the letter, 2, sqq., 76; pronunc.

84 sqq.; palatalization of, 87 sqq.; for qu, 299 sqq., 315; d for ã, 283 sqq.

cadaver, 541.

caduceus, 288.

caedus, 337.

cadus for cashdi, 509.

Caecilius, Occ-; Caere, 422; Caec-., 424.

cæcins, 242.

cædes, 246.

caelo, 242; cashdi; 496; cedere, 184.

cælebs, 48.

cædes, 353.

cæsum, the spelling coe-, 44.

cæmentum, 285; -a, P., 406.

cæræleus, 275.

cælimata, 283; kæld-, 286.

cælamitus, 353.

cælandae for cæle-, 23.

cæcar, 203.

cælæs for -lid-, 173.

cæle-(facio), 490; cælf-, 173, 184.

cælicare, 95.

cælie, 355.

cælæscent, Cato, 481.

cælim (?), 580.

*cadens for -tan-, 198.

cælor, N., 336.

cælnnia, cælor, 327.

cæclus, 323.

cæla, heel, 355.

cælae, lime, 95; -is, 107.

Cælogénem, 155.

cæmælus for cælus, 115.

Cæmeæ, 308.

cæmera (-mar-), 197.

Cæmeæ (-mar-), 197.

Cæmillus, 308.

cæmæus (ga-), 74.

Cæmpæ for -næs, 182.

cæmpæ, 330.

cæncæ, 96.

cænes, Nom. Sg., 346; -næs, Pl., 399.

cænicula, 347.

cæno, 223; -næ, Carm. Sal., 459; Perf., 501, 509.

Cænæus, 75.

cænæus, 397.

cæpæ, 355.

cæper, 276.

cæpperæ, spelling of, 117.

cæpæssæ, 462.

Cæpæcum for -tulum, 83.

cæpio, 298; cepi, Perf., 502.

cæpis, bowl, 83.

cæpisæ, 331.

Cæpio, 349.

Cæralis, -lar-, 93; -lar-, 93.

Cæralis (-dar-), 317.

Cardinal Numerals (see Numerals).

cærusæ, 478, 174.

cæreæ (?] for -recæ, 23.

Cævæ (çræ), 515.

cæmen, 271 sqq.; C. Saliare, 5, 245, 459 n.
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Carna, 317.
cirro, 278, 273, 349.
capratinae, 75.
corpo, 279.
cartilago, 279.
Carvilius Ruga, letter G, 7.
carus, 491.
cacus, 307.
Cases, 366 sqq.; Strong and Weak, 367; suffix ousted by Prep., 573; Adv. use of, 548 sqq.; of Nom., 553 sqq.; of Gen., 555; of Acc., 555 sqq.; of Abl., Instr., Loc., 559 sqq. (See Declension.)
casis, -ida, 354; casida, 286.
casus, empty, 565.
Castorem, 155.
casus, -ss, 110 sq.
Cato (Elder), -ae for -am, 61, 493 n.
catulio, 484.
catus, 258, 541.
cavedium, 362.
cauculus for -ecal, 96.
cauca, 41.
cavec, 235; cave, accent, 169; pronunc., 49; caeri, 499.
Cautinos (cave ne eis), 169.
Caurus, 258.
causa, -ss, 110 sq.
Causative Vbs., 477, 481 sq.
causis (case sib), 49.
cavus (cov-), 234 sq.
-ca, Particle, 432 sq.
cēdo, 432, 518; cētē, 284.
cēdo, Perf. cessi, pronunc., III.
cedere for caedere, 184.
cedrus, 289.
celer, 351; -rissimus, 407.
-cēlo, 486.
celo, 488 n., 227.
celox, 354.
celsus, 229.
cena, 277; -atus, P. P. P., 520, 542; -ae-, 44, 277.
-cendi, Perf., 501.
censeo, 273; -endo, Pass., 519.
centum, 418 sq.; -plex, 418 sq.; -tussi, 409; -centum for -ti, 418 sq.; -ten
tius, -tensus, 418 sq.
cerebrum, 296; -ber, 370.
cerestium, cherry, 18.
cerna, 472; crevi, 500.
cepto (-e), 550.
cervix (Sg., Plur.), 355.
Cerus, 329.
cesvae for caes-, 43.
cetero, 244; -rum, Conj., 602; -ra, 486, 562; -roqui (-n), 568, 614.
cette, 284.
-cetum, 335.
cėu, 607.
-ch- (Gk. χ' ), -ekh-, Plaut., 58.
Change of unaccented vowel (see Weakening).
Chersonenus, the spelling, 136 n.
Chi (see Aspirates).
Chius (Adj.), scansion of, 132.
-ci- and -ti-, 82 sqq.
cibus, decl. of, 344.
cicindela, 333.
ciconia, Praen. conea, 22.
cicur, quant. of i, 485.
cīcus for -icis, 116.
cīo (ció), 481; cītus, 335, 541.
cincinnus, 315.
cinctus, 335.
cingo, -nixi, -nexus, pronunc., 140.
cinis, 357.
cīnor (-cīnium), 488.
circus, 354.
circus, -wm, Prep., 579; -ā, 579; -iter, 580.
Circumflex Accent, 153 sqq., 161.
cis (citra), 580, 432; -ter, 432.
cistella, 333.
citer for -thar-, 190.
citrus, 289.
citus, 541; cīr, 335; -ūr, Adv., 551.
civicus, 337.
-cī for -tl-, 81.
clades, 219.
clam (clanculum), 580; clamā, 580.
clamo, 279.
claudesimus, 580.
clango, 471.
clarare (-ere), 484.
Claudius (App.), reforms alph., 6, 105; (Emp.), reforms alph., 3 sqq., 36, 47 sq., 79 (see also Clo-).
claudus, 180, 252; clui, 40, 196.
clavis, 347.
clavus, 298.
clavo, 298; -psi, 505.
cliens (clui-), 29.
clipeus (clui-), 29.
clīvus, 275, 323.
cloaca (clui-), 37.
Clodius, 41; Clav., 42.
Clodius, 250; Clou[c], 246.
Close Syll., quant. of vowel, 133 sqq.
checo (-wo), 473, 295.
-chum (-culum, q. v.) (see Suffix -LO-).
chumis, 250.
Chutemestra, the scansion, 202.
co- for quo-, 300.
-co of albico, &c., 479.
coa (from ccoo), 318.
colaeso, 481.
coculum, 300.
coculm for cael-, 44.
coempytonalis senex, 143.
coenæ for ce-, 44, 277.
coopio, 545; -di, 502; scansion of, 143; -plus sum, 522.
coero, coi, for cura, 248.
coeus, 142, 39.
cogito, 143.
cognatus, spelling of, 114.
cognomen, 294.
cognosco, con-, 294; Perf., 509.
cogo, 143.
cohibeo, scansion of, 143.
cohors, 183.
col(illum), 235.
cojicio, pronunc. of, 53.
coi(nque), 311.
colina (?), the spelling, 236.
Collective, Compd., 360 sq., 365:
Noun, 399.
collega, 318; -gins for -m, 370.
collis, 271.
collem, gender of, 369.
collem for -l, 112.
cido, 227; spelling of, 300.
colobor for -lab-, 37.
colophaica for -ly-, 36.
colonia, 321.
colummen (cubm-), 185.
columna, pronunc., 69; -tom-, 37, 69;
C. Rostrata, 7; -mella, 69.
columnus, 97.
cohus, 300.
com- (cum) (co-?), Prep., 580; bef. v.,
-f, 50 sq., 66, 99 sq.; bef. n., gm-, 114;
beef. s-, f-, 136 sqq.; quom, 581;
cum bef. n., 121; c. eo c. quiqui, 448.
combreum, 227.
commbrum, 578, 144.
comes, 350.
comis, 307.
commendo (-man-), 200.
commentus, 335.
comminus, 554; -m-, 115.
commicium, the spelling, 229.
communis, 247.
como, -mphi, 505.
compages, 346.
Comparison, of Adj., 404 sqq.;
Compar., 404, 406; Superl., 405,
compellare, 472.
Compensation, length by, 314.
comperendinu, 486.
compesso, 192.
compitum, 194.
complexe, in Romance, 489.
Compounds (Noun and Adj.), 358
sqq.; accent of, 161 sqq.; A-stems,
363 sq.; O-stems, 364; I-stems,
364; U-stems, 364; N-stems, 364;
R-stems, 365; Dent., Gutt. Stems,
365; S-stems, 365; in Pauc., 360;
in Luer, 360; in Plaut., 362;
(Verbs), 362 sq.; accent of, 164;
influence on Simple Vb., 468;
(Adv.) (see Adverbs) (Prep.) (see
Prepositions).
concipit, xii Tab., 379
concino, -ui, 509.
conditio, 341; -cio, 88.
comea, Praen., 22.
conesto for cohors-, 143.
confestim, 556.
confisca (sus), 318.
confo, 309.
couger (go-), 74; gu-, 33.
congressus, 280.
congruens (-nus), 540.
conitor, spelling of, 114.
conicco, 302; -nixi, 499.
Conjugations (see Verb).
Conjunctions, 596 sqq.; accent, 169;
variety of meaning, 596; of stem,
596; of vow.-quant., 596;
Conjunctive, 596 sq.; Disjunctive, 599
sqq.; Adversative, 600 sqq.; Limitative,
602 sq.; Exploratory, 603
sqq.; Conclusive, 604 sq.; Optative,
605; Interrog., 605 sq.; Compar.,
606 sqq.; Temp., 608 sqq.; Causal,
610; Condit., 610 sqq.; Concessive,
613; Final, 613 sq.; Assev., 614 sq.;
Neg., 615 sq.
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conjux (-nx), 69, 358.
conquaesirei, 242.
conquitinus, 470.
consacror for -sec-, 200.
conscibillo, 479, 487.
considero, 488.
consilium, 286; -sidi-, 286.
consiptus, 195.
Consiva, 199.
Consonant, lost in group, 309 sqq.; Stems and I-stems, 338, 341 (see Suffixes).
consternare, 470, 192.
consul, pronunc. of, 136 sq.
contages, 346.
contamino, 292, 294.
conterere, in Romance, 489.
conticinium, 194.
continue, 557.
contest, 67; pronunc., 141; coervt-, 250; -net-, 310.
contr, 581; -d, 557.
Contraction, e.g. cra for cera, 177; e.g. mg for magnus, 125; Contr. Vb.-forms (see Verb).
controversia, 581.
contubernium, spelling of, 193.
contidi, 496.
contumelia factum itur, 538.
contumium, spelling of, 114.
conuella, 273.
convicium, 225.
conviva, 318.
convillo (-veil-), 228.
copia, 144; copis, Adj., 144.
copula, 143.
coquino, 470.
cogw, 467; -int (?), 515.
cogus, 291; spelling of, 299.
cor, 279; scansion, 122, 215.
corallium (curalli-), 34.
coram, 581.
corbus for -vus, 51.
cordatus, 483.
coriga for corr-, 114.
Cornelis, 372.
cornicen, 192.
Corniscos, 404.
cornis, 347.
cornu, 279.
cornus, cornel, 279.
corolla, 333.
corona, 59; spelling of, 59.
corruptus, cor-, 114; -mpl-, 471.
Corus, 258.
cos, 259.
cosulent, Scipio Epit., 529.
cosmis, Dvenos inser., 307.
cothurnus, 33.
cotonea, 75.
cottidie, 560; spelling, 227 sq.
correnti, S. C. Bacch., 250.
couraerent, 246.
coxa, 298.
crobro, 220.
crati for clatri, 97.
crapula, 197.
Crasis, 142 sqq.
Crassus, story of, 169.
crastinus, 325.
crates, 219, 279.
crbesco for -br-, 95.
credo, 479; -dum, -im, 514.
creo, 329.
crepus for capra, 98.
crep, -ut, -ut, 499, 506; -lus, P. P. P., 542.
crepus, 98.
crepusclium, 273.
cresco, 479; -vui, 500.
cretariae for cct-, 96.
cretetra, 118.
cribrum, 330.
crimen, 336.
crinis, 339.
crista, 339.
croco, 476.
crudelis, 340.
crudus, 298.
cruentes, 352.
cruor, 298.
crustum, pronunc. of, 141; -trum, 96; - humiliation, clustr-, 97.
Crustuminus (Cl-), 93.
-cd- for Gutt. with t, 291, 293.
-chum, e.g. viirechum, 335.
-ca- for qui, 86 sq, 300.
-cubi, 446.
cubiculum, scansion of, 175.
cubus, -ui (-avi), 506, 499.
cuculus, 290; -illus, 115.
cudo, 486; -di, 502.
cui (see qui, quis); cui rei ?, 606.
cuiicimodi, 445, 564.
cujus, Poss., 443, 447; cujus, 447.
cuiuscemodi, 444.
culfus (κύλως), 59.
-culli, Perf., 501.
culmen, 235; (column-), 185.
culmus, 328.
culo-, Dim. (see Suffix -LO-).
culpa, col-, 236.
culm, scansion of, 146, 175 sqq. (see -cium).
cum (see com-).
cumbo, 471.
cumprimis, 565.
cunae, 258.
cunchn for co-, 33.
cunctus, 541 n.
cundus, 544 sq.
cunil (?), 155.
cunio-, 598.
cunstelum for cult-; 97.
cup (cup-), 116.
cupio, 476; -is, 475.
cur, 606.
cura, 247; coi-, coe-, 248; cou-, 246.
curba for rect-, 51.
curia, 180.
curiosus, 353.
curculio, 556.
curro, 239; cecurri, 503; Perf. in Romance, 509.
cursion, 556.
curtina for co-, 34.
curtus, 239.
custus, 308.
cuto, (quatio), 196.
cutis, 260.

cygmus, 292; ci-, 36.

D, pronunc., 80 sqq.; and -i in at, ad, &c., 76 sq.; phon. changes of, 285 sqq.

D-particle (see Particles).
-d, Abl., 391 sq.
Dalmatio (De-), 17.
-dam of quidam, &c., 552.
Dama, spelling of, 117.
damna, spelling of, 117.
damnas esto, 183.
damnum, 328.
Danubius for -uv-, 51.
damnunt, 531.
dapsilis, 340.
dasi (?), O. Lat Inf, 537.
datam, 556.

Dative (see Declension).

dautia, 286.
-de of inde, &c., 570.
dego, Prep., 581; confused with di-: 574.
deabus, 403.
decus, scansion of, 143.
debil for -lis, 376.
debilita, 176.
decem, 416; -cim, 19, 21; -cimus, 416,
Decius, 416.
decimanus, 326.

Declension (Noun, Adj.), 366 sqq.;
Nom. Sg., 371 sqq.; Gen., 379 sqq.;
Dat., 385 sqq.; Acc., 387 sqq.; Voc.,
388 sqq.; Abl., 390 sqq.; Instr.,
392 sqq.; Loc., 395 sqq.; Nom. Pl.,
397 sqq.; Gen., 401 sq.; Dat., Abl.,
Loc., Instr., 402 sqq.; Acc., 404;
(Pron.) Pers., 421 sqq.; Demonstr.
431 sqq.; Rel., 443 sqq.; Pron.
Adj., 450 sqq.; (Verb) (see Verb).
declino, 470.
decor, M., -us, N., 356; decorus Adj., 356.
decresuit, 22.
decussi, 409.
dedro, 531; -d, 531.
defendo, 486.
defrudo, the spelling, 196, 40.
defructum, 261; -fri-, 197.
defuctus, 471.
degener, 356.

Degrees of Compar. (see Comparison),
degenerere, 472.
Dehnstufe (see Gradation).
deiniceps, 553.
deinde, 570; dein, 122.
delenio (-lin-), 199, 225.
deliciatus, 287.
delico, 286.
delirus (-ler-), 199, 22.
delubrum, 331.
-dem of idem, &c., 441; of tandem, &c.,
552.
demo, -psl, 505.
Demonstratives (see Pronouns),
demum, 549; -s, 553.

Denominative (see Derivative).
dens, 540.

Dentals, phon. changes of, 283 sqq.
dentio, 485.
denuo, 564.

Deponent, 519 sqq.; Past Part. of
Act. Vb., 520, 542; Perf. of Neut.

depensa, 336
derbiosus, 268.

Derivative Verbs, 478, 483 sqq.
descendisti, 502.
desculo, pronunc. of, 479.
descus, 358.

Desideratives, 478, 482, 484.
desiderum, 488.
desitui (-ivī), 499.
desitus sum, with Pass. Inf., 522.
destino, 470, 472.

Determinative Comp., 360 sq.
detratus, Pass., 542.
detotum (-totum), 504.
devas Cornecas, 404.
devaux, 409.
devīra, Fut. Perf., 507.
deuus (cf. die-), 244; dei, dī(i, Nom. Pl., 399, 21; deum, -orum, Gen., 402; desis, diīs, Dat., 21; diibus, 404; -dius (?), 618.
dextus, 409.

DH, phon. changes of, 289 sq.

DH-particle (see Particles).
dhē, 'to put,' 457.
di- (see dis-) for de-, 574; for bi-, 412; di for s, 105.
dicus for -am, 492.
dicax, 355.
dicus, Gen., 358.
dico, 243; -ces (?), 2 Sg., 526; -ce (-ce), Imper., 518; -ci, 495, 497, 504; -co, 463; -cin-, 465; -cervī, 212; dicebo, 492, 494; dicturam, O. Lat., 537.-dicī, Perf., 496, 502.
dienoine, Dvenos inscr., 560.
diequant, 397; pronunc., 212.
dies, 252; pronunc., 24, 39, 133; gend., 399 n.; Nom. Sg., 377; Gen., 382; diī, 382; in word-group, 169; in Comp. Adv. 560; dienoine, Dvenos inscr., 416.

Disspiter, decl. of, 364.
difficult, N., 205; -iter (-liter), 553.

Digamma, Lat. F., 2, 5; for r, 8.

Dignitas, 287.
digitus, 76; -ct-, 185.
dignus, 293; pronunc., 138 sq.

dilexi, Perf., 505.
diloris, 412.
dimico, 194; -avi (-āvī), 499.
dimidius, 409, 159; de-, 30.

Diminutives, 333, 336 sq.
diminuō, the spelling, 314.
dingua, O. Lat. for lingua, 286.
dinumnum, 412.
dinus for divin-, 52.

Dioecem, 263 sq.

Diphthongs, phon. changes of, 239 sqq.; pronunc., 37 sqq.; shortened bef. cons., 251 sq.; when final, 213; Gk. in Lat. orth., 43 sq.; Gk. ει, 244.
dirimo, 582.
dirrumpo, the spelling, 314.
dis-, Prop., 582.
discriminulum, 333.
disciplina, 176; -dic-, 97.
disco, 477; didici, 501.
disertim, 556.
dispalesco, 586.
dispensate for -nd-, 64.

Dissimilation of l, r, 275; syll. lost by, 176.
dissipae, 304; spelling of, 193.
distenname for -nt-, 64.
distinguo, 471; spelling of, 301 sq.

Distributives (see Numerals).

Dite, Voc., 389.
div, 555; -timus, 325.
dives, dis, 406; Compar., 408.
divisi, Perf., 498.

Division of Syl., 124 sqq.
divisio, the spelling, 110 sq.
dius, Adv., 555.
divus (cf. deus), 244; deus, 494.
dixeram illis, pronunc. of, 123.

-dō of cupidō, &c. (see Suffix -N-).

-dō, Vbs. in, 486; Perf., 502; of condō, &c., 457.
dō, I give, decl. of, 457; da, Imper., 518; deā, 495 sq.; deāro (-t), 531, 124; datus, 222 (see duō).
doceo, 259, 482; -cunto, 3 Pl., 519.
dodrano, 409.

Dolabella, 331.
dolitus, 485.
dobus, 318.
domus for -min-, 185.
domo, Vb., 474; 481; -mi, 506 n.
domus, 256; decl., 344; -mos, Gen., 380, 384.
done, 609; -icum, 609; -ique, 609.  
donum, 232.  
dorsalis, 340.  
dos, 341.  
dossum for -rs-, 96.  
Double Cons., pronunc. of, 108 sqq.;  
for Single, 113 sqq.; written, 3; 8;  
II, 7 sq.; VV, 7; Vow., 3, 9 sq.  
Doublets, 120 sqq., 204.  
drachma, 145.  
Dropping (see Loss).  
drum for tr-, 289.  
Drusus, 280.  
Dual, traces of, 366, 400.  
Dvandva, Comp., 360 sq., 365.  
dubito, 482.  
dubius, 411.  
dicenti, 419; -tum, 0. Lat., 418 sq.  
dico, 466; dice, Imper., 518; -xi,  
pronunc., 498; ductus, pronunc., 542;  
duelum, 268.  
Dvenos Inser., 2.  
duicensus, 411.  
duidens, 411.  
Dvigus, Comp., 360 sqq.  
duir, 0. Lat. for bis, 411.  
dum, 609, 570.  
*dumpa, 286.  
dumatexa, 565.  
dumus, 237.  
dunc, 609.  
duo for do, 515; -im, 515.  
duo, Num., 410 sq.; scansion, 411;  
-un, Gen. Pl., 412; -a, Neut. Pl.,  
412; -decim, 416; -centi, 419; -vice-  
simus, 417; -diviniti, 416.  
Duodecim Tabb. (see Twelve Tables).  
duusus, 268. (see Twelve Tables).  
duxus, 237.  
dw-, phon. change of, 265 sqq.  

E, pronunc., 18 sqq.; for oe, 44; for  
ae, 42 sq.; for i in hiatus, 19,  
22; in atomic syll., 25, 30; e for i,  
25, 29 sq.; phon. changes of, 223  
sqq.; for short vow. in atomic syll.,  
191 sq., 194; for a after i, 17; for i  
after e, 230, 232; for -i, &c., 205 sq.;  
ê for e lengthened, 224; for -ê-,  
-êh-, 224; in grade of ê-root, 260;  
not weakened to i, 199; shortening  
of ê, 211 sq.; O. Lat. ê for ei, 244  
sq.; Gk. (see Eta).  
-ê, loss of, 204 sq.; 'Dat.' in, 387;  
with -i inabl. Sg., 390 sqq.  
-ê of Adv., 548.  
-ê, ex, Prep., 583; êc-, 583.  
E-grade of Root (see Gradation).  
E-Subjunctive, 512 sqq.  
eapse (-ã?), 441.  
ebam of tegebam, &c., 490.  
ebo, Fut., 3 Conj., 493.  
ebris of funebris, &c., 196.  
ebris, 592.  
ecastor (êc-), 618.  
ecco, 617; -cere, 618; -cum, 617, 435;  
-ilium, -istam, 432.  
eclesia, the spelling, 115.  
equis, 447.  
Ecthilipsis, 309 sqq.  
ecus for equus, 86.  
edepol, 618.  
edile, Imper., 518.  
edo, Vb., decl. of, 456; êdi, 497; -am,  
-im, 512; Imper., 518; essus, the  
spelling, 112; -tus, 309.  
edo, edula (see Suffix -D-).  
edulis, 340.  
edus for haedus, 42.  
egestas, 326.  
ego, decl., 421 sqq.; scansion, 422;  
mihi, scansion, 422.  
egregius, Voc. of, 389.  
egretus, 0. Lat., 285.  
EI, on inser., 244 sq.; for i, 9; for  
i, 245, 22; for ê, 22; phon. changes  
of, 243 sq.; for atomic ai, oi, 243  
sq.; EI, 252; O. Lat. ê for ei, 244 sq.  
ei-, 'togo,' 456.  
jeru, 199.  
jenom, Dvenos inser., 604.  
jetulo, pronunc. of, 53.  
etius, Prop. Names in, 320.  
jesucomedi, 437.  
et-, phon. change of, 228 sq.  
etra (see Suffix -LO-).  
etuflat, Perf., 505.  
etis (see Suffix -LI-).  
Elision, 144 sq.; of -m, 61 sq., 144;  
s, 123; -i of -ãi, -ã, 381, 383 (see  
Hiatus).
INDEX.

criticus, 293.
-ella (-us), 46, 112 sqq., 115.
elum, 617.
elus (see Suffix -LO-).
-en- for L.-Eur. m, 273 sq.
-em, -im, Acc. Sg., 388; for -am, Fut.,
493 n.
em, Interj., 617.
em, 'tum,' 438; 'eum,' 438.
emem, 554.
emitor for in-, 30.
emo, 505; emi, 502; -psi, 505; -plus,
spelling of, 70; emenu, 531; -psiim,
466.
edus, -undus, Ger., 544.
emunus, 471.
enus of supremus, &c., 407.
en- for L.-Eur. n, 273 sq.
en, Prep. (see in).
en, Interj., 617.
Enelitics, 165 sqq.
endo, indu, 582 sq.; and in-, 583;
doque plurato, 573.
eneo, spelling of, 194.
enim, 603; -ero, 603.
Ennius, introduced double cons.,
3, 8.
enocilis, 197.
enos, Carm. Arv., 425.
en- (see Suffix -NT-).
en- for Gk. ποτι (?), 136 n.
enis, 274.
entia, -ium (see Suffix -NT-).
entior, Compar., 407.
enubro- (-nib-), 191.
enunquam, 617.
enus (see Suffix -NO-).
eco, Adv., 568 sq.
eco, Vb., decl. of, 456; emot-, Part., 541;
-lit, Perf., 214.
Epirus, accent of, 155.
epulonus, 348.
egues, 336.
eguidem, 603.
eguider, 361.
eguile, 484.
eguus, 226; spelling, 300; pronunc.
of e-, 42.
er- for ri, 231 sq.; for -dr- in funeris,
&c., 34 (see also E).
er, from -ros, 374; M., -ris F., 371.
ercisco, pronunc. of, 479.
ceremus, the scansion, 156.
erga, 583.
ergo, Prep., 583; Conj., 604; accent,
166; -i, 212.
erro, 308.
erugo, -eto, 298.
eruina for aer, 43.
-ruin, -i-ru, 3 Pl., 531 sq.
erum, 196.
és, íst (see eso, decl. of).
es, íst (see sum, decl. of).
es (see Suffix -T-); -es, -is, Acc. Pl.,
404; Nom. Pl., 399; O-stems, 398.
esco, 310.
esco, 479.
esimus, -ensimus, 418.
esere for esse, 536.
esis (?), 466.
esso, Vb.-forms in, 462 sqq.
(e)st, (e)s, Procopio of, 121.
ester (see Suffix -TERO-).
est, Conj., 599.
Eta (Gk.), Lat. ae, 42 (see -ens-).
etiam, 599; -dum, 609; -num, 570;
-num (-wm-), 62, 69, 121.
eti, 613.
etum, e.g. arboretum, 335.
EU, pronunc. of, 39 sqq.; phon.
changes, 245 sq.; 3, 252.
evenal, 464.
eve (-ae), 617; accent, 164.
eus, -eum (see Suffix -TO-).
ex of remex, &c., 358.
exadversus (-in), Preap., 595.
examen (-adg-), 292.
examussim, 563.
exaurio, the spelling, 475.
exemplum, 271.
exfutu, 309.
exist (?), Fut., 493.
eximus, 319.
exinde, 570.
exolesco, 481.
expergitus, 542.
expers, 192.
explovent, 531.
exploido, 196.
explorato (-e), 550.
exsugebo, 494.
exa, 311.
extemplo, 365.
exitnguo, spelling of, 301 sq.
exitispica, 358.
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extra, 584.
exu, 475.

F, the letter, 2, 5, 291; pronunc., 98 sqq. for Gk. φ, ι; from L.-Eur. bh, 282 sq.; -bh, 283; dh, 289 sq.; -dh-, 289; ghw, 297; ghº, 302; for h, 294 sq.; h, 78, 80.

Fabaris, 95.

fabula, 334.
faceo, 462.
facetus, 335.
faciae for -am, 492.
faecies, 345; -is, 347.
facio, 457; decl. of, 458; cal eʃ, &c., 183 sq., 488; -es, -e, 475; feci, 497, 502; fec(ε), 518; fexxo (-im), 465; -set (?), 508; fefaked, Praen. fib., 504; fefed, Dvenos inser., 528.

facundus, 545.
faeniaeia (fren-), 42.
faenus (fen-), 42.
fugus, 221.
fullo, 355.
fulx, 486.
funæ, 345.
funæ, 355.
familia, 193; -i (?), Nom., 211; -as, Gen., 381.

funæ for -atus, 374.
funum, 397.
fur, 357.
furio, 476; decl., 458; -rus, 542.
-fariam, 552.
furia, 357.
furnus, 279, 294.
furus, 277.
fastidium, 176.
fastigium, 277.
fustus, decl. of, 344.
fatigo, 593.
fatum, 593.
fatum, 542; -us, 370.
Fatumus, 324.
fatus, 324.
favilla, 235.
favor, 357.
fau, 355.

fbricula, 333.
INDEX.

finitimus, 405.
flu, 545; 522; fl, 522; fler, 132; O. Lat. -re, 522; fler, 522.
firmus, pronunc. of, 141.
First, Pers. Sg. ending, 524 sq.; Pl., 529; Syll., accent of, 157 sqq.
fi, 545; Syll., 522.
fieri, 132; 0. Lat. -rei, 522; yftw, 522.
firmus, pronunc. of, 141.
for, decl. of, 457; furi, 221.
flora, 356.
florere, in Romance, 489.
flora, 550, 557.
formae, 178.
formula, the spelling, 239.
forvus, O. Lat., 182 sq., 541.
form, 545 n.
foris, 551; in Vb. Comp., 575.
forma, pronunc. of, 141.
formalodosus, spelling of, 197.
formonsus for -os-, 69.
formus, 302.
formax, 239.
for, 278; Adv., 560; forstau, -m, 560; forstans, -m, 560; f. fuit an, 516; forte, 560.
fortasse (-is), 560.
Fortes and Lenes, 71 sqq.
fortis, 541; -ret-, 342.
fortuito (-u), 550.
forum, 289.
Positus, 307.
fovea, 295.
fovea, 289, 302.
Fourth Decl., blends with Second, 343 sq.
fr- for mr-, 269 sqq.
frases, 270.
Fractions (see Numerals).
fragro and flagr-, 92; fragl-, 92.
fragum, 306.
frango, 222; fregi, 502; fractus, pronunciation of, 139.
frater, 221.
fraxinus, 279.
frenes, 486; (-deo), 486 n.; fressus, the spelling, 115.
frequens, 559.
Frequentatives, 478, 482 sq.
frigidus, frid(d)-, 30, 119; -grf-, 185; -avius, 172.
frigus, 306.
frigutio, 488.
frugi, 407; Compar., 408.
frumentum, -mint-, the spelling, 23.
frondes for -ond-, 31, 33.
fruniscor, 470, 237.
fruor, 484 n.; -minos, 519.
frustra, (-a), 557; -au-, 40; -or, Vb., 558.
frustram for -tim, 96.
fulgorio, 485.
fulgurio, 476; fugi, 502.
fulvus, 235.
funeral, 295.
fulmen, 310.
fulmen, 235.
funus, 237.
funeralis, 364.
Fundanius, 6k. mispronunc. of, 58, 99.
fulgadit, Luceria inscr., 519.
fulgitus, 561.
funo, fudi, 502; excitus, 309.
funera nec funera, 616 n.
funerus (?), 356.
fuger, 471.
funtes for -ont-, 33.
ful, -ani, 515; fui, 518; fui, Perf., 545; scansion, 132, 508 sq.
for, 233; scansion, 215.
furo, 239.
furnus, 239; for, 239.
furo, 297.
ferus, 306.
fuscus, 306.
Fusio-, 305.
fussus, the spelling, 113.
fulturus, 309; spelling of, 117.
Future (see Tense-stems); Fut. Perf. (do.); Fut. Imper., 516 sqq.


guestum, 305; spelling of, 112.

Gaius, 252; pronunc., 53.
galicinum, 194.
gallina, 370.
garrida, 277.
gaudes, 479; gavisus, 522; -us sum, 522.

Gaulish, mispronunc. 27.
gota, 296, 261.
gemma, 273.

gener, 271.
generix, 191; -nit-, 200.
genista, 195.

Genitive (see Declension); IO-stem, accent, 163 sq.; Gerund. of Purpose, 270.
gen for gigno, 459, 465.
gens, 341.
genus, 296; -nus, the scansion, 144.
genius, 326.
genus, 225.
germin, 271 sqq.

Gerund, &c., 543 sqq.
gesticulor, 488.

-gy- written for ng, 10 sq.

GH, phon. changes of, 296 sq.; GH, 298; GH, 302.

Ghe- (gho-), Dem. Pron., 430.
gigno, 468; geno, 459, 465.
gingrina, 483; -ivus, Vb., 483.

-ginta, the scansion, 418.
glaber, 290

glacies, 261.
glans, 302.
glarea, 268.

*glarem for -dir-, 30.
globus, -mus, 80.
glos, 296.

glosa, spelling of, 112.
gluma (glubo), 282.

-gn-, pronunc. of, 89; -gn-, 64, 70.

gnaeus, 294.

gnar- (Adj.), -us, 220; -aris, 541; (Vb.) -iter, 485; -ivisse, 485; -igavil, 488.

gratus (nat.), 541.
gravitur, 485.

Gnosus, spelling of, 117.

-gnus (see Suffix -NO-).

-go (see Suffix -N-); for -guo, 301 sq.
gobius, 74.
gorius for gy-, 36.
gorytus (co-), 74.
grabattus, 118.

Graechus, Varro's deriv., 93.

Gradation of Vowels, 253 sqq.;

Weak grade, 255 sqq.; of ye, we, 256; E-grade, 255 sq.; O-grade, 255 sq.; ē-ō, 258; ē-ō, 258; ō-ā, 258; ō-ā, 258; ă-ā, 258; ă-ā, 259; ă-ā, 259; ă-ā, 260; ă-ā, 260; ū-ū, 260 sq.; ē-ā, 261; ē-ā, 261 sq.

gradior, 476.
gradius, 222.
grallae, 285.
granae, -mmosus, 118.
grando, 297.
granum, 219 sq.
grates, 341.
gratis (-iis), 403, 551.
gratus, 279.
gravastellus, 332.

Grave Accent, 153 sqq.
gravedo (-ido), 29, 353.
gravis, 301; -īd, 210; *grevis, 18.

Greek, Aspirates (see Asp.); Diphthongs (see Diph.); Letters (see Alphabet); Loanwords, parasitic vow., 70 sq.; accent, 155 sq.; for nuances of feeling, 182; for exclamations, 617; Mispronunc. of Lat., 27, 45, 58, 114 sq.; Orthography, influence on Lat., 12, 576; Phonetics, infl. on Lat., 28, 32, 152 sq.; Transcription of Lat., ch. ii. passim, 135; Lat. of Gk. (see under Gk. name of letter, e.g. Eta, also Aspirates, Diphthongs, Breathing, Tenues).

Grimm's Law, 31.
groma, 96.
grus, 298.
INDEX.

-gu- for guv, 86 sqq., 301 sq.; pronunci., 84 sqq.
guberno, 74.
gulfus (see cul-).
gumnii, 74.
-guo (-go) in Vbs., 301 sq.
gurges, 301, 358.
gurgula, 275.
gusta, Vb., 482; -us, Noun, 296.

Gutturals, letters, 2 sq., 6 sq., 10 sq.; phon. changes of, 290 sqq.; three series, 290 sqq.; Proper (or Velar), 297 sq.
gutta (-ut-), 116.
gyla, the spelling, 29, 36.
gyros (gyoe-), 36 sq.

H, pronunci. of, 53 sqq.; to denote vowel-length, 54; hiatus, 265; for, 56, 294 sq.; dropped bet. vow., 54, 294; from gh, 296 sq.; from ghg, 298.
habeo, 280; scansion of Comp., 143; 'to dwell,' 483.
habito, 482.
hacefenus, 433.
haddus, 242; fadl-., 56; ed-, 42.
hraeo, 242; -sli the spelling, 112; -surus, 542.
Half-long Vowel, 127.
halica (-alc-), 56.
halo, 220.
hanser (see anser).
harea, spelling of, 56.
harialis, spelling of, 56; far- (?), 56.
haruspex, arisp-, 29.
hasto, 308.
haud,616; hau, 120, 122; -guaquam, 569.
haev, pronunci. of, 49, 56, 127 n.
haurio, 475; -ssi the spelling, 112; -surus, 542.
hebes, 351.
hec, O. Lat., 433.
Hecoda, O. Lat., 197.
hedera, haed-., 43.
Hedonei, Gen., 381.
heia, 617 n.
heius, 276, 229.
hem, Interj., 617; pronunci. of, 61.

Heredes, spelling of, 197.
Herentas, 482.
heri, 264, 396; (-e), 25 sq.; -sternus, pronunci. of, 135.
heries (heriem Junonia), 345.

Heteroclitae, Nouns, 367; locus, -ca, 400; Vbs., 545 (see Comparison, irreg.).
heu, Interj., 39.
Hiatus, 144 sq. (see Prosodical H.)
hibernus, 269 sq.
hic, Pron., decl. of, 430 sqq.; pronunci., 433; huic, pronunci., 44.
hic, Adv., 567, 433.

Hidden Quantity (see Close Syllable)
hiems, 358, 297; -mps, 70.
hilaris, 338 sq.; -rus, 182.
hilaritudo (-lus), 341.
Hilaria for Hlyr-, 36, 115.
hinnuleus, pronunci. of, 118.
hio, 476.
hiquidem, 433.
hirca, spelling of, 56.
hirria, 90.
hirsutus, hirtus, 229.
ihiatus, 337.
hoc (Adv.), O. Lat., 568.
hoodie, 433.
hodie, 561; pronunci., 84.
holus (-hol-), 228 sq.; -atrum, 362.
homicida, 364.
homo, 349; hem-, 367; hum-, 33, 236; -ulus, 333; -uncio, 337; -unculus, 337.
hordeum, 298.
horitur, Emm., 482.
horreo, 277.
horum, 568.
hortor, 482.
hortus, 296.
hospes, 178, 298.
hosticapas, 187, 371, 373.
hosticus, 337.
hosti, 298, 341.
huc, Adv., 568.

Huncare, 486.

Hui, Interj., 39.

hujusce,o, accent. of, 162.
humanæ (-iter), 554.
humerus (see um-).
humilis, 338.
hummus, 236; decl., 344.

Hydruntum, 289.

I, the letter, 3, 7 sq.; written for II, 7 sq.; tall form, 4, 8 sqq., 47, 133 sq., 137 n.; doubled in ait, &c., 8, 47, 53; symbols of long, 9; pronunci., 23 sqq.; phon. changes, 230 sqq.;
Lat. i for atonic vow., 193 sqq.; for e bef. ng, gn, &c., 225 sq., 229 sq.; in hiatus, 19, 21 sqq.; in tunice, &c., 206 sq.; for u in optimus, &c., 189, 23 sqq.; i- prefixed to st-, &c., 102, 105 sqq.; -i dropped, 204 sq.; Lat. i for e in filius, &c., 224 sq.; for atonic ai, oi, 243 sq.; for ei, 243 sq.; for i lengthened, 230; varying with i, 250; -i shortened, 213.

J, the letter, 7; pronun., 44 sqq.; I-Eur. Y, phon. changes of, 262 sqq.; Lat. j for ghy, 263 sqq.; for dy-, 263 sqq.; dropped bef. accented vow., 144.

I-stems, mixed with Cons.-stems, 338, 401 (see Suffix -I-).

I-Subjunct. (Opt.), 513 sqq.

-i- in Fut. Perf., 510; Perf. Subj., 500; 3 Conj. Vbs. in -io, 475.

-i, -i, in stupila, &c., 37.

ja- pronounced je-, 15, 17.

jacio, jaceo, 473; jeci, 502.

jaculum, 332.

jejentaculum, 17.

jejunos, 17.

iam, 'cam,' Acc. Sg., 437.

jam, 570.

jandulum for -md-, 66, 121.

janiričes, 274.

jante, 17.

janna, 264; jen-, 17.

Januarius, pronun. of, 15; Jen-, 17.

Janus, decl. of, 344; -is, Carm. Sal., 339.

-ibam, -iebam, Impft., 491.

ibi, 567; -dem, 571, 567.

-ibo, Fut., 493.

-i of illis, &c., 551.

-icam, o. g. Afr., 327.

ici, Perf., 502.

-iicius (see Suffix -KO-).

Ictus, and accent. in Plaut., 165 sqq.

-ieus (see Suffix -OK-).

idecirco, 580; ic-, 314.

ideam, 431; decl. of, 441 sq.

identidem, 571.

ideo, 568.

idolatria, 176.

idēum, the scansion, 150.

-idus, o. g. pallidus, 353 sq.

je- for jae-, e. g. jecto for jacto, 15, 17.

jecur, deel. of, 349; joc-, 41.


jejunos (ja-), 17; pronun., 53.

-ie(n)s of Numeral Adv., 408.

iens, evnitus, Gen., 541.

jento (ja-), 17; jejent-, 17.

-ier, Inf. Pass., 536 sq.

-īrem, accent of, 164.

igitur, 565, 605; accent., 169.

Ignatius for Egn-, 229.

ignis, 229.

ignoro, 485.

ignosco, 349, 615.

-igo of navigo, &c., 479.

-igo (see Suffix in Gutt.).

-iit of abīt, &c., 528; of audit, &c., 132.

ilicet, 564.

ilico, 564.

ilignus, 293, 229.

-ilis (see Suffix -LI-); -ilis, of Pass. Adj. (do.).

illac, Adv., 569.

ille, 430, 436 sq.; pronun., 122; accent., 167; -mi, Dat. Sg., 452.

illex and illex, 135 n.

ille, the spelling, 112.

illī (-i), Adv., 567, 432.

illicio, -exi, pronun. of, 498, 139.

illim, Adv., 570.

illimodi, 431.


illuc, Adv., 568.

-ilus (see Suffix -LO-); (-illus), 115.

illustris, 293.

-im of seminis, &c., 548; of illim, &c., 551; (-em) Acc. Sg., 388.

im, 'eum,' 438.

imago, 521.

imbilicus for umb-, 29.

imeum (?), 'eundem,' 438.

imitor, 521.

immanis, 339.

immo, 603.

impendo, 560.

Imperative (see Moods); as Particle, 600; accent of addūc, &c., 163.

Imperfect (see Tense-stems).

impero, 192.

Impersonal Pass., 520 sq.

impetrō, 485.

implorō, 473.
INDEX.

impciscor, 480.
impcitus, P. P. P., 542.
Impcritor, 279.
impresentiariun, 562.
imprin, 565.
improno, 615.
impudenter, 554.
imrine, 559.
-imus of Superl. (see Comparison).
imus, infimus, 407.
in (em), Prep., 584; im, im-, 50 sq., 66, 69, 99 sqq., 121; bef. s., f., 136 sqq.
in-, Neg., 615; with Vb., 615, 363.
-in (see Suffix -N.).
ineassum, 564.
Inceptives, 476 sqq., 479 sqq.; -esco, 134.
incipisso, 462.
incitare, 197.
indilno, 470.
incitus (-hit-), 239; spelling of, 197.
incogitabilis, 334.
incho, spelling of, 57.
incolomis, the spelling, 192.
incolomis, the spelling, 192.
incom, 581.
incombus (-bo), 348.
incurmcervicus, Accius, 360.
indaudio, 583.
indu (see enu). 
Indefinite Pron. (see Pronouns).
Indeterminate Vow., 257.
indigna, 583.
indigeo, Vb., 583; -us (-ens), Adj., 540.
Indo-European languages, 218; prototype of word, 218; alpah, 218 sqq.
indoles, 345; 583.
indu (see enu).
indugredior, 583.
induo, 475.
induperator, 583.
indutrius, 189.
inbrae aces, 191.
infans for infans, 182.
inferbis, 494.
inferus, -fer, 374; -fra, Prep., 585; -fera, 181; infimus, imus, 407.
infilt, 546.
infiteor, 615.
ingens, 274, 541.
ing, Imper., 526.
ingratis (-tis), 551.
indb, 567.
inipile (?), 198.
Initial Syll. (see First Syll.).
inleite, the scansion, 475.
inpeitorator, 22.
inguam, 524; Conj. of, 545 sq.
inquies, -etus, 182.
inqueius, 227.
insane, -um, 550.
insciens, -us, 540.
instar, 205.
instigo, 284, 471.
istinui, Perf., 508.
Instrumental, 548 (see Declension); Adv. use of, 559 sqq.
insuper, 593.
int (?), 3 Pl., 456.
intellevi, Perf., 505.
temperies, Sg., -as, Pl., 347.
ter, 585.
teratim, 556.
terili (-s), 555.
teruadum, 556.
terum, 609.
terduc, 515; -im, 515.
teradicci, accent. of, 162.
teribl, 567.
Interjections, 616 sqq.; from Gk., 617; Imper., 618; accent. of, 164.
terim, 570.
Interrogative, Particles, 605 sq.; Pron. (see Pronouns).
terius, 593.
tolerans for -andus, Laev., 543.
intrare, 474.
titus, Adv., 561; Prep., 585.
inventio, 274.
inveito, Vb., -us, Adj., 299.
-inum for -enum, 23.
inunt, 3 Pl., 531.
inovatum, 329.
-inus (see Suffix -NO-).
jocus, 264.
-totum, accent. of, 164.
-tor (see Comparison).
Iotacismus, 27.
Iones (Dvenos Inser.), 264.
ipse (-ius), 430, 440 sq.; isse, 79; ipsima, -issimus, ipsippe (-ipse, -ippe), 441;
epse (-a), 441.
iva, spelling of, 245.
Irregular Verbs, 545 sqq.
is of Cornelia, &c., 375.
is, Pron., 430; decl. of, 437 sqq.;
ejus, pronunc., of, 53.
isco for esco, Incept., 480.
isst., 79.
-issimus, Superl. (see Compar.).
isso, Vb., 488.
istae, Adv., 569.
ist, 430; decl. 435; pronunc., 122;
accent, 167.
ister (-i), Adv., 567.
istic, Adv., 568
-it, 3, 8g. Perf., 527 sq.
it, 571; -idem, 571.
Italia, the scansion, 127 n.
-Itanus, e.g. Abder- , 327.
itque, 604 sq., 571; scansion, 604.
Itur, 482.
item, 571.
-iter, Adv., 549. 553.
iter, decl. of, 349.
Iteratives, 478, 482 sq.
Iturum, 350; 550.
-itus (-um) (see Suffix -IO-).
itur, Imper., 520.
jus, pronounced jii-, 15.
jubec, 481; joussi, pronunc. of, 110 sq.;
O. Lat. joussi, 498.
jucundus, 545.
juder, 182.
Jugatinus, 325.
jugis, 338.
jugementum, -gum-, 336, 292.
juger, 245; jugra for-era, Lex Agr., 184.
jugum, 267 264.
Julius, 250.
ivm, 'eum,' Luceria inser., 437.
jumentum, 336.
jungus (?), 471.
junior, 408.
juniperus (-pir-), 374, 192; ji-, 35.
juniz, 345.
Jupiter (-pp-), 246, 389; spelling, 116;
decl., 377; Jor-, 263 sq.
jurigo, O. Lat., 173.

jus, 'broth,' 237; 'law,' 264.
-itus, Compar., scansion of, 406 n.
justurandum, 358.
justus, 356.
juvenalis, -illis, 340.
juvenis, 239; Compar., 408.
juvenit, 334 n.; -tas (-tus), 341.
juven, 476; juerint, 508.
juxta, 585.
-ix of felix, &c. (see Suffix -KO-, Gutt.);
of cornix, &c. (see Suffix -I-)
Kadamitas, 286.
Kappa in Lat., 72.
Karmadhāraya, Comp., 360 sq.
ke- (ko-), Dem. Pron., 429 sqq.

L, pronunc. of, 89 sqq.; bef cons., 96 sq.; L.-Eur. L, phon. changes of, 275 sq.; L, 278 sq.; Lat. l for d, 80, 82, 285 sq.; for r, 92 sq.; for n, 96; for ll, 109 sqq.
-l- for ll-, 283 sq.
-l, vow. shortened bef., 213; decl. of
Nouns in, 376.
Labials, phon. changes of, 281 sqq.
Labiovelar Gutt., phon. changes of,
299 sqq. (see Qs, Q, QH). 
labes, 345.
labium, 261.
labo, 393.
librum, 180.
lac, spelling of, 122; lact (-te), 378.
laccu, 307.
lacer for -ratus, 540.
lacesso, 462.
lacio, 191.
lacrima, 223; spelling, 57 sq.
lacus, 301.
lacta for loc-, 201.
lacrus, 242.
lamberto, 479.
lamba, 471; -bi (?), Perf., 501.
lambroset for lab-, 65.
lammina, -mn- (-mn-), 184.
lana, 279.
lancino, 470.
languio, 306.
lanius (-i9), 348.
INDEX.

lanterna (-mpl-), 70.
lapis, 353.
lavignus, 293.
larinum, 288.
larix, 286.
larva (-rva), 46.
lasseus, 258.
lax, 335.
laticlaurus, 361.
Latona, 349.
latus, 219 sq., 541.
lavo, 235; -vi, 499; latus, lo-, 250; -luc in Compounds, 196.
laurus, 286.
lauia, 286.
lector, pronunc. of, 139.
lectum (-se), 542; pronunc., 139.
Legato Pronunciation, 131.
legatus, 541.
legirupa (-ger-), 373, 192.
legimius, 405.
lego, 260; legi, 502; lectum, pronunc., 139.

Lenes and Fortes, 71 sqq.

Length (see Long Cons., Vow.)

Lengthening, by Position (see Pos.); by Compensation, 314; bef. c, s, 136 sqq.: gn, gm, 138 sq; ct, x, 139 sq; net, ns, 140; r with cons., 140 sq; s with cons., 141.

lenibat, 491; -libunt, 493.
lenocinor, 488.
-lentus (-lentus) (see Suffix -NT.).
lenus, 252.
lepoeta, 286.
leptis for nep, 96
Letters (see Alphabet).
Levana, 326.
Leucoscis, Carm. Sal., 245.
levir, 200, 242.
levis, 292.
levis, 244.
lex, 260.
-lexi (-legi), Perf., 505.
-li, syncopated after cons., 171.
liberatus, 493.
libet (lbe-), 29.
libra, 289.
licet, 613.
lien, 394.
ligula, 272.
ligurro, 291, 482.
limitrophus, 176.

limus, mud, 328.
lingo, 471.
linqua, 229, 286.
lingula, 272.
linio, 483.
ilo, 470.
linque, 469; liqui, 502.
liner (liner), 29.
ligare, -are, 484.
ligur, 268.
ila, 199.
littera, spelling of, 117; l. canina, 90.
ilus, spelling of, 117.
ilx, 293; -ixus, 323.
-lr for lr, ln, ls, 275; dl, 285; nl, 271; rl, 277.
Locative (see Declension); Adv. use of, 559 sqq.
locus, -co, Pl., 400; O. Lat. sufficient, 303, 307, 564; in wordgroup, 170.
Loebarius, 248.
loecus, O. Lat., 248.
Long, Cons., orth. of, 3, 109; Vow., 3 sq, 9 sq. (see Quantity).
longus, spelling of, 236.
loggetta, the spelling, 112 sqq.
loquor, 284.
Lorsa, 292.
Loss, of Cons. in Group, 309 sqq.; of final syll. in -m, 216 sq.
lotus, 250.
lubricus, 306.
lubs, Marso-Lat., 12, 177.
luceo, 481.
lucerna, 237.
luci claro, 396.
Lucilius, _i_ and _ei_, 9, 27; _g_ for _gg_, 11; _a_ for _ā_, 10, 14; _e_ and _ae_, 42; _r_, 90; _pellicio_, 97; _numeri_, Gen., 383 n; _mille_, 420; _milli_, 437.
Lucipor, 183.
Lucetius, use of Compounds, 360.
luctus, pronunc, of, 135.
lucus, 250.
ludus, 287; loed-, 248.
lues, 345.
lumbus, 290.
luna, 292.
lupus, 291; _F_, 370.
luro, 179.
*tār(t)ius for tārī-, 37.
tāstra, tāstra, 141.
lustro, 293.
THE LATIN LANGUAGE.

lutra, 289.
luex, 276 (see luci).
lympha, 286; spelling, 11, 36.

M, the letter, 7; pronunciation, 60 sqq.;
final dropped, 68 sq., 123; assimilated,
Lat. n for m, 269; bef. r, f, 50 sq.,
66, 99 sqq.; for r, 281; for b, 282 sq.
m, vow. shortened bef., 133 sq.
assimilation, 121.

Lat. m for w, 269;
befr., r- and -f-, 50 sq., 66, 99 sqq.;
for p, 281; for b, 282 sq.
m, vowel shortened bef., 213; final
syllable dropped, e.g. nihil(um), 216
sq.; of 1 sg., 524.

macer, 223.
macero, 488.
madeo, 223, 473.
moctis (-e), 558.
magister, 232.
magistratus, 343.
magnanimus, 364.
magnopere, 362.
magnus, 261.
Maius, -ii-, 8; -i-, 105.
majus, 292, 408; pronunciation, 53.
malus, 551; mal(e)-, 184; -icus, 51.
malignus, pronunciation of, 138.
malo, 547; -ill-, 111 sqq.; malum, 515.
malogranatum, 364.
malus, 307.
Maners, 95.
mamilla, 113.
mamma, 116, 363.
mamor for marm- (see Gender), 95.
mamphurium, 383.
mancere, 472; Perf. of, 501.
mare, 396.
meneo, 476; -nis, 505.
mansi (-no-), 183; M. -nis, 339.
manico, a handle, 337.
manifestus (-nus-), 193.
manipulus, pronunciation of, 94.
manus (-tus), 182.
manete (-illum), 117.
manualis, 340.
marerat for -cidat, 288.
marsi, 339.
mareus for -idius, 288.
maritimus, 405.
Marius, 320.
marmor, 18; pronunciation, 95.
Marpesius (-pessus), 117.

Marpur, 185.
marsupium (-p-), 117.
Marsus, 84.
marsiae, 375.
Masculine (see Gender).
Masper, 278.
massa, 104.
mater, 19.
matera, 219.
matera, 405.
materculis, 349.
*matriminus for -lat-, 184.
matribarba, 197.
matar, 185, 309.
maturine, 407.
mavolo, 547.
maturinus, 407; pronunciation, 139.

Media Prosodia, 161.

Mediae, pronunciation of, 71 sqq.; M.,
Tenues and Asp. phon. changes of,
279 sqq.
mediastinus (-nus-), 330.
medicius, 407.
medipontus (-p-), 287.
medius, 521, 287.
Mediolina, 347.
medius, 226.
medius fidius, 618.
medullitis, 561.
mehe, 1. Lat., 422.
meherole (-cules), 618.
mejo, 466.
med, scansion of, 122.
meles, 346.
Medica for Med-, 287.
medior, 406.
mellum (?), 406.
mellum for mell-, 18.
membrum, 270.
memini, 270; -mento, 517.
memor, 541.
mendicus, spelling of, 245.
menetius, N. (-di, F.), 400.
menetria, for meretrix, 96.
mens, 274; -mente, Adv., 549, 552.
mensas, pronunciation of, 67.
mentio, the scansion, 212.
-mementum (see Suffix -TO-).
mercedinemum, 540.
mercenarius (-n-), pronunciation of, 118.
merda, 306.
meceo, -unt 3 Pl., 519; merhabatur,
the scansion, 202.
meridia, 288; med-, 288.
meritio, 559.
mers for -rx, 107.
merto for -so, 482.
mervola, 288.
messis, 340.
-met of egomen, &c., 421, 423 sq., 429.
Metathesis of r, l, 91, 97 sq.
Meteor, 486.
ceter, mensus, 471.
mito, 486; -ssui, 499.
metuculosus, 333.
metus, F. (O. Lat.), 343 sq.
meus, 426 sqq.; ml, Voc., 427.
Messentius, Med., 104.
mica, 306.
migro, 302.
miles, 487; scansion, 119, 215; -ex, 108.
mille, 419 sq.; milia, spelling of, 112 sq.
mirus (-mcus), 46.
mica (µrâ), 64; in word-group, 169 sq.
mixerrimus, 407.
migro, 455
-mcti, 2 Pl., Ind., 534; Imper., 517.
minimus, 407; -me (-mm), Adv., 550.
mimicitar, 200.
misertar, 232.
-mcni, Pass., 517, 519.
mimor, 407.
mim(n)stcrion for -nct-, 173, 202.
mimno, 471.
Minucius, Praen. inscr., 229.
mis, Gen., 421 sq.
miscio, 479; mixtus, -stus, 107.
miscellus, -serculus, 333.
miser, 306; myr-, 29.
mitto, pronoun of, 117; misi, O. Lat.
meisei, 499, 112.
misti, myctis, 37.
ml, phon. change of, 270 sq.
-mn-, pronoun of, 64, 69 sq.
mor for moeo, Foss., 426.
moderor, 356.
mordus, 356.
modus, 612; -â, 551; Comps. of, 559.

modus in word-groups, 169, 564.
moes, O. Lat. for mc- in moerus, &c., 248.
mores, 345 sq.
mollibit (?), 493.
monedula (-er-), 288.
moneo, 477; moneris, -int for monus, 506.
-monium (-nâ) (see Suffix -IO-).
Monosyllables, shortening of, 215 sq.
monstrum, 331.
Months, Gender of, 369.
monumentum, -nom., 201; -tus, 370.
Moods, 511 sqq.; Subj., 511 sqq.;
Opt., 511 sqq.; Imper., 516 sqq.
mordeo, 303, 482; Perf. of, 505; moemordi, 497; mem-, 503.

morigeror, 485.
motor, 473; -imir, -iri, 475; -tus, 324; -tus, 174.
motor, 403.
mors, 278.
morces for -bus, 52.
mostellum, 331.
moveo, Perf. in Romance, 509.
mov, 555.

mrs, phon. change of, 270 sq.
-ms-, phon. change of, 270.
mucus (-mcus), 46.
mulceo, -isi, 505.
mulgeo, 296; -isi, 505; -ctus, 279.
muler, 287; -ïere, accent. of, 164.
munulosus, 362.
multus, Compr., 408.

Mummius, dedicatory inscr., 11.

-mungo, Vb., 471.
munus, 247.

-mur, 1 Pl. Pass., 534.
*murca for aw-, 107.
muriola, spelling of, 117.
murmor, 315.

-mus, 1 Pl. Act., 529; scansion, 529.
mus, 237.
musca, 239.
muscula, 365.
musino, 71.

Mutation of Vowels (see Gradation).
Mute and Liquid, vow. lengthened
bef., 94; accent. of penult with, 164.
mute, 247; for -tor, 522.
multus, 58.
matus, 324.
myser for mis-, 29.

N, pronoun of, 60 sqq.; I.-Eur. N,
phonic changes of, 271 sqq.; N, 273 sq.; Lat. n for l, 96; for m, 270; for gn-, 292, 294.

**N-piece** (see Particles).

Naeopor, 183.

Naevius, 294.

Nahartis, Nart., 54.

Nam, 604, 571.

**Names**, of birds, &c., changed by

Anal., 201; Proper, form of Italic, 319 sq.; in -o, 348 sq.; in -is, 375.

Namque, 604.

Nanciscor, 261, 480; -cio, 480; -etus ('-etus'), 471.

Namis, 272.

Narro, 483; pronunc., 118; -r-, 118 sq.

Nasal, pronunc. of, 60 sq.; Gutt., 10 sq., 60, 65; Vb., 469 sqq.; 3 Pl., e.g. damus, 530 sq.

Nasifera, the spelling, 112.

Natum, 259; -stitum, 112.

Nivris, 353.

Natus (gn-), 541, 219 sq., 294.

Naufragus, 180; -(is), 252.

Natis, 221, 252.

Nct-, pronunc. of, 64, 70.

Nd-, pronunc. of, 64, 70.

Nde of unde, &c., 551.

Ndo-, of Gerund, 543 sq.

N, Interrog., 605 sq.

Ne, Affirm., 615.

Ne, Neg., 615.

N, Nee, Affirm., 614 sq.

Ne, Neg., 614; accent of, 166.

Nebula, 226.

Nec, ‘non’, 616.

Nec (see neque).


Necc, 481; -avi (‘-i’), 499.

Necto, -xvi, 509.

Necubi, 446.

Nenufactem, 570.

Nedum, 614.

Nefas, 615.

Negatives, 615 sq.

Neglego, 616; -xi, 505.

Negro, 486.

Negotium, 616.

Nemo, 449.

Nempe, 604; scansion, 63; pronunc., 122.

Nec, 476, 225; nemni, 519.

Nepos, 351, 272; -nis, 32.

Neptis, 351; lept-, 96.

Nequalia, 571.

Nequam, 571.

Nequaquam, 569.

Neque (ne), 122.

Nequeo, 547; -quiont, 531; -quitur, 522.

Nero, 271.

Nescio, 547.

Nesciobre, 446.

Nesi, 592.

Nere (nwm), 614, 122.

Neuter (see Gender); in -r, decl. of, 349; in -es, 355 sq.

Neuter, 450; pronunc., 143.

Neutiquam, pronunc. of, 143.

-nt-, lengthening of vow. bef., 136 sqq.

Ni, 611.

Nicto, 293.

Nigidius, on i, 55; Agma, 65; accent of Valerii, 163, 390.

Nihil (nil), 216 sq., 144, 57.

Nimes (-imm), 558.

Nisi, 611; -se, 25.

Nigelula (-ella), 333, 353.

Nitror, Vb., 521; -ito, 519; -xus, 294.

Nitti for -ct-, 89.

Nict, Vb., Paceuv., 455.

Nix, 272.

-ntm-, phonic change of, 271 sqq.

No, 476.

Nobilis, 334.

Nocce, 481; -ivus, Adj., 323.

Noctu, 555.

Nomen (-d), 615.

Nola (from nolo), 318.

Nolo, decl. of, 547; -ilt, 111 sqq.; -lim, 515.

Nomens, 294; -clator, 364.

Nominative (see Declension); Adv. use of, 553 sqq.

Non, 615, 216 sq.

Nomaginta, 417.

Nonadrum, 570, 609.

Nongenti (noning-'), 419.

Nonne, 605.

Nonus, 416.

Nuptiae for nuptiae, 37.

Nos, decl. of, 424 sqq.; -ss, 112.

Nosco, 479; gm-, 294; -vi, 500.

Notris &c., accent. of, 163.

*Nolus* for *na-*, 15, 17.

Notus, (gn-), 233.

Novem, 415 sq.; -decim, 416; -venus, 416.
INDEX.

Novensiles (-d-), 286.
novicius, 338.
novitas, 341.
nows, 226.
nox, 234 sq.; Adv., 555.
-ns-, prono. of, 63 sq., 69; for s after long vow., 69; from -ns-, 112; vow. long bef., 136 sqq.
-us of triens, sextans, &c., 409.
-mnt, 3 Pl., 529; -nto, 531; -ntor, 535; -ntur, 534.
nubes, 346; nubs, 182.
nudipes, 361.
nudius terius, 260, 377.
nudus, 260, 235, 179.
nudus, 449; prono., 113.
nun, 605.
Numasios, Praen. fib., 305.
Number, 366, Dual (see Dual).
Numerals, 408 sqq.; Fractions, 409; accent, of, 165.
Numerius, 560; vii, Gen., 383 n.
numerus, 270; numero, Adv., 560.
nunnum, Gen. Pl., 402.
nune, 570.
nuncubi, 446.
nundinae (nond-, nonund-), 251, 180.
nunquam, 570.
-mnt, 3 Pl., e.g. damunt, 530 sq.
multius, 180; novent-, non-, 250 sq.; prono., 141.
murus, 239; -ra, 343; no-, 37.
-nus, e. g. facinus, 356.
nusicos (<citiusus), 96.
nutriö, 349.
O, prono. of, 30 sqq.; phon. changes of, 232 sqq.; ò in e-roots, 258; ò in ò-roots, 258; ò-ò, 260; ò-ò, 239; Lat. ò for lengthened ò, 233; Lat. ò for a, 17 sq.; for e with w, l, 225 sqq.; for atonic vow. bef. Lab., 192 sqq.; after gu, 300; Lat. ò for au, 40 sq.; for ou, 428 sqq.; not weakened to ì, 190.
O-stems, blend with U-stems, 343 sq. (see Suffix -O-, -YO-, &c.)
-ò, 1 Sg., 524; of Riva, &c., 348 sq.; of quo, Adv., &c., 551; of vero, Adv., &c., 550; for ò in Adv., 559; shortening of, 512 sq.
ob (obs.), Prep., 585; ousted by ab-, 574.

ob vos sacro, 573.
obinunt, 531.
obiter, 503.
oblitterus for -atus, 543.
obliriscor, -isc, 52; -itus, Pass., 543.
oboedio, 196, 246.
obrussa, 198.
Obscure Vowel, 185 sqq., 257.
obssequium, 321.
obsolesco, 481.
obsono, 488.
obsdress, 191.
obstino, 472; obstinatus, 310.
obstringilla, 487.
oblino, spelling of, 78 sq.
obviam (us, Adj.), 563.
occuni, Perf., 599, 198.
occidentas (?) for -edt-, 199.
ocillo, 487.
occulo, 227; ogulotol, S. C. Baeh., 227.
ocupe, 470, 486.
ocur, 259, 406.
ocris, 259.
octo, 415; -decim, 416; -ginta, 417 sq.; -dyg, 418; -dyag, 418; -tingenti, 419; -tacus, 220.
ocibus, 234.
odium, 259.
odor, 235.
OE, prono. of, 39 sqq.; spelling, 246. (See Ol.)
omens, 248, 410.
offs, 113.
offendices, 272.
offendo, 486; -sa, Noun, 542.
officiant, 174, 349.
OL, phon. changes of, 246 sqq.; OI, 252 sq.; OL, OE on insert., 247 sq.
oi, Interj., 39.
oins, 410.
Oinumama, 193.
oinorosi, 178.
-ol- from ol, 228 sq.; l, 278 sq.
onenica, 337.
oleo, 287.
olum, 570; o oliorum, 436; olitans, 436.
oliva, 228; -num (oleum), 196.
oita (aula), 41.
able (-us), 436; odes, olorum, 436.
Olympus, accent, of, 155.
Omega, Lat. transcr. of ϕ, 44.
Omicron, Lat. transcr. of, 33.

omittio, 113 sq., 202.
noise, 80.

omnimosis, 362.

omnis, 450; omnino, 325.

Onomatopoetic Verbs, 483, 476.

ossus (-ossus), 353.

ont, 3 Pl., O. Lat., 529.

onitis, O. Lat. for -ō, 348 sq.

opus, 306.

-oper, 400.


operio, 475; for ap-, 18.

oper, 485.

opificina, 174.

opilio (ap-), 34.

opinor, 472.

opiparns, 192.

Opiter, 180.

opitular, 485.

opituma, 174.

oppe, 566.

opportune, oper-, 114.

Optative (see Moods).

optimus, 406.

optio, 369.

opidens (-lentus), 352.

opina, 485.

opulens, 34.


-or, 1 Sg. Pass., 533; Nom. Sg., e. g.

color (see Suffix -S-).

Orta, as a nickname, 40.

orbis, 239; orbs, 182.

orbus, 258.

orca, 239.

orcla prima for primord-, 362.

Ordinal Numerals (see Num.).

ordio, pronunc. of, 141.

orae, 261.

orichalcum, 202.

olica for auricula, 40 sq.

orno, 33, 310; pronunc., 141.

-ornum (-um), Gen. Pl., 402.

-os, Nom. Sg., e. g. O. Lat. cosos, 356.

os, mouth, 358.

os, bone, 495.

-os- (aus-), e. g. osculor, 41.

Oscus, 310.

ostendp, 310.

ostium, 262; ust-, 34.

-ōsus (-ossus, -ossus), 112, 353.

OU, phon. changes of, 248 sq.; ŌU, 253; Lat. ou for eu, 245 sq.; on inscr., 246; written for u, 246; for ō, 246.

-ov- for -ue-, 33.

ovefer, 361.

ove, 235.

*ōvum for ōv-, 34.

-ōx (see Suffix in Gutt.).

oxime, 407.

P, pronun. of, 78 sq.; phon.

changes of, 281 sq.; dial. from q, 299 sq.; not final, 77; bet. m-n, &c., 70.

P-particle (see Particles).

pacant or papa-, xii Tabb., 465; paciscor, 465; -peciscor, 200.

Pacuvius, use of Compds., 360.

paedora for -res, 356.

Paedimus, pronunc. of, 138.

paene, 558 n.

paenisula, 360.

paenula, 197.

Paenultima Accent.-Law, 160 sqq.

pagina, 326.

palam, 586.

Palatal Gutt., phon. changes of, 295 sqq. (see K, G, GH).

Palatalization of Cons. bef. y, 263.

of l, 81 sqq.; of c, 87 sq.; l, 91, 98; r, 91, 98.

palea, 279.

palma, 279, 328.

palar, 586.

palpebra (-tra), 331.

patines, 346.

pātus, -ūs, the scansion, 214.

pātus, 293.

Panda, 318; -āna porta, 318.

pandiculor, 488.

pando, 472; -ār, Perf., 502.

pange, 259; Perf. of, 504; panxi, 504; pēgi, 497; pēpīgī, 495.

panis, 339.

panmucia, 337.

panus, pannus, 117.

papa, accent. of, 164.

papaver, 341.

Papirius Crassus, his use of r for z, 6.

Parasitic Vowel, 145 sqq.; with l, r, 93 sqq.; in Gk. loanwords, 70 sq.; u bef. l, 193 sq., 197 sq.

parcarpus (?) for pance, 273.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEX.</th>
<th>645</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>parco, Perf. of, 505; -rsi, 505.</td>
<td>pelegrinus for per-, 93.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parcus, 318.</td>
<td>pellex for pael-, 115.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parentialid, Luceeria inscr., 519.</td>
<td>pelio, 472; pepulli, 504.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paret (-rr-), 117.</td>
<td>penedo, pendo, 473.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>particidas, 371, 373, 117 sq.</td>
<td>penes, Prep., 586.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pario, 279; -we, 475; -ibis, 492 sq.</td>
<td>penetro, 586, 594.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pars, 278; partem, Adv., 555.</td>
<td>penna, 313.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participo, 539 sqq.; Pres. Act., 540; Fut., 540; Perf., 541; Pres. Pass., 540; Perf., 541 sq.; -tus (-sus), 542; truncated, 543; used as Adj., 540 sq.</td>
<td>penuria, 558 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paticipo, 539 sqq.; Pres. Act., 540; Fut., 540; Perf., 541; Pres. Pass., 540; Perf., 541 sq.; -tus (-sus), 542; truncated, 543; used as Adj., 540 sq.</td>
<td>penus, 586.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paticipo, 539 sqq.; Pres. Act., 540; Fut., 540; Perf., 541; Pres. Pass., 540; Perf., 541 sq.; -tus (-sus), 542; truncated, 543; used as Adj., 540 sq.</td>
<td>-per, e.g. paulisper, 562.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paticipo, 539 sqq.; Pres. Act., 540; Fut., 540; Perf., 541; Pres. Pass., 540; Perf., 541 sq.; -tus (-sus), 542; truncated, 543; used as Adj., 540 sq.</td>
<td>peragro, pronunc. of, 94.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paticipo, 539 sqq.; Pres. Act., 540; Fut., 540; Perf., 541; Pres. Pass., 540; Perf., 541 sq.; -tus (-sus), 542; truncated, 543; used as Adj., 540 sq.</td>
<td>percello, 486; -culsus, 542.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paticipo, 539 sqq.; Pres. Act., 540; Fut., 540; Perf., 541; Pres. Pass., 540; Perf., 541 sq.; -tus (-sus), 542; truncated, 543; used as Adj., 540 sq.</td>
<td>percussi, Perf., 545.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participo, 539 sqq.; Pres. Act., 540; Fut., 540; Perf., 541; Pres. Pass., 540; Perf., 541 sq.; -tus (-sus), 542; truncated, 543; used as Adj., 540 sq.</td>
<td>persegre, 396.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partim, 556.</td>
<td>peremne, 191.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Param, 562; parumper, 562.</td>
<td>peremo, 587.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partim, 556.</td>
<td>perendie, 560, 588, 192.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partim, 556.</td>
<td>perendino (see comperendino).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasci, 310.</td>
<td>peres for pel-, 81.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passim, 556.</td>
<td>perfacul, 198.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive, 519 sqq.; Impers., use, 520 sq., 523; with Acc., 521; Person-endings (see Verb); Inf. (see Inf.); Part. (see Participles).</td>
<td>Perfect (see Tense-stems); quant. of penult of S-perf., 134 sq.; accent. of -it, &amp;c., 163; scansion -iit, 214.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pastillus, 339.</td>
<td>perfidus, 587.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pateo, 476, 222.</td>
<td>pergy, 587.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pater, 222; p. familias, 381.</td>
<td>periculum, scansion of, 175 sq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricoles, 197.</td>
<td>perjero (see pej-).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patrisso, 488.</td>
<td>Periphrastic Tenses, 510 sq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patrocinor, 488.</td>
<td>perna, 251.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patronus, 349.</td>
<td>pernix, 354; pérn-, 141.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patres, 340.</td>
<td>pernax, 361, 555.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paucus, 243.</td>
<td>perperam, 557.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pavo, pavio, 473.</td>
<td>perplovere, 466.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paulatim, 556; -isper, 562; -hum, 562; -hum, spelling of, 111 sq.</td>
<td>perquam, 571.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pax, 259.</td>
<td>Personal Pron. (see Pronouns).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-pe, Particle, 597.</td>
<td>Person-endings (see Verb).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pecell, 349.</td>
<td>perstoma, 172.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pecell, 349.</td>
<td>pertineo, 476.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peckus, 488.</td>
<td>pertius, 195.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peco, 479; -xi, 505; -xi, 509.</td>
<td>perovnum, 464.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pecus, 281; pecus, 354.</td>
<td>percus, 317 sq.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pedeppressim, -temptim, 556.</td>
<td>pes, 286.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pedilaster, 330.</td>
<td>pesna (?), 313.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>péde, 307; pepedi, 501.</td>
<td>peessum, 539.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pejero, 48, 199; perj, 313, 587.</td>
<td>pettesso, -issi, 462.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pejor, pronunc. of, 53.</td>
<td>petiolum (?), 76.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pétreus, 300.</td>
<td>peto, 468; -iici, 506.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petrorium, 300.</td>
<td>petrorum, 300.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE LATIN LANGUAGE.

petulcus, 337.
phaleræ, 190.
phasellus, — for —, 115.
Phi (see Aspirates).
Philippus, accent of, 155.
Pi, Lat. transcr. of, 75.
piaculum, 333; O. Lat. — colom, 193.
piato (pedatū), 19, 21.
pigmentum, pronunc. of, 139.
*pilla for pua, 115.
pilleus (—Z—), 117.
pilumnoe poploe, Carm. Sal., 398.
pinaria for pen—, 200.
pinguis, 292.
pinna, 229.
pmsq, 471; —/o, 470.
pttvi, 374.
pnc, 225.
pncsima (?), Carm. Sal., 408.
pnclo, 225.
placenta, 190.
plaga, 318.
Plancus, 179.
plango, 471.
planda, plado, 41.
plastrum, plostrum, 41.
Plautus, use of Compds., 362; dial.
Plotus, 242.
plebes, 376.
plecto, 486.
plenerus, 324.
—leo, to fill, 458, 473, 223.
pleris (?), Carm. Arv., 408.
plerumque, plerus, Adj., 559.
pico, 200, 468.
Plinius, 225.
plisma (?), Carm. Sal., 408.
plado, 41.
*plopus for pūpidus, 98.
plostrum, 41.
pluo (plauo), 466.
Pluperfect (see Tense-stems).
plurimus, 408.
plus, 408, 558; —ra (-ría), 401.
pōr—, Prep., 575, 588.
podex, 307.
poella for pu—, 37.
poena, 246 sq.
Poemus, 246.
poe(a), 373.
pōl, 618.

polio, 575.
Polla, 41.
pollen, polenta, 367.
Poliō, spelling of, 112; —, 212.
Polum, 179, 182; —uces, O. Lat., 245.
polubrum, 575, 331.
pomerium, 588.
Pompeius, 300.
pondo, 258.
pourdus, 356.
pone, Prep., 588.
pone, 178; posui (posivi), 499; —ss—, 115.
Pontius, 300.
popina, 300.
populus, scansion of, 146; —oi Romani,
O. Lat., 387.
pōpulus, in Romance, 98.
—por for puer, 183, 185.
por—, Prep., 590.
porca, 279.
porco, 588.
porep, 277.
povicio, 485.
porrigo, porgo, 545, 178.
porro (O. Lat. porod), 568.
porrum, 279.
Poseanna, spelling of, 23.
posco, 477; poposcei, 501; pep—, 503.
Position, length by, 129 sqq.; bef.
Mute and Liq., 94, 129 sqq.
Possessive, Compd., 360 sq.; Pron.
(see Pron.).
possim decl. of, 546; Inf. in Romance,
535; potestur, 522.
pot, pos, pōr, poste, postid, 588 sq.;
postea, 569; postecac, 437; posthac,
569; postibi, 567; postmodum (—o),
559.
posterior, N., 378.
posticus, 337.
postmeridianus, spelling of, 589.
potridic, 560.
Post-tonic, Syncope (see Syncope);
Vow.-change (see Weakening).
potulo, 179.
potumus (—remus), 407.
*poteca for apoth—, 107.
Potina, 349.
potior (-io), 484, 546.
potis, 233.
potis (pote) sum, 546.
poto, 232.
potus, 520, 542.
propinquus, 358.
propitius, 194.
propius for -pri-, 95.
propitium, 556.
propter, 591, 179; -ea, 569.
proterus, 590.
prorsus (-m), 553; cf. 549.
prosa, 553.
Prosperina, 98; Proserpina, (not -ais) 382, 184.
Prosodical Hiatus, 132, 144 sq., 209 sq.
prosper, 257.
prosteriore, in Romance, 489.
Prosthetic, 102, 105 sqq.
prosum, vb., 590.
proverbus, 590.
proximus (-tenus), 554, 556, 200; -am, 557; -is, 554.
proclamation for prodegray-, 190.
proximus, 591.
proria, 487.
*psalli, Perf. (?), 501.
-pse, pte, Particles, 440.
puber, 356.
pubes, 346.
Pubicola (Popli-), 76.
publicus, 287.
Publius, 287.
puer, -re, Voc., Fem. in 0, Lat., 374; -por in Compd., 183, 185.
pueria (-rid-), 174.
pugil, 376.
puler, spelling of, 12, 59 sq.
puleium (-eji-), 48, 292.
pulenta for pot-, 33.
pulix, 355.
puli of impuli, &c., 501; pulsus, 278.
palto (-so), 482.
palvis, 235.
pumex for pirm-, 37.
pumilio (pon-), 34.
pungo, 471; pepend, 503; punctus, pronune., 140.
papa (-pp-); 116.
paurus, 542; purine, 407.
pusillus, 305.
puter, 260; puteo, 260.
pudo, 482; -idi, 211, 600.
purtrefaciens, scansion of, 212.
pitus, 542.

Q, the letter, 3, 7; qu, pronune., 84 sqq.; length by Position, 87; I.-Eur. QH, phon. changes of, 299 sqq.
q3o, qH-, qu-, Pron. stems, 443 sqq.
quo (Dvenos inser.), 445.
qua, Adv. (quaud), 569 sq.
quadra, 413.
quadraginta, 417 sq.; accent., 165; quarr-, 418.
quadranis, 409.
quadrigae, 196.
quadrigenti (-ing-), 419.
quadruplex (+plus), 414.
quaequalis, 448 n.
quero, 487; -svi, 506.
quaeo, 462, 487; -imus (-imus), 487
-sse, 112.
quais, 451.
quattuor, the spelling, 112.
quam, 570, 607; of unquam, &c., 552; quamide, 570, 607; -libet, 613; -vis, 613; -obrem, 66; quamquam, 613.
quando, 608, 571; -o, 213; -que, 571; -quidem, 571, 608; quandox, 608; quandone, 608.
quansei, 607.
Quantity, 126 sqq.; overmastered by accent, 129 (see Shortening, Lengthening, Scansion); changed bef. cons.-group, 133 sqq.; of vow in close syll., 133 sqq.
quattuor, 451; -meis, 613.
quaproprier, 569.
quare, 606.
quartus, 413.
quasi, 607; -se, 25.
quisquis, 305.
quattuor, 557.
quater, 413; -mus, 414.
quatic, n in Comp., 196.
quattuor, 413 sq.; spelling, 414, 113; -tor, 414; -decim, 416.
que, 598 sq.; enclitic, 166 sq.; qua(e), 598.
queistores, 242.
quercus, 291; -mus, 294.
querella, the spelling, 112 sqq.
querror, 227.
querrqua, 315.
quasis for quic-, 142 sq.
-qui- for Gk. ku, 36.
qui, Pron., 443 sqq.; pronune., 39.
THE LATIN LANGUAGE.

repandirostro, Pacuv., 360.
répens, 268; Adv., 554; -nité, 551.
repo, 307.
repperi, Perf., 504.
reppuli, Perf., 504.
repulsa, 542.
requies, decl. of, 346.
res, 252, 225; in word-group, 169.
reses, 358.
respondeo, Perf. in Romance, 509.
Res(t)tutus, 176.
retro(r)sum, 549.
rettuli, Perf., 503 sqq.
retur for refl., 520.
reus, 244.
rex, 260, 276.
Rho, Lat. transcr. of, 12, 59.
-ri, syncop. after cons., 171, 179 sqq.
rien, 264.
rigor, 306.
ringor, 471.
-ris, 2 Sg. Pass., 533; and -er in Adj.
M., F., 371.
rite, 560.
ritus, 560.
Rivais, gender of, 368.
rius for rivus, 52.
-ri, pronunc. of, 97.
-riu- for nm, 271 sqq.
-ro, e.g. lauris, 479.
robigo, 348; rub-, 34.
rubur (-or), 356, 379; -us, 379.
robus, Adj., 248.
rodus, 248 sq.
rópio, 76.
Rostrata Columna (see Col. Rostr.),
rota, 258.
rothnus, 544 sq.
Rough Breathing (Gk.) (see Breathing).
-rr for rs, 277 sq.
-rs, pronunc. of, 91, 96.
rubro, 476.
ruber, 239.
rubicundus, 545.
rubigo for rob-*, 34.
rubus, 307.
rubustus for rob-*, 34.
ructo (see eructo).

rudentes, 467.
rudis, 249, 338.
rúdo, 307.
rudis, 248 sq.
rus, 345.
rustus, 248.
Ruga (see Carvilius).
rumen, 307.
rumentum, 'abruptio,' 314.
rumpia, 33.
rumpo, 471; rupi, 502; -mptus (see corruptus).
rupes, 346; -pr-, 118.
rur (v), 396.
ruris (v), 503, 553.
rurus (v), (rurus), 549, 553.
-rus, 2 Sg. Pass., 534.
Rustic Latin, ᵍ for ʰ, 19, 25, 30.
vehab, 22; ᶑ for ʰ, 24 sq., 29 sq.;
frundes, 31, 33; tundo, 33; o for au, 40 sq.; e for ae, 42 sq.
rusticus, 337.

S, voiced written z, then r, 6; pronunc. of, 101 sqq.; phon. changes of, 303 sqq.; Lat. s for ss, 305 sqq., 109 sqq.; for vs, 136 sqq.; for th in Not. Tir., 58; O. Lat. s, class. r, 305; dial. s, 305.
S-Perf., Vb.-forms (see Tense-stems).
s- from ps-, ks-, 303.
s- O. Lat., e.g. colos, 356; 2 Sg., 525.
sabulium, 304.
sacena (scena), 261, 184.
sacerdos, 179 sqq.
ściri-, ścro-, 183.
sactus for sanct-, 70.
saepe, 559.
saepe (se-), 42.
Saeturni, 242.
Saguntum, 104.
sagus, 259 sq.
sal, 223.
Saliare Carmen (see Carmen Sal.).
saligus, 293.
salto, 223.
salix, 278, 223.
sallo, 285, 479.
saltem, 556.
salvaticus for silv-, 201.
sambucus (sab-), 65.
Sanates, 183.
INDEX.

sacelio, 470; sanctus, pronunc., 140; sanct., sanct., 70.
Sancti, 120 sqq.
sanctus (-en), 377.
saphetis, 104.
sarina, 326.
sarmentum, 310.
satis (sat), 558; sativn, 558 n.
satur, 558 n.
satura (-ira), 197.
Saturnian Metre, 128 n., 132 n., 139.
satus, 222.
saucius for -atus, 543.
savium, 268.
saxum for saga, 89.
saxum, 261.
sc- lengthens final vow., 131; isc-.
(see Prosthetic i).
scaevolum (-mill), 283.
scoena (see-), 42.
scoeptrum (sco-), 42.
scoetus, 242.
sceplio, 279.
sceptrum, 333.
sconnum, 283.
sceudo, -di, Perf., 502.
Scansion, traditional, 127 n.; errors in late literature, 128 sq. (see Shortening).
sceptenadus, the spelling, 136 n.
sceato (-bo), 476.
sceaturia, 482.
scaurit for soc-; 41.
sceerus (?), 356.
scebus, 229.
sceua, a priest's knife, 184, 261.
sceia, (sceph), soae, 42.
scheda, sc(h)i, 29.
sclitoc, 564.
scindio, 280, 471; sciditi, 495, 501;
scisc (?), 593; sciti, 495, 501.
Scipio Afr. (Min.), ve- for vo, 228.
sclis (sil-), 307, 83.
sclopus, 397.
-sco, Incept., 477.
scobis, 259, 338.
scoptus, 197.
scoriscus for corusc-, 29.
scriba, 318.
scriba, 282.
scribis, 306.
scrofa, 80.
scrupulus (scrip-), 29.
scriba, 184.
sclipo, 279.
sê-, 'to sow,' 224.
se, Pron., 424.
se (sed), Prop., 592; se fraudi, 592.
secespita, 261.
secius (sed set-).
seco, 298; si-, 23.
Second Pers., Sg. ending, 525 sq.; Pl., 529.
Secondary Accent, 158 sqq., 161.
seconitis, 592.
secreatum for sacr-, 18.
secta, 566.
sectius (?), 566.
secdum, Prop., 591.
secundus, 411.
securus, 592.
securis, Noun, 552; Adj., 591; Adv., 552; Prep., 591.
-sec, 552, 554.
sec, O. Lat., 'himself,' 424.
secd, Conj., 601.
sedla for -li, 287.
seedocim (seed-), 416.
sedes, 345 sq.
seditio, 592.
sedulo, 563; -ns, Adj., 563.
sedum, 601.
sedutraque, 450.
seges, 351.
segmentum, 293.
sefum, the scansion, 156.
seliquastra, 287.
sella, 287.
semel, 410, 229.
sememris, 304.
semi-, 409, 225.
se(mf)modius, 176.
semis-, 409, 586.
semper, -iternus, 562.
semptem, for sept., 66.
semptus, decl. of, 343; -li, Gen., 380;
384; -lus, Gen., 384.
sevena, 337; sceneo, 337.
sevena, 334 n.
seven, 271, 354; decl. of, 367.
Sentence-Accent, 148 n., 165 sqq.
sententia, 352.
sema, 415.
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sessorum, 592.


septentriones, 269.

Septidonium for Septiz-, 104.

septimus decimus, accent of, 163.

septemcerum, 334: spelling of, 57, 59 sq.

septem, 566.

sequor, 520.

Serena for Sir-, 30.

serius, Adj., 267.

serpillum, 197.

serpo, 277.

serra for sere, 115.

sero, 468; sevi, 500; satus, 222.

sesquum, spelling of, 198 sq.

sescenti, 419.

sescentophagus, 364.

sesuncia, 300; -once-, 236.

sesqui-,

sesse, 409.

sesse for sese, 112.

sesterius, 409; -ium, Gen. Pl., 402; 418.

setius, 566.

Setus (Ziphos), 104.

seu, 122.

severus, 226 sq.

sex, 415; sexaginta, 417.

sexans, 409.

Sextius (-st-), 415.

Shva, 257.

Short Vowel (see Quantity).

Shortening, of vow. bef. vow., 131 sqq.; bef. n with cons., 141 sqq.; bef. l with cons., 142; bef. l, m, -r, -t, 213 sq.; of final vow., 207 sq.; of final syll. long by position, 215 sq.; of monosyll., 215 sq.; after short syll. (see Breves Breviantes); of long diphth. bef. cons., 251 sq.

si, 610.

sibi, 424; -et, 25.

Sibilants, phon. changes of, 302 sqq.

sibilo, 76; -f, 80; -w, 30.

sic, 567; proununc., 121 sq.; sicine, 433.

sicus, 447.

Sieillens, mark of double cons., 4, 8.

sici, 446.

sido, 468; sidi (sedli), 503.

sidus, 267.

sien, 514 sq.

*sifilo for sib-, 30, 78, 80.

signum, pronunc. of, 138 sq.


silicernium, 287.

-sim, Subj., 465.

similaris, 286.

similis, 338.

similis (-tor), 565.

simplex (-plus), 410.

simularea funera, 410.

simul, Adv., 553; Prep., 592.

simulator, 553.

simus for summus, 29.

sin, 613.

sinatus for sen-, 200.

sincinia, 410.

sinciput, 141.

sine, 592; seii, 592.

Single Cons. for Double, 113 sqq.

singular for sign-, 66.

singuhi, 410.

sino, 471.

sins, Carn. Arv., 518 n.

siquidem, the scansion, 216.

sis for si vis, 52; sultis, Plur., 181.

sirempos(-e), 566.

sisto, 468; Perf. of, 503.

sive (see), 122, 600.

-so, Vb.-forms in, 462 sqq.

so- (se-), ‘this,’ 430.

so- for suo-, Poss., 426 sqq.

so-, O. Lat. Demonstr., 430, 432.

subrinus, 503.

sobrius, 592.

soc (-?), ‘ita,’ 432.

socer, 192, 227; -erus, 374.

soeinnus, 545.

sociofraudus, 430.

socius, 262.

socors, 592.

socrus, 344; -a, 343.

sodes, 265, 486.

Sofia, scansion of, 150.

soi, the scansion, 215.

soidus for -ild-, 185.

solea, 287.

solemnis for -ill-, 111.

solerae, ‘solidare,’ 288.

solinent, 531.

solidarium, 8.

solidus sum, Perf. Dep., 522.

solidum, 287.

solemmnus (-nn-), 70; -mpn-, 70; sole- 111.

solidicus, 361.

saliium, 407.
INDEX.

sollo-, 8, 16.
solaz, 354.
soluz, 287.
soloe, 592; -hui for -hvi, 48; -lutus, 260.
solus, 449.
somnium, 319.
sommolentus, spelling of, 192.
sommus, 227.
Sonant L, M, N, R (see L, M, N, R).
sonivoius, 323.
sowo, 488 w.
sonui, 506.
sopor, 227.
sordeo, 283; -psi for -hui, 509; -billo, 487.
sordere, -ere, 476.
sordes, 345.
sopor, 227.
sortus, P. P. P., 542.
sp-lengthens final vow., 131; isp- (see Prosthetic i).
sparsi, Perf., 505.
spatarius, 534.
species, decl. of, 346.
specio, 472; spi-, 23.
sperno, 472.
spes, 257, 345 w.
spica, spe-, 25.
Spiritus (see Breathing).
spondeo, 482; sponondi, 496; spe-
(sposp- ?), 503.
spongia (-ea), 22.
spus, 264.
-ss- for tt, 304, 309; for x, 102; reduced to s, 110 sqq.
-ssere, Inf., 465.
-(s)sim, Subj., 465.
-(s)so, Vb.-forms in, 462 sqq.; Perf. of, 506.
stā-, 'to stand,' 457.
Staccato pronunciation, 131.
stagnum, pronunc. of, 138.
stātim, 556; ste-, 15.
Statina, 349.
statod (Dven. inscr.), 519.
status, 221; as P. P. P. of sum, 542.
ste for iste, 435, 167.
stellio (-il-), 117.
stella, pronunc. of, 112.
Stem, Noun and Adj., 316 sqq.; suffix (see Suffixes); interchange of U- and O- stems, 343 sq.
sterīus, 338.
sterne, 470, 219; stratus, 219, 306.
stermin, 471.
sterquilinium, the spelling, 301.
stenoma for stat-, 15.
-stl, 2 Sg. Perf., 525.
stillicidium, spelling of, 112.
stitl, 487.
-tīngua, 471.
stipeniatum, 116.
stircus for -erc-, 20, 229.
stillarius, 219.
stis (scl-), 83, 307.
sto, decl. of, 457; steti, 501; Perf. in Romance, 509; status, 221, 542.
stolidus, 235.
storax, 37.
stramen, 279; stratus, 219.
stratna for -n-, 116.
strenuus, 323; -nim, 113.
Stress-Accent, 148 sqq.
strictin, 556.
strīdī, Perf., 502.
stringo, 229; strictus, 542.
strītus, O. Lat. for trīt-, 196.
Strong, Cases, 367; Root-grade (see Gradation).
struc, 345.
strufertiīi, 361.
stru, in Romance, 489.
struppus (-opp-), 58.
studeo, 476.
stultus, 235.
stupa (-pp-), 116.
stupida for stipula, 37.
suad, 'sic,' 611.
suada, spelling of, 115.
suadeo, 482, 259; pronunc., 53.
Svarabhaktio Vowel (see Parasitic).
suavisaviatio, 361.
suānsro, 545.
suānhaedi, 193.
sub, sus, Prep., 593; sub vos placo, 572.
subaediani, spelling of, 195.
subaxet (?), 508.
*subīo for sib-, 30.
Subjunctive (see Moods).
sublimen, 559; -is, 338.
subōles, 345.
Subordinate Words, 165 sqq.
subrigo, 545.
suaurantia, 361.
subricsi, 523.
THE LATIN LANGUAGE.

subtel, 199, 213.
subtemen (-segm-), 292, 70.
subter, 593; -tes, 561; Prep., 593.
subverbustus, 306.
subula, 334.
succedanea porae, 195.
succur, 260.
suces, 76; spelling of, 116.
sudus, 307.
suecso, 481.
sufflu, 267.

**Suffixes**

**Suffixless Stems**
(Noun, Adj.), 357 sqq.

*suftlo for sib-, 30.
sugo, 76.
Sulla, Sy-, 29, 36.
sultis, for si vultis, 181.
sun, 237; decl. of, 455 sqq.; enclitic, 167; Perf., 545; es, Imper., 518; sim, 514; simus for simul, 29; evo, 492; eram, 490; forem, 227, 545 n.; (e)st, Procopee, 121.
sunnannes, Hor., 507.
sunnus, 407; -opere, 362.
suno, -psi, 505; suremit, 505, 593; suremempt, 593.
suso, 264, 484 n.
suitorauria, 361.
supellex, decl. of, 367; -erl-, 97; -pp-, 118.
super, Prep., 593; Adj. (-rus), 374.
superbus, 590.
supercilium, 195.

**Superlative Degree** (see Comparison); i for u in, 189.
superne, 593.
superus (-per), 374.

**Supines, 538 sq.**
supparum (sip)-, 29.

**Suppression of Syll., e. g. ar(ci)cubii, 176 sq.**
supra, 593; -pera, 181, 593.
suremit, 505, 593; -psi, 593.
surgo, 178; surexi, 545, 555; suregit, 505; sortus, 542.
surpae, Perf., 178; surputus, 178.
sursum (-s), 549, 553.
(sus) -sus (-tus), P. P. P., 542.
sus, Prep. (see sub); susque deque, 593.
sus, sowe, 260.
suspicio, 225.
susstricti, Perf., 545.
susus, 426 sqq.; monosyll., 426 sqq.; O. Lat. so-, 426 sqq.
swē-, phon. change of, 227.

**Sylla, 29.**

**Syllable, Close** (see Close Syll.);
Division, 124 sqq.; First (see First Syll.); Suppression of (see Suppression; Syncope); Syllabic Writing, 12, 177.
sylva, the spelling, 11, 29.

**Syncope, 170 sqq., 150 sqq.; Praenesteine, 177; by old Accent-Law, 178 sqq.; final syll., 181 sqq.; pre-
tonic, 183 sqq.; post-tonic, 184 sqq.; final vow. (see Apocope); vow. in final syll., 203 sqq.

**Synizesis, 142 sqq.**

T, pronouce. of, 80 sqq.; and d, final, 76 sq.; phon. changes of, 283 sqq.;
for d bef. r, 285, 289.
T-particle (see Particles).
-t, 3 Sqg. 526 sqq.; vow. shortened bef., 214.
-ta of ita, &c., 552.
tables, 346.

**Tables, Twelve** (see Twelve).
taceo, 476.
t teaser, 289.
talis, 451.
talus, 293.
tam, 570; -me, Carm. Sal., 570; -elsi, 602; tanne, 602, 69.
tamen, 601; -elsi, 602.
INDEX.

tango, 471; tago, 464; tetigi, 495.
tangum, 570.
tantus, 451; -tidem, 571; -tisper, 562; -tunmodo, 554.
Tarennum, accent of, 155, 197.
tarpeissiâ, 104.
tata, 116 n., 363.
Tatpurushâ, Comp., 360 sq.
*taxilare, 482.
-te, 2 Pl. Imper., 529.
tector, pronunc. of, 139; -tem, 542.
Teceanessa, 64, 71, 145 sq.
ted, 423.
teges, 351.
tego, 303; teści, 505; pronunc. of, 139.
tegula, 318.
tela, 293.
Telesia, 287.
Telès for Thetis, 75.
telum, 293; -tê, 112.
-tem of item, &c., 552.
temere, 560.
temperi, spelling of, 192, 356.
temperies, 344.
temperint (?), 515.
tempestas, 342; -tus, O. Lat., 342.
templum, 565.
Tempsa, Teneșe, 181.
tendo, 486; -sus, 542.
tenebrae, 270.
teneo, 476; -tus, 542; tetini, 501.
tenor, tenus, 355.
Tense-Stems, 459 sqq.; Aor. and S., 459 sqq.; Pres., (1) Them. E-grade, 466 sqq.; (2) Redupl., 468; (3) Nasal, 469 sqq.; (4) Yo-, 472 sqq.; (5) Inceptive, 476 sq., 479 sqq.; (6) Causatives, 477, 481 sq.; (7) Desideratives, 478, 482, 484; (8) Iterative, 478, 482 sq.; (9) Deri-
vatives, 478, 483 sqq.; Stem-suf-
fixes, 478 sq., 486 sqq.; Impft. (Ind.
Subj.), 489 sqq.; Fut., 491 sqq.; Perf. (Ind. Subj.), 494 sqq.; (1) Redupl., 496 sq., 501 sqq.; (2) Un-
tendo for -mpt-, 70.
Tenues, (Lat.) pronunc. of, 71 sqq.;
(Gk.) Lat. trascr. of, 74 sq.;
tennis, 274; pronunc., 46, 174; -tûn, 144.
tenus, Prep., 593; bâchenus, &c., 569.
tenus, Noun, 355.
-ter, Adv., 549, 553.
ter, 412; scansion, 119; tenuis, 412.
terebra, 331.
teres, 331.
tergus, 302.
-terior (see Comparison).
terminus, 269; termo, 327.
ter, torii for trivi, 509.
torreo, 481.
terrimum, 362.
terrucius, 412.
tertius, 412; -o (-um), Adv. 559.
tesca (-qua), 337.
tesera for -ss-, 115.
testamentum, 277.
tetini, Perf., 501.
tetuli, Perf., 494, 497.
-th- for s, 58.
Thelis, for Thetis, 286.
Thematic, Conj. (see Verb); Vowel, 453.
thesaurus for thes-, 69, 136 n.
Theta (see Aspirates).
Third Pers., Sg. ending, 526 sqq.;
Pl., 529 sqq.
-ti- and -ci-, confused, 82 sqq.
tibi, spelling of, 423 (see tu).
tibicen, 364.
ticus (see Suffix -kO-).
tilâ, 225.
-tim, Adv., 548.
tingo, 225; tinctus, pronunc., 140.
tinnio, pronunc. of, 118; tinnitus (-no), 483.
-tinus, Adj. (see Suffix -NO-); Adv.
(see tenus).
tis, 2 Pl., 529.
tis, Gen., 423.
ticus (see Suffix -UO-).
Tmesis, 187, 573.
to-, 'this,' 430.
toga, 255.
Toidesiai, Dvenos inser., 305.
tolero, 498.
tolle, sustuli, 545.
tolutum, 556.
tondeo, 486; totondi, 496.
THE LATIN LANGUAGE.

**Tone-Accent**, 148 sqq.

- **toner**, 259.
- **tonguallatum**, 556.
- **topper**, 562.
- **torus**, 533 sqq.
- **torculus**, 300.
- **torium** (see Suffix -IO-).
- **tomentum**, 310.
- **torpedo (tido)**, 23.
- **torpeo**, 476.
- **torqueo**, 482; **torsi**, 310; **tortus**, 310.
- **torre**, 477.
- **torris**, 339.
- **tul**, 451; **tolidem**, 451, 571.
- **tote**, Fut. Imper., 517.
- **tulus**, 450; **-tt-**, 116.
- **tubus**, 451.
- **-tr-** for dr, 81, 289.
- **trāt-**, ‘to go through’, 458.
- **trabes**, 476.
- **Tars-**, 116.
- **tricuspid** (see Suffix -TRIC-), 259.
- **tripodare**, 568.
- **trees**, 489.
- **transmittus** (-msm-), 594.
- **transmarinus**, 362.
- **transstino**, 476.
- **Trasennennus** for Tars-, 97.
- **Trees**, gender of, 368.
- **tremo**, 499; **tremebit**, 494; **tremonti**, 530.
- **tres**, 412 sqq.; **trēs**, **trē**, 412; **tredécim**, 416; **trecenti** (-um), 418 sq.; **triginta**, 417 sqq.; accent., 165; **trienta** for trigi-,
- **tricuspus** (-us), 418; **tricesus** (-us), 418; **tricies** (-us), 418; **trinus**, 412; **triplus** (-us), 412.
- **tribunali** (e), 205.
- **tric**, 58, 116.
- **tric(h)ilinium** for tricl-, 94.
- **tricisus**, 409.
- **triginta dies**, accent. of, 169.
- **tripodare**, 256.
- **trippa**, 119.
- **tristis** for -is, 368.
- **tritius** (strit-), 196.
- **triumphus**, spelling of, 59.
- **Troja**, pronunciation of, 53.
- **tridus** for lano, 95.
- **trudis**, 338.
- **trudo**, 486.
- **-trum**, (see Suffix -TRO-); with e, 191.
- **-tt** for ct, 86, 89; by Sync., 284.

- **tu**, decl. of, 423 sq.
- **-tu**, 2 Sup., 538 sq.
- **tuber**, 270.
- **tubercum** (see Suffix -TUT(I)-, -D-).
- **tueor** (-uor), 476.
- **tudes**, 351.
- **tudo** (see Suffix -TUT(I)-, -D-).
- **tuli** (see fero).
- **tum**, 1 Sup., 538 sq.
- **tum**, 570; **tune**, 570.
- **tumba**, 36.
- **tundo**, **tutuli**, 496; **tunsi** (?), 471; **tunsus**, 471; **tundo** for lundo, 33.
- **tur**, 3 Sg. Pass., 534.
- **turba**, 239.
- **turbinis**, the scansion, 399.
- **tur dam**, 308.
- **turto**, Desider., 478.
- **turnus** for lto-, 31, 33.
- **turnus**, Fut. Inf., 537; Part., 540.
- **turteur**, 353.
- **tus**, 58.
- **Tuscus**, 278.
- **tudex**, Pron., 423 sq.
- **tudela**, spelling of, 115.
- **tundus**, 426 sq.; **monosyll.,** 426 sqq.

**Twelve Tables**, 7, 565.
- **tympanum** (typ-), 272.

**Tyrannio**, taught Accent., 151, 154.

-U, V, the letter, 3, 7 sq.; **V and WV**, 267 sq., 52; **wu** for **ū**, 10; **Gk.** (see Upsilon); U, **pronunc.,** 34 sq.; V, 44 sq.; **ū**-sound, 25 sq.; **L-Eur.**
- **-ā**, shortening of, 213; of **cornu**, &c., scansion, 377 sq.
- **ā-ī and l-ā**, e.g. **stupīda**, 37.
- **V-perfect** (see Tense-stems).
INDEX.

U-stems, blend with O-stems, 343
sq. (see Suffix -U-).

vado, 467.

vadum, 467.

vae, 618.

valde, 561; -ltd-, 174.

Valeri (Voc., Gen.), accent. of, 164.

vapor, 299.

vapula, 522.

Variation of Vowels (see Gradation).

varix, 279, 355.

Varro, i and ei, 9; deriv. of Gracus, 147 n.; on dicus, 244.

vas, a surety, 290.

vase, a vessel; vassa, Pl., 112.

vales, 346 sq.; 221; O. Lat. calius, 375.

vavitium, spelling of, 51.

ubba for obba, 33.

uber, 290, 250.

ubi, 567; -e, 25.

-ubris, e.g. lugubris, 196.

uc, Adv., 551.

-uus (see Suffix -KO-).

udis, 180.

-ta, Conj., 599; enclitic, 166 sq.

ve for vo, 228.

ve-, Prefix, 615.

veclus for -vel-, 83.

veclis, 341.

vegeo, 482, 296.

vegetus, 296, 335.

echo for viv, 22.

vehemos, vi-, 54, 57; -er, Adv., 554.

echo, 226; -eri, 499.

vel, 599 sq.

Velar Gutta. (see Gutt. Proper, Labio-
velar).

velaturn, 308.

velim (see rolo).

fell to v+, 29.

vellico, 488.

vello, older ro- (?), 228; -i, 502; vulsi, 509.

vellus, 266.

velar, 354.

velrahus for -trag-, 93.

velum, 333; -ll-, 112.

velo, 472, 488; -ditus, in Romance, 542.

veneficus, bene-, 51.

venenum, 326.

veno, 488, 539; -iri, 522.

venio, 473; veni, 500; Perf. in Romance, 509; -venat, 464; -venio, 274.

ventus, 251.

vexum, 539; -do, 472.

Venus, 356.

verpres, 346.


-5o, 475; atonic form of Simple Vb., 468; in -o, -co, 476; -urrio, 482; -uo, 484 n.; Onomat., 483; Compound, 485; in -attio, 488; -cinor, 488; -isse, 488; 1 Conj. predominant, 488; Noun-stem in -x, 490; Irreg., 545 sq.; Contracted Perf.-forms, V-perf., 506 sq.; S-perf., 508.

verberil (?), 515.

verbum, 290.

verecundus for -x, 202.

verecor, 473; verebamini (?), 202.

Verylius, spelling of, 23.

vermius, 310.

vermis, 339.

Verner's Law, 157.

vernus, 324.

vero (-e), 550.

verres, 277.

verro, 468; vo, 228; -ri, Perf., 502.

verruca, 277, 337.

Verrugo, 337.

-versus (-m), Adv., 549.

versus (-m), Prep., 595.

Verticordia, 361.

verlo, 266; ro-, 228; -ti, Perf., 502.

Vertumnus, 327.

verna, 301.

vernis, 266; -m, -o, Conj., 602; -o (-e),


vessp, 266.

vesper, 396.

vespernus, 324.

vestis, 395, 341.

veto, 288; vo-, 228.

retro, for -ter-, 184.

Veto, the scansion, 212.

vetus, 356; Compar., 407; veler, 356;

-tustus, 497.

Ufenina, 250.

-ago (see Suffix in Gutt.).

-ui (-avi), Perf., 506.

UI, pronunc. of, 39, 44; vi-, pronunc.,

29.
-vit, Syncope of, 171 sq., 180 sq.  
vix, 555; -dum, 614.  
ul- for li, 232; from l, 278 sq.  
ulicisor, ultus, 310.  
uligo, 287.  
ulis, see Suffix -LI-.  
ultus (-ultus), 115.  
ultus, 449; pronunc., 113.  
ultus, 279.  
ultus, 260, 170.  
uls, ultra, 594 sq.; pronunc., 142; -limum, 236.  
ulula, 363.  
ullo, 474.  
Ulysses (Ulices), 286, 200.  
-in (orum), Gen. Pl., 402.  
umbilicus, 283; imb-, 29.  
umbo, 283.  
umerus, 236; spelling, 56  
um, Adv., 561.  
Unaccented Vow., weakened (see Weakening); Syncope of (see Syncope).  
woco, 476.  
wuncus, 259.  
wode, 570; pronunc., 122.  
wundecim, 416; pronunc., 141.  
wundeviginti, 416.  
wundique, 570, 206.  
undus (-endus), Ger., 543.  
wunguis, 293.  
wunguo, 301; -nctus, pronunc., 140.  
wuncus, 337.  
wuniversus, 178; -sim, 554; oinuorsel, 178.  
Unomammia, Plaut., 364; Oinumama 193.  
wun, 554.  
wunguam, 570.  
wunus, 409 sq.; -quisque, 449.  
vo-, O. Lat. for ve-, 228.  
-vo- atonic changed to vu, 267.  
-w4, Vbs. in, 484 n.  
Vocative (see Declension); of 10-stems, accent., 163 sq.  
*rata, empty, 18.  
vocat, 18; voco for var, 15, 18.  
voco, 228.  
Voice (see Passive, Deponent).  
Voice-Stopes (see Mefi).  
Volaterrae, 228.  
-volo (in), 228.  
Volo, I wish, decl. of, 456 sq.; accent., 169; velim, 515; volam, 516; volimus, 456 n.; Inf. in Romance, 536.
INDEX.

vultur, 374.
Volumnus, 327; -nius, 228.
volutas, 541.
volup, 553.
voluptas, 342.
vorne, 267, 506 n, 228.
voire, 426.
voio, 301, 228.
voio (re-), 468, 228.
voire (re-), 467, 227.
vos, decl. of, 425 sq.

Vowel, Grades (see Gradation);
Quantity (see Quant., Shortening, Lengthening).
vox, 358.
upillo (op-), 34.
Upsilon, Lat. transcr. of, 4, 11, 36, 248.
upipa, 315, 363.
urbanus, 325.
urbs, 239; spelling, 78 sq.
urceus, 239.
urice, 239, 482.
urna, 310.
-urus (see Suffix -NO-).
uro, 466; ussi, 497; pronunc., 111; usus, pronunc., 255.
-urvo, Vbs. in, 482.
ursus, 239.
-us, Gen., e.g. Venerus, 384; decl. of Neuts. in, 355 sq. (see -rus, 2 Sq. Pass.).
usque, 571, 595.
usium for ost-, 34.
usuro, 173.
ut, 606, 605; accent., 166; uti, 607.
it, Noun, 289.
iter, Pron., 450; -que, 450.
iterus (-um), 369.
Utica, 37.
utinam, 605.
utor, 247; utarius, 534; ultimo, 112; ulula, 519.
usiate, Adv., 557.
usine, Adv., 570.
usine, Adv., 570.
uro, 568.
urbi, Adv., 567.
urum, Conj., 606.
-ult(o)io, Vbs. in, 488.

-utus, P. P. P., 542.
-uu- written for ő, 10.
-ůi, Perf., 508 sq.
ulge, 560.
ulthus, spelling of, 236.
ulipes, 346.
ulipinor, 472.
uultur, vulturus, 374.
-urus (see Suffix -UO-).
uxor, written uxor in MSS., 5.


Weak, Cases, 367; Grade of Root (see Gradation).

Weakening, of Atonic Vowel, 185 sqq., 148 sqq.; syll. long by Position, 191 sq; short syll., 194 sq.; bef. r, 192; bef. Lab., 192 sqq.; of Dipth., 195 sq.; of Dipth. in Hiatus, 196; of jì, vì, 196; o, u, i, 196 sq.; Gk. loanwords, 197 sq.; long vow. unweakened, 199; short, 198 sq; re-formation, 199 sq.; weakening in pretonic syll., 200; by Assimilation, 201; in final syll., 203 sqq. wel-, 'to wish,' 456 sq.

Wharton's Law, 159, 222.

Winds, gender of names, 369.

Word-Groups, 361 sq., 365; accent., 161 sqq., 169 sq.

X, the letter, 2, 5; written xs, ce, &c., 5; pronunc. of, 101 sqq.; -ss- for, 102 107; for (Gutt. with s, 291.
- (see Suffixes in Gutt.).

Y, the letter, 4, 11; Gk. (see Upsilon); Lat. expression of y-sound, 7 sq.; pronunc. of Lat. y, 34 sqq.; I.-Eur. Y, phon. changes of, 262 sqq.; Lat. y for i, u, 29 (see U).

Z, the letter, 4, 5 sq.; Gk. (see Zeta); pronunc. of, 101 sqq.; I.-Eur. Z, phon. changes of, 303 sqq.; Lat. ź for j, 49.

Zabulus, diaboulus, 105.
Zeta, Lat. transcr. of, 4, 11, 101, 104.

THE END.
Prof. Stolz has now published a *Lautlehre der lateinischen Sprache* (Leipz. 1894), giving the phonetic laws of Latin, (cf. chap. iv of this book) along with a general introduction to the study of the language.

p. 344. § 95. The new number of the *American Journal of Philology* (vol. xv. p. 194) has a paper by Mr. L. Horton-Smith, in which this view of the origin of the Gerundive -ndo- is supported by a strong array of arguments.

p. 153, l. 12 for *illé* read *illé*.


p. 235, l. 7 ab im. .. *on-* .. *ön-.*

p. 238, l. 9 ab im. .. *orbs* .. *orbis, late Lat. orbs.*

p. 242, l. 14 .. déveri .. déveri.

p. 276, l. 8 .. *cālāre* .. *calāre.*

p. 291, l. 11 ab im. .. *qenqāē* .. *pēnqāē.*

p. 356, l. 4 .. *modes-* .. *modes- (whence moderor).*

p. 415, l. 6 .. *sēnus* .. *sēnus.*

p. 420, l. 3 .. *eɡō* .. *eɡō.*

p. 420, l. 4 .. *eɡōm* .. *eɡōm.*

p. 528, l. 22 .. *sefaced* .. *sefaked.*

p. 551, l. 19 .. *U-stems* .. *Vow.-stems.*
**SELECT LIST OF STANDARD WORKS.**

**STANDARD LATIN WORKS**  Page 1

**STANDARD GREEK WORKS**  Page 3

**MISCELLANEOUS STANDARD WORKS**  Page 7

**STANDARD THEOLOGICAL WORKS**  Page 8

**NEW ENGLISH DICTIONARY**  Page 8

---

### 1. STANDARD LATIN WORKS.

- **Avianus.** *The Fables.* Edited, with Prolegomena, Critical Apparatus, Commentary, &c., by Robinson Ellis, M.A., LL.D. 8vo. 8s. 6d.

- **Catulli Veronensis Liber.** Iterum recognovit, Apparatum Criticum Prolegomena Appendices addidit, R. Ellis, A.M. 8vo. 16s.

- **Catullus, a Commentary on.** By Robinson Ellis, M.A. Second Edition. 8vo. 18s.

  
  Also, separately,
  
  Book I. 7s. 6d.  
  Book II. 5s.  
  Book III. 6s.

- **Philippic Orations.** With Notes. By J.R. King, M.A. Second Edition. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

- **Pro Milone.** Edited by A.C. Clark, M.A. 8vo. 8s. 6d.

---

- **Cicero. Select Letters.** With English Introductions, Notes, and Appendices. By Albert Watson, M.A. Fourth Edition. 8vo. 18s.

  
  
  Vol. II. The Satires, Epistles, and De Arte Poetica. 8vo. 12s.


- **Merry. Selected Fragments of Roman Poetry.** Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by W.W. Merry, D.D. Crown 8vo. 6s. 6d.

---

Aristophanes. *A Complete Concordance to the Comedies and Fragments.* By H. Dunbar, M.D. 4to. 11. 1s.

--- *Comoediae et Fragmenta,* ex recensione Guili. Dindorfii. Tomi II. 8vo. 11s.

--- *Annotationes Guili. Dindorfii.* Partes II. 8vo. 11s.

--- *Scholia Graeca ex Codicibus aucta et emendata Guili. Dindorfii.* Partes III. 8vo. 11.

--- *In Single Plays.* Edited, with English Notes, Introductions, &c., by W. W. Merry, D.D. Extra fcap. 8vo.

The Acharnians. *Third Edition,* 3s. 6d.

The Birds. 3s. 6d.


The Wasps. 3s. 6d.

Aristotle. *Ex recensione Im. Bekkeri.* Accedunt Indices Sylburgiani. Tomi XI. 8vo. 2l. 10s.

The volumes (except Vols. I and IX) may behav separate, price 5s. 6d. each.

--- *Ethica Nicomachea,* recognit brevique Adnotatione critica instruxit I. Bywater. 8vo. 6s.

*Also in crown 8vo, paper cover, 3s. 6d.*

--- Contributions to the Textual Criticism of the Nicomachean Ethics. By I. Bywater. 2s. 6d.

--- Notes on the Nicomachean Ethics. By J. A. Stewart, M.A. 2 vols. 8vo. 32s.


--- *The Politics,* translated into English, with Introduction, Marginal Analysis, Notes, and Indices, by B. Jowett, M.A. Medium 8vo. 2 vols. 21s.

Aristotle. *Aristotelian Studies.*

I. On the Structure of the Seventh Book of the Nicomachean Ethics. By J. C. Wilson, M.A. 8vo, stiff covers, 5s.

--- *The English Manuscripts of the Nicomachean Ethics, described in relation to Bekker's Manuscripts and other Sources.* By J. A. Stewart, M.A. (Anecdota Oxon.) Small 4to. 3s. 6d.

--- *On the History of the process by which the Aristotelian Writings arrived at their present form.* By R. Shute, M.A. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

--- *Physics.* Pook VII.

Collation of various mss.; with Introduction by R. Shute, M.A. (Anecdota Oxon.) Small 4to. 2s.


Demosthenes. *Ex recensione G. Dindorfii.* Tomi IX. 8vo. 2l. 6s.

*Separately:*—

Text, 11. 1s. Annotations, 15s.

Scholia, 10s.

Demosthenes and Aeschines.


Demosthenes. *Orations against Philip.* With Introduction and Notes, by Evelyn Abbott, M.A., and P. E. Matheson, M.A.

Vol. I. Philippic I. Olynthiaca I–III. Extra fcap. 8vo. 3s.

Vol. II. De Pace, Philippic II.

De Chersoneso, Philippic III. Extra fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

| Scholia Graeca, ex Codicibus auta et emendata a Guili. Dindorfio. Tomi IV. 8vo. 1l. 16s. |
| Homer. Odyssea, ex rec. G. Dindorfii. 8vo. 5s. 6d. |
| — Scholia Graeca in Odysseam. Edidit Guili. Dindorfius. Tomi II. 8vo. 15s. 6d. |
| Oratores Attici, ex recensione Bekkeri: I. Antiphon, Andocides, et Lysias. 8vo. 7s. II. Isocrates. 8vo. 7s. III. Isaeus, Aeschines, Lycurgus, Dinarchus, &c. 8vo. 7s. |
| Poromeiographi Graeci, quorum pars nunc primum ex Cod. mss. vulgatur. Edidit T. Gaisford, S.T.P. 1836. 8vo. 5s. 6d. |
| Plato. Apology, with a revised Text and English Notes, and a Digest of Platonic Idioms, by James Riddell, M.A. 8vo. 8s. 6d. |
| — Philebus, with a revised Text and English Notes, by Edward Poste, M.A. 8vo. 7s. 6d. |
| — Republic. The Greek Text. Edited, with Notes and Essays, by the late B. Jowett, M.A. and Lewis Campbell, M.A. In three vols. Medium 8vo. 2l. 2s. |
| — Sophistes and Politicus, with a revised Text and English Notes, by L. Campbell, M.A. 8vo. 18s. |
Plato. Theaetetus, with a revised Text and English Notes, by L. Campbell, M.A. Second Edition. 8vo. 12s. 6d.

— The Dialogues, translated into English, with Analyses and Introductions, by B. Jowett, M.A. Third Edition. 5 vols. medium 8vo. Cloth, 4l. 4s.; half-morocco, 5l.

— The Republic, translated into English, with Analysis and Introduction, by B. Jowett, M.A. Medium 8vo. 12s. 6d.; half-roan, 14s.


I. The Apology, 2s. 6d.

II. Crito, 2s. III. Meno, 2s. 6d.


Plotinus. Edidit F. Creuzer. Tomi III. 4to. 1l. 8s.


Plutarchi Moralia, id est, Opera, exceptis Vitis, reliqua. Edidit Daniel Wytenbach. Accedit Index Graecitatis. Tomi VIII. Partes XV. 1795–1830. 8vo, cloth, 3l. 10s.

Sophocles. The Plays and Fragments. With English Notes and Introductions, by Lewis Campbell, M.A. 2 vols. 8vo, 16s. each.


— Tragoediae et Fragmenta cum Annotationibus Gul. Dindorfii. Tomi II. 8vo. 10s. The Text, Vol. I. 5s. 6d. The Notes, Vol. II. 4s. 6d.


Theodorei Graecarum Affectionum Curatio. Ad Codices mss. recensuit T. Gaisford, S.T.P. 8vo. 7s. 6d.


Expeditio Cyri. Second Edition. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Institutio Cyri. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Memorabiliæ Socratii. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Opuscula Politica Equestria et Venatica cum Arriani Libello de Venatione. 8vo. 10s. 6d.
3. MISCELLANEOUS

Arbuthnot. The Life and Works of John Arbuthnot. By George A. Aitken. 8vo, cloth extra, with Portrait, 16s.

Bacon. The Essays. Edited with Introduction and Illustrative Notes, by S. H. Reynolds, M.A. 8vo, half-bound, 12s. 6d.


Finlay. A History of Greece from its Conquest by the Romans to the present time, B.C. 146 to A.D. 1864. By George Finlay, LL.D. A new Edition, revised throughout, and in part re-written, with considerable additions by the Author, and edited by H. F. Tozer, M.A. 7 vols. 8vo. 3l. 10s.

Gaii Institutionum Juris Civilis Commentarii Quattuor; or, Elements of Roman Law by Gaius. With a Translation and Commentary by Edward Poste, M.A. Third Edition. 8vo. 18s.

Fragmenta Herculanensia. A Descriptive Catalogue of the Oxford copies of the Herculanean Rolls, together with the texts of several papyri, accompanied by facsimiles. Edited by Walter Scott, M.A., Fellow of Merton College, Oxford. Royal 8vo. 21s.


Pattison. Essays by the late Mark Pattison, sometime Rector of Lincoln College. Collected and Arranged by Henry Nettleship, M.A. 2 vols. 8vo. 24s.

Ralegh. Sir Walter Ralegh. A Biography. By W. Stebbing, M.A. 8vo. 10s. 6d.


Selden. The Tattle Talk of John Selden. Edited, with an Introduction and Notes, by Samuel Harvey Reynolds, M.A. 8vo, half-roan, 8s. 6d.


Strachey. Hastings and The Rohilla War. By Sir John Strachey, G.C.S.I. 8vo, cloth, 10s. 6d.

Thomson. Notes on Recent Researches in Electricity and Magnetism, intended as a sequel to Professor Clerk Maxwell's 'Treatise on Electricity and Magnetism.' By J. J. Thomson, M.A., F.R.S., Professor of Experimental Physics in the University of Cambridge. 8vo. 18s. 6d.
4. STANDARD THEOLOGICAL WORKS.


Bigg. The Christian Platonists of Alexandria; being the Bampton Lectures for 1886. By Charles Bigg, D.D. 8vo. 10s. 6d.


The Book of Enoch. Translated from Dillmann's Ethiopic Text (emended and revised), and Edited by R. H. Charles, M.A. 8vo. 16s.

Parts I–IV. 8vo. 21s. each.
Part V. Immediately.

Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica. Essays in Biblical and Patristic Criticism, and kindred subjects. By Members of the University of Oxford. 8vo.
Vol. I. 10s. 6d. Vol. II. 12s. 6d.
Vol. III. 16s. Vol. IV. 12s. 6d.

5. A NEW ENGLISH DICTIONARY on Historical Principles, founded mainly on the materials collected by the Philological Society. Imperial 4to.

Present State of the Work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vol. I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Half-morocco</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Half-morocco</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D—Deceit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deceit—Deject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deject—Depravation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Depravative—Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Development—Diffuency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diffuent—Disburden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(The remainder of the Letter D is far advanced.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Everybody—Ezod</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fanged—Fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fee—Field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Field—Fish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(The remainder of the Letter F is far advanced.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Everybody—Ezod</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fanged—Fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fee—Field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Field—Fish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(The remainder of the Letter G is far advanced.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To be edited by Mr. Henry Bradley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In Preparation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Oxford
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS
LONDON: HENRY FROWDE
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE, AMEN CORNER, E.C.